MAR 1 1948

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 80th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 93—PART 6

JUNE 12, 1947, TO JULY 2, 1947
(PAGES 6851 TO 8178)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1947

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

LAW LIBRARY
FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 80th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 12, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. James D. Bryden, assistant minister of the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our God, we confess that we need Thee in the affairs of our country, and do believe that our highest concerns are Thine also. Therefore, we pray, bless the Senate of the United States with light upon the issues here considered. Save us from the old lie that selfishness runs the world, and teach us so to read history that we may never forget that selfishness ruins what it touches.

Promote in us true concern to do Thy will and inform us of its meaning in the daily round of business. Help us as individuals, that we may have margins of strength around our necessities and inner resources more than sufficient to do our duty.

May no darkness hide Thee from us, nor light beguile us ever to forget Thee.

Hear our prayer, for Thy mercy's sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, June 11, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSIONS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands and a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I make a similar unanimous-consent request that the subcommittee that is engaged in hearings today on proposed legislation against discrimination in employment may be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Morse
Baldwin	Hawkes	Murray
Ball	Hayden	Myers
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Brewster	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Hoey	Pepper
Bridges	Holland	Reed
Brooks	Ives	Revercomb
Buck	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Byrd	Kem	Saltonstall
Cain	Kilgore	Smith
Capper	Knowland	Sparkman
Chavez	Langer	Stewart
Connally	Lodge	Taft
Cooper	Lucas	Taylor
Cordon	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McClellan	Tobey
Downey	McFarland	Tydings
Dworshak	McGrath	Umstead
Ecton	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ellender	McMahon	Watkins
Ferguson	Magnuson	Wherry
Flanders	Malone	White
Fulbright	Martin	Wiley
George	Maybank	Williams
Green	Millikin	Wilson
Gurney	Moore	Young

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-seven Senators having responded to their names, a quorum is present.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be granted permission to be absent from the Senate tomorrow and Monday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR WALSH, OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I regretfully announce the death of former Senator David I. Walsh. In his passing Massachusetts has lost a worthy and distinguished son, and every Member of this body who served with him at any time during the course of his long and notable career in the Senate has lost a warm and sympathetic friend. His many years of faithful public service to his State and to his country, his profound knowledge of government, his courage and good humor endeared him to his colleagues in Congress as they won for him many close friends in Massachusetts. We all deeply regret his passing. I personally have lost a friend.

Senator Walsh's death ended an outstanding political career, steeped in the best American tradition. The son of immigrant parents of the most modest means, he became a prominent figure in Massachusetts political life at an early age. As one of the youngest men ever to hold that office, he served as Governor of Massachusetts for two terms and was then sent to the United States Senate, where he served 26 years. He could always be counted upon to give a helping hand on matters affecting the welfare of the citizens of his native State and of the Nation, irrespective of party differences.

Senator Walsh, the long-time chairman of the Senate Naval Affairs Committee, will always be remembered as a champion of a strong navy, particularly during the period of the last war when the Navy was our first line of defense.

His contribution to the establishment of the selective-service program and to other high-level policy decisions which helped us win the war highlights his long record of public service. The Navy has lost a good friend and loyal adviser and the Nation an able public servant and fine citizen.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I know that all Members of the Senate were sincerely grieved at the news of the death of Hon. David I. Walsh in Boston yesterday. His career, so full of success and accomplishment, will long be remembered and appreciated. He was repeatedly honored by the people of Massachusetts and had served them in the legislature, as Lieutenant Governor, as Governor, as delegate to the Constitutional Convention, as delegate to many Democratic national conventions, and as United States Senator, where he served for 26 years, and for more than half of that period he was chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee.

It would be impossible to enumerate here all the great questions in which he was involved and all the important contributions which he made to the Nation's welfare during his long and active life, but it is appropriate to recall that one phrase in the Constitution which especially appealed to him was the admonition "to establish justice." This was a watchword with him, as I know from

frequent personal association—an association of which I shall ever keep a valued and pleasant memory.

He will also be remembered because he sought ever to unify the people and shunned efforts to split up Americans along lines of race or creed or color. In his Senate work he was conscientious, industrious, and earnest. In his outlook on life he was tolerant, broad minded, and humane. He was completely and deeply American.

My heartfelt sympathy goes out to the members of his family. I trust that their thought of his years of service to his fellow men will be a source of strength and comfort to them.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I cannot let this moment pass without joining the two Senators from Massachusetts in a word of tribute to our late colleague, Senator Walsh. I served here with him during most of his long tenure in the Senate, in which he preceded me by a short period. During the time when I, and many others of us, if not most of us, served together with Senator Walsh, we experienced and were compelled to become participants in some of the most tragic events in the history of the world. Never during his long service did Senator Walsh desert his own conception of what it was his duty to do in any great crisis that affected his country. He was a man of strong convictions. He was a man who believed in the traditions of American history, and he never hesitated to stand by his own convictions, no matter what the political implications might be or what the political advantages to him or to his party might be considered to be.

It fell to my lot in my service in the Senate to serve with him for a long time on the Committee on Finance, to which he devoted a great deal of his attention, and in whose problems he was tremendously interested, which problems he mastered in large measure in the consideration of fiscal policy both in times of peace and in the days of war. In association with him, not only in that committee but in the Senate and in other relationships between us, I learned to admire his courage, his sincerity, his fidelity, and also his gentility and his deep sympathy for what we might call the underdog in the social and economic strata of our great people.

He was warm-hearted, forceful in debate, sincere in his friendships, and had a deep sense of appreciation and gratitude to those who conferred their friendship and their confidence upon him.

I mourn his death as a personal loss. I express to his friends and family my deep condolence, with the assurance that his memory and his high qualities will long endure with all who served with him and who knew him during his lifetime.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should like to add a brief word of respect tribute upon the passing of Senator Walsh.

During almost my entire service in the Senate I served with him on the Committee on Naval Affairs. From 1932 onward he was the chairman of that committee, and during most of that period I was the ranking majority member. He was very attentive to his duties as chairman of that committee. He had a wide comprehension of naval needs and a thorough understanding of the importance of the duties which devolved upon him as chairman of that committee through the critical years preceding and during World War II.

He was a kindly man, of judicial temperament. I doubt if there was ever a committee of the Congress which held a higher regard for the tolerance and fairness of its chairman than was held by all the members of that committee for Senator Walsh during the 15 or more years he served as chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs.

I think it can be said in measured words that the great record made by our Navy during the course of World War II was to a very large extent due to the foresight, the painstaking effort, and the splendid leadership of David I. Walsh as chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate. He helped to prepare the Navy for its great task in World War II. The people of Massachusetts have every reason to be proud of the service he rendered here, particularly as chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs. With his passing the Navy has lost one of the best friends it ever had.

We in the Senate join with Massachusetts and with the members of his family in lamenting his passing, but are comforted with the thought that he lived a full life and left his mark upon the history of our time, and particularly upon the greatness of the United States Navy.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with Senators who have spoken so kindly of David I. Walsh. I was acquainted with him for a period of about 30 years. Everything that has been said about him is true. Knowing him as well as we did, we can repeat the words of Shakespeare when he spoke of the dead king: "After life's fitful fever he sleeps well."

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in eulogizing the memory of our late colleague the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, David I. Walsh. I was closely associated with him from the time I first came to the Senate. I have in my memory a very vivid recollection of his ability, of his sympathy for the ordinary man, and of the splendid work which he performed in this body.

I feel that I have lost one of my very sincere friends. I join my colleagues in expressing our great regret at his passing.

RATIFICATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TERM OF OFFICE OF PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate certified copies of joint resolutions of the Legislatures of the States of Nebraska and Delaware ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the term of the office of the President, which were ordered to lie on the table.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AUDIT REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION AND AFFILIATED COMPANIES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and affiliated companies, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

MAXIMUM PRICE OF MOTOR VEHICLES PURCHASED FOR USE IN PHILIPPINES

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to waive the maximum price limitations with respect to certain passenger motor vehicles purchased by the Public Health Service for use in the Philippine rehabilitation program (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

AUTHORITY FOR PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE TO MAKE CERTAIN EXPENDITURES

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Public Health Service Act to permit certain expenditures, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PETITION AND MEMORIAL

A petition and a memorial were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the Maryland State and District of Columbia Federation of Labor, at Baltimore, Md., requesting the President of the United States to veto the so-called Taft-Hartley labor bill; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. MORSE:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Public Lands:

"House Joint Memorial 21

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress Assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Oregon, in the forty-fourth regular session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas many Indians from various tribes gather at and in the vicinity of Celilo Falls on the Columbia River, located in Wasco County, State of Oregon, to fish at said Celilo Falls on said Columbia River and elsewhere; and

"Whereas these rights of the Indians to fish have existed and have been continued and maintained for many generations, and granted to said Indians under the treaty of June 9, 1855, with the Government of the United States of America and otherwise, and are the principal source of livelihood and food for many of said Indians; and

"Whereas said fishing operations by said Indians are a valuable source of attraction to thousands of motorists and tourists annually as they drive along the Columbia River Highway, since these fishing grounds are adjacent to said highway, and said motorists and tourists usually stop and view and visit them; and

"Whereas the present buildings for many years past used by said Indians at said Celilo Falls are entirely inadequate, insanitary, unsightly, and very dangerous not only to said Indians who are compelled to use them, but also to the traveling public, and are without sewer connections or disposal or water supply whatsoever, which leaves a bad impression on out-of-State tourists as well as to jeopardize the health and welfare of said Indians who must dwell there; and

"Whereas the United States Department of Indian Affairs is the appropriate and responsible governmental agency to relieve and remedy this deplorable and long-endured situation; and

"Whereas the Columbia River Indians have long lived at Celilo Village and are without any reservation such as other Indian tribes enjoy and their long and continued residence there makes them familiar with conditions at and near Celilo Falls and Celilo Village: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the senate jointly concurring), That we, your memorialists, the Forty-fourth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, hereby do petition and request the Congress of the United States of America to take the proper steps to immediately have removed the shacks and filth in the present Indian quarter on that certain 7½ acres of Government land at Celilo Village in said county and State, and to have properly and adequately constructed, suitable, and appropriate buildings and dwellings for the use of said Indians, as well as an adequate pure and sanitary water supply; also an adequate sewer system and/or sewage-disposal system to take care of each building and/or dwelling, as well as properly equipped rest rooms, containing wash basins, urinals, toilets, and shower baths, for the use of both said Indian village as well as the tourists and general public on the adjacent Columbia River Highway.

"Adopted by house April 3, 1947.

"Adopted by senate April 4, 1947."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GURNEY, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 1218. A bill to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military Establishment of the United States; with amendments (Rept. No. 262).

By Mr. BRICKER, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. J. Res. 125. Joint resolution to strengthen the common defense and to meet industrial needs for tin by providing for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry; without amendment (Rept. No. 263).

By Mr. REED, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 1297. A bill to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act; with an amendment (Rept. No. 264).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate oil compact to conserve oil and gas; without amendment (Rept. No. 265).

By Mr. VANDENBERG, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. J. Res. 124. Joint resolution to enable the President to utilize the appropriations for United States participation in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration for meeting administrative expenses of United States Government agencies in connection with United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration liquidation; without amendment (Rept. No. 266).

By Mr. TAFT, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. 1056. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, so as to permit adjustment of benefits authorized by section 1506 thereof and similar benefits extended by governments allied with the United States in World War II; with amendments (Rept. No. 267);

S. 1392. A bill to prescribe certain dates for the purpose of determining eligibility of veterans for vocational rehabilitation, and for education, training, guaranty of loans, and readjustment allowances under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 268); and

H. R. 2368. A bill to amend paragraph 8 of part VII, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to authorize an appropriation of $3,000,000 as a revolving fund in lieu of $1,500,000 now authorized, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 269).

CONTRIBUTIONS TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS ON ACCOUNT OF NONTAXABLE FEDERAL LANDS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. CORDON, from the Committee on Public Lands, submitted a report of an investigation of contributions to local governments on account of nontaxable Federal lands, which was ordered to be printed as Senate Report No. 270.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. LANGER, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

PRINTING OF REPORT ON PAONIA FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECT, COLORADO (S. DOC. NO. 61)

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present a report on the Paonia Federal reclamation project, Colorado, by the regional director of the Bureau of Reclamation, region 4, as concurred in by the Commissioner of Reclamation and the Secretary of the Interior, and I request that it be printed as a Senate document, with an illustration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a report for the month of April 1947, from the chairman of a certain committee, in response to Senate Resolution 319 (78th Cong.), relative to persons employed by committees who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPECIAL COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM,
June 1947.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the name of a person employed by the committee who is not a full-time employee of the Senate or of the committee for the month of April 1947, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

W. Harold Lane to April 18, 1947, 1436 North Inglewood Arlington, Va., Bureau of Internal Revenue; annual salary $7,102.20.

OWEN BREWSTER,
Chairman.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

John Price Gregg, of Oregon, to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission for the term expiring June 16, 1953 (reappointment).

By Mr. WHITE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Sundry employees for promotion in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

By Mr. TAFT, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Sundry candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 1431. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Edna Mary Jakimowicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. BUTLER introduced Senate bill 1432, to provide for the sale for domestic use of certain fertilizer produced in plants operated by the War Department, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BREWSTER (by request):

S. 1433. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Temporary National Air Policy Board; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 1434. A bill for the relief of Royal C. Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1435. A bill to establish a commission to determine the competency of members of the Crow Indian Tribe; to the Committee on Public Lands.

(Mr. JENNER introduced Senate Joint Resolution 128, to provide for designation of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Fort Wayne, Ind., as the "Thomas Lau Suedhoff Memorial Hospital," which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

DOMESTIC USE OF CERTAIN FERTILIZER

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the sale for domestic use of certain fertilizer produced in plants operated by the War Department.

This bill is designed to help meet the urgent needs of American farmers in the Middle West and elsewhere for some additional supplies of fertilizer for the current season.

In my own State of Nebraska the Army is at present manufacturing fertilizer, and then shipping it thousands of miles across land and water to the countries occupied by American armed forces. At the very same time, there is an urgent need for additional fertilizer by the farmers of Nebraska and other States. The farmers feel that they have produced to the limit all during the war and have seriously depleted the fertility of their soils by doing so. Now they are still being asked to continue this maximum production to feed the starving people of foreign countries, but at the same time the fertilizer they must have for this production is being taken away from them and shipped abroad. During the war they could understand the necessity for doing without. Now the war has been over almost 2 years. They realize our responsibilities to foreign countries; but they feel that they, too, should receive some consideration.

I have taken this problem up with a number of Government officials, requesting that some steps be taken to meet this pressing need at home. In particular, I have suggested that just 1 or 2

weeks of the output of the Grand Island, Nebr., plant should be made available to our farmers. I have pointed out that our need is particularly urgent during this next month, and I have suggested that if we could have a small additional supply right now we would gladly agree to accepting it on a loan basis with repayment of equivalent quantities to the foreign-assistance program later on. Dr. Steelman and the others with whom I have talked have given me a courteous hearing, but have categorically refused to accept any of my proposals.

For that reason, I am introducing this bill which would require diversion of only 2 weeks of the Army output to American agriculture. I hope it will be possible for the bill to receive prompt consideration.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1432) to provide for the sale for domestic use of certain fertilizer produced in plants operated by the War Department, introduced by Mr. BUTLER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

DESIGNATION OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL, FORT WAYNE, IND., AS THOMAS LAU SUEDHOFF MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution to provide for designation of the Veterans' Administration Hospital at Fort Wayne, Ind., as the Thomas Lau Suedhoff Memorial Hospital, and I request consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the David Parrish Post, No. 296, the American Legion, Department of Indiana, endorsing the joint resolution I have just introduced.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the resolution will be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 128) to provide for designation of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Fort Wayne, Ind., as the Thomas Lau Suedhoff Memorial Hospital, introduced by Mr. JENNER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The resolution presented by Mr. JENNER was received, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there is to be established a veterans' hospital in Fort Wayne, Allen County, Ind., and such hospital will have the status of a memorial hospital bearing the name of a dead comrade; and

Whereas this American Legion post believes that said memorial hospital should be named after one of Fort Wayne's own war dead; and

Whereas Staff Sgt. Thomas Lau Suedhoff died on October 13, 1944, a hero's death as a result of wounds received in combat La Region De Lyon while establishing a road block on a main highway on the east side of the Rhone River near Valence, France, and who was many times decorated for heroic and meritorious service, and who was the first soldier of World War II from Indiana to receive a Bronze Star, and who received many other decorations, including the Silver Star, Purple Heart, Combat Infantry Badge, Good Conduct Medal, Croix de Guerre Bronze Star, Presidential citation with extra cluster, and Bronze Arrowhead for D-day spearheading in southern France; and

Whereas David Parrish Post, No. 296, the American Legion, Department of Indiana, is proud to remember Staff Sgt. Thomas Lau Suedhoff as a gallant and brave soldier who gave everything for his country, and who made the supreme sacrifice: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That David Parrish Post, No. 296, the American Legion, Department of Indiana, go on record recommending that said veterans' hospital to be erected in Fort Wayne, Ind., be named the Thomas Lau Suedhoff Memorial Hospital;

That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this organization and that copies be forwarded to Senators and Representatives from the State of Indiana.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN AGREEMENTS BETWEEN CARRIERS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. TAYLOR submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 110) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, AND JUDICIARY—AMENDMENT

Mr. GREEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3311) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 4, between lines 15 and 16, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"North Atlantic fisheries: For necessary expenses of surveys, discussions, and other preliminary activities incident to the negotiation of an international agreement relating to conservation of the North Atlantic fisheries, $25,000."

FLOOD DISASTERS IN THE MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, during the past few days the press of the Nation has been graphically describing a flood story of stark tragedy, human suffering, destruction of property, and destruction of the agricultural business, and industrial life in the great Missouri River Basin. Flood disasters in the Missouri Valley have been recurring with such frequency that we outside the valley take the news as a matter of course. We in the Congress are not quickened into action as we should be by the tragic report which came over the Associated Press wire yesterday in the following words:

HANNIBAL, MO., June 9.—Spilling over levees at several points, the Mississippi River and its tributaries surged to record high levels and left an estimated 22,240 persons homeless in a four-State area. Approximately 26,000 acres of farm land between Wapello, Iowa, and St. Louis were under water, and an additional 120,000 acres on the Illinois side were threatened with inundation. Rail traffic between St. Louis and Burlington, Iowa, had been halted, and highways were closed in flood areas along the river. * * * The American Red Cross had 50 staff workers and about 600 volunteers in the flooded area.

And the following report appears in this morning's paper:

ST. LOUIS, June 11.—The prospect of additional rain in the Missouri River watershed worsened the outlook along the flooding river in central Missouri today. * * * Army engineers, Government agencies, and the Red Cross estimated the Missouri and the Mississippi already had flooded 1,000,000 acres in the two States (Missouri and northern Illinois), adding 5,700 homeless to the total of 18,500 driven from their homes by other floods in Iowa and Nebraska. Further inundation was predicted as the Missouri and Mississippi crests moved toward the confluence of the two rivers about 20 miles north of here.

Mr. President, much is hidden from us by this short, terse description of the devastating flood now sweeping uncontrolled down the tributaries of the upper Mississippi and Missouri, rushing at torrent speed down the high-diked channel of the main river, breaking levees and carrying before it human beings, livestock, farm buildings, machinery, provisions, feed, newly planted crops and costly fertilizer, and worst of all, washing off the valuable productive topsoil of hundreds of thousands of acres, destroying the lifetime toil of thousands of good, honest, hardworking and frugal American citizens.

Let such a report come to us from war-ravaged Europe these days, and Congress would spring into action and send aid to the stricken area to meet the calamity. But such disaster may come again and again to that vast area of the Missouri-Mississippi Basin, and the Congress of the United States and its committees, satiated with the propaganda of the interests who for years have blocked solutions, seem to accept the news as relating just another horrifying chapter in the long history of flood tragedies inflicted on that sadly neglected region—a region which through sound integrated planning of river development and flood control could be a great, rich, well-balanced inland empire safe and secure from such recurring disasters.

When we realize that this problem of controlling the floods, conserving the soil, reclaiming the lands, and developing the resources of that area, it is clear that the Congress and the Government of the United States are collectively responsible for providing a program to prevent the destruction visited upon our fellow citizens in the Missouri River Basin. It has long been within our power to take the necessary steps to make such recurring floods impossible. We could have enacted legislation as proposed in the Missouri Valley Authority bill, S. 1156, and its predecessors offered for the past several years, which would have developed a unified program of flood control and river-basin development for the whole Missouri River area.

Instead, we have deliberately chosen to ignore the interrelated character of the problem and proceeded in the antiquated and discredited piecemeal method of divided responsibility. We meet the emergencies as they come and have no long-range, completely integrated

method of treating the river as a single entire problem. We order the Army engineers to build main-stream dams and levees to prevent floods which are largely uncontrollable when once they have begun to rush on down the main river. We order the Bureau of Reclamation to build upstream dams and carry on irrigation works calculated to store waters and use them on the land irrespective of the effect of that program on the downstream conditions producing floods and destruction. But we provide in no way for the unification of their efforts.

No one agency is responsible for really effective flood control. That control begins away back on the land where each drop of water should be controlled and utilized, but here the Army engineers have no responsibility or authority and no professional interest. Neither has the Bureau of Reclamation, for that agency is not in the business of assisting farmers to so organize their pattern of crops and soil-erosion control as to prevent harmful water run-offs.

Nor can either agency conduct forestation and reforestation programs which are essential to the prevention of floods, for this work is the sole responsibility of the Department of Agriculture. But that Department is hindered in accomplishing these essential purposes by meager budgets, and by lack of any comprehensive unified program of action. It consequently makes relatively feeble thrusts at the land, accomplishing on an infinitesimal scale what would have to be projected many thousandfold to be sufficient to do its part in preventing floods.

But the real reason why floods go on unabated, why loss of life and property in the Missouri Valley occurs so often, is that we have not taken the steps to appropriate adequate funds and tie together the abilities and resources of these several Federal agencies in a unified program under a single authority with power to reconcile their several interests, and combine their diverse activities into an effective attack on flood control.

I repeat again, no piecemeal methods, no emergency attacks on this horrible destructive monster, flood, will bring raging waters under control.

Flood-controlled rivers can be the Nation's greatest asset. Their full control can never be achieved by continuing the present program of building dams and levees in the main river channel. As has been amply proved by the experience in the TVA, to control water it is essential to start way back from the rivers and their main tributaries, up on the hills and slopes where the raindrops fall. It is there where raindrops exert their first influence on the land, where they begin to collect to form run-off. And it is there that the first important steps must be taken to prevent floods, to turn these raindrops into benefits to mankind.

Combine a program of land, forest, and water conservation with a system of check dams on the smaller tributaries and multiple-purpose dams on the larger streams and waters will flow downstream under control, no matter what the vagaries of climate and Nature may attempt to dictate. These are sound engineering facts I am relating. There are Senators in this body today who can recall vividly the recurring loss of life and property in the seasonal and flash floods of the Tennessee Valley, floods which were only stopped, and effectively stopped for all time, by the development of the unified program of resources conservation and flood control ushered in with the establishment of the TVA.

Here is proof positive that periodic raging rivers can be controlled by man's action. But this only happened after long years of experience with repeated failure of piecemeal methods of control under the supervision of separate independent and ofttimes conflicting agencies. That antiquated system was finally rejected when the Congress acted to establish a single and inclusive program of river-basin development, under the TVA, which has become recognized as one of the great achievements of the Nation to be copied by other countries throughout the world.

Mr. President, we cannot afford any longer to go on diking up the Missouri River until its stream flows artificially higher than the surrounding land, trusting to Fate that flood crests of its tributaries will not converge at one time in the main stream to break these flimsy artificial boundaries and spill that great river torrent out onto the land, destroying prosperous communities along its banks. Many hundreds of thousands of people live in yearly terror of such an eventuality.

The solution of this problem is clear. It has been demonstrated in the TVA. For us to sit supinely by, trusting to luck and to the hope that the Army engineers are on the job and the other Federal agencies will cooperate is just a snare and a delusion.

The Flood Control Act of 1944 and its limited appropriations constitute no real remedy for preventing floods in the Missouri Basin.

We in the Congress are all too prone to pass an act which has a high-sounding purpose, declared in its title, and then assume that our duty has been discharged and forever afterward our great river systems will be controlled. We must realize that the Flood Control Act of 1944 failed to control the 1946 floods on the Missouri and its tributaries. Nor would such floods be eliminated, according to the plans of the Army Engineers, even if Congress made all appropriations asked for from year to year, until about 1965. Twenty years more of fear, suffering, loss of life and property await the residents of the Missouri River Basin if the plan envisaged in the Flood Control Act of 1944 is carried out to completion on time.

What do we have to offer the people of that vast region during these next 20 years—more floods, hitting in unpredictable places without warning?

The people of the Missouri Valley States are not content with that sort of an answer to their problem, Mr. President. Their dissatisfaction with the Flood Control Act of 1944 grows as its initial pattern unfolds before them. Protests from Missouri are mounting against the Army engineers' plan to build a huge dam in the western part of the State and flood vast acres of highly fertile land. From Kansas comes a report that the proposed dams are meeting with marked disfavor from farmers and townspeople alike. Nebraska, Iowa, and Minnesota show deep concern for needed development of hydroelectric power not contemplated in the program of development under the Flood Control Act. The specific projects to be launched in both North and South Dakota are opposed by citizens from all walks of life who consider them detrimental to the best interests of these States. And in Montana, Wyoming, and Colorado the regional committee for the MVA has exploded the Pick-Sloan plan because of its inadequate consideration of the headwater storage problems and the almost total disregard of forestation and land-control problems in the area.

Mr. President, the initial steps being taken to launch the programs of flood control proposed in the act of 1944 are far too uncertain in their consequences for us to permit them to go forward without a careful appraisal on the ground, where the people themselves may be heard, and where the actual and proposed installations can be considered in relationship to each other. Field hearings on flood control and resources development proposals are essential to a proper understanding of such matters.

This present flood situation is so serious, and is indicative of such future hazards for our people, that I am constrained to urge upon this busy Congress the necessity of early study of a Missouri Valley Authority patterned on the TVA.

Moreover, the present disastrous floods are so widespread in their effects, and so symptomatic of even greater imminent danger to our people and their property, that this Congress should make every effort to ascertain all the facts and seek immediate and appropriate measures to prevent any more floods in the Missouri Valley. Accordingly, I am submitting a resolution calling upon the Public Works Committee, or an appropriate subcommittee thereof, to proceed at once with field investigations and hearings calculated to produce all the essential facts descriptive of the present flood and its causes, and the present conditions of the Missouri River Basin which may cause similar or more serious floods in the unpredictable future, together with such recommendations for action as will prevent such fatal occurrences. The resolution also urges the formulation of an appropriate program of rehabilitation whereby these farmers and townspeople who have been brought to the brink of ruin through no fault of their own shall be assisted to reestablish themselves once more, as speedily as possible and on terms which shall not prove onerous or unfair.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit for appropriate reference a resolution for the purposes which I have outlined.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 125) was received and referred to the Committee on Public Works, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Public Works, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized and

directed to conduct a full and complete study and investigation with respect to (1) the causes of the recent floods in the Missouri River Basin and the Mississippi River Basin and (2) the extent of the damage to the inundated areas and of the injury to the victims inflicted by such floods. Such study and investigation shall be conducted with a view to formulating a program for the prevention of the recurrence of such floods and plans for the rehabilitation of the areas inundated and for the relief of the victims of the floods.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of the study and investigation, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem desirable.

SEC. 3. In carrying out the study and investigation, hearings shall be held in the area affected by the floods. For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $15,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in connection with my remarks, I ask to have printed in the RECORD a statement bearing on this subject recently prepared by the American National Red Cross.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 11, 1947.

With thousands homeless as a result of floods in the Middle Western States the American Red Cross has dispatched large numbers of experienced disaster relief workers from its area headquarters in St. Louis and elsewhere to affected districts so that they might augment local Red Cross chapter workers and assist in coordinating and directing relief operations.

In Missouri where at least 3,200 persons are said to be homeless, reports to Red Cross indicated that six levees are expected to go. These levees are Franklin Island Levee opposite Boonville; the Boone County Levee; the Capitol Levee; the Hartsburg Levee; the Wainwright Levee; and the Rievaux Levee. These are six of the major levees between Boonville and St. Charles. Latest reports to the Red Cross indicated that the flood crest on the Missouri and the floodcrest on the Mississippi may converge near Alton, Ill., at about the same time but this is as yet by no means a definite certainty.

Flooding of the Grand River, tributary of the Missouri, has called forth Red Cross disaster workers in Livingston County, in addition to those in other areas of the State.

All Red Cross chapters from Boonville to Jefferson City have been alerted for possible action as has also the St. Charles County chapter lying at the confluence of the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers. At Boonville a crest of 29.3 feet was recorded which is 1½ feet less than in 1944. At the present time three Red Cross representatives are making a survey of the affected area along the Missouri and Grand Rivers. The results of this survey are not expected to be available until tomorrow, Thursday. Reports so far indicate that approximately 1,000,000 acres have been flooded by the Missouri, Mississippi and Grand Rivers. Of these approximately half are reported to lie between Glasgow and Boonville along the Missouri.

Four counties in eastern Nebraska have also been affected by minor floods. They are Ashland, Saunders, Cass, and Lancaster. Two Red Cross workers have been sent in to assist chapter workers in providing food and shelter for the homeless and to initiate the usual Red Cross post disaster rehabilitation.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I also ask that a series of press reports bearing on the same subject be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the press reports were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of June 10, 1947]

26,000 ACRES UNDER WATER—MISSISSIPPI AND TRIBUTARIES DRIVE 22,240 FROM HOMES

HANNIBAL, Mo., June 9.—Spilling over levees at several points, the Mississippi River and its tributaries surged to record high levels and left an estimated 22,240 persons homeless in a four-State area.

Approximately 26,000 acres of farmland between Wapello, Iowa, and St. Louis were under water, and an additional 120,000 acres on the Illinois side were threatened with inundation.

The muddy waters reached into several river communities.

Downstream from St. Louis a further rise of up to 5 feet was forecast by the Government Weather Bureau, which added that in that area "it will hardly be a major flood in the sense of the 1943 and 1944 floods."

Rail traffic between St. Louis and Burlington, Iowa, had been halted, and highways were closed in flood areas along the river.

United States Army engineers and the Coast Guard had every available worker on the job, and the American Red Cross had 50 staff workers and about 600 volunteers in the flooded area.

Water was 8 to 10 feet deep in the village of Alexandria, Mo., near the Iowa line, and the Coast Guard said a survey from the air showed the little town "completely flooded with only the rooftops showing." The residents all had been moved out when a levee break flooded the community.

In Hannibal, one block of the main street and the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad yards were under water. The Coast Guard reported farms flooded under 8 feet of water north of Hannibal.

The Alexandria levee failure eased the flood situation at Canton, Mo., somewhat and the water was receding after about half of the city had been inundated. The municipal light and power plant, still surrounded by water, continued to operate. About 125 persons still were unable to return to their homes.

At Quincy, Ill., where the river reached a record stage of 23.6 feet, railroad yards in the water-front area were flooded, but the town itself, situated on a bluff, was not endangered. Several persons were forced from their homes in South Quincy.

Col. W. M. Leaf, district Army engineer at Rock Island, Ill., said the Mississippi was cresting north of Hannibal but that the danger remains great.

"Our heaviest fight now is to save the levee at Pike County, Ill., across from Hannibal," he said. About 120,000 acres were threatened with inundation in this area, he said.

EIGHT LEVEE BREAKS LISTED

The Army Engineers reported eight levee breaks between Wapello, Iowa, and Louisiana, Mo., as follows: Two at the mouth of Iowa River near Wapello, 1,200 acres flooded; at St. Francisville, Mo., 1,000 acres; South Quincy, Ill., 5,500 acres; near the mouth of the Des Moines River, 11,000 acres; two private levee breaks between Clarksville and Annada, Mo., 3,500 acres; and Marion County, Mo., 4,000 acres.

At St. Louis, the midwestern area headquarters of the Red Cross estimated the number of persons forced from their homes at 2,540 in Nebraska, 2,400 in Missouri, 1,300 in Illinois, the number of homeless in Iowa, where the city of Ottumwa was hard hit, was estimated at 16,000.

The Red Cross said its latest report from Nebraska, where several small tributaries of the Missouri River in the eastern part of the State overflowed, was that the situation was easing in that area.

The crest of the Missouri River flood, farthest west in Missouri, was reported nearing Waverly with a stage of 22.5 feet, 4½ feet over the banks.

The Grand River was at 23.6 feet at its mouth near Brunswick, Mo., but was receding further upstream.

[From the Washington Post of June 12, 1947]

NEW FLOODS FEARED AS CRESTS NEAR CONFLUENCE OF TWO RIVERS

ST. LOUIS, June 11.—The prospect of additional rain in the Missouri River watershed worsened the outlook along the flooding river in central Missouri today, but the flood picture improved gradually in northeastern Missouri and northern Illinois.

Army engineers, Government agencies, and the Red Cross estimated the Missouri and the Mississippi already had flooded a million acres in the two States, adding 5,700 homeless to the total of 18,500 driven from their homes by other floods in Iowa and Nebraska.

Further inundation was predicted as the Missouri and Mississippi crests moved toward the confluence of the two rivers about 20 miles north of here.

The Red Cross reported it had alerted all its chapters along the Missouri River between the State capital at Jefferson City and Boonville.

Further levee breaks were anticipated on the Missouri.

More than a half million acres were under water in this area and along tributaries to the north but the only evacuations reported thus far were 20 families at Glasgow and two in Jefferson City. The capitol and other public buildings were safe on high ground.

The Missouri was 7 feet above flood level at Boonville, but still a foot below the 1944 flood peak and had risen only a tenth of a foot in 24 hours as the crest approached.

Federal Meteorologist Harry F. Wahlgren said that while the Mississippi probably would be 5 feet above flood stage when it crests here some time Friday, he did not believe the rising waters would cause any great amount of damage.

The Missouri was 4.5 feet above flood stage today at St. Charles, Mo., near the point where it empties into the Mississippi and it was expected to crest a foot and a half higher tomorrow, Wahlgren said.

ONE HUNDRED AND NINETY PERSONS REMOVED

Stages along the Mississippi below St. Louis rose steadily and farmers as far away as Cairo, Ill., and Cape Girardeau, Mo., 122 miles south of here, prepared to evacuate if necessary.

The Red Cross reported 190 persons were removed by boats from Kaskaskia and Crane islands in the Mississippi below here.

The Mississippi had dropped a foot in the last 24 hours along the 80-mile stretch below Keokuk, Iowa, where much of the damage occurred. Alexander, Mo., remained completely flooded and parts of Canton and Hannibal, Mo., still were under water, but the worst was believed past.

[From the Washington Post of June 11, 1947]

FLOODWATERS OF MISSOURI STILL RAMPANT

HANNIBAL, Mo., June 10.—The Missouri River crumbled levees and poured torrents of muddy water over hundreds of thousands of acres in north central Missouri today, but the swollen Mississippi was leveling off in the hard-hit sector north of here as its crest moved downstream.

Col. W. E. Potter, district Army engineer at Kansas City, estimated in a report telephoned from Glasgow, Mo., that 1,000,000 acres had been inundated by the rampant Missouri and its tributaries in the rich farming district of north central Missouri.

The midwestern area headquarters of the American Red Cross said another 2,200 per-

sons had fled their homes in Missouri and Illinois, bringing to about 5,700 the number of homeless in the 2 States.

Red Cross officials estimated that 16,000 persons were homeless in Iowa, bringing the three-State total to 21,700. Some of these were expected to return to their homes as flood waters receded in the Des Moines River valley.

Meanwhile, lowland residents below the confluence of the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers, near Alton, Ill., were threatened with a repetition of the flood of last April.

In north central Missouri, Colonel Potter reported that about 500,000 acres of the flooded farm land was in the Glasgow-Boonville area. He said that only six levees were still standing in that area and that five of these were expected to break momentarily.

Five hundred weary workers continued their fight to save a 60-mile section of levee in Pike County, Ill., across the Mississippi from Hannibal, with more than 100,000 acres in danger of going under. The upper section of the dike was reported by Army engineers to be in a critical condition.

The muddy waters remained in parts of several river towns, including Hannibal, Canton, and Alexandria, Mo., and the Red Cross said the towns of Annada, Mo., and Meyer, Ill., were being evacuated.

Army engineers reported two new levee failures, one at Riverland, Mo., inundating 5,900 acres and another near Kissinger, Mo., flooding 2,300 acres, and revised upward to more than 39,000 their estimate of the number of acres flooded between Wapello, Iowa, and St. Louis.

The Missouri division of health urged immunization against typhoid of persons in the flood area, and said adequate supplies of vaccine were available at local health offices.

SIXTEEN THOUSAND DRIVEN FROM HOMES BY FLOODS IN IOWA—OTTUMWA INUNDATED—SEVEN LOSE LIVES—MAJOR RISE PREDICTED ON MISSISSIPPI RIVER

GREAT LAKES, ILL., June 7.—Naval Reserve units in St. Louis, Quincy, Ill., and Burlington, Iowa., were alerted tonight for possible flood duty as the Mississippi River neared record stages along the eastern borders of Iowa and northern Missouri. Vice Adm. G. D. Murray, commander of the Ninth Naval District, instructed the units to be prepared to operate as requested by the commander of the second Coast Guard area, St. Louis. The One Hundred and Thirty-eighth Infantry of the Missouri National Guard was awaiting an alert order from Jefferson City.

OTTUMWA, IOWA, June 7.—Seven persons have perished as a result of the Des Moines River flood in this southeastern Iowa city and more than 16,000 persons have been driven from their homes.

As the river rose to a record high and water swept through second-story windows of some homes, Joe Griffin, Red Cross disaster chairman here, estimated today that one-third of the residents of this city of 32,000 persons were homeless.

Five persons drowned when their boat was smashed in the swift current. Herschel Loveless, in charge of flood rescue work, said no attempt would be made to recover the unidentified bodies until the water recedes. Three children and two women were in the boat.

Mrs. Pauline Williamson, 30 years old, died of shock and exposure on her way to a hospital, and Mrs. Charles Saunders, 58, Ottumwa, drowned when she apparently fell down in trying to make her way to safe ground.

About 2,000 persons were stranded during the day, and rescue operations are continuing.

With the power off, part of the business section under water and such big plants as the John Deere farm equipment and Morrell meat-packing plants flooded, business in this industrial city was virtually at a standstill.

Residents obtained drinking water at Red Cross headquarters and various stations about the city.

Electric light service was restored in most sections at 8 p. m. more than 20 hours after the power plant was flooded. Service was resumed when electrical crews cleared a short circuit in a cable on a dike at the edge of the city.

H. A. Brown, superintendent of the city waterworks, said the river would have to drop about 8 inches before the city could supply its residents with drinking water.

Enough typhoid vaccine to immunize 2,200 persons was flown here from Des Moines.

Nearly every home in a low south side residential district was under water, Griffin reported.

The flood reached its crest at 20.4 feet, held firm for several hours and then began falling.

In all, 11 lives have been lost in floods in Iowa this week.

There were other stricken areas, too, and forecasts of more flooding to come.

MAJOR FLOOD PREDICTED

A major flood on the Mississippi River, bordering Iowa on the east, was predicted for Monday by the Weather Bureau in Des Moines. The expected danger spot was the stretch from Keokuk, Iowa, to Quincy, Ill., and Hannibal, Mo.

The Mississippi was expected to reach stages of a foot to a foot and a half higher than the disastrous 1944 floods. Stages of 24 to 25 feet were forecast for Quincy and Hannibal Monday and Tuesday, and 20 to 21 feet at Keokuk.

Already the Mississippi had flooded a third of Canton, Mo., and driven at least 600 persons from their homes, the Red Cross reported. The stage of 19 feet at Canton at noon was only .65 foot below the record set in 1944. Workers began sandbagging the municipal light and water plant.

The Iowa and Mississippi Rivers were rising in Iowa and spilling over fertile farm land and across the State, on the western border, the Missouri and Nishnabotna were flowing into Hamburg, Iowa, and over other farm lands.

South of here in Missouri several rivers were at record 38-year stages and continuing to rise. A man drowned near Bethany, Mo., when trying to swim a creek.

ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-SEVEN SHELTERED AT HANNIBAL

In addition to the approximately 150 families driven from their homes at Canton, 137 persons are being sheltered at Hannibal, according to the Red Cross.

About 630 persons were leaving their homes in the face of the flood at Alexandria, Mo., in Clark County, north of Canton, as the town was ordered evacuated.

The Ottumwa (Iowa) Courier maintained a 99-year record of unbroken service in publishing a newspaper with the assistance of the Daily Times of Davenport, 100 air miles away.

With electric power paralyzed in the Ottumwa area, due to floods, the Times received special dispatches from Ottumwa by telephone and over the Iowa Associated Press wirephoto network from Courier reporters.

Pictures were flown to Davenport by plane and with those taken from the Associated Press network, a four-page edition was printed on Times presses and flown to the Ottumwa municipal airport.

The Times and Courier are members of the Lee Syndicate.

NORTHERN MISSOURI STREAMS AT RECORD HEIGHTS

KANSAS CITY, MO., June 7.—Flood waters sent northern Missouri streams to record stages today. Chillicothe was almost isolated by the rampaging Grand River and other streams in the area, and the Kansas City Weather Bureau issued flood warnings for residents and farmers along the Missouri River from St. Joseph down to the mouth.

The bureau predicted a stage of 27 feet at Boonville by next Tuesday, which probably will overflow United States Highway 40 on the north side of the Boonville bridge.

Virtually all avenues of approach to Chillicothe were blocked by flood waters. United States highways 36 and 65 which unite south of the city, were under water for several miles. No busses had left the city since 1:30 a. m. this morning. The Wabash Railroad has operated no trains through the city in 48 hours. Only the Milwaukee Railroad continued to operate.

Hard hit by the floods was Pattonsburg in northwest Daviess County. Here the Grand River, on the south and Big Creek on the north, combined to flood part of the city.

H. H. Green, Pattonsburg grain man, estimated 30,000 acres of crop land was flooded.

Fifty farm families were evacuated from their homes in the Pattonsburg area.

Yellow Creek flooded the water plant at Brookfield leaving that city without water.

Traffic halted by high water east of Brookfield was moving late today, although the slab was covered with 6 inches of water.

At Laclede, 22 miles east of Chillicothe, the floodwaters of Locust Creek and other streams washed out 1,700 feet of track on the Burlington Railroad. All traffic has been diverted to other lines.

GIRL SWEPT INTO FLOODWATERS AT KIRKSVILLE

KIRKSVILLE, MO., June 7.—Miss Sarah Hamilton, 17 years old, of Kirksville, was swept into the floodwater of the Charlton River last night.

Miss Hamilton and Miss Leona Ewing, 16, of Kirksville, were wading in backwater from the flood 6 miles west of here last night and ventured too far. The current caught them and swept them from Highway 6.

Lewis Polovich found Miss Ewing clinging to a tree half a mile away an hour later. Miss Hamilton's body has not been found.

COAL CREEK BREAKS LEVEE TWICE IN ILLINOIS

BEARDSTOWN, ILL., June 7.—A break in the levee of the Coal Creek Drainage and Levee District in Schuyler County was repaired today after heavy rain had opened the breach twice in 24 hours.

Army engineers reported the situation under control after the waters of Coal Creek had flooded the south flank of the district, inundating State Highway 103 near Twin Bridges. Waters of the creek, which rose 5 feet early today, had subsided. Approximately 2,000 acres were flooded.

NO THREAT OF SERIOUS FLOOD HERE, SAYS WAHLGREN

The Mississippi River stood at 28.5 feet here yesterday, 1.5 feet below flood stage. Meteorologist Harry F. Wahlgren said there is no threat of a serious flood here, unless heavy rains fall during the next few days. He doubted that the Mississippi would rise much above the 34.5 foot level it reached here last month.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of June 10, 1947]

FLOOD RECEDING ON 80-MILE MISSOURI-ILLINOIS STRETCH—SLIGHT DECLINE IN RIVER STAGE AT HANNIBAL AND QUINCY—EFFORT TO PREVENT NEW BREAK, SAVE 120,000 ACRES

HANNIBAL, MO. June 10.—The swirling Mississippi River began receding slightly today along a flood-ravaged 80-mile stretch in eastern Missouri and north central Illinois where the evacuation of about 3,500 persons ran the number of homeless from high water in a four-State midwestern area to more than 22,000.

"The rather long crest" of the Mississippi rose slightly overnight from record heights reached yesterday but, with a slight fall noted today, rivermen and United States Army Engineers expressed belief that only further rains would aggravate the situation.

Declines of a fraction of a foot were noted in the river stages at Hannibal and Canton, Mo., and at Quincy, Ill.

Weather forecasters, while predicting a rise of as much as 5 feet at St. Louis and below when the crest is reached in that vicinity, added, however, that in that area "it will hardly be a major flood in the sense of the 1943 and 1944 floods."

With floodwaters now covering 58,000 acres in the upper Missouri-Illinois area, following overtopping of levees at Kissinger and Riverton, Mo., flooding 8,000 acres of rich farm land, volunteers concentrated on the effort to save the soaked levee across the river from here in Pike county, Ill. Failure of the levee there, Army engineers said, would flood 120,000 acres.

Evacuees, removing livestock, stored grain and household effects, cluttered highways along the Illinois side of the river in southern Hancock, northern Adams, and Pike counties.

Red Cross midwestern area headquarters at St. Louis estimated 2,400 persons were driven from their homes in Missouri and 1,300 in Illinois. It placed the homeless from high water in Nebraska at 2,540. In Iowa, where the city of Ottumwa was hard hit, 16,000 were reported forced from their homes.

Army Engineers and the Coast Guard had every available worker on the job in the flood area and the Red Cross had 50 staff workers and about 600 volunteers aiding the homeless.

Water was 8 to 10 feet deep in the village of Alexandria, Mo., near the Iowa line, the result of a levee break, and all residents have been evacuated.

In Hannibal, a city of 20,000, the water covered 9 blocks of the main street after a break last night. Four thousand residents of south Hannibal were partly isolated.

Guests at the Mark Twain and Windsor Hotels were rowed to the doorways and climbed over the sandbag barricades into the lobbies. Main street merchants sandbagged their stores and hastily moved their merchandise to shelves above the highwater mark.

All night long an electric pump pushed 7,000 gallons of cold water an hour out of the Mark Twain Hotel basement. A bellboy in rubber boots unloaded luggage. Most of the hotel's employees were at work when the levee broke.

At Canton, Mo., 30 miles upstream, the river had reached a stage of 19.92 feet, a record. Although half of the town is under water and a third of the 2,200 residents are homeless, relief work was reported well in hand. No trains or busses are operating out of the town and only one highway is open. Ironically, the ice plant was still running and deliveries were being made in dry areas.

A Riverland district levee, 2 miles north of Louisiana, broke yesterday, flooding 3,000 acres. Sixty families in Louisiana were evacuated.

Rail traffic between St. Louis and Burlington, Iowa, remained halted.

In central Missouri, additional thousands of acres of cropland were inundated as floodwaters of the Grand and Chariton Rivers joined the Missouri River. One levee broke above Boonville yesterday, flooding 5,000 acres of bottom land, and others were expected to fail. Missouri highway patrol closed United States Highway 40 at Boonville.

The Grand and Chariton Rivers fell from 1 to 2 feet overnight, while the crest of the Missouri River flood passed Boonville this morning, the weather bureau in Kansas City reported.

The stage at Boonville was 28.3 or 7.3 feet above flood level and was expected to remain stationary there for about 24 hours. This compared with a crest there of about 30 feet in the 1944 flood.

Jefferson City, farther down the Missouri River, had a stage of 26.2 or 3.2 above flood level. A crest of 28.5 or 29 feet was forecast for tonight. At Hermann the stage was 24.2 with a top of 27 feet predicted for Thursday.

On the Grand River, the stage at Chillicothe was 29.5, a drop of nearly 2 feet in the last 24 hours. At Sumner the stage was 35.6, also a fall of about 2 feet. At Brunswick, near the mouth of the Grand, the stage was 23.4, a drop of 2 feet.

The Missouri Division of Health urged immunization against typhoid of residents in the flooded areas and reported that ample supplies of vaccine have been supplied to local health officers or to special clinics set up in threatened communities.

The State highway patrol, meanwhile, stood ready to fly food or medicines to any point in need of aid. Col. Hugh H. Waggoner said the patrol's two planes would answer any emergency calls.

ILLINOIS LEGISLATURE IS ASKED FOR $2,000,000 FLOOD RELIEF

SPRINGFIELD, ILL., June 10.—The Illinois Legislature was asked yesterday to provide $2,000,000 for emergency flood relief in the State.

The bill, introduced by Senator Frank Dick (Republican), Quincy, would make the funds available for prevention and suppression of disease in the flood areas; repairing highways, bridges, and State-owned buildings damaged by floods, and for advancing money to drainage and levee districts to enable them to acquire rights-of-way for repairing and rebuilding existing levees.

The bill was referred to the senate appropriations committee, which set a hearing for this afternoon.

VALLEY RESIDENTS URGE COMPLETION OF LEVEE PROJECTS

WASHINGTON, June 10.—A House Appropriations Subcommittee yesterday heard Mississippi Valley residents urge early completion of main-line Mississippi levees and increased bank stabilization to protect a $500,000,000 Government investment in levees. They asked for funds to complete the last 30 percent of a lower Mississippi flood-control project started in 1928.

ADDRESS BY FLEET ADMIRAL NIMITZ, RECORD OF VICE ADM. C. H. McMORRIS, AND LIST OF NAVAL VESSELS NAMED FOR ALABAMIANS

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz, United States Navy, at the graduation exercises of the University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, Ala., on June 9, 1947; a summary of the record of Vice Adm. Charles H. McMorris, United States Navy; and a list of ships in the Navy named for Alabamians; which appear in the Appendix.]

IMPLICATIONS OF INVASION OF SINKIANG—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON NEWS

[Mr. McCLELLAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Choice of Doctrines," from the Washington Daily News of June 12, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN ECONOMIC SYSTEM ON TRIAL—ADDRESS BY GEORGE W. ROCHESTER

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "American Economic System on Trial Against Russian," delivered by George W. Rochester on April 28, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEVELOPMENT OF COLUMBIA BASIN WATER RESOURCES

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by Theron D. Weaver, Chairman of the Columbia Basin Interagency Committee on May 29, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD three editorials dealing with Federal aid to education, which appear in the Appendix.]

POSTMASTER OF HARTFORD, CONN.—EDITORIAL FROM HARTFORD TIMES

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mr. Dillon Fills the Bill," from the Hartford Times of June 6, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

SUPPLEMENTARY ANALYSIS OF LABOR BILL AS PASSED

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in the course of the debate on the conference agreement on H. R. 3020 a number of arguments directed at specific provisions of the bill were made on the floor which were not justified by either the text of the bill or the background of statutes and decisions against which it was written. In addition, numerous completely erroneous statements were made with respect to the effect of certain portions of the bill. In order to make clear the legislative intent, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD last Thursday an analysis of its provisions. As I stated at the close of debate on Friday, I consider it advisable to supplement that analysis to cover some additional subjects and to correct mistaken statements made on the floor.

I therefore ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a supplementary analysis.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Section 2 (2): One amendment to the Wagner Act which was adopted in conference excludes Federal Reserve banks from coverage of the statute. The objection has been made to this provision that there was no more reason for exempting Federal Reserve banks than national banks. It seems a complete answer to say that Federal Reserve banks are essentially public in character and are operated for public or governmental purposes. They issue the currency. They are the instruments of the Government's open-market policy in purchasing and selling Government bonds. All of their operations are under the supervision of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, who are appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, and the compensation of all of the officers and employees of the member banks are subject to the Board's approval. Consequently, these member banks are prevented by law from making any binding collective agreement with representatives or their employees on the most controversial topic of collective bargaining, namely, wages, since a determination of the wage scale is reserved by law to the United States Government.

Section 2 (2), 2 (13), and 301 (e): The conference agreement in defining the term employer struck out the vague phrase in the Wagner Act "anyone acting in the interest of an employer" and inserted in lieu thereof the word "agent." The term agent is defined in section 2 (13) and section 301 (e), since it is

used throughout the unfair labor practice sections of title I and in sections 301 and 303 of title III. In defining the term the conference amendment reads "the question of whether the specific acts performed were actually authorized or subsequently ratified shall not be controlling." This restores the law of agency as it has been developed at common law.

These amendments are criticized in one breath as imposing too harsh a liability upon unions for the acts of their officers or representatives and as too mild with respect to the liability of employers for the acts of their managerial and supervisory personnel. Of course, the definition applies equally in the responsibility imputed to both employers and labor organizations for the acts of their officers or representatives in the scope of their employment.

It is true that this definition was written to avoid the construction which the Supreme Court in the recent case of United States against United Brotherhood of Carpenters placed upon section 6 of the Norris-La Guardia Act which exempts organizations from liability for illegal acts committed in labor disputes unless proof of actual instigation, participation, or ratification can be shown. The construction the Supreme Court placed on this special exemption was so broad that Mr. Justice Frankfurter, speaking for the dissenting minority, pointed out that all unions need do in the future to escape liability for the illegal actions of their officers is simply to pass a standing resolution disclaiming such responsibility. The conferees agreed that the ordinary law of agency should apply to employer and union representatives. Consequently, when a supervisor acting in his capacity as such, engages in intimidating conduct or illegal action with respect to employees or labor organizers his conduct can be imputed to his employer regardless of whether or not the company officials approved or were even aware of his actions. Similarly union business agents or stewards, acting in their capacity of union officers, may make their union guilty of an unfair-labor practice when they engage in conduct made an unfair-labor practice in the bill, even though no formal action has been taken by the union to authorize or approve such conduct.

Section 3 (d): In order to make an effective separation between the judicial and prosecuting functions of the Board and yet avoid the cumbersome device of establishing a new independent agency in the executive branch of the Government, the conferees created the office of general counsel of the Board, to be filled by appointment of the President, subject to Senate confirmation. We invested in this office final authority to issue complaints, prosecute them before the Board, and supervise the field investigating and trial personnel. It is asserted that this is inconsistent with the Administrative Procedure Act and that it places a tremendous amount of unreviewable power in the hands of a single official.

The Board itself has been sensitive to the reproach that it acts as judge, jury, and prosecutor, and in recent years has promulgated regulations which have delegated the power of issuing complaints to the various regional directors. Presumably the General Counsel would keep these regulations in effect, except that the regional directors would act pursuant to his general instructions rather than those of the Board. The present regulations permit a person aggrieved by the refusal of a regional director to issue a complaint to appeal the matter to Washington. This is not an adversary proceeding but simply a review, based upon the confidential report of the field staff which conducted the investigation. Presumably, under the conference agreement such appeals would be routed to the General Counsel's office rather than to the Board. The assumption that the Board itself presently reviews these appeals, however, is utterly erroneous. According to the testimony of the chairman of the Board these appeals are considered by an anonymous committee of subordinate employees. What the conference amendment does is simply to transfer this "vast and unreviewable power" from this anonymous little group to a statutory officer responsible to the President and to the Congress. So far as having unfettered discretion is concerned he, of course, must respect the rules of decision of the Board and of the courts. In this respect his function is like that of the Attorney General of the United States or a State attorney general.

Section 7. In this section guaranteeing the right of employees to self-organization, to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, and to engage in concerted activities, there has been inserted the language "and shall also have the right to refrain from any and all of such activities * * *." It is contended that the inclusion of the new language destroys collective bargaining and legalizes the device of the yellow-dog contract. Nothing could be further from the truth. There is similar language in the Norris-La Guardia Act, a statute outlawing the yellow-dog contract. Moreover, the Board itself has held that a right to refrain from the exercise of the rights guaranteed in section 7 was always implicit in the Wagner Act. (See Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., 66 NLRB 1083.) The new language therefore, merely makes mandatory an interpretation which the Board itself had already arrived at administratively. The reason for its inclusion was that similar language had appeared in the House bill and since section 8 (b) (1) of the Senate bill, which was retained by the conferees, made it an unfair labor practice for labor organizations to restrain or coerce employees in the rights gauranteed them in section 7, the House conferees insisted that there be express language in section 7 which would make the prohibition contained in section 8 (b) (1) apply to coercive acts of unions against employees who did not wish to join or did not care to participate in a strike or a picket line.

Section 8 (a) (3): Criticism of this section has not been directed at any amendment made by the conferees, but to a proviso of both the Senate and House bills. It is argued that the requirement of "a majority of the employees eligible to vote" rather than a majority of those voting creates insurmountable difficulties in obtaining a contract requiring compulsory union membership. Elections conducted by the Board differ from political elections in that ordinarily they are conducted on company time and property. The employees' alternative is to go to the poll or continue at work. An average of over 90 percent of the eligible employees participate in such elections and a 100-percent vote is not unusual.

Section 8 (b) (4), relating to illegal strikes and boycotts, was amended in conference by striking out the words "for the purpose of" and inserting the clause "where an object thereof is." Obviously the intent of the conferees was to close any loophole which would prevent the Board from being blocked in giving relief against such illegal activities simply because one of the purposes of such strikes might have been lawful. It has been asserted on the Senate floor, however, that if even one of the strikers had an improper motive he would thereby make the union liable for an unfair labor practice and to an action for damages brought by the employer, even though the demands made upon the employer were perfectly lawful. This is a ridiculous construction. In any strike an employer is informed as to what demands he must submit in order to get the strikers to return to their work. Consequently, the strikers cannot ask him to do anything which would achieve the objectives prohibited by this section. The hidden motives of the union or the employees would be immaterial.

Section 8 (b) (5). Initiation fees: This section was taken in part from the House bill and makes it an unfair labor practice for a union to charge excessive or discriminatory initiation fees with respect to employees covered by a compulsory union membership agreement. It has been argued that the effect of this section is to give the Board vast discretion in regulating the dues and initiation fees of all labor organizations and thereby putting the Government in charge of the internal affairs of unions. The express language of this subsection shows how unfounded such an argument is, for it is only in cases in which the employees affected are covered by union-shop or maintenance-of-membership agreements that the Board has any jurisdiction. Even then it is limited to initiation fees and does not cover dues. It was the opinion of the conferees that unless such a provision was inserted, the restrictions on the union shop in section 8 (3) could be easily circumvented.

Section 8 (b) (6): This is a section taken from the elaborate prohibitions in the House bill with respect to featherbedding. All that it does is to make it an unfair labor practice to cause or attempt to cause employers to pay money in the nature of an exaction for services which are not performed or not to be performed. A number of Senators have contended that this means that union requests for payment to employees of wages for lunch and rest periods or for waiting periods when machinery is being repaired will be illegal. It has also been stated that it would be a breach of this section for employees who are asked to report for work so as to be available as a relief squad in the event of emergency or need, to demand any money for their time. Of course this section does not affect such industrial practices, as such activities are done at an employer's request and for valuable consideration incident to the employment itself. The use of the words "in the nature of an exaction" make it quite clear that what is prohibited is extortion by labor organizations or their agents in lieu of providing services which an employer does not want.

Section 8 (c). Free speech: During the conference the provisions in the Senate bill relating to the right of free speech were rewritten to conform to the House bill so that this subsection now reads as follows: "(c) The expressing of any views, argument, or opinion, or the dissemination thereof, whether in written, printed, graphic, or visual form, shall not constitute or be evidence of an unfair labor practice under any of the provisions of this act, if such expression contains no threat of reprisal or force or promise of benefit."

Several Senators have assailed this section on the ground that the words "shall not contribute or be evidence of an unfair labor practice" would prevent the Board from applying ordinary rules of evidence in unfair labor practice cases. The purpose of the conferees, as said in the statement I placed in the RECORD at the opening of the debate, was to make it clear that the Board is not to construe utterances containing neither threats nor promises of benefit as an unfair labor practice standing alone or as making some act which would otherwise be legal an unfair labor practice. The conferees had in mind a number of Board decisions in which because of the fact that an employer has at some time committed an unfair labor practice a speech by him, innocuous in itself, has been held not to be privileged. The conferees did not believe that past misconduct should deprive either employers or labor organizations of the privilege of exercising constitutional rights. There have also been a number of decisions by the Board in which discharges of employees, even though there was no evidence in the surrounding circumstances of discrimination, have been deemed

unfair labor practices simply because at one time or another the employer has expressed himself as not in favor of unionization of his employees. The object of this section, therefore, is to make it clear that decisions of this sort cannot be made under the conference bill.

It has been argued, however, that the prohibition against using expressions of opinion as evidence goes much further than the rules with respect to admissibility in a criminal or civil trial. Senators making this argument overlook the fact that the privilege of this subsection is limited to expression of "views, arguments, or opinion." It has no application to statements which are acts in themselves or contain directions or instructions. These, of course, could be deemed admissions and hence competent under the well-recognized exception to the hearsay rule.

Numerous comparisons with criminal and civil trials have been made. Consider a more exact comparison. A man is on trial for selling liquor illegally. The fact that he had argued against adoption of the Volstead Act would scarcely be permitted to be used in evidence against him. In a murder trial in which defendant is accused of killing a Republican Senator his political views or opinions would not be competent testimony. Yet the Board has permitted employers' expressions of opinion on unionism to be used to sustain the theory that he was guilty of violations of the National Labor Relations Act.

Section 8 (b) (4) (D): In the conference the paragraph making strikes to bring about the assignment of work tasks to a particular labor organization was amended to read as follows: "* * * forcing or requiring any employer to assign particular work to employees in a particular labor organization or a particular trade, craft or class rather than to employees in another labor organization or in another trade, craft, or class." It is contended that the addition of the condition "another trade, craft, or class" has transformed this subsection into what started to be a prohibition of jurisdictional strikes into a prohibition preventing one union from striking even though no other union was in the picture. I have no hesitation in saying that this subsection applies not only to strikes over the assignment of particular work to one union rather than another, but also to the assignment of work to one union rather than another group of employees. It is submitted, however, that this is not a proper criticism of this section since under the Labor Relations Act at the present time an employer would be violating subsection 8 (3) if he discharged or discriminated against some employees merely to provide work to members of a union. Under existing law, employers have no right to accede to such union demands unless there is a closed or union-shop agreement in effect. If an employer discriminates in the assignment of work so as to encourage a non-union group by assigning them work which properly should be performed by union employees, it would be an unfair labor practice under the provisions of existing law and the conference bill. In other words all that this amendment to the Senate bill does is to make it illegal for unions to coerce employers into doing something which an employer is already prevented from doing by the operation of section 8 (3) of the present Wagner Act.

Section 8 (d): The amendment to this subsection providing that the duty to bargain collectively should not be construed as requiring either party to discuss or agree to any modification of the terms of a contract if such modification is to become effective before the contract may be reopened has been construed on the floor to mean "parties will be bound by contract without an opportunity for further collective bargaining." The provision has no such effect. It merely provides that either party to a contract may refuse to change its terms or discuss such a change to take effect during the life thereof without being guilty of an unfair labor practice. Parties may meet and discuss the meaning of the terms of their contract and may agree to modifications on change of circumstances, but it is not mandatory that they do so.

Section 9 (C) (4): The conferees dropped from this section a provision authorizing prehearing elections. That omission has brought forth the charge that we have thereby greatly impeded the Board in its disposition of representation matters. We have not changed the words of existing law providing a hearing in every case unless waived by stipulation of the parties. It is the function of hearings in representation cases to determine whether an election may properly be held at the time; and if so, to decide questions of unit and eligibility to vote. During the last year the Board has tried out a device of holding the election first and then providing the hearing to which the parties were entitled by law. Since its use has been confined to an inconsequential percentage of cases, and more often than not a subsequent hearing was still necessary and because the House conferees strenuously objected to its continuance it was omitted from the bill.

Section 9 (C) (5): This amendment was contained in the House bill. It overrules the "extent of organization" theory sometimes used by the Board in determining appropriate units. Opponents of the bill have stated that it prevents the establishment of small operational units and effectively prevents organization of public utilities insurance companies and other businesses whose operations are widespread. It is sufficient answer to say that the Board has evolved numerous tests to determine appropriate units, such as community of interest of employees involved, extent of common supervision, interchange of employees, geographical considerations, etc., any one of which may justify the finding of a small unit. The extent-of-organization theory has been used where all valid tests fail to give the union what it desires and represents a surrender by the Board of its duty to determine appropriate units. Its use has been particularly bad where another union comes in and organizes the remainder of the unit which results in the establishment of two inappropriate units.

Section 9 (h): This provision making the filing of affidavits with respect to Communist Party affiliation by its officers a condition precedent to use of the processes of the Board has been criticized as creating endless delays. It was to prevent such delays that this provision was amended by the conferees. Under both the Senate and House bills the Board's certification proceedings could have been infinitely delayed while it investigated and determined Communist Party affiliation. Under the amendment an affidavit is sufficient for the Board's purpose and there is no delay unless an officer of the moving union refuses to file the affidavit required.

Section 10 (b): The conferees amended this section to require that proceedings before the Board be conducted, so far as practicable, in accordance with the rules of evidence applicable in the United States district courts. This provision has been attacked as one completely strait-jacketing administrative procedure. As I stated on the floor, this is more a preventive measure than one to cure existing abuses. The Board's earlier habit of accepting literally anything into the record was indefensible. I am informed that now the trial examiners conduct their hearings pretty much in conformity with the practice of the courts in the locality where the hearing is being held. Then, too, the limitation "so far as practicable" gives to the trial examiner considerable discretion as to how closely he will apply the rules of evidence.

Section 10 (c): In an effort to lessen the work load of the Board and facilitate its disposition of cases this subsection was amended to give finality to recommended orders of trial examiners without Board review if no exceptions were taken within 20 days. It has been stated that this permits an unsuccessful litigant to stand idly by while an erroneous report of a trial examiner becomes the order of the Board and then embarrass the Board when the case goes into the courts for enforcement. Several checks would prevent this happening. Section 10 (c) provides, "No objection that has not been urged before the Board, its member, agent, or agency, shall be considered by the court." In addition, the attorney trying the case would presumably file exceptions to such a report and the General Counsel in any event would not go forward with enforcement if the order was erroneous.

Section 11: It has been stated that in modifying the procedure for obtaining a subpena we have dispensed with the requirements of materiality and relevancy. Such statements ignore the remainder of paragraph (1) which provides that the Board shall revoke its subpena on a motion to quash if the evidence required is not relevant or not described with sufficient particularity.

Section 206: In the Senate bill the injunction procedures created in national emergencies became applicable in a strike affecting substantially an entire industry. In conference this was amended to read, "affecting an industry or a substantial part thereof." The statement has been made that this amendment would subject a strike of the employees of one automobile manufacturing company to an injunction. Here again the speaker ignored the remainder of the paragraph which imposes the additional requirement that such strike imperil the national health or safety, a condition which, it is anticipated, will not often occur.

COMMENTS OF THE PRESIDENT AT OTTAWA ON ST. LAWRENCE RIVER DEVELOPMENT

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, in his speech in Ottawa yesterday Mr. Truman said:

Gratifying as the volume of our trade now is, it is capable of even further expansion to our mutual benefit. Some of our greatest assets are still to be developed to the maximum. I am thinking of one particularly that holds tremendous possibilities, the magnificent St. Lawrence-Great Lakes system, which we share and which we must develop together.

The St. Lawrence project stirs the imagination of men long accustomed to majestic distances and epic undertakings. The proposal for taking electric power from the river and bringing ocean shipping 2,400 miles inland, to tap the fertile heart of our continent, is economically sound and strategically important.

When this program is carried out, the waterway that is part of our boundary will more than ever unite our two countries. It will stimulate our economies to new growth and will speed the flow of trade.

This enunciation of President Truman should stir our country to do its part without delay. As the President says, the St. Lawrence River project "is economically sound and strategically important." This assertion is supported by the greatest men of this country, men who have a broad outlook on national and international affairs, and are not restrained by the charge of self-interest or provincialism being presented. Only 2 weeks ago ex-President Hoover and Secretary of State George Marshall urged the development of this great waterway for the same reasons that President Truman urged it at Ottawa yesterday.

Already the northeastern section of the United States and the southeastern area of Canada are experiencing an acute shortage of electric energy. Many lines of industry cannot expand because power is not available, while the great middle area of the continent, the greatest agricultural region in the whole world, is producing ever-increasing crops of grain which cannot be moved economically because existing facilities are hopelessly inadequate to meet the needs. Our American economy calls desperately for more power and for more adequate transportation, and yet here and there we still find men of little vision working to prevent developments which will make America greater and stronger and more secure. How long, Mr. President, will we let them block the economic expansion of our Nation? How long will we let them jeopardize our security in the event of war? Is it not about time for the Congress to assert itself to see that the needs of the whole country come first? Let us sweep aside the objections of the myopic obstructionists, and authorize the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway without further delay.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont, my esteemed colleague, whether service to the needs of the entire Nation is not the objective of the St. Lawrence project, which not only President Truman and President Roosevelt, but all Republican Presidents in recent years have favored? Is not that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. That is true.

Mr. TOBEY. I point out to my colleague that the forces that are trying to strangle and kill and put out of business the successful carrying out of the St. Lawrence seaway find a deadly parallel in the corporate forces that are trying to put through the so-called Bulwinkle bill. Is not that true?

Mr. AIKEN. In many instances I think they are interlocking interests.

Mr. TOBEY. Of course they are.

SUGGESTED VETO OF LABOR BILL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the body of the RECORD a statement by George W. Taylor and a statement by William H. Davis, Chairman and former Chairman of the War Labor Board, respectively, urging a Presidential veto of the Taft-Hartley bill.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the newspaper PM for June 11, 1947]

TWO EX-WLB CHIEFS URGE TAFT-HARTLEY VETO

Two former chairmen of the War Labor Board today join other former public members of the WLB in denouncing the Taft-Hartley Labor Bill now awaiting President Truman's signature or veto.

Yesterday PM printed exclusive statements from Lloyd K. Garrison, Frank P. Graham, Edwin E. Witte, Nathan P. Feinsinger, and Senator Wayne L. Morse. These men were members of the small group of WLB public members who held the balance of power between labor and management in framing a successful wartime industrial relations policy. Unanimously they branded the Taft-Hartley bill unworkable, inequitable, and unsound.

William H. Davis and George W. Taylor served successively as Chairman of the WLB from January 1942 until after VJ-day. They had great responsibilities and unparelleled experience in industrial relations during the war. Their statements on the labor bill, written expressly for PM, are printed below.

GEORGE W. TAYLOR, PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

"The labor-management bill of 1947 has been characterized as antilabor. Anyone who takes a position against it on the ground that it is merely antilabor is due for a rude awakening.

"Labor relations in this country have been anchored in collective bargaining, which presupposes that the working out of employment conditions is a private matter between unions and management.

"The bill says that its 'purpose and policy are to prescribe the legitimate rights of both employees and employers in their relations affecting commerce, to provide orderly and peaceful procedures for preventing the interference by either with the legitimate rights of the other, to protect the rights of individual employees in their relations with labor organizations * * * to define and prescribe practices on the part of labor and management which affect commerce, and to protect the rights of the public.'

"I don't believe that we have to look to government to interject itself to direct labor and management in resolving the issues between them. I believe they are perfectly able to work out their own affairs without Government direction. For a long time we have tried to apply the principle of free collective bargaining, and with great success. This bill substitutes Government-managed collective bargaining. I am not willing to accept Government-managed bargaining because I, for one, do not propose to sell democracy short."

WILLIAM H. DAVIS, ATTORNEY

"I have read the comments on the Taft-Hartley bill by the public members associated with me on the War Labor Board as they appear in this morning's PM. I agree with them that the Taft-Hartley bill, if it becomes law, will be on the whole a handicap to good management-labor relations and detrimental to the national welfare.

"Wherever it goes in any significant way beyond the recommendations made by the President in his message of last January, the bill reflects a yearning to go backward to conditions of the roaring but disastrous thirties. The fact is, however, that when we discovered how to release the energy of the atom, we blew up our bridges behind us. There is no road back to those good old days. We have to go forward.

"I think all of the objections to the Taft-Hartley bill made by my conferees on the War Labor Board are sound. The most disturbing of these all, in my opinion, is that the bill gives no real answer to the question: What shall we do about strikes that endanger the national welfare? This lack is correctly expressed by Mr. Garrison, in Tuesday's PM, when he points out that the bill ties the hands of Government in such cases, and that its provisions would be no good, for instance, in an emergency created by a strike in the bituminous-coal mines."

EFFECTS OF PASSAGE OF LABOR BILL

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I have a communication which is not very long, which I should like to read, and then I have an observation which I should like to make.

This is a letter dated June 12, 1947. It reads as follows:

CIO MARITIME COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C., June 12, 1947.

The Honorable CLAUDE PEPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR PEPPER: Maritime workers have followed with deep interest the outstanding fight you have waged in behalf of all American workers. In your statements in opposition to the Taft-Hartley bill you pointed out the effect of the passage of this legislation would have upon the living standards, working conditions, and union rights of American workers.

It was clear to us, with our contracts expiring June 15, that the first impact of this legislation would be felt in the maritime industry. As you recall, during the month of June in 1946, the maritime industry faced a national shut-down because of the stalling of the employers and it was only the threat of a strike and the intercession of certain Government agencies that prevented this. The history of collective bargaining in the maritime industry is replete with evidence that the shipowners just do not believe in collective bargaining.

In the current negotiations we have been faced with the same medieval attitude with something new added. Under the shadow of the Taft-Hartley bill even the pretense of collective bargaining has disappeared.

Our contracts have been open for renegotiation since the early part of May. Despite strenuous efforts on the part of the unions to conclude a new contract, the shipowners have engaged in the most blatant kind of stalling and have made quite clear their intention of prolonging negotiations indefinitely without any effort to really bargain. At the present time, although only 3 days remain before the expiration of the contracts, the employers are still refusing to bargain on the reasonable demands of the unions. In an earnest desire to conclude the contracts before the dead line, the unions have proposed night and day negotiations. The shipowners refused this request.

We are trying to negotiate with a group of employers who currently enjoy the most profitable years in maritime history. As Under Secretary of State Will Clayton recently told a congressional committee, the shipping companies are "making enormous profits, unheard of profits in peacetime * * * I tell you they are making plenty of money and they are not complaining on that score. They would be laughed out of court if they should."

This confirms the truth of your statements during the debate on the Taft-Hartley bill, that totally apart from the punitive provisions, the bill is a complete barrier to real collective bargaining.

* * * * *

We are informing you of this situation because it so clearly illustrates that what you foresaw has already come true.

Mr. Senator, our problem is that even before the Taft-Hartley bill is law, we cannot achieve genuine collective bargaining. It is obvious that collective bargaining relations will be infinitely worsened if and when the bill became law. We are hopeful that you will bring these facts to the attention of the Senate and the American people.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CURRAN,
Chairman.

MURRAY WINOCUR,
Secretary, East Coast Joint Policy Committee.

Mr. President, I previously called attention to my belief that the effect of the Taft-Hartley bill would be to prolong industrial strife. The coal, maritime, and textile industries furnish examples, in my opinion, of employers, who, made more recalcitrant by the imminent passage of the bill, are stalling during the renegotiation of contracts, even before the measure becomes law.

Not the Taft-Hartley bill but merely the threat of it has led to a hardening of the collective-bargaining arteries. A number of important union-management contracts, notably in coal, maritime, and textile, expire at this time of the year. I

am informed that the pattern of employer refusal to bargain is consistent. There appears to be a widespread effort to lock out hundreds of thousands of workers in an effort to make it appear that there is a general strike against the Congress.

In the coal industry negotiations have collapsed in the face of completely inadequate proposals by the northern operators. Negotiations with the southern operators never really got underway because they are awaiting action on the Taft-Hartley bill.

Mr. President, I doubt whether there will be presented again for many years such a favorable opportunity for the coal business and other businesses in the United States as the one today at hand. So it seems to me they are doing a disservice to themselves when they try to take advantage of the contemplated enactment of this law to deprive their workers of the advantages which they have enjoyed in the past, and deny them the renewal of contracts.

On the west coast the CIO maritime unions today accused the shipowners, as I said before, of stalling contract negotiations while awaiting action on the Taft-Hartley bill. On the east coast a similar situation has developed. This means that June 15 may see a Nationwide shipping tie-up. Although the contracts expire midnight this Sunday, the shipowners have refused, despite the insistant demands of the union negotiation committees, to schedule 'round-the-clock bargaining sessions. Instead the shipowners consent to meet with the unions for brief sessions. This is not even the shell of collective bargaining. The unions opened negotiations more than a month ago, but no bargaining sessions involving anything more than formalities have yet taken place.

In the textile industry there are numerous examples of employers coming into collective bargaining meetings and openly admitting that they will delay negotiations pending the outcome of the Taft-Hartley bill, after which, they candidly state, they will not bargain at all.

The present record of collective bargaining under the shadow of the Taft-Hartley bill proves that it will not solve a single labor-management dispute. What is needed in each of these industries—coal, maritime, textile—is real collective bargaining. The Taft-Hartley bill prevents this.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE FOR ATTENDANCE AT PRINCETON BICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, on Monday and Tuesday next, June 16 and 17, Princeton University is concluding the year of its bicentennial celebration. Last year, the Senate and the House of Representatives by joint resolution appointed a commission from the Senate and the House to participate in the bicentennial celebration and to be present at the ceremonies. In view of that fact, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday and Tuesday next, the following-named Senators, who have been appointed the Senate members of the commission, be excused from attendance on the Senate: The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and myself, the junior Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3756) making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 3756) making appropriations for Government corporations and independent executive agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN AGREEMENTS BETWEEN CARRIERS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 110) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I address myself to the Reed-Bulwinkle bill, and I shall give in detail my reasons for opposing its passage.

A growing concentration of economic power is steadily subjecting an ever larger part of our industry and our economic life to the control of a smaller and smaller group of interlocked financial and industrial interests. There is general agreement, in principle at least, that this concentration of dominating power in a few hands, whether private or public, threatens the freedom of individual opinion, individual initiative, individual opportunity, and individual enterprise on which our Nation has always relied for present welfare and future progress.

In this difficult time when our Nation is exerting its influence throughout the world to preserve individual freedom and encourage democratic political and economic ideals, this Congress is confronted with a bold proposal to sanction here at home a regimentation of our transportation industry under a system of private collective controls operating under Government license without Government supervision. This system of regimentation, which we are today asked to approve by enacting Senate bill 110, the Reed-Bulwinkle bill, has been in operation for some years in brazen defiance of our laws intended to preserve the American system of free trade and free competitive enterprise. The sponsors of this proposed legislation seek our license now only because the Association of American Railroads, and the private collectivism through which it secretly governs railroad affairs, are today in court charged with violations of the antitrust laws. They therefore seek to have this Congress cut off the jurisdiction of the courts by immunizing a palpable combination in restraint of trade from the operation of the antitrust laws.

Yet we are told by its sponsors that this bill will not affect the pending antitrust suits. What, then, is the purpose of this proposed legislation? The conference method of rate making, authorized by Senate bill 110, is already in full operation under the private authorization of the Association of American Railroads, and therefore requires no enabling legislation from the Congress. It is obvious that the real purpose of the bill is to protect the private collective control over railroad affairs which now exists from an anticipated condemnation under the antitrust laws. This conclusion is fortified by the haste with which this bill is pressed upon us, by the unseemly vituperation which a sponsor of this bill has publicly heaped upon the Department of Justice for daring to introduce the law into the private preserve of the railroad combination, and by dire predictions of the chaos and disaster which the sponsors of the bill assure us will result from any interference with the presently functioning private system of collective control over railroad affairs.

Mr. President, I see no need for haste in this matter. On the contrary, I see compelling reasons for delay. The Department of Justice and the sovereign State of Georgia have brought serious charges against the railroad combination. It is charged that under the dominating control and active supervision of the Association of American Railroads the railroads of the country are operating under a private form of collectivism which, outside and beyond the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission, fixes railroad rates and services through agreements which have almost entirely eliminated competition and freedom of individual initiative and enterprise from railroad affairs. It is further charged that this conspiracy and combination has allied itself with eastern financial and industrial interests to serve their mutual selfish purposes in preserving the status quo by maintaining rigid rate relationships. The Government charges that eastern railroads and their industrial and financial allies have sought to preserve the West as a source of raw materials for eastern fabricators, confining the western railroads to the carriage of western grist to eastern mills and keeping the people of the West in colonial status as drawers of water and hewers of wood.

These charges are serious and are worthy of serious answer. They cannot be dismissed as the delusions of Government visionaries. I am informed that both Georgia's and the Government's charges have withstood preliminary judicial scrutiny. The evidence submitted by the United States to the district court in Lincoln, Nebr.—evidence procured from the files of the railroads—is open to examination. The evidence submitted by the State of Georgia is likewise available. The latter case has been submitted to a special master designated by the Supreme Court, and his findings of fact may be reported to the Supreme Court

at any time. The unwillingness of the Association of American Railroads to test the facts in the time-honored, traditional American way in a court of law suggests a recognition on the part of the railroads that the charges are well founded. The powerful lobby of the Association of American Railroads is now working night and day to persuade this Congress to exempt the transportation industry from the antitrust laws by passing this bill. I ask this question, Mr. President: If the serious charges made by the Government in the western case are unfounded, why the anxiety on the part of the Association of American Railroads to deny the Congress and the public at large the benefit of a judicial examination of the charges?

By "the public at large" I do not mean the—I quote from Government exhibit 166 in the Western case—"lawyers, operating men, traffic men, transportation men, and local surgeons" who constitute the backbone of the railroad lobby, and from whom we have been hearing, nor am I referring to those shippers whose selfish interest is also served by the preservation of the status quo. Rather by the "public at large" I mean all our constituents who, as consumers, pay the freight. This is the one group that finds no representation in the railroad lobby. This is the one group that must depend upon its representatives in Congress for the protection of its interest. If we are going to allow the railroad lobby to persuade us to cut off the jurisdiction of the courts to try the charges brought by the Government against the railroad combination, then we can hardly discharge our obligation to the great mass of the American people unless we, ourselves, examine the evidence which the Government brings forward to support its charges.

That evidence is substantial and voluminous. It was presented by the Government to the district court at Lincoln, Nebr., on April 23 of this year, after this bill had been favorably reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. In my opinion this bill should now be referred back to the committee for consideration of the evidence presented by the Government in support of its charges.

I understand that a large part, but by no means all, of the Government's evidence was placed before the Interstate Commerce Committee of the last Congress, when it was considering a similar bill. I also understand that the Department of Justice was invited to present only brief statements when the pending bill was before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I quote from the statement submitted to the committee by the Attorney General:

> The pending legislation would authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission to approve agreements setting up basic plans of organization and procedures whereby private groups would be empowered to regiment the transportation industry. I am convinced that the proposal before this committee to set up such immunities from the antitrust laws raises a serious question concerning the entire antitrust program.
>
> * * * * *
>
> While in the field of transportation the Interstate Commerce Commission has been given the power to limit and control railroad rates and practices in many important respects, both the Commission and the courts recognize that under the statutory scheme of regulation the railroads possess wide latitude and are charged with individual responsibility and initiative in the establishment and modification of rates and fares and in the provision of facilities and services. As to those respects in which the carriers are free, competition remains the rule of law in transportation and in those respects the public relies upon competition between carriers for the protection and advancement of the public interest.
>
> The bill now under consideration by this committee would set up machinery that could permit powerful groups to destroy free enterprise in the transportation industry by freeing that industry from restraint of the antitrust laws. I am aware that the immunity from the antitrust laws which the bill would accord under the private agreements between carriers authorized by the bill is made contingent upon the approval by the Interstate Commerce Commission of such agreements. The bill fails, however, to give any assurance that the private power created by such agreements, once they are approved by the Commission, will be susceptible to public control and supervision. It is the things which might be done under these private agreements which threaten the public interest; and it is these very things which the bill shields from the attention of the prosecuting agencies of the public.
>
> The Department of Justice is seriously concerned with the extent to which private controls in the railroad industry have already become, even without the sanction of law, a fulcrum upon which private groups have successfully applied pressure to eliminate competition in other industries, to create rigid, noncompetitive market relationships, and to preserve the economic status quo. These private controls within the railroad industry are now under attack by the Department of Justice. Should the passage of this bill succeed in immunizing such private controls from the antitrust laws, I am fearful that the transportation industry will turn its face from the ideal of free enterprise to a new order of private regimentation. Our experience in the enforcement of the antitrust laws demonstrates that there are powerful influences in the economy constantly seeking rigidity of market control and the elimination of competition. Congressional approval of regimentation in transportation would both accelerate the present drive for the immunization of private controls in other industries, and furnish a mechanism for the indirect extension of such controls. And, because transportation is a basic factor in every industry, our problem in enforcing the antitrust laws in the "free" remainder of the economy would be seriously complicated.

Assistant Attorney General Wendell Berge, in testimony before the committee, condemned the bill as "a bold and flagrant attempt to get special privileges and special protection" for the railroad "monopoly group already well entrenched."

Mr. Berge pointed out that the bill would have the effect of exempting from the antitrust laws the railroad, truck and bus, water carrier, pipe-line and freight forwarder industries.

Mr. Berge told the committee that—

> (1) Through the device of a hierarchy of associations, headed at the top by the Association of American Railroads, the transportation monopoly, in combination with monopolies in other basic industries, such as the cement and oil combines, has so fixed transportation prices as to maintain the industrial status quo and to prevent new enterprises from competing with the industrial monopolies.

This was so well recognized 10 or 12 years ago that I recall when we were building the Fort Peck Dam in Montana, and were in need of huge quantities of cement, the prices of cement were skyrocketed so high that it was necessary for the Secretary of the Interior to reject the bids and threaten to build a Government plant to produce cement for the construction of that project.

I continue the quotation of Mr. Berge's testimony before the committee:

> (2) The arbitrary rail rate structure established by the illicit monopoly has prevented southern and western regions from developing competitive industries.
>
> (3) This bill would legalize the present unlawful domination and control over the Nation's competitive economy possessed by the Association of American Railroads and its industrial allies.

Mr. Berge further stated:

> The apparent purpose of pressing for early enactment of this bill is to attempt to deprive the courts of jurisdiction in pending antitrust cases instituted by the Government and the State of Georgia against the railroad combinations.

Mr. Berge added that other interests have "already announced their intentions to follow the example of the transportation industry in asking the Congress to exempt them from the antitrust laws."

This matter was discussed on the floor of the Senate a day or so ago when our distinguished leader pointed out that just such consequences would flow from the sort of legislation now proposed.

James E. Kilday, special assistant to the Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division's Transportation and Public Utilities Section of the Department of Justice, appeared before the committee and quoted statements by railroad officials describing private ratemaking associations within the railroad industry as constituting a private government endowed with powers of police, administration, and self-regulation unknown to the law.

Mr. Kilday described the commissioner plan, under which a neutral commissioner functioned for many years—until the plan was discovered by the Department of Justice in 1943—as the arbiter of western rates and competitive practices, backed by a committee of directors representing stockholding interests, which met regularly at 40 Wall Street, New York City, to hear reports from the commissioner, to review decisions of western rate bureaus, and to formulate policies to be followed by the western railroads.

Mr. President, I have here the plaintiff's trial brief in the Nebraska case, which gives a detailed statement of the situation. On page 13 of that brief, I find the following:

> B. THE PRESENT CONSPIRACY
>
> 1. THE WESTERN COMMISSIONER AGREEMENT
>
> (Pt. II, pp. 7–24)
>
> A common bond between western carriers which would prevent the exercise by individual railroads of independent managerial discretion was formed in 1932 by the western commissioner agreement establishing the commissioner plan for the railroads serving the States west of the Mississippi, known as the western district of the United States.

This plan was explicitly designed to expand the private control over western rates and practices previously exercised by the Western Association of Railway Executives and its subordinate organizations, and to insure that decisions affecting railroad rates, service, and policy should be made collectively rather than individually, from the standpoint of group interest rather than that of individual initiative.

Under this agreement, which became effective December 1, 1932, the defendant railroads individually agreed to submit proposed changes in rates, both passenger and freight, and changes in facilities and services, to existing rate bureaus for group consideration and decision in the interest of the carriers as a whole. The agreement established an additional control over western rate matters by creating the office of the western commissioner, to be occupied by the ex-officio chairman of the Western Association of Railway Executives, empowered to decide appeals from subordinate rate organizations. The commissioner was also given power to stay the action of any road which might propose independently to effectuate a rate or practice disapproved by the group. Any road refusing to accept his decision was to be cited to a committee of directors which met regularly at 40 Wall Street, New York City. One of the organizers of the plan subsequently pointed out that its purpose was to subject western railway management decisions concerning rates and practices to review by eastern financial interests:

The directors already supervised expenditures by management to a very close degree and yet large sums could be lost in unfortunate traffic experiments or improper traffic policies without the matter coming to the notice of directors until after the damage was done. With the onset of depression conditions, directors made closer and closer scrutinies of expenditures but were still powerless to exercise any effective supervision over policies of rates and practices involving substantial sums.

The directors' committee created by the commissioner plan was designed to correct this situation—to them the commissioner reported many of the problems which came to him—so as to give the Directors the benefit of his investigations and research. All problems in which the recommendation of the commissioner were not adopted came to the committee. * * * In this committee of directors all personality, prejudice, and suspicion of traffic officers was left behind, the necessity of management to uphold a subordinate did not exist, because no president, vice president, or trustee was eligible for membership.

2. THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN RAILROADS

(Pt. II, pp. 25–27)

The agreement establishing the commissioner plan for the governance of western railroads made specific provision for cooperation by the Western Association of Railway Executives with the railroads in the eastern and southern district of the United States in the collective determination of railroad policy, rates, and services on a national scale. This cooperation was earnestly sought by railroad bankers, leading institutional investors and railroad managers, whose common apprehension of competitive initiative induced a common course of action.

Preliminary discussions among banking and investment groups led to the creation in 1933 of a national steering committee of railroad directors to represent stockholding and investment interests in creating a national organization for the collective control of railroad affairs. The members of this committee and their principal financial and industrial affiliations were:

Pierre S. du Pont, director, Pennsylvania Railroad; E. I. du Pont de Nemours; General Motors.

W. A. Harriman, chairman of the board, Union Pacific System; Harriman Bros.; Guaranty Trust.

Jeremiah Milbank, director, Southern Railway; Chase National Bank; Metropolitan Life.

John R. Morron, director, Baltimore & Ohio Railroad; Alton Railroad; First National Bank of New York City; First Security Company of New York; Pullman, Inc.

R. F. Loree, director, New York Central Railroad; Guaranty Co. of New York; vice president, Guaranty Trust Co. of New York.

W. W. Colpitts, director, Seaboard Air Line; Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railway; Pere Marquette Railway; Central National Corp.; Pierce Petroleum Corp.; partner, Coverdale & Colpitts.

F. B. Adams, director, Atlantic Coast Line; Louisville & Nashville Railroad; Chicago, Indianapolis & Louisville Railway; Air Reduction Co.; Lima Locomotive Works; International Motor Truck Corp.; Mack Trucks; National Carbide; Remington Arms; United State Industrial Alcohol.

H. W. deForest, director, Southern Pacific Lines; Illinois Central Railroad; Delaware & Hudson; Texas & New Orleans Railroad; Guaranty Trust Co.; Western Union; Tide Water Associated Oil Co.; partner, deForest Bros., New York City.

Arthur Curtiss James, director, Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad; Great Northern Railway; Colorado & Southern Railway; Western Pacific Railroad; Phelps-Dodge Corp.; Northern Securities Co.; First Security Co. of New York.

Under the western agreement, the previously independent or loosely allied western rate bureaus and associations were combined into a hierarchy of trade associations that ultimately placed private control over the western railroad industry in the hands of a committee composed principally of representatives of eastern financial interests. This integration of existing bureaus into a unified system of controls was the model after which the conspirators patterned the national combination.

The need for authoritative control at the top was expressed by one of the conspirators in the following words:

"The necessity for a strong effective committee or organization representing the railroad industry as a whole as opposed to the interests of individual railroads is emphasized at the present time in connection with the weakness the railroads are showing in protecting their rate structure.

* * * * *

"From the way that this grain rate reduction is spreading like a prairie fire, it now looks as if the only hope would be for some individual or organization, disassociated with any particular railroad, to take the lead in opposing the rate reduction. * * *

"It would seem to me that our committee should bring this matter immediately to the attention of the executives with whom we are discussing the formation of a committee whose duty it would be to prevent the individual carriers forcing the industry as a whole along the road to suicide."

General Atterbury, of the Pennsylvania Railroad, took the lead in preparing a plan of organization that would embrace all of the railroads, that would not be subject to Government supervision, and that would have power to control all of the economic aspects of railroad transportation that had theretofore been left to competition.

The conception evolved by the Pennsylvania group to eliminate competition between railroads was bold, clear, and simple. This group proposed that all existing trade associations be merged into a single integrated structure of controls bound together at the top by a new national association which would have the power to enforce its mandates by the economic discipline of its members.

I take that statement from the brief filed by the Government in the case of United States of America, plaintiff, versus the Association of American Railroads, the Western Association of Railway Executives et al., defendants, which is known as the Nebraska case. It is found at page 13 of the brief.

In connection with his testimony, Mr. Kilday introduced an exhibit listing 81 overt acts of control or prevention of rate or service changes in the West which were actually carried out by the private collective controls which he described.

Mr. Kilday stated that the Association of American Railroads is the apex which dominates and coordinates the entire hierarchy of private rate mechanisms.

The proponents of this legislation deny these charges brought by the Government but are unwilling to abide by the test of judicial determination. Indeed by inference they admit the existence of the private collective controls alleged by the Government when they argue that collective action in the determination of railroad rates and policies is necessary to the efficient operation of our transportation system. This argument has an ominous resemblance to the justification advanced for the strikingly similar fascistic system of collective control established in Italy by Mussolini—that it was necessary in order to make the trains run on time. Recent history has persuaded me that the incidental inefficiencies of democracy are preferable to the efficient tyrannies of a regimented totalitarianism.

I cannot agree that the bill establishes any effective public control over the private collective action which it approves. As pointed out by the Attorney General, the approval which the bill requires from the Interstate Commerce Commission is an approval only of the basic agreements establishing private machinery for the private determination by railroads, acting as a group, of collective rates and policies. The rates made and the policies enforced pursuant to these basic agreements are shielded by the bill from the scrutiny of our public prosecutors. The influences which shape the products of this private machinery, and their purposes and objectives, are to be protected by the bill from public disclosure and from public responsibility. I am aware that the rates made by this approved private machinery will continue to be subject to the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission. But the rates now made by collective action without our approval are subject to that jurisdiction. The Government charges that the railroad combination has been able to flout and even to preempt the Commission's control over rates. The bill adds nothing to the existing power of the Commission to deal with rates. Will not the railroad combination be emboldened by approval of the bill to go further than it has already gone in mocking the regulatory process?

Indeed, under the bill the railroads collectively are given greater powers than the Congress has heretofore seen fit to entrust to the public regulatory body, the Interstate Commerce Commission. For under the bill a group of railroads acting

through a rate bureau can collusively fix and agree upon not merely the maximum rate for a given transportation service, or the minimum rate for such service, but the specific rate, in so many dollars and cents. The Interstate Commerce Commission can rarely prescribe a specific rate, and then only on the basis of findings that pre-existing rates were unlawful. And two or more groups of carriers in different sections of the country, acting collectively under the bill through their respective rate bureaus, can fix and agree upon rate differentials, or relationships, which determine how much more a furniture manufacturer in Montana, for example, must pay to move his furniture to the St. Louis market than a furniture manufacturer in the East pays to move the same product approximately the same distance to the same market; or, indeed, how much more the Montana manufacturer must pay to move his product the much shorter distance to common western markets in which he must compete with the eastern manufacturer.

As a representative here of the people of the State of Montana, I am particularly concerned with the injury which the bill threatens to impose upon my State. The bill would license those who control the railroads to continue with impunity to impose upon the people of my State and of the West the discriminatory and prejudicial treatment which the Government charges has been and is now accorded the West by the railroad combination.

I quote from the statement made to the court at Lincoln, Nebr., on April 23 of this year by Wendell Berge, then Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division, in opening the presentation of the Government's evidence against the private collective controls which we are now asked to approve:

The power to discriminate which is implicit in monopoly control of an industry has in this case been made explicit against the West. The Government's evidence will show that under the terms of the western agreement ultimate control over western rates and practices was vested in a committee of directors which met in New York City to review the decisions made by western railroad management with respect to rates, services, and practices.

The evidence conclusively shows that the authority and influence of this committee of directors was exerted to prevent rate reductions and the inauguration of competitive practices sought by individual western roads. For example, in 1933 the committee of directors prevented the Chicago Great Western Railroad from publishing reduced rates on packing-house products. And in 1934 the committee of directors dissuaded the Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railroad from extending industrial-track facilities designed to develop new industry at San Antonio, Tex.

Again, the evidence shows that the Association of American Railroads prevented western railroads from establishing transit privileges on grain at cities in the Midwest, thereby denying midwestern cities the opportunity to develop industries engaged in processing grain into flour, cereals, or other grain products. The evidence also shows that in 1938 the committee of directors, under the western agreement, directed the western commissioner to "convey to the western executives their concern over the extension of transit privileges to Omaha and Council Bluffs," and "to request the executives to review these transit privileges in an effort to find a way to correct the situation."

The specific acts of discrimination against the West disclosed by the evidence, injurious though they have been to the western economy, are merely surface manifestations of the deeper discrimination against the West which the combination and conspiracy here has effectuated by its maintenance of traditional geographic rate differentials. Because of these differentials, the people of the West pay more for railroad service than people in the East pay for railroad service, and the product of western industry suffer a rate disadvantage when they compete in common markets in the East with the products of the East, notwithstanding the fact that the actual mileage may be in favor of the western industry.

The evidence shows that this differential in the class rate scales shows a discrimination varying between 112 percent and 160 percent against the West and in favor of the East, and a discrimination of 136 percent against the South and in favor of the East.

These traditional differentials are not justified by differences in the cost of service. * * *

The Government's evidence conclusively establishes that these differentials have been perpetuated by the operations of the combination and conspiracy here in preventing rate reductions and readjustments sought by shippers and by individual railroads.

This regional rate discrimination penalizes substantially the present and potential movement of processed goods from the South and West, thereby discouraging the expansion and diversification of industry natural to those areas. * * *

Decentralization and diffusion of industry based upon local resources is a part of the price of national unity and maximum economic stability. The present interterritorial freight-rate barriers militate against this attainment. Their continuance tends to accentuate the development of one region as an urbanized industrial area and to maintain the other regions in a colonial position as contributors of raw materials.

This charge that the railroad combination discriminates against the West is supported by evidence presented by the Department of Justice to the district court at Lincoln, Nebr. The charge of discrimination is also supported by findings of the Interstate Commerce Commission. On May 12 of this year the Supreme Court upheld an order of the Commission in the so-called Class Rate Investigation, Docket 28300, which found these regional class-rate differentials to be unlawfully discriminatory against the West and against the South. At page 5 of the slip opinion delivered on behalf of the Court by Justice Douglas, the Court said:

The Commission found that class rates within southern, southwestern, and western trunk-line territories, and from those territories to official territory, were generally much higher, article for article, than the rates within official territory. It found that higher class rates have impeded the development and movement of class-rate freight within southern, southwestern, and western trunk-line territories and from those territories to official territory. It concluded that neither the comparative costs of transportation service nor variations in the consists and volume of traffic within the territories justified those differences in the class rates. The Commission also determined that equalization of class rates is not dependent on equalization of nonclass rates and that interterritorial rate problems can be solved only by establishing substantial uniformity in class ratings and rates.

Section 3 (1) of the act outlaws undue or unreasonable preferences or advantages to any region, district, or territory. The Commission found that the relation between the interterritorial class rates to official territory from the other territories in question and the intraterritorial class rates within official territory results in an unreasonable preference to official territory as a whole, and to shippers and receivers of freight located there, in violation of section 3 (1).

After setting forth tables and figures showing the degree to which specific rates from western and southern origin points exceeded rates for the same distance from eastern origin points to common markets, the Court said, at page 15:

The disadvantage to the southern or western shipper who attempts to market his product in official territory is obvious. Thus the first of these tables shows that a Nashville shipper pays 39 cents more on each 100 pounds of freight moving to Indianapolis, Ind., than one who ships from Indianapolis to a point of substantially equal distance away (Kent, Ohio) in official territory.

Similar disadvantages suffered by southern and western shippers are revealed in the other comparable interterritorial freight movements set forth in the tables.

There is rather voluminous evidence in the record tendered to show the effect in concrete competitive situations of these class rate inequalities. The instances were in the main reviewed by the Commission. They are attacked here on various grounds—that some of them involved rates other than class rates, that others were testified to by shippers who made no complaint of class rates, that others showed shippers paying higher rates, yet maintaining their competitive positions and prospering. We do not stop to analyze them or discuss them beyond saying that some of the specific instances support what is plainly to be inferred from the figures we have summarized—that class rates within southern, southwestern, and western territories, and from those territories to official territory, are generally much higher, article for article, than the rates within official territory. That was the basic finding of the Commission; and it is abundantly supported by the evidence.

Thus discrimination in class rates in favor of official territory and against the southern, southwestern, and western trunk line territories is established.

Again, at page 20, the Court said:

As we stated in *Georgia* v. *Pennsylvania R. Co.* (324 U. S. 439, 450), "discriminatory rates are but one form of trade barriers." Their effect is not only to impede established industries but to prevent the establishment of new ones, to arrest the development of a State or region, to make it difficult for an agricultural economy to evolve into an industrial one. Nondiscriminatory class rates remove that barrier by offering that equality which the law was designed to afford. They insure prospective shippers not only that the rates are just and reasonable per se but that they are properly related to those of their competitors. Shippers are then not dependent on their ability to get exception rates or commodity rates after their industries are established and their shipments are ready to move. They have a basis for planning ahead by relying on a coherent rate structure reflecting competitive factors.

The Court found that the development of the West and South had been prejudiced by discriminatory freight rates. At page 25 the Court said:

In 1940 the average annual dollar income per person employed in official territory was $1,988; in southern, $940; in southwestern,

$1,177; in western trunk-line, $1,411. Official has 69 percent of all workers engaged in manufacturing in the United States and 29 percent of all workers in extractive industries. It has, for example, a high concentration in the manufacture of steel and copper products, though less than 4 percent of the iron ore reserves, and no reserve of metallic copper. The South and West furnish raw materials to official and buy finished products back. They are also dependent to a great extent on the markets for their products in official, which has over 48 percent of the population of the country, 76 percent of the national market for industrial machinery and raw materials, 64 percent for all goods and sources, 62 percent for consumer luxuries, and 53 percent for consumer necessities. Yet the South and West suffer rate handicaps when they seek to reach those markets.

The charge that the railroad combination has perpetuated these historic rate differentials against the West and South is supported, and their motivation in doing so is indicated by findings of the Interstate Commerce Commission. I quote from the Commission's decision in this class rate case, at pages 695–696 of volume 262 of the Commission's reports:

Although manufacturing has grown in the South and Southwest and to a lesser extent in western trunk-line territory in the last decade, it is still vastly less in diversification and amount than in official territory. The increases in manufacturing in these territories has created a demand for rates which will at once permit the free movement of the manufactured articles, but because of the level of the intraterritorial and interterritorial class rates, such free movement has been impeded insofar as such commodities move at class rates. In most instances it has been necessary either to reduce the class rate levels or to establish exception or commodity rates in order that the manufactured products may move freely, and this action has frequently been subject to long delays because of the failure of individual carriers or groups of carriers to agree upon a basis.

Official territory is the greatest consuming territory in the country, and is the market that nearly all manufacturers desire to reach, particularly where they have a surplus of their products to sell. In shipping to official territory, manufacturers in the other territories not only have the disadvantage of location, but are subjected to an additional burden in those instances where they must pay class rates on a much higher level than their competitors in official territory. This situation reacts to the disadvantage of manufacturers in the other territories, and to the advantage of those in official territory, tends to restrict the growth and expansion of the manufacturers in the other territories, and, to some extent, to prevent the establishment of new manufacturing plants in those territories.

The statistics which reflect the economic results of the discrimination against the West perpetuated by the railroad combination make dull reading. But the consequences are real and vivid enough to the people who suffer the blighting effects of the discrimination. The people of Montana have felt this blight of discriminatory freight rates.

After the turn of this century Montana created in a small way an independent milling industry. Most of its mills were what may be termed local consumption mills, milling only sufficient grain to provide local markets with flour, feed and cereals. One of these milling concerns grew into prominence in the bakery-goods industry because of its excellent flour, and projected its sales into interstate commerce.

Today throughout the great western grain-producing area there are deserted grain mills with their broken windows and rusting machinery. These gaunt mills are silent monuments to the independent milling industry in the West, destroyed by freight-rate discrimination.

On the representations of the railroads and of the midcontinent and midwestern millers, most of which are chain mills, the Interstate Commerce Commission in 1930 created the so-called rate-break method of rate making for the movement of grain and its products—One Hundred and Sixty-fourth Interstate Commerce Commission Report, page 619. What is meant by the rate-break method is this: When a farmer living in Montana or any of the Western grain-producing States ships his grain, he pays the initial freight rate from the farm shipping point—if he sells locally, the grain elevator or the mill deducts the freight rate from the price paid—to the controlling market. The leading midwestern price-controlling market was then and is still Minneapolis, Minn. Its quotations govern the markets throughout the western plains region. If the farmer sells his grain at any of the great midwestern markets located on the Missouri River, the purchasing grain miller or speculator can and normally does continue the grain or grain products milled from the same grain—or may substitute an equal poundage of any like kind of grain—to milling markets east of the Missouri River territory on payment of the so-called "proportional" rate. Such proportional rate is the difference between the local rate already paid by the farmer and the through rate from initial origin to final destination.

A common example illustrates the prejudice to the Montana farmer. The basic freight rate on grain and its products originating at points located within the region in Montana termed The Montana Triangle to Minneapolis, Minn., is 42 cents per 100 pounds in carloads of 60,000 pounds. The average distance for the movement is approximately 950 miles. After arrival at Minneapolis the grain can be milled into flour, then reshipped by the Minneapolis miller to Chicago, a distance of 437 miles, on a rate of 12 cents per hundred pounds with a lower minimum carload weight of 36,000 pounds. The Minneapolis miller, not the Montana farmer, enjoys the benefit of the through rate. And the independent Montana miller cannot compete in the Chicago market with the chain miller who enjoys both the geographical advantage of location at Minneapolis and the transportation advantage of a low proportional rate.

After the rate-break plan became effective, a small Montana miller was forced to acquire a mill located at Cleveland, Ohio, so that it, too, would be enabled to manipulate its grain under transit arrangements. Under present transit arrangements, a miller or shipper may stop a carload of wheat three times after it leaves its origin point in the West. Each stop must be made west of the so-called primary markets located on the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers. Grain may be stopped for cleaning in transit, for grading, for blending and milling. Such stops are free of charge and were authorized by the Commission in supplemental orders entered in docket 17000—part 7, One Hundred and Sixty-fourth Interstate Commerce Commission Report, page 619. Who derives the benefit from such stops in transit? Not the small miller who owns only one mill. These transit arrangements favor the chain miller. Chain-mill corporations own scores of mills in some cases, and they manipulate Montana, Idaho, North Dakota, and other western hard high-protein wheat by stopping the car at any of their mills, en route eastward, unloading the lading, and then loading soft wheat to be used at another mill which may need such grain. All this is done on the primary market rate, which the farmer has already paid, either directly or indirectly, plus the low proportional rates which are available from any midwestern milling point. Transit on grain today has become an economic advantage which produces fat profits for chain millers at the expense of and to the marketing disadvantage of the western farmer.

Here is another prejudicial situation in the grain-rate structure: Supplemental orders in the Hoch-Smith case authorized the transcontinental railroads to publish rates of 65 cents per hundred on grain and grain products originating at Minneapolis, Duluth, Omaha, and so forth, and destined to Pacific Coast cities. The stated rates are basic and do not include subsequent rate increases since authorized by the Interstate Commerce Commission. These rates apply over several routes and are applicable from any of the above-named origins to Seattle, San Francisco, Portland, or Los Angeles. A carload of flour or grain destined to Los Angeles, which originates at Duluth, Minneapolis, or Omaha, may be transported at this rate via the Northern Pacific, the Great Northern, the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific to Seattle, thence, after further milling or blending, to Los Angeles via Southern Pacific. The movement from Seattle to Los Angeles over the Southern Pacific Railroad, which line has not participated in the haul from the origin point to Seattle, is a free ride for the Missouri River miller. It is not meant that Southern Pacific will haul the carload of flour free. What is meant is that the originating line will have to divide the 65-cent rate, Duluth to Seattle, with the Southern Pacific, and the shipper will pay no part of that cost.

Why do the Northern Transcontinentals publish such rates and routes? The answer is, first, that they desire to participate in California traffic, and to do that, they accept a routing which will decrease their earnings; and, second, that their friendly patrons, the Missouri River millers who own mills both at Seattle and at the Missouri River milling point at which the car originates, desire to have the privilege of shipping certain types of grain for use in certain milling blends at a Seattle mill; or, if

the car is loaded with flour, the miller may desire to utilize the flour at Seattle in making staple blends, and then reload the car with grain needed at its Los Angeles mill. The independent California mills which draw wheat from Idaho, Utah, and Montana cannot meet such competition. If the shipper located at the Missouri River milling point happens to be General Mills, it can use one stop in transit at Seattle, where it operates a large mill; it can then exchange the lading, and stop the car at San Francisco, where it also operates a large mill; and finally the new lading, with which the car is loaded at San Francisco, arrives at Los Angeles. All this can be done on through billing and on the 65-cent basic rate, with no charge for the three stops in transit. If the grain in the car originated in Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, or northern Idaho, the freight was prepaid by the farmer to any of the Missouri River markets. Thousands of cars move each year under these conditions. It will be noted that the grain or the flour, if milled from western wheat, makes a round trip through the States where it was grown.

How can southern Idaho, Utah, or Montana independent millers meet such competition? It cannot be done, especially in view of the fact that a shipper, whether he is a miller or a farmer, cannot ship grain from any of these States to Los Angeles via San Francisco, through the Butte gateway, with the privilege of stopping in transit for any transit operation on the grain. The Interstate Commerce Commission is now in process of making a determination as to whether such stops in transit in the Sacramento River Valley are lawful; but the investigation, initiated early last year on the Commission's own motion, is limited to Idaho grain.

Similar examples can be adduced to show the prejudicial effects of freight-rate discrimination upon other western industries and upon the people of my State. The effect of all these discriminations is to limit Montana and the West to the production of raw materials. The railroad combination effectively bars the way to the industrial development which would otherwise be the natural consequence of the West's rich endowment of natural resources.

The manner in which the railroad combination discourages the establishment of new manufacturing industries in Montana is illustrated by the case of the Yellowstone Cabinet Co., located in Billings, Mont. This case was documented before the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee of the Seventy-ninth Congress, during hearings on H. R. 2536, at pages 1046–1051. I shall not take time now to read that documentation, but I call it to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. President, at this point I should like to give a list of examples of the kinds of rate adjustments which operate to Montana's disadvantage.

In 1946, C. E. Childe, transportation consultant of the Senate Small Business Committee, made a study of rail freight rates as they affect Montana. Following his study, Mr. Childe made the following report to the Small Business Committee:

These rail freight rates fall generally into the following classes: (1) Excessive rates on finished manufactured articles, compared with rates on the raw materials, which discouraged manufacturing near the sources of raw materials by making it cheaper to ship them to distant markets for manufacture; (2) more favorable rates, distance considered, for long transcontinental hauls than for shorter hauls to and from intermediate territory; (3) excessive rates on some raw materials; (4) excessive class rates.

Montana's growth and prosperity will depend, of course, on the extent of utilization of its natural resources, either by shipping raw materials to other States for manufacture and consumption or by manufacturing at home. It would be to Montana's advantage to manufacture its raw materials at home, rather than ship them outside, because manufacturing employs many more people and creates more wealth than the mere production of raw materials.

It is economically desirable that manufacturing be performed wherever it will result in the lowest ultimate cost to the consumer. If freight rates on all commodities, both raw materials and finished products, were based on the cost of hauling them, plus a fair profit, production and manufacturing would be encouraged at the points where they could be done most economically. Unfortunately, that is not the way freight rates are made. The cost of the service has largely been ignored, and custom, competition, and the desire of the railroads for long hauls, heavy tonnages, and "all that the traffic will bear" have been the controlling considerations.

Montana's retarded economic development, the dependence of the people upon raw-material production, and lack of manufacturing are indicated by the fact that it is losing population. It had more people 30 years ago than it has today. Statistics show that, although it is the third largest State in the United States, it has a population of only about 500,000. Nevertheless, it is a rich State in point of natural resources. It possesses extensive cattle, wool, beet sugar, and wheat-growing industries. It has an abundance of forest and mineral resources which, properly developed, can bring about a substantial increase of industry and business, and place the region on a basis of continuous prosperity. It has vast undeveloped deposits of phosphates so essential in the agricultural industry. It has rich, productive soils and favorable climatic conditions. It has water resources with magnificent potentialities for irrigation, reclamation, and electric-power development. Yet, the population of the State is static. Just before the war it had less people than it had 30 years ago.

Only 7 percent of Montana's workers are engaged in manufacturing, as compared with an average for the rest of the country of 25 percent, whereas 40 percent of Montana's workers are producing raw materials as compared with 20 percent for the rest of the United States. If manufacturing industry can be stimulated in Montana, it will increase the production and value of its raw materials, as well as providing finished products, and, by providing more jobs and bringing more population to the State, will increase all lines of business and general prosperity, including that of the railroads. Certainly, there is no advantage to anyone in maintaining an adjustment of freight rates which holds down population, income, and traffic.

Mr. President, I should now like to point out that officials of the western railroads recognize the need of industrial development in many of these Western States. Mr. Frank J. Gavin, president of the Great Northern Railway Co., in an interview printed in the Great Falls Tribune in May 1944, discussed the need for the development of Montana's resources. Among other things, he said:

Power has a lot to do with development. Montana certainly has the raw materials, and I don't know why Montana can't have manufacturing if it has power, labor, and population.

Mr. Childe's report continues as follows:

The principal commodities which Montana produces and ships are wheat, flaxseed, barley, rye, oats, and mill products; dried peas and beans, livestock, lumber, petroleum and products, copper, lead and zinc ores, concentrates, and ingot; bituminous coal, phosphate rock, cement, and sugar. Statistics are available showing carloads and tons originated, and an analysis was made, by the Board of Investigation and Research, of 1939 traffic, showing States to which Montana ships these products and the rates charged as compared with the cost to the carriers of performing the transportation. Reference will be made to typical rates and transportation costs on raw materials and products shipped out; also on commodities consumed in Montana.

Wheat and products: Rates on wheat from Montana are high compared with cost of performing the service. The following table shows typical rates compared with the approximate cost, including 4-percent return to the railroads, as developed by the Board of Investigation and Research for the year 1939. Costs were somewhat lower in the war years. The trend of costs is now upward, because of declining traffic and higher wages and material prices. However, it is doubtful that 1946 costs will exceed those of 1939. The railroads are now seeking general increases in rates to offset rising costs. If costs have gone up, rates will go up correspondingly. The 1939 rate-and-cost relationships may therefore be taken as representative of the present-day relationships.

[In cents per hundred pounds]

From—	To— Minneapolis		Chicago		Pittsburgh		Seattle	
	Rate	Cost plus 4 percent	Rate	Cost plus 4 percent	Rate	Cost plus 4 percent	Rate	Cost plus 4 percent
Great Falls	44	32	57	43	78½	56	41	27
Billings	44	29	57	39	78½	53	42	31
Kalispell	50	36	63	47	84½	60	37	21

Rates on other grains and flaxseed are the same as the wheat rates. The cost, per 100 pounds, of hauling the lighter-loading grains is slightly higher than on wheat, but otherwise what is said about wheat is applicable to the other grains.

Flour and feed rates are the same as wheat rates, which gives Montana flour and feed mills an opportunity to ship to consuming markets, but rates on more highly finished articles manufactured from wheat or flour are prohibitively high. For example, the rate on macaroni and spaghetti, in carloads, from Montana points to Chicago, is $1.38 per 100 pounds, and to Pittsburgh, $1.54 per 100 pounds, which is, to Chicago, more than double, and to Pittsburgh almost double the rate on wheat and flour. Since the price which the Montana farmer gets for wheat and other grain is based on the price quoted at consuming markets, less the freight rate from the point of shipment to market, farmers would benefit from a reduction in these rates to reasonable levels approximating the

cost figures shown above, which include a reasonable profit to the carrier. Rates on macaroni products could reasonably be reduced 50 percent and still yield the carriers a handsome profit.

Beans and peas: Montana is the thirteenth State in production and shipment of these commodities. The rates on dried beans and peas from Montana are even higher than the rates on wheat. The following table shows typical rates compared with approximate cost, including 4 percent profit to the carriers:

[In cents per hundred pounds]

From—	To— Minneapolis		Chicago		Seattle	
	Rate	Cost plus 4 percent	Rate	Cost plus 4 percent	Rate	Cost plus 4 percent
Great Falls	55	41	72	56	75	35
Billings	39	36	59	51	95	40
Kalispell	65	46	77	60	79	27

If, instead of shipping beans and peas, dried, a Montana canner should attempt to ship the canned products, the rates would be:

[In cents per hundred pounds]

From—	To— Minneapolis		Chicago	
	Rate	Cost plus 4 percent	Rate	Cost plus 4 percent
Great Falls	64	41	88	56
Billings	64	36	76	51
Kalispell	88	46	88	60

The rates on canned goods from Montana to Chicago are higher than the rate from Seattle and Portland to Chicago, which is 70 cents per hundred pounds, notwithstanding the shorter hauls from Montana. On a cost basis, canned goods rates from Montana to the East should be at least 15 cents, from western Montana, to 30 cents, from eastern Montana, lower per 100 pounds than the rate from the north Pacific coast to the East.

Livestock: Rate levels maintained by the railroads on livestock are relatively low; for most hauls they are only slightly above out-of-pocket costs, and for some of the longer hauls they are even below out-of-pocket cost levels; in no case are they high enough to cover full cost plus 4 percent profit. Montana's livestock rates are somewhat higher, mile for mile, than the rates prevailing east of the Montana-Dakota border, but cannot be said to be unreasonably high. The objectionable feature of the livestock rate adjustment from the standpoint of Montana's development, is that rates on products are so much higher than the rates on the live animals that slaughter and manufacturing of livestock products near the source of production is discouraged. It costs the railroads no more to haul fresh meats than livestock. The cost of hauling cured meats and inedible products of livestock is less than cost of transporting livestock. However, the rates on fresh meats are much higher than the livestock rates. As a consequence, eastern and Pacific coast packing houses and processing plants have decided rate advantages over packing plants located in Montana or other interior Western States.

To the East, the rate disadvantage in shipping fresh meats is about 50 percent. To the Pacific coast, which would be a logical market for Montana meat products, interior western meat packers were, until recently, at a still greater disadvantage but succeeded in getting an order of the Interstate Commerce Commission reducing their rates, which, however, did not apply to the rates from Montana to the Pacific coast. For example, the rate from Omaha to Portland, Oreg., on livestock, was $1.09 per hundred pounds; on fresh meats, $2.56 and on cured meats, $2.05 per hundred pounds, which were respectively 235 and 188 percent of the livestock rate. The Commission ordered the rate reduced on fresh meat to $1.56, which is 143 percent of the livestock rate, and on cured meat to $1.30 per hundred pounds, which is 119 percent of the livestock rate.

Now, taking a Montana example, the rates on livestock from Butte to Portland is 57 cents per hundred pounds; the rate on fresh meats, $1.09 per hundred pounds, and on cured meat, 80 cents per hundred pounds. If the meat rates from Butte were made the same percentage of the livestock rates as the Commission applied from Omaha, the rates from Butte to Portland would be reduced, on fresh meat, to 82 cents per hundred pounds, and on cured meats, to 68 cents per hundred pounds. Similar large reductions should also be made in rates to other Pacific coast cities.

Lumber: Like the livestock and products rates, the levels of rail rates on lumber are relatively low, but on finished wood products, they are high. The effect is to discourage the manufacture of finished wood products near the source of the lumber. Lumber rates from Montana are, however, on relatively higher levels in comparison with the cost of transportation than the rates from the Pacific coast, and equality of treatment would call for lower rates from Montana. The following examples are typical:

[In cents per hundred pounds]

From—	To— Minneapolis		Chicago	
	Rate	Cost plus 4 percent	Rate	Cost plus 4 percent
Seattle	65½	72	75½	88
Libby	60	53	72	69
Missoula	60	52	72	68

To destinations east of Chicago, as far as the Atlantic coast, a blanket rate of 82 cents per hundred pounds is in effect from the North Pacific coast and also from Montana. The cost of shipping from Montana is about 20 cents per hundred pounds less than from the North Pacific coast. The Montana rates should be lower, reflecting this difference in cost. There is very little production in Montana of finished products manufactured from wood. The rates on finished wood products, such as furniture, are several times higher than the lumber rates, and 50 percent or more higher than rates on similar articles manufactured in the East and South.

Nonferrous metallic ores, concentrates, and ingot: Rates on Montana's ores and concentrates are relatively low. There is no manufacture or movement of metal products of any consequence from Montana to points outside of the State. Rates on finished products are so many times higher than the rates on the raw material that it is cheaper to ship the raw materials to the East for manufacture.

Phosphate rock: Rates on this commodity from Montana to the East are reasonably low. For example, the rate from Garrison to Chicago is $8.58 per ton, and the cost of transportation, including 4 percent profit, is approximately $8.50 per ton.

Petroleum products: Movement from Montana is principally for short distances and the rates are not excessive. For example, the rates from Cutbank to Great Falls is 9½ cents; to Butte, 22 cents; to Missoula, 30 cents; to Billings, 29 cents, compared with approximate cost, including 4 percent profit, of 10, 20, 22, and 24 cents, respectively.

Bituminous coal: Hauls from Montana mines are short. Rates, especially on domestic sizes, are rather high. The following rates from Roundup, Mont., are typical:

To—	Rate (per ton)	Cost plus 4 percent (per ton)
Great Falls	$2.35	$2.14
Butte	2.36	2.06
Missoula	3.38	2.78
Miles City	2.25	1.40

Cement: Montana's shipments are for relatively short distances. Rates are high in relation to cost. The following rates, from Trident, are typical:

[In cents per hundred pounds]

To—	Rate	Cost plus 4 percent
Great Falls:		
25-ton car	18	
40-ton car	14	9½
Butte	14	6½
Missoula	20	10
Miles City	24	14

Sugar: The freight-rate adjustment on sugar, from Montana and other western producing States, is a very peculiar one and is complicated by the system of quoting prices, delivered at destination, on a base price at New Orleans or San Francisco plus the freight rate therefrom, rather than having a price at the western mill plus the freight rate from the western shipping point. As a result of this system, the price charged by Montana sugar mills on their product delivered at a nearby point in Montana, is much higher than the delivered price at a point farther east, such as Fargo, N. Dak. The delivered price at Minneapolis is still lower than at Fargo, and the delivered price at Chicago is lowest of all. For this reason, manufacturers of candy and other sweet products located near the western sugar mills, are unable to compete with manufacturers located at Chicago, who buy the sugar cheaper, notwithstanding the long haul to Chicago compared with the short haul to a Montana destination. Even the manufacturers at the Twin Cities have trouble competing with Chicago because sugar costs them more. This situation is reflected in the freight rates; the railroads charge very high rates on sugar from western producing points to nearby destinations, and relatively very low rates to Chicago. For example, from Chinook, Mont., to Helena, the rate is 46 cents per hundred pounds, whereas a reasonable rate based on cost plus 4 percent would be about 12 cents per hundred pounds. The rate from Chinook to Fargo, N. Dak., is 52 cents per hundred pounds, although a reasonable rate based on cost would be 25 cents. The rate from Chinook to Minneapolis is also 52 cents per hundred pounds and a reasonable rate based on cost would be about 32 cents. The rate from Chinook to Chicago is 47 cents per hundred pounds, 5 cents lower than either to Fargo or Minneapolis. This is just about equivalent to the cost of transportation from Chinook to Chicago, including 4-percent return. Of course, the rate of 46 cents, from Chinook to Helena, for a haul of 243 miles, is prohibitive as compared with a 47-cent rate to Chicago for a haul more than 1,000 miles longer. Both the inequitable price system and freight-rate system on sugar must be broken up before Montana manufacturers and consumers will be able to use Montana sugar on a fair relationship with the distant Chicago market.

Class rates: Class rates are the rates maintained by the railroads on miscellaneous small shipments on which the volume of traffic or competition is not great enough to cause them to establish lower individual commodity rates. Class rates are on much higher levels than individual commodity rates, and are much higher in the West than in the area east of the Mississippi River. Class rates in the South are also high compared with the eastern rates. General complaints of the southern and western shippers about this situation brought about an investigation by the Interstate Commerce Commission of all the class rates in the United States, except those in the Mountain-Pacific Territory, which comprises Montana and most of the area west of the Rocky Mountains. The Interstate Commerce Commission's decision in this investigation was made a year ago, and ordered reduction of 10 percent in all of the western and southern rates involved, along with a 10-percent increase in the eastern rates. The decision has been held up by a temporary injunction, obtained by eastern States, but this week the Federal court denied a permanent injunction and the changes ordered will presumably become effective in the near future. The effect of the decision will be to leave Montana's rates at levels much higher than those in all of the area east of the Montana-Dakota line. Some comparisons of Montana rates with the present eastern scale are shown below, taking first class (which applies on such commodities as dry goods, shoes, etc., in less-than-carload lots, as an example:

[In cents per hundred pounds]

Between—	And—									
	Minneapolis		Chicago		Seattle		Great Falls		Billings	
	Present rate	Eastern scale	Present rate	Eastern scale	Present rate	Eastern scale	Present rate	Eastern scale	Present rate	Eastern scale
Miles City	253	149	309	193	378	190	167	109	96	73
Helena	340	196	392	240	279	157	---	---	---	---
Kalispell	359	201	416	246	238	141	130	90	200	122

It will be noted that the Montana rates range from 130 to 199 percent of the eastern scale. The 10 percent reduction ordered by the Commission, in the rates east of the Montana-Dakota line, together with the 10 percent increase in the eastern rates, is a temporary expedient until the Commission has time to prescribe a uniform classification and a uniform scale of class rates throughout the United States, except the Mountain-Pacific territory. The Commission found that there was no reason why the rates should not be uniform. The reason that the Mountain-Pacific States were left out was because the Mountain-Pacific States asked that they be left out. There is no reason, from a cost standpoint, why the rate levels from Montana or other far western States should be any higher than from the Dakotas and east. Class rates are the rates paid by the small manufacturer and shipper until he is able to get a start to develop enough traffic to demand commodity rates. It is important, therefore, that Montana take steps to get its class rates reduced to the same levels as those of the States to the east.

Carload commodity rates from the East to Montana: Rates on carload freight shipped into Montana from the East are generally related to the class rates. Although commodity rates somewhat lower than the class rates are in effect on most carload freight which moves in any volume, they are, nevertheless, exceedingly high compared with the cost of the transportation. Typical examples of present inbound commodity rate levels are shown below:

AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS

[In cents per hundred pounds]

From—	To—					
	Kalispell		Helena		Miles City	
	Rate	Cost plus 4 per-cent	Rate	Cost plus 4 per-cent	Rate	Cost plus 4 per-cent
Minneapolis	157	78	150	75	103	50
Chicago	182	102	173	99	125	74
IRON AND STEEL WIRE AND NAILS						
Minneapolis	116	52	109	50	97	33
Chicago	135	67	131	65	121	48

It is interesting to note that the rate on agricultural implements from Chicago to Seattle is $1.54, and on wire and nails from Chicago to Seattle, $1.10 per hundred pounds. The rates are lower to Seattle, notwithstanding the longer distance.

Machinery: The rate on power machinery in carloads, from Chicago to Montana destinations (Billings, Great Falls, Butte, Helena) is $1.74 per hundred pounds, as compared with a rate to Seattle of $1.78 per hundred pounds, with a special rate on boilers and like heavy machinery from Chicago to Seattle, of $1 15 per hundred pounds.

On a cost basis, the rates on agricultural implements and machinery to Montana points should range from 25 to 50 cents per hundred pounds lower than the rates to Seattle; the rates on iron and steel wire and nails, from Chicago to Montana, should be 15 to 30 cents per hundred pounds lower than the rates to Seattle.

Mr. President, the recent decision of the Supreme Court upholding the Interstate Commerce Commission's finding of unlawful discrimination against the West in class rates is a step in the right direction. But class rates move only approximately 5 percent of the freight carried by rail. The rates on the remaining 95 percent of freight traffic remain under the discriminatory power of the railroad combination which would be legalized by this bill. The power of the railroad combination headed by the Association of American Railroads to discriminate against the West remains untouched by the class rate decision. It is the Association of American Railroads' power authoritatively to control railroad affairs which gives rise to such discriminations against the West as the perpetuation of rate differentials. The unequal distribution of freight cars, now receiving attention from the caucus of western Congressmen, is another instance of discrimination against the West attributed to the Association of American Railroads. Other discriminations inevitably result when the interests of the West conflict with the Association of American Railroads' firm policy of preserving the industrial and economic status quo. This policy is but a reflection of the interest of the eastern financial and industrial interests, which, consistent with their history of intimate participation in railroad affairs, were very active in the formation of the Association of American Railroads and have since been actively involved in the formation of Association of American Railroads' policy and the exercise of its control over the railroad industry.

The fashion in which dominant eastern industries work through collective railroad controls to erect an arbitrary rate blockage against the entry of new industry in the West into competition with established industries in the East has been documented by the Government in the evidence presented on April 23 to the district court at Lincoln, Nebr. I shall summarize one example taken from railroad documents offered to the court by the Government.

During the war, the Government, through the Defense Plant Corporation, invested approximately $200,000,000 for the construction of the steel plant at Geneva, Utah. The plant was built to meet the needs for steel at points on the west coast during the war and to provide facilities for making iron and steel articles in a section of the country which had not been developed industrially.

Before the Geneva plant was placed in operation, the Defense Plant Corporation took steps designed to secure a fair and equitable level of rates for general application to shipments of iron and steel articles from Geneva to the West coast. Its purpose was to reduce costs of operation during the period of governmental operation and to provide a fair and equitable level of rates which would be available after the war to any purchaser of the plant.

Upon at least three separate occasions during December 1943, and January, February, and March 1944, representatives of the western carriers met and rejected proposals for reduced rates from the Geneva plant.

Although it has been stated that shippers are provided, through the conference method of rate-making presided over by the Association of American Railroads which would be approved by this bill, with a forum in which to present their needs for rates to the carriers, discussion of the domination over carriers exercised by the powerful shipping interests through the conference method has been avoided. The eastern iron and steel manufacturers were promptly consulted by the railroads when the proposal for reduced rates from Geneva was first made. As a matter of fact, those manufacturers were invited to participate in the discussions between the railroads and the representatives of the Government. The eastern manufacturers were vehement in their opposition to the request made by the Government for reduced rates. It threatened the rigidity of the entire steel basing point system. The eastern steel interests controlled the western market for iron and steel prior to the war. The action taken by them during negotiations between the railroads and the Government indicates that they intended to exercise, to the fullest extent possible, every means within their power to prevent independent operation of the Geneva plant after the war.

An illustration of the length to which they went is shown by the statement made by H. C. Crawford, general traffic manager of the Bethlehem Steel Co. The Western Pacific and the Denver &

Rio Grande Western granted the Government early in 1944 special reduced rates for the duration of the war only and 6 months thereafter. On April 19, 1944, D. C. McCready, eastern traffic representative of the Western Pacific, wrote to Mr. H. E. Poulterer, vice president of the Western Pacific, that Mr. Crawford, after referring to the 78,529 tons shipped by Bethlehem over the lines of the Western Pacific during 1943, said:

> You can tell your people that your 1944 figures will be nil if I have anything to say about it.

The eastern steel companies also applied pressure through the Association of American Railroads. On March 8, 1944, A. F. Cleveland, vice president of the association, wired Mr. Poulterer as follows:

> Serious complaints have been made to me by steel companies regarding proposition section 22 quotation from Geneva to Pacific coast points, and especially application of those rates at intermediate points to commercial consumers either at the intermediate points or at the Pacific coast terminals. They think this constitutes unfair competition against competing commercial steel industries.

The close working arrangement between the eastern manufacturers and the railroads results from common control of the carriers and the steel companies. This common control is typified by Thomas W. Lamont, who holds the positions of director upon the boards of J. P. Morgan & Co., Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway, and United States Steel Corp. The Santa Fe refused to grant even special reduced rates for the Government from Geneva to the west coast.

After the war, the Geneva plant was acquired by United States Steel, and for its benefit the roads promptly published reduced rates from Geneva. It is significant that the Sante Fe, which is closely allied with United States Steel, declined to join in these reductions. There is reason to believe that this refusal of the Santa Fe to join in reductions for its ally, United States Steel, was a part of a deliberate scheme to deny rate reductions to Kaiser's plant at Fontana, Calif. Kaiser represents the only threat to the continued control of the western steel market by eastern steel interests. Kaiser's plant at Fontana is served by the Santa Fe and the Southern Pacific. If the Santa Fe joined in the reductions from Geneva to the west coast, it would run the risk of being compelled to reduce rates from Kaiser's plant at Fontana, in order to avoid unlawful discrimination. The Southern Pacific, which is the only other road serving Fontana, likewise declined to join in the recent reductions from Geneva. These two roads also refused to grant reductions requested by Kaiser from Fontana. Because these two roads did not join in the reductions from Geneva, the discrimination against Kaiser's Fontana plant cannot be remedied under existing law.

Many other similar illustrations of common control could be provided which would show not only what has been done but what may be done legally if the pending bill is approved.

The bill seeks to substitute government by commission for government by law. With limited exceptions, the regulatory pattern which has been created by legislation establishing commissions and regulatory bodies in various industries, leaves the actual day to day trade practices and activities of those regulated industries subject to the basic policy of free enterprise embodied in the Antitrust Acts.

Various commissions and regulatory bodies have been given power, it is true, to approve certain mergers and other forms of integration in certain industries, with immunity from the antitrust laws. This power of absolution from the antitrust laws extends, however, only to the structure of individual components of the industry and does not reach so far as to permit collusive agreements and other restraints effected by agreements between a number of independent companies engaged in a similar trade.

Two so-called exceptions to this rule have been brought forward by proponents of this bill as precedents for the action now urged upon the Congress. We are told that the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 provides for agreement between air carriers "not inconsistent with the public interest." Upon approval by the Civil Aeronautics Board, parties to the agreement are relieved from the antitrust laws with respect to carrying out agreements so approved.

Again, the Shipping Act of 1916 permitted agreements by common carriers by water and provided for immunity from the antitrust laws upon approval of the agreements by the Shipping Board.

Neither of these so-called exceptions is a valid precedent for what we are now asked to do. Both relate solely to contractual agreements providing for specific cooperative action, in the form of a single transaction, or of a continuing specific relationship, such as a pooling arrangement, an agreement for the interchange of equipment or for the cooperative use of facilities, or the like. The Interstate Commerce Act already gives the Interstate Commerce Commission similar authority. An example of its exercise is found in the Commission's recent approval of the joint purchase and operation of the Pullman Co. by a group of carriers. Under the War Shipping Act, the Civil Aeronautics Act, and the Interstate Commerce Act, the things to be done under the immunized agreements are before the agency authorized to grant antitrust immunity at the time the agreement is approved. None of these acts provide for a blank check to the parties to an approved agreement to enter into subsidiary agreements immune to the antitrust laws. Any such subsidiary agreements must be brought in for specific approval by the Board or Commission before antitrust immunity attaches. A good example of this is furnished in the order issued on May 5 of this year by the Civil Aeronautics Board in Docket No. 2423, which approves an agreement for the interchange of equipment between the Pan American Airways and Pan American Grace Airways, commonly known as Panagra, under the authority of the act cited as a precedent here. The parties to that agreement sought approval not only of the interchange agreement, but of such subsidiary pooling arrangements as might follow therefrom in the day-to-day operations under the basic interchange agreement. The Civil Aeronautics Board interpreted the act as requiring that any such subsidiary agreements must be brought in for specific approval by the Board before antitrust immunity could be given.

It is clear that that act is in no way a precedent for the provision in the pending bill of a blanket antitrust exemption to be given to the things done pursuant to an approved agreement for the establishment of a rate bureau, without requiring specific approval by the Interstate Commerce Commission of the things done pursuant to the rate-bureau agreement. It is argued that the rates made by such approved rate bureaus must be approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission before they can become effective. Of course the advance agreement among the carriers on the rate filed with the Commission operates to preclude the raising before the Commission of any objection, and unless objection is raised, Commission approval is merely a formality. Commission representatives testified at the hearings that perhaps 99 percent of the rates filed with the Commission are approved without anything more than formal examination.

But the real answer to that argument is this: There is no provision in this bill for approval or even for a public knowledge of the agreements reached through the approved rate-bureau machinery not to publish a proposed rate, not to grant a reduction sought by shippers, not to permit changes in schedules, facilities, and services. And the Government's antitrust charges against the railroad combination are founded not on the rates and services which have been affirmatively made by the rate bureaus and filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission, but rather on the rates and services which have been throttled, stifled, and suppressed by the rate bureaus.

The authorization in the Shipping Act of 1916 is, of course, peculiar to the field of foreign commerce and it stands upon a basis totally different from that advanced in support of this measure. It is more appropriately grouped with such measures in aid of our foreign commerce as the Webb-Pomerene Act, which permits independent companies engaged in the same trade to channel their foreign trade through a common export corporation when they find it necessary and desirable to resort to such collective action in order to meet competition from state trading corporations and groups which pool the entire trade resources of foreign companies engaged in the same foreign trade and commerce.

The measure now before the Congress would establish a precedent for the collusive control of the day-to-day activities of independent transportation agencies under an agreement for absolute private collective action. Only the agreement, and not the action taken pursuant to it, would be subject to the control of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

If the bill passes, Congress will be unable to deny the demand from other powerful industries that they be afforded

the same relief from the antitrust laws, that is, the same authority to substitute private collective control for independent initiative and freedom of competitive action. I apprehend that the radio and communications companies would bring forward similar legislation providing for the approval by the Federal Communications Commission of agreements under which competition would be replaced by collective action in the communications industry. I assume that this would be a logical outcome of the announced purpose of the Associated Press to seek immunity from the antitrust laws. We often pay tribute to freedom of the press as one of our basic guaranties of the continued liberty of our people. Yet it is a fact no longer controverted that the application of the antitrust laws to the Associated Press was required within the last few years in order to permit certain newspapers of an independent opinion to have access to the news which had been monopolized by the Associated Press, and without which the independent newspapers in question were seriously handicapped and probably would have failed in their efforts to become established. Can we afford to abandon the antitrust laws in the communications industry? If not, how shall we answer the advocates of such legislation once we have conferred this favor upon the transportation industry?

I likewise apprehend that there would be similar demands from the other industries. The insurance industry has already sought this immunity, and I anticipate that their demands will soon be renewed. Under the precedent set by the bill, I assume that there would be little difficulty in granting insurance the same favor as transportation. All that would be necessary would be to provide a commission authorized to approve the restrictive agreements desired by the insurance industry.

The banking and financial interests so closely allied to the insurance industry would, I think, be next in line. Their activities are now subject to limited regulation by different agencies of the Government. If the bill were passed it would seem appropriate that the Securities and Exchange Commission, which now has jurisdiction over the securities market, should be given authority to approve agreements between investment and security houses under which the recent victory of Robert R. Young and of progressive railroad management following his lead in bringing about competitive bidding for railroad securities would be completely nullified. The agreements between the bankers might, perhaps, be authorized by the Federal Reserve Board. There have been some demands in recent months for the application of the antitrust laws to alleged restrictive agreements between financing and lending institutions, particularly in New York City, under which, according to complaints which have been publicly voiced by various individuals and groups, collective control over credit is used to restrict competition not only in the lending and supplying of money, but in industry generally. Are we prepared to shield this alleged suppression of competition from the enforcement of the laws designed to preserve economic opportunity for all our people?

It would be a short step from the development which I have just described to authorize the Securities and Exchange Commission to immunize mergers and consolidations in industry generally from the antitrust laws. And it would be an equally short step to authorize the Federal Trade Commission to grant antitrust immunity to all sorts of restrictive agreements which would impose the dead hand of collective uniformity upon the hitherto vigorous, competitive enterprise in those parts of our economy not now controlled by monopoly.

If the bill is passed it will constitute the figurative "last straw that breaks the camel's back." Already we have gone a long way along the road to a collectivist economy. In the last 50 years our so-called system of free enterprise has been radically affected by the growth of monopoly and concentration of industry. Hardly a day passes in this body that we do not hear a warning sounded to the effect that we are approaching the deadline which marks the end of free enterprise. It must not be forgotten that it was the rapid increase of monopoly that led to the collapse in 1929 and subsequent failure to restore sound economic conditions, notwithstanding Government aid to the extent of billions of dollars. It was World War II and a national debt of nearly $300,000,000,000 that pulled us out of the hole.

I say that the bill is a fundamental departure from the original American concept of free competitive enterprise which has stimulated and made possible the phenomenal growth and development of our economy. The bill would eliminate free competitive enterprise from the transportation industry—and from such other allied industries as might be construed to be within the term "other persons party to such agreements," to whom the antitrust immunity provided by the bill would be given. At the same time the bill opens the door to a general abandonment of the principles of free competitive enterprise—not directly, not honestly nor openly, but by an indirection which pays lip service to those principles even as it violates them. I maintain that we must not accept the bill unless we are prepared openly and honestly to go down the road of collectivism on which the bill sets our feet.

Mr. President, I say we must reject the bill. I am persuaded to that conclusion by broad considerations of public policy. I do not approve resort to the Congress by special interests for relief from anticipated unfavorable court decisions rendered under public laws applicable to all. I think it would be unfair to exempt big business—and the railroads are our biggest single industry—from antitrust prosecution and leave little business subject to the law. I believe that the bill is an unconscious step in the direction of eventual Government ownership of the railroads.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGRATH in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator speaks of exempting big business from the antitrust laws and keeping little business under the limitations of the antitrust laws. When the Senator does so he speaks not only as a Member of this body, but as former chairman of the Special Committee on Small Business. I know that the Senator from Montana, while chairman of that committee, spent many long days and weeks and months studying the problems of small business. Can the Senator think of any step that will be more harmful to small business than the passage of the pending bill?

Mr. MURRAY. No; I think passage of the measure would be disastrous to small business. We all know how the big monopolistic concerns can influence the railroads in the matter of favorable rates and rulings and decisions—I have already brought out that point in the course of my discussion—whereas small business cannot bring influence to bear to receive favors. I gave as an illustration the case of the Billings, Mont., furniture company, which sought to find a market in other areas of the United States outside the State of Montana, but for a period of over 18 months, it was blocked in its efforts even to secure a ruling; indeed I believe that no ruling has even yet been handed down. Whereas when the United States Steel Corp. took over the Geneva plant it was only a very short time before they were able to secure all the favorable rates they needed to be able successfully to conduct their activities at that plant. At the same time matters were so arranged that Fontana, the independent plant in California, was unable to get favorable and reasonable rates in order to be a competitor in that field.

Mr. HILL. The Senator could stand on this floor for many hours citing examples, as he has done, illustrating what the monopoly-cartel system in our transportation industry is doing not only to individual industries, not only to great sections of our country, but to the entire American economy. Is not that true?

Mr. MURRAY. That is absolutely true. I can give as an illustration the situation in the State of Montana. We are completely blocked and prohibited from developing any industry in our State, although in area it is the third largest State in the Union and in point of natural resources is one of the richest States. We are compelled to exist under a raw-material economy. We are unable to engage in manufacturing in the first place, because the rates are discriminatory against us, and secondly, because of the power monopoly in that area where power rates are so high it is difficult to engage in industrial activities. If that State could have favorable railroad rates, comparable to those which are in effect in other parts of the country, there is no question that with our enormous natural resources we could develop industries which would enable the young folks who grow up in Montana to find jobs and remain at home, whereas at the present time, when they obtain their

education they are compelled to leave the State to go to other sections of the United States in search of employment. The president of the State university discussed this question not long ago, and pointed out that following the last war only a small percentage of the boys who went off to fight in that war were able to return and settle in Montana, because they had nothing to come back to. He pointed out that the same situation prevails today. Under these conditions Montana will not be able to prosper. It is becoming poorer every year because as we extract our natural resources, our raw materials, and ship them elsewhere, our assets are being depleted and we are becoming poorer and poorer each year.

Mr. HILL. What the Senator says about Montana and the retardation and strangulation of the development of Montana is absolutely true. Is it not also true that in other sections of the United States, in the eastern or official territory, which enjoys lower freight rates, consumers, as American citizens, are entitled to buy the goods, commodities, and products which they need in the most favorable market? They are entitled to obtain those commodities and goods at the most reasonable price and therefore should be entitled to buy from Montana if a free market existed.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. REED. I do not want to have to invoke the rules of the Senate, but I hope my colleagues will observe the rules when it comes to yielding the floor for any purpose except a question.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator from Alabama was asking the Senator from Montana a question—a very relevant, germane question. If the Senator wishes to invoke what he calls the rules of the Senate, I can assure the Senator that the rules work both ways. The Senator from Alabama knows how to invoke them on his behalf as well as the Senator from Kansas may know how to invoke them on his behalf. The Senator from Alabama was asking the Senator from Montana a very germane, relevant, and legitimate question, a question which ought to be asked, a question which should be brought out in this debate. If the Senator from Alabama is not permitted to bring it out by asking the Senator from Montana a question, the Senator from Alabama, in his own right, will take the floor and bring out the information which should be brought to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the RECORD shows that very little regard has been paid to this rule of the Senate. Being in charge of the bill, I have not wanted to invoke it; but I believe that when it comes to yielding the floor we ought to have some regard for the rules of the Senate. Frequently discussion back and forth does develop information which is very helpful, and we are all more or less guilty of disregarding the rules. However, this practice consumes time. We have already exceeded the time which my friends on the other side thought would be necessary. We should conclude consideration of the bill as early as possible.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HATCH. Is the point of order debatable?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is endeavoring to ascertain just what the point of order is.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I should like to be heard on the point of order before the Chair rules.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am going to withdraw the point of order after we discuss it.

Mr. HILL. There is absolutely no merit to and no basis for the point of order.

Mr. REED. The point of order is that a Senator may not yield except for a question. If he does, he loses the floor. That is the rule of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana yielded to the Senator from Alabama for the purpose of asking a question. So far as the Chair observed, the Senator from Alabama was still in the process of asking his question.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HILL. There is nothing in the rules of the Senate which says how long or how short the question may be. Is not that true? If it is a question, it is a question, and it is in order under the rules of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The rule of the Senate is that a Senator may not make a statement in the guise of a question. As the Chair has observed, he does not believe that the Senator from Alabama was making a statement, but was asking a question. The Senator from Alabama may proceed.

Mr. HILL. The Chair is eminently correct, as he usually is.

Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. I ask the Senator from Montana if it is not true that the monopoly-cartel system about which he has been speaking not only works adversely to the interests of Montana, as he has so well described, strangling the growth and development of Montana, but also denies to consumers in other sections of the country the right and the opportunity to buy the goods, commodities, and products which they need, and which they must have in their every-day life, in the most favorable markets and at the most favorable prices. Is not that true?

Mr. MURRAY. Of course, that is true. It destroys free competition, and sets up monopoly in its place. The expansion of monopoly and concentration of business in this country have proceeded so far that economists feel that we are now operating under practically a collectivist economy, because the great basic industries of the country are all under the control of monopolies.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that in waging the battle against this bill the Senator from Montana is fighting for the interest of all the people, as well as for the interests of the people of Montana?

Mr. MURRAY. Certainly. That is the motive which we all have. We do not want any special favors for any State or any area or section of the country. However, we in the South and West do not want to be discriminated against. We feel that the plan which is here proposed, if adopted, would discriminate against the western and southern sections of the country.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. Continuing that thought, I ask the Senator from Montana if it is not his conviction that those of us who are opposing the bill are in reality serving the best interests of the railroads and of industry, big and little? If our economy is concentrated into monopolies and cartels, does not the Senator from Montana feel that there is much more likelihood that the entire economy will be taken over and operated by the Government?

Mr. MURRAY. The Senator from Idaho is exactly correct. In fact, that question has been discussed in the Congress heretofore and it has been suggested that because of the great growth of monopoly the time will come very soon when the Government will have to take over some of the Nation's industries. Take, for example, the steel industry. Who can say that the steel industry is a purely private institution? It has an investment of billions of dollars and employs a million men or more. By its very bigness it is of public concern. The same is true with reference to the railroads. If the railroads get together under the plan which they are proposing, and it works out to create a monopoly, of course the Government will take them over; there can be no question about that. The extent to which we have already gone in that direction has, as I say, been the subject of very careful studies.

I have an article from the Fortune magazine which discusses the growth of monopoly and the wiping out of free enterprise. The article goes on to say:

> American business was founded upon the principle of free competition maintained through free markets. But during the era of bigness, when American business was, so to speak, winding up, the units of business became so big that they developed a fear of price wars; they dared not compete against themselves, and no one dared compete against them. There consequently emerged the super units—well-defined industrial groups whose members act in concert and whose aim is not price competition but, on the contrary, price stabilization.

That is exactly what the railroads are trying to accomplish under this bill. They do not want competition; they want to escape from competing with each other. So they get together under the kind of a program contemplated by the bill, and enter into arrangements whereby they fix rates and determine what

States are to receive favorable rates and what States are to be favored for industrial purposes.

The article continues as follows:

The efforts of the super unit produce the reverse effect of the competitive effort. When the market falls off the super unit tries to keep prices up. And often it does not consider it advisable to lower prices until recovery actually sets in.

The article goes on to say:

Now, this technique of bigness, involving the artificial control of prices and other basic factors, is a collectivist technique. And the operation of the collectivist technique has created for business a precarious situation. Business has carried collectivism so far in its private affairs that its affairs are no longer private, but by the bigness of their impact, public. It is untenable, indeed, to suppose that the policies of the steel industry with regard to prices, production, and employment are strictly private matters.

The same can be said with reference to the railroads. If they get together in this kind of program of course the Government will have to step in eventually. As it is discovered what the effect is upon the country, there will be a demand for the Government to take over the railroads, and, doubtless, they will be taken over. We shall help the railroads by opposing this proposed legislation, because if the railroads will put into effect fair and reasonable rates for all sections of the country there will ensue a huge development in America; the South and West will develop, and the railroads will benefit by the increased freight traffic which will be created. They are working against their own interests in endeavoring to seek monopolistic privileges under this legislation. I believe, Mr. President, that this bill is a step along the path of Government ownership of the railroads.

Let us remember that the way for state socialism in Italy and in Germany was prepared by state approval of the private cartelization of industry. I question whether freedom of enterprise can live in our land if the railroads are given, as contemplated by this bill, a license for the private collective determination of the rate levels and rate relationships on which the competitive success or failure of virtually every business, large and small, depends.

Mr. President, this is the most dangerous piece of legislation which has ever come before the Senate. If enacted it will lead the country straight into a controlled economy and the downfall of democratic government. If free enterprise is to be retained in America, this bill must be rejected.

MEETING OF COMMITTEE DURING SESSION OF THE SENATE

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, if the Senator from Wyoming will yield to me, I wish to ask unanimous consent for the Committee on the District of Columbia to meet at 2 o'clock this afternoon.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course the Senator from Delaware recognizes the fact that by his request he is asking unanimous consent that certain Senators may be absent from the Senate while I shall be speaking. Does the Senator from Delaware expect me to yield for that purpose?

Mr. BUCK. I am sorry, but I wish to request such unanimous consent.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, again I wish to call attention to the fact that it is the granting of such requests for unanimous consent that committees be allowed to meet during the sessions of the Senate that results in emptying the Senate Chamber. It is a practice which should not be followed. I am calling the attention of the majority to the sad effect such a practice has upon the attendance of Senators in the Senate Chamber during the consideration of important legislation. However, I shall not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'CONOR in the chair). Without objection, consent is granted.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN AGREEMENTS BETWEEN CARRIERS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 110) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield, to permit me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Morse
Baldwin	Hawkes	Murray
Ball	Hayden	Myers
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Brewster	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Hoey	Pepper
Bridges	Holland	Reed
Brooks	Ives	Revercomb
Buck	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Byrd	Kem	Saltonstall
Cain	Kilgore	Smith
Capper	Knowland	Sparkman
Chavez	Langer	Stewart
Connally	Lodge	Taft
Cooper	Lucas	Taylor
Cordon	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McClellan	Tobey
Downey	McFarland	Tydings
Dworshak	McGrath	Umstead
Ecton	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ellender	McMahon	Watkins
Ferguson	Magnuson	Wherry
Flanders	Malone	White
Fulbright	Martin	Wiley
George	Maybank	Williams
Green	Millikin	Wilson
Gurney	Moore	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-seven Senators having answered to their names; a quorum is present.

BULWINKLE BILL (S. 110) WOULD SANCTION CONTROL OF TRANSPORTATION BY GOVERNMENT OF PRIVATE ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, 10 years ago this month, if my memory serves me correctly, this Chamber was filled and the galleries were filled during a debate upon a proposal to reorganize the Supreme Court of the United States. Congress and the country were aroused by what they conceived to be a measure which would change the traditional American system and lodge in the Chief Executive the power to sway the decisions of the Supreme Court. The bill failed. Today we are considering a measure which, in its present form, I believe goes to the other extreme, and proposes to give congressional sanction to the organization of a private government to handle the transportation system of the United States.

The Bulwinkle bill, as it is before us now, is in fact a delegation to private organizations of the congressional power to regulate interstate transportation. It is a delegation in the second degree. Already Congress, by the Interstate Commerce Act, has given the Interstate Commerce Commission the power to adjust rates, but here is a measure which goes beyond that, and, for the first time in the history of the transportation system of this country, places legislative sanction upon the creation of private organizations, not only among carriers who are engaged in the same business, but among carriers who are engaged in different kinds of business, carriers who are engaged in competitive enterprise, as well as carriers who are engaged only in supplementary enterprise, one supplementary to the other.

No standards are laid down in the bill to govern the manner in which this power in the second degree delegated to these private organizations shall be exercised, save only that certain prohibitions are provided, and certain standards are required to be observed by the Interstate Commerce Commission before approval is granted to the agreements which are here proposed to be legalized.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. I do not desire to interrupt the Senator's train of thought. In the course of his remarks, going back over the years, the Senator mentioned a situation that existed on the floor of the Senate 10 years ago. I recall, as I am sure the Senator recalls, that, about that time, the first reorganization bill was presented to the Congress, which merely gave certain powers to the President of the United States to reorganize the executive branch of the Government. I recall very well—I do not know whether the Senator does—the protests which came from all over the United States about the terrible thing that was taking place in the delegation of power to the executive branch of the Government, predicting all kinds of dire disaster, if Congress did not retain within its own hands the powers vested in it by the Constitution. The Senator recalls that very well, does he not?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes, indeed.

Mr. HATCH. I was also thinking of what the Senator was just saying about the pending bill. Does not the pending measure, insofar as it relates to the Interstate Commerce Commission, with respect to agreements submitted to the Commission, delegate to an executive branch of the Government, to a bureau,

if the Senate please, sole and exclusive authority to determine what is in the public interest, and what does or does not amount to undue restraint of trade or competition? Does not the pending bill do that?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I feel that it does. I am glad the Senator has raised that question. The Senator comes from New Mexico.

MANY WESTERN AND SOUTHERN STATES WOULD HAVE NO REPRESENTATION

I call his attention to the fact that the entire Tenth Federal Reserve District, which includes the State of Wyoming, the State of Colorado, the northern part of New Mexico, the northwestern part of Oklahoma, Kansas, Nebraska, and the western part of Missouri, is without representation on the Interstate Commerce Commission. It will have no representation, unless one of the amendments which I have proposed is adopted, upon the new organizations to which it is proposed now by legislative sanction to convey the congressional power of fixing railroad rates and fares, and guiding the other matters relating to transportation. So I say, Mr. President, it is a delegation of the congressional power, in the second degree. If the people were aroused for fear that Congress should hand over to some executive officer of the Government or to some executive bureau the powers granted to it by the Constitution, how much more should they be concerned that we are here dealing with a proposal to delegate the powers to private organizations? We are not doing a thing to determine what the character and form of the organizations shall be. If the pending bill is adopted as it came from the committee, without amendment, it will be congressional authority to the railroads and the pipe lines, the pipe lines and the water carriers, the railroads and the motor carriers, to enter into agreements which will affect the most fundamental interests of all business in the United States; and it will be done outside any public agency. Such agreements, by the terms of the bill, when made by the carriers, shall be approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission, unless they violate certain prohibitions.

Mr. President, I am not one of those who believe that the men who are administering the railroads are seeking opportunities to monopolize transportation within the United States. I do not believe that they have any evil intent. As a matter of fact, I feel that the genesis of the pending bill was the very plain fact that the transportation companies of the country cannot make agreements on through rates or on through routes, without danger of running afoul of the antitrust laws, and they would like to be given a relief from the possibility that they would be committing a crime or rendering themselves liable to punishment under the law, if they should make arrangements regarding the administration of the transportation system, which in their judgment are essential in the interest of efficient transportation.

The difficulty, Mr. President, however, is that by the pending bill the grant of power is much broader than that which the carriers need, much broader than they should have. I think that can be clearly illustrated by reading the bill.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have given considerable study to the pending bill, myself. I am not a member of the committee, and I do not think the Senator from Wyoming is a member of the committee. I know that he has studied the bill. I have been concerned, first, with the transfer of powers, as the Senator has pointed out, to private industry itself; secondly, with the determination by the Interstate Commerce Commission of subjects that are so vital to American life. Is there a provision in the bill to the effect that when such an agreement is submitted to the Interstate Commerce Commission for approval, a hearing shall be held?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is no adequate provision; but I have offered an amendment to take care of that aspect.

Mr. HATCH. The bill, as it comes from the committee, merely proposes submission of the agreement to the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the determination by the Commission according to such standards as may be contained in the bill, without any opportunity whatever to the public or to anyone interested from the Senator's section of the country, or mine, to be heard. It will represent solely an ex parte determination by the Interstate Commerce Commission. Am I right in that construction?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is correct, as I understand the provisions of the bill.

I might say, Mr. President, that the public as a whole, I think, entertain the belief that the Interstate Commerce Commission fixes all railroad rates. The Interstate Commerce Commission does not do that. If it should attempt to do it, it probably would have to be a much larger body than it is, not only in its membership but in the number of its employees. There are, I suppose, thousands upon thousands of rates which are made and which become effective every year, without having been passed upon by the Interstate Commerce Commission at all. The Commission has what amounts to appellate jurisdiction. When a complaint is made, the Interstate Commerce Commission then moves into action.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. TAYLOR. I pointed out in my talk on the floor yesterday that the Interstate Commerce Commission actually reviews about 2 percent of the rates submitted to it, a mere sampling.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I myself was about to say that approximately 90 percent of the rates are put into effect without actual review by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. REED. I am very much interested in the question asked by the Senator from New Mexico of the Senator from Wyoming, and the reply of the Senator from Wyoming, and their apparent agreement upon what is obviously a wrong view of the bill. Paragraph 8 on page 6 of the bill provides:

> No order shall be entered under this section except after interested parties (including in all cases the Attorney General of the United States) have been afforded reasonable opportunity for hearing.

I shall be happy to have the Senator from New Mexico now, with the permission of the Senator from Iowa, or later, explain why that is not a completely adequate provision for hearings.

PUBLIC SHOULD BE HEARD ON MATTERS AFFECTING PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am aware of that provision of the bill, but it seems to me that it does not go quite far enough. I was about to point out that the difficulty in this measure arises from the fact that in paragraph (2), which appears on page 2 of the bill, a mandate is placed upon the Interstate Commerce Commission to approve any of the agreements which are made by these carriers, if the approval is not prohibited by paragraph (4), (5), or (6), "if it finds that the object of the agreement is appropriate for the proper performance by the carriers of service to the public, that the agreement will not unduly restrain competition, and that it is consistent with the public interest as declared by Congress in the national transportation policy set forth in this act."

My point is that these provisions are so vague that, if we are to protect the public interest, language additional to that to which the Senator from Kansas has just alluded should be incorporated in the bill. Let me illustrate what I mean by turning to paragraph (4) of the bill, which is one of the paragraphs supposed to be a prohibition upon the nature of the agreements to be made.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more? I beg the Senator's pardon, but I am compelled to leave the floor, as I have another engagement I must keep.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. In connection with what the Senator from Kansas has said, I merely want to observe that while the paragraph to which he refers does in a measure prescribe something in the way of a hearing, yet it is very vague, very uncertain, very indefinite as to its terms, especially as to the parties to be heard. It includes the Attorney General of the United States. It says "interested parties—including in all cases the Attorney General of the United States." I have given some thought as to who are interested parties who would be heard. I ask the Senator from Wyoming if his State or my State would have an opportunity to come here and be heard? I do not find language to that effect in the bill. The provision is not clear. It is vague. What I have in mind may be covered by the amendment which the Senator from Wyoming intends to propose. I should be glad to have the Senator explain the matter and make it a part of the history being made here in reference to the bill.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May I say first, so that the position may be clear, that I have offered two amendments dealing with this precise question, and it seems to me there should be no hesitation on the part of the Senator in charge of the bill to accept them. The first of the amendments is on page 2, line 15, after the word "if", to insert the words "after public notice in the Federal Register and public hearing not less than 60 days thereafter," so that that part of the sentence would read:

The Commission shall by order approve any such agreement (if approval thereof is not prohibited by paragraph (4), (5), or (6)) if after public notice in the Federal Register and public hearing not less than 60 days thereafter—

Then the second amendment which I have proposed would be inserted on page 2 in line 21, after the word "The" in the last sentence. That sentence now reads as follows:

The approval of the Commission shall be granted only upon such terms and conditions as the Commission may prescribe as necessary to insure compliance with the standards set forth in this paragraph.

I may say that I think that sentence in itself indicates an intention upon the part of those who drafted the bill to give the Commission power to review and to make certain that the antitrust law is not actually being evaded. But at the very beginning of the sentence, following the word "The" I would add the following language:

Commission shall prescribe and may from time to time modify the rules and regulations under which such agreements may be made (which shall include provision for the representation of shippers and interested State regulatory commissions or other authorities in hearings thereon), and the.

AN AMENDMENT TO GIVE SHIPPERS AND STATES REPRESENTATION

That language, I call to the attention of the Senator from New Mexico, would make it certain that States like those which he and I have the honor in part to represent, which are not now represented on the Interstate Commerce Commission, would have official representation when these matters so vital to the welfare of the people of that area were under consideration.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I merely express the hope that the Senator in charge of the bill will agree to the amendments which have been read, because they are so obviously fair and give the protection which I am sure the Senator from Kansas is anxious to give.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. REED. At the proper time in the course of the debate or consideration of the bill I shall discuss the amendments of the Senator from Wyoming. Now I only want to say that the language of the paragraph so far as hearings are concerned is consistent with the language used throughout the Interstate Commerce Act. All the way through we find the language "The Commission, after hearings." It does not go any further than that. The practice of the Interstate Commerce Commission as to hearings has been established and is well known. I have never heard of any complaint of a failure on the part of the Interstate Commerce Commission to give everybody a full opportunity to be heard upon anything that comes up relating to the Interstate Commerce Act. On the other hand I have heard plenty of criticism of the Commission——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What the Senator from Kansas said is to my way of thinking indicative of one of the oversights which have been made, as I see it, in drafting the bill. There is a great difference in the system which the Senator now proposes from the system which is now in effect, because the language of paragraph (2) places the solemn sanction of the Congress of the United States upon the privately organized groups and associations which the carriers already have or which they may want to have in the future. That introduces an utterly new system into the Interstate Commerce Act, and for which there is no provision by the mere casual sort of hearings which have been held in the past.

Mr. REED. With the permission of the Senator from Wyoming I want to say that I do not agree with that statement, but I shall discuss it later. I am interested in the discussion by the Senator from Wyoming of the amendments which he has offered. I think his approach to the bill is an intelligent approach—I was tempted to say almost the first intelligent approach to it.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. If the Senator had made such a statement I would have been compelled to make the point of order that he was not asking a question.

Mr. President, I must leave the Chamber, but I wish to say that the mere fact that the Interstate Commerce Act in the past has only provided that so and so shall be done after hearings does not spell anything in particular. We are, as the Senator from Wyoming has just said, embarking upon a new and, I think, a rather revolutionary course. Certainly we should scan the language being adopted far more carefully than has been done before we embark upon this revolutionary—and to some of us somewhat strange—course. I hope the Senator from Kansas will give the most careful consideration to these amendments and, regardless of what the Interstate Commerce Act may have provided in the past, insert in this new bill every safeguard and every protection possible.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me say first that I am very much interested to note that the three of us who are now discussing the bill, namely, the Senator from Kansas, the Senator from New Mexico, and I, all come from States which are without representation on the Interstate Commerce Commission. In the present situation the shippers of Kansas are as unrepresented as are the shippers of northern New Mexico and of Wyoming. Under the provisions of this bill, they would be sitting by while Congress delegated away authority to new associations to be authorized in the name of Congress, to govern the transportation system of the country.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. REED. The second amendment to be offered by the Senator from Wyoming relates to notice to be given to the States and to the participation of State bodies. In paragraph (3) of section 13 of the act as it presently stands, on page 51 of the printed volume of the Interstate Commerce Act, is the following language, going to the very thing which the Senator from Wyoming and the Senator from New Mexico bring up:

Whenever in any investigation under the provisions of this part—

"This part" means the part which relates to railroads. Part I relates to railroads; part II to motor carriers; and part III to water carriers—

Whenever in any investigation under the provisions of this part * * * there shall be brought in issue any rate, fare, charge, classification, regulation, or practice made or imposed by authority of any State or initiated by the President * * * the Commission, before proceeding to hear and dispose of such issue, shall cause the State or States interested to be notified of the proceeding. The Commission may confer with the authorities of any State having regulatory jurisdiction over the class of persons and corporations subject to this part.

I shall discuss this question later. I know that the Senator from Wyoming is trying to be helpful. I value his cooperation in offering the amendment. It is an intelligent approach to the question, and I assure him that I shall give it the fullest consideration.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I appreciate the assurance of the Senator; but let me remark in connection with what he has just said that if the implication which he seeks to give, that paragraph 3 on page 51 of the printed copy of the Interstate Commerce Act does what I seek to do by these amendments, then certainly he has no possible ground for objecting to the amendments.

However, my fear is that the language on page 51 will not apply to the formulation of these agreements. In any event the Senator has acknowledged—and I am very happy to have that acknowledgement—that there ought to be notice and representation. Let us make sure that we have it.

Before the beginning of the colloquy between the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Kansas I was referring to the fact that the bill as it comes to us provides that the Commission shall approve these agreements if the approval thereof is not prohibited by paragraph (4), (5), or (6). Let me turn to paragraph (4) to show what the prohibition in that paragraph is. It reads as follows:

(4) The Commission shall not approve under this section any agreement between or

among carriers of different classes unless it finds that such agreement is limited to matters relating to freight classifications—

That amendment was inserted by the committee—

or to transportation under joint rates or over through routes; and for puposes of this paragraph carriers by railroad, express companies, and sleeping-car companies are carriers of one class; pipe-line companies are carriers of one class; carriers by motor vehicles are carriers of one class; carriers by water are carriers of one class; and freight forwarders are of another class.

CAREFUL READING SHOWS BILL COVERS WHOLE FIELD OF TRANSPORTATION

At first reading one might gain the impression from this section that the Interstate Commerce Commission was being forbidden to approve an agreement among carriers of different classes unless it finds that such agreement is limited—using the words in the bill—to freight classifications, joint rates, or through routes. But the draftsman who prepared this section was careful not to limit it in that way. The draftsman added these qualifying words: "Limited to matters relating to transportation under joint rates or over through routes."

So it is obvious that this limitation, instead of being a prohibition against any sort of an agreement except with respect to freight classifications and joint rates or through routes, is as broad as a barn door, because the permissible agreement may consider not only those factors, but also all matters relating to them, and also all factors involving transportation under joint rates or over through routes. Obviously from a mere reading of the paragraph the broadest liberty is allowed to the carriers of different classes to make their rates and to fix their routes.

I should now like to draw the attention of the Senator from Kansas to the interpretation which should be given this section. What is meant by "carriers of different classes," particularly when we read the definition of classes? One might at a hasty glance imagine that railroad carriers and pipeline carriers are in different classes. I am not so sure that they are, as I read the bill, because the language which is employed is a clear result of differentiating only freight forwarders as a different class, because it provides that—

for purposes of this paragraph carriers by railroads, express companies, and sleeping-car companies are carriers of one class; pipeline companies are carriers of one class.

Does that mean the same class or another class? The difficulty arises because, when we come to the last classification, we find that freight forwarders are of another class, which is the first time that the word "another" is used in the bill.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. REED. There is a reason for that. Railroad companies, express companies, and sleeping-car companies are carriers of one class. Pipe line companies are carriers of one class—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does that mean another class?

Mr. REED. That is another class.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But it does not say so.

Mr. REED. Carriers by motor vehicles are carriers of one class. They are all common carriers, and only in this bill are they put into separate classifications for the purposes of the bill. The language to which the Senator from Wyoming refers regarding freight-forwarders relates to a horse of quite a different color.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is not getting my point.

Mr. REED. I am coming to it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I realize that freight-forwarders are horses of a different color.

Mr. REED. During the time I have been in the Senate I have served on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. One of the most difficult questions which that committee ever had to solve was the status of a freight forwarder among common carriers and contract carriers. What is a freight forwarder? The committee has always held—and it has never been overruled on the floor of the Senate—that a freight forwarder is not a carrier at all, and yet for practical purposes we have undertaken to regulate freight forwarders, and we apply pretty much the same regulation to them as we have applied to common carriers, but we have been very careful not to classify them as common carriers. I shall be very happy, if the Senator is interested, to tell him why. They are, in effect, shippers.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. May I interrupt the Senator at that point?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I understand that there was a very definite reason for that; but let me call the attention of the Senator to line 10. Paragraph (4) purports to forbid the Interstate Commerce Commission from approving any agreement between or among carriers of different classes. Therefore, it becomes very important to determine what are the different classes. My statement to the Senator is that the language of the definition is so vague and uncertain that it is not clear whether the committee meant to say that all carriers by railroad, and express companies, and sleeping-car companies are of a class different from pipeline carriers. Are they?

Mr. REED. If the Senator will go back to page 1, he will note that the first paragraph on page 1 contains this language:

The term "carrier" means any common carrier subject to part I—

Which is a railroad—

part II—

Which is a motor carrier—

or part III—

Which is a water line.

It does not say that a freight forwarder is a carrier. It carefully refrains from saying that. It says: "and shall include any freight forwarder subject to part IV of this act."

That is the part of the Interstate Commerce Act regulating freight forwarders.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is perfectly plain. But the issue here is not the definition of a carrier; it is, What is the definition of different carriers in paragraph (4)? I shall state the reason why that is very important. If the Senator will bear with me for a moment I think he will get the point I am trying to make. Paragraph (4) undertakes to prohibit agreements among carriers of different classes unless such agreements are limited to a specific kind of matter. Therefore it becomes important to know whether pipe-line companies are of a different class from railroad companies, because if they are not a different class, this prohibition does not apply to them. If they are, in fact, as this language seems to make possible, carriers of the same class, then the railroads and the pipe lines can make agreements without coming within this provision at all. Does the Senator follow me?

Mr. REED. Yes, I do. This paragraph of the bill was written very largely at the request of the National Industrial Traffic League, which, as the Senator from Wyoming doubtless knows, is the great traffic organization of the country, including in its membership and on its various committees the foremost traffic experts of the United States. This is the very section which they asked the committee to put in the bill so as to limit carriers of a different class from negotiating or making agreements with carriers of the other classes, except for transportation under joint rates and over through routes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. With the purpose I am in entire agreement, but I do not think it has been accomplished, because apt language to accomplish it has not been used, unless it is made clear that the intention is to regard pipe-line carriers, motor-vehicle carriers, and railroad carriers as carriers of different classes. The question is a simple one: Do we or do we not correctly understand that they are carriers of different classes?

Mr. REED. They are carriers of different classes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My point is that that is not clear from the language, and it should be cleared up; but I have not offered any amendment to that effect.

Mr. REED. Let me remind the Senator from Wyoming that this proposed legislation has been kicking around for 4 years. The hearings were the longest hearings that I can remember upon any subject. The bill passed the House and has been twice before the Senate committee, and this is the first time we have adopted the language of the recommendation of the National Industrial Traffic League, which is composed of the most expert traffic men in the whole country, and this is the first time that any question has been raised with respect to placing railroads in one class, motor carriers in another class, and pipe lines in another class.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I acknowledge that it is a technical criticism, but it arises from the fact that in the listing of these carriers, it is only in the case of freight forwarders that the phrase "another class" is used. All the others are listed as one class. Certainly the proper way to make this matter clear, if I may make a suggestion to the Senator from Kansas, would be to state that for the purposes of this paragraph, carriers by railroad, express companies,

and sleeping-car companies are carriers of one class; pipe-line companies are carriers of another class; carriers by motor vehicle are carriers of another class; carriers by water are carriers of another class; and freight forwarders are, likewise, carriers of another class. That would make the matter perfectly clear.

However, my amendment is not directed to that part of the language. I was calling attention to it merely because it came up in the course of the discussion.

AMENDMENT TO LIMIT THE FIELD OF AGREEMENTS AND PROTECT PUBLIC INTEREST

However, Mr. President, what I am calling attention to is the fact that the amendment which I have proposed would strike out, in line 12, the words "matters relating to"; in lines 12 and 13, the words "transportation under"; and also in line 13, the word "over", so that it will be clear to the Interstate Commerce Commission and to everyone else that the only type of agreement which may be made by carriers of different classes is an agreement on freight classification, on joint rates, or on through routes. I think that is what the Senator wished to do, but certainly it is not what this language does.

Mr. REED. That is what we did do.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If that is what was intended, then to "make assurance double sure," let the Senator accept my amendment. Then there will be no doubt.

Mr. REED. The bill as it now reads has the approval and support of the Interstate Commerce Commission. We have put into the bill, I think, virtually every amendment which has been suggested. The bill as it is now before the Senate is a very different bill, as I think the Senator from Wyoming knows, than the bill which came to the Senate from the House of Representatives.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I know that, and I commend the Senator from Kansas for the diligent attention he has given to this measure. I think he has tried to improve it, and I think he has improved it.

Mr. REED. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, let me say that we have had the benefit of the help of the Interstate Commerce Commission. Quite a number of the changes which we have made in the bill as it came to us from the House of Representatives have been made at the suggestion of the Interstate Commerce Commission. We have invited the Commission to make criticisms and suggestions and to give us the benefit of its views, and it has done so.

The bill as it now stands has been changed only slightly, as the Senator from Wyoming knows, from the bill which was reported by the committee last year, but which failed to pass the Senate because it got caught in the legislative jam at the end of the session.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I suggest to the Senator from Kansas that the Interstate Commerce Commission is not beyond the capacity to err, as indeed, none of us are. Therefore, the fact that the Interstate Commerce Commission may have approved this measure is no reason why we should not improve the language.

Mr. REED. I shall accept any language of the Senator from Wyoming improving the bill, Mr. President.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, that is progress.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, if the Senator from Wyoming will permit me to interrupt again, I wish he would further discuss his reasons for offering the amendment which he has proposed, striking out the two words in one case and three words in the other case, I believe. The Senator from Kansas is unable to follow the line of reasoning behind those two suggested changes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be very glad to accommodate the Senator.

Mr. President, I say that an agreement on joint rates is one thing, but an agreement on matters relating to joint rates is another thing, and an agreement as to transportation under joint rates is still quite another thing altogether. When the words "transportation under" are used in connection with joint rates, they widen the area of the agreement almost beyond definition. It is impossible, as I see it, for any Senator to stand here this afternoon and define what character of agreements might be made under that language.

But if the words are stricken out, then it is clear that the agreements shall expressly be limited, as the language seems to indicate in the first place, to joint rates or to through routes. When the agreements are so limited, the possibility of abuse, the possibility of making agreements which are not in the public interest, the possibility of making agreements with respect to collateral and sometimes substantial collateral matters, would be very much reduced, if not eliminated. That is my purpose. Have I made it clear?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Interstate Commerce Act, in regulating and covering the property of railroad carriers, places this burden and responsibility on the carriers: They are required by law to establish through routes and to maintain joint rates.

If they are going to be permitted to talk about classifications and joint rates and transportation, I do not see how they can be prevented or should be prevented from talking about all matters which relate to transportation on through routes and under joint rates. The Senator from Wyoming attempts to make a much finer distinction there than my mind is able to follow.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if I remember correctly, the Interstate Commerce Act contains, somewhere, a definition of transportation. The Senator from Kansas, the chairman of the subcommittee, probably can put his finger upon it immediately. I ask the Senator from Kansas whether I am correct. Does not the Interstate Commerce Act contain a definition of transportation?

Mr. REED. It contains a definition of transportation facilities. I think it does contain such a definition as the one the Senator has mentioned, but I cannot put my finger on it now.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, my point is that "transportation," as defined in the Interstate Commerce Act, is very much broader than "joint rates," and it is very much broader than "through routes"; and when we give permission to carriers of different classes to make agreements respecting "transportation," we are granting them a very broad power.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] has kindly handed me the definition as contained in the act. So, Mr. President, I am now able to quote directly from the Interstate Commerce Act when I say that the term "transportation" is defined in that act to include "locomotives, cars, and other vehicles, vessels, and all instrumentalities and facilities of shipment or carriage, irrespective of ownership or of any contract, express or implied, for the use thereof, and all services in connection with the receipt, delivery, elevation, and transfer in transit, ventilation, refrigeration or icing, storage, and handling of property transported."

Obviously, therefore, when in the guise of a prohibition we grant authority to make agreements upon that broad segment of the transportation industry, we are going so far as to make it difficult for anyone to determine whether the exemption from the antitrust laws which we are asked to make would be wise and in the public interest.

Let us consider, for example, agreements between railroads and pipe lines, with respect to the transportation of oil. To me it seems to be perfectly clear that if we say in the bill that railroads and pipe-line carriers shall be limited to agreements on joint rates and through routes, we are saying one thing, but if we say they shall be limited to agreements on matters relating to transportation under joint rates or through routes, we are granting a very different power and authority.

Oh, Mr. President, there are in this body many lawyers who know the skill of the advocate when an issue arises in court, or in negotiations between businessmen and others; they know how every little word and phrase is weighed and measured in order to determine what is right and what is wrong. We may be sure that when a question of the violation of the antitrust laws arises every phrase will be carefully measured and weighed, and when we undertake to grant an exemption from the antitrust laws, and say that such laws, which were intended to maintain free enterprise and a competitive economy, shall not apply to agreements between railroad carriers and pipe-line carriers, then it becomes clear that the exact meaning of every single one of the words contained in this bill must be determined before the measure is passed.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I do not want to break in on the argument of the Senator from Wyoming——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am always glad to have the Senator break in. The Senator helps to illuminate the discussion.

Mr. REED. Is not the Senator from Wyoming overlooking the fact that every agreement after being made must be submitted to the Interstate Commerce Commission for approval before the parties may proceed under it?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is precisely the point I am discussing. I am pointing out to the Senator that the language of the bill which he has brought in says, on page 2, line 13, "and the Commission shall by order approve any such agreement (if approval thereof is not prohibited by par. (4))." I am undertaking to demonstrate to the Senator that paragraph 4 is an illusory prohibition, that while it seems to be limiting these agreements between carriers and among carriers of different classes to rate classifications, to joint rates and through routes, as a matter of fact it gives them the broadest possible latitude, and therefore that the prohibition is not effective.

Mr. REED. The only reason for the inclusion of the parentheses is to prohibit any agreement which is not in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (4).

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My point is that it is a prohibition which does not prohibit.

Mr. REED. Let me finish. If carriers of different classes should make between themselves an agreement which was in violation of paragraph (4) the Commission could not approve it if it desired to do so, because it would be prohibited.

Now let us get back to the character of the standards provided.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Before the Senator leaves that question let me ask him, What sort of an agreement does the Senator have in mind as permissible under paragraph (4)?

Mr. REED. I suppose agreements under paragraph (4) will be rather scarce. Possibly, however, there might be transportation of oil over a part of the distance in tank cars, and a part of the distance by pipe lines under a joint rate. Of course, joint rates can be made between the railroads and the water-borne carriers. They could be made, if the railroads would make them, between motor carriers and the railroads. As a general policy, the railroads do not maintain joint rates with motor carriers. It is agreements of the character I have indicated which might be made.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. With respect to what?

Mr. REED. Any agreements. They make an agreement, and they have to apply to the Commission for approval, "and the Commission shall by order approve any such agreement," except paragraph (4) agreements, "if it finds that the object of the agreement is appropriate for the proper performance by the carriers of service to the public, that the agreement will not unduly restrain competition, and that it is consistent with the public interest as declared by Congress in the national transportation policy set forth in this act."

There is the standard by which the Commission must judge these agreements, and unless they meet the test of that standard, the Commission may not approve them.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it is clear that I have not stated my position so that it can be understood by the Senator from Kansas, so I shall try once again. If I understand the English language, under paragraph (4) as it has come in from his committee, it would be possible for a railroad carrier to enter into an agreement with a pipe-line carrier on matters relating to joint rates, not as to joint rates as such, that the rail carrier should charge such and such a rate on oil transported between points within the railroad, and the pipe line should charge such and such a rate between points within the pipe line, in order that oil which was transported on both the railroad and the pipe line might be carried at different rates. That would be perfectly possible, however unlikely, under the language of the bill as reported by the Senator from Kansas. But if the amendments which I have proposed were adopted, it would not be possible, because then the prohibition would be a real limitation, and would mean that the agreement would have to do with joint rates, that is to say, with rates which applied to both the railroad and the pipe line jointly.

I recognize how difficult it is to deal with these very complex matters by writing down words, marks on white paper, to convey thoughts and ideas. It is one of the most difficult things in the world, and because it is so difficult, the courts are full of lawsuits among parties to contracts who thought they had clear meetings of minds, and who thought they wrote them down in contracts upon white paper. But when they came to watch them operate, they discovered that they were in violent disagreement. Every lawyer has had such experiences with his clients. They come into his office and say, "I entered into a contract with this man, and we were perfectly agreed. This is what is said in the contract, but this is what he is trying to do." Then they go to court about it.

I am saying, Mr. President, that the exemption of any group of carriers or any group of businessmen from the prohibitions of the antitrust laws is so grave an issue that we must be doubly certain that we are saying precisely what we mean, because if we do not do that, we shall be opening the door to great abuses.

I know the Senator from Kansas desires to prevent abuses arising under this exemption which he asks the Congress to grant, and I believe that upon consideration of the suggestions which I have made he will go much further than he has gone already this afternoon in discussing them so as to help close the door against creating opportunity for agreements which are against the public interest. I believe that upon consideration of the suggestions which I have made, he will go much further than he has gone already this afternoon in the discussion in helping to close the door against creating opportunities for agreements that are against the public interest.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. REED. I should be very happy if the Senator from Wyoming would proceed to discuss all his amendments, and I promise not to interrupt him too much. I am interested in the reasons behind the Senator's amendment. It is an intelligent approach to the pending bill. This is an important bill. I have certain responsibility in connection with it, and I want to discharge that responsibility with the fullest knowledge it is possible for me to have. I recognize the very able Senator from Wyoming as being equally interested.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should be very glad to accommodate myself to the Senator's suggestion. I have taken so much time upon this amendment solely because the Senator from Kansas was asking me questions.

Mr. REED. I was interrupting the Senator all the time.

AMENDMENT TO GUARD AGAINST DISCRIMINATION

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, there are two other amendments to which I think there should be no possible objection upon the part of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce or its able chairman. I have mentioned certain others already in the discussion, but the two that I have in mind at the moment are the following: On page 2, line 18, to amend by inserting after the word "agreement" the language "is not discriminatory among shippers or geographical areas." The purpose of that is to set up one of the standards for the guidance of the Interstate Commerce Commission in passing upon these agreements, to make it plain, in explicit language, that no agreement should be approved if it is discriminatory among shippers or discriminatory among geographical areas.

Mr. President, the lawsuits that are now pending in the Supreme Court of the United States affecting this issue have arisen from the fact that respectable representatives of great areas of the country have charged, and apparently they sincerely believe, that great areas have suffered discrimination in the fixing of railroad rates. I know that the Senator from Kansas does not desire to permit discriminatory rates or discriminatory agreements with respect either to shippers or to geographical areas. I say to him, however, again, that when one considers that every acre which is in the Tenth Federal Reserve District—every State within that district—is without representation upon the Interstate Commerce Commission it becomes clear how important it is to us all that there be written into the pending bill specific language which will make it clear that we do not want to have the Interstate Commerce Commission approving agreements among carriers which are geographically or individually discriminatory.

Then, Mr. President, the second amendment on this floor is the one which I seek to insert at the bottom of page 2. The last sentence on that page reads as follows:

> The approval of the Commission shall be granted only upon such terms and conditions as the Commission may prescribe as necessary to insure compliance with the standards above set forth in this paragraph.

I would have it read as follows—and I ask, Mr. President, that the inserted language appear in the RECORD in black type, so that it may be clear.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. This is my amendment:

On page 2, line 21, after the word "The", where it appears a second time, insert the following: "Commission shall prescribe and may from time to time modify the rules and regulations under which such agreements may be made (which shall include provision for the representation of shippers and interested State regulatory commissions or other authorities in hearings thereon), and the."

That is the end of the amendment. I now go on with the sentence:

The approval of the Commission shall be granted only upon such terms and conditions as the Commission may prescribe as necessary to insure compliance with the standards above set forth in this paragraph.

Obviously, the purpose of that amendment is to guarantee, to the shippers and to the States affected, representation when the agreements are being made. That, Mr. President, seems to me to be a very mild request to make. When we are saying by law of Congress that the carriers may combine, why should we not say in the same breath that when they are discussing the combination, the shippers who are to be affected, and the States which are to be affected, shall be present during the discussion? It seems to me, Mr. President, there can be no reasonable objection to that amendment. I think it clarifies what the advocates of the measure have said that they mean. All I am trying to do, with respect to the amendments, is to clarify the language and make certain so far as possible that the people of the United States shall be present by representation when the private agreements are being made.

RAILROADS LONG CONTROLLED BY EASTERN FINANCIAL INTERESTS

It should be pointed out, Mr. President, that the system now in use for the making of rates and handling transportation is a growth over many years. When the railroads were first built in this country, they were few in number. They covered comparatively small areas. They extended gradually westward, across mountains and rivers and plains, and reached finally to the Pacific coast. They have been controlled, Mr. President—everybody knows this—largely by the financial interests of the East. It has been common usage to refer to such-and-such a railroad as a Morgan railroad or a Hill railroad, or a Vanderbilt railroad. The financial institutions which have financed the railroads have exercised a great influence in the affairs of the country. But the management thus affected has also been affected by the needs of growing communities, the needs of the growing West, and of course a great problem, as the country became settled, was one of adjusting the freight rates in one area to the freight rates in another area. Agreements were made among the railroads; they had their rate bureaus and their conferences; but, heretofore, those bureaus and conferences never had the sanction of law; they were never expressly approved by law. Today, if we pass the pending bill we shall have said that in the opinion of the Senate of the United States, the railroad bureaus and conferences which have thus grown up should now have approval of the Congress of the United States by statute, and become semiofficial agencies of Government.

Who is there to deny that if that is to be done the Congress should exercise the greatest care to make certain that the rules and regulations whereby they are governed shall be rules and regulations in the public interest? In paragraph (2) of the bill we are doing an utterly new thing. We are giving sanction not only to the fixing of rates but to the creation of these organizations. Those are two very different things. I think adequate protection for the fixing of rates in the manner which has grown up—and I would not disturb that procedure at all—will be granted by the language of the bill and the amendments which I have proposed or suggested, amendments which are designed to prevent discrimination and to grant representation.

AMENDMENT TO PROVIDE CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL OF ORGANIZATIONS TO SET RATES, ETC.

But there is another most important factor which is completely and utterly overlooked, and that has to do with two amendments which I realize the Senator from Kansas and the members of his committee may regard as being perhaps a little difficult to take. I suggest, Mr. President, that they are not so difficult to take as may be imagined. The first of these amendments is on page 2, line 25, immediately following the word "paragraph.", to insert the following:

No such agreement—

Referring of course to the agreements among the carriers—

for the establishment of any association or organization composed of two or more carriers, or prescribing rules, regulations, or procedures for its consideration of any of the subjects heretofore specified, shall be approved by the Commission unless such agreement shall first have been submitted to and approved by the Congress by joint resolution.

That does not mean, as some Senators have thought when first they glanced at it, that every rate agreement would have to come to Congress. It does not mean that at all. It does not say so. It would be impossible to bring the rate agreements to Congress. I recognize that. I do not want to turn Congress into a rate-making body. That would be absurd. It was because Congress, as constituted, cannot be a rate-making body, that we created the Interstate Commerce Commission over a half century ago. Congress delegated the power to the Interstate Commerce Commission to supervise these rates. I have no objection to that. That is necessary. I do not wish to recall that action. But on the other hand, Mr. President, when we go beyond anything that Congress has ever done before and we say in words of one syllable, "the railroads and the pipe lines and the motor carriers and the water carriers may create an organization to provide rules and regulations to govern transportation throughout the United States," then I say Congress will be neglecting its duty if it does not look at the type of organization that is set up, if it does not examine the powers which the carriers will give to themselves.

I make no charge of wrongful intent. Mr. President, this is merely a part of the great problem that is affecting the whole world, the problem of adjusting the individual economy to the organization under which we live. We have been struggling with this problem for 25 years and have not solved it. We have tried one scheme after another. One thing we know is that because leadership throughout the world has failed to make that adjustment, totalitarian power has appeared in the world, for when people in their individual capacity were unable to receive what they thought was justice and fair dealing from private organizations, they turned to government to do the job, and that is why the authoritarian governments were set up.

Here we are establishing a new private authority. Call it what you will, gloss it over with the necessities of the occasion, acknowledge that the railroads have done a great job, and I do—during the war they did a magnificent job—acknowledge all of that, nevertheless when it is provided in the bill that "any carrier party to an agreement between or among two or more carriers concerning, or providing rules and regulations pertaining to or procedures for the consideration, initiation, or establishment, of rates, fares, charges," and so forth, "may, under such rules and regulations as the Commission may prescribe, apply to the Commission for approval of the agreement, and the Commission shall by order approve," unless so and so—when the bill contains such a provision, Mr. President, surely it is plain to anyone who cares to pay one moment's attention to the plain words of the English language, that we are saying that the Interstate Commerce Commission shall approve this private authority to handle the transportation system of the United States. So I say, let not Congress abrogate its solemn duty to make certain that it shall not turn loose a private authoritarian power to govern the basic transportation industry of America.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator does not mean to say, does he, that although authority is given for the formation of the agreements the Commission itself does not have the final say in what the rates shall be?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Before the Senator came onto the floor——

Mr. ELLENDER. I will say to the Senator that I was busy in a committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I know. We are all busy, and I have complained many times that committees are sitting during the session of the Senate, when Senators ought to be here on the floor. I am pointing out that there is a grave difference between rates and the organization which will fix the rates. I do not want to bring the rates to Congress for determination of them, but I say that

when we are giving authority to the carriers to set up an organization, then we have got to be very sure that we know what sort of an organization they are going to set up.

Mr. ELLENDER. What is proposed to be done under the bill is simply to give legal sanction to the custom which has prevailed for the past 40 years. The point I want to try to emphasize is this. Is it not true that even under the bill as it is now drafted, the Interstate Commerce Commission, which is a creature of Congress, shall finally pass on whether the rates shall be as presented to the Commission, or whether they shall be changed. Is that not true?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; it is not.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the way I understand it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will tell the Senator why I believe it is not. I think that was the intent.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why not put it in language to make it certain?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am sure the Senator feels that way. That is why I hope he will give attention to the amendments which I have proposed. The Senator from Kansas has already indicated that he will give them careful consideration; and I think he means more than those two words sometimes mean. If the Senator from Louisiana will examine them, I am sure he will agree that those amendments, except for two which I am now discussing, are intended to make clear, in the public interest, the system with respect to rates which has grown up.

Mr. REED rose.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Kansas that I must answer the Senator from Louisiana first.

The importance of this matter becomes clear when we read the terms of the delegation of power contained in paragraph 2. First let me say to the Senator that this is a broad delegation to the carriers, no matter what their classification, to enter into agreements of every shape and form relating to the transportation service of America—not only in connection with rates and charges, but the use or nonuse of safety devices—perhaps suppression as well as utilization. It is a delegation of power in the broadest possible language to the carriers to make agreements; but the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission to approve is restricted.

Mr. ELLENDER. Where?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I will show the Senator.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to have the Senator point to specific language.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I know that some may say that it is not intended to restrict it, but I shall indicate that it is necessarily restricted, because we say in paragraph (2) that when an agreement is made any carrier may apply to the Commission for approval of the agreement. Bear in mind what that means. An agreement is made. Some of the carriers are great railroad transportation companies. Some of them are little companies. The big company may apply, as well as the little company. It may be the pipe-line carrier which will apply, or the railroad carrier, or the motor carrier. But all these carriers, dealing with every branch of the transportation industry, are given authority to establish rules and regulations "pertaining to or procedures for the consideration, initiation, or establishment, of rates, fares, charges (including charges as between carriers), classifications, divisions, allowances, time schedules, routes, the interchange of facilities, the settlement of claims, the promotion of safety, or the promotion of adequacy, economy, or efficiency of operation or service."

There is the grant of power. These agreements go beyond the mere making of rates. They deal with every single phase of the transportation industry, but they deal also with the impact of the motor carrier upon the railroad, of the railroad upon the pipe line, the water carrier upon the pipe line, and the water carrier upon the motor-transport unit. So we are now saying, in a law of Congress, that carriers which have these various modes of transportation, many of which are supposedly competitive, may nevertheless form organizations and make agreements, rules, and regulations; and the Commission shall approve them—unless what? Unless they are prohibited by paragraphs (4), (5), or (6), and if the Commission finds certain things set out in the language beginning in line 16 and extending to the end of the paragraph.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the Senator will continue reading from where he left off, he will find this language——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have read it several times during the debate:

> if it finds that the object of the agreement is appropriate for the proper performance by the carriers of service to the public, that the agreement will not unduly restrain competition.

By the way, I have submitted an amendment to insert "is not discriminatory among shippers or geographical areas"——

Mr. ELLENDER. But all these agreements come into being "under such rules and regulations as the Commission may prescribe," reading from lines 11 and 12. The carriers apply to the Commission for approval of the agreement, and the Commission shall order approval of such agreement.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I beg the Senator's pardon. He is misreading the language. He referred to lines 11 and 12. The rules and regulations there authorized to be laid down by the Commission do not apply to the approval of the agreements. They apply only to the manner in which the application for approval may be made. The carrier—

> may, under such rules and regulations as the Commission may prescribe, apply to the Commission for approval of the agreement.

That is a purely procedural provision.

Mr. ELLENDER. In line 12 there is the language:

> apply to the Commission for approval of the agreement.

What would the agreement consist of, except an agreement as to rates, and everything else enumerated?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It would apply to the organization, such as the Association of American Railroads, the Western Association, the Southeastern Association, or the Eastern Association, which are private governments.

Mr. ELLENDER. But if an agreement were entered into among 3 or 4 carriers providing certain rates, and providing that the classifications, and so forth, should be as stated in the agreement, is it not true that such an agreement among the several carriers must be submitted to the Commission for approval?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; but the Commission must approve it unless it falls within certain narrow prohibitions. That is my point.

Mr. ELLENDER. What are those prohibitions?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator had been in the Chamber instead of in committee, he would have heard me discuss paragraph (4) which is a prohibition to the eye, but to the mind, when we read it, it is no prohibition at all.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to ask the Senator this specific question: Suppose 3 or 4 railroads should enter into an agreement sanctioned by the Commission, under rules and regulations set out by the Commission, and should agree to certain rates. Is it the Senator's view that the Commission itself cannot alter or change the rates agreed upon?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Not unless it can cite a specific phrase in paragraph (2).

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator mean to tell the Senate that the railroads themselves acting through these agreements, sanctioned by the Commission, would be the final arbiters as to what the rates should be? If the Senator from Wyoming gives an affirmative answer to that question, I should like to hear from the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] in answer to the question. As I understand the bill, it simply sanctions the method of rate fixing which has been in effect for the past 30 or 40 years, and under it the Interstate Commerce Commission has the power to pass judgment as to all rates presented to it under such agreements as may be added by the railroads.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My answer to the Senator from Louisiana is that that is a mistake. I am doing my best to point out that it deals not alone with rates——

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It deals also with organizations. Never before in the history of the development of the transportation system has Congress undertaken to put the seal of its approval upon any of these associations. But the moment we pass this bill Congress does that, and it makes such an association an agency of the public, a secondary delegation of congressional power. I do not say that that might not be desirable or necessary, but I say that Congress at least should be careful enough of the interests of constituents to make sure that Congress knows what shall be the terms and conditions, the rules and regulations, to be made by these private associations.

The reason I say that is because there is a volume of testimony showing that these associations were being brought into being for the purpose of establishing a plan of organization and government. I am using the language of the

railroad men themselves. I have here a memorandum which was prepared by Mr. Fletcher of the Association of American Railroads, and transmitted to Mr. Carl R. Gray on October 18, 1934, in which he describes the sort of an organization which he thought would be desirable. Understand, I am not attacking Mr. Fletcher; I make no charges against him; but I want the Senate to realize what he was proposing. I want to ask, if Mr. Fletcher proposed this in 1934, before Congress gave authority, may not some successor of his propose something like it hereafter? This is what he said:

It was realized that the association could best serve all needs of the industry by doing the work which the law now imposes upon the Coordinator and the coordinating committees created by the Emergency Transportation Act, 1933. This is particularly true since the Emergency Act will expire by its own terms in June 1935. It was the hope of those who conceived this plan of organization and government that the industry would demonstrate its capacity for self-regulation, and therefore make it unnecessary for Government authority to intervene in railroad activities.

A "BLANK CHECK" GRANT OF POWER

Can anything be plainer than that? Here were the spokesmen for the railroads undertaking to work out a private plan for organization and government of the railroads. We now propose to let them work out a plan for the organization and government not only of railroads, but of pipe lines, motor carriers, water transport companies, of every branch of the transportation industry. In other words, Congress is saying, "We grant you here the franchise to establish your own government of the transportation system, and when you have done it the Interstate Commerce Commission shall agree to it unless it falls within this little narrow fence of prohibition."

Are we so naive as to believe that men in the future who desire to do so cannot work out, under this broad grant of power, an organization which would not fall within its prohibitions but of which the Interstate Commerce Commission would have to approve under the law?

It has the effect of giving to the carriers the power to combine and agree among themselves, to use Mr. Fletcher's language, so that it will be "unnecessary for Government authority to interfere in railroad activities." I change that to say, "so that Government authority will not intervene in any transportation."

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. REED. I agree with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] that the Senator from Wyoming, I feel, has a misconception of a fundamental element of this problem. The duty of initiating reasonable rates always has devolved upon the railroads——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, I know that; and I do not want to interfere with it.

Mr. REED. It still devolves upon the railroads.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But they were first doing it separately. Then they began to combine; they began to go together, and then, finally, they went a step further and established this organization and that organization. They have the Association of American Railroads, the Western Association, the Southeastern Association, the Eastern Association, all composed of railroads. If this legislation is enacted these organizations and associations will include motor carriers, pipe lines—they will include the tankers upon the sea and the cargo ships upon the sea.

Mr. REED. I realize that I am breaking into the Senator's time, but the fundamental point involved is not any different from what it always has been. Originally every railroad published its own rates. As commerce grew and the railroads grew in size and the thousands of rates went into hundreds of thousands, then into millions, and then into billions, rate bureaus became a necessity in the operation of publishing rates. There was no restriction, no regulation; no reports were required, no rules or regulations governing them. What this bill does is to recognize them, establish rules and regulations, require reports, and make their operations public. But they still publish the rates, and the duty of initiating rates still rests upon the carriers, except that now we shall regulate their operation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. To give a specific example of what I have in mind on the rate question, I want to refer to a memorandum which was prepared by Mr. Cleveland, head of the Association of American Railroads, on January 28, 1937. I do not intend to read it all, but I want to tell the Senate briefly what it was about. It seems that railroad lines in the southwestern area of the United States were charging rates for the transportation of furniture which were regarded by the eastern roads as too low. Understand that these charges for the transportation of furniture were levied by the southwestern lines between points of shipment wholly on southwestern roads, and the railroads down East said. "You sons of the wild jackasses out there in the Southwest, you are not charging enough for the transportation of furniture. We want you to up those charges." The southwestern lines did not believe that. They said, "No. If we did that, our business would go to the motor carriers."

Mr. President, here is the memorandum of Mr. Cleveland to Mr. Pelley:

The southwestern lines maintain rates and minima on furniture within Southwestern Territory and between Southwestern Territory and certain points in Western Trunk Line and Illinois Freight Association Territory on a basis more favorable than those maintained by the eastern and southern carriers.

Mr. President, could anything be plainer than what the eastern and southern carriers were complaining about? They wanted those rates raised.

What happened? To make the story short, let me say there was a great deal of discussion backward and forward; and finally we have a statement by Mr. Cleveland, after a suggestion had been made to the railroads in the Southwest that they raise their rates:

This suggestion appealed to me as very fair, since under normal conditions rates in Western Trunk Line Territory should be higher than the rates in Eastern Territory and the rates in Southwestern Territory on a still higher basis. * * * After those conferences, we were finally notified that they—

The southwesterners—

could not comply with the request because they were more convinced than ever that if they made the readjustments suggested it would result only in transferring the traffic to competing trucks.

Then, Mr. President, listen to this:

This conclusion was not satisfactory to the eastern and southern carriers.

The statement continued somewhat further. Finally, at the end of the list of recommendations prepared by the freight bureau, we find this:

Considering the nature of the association and the fact that it is expected to operate in the interest of the railroad industry—

Not in the interest of the public, Mr. President, you see—

and without taking into account the interest of an individual carrier or one group of carriers as against others, I very reluctantly recommend that the board pass a resolution requiring the Southwestern and the Western Trunk Line carriers to make the revision in the rates recommended by the eastern and southern carriers.

Mr. President, what are we going to do about it?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. In other words, is it correct to say that the eastern and southern carriers were requiring the western carriers to impose higher rates than the western carriers wished to impose, upon freight moving in the West, only on the western carriers?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is absolutely correct. The eastern railroad interests were not satisfied to let the western railroad interests govern themselves, and they undertook to form an organization by which they could compel the southwestern railroads to conform to the will of the eastern railroads.

Mr. HILL. And under this bill such a private government would be ratified and made legal by the Congress of the United States; is not that true?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly, and without having the Congress know what is contained in it.

Mr. President, I have heard these timbers ring with the challenges which were made by Members of the Senate against the so-called blank checks that were issued to President Roosevelt to fight the depression and to fight the war; but here is a blank check that outrivals any blank check that ever was issued before. Under this measure, we would say to them, "Go and make your own rules and regulations; and unless they are within this narrow little fence, bless you, boy, they will rule the transportation system of America."

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me once more?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The blank check now sought to be issued would not be issued to a President of the United States elected by the people of the United States, an officer sworn to serve the people, to protect the people, and to safeguard their interests, but it would be given to persons who have no obligation or responsibility to the people, but who serve a selfish interest. Is not that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly it is.

Mr. President, in order to make clear precisely what happened, I wish to refer to an exhibit which I think was placed in the RECORD yesterday by the Senator from Idaho. It is a report from Mr. Cleveland to Mr. Pelley, under date of October 12, 1937.

I ask the Senate to remember the words I read a moment ago from the report of Mr. Cleveland to Mr. Pelley; that the association was for the purpose of protecting the rights of the railroad industry. However, Mr. President, we in the Senate are concerned, not only with preserving the rights of the railroad industry, but also with preserving the rights of the people of the United States who are affected.

But among the accomplishments cited by Mr. Cleveland in his report to Mr. Pelley, on October 12, 1937, I find the following:

> Composing harmoniously the differences between the Western Trunk Lines and the Southwestern Lines on the one hand and the Official and Southern Lines on the other with reference to the rates on furniture and the minima in connection therewith.

Mr. President, it is my understanding that that memorandum relates to the struggle with the Southwestern Lines to keep the rate on furniture down to where they thought it should be.

However, I was talking about these agreements in the association.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield before he leaves that point, let me say that I was impressed with the statement he made about the Southwestern railroads and his statement that the rates were finally required to be fixed without regard to the needs or wishes or desires of the carriers in that section of the country, and without regard to the public need or necessity, but were finally determined upon an industry-wide basis, involving the railroad industry all over the United States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. HATCH. The bill now before us, which at least would tend to make such agreements possible legally, is sponsored by the majority party of this body. In that connection, let me say that I recall an amendment which, only a few days ago, was offered in the Senate from the majority side, and it received support from that side of the aisle. That amendment would have prohibited and made illegal actions or efforts by the laboring men of this Nation to engage in industry-wide bargaining. I think the Senator recalls the vote on that amendment in this Chamber; I believe he recalls how that restriction and prohibition against the laboring men failed by only one vote to be carried by this body.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am very glad the Senator from New Mexico has made that comparison. It certainly is most pertinent.

Mr. President, I was discussing the nature, the effect, and the power of these associations, the creation of which will be made legal if the bill passes in its present form, and here I have some testimony given by Mr. Pelley, president of the Association of American Railroads, in the suit instituted by the State of Georgia against the Pennsylvania Railroad.

A resolution had been adopted by the association, and the question was as to the effect of this resolution. Was it merely advisory, or did it have any control?

The attorney asked:

> Question. Now, Mr. Pelley, that resolution appears in the form of an absolute mandate, does it not?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that Mr. Pelley was the president of the American Association of Railroads?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. Pelley was the president. I may say that I think he did an excellent job during the war in helping to organize the railroads to carry on during the emergency. Unfortunately, he has since passed away. He was a very able man, and he was the head and front of this system. I repeat, now, reading from the testimony:

> Question. Now, Mr. Pelley, that resolution appears in the form of an absolute mandate, does it not?

The wording is:

> "That the president"—

The president being the president of a railroad—

> "That the president be directed to issue an order forbidding the establishment of joint rates," and that was precisely the purpose you had in mind in stating the resolution in that form, was it not?
>
> Answer. Yes.
>
> Question. To make it an absolute mandate? Is that correct?
>
> Answer. That is the way it reads.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Question. What would you contemplate would be the effect of such an announcement of policy by the Board with regard to proposals pending in the territorial rate organizations?
>
> Answer. That is proposals covered by the resolution?
>
> Question. That is right. I was not attempting to mislead you.
>
> Answer. That is what I thought you meant.
>
> By the special master:
>
> Question. And what is your answer?
>
> Answer. Well, I think it was contemplated to stop arrangements of that kind that might have been pending.

In other words, here is a clear, explicit statement, capable of no misunderstanding, that the directive which was issued by the head of the organization was a mandate which it expected to be obeyed.

Mr. President, the question which must be answered is whether we shall undertake to permit such associations to be established without at least having Congress look at them. So this is another of the amendments which I propose. I think I have already read it, and I shall not repeat it, but I ask that it be incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 25, immediately following the word "paragraph" and the period, it is proposed to insert the following:

> No such agreement for the establishment of any association or organization composed of two or more carriers, or prescribing rules, regulations, or procedures for its consideration of any of the subjects hereinbefore specified, shall be approved by the Commission unless such agreement shall first have been submitted to and approved by the Congress by joint resolution.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, all in the world the amendment does is to provide that when the carriers, whether they are railroad carriers, motor carriers, pipe-line carriers, or water carriers, all together, when they form an organization for a plan of government of the transportation industry, shall submit it to the Congress of the United States before it becomes effective. That is one amendment.

AMENDMENT TO PREVENT CONTROL BY EASTERN FINANCIERS

The other amendment arises out of the fact that we know as a matter of fact, from the history of the railroad industry, that the great banking institutions of the East have controlled our railroads. If we are to allow self-government of the railroads, then, Mr. President, we should be certain that that government will be carried on, not by the financial institutions of the East, but by those who are engaged in the business. If we are to grant self-government to the entire transportation industry so that an agreement may be made by all the different carriers, then it seems to me we should be certain that they will not be controlled by big money.

Let us not forget that when the little man, in his little business in New Hampshire, in Wyoming, in Alabama, in West Virginia, in Georgia, in Kansas, or in New Jersey, wherever he is, pays a rate which he regards as heavy, he does not have the financial resources which the great associations have, so that he can come to Washington and sit before the doors of the Interstate Commerce Commission. We know that Washington today is filled with representatives of great national organizations, business organizations, labor organizations, farm organizations, which are constantly working upon the Congress and working upon the Executive Department of the Government to gain the ends they desire, whereas the small people of the land, out in the States, are represented only by us.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Apropos of what the Senator has just said, if he will pardon my speaking in the first person, in the address I made here Tuesday I read excerpts from the official records of the Interstate Commerce Committee, where these very same railroad groups testified, at the hearings before Senator Wheeler, and the then Senator Truman, that the hearings which are held by these respective committees, referring particularly to the Interstate Commerce Committee, for example, are only scenery, that they do their work on the individual Senators, that they keep the dossier of each individual Senator, knowing his weak points and strong points, his affiliations, and so forth. That is where they get in their work.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to read the dossier of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. President, the amendment which I offer to meet this situation is very simple. On page 3, line 8, immediately following the word "representatives" and the period I propose to insert the following: "No banker, bank, or other financial institution shall be a member of any such conference, bureau, committee, or other organization, or participate directly or indirectly in its consideration of any of the subjects specified in paragraph (2) of this section."

So that it will be clear what this paragraph 3 means, I read it now with the amendment in it:

Each conference, bureau, committee, or other organization established or continued—

Observe the word "continued." It is intended to continue organizations now in existence—

pursuant to any agreement approved by the Commission under the provisions of this section shall maintain such accounts, records, files, and memoranda and shall submit to the Commission—

I think the words "to the Commission" should be included there—

such reports as may be prescribed by the Commission, and all such accounts, records, files, and memoranda shall be subject to inspection by the Commission or its duly authorized representatives. No banker, bank, or other financial institution shall be a member of any such conference, bureau, committee, or other organization, or participate directly or indirectly in its consideration of any of the subjects specified in paragraph (2) of this section.

Mr. President, I shall add only another word. When Congress delegates to any department of Government the power to make rules and regulations to carry out a particular law, Senators are all aware that those rules and regulations have the force and effect of law. When Congress says, "You may make the rules and regulations," then the people must obey those rules and regulations because it is Congress speaking. We here provide in the pending bill, as reported by the committee, on page 2, in paragraph (2):

Any carrier, party to an agreement between or among two or more carriers concerning, or providing rules or regulations pertaining to or procedures for the consideration—

Of these various subjects. Here is the authority, delegated not to the Commission but to the carriers, to make the rules and regulations under which all the shippers of the United States shall be governed, when it comes to the fixing of rates and charges, either for freight or for passengers or for any of the other factors that enter into the transportation business. I say, Mr. President, if we, here in Congress, now take that step, and grant to the carriers of the United States the power to make the rules and regulations governing their business, we shall have gone far beyond the limits of the old NIRA, which was condemned as an unconstitutional exercise of congressional power. We shall be setting up the pattern whereby the loss of the power of the people to control their own economic welfare will be pushed a little further toward the abyss. The whole world is now in a state of turbulence bordering, many think, upon a third world war, because we have not been wise enough to regulate in the interest of all the people, instead of permitting a few people to exercise authority for themselves in the area in which they make profit, though it may affect all the people of the United States and of the world.

I recognize, Mr. President, that this is a difficult and complex question. I believe that much delegation is necessary, but it cannot be made safely, unless the Congress is careful to set up explicit standards to protect the public interests, and then let Congress itself oversee the organizational structure of those associations which it may authorize among private businesses to affect the economic life of the people of the United States.

I conclude by suggesting to the Senator from Kansas that, in my opinion, the adoption of the amendments which I propose will not deprive the carriers of anything that they ought to have. The adoption of the amendments will not prevent them from making their rates and their regulations. The adoption will not bring back to Congress the fixing of rates. It will merely provide a rule of responsibility by which the organizations, just like the Congress of the United States, would be primarily responsible to the welfare of all the people.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for just one question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Do I understand the Senator from Kansas has accepted the amendments offered by the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no. The Senator has indicated that he will give very careful consideration to the amendments.

SUGAR RATIONING

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, yesterday the Secretary of Agriculture announced that all sugar rationing for household use would be discontinued immediately. In my judgment, that was a very sound decision and constructive action for him to take at this time. I commend him highly for a step in the right direction.

It is, however, only one step. The Secretary's order does nothing to price controls. And it does nothing at all for the industrial user. I believe there have been more inequities in handling sugar allotments to industrial users than in any other one item under control during the war. Possibly some inequities were unavoidable. Yet under this system, the returning GI who set up a small bakery or bottling plant was prevented from expanding and developing his business beyond the barest minimum needed to keep him in operation. He could not show a record of historical use, and so he was denied an equal chance at the market in competition with his long-established competitors. It is the same as if each family were held to its prewar record of use, thus cutting out the newlyweds almost entirely.

Furthermore, this order is likely to open up the way to a host of uneconomic and illegal activities. Industrial users, particularly the smaller ones, because of their rather desperate plight, are likely to be tempted to evade the intent of the order by shopping for their needs as individuals at local stores. I do not believe any enforcement can be effective against such practices. It is bad government and bad morals to tempt men, and almost force them, into illegal activity.

In short, if we are going to remove half the sugar controls, I believe we should go all the way and remove them all. Without rationing all users, price control is either ineffective, or it is unnecessary.

As it happens, no later than last Tuesday, I proposed to a number of my colleagues that we should remove all controls on sugar, at the end of this month, by cutting off funds for administering the control program. I am now rising to renew that suggestion. The Agriculture appropriation bill will soon be before the Senate. If we are convinced, as I believe most of us are, that sugar control is no longer necessary, there is no use in delaying action. We have it in our power to bring all the controls to an end on June 30. I hope the Senate will take advantage of this opportunity to free one more American industry from unnecessary controls. Perhaps it would be well if the report from the Senate Committee on Appropriations carries no appropriation for the continuance of sugar allotment control after June 30.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN AGREEMENTS BETWEEN CARRIERS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 110) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to call attention to the fact that the bill under consideration has now been debated since last Monday. I wish to say further that we are trying to keep up to schedule with respect to pending legislation. I have spoken to several Senators on both sides of the aisle respecting a suitable time when the Senate might vote on the pending bill and all motions or amendments

pertaining thereto with a view to fixing a definite time for a final vote. I know that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] have a very deep interest in the bill, and are in opposition to it. Since they and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] and other Senators are now present in the Senate Chamber, I wonder if I can be of some service to them all by suggesting that we enter into a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on the bill tomorrow afternoon at, let us say, the hour of 5 o'clock or 6 o'clock, and that 2 hours before that time the time be divided equally between the opponents and the proponents of the measure.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator well knows that for the most part we have been debating the bill in a vacuum because many Members of the Senate have been absent from the floor attending committee meetings. This afternoon I talked a great deal longer than I expected to because the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] was good enough to ask me many questions indicating that he had some interest in the proposals which I made, in fact, at one time he indicated that perhaps some of the amendments I am offering are not too bad.

I feel that no unanimous-consent agreement should be entered into until the Senator from Kansas has had an opportunity to study my amendments in the light of what has been said this afternoon and to discuss them. He promised me this afternoon that he would discuss them. I am looking forward to that discussion. I am hoping that when it takes place we shall have a quorum of the Senate present, because I feel that when the Senator from Kansas undertakes to discuss my amendments he will either acknowledge that the amendments are good and ought to be adopted, or that the purpose of the bill is to go much further toward the establishment of private authoritarian government over the transportation system of the country than anybody has acknowledged to date. So, Mr. President, I think the Senator's unanimous-consent request would be a little premature at this time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I want to be sure the Senator understood me. I did not mean that the Senate should vote at 5 o'clock today.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, yes; I understood the Senator's request to be that the vote be taken tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. I wondered if it would be agreeable to the Senate that a vote be taken on the bill at 5 o'clock tomorrow, Friday. My thought also was that if the majority leader were favorable to the suggestion, the Senate, when it recessed today, would recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning, which would give us, say, until 3 or 4 o'clock for unlimited debate, after which for 2 hours the time would be divided equally before the vote. I certainly do not desire by the unanimous-consent request to cut off any Senator who may desire to debate the bill. I certainly would not want to do so in the light of the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming respecting his amendments, discussion of which may take more time than anticipated. I think the Senator will agree with me that most of the speeches heretofore made have occupied more time than was anticipated. I simply felt that this was the time to suggest that we might agree upon an hour certain at which to vote on the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the amendments which are now before the Senate deal with specific phases of the bill. I believe approval of the amendments would go far to prevent a veto of the bill. I think they are in the interest of those who are seeking the legislation. Therefore I hope the Senator from Nebraska will not press his unanimous-consent request until the Senator from Kansas has had an opportunity to consider what has been said today and to discuss it upon the floor. I suggest that the Senator renew the request tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, would the Senator suggest an hour which would be agreeable to him at which to vote on the bill?

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator for a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCGRATH in the chair). The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] has the floor.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. I want to be perfectly fair to the Senate. There is a Senator who has the feeling that the membership on both sides of the aisle has been rather deficient in the last 4 days, and manifestly all Senators could not have the benefit of listening to the debate. However, on the assumption that Senators have not read the hearings, the suggestion was made that perhaps a sense of duty would inspire him, and that it might be a part of wisdom to take the book of hearings and proceed forthwith to read the 2,407 pages, with repeated roll calls to assure the presence of Senators to listen, in order that each Senator would know the contents of this very voluminous compilation of evidence upon the bill. I do not know how long such a reading would take. My guess is that it would require 10 days. Nevertheless, in all good faith that suggestion is made, because it might eventuate. I do not know that it will. I hope it will not.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, evidently my suggestions are without avail. So I shall withdraw my unanimous-consent request and renew it tomorrow. I feel that it would be advantageous if the proponents and opponents of the measure would arrive at an agreement tomorrow respecting an hour at which the Senate can proceed to vote on the bill and all amendments and motions pertaining thereto.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of pleasure to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], who brought to our attention some of the true facts concerning the pending bill. I, too, suggest that before any Senator votes on the bill he give careful consideration to the question as to whether or not it is proper to pass the bill in view of the fact that two cases are pending in the Federal courts involving the very subject matter encompassed in the terms of the bill. First, there is the case of the State of Georgia. That State has brought a lawsuit in the Supreme Court of the United States, claiming and contending that Georgia and all other Southern States have been damaged and discriminated against in the field of railroad rate making. Georgia complains not of rate making by the Commission, but of rate making by the railroads themselves in private organizations, committees, and associations. Georgia went to great expense and trouble and consumed long periods of time in preparation and presentation of the evidence in support of its charges to a master in chancery appointed by the Supreme Court for that purpose. Georgia has presented its voluminous testimony to the master. The railroads have presented their defense testimony to the master. That case has been completely presented to the master, and is before him in such fashion that very soon he will be in a position to present his analysis of the testimony of both sides, as well as his recommendations with respect thereto, to the Supreme Court of the United States itself. In view of the fact that the State of Georgia has gone to such a great expense to make up its record, it is a serious thing for the Congress of the United States at this time to consider the pending bill affecting, as it does, the case of the State of Georgia. In my opinion, and in the opinion of the Department of Justice, the enactment of the bill at this time, affecting that case, would result in the case being thrown out of court.

The Congress is in no position to evaluate what has taken place. We have not even studied the testimony in that particular case. We have not weighed the voluminous testimony to any extent, and certainly not to such an extent as would enable us to enact intelligent legislation with respect to the issues involved.

I take the position that it shows a lack of respect for the State of Georgia to have its properly directed efforts affected or frustrated by Congress. As I see it, Georgia is trying to defend herself against what she conceives to be an evil and a wrong perpetrated upon her. Why should the Congress inject itself into that case by the passage of such legislation as this, which might jeopardize the case?

My State, the State of South Carolina, has a vital interest in that case. As a Senator from that State I urge that the court be permitted to proceed in the time-honored American way to a judicial decision in the case now pending. If the railroads need relief from whatever judgment may be entered in that case, or if they find that they cannot operate efficiently with such a judgment outstanding against them, then, and not until then, will it be proper to pass such a bill as this, which so vitally affects not only the issues, but the relief which the Court may grant to Georgia and all other southern States in that case.

Second, the record shows that the Federal Government has brought a suit against the railroads, their associations and organizations, and New York bankers and others, asserting that in the section of the country lying west of the Mississippi River the rate bureaus and other organizations have done great damage to the commerce of the West and to its people. The trial of that case was begun in Lincoln, Nebr., on April 23 of this year, and is still in progress. The Government has completed the presentation of its evidence, which consisted largely of documents from the files of the railroads themselves. The railroads have been given until October 1, 1947, to prepare and file their objections to the Government's evidence. I cannot understand the urge for the Congress to pass a bill vitally affecting the issue of that case and vitally affecting the measure of relief which the Government may obtain in that case.

At a time when the South and the West are bringing these suits under the antitrust laws of the Federal Government to try to obtain some relief, we find before the Congress this bill which would block the relief which is being sought. Certainly if legislation is necessary it would injure no one to await the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States and the decision of the Federal court at Lincoln, Nebr., before passing this bill. This is especially true since the Attorney General of the United States has stated in writing to all the carriers and to all interested persons that he will not file any additional suits or seek any additional indictments based upon the same issues or the same subject matter as that involved in the case in Georgia, which is now in the Supreme Court, or in the Government's case in Lincoln, Nebr. Then why so much haste? The pending legislation may well be held in status quo, as it should be held, pending decisions in those cases, without harm, danger, or hazard to any carrier or any interested party.

The complained-of organizations of carriers are operating in the time-honored way, and they might continue so to operate until those cases are decided, for the reason that the Attorney General has said that he will not disturb them pending such decisions.

No Senator could intelligently decide the propriety of this legislation without reading the testimony adduced before the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce in 1943 on Senate bill 942; without reading the testimony before the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce in 1946 on House bill 2536; and without reading the testimony adduced before the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in 1947 on Senate bill 110, which is the pending bill. This would involve the reading of approximately 4,000 pages of testimony, much of which is in fine print—an impossible task. Much of the testimony is conflicting and difficult to understand because of the highly complex and technical nature of the subject matter.

The Supreme Court of the United States evidently recognized these complexities and technicalities, because it appointed a master to take the testimony and analyze it, digest it, and make recommendations in regard thereto. It seems extraordinary to think that Senators could with any degree of accuracy or propriety pass a good bill based on the thousands of pages of testimony.

It seems to me that the only reasonable thing for Senators to do is to await the decisions of the courts. The courts were created for just such a purpose. The master was appointed to look into all the facts and circumstances and render justice to the people, without thinking primarily of the railroads. The bill only cares for the railroads. It does nothing for the people. It would create a government within a Government, made up of the railroads.

A casual reading of the record in connection with the three bills mentioned shows, first, a description, general in its measure, of the "Organization of Railroad and Truck Rate Bureaus and Conferences." This description begins on page 823 of the printed record. There will be found a description of the railroad rate organizations.

The first to be described is the organization of railroad rate bureaus. Reading from the record on page 823, at the bottom of the page:

It should be borne in mind that the railroad industry is the largest of the inland transportation agencies. In 1943, the total capitalization of rail carriers subject to regulation by the Interstate Commerce Commission exceeded $23,000,000,000; the gross income of these railroads for 1943 was about $9,300,000,000. It is inevitable that considerable economic power accompanies such a vast accumulation of financial resources.

In the words of the Supreme Court, "Twice Congress has been tendered proposals to legalize rate-fixing combinations." To the Sixty-third Congress and to the Seventy-eighth Congress these proposals were made. Both proposals were refused. In this third attempt to obtain relief from the antitrust laws, the railroads using many of the resources available to a group with ample funds at their disposal have waged an intensive campaign throughout the country pleading that relief from the antitrust laws for the railroads would be in the public interest.

Presentation of the material by the Department of Justice showing the operation of the Nation-wide network of private rate-making machinery may shed some light upon whether such relief is in the public interest. Likewise, an analysis of rates paid by the Government at war will be presented. Many of these rates are tendered to the Government under the guise of private contracts. How the Government departments fare against the united front presented through the railroad rate-making machinery is indeed significant.

An indication of the attitude of the railroads is the pronouncement by a spokesman for the rail carriers that the railroads must be permitted to maintain rates that reflect a reasonable maximum basis if they are to obtain revenues sufficient to enable them to carry out the policies laid down in the declaration of the national transportation policy.

That was Elmer A. Smith, of the Railway Age, speaking.

A very frank announcement.

It is well to remember that the freight rates made by the railroads through rate bureaus profoundly influenced the course of the economic development of the United States.

Give me the right to fix rates, as we are preparing to give to the railroads by this bill, and I can make any section of the United States or break any section of the United States. As proof of that, we can go to the record and find that in the United States the railroads and Wall Street bankers have manipulated rates in the past, and we are just now catching up with them and dragging in the net, by the use of the antitrust laws, when the railroads wanted to get out of the net by getting from under the antitrust laws. What has happened? It will be found that they have had rates into official territory much lower than the rates out of official territory.

Mr. President, I should like to read further from the testimony of James E. Kilday, special assistant to the Attorney General, Transportation and Public Utilities Section of the Antitrust Division, Department of Justice, Washington, D. C. I read now from page 824 of the hearings:

Discriminatory rates are but one form of trade barriers. They may cause a blight no less serious than the spread of noxious gas over the land or the deposit of sewage in the streams. They may affect the prosperity and welfare of a State as profoundly as any diversion of waters from the rivers. They may stifle, impede, or cripple old industries and prevent the establishment of new ones. They may arrest the development of a State or put it at a decided disadvantage in competitive markets.

Mr. President, Mr. Kilday was there quoting a ruling of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Let me say that it is true that if we give to the railroads—who are only the agents of Wall Street, for they are in debt to Wall Street—the right to regulate freight rates in the United States, then we shall find big business being protected, because Wall Street must protect big business in order to protect itself.

But let us see what little business thinks of this matter. I hold in my hand a letter from George J. Burger. In writing to me he gives statistics from his organization, the National Federation of Small Business, Inc. His letter reads as follows:

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF SMALL BUSINESS, INC.,
Washington, D. C., June 9, 1947.

Hon. OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSTON: It is reported in the New York Times today Fight on Rail Bill Looms in Senate—Antitrust Easing Draws Fire From South.

Senator, it might be well for you to know that officials of this association appeared before the Senate committee and gave testimony opposing the Bulwinkle bill. Furthermore, it is important to note that this association made up of independent small business with a Nation-wide membership in excess of 100,000, recently polled its membership on this bill. The results of the Nation-wide poll through small business institutions was as follows: 18 percent for the bill, 80 percent against, 2 percent not voting.

It is our opinion that once an exception is made to bypass the Sherman Act others will come in and ask for the same exception.

From where we sit and observe the enforcement of the antitrust laws, and due to the testimony by the then Assistant Attorney General Wendell Berge before the Senate

Civil Service Committee, it appears, in our opinion, that the then Assistant Attorney General spoke the truth when he said, in substance, that for the past 35 or 40 years the administrations have been giving merely "lip service" to antitrust enforcement.

What small business needs and demands is the full enforcement of the antitrust laws, and with no exceptions or omissions for anyone in Nation's business.

I'm attaching a copy of the Mandate, official publication of the federation, which you will note discloses the result of the Nation-wide poll. I'm also enclosing a copy of the testimony given on the Reed-Bulwinkle bill.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE J. BURGER.

Some of his testimony is so to the point that I am forced to read it at this time:

In our opinion, the bill would legalize the growth of private monopoly in railroad transportation and reinforce its existence in other fields of transportation, such as motor and water carrier and pipe-line companies. Today monopolistic rates in railway transportation are seriously preventing recovery of private business in the United States.

In 1929 American business went into a profound depression.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. The Senate has been in session something over 6 hours. I wonder if the Senator would wish to proceed further this evening, or would desire that we might recess.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I will yield, provided it will not take me off the floor.

Mr. WHITE. I am sure that if the Senator asks unanimous consent that he be recognized when the Senate reconvenes tomorrow, there will be no difficulty about it.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Could I get unanimous consent?

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object for a moment, I may say to the Senator from Maine that I have a statement which I should like to get into the RECORD concerning Mr. Gromyko's statement yesterday at Lake Success. It would take not over 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITE. If the Senator from South Carolina will now yield, with the understanding that he will be followed by the Senator from Connecticut, and that at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Connecticut the Senate may recess, the Senator from South Carolina to be recognized when the Senate reconvenes tomorrow, will that be satisfactory?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It will be satisfactory to me.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Reserving the right to object, and of course it is not my intention to object, I should like to address an inquiry to the majority leader, as to when the calendar will be called again. I am asking the question with this situation particularly in mind, that there is on the calendar a bill to which I understand there is no opposition, H. R. 1874, Order No. 200, extending the time for the matching of road funds by the individual States. The time will expire on June 30; the States now are trying to make contracts for road construction, and I think it is highly important to all the States in the Nation that this proposed legislation be enacted at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. WHITE. It is the purpose to have a call of the calendar within the next few days, and I hope the Senator from Alabama will be satisfied to take his chances upon the call of the calendar.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I certainly shall be. I merely wanted to propound that inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina yields the floor to the Senator from Connecticut, with the understanding that thereafter the floor will be yielded to the Senator from Maine, who will then make a motion to recess. Unanimous consent is requested that upon the meeting of the Senate tomorrow, the Senator from South Carolina be recognized.

Mr. WHITE. That is my understanding of the situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

INTERNATIONAL CONTROL OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, yesterday at Lake Success, Mr. Gromyko made another speech. It was made before the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission, and has attracted much attention. It was previously advertised as heralding a break in the wall of Russian obduracy. It was advertised as meaning a change in the Russian position on the subject of international control of atomic energy, and I am sure most Americans awaited the speech with keen interest and with some degree of hope. That hope, however, has unfortunately been dashed. I have read Mr. Gromyko's speech, and I should like to make a few brief comments on it.

This so-called new Russian plan contemplates an international agency which would inspect the atomic activities of the member nations but could not control them.

The agency could only recommend action with the enforcement resting in the United Nations Security Council where the big power veto still would remain.

Each nation would own and operate its own facilities and carry on its own research, although the international agency would also carry on independent research.

The plan would begin with an international treaty outlawing atomic and other weapons of mass destruction.

Later a second treaty, or convention, would be agreed to, setting up the International Control Commission within the framework of the Security Council.

The Control Commission would have its own inspection staff with access to all nations' facilities for mining and production of atomic materials and atomic energy. It would make periodical inspections as it felt necessary, and special inspections if it suspected clandestine operations.

The Commission could not order any nation to do anything; it could only make recommendations, requests, and presentations. One type of recommendation would be to individual nations regarding the production, stock-piling, and use of atomic materials. The second type of recommendation would be to the Security Council with respect to measures for the prevention and suppression in respect to violators of the proposed treaties.

The International Commission would have its own laboratories and experimental facilities and materials, and conduct research in the peaceful uses of atomic energy. However, each nation would reserve for itself the right to carry on unrestricted scientific activities in the field of atomic energy, directed toward discovery of methods of using atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

Now, what does this new Russian plan mean?

It means that Russia, while clarifying her position, has not changed it regarding any one of the fundamental issues over which there is dispute.

Russia still wants to retain her veto power.

Russia still wants the United States to disarm unilaterally by scrapping her bombs before the control system is in effective operation.

Russia still refuses to accept the stage-by-stage timetable.

Russia still insists on national rather than international ownership and operation of atomic plants and facilities.

Russia still wants to leave the power of punishment of violators in the Security Council.

Russia still wants the international agency to remain powerless to enforce effective control.

Mr. President, I consider Mr. Gromyko's speech simply an attempt to gain favorable propaganda from unthinking individuals. It is in no sense a change of plan, nor does it demonstrate a change of heart.

The plan proposed by Bernard Baruch, a great American who has earned the gratitude of men of good will everywhere in the world, is fair and just. Its acceptance by the Russians would constitute a tremendous step forward to peace.

RECESS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow forenoon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, June 13, 1947, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 12, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our Lord, at this hallowed moment we would have an altar in our breasts where we may confess our sins, renew our vows, and ask Thy blessing. In Thy bountiful mercy be Thou the source of our understanding, and remove from our hearts all undue anxiety, that constructive reason may give us the vision of our common duty.

We pray Thee to redeem our country from divisive groups that would paralyze the spirit of justice and personal rights. We praise Thee that we need not look to any other government for ideas, help, or inspiration, but rather to our historic fathers who realized the immortal truth that a nation divided against itself cannot stand. Shame upon any citizen who would repudiate his own homeland through resentment or for personal gain.

Dear Lord, grant that the Members of Congress this day may have the seal of Thy blessed approval upon their labors, and be bound one to another with the cords of Thy holy purpose.

We pray in the name of Him who is the chief cornerstone. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE LATE HONORABLE DAVID I. WALSH, A FORMER MEMBER OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I must announce to the House the death of a former Member of the Senate of the United States, the late David I. Walsh.

During his lifetime Senator Walsh symbolized the spirit of America. One of a family of ten, he took advantage of our institutions of Government and became in his life one of the most prominent and outstanding statesmen of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and of our Nation.

Born in Leominster, Mass., on November 11, 1872, he attended the schools of Clinton, Mass., graduating from Clinton High School and later from the College of the Holy Cross, Worcester, Mass. In 1897 he was graduated from the Boston University Law School. A number of our colleges and universities have recognized the great contribution he made during his lifetime by conferring upon him honorary degrees. Among those colleges were Holy Cross, Georgetown, Fordham, and Notre Dame.

With brilliancy he represented the Commonwealth of Massachusetts as Lieutenant Governor and Governor. And for years he served in the Senate of the United States. He was always the advocate of a strong navy, recognizing it as our first line of defense. He also served for years with distinction as the chairman of the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs.

His progressive mind and outlook was always evident in his support by voice and vote of progressive legislation in the best interests of the people. My first public office was as a member of the Constitutional Convention in 1917, in which body I served with the late David I. Walsh. Our close friendship dates from that time.

David I. Walsh has left his strong favorable imprint on the pages of the history of Massachusetts and of the Nation. In his death I have lost a personal friend. His legion of friends and admirers grieve his passing.

Massachusetts has lost one of its outstanding sons, and the Nation one of its most prominent statesmen.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to my colleague from Massachusetts.

DAVID I. WALSH, PIONEER LEADER OF MASSACHUSETTS DEMOCRACY

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, we remember him as the champion of the American Navy, and for that fact alone a grateful Nation mourns his passing.

In the years before the war, the people of the United States were indeed fortunate that David I. Walsh was chairman of the Senate Naval Affairs Committee, lending his voice and his influence to building a strong navy. It is no exaggeration to say that many, many American lives were saved and the war considerably foreshortened by the vision and determination of this able public servant.

At the age of 74, worn out by his labors in behalf of Massachusetts and the Nation, David I. Walsh has been called to his reward.

He was a gentleman and a patriot who never spared himself in the service of others. We who were privileged to know him will miss his friendship and his wise advice.

Several times my path crossed his during the political campaigns of last fall. Though I was immediately interested in my own contest, I was impressed by the dignity with which this elder statesman was waging his fight. He was old and he was tired, but he fought hard and clean, fighting a losing battle against a younger statesman who had resigned from the other seat in the Senate representing Massachusetts to serve his country in World War II. It was obvious, early in the campaign, that youth must be served, but Senator Walsh went down to defeat without saying one unkind word about his opponent. Both men knew and respected one another. Senator Walsh's career came to a close, but he accepted it with a dignity which I shall never forget. It did honor to the man.

Here was the son of working-class parents, who overcame every advantage which others possessed, pulling himself up by his own bootstraps to become a leader in his State and in the Nation, facing the sunset of his career with wisdom and tolerance which earned the admiration of friend and foe alike. This was the measure of his character and of his Americanism.

As a child, I remember hearing the grown-ups speaking of David I. Walsh. To my youthful fancy, he seemed like a knight in shining white armor who was out to slay the dragons of bigotry and intolerance. As I grew older, I was charmed by the alert intelligence, the eloquence, and the zeal which he displayed in behalf of the underprivileged. To those of us who grew up on the other side of the tracks, David I. Walsh was our champion, proving that the promises of democracy could become realities. He inspired us by example.

He was born of the union of James and Bridget Donnelly Walsh, at Leominster, Mass., on November 11, 1872. Working his way through school, he received his A. B. degree from Holy Cross College in 1893, and his bachelor of laws degree from Boston University in 1897. As a struggling young lawyer, he was fascinated by politics and began his career in the most practical way, as a member of the Democratic town committee. The first recognition of his worth came when he was chosen by the citizens to serve as town moderator. But the youthful David, stirred to righteous anger by the meager pay and back-breaking hours and wretched working conditions of the laborers in the factories of Massachusetts, set himself the goal of correcting these abuses. He won a seat in the Massachusetts Legislature, but most of the time he was on his feet fighting for progressive labor legislation. Seldom had the staid old hall on Beacon Hill heard such passionate pleading, backed by irrefutable facts, in behalf of the depressed workers of the Commonwealth. Even the Republicans, inured to special privilege, sat up and took notice. Here was new blood, demanding a voice in the making of the laws and reminding the complacent that democracy can never stand still. It must evolve with life or wither and die.

The crusading figure of David I. Walsh caught the imagination and belief and active support of the people.

In 1913 he was elected Lieutenant Governor, and in 1914 and 1915 he broke the long Republican monopoly and served two terms as Governor of the Commonwealth. With an interruption of but 3 years—1924–27—he was a United States Senator from Massachusetts from 1919 to 1946. It was a truly remarkable record, testifying to the confidence of the people in his stewardship. David I. Walsh was first and last a Democrat, but the quality of his statesmanship was such that he won the votes of many Republicans as well as the solid backing of his own party.

On the domestic front Walsh worked constantly for economic justice. His most conspicuous contribution in the field of constructive labor legislation was as coauthor of the Walsh-Healey Government Contracts Act. Even at that time—1936—the Federal Government was one of industry's greatest consumers. As industry made extensive profits on these sales it was only fair that labor should share in the gains. Under Walsh's leadership, the Congress inserted labor terms in all contracts made by producers with the Federal Government in amounts over $10,000. These contractors were required to pay not less than the prevailing rate of wages in the locality, they were to abide by an 8-hour day and a 40-hour week, and they were prevented from employing boys under 16 years of age and girls under 18. Within given areas of industrial enterprise the Walsh-Healey Act established minimum standards of employment. It helped to implement the new social and economic concept of a basic security for all.

With growing knowledge and experience, David I. Walsh saw the dangers looming up on the international horizon. He realized that the United States, preoccupied with its internal problems, was oblivious to these dangers, and woefully unprepared to meet them. As chairman of the Senate Naval Affairs Committee he constantly warned the Nation of its exposed position. In committee and on

the floor of the Senate he fought for an adequate, modern Navy to serve as our first line of defense. Because of his untiring efforts, when the Japs made their sneak attack on Pearl Harbor we had a Navy—a Navy which prevented them from taking Hawaii and bombing the west coast, a Navy which broke the Nazi submarine blockade, a Navy which, in the final analysis, was the the margin of strength by which we were enabled to recover, fight back, and preserve our freedoms.

I have spoken of his services to the Nation, but here in Massachusetts, where he comes home to rest, we shall remember him with affection as the pioneer of the Democratic Party. Almost single-handedly, David I. Walsh raised the party of the common man to that position of influence and responsibility where the promises of democracy were fulfilled. Wherever, in our State, humble young men are beginning their careers they will remember and be inspired by the example of David I. Walsh.

In the hearts of all veterans, whether they served in the Army or Navy, there is a feeling of bereavement. David I. Walsh was their friend and protector. In the high councils of the Nation he also served with intelligence, with energy, and devotion.

If ever a representative of the people deserved the following epitaph, it is David I. Walsh, of Massachusetts:

"Well done, good and faithful servant."

May his immortal soul find the happiness which he has earned.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to my distinguished friend from New York.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I join with the other Members of the House today in expressing my deep regret at the passing of Hon. David I. Walsh, former Senator from Massachusetts. I can well recall years ago on the day of my graduation from Fordham University when he received an honorary degree from that great university, and addressed us of the graduating class. His words have long lingered in my memory. I have looked upon him as one of the great leaders of American life. I believe he has done more to encourage those on the threshold of life than any other man I know of in public service.

I wish to express my deep regret at the passing of Senator Walsh. At the same time I know he goes to the reward which he so justly earned upon this earth.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join the gentleman from Massachusetts in paying tribute to Senator Walsh.

I am reminded of the poet's lines:

A king once said of a prince struck down,
"Taller he seems in death";
And the speech holds truth,
For now as then,
It is after death
That we measure men.

As the friends of Senator Walsh and the American people generally come to appreciate the patriotism of David I. Walsh, his stature will grow larger in the estimation of coming generations.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman and the others who made their contribution to our late friend and colleague, David I. Walsh, who served with such distinction in the Senate of the United States.

I might note in passing that it was only last Saturday that he was visited with tragedy in the loss of a sister. His sister died last Saturday and our late friend died yesterday.

To his remaining two sisters I know I speak the sentiments of all of my colleagues in the House when I extend to them our deep sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I feel a very personal loss in the passing of Hon. David I. Walsh, of Massachusetts. He will go down in history as one of the greatest statesmen of our country. His services of over a quarter of a century in the United States Senate are outstanding in accomplishment and in help to humanity. His whole life in the public service of the State and the Nation was devoted unselfishly and loyally for the welfare of all. He was a man of great courage, of most unusual vision in State, national, and international affairs. During the many years I served with him here at the Capitol, he was always a loyal unfailing friend in time of need. Many times I consulted with him and his wisdom and loyalty never failed. His development of our great Navy during the years he served on the Senate Naval Affairs Committee was of untold value not only to America, but to the entire world. His fight for the institutions of our country and his efforts to preserve them will go down in history as one of the great accomplishments of our times. Massachusetts and the Nation in the passing of Hon. David I. Walsh mourn the loss of a man of fine Christian character; a most devout Catholic; a statesman of great accomplishments in State and Nation.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound sorrow and a keen sense of personal loss that I received the news of the passing of a dear friend, neighbor and advisor, one of Massachusetts outstanding citizens, the late Senator David Ignatius Walsh.

Senator Walsh typified everything that is dear to the hearts of every real American. An inspiration to the youth of this country, in that his life portrays the opportunities available, under our form of government, for any one who has the will, the industry, and the ambition to be successful in any field of endeavor.

Senator Walsh was one of a large family of poor, immigrant parents, but as a result of his untiring efforts and hard work, he entered Holy Cross College, Worcester, Mass., from which he graduated in 1893; later graduating from Boston University School of Law, in 1897, he became one of Massachusetts ablest lawyers; twice elected its governor, and its distinguished Senator for the past 26 years.

Today the people of Massachusetts and this Nation mourn the passing of a great statesman who gave the greater part of his life in public service to his fellow men.

It has never been more truly said of any man that he "laid down his life for his friends." During the recent critical war years, he labored unceasingly with his unsurpassed energy, experience and wisdom on behalf of his beloved country. The contribution that he would have made in this reconstruction period will be sorely missed.

I know that we could make no better resolve in his memory today than to pledge ourselves to carry out our Representative responsibilities in the spirit and sacrifice of the late Senator David I. Walsh, who did, indeed, give his life to the service of his people.

I am honored to have called him friend. I am proud to accept his inspiration.

Although his presence will be missed among us, his record of devotion to public duty will remain forever, and to us, his friends, the memory of his estimable character will remain a treasured asset.

DRAW-BACK ON EXPORTATION OF DISTILLED SPIRITS AND WINES

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk H. R. 959, to amend section 3179 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have no objection, but for the RECORD I think the gentleman from New York should explain briefly what the purpose of the bill is.

Mr. REED of New York. This is a bill which was introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH], a member of the Committee on Ways and Means. It was reported favorably by the Committee on Ways and Means. It has for its purpose to facilitate the exportation of distilled spirits and wines by permitting the use of casks or packages—barrels or similar containers—other than bottles in packaging tax-paid distilled spirits and wines for export with benefit of draw-back.

Section 3179 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code now provides for the allowance of a draw-back equal to the tax found to have been paid upon the exportation of tax-paid bottled distilled spirits and wines which have been bottled especially for export.

Under existing law distilled spirits and wines upon which the internal-revenue taxes have been paid may be exported in casks or packages with benefit of drawback only if those casks or packages are distillers' original casks or packages containing not less than 20 wine-gallons as required by section 2887 of the Internal Revenue Code.

This bill H. R. 959 would amend section 3179 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code to provide for the allowance of draw-back upon the exportation of tax-paid distilled spirits and wines of domestic manufacture or production contained in any cask or package or in bottles packed in cases or other con-

tainers if such distilled spirits and wines have been packaged or bottled especially for export.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (b) of section 3179 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Draw-back: Upon the exportation of distilled spirits and wines manufactured or produced in the United States on which an internal-revenue tax has been paid, and which are contained in any cask or package or in bottles packed in cases or other containers, there shall be allowed under regulations to be prescribed by the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, a drawback equal in amount to the tax found to have been paid on such distilled spirits and wines: *Provided*, That such distilled spirits and wines have been packaged or bottled especially for export, under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary. The Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, is authorized to prescribe regulations governing the determination and payment of draw-back of internal-revenue tax on domestic distilled spirits and wines, including the requirement of such notices, bonds, bills of lading, and other evidence of payment of tax and exportation as shall be deemed necessary."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EMERGENCY FLOOD-CONTROL WORK

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of H. R. 3792, to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to ask the gentleman if this resolution permits the Army engineers to take care of all the floods that have occurred during the year 1947 up to this time.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the bill authorizes the Army engineers to determine what levees have been damaged by recent floods, and also it makes available whatever funds are not expended for past or recent floods to be used for floods that may occur in the future.

Mr. RICH. Everyone knows we have been having a series of floods on the Mississippi River and we all want to give attention to those localities on the Mississippi that have been damaged. But I wish to call attention to the fact that a disastrous flood occurred in Bradford, Pa., in May 1946.

In April 1947, there was another flood in Bradford. A lot of damage has been done in several of those small communities. I want to know if we pass this bill whether the Army engineers are going to look after those flooded areas as well as the Mississippi River.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I can assure the gentleman from Pennsylvania that flood damages, no matter where they occur in this country, are covered as completely as possible.

Mr. RICH. I want the Army engineers to look after that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the sum of $15,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated as an emergency fund to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers for the repair, restoration, and strengthening of levees and other flood-control works which have been threatened or destroyed by recent floods, or which may be threatened or destroyed by later floods: *Provided*, That pending the appropriation of said sum, the Secretary of War may allot, from existing flood-control appropriations, such sums as may be necessary for the immediate prosecution of the work herein authorized, such appropriations to be reimbursed from the appropriation herein authorized when made: *Provided further*, That funds allotted under this authority shall not be diverted from the unobligated funds from the appropriation "Flood control, general," made available in War Department civil functions appropriations acts for specific purposes.

SEC. 2. The provisions of section 1 shall be deemed to be additional and supplemental to, and not in lieu of, existing general legislation authorizing allocation of flood-control funds for restoration of flood-control works threatened or destroyed by flood.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CIO OPPOSITION TO THE LABOR BILL

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week some 60,000 members of the CIO held a mass meeting at Madison Square Garden in the city of New York. One of the principal speakers at this rally was Mayor William O'Dwyer of the city of New York who apparently has none of that attribute of minding one's own business.

What I wish to report to you, however, is that while these 60,000 members of the CIO were urging President Truman to veto this bill which passed both Houses of Congress by a majority of both parties, reverberating through Madison Square Garden were cries of "Henry Wallace for President."

(The newspaper article referred to follows:)

RAYMOND MOLEY SAYS BIG LABOR'S COSTLY HOKUM PUTS BIG BUSINESS IN SHADE

When the holding company bill was going through Congress, in 1935, New Dealers had a lot to say about the efforts of the companies to prevent its passage. They denounced the flocks of telegrams, the paid advertisements and the power lobby.

What have they to say now of the frantic efforts of labor leaders to kill the Taft-Hartley bill? It was reported, 2 weeks ago, in the New Republic that $1,500,000 had been set aside for this campaign, and that between $300,000 and $400,000 of this was for radio.

Thousands of dollars in talent are being contributed by soap opera queens and lowly continuity writers, famous playwrights and successful musicians and composers of jingles and big-time theatrical press agents.

Slogans, emotional appeals, stunts and occasional serious arguments are being pumped into the ears of the listening public. And constant exhortations are broadcast to write to the President to kill the fiendish attack on the workingman.

Some of the argument is raw demagoguery. The usually calm and reasonable Mayor William O'Dwyer was induced to give a radio harangue in which he called the new bill "a stab in the back of our free labor movement" and said: "This law gives positive aid and comfort to the totalitarians."

The bill is neither a stab nor is it aimed at the back of labor. It is an effort to curb the excesses of certain labor leaders.

Nor does the bill increase the regulatory power of Government. It reduces the part Government has been playing in collective bargaining under the Wagner Act.

There was much to criticize in the opposition to early New Deal legislation. It was costly and it contained plenty of misrepresentation. But it never reached the degree of hokum that the campaign against the labor bill has assumed.

There was loud denunciation of corporations in 1936 for spending stockholders' money in propaganda. But in the present instance, the funds of unions are presumably being expended by the officers. And the rank-and-file membership are, in reality, the stockholders. Surely they are the ones who contributed the money to the union funds.

SUGAR RATIONING

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, just a short time ago the Banking and Currency Committee reported a bill to discontinue sugar rationing. The Rules Committee yesterday reported a rule so that we could get action on that, if necessary, today. Last evening the majority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] made a statement in reference to what was going to be taken up today and said that a rule on the sugar-decontrol bill had just been filed and that he should like to dispose of that today. At the same time the Secretary of Agriculture was asking the Appropriations Committee for more money for its continuation. When the Secretary heard the bill was coming up today he knew what was going to happen. We Republicans would decontrol household sugar. So he took the bull by the horns and he said at midnight, "We will have no more sugar rationing." In other words, the Republican Party had him over the sugar barrel. Therefore Mr. Anderson issued that order last night at midnight. Now we do not have to monkey with household sugar rationing any longer and thank goodness for that, our wives can get sugar for canning and we can save our fruits, and cut down our living expenses.

Mr. Speaker, in a deficiency appropriation bill we will consider shortly there is a sum to continue sugar rationing. Let us cut out all these appropriations for

sugar rationing. Let us cut out a lot of this rationing that we have been indulging in, it is rash stuff, because the quicker we get back to the old fundamental principles of the American doctrine of letting the people run this country instead of the bureaucrats here in Washington, the better this country is going to be, the better they will like it and the better off we will be as Members of Congress. Let us do our job and cut out bureaucratic control of the American people which was saddled onto the people by the Democratic new deal during the past 14 years. Get the country on its feet again with freedom.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, it is, of course, very disappointing to the gentleman from Pennsylvania and a good many others when they get a little dirt removed from under their feet. Of course, everybody who knows anything about this question appreciates that the Secretary of Agriculture has been working on this matter for many weeks. Many have known, including members of the Committee on Appropriations, that it was daily expected that the Secretary of Agriculture would do what he has done. The thing that hurts the gentleman from Pennsylvania is that the newspapers of the country this morning headlined the matter that the Secretary of Agriculture had removed these controls and that the Republican Party in the House and Senate did not remove them. I can appreciate the great disappointment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the headlines did not go out all over the country that the Republican Party had been responsible for this.

Mr. RICH. I am not disappointed at all.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, the RECORD should be very clear. I happen to be a member of the deficiency subcommittee to which the distinguished gentleman from Texas has referred. I may say to the gentleman that the Secretary of Agriculture was before this deficiency subcommittee, and if you will turn to the bill that will be considered in a few moments you will see on page 6 of that bill where we provide him with the funds to continue payment for the personnel involved in sugar rationing. They are the same eight-hundred-and-odd personnel that he said in his statement to the press last night he was going to remove immediately. The Secretary of Agriculture was before this same committee as late as 4 o'clock yesterday afternoon and did not advise the Appropriations Committee of his change of attitude, that he was going to do away with sugar rationing as of midnight last night.

Let us take politics out of this thing. He was still asking this Congress to give him the money in a supplemental deficiency appropriation which you will have before you in just a minute to pay for the people that he said last night in his hurry up to beat the gun on this proposition he is going to discharge immediately.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, an amendment will be in order, of course, to reduce that appropriation.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman may be sure that an amendment will be in order, and an amendment will be offered, but I think my distinguished friend the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], who is laughing up his sleeve, will find that the American people are not fooled about this, and that the Secretary's hand was forced, and he never gave an inkling except to say that he was going to keep these people on for an indefinite period, but he was forced by the Republican attitude in this matter to act.

WATER CONVERSION

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include a resolution which I am introducing today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a resolution which requests the Secretary of the Interior, through the Bureau of Reclamation, to look into and report to Congress on the engineering and financial feasibility of diverting surplus waters from other river basins for use in southern California and in the Colorado River Basin generally.

So far as southern California is concerned, I am persuaded that the time is approaching when it shall have to say: "We can accommodate no additional people until we get more water." The population of California, and of southern California particularly, has grown by leaps and bounds. It shows signs of continuing so to grow. Yet, consistent with other justifiable developments in the Colorado River Basin, there is no sign of the availability of an increasing water supply to southern California. In 20 years, the full utilization of all present sources of water supply available to that area will have been reached. The Colorado River Basin and southern California are arid. Already our most magnificent water projects have been built there. Without them, the present growth would not have been possible. The future of these areas depends on far-sighted planning now, and development later on a scale hardly dreamed of a few years ago.

Other river basins are blessed with abundant water supplies—supplies so abundant that, each year, thousands of acre-feet of good water are wasted into the ocean. In this connection, I think particularly of the Columbia River. I do not regard it as too fanciful to suggest that ways and means be found to divert, from some point whence it would otherwise be wasted into the sea, a portion of the surplus waters of that ideal stream. Let me emphasize the word "surplus," for it is extremely important. The Columbia River Basin has barely begun the utilization which is there possible of the waters of its great river for irrrigation, power, and other useful purposes. I want to see full development of that utilization in the Columbia River Basin itself. But, so immense are the water resources of that basin that, even after full development in its basin, after it has served all of the great projects and power plants that are planned, there will be surplus water below Bonneville Dam available for the Colorado River Basin. What some of that surplus would mean to southern California, for instance, is beyond measure.

The Central Valley project moves water from Shasta Dam south to a point near Bakersfield, almost 500 miles. This southward shift must be continued progressively in the years to come.

My resolution will, under the general investigation provisions of the reclamation law, make it possible for Reclamation engineers to be assigned promptly to the task of investigating the feasibility of bringing surplus water into the arid basins where it is going to be so badly needed. Of course, this is not a job that can be done in 1 year or even in two; but it is a job that ought to be started, handled imaginatively, and prosecuted vigorously, so that the President and the Congress and the people of the West will have the complete picture and will be enabled, then, to adopt a long-time plan of action.

The resolution I am introducing today reads as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior through the Bureau of Reclamation is requested, under and by virtue of authority conferred upon him by the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto) for general investigations relating to proposed Federal reclamation projects, to investigate and report as soon as practicable to the President and the Congress on the engineering and economic feasibility and economic justification of diverting surplus waters from other basins to southern California and the Colorado River Basin and the practicability of exchanges of waters, and other possibilities for effecting improvement in the distribution and utilization of the water resources of the West: *Provided*, That such investigations and reports shall be made, among other things, in accordance with the policies and procedures laid down in section 1 of the act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887).

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SEELY-BROWN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. FARRINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one an article relating to the Smithsonian Institution, and in the other an editorial relating to statehood of Hawaii.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement he made be-

fore the Committee on Public Works on the bill H. R. 3036.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in regard to the appointment of Emmet O'Neal as Ambassador to the Philippines, further to extend his remarks and include a statement he made concerning the Hungry Horse project appropriation before a Senate committee, and in another extension in two parts, to include a speech he made before the National Federation of Catholic Students at New York last Monday.

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some remarks by J. Edgar Hoover on communism.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL, FORT WAYNE, IND.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include two resolutions and a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I have just placed in the hopper a joint resolution providing that the proposed Veterans' Administration Hospital at Fort Wayne, Ind., shall be known and designated on the public records as the Thomas Lau Suedhoff Memorial Hospital.

Tom Suedhoff, a staff sergeant in the Infantry, died in combat on October 13, 1944. He met an heroic death on the battlefields of Europe during the dark days when America's destiny was in the balance.

During his service in the European theater, Tom volunteered to lead a detachment la region de Lyon in establishing a road block on the main highway on the east side of the Rhone River near Valence, France, thereby saving the lives of many of his comrades.

The mission was successfully completed in spite of intense small arms and mortar fire. During this battle Tom was wounded and taken by plane to Naples, where he died a short time later.

Tom's decorations include the Purple Heart, Good Conduct Medal, Combat Infantryman Badge, the Presidential Citation with an extra cluster, the Bronze Arrowhead for D-day spearheading in southern France, together with the Silver and Bronze Stars. He was later awarded the French Croix de Guerre with Bronze Star in the name of the French Nation.

Tom lived in Fort Wayne within a few blocks of the site of the new Veterans' Administration Hospital and played on these grounds when he was a boy.

He was a graduate of North Side High School in Fort Wayne and the University of Pennsylvania's Wharton School of Finance. He is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Carl J. Suedhoff, of Fort Wayne. Tom's father, a veteran of World War I, has long been prominent in veteran's and civic affairs in the Fourth Congressional District of Indiana.

Fort Wayne is proud of Tom Suedhoff and his many comrades who fought and died in defense of their country.

The resolution naming the new veterans' hospital after Thomas Lau Suedhoff has the support of the entire community, and I urge that it receive immediate consideration.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions in support of this measure; together with an article from the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel:

JIM EBY POST, NO. 857,
VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS,
Fort Wayne, Ind., May 21, 1947.

Hon. GEORGE W. GILLIE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a regular meeting of Jim Eby Post, No. 857, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Fort Wayne, Ind., held on Tuesday evening, May 20, 1947, the members present voted unanimously to adopt the following resolution:

"Whereas there is to be established a veterans' hospital here in Fort Wayne, Ind., and such hospital will have the status of a memorial hospital bearing the name of a dead comrade; and

"Whereas Staff Sgt. Thomas Lau Suedhoff, a member of Jim Eby Post, No. 857, VFW, a comrade who died October 13, 1944, a hero's death as the result of wounds received in combat, la region de Lyon. A comrade who was many times decorated for heroic and meritorious service, a comrade who was the first soldier in Indiana to receive a Bronze Star, and whose other decoratons consisted of Silver Star, Purple Heart, Combat Infantry Badge, Good Conduct Medal, and Croix de Guerre with Bronze Star; and

"Whereas Jim Eby Post, No. 857, VFW, is proud to remember that Staff Sgt. Thomas Lau Suedhoff was a comrade and a gallant and brave soldier who gave everything for his country—he made the supreme sacrifice: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That Jim Eby Post, No. 857, Veterans of Foreign Wars, go on record as recommending that said veterans' hospital to be located in Fort Wayne, Ind., be named Thomas Lau Suedhoff Memorial Hospital."

Yours truly,

MELVIN J. CURTIS,
Commander, Post No. 857.

RESOLUTION PASSED BY GENERAL MEMBERSHIP OF DAVID PARRISH POST, NO. 296, THE AMERICAN LEGION, ON MAY 23, 1947

Whereas there is to be established a veterans' hospital in Fort Wayne, Allen County, Ind., and such hospital will have the status of a memorial hospital bearing the name of a dead comrade; and

Whereas this American Legion post believes that said memorial hospital should be named after one of Fort Wayne's own war dead; and

Whereas Staff Sgt. Thomas Lau Suedhoff died on October 13, 1944, a hero's death as a result of wounds received in combat la region de Lyon while establishing a road block on a main highway on the east side of the Rhone River near Valence, France, and who was many times decorated for heroic and meritorious service and who was the first soldier of World War II from Indiana to receive a Bronze Star and who received many other decorations, including the Silver Star, Purple Heart, Combat Infantry Badge, Good Conduct Medal, Croix de Guerre with Bronze Star, Presidential citation with extra cluster, and Bronze Arrow Head for D-day spearheading in southern France; and

Whereas David Parrish Post, No. 296, the American Legion, Department of Indiana, is proud to remember Staff Sgt. Thomas Lau Suedhoff as a gallant and brave soldier who gave everything for his country and who made the supreme sacrifice: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That David Parrish Post, No. 296, the American Legion, Department of Indiana, go on record recommending that said veterans' hospital to be erected in Fort Wayne, Ind., be named the Thomas Lau Suedhoff Memorial Hospital.

That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this organization, and that copies be forwarded to Senators and Representatives from the State of Indiana.

[From the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel]

SERGEANT SUEDHOFF GIVEN FRENCH ARMY CITATION

WASHINGTON, D. C., August 26.—The French Government has awarded to Staff Sgt. Thomas Lau Suedhoff the Croix de Guerre with Bronze Star by decision No. 256 dated July 3, 1946. Sergeant Suedhoff, an infantryman with the Thirty-sixth Division, volunteered to lead a detachment "la region de Lyon" in establishing a road block, thereby saving the lives of many of his comrades. The mission was successfully completely in spite of intense small arms and mortar fire. The citation and medal have been mailed to his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Carl J. Suedhoff, 1922 Forest Park Boulevard, Fort Wayne, Ind., with a letter from Col. E. Caminade, military attaché.

"Not only in my own name, but in that of France and the French Army, I wish to extend to you and to your family heartfelt sympathy and the expression of gratitude for the courageous spirit of Sergeant Suedhoff who so nobly dedicated his life to the cause for which our countries were fighting.

"France is gratefully aware of the great assistance given by the American Army and feels a personal loss in the passing of Sergeant Suedhoff who displayed such heroism in the performance of his duty."

Sergeant Suedhoff died October 13, 1944, in a hospital in Italy as a result of wounds received in action in France August 26. In addition to the Croix de Guerre, he has been awarded the Silver Star, Bronze Star, Purple Heart, Combat Infantryman's Badge, and the Good Conduct Medal.

He was a graduate of the Wharton School of Finance, University of Pennsylvania, and a member of the Psi Upsilon fraternity there. He was the first Indiana soldier to receive the Bronze Star decoration.

MAYOR O'DWYER

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to answer the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey who made the unwarranted attack upon Mayor O'Dwyer, of New York. I do not blame the gentleman from New Jersey for being perturbed when he hears of the thousands upon thousands of people in New York City who are protesting the passage of the Hartley-Taft labor bill. I do not blame him so much for being annoyed, because I know the feeling is seeping into New Jersey, where the gentleman comes from. When he says that the mayor of a great city like New York, with 8 or 10 million people, should have no interest in legislation that affects the people of that great city, when he says that the

mayor of New York, who is responsible for the welfare of the people, should not raise his voice in protest against legislation which we in New York believe to be vicious and antilabor, then I say the gentleman has a queer idea of the duties of public office, and he has a very queer idea when he believes that it is not minding one's business when one speaks out against legislation that affects the people of the city of which one is mayor as in the case of Mayor O'Dwyer. May he speak out louder and clearer, and may his words strike home. Would that Governor Dewey would make known his position on the Hartley-Taft antilabor bill.

EMMET O'NEAL

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I know I express the sentiments of his colleagues from Kentucky and of the entire membership of the House who were familiar with his public service when I say we rejoice at the appointment of Emmet O'Neal as Ambassador to the Philippines.

By reason of his industry, his wide experience, his tact, his genial disposition, his capacity to make friends and to hold their affectionate regard, he is admirably adapted to fulfill the varied duties of the position to which he has been appointed.

The American people have a very deep interest in the welfare of the courageous Philippine people. With their heroic aid our armed forces have restored to them the liberty which they so richly deserve. They have a high sense of obligation and a very deep affection for our Government. That affection will be stimulated and grow under the relationship that will be established through our Ambassador.

His lovely wife and two charming daughters will add to his influence and prestige.

We wish him and his family success and happiness in his new undertaking, and that he may be able to render conspicuous service to the Philippine people and to his country.

Mr. CHELF. If the gentleman will yield, I want to add a resounding "amen" to what the gentleman has said.

LOYALTY OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, there has never been a time in the history of our country when the traditional civil liberties of American citizens were more widely threatened than today.

We are constantly being warned that the Federal Government is infiltrated with disloyal, subversive employees secretly plotting its destruction. Because of this alleged danger, we are urged to bypass many of the normal processes of justice and to dismiss accused employees simply on the basis of someone's doubts, suspicions, confusions, or prejudices.

The President has issued a loyalty order, Executive Order 9835, which places the full weight of Executive authority behind existing procedures which afford accused employees few, if any, real safeguards consistent with due process of law, and expands these existing practices into a master plan for spying into the private lives and thoughts of citizens.

As the journalist Max Lerner commented in PM on March 25:

> We are in danger of taking a big step toward the creation of a police state. Everyone knows that one of the characteristics of the police state is that you place all Government servants under the continuous surveillance of a political police. The ordinary Government employee will find his workday harassed, his hours of rest shadowed, his inmost thoughts guessed about, his whole life made intolerable. Someone ought to tell the President and his advisers that you can never purchase security of any sort—for themselves or for the Nation—by surrendering the most elementary freedoms of the people.

When objection is made to the lack of provision for due process in the contemplated loyalty program—the failure to permit accused employees to face their accusers, cross-examine hostile witnesses, and identify sources of information—it is argued in justification that Government employment is not a right, but a privilege; and that therefore a Government employee may be deprived of his livelihood on suspicion alone and without proof, as some private employers may do with employees not adequately protected by union-security contracts. Indeed, we have fallen into the unwholesome habit of expecting the accused to prove himself innocent, rather than conforming to the elementary principle that the burden of proof should rest on the accuser. These habits and attitudes are completely at variance with the ethics and standards of American law. Now is the appropriate time to reassert the basic principles of the Bill of Rights before these principles are smothered under a blanket of rationalizations.

It is true that Government employment is a privilege rather than a right. It is both a privilege and an honor to be a Government employee. The Government employee has assumed a sacred trust when he takes the oath to defend the Constitution against all enemies, foreign and domestic. But if the employee has assumed obligations, so has the Government.

By and large, citizens who work for the Government are a loyal, hard-working group of people. Many of them could be earning more money in private industry, but they have elected to serve their Government—a sometimes arduous and thankless task, as every Member of Congress ought to know. The Government is obligated to protect, rather than nullify, the civil liberties of its employees. The Government is not in the same position as a private employer. It cannot arbitrarily fire a public servant because of doubt, rumor, or suspicion. The Government of the United States is not a business, as a bank, a grocery, or a factory is a business. It is the sum total of the lives of its citizens—the focus of their hopes and aspirations, and the guardian of their liberties.

When a Government employee is dismissed on charges of disloyalty, it is not parallel to loss of employment in private industry. Such a dismissal, in the thoughts of most citizens, is tantamount to conviction for treason. It disgraces its victim for life, and often his family—just as would a dishonorable discharge from the military service. It renders future employment in Government impossible and in private industry difficult. Such a heavy penalty should not be imposed on any employee until it is proved beyond a reasonable doubt that the penalty is in fact deserved.

While no reasonable person will deny the need to exclude disloyal persons from Government service, opinions as to what constitutes disloyalty differ. Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt recently said, in referring to the sympathetic-association clause in the loyalty order:

> However, the more I think about one clause in the President's Executive order the more troubled I am. Under this clause I am afraid it would be possible to declare subversive many organizations that are simply in opposition to the thinking of certain powerful groups.

I am today introducing a bill to promote equitable personnel practices in the Federal Government by the establishment of a Federal Appeal Board, and for other purposes.

This bill provides orderly methods by which any employee or applicant for Government employment charged with disloyalty may have his case reviewed by a Federal Appeal Board. This board is to operate on the basis that an accused person is innocent until proved guilty. The rights of due process, including the right of cross-examination, are afforded by this bill, as well as the right to seek judicial review of the dismissal or other action. I submit this bill for your consideration as a contribution toward the solution of a vexing problem which has too often been approached with emotion rather than reason.

TAX ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, according to the newspapers, Chairman KNUTSON has appointed a special tax-study group—with Mr. Roswell Magill, Wall Street lawyer, as chairman "to hold continuing conferences with the Ways and Means Committee and Treasury officials so the group's judgment on specific provisions will be available to us as the work progresses."

The appointment of this outside committee was made without authorization by the Committee on Ways and Means. Although our committee has been sitting daily to hear testimony of the Secretary of the Treasury and of taxpayer groups in connection with the proposed com-

prehensive revision of the Federal tax laws, and frequent executive sessions have been held, not one word has been said in the committee about the necessity or the propriety of picking a small group of tax practitioners and businessmen to pass judgment on specific provisions as the 1948 tax bill is drafted. I fear this is laying the foundation for writing the 1948 tax bill by outsiders, as was done with the Tariff Act of 1930.

The pages of early American history are filled with the accounts of the fight to safeguard the taxing power from abuse. The founding fathers fought the Revolutionary War over taxation without representation. So they specified in the Constitution that only the House of Representatives should have the power to initiate tax legislation.

Now, it is proposed to impose upon the taxpayers of this country the secret deliberations of men who have not been subjected to public scrutiny, nor even to the advice and consent of the membership of the House of Representatives or its Committee on Ways and Means.

For nearly a month the committee has heard testimony of the Secretary of the Treasury and has received recommendations of more than a dozen industry groups for repeal or amendment of certain excise taxes. These industry spokesmen have presented their case in open hearings—and they thought they were addressing themselves to the elected Representatives in Congress responsible for deciding such matters.

Now, it seems that these advocates of repeal, reduction, or revision of the excise taxes—commonly known as sales taxes—will have to "clear it with Roswell."

Mr. Speaker, the appointment of any outside group to advise in the final decisions in executive sessions on what and whom to tax, at what rate, and with what exemptions is, in my opinion, a precedent dangerous to the democratic process. The dangers are doubly apparent when the chairman of the advisory committee is as ardent and able in advancing his own views on tax matters as Mr. Magill. This gentleman was one of two non-Government witnesses allowed to appear before our committee on H. R. 1. The other, Mr. John W. Hanes, is also a member of this study group. The industry representatives and consumer groups who had hoped for excise-tax relief now know better. It is significant that the New York Journal of Commerce—one of the financial dailies of Wall Street—headlined the selection of Mr. Magill on June 10, 1947, as follows: "Magill appointment underscores trend toward sales taxes." And to indicate that everything from here on is to be cut and dried to "Doctor" Magill's prescription, the Journal of Commerce says:

Any lingering doubts that Republican legislators plan to shift the center of gravity of the Federal tax system from income taxes are pretty much dispelled by appointment of Roswell Magill as key outsider to help formulate the 1948 tax-law revision.

Named by the Ways and Means Committee as chairman of a new advisory group, Mr. Magill favors minimizing income taxes as a source of Federal revenue. Excises and other sales-tax types of levies would be given a greatly expanded role as revenue raisers.

As chairman of the special advisory group, Mr. Magill will play a key role in formulation of new tax law. His general views have followed closely Republican tax and budget programs since the beginning of the year; some, in fact, suggest that the Republicans got the programs from him.

Of course, one man—even such an expert as Mr. Magill—does not make a committee. But the temper of the group—at least, of those who have expressed themselves publicly on Federal tax matters—is preponderantly in agreement with their chairman's affection for the sales tax.

To demonstrate that my suspicions as to the bias of this so-called special tax-study committee are founded in fact, I have prepared a thumbnail biography of the present occupation of each appointee, with his affiliations and general views on Federal taxation. The biographical sketches follow in alphabetical order:

FRANK CARLSON

Present occupation: Governor of Kansas, Topeka, Kans.

Biographical data: Born January 23, 1893. Student at Kansas State College. Farmer and stockman since 1914. Member Kansas State Legislature, 1929–33. Chairman Republican State Committee, 1932–34. Member of Congress, 1935–41 (Seventy-fourth to Seventy-sixth) from the Sixth Kansas District.

Affiliations: Member and officer of Farm Bureau, American Legion.

Views on taxes: As a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, he advocated the inclusion of a sales tax in the Revenue Act of 1942.

NORRIS K. CARNES

Present occupation: General manager, Central Cooperative Livestock Association, Exchange Building, South St. Paul, Minn.

Biographical data: Born May 9, 1895. Graduate University of Minnesota, B. S. 1917, M. S. 1920. Farmer; father's partner at Royalton, Minn. Assistant professor of animal husbandry at University of Minnesota 1923, assistant general manager, Central Cooperative Association. 1919–41, Minnesota State Fair official.

Affiliations: St. Paul Association of Commerce, chairman of the agricultural committee. American Horse Show Association. Chairman of the sale committee of Junior Livestock Show.

Views on taxes: Not available.

JOHN L. CONNOLLY

Present occupation: Secretary and general counsel, Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing Co., St. Paul, Minn.

Biographical data: Born 1892. Member of advisory committee that published the Twin Cities Plan on Post War Taxes, 1944.

Views on taxes: He favored tax reduction over debt reduction. He favored H. R. 1; opposed Lucas proposal. The income-tax base should be very broad, in his opinion. It is unfair to tax corporation income and then to tax stockholders on dividends. If additional revenue is needed, we should adopt a retail sales tax with no exemptions.

JOHN CHEEVER COWDIN

Present occupation: Chairman of the board, Universal Pictures Co., Universal City, Calif.

Biographical data: Born March 17, 1889. Student, St. Paul's School, Concord, N. H. until 1907. Clerk in Morgan & Co. Partner Bond & Goodwin, San Francisco, until 1919. Organized Blair & Co. and Blair Co., Inc., 1920. Vice president Bancamerica Blair Corp., 1930–34. Organized Standard Capital Co.; president of same from 1935 until its dissolution in December 1944. Former chairman, committee on government finance, National Association of Manufacturers.

Affiliations: Chairman of the board, Universal Pictures since 1936. Director: California Packing Co., Curtiss-Wright Corp., Curtiss-Wright Air Terminals, Inc., Devon Corp., Douglass Aircraft Corp., Ford Instrument Inc., Intercontinent, Inc., Sperry Corp., Sperry Gyroscope Inc., Transcontinental Air Transport, Inc., Big U Film Exchange Inc., Motion Picture Export Corp., Universal Film Exchange Inc., Universal Music Corp., Universal Pictures Co., Inc., Canadian Universal Film Co. Ltd., Waterbury Tool Co., Wright Aeronautical Corp.

Views on taxes: He urged the Congress to enact a "wartime consumption tax" of 8 percent at point of final sale. He recommended, however, that the tax on corporations should not exceed 40 percent. He would eliminate the distinction between long-term and short-term capital gains and tax such income at a maximum rate of 10 percent.

CARSON SAMUEL DUNCAN

Present occupation: Economist, Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.

Biographical data: Born August 25, 1879. B. A. Wabash College, Indiana, 1901. A. M. Columbia University, 1905. Ph. D. University of Chicago, 1913. Professor of English, Ohio State University, 1906-14. Assistant professor of marketing, University of Chicago, 1915–18. Statistical expert with the American Shipping Mission, London, 1918–19. Statistical expert, United States Shipping Board, 1918–19. Attended Peace Conference, Paris, January–June 1919. Chief investigator, National Industrial Conference Board, 1919–21. Director, bureau of research of the Southern Wholesale Grocers Association, 1921–22. With the Association of American Railroads since 1922.

Affiliations: American Economic Association, American Statistical Association.

Publications: Argumentation (with others), 1910. Commercial Research, 1919. Marketing. Its Problems and Methods, 1920. Editor—Specimens of Prose Composition (with others), 1913. A National Transportation Problem, 1936.

Views on taxes: Not available.

JOHN WESLEY HANES

Present occupation: Chairman of the board of trustees, Tax Foundation, 959 Eighth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

Biographical data: Born April 24, 1892. A. B., Yale, 1915. Former senior partner, Charles D. Barney & Co., investment bankers. Member, Securities and Exchange Commission January–July 1938. Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, July–November 1938. Under Secretary of the Treasury, November 1938–December 1939.

Affiliations: Director and member of pension trust committee and executive committee, Johns-Manville Corp. Director and chairman of the finance and operating committee, United States Lines Co. Director and chairman of the finance committee, Hearst Corp. and Purolator Products, Inc. Director, member, executive committee and personal trust committee, Bankers Trust Co. Director: American Superpower Corp., Thomas Young Orchids, Inc., Pan American Airways Co. Trustee: Hampton Institute, Smith College, Geneva, N. Y.

Views on taxes: The theory of ability to pay, which underlies our income tax, has been abused. H. R. 1 is a good program and is not inflationary. Existing surtax brackets have sucked dry almost every available dollar that can be obtained from the high income groups. Present tax rates are a stupid levy against the know-how and the managerial experience that are the Nation's greatest assets.

E. H. LANE

Present occupation: President, Lane Co., Inc., Altavista, Va.

Biographical data: Born July 4, 1892. Student, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, 1906–10.

Affiliations: Connected with the Lane Co. (manufacturers of cedar chests) since 1912; president since 1925.

Views on taxes: He included a retail sales tax of 5 to 10 percent, or a graduated sales tax starting at 5 percent and running to 25 percent, in his recommendations to the Committee on Ways and Means on the Revenue Act of 1942.

ROSWELL FOSTER MAGILL

Present occupation: Professor of law, Columbia University. Member of law firm of Cravath, Swaine & Moore, 15 Broad Street, New York.

Biographical data: Born November 20, 1895. A. B. Dartmouth, 1916. J. D., University of Chicago, 1920. Admitted to Illinois bar 1920 and in practice of law at Chicago until 1926. Instructor of law, University of Chicago, 1921–23. Assistant professor of law, Columbia University, 1924–25. Associate professor of law, Columbia University, 1925–27. Professor of law since 1927; only taxation since 1943. In law practice in New York City since 1928. Special attorney and chief attorney, United States Treasury Department, 1923–25. Assistant to Secretary of Treasury, 1933–34. Under Secretary of Treasury, 1937–38. Counsel, Dunnington, Bartholow & Miller, 1938–43. Member, Cravath, Swaine & Moore since 1943. Adviser to the Tax Commission of Puerto Rico, 1925, 1928–29. Adviser to the Cuban Treasury, 1938–39. Publicity governor, New York Stock Exchange, 1940–41.

Affiliations: Chairman of the Committee on Post War Tax Policy. Member, American Bar Association. Member, Associated Bar of the City of New York. Trustee: Mutual Life Insurance Co. of New York, Tax Foundation, Vassar College, Macy Foundation, Academy of Political Science.

Publications: Cases on Federal Taxation (with J. H. Beale), 1926. Federal Tax Practice (with R. H. Montgomery), 1929; Cases on Taxation (with J. M. Maguire), third edition, 1940. Cases on Civil Procedure (with J. H. Chadbourn), third edition, 1939. Cases on Business Organization (with R. P. Hamilton), 1933. Federal Taxes on Estates, Trusts, and Gifts (with R. H. Montgomery), second edition, 1936. Taxable Income, 1936. The Cuban Fiscal System, 1939 (2d ed., 1945). Contributor to the Columbia Law Review, Harvard Law Review, etc. The Impact of Federal Taxes, 1943.

Views on taxes: Present tax rates tend to restrict and impede full operation of productive forces in the economy. He is opposed to increase in personal exemptions under the income tax. In his opinion, 50 percent should be the top rate on incomes over $100,000. We should continue to rely on a broad excise-tax system either under a manufacturers' excise or a retailers' excise, or both, in some combination. They should produce about one-fourth of total tax revenues.

WRIGHT MATTHEWS

Present occupation: Lawyer, member of Robertson, Leachman, Payne, Gardere & Lancaster, Dallas, Tex.

Biographical data: Born January 27, 1897. LL. B., University of Texas, 1923. Admitted to bar in Texas, 1923. Assistant to Commissioner of Internal Revenue, 1934–36.

Affiliations: Member of law firm of Robertson, Leachman, Payne, Gardere & Lancaster. Representative clients: Dallas Times Herald, Southern Pacific Railroad Co., Lone Star Gas Co., Liberty Mutual Insurance Co., Hartford Accident and Indemnity Co. Tax counsel for more than a dozen oil companies. Member Houston, Federal, and American Bar Associations. Member State Bar of Texas.

CLARENCE HAMILTON POE

Present occupation: Editor of the Progressive Farmer, Raleigh, N. C.

Biographical data: Born January 10, 1881. Litt. D., Wake Forest, 1914. LL. D., University of North Carolina, 1928. Washington College (Md.), 1929. Sc. P., Clemson Agricultural College, 1937. President, the Progressive Farmer Co., 1903–30. Chairman, executive committee and board of trustees, North Carolina State College of Agriculture and Engineering, 1916–31. Member, State board of agriculture, 1913–31. Member, State commission authorized to draft revision to North Carolina State Constitution, 1931–32. Chairman, State commission which secured ratification of five amendments revising State tax system, 1936. Member, executive commission, State food administration, State fuel administration, and war savings commission, 1917–18. President, State Press Association, 1913–14. President, State Literary and Historical Association, 1914–15. President, State Farmers' Convention, 1919–20. Master, North Carolina State Grange, 1929–30. President, State Dairymen's Association, 1929–30. President, American Country Life Association, 1940–41. General chairman, Campaign for Balanced Prosperity in the South, 1940–43. Awarded Literary Historical Association's Cup for best literary production by a North Carolinian, 1909–12. Awarded Southern Agricultural Worker Medal for "distinguished service to southern agriculture," 1942. Chairman, North Carolina Hospital and Medical Care Commission, 1944–45. Member, National Committee on Hospital Care, 1944–46.

Affiliations: Editor, the Progressive Farmer since 1899. President, Progressive Farmer Ruralist Co. (a consolidation) since 1930. Member executive committee of the consolidated University of North Carolina since 1931. Trustee, Wake Forest College. Chairman executive committee, North Carolina Art Society. Director from North Carolina for Hall of Fame, New York. Member, Federal Board for Vocational Education (the representative of American agriculture). Director, North Carolina Forestry Foundation. President, Longview Gardens, Inc. Member, North Carolina Council for National Defense. Chairman of executive committee, North Carolina Farm Manpower Commission. Member, board of advisers, Institute of Public Affairs, University of Virginia. Member, advisory committee, National Youth Administration. Member, State Planning Board of North Carolina. Vice chairman, North Caroline Medical Care Commission since 1945.

Publications: Cotton, Its Cultivation, Marketing, and Manufacture (with C. W. Burkett), 1906. A Southerner in Europe, 1908. Where Half the World Is Waking Up, 1911. Life and Speeches, Charles B. Aycock (with R. D. W. Connor), 1912. How Farmers Cooperate and Double Profits, 1915.

Views on taxes: Not available.

MATTHEW WOLL

Present occupation: Vice president, American Federation of Labor, 570 Lexington Avenue, New York City, N. Y.

Biographical data: Born January 25, 1880, in Luxembourg. Came to the United States (Chicago) in 1891. 1904 completed Lake Forest University's College of Law (Kent College of Law). President, photoengravers union, 1906–29. Sent as a fraternal delegate to the British Trade Union College at Birmingham, 1915–16. 1919 became eighth vice president of AFL. 1930 became first vice president of AFL. Represented American labor in Warsaw at the Federation of Trade Unions, 1937, and at the International Labor Organization, Oslo, in 1938. Former editor of American Federationist. Member, President Truman's Labor-Management Conference, 1945. Director of legal bureau of AFL. Member, President Harding's Unemployment Commission.

Affiliations: Head of Union Labor Life Insurance Co.; president of Sportsmanship Brotherhood; League for Human Rights, Freedom, and Democracy; Union Label Trades Department; United Nations Relief, for AFL; Friends of Luxembourg, Inc.; International Labor Presidents of America; International Labor News Service; American Wage Earners Conference. Legislative representative of International Allied Printing Trades Association. Member, National Academy of Political Science. Member, Catholic Conference on Industrial Problems. Member, New York State Insurance Advisory Board. Member, National Committee on Prisons and Prison Labor. Chairman, International Labor Relations Committee. Member (1 of 4) of War Labor Board since 1942. Trustee and AFL representative of radio station WCFL (Chicago). Director and member of executive committee of New York's World's Fair, Inc. Director of National Bureau of Economic Research. Trustee: Public Education Association, Chicago Tuberculosis Institute, National Tuberculosis Association. Chairman of American Labor Committee to Aid British Labor. Chairman of AFL's standing committee on education, social security, and national defense. Chairman of a nine-man post-war planning committee, named by William Green in December 1942. President of Workers Educational Bureau.

Publications: Labor, Industry, and Government, 1935. Articles on economics and labor topics.

Views on taxes: Corporations have no right in equity to expect exemption from paying their fair share of taxes. Shareholders have no right to expect removal of taxes on corporations. Income taxes on individuals and corporations and inheritance taxes are correctly referred to as taxes which people are fortunate to pay, because they are applied only on the basis of ability to pay. Lower costs of goods, higher wages, and higher profits depend more on volume production and technological and managerial improvement than on tax policy. High corporate taxation need not be a barrier to accumulation of reserves for reinvestment. One of the largest loopholes is that which allows individuals to avoid income taxes through nondistribution of corporation profits. The wage-earning group, representing the great mass of consumers, is the one ultimately to bear the burden of taxation, no matter what form it takes.

I serve notice to the members of this hand-picked study committee, Mr. Speaker, that I shall protest every effort they make to influence the decisions of the Committee on Ways and Means on the current tax revision. Even though the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means is running true to form in trying on his own initiative to set up such a group, these eminent gentlemen should appreciate that their announced functions go beyond the scope of long-standing legislative practices. If they desire to present their views in open committee hearings, I should be very glad to hear them. But under no circumstances should they be permitted to advance either their own views, or the interests of persons whom they represent, behind the closed doors of the committee room in executive session.

SPECIAL TAX STUDY GROUP

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, the usurpation of committee authority by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means has become so serious that I am compelled to bring the matter to the House floor. The most recent display of Chairman KNUTSON'S arrogance was the appointment of a so-called special tax study committee headed by Roswell Magill, a Wall Street lawyer, and including John W. Hanes, the New York banker, and J. Cheever Cowdin, tax spokesman for the National Association of Manufacturers. Mr. Speaker, this very day, in the official meeting room of the Committee on Ways and Means just a few feet off the floor of this House, this little band of businessmen are organizing to write the 1948 tax bill. Yet not one word has been said about the matter in the committee. Mr. Speaker, representative government will not long endure if the chairman of a committee is allowed to take unto himself the authority of the full committee. And how much greater is the danger when he undertakes to delegate committee responsibility to a small group for the advancement of their own special interests.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS ON THE LATE HONORABLE DAVID I. WALSH

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may have five legislative days within which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the late honorable David I. Walsh.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article on statehood for Hawaii.

DR. ROSWELL MAGILL

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND] a few moments ago made some disparaging remarks about the distinguished citizen who has just been appointed chairman of the Tax Study Committee. I think the RECORD should show that Dr. Roswell Magill is currently a professor of law at Columbia University; that he is one of the noted tax authorities of the country; that he served under appointment by President Roosevelt as Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

I think the RECORD should also show that President Roosevelt was once a Wall Street lawyer, although he did not practice there very successfully.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, this past week one of my friends sent me a document his 16-year-old son had received through the United States mails. It is an advertisement mailed by someone called Bulco, New York, and it offers to sell through the mails this partial list of lurid titles: "From Dance Hall to White Slavery," "Tales of French Love and Passion," "The Tragedies of the White Slaves," "One of Cleopatra's Nights," "Facts About Nudism," "Love Tales," "The Seven Keys to Power," "Scientific Betting," "The Art of Kissing," "How To Make Love."

One of these advertisements puffing up The Seven Keys to Power says: "Cast a spell on anyone, no matter where they are. Gain the mastery of all things. Cure any kind of sickness without medicine."

When this was called to my attention I immediately wrote to Postmaster General Robert Hannegan. In response to my letter, Mr. J. M. Donaldson, Acting Postmaster General, wrote promising an investigation.

Mr. Speaker, I have three questions:

First. Where is the fellow who is supposed to look over the kind of literature sent through permits issued by the postal authorities?

Second. What standards are employed in determining what we allow to circulate to 16-year-old youngsters?

Third. Where did this outfit get the list of names including young people for these purposes?

And what is Mr. Hannegan going to do about the whole business?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

DEPORTATION OF CHARLIE CHAPLIN

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks and include an article from the Commercial Appeal, Memphis, Tenn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the recitation by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] of the filth being sent through the mails to destroy the morals of the youth of America is in line with something the Committee on Un-American Activities uncovered in Hollywood in its recent investigation.

But I arose to pay my tribute to Chairman Lloyd T. Binford, head of the Censor Bureau of Memphis, Tenn., for banning a rotten picture made by Charlie Chaplin. If every other city in America had a man like Binford at the head of its censorship bureau, we would get rid of a lot of this filth that is being spread before the eyes of our children through the moving-picture shows.

I am today demanding that Attorney General Tom Clark institute proceedings to deport Charlie Chaplin. He has refused to become an American citizen. His very life in Hollywood is detrimental to the moral fabric of America. In that way he can be kept off the American screen, and his loathsome pictures can be kept from before the eyes of the American youth. He should be deported and gotten rid of at once.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. RICH. How about Harry Bridges? We tried to deport him and the President pardoned him.

Mr. RANKIN. I was for that, too; but from a moral standpoint I do not suppose he ever did stoop to the low level that this Charlie Chaplin has reached.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances; in one to include a speech he gave at a graduation exercise; second, a reprint of an editorial carried in a Hartford newspaper; and, third, a copy of his Memorial Day speech.

Mr. NORBLAD asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. ROHRBOUGH asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address recently delivered.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from the secretary of the Association of New York State Canners.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker * * *

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand that those words be taken down.

Mr. Speaker, this is still America.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the words objected to.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand that the rule be enforced. The gentleman cannot speak until this matter is disposed of.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct, unless he makes a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, he cannot make a unanimous-consent request.

The SPEAKER. The Chair can always recognize anyone to propound a unanimous-consent request. Of course, it would be within the province of the gentleman from Mississippi to object, but the Chair can put unanimous-consent requests at any time.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. The Chair does not have the right to recognize anyone whose words

have been taken down until that matter is disposed of, even for a unanimous-consent request.

The SPEAKER. On previous occasions that has been done.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand, but it is a violation of the rules of the House, and I make that point of order.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk read the words objected to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair holds that the motives of the committee have been impugned by calling it the "Un-American Committee."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike those words from the RECORD and ask for recognition.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am recognized now for 1 hour and I have a right to yield to any other Member I desire in this discussion?

The SPEAKER. As long as the gentleman retains the floor he may yield, of course, but he must retain the floor for 1 hour, if he so desires.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER], a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial on the flood control project of the Roanoke River in North Carolina and Virginia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for the making of a privileged motion or request?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I think what the gentleman is going to say is very important and we should have a quorum here. I therefore suggest the absence of a quorum.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized for 1 hour.

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, these attacks on the Committee on Un-American Activities have been going on for a long time. The Communist slogan as it appears in the Communist Daily Worker and the PM, the uptown edition of the Communist Daily Worker, is to refer to it as the un-American committee, the term used by the gentleman from California.

I have long since made up my mind that if another Member undertook to repeat that slogan on this floor I would move to strike his words from the RECORD, and take the time to defend that committee against these invidious attacks.

For years we have had a Communist movement in this country designed to destroy the American Constitution, as well as the American way of life. They are now using the picture shows for that purpose, as well as every other means of propaganda.

They are attempting to destroy what they call the capitalist system; that is, our system of free enterprise that permits a man to own his home, his land, his store, or his factory.

They have published a booklet entitled "The Negro in Soviet America," and sent it down through the Southern States with a map drawn showing the Negro soviet they propose to set up as soon as they take over.

The head of the Communist Party night before last went on the radio in one of the most vicious attacks on Congress that the human mind could possibly conceive. He has said time and time again that when the Communists take over this will not be a government of the United States, but that it will be a soviet government, and he said—and I quote his exact words:

> And behind that government will stand the Red Army to enforce the dictatorship of the proletariat.

About 1938 we created the Committee on Un-American Activities which became known as the Dies committee, because the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Dies, was made chairman of it.

I have never seen a man take more abuse than Martin Dies took from the Communists of this country and their sympathizers. They not only threatened him, but they threatened to murder his wife and children; and only yesterday there came through the mail a threat against the life of the chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMAS]. They said in that threatening letter that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMAS] would be knocked off in June, and that I would be knocked off in July.

They gave me an extra month.

I do not propose to sit quietly by and see the water poured on the wheel of those elements that are challenging our civilization throughout the earth. When the last Congress convened in 1945 it looked as if the Committee on Un-American Activities was lost. It looked as if there was no chance to get a committee to continue these investigations. Therefore, on the opening day of Congress, when we were adopting the rules of the House, I offered an amendment to set up this standing Committee on Un-American Activities to continue these investigations.

We have gone on now for more than 2 years, and I want to say to you that if you go into those records and see what is being uncovered and see the threats that are being made and the plans that are being laid under our very noses to destroy this country, you will realize the alarming situation.

No wonder they have Henry Wallace going down into the South making speeches to try to stir race trouble all over the South.

No wonder they have him going out and denouncing President Truman who does not even need a recommendation for his patriotism at the hands of Henry Wallace or anyone else. Harry Truman has not only proved his patriotism as a Member of the United States Senate and as President of the United States, but in the First World War he proved it on the battlefield.

But they do not like him because he is not communistic enough. He is not willing to join in their efforts to undermine and destroy America.

Last year they tried to force out the FEPC bill, which is the chief plank in the Communist platform. They finally did manage to force it through the Legislature of the State of New York, and succeeded in driving the businessmen of that State underground, so to speak. They are trying now to figure out every way in the world to operate under it, or in spite of it.

They took it to California and put it on the ballot there, and it was defeated by more than a million votes. It was defeated by a majority in every single county in California. Yet the same element that supported that measure, the same element in Hollywood that spreads communism through the moving pictures and virtually defies the Government of the United States in their efforts to undermine and destroy the morals of the youth of America defiantly attempts to keep from complying with the laws of the land, even when the Committee on Un-American Activities go there to investigate them.

The best people in California sent me a petition, which I threw across this House here for you to see. It had signed to it thousands of names, protesting against the condition in Hollywood and begging us to do something about it.

They called attention to the Communist infiltration there. Letters have poured in from the best people in California urging that something be done. We sent out investigators there. I did not go, but the chairman and another member and two of the investigators did go. Those men who are disturbed over this Communist infiltration into the moving pictures came before that committee and told a story that, when made public, is sufficient to arouse the Christian people of America from one end of the country to the other.

Yet they call us the "Un-American" Committee.

Such attacks are not going to take place on this floor unchallenged as long as I am a Member of this House. Such insulting remarks with reference to the Committee on Un-American Activities are not going unnoticed.

The members of this committee are doing everything possible to protect this country from the enemies within our gates, and we are entitled to the support of every Member of this House.

For that reason, I demanded that the gentleman's words be taken down and moved that they be stricken forever from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

On that, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to strike out the objectionable words.

The motion was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 94 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of the investigations to be made pursuant to House Resolution 93, by the Committee on Public Lands (now comprised of the six former committees on Insular Affairs, Territories, Public Lands, Irrigation and Reclamation, Mines and Mining, and Indian Affairs), acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $25,000, including expenditures for the employment of stenographic and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of such committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 163), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1947, the expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 318 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, continued under authority of House Resolution 153 of the Eightieth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed the unexpended balance of the sum made available for conducting such investigation during the Seventy-ninth Congress, including expenditures for the employment of experts and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of such committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held by such committee or subcommittee in the District of Columbia unless otherwise officially engaged.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out lines 7 and 8 and "gress" in line 9 and insert "$25,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 228), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of the investigation and study to be conducted pursuant to House Resolution 195, by the Committee on the District of Columbia, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $15,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on voucher authorized by such committee or subcommittee, signed by the chairman of such committee or subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 177), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 176, Eightieth Congress, incurred by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $25,000, including expenditures for printing and binding, employment of such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee and signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out the words "printing and"; line 6, strike out the word "binding."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 185), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations with respect to the activities of the Department of State in connection with the number of its personnel and the efficiency and economy of its operations incurred by the subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments not to exceed $10,000, including expenditures for printing and binding, employment of such experts, special counsel, and such clercal, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said subcommittee and signed by the chairman of the subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, after the word "operations", insert the words "authorized by rule XI (1) (h)."

Line 7, strike out the words "printing and binding."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REVISED EDITION OF ANNOTATED CONSTITUTION OF UNITED STATES

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up Senate Joint Resolution 69, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas the Annotated Constitution of the United States of America published in 1938 as Senate Document 232, Seventy-fourth Congress, has served a very useful purpose by supplying essential information in one volume and at a very reasonable price; and

Whereas Senate Document 232 is no longer available at the Government Printing Office; and

Whereas the reprinting of this document without annotations for the last 10 years is not considered appropriate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That the Librarian of Congress is hereby authorized and directed to have the Annotated Constitution of the United States of America, published in 1938, revised and extended to include annotations of decisions of the Supreme Court prior to January 1, 1948, construing the several provisions of the Constitution correlated under each separate provision, and to have the said revised document printed at the Government Printing Office. Three thousand copies shall be printed, of which 2,200 copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and 800 copies for the use of the Senate.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for carrying out the provisions of this act, with respect to the preparation but not including printing, the sum of $35,000, to remain available until expended.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF PEARL COX

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 233), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Pearl

Cox, wife of Milton R. Cox, late an employee of the House, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death, and an additional amount not to exceed $250 toward defraying the funeral expenses of the said Milton R. Cox.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT, 1947

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 245) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed 12,000 additional copies of House Report No. 510, current Congress, being the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3020) entitled "Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947," of which 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, 3,000 copies for the use of the House Committee on Education and Labor, 2,000 copies for the Senate document room, and 6,000 copies for the House document room.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 3

Mr. HOFFMAN, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, submitted the following privileged report (H. Con. Res. 51) against the adoption of Reorganization Plan No. 3, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress does not favor the Reorganization Plan No. 3 of May 27, 1947, transmitted to Congress by the President on the 27th day of May 1947.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3791) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

Pending that motion I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to 20 minutes, one-half to be controlled by myself and one-half by the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. I suggest the gentleman modify his request to read "not to exceed."

Mr. TABER. I so modify my request, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to not to exceed 20 minutes, the time to be equally divided between himself and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3791) making appropriation to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, with Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this bill involves a total of about $58,000,000. The large items involved are items for the Veterans' Administration to finish out the rest of this fiscal year, about $28,900,000; an item for legislative printing of $1,196,000; an item for the Post Office Department of about $33,000,000; and several other items of small character which are necessary for the immediate operations of the agencies of the Government.

These estimates were received only within the last 3 or 4 weeks from the Budget and this is our first opportunity to present them. They must be through in time, some of them, for the operations in the Treasury by the 16th of June. That is the reason we are bringing this bill in at this time.

There is one item with reference to sugar which I believe we can cut as a result of the action of the Agriculture Department yesterday; and there is one little clerical correction to be made in the bill.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. RICH. In reference to the rationing of sugar by the Department of Agriculture, I notice the gentleman asks for continuation of that money until the end of June but that in the report it is stated:

The committee expects to go into the matter thoroughly in connection with a pending estimate of $5,000,000 for sugar rationing in the fiscal year 1948.

Evidently the Secretary of Agriculture has sent his representatives to the gentleman's committee to request additional appropriations.

Mr. TABER. We have pending an estimate from the budget for $5,000,000 for next year. Even if rationing had continued we would have been able to make very substantial cuts, probably close to 50 percent, as a result of a new method of doing business. Other cuts also are in sight as a result of the reduced operations because there will be nothing left of sugar rationing from this time on except that for industrial use. Rationing of industrial sugar continues.

Mr. RICH. That is not going to require a very large force to administer, is it?

Mr. TABER. It should not, but I have not any idea what it will require.

The Secretary has announced the discharge of only 800 people as of this date, but that should be followed by a larger number as we get along.

Mr. RICH. How about the $415,000 that is asked for?

Mr. TABER. I am proposing to cut that to $215,000 because as I figure, the discharge of 800 employees as of this date would permit it. But we will have to pay those who have been on the roll down to the middle of June.

Mr. RICH. It seems to me that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] who stated last night he would bring in this bill, to stop sugar rationing, put the Secretary of Agriculture over the sugar barrel.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman states that the Secretary of Agriculture contemplates releasing 800 employees since sugar rationing has been taken off. How many employees have their been in that rationing department?

Mr. TABER. I have not the figure in my head at this time. I cannot tell the gentleman the exact number involved in sugar rationing. It was up in the several thousands, but it is down now to a very moderate figure, as compared with what it was previously.

Mr. SPRINGER. As a matter of fact, if sugar rationing is taken off that will permit the reduction of a very large number of those employees, will it not?

Mr. TABER. A very large amount for this banking operation that has heretofore been indulged in.

Mr. SPRINGER. As a matter of fact, is it not possible for them to release many more than the 800 employees?

Mr. TABER. It will be as they get a little farther along.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not true that the Congress directed the Secretary to remove the rationing the minute he felt he could?

Mr. TABER. Why, the Congress reported out a resolution to do away with household sugar rationing yesterday and the Rules Committee passed a rule for its consideration today. It would have been up for consideration today. I cannot tell the hour that the Secretary made his determination.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. May I say that the Department in communications by telephone and otherwise indicated to me that the housewives would have plenty of sugar this summer.

Mr. TABER. We all know that sugar has been piling up on the shelves and the situation was getting to the point where the Government was going to take a big loss in sugar unless the rationing controls were taken off.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman feel it should be removed at this time for industry as well?

Mr. TABER. I do not know enough about that to know, but I think it should be by the end of the month.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, this is a very satisfactory report. It may be taken as a strong endorsement of the efficiency with which the various activities represented in the bill are being administered. Here is a bill which involves many items, some in the legislative branch of the Government, some in the judicial branch and the remainder in more than half a dozen departments of the executive branch of the Government.

After exhaustive consideration by the committee, all estimates are reported to the House with recommendations for appropriation of the full amounts of the estimates. So economical has been the administration of the agencies that there is no proposal to cut any of them and so effectively have the affairs of the agencies been handled in the disbursement of their funds that no suggestion is made for retrenchment or improvement. Every item has been approved in full without reduction or criticism.

There is only one possible exception, which is not really an exception, and that is the estimate for the Veterans' Bureau. No suggestion for any readjustment of routine or service to veterans is made and no criticism of the Bureau is involved. The work of General Bradley and his staff is apparently satisfactory in every respect. The only proposal is to limit provision to the end of the fiscal year. So that is not to be taken as an exception to the rule.

There is a deduction in the amount provided for penalty mail. But, as has been amply demonstrated in the hearings on many of the supply bills, no real control is exercised over penalty mail appropriations, and such items may be considered largely as surplusage.

As a matter of fact, such items are worse than surplusage for the reason that they not only fail to effect any appreciable savings, but require additional personnel and involve the administration of additional machinery of operation, without corresponding advantage. For example, the Department of Agriculture alone expends on an average of $200,000 annually for this purpose without convincing dimunition of costs of distribution.

So, on the whole, inasmuch as no reductions or retrenchments are proposed, the report of the committee on the pending bill may be accepted as an expression of approval of the economy with which the various agencies supplied by the bill have been administered.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Such sums as may be necessary are hereby appropriated for making for the first quarter of the fiscal year 1948 payments to States in accordance with the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended (29 U. S. C., ch. 4): *Provided*, That the obligations incurred and expenditures made for such purpose under the authority of this appropriation shall be charged to the appropriation therefor in the Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1948.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to propound an inquiry to the chairman of the committee. I notice there is $500,000 appropriated for the Federal Security Agency. I would like to ask whether that is the amount that the Commission has requested or needs.

Mr. TABER. That is the amount the budget asked us for and that the representatives of the Employees' Compensation Commission asked for in full. There was no cut in that item.

The Clerk read as follows:

SUGAR RATIONING ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses: Not to exceed $415,000 of the $898,000 transferred to the Department of Agriculture pursuant to section 3 (c) of the Sugar Control Extension Act of 1947 for the payment of terminal leave, is hereby merged with and made available for the fiscal year 1947 for the same purposes as other funds transferred to the Department of Agriculture pursuant to the same authority, notwithstanding the provisions to the contrary under the head "Office of Temporary Controls" in the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 6, line 12, strike out "$415,000" and insert "$215,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered pursuant to the discontinuance of household sugar rationing and the discharge of 800 people from the service.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is gratifying that we are able to remove the last rationing limitation imposed during the war. It has come sooner than anticipated. Due to last-minute developments which have increased the supply of sugar available for distribution in the United States, and the reduced demand on the part of consumers, it is possible to lift the last war restriction on food and provide unlimited supplies to housewives in every market in the country.

In response to the mistaken assertion that this action was taken without advance notice to the committee it is only necessary to recall the statement of the Secretary of Agriculture when he appeared before the committee on this item week before last. At that time he made the unequivocal statement, as all present will testify, that he would discontinue rationing of sugar as soon as assured of sufficient supplies to warrant it.

In response to an inquiry from the chairman of the committee, at the hearings held on June 4, Secretary Anderson said he was awaiting advice from Cuba and if reports on the Cuban situation warranted it—as he hoped—he would terminate household rationing of sugar.

His hopes were more than realized as the International Emergency Food Council increased the quota of the United States and allotted us 350,000 additional tons of sugar from the world pool. This was made possible by the increased tonnage of Cuban sugar available for export and by the announcement that 200,000 tons of sugar from Java, the disposition of which had been uncertain, would be placed on the world market.

By way of résumé, Secretary Anderson told the committee on June 4 that if conditions with which he was in touch permitted, he would lift restrictions on sugar. Conditions developed favorably and in conformity with his assurances to the committee he discontinued rationing as of last night.

Secretary Anderson added, however, at the time, in response to the question from Chairman TABER, that in any event, whether rationing was lifted or whether it was continued, the $415,000 would still be required for the remainder of this fiscal year; that even if restrictions were lifted, it would be impossible to notify the 800 employees to be dismissed in time to get in their 30 days' notice and accumulated leave before June 30, and the full amount of the estimate would be required to liquidate.

This conclusively disposes of the suggestion that Secretary Anderson should have notified the committee so that the estimate for that purpose in the pending bill could be rescinded. There was no occasion for the Secretary to further notify the committee and certainly no reason for his proposing reconsideration of the sum carried in the pending amendment. We must have this amount to close out the activity. If it is not appropriated in this bill it will have to be appropriated by a later bill. The amendment should be rejected.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Was not the Secretary before the Committee on Appropriations yesterday asking for funds for the continuation of sugar rationing?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly not. He appeared before the committee on June 4.

Mr. RICH. Here it is June 12. In the meantime the committee reported out a bill to discontinue sugar rationing, and yesterday the Committee on Rules reported out a resolution for the consideration of that bill. The majority leader last night at 4 o'clock said we would bring that bill up today. Secretary Anderson knew yesterday after 4 o'clock that by today we would pass a bill doing away with sugar rationing, so he jumped the gun.

In other words, the Republican Party rode Secretary Anderson over the sugar barrel and then he decided that he would let the housewives have the sugar for canning for their own personal consumption. So, I think the Republican Party did a good thing in causing Secretary Anderson to have such a fine idea. It certainly is good for the country.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman's attitude is reminiscent of the son-in-law who said he had so much trouble settling the estate of his father-in-law that "sometimes he almost wished the old man hadn't a died."

The gentleman from Pennsylvania and his colleagues who have criticized the Secretary, would almost rather continue rationing with all its disadvantages to the housewife, than to see the administration getting credit for it.

Secretary Anderson considered discontinuing rationing of sugar in May, but

decided against it, as related in this morning's paper, because removal of rationing at that time would have placed the United States at a disadvantage in its application to the world pool for an increased quota from the Cuban crop.

He notified the committee on June 4 that he intended to lift restrictions if we got the increased quota, all this before there was any intimation that the bill H. R. 3612 would be brought on the floor today or any other time.

In accordance with assurances given the committee he acted on June 11 as soon as notified of th additional quota.

There are the facts and the dates. They speak for themselves.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to get into any gutter political discussion with my friend from Missouri, but he covers a lot of ground in the statement which he has just made to the Committee—as usual.

I attended the hearings of the Subcommittee on Deficiency Appropriations. I was there, as was the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] and the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], but the gentleman from Missouri was not there. I think we know what transpired with respect to the sugar situation when the Secretary of Agriculture was before the committee. You can look at the record of the hearings and you will not find a word in them. It was off the record because the Secretary of Agriculture insisted upon talking off the record.

But I want the Members of Congress to know, despite anything that the gentleman from Missouri may say, and I want the people of America to know that when the Secretary came before the Subcommittee on Deficiency Appropriations and asked for this urgent authorization for a transfer of funds of $415,000 in order to carry on sugar rationing he was questioned off the record, and he did tell us off the record what his program was. That program gave us the impression that the earliest that he could conceive at that time that sugar rationing could be lifted would be June 30.

I heard every word of the testimony, and I have been trained for 30 years to listen to testimony and to remember it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I am sure the gentleman recalls the off-the-record statement which was made by the Secretary in answer to an inquiry by the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], that if it was possible to accomplish that, although it was impossible on the basis of reports he had up to that time, he would do it if he could.

Mr. KEEFE. Yes; that is very true. He discussed with us the possibility of having a greater allocation out of the world pool of sugar which came to us out of the Cuban crop.

The thing about which we complain and about which I think the committee has a right to complain is not that the Secretary of Agriculture has lifted the restrictions on sugar rationing. We applaud that action. We do complain of the apparent attempt to secure political advantage by getting headlines announcing the end of sugar rationing when his action was forced by Republican action. The fact that when he knew of the interest of the members of this committee and knew that we were going to report this bill today, he failed to advise us when he was before our committee as late as 4 o'clock yesterday afternoon. He must have known he was going to take off sugar rationing last night at midnight. He did not let this committee know he was going to let go over 800 employees as a result of the action which he took last night, and allowed us to come in here and report this bill which in view of his latest action asks for a transfer of funds away beyond what is necessary. He, whom we have treated with such great kindness and respect because we all like Clinton Anderson as a former Member of this House, did not even give to the members of this Subcommittee on Deficiency an inkling that he was going to take off this sugar rationing.

I want to say to you, I do not care what the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] or anybody else who thinks as he does, thinks, the fact of the matter is that Mr. Anderson knew the Rules Committee had reported the bill from the Banking and Currency Committee on yesterday, that would have been before this House today, to have compelled the abolition of any further rationing of sugar. With that gun at his head he acted and took it off, and for no other reason. There is no member on this committee who had any idea there would be any lifting of sugar rationing, regardless of how we urged him, until June 30 at the very earliest date.

The record ought to show that and ought to be kept clear. Secretary Anderson hurried to remove rationing before the Republican Members forced him through passage of legislation reported out of the House Committee on Banking and Currency yesterday.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses of marshals, and so forth: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1947, for "Salaries and expenses of marshals, and so forth," $140,000.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as has already been pointed out, I announced on yesterday about 4 o'clock that the measure to decontrol sugar, which had been reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency, had just been granted a rule by the Rules Committee to provide for its consideration on the floor of the House today, and that we proposed to call it up today. Subsequently, the Secretary of Agriculture himself, by Executive order, decontrolled sugar for domestic use. According to the press, he was asked as to whether or not the proposed congressional action had brought about that action on his part, and he said, "Possibly it is the other way around."

I would take that to mean that what he had done or said might have accelerated the action by the congressional committee. The fact of the matter is that the record is exactly the opposite. Mr. Anderson appeared before the Banking and Currency Committee on June 7, last Saturday, to testify upon the very decontrol bill that we proposed to call up today and it is clear that at that time he opposed the bill. In the course of his testimony he said this:

As to H. R. 3612 to terminate household rationing of sugar I might say that we find ourselves in sympathy with the purpose of the bill. We think the time is getting close when it might be done safely. We do not think the time has yet arrived. We think that because there are so many unknown factors still in the picture we are justified in waiting until we can be very sure that the supply is adequate.

Last Saturday he said the time was not here, he was against the bill.

Subsequently in his testimony he said, and I quote the Secretary of Agriculture:

So that I say while there are many indications that we are moving in the direction that this bill would propose, we do not think we are there at the present time.

Then to show what they really were thinking about—and the hearings as I have glanced through them contain many evidences of contemplation of things to be done in connection with the rationing of sugar to be long continued, the Secretary said this:

But to get to the purpose of this bill, we believe that when this present discussion or controversy over the remaining portion of the sugar crop is ended we will have available enough sugar to give the housewife, if we do not terminate domestic rationing, another 5-pound stamp, or we might have enough to give a 10-pound stamp for home-canning purposes if we felt there would be some restriction or control on the use of that stamp.

Mr. Chairman, I think from all of this it is perfectly clear that the proposed Republican action to bring about the decontrol of sugar stimulated the Secretary of Agriculture himself to issue his order of decontrol last night at midnight. So for whatever it may be worth and not to prolong the controversy but in order to keep the record straight, I think it clearly appears that had this legislation not been presented by the Committee on Banking and Currency and if the Rules Committee had not granted this rule, and if we had not declared on yesterday that we would take up today the decontrol measure, the order of decontrol would not have been issed last night.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. ARENDS. Do I understand that the testimony the gentleman has read, given by Mr. Anderson, was given on Saturday last, or just 4 days before the action he took on yesterday?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes; on June 7. That is the arithmetic of it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. We have heard the proposed unification bill referred to as a "shotgun wedding." I

wonder if it would be proper to refer to this as a "shotgun divorce"?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment of the gentleman from Indiana.

As I said earlier in the morning, of course, our friends expected the headlines to say tomorrow that the Republicans, in the House of Representatives at least, had given the American housewife some sugar. All this talk reminds me of when I first came here and I saw the comic strip Mutt and Jeff in the paper one day. They were sitting down at a table and had steak before them. Mutt carved the steak and he gave Jeff the small end of it. Jeff said: "You have got no table manners at all. If I were carving the steak I would have given you the big piece and kept the little one myself." The answer was, "What are you kicking about? You got it anyhow."

The Clerk read as follows:

Foreign air-mail transportation: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1947, for "Foreign air-mail transportation," $21,262,000, of which $5,977,000 is to be transferred in the following respective amounts from the appropriations "Domestic Air Mail Service," $5,972,000, and "Electric-car service," $5,000, $15,285,000.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 9, line 16, after the figures "$5,000" strike out the comma and the figures "$15,285,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, that is a clerical amendment to correct the language so that the paragraph will read better.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SECRET SERVICE DIVISION

Reimbursement to District of Columbia, benefit payments to White House Police and Secret Service forces: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1947, for "Reimbursement to District of Columbia, benefit payments to White House Police and Secret Service forces", $16,000.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: Page 10, after line 15, insert the following:

"WAR DEPARTMENT

"Emergency flood-control work, $12,000,000, to be expended in accord with the provisions of the bill, H. R. 3792, Eightieth Congress, if and when such bill is enacted into law, and to remain available until June 30, 1948."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment after consultation with the other members of the subcommittee and for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of H. R. 3792 which was passed by the House this morning.

I understand that there is a terrible flood condition existing out in the entire Mississippi Valley and that it is necessary immediately to go ahead and repair and supplement the dikes, levees, and other flood-control operations out there. It is in progress now insofar as funds are available.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], chairman of that committee, so that he may tell the committee at this point just why they brought this in at the present time.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, this bill passed the Committee on Public Works unanimously. In years gone by the Army engineers have been granted an appropriation amounting to ten or twelve million dollars annually as an emergency fund with which to repair levees and dikes wherever an emergency should occur. That fund has been exhausted and no funds are on hand to meet a present emergency.

This year, because of heavy rains, a great emergency exists in the Mississippi Valley, the Missouri Valley, and in other river basins. It is absolutely mandatory that the engineers have funds at once to meet such emergency. Therefore, our committee—the Committee on Public Works—passed this bill unanimously. The House this morning very generously passed it without a single dissenting vote, and it is thought best to expedite the passage of this bill, in order that this fund might be made available, by adding it to this bill rather than wait for action by the Senate on the authorization bill passed today by the House. I hope the House will accept this amendment. Both sides have been consulted. I understand there is no objection whatever.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I spoke to one of the members of the subcommittee this morning with reference to this bill. I agree with you that the repair work on these dikes, and so forth, should be done just as soon as possible. But now let me ask the gentleman this question: Let me point out one specific instance. In the city of Bradford, Pa., last year, in May, they had a terrible flood. This year, in April, they had floodwater 18 inches higher than it was last year; the highest the water has ever been in that town. Now, they have built up the streams, but the streams are all filled up. They did not have the necessary number of dikes that the Army engineers recommended. The stream bed is filled up. They are going to try to open that stream so that the water can get through.

Mr. DONDERO. I suggest the gentleman contact the Army engineers or consult them regarding this matter to see what can be done to alleviate the situation the gentleman has described.

Mr. RICH. Then it is the intention in this bill to do the necessary work to cure this damage that has been caused by floods and the proper elimination of the water through the stream channel in order that we might reduce these floods?

Mr. DONDERO. There is no limitation in the bill whatever. This is an emergency fund to be used at the discretion of the Army engineers. We all have great confidence in the Corps of Engineers. It is due to the emergency caused by the recent floods that have taken place as the gentleman knows, all over this country.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman means during this year?

Mr. DONDERO. During this year; that is correct.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I want to compliment the gentleman and his committee for the speed and the fine sense they have manifested in handling this very serious proposition, and I want to ask just one question: The committee, as I understand, has done everything it could possibly do to make the distribution of this money absolutely fair and without any favoritism to anybody, and purely along engineering lines?

Mr. DONDERO. Exactly that, and we have great confidence in the Army engineers in their use of this money.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for four additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. I might say that my district adjoins that of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]. I have a condition similar to that existing in the town of Bradford. In the town of Warren, with a population of 10,000, and Meadville and the immediate area, the flood conditions have caused estimated damages of $1,500,000. All the stream requires is channeling and dredging and widening, and I sincerely hope that the Army engineers, under this bill, will give consideration to the difficulties that exist in that particular part of Pennsylvania.

Mr. DONDERO. I suggest the gentleman contact the Army engineers in regard to that.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I want to pay my compliments to the gentleman and his committee in bringing out this legislation. I also wish to thank our chairman of the Committee on Appropriations for permitting this item to go in this deficiency bill today in order to speed it up. We have a terrible flood condition in the lower reaches of the Missouri River and in almost all of its tributaries. Levees have been washed out and destroyed, and, if we do not get at this matter quickly, millions of acres will be out of cultivation this year. I again want to thank the committee, and I hope the amendment will pass.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SHAFER. I think the gentleman is well aware of the situation that existed in Michigan this year as a result of the

LAW LIBRARY
FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

extraordinary rains in the Kalamazoo Valley.

Mr. DONDERO. Yes, I am. Some occurred in my district.

Mr. SHAFER. I have been in touch with the Army engineers, and they told me that I had to have special legislation passed for them to go into my district, to make the proper surveys, and to correct the situation as far as possible. Will this legislation take care of that? Can we expect the Army engineers to go into the Kalamazoo Valley?

Mr. DONDERO. They might, if they saw fit to do so, because there is no limitation except the provisions in the authorization bill.

Mr. SHAFER. Then by passing this legislation today it will not be necessary for me to submit individual legislation to provide for it?

Mr. DONDERO. I doubt it very much.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HOEVEN. I commend the gentleman and the members of his committee and the Committee on Appropriations for putting this item in the bill. It is absolutely essential that this be done on account of the situation in the Missouri Valley. Sioux City in my congressional district is classed as being in the critical area. We are very happy to know that this money is being appropriated.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The Mississippi River flood, as the gentleman knows, is just about to strike the part of Missouri I live in. We are going to have a lot of water down there. I should like to know if this money you are providing is applicable to the lower Mississippi as well as the breaks in other parts of the country.

Mr. DONDERO. There is no restriction on it whatever, except as stated. They can use it wherever they think the emergency demands in order to repair the damage done by recent floods.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. That is on tributaries as well as the main stream?

Mr. DONDERO. That is true.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I compliment the gentleman on taking that step in the interest of the welfare of our country.

Mr. MUHLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MUHLENBERG. Is it not possible that the gentleman may have misinterpreted the wording of the act that was passed? Was that not to repair only existing levees and things of that sort? Have you not interpreted it a little broadly, therefore? I believe it is more specific.

Mr. DONDERO. The language of the bill contains the words "repair, restoration, and strengthening of levees and other flood-control works."

Mr. TABER. Or that may be threatened or destroyed by later floods.

Mr. DONDERO. The language is rather broad. It leaves it to the judgment of the Army engineers as to how best this fund may be expended.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a counterpart of provisions carried in bills enacted in the two previous Congresses. On two occasions they were considered as separate resolutions and on other occasions were carried, as in this instance, as riders on deficiency bills.

The amendment provides for repairs to existing river improvements and emergency flood control throughout the United States, but applies particularly to the upper Mississippi River, which is much in the public eye at this particular time due to unprecedented flood damage from the upper reaches of the river to St. Louis.

Beginning in southern Iowa and on down to St. Louis, practically every town situated on the river is inundated. In Hannibal, for instance, the fourth largest city in Missouri, and in other Iowa, Illinois, and Missouri cities, streets are flooded, business is impeded, large areas are devastated, property has been destroyed, and lives have been lost.

Levees have been broken and fields are under water from Iowa down to the confluence of the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers.

The advantage of this provision is that it not merely takes care of the emergency at this particular time but preserves permanent river work which, unless supported, will result in permanent loss, and in the end will involve expenditures of many times the amount carried in the pending bill.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The gentleman made the statement a while ago that it applied to the upper Mississippi. The gentleman knows the flood is now past St. Louis or reaching St. Louis, and will soon pass down to the lower Mississippi. This money is available for breaks or damage that may be done on levees on the lower Mississippi as well as the other parts of the river? Is not that right?

Mr. CANNON. That is true. All sections of the river and its tributaries. In fact, it provides for emergency flood control wherever needed, throughout the United States.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I wanted that to be clear.

Mr. CANNON. It is especially applicable to the gentleman's section of the State where rich agricultural areas and expensive engineering projects should have protection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. I commend the committee on this prompt action in handling this matter. I think it is vitally needed. I notice by the press dispatches that there have already been more than 20 deaths from floods in these areas.

May I ask the gentleman if this appropriation will be available to any tributaries of the Mississippi, too?

Mr. CANNON. It will be applicable to emergency flood control in any part of the United States. Of course, the emergency which has brought about such prompt action at this time has been precipitated by the situation on the Mississippi, where unprecedented floods are sweeping down the valley and must have early attention.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. As has been indicated here, this is general in its application and under the discretion of the Army engineers to carry forward this work where it is needed?

Mr. CANNON. Yes, funds will be at the disposal of the Army engineers as heretofore. I might say in answer to the gentleman from Tennessee that the Board of Engineers advises us that funds which ordinarily are available to the Army engineers for this purpose have now been exhausted, and unless replenished by the pending amendment will leave the corps without means to meet the routine needs of the Department—much less to take care of the emergency requirements referred to in the debate here this morning.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am very glad that both the legislative committee and the Committee on Appropriations have acted so promptly in this very important and vital matter of flood-control protection. It shows that the House of Representatives can act speedily in an emergency.

This matter coming up recalls to my mind the fact that at the present time the Subcommittee on the War Department Appropriations is considering the very subject of flood-control appropriations for the fiscal year 1948. I do hope that the Committee will take to heart the lesson that is here before us today on how much damage floods can do not only to the homes and farms and industry of the country but to the very lives of the people. I do hope the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the War Department, having this matter under its jurisdiction, will not follow a policy of false economy by trying to cut down on flood-control appropriations. If we do that, I am sure it will not be for the best interests of the country. The whole country will be aroused next year if floods reoccur and if many projects which could have been completed are not completed because the committees were too economy-minded. I hope they will keep this in mind. Again I say I am glad that the committee acted expeditiously and wisely in this matter.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. I am glad to hear the distinguished and very able gentleman from the great State of Pennsylvania make the remarks that he has. I think it is false economy to cut down too much on flood control and on projects of this character. We often sustain a loss over and above our expenditures when we seek to economize falsely on projects of an internal character such as this.

I can recall in 1945 when we had an all-time record flood on the Red River. We sustained damages of something like $16,000,000 that year from the all-time record floods in that valley. We appropriated that year $15,000,000 for emergency purposes which shows that if we could have prevented that flood we would actually have saved in wealth more than we expended for floods all over the country in that year.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

In my own particular area when a flood occurs the loss in payment of corporate income tax and personal income taxes far exceeds the cost of flood-control projects. So that it is false economy not to complete those projects at the earliest practicable moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 102. The appropriations and authority with respect to appropriations contained in (1) any regular annual appropriation act for the fiscal year 1948, or (2) contained in other than a regular annual appropriation act for the fiscal year 1948, and being for such fiscal year, or (3) contained in other than a regular annual appropriation act for the fiscal year 1948, and being supplemental to an existing appropriation and for obligation after June 30, 1947, such acts not being laws on July 1, 1947, shall be available from and including July 1, 1947, for the purposes respectively provided in such appropriations and authority. All obligations incurred during the period between June 30, 1947, and the date of enactment of such appropriation acts as may not have been enacted on or before July 1, 1947, in anticipation of such appropriations and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms thereof.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the $12,000,000 appropriation recently enacted brings to mind some experiences I have had with flood disasters in my own district during the past 4 years. I might mention that during the past 4 years five small communities in my district were practically wiped out by floods.

I want to pass on to you gentlemen who are witnessing that experience now in your various districts that you are up against a stone wall in trying to get some aid for reconstruction or rehabilitation. It brings to mind how thoroughly inadequate are our Federal funds and our Federal laws when it comes to the aid of communities that have been stricken by a disaster of any kind.

In my district the little town of Mellen, where a power dam broke loose, was practically wiped out. Even when it came to getting equipment whereby the citizens of that community could reconstruct the community and pay for it themselves, they were handicapped. In other words, they could not even get priorities in the county in which the community was located, when they offered to pay for the equipment, for bulldozers and caterpillars and such machinery as that. They could not even get the necessary priorities approved by the War Assets Administration to get the equipment that they themselves offered to pay for with their own money, to reconstruct their community.

I call attention to this fact that those of you who are having the experience now, where your communities have been washed out as a result of floods, that there is nothing in the Federal appropriations today to help you. For instance, if a street has been destroyed in a community, there is no Federal aid of any kind available to reconstruct that street. The only aid that is available is where there is a Federal dam involved or a Federal highway involved. Then, of course, there are Federal funds available to help in the reconstruction. But I want to point out this fact, that what we need, in my judgment, is a Federal agency set up, with an appropriation, to come to the aid and rescue of communities which have been stricken by disasters. Our laws and our appropriation bills in that respect at the present time are entirely inadequate for that purpose. I think if we can offer to reconstruct the world, we can have a provision whereby we can reconstruct our own communities that have been stricken by disaster.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I agree with you, that rather than spend our money by the millions and the hundreds of millions doing everything to build up some war power in some other nation, we ought to try to help our own communities. But I do not want to go quite as far as the gentleman in that respect. If everybody came to the Federal Government to get money to do everything and repair all damages caused by floods, then you would break the Nation. We do not want to do that.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise, and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3791) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RULE MAKING IN ORDER HOUSE RESOLUTION 223

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 223, providing for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3492) to provide for the expeditious disposition of certain war housing, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3492) to provide for the expeditious disposition of certain war housing, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] and yield myself such time as I may use.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, this rule speaks for itself. It makes in order H. R. 3492, a bill from the Committee on Banking and Currency in reference to the disposition of certain wartime housing. It is very timely in my judgment that we should sell these houses to the citizens of this country and clean up this war mess just as fast as we possibly can. Turn the cash over to the Treasury and cut down expenses. This will be explained in full by members of the Banking and Currency Committee. I am sure this will be considered welcome on the floor of the House by the membership so that we may in orderly procedure dispose of the surplus property and do what is necessary to economize in the operation of our Government. We will secure the funds from the sale of these properties and return

this money to the Treasury of the United States and if we do the right thing so far as the business of the country is concerned we will turn over the money received from the sale of this surplus property to the Treasury in order that we can cut down the interest rate and make this really a good business administration. We must take the Government out of business and put more business methods in the operation of the Government.

OPPOSES HOUSING TRANSFER

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the rule has been explained by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] so I shall not waste any time on that. The bill that this rule makes in order will transfer from the National Housing Agency the authority to dispose of approximately 166,000 housing units contained in 520 projects to the Federal Works Agency. This housing is of a permanent nature and is really in about 300 different cities of the country. The amount that it cost to construct these housing units was close to $750,000,000. Under the bill the housing must be disposed of by December 31, 1948, and the Federal Housing Administration will be authorized to insure mortgages on such sales.

Preference is provided to veterans in buying this housing but it also allows corporations, associations and cooperatives to buy these properties containing many units and giving preference to two or three veterans who must exercise their option to buy from the private agency or agencies within 60 days, otherwise these private agencies can sell them to anyone.

WILL ENCOURAGE SPECULATION

I charge that this will enable these private agencies to speculate and will in the majority of instances deprive the veterans of the opportunity of obtaining these homes. Why should authority to dispose of these properties be taken away from the National Housing Agency and transferred to the Federal Works Agency, an agency which is not set up with experienced personnel to undertake this job? The National Housing Agency has been working on the disposition of this housing for nearly 18 months, and has already sold many of these dwellings and made commitments and is now in a position to act speedily.

I feel this transfer should not be made, as I honestly believe the Federal Works Agency cannot do the job as well as the National Housing Agency because the latter has the experience and knowledge and it has had jurisdiction for all these years. Instead of economy resulting it will cost the Government large sums of money by transferring this matter to the new agency. It does not tend toward economy.

I am interested in the veterans having the opportunity to obtain these homes, but under the wording of this bill I am fearful that the real-estate manipulators will obtain possession and the veterans will find themselves out on a limb.

This is substantial permanent housing we are disposing of here. They are occupied by tenants paying the Government fair compensation.

TRIUMPH OF THE REAL ESTATE LOBBIES

This legislation, Mr. Speaker, is the final triumph of the real estate lobbies which have bitterly fought every effort of the Government to help the unfortunate people who otherwise could have no decent shelter.

We all know that the Lanham Act itself was hedged around with all sorts of limitations written in by the real estate lobby.

But that was not enough for the unending avarice and malice of this high-pressure gang which can even libel the senior Senator from Ohio without laughing. When they have everything, they still want more.

Under the terms of this bill the Federal Public Housing Authority, the agency now clothed with the authority to administer and dispose of the Government's public housing projects—including the Lanham Act wartime construction—will be stripped of its jurisdiction.

Once more, and this time by the deliberate mandate of Congress at the instigation of special privilege, and not by the accident of emergency growth, the work of years in gathering all the Government's housing activities in a single efficient agency will be undone and the property dispersed. You all remember when 19 different housing agencies existed at one time.

HAVE LOBBIES OUTDONE THEMSELVES?

Mr. Speaker, it is unthinkable that a bill so obviously weighted toward the benefit of a few, at the expense of the many, should pass in this House; that this Congress should deliberately throw away all the gains of the last 14 years; yet it probably will pass.

I can only say that when the American people learn the full shame of this surrender to private greed, their rage will be enormous; and that knowledge will become a flaming issue just as the election campaigns of 1948 get under way, as the dead line for bids is reached in July 1948.

Do you on the Republican side think that then you can disclaim responsibility for giving away to inordinate avarice?

The true issue in many of the recent triumphs of business lobbies in Congress has been obscured by clouds of oratory and misrepresentation, by war-weariness and shortages and sheer boredom.

Here the issue is clear: Is this a government of the people, by the people, for the people; or is it a government of the people by profiteers for profiteers?

I have used the phrase, "invisible government," before to describe what is happening. Now the invisibility is wearing away. The deft hands of the real estate lobby have left highly visible fingerprints all over this bill. Why, you can almost hear their voices. It was for this and for other acts of legislative violence against the will of the people that manufacturers, wholesalers, builders, contractors, and realtors have been tapped, and tapped, and tapped again for a war chest.

BILL RAPES THE HOUSING PROGRAM

Others better informed than I, particularly the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency who signed the minority report, will explain later in more detail the full implications of this rape of the public-housing program; but I cannot resist some brief observations.

First, the legislation defies the recommendations of President Truman—and of every housing expert not bound to the lobby—that there should be a single, unified housing agency, and reverses the judgment of the late President Roosevelt and of three previous Congresses on that score. This bill scatters both administration and disposition all over the map—it gives a bit to every agency except FPHA, the one agency equipped with personnel and trained by experience to carry out the intent and mandate of the Lanham Act. The pressure boys like to have it scattered.

Administratively, on every count, the bill, if enacted, would be virtually unworkable.

This legislation pointedly ignores the existing set-up; pointedly ignores previous congressional directives; pointedly ignores the social and economic benefits of existing procedures. Its obvious intent is to discredit the public-housing program by setting up an impossible task.

The bill would waste all the work and time and effort and taxpayers' money already put into a carefully planned process of orderly and beneficial disposition.

SETS STAGE FOR NEW TEAPOT DOME

The bill repudiates provisions of the Lanham Act, and repudiates agreements already entered into with good faith on both sides based on previous congressional mandates. It presents an unconstitutional mandate which must be untangled by the courts.

But, worst of all, and most dangerous of all, it sets the stage for a new Teapot Dome scandal.

The disposition procedure set up in this bill is not only maliciously and intentionally cumbersome, but is so clearly against the public interest that even the most naive and trusting individual must have his suspicions aroused.

On the face of it, the bill has two major objectives which do not jibe:

First. To clear housing out of Government ownership with disorderly and undignified haste by December 31, 1948.

Second. To bring back to the Government the largest possible cash return.

The obvious effect of this is to open the way for disposing of almost three-fourths of a billion dollars in Government property at give-away prices to big interests who can put up that amount in cash, and at the same time crack the overinflated real-estate market by dumping and precipitate a near panic.

If any member should believe my words are too darkly prophetic, then let him read this bill with care and note the loose language, the conflicting objectives, and the calculated chaos to be wrought by the bill should it be enacted.

LIP SERVICE TO VETERANS MEANINGLESS

I believe in economy. I believe in the true economy of efficiency. This bill is another example of penny-wise, pound-foolish false economy which the Republican Party seems bent on making its own trade-mark. This bill will increase the cost of disposition of the property.

As for the sops tossed to veterans, they are meaningless lip service.

Veterans do not have such large sums of cash. Few of them have had an opportunity to build up bank credit, or to accumulate any collateral security for bank credits. It is much more likely that this legislation will enable greedy private operators to defraud the veterans, or at best to increase their cost of living sharply with increased rents or inflated prices.

We promised the veterans that when they fought their way out of the foxholes we would provide them with a decent place to live at prices they can afford to pay. Has the Republican Party utterly forgotten those fine promises, or is this just indifference, cold, callous, heartless indifference, to the brave men who risked their lives that America might live?

It is true that this bill provides for FHA guaranties on mortgages; and if this single provision is actually administered in the interest of the veterans it might be helpful. But this is only one of many provisions in the bill, and the net effect of the bill is so inimical to the public interest, and to the veterans' interest, that it ought not to be passed.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I am glad we have this rule called up and that we are to consider the legislation that will follow it. I direct the attention of the House to a situation that exists now insofar as Federal housing is concerned. In my own congressional district we have several projects built under the Lanham Act. Recently in one of the projects, in fact, in my home town, we find this situation: A duplex house, a two-family duplex, is occupied on one side by a war worker who has been in that house all during the war and is still there, and on the other side is a returned veteran who came back after VJ-day. The war worker is paying a rent $4.50 a month lower than that now being paid by the war veteran. You will find it all through those projects in that area, different rents for identical living quarters.

In that particular project, in some of the units the rents were set when the project was opened in January 1943 at $45 a month, including the utilities. In the summer of 1943 OPA was asked to review the project and they made a review. In November of 1943 they set higher rents for this Lanham housing project. It is my understanding that under the Lanham Act—and I wish the gentleman from Michigan would tell me if I am in error—the Federal Housing Administration is supposed to have charged a reasonable economic rent throughout the war period. Is that correct?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not know that I can answer the gentleman until I know in what category this particular housing is.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. The so-called Lanham Act permanent housing.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes; they must charge an economic rent, but the rent was set in conference between the Administrator of FPHA and the Administrator of OPA.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. In the case I am complaining of, OPA set a higher rent ceiling in the fall of 1943. Those increases were never made effective until after VJ-day. The result is that the returned veteran coming back and occupying that housing, as I said at the outset, is paying in some cases $4.50 a month more for the identical unit, the other half of a duplex house, than is being paid by the war worker who occupied it all the time.

Now it comes to the disposition of housing, and we are going to have a tremendous problem in those areas where there just are no vacant tenements at any price. You cannot evict the people that are in there to make that housing available for veterans. I think we are going to have a tremendous amount of confusion, or worse, now that the regional office in Boston has notified the housing authorities in those communities that they must now, 2 years after the war has ended, charge the maximum OPA rent ceiling. It is my understanding that under the OPA law there was no such thing as a minimum or a maximum rent; there was a rent ceiling. The result is that these veterans feel that during the war FPHA charged the war workers a lower rent, people who could well afford to pay a reasonable, economic rent, and the war veteran now coming back, and in at least 30 percent of the cases occupying that housing, is being called upon to pay a greatly increased rent above that which was paid by the war worker. In other words, in one project the rents have gone from $45, that was charged to war workers, up to $62.50; that is what they are now charging the war veterans. I can say to you that there is tremendous ill feeling among the occupants of these housing projects. I am glad this legislation is here, because I believe that as a result of this legislation we might get the Federal Government out of the picture altogether.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I have the language of the law in respect to the rents now, if the gentleman would care to have me put it in the RECORD.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I would like to have that in the RECORD.

Mr. WOLCOTT. It states:

Provided further, That the Administrator shall fix fair rentals, on projects developed pursuant to this act, which shall be based on the value thereof as determined by him, with power during the emergency, in exceptional cases, to adjust the rent to the income of the persons to be housed, and that rentals to be charged for Army and Navy personnel shall be fixed by the War and Navy Departments.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I can say to the gentleman that insofar as that area was concerned the war workers were well able to pay an economic rent. It now appears that the war veteran is being called upon to pay a substantially higher rent to make up the losses that occurred during the war.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, this bill purports to provide for the "expeditious disposition" of permanent war housing. It also purports to set up preferences to veterans in the sale of this housing.

Actually, this is a bill to expedite the movement of most of this permanent war housing into the hands of greedy real-estate speculators. Behind the smoke screen of preference to veterans these real-estate speculators would surely be the principal beneficiaries of this hasty, ill-conceived, and unworkable legislation.

There is another aspect of this legislation which merits the attention of the House. It appears to me that one of the main purposes of this bill is to disrupt the present vitally needed housing program. That is the only meaning I can place upon the provision of the bill which would transfer the authority and responsibility for the disposition of our permanent war housing from the National Housing Administrator to the Federal Works Administrator.

Certainly you do not expedite the disposition of war housing by taking the job away from the agency specially equipped with facilities and experience to perform it effectively, and by giving the job to another agency without the facilities or experience needed. And you certainly do not economize by an arrangement requiring the Federal Works Agency to set up an entirely new and duplicating housing organization. No; the only way this transfer makes sense is to recognize it as another effort on the part of the real-estate lobby to knife the housing program, which should be first in the minds of all of us today.

I think the House will be interested in the history of the transfer provision contained in this bill. If you have read the hearings conducted by the Banking and Currency Committee, you will note that the only witness recommending the transfer of our permanent war housing to the Federal Works Agency was one Mr. Morton Bodfish, representing the United States Savings and Loan League. Many of you are probably acquainted with Mr. Bodfish or are at least familiar with his reputation as one of the smartest lobbyists operating on Capitol Hill. The "kingfish" gets around a lot. And he certainly has been faithful in his attendance at the sessions of the Banking and Currency Committee. I understand he is the author of the "blackjack" clause in the "phony" rent-control bill passed by the House on May 1, the clause which permits the landlords to say to the tenants: "Sign for a 15-percent increase, or we'll slug you."

I am informed by one of the members of the Banking and Currency Committee that this "kingfish" was permitted to rise in the audience during the course of the hearings and question the Federal Home Loan Bank Commissioner with the same latitude as any member of the committee for almost an hour. And that although this did occur, the colloquy is strangely not printed in the committee hearings.

Mr. "Kingfish" Bodfish, who is always quite at home in committee hearings, appeared as the next to the last witness before the committee. Up to that time no witness during the hearings had suggested transferring the disposition of our war housing to the Federal Works Agency, and, of course, the committee then had no bill before it; the hearings were simply an exploration of the general

disposition problem. Mr. Bodfish proceeded to lecture the committee on his housing views, which are in line with those of the real-estate lobby generally. He then recommended that the disposition job be transferred to the Federal Works Agency and made other recommendations as to the methods of disposition.

All these recommendations appeared miraculously in this bill when it was finally introduced 24 hours before the committee voted to report it out—in fact, Mr. Bodfish's recommendations represent the core of this bill. There were no open hearings held on this bill; the hearings were closed more than a week before the bill was introduced. There was no effort made to get the views of Major General Fleming, the Federal Works Administrator, as to whether his agency is equipped to carry out this disposition job in a field totally unrelated to its present activities.

The real-estate lobby is in favor of this bill for two reasons: First, as I said, the bill will weaken the housing program by knifing the National Housing Agency; second, the bill will play into the hands of greedy real-estate speculators.

The speculators will have a field day with those war-housing projects which will have to be sold as projects rather than disposed of by individual sale of the individual buildings. I am advised that more than 300 of the 540 permanent war-housing projects will have to be sold on a project basis because of the nature of the buildings, the use of common utilities, or similar factors. For such project sales the bill extends a first preference to "any private corporation, association, or cooperative society which is the legal agent of veterans who intend to occupy the war housing purchased by such corporation, association, or society."

As I interpret this, the door is left wide open for real-estate speculators to become the eventual owners of these projects. In order to qualify for a preference does the membership of the corporation, association, or cooperative society have to be composed exclusively of veterans who will occupy all the dwelling units in the project. This would impose an almost impossible requirement; many of these projects are large and experience has shown that there is great difficulty in forming groups composed exclusively of veterans to purchase the larger housing projects. Consequently, few, if any, bona fide war veteran groups would be able to qualify for this preference if they had the money and the projects would have to be thrown open for sale to speculators in order to meet the December 31, 1948, sales deadline which this bill also sets up.

Does this language mean that any private organization serving as legal agent for two or more veterans would qualify for preference? If this is correct, then this provision is a joker and would be a direct invitation to speculators to form dummy corporations, with a handful of veterans as frontsmen, and thereby secure preferential rights for the purchase of projects containing 500 to 1,000 dwelling units.

I believe that our war veterans are entitled to a preference in these housing projects. I believe they are entitled to a real preference which will enable them to get the benefits of this housing under terms and conditions that will work. But the phony preference I have just described is no real preference at all; in combination with the requirements for cash sales and for disposal of all properties by December 31, 1948, it is merely a smoke screen for the acquisition of this housing by real-estate speculators. Do you suppose the mighty real-estate lobby has gone philanthropic?

The present bill would do another big favor for the real-estate lobby. It would absolutely ban local governments from acquiring projects for use as low-rent housing. The Lanham Act says that these projects may not be transferred to provide subsidized housing for persons of low income "unless specifically authorized by Congress." The insertion of that clause carried the clear intent that local governments would have the privilege of submitting requests to Congress for transfer of certain projects for postwar low-rent use if they so desired. In reliance upon that provision, 47 local governments have officially requested that 72 permanent projects containing over 18,000 dwellings be reserved from sale until formal requests can be submitted to the Congress for their transfer to low-rent use. A number of other cities and towns have been studying their housing situations to determine whether they wish to submit similar requests.

These local governments should have the opportunity to present these requests to the Congress, in accordance with the existing provisions of the Lanham Act, and to have the Congress pass upon them. I also call the attention of the House to the fact that the transfer of some of these projects to low-rent use, where the projects are suitable and needed for that purpose, would afford the only opportunity for low-income veterans and their families to get any benefit whatever from this permanent war housing. Certainly they will not get any benefit from the housing that is sold to speculators and most of them cannot afford to purchase any of the individual units themselves. The low-income veterans are the worst sufferers from the housing shortage. Yet this bill would completely foreclose the transfer of any of this housing to local governments for low-rent use. It would even deny these local governments any preference over real-estate speculators in the cash purchase of this housing at its appraised value.

The all-powerful real-estate lobby wants this bill to pass. It fits in with the lobby's attack against an effective housing program. It would give real-estate speculators the chance to buy a large volume of good housing at low price, with the prospect of reaping big profits from the lapsing of rent control and the continuation of the desperate housing shortage.

In the time allotted I have been able to cite only a few of the most glaring weaknesses of this bad bill. There are only two ways to correct this bill. One is to recommit it to the Committee on Banking and Currency. The other is to vote the bill down. I intend to do so.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Illinois care to yield further time?

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

DISPOSAL OF WAR HOUSING

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3492) to provide for the expeditious disposition of certain war housing, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3492) providing for the disposal of war housing, with Mr. BENDER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] is recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] for 1 hour.

The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, it will be recalled that under the Lanham Act we authorized the construction of certain permanent units as well as temporary housing accommodations. The bill before the committee today deals with the disposition of the permanent units only.

The law as it now exists requires the disposition of these permanent projects. The power to administer them and dispose of them rests in the Federal Public Housing Authority. These properties are owned by the Federal Government.

Along in February, as a result of some hearings before the Appropriations Subcommittee on Government Corporations, it developed that the Federal Public Housing Authority was disposing of these units in such a manner as to effectuate certain very doubtful policies. It came to our attention that the Administrator was entering into commitment contracts for the sale of these properties to cooperatives of tenants, with in some instances 5 percent down payment and a loan for the balance amortized for as long as 45 years at 3½ percent interest. We decided that we should take a look at this program; that if there was a question of policy involved, it was our duty and responsibility to formulate that policy, especially when there was an existing policy under which the properties would not finally be disposed of for from 40 to 45 years. We thought it was a matter of congressional duty to determine the standards under which these properties should be disposed of.

When we found out that Mr. Myer, the Commissioner, was reserving certain of these properties for sale to local housing authorities and municipalities, contrary as we thought, and still think, to the spirit and intent of the Lanham Act, we asked by a resolution passed by the joint

committee that he not dispose of any more of these projects unless he got cash for them until the House Banking and Currency Committee had an opportunity to study the matter and lay out a policy under which they should be disposed of.

That resolution was sent to Mr. Myer on February 25, 1947, in a letter, the resolution providing—

> That it is the sense of this joint committee that sales of permanent war housing units by the Federal Housing Authority be limited to such transactions as will return all proceeds of the sales in cash to the general fund of the Treasury of the United States at the time of the consummation of the sale.

It was very well understood by Mr. Myer and by the committee that this was a temporary arrangement, designed only to keep the matter in status quo by more or less mutual agreement, because, of course, the resolution did not have the effect of law. We said we would get to it within a reasonable time. We said that probably 60 days would be a reasonable time. And almost 60 days to the day, or a little better, we reported out a bill, after weeks of hearings and discussion.

I am still a little concerned that some might believe what the gentleman who preceded me said about the hearings. Here are the hearings; the open public hearings held on this matter. They contain something like 170 pages of testimony, questions and answers, and on page 1 is the list of the witnesses, and the exhibits which were submitted, and even a casual reading of the hearings by the gentleman should have even convinced him that there had been open hearings.

I would suggest for his reading the testimony of the chairman of the housing committee of the American Legion. The American Legion submitted to the Committee on Banking and Currency a plan, and the plan which we have provided for for the disposal of Lanham permanents in this bill follows not, of course, verbatim the recommendation of the American Legion, but in principle it is the American Legion proposal. So, it is quite satisfactory to them.

I wish that you might read the testimony of the Veterans of Foreign Wars by which we have been informed the bill is substantially in compliance with the recommendations made by the Veterans of Foreign Wars and is quite satisfactory to them.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I think it would be well to state that not only the American Legion but also the Veterans of Foreign Wars approve this bill in toto. I know of no serviceman's organization that is not in favor of this bill. I understand they are wholeheartedly in favor of it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I understand there is only one veterans' organization, the American Veterans Committee, that might be opposed to it.

Mr. JENSEN. Of course, the American Veterans Committee is not composed entirely of veterans. Anyone can join the American Veterans Committee. That is why they call it a committee, so most of us do not consider that a veterans organization.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. It seems to me that it is very apparent that the gentleman who preceded the present speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] simply had not read the hearings. Men of distinction and ability in this field appeared, as has now been pointed out by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN]. Men like Mr. Morton Bodfish and other able men appeared. That simply indicates, from what he said, that he had not read the hearings and was not familiar with the subject.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I might say for Mr. Morton Bodfish that he, as well as all other representatives of all segments of our economy who are interested in legislation pending before the Committee on Banking and Currency, will continue to receive a very courteous reception if he has any information to offer to the committee on any matter pending before the committee.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Is it intended by the language of section 9 to make valid agreements entered into by the Government with local housing administrations?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman is entirely correct. Section 9 was put in to continue oral as well as written contract which had been made previous to February 26 with respect to the disposition of these properties.

Mr. WALTER. In other words, it is intended to make oral contracts as binding as would be written contracts.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes.

Now, there is no question about the American Legion endorsing this legislation because it is virtually the proposal which they handed to the committee. I want to read what the Veterans of Foreign Wars had to say in a letter to me as chairman of the committee under date of May 20, 1947, the first paragraph of which reads as follows:

> On behalf of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, I would like to take this opportunity to thank you and the members of your committee for your realistic thinking in drafting the bill H. R. 3492. The several thousands of permanent war housing units that would be sold to veterans under the provisions of this bill will materially help veterans in the low-income brackets to obtain a home of their own at a price they can afford.

It is unfortunate that someone in the Federal Public Housing Authority gave out the information that the program which they had set up was a veterans' program. It was the opposite to a veterans' program. The only veterans who could possibly be benefited under the policy which was put into practice and had been in practice by the FPHA was that a veteran might be a tenant in one of the properties they were going to dispose of. A veteran who was not a tenant in the property to be disposed of was just as far out of this picture as if he had not been a veteran at all or lived a thousand miles away from the project. And, of course, even a veteran living in a project which was being reserved for transfer for low-rent use had no opportunity to purchase the property, or participate in its purchase.

Taking cognizance of the fact that somebody somewhere or other was using some broad powers under the Lanham Act to perpetuate the base upon which a socialized economy might eventually be built, taking cognizance of this fundamental problem which has confronted us in respect to housing ever since 1937, this committee did what I think to be the American thing at this particular time in setting up the standards under which these properties should be sold. We have set the program up in such a way, notwithstanding anything which the administrator of this act thinks to the contrary, under which we are giving the veterans real priority to acquire housing at the lowest possible cost. They should be able to buy these units on an average of something slightly more than $3,000. Have that in mind. Neither the veteran nor anyone else can build a house today or buy a house for less than $6,000 at the very minimum, in the North, anyway, where they must have basements. But here is an opportunity we have provided for the veterans to get good, permanent homes cheaper than they can buy them anywhere else. That is what we intended to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself ten additional minutes.

We provide that these properties shall be offered for sale first to veterans, and we provide also that where the project can be split up and sold as individual units they shall be split up and sold as individual units, so that the individual veteran can get a single home. I will not attempt to cover all of them, but there is a series of preferences covering a period of 180 days, even to the point of providing that the whole project must be set aside for veterans' groups, veterans' organizations, or those organizations which are set up as legal agents of veterans, so that a veterans' organization, a group of veterans, can get together and buy a whole project. There is nothing better in my perspective than that. It is something that should be done. In this case we assure them of shelter, we assure them a roof over their heads. The veterans have told us that they are very much more concerned with obtaining shelter than they are with listening to the demagogy which has been going on around here that the Government under the program up to the present time has been doing something for them. The veteran wants a home, not promises.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Will the chairman of the committee please explain how much money a veteran would have to have before he could buy one of these units?

Mr. WOLCOTT. He would have to have 10 percent because we have made

the properties eligible for FHA insurance, and the FHA can insure the mortgages at 90 percent.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. If the veteran has 10 percent of the purchase price, then he can buy the property?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Let us say that the unit is to be sold for $5,000, which should be much higher than the average. If the veteran has or can borrow from the Veterans' Administration or elsewhere $500, then he can have the balance of the mortgage insured by the FHA, and he can pay back the mortgage over a 20- or 25-year period.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Would the gentleman have any objection to an amendment providing that terminal leave bonds should be accepted as a first payment on these houses?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I can see no particular objection to it, although it is something that we have not discussed.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. The gentleman would not object to such an amendment?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I believe not. Personally, I cannot at this time see any objection to it.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Many of the veterans have the bonds and cannot use them. If they could use the bonds, and the gentleman would not object to such an amendment that the bonds be used as part of the purchase price, I think it would be rendering the veterans a service.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Inasmuch as the properties are being purchased from the Government, and the payment to the Government of the bonds would be ostensibly for the purpose of cashing the bonds, offhand I cannot see any objection to that.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. LYLE. In the event that a veteran does not file promptly, what is the procedure?

Mr. WOLCOTT. It is held for the veterans on a graduated scale for 180 days. It is held 30 days for veteran occupants. On page 6 it is provided that a veteran and his family who occupy a dwelling unit in the dwelling to be sold is given 30 days priority. You must read the language on page 6 and the language at the top of page 8 together.

The second priority is for a veteran and his family who do not occupy a dwelling unit in the dwelling to be sold but who intend to occupy a dwelling unit in the dwelling to be sold, and they have up to 60 days in which to purchase. That is, a veteran who does not live in the unit has a second priority up to 60 days.

The third priority is for a nonveteran who occupies a dwelling unit in a dwelling to be sold. That is for the protection of the present tenant. After these first two veterans' priorities are exhausted, then a nonveteran tenant has a third priority, and he gets up to 90 days in which to buy the property.

Then, a group of veterans can get together, let us say, of four families, and buy a four-family unit; or two families can buy a two-family unit. They are given priorities.

Next, organizations or groups of veterans or an organization which is a legal agent of veterans who intend to occupy the properties after the other priorities are exhausted are given a further 90 days.

The total is 180 days on priorities altogether.

After that, anybody may come in and purchase the priorities.

I might say also in response to the gentleman from New York in reference to low-rent housing as a slum clearance project, we have removed the prohibition in the Lanham Act. The enactment of this bill will remove the prohibition in the Lanham Act against purchase of these properties by local housing authorities for low-rental purposes. So he is altogether wrong in his assumption that we prevent in any manner local housing authorities from buying these properties for slum clearance. But we do say the veterans are going to have first preference, and we should insist on that.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. KEAN. A public housing authority will have no priority against the ordinary real-estate speculator in buying one of these properties?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No.

Mr. KEAN. They will have to go into the market and take a chance with everybody else?

Mr. WOLCOTT. They will have to take a chance with everybody else after the priorities have been exhausted.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. I do not find anything here with reference to competitive bidding, or requiring it to be sold to the highest bidder. I wonder whether it would be the practice, in case of two veterans of equal priority, or two veterans' organizations with equal priority, or in case there were no veterans, to have some plan so that these properties would go to the best bidder.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The way it has been handled up to the present time, they draw for them, if everything was equal, but there were so very, very few cases in which they would be equal that we did not make provision for it. In the priorities up to the category of veterans' organizations there cannot be any conflict there, because there is either a veteran occupant of the project to be sold or a veteran nonoccupant. If you are a veteran and live in the property you want to buy that gives you the higher priority. If you are a veteran who does not live in the project, of course that is the second category. There is no conflict there. You are out of the project and, as opposed to a veteran who is living in the project, the veteran living in the project is given the higher priority. So that there is no conflict until you get to the fourth category, where we provide for the creation of the veterans' organization. That can be done by negotiated bid, with the proviso that the purchase price of the property shall not be less than the appraised value placed upon the property by the FHA appraisers or appraisers employed by them.

Mr. VORYS. I understood that the second priority would be a veteran and his family who did not live in the project, but who wanted to.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is right.

Mr. VORYS. There might be a number of such veterans, and I have wondered whether the plan was to take up first come first served, or whether a fair way would not be to let them bid.

Mr. WOLCOTT. They may be all negotiated bids.

Mr. VORYS. What is a negotiated bid?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Well, it is the opposite of an open bid. You can negotiate with them for a price. You can get all the people together and say, "How much will you pay for it, Mr. A?" and he says, "$5,000." "How much will you pay, Mr. C?" and he will say, "$5,500." Or they can sit down with an individual and sell the properties at a negotiated price.

Mr. VORYS. Would the preference be between two veterans who came under class 2, who did not live there but wanted to? Would the preference be for the highest bidder or the one who came in first? It seems to me there should be some arrangement made.

Mr. WOLCOTT. It could be either way. You will not run into that very often. We should have in mind that, under the provisions of the bill these matters can be handled under regulations in respect to conditions of the sale, which the Administrator is authorized to promulgate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Would there be any preference in the case of a veteran who was occupying a multiple dwelling now and wanted to buy some other unit in that project?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. He is not living in the project, but he wants to buy a single unit in that same project.

Mr. WOLCOTT. He would come within the second category of preferences.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. He would lose his first priority if he wanted to buy another house?

Mr. WOLCOTT. It is very obvious that in the administration of the act, if a man did not want to buy the particular accommodation he was living in, and wanted to buy another in the same project it would follow that he would be given a priority.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. He would be practically at the head of the list in No. 2?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Following through on the suggestion of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN], would there be any objection to accepting an amendment which would provide preference to local governments and State governments, to come in between the veterans'

preferences and the time when this is thrown out to any bidder? Would there be any objection to giving the State and local governments a preference in there?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not think I would want to answer that offhand. I would want to see the amendment before I pass on that.

Mr. JAVITS. I will submit it to the gentleman.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think the gentleman has such an amendment.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. LYLE. Subparagraph (b) on page 4 provides for the sale of these houses at a price of not less than the reasonable value at the time of the offer for sale. It occurs to me this provision will make it prohibitive for the average veteran to purchase one of these units, because if they are valued upon the basis of other real estate in the same area they will be literally about three times what their actual value is.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is just one of the factors in determining a reasonable value.

Mr. LYLE. The thing is that they are now probably three times as high as property was when they sold their property when they went in the Army.

Mr. WOLCOTT. No; I do not think these projects would be sold at any such valuation under these priorities to veterans. They should be able to buy these properties for much less than they could buy a house for now. They could buy one of these homes at a price comparable to what they sold their home for when they went into the service.

Mr. LYLE. I think that is probably the intention. My fear is that it will not work.

Mr. WOLCOTT. We went into that matter very carefully, and this is the language we thought was the fairest and which gave the most latitude to do the job that we thought ought to be done.

We have full faith and confidence in FHA to do the job we want done, and we have full faith and confidence in the present Administrator of the FHA to do a very sensible job in respect to the appraisals. I say that calling attention at the same time to the fact that he is not of my political faith; but I think that Ray Foley is one of the most honest, most conscientious, efficient, and outstanding administrators whom we have in Government service today.

Mr. LYLE. I agree with the gentleman there. The gentleman should stress the fact that it was the intention of his committee that the veterans get possession of these houses in some way so they would not have to pay prices two and three times their value, and not have to bid on them on the basis of today's market on real estate in the area.

Mr. WOLCOTT. It is not based on today's market. That is the reason why we are so general in this language and expect the FHA to take into consideration the value of this property over a long period of time with all the ups and downs in values that are to be expected will occur in the 25 years over which they are to be amortized. They do not take it at a replacement value or at present market value.

It was our contention that FHA should take into consideration the fact that there might be a decline in the real estate market before the termination of the period within which the property was to be paid for.

Mr. LYLE. If the gentleman's committee does that they are rendering the veteran a great service.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That was our intention.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. FOLGER. I believe the committee adopted the word "reasonable" instead of "present market value" in view of the abnormal prices and knowing and having been told that the policy had been established by the appraisers to take into consideration the abnormal conditions that obtain now not to fix the price but to take consideration of conditions.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman is correct. The gentleman himself argued that that should be our intention and presented some language to carry out that intention. I am glad to have the gentleman make that contribution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself one additional minute.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Could not the legal agent of a veteran or veterans make some kind of deal whereby the veteran could obtain housing? It occurs to me that many veterans probably are not able individually to arrange for these larger units or buildings that have several units in them. Is there any limitation as to how much the legal agent can make percentagewise?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The veterans interested in a certain property would have to appoint their own agent. There could not be such a thing as a corporation which could claim to be the agent of all the veterans interested in the project. The law of agency would step in then and say that there was no contract between the principal and the agent. There must be a very definite contract.

Mr. BECKWORTH. The gentleman has no fear that so-called legal agents may be privileged to make a high percentage of profit?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No; the agent cannot act for the principal until he has been hired for that purpose. On these big projects, therefore, in order to effectuate a fraudulent deal in respect to the project, they would have to conspire with almost as many veterans in the locality as there were units in the project, which would seem impossible.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we are again confronted with that very perplexing problem—housing. The Lanham Act provided that these houses which we are providing for the disposition of and which were erected for an emergency purpose be disposed of when the urgent need for them for the purposes for which they were constructed no longer existed. I am in favor of disposing of these properties, I am in favor of giving the veterans every priority and preference in the purchase of these houses, and I think it is very important that we sell these properties as soon as possible.

The housing situation is still acute in the United States and the housing situation is one of the most important things with which we have to deal, not only for the comfort and happiness of the people, but the home is the foundation of our society and the more good homes we have in America the more stable will be our institutions.

I do not think anybody is opposed to the sale of these properties. It is a question of how these properties shall be sold.

Since 1942 the Federal Public Housing Authority had control of these properties under the jurisdiction of the National Housing Agency, of which Mr. Foley is Chairman. They built the properties, they know where they are located, they know who occupies them, they know their worth. Now, why should we take the sale of these properties from the Federal Public Housing Agency and place it in the Federal Works Agency?

We are told that Mr. Myer has some peculiar ideas, that he does not conform to the wishes of the Congress. But are we going to make a pattern of government to meet the peculiar ideals and the peculiar wishes of individuals? It seems to me you cannot find a valid argument for such a course.

The Federal Public Housing Authority ought to have control of the sale of this property. General Fleming was not heard by the committee. But it is obvious that he has neither the organization nor personnel to carry out the purposes of this law. If it is transferred to the Federal Public Works, an organization would have to be perfected, personnel will have to be employed, all of which will take time. We put a time limit on the disposition of these properties. They must be sold by December 31, 1948. For the expeditious sale of these properties it is necessary to place them in an agency that is organized to sell them, that has the knowledge of them, and that can proceed immediately.

It seems that the only argument to take this power away from the Federal Public Housing Administration is the fact that some of the Members of Congress believe their views are contrary to the wishes of Congress and believe they will not carry out the purposes of the legislation. While we certainly ought not to change legislation to meet the varying views of the individuals, the way to meet that condition is to discharge the people who do not carry out the wishes of Congress. I express no opinion on this subject. I assume that the Federal Public Housing Authority will carry out the mandate of Congress.

The President on May 27 sent his housing reorganization plan to the Congress. The 60 days within which the Congress can act on that plan has not

expired. The passage of this act is congressional action upon that plan. That plan is not susceptible of amendment but this, in effect, amends it, and I think this act, if passed, like a lateral attack without hearing, will sabotage the President's housing plan. That plan was to organize and coordinate the various housing agencies to prevent overlapping and duplication of functions. Certainly, the President's plan deserves an independent investigation and an independent hearing, and by the adoption of this act as now drawn it takes away that right and authority of the Congress. I am sure the Congress does not want to sabotage a plan proposed by the President in that manner. The action is within the 60 days. It is an amendment to the plan. It changes the whole picture, something that was not contemplated by the President. It makes his plan now a nulliity, and for that additional reason I ask you to vote down this amendment.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. Do I understand from the gentleman's remarks that the President's reorganization program specifically includes the matter contained in this legislation?

Mr. SPENCE. No; it does not exactly include the matter, but it reorganizes the housing agencies of the Government. It does not delegate to the Federal Works Agency any authority over housing. The President presented a comprehensive plan for the reorganization of these agencies. We either have to adopt that plan in its entirety, without change, without amendment, or reject it. If this passes before that plan has been acted upon within the 60 days within which the Congress has the authority to act upon it, it changes the whole picture of housing.

Mr. CARROLL. In other words, this bill now is premature?

Mr. SPENCE. It is premature, unless you want to sabotage the plan presented by the President, without independent consideration directly of his plan. I do not think it would sabotage it at all if all of these authorities were placed back in the housing agencies, because he dealt only with the housing agencies, but here we take a substantial part of the housing jurisdiction and place it in the Federal Works Agency. It seems to me it is obvious that that nullifies the plan of the President.

Mr. CARROLL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I do not pose as an authority on housing or many of the problems presented in this bill. I say at the outset that it is not my intention to attempt in any way to jeopardize the objectives of the committee in reporting this legislation. However, I requested this time to try to clarify a situation that is particularly important to me because of the fact I have in my district a housing project which has all but been disposed of. It has been in its final stages ever since the first of the year. The people involved have put in a great deal of effort and time and in fact money to bring the matter to a head. I am very deeply concerned that unless some amendment or some provision is put into this bill to correct the situation all of their efforts will be of no avail. I do not think it is the intention of this Congress to jeopardize those cases where people have definitely proceeded under the assumption that the Government would do a certain thing and relying on the representations of the Government have expended money and changed their status.

I should like to propound this question by way of setting forth the circumstances that exist in the particular case in my district. The project I have in mind is the Custerdale project, called Wis.-47011. The project was built at the city of Manitowoc, Wis., in connection with the shipbuilding activities in that city. Probably many of you are acquainted with the submarines that were built on Lake Michigan, in the center of our country, during the war. You are acquainted with the great job that was done by the workmen there in producing these submarines. The people occupying these homes are those who worked in the shipyards in this city. They are good, honest, sincere, working Americans. When they found that this project was to be disposed of to somebody in some method, they inquired as to what could be done whereby they as individuals could prochase the property. It so happens that because of the zoning regulations and building codes of the city of Manitowoc the dwellings as they presently are could not be acquired by individuals. They have to be moved to new locations, so that the street planning conforms to the city plan, and so forth. I call attention to the text of a resolution adopted by the City Council of Manitowoc on December 16, 1946. This resolution shows some of the conditions that must be complied with before private ownership will comply with the laws and regulations of that community.

This resolution shows why it is necessary for them to organize and buy as a group rather than try to buy individually.

Whereas the United States of America, acting through the Federal Public Housing Authority, proposes to dispose of the housing property, including 400 family units, known as "Custerdale Project WIS-47011"; and

Whereas the city of Manitowoc is advised that under existing Federal statutes, regulations, and appropriation acts it will be necessary that the property be sold for its fair value as it now exists without improvement of structures or changes in locations of buildings or improvements; and

Whereas the building code, the planning and platting regulations, and the zoning ordinance of the city of Manitowoc require standards to which the Custerdale project does not now conform, and

Whereas sale of the Custerdale project to a mutual ownership corporation organized by occupants of the project and nonresident veterans is proposed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the city of Manitowoc approves a proposal to offer the project WIS-47011 to a mutual ownership corporation currently known as the Custerdale Home Owners Club, and that the city hereby waives its prior rights to acquire this project from the Government in favor of this corporation or group, but reserves its priority in the disposition of the project if this sale is not consummated; be it further

Resolved, That in the event of a sale to the Custerdale Mutual Ownership Corp. the following, and no other minimum requirements be made with respect to the platting of the property and relocation of the houses, and with respect to improvements in the structures and minimum deed requirements.

1. That the Mutual Ownership Corp. will, within a period of 5 years, relocate the housing in the project according to the approved replat of the subdivision. However, this period of 5 years may be extended by the city of Manitowoc if general economic conditions prove this time period not feasible.

2. That inasmuch as the underground utilities are substandard, that the street layout does not conform with the adopted master plan or the planning and platting regulations of the city of Manitowoc, that the location of buildings, the yard areas, and so forth, do not meet the minimum requirements of the zoning ordinances; that strict compliance with these minimum standards must obtain within the time limit outlined in the above paragraph.

3. That in the relocation of these houses, all regulations of the building and plumbing code shall be followed. The two major items requiring correction at the time of relocation are:

(a) Lack of basements, or foundations to frost line.

(b) Lack of masonry chimney with flue linings.

4. That the articles of incorporation of the Mutual Ownership group shall be reviewed and approved by the city of Manitowoc before actual incorporation, and before the sale of the housing property by the Federal Government to the corporation is consumated.

5. That before the corporation shall convey said real estate by deed or contract the above minimum requirements must be fully complied with; be it further

Resolved, That after the approval of the articles of incorporation and before the actual sale of the project to the corporation, the city of Manitowoc shall approve the type of a deed or contract to be given by the Federal Government to the corporation to insure that the provisions of this resolution will be executed.

ED. KLUSMEYER.

Dated December 2, 1946.
Adopted December 16, 1946.

It certainly is apparent that these people cannot comply with the various regulations as long as they act individually. Under representation made by the Federal Public Housing Administration and in accordance with regulations set up by the agency, these people got together and worked out an arrangement whereby they would jointly take care of these obligations that the city imposed in order to live up to the building restrictions, and so forth, and they would buy them as a mutual ownership corporation or organization and then they, as individuals, could acquire individual ownership of the property. They hired counsel. They went to a great deal of trouble and work, and now everything is all set. They have been negotiating with the Government for over a year. Everything has been done except the fixing of the price. They have had appraisals by the local groups, and on the 1st of February they were all set for a Government appraiser to fix the price. Of course, since then everything has remained in the status quo in view of the request of the committee that the Housing Authority discontinue any further commitments.

That is the way the case stands today. Really, all that has to be done is to find the value of this property and determine whether or not the organization is then willing to purchase it at that price.

Mr. Chairman, I am afraid of what will happen, and I ask the chairman or some other member of the committee what will happen in the event of the enactment of this bill to the arrangements that these people have entered into and what will happen to the property, in view particularly of the fact that the property does not conform to the very definite building restrictions and, therefore, cannot be sold under any circumstances to individuals because individuals, as such, cannot buy the property in violation of these building code restrictions.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I may say to the gentleman that unless a firm commitment was made for the sale of the project previous to February 26, 1947, the project would come within the terms of this bill, and if the negotiations carried on up to the present time were contrary to the standards and priorities set up in the bill, they would have to be canceled. But in respect to the gentleman's project, I might call attention to the fact that I am informed there are 94 single dwelling units and 153 duplexes. So it should not be too difficult for the individuals to buy the properties. If the city or municipality has zoning ordinances that do not permit this type of project, before the project is sold, in any event it would have to be put in condition where they comply with the zoning ordinances or the zoning ordinances would have to be amended. In many instances we find that they have to rebuild some of these properties when they are sold at private sale to comply with local health regulations, and that would have to be done in this particular case.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I hate at any time to burden the membership of the committee with any lengthy discussions on my part, but there are some 300 to 400 units involved here and these people are very definitely concerned. It is because of that that I wanted to get this straightened out to the best satisfaction of these people, and for their individual interests. There are more than 75 or 100. There are 400 units involved. One hundred of them will definitely have to be sold off the site. They have got to get rid of this. There is no question about that. However, there are 300 that will remain in the site. They have to be moved around in order to conform with street lay-outs, and so forth. You are not going to sell that to any individual, be he veteran or anybody else, except as you sell it to move it off of the property. Who is going to pay for it under those circumstances?

The only way this property can be sold to individuals at the present time is through the mutual-ownership organization that has been negotiating for the purchase.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] has again expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, this bill deals with a problem of great importance, not only to many individuals but to many communities. It is a subject that should be given very careful consideration by the whole Congress in accordance with the best advice available.

First, it should be remembered that responsibility for disposition of this housing was placed by the Congress in April 1942 with the National Housing Administrator. The law contemplated his delegating the operating task and the legislative history clearly revealed that delegation to the FPHA was expected—that being the logical agency from the standpoint of available field organization and previous engagement in related tasks.

The former administrators of the NHA made and continued the delegation, retaining general supervision of policy. Those matters were known to the previous Congress.

The present Administrator, Raymond M. Foley, after his appointment a few months ago, reviewed the situation, and concluded that conditions existent today were widely different from those recognized when existing laws were passed. He felt that the problems of veterans' preference, the housing shortage affecting veterans especially, the nature of some of the housing projects themselves, the growing interest in mutual and cooperative ownership associations, the inflation in housing prices—all created a situation in which there was room for differences of opinion in interpretation of existing law as to the intent of Congress on disposition matters. He held conferences with FPHA Commissioner Dillon Myer, as a result of which a request was made of the Appropriations and Banking and Currency Committees of the House for advice. Interim advice was given in a letter to Mr. Myer and the subject thus opened was made the topic of public hearings at which Mr. Foley and Mr. Myer both testified.

Mr. Foley made it very clear that he wished the further advice of Congress and that it was his earnest desire to be sure that the intent of Congress would be followed out. Mr. Foley is a man of long and successful experience in governmental administration. He gave every evidence of an active interest and desire to supervise the disposition operation in accordance with the desires of Congress.

It should be remembered that these hearings were all on the general problem of disposition, before a bill was drawn. It should be known to the House that there have never been any public hearings on the bill now before you. This bill, in spite of the importance of the subject, was referred to committee on one day and reported out the next. It bears within it the most conclusive evidence of hasty drafting and brief consideration.

It transfers from the National Housing Administrator to the Federal Works Administrator the entire matter of disposition and jurisdiction over 166,000 units of permanent war housing. I protest the proposed transfer as ill-considered, wasteful, and damaging to the public interest. The bill is ill-considered, because there was never any inquiry by the committee as to whether the Federal Works Agency is equipped in any way to handle the task. The committee neither sought nor received any advice or information from the Administrator from FWA. It was inspired solely, in that particular, by a determination to reduce the scope of activities of the FPHA.

The bill is wasteful—because the fact is that FWA has no organization, personnel, or equipment for the task and has not had since 1942. If this bill is passed, FWA will have to set up an organization largely duplicating that of NHA and FPHA because the latter agencies still will have responsibilities for management and disposition of a great deal of other housing all over the Nation.

The bill is contrary to the public interest because it will in its effect run exactly counter to aims long expressed in this and previous Congresses—economy, simplification, and elimination of overlapping and duplication in governmental operation.

But the evidence of hasty, ill-considered action is not confined to the transfer sections of the bill. If I were the administrator of any agency, I would protest being given the impossible task contemplated in this bill.

This bill imposes two iron-clad requirements on the Federal Works Administrator with respect to the permanent war housing transferred to him. First, he is required to sell all this housing for cash as expeditiously as possible but in any event not later than December 31, 1948. Second, he is required to sell this housing at a price not less than its reasonable value as determined by an appraisal made by the Federal Housing Administration.

There are no if's, and's, or but's about these two requirements. The Federal Works Administrator is ordered by this bill to obey both of them, even though they may well prove to be mutually contradictory. What is he to do if he cannot find cash buyers for any part of this housing at the price set by the FHA? The bill is completely silent on this point. It grants no exceptions and makes no allowance for administrative discretion.

Members of the House, how would you like this assignment? How would you like the responsibility for disposing of 160,000 housing units on this basis? You would have to have them appraised by another agency of Government. You would have to set the price at that appraisal figure. You could sell none of them for any less than that figure, but you would have to sell all of them for cash before December 31, 1948. And you would have to operate under a system of rigid holding periods for various preference categories of prospective purchasers. In the case of large projects, which will have to be sold as single entities, you

would have to give an ambiguously defined group of corporations, associations, or cooperative societies acting as legal agents for veterans 6 months' time to present an offer.

And how would you like the task, quite likely to arise in an effort to meet the dead-line date in this bill, of trying to get a lower price fixed by arguing with an appraiser that his figure of value was wrong because no one had appeared to buy at that price before a date arbitrarily fixed by Congress.

Yet this bill very wisely, I think, relies upon the Federal Housing Administration and its commissioner to make those appraisals—expressing the greatest confidence in them. And well it may. The Federal Housing Administration has won the confidence of the Congress and the Nation by its appraisal and mortgage-insurance practices.

It has not won that confidence by employing staffs who will obligingly change an appraisal figure to fit the fact that a sale is not made under it by a given date. Yet if the agency to whom this job is given is to carry out that job—assuming it were otherwise possible, which I doubt—it might be able to do so only by requiring that sort of subservience from FHA appraisers. It will be a sorry day for real estate, for lenders, borrowers, and the whole public if the Commissioner of FHA ever permits such an attitude with respect to appraisals by his agency.

But even this is not all. Congress has carefully recognized in the original laws on this subject that the Army, the Navy, and other governmental agencies may have real need for some of these housing projects and authorized the administrator to make transfers to them upon showing of such need. Where are they recognized in this bill?

And still further—the communities in which this housing was built have great and geographically varying interest in the manner and time of its disposition. Previous law recognized that. Where are they adequately recognized in this bill?

Members of the House, I have seldom seen a subject of such great importance dealt with so cavalierly, with such evidence of haste, such intemperance of handling as is demonstrated here.

I believe Administrator Foley was right in asking Congress for more specific definition of its desires in the face of new conditions. But neither do I doubt, if given such definitions, the Administrator in whom the majority report expresses such great confidence as the result of his work as FHA Commissioner will make an equally conscientious record in his new additional task as administrator in general supervision of this disposition job.

I have no doubt, on the other hand, that any administrator, no matter who he may be, would find himself confronted with an impossible task under this contradictory, wasteful, hastily concocted measure.

I agree that we need a new expression of congressional desires on many of the new problems of disposition. I agree that the disposition in most cases should be expedited and that it can now be more speedy than it was or could be in the past. I support every possible, feasible preference for veterans in such instructions. I am in accord with cash transactions so far as possible.

But this bill is so badly conceived that to amend it into proper shape on the floor would be a very difficult task. Even after striking out the transfer provisions we would still confront a contradictory hodge-podge. I believe it should be recommitted.

States wherein Lanham permanents are located

	Number of projects, by States
Region I:	
Connecticut	38
Maine	7
Massachusetts	8
New Hampshire	3
Rhode Island	2
Vermont	2
Region II:	
Delaware	1
Maryland	14
New Jersey	8
New York	17
Pennsylvania	62
Region III:	
Illinois	18
Indiana	16
Iowa	4
Missouri	5
South Dakota	2
Wisconsin	2
Region IV:	
Alabama	22
Florida	14
Georgia	13
Mississippi	6
North Carolina	8
South Carolina	8
Tennessee	7
Virginia	16
Region V:	
Arkansas	9
Colorado	2
Kansas	6
Louisiana	7
New Mexico	2
Oklahoma	3
Texas	22
Region VI:	
Arizona	2
California	40
Nevada	2
Utah	4
Region VII:	
Alaska	4
Idaho	1
Oregon	13
Washington	26
Region VIII:	
Kentucky	3
Michigan	11
Ohio	23
West Virginia	3
District of Columbia only	17
Region general (includes Alexandria, Va., Arlington, Fairfax)	7
Other outlying districts in Maryland	8

Projects requested by community for low-rent transfer, based on central office approval of Form 1279, as of Apr. 4, 1947

State	Project No.	Location	Project name	Number of units	Date of community request
Connecticut	6041	Waterbury	Hamilton Heights	178	June 10, 1946
Do	6031	New Britain	Hedgecrest	300	Jan. 4, 1947
Do	6032	do	Sunvale Manor	200	Do.
Do	6061	Stratford	Stonybrook Gardens	400	Jan. 10, 1944
Do	6213	Waterbury	Warner Gardens	122	Dec. 27, 1947
Rhode Island	37013	Newport	Lonomy Hill	538	Jan. 9, 1947
Maryland	18095	Baltimore	Lyon Homes	304	Jan. 16, 1947
Do	18096	do	Fairfield Homes	300	Do.
Do	18097	do	Brooklyn Homes	500	Do.
Do	18098	do	Westport Homes	200	Do.
New Jersey	28044	Camden	Chilton Terrace	200	Nov. 27, 1946
Do	28111	Phillipsbury	Heckman Terrace	250	Dec. 10, 1946
Do	28072	Newark	Bradley Court	301	Jan. 29, 1947
New York	30031	Buffalo	LaSalle Court	206	Dec. 16, 1946
Do	30032	do	Longfield Homes	594	Do.
Do	30033	Buffalo-Lackawanna	Albright Court	200	Oct. 29, 1946
Do	30034	Buffalo-Niagara Falls	Griffin Manor	300	Dec. 14, 1946
Do	30039	Buffalo-Lackawanna	Redgewood Homes	400	Oct. 29, 1946
Do	30042	Elmira	Hoffman Heights	144	Oct. 15, 1946
Do	30071	Buffalo-Niagara Falls	Griffin Manor	450	Dec. 14, 1946
Do	30078	Buffalo	Talbert Court and Carver Apartments.	115	Dec. 16, 1946
Pennsylvania	36021	Erie	Franklin Terrace	500	Nov. 13, 1946
Do	36031	Williamsport	Penn Vale	250	Dec. 20, 1946
Do	36061	Elwood City	Walnut Ridge Homes	100	Nov. 27, 1946
Do	36101	Pittsburgh	Glen Hazel Heights	999	Dec. 5, 1946
Do	36041	Allentown-Bethlehem	South Terrace Homes	320	Nov. 13, 1946
Do	36042	do	Parkridge Homes	168	Do.
Do	36044	do	do	12	Do.
Do	36272	Coatesville	Brandywine Homes	150	Dec. 14, 1946
Do	36273	do	Carver Homes	100	Do.
Indiana	12071	Fort Wayne	Miami Village	75	Dec. 27, 1946
Illinois	11081	Alton	Job Homes	150	Dec. 26, 1946
Do	11082	do	Job Homes Addition	200	Do.
Do	11111	Rockford Township	Nocomo Heights	80	Jan. 3, 1947
Do	11112	Rockford	Central Ter	50	Do.
Do	11113	Rockford Township	Victory Homes	200	Do.
Alabama	1072	Childersbury, Sylacauga	Sylavon Ct	150	Dec. 27, 1946
Do	1061	Gadsden	Campbell Ct	150	Dec. 10, 1946
Do	1062	do	Starnes Park	100	Do.
Do	1076	Childersbury, Sylacauga	Sylavon Ct Extension	75	Dec. 27, 1946
Florida	8121	Lakeland	West Lake Addition	60	Jan. 23, 1947
Georgia	9011	Augusta	Oglethorpe Homes	75	July 13, 1946
Do	9042	Savannah	Bartow Pl	150	Dec. 17, 1946
Do	9071	Albany	Bennes Homes	100	Dec. 5, 1946
Mississippi	22041	Meridian	Oakland Heights Village	100	Feb. 4, 1947
North Carolina	31023	Wilmington	Hillcrest	90	Dec. 17, 1946
Do	31024	do	Hillcrest Extension	126	Do.
Do	31041	Charlotte	Jackson Homes	85	May 7, 1946

Projects requested by community for low-rent transfer, based on central office approval of Form 1279, as of Apr. 4, 1947—Continued

State	Project No.	Location	Project name	Number of units	Date of community request
South Carolina	38041	Spartanburg	Camp Croft Ct	110	Dec. 17, 1946
Do	38042	do	Spartanburg Defense Homes	10	Do.
Do	38061	Charleston	Kiawah Homes	60	Aug. 23, 1946
Tennessee	40011	Nashville	Vine Hill	300	Dec. 16, 1946
Virginia	44074	Newport News	Oak Leaf Park	300	Dec. 27, 1946
Do	44075	Norfolk-Portsmouth	Liberty Park	900	Do.
California	4121	Camp Roberts	Oak Park	150	Sept. 12, 1946
Do	4031	Fresno	Funston Pl	150	Oct. 17, 1946
Do	4141	Taft	Victory Sq	72	Do.
Do	4161	Bakersfield	Kern Homes	85	Do.
Do	4171	Richmond	Atchison Village	450	Oct. 8, 1946
Do	4174	San Francisco	Atchison Village Annex	100	Feb. 11, 1947
Oregon	35021	Portland	Dekum Ct	85	Apr. 10, 1946
Washington	45131	do	Kirkland Heights	300	Nov. 25, 1946
Do	45132	do	Lake View Ter	100	Do.
Do	45133	do	White Center Heights	600	Do.
Do	45052	do	Ranier Vista Homes	500	Dec. 23, 1946
Do	45053	Seattle	High Point	700	Do.
Do	45054	do	Holly Park	900	Do.
Do	45055	do	High Point addition	250	Do.
Do	45056	do	do	350	Do.
Do	45121	Portland-Vancouver	McLaughlin Heights	503	Dec. 27, 1946
Ohio	33021	Cincinnati	Valley homes	350	Jan. 20, 1947
District of Columbia	49044	Washington D. C	21st St. homes	36	Dec. 31, 1946
Total units				18, 178	

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE].

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, in considering H. R. 3492, no one can escape the conviction that it materialized solely as the product of expediency. Legislative expediency—when it aims at doing the most good for the most people—can be an admirable thing. But expediency in this case has been dictated by the ulterior motives of the tightly organized real-estate lobby.

The bill in question would transfer all authority and responsibility for disposal of permanent war housing from the National Housing Agency—which has been handling the problem ably—to the Federal Work Agency, which has not been handling the problem at all. The justification for this move, apparently, is that Federal Works Agency would handle the disposal more efficiently and speedily. The logic in that argument is not questionable—because there is no logic in it at all. The situation is simple. You have on one hand the NHA, which has all the machinery and facilities for disposal of war housing. You have on the other hand the FWA, which, if it inherits the job, will be forced to consume time and money in a laborious investigation and development of staff and organization before it can venture into actual disposal. Where now, if FWA is saddled with disposal, is all the hue and cry for governmental economy? Economy, it would seem in this case, is a meaningless word indeed. Speed of disposal, by the same token, is an impossibility.

Consider this—and I personally find it an incredible abortion of logic. FWA was not once consulted by the committee to ascertain if it could handle disposal and, if so, how well and how quickly. That knowledge dovetails perfectly with another piece of information on the subject—that fact that the committee did not even discuss such a transfer until it was proposed by one Mr. Morton Bodfish. Well known for his shrewd lobbying on behalf of real-estate interests, the ubiquitous Mr. Bodfish pops up with startling regularity whenever an opportunity arises to stab the housing program in the back. This, of course, was a golden opportunity, which Mr. Bodfish did not miss. Next to the last witness before the committee, he proposed the transfer. And I might add he was the only witness who did. The committee seized on the suggestion, with no open hearings, no investigation, no consultation with FWA. The next thing we knew the Bodfish brain-child was incorporated in the bill.

The Bodfish strategy in introducing the transfer is obvious. He, along with such sterling lobbying organizations as the National Association of Real Estate Boards, is intent on scuttling the National Housing Agency in order to scuttle the housing program. What better way is there to start this scuttling than to knock out FPHA, one of the constituent parts of NHA? You might compare it with tearing off a man's arm before you shoot him through the head.

Consider this. The lobbyists I mentioned previously put up a great hullabaloo about taking care of the veterans in disposing of this war housing. That is not only pure camouflage, it is sheer hokum. Of 540 permanent war housing projects, I am informed that—because of the make-up of the buildings, the presence of common utilities, and other pertinent criteria—more than 300 must be sold on a project basis. The bill gives first preference on these project sales to private corporations, associations, or cooperative societies acting as the legal agent of veterans who intend to occupy the housing. Since it would be utterly impossible, except in a few cases, to find any such organizations composed exclusively of veterans, this means that the projects would have to be sold to speculative buyers so as to beat the sales deadline established by the bill as December 31, 1948. That proviso amounts to an "open house" for the speculators who follow the trail of the real estate lobbies like a flock of vultures waiting for the kill.

If that is not enough to illuminate this leaky legislation, you may take into account the fact that—according to the language of the bill—there exists a possibility that any private agency acting for two or more veterans could obtain sales preference. A dummy corporation, with a few veterans for a screen, could acquire large holdings by this device for speculative purposes.

Those are not the only damning facets of this bill. It calls, for example, for disposal on a cash basis, without exception. This would gravely handicap the efforts of many veterans to obtain the housing. Further—and this is another victory for the real estate lobbies—it would completely block communities from acquiring projects for use as low-rent housing. Desire for acquisition for this purpose, allowable under the Lanham Act, if specifically authorized by the Congress, has been signified by 47 local governments, who have formally requested that 72 projects comprising more than 18,000 units be reserved from sale until the Congress can be asked for permission to transfer them. Other communities are contemplating like action.

The conclusion, it seems to me, is inescapable. This bill, which should do its utmost to channel these homes into the hands of veterans and needy communities as quickly and efficiently as possible, will actually serve mainly to take care of profiteering speculators. Does anyone believe that these speculators will fail to shoot rents sky high on any projects they acquire as soon as rent controls terminate?

This bill is nothing but a farce to the veterans who are hardest hit by the housing shortage. If it passes it will no longer be a mere farce—it will be a full-fledged tragedy.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Chairman, the following action was taken by the San Diego Citizens' Housing Council at the monthly meeting of the executive committee, Tuesday, May 20, 1947:

1. Whereas there are approximately 2,000 nonveteran families now living in saleable housing units in San Diego; and

2. Whereas 8,000 veterans are now on the official waiting list for Federal Public Housing units representing an emergency need; and

3. Whereas the provisions of the proposed revision of the Lanham Act would cause the eviction of 2,000 San Diego nonveteran families now residing in housing projects; and

4. Whereas these 2,000 nonveteran families would be replaced by 2,000 veteran families; and

5. Whereas 6,000 veteran applicants for housing units would still be without adequate housing; and

6. Whereas it is apparent that this is the only housing bill that will be acted on by this Congress: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the feeling of the San Diego Citizens' Housing Council (1) that the passage of the suggested revision of the Lanham Act would aggravate the housing situation in San Diego; (2) that a mere change of occupants is not solving San Diego's housing problem; and (3) that adequate housing in San Diego cannot be hoped for until a housing program is formulated which, when in operation, will actually increase housing facilities.

BEN HADDOCK, Jr.,
President.

The following petition was received from the Azure Vista Civic Council, William A. Emerson, chairman, 4429 Marseilles Street, San Diego, Calif.:

We the undersigned nonveteran occupants of Azure Vista, FPHA housing project in San Diego, under the priority system of the proposed revision of the Lanham Act, will be evicted by the veteran purchasers. We protest the injustice of this discriminatory legislation which forces us American citizens to sacrifice our homes. We demand that restoration to the present occupants, nonveterans or veterans, of the right to purchase our homes before any other groups. We are joined in this protest by many veteran occupants of Azure Vista.

This petition was signed by 270 persons representing a total of approximately 1,050 individuals. Of the 270 persons signing the petition, 59 are veterans.

The Bayview Terrace Citizens Council, San Diego, Calif., has sent me the following telegram:

We urge revision of present housing disposal bill as follows: first priority, occupants as of December 1948; second priority, nonoccupants veterans; third priority, nonoccupants civilians. Failure to revise bill will displace over two thousand persons in this project alone and will promote high percentage of speculation by nonoccupant buyers at expense of occupants.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, while the able chairman of the committee was discussing this bill the thought occurred to me that this would be a good place to do something for the veterans, as he said they wanted to do and as they have provided in this bill. I repeat what he said, that the only thing the veterans have gotten so far is priority. That is all they have gotten in anything I have seen. They have gotten priority, all right, but when it comes to getting the execution of that priority there is nothing doing.

I was glad that the fine chairman of this committee said he could see no objection to the proposal I made when I asked him how some of these veterans that have no money could get the benefit of this act, and asked if he would object to an amendment that would provide that the veteran who held a terminal-leave pay bond, which is useless to him at the present time since he cannot us it for 5 years, could make use of that bond in making the down payment on some of this housing. I was glad to see that the gentleman from Michigan said that he had no objection to it, because I believe it is his intention and he wants to take care of the veteran, and he has shown that since he has been here.

I intend to offer this amendment:

On page 4, line 3, after "1948", strike out the period and insert a semicolon and the following: "*Provided*, That any veteran holding a terminal-leave bond shall be permitted to use said bond as a cash payment on the purchase price of any dwelling in the war-housing project purchased by said veteran, and said Administrator is authorized and directed to accept said terminal-leave bond as cash payment at its full face value plus all accrued interest."

I am sure that that cannot be obnoxious or objectionable to any Member of this House. It merely permits the veteran who has no money but who has a bond to use it as part of the purchase price on one of these dwellings, if he needs to. There is a precedent for this. At the present time you can use the bonds to pay on the national life insurance. If they can be used in that case, why should there be a distinction here? I cannot see why there can be any objection to this amendment which I am going to offer at the proper time when the bill is read for amendment.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Since there is a lack of legislation permitting all veterans to use their bonds or cash their terminal leave bonds, would not that be a discrimination against those who are not fortunate enough to buy a house on which they might apply their bonds as a payment? We lack legislation enabling all veterans to use their terminal leave bonds except for life insurance. If you make it apply just to Federal housing, what about the veteran who does not get a house and who cannot use his bonds? Would not that be a discrimination against him?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I am depending upon the wisdom of this House to report out my bill which would permit every one of these bonds to be negotiated or which would permit the veteran to file an application with the Treasury Department and get the cash. I am hoping that the majority side of the House will agree with the minority side and bring that bill out.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes, but in the absence of your legislation, would not that be a discrimination against the other veterans?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Not at all, not at all.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It certainly would.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. It simply permits the use of these bonds. The houses belong to the Government. The Government owes the money. It would just be taking money out of one pocket and putting it into the other.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. As I understand, these bonds can be used at this time only for the purpose of applying on the payment of insurance. The gentleman proposes to offer an amendment, according to which the veterans can use their bonds to apply on the payment of property which they might want to purchase.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. That is right.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is, the bond may be negotiated for that particular purpose?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. It may be negotiated for that particular purpose. They can come in and make a first payment in the purchase of these houses.

Mr. SPRINGER. And that would then permit those who want to purchase a house to cash their bonds or receive the value of the bond in the purchase price of the property?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Yes, they would be able to use the bonds in the purchase price of the property. That is correct.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I am rather disappointed that there does not seem to be as much interest in this measure as its importance warrants. I think there would be a good many more objections voiced on the floor of the House during the committee consideration of the bill this afternoon if the membership generally knew just how impracticable and how unworkable this bill is in its present form.

I have always looked to the Committee on Banking and Currency to bring out legislation which is well considered and well drafted and practicable in its application. But this, I think, will sort of damage the reputation that that committee has established in past years.

I have here some communications from quite conservative people who condemn this legislation in its present form very viciously. They claim it will give speculators a grand opportunity to take advantage of the Government to the detriment of the veterans. They claim that it can very easily be seen to have been drawn just from the suggestions made by real estate lobbyists. These communications are from people who usually do not communicate with the Congress. They are from public agencies, agencies of municipalities and of cities that have had something to do with the management of these properties for several years. They know what they are talking about. This measure goes directly contrary to the practical experience of those people who have done such a fine job in handling these properties, without loss to the Government and without loss to the local municipalities. Not to allow the municipalities and the agencies which managed these properties for so many years an opportunity to purchase them at fair and reasonable terms, is, I think, an unpardonable mistake. I think the Congress of the United States ought to be very particular in the disposition of these properties. This bill certainly is not fair in that respect. I think it is inexcusably deficient in not giving a positive and certain priority that is workable to the veterans of this country. As was well said by the preceding speaker, we give veterans a priority and it does not mean a thing, because all he gets is a priority which in fact means nothing but

a certificate, which gives him no benefit whatsoever. Whenever you say that these projects must be disposed of by a certain date, by an agency that has never had any experience in handling housing, I cannot realize how the committee could come to such a conclusion. To take away the responsibility from an agency that knows the subject and has been having surveys and investigations and studies made for a year or so with respect to the disposition of this property—to take the responsibility from that agency and give it to a different agency that has never had any experience is unpardonable and raises an objection to the bill which, if not corrected by amendment, should be defeated.

Mr. Chairman, we have the possibility of improving the measure this afternoon by offering amendments. Generally speaking I do not like to rely on another body to correct mistakes made in the House. I take pride in this side of the legislative body. I like to think that we turn out legislation that does not need any correction. If this legislation goes out of this House this afternoon in its present form, I hope that some improvement will be made on the other side of the Capitol. We are going to waste all the experience that the housing agencies of this Government have obtained by turning this responsibility for the disposition of these buildings over to an agency that does not want it, in my opinion, and that has had no experience, with a resulting loss to the Government and plenty of confusion. I predict that before December 31, 1948, the disposition of these housing units will be again before this House, because this measure will have been found to be totally unworkable and impracticable.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS].

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 3492 is not a good bill. It is not an answer to the veteran's desperate need for housing. The Republican leadership in this Congress talks a lot about the American way of life, but it does little to defend it.

In the disposal of permanent war housing the Republican leadership had an opportunity to make permanent homes available at reasonable prices to the individual veteran and nonveteran. This bill as written does no such thing despite Republican speech to the contrary. H. R. 3492 will permit a private corporation composed of a few veterans the right to purchase a huge housing development, including many hundreds of individual units as a speculative investment.

It would require that all permanent war housing be sold for cash and not later than December 31, 1948.

When on top of this the bill turns over the disposition of war housing to the Federal Works Administration which is not equipped to undertake this work, you have clearly a mess, a mess that will play into the hands of the real-estate lobbies, but will not work out to the benefit of the families of young veterans and low-income groups.

This bill is quite in line with the phony rent-control bill this house passed and with the heartbreaking injury inflicted yesterday on Federal Public Housing, FHA, and Federal Home Loan Administration in the appropriation bill for special agencies.

This Congress, I am sorry to say, shows little concern with the needs of the common people.

I include now an analysis of H. R. 3492:

ANALYSIS OF H. R. 3492

The permanent war housing which is the subject of H. R. 3492 is now under jurisdiction of the National Housing Administrator and has been since early in 1942. With the knowledge of the Congress, the Administrator has delegated from time to time many of his responsibilities for the detailed administration of this housing to the Federal Public Housing Authority. The Administrator, however, retains general supervision.

The policies which now govern disposition of this housing were developed by NHA and FPHA under the provisions of the Lanham Act and have been periodically explained and discussed before a number of Congressional committees. Early in the present session of the Congress, both the National Housing Administrator and the Commissioner of the FPHA sought the advice and guidance of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives regarding these disposition policies.

The bill has five major provisions:

1. It would transfer responsibility for permanent war housing built under the Lanham Act from the National Housing Administrator (who has delegated the operations to the Federal Public Housing Authority, subject to his supervision) to the Federal Works Administrator.

2. It would require that all permanent war housing be sold for cash and not later than December 31, 1948.

3. It would make the Federal Housing Administration responsible for appraising the reasonable value of the permanent war housing at the time of sale and would prohibit the FWA from selling at a price lower than this appraisal.

4. It would establish a specific system of preferences governing disposition of the permanent war housing.

5. It would amend title VI of the National Housing Act so as to permit the Federal Housing Administration to insure mortgages on Lanham Act properties up to 90 percent of their appraised reasonable value.

The first of these provisions is quite obviously distinct from the other four. The policies governing disposition could be changed without transferring responsibility, or responsibility for disposition could be transferred without changing the policies.

In addition to these five explicit provisions, the bill would apparently do two other things which are not specifically stated. First, it would seem to eliminate the provision now contained in the Lanham Act permitting the transfer of permanent projects to the War and Navy Departments. Secondly, it would appear to contemplate the elimination of the present provisions of the Lanham Act authorizing the transfer of these projects to local housing authorities for low-rent use with the specific approval of the Congress.

MAJOR CONSEQUENCES OF THE BILL

If the bill should be enacted in its present form, it would have the following consequences:

A. It would disrupt a carefully planned program for disposition of the permanent war housing which is now going forward on the basis of 2 years of intensive study and lengthy consultations with key officials in hundreds of local communities. These consultations were necessary in the public interest because of many community problems—deviations from local building codes, relationships to over-all community plans, effect of disposition on the local real estate market, and other similar considerations. They have now been completed in 234 communities, covering 308 permanent projects. In place of this carefully planned program H. R. 3492 would require that all of the 540 permanent housing projects must be disposed of by December 31, 1948. It thus creates a real and serious danger that the housing would have to be disposed of in great haste with insufficient regard for local plans or real-estate values or for community wishes and recommendations.

B. The bill would result in a wastage of all the experience which the NHA has gained over the past 5 years in connection with this housing and transfer responsibility to another agency which has almost no familiarity with it.

It would also cast aside a large part of the preparatory work which NHA has accomplished over the past 2 years looking toward the disposition of these permanent projects. The FWA would have a great deal to learn about these properties and almost no time in which to learn the facts.

C. By preventing the transfer of permanent war housing to local communities for use in housing low-income families, the bill would disappoint a great many local plans and expectations. Under the Lanham Act such transfers are permitted if the Congress approves. In reliance on this provision of the act, 47 cities have registered official requests covering the proposed transfer of 72 projects. H. R. 3492 makes no provision for submitting these requests to the Congress.

D. By splitting off the permanent Lanham Act projects from other housing under jurisdiction of the National Housing Agency, H. R. 3492 would take the Government back to the chaotic conditions that prevailed before consolidation of Federal housing activities under NHA in February 1942. Approximately 60 percent of the permanent Lanham projects are being managed under leasing arrangements by local housing authorities. Most of these authorities are also managing other types of housing which would be left under NHA's general supervision by the provisions of H. R. 3492. In a considerable number of cases, the housing transferred to FWA and the housing remaining under NHA are located on the same site and even use a common utility system. The inevitable result of the transfer would be a tremendous complication of management relationships and a large amount of administrative duplication and overlapping. Instead of dealing with one set of Federal officials on all types of Lanham Act housing, as at present, the local agencies and others concerned would henceforth be required to deal with two.

E. Because of the tight disposition dead line that would be established and the cash payment that would have to be made for purchase of some of the larger projects, the bill would make it extremely difficult for veterans and other occupants or prospective occupants to organize mutual ownership corporations (cooperative societies) for group purchase of the projects. In many cases it has proved unfeasible for a variety of reasons to subdivide the Lanham Act projects for sale of the individual buildings. Where this is the situation, the National Housing Agency has considered the possibility of selling to mutual ownership corporations as the most practicable way of encouraging home ownership. The Congress will doubtless want to consider whether it wishes to encourage home ownership through this particular device. In this connection, it should be remembered that some of the veterans' organizations have strongly recommended the sale of many of these projects to mutual ownership corporations.

F. Although the bill is apparently intended to give top preference to veterans for purchase of the permanent war housing, would it not actually complicate the problem of purchase for a great many home-seeking veterans and perhaps work directly against their interests? The bill sets up a dual system of preferences. In cases where the projects can be subdivided for sale of the individual buildings, all buildings containing less than five apartments are to be disposed of to purchasers in the following order of priority:

(1) Occupants who are veterans; (2) prospective occupants who are veterans; and (3) occupants who are nonveterans. In the disposition of projects which cannot be subdivided and of buildings which contain more than four apartments, however, the only preference that is given is to a "private corporation, association, or cooperative society which is the legal agent of veterans who intend to occupy the war housing" to be purchased. This language is subject to two interpretations. It may mean that the corporation or society purchasing the housing must be composed exclusively of veterans. In that case, the provision may be a serious handicap since experience indicates that it is extremely difficult to organize a group composed entirely of veterans for the purchase and operation of the larger war-housing projects. Experience also indicates that some of the veterans' organizations will want the opportunity to accept nonveterans as members. On the other hand, the language of the bill may mean that any organization which has itself appointed as the "legal agent" for a handful of veterans "intending to occupy" is fully qualified to exercise top priority for purchase of a 1,000-unit or even a 2,000-unit project. In that event, the bill would have the effect of freezing out the individual veterans.

G. The time schedule established for disposition of the properties is actually much tighter than might at first appear. At least a few months, at the very minimum, will have to be allowed for working out the somewhat complicated features of the transfer and for FWA to acquire even an elementary familiarity with the properties. On top of this, many of the projects will have to be held for periods ranging up to 180 days before the priorities have expired; new appraisals will have to be made; and community consultations will have to be conducted all over again by the Federal Works Agency. Finally, FWA will have to make some allowance for disposing of those projects—and there probably will be many of them—which cannot be sold to the priority holders. Administrative prudence would seem to require at least 2 months to be reserved for this purpose at the end of 1948. As a result of all these deductions, the time schedule established by the bill becomes almost completely unworkable.

H. The bill sets up two inflexible requirements that would severely handicap the agency handling disposition: (1) the requirement that all sales must be completed before December 31, 1948, and (2) the requirement that none of the housing may be sold for less than its appraised value. These two requirements together permit the disposal agency almost no discretion whatever in sales of the properties. Regardless of what the bill may say, it may well develop that the market simply will not absorb these properties at the appraised values within the time limit established.

OTHER COMMENTS OF THE BILL

The provision permitting the Federal Housing Administration to insure mortgages up to 90 percent of the appraised value of Lanham Act properties is highly desirable and should be enacted.

As already indicated, the section of the bill providing for veterans' preference is ambiguous and may well produce serious complications. A better way of accomplishing this objective would be to provide simply that individual buildings or dwellings may be sold to purchasers in the following order of priorities: (1) veteran occupants, (2) veteran prospective occupants, (3) nonveteran occupants, and (4) nonveteran prospective occupants. In sales to groups, preference could be given to groups made up of individuals in the above mentioned four categories.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "War Housing Disposal Act of 1947."

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this act—

(1) The term "Administrator" means the Federal Works Administrator.

(2) The term "Lanham War Housing Act" means the act entitled 'An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended.

(3) The term "war housing" means any interest, owned by the United States and under the control of the National Housing Agency, in (A) housing (other than temporary housing) acquired or constructed under the Lanham War Housing Act, under the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1941 (Public, No. 781, 76th Cong.), as amended, under the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1941 (Public Law 9, 77th Cong.), or under the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1944 (Public Law 375, 78th Cong.), and (B) such other property as is determined by the Administrator to be essential to the use of such housing.

(4) the term "veteran" means (A) any person in the active military or naval service of the United States during the present war, or (B) any person who served in the active military or naval service of the United States at any time on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the present war, and who has been discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable after active service of 90 days or more or by reason of an injury or disability incurred in service in line of duty.

(5) The term "dwelling" means a war housing building designed for residential use of one or more families.

(6) The term "dwelling unit" means a dwelling, or that part of a dwelling, which is designed for residential use of one family.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPENCE:

Page 1, lines 7 and 8, strike out the words "Federal Works Administrator" and insert in lieu thereof the words "National Housing Administrator."

Page 3, in lines 6 through 21, strike out the words "Transfer of War Housing to Federal Works Administration" and all of Section 3 and renumber the succeeding sections and references and cross-references thereto.

Page 3, in line 24, and page 4, in line 1, strike out the words "transferred to the Administrator by Section 3" and insert in lieu thereof the words "under the jurisdiction of the Administrator."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would take from the Public Works Agency the authority given it under the act and place it in the Federal Public Housing Administration, under the National Housing Agency.

In the hearings General Fleming, the Federal Works Administrator, did not testify. There is not a word of testimony in the record that the Federal Works Administration is equipped or qualified to carry out the mandate of this legislation. Not since 1942 has the Federal Works Agency had anything to do with this housing we are attempting to dispose of. It has been in the Federal Public Housing Agency and it was built by the Federal Public Housing Agency, and they have a personnel and an organization that could handle this matter immediately. We say that expedition is what we are seeking. Certainly, it would mean interminable delay to place this power and this authority in an agency which is in no way connected with the building and maintenance of these properties.

There is an incongruity also in this matter, it seems to me. In the interest of scientific legislation it should be placed in the Housing Administration. The Federal Housing Administration appraises this property and the Federal Works Administration which has no connection at all with the Federal Housing Agency has the disposal of it. In addition, I wish to repeat—and I think I am perfectly sound in my conclusions—that if you grant this power to the Federal Works Agency you sabotage the reorganization plan that the President submitted to Congress on May 27. The Congress has 60 legislative days within which we can act upon that plan. The plan is not susceptible to amendment but we in substance amend it, we nullify it by collateral action. The President probably would have presented an entirely different plan if the Federal Works Administration had at that time the jurisdiction delegated in this bill.

It seems obvious that this transfer is a mistake. It was brought about by a prejudice against the agency. Legislation based upon prejudice is never good legislation. Legislation that is based on the hypothesis that the agency will not carry out the mandate of Congress is certainly not scientific legislation. There is another way to approach that contingency.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that free from partisanship and free from prejudice the Members will give this amendment their careful consideration. We want to expedite this matter. It is essential that these houses shall get in the hands of the people who want to purchase them at the earliest possible date, and the way to effectuate that purpose is to give the agency that has control over them now, that has the personnel and the organization to do the job, the authority and the direction to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Fifty-seven Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 78]

Barrett	Gallagher	O'Hara
Bell	Gamble	Patman
Bishop	Gifford	Pfeifer
Bland	Granger	Philbin
Bloom	Grant, Ind.	Ploeser
Buckley	Hall,	Powell
Bulwinkle	Leonard W.	Price, Fla.
Busbey	Hartley	Rayfiel
Byrne, N. Y.	Heffernan	Riley
Case, S. Dak.	Hess	Rizley
Celler	Hill	Robertson
Clark	Hinshaw	Sarbacher
Clements	Hull	Scott, Hardie
Clevenger	Kearney	Scott,
Clippinger	Kearns	Hugh D., Jr.
Cole, Kans.	Kefauver	Seely-Brown
Cole, N. Y.	Kelley	Shafer
Combs	Kennedy	Sheppard
Courtney	Keogh	Simpson, Pa.
Cox	Landis	Smith, Ohio
Crawford	LeFevre	Stockman
Dingell	Lesinski	Stratton
Dirksen	McGarvey	Taylor
Domengeaux	Macy	Thomason
Eaton	Mansfield, Tex.	Towe
Feighan	Martin, Iowa	Vinson
Fellows	Meade, Ky.	Wadsworth
Fisher	Merrow	Welch
Flannagan	Morrison	Winstead
Fletcher	Nodar	Wolverton
Fogarty	Norrell	Zimmerman
Fuller	Norton	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BENDER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3492) to provide for the expeditious disposition of certain war housing, and for other purposes, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 335 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] is recognized in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, it has been explained that the functions and the powers of the National Housing Administrator with respect to the Lanham permanent projects will be transferred under the provisions of this bill to the Federal Works Administrator, which, of course, virtually means that the functions and powers now being exercised by the Federal Public Housing Authority will be transferred to the Federal Works Administrator. We are not transferring these powers to an agency which is not fully acquainted with these housing problems. These projects were originally in the Federal Works Agency and were transferred from that Agency to the Federal Public Housing Authority. We are merely transferring them back to where they came from.

It has been suggested that jurisdiction over the disposition of these properties must stay in the Federal Public Housing Authority because they have had more experience than the Federal Works Agency in the disposition of them. I merely bring out the fact that the Federal Works Agency originally had jurisdiction over these projects or many of them in order to show that they have had experience in this line and, further, may I call attention to the fact that up to the present time—and the war has been over for almost 2 years, that is hostilities ceased almost 2 years ago—and during these 2 years, although the Federal Public Housing Authority had an express mandate from the Congress to dispose of these properties, the total disposals up to April 11, 1947, amounted to only 45 projects involving 10,167 housing units. Of these 45 only 29 projects containing 6,867 dwelling units represented actual sales. The balance of 16 projects containing 3,330 dwelling units were transfers from the Federal Public Housing Authority to the War and Navy Departments. So that there have been only 29 projects containing 6,867 dwelling units actually sold.

What happened to the rest of them? A great many are being reserved for transfer to communities for low-rental purposes. I want to read just a short paragraph from the report in that respect:

> Despite the provisions of the Lanham Act prohibiting the transfer of any of these properties to communities for subsidized housing use, unless approval of Congress is obtained, the FPHA has already reserved from sale for possible transfer to communities or local housing authorities for low-rent use, almost three times as many dwelling units as they actually sold.

The FPHA—we will have to be very realistic about this situation—up to the present time has been very public housing minded.

In providing for the transfer of the functions and powers of FPHA, with respect to Lanham permanent projects, to the Federal Works Administrator, the committee is of the opinion the latter agency is more sympathetic with our policies, and the disposal program is more likely to be administered in keeping with the expressed intent of Congress.

The amendment should be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to address myself generally to the bill. Being a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency I had some opportunity to observe with what particularity this matter has been considered, and I cannot agree with the statement or the imputation or insinuation that it has been a half considered matter.

Following the resolution which was adopted on the 26th of February, at which time the disposal of Lanham housing was interrupted, the committee did have hearings and rather extensive hearings upon the subject of the proper disposal of these permanent Lanham houses. I think the great objective, besides properly preserving the Government's rights and its interest in the matter, was to make sure to provide for veterans an opportunity to secure homes either by purchase of individual units or by associations or otherwise purchasing housing as they found it for the collective occupancy of many veterans. I believe that has been done. If you will read the preferences provided for in the bill I think you will see that very minute attention has been paid to accomplishing that which we all desire. I will not go over the preferences as they are written here, but I do suggest for your consideration that they are well conceived. I have, however, only two question marks in my mind with respect to the sufficiency and the wisdom of the bill's provisions.

No. 1, I may name it, is the transfer of the disposal authority from the National Housing Administration to the Federal Works Administration. Not since 1942 has the Federal Works Administration known what went on with respect to the construction or the disposal of houses that were erected either in single units or in multiple units under the Lanham Act. They therefore have no machinery by which they might go to work, and time is of the essence when you contemplate the fact that these houses must all be disposed of on or before December 1948, and that is not so long away.

I believe that governmentally, administratively, and logically, the authority and the responsibility for the disposal of these houses should remain in the National Housing Administration. It is true that that would contemplate appraisals by the Federal Housing Administration, and of course they are controlled by the provisions in this bill as to those appraisals, which seem to me to be well conceived and well ordered, so that the Federal Housing Administration must do the appraising, to which nobody offers an objection. The Federal Public Housing Authority is already engaged in it, but having been interrupted by the resolution, and I think properly so, are acquainted with every bit of property that would come under the purview of this act. I believe that ought to remain where it is, and that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky ought to prevail.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I had the benefit of hearing the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency when this question first came to the floor a couple of hours ago. I have since examined the report and the bill. It seems to me this is a very simple question, that we ought not to have a great deal of difficulty with. Certainly it presents no difficulty to any member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Government Corporations. The members of that committee had the interesting and enlightening experience of having before them for several long, hot days in the subbasement of this Capitol a group of representatives of FPHA. Having had its records before us as well as the administrative history of that agency, we can have very little doubt as to the wisdom and necessity of this bill. It is perfectly apparent on the record, as the distinguished gentleman from Michigan pointed out, that this agency has completely failed, for whatever reason is unimportant, to carry out the intention of the Congress, which was to dispose of this housing rapidly so that it might be put to the best possible use. In view of such failure, it is certainly proper to transfer that duty to another agency that is more capable, and will be more likely to carry out the congressional purpose. The FPHA has indicated such a degree of incompetence and has presented to our subcommittee such

a picture of confusion worse confounded that it is not surprising that the housing has not been moving as intended. I think Congress has shown patience in not acting sooner. I think this amendment should be defeated and the bill should be passed.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, last year the Subcommittee on Appropriations having jurisdiction of Government Corporations by unanimous request caused an investigation to be made of all the Federal Housing projects under FPHA, and a report was submitted to the committee early this year:

The report is the result of a 6 months' investigation headed by Robert E. Lee, who was loaned to the committee by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

High-lighting the report's conclusions was the startling fact that more than 31 percent of all tenants of public housing were totally ineligible for such public assistance, yet the FPHA had taken virtually no action to rectify this situation.

The FPHA also failed to dispose of wartime housing and has instead inaugurated a socialized scheme of disposition to mutual organizations which completely ignore any veterans' preference, unless the veteran was already an occupant, according to the report. As the result of these findings, it was necessary for the Banking and Currency Committee of the House to bring out legislation which has already been introduced and about to come to the floor, which will give the veterans preference for purchase as well as rental.

In addition the FPHA has adopted a policy providing that local authorities build up unreasonable cash reserves at the expense of the Federal subsidy for alleged vacancy and collection losses and other contingencies that may or may not materialize. This amount approximates $40,000,000.

Under the United States Housing Act, for every dwelling unit built there should be one slum dwelling unit eliminated. This has been almost completely ignored, and the slums have continued to develop and grow, the report says.

In the face of the terrific housing shortage in the United States, 8,110 new prefabricated housing units were sold to France by the FPHA. This was early in January 1946, just at a time when veterans were returning by the millions and were desperately in need of houses.

Storerooms of FPHA were found to be replete with propaganda material to influence passage of public housing legislation. This despite the fact that section 201 of title 18, United States Code, specifically provides criminal penalties for the use of appropriated funds to influence legislation.

The FPHA records were in such "atrocious condition" that a nationally known accounting firm (Price, Waterhouse & Co.) were retained by the General Accounting Office to make an audit, declined to do so after inspecting the books on the ground that the fiscal facts could not be ascertained from their records. One of the FPHA auditors, in describing the condition of the records, said:

"A great many deficiencies existed in accounts for all programs which were not being corrected because of improper staffing. Postings for current fiscal year have been very incomplete, and in many instances are so inadequate that the accounts failed to convey proper meaning * * * the lack of adequate fund controls has been the cause of a large number of errors and is, in the opinion of the auditors, responsible for the lack of internal control of rental-office fiscal activity.

If every Member of the House could read this full report, the bill now being considered would be unanimously adopted as written by the Banking and Currency Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SPENCE) there were—ayes 63, noes 144.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

TRANSFER OF WAR HOUSING TO FEDERAL WORKS ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 3. (a) The functions of the National Housing Administrator and of the National Housing Agency with respect to war housing are hereby transferred to the Administrator.

(b) There are hereby transferred to the Administrator, to be used or held in connection with the exercise of the functions transferred by this section, (1) the records and property used or held on the date of the enactment of this act in connection with such functions, and (2) so much of the unexpended balances of appropriations, allocations, or other funds available for use by the National Housing Administrator or the National Housing Agency in the exercise of such functions as the Director of the Budget shall determine.

SALE OF WAR HOUSING

SEC. 4. (a) All war housing (except mortgages, liens, or other interests as security) transferred to the Administrator by section 3 shall, subject to the provisions of this act, be sold for cash as expeditiously as possible and not later than December 31, 1948. Wherever practicable each dwelling in a war housing project shall be offered for sale separately from other dwellings in such project. Any mortgage, lien, or other interest as security transferred to the Administrator by section 3 or acquired by him under this act pursuant to a contract entered into prior to February 26, 1947, may, subject to the provisions of this section, be sold for cash.

(b) (1) Except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, the price to be paid for war housing sold under this act shall be a price not less than the reasonable value thereof at the time of the offer for sale as determined by appraisal made by an appraiser or appraisers designated by the Federal Housing Administrator.

(2) The price to be paid for any mortgage, lien, or other interest as security sold under this section shall be a price not less than the unpaid principal (plus accrued interest thereon) of the obligation with respect to which the mortgage, lien, or other interest as security is held.

(c) Except as provided in subsections (a) and (b), the sale of war housing under this act shall be with or without warranty and upon such other terms and conditions as the Administrator deems proper.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Florida: On page 4, line 3, after "1948" in line 3, strike out the period, substitute a semicolon, and insert *"Provided,* That any veteran holding a terminal-leave-pay bond shall be permitted to use said bond as a cash payment on the purchase price of any dwelling in the war-housing project purchased by said veteran, and said Administrator is authorized and directed to accept said terminal-leave bond as cash payment at its full face value, plus all accrued interest."

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I spoke on this amendment a few moments ago, but inasmuch as just a few Members were present then I am going to repeat to some extent what I said.

I am offering this amendment to provide that a veteran who holds a terminal-leave-pay bond, who wants to buy one of these units in a housing project can use this bond as a part payment. As was said by the fine chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the only thing we have given to the veteran so far is a priority. We have given him a priority, but unless they have something to carry out that priority the gift that the Congress has made them amounts to nothing.

I am glad to say to the membership of this House that before I prepared this amendment I asked the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, if he had any objection to it, and I am glad to say that he did not.

The proviso, as I say, is merely that the Administrator is authorized and directed to accept terminal leave pay bonds as part of the cash payment.

That does not affect anything so far as the Treasury is concerned. The bonds are not payable until maturity, but the Administrator is just taking property that is real and transferring it to property which is personal.

I do not see how any Member of the House who wants to show any interest at all in helping the veterans can object to this amendment. This gives him something real instead of just a priority. I do not believe any Member will object to the amendment.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very important amendment. Certainly the amendment is predicated upon justice. I do not know of any amendment in a long while that has appealed to me so much. Let me read it:

Provided, That any veteran holding a terminal-leave-pay bond shall be permitted to use such bond as cash payment.

That means a part of the cash payment. It seems to me this is an excellent way to accomplish several desirable objectives. If the veteran is to buy a home from the Government, certainly the Government ought to permit him to use his terminal-leave-pay bond. That is something of real benefit to the veteran, for it enables him to get a home. It may be the one thing that will enable him to get a home, with other cash. He may not have sufficient cash to make the complete down payment. This terminal leave pay bond might supply the difference.

Permitting the use of terminal-leave-pay bonds in this manner carries out sev-

eral objectives and at the same time discharges an outstanding obligation of the Government.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. MASON. I understand there is no objection to this amendment.

Mr. McCORMACK. Then I shall be very glad to yield the floor.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there is a question in my mind as to the germaneness of this amendment; furthermore, I doubt whether or not we can make these bonds negotiable in view of the fact that the basic act makes them nonnegotiable. If this amendment is adopted and it is possible for the veteran to apply the value of his bond to the purchase of a home, I think we are discriminating against the majority of the veterans of World War II who hold bonds and who are awaiting the necessary congressional action to make these bonds negotiable for all purposes. In the near future the House Committee on the Armed Services will give consideration to the necessary amendments that will provide the veterans of World War II who hold terminal leave bonds the privilege of cashing them at face value or holding them until maturity.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. This would be the same method of cashing them, by applying them as a cash payment on the purchase of a home.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Yes; but it is discriminatory in that it applies to one class of veterans, those who wish to purchase a home. The rest of the veterans would have to continue holding their bonds.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Does the gentleman consider there is discrimination because these bonds may be used as payment for national life insurance? Is that discrimination? They can use them at the present time to pay their insurance.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. There is a very decided difference between the national life insurance premiums being paid by these bonds and applying them on a very limited number of houses. In my community there will be approximately 119 houses made available for sale under this act. Who is going to select the 119 veterans who are going to be put in that preferred position of now having their bonds paid in cash with interest that is not due for 3 or 4 years? I agree wholeheartedly with the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Let us deal with this thing in a proper way by making these bonds payable in cash at the earliest possible opportunity.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Who is going to select them when they come in and are paid on a cash basis?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Every one of them are paid in cash.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, the question before us is of such importance that it should only be considered after the House Committee on Armed Services has had an opportunity to perfect a bill to make possible the cashing of these bonds. Let us not make the mistake of hasty and inconsiderate action that will benefit only a handful of veterans. Let us do the job right in fairness to the several millions of veterans who hold terminal-leave bonds.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for the defeat of the pending amendment.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. If it is right for the terminal leave bonds to be made available for housing necessities, is it not also right that they be made available for other necessities of life that the veterans have to provide for?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct. I am in favor of giving the veterans the right to cash their terminal leave bonds, but I believe the necessary legislation should be brought to this floor and due consideration given to it so that every veteran will be able to cash those bonds and not just those who may purchase real estate.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Has the gentleman signed the discharge petition to bring this bill to cash terminal leave bonds to the floor? Has the gentleman signed that to bring it on the floor?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I happen to be a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services that will consider legislation on the subject very shortly. In my opinion it is unnecessary to circulate a discharge petition in behalf of legislation to cash terminal leave bonds. I have introduced H. R. 2 to provide for cashing terminal leave bonds and would have circulated a discharge petition myself if I had any doubt that the legislation would not be considered during this session of Congress.

Mr. SMATHERS. It can be considered right away if the gentleman will sign it and get some of his friends to sign that petition.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. If this amendment is adopted, those veterans who want to use the certificates for that purpose may use them. That would not discriminate against them. Why could not that be done pending the bringing out of the bill which would pay them in cash that the gentleman from Florida has been working on? I do not see how it would be a discrimination against anybody. It would give relief to that many. Does the gentleman agree with that?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Mississippi would like to have 5 minutes and I hope the gentleman will permit him to consume that much time.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 6 minutes, to be equally divided between the gentleman who are on their feet and any member of the committee who may be opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] is recognized.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, since I have been a Member of Congress, I have watched it treat veterans as if they did not have enough sense to know what to do with their own money. I want to remind the Congress that the veterans of our country are grown men. I think that certainly we should recognize the fact that they have sense enough to know what to do with their own money. For that reason I think we ought to go ahead and allow them to cash these bonds.

I was somewhat surprised at my good friend from Pennsylvania when he stood up here and spoke against allowing veterans to use their terminal leave bonds as a part payment on a home. I am surprised. He has always been a friend of the veterans, so I am sure he is possibly a little misled on this subject, because he says he wants them to be given the right to cash those bonds, but is against this amendment. Certainly this amendment would be a step in the right direction. It is his party that says that the boys cannot cash them; it is not our party. The bill is in a Republican committee of a Republican Congress.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. If my memory serves me correctly, I was not here then, I was in the service, but during the Seventy-ninth Congress the gentleman's party was in control of this House, and they were the ones that passed the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the gentleman will let me reply to that. I will tell him that I was not here either. I was in a service hospital.

Mr. ANGELL. The gentleman's party held it up.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now, whether my party held it up or not, the Republican Party is in power now, and you have the power to cash them. Two wrongs do not make a right.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I ask the gentleman from Mississippi if it is not a fact that there is a discharge petition on the Clerk's desk, which would relieve the committee from considering the bill to cash terminal leave bonds.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand this Republican-controlled committee refused to bring this bill out on the floor. So, as a last resort, the author of the bill placed a petition on the Speaker's desk and it is up there now. If you really want to pay these bonds, sign this petition in order to bring it up. You ought to give these boys a right to cash these bonds. There are very few Members, to my left, if any, who have signed that petition.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I think I might be able to throw some light on this matter. When the question was up last year whether they should be paid in cash or be paid in bonds I was a member of the conference committee. The House voted to pay in cash. We sat in conference for a number of days and finally, word came from the White House that the bill would not be signed unless they took the bonds and therefore we took the bonds.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I was not here then.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I hope that they will not make this a party issue. It is the interest of the veteran that I am concerned with.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly do not want to get involved in a partisan argument. The last thing in the world I want to do is to get into an argument with my distinguished friend the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I think we are both in accord on cashing these bonds.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I am in accord on that point, and I believe the bonds should be cashed at the earliest possible moment. I have confidence in the leadership of my party that the matter will be considered in due time and by the proper committee. I am not going to be jockeyed into signing a discharge petition, but I say, when we deal with it, let us deal with it for all veterans and not a mere handful. It will be a comparatively small number that can use their bonds to get these houses that are going to be offered for sale on the market. If you want to do that, if you want to make these bonds payable for the purchase of a house, let us require the FHA to accept these terminal-leave bonds in payment for the purchase of any other real estate, not require any cash at all, and the mortgage to be insured by FHA. I could go along with that, but I cannot go along with an amendment the benefits of which will be limited to a few veterans. In my community, out of 1,400 veterans there will be 119 that will have a chance to buy a home now. In some communities a few hundred miles away, with no war housing whatsoever, such veterans will not have an opportunity to buy them. I think the proper committee of the House should continue its hearings on the question of cashing the terminal leave bonds and thereby reach the objective that the gentleman from Florida so earnestly desires, the payment of the bonds at the earliest possible moment.

I urge, for that reason and that reason alone, that the amendment be defeated and that we deal with the subject matter at the proper time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROONEY) there were—ayes 100, noes 123.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. WOLCOTT and Mr. ROGERS of Florida.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 100, noes 137.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAINS:

On page 4, immediately following section 4, add the following new section:

"Transfer of war housing to the War or Navy Department.

"SEC. 5. Notwithstanding the provisions of this act or any other provision of law, the Administrator may in his discretion upon the request of the Secretaries of War or Navy transfer to the jurisdiction of the War or Navy Department any war housing that may be considered to be permanently useful to the Army or Navy."

Renumber sections 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10, as sections 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11, respectively.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BENDER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3492) to provide for the expeditious disposition of certain war housing, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

SUPPORT PRICE ON WOOL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HOPE submitted a conference report and statement on the bill S. 814, an act to provide support for wool, and for other purposes, for printing, under the rule.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the bill H. R. 3492 may have five legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON H. R. 3769

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 3769.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GAVIN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include two editorials.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech he recently made.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain extraneous matter.

Mr. SPRINGER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Indianapolis Times.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. JOHNSON of California (at the request of Mr. DONDERO) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD with reference to the Mundt bill.

Mr. STEVENSON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement made before the Subcommittee on Retirement Legislation of the Civil Service Committee of the House of Representatives regarding the report of the actuaries of the Civil Service Commission retirement and disability fund.

Mr. HAND asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin asked and was granted permission to revise and extend the remarks he made today in Committee of the Whole and include a resolution adopted by the common council of the city of Manitowac.

Mr. ARNOLD asked and was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. POTTS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. LODGE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. MUNDT asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a recent public statement by Secretary of State Marshall on the importance of the student exchange program.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include the address made by President Truman at Ottawa, Canada, on yesterday.

Mr. BLATNIK asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana (at the request of Mr. CARROLL) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made earlier today and include two schedules showing the States wherein the Lanham permanents are located, and a statement showing projects requested by community or low-rent transfer based on central office approval of Form 1279.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, for Friday, June 13, on account of illness of mother.

To Mr. JOHNSON of California, for Friday, Saturday, and Monday, June 13, 14, and 16, 1947, on account of sickness of mother.

To Mr. LANE, for June 13, 1947, on account of attendance at the funeral of ex-Senator David I. Walsh.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 13, 1947, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

782. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to permit certain expenditures, and for other purposes; to the committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

783. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the leasing of salmon trap sites in Alaskan coastal waters and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

784. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting report of a proposed transfer to the American Naval Cadets of naval equipment; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 3792. A bill to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 563). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 94. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation authorized by House Resolution 93; without amendment (Rept. No. 572). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 163. Resolution to provide funds for the conduct of the investigation continued by House Resolution 153; with an amendment (Rept. No. 573). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 228. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 195; without amendment (Rept. No. 574). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 177. Resolution providing for the expenses incurred by House Resolution 176; without amendment (Rept. No. 575). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 185. Resolution relative to the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations with respect to the activities of the Department of State relative to personnel and efficiency and economy of its operations; with an amendment (Rept. No. 576). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. Senate Joint Resolution 69. Joint resolution to prepare a revised edition of the Annotated Constitution of the United States of America as published in 1938 as Senate Document 232 of the Seventy-fourth Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 577). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 233. Resolution for the relief of Pearl Cox; without amendment (Rept. No. 578). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 245. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 510, current Congress, being the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3020) entitled "Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947"; without amendment (Rept. No. 579). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HOFFMAN: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. House Concurrent Resolution 51. Concurrent resolution against adoption of Reorganization Plan No. 3 of May 27, 1947; without amendment (Rept. No. 580). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 2955. A bill authorizing and directing the Commissioner of Public Buildings to determine the fair market value of the Fidelity Building in Kansas City, Mo., to receive bids for the purchase thereof, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 581). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 3219. A bill to authorize the Federal Works Administrator or officials of the Federal Works Agency duly authorized by him to appoint special policemen for duty upon Federal property under the jurisdiction of the Federal Works Agency, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 582). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 3146. A bill to amend section 3 of the Flood Control Act approved August 28, 1937, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 583). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REED of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3769. A bill to provide that membership in the National Guard shall not disqualify a person from serving as a part-time referee in bankruptcy; with an amendment (Rept. No. 585). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SPRINGER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 317. An act for the relief of Robert B. Jones; without amendment (Rept. No. 564). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPRINGER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 470. An act for the relief of John H. Gradwell; without amendment (Rept. No. 565). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPRINGER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 514. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Sylvia De Cicco; without amendment (Rept. No. 566). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPRINGER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 561. An act for the relief of Robert C. Birkes; without amendment (Rept. No. 567). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPRINGER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 824. An act for the relief of Marion O. Cassady; without amendment (Rept. No. 568). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPRINGER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 882. An act for the relief of A. A. Pelletier and P. C. Silk; without amendment (Rept. No. 569). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 710. A bill for the relief of Fritz Hallquist; with amendments (Rept. No. 570). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 718. A bill for the relief of Clarence J. Wilson and Margaret J. Wilson; with an amendment (Rept. No. 571). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 3807. A bill to provide for the operation of the recreational facilities within the Catoctin recreational demonstration area, near Thurmont, Md., by the Secretary of the Interior through the National Park Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HEDRICK:

H. R. 3808. A bill to make inapplicable to future actions and proceedings section 200 (1) and (2) of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, relating to default judgments; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 3809. A bill to provide for the payment of subsistence allowances to members of the armed forces who were held captive by the enemy during World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 3810. A bill to amend section 522 of the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to clarify the procedure in ascertaining the value of foreign currency for customs purposes where there are dual or multiple exchange rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 381 . A bill to authorize the Attorney General and his assistants and United States district attorneys and their assistants to act as notaries public; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 3812. A bill to promote equitable personnel practices in the Federal Government by the establishment of a Federal Appeal Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 3813. A bill to provide for removal from, and the prevention of appointment to, offices or positions in the executive branch of the Government of persons who are found to be disloyal to the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 3814. A bill to provide for the establishment of a veterans' hospital for Negro veterans at the birthplace of Booker T. Washington in Franklin County, Va.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 3815. A bill to provide Federal aid to the States for the construction of armories and similar training facilities for the National Guard and Naval Militia; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 3816. A bill providing for a District of Columbia Sales and Compensating Use Tax Act of 1947; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PLOESER:

H. R. 3817. A bill authorizing the transfer of certain real property for wildlife and other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 3818. A bill to amend the Federal Insurance Contributions Act with respect to rates of tax on employers and employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of Indiana:

H. R. 3819. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes," approved December 22, 1944, with respect to the Clark Hill Reservoir on the Savannah River in South Carolina and Georgia; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GILLIE:

H. J. Res. 216. Joint resolution to provide for designation of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Fort Wayne, Ind., as the Thomas Lau Suedhoff Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. Res. 244. Resolution for the initiation of investigations looking to the provision of additional water for southern California and the Colorado River Basin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to ratify a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to terms of office of the President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL:

H. R. 3820. A bill for the relief of Leo Gottlieb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 3821. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent for certain lands and for the minerals therein; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 3822. A bill for the relief of Howard S. Lawson; Winifred G. Lawson, his wife; Walter P. Lawson; and Nita R. Lawson, his wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H. R. 3823. A bill for the relief of Domingo Ozamis Ormaechea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. R. 3824. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Cletus E. Todd (formerly Laura Estelle Ritter); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

627. By Mr. CANNON: Petition signed by 305 citizens of Albion, Nebr., protesting the elimination of Federal cooperation in the farm-conservation program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

628. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Maryland State and District of Columbia Federation of Labor, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for veto of Taft-Hartley bill; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

629. Also, petition of the membership of the Stuart Townsend Club, No. 1, Stuart, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of a uniform national insurance program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

630. Also, petition of Mrs. Albina Bibeau and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

631. Also, petition of Mr. Wilbert B. Scott, Daytona Beach, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JUNE 13, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers, in whose name this Republic was born, we pray that by Thy help we may be worthy to receive Thy blessings upon our labors.

In the troubled and uneasy travail before the birth of lasting peace, when men have made deceit a habit, lying an art, and cruelty a science, help us to show the moral superiority of the way of life we cherish. Here may men see truth upheld, honesty loved, and kindness practiced. In our dealings with each other, may we be gentle, understanding, and kind, with our tempers under control. In our dealings with other nations, may we be firm without obstinacy, generous without extravagance, and right without compromise. We do not pray that other nations may love us, but that they may know that we stand for what is right, unafraid, with the courage of our convictions.

May our private lives and our public actions be consistent with our prayers. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 12, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 69) to prepare a revised edition of the Annotated Constitution of the United States of America as published in 1938 as Senate Document 232 of the Seventy-fourth Congress.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 959. An act to amend section 3179 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 3791. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3792. An act to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Immigration of the Judiciary Committee be permitted to sit during today's session of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

Mr. WHITE. I also ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to sit during this afternoon's session of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, at the request of the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee of which he is the chairman, of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, may be permitted to sit today during the session of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] is recognized.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield for that purpose?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Thirty-eight Senators are accounted for. A quorum is not present. The clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

The legislative clerk called the names of the absent Senators.

The roll call disclosed the presence of the following Senators:

Aiken	Buck	Connally
Ball	Bushfield	Cooper
Barkley	Butler	Cordon
Brewster	Byrd	Donnell
Bricker	Cain	Downey
Bridges	Capper	Dworshak
Brooks	Chavez	Ecton

Ellender	McCarran	Robertson, Va.
Ferguson	McCarthy	Robertson, Wyo.
Fulbright	McClellan	Russell
George	McFarland	Saltonstall
Gurney	McGrath	Smith
Hatch	McKellar	Sparkman
Hawkes	McMahon	Stewart
Hayden	Magnuson	Taft
Hickenlooper	Malone	Taylor
Hill	Martin	Thomas, Okla.
Hoey	Maybank	Thye
Holland	Millikin	Tobey
Jenner	Moore	Tydings
Johnson, Colo.	Morse	Umstead
Johnston, S. C.	Murray	Vandenberg
Kem	Myers	Wherry
Kilgore	O'Conor	White
Knowland	O'Mahoney	Wiley
Langer	Pepper	Williams
Lodge	Reed	Wilson
Lucas	Revercomb	Young

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is necessarily absent.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-four Senators having responded to their names, a quorum is present. The Senator from South Carolina has the floor.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I yield for the transaction of routine morning business.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

TRANSFER BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF A CABIN CRUISER TO AMERICAN NAVAL CADETS, INC., PLAINFIELD, N. J.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the American Naval Cadets, a nonprofit organization incorporated under the laws of the State of New Jersey, Plainfield, N. J., had requested the transfer of a small cabin cruiser for use by that organization for training personnel in seamanship, boat handling, and related subjects; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF INVESTIGATION OF CODY DAM AND POWER PLANT, WYOMING

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report and findings on an investigation of the Cody Dam and power plant, Wyoming (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Lands.

LEASING OF SALMON TRAP SITES IN ALASKAN COASTAL WATERS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the leasing of salmon trap sites in Alaskan coastal waters, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PETITIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Florida, praying for the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan to provide old-age assistance, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY PROJECT—RESOLUTION OF COMMON COUNCIL OF MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, Wis., relating to the St. Lawrence seaway project.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the development of the St. Lawrence seaway project will provide vast quantities of low-cost hydroelectric power, will extend the benefits of direct ocean transportation to the city of Milwaukee, the State of Wisconsin, and the entire Great Lakes area; will permit Milwaukee industries to import raw materials at low cost and, by utilizing direct ocean service, to expand greatly their foreign trade and to reach new foreign markets, and in general will enhance the economic prosperity and well-being of the Great Lakes area and the entire Nation; and

Whereas the recent world confict has demonstrated the absolute necessity of the St. Lawrence seaway for the national defense and the military security of this Nation by providing a safe and landlocked basin for national defense industries, for storage of strategic materials and for construction of naval and merchant vessels; and

Whereas the agricultural and industrial resources of the Great Lakes area could have been more effectively employed had the St. Lawrence seaway project been completed and available for use at the outbreak of the late hostilities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, That we urge all Senators and Representatives from Wisconsin to lend their best efforts to assure the construction of the seaway at as early a date as possible to permit expanded foreign trade and to insure the national defense; further

Resolved, That we hereby reaffirm the unalterable belief of the city of Milwaukee and its citizens in the merits of this great project which holds vast potentialities for the future welfare and prosperity of the city of Milwaukee, the State of Wisconsin, and the Nation at large; further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States and to Senators and Representatives from the State of Wisconsin.

TRANSPORTATION RATES AND SERVICES DIVISION, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, the Midwest Conference of State Utilities Commissions held their first conference at St. Paul, Minn., on May 9, 1947.

The conference adopted a resolution in recognition of the value to agriculture of the work of the Transportation Rate and Service Division of the Marketing Facilities Branch of the Department of Agriculture.

I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the conference resolution.

I may add that there is no issue on appropriations here. The Transportation Rates and Services Division has a very commendable record which is well recognized. To carry on their activities, they requested $138,000 in appropriations. This has been approved by the Budget Bureau and the House Appropriations Committee. It is interesting to know that the total measurable savings to agricultural producers because of the service of this agency from 1939 through June 30, 1946, has been $761,684,673. This is a $2,000 saving to the farmer for every dollar that was spent on appropriations.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT THE FIRST CONFERENCE OF THE MIDWEST CONFERENCE OF STATE UTILITIES COMMISSIONS, HELD AT ST. PAUL, MINN., MAY 9, 1947

Whereas the Midwest Conference of State Utilities Commissions composed of the State regulatory bodies of Minnesota, Wisconsin, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Iowa, and Missouri, meeting in executive session at St. Paul, Minn., on May 9, 1947, recognized the value of the work of the Transportation Rates and Services Division, Marketing Facilities Branch of the United States Department of Agriculture, to agriculture of this country; be it therefore

Resolved, That this conference go on record urging that sufficient and ample funds be appropriated by the Congress of the United States to carry on the work of the Transportation Rates and Services Division of the United States Department of Agriculture which has been so helpful to the agricultural interests of this Nation in numerous proceedings before the Interstate Commerce Commission; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Honorable EVERETT N. DIRKSEN, chairman, subcommittee, Appropriations Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C., and to the congressional delegations from the States above mentioned.

SOIL CONSERVATION PROGRAM

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a letter from Don Evertson, of Melvern, Kans., in which he expresses the strong opposition of a group of Osage County, Kans., farmers to the proposed cut in the appropriations for the Agricultural Department. I ask unanimous consent to present Mr. Evertson's letter, and request that it be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was received, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 10, 1947.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: A meeting of farmers of Osage County, Kans., was held in Lyndon, Kans., Monday, June 9, 1947, for the purpose of discussing the appropriation of funds, by Congress, for the Department of Agriculture programs for the 1948 fiscal year.

Our purpose and interest is that of public welfare and future security of the Nation, and just consideration of private businesses established to assist in carrying out certain governmental programs, such as the soil conservation program.

The 1947 Congress authorized the Departmene of Agriculture to administer a soil conservation program for the 1947 calendar year, but the present Congress has failed, to date, to make sufficient appropriations to take care of the obligations to the farmers under such programs.

We, as citizens and taxpayers, are expected to fulfill our obligations, and we expect our Congress to do the same.

Congress is charged with the responsibility of caring for the general welfare of the Nation, both present and future. Though we farmers are directly responsible for the production of food for the Nation, it is the responsibility of all groups to assist in the preservation of the soil. And such preservation must be made if our Nation is to maintain its high agricultural standing. This being true, what is to be gained in discontinuing the soil-conservation practices offered through the PMA and the soil-conservation service? Where is the economy in quitting a job well started, when it will only have to be started over again, for certainly such soil building practices will have to be continued if our Nation's agriculture is to survive.

On the fertility of our soil depends the prosperity of our Nation.

Believing this, we have resolved to request that funds be made available for the 1948 fiscal year for the following programs:

1. Three hundred million dollars for AAA.
2. One hundred and forty-eight million dollars authorized under section 32 of the 1935 Agricultural Adjustment Act.
3. Funds equal to that requested by the President for the Farmers Home Administration.
4. Funds equal to that requested by the President for the REA. This program, a self-liquidating agency, largely, and not tax supported.
5. Funds equal to that requested by the President for the agricultural price-support and commodity-loan programs.
6. Funds equal to that requested by the President for the Soil Conservation Service.
7. Funds equal to that requested by the President for the school-lunch program.

Being empowered by all farmers at the meeting to inform you of our sentiment on this matter, and requesting that you as our Representative in Congress to do all in your power, to see that these funds are appropriated which will permit the Department of Agriculture to carry on a well-balanced program in the interest of national welfare, I send you this letter and remain,

DON EVERTSON,
Chairman of Meeting.

CONTINUATION OF REA PROJECTS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received from J. Herman Salley, president of the Western Kansas Development Association, Garden City, Kans., a telegram embodying a resolution adopted by that association urging adequate appropriations for the continuance of the present REA projects and the advancement of new projects. I ask unanimous consent to present the telegram and request that it be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was received, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GARDEN CITY, KANS., *June 10, 1947.*

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.:

The directors of the Western Kansas Development Association, representing the 46 western counties of Kansas, in executive session on June 9, 1947, passed unanimously the following resolution: Be it

Resolved, That the Western Kansas Development Association favors adequate appropriations for the continuance of the present REA projects and the advancement of new projects, both line construction and power units wherever needed.

WESTERN KANSAS DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION,
J. HERMAN SALLEY, *President.*

PROTEST AGAINST REDUCTION IN APPROPRIATIONS FOR AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for reference to the Committee on Appropriations and to have printed in the RECORD a letter which I have received from a citizen of my State of Wyoming, together with a clipping of a news story and an advertisement from the Goshen County (Wyo.) News.

There being no objection, the letter, together with a clipping of a news story vertisement, were received, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YODER, WYO., *May 27, 1947.*

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senator from Wyoming,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I wish to enlist your wholehearted support in what farmers and ranchers of our community are saying about the Appropriations Committee recommendation of a 32-percent cut in agricultural appropriations. It has been anticipated that the farm program would be about the same as in years past, that farmers could get some financial assistance to do some of the most essential parts of improvement needed on the farms. The things we could not do during the war period, and now that help and material has become available we are cut in the appropriation, when it should have been raised by the amount of the anticipated cut. Now this is not a fooling gesture, according to our sign-up this spring.

We find that farmers want to do over 200 percent of their earning allowance. This clearly shows that farmers have a vital need for a good farm program. Commitments have been made. The State handbook outlining the farm program has been used for compliance. Alfalfa has been seeded, land-leveling has been done. All types of farming has been done in compliance with rules and regulations of the farm program.

Others who have made investments to do some of this work are facing ruin because of the Government's pledges to farmers which now seems to be in line of repudiation.

Well, we just can't believe that any public figure can or will wantonly destroy something which has been of such a tremendous benefit to the Nation during these turbulent times as our farm program has been. We are today drawing heavier on the resources of our soil than we ever have before through the better methods of farming, and we should do everything within our power to produce at a maximum rate at this time because of a world-wide shortage of food, and what have we or any nation?

What can get the respect and cooperation of a hungry people better than food? Yes; we want to do our share as farmers, but agricultural conservation must be the public's responsibility. There is no wa for farmers to keep up the fertility of the soil by just doing a good job of farming. The soil must have rest, and it must have some of the vital elements put back into it to keep it producing for an ever-increasing population.

The farmers, of course, are the biggest gamblers in the world. They plant the crops in the best of faith, hoping the elements will be kind to them—give us all the rain we need. O Lord, we pray, and don't let the grasshoppers and beetles eat us up. Yes; we want to do our best, but so many times do we sow but never reap—in times of pestilence, the expenses and taxes, too. That means the next season to catch up. Then we have hope of owning that farm some day, and all of this on a soil-depleting farm.

Out of the terrible depression we had in agriculture in the thirties grew the agricultural conservation program. Sometimes it takes almost a national disaster before we are properly awakened and become sensible regarding our responsibilities. It is unfortunate that the cost of being adequately aroused is so great.

We believe that all of our citizens enjoying our high standards of living will agree that he has a share in preserving our national heritage—our soil—and every citizen owes it to himself soundness in national welfare.

We expect your very best effort in maintaining the best farm program as possible.

Yours truly,

JOHN H. HELZER.

[From the Goshen County News, Torrington, Wyo., of June 5, 1947]

ACTION TAKEN AGAINST PROPOSED SLASH IN FUND FOR AG PROGRAM

Goshen County's share of the farm program as handled through the AAA office here is jeopardized by a bill now in Congress to slash the appropriation from $300,000,000 to one-half, it was pointed out before the chamber of commerce last Thursday night by R. E. MacLeod, Holly, sugar superintendent, and A. E. Olson.

The organization then voted for a resolution against the curtailment. Mr. MacLeod stated that it is not a political question and that agriculture supports this county and communities here. He contended that present commitments set up earlier in the year for 1947 should not be cut off from funds in midstream. He said $1,500,000 was handled through the local office last year to aid the farmers and stockmen.

Mr. Olson said cutting funds would curtail farm acreages and food production. Any time you kick the props out from under farming it will be felt by everyone, he declared.

[From the Goshen County News, Torrington, Wyo., of June 5, 1947]

ECONOMY, TRUE OR FALSE

Businessman, professional man, laboring man, general public: Are you concerned regarding present action of Congress in dealing a death blow to our farm program?

Is this program of any value to you?

Are you deriving any personal benefits?

We, as farmers and ranchers, believe you do receive personal benefits. The entire economy of the Nation hinges on the prosperity of the farm and ranch. Each depression in the past was started by a collapse of farm prices. Through our present AAA farm program, with a guaranty of 90 percent of parity, farm prices cannot fall to a disastrous low level. Now what does this program and guaranty cost you as a taxpayer? Less than 1 percent of the entire appropriation bill is earmarked for AAA. With that 1 percent you are assured of an abundance of food and fiber, an assurance that the soil will not be depleted, and a guaranty against a general pr e collapse.

Through the efforts of the program our ever normal granary was full when war was declared, a fact which no doubt shortened the war and saved many lives.

Do you know that there is only 3 acres of farm land per capita in our Nation on which to grow our food and fiber? Can we afford to exploit this land?

During the war it was necessary to supply enormous quantities of food and it will be necessary for some time to come, which, of course, is a heavy drain on soil fertility.

What can get the respect and cooperation of a hungry people better than food? Yes, we want to do our share as farmers, but agricultural conservation must be the public's responsibility. To many people, it is still a new thought that land can wear out. Farmers have known it for as long as farming has been practiced, but even they have not realized that the land need not wear out if it is properly managed. For the first time in the 300 years since settlement began, there is no more virgin land in our United States ready to plow or clear. The future security of the American people depends, henceforth, upon how wisely and how carefully we use the land that we already have. But soil will wear out, and with terrible speed. It washes away and blows when it is stripped of its cover of plants. Once the plants are removed, erosion sets in and the best soil, on top, begins to wash downhill or blow away as dust. We have ruined or severely damaged 282,000,000 acres of land in this way, about 50,000,000 acres of cropland alone having become too depleted for further cultivation. There is no way of counting the losses caused by erosion. But the total, in terms of duststorms, floods, ruined farms and ranches, bankruptcy, and diminished wildlife has been enormous. It is estimated that current damage by erosion of land, navigable streams and reservoirs, highways, buildings, and other improvements cost the American people about $840,000,000 annually.

We have two large areas in Goshen County that were heavily populated at one time and now are almost useless as farm land, with nobody living in the area. That condition would not have existed had the AAA program been in force at that time. When and where will a similar condition reoccur?

At a time when farm prices are at or near parity, farmers have money to maintain fertility; however, when farm prices are below parity they are forced to neglect soil fertility.

After due consideration of the foregoing statements, is it possible that we can consider a program of the immense importance to all of us to be so easily disposed of as we see and hear by our daily news service?

Is it possible that anyone can think that protection of our soil is but the concern of the farmer?

If we have ruined and severely damaged 282,000,000 acres of our good earth in the short time that we have been farming here, how long will it be before our descendants will be living in a second China, where population reduction is a necessity because of a lack of food? Many, many more questions like these could be asked, and yet we could receive but one answer, that we must, all of us, take an active part in the protection and conservation of our national heritage, our land and farms.

We have made a good beginning through AAA but there can be no let-down from here on. As the population increases, our soil must increase production, and only by the most diligent care can we keep up with the requirements of the Nation's food supply.

As a member of the UNO we cannot disregard the demand of all if its members and their requirements, therefore a greater incentive must be offered farmers to produce that which is needed most to effectuate the best relationship that we must have with the rest of the world.

If you are interested in doing your share to protect our Nation's heritage, our soil, write your Congressman and Senators today.

(This ad paid for by farmers and ranchers of Goshen County.)

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

H. R. 1344. A bill to admit the American-owned ferry *Crosline* to American registry and to permit its use in coastwise trade; without amendment (Rept. No. 273).

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 468. A bill to amend section 115 of the Internal Revenue Code in respect of distributions by personal holding companies; without amendment (Rept. No. 274);

H. R. 2872. A bill to amend further section 4 of the Public Debt Act of 1941, as amended, and clarify its application, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 275); and

H. J. Res. 210. Joint resolution to extend the time for the release, free of estate and gift tax, of certain powers, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 276).

By Mr. WHERRY, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 3123. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 278).

By Mr. WHITE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 1421. A bill to provide for the appointment of one additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 272).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 651. A bill for the relief of the estate of Rubert W. Alexander; without amendment (Rept. No. 277); and

H. R. 925. A bill for the relief of Therese R. Cohen; without amendment (Rept. No. 271).

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Civil Service:

S. 263. A bill to provide for the carrying of mail on star routes, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 279).

By Mr. CAIN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 3737. A bill to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 280).

By Mr. ECTON, from the Committee on Public Lands:

S. 483. A bill to relocate the boundaries and reduce the area of the Gila Federal reclamation project, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 281).

By Mr. McFARLAND, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 816. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended; with amendments (Rept. No. 282).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WILEY (by request):

S. 1436. A bill for the relief of Thomas D. Sherrard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 1437. A bill to amend section 311 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, with respect to the shipment of distilled spirits and wines to Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. McMAHON (by request):

S. 1438. A bill for the relief of Gaetanina Lombardo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER (by request):

S. 1439. A bill to revise the method of issuing patents for public lands;

S. 1440. A bill to repeal that portion of section 203 of title 2 of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, as designates the land herein described as available land within the meaning of that act, and to restore the land to its previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii; and

S. 1441. A bill to prescribe the measure of damages on account of trespass upon, unlawful use of, and unlawful enclosure of lands or resources owned or controlled by the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 1442. A bill to amend sections 235 and 327 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1443. A bill authorizing the naturalization of Arthur Sonnenberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 1444. A bill authorizing the sale without advertisement of national forest timber for use in the construction of homes for veterans of World War II; to the Committee on Appropriations.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 959. An act to amend section 3179 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 3791. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 3792. An act to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

SUPPORT FOR WOOL—PRINTING OF BILL SHOWING HOUSE AMENDMENTS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 814, a bill to provide support for wool, and for other purposes, be printed with amendments of the House of Representatives numbered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MARTIN AT NATIONAL CONVENTION OF YOUNG REPUBLICANS

[Mr. JENNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Youth Shapes America's Tomorrow," delivered by Senator MARTIN at the National Convention of the Young Republicans at Milwaukee, Wis., on June 6, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

FLAG DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHNSTON OF SOUTH CAROLINA

[Mr. SPARKMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Flag Day address delivered by Senator JOHNSTON of South Carolina at Eastern High School, Washington, D. C., on June 13, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL LABOR LEGISLATION—STATEMENTS BY NATIONAL CATHOLIC WELFARE CONFERENCE AND SENATOR MURRAY

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD statements on national labor legislation, issued by the Social Action Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, and by himself, together with an article from the Washington Post of June 13, 1947, on the same subject, which appear in the Appendix.]

REORGANIZATION OF EXECUTIVE BRANCH—EDITORIAL FROM THE BUFFALO NEWS

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Sensible Way To Economize," published in the Buffalo (N. Y.) News for May 10, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY PROJECT—EDITORIAL FROM THE MONTGOMERY (ALA.) ADVERTISER

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Build the St. Lawrence Seaway," from the Advertiser, of Montgomery, Ala., for May 29, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

DON'T SELL AMERICA SHORT—ARTICLE BY THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, the State of Wyoming is a State of great scenic beauty. It also possesses a vast potential oil supply for the Nation. Lovers of scenic beauty and wildlife have always objected to any development of the great natural resources, such as oil, minerals, lumber, and so forth. In this connection, Mr. President, there appears in the June issue of the American magazine a very interesting article by the Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable J. A. Krug, from which I should like to quote a few lines:

No matter how great the problem or how diverse the views of those who would solve it, Americans have proved that a solution can be arrived at through democratic processes. Some time ago a group of oil men applied to the Department of the Interior for the privilege of sinking test oil wells in the vicinity of Jackson Hole, Wyo. * * *

We held a long series of conferences. Never were two groups more diametrically opposed.

Those groups, Mr. President, I may say, were the oilmen and the conservationists.

When the passion had subsided we thrashed the matter out to the satisfaction of everybody. There was no doubt, in view of our dwindling oil reserves, that every new field should be tapped. At the same time, there was no doubt that every reservation of natural beauty set aside for the people of this Nation by their Government should be preserved.

Through discussion, all parties finally arrived at this solution: The oilmen would be permitted to sink a very limited number of test wells with the minimum destruction of natural beauty. These wells, if a pool of oil were discovered, would be the only wells sunk if they were adequate to bring the pool to the surface. Holders of leases on the surface above the pool would all share in the profits of the oil. Oilmen and nature lovers all departed from the hearing good friends.

I would say, Mr. President, that I was present at the hearings both of the oilmen and of the nature lovers, and I can thoroughly endorse the statement that a spirit of cooperation prevailed in both conferences.

I ask unanimous consent to have the entire article printed with my remarks in the body of the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DON'T SELL AMERICA SHORT!

(By J. A. Krug, Secretary of the Interior)

If we suffer another critical economic depression—and it is still within our power to prevent it—the resulting unemployment, poverty, and despair will drive more Americans into the ranks of communism than Stalin, Marx, and the Comintern ever won through argument and persuasion. It is well, therefore, if we are to continue our free way of life, to appraise democracy soundly while we are well off and calm, lest misfortune stampede us to false gods, as it did the people of Europe before the last war. When the Christian martyrs entered the Roman arena to meet lions or gladiators, they had so fortified themselves with faith in their cause that they faced disaster unflinchingly.

I do not think that anything comparable to lions and gladiators lies ahead in the economic field, but I do believe that there may come, in the not far distant future, a severe test of our faith in democracy. It is well to fortify that faith now, not with dialectics and oft-repeated credos, but with an examination of the fruits of our system as compared with others.

By their fruits ye shall know them. It is hardly worth repeating that our system of government, combined with our vast natural resources, has given us the highest standard of living that any peoples of the earth have ever enjoyed. The lot of the average Russian, even though Russia has natural resources greater than ours, cannot be compared with that of the average American worker. The American not only produces and consumes more, but he does it in a happier spirit. He lives under a system that is noncoercive. He is a free man, and what he achieves is largely voluntary. Freedom of action is one of the most important things that our democracy has to offer.

When my grandparents came to this country from Germany in the 1850's to escape the military servitude that lay ahead for their children, they migrated to the wilderness of Wisconsin and, through the most arduous drudgery, helped make it a fruitful land. But they and my father looked upon the drudgery as a privilege, not a penalty. Many of these German immigrants resisted Union conscription in the Civil War, preferring to buy their way out, as was permitted in those times, rather than to suffer the indignity of coercion. But having done so, many of them went out immediately and enlisted in the Union ranks. They considered the right to volunteer in the service of a free country a privilege.

It is true that we employed the Selective Service System in the recent war, but the system was invoked by a free electorate, through its Congress, in a Government sensitive to the will of the people.

The other day I was talking with a coal miner. To hear some reports one might imagine that coal miners are slaves, forced by the iron hand of necessity to live like moles in dark, underground tunnels, undernourished, underpaid, and everlastingly trembling in the clutch of fear.

I said to this coal miner, "Do you like your job?"

"I chose to do it," he said. "I wouldn't have any other job in the world. I like it, and I'm proud of it. When workers on the surface are fighting rain and snow or sitting cramped up in stuffy offices, I am warm and happy far down below the surface of the earth in a black room glittering with the lights of our torches, working and talking with my buddies, the men I grew up with."

I am not underestimating the arduousness or the peril of a coal miner's lot; I simply am quoting a man who chose his job in a free country. He did not behave like a prisoner of war in a salt mine or a serf in a peat bog. He behaved like a free and happy man with sincere pride in his contribution toward building a great and strong country.

When I was a child, one of the finest things my father did for me was to take me at intervals through different kinds of factories and many foundries, machine shops, rock-crushing plants, and dairy farms.

"I want you to see," he said, "how things are made, and to help you understand that in a free country you can make anything you choose. You may be what you wish. I shall not tell you what to be. When you grow up you will have freedom of action and of choice. Class and religion will not stand in your way."

Since those days I have been many things. I have worked on a high scaffolding as a carpenter. I have carried ice to refrigerator cars, serviced cars in a filling station, served in the Navy, and worked over columns of figures in offices. I have dug ditches, driven moving vans, and wiped grease from railroad locomotives. When I did not like a job, I changed it, because I was brought up under a voluntary system.

In this country we have a tradition of change. In many of the countries of the earth a man is classified, either by circumstance or by government, when he is born, and he is apprenticed at a tender age. He has no choice. Two of the greatest boons that government can provide to an individual are freedom of choice and freedom of action.

There is another fruit of our democracy that is seldom mentioned—the development in the individual of a sense of responsibility and the delegation of responsibility to the individual. The freedom of choice and action which I was given at an early age, as all Americans are, helped me to develop a strong sense of responsibility. If I changed jobs mistakenly when I was a kid, I paid the price. If I spent my money improvidently, I was the loser. If I failed to study and to pass my examinations, it meant another year in school and the loss of a year in fulfilling myself out in the world. On the farm, which grows responsibility in America more than any other crop, I learned from my grandparents what it was to be completely on one's own.

The kind of personal responsibility which we have developed under this democracy enabled us, in the recent war, to move with a facility and an efficiency which the dictatorships could not match. It was often said during the defeatist beginnings of the war that democracy was so cumbersome that it could not operate rapidly enough to defeat its streamlined autocratic adversaries. Although nobody disputed the argument, we went right ahead, armed the world, bridged the seas with ships and airplanes, and completely crushed our enemies.

The dictatorships had only one authority—at the top—and all decisions trickled down from the top An example of what that meant in strait-jacketing any direct, forceful action was indicated to me by our authoritarian ally, Russia. When I was directing the War Production Board a Russian delegation informed us that Russia must have large power plants immediately, in much less time than it would take to manufacture them. Unfortunately, our plants, for the most part, are 60 cycles, while Russian plants generally operate on 50 cycles. Within 2 weeks we found two 50-cycle plants that could be dismantled and shipped.

It took the Russians 11 months to dismantle the plants and ship them to Russia. Why? Every decision that was made had

to be made in Moscow. Every request made to the homeland had to be carried from echelon to higher echelon until, in all likelihood, it was carried virtually to Stalin himself. In this country responsibility for decisions on many important matters was delegated far down in the ranks of authority.

When the high command in Germany during the war delivered specifications for materials to manufacturers they could not be altered except with the consent of the high command. In the WPB on many occasions I have seen lieutenant colonels who were not the heads of their departments authorize important changes in specifications in war materials when we convinced them that the material or process demanded was impracticable for mass production. Under the dictatorships the most trivial decisions often had to be made at the top level of responsibility.

Our fluid and flexible system proved in every way to be far more efficient than the rigid, autocratic systems of our enemies. We won the war because, in a sense, we were able to pool the initiative, genius, and energy of 130,000,000 people. This would be unthinkable in many European and Asiatic nations, class-ridden and arbitrary as they are.

When Jimmy Byrnes, former Secretary of State, returned from the Four-Power Conference in Paris, he made a very significant statement to the Cabinet when I was present. He said that he found the principal difficulty in dealing with the Russians was the fact that they simply did not think the way we do. He observed that Americans, even though of different political and philosophical points of view, almost always came to the same conclusion in a conference, provided they all had the same set of facts and were convinced that those facts were sound. He said he found that the Russians, even though agreeing with the basic facts submitted to a conference, usually disagreed completely with us as to the conclusion.

No matter how great the problem or how diverse the views of those who would solve it, Americans have proved that a solution can be arrived at through democratic processes. Some time ago a group of oilmen applied to the Department of the Interior for the privilege of sinking test oil wells in the vicinity of Jackson Hole, Wyo., where there is a national monument which is part of our national park system. Immediately a howl came up from wildlife and outdoor lovers of the Nation. They had seen beautiful regions despoiled before by oil rigs, derricks, and tanks, and the atmosphere tainted by the smell of petroleum.

We held a long series of conferences. Never were two groups more diametrically opposed. When the passion had subsided we thrashed the matter out to the satisfaction of everybody. There was no doubt, in view of our dwindling oil reserves, that every new field should be tapped. At the same time, there was no doubt that every reservation of natural beauty set aside for the people of this Nation by their Government should be preserved.

Through discussion, all parties finally arrived at this solution: The oilmen would be permitted to sink a very limited number of test wells with the minimum destruction of natural beauty. These wells, if a pool of oil were discovered, would be the only wells sunk if they were adequate to bring the pool to the surface. Holders of leases on the surface above the pool would all share in the profits of the oil. Oilmen and nature lovers all departed from the hearing good friends.

This was not my solution. It was the composite solution of every citizen present.

Again, the War Department proposed that certain public lands, now used for grazing cattle in the West, become a testing field for guided jet bombs. The Army wanted a strip 200 miles long and 50 miles wide, a serious cut into the grazing range of cattlemen in the vicinity. And so we brought together the irreconcilables—in this case the men responsible for the security of the Nation and those responsible for its food.

I called them irreconcilables. As a matter of fact, both groups, like most Americans, had only one object ultimately in view—the public good. They solved the problem very simply by finding another strip of land such as they desired, which was unproductive and, as far as we know, good for nothing except to blow up. Everybody went away happy.

Under the national congressional reclamation policy, no farmer is permitted to use water from a Federal Government project on more than 160 acres. The big farm corporations for many years have protested this law, because it prevents mass production by farm corporations. There is in Congress today a bill to change this law. Public hearings will be held in Washington and in California, where the controversy is centered. Through these hearings both Congress and the Department of the Interior will learn how the people feel.

Dictators don't ask. They order. Democracy works for the individual good on the assumption that the state was created for the individual, not the individual for the state.

I think our system of holding public hearings to provide first-hand information for our lawmaking bodies is one of the most important instruments of democracy. Let no American say he is without a voice in the Government of his country when he has the right to appear at any public hearing called by Congress, his State legislature, or his city council. Politicians as well as administrators favor the public hearing because it enables them to hear direct the voices of their constituents.

If you will watch public hearings closely, you may observe that Communists attend them faithfully, and testify on every possible subject. They know that lawmaking in this country is influenced through public hearings. Their testimony is so frequently extreme and irresponsible in its denunciation of democratic procedures and proposals that it is easy to identify and, more important, it is easy to answer. The Communists participate in elections and political campaigns because they know that these democratic procedures create the power of the leadership of this Nation.

I cannot understand how any American who is cognizant of the poverty and political impotence of other peoples could countenance for one moment any utopian ideology, no matter how logical, to supplant our own.

Shots are still being fired in various parts of the world over the right of men to choose their own government. And yet there are still thousands of men and women in this country who will not take the trouble to walk to a polling place to cast a vote. This has been said many, many times, but now, with the ghastliness of the last war so fresh in our minds, I do not see how anybody could be so unappreciative of his rights as a free human being as to neglect to participate in his government.

Dark days may lie ahead. We have all the set-up for a mighty economic crash. Organized industrial labor is averaging a wage of $1.26 an hour, as against the unorganized workers' average of 85 cents. Many businessmen are asking too high prices. The consumer debt is up $6,000,000,000 this year, indicating that the high cost of living is forcing many people into debt. There you have an invitation to economic disaster.

Who is at fault? Government? Labor? Industry? I should say avarice is at fault—individual, unsocial greed. When the war ended and peacetime production was revived, some labor leaders, some manufacturers, and some consumers went all out in their efforts to get the most they could out of whatever existed in short supply. In other words, they sold America short. They had worked for years to save their freedom of choice and freedom of action, and, having saved it, they violated it with greed.

Those who were responsible still have the right and duty to change. It is such people as they, a minority, who endanger our democracy by taking advantage of it. They are the ones who always bring about coercive legislation, and coercive legislation never works as well as voluntary action.

This was demonstrated graphically during the war. The War Production Board did not even arbitrarily control vital materials, and yet these materials were distributed equitably by regulations which, for the most part, were voluntarily enforced by the producers and manufacturers themselves. On the other hand, the Office of Price Adjustment employed a huge staff of agents to enforce OPA rulings. Everybody knows the story of the scandalous black market which flourished in spite of OPA.

It is an old trick of men in responsibility to step aside, when in trouble, and throw the burden of guilt upon the citizens in a democracy. If a crash comes, I say to you now that it will be the fault of the free people of this country. If we begin now and for 1 year dedicate ourselves to making democracy work, we can win out against depression, communism, or anything else that menaces our happiness and well-being.

We shall have to work, work, and work, just as we did during the war. The goal will be the same—the saving of our democracy. Through this rededication we must produce as we did during the war.

Volume of goods, enough to satisfy American consumers and fulfill our commitments abroad, is the force which will bring down prices. There should be full and continuous use of every productive facility of the country. Consumers must curb their demands for goods in short supply. Stoppage of coal mining and steel production have curtailed production all the way down the line. If we can keep up a high output of coal, steel, lead, zinc, copper, glass, paper containers, and building materials, to name but a few, our whole economy will speed up.

Our industrial democracy will work only if we work it. We can out-produce every other country on earth. In doing so it will become apparent to every American, as well as to our friends and enemies abroad, how great and powerful and invulnerable our system of democracy is in spite of its imperfections. Prices and wages will adjust themselves normally through the law of supply and demand if, and only if, we have increased production.

"By their fruits ye shall know them." Let us produce those fruits in greater and greater abundance.

All of this can be accomplished voluntarily, and by no other means. Our tradition of free action and free choice is a source of far greater strength and ability to handle emergencies than any authority imposed from the top down can ever be.

We can bank on success for our system of free choice and action, our system of compromise and eventual agreement. With faith in democracy, and good hard work, we shall not sell America short.

TRIBUTE TO LIBERTY PARTY LEADER DEZSO SULYOK, OF HUNGARY

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, a story in the Washington Post this morning deals with a speech delivered yesterday in the Hungarian Parliament by Liberty Party Leader Dezso Sulyok, who said on the floor of the Hungarian Parliament that,

as we all know, Hungary is nearing the stage of complete control by the Communists, and for 1 hour told his colleagues the facts as to what had happened in Hungary and about the totalitarian tactics by which the Communists there had finally seized power.

Mr. President, as a Member of the Congress of the United States, one of the legislative bodies of the world—and under our principles of government it is the legislative bodies which are the guardians of the people's freedom—I cannot resist paying my own humble tribute to this member of the Hungarian Parliament who made that speech, knowing full well that he probably faced at least exile to Siberia, and at the worst perhaps a firing squad. I think that by that one action he has joined the ranks of the immortals who have fought the fight for human freedom down through the centuries. He has proven once again that in the hearts and spirits of men the flame of freedom still burns and that there are still men who are willing to say with Patrick Henry, "Give me liberty or give me death." I think his action, Mr. President, will prove, when history is finally written, tremendously significant, and I think it is a warning to the Russian aggressors that, no matter how ruthlessly they may close their grip on countries and suppress all freedom, there still will always be a sufficient number of men and women in the world who put devotion to freedom above everything else finally to make sure that the effort now being made to turn back the whole tide of history and return to the time when there were absolute rulers and individual freedom meant nothing, is doomed ultimately to failure.

Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the story which appeared in this morning's Washington Post. As I say, I think Mr. Sulyok has earned his place among the immortals of history.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I have no objection to the printing of the article, but I recall that the Committee on Rules and Administration has been considering the question of printing. I believe the Senator's request was that the newspaper article be printed as a part of his remarks. If the article is to go in as a statement of the Senator——

Mr. BALL. My request was that it be printed as a statement at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARLIAMENT THROWN INTO UPROAR BY ATTACK ON ALL WHO HAD HAND IN CRISIS

BUDAPEST, June 12.—Liberty Party Leader Dezso Sulyok caused an uproar in the Hungarian Parliament today by attacking the Communists, the secret police, the present Cabinet and ousted Premier Ferenc Nagy for their parts in the political crisis.

Two hours after he spoke, and caused the suspension of the session, the Peasant Party newspaper appeared on the streets with a report that prosecution authorities intended to arrest him and his deputy.

Lashing out against all elements involved in the crisis and accusing the Communist-dominated interior ministry of trying to trap him into accepting bribes, Sulyok said:

"The city is calm. But it is the calm and peace of fear and terror. There is no democracy here. All of public life is thrown into a net of police espionage. There is no freedom of press or assembly here."

COMMUNISTS IN FRENZY

Roused to a frenzy of anger, Communists catcalled and shouted. The Communist whip stalked from the chamber.

Sulyok spoke unscheduled soon after news reached Parliament that Brig Gen. George H. Weems, American member of the Allied Control Council, had delivered to Russian Gen. N. P. Sviridov, the man behind the crisis, the State Department's note accusing Russia of a most flagrant interference in Hungarian affairs.

His speech followed also the disclosure that a Russian claim to 825 American-owned patents, worth many millions of dollars, had been referred to the Allied Control Council in Berlin. Russia claims the patents as German assets liable to seizure as reparations.

Szabad Szo, the Peasant Party paper, said the public prosecutor intended to arrest both Sulyok and his deputy, Janos Nagyivan, on the basis of speeches they made at Szeged 2 months ago.

FRAME-UP ATTEMPT CHARGED

The prosecutor intends to ask the lifting of Sulyok's parliamentary immunity to accuse him of treacherous and libelous remarks against the government, the newspaper said. Nagyivan, it added, is to be accused of breaking the laws for the protection of democracy.

Sulyok charged in his speech—a possible foreshadowing of his arrest—that several frame-up attempts had been made recently to trap him into accepting money for political espionage.

Speaking, despite the cat-calls of his opponents, Sulyok charged that the press had been muzzled and appealed to the Catholic Church to suspend negotiations with the government until students, arrested months ago for demonstrating against religious bills, had been released.

Attacking ousted Premier Ferenc Nagy as having played both sides and submitting to the domination of the Marxist parties, Sulyok said:

"Hungary has fallen between two chairs as a result of Nagy's equivocal policy. Both the Soviet Union and the western powers have lost confidence in Hungarian politics. Hungary must now make herself independent of the great powers and pursue an independent foreign policy."

Sulyok said the solution of the political crisis lay in forming a true coalition without the revival or reaction and without "the fear that such a coalition would lead to a Marxist revolution and single-handed dictatorship."

If Nagy had been frank in his dealings, he said, the situation would now be different. When Nagy finally failed, he said, the leftists "allowed him to escape—an excellent political maneuver for then they could make him appear a traitor." The result of Nagy's policies, he said, was that Russia distrusted all non-Marxist parties and the western countries see Hungary as a mere Russian satellite.

He also criticized Premier Lajos Dinnyes for failing, in his maiden speech in Parliament yesterday, to mention the new electoral law which is to disenfranchise more than 10 percent of the country's registered voters.

Sulyok said that, though foreign reports exaggerated the situation here, civil liberties had been suppressed.

"It is not true that there are bloodshed and barricades in the streets," he said.

Communist leader Joszef Revai stalked dramatically from the chamber in anger and shouts of "Fascist" came from Communist members. Sulyok turned to Communist Interior Minister Laszlo Rajk and said:

"It was no use sending political spies to me. Not long ago I had a visitor who asked if I would accept financial assistance from Anglo-Saxons. Well, it's a waste of time trying to trick me this way. I will not be deceived by such tactics."

After Sulyok's speech, the speaker suspended the order of business, including speeches by other opposition leaders and a vote of confidence in the new cabinet, and adjourned the session until next Wednesday.

Sulyok and 15 adherents were expelled from the Smallholders Party of ousted Premier Ferenc Nagy in April 1946. A prewar liberal and wartime resistance leader, his party is conservative and opposes Soviet domination.

BELA VARGA IN UNITED STATES ZONE

VIENNA, AUSTRIA, June 12.—Former President of the Hungarian Parliament Bela Varga, whose fate had been unknown since he fled Budapest, arrived in Innsbruck today by train, authoritative sources said.

Varga was smuggled into the American zone after spending several days in a Vienna monastery, informants said.

UNVEILING OF BUST OF BERNARD M. BARUCH AT ARMY WAR COLLEGE

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, at noon today I had the great privilege to be present at the Army War College when a bust of the Honorable Bernard M. Baruch was dedicated by the Commandant and faculty of the War College. A very notable address was delivered upon that occasion by Mr. Baruch. As a matter of fact, it was more than notable: it was most eloquent and moving. It seems to me that it should be read by all the people of the United States. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

At this time I desire to call attention to one or two of the very simple but true statements made by Mr. Baruch in the address:

Now, I am in my second round trip through two world wars, the aftermath, and the endeavor to make a lasting peace. I marvel at the regularity with which errors are repeated.

It takes only a moment's consideration to realize that Mr. Baruch has spoken a great truth in that statement.

Of great importance, however, was this injunction, which should be called to the attention of all our people:

Let us never depart from the belief that has made us great: Man is not the means; man is the end. His freedom and his dignity are sacred.

Mr. President, I think this speech deserves reproduction in the RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at the conclusion of Mr. Baruch's speech the introductory remarks which were made on this occasion by Mr. Herbert Bayard Swope, who presented the bust to the War College.

There being no objection, the address and introductory remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. BERNARD M. BARUCH

My friends, I am profoundly stirred by this tribute which, even if not deserved, is deeply pleasing.

I cannot count how many wars have taken place in my lifetime, but I personally have had knowledge of four. I was born not long after Sherman's march to the sea, through which my people were impoverished. I saw but was physically disqualified from service

in the Spanish War. Now, I am in my second round trip through two world wars, the aftermath, and the endeavor to make a lasting peace.

I marvel at the regularity with which errors are repeated. That is not a military characteristic—it couldn't be with Generals Marshall and Eisenhower and Admirals King and Nimitz and their associates on the job—but it is definitely true of the civilian and political mind.

One of the ancients—among whom some of my friends class me—Plutarch said: "In war it is not often permitted to make the same mistake twice." But we did, and got away with it. It is one of the primary functions of this newly established National War College to guard against this weakness by perfecting the marriage of political and military objectives.

In America it is not an army we must train for war; it is a nation.

That truth makes it essential for a Regular officer to claim his status as a citizen, instead of being denied his civic responsibilities because he wears the uniform of service. After all, a soldier is still a citizen. The men who commanded on land and sea and in the air, and those whom they commanded, have given new dignity to the spirit of America. I resent the implication that these war leaders are any less able or willing to discharge their duties in peace. I reject the theory that they think narrowly and rigidly in terms of war. As I said recently, we are in the midst of a "cold war," and we depend upon our soldiers and sailors not only to protect us, but to help us avoid the entanglements that may prove fatal. They should not be forced into a secondary citizenship.

Let us never depart from the belief that has made us great:

Man is not the means; man is the end.

His freedom and his dignity are sacred.

He must not be stamped into a set pattern; into forms that bind his spirit instead of freeing it.

The spirit of man grows in freedom; it withers in chains.

He has the right to live a free life. That right springs, inalienably, from within himself. It is not existent by decree of the state. Let us better ourselves; then will come a bettered state.

We look forward with hope to a world ruled by the force of law and not by the law of force. To that end we have devoted our lives.

If I have been at all helpful in the Nation's needs, it is due to those who have helped me. I dare not give names for fear the listing would be incomplete, but in the first war and in this, I have been fortunate beyond words in having at my right hand men of vision, of stature, of action, who, because they knew how to give orders, would take them.

Representative of their loyalty and ability is the man who has made this presentation for them, Herbert Bayard Swope. He was always by my side no matter how loudly the lion roared.

My deep thanks to all who have made me possible, who have helped me to preserve my creed.

Now in the afternoon of my life, I reaffirm my faith in this country of ours—this infinitely patient, this quick-rewarding, this slow to anger, bold, independent, just, and loving mother of us all.

To uphold her, we oppose dictatorship of the right or left. We oppose despotism. We oppose totalitarianism. We oppose slavery, whether imposed by the state or individual.

We are dedicated to the preservation of free initiative and expression, but with it goes the responsibility for the protection of opportunity, political, religious, social, and economic.

That is the heart of democracy: the maintenance of rights, not privileges; the dignity of each man and woman. That is what we are fighting for.

My gratitude to Secretaries Marshall, Patterson, and Forrestal, and Admiral Nimitz for what they have said. My thanks to you, Admiral Hill, and particularly to you, General Eisenhower. I hold myself subject, at any time, to their call.

REMARKS OF HERBERT BAYARD SWOPE AT PRESENTATION OF BARUCH BUST, NATIONAL WAR COLLEGE, FRIDAY, JUNE 13, 1947

Ladies and gentlemen, on such an occasion as this, it is wise to avoid the elegiac. Eulogies and epitaphs are usually overdrawn. It was a Chinese philosopher who, assigned by the Emperor to get him some good men, spent the day in a cemetery reading inscriptions on the headstones of the great and the little, and then advised his boss to kill all the living and resurrect the dead.

The record of the man we honor today will outlive this bronze. The book written by life is the final memorial. Nevertheless, this monument, and its emplacement here, is a public tribute to great services greatly rendered. And coming during his life, it is heart pleasing, for all of us are gratified by public recognition.

Woodrow Wilson was the first to publicly recognize the spirit and ability of the man who sits here.

He has been successful in a tough battle—the money game. He was, and still is, consumed by a passion for service—for public service.

He came to Washington willing to accept any role in the first World War, as long as it would be helpful. After several experiments with others, this man was chosen to be head of the War Industries Board. Thus, he became the first to command the Arsenal of Democracy.

How well he did is now a matter of history. From the German Commander, Field Marshal Von Hindenburg, came a tribute that was earned largely through his work. Hindenburg wrote:

"America's brilliant, if pitiless, war industry had entered the service of patriotism and had not failed it. Under the compulsion of military necessity, a ruthless aristocracy was at work and rightly, even in the land at the portals of which the Statue of Liberty flashes its blinding light across the seas. They understood war!"

Through the troubled period we called peace after the first World War, he was never wanting in his sense of devotion to his country. He was used freely by Presidents, Secretaries and Governors, denying himself to none.

This man saw clearly the coming conflict in which we still are. He, like Cassandra, was fated not to be believed.

In 1937 and 1938 he sounded warnings that brought him only obloquy. There were those in high places who squirmed away from the embarrassment his truths carried. Then came the war—and now I tell you a story that you will find incredible—and I tell you on my own, without his authority.

From the moment of the declaration, the military wanted to use the genius of this man and they did. But, in other fields, there were those who sniffed at the idea of using him. "Too old," they said—I quote verbatim—"too old—and this is a different kind of war."

For a while these astigmatic cynics held to their theory but soon they rediscovered the qualities of Baruch—a sense of duty; wisdom; experience; directness; integrity; and understanding of the people and their confidence in him. These qualities forced his return to Washington through the call of President Roosevelt. Secretaries Byrnes, Patterson, Forrestal, Generals Marshall and Eisenhower, Admirals King and Nimitz, speaking for themselves and their associates, can bear testimony to the depth, width and value of his services.

Too old indeed. May America benefit for a long time by the spirit the years have developed in Bernard Mannes Baruch. His life has been lengthened by the gratitude of the people who recognize in him their tribune. May he long be spared to serve them with the eye of the seer and the heart of truth.

I would be missing in my duty if I did not say that this recognition—the only private citizen thus to be honored—was made possible by the appreciation and initiative of the Chief of Staff, General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower, everybody's General Ike, supported by the Navy.

It is my privilege now to present this bust to Admiral Hill, Commandant of the National War College.

JUDICIAL INTERFERENCE WITH JURIES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of Senators to the fact that on the front page of the Washington Post of this morning, Friday, June 13, is an article under the headline "Motorist is cleared, judge flays jury." I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed in the body of the RECORD.

I call attention to the fact that although judges are supposed to pass only on the law, they are trying to tell good, honest men who are on juries how to decide the facts. Anyone reading this article cannot come to any other conclusion than that the judge was setting up his own conception of the facts against a verdict arrived at by the 12 persons who composed this jury.

Mr. President, I know this judge, Municipal Judge George D. Neilson; I know him personally; he is a very fine man; but apparently he entertains the general view that seems to be coming into acceptance all over the country, that a judge can tell a jury how to decide the facts in a lawsuit. If this persists, sooner or later the Congress will have to take action to prevent it. Not only is it bad in this particular case, but it intimidates jurors in Federal courts who may be called upon to decide upon the life and the liberty and the property rights of people all over the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOTORIST IS CLEARED, JUDGE FLAYS JURY—"NOT GUILTY" RETURNED IN TRAFFIC DEATH OF AGED MAN—NEILSON CRITICIZES VERDICT AS FLAGRANT MISCARRIAGE; DRIVER FACES SECOND CHARGE

A verdict which freed a Baltimore truck driver of negligent homicide was criticized as a flagrant miscarriage of justice by Municipal Court Judge George D. Neilson yesterday.

Marvin B. Stevens, 33, who went on trial in connection with the death of 87-year-old John H. Cook, of 515 Eighth Street NE., March 31, still faces charges of driving while intoxicated and operating on a suspended driver privilege.

The jury of six men and six women deliberated 2 hours yesterday before returning the not-guilty verdict. They had heard two policemen testify Stevens smelled of alcohol

and was unsteady on his feet immediately after the accident.

The jury also heard Deputy Coroner Dr. Richard Rosenberg testify a urinalysis disclosed .22 of alcohol in Stevens' body after the accident. Rosenberg said .15 is considered intoxicating.

Cook, a pedestrian, was struck at First Street and New York Avenue NE. on March 19 and died at Casualty Hospital March 31.

Stevens testified his truck did not strike the man. He said Cook apparently was frightened when Stevens stopped the truck suddenly and fell on the paving striking his head.

Police Pvt. Joseph A. Meyer, of the traffic division, one of the two policemen testifying as to Stevens' sobriety, said he saw the truck strike Cook. The other policeman was Pvt. John C. Vinson, of the accident-investigation unit.

Stevens' attorney was Michael J. Colbert.

Judge Neilson's criticism lashed the jury immediately after the verdict was read. He repeated the "flagrant miscarriage of justice" and declared, "It is high time an end were put to this sort of thing."

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY PROJECT

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, one of the most consistent opponents of the St. Lawrence seaway among the newspapers of the country has been the Buffalo Evening News, of Buffalo, N. Y., which has contended editorially that the construction of the seaway would be bad for Buffalo, and that Buffalo citizens did not approve it. However, this newspaper a short time ago undertook a poll of the citizens of Buffalo to ascertain how they stood on the matter of constructing the St. Lawrence seaway. The poll showed, according to the Buffalo Evening News itself, that 59.3 percent of Buffalo residents believed that the St. Lawrence seaway should be developed, 21.1 percent answered "No," and the remaining 19.6 percent had no opinion at all. I think this newspaper is to be commended for its willingness to print the facts, which contradicted its editorial policy.

I ask leave to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial from the Watertown Times, of Watertown, N. Y., commenting on the result of the poll.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUFFALO SUPPORTS THE SEAWAY

Buffalo's opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway, it now develops, is something of a myth. We confess that we have always thought that Buffalo was opposed to the development. Buffalo senators and assemblymen at Albany are always submitting anti-seaway resolutions for legislative approval. Delegates to party nominating conventions are always trying to leave the St. Lawrence seaway plans out of the party platform in deference to Buffalo voters.

The Buffalo Evening News likewise is a fighting opponent of the development. That newspaper must have been surprised just as we have been over the results of a poll conducted by Homer Kempfer, of the Buffalo News staff. The subject was the St. Lawrence seaway. The results speak for themselves.

A total of 59.3 percent of Buffalo residents believe that the St. Lawrence seaway should be developed by the United States and Canada. Only 21.1 percent answered "No." A total of 19.6 percent had no opinion. Assuming that the 19.6 percent were to make up their minds to oppose the seaway, even then the percentage in opposition would be 40.7.

The Evening News writer goes further. He found that of those with opinions 78 percent between the ages of 21 and 34 favored the project. In the 35-49 age group 73 percent were in favor and among those of 50 and over 67 percent were supporters.

This poll conducted by the Evening News represents the best in opinion research methods. The newspaper utilizes the Gallup and Roper techniques in arriving at a truthful cross section of opinion.

Buffalo favors the seaway. There is no question about it. Hereafter it will be difficult for one to speak in behalf of Buffalo claiming opposition to the St. Lawrence seaway. Buffalo spokesmen should present this different view.

EDITORIAL COMMENT ON ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY PROJECT

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The St. Lawrence Seaway," from the Toledo (Ohio) Blade of May 29, 1947.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed an editorial on the same subject entitled "Build the Waterway," from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of May 30, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Toledo (Ohio) Blade of May 29, 1947]

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

The testimony of former President Herbert Hoover and Secretary of State George C. Marshall in favor of the St. Lawrence seaway project yesterday was neatly complementary. Whereas Mr. Hoover stressed the economic advantages of connecting the Great Lakes with the seven seas, General Marshall concentrated on its military advantages.

Either, it seems to us, would justify carrying out the project on a self-liquidating basis. Combined, these reasons appear overwhelming. Anything which will promote the economic interests of the American people in time of peace and increase their security in case of war should be a sensible undertaking.

What, then, are the obstacles which have held up the project much longer than engineers say it would take to complete the seaway? There is the opposition of the railroad interests, which fear that the seaway would take away some of their business. But that, of course, merely confirms the economic advantages of the seaway. There is the objection of those cities which fear that the seaway would jeopardize the advantages of their transportation facilities. But why should the geographical advantages of some cities be perpetuated when geography cries aloud for man to complete the river links which will connect the greatest inland waters with the sea?

Because the benefits of the St. Lawrence seaway would be so tremendous in peace or war, the opposition to it comes almost entirely from those who place their private interests above the interests of the Nation. Mr. Hoover and General Marshall, in calling for its approval, have shown again that any unbiased person who studies the proposal as a whole thinks it should be undertaken.

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of May 30, 1947]

BUILD THE WATERWAY

Pittsburgh could become a seaport as well as a great river port if two projects long in the planning stage were ever completed. One is the proposal to link Pittsburgh to Lake Erie by a 105-mile canal. The other is the St. Lawrence seaway project now under congressional study.

The seaway project is provided for in the Deep-Water Treaty which this country and Canada signed in 1932. Congress has failed thus far to ratify the treaty, which provides for a system of wide canals around the International Rapids of the St. Lawrence River, through which ocean vessels could pass and then ply the Great Lakes as far west as Duluth. It also provides for the construction of a dam at International Rapids which would create 2,200,000 horsepower of hydroelectric capacity.

The project received a boost on Wednesday when Secretary of State Marshall, Herbert Hoover, and Maj. Gen. Francis B. Wilby, chairman of the New York Power Authority, testified in its behalf before a Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee.

Secretary Marshall described the waterway as an essential step toward tightening the continent's defense. He said it would enable this country to build and repair oceangoing vessels in relatively secure inland waters handling ships up to a 25-foot draft and 10,000 tons.

All the witnesses agreed that aside from its defense advantages the project would provide cheap hydroelectric power and open an artery of communication to the industrial and agricultural heart of the Midwest without real harm to other modes of transport or to coastal ports.

Among those who have opposed the waterway is the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce, which fears that this area's coal, iron and steel, railroad, and other industries would suffer as a result of new competition. It has argued that the railroads will suffer loss of traffic and that coal and iron ore will have to compete with cheap imports.

Mr. Hoover told the committee, however, that he believes railroad business would not be cut more than 5 percent and that the railroads ultimately would gain because of increased industry in the Midwest. It has also been pointed out that the waterway could reduce the burden on the railways during periods when commodities awaiting shipment exceed available car space.

The former President told the committee, too, that the Midwest is in dire need to import high-grade iron ore to maintain its industries, since its deposits were almost exhausted in the war effort. He said it would not be "economic" to import the ore by rail because of the prohibitive cost.

The manufacture of electric power at International Rapids would greatly increase the industrial capacity of the Nation. And when the industrial capacity is boosted, the entire country benefits.

Our relations with Canada would be strengthened if Congress would ratify the Deep-Water Treaty, now in the form of an "agreement," which was rejected in 1934 and again in 1944.

We hope the agreement will not be blocked again. Even though costs are up, we believe that construction of the $500,000,000 project now is justified. It would be completed at about the time foreign countries begin to get back on their feet, and this country will be trying to stimulate world trade.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask permission to be absent from the Senate during next week.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate on Monday next.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN AGREEMENTS BETWEEN CARRIERS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 110) to amend the Inter-

state Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, when I was interrupted yesterday I was discussing evidence presented in the hearings before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on Senate bill 110. I was reading from testimony presented by Willis J. Ballinger, Economic Adviser to the National Federation of Small Business, on behalf of the Federation, in opposing the bill. I had just begun reading from evidence presented by him, and shall continue from the point where I left off:

In 1929 American business went into a profound depression. From that depression the economy has never recovered. From 1929 to the beginning of war mobilization the economic system was sustained by Government spending. As a result of the war there are some billions of war savings, the spending of which, for a time, will give the appearance of a sound forward movement in private business. But when those savings are gone, it is our opinion that the depression of 1929 will return with greater virulence, and that the system will remain locked in depression until the forces causing the collapse of business in 1929 have been remedied. A capitalistic system dependent on Government spending is a capitalistic system in danger of liquidation. If private enterprise cannot afford employment to millions, and Government spending becomes necessary to take care of millions of unemployed, then private enterprise will eventually be replaced by Government control and direction of the economic system.

Not reading from the record but making my own statement along that line, Mr. President, I wish to say that I have never been able to understand why the businessmen of the Nation cannot see the dangers lurking in the monopolistic system we have in America, and their control of business throughout our Nation.

I continue to read from Mr. Ballinger's testimony:

The break-down of business in 1929 was the result of half a century in which capitalism in the United States was systematically misoperated by an alliance of big businessmen and bankers.

Monopoly controls appeared in finance, industry, transportation, and distribution. Regional competition was also eliminated through a discriminatory freight-rate system on the railroads of the Nation, which prevented the development of more efficiently located industries in the South and the West. The purpose of this discriminatory freight-rate system was to protect giant monopolistic corporations from potential competition in the South and West.

Mind you, Mr. President, this is small business speaking.

The rapid spread of monopoly in American capitalism from 1890 to 1929 caused a progressive loss of productive power in our economic system. This is always the effect of monopoly in a capitalistic system. The depression of 1929 registered the fact that private business had become incapable of carrying the employment load of the Nation, shackled as it was by monopolistic restraints placed on trade by big businessmen and bankers. At the same time the elimination of regional competition through the system of discriminatory freight rates had caused a congestion of the population of the Nation in a few giant cities with hideous slums.

But for this system of discriminatory freight rates the population of the Nation would have been dispersed. Hundreds of vigorous small towns and cities would have sprung up in the West and South. The health and prosperity of the American people would have been materially increased. And from a military standpoint, the productive powers of the Nation in time of war would have been better located from the standpoint of defending those resources from aerial attack. No Communist or Fascist could have thought up a more ingenious scheme to generate mass discontent and to weaken the military defenses of the United States than the men who engineered and have maintained the system of discriminatory freight rates on our railroads.

Who are these men? They are the investment-banking houses who for decades have controlled the railroads because they controlled their credit. They are now asking the Congress of the United States to approve and make impregnable, by passing S. 110, the vicious system of monopoly controls and discriminatory freight rates which they have established in railroad transportation.

Today, capitalism in the United States is headed for destruction unless the controls which have been imposed upon the production and distribution of goods by private monopolists in defiance of the spirit and intent of the antitrust laws can be broken.

The antitrust laws of the United States protect against private monopolists when they get together and try to manipulate railroad rates against any section of the United States. As I stated yesterday, at the present time there are two cases pending in the courts which will lay down fundamental principles and will provide a chart, so to speak, by which we can protect ourselves against such unjust discriminatory rates in the United States. As I see it, we should let the courts proceed in an orderly manner to finish what they have begun; and we should not at this juncture step in and stop the action of the courts.

I continue to read from the statement of Mr. Ballinger:

The task of reform is staggering. But we must accomplish the job or watch free enterprise in America perish as it did in Germany and Italy.

S. 110 should be the job of those radicals in America who are hoping that capitalism in the United States will fail and be supplanted by an authoritarian state of a Communist, Socialist, or Fascist type, and are, therefore, enthusiastic about policies of big business which are making free enterprise in America unworkable.

For half a century, Congress has insisted that railroad rates should be determined on the basis of competition among carriers. We believe this philosophy of Congress to be thoroughly sound. Competition alone offers a possibility of railroad rates adjusting themselves to promote the maximum expansion of business. During the last half century, however, monopolistic controls have been progressively introduced into the railroad industry. Private rate-making bodies have multiplied which, in violation of the antitrust laws, have increasingly put into effect monopolistic rate-making agreements. Toward this growth of monopoly in railroad transportation the Federal Government has been as negligent as it has been toward its growth in banking, in industry, and in distribution. But the effect of monopoly in transportation, on the economic system, has been particularly deadly. The capacity of monopoly in transportation to restrict production in a capitalist economy is far greater than its capacity in any other field of economic activity. This is so because a monopolistic rate in transportation may be pyramided many times before a product ultimately reaches the consumer. Every pyramiding is a reduction of total consumer income resulting in less buying power and less production.

Under S. 110 the progress of monopoly in railroad transportation, and in other fields of transportation, such as motor and water carriers, would be legalized.

If capitalism in America is to be rescued from monopolists, and the system reconditioned so that private business may produce abundantly and furnish full employment to the American people, the field of transportation cannot be left in their hands.

S. 110 would rivet monopoly controls in the vitally important transportation industry and further exhaust the productive powers of capitalistic enterprise in America at a time when democratic capitalism in the United States is fighting for its life.

From the standpoint of small business, S. 110 is especially disastrous. The giant monopolistic concerns existing today in industry and distribution have been largely the work of investment bankers who, many years ago, established and maintained a monopolistic control over long-term credit. Having created these giant corporations, their investment banker sponsors have tended to protect them from competitors who could only challenge them by obtaining credit. The control of credit, however, has only been one arm by which giant monopolistic corporations have been protected. The other arm has been transportation.

Investment banking control of railroads has been used to obtain for large shippers railroad rates which would protect them from regional competitors and from the efforts of smaller competitors in the same market. The monopoly controls which have been established in railroad transportation have been uniformly exercised to protect and expand markets for big business and to limit and destroy markets for small business. Small business shudders at the mere thought of legalizing this unjust system. Yet, this is exactly what S. 110 would do. If monopolists in railroad transportation are to be given legal authority to fix rates in the interests of big business, then small business is doomed to economic serfdom.

We urge the members of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to report unfavorably S. 110. Instead of legalizing the destruction of productive power in our economic system, we urge this committee to insist upon a vigorous application of the antitrust laws to the field of transportation, as well as in other fields, and to consider other abuses which are causing the transportation system to aid and abet the restriction of production.

We would like to have the committee investigate the reported existence of preferential commodity rates allowed large shippers. We would like to have the committee go into the whole matter of large shippers owning railroads.

Under the Hepburn Act, passed many years ago, Congress specifically forbade any railroad company from owning a manufacturing company. The purpose of this prohibition was sound and clear. It was to prevent any manufacturing company from having its costs of transportation subsidized by its railroad owner, so as to give it an advantage in the competitive struggle for markets. Yet today many large shippers own railroads. The effect of this ownership is to subsidize their transportation costs in manufacturing and to accomplish precisely what was forbidden by the Hepburn Act. These railroads are frequently short-line railroads. They used to be called extension of plant facilities. Mysteriously these extensions of plant facilities were suddenly incorporated into interstate railroads with the power to issue through bills of lading. These short lines were built up to the tracks of competing regular carriers, and by playing one carrier off against another, they obtained an unfair division of the shipping dollar. These railroads have been enormously profitable.

But their profits have been a direct subsidy to the transportation costs of larger shippers. Through the profits of railroad ownership large shippers have been able to lay down prices in markets, which can stop small enterprise from attempting to expand in those markets on a basis of legitimate efficiency.

Finally, we urge the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to go into the whole issue of railroad freight rates which are discriminating between regions of the United States.

These fields of inquiry, we earnestly believe, offer greater opportunities to promote sound capitalistic enterprise in America than S. 110.

That completes the testimony of Mr. Ballinger.

Let me say that the same record, beginning at page 823 and extending, in fine print, to page 865, describes the railroad rate-making mechanism in official territory, which is that part of the United States east of the Mississippi River and north of the Ohio and Potomac Rivers.

Beginning on page 839, Senators will find set forth the rate-making structure of official territory. It is a complicated system, so difficult to understand that to comprehend it would require almost the lifetime of a Philadelphia lawyer. It is so complicated that the small business man seeking better rates and petitioning for better rates under it might not obtain better rates before he dies. This system, as set up, I call a game of seven up. It is so fixed and established that when eventually a decision is reached the official territory has four votes out of the seven. So, according to the sections of the United States from which we come, we may know exactly what the decision will be and what will be its effect when we become parties to a rate-making proceeding. That is an awful thing to say; but if one is from the West or from the South he can get very little relief.

To indicate how long it sometimes takes to get relief, I remember that in November 1934, the governors of the Southern States met in Atlanta, Ga., when we were just beginning to wake up to the effect that freight rates had had upon the commerce, business, and industry of America. When the governors met in Atlanta in November 1934, it happened that I was at that time governor of the State of South Carolina. We discussed the freight rate problems. That was the first governors' conference that discussed it. Later, during that same conference, we left Atlanta and went to Warm Springs, and there had a conference with the President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt. We discussed with him at that time the discriminatory freight rates prevailing in the United States, and he advised us that the South was economic problem No. 1, and that it was economic problem No. 1 because of the cheap wages in the South and because of the freight-rate discrimination in the United States at that time.

We began our fight in the courts. Only a few weeks ago the case which was instituted reached the Supreme Court of the United States, and the Court in its decision had something to say about this matter, even though that was 13 years after the fight had begun. I read now from the opinion of the Supreme Court, at page 13, in cases Nos. 343, 344, and 345. These are appeals from the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of New York:

The great differences between territorial class rate levels are shown by the following table. It gives a comparison (in cents per 100 pounds) between the first-class rate scale within official territory and that within each of the other territories.

Notice what the table shows, Mr. President. We see that for a distance of 50 miles, the eastern scale rate is 47 cents, the southern scale rate is 57 cents; and the western trunk line scale rate is 53 cents for the first zone, 61 cents for the second zone, and 65 cents for the third zone.

For a distance of 100 miles the eastern scale rate, which is the rate for official territory, is 62 cents, the southern scale rate is 79 cents; and the western trunk line scale rate is 73 cents for the first zone, 83 cents for the second zone, and 90 cents for the third zone.

For a distance of 900 miles, the rate is $1.71 in the official or eastern territory, $2.35 for southern territory; and for the western trunk line scale it is $2.26 for the first zone, $2.56 for the second zone, and $2.82 for the third zone.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire table which appears in this opinion, written by Mr. Justice Douglas, who delivered the opinion of the Court, be printed in full in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Distance	Eastern scale rate	Southern scale		Western Trunk Line scale					
				Zone I		Zone II		Zone III	
		Rate	Percentage of Eastern	Rate	Percentage of Eastern	Rate	Percentage of Eastern	Rate	Percentage of Eastern
50 miles	47	57		53		61		65	
100 miles	62	79		73		83		90	
150 miles	73	96		86		98		107	
200 miles	80	112		97		111		123	
300 miles	96	134		117		134		147	
400 miles	109	156		136		156		172	
500 miles	122	173		156		178		196	
600 miles	135	189		176		200		220	
700 miles	149	205		196		222		244	
800 miles	160	222		210		239		263	
900 miles	171	235		226		256		282	
1,000 miles	182	249		240		273		300	
Average			137.7		129.6		144.4		159.4

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to read now a portion of what the Supreme Court had to say in what is known as the Georgia and Pennsylvania Railroad case. It is to be found in United States Reports, volume 324, at page 450; and I begin to read with the second paragraph on that page:

If the allegations of the bill are taken as true, the economy of Georgia and the welfare of her citizens have seriously suffered as the result of this alleged conspiracy. Discriminatory rates are but one form of trade barriers. They may cause a blight no less serious than the spread of noxious gas over the land or the deposit of sewage in the streams. They may affect the prosperity and welfare of a State as profoundly as any diversion of waters from the rivers. They may stifle, impede, or cripple old industries and prevent the establishment of new ones. They may arrest the development of a State or put it at a decided disadvantage in competitive markets. Such a charge at least equals in gravity the one which Pennsylvania and Ohio had with West Virginia over the curtailment of the flow of natural gas from the West Virginia fields. There are substitute fuels to which the economy of a State might be adjusted. But discriminatory rates fastened on a region have a more permanent and insidious quality. Georgia as a representative of the public is complaining of a wrong, which if proven, limits the opportunities of her people, shackles her industries, retards her development, and relegates her to an inferior economic position among her sister States. These are matters of grave public concern in which Georgia has an interest apart from that of particular individuals who may be affected. Georgia's interest is not remote; it is immediate. If we denied Georgia as parens patriae the right to invoke the original jurisdiction of the Court in a matter of that gravity, we would whittle the concept of justiciability down to the stature of minor or conventional controversies. There is no warrant for such a restriction.

I read further from the same opinion, by Justice Douglas, page 455:

The relief which Georgia seeks is not a matter subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission. Georgia in this proceeding is not seeking an injunction against the continuance of any tariff; nor does she seek to have any tariff provision canceled. She merely asks that the alleged rate-fixing combination and conspiracy among the defendant carriers be enjoined. As we shall see, that is a matter over which the Commission has no jurisdiction. And an injunction designed to put an end to the conspiracy need not enjoin operation under established rates as would have been the case had an injunction issued in *Central Transfer Co.* v. *Terminal R. Assoc.*, supra.

Mr. President, why am I reading this from the Georgia opinion? In the Georgia case the complainants went before the Supreme Court first to see if they had a cause of action. The Supreme Court is now having this case heard, after having said that the complainants had

a cause of action if the facts stated in the complaint were true.

Now there comes before the Senate a bill which stops that suit, although the complainants have been to the Supreme Court to see if they had a cause of action stated in their complaint, and have taken voluminous testimony. As the decision states, a start is made on the road toward laying down the fact that the railroads have, in their manipulation in rate making, violated the interstate commerce laws Then would it be right for the Senate of the United States, at that juncture, to intervene and throw the complainants out of court? That is what the bill does.

Mr. President, I believe in justice. I believe, if the interstate commerce laws provide a remedy, that we will find that the rates will be adjusted.

As I said a few moments ago, there was a case in the Supreme Court which said, in effect, "Go back; reduce all rates in these classes 10 percent in the South and in the West, and increase them 10 percent in the official territory, because the people in the South have been discriminated against in the matter of freight rates."

Now I come to my third point. Beginning on page 866 of the record of the hearings before the Committee on Interstate Commerce of the Senate, and extending in fine print to page 885—I do not care to read it all—there is a description of the "Railroad rate-making machinery in the western and southern territories." Western territory is that part of the United States lying west of the Mississippi River. Southern territory is that part of the United States lying east of the Mississippi River and south of the Ohio and Potomac Rivers.

I have never understood why an imaginary line was drawn in the field of freight rates. I call the line between the official territory and the South the Smith & Wesson line, because the railroads have held the South up at the point of a gun and made them pay additional high rates.

Mr. Kilday was testifying for the Department of Justice, and a statement was placed in the record of the committee by him, when the Department of Justice was trying to show the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce last year what the situation was. The hearings went on last year and this year. About 4,000 pages of testimony have been taken. Last year and this year the Department of Justice appeared and pleaded day after day that such legislation as that proposed by the pending bill be not passed. Railroad attorneys were present in large numbers pleading for the passage of the proposed legislation so that they could make their freight rates behind closed doors, and further hold up the South and the West under the system in operation at the present time.

Mr. President, I shall not burden Senators by reading into the RECORD all this evidence concerning the rules and regulations, and the way rates are made. I shall move on to my point No. 4.

Beginning at page 885 of the record made in the committee, and extending in fine print to page 920, there is a discussion of a subject styled "Freight Rate Negotiations With Major Industrial Interests." I think that every Senator should read those pages so as to find out how freight rates are negotiated and established. Such a reading, I believe, would make it perfectly apparent that it would be physically and humanly impossible for the Interstate Commerce Commission to review all matters having to do with the making of freight rates. Why do I make that statement? I make it because the pending bill would relieve railroads against any suit based on a freight rate, in case the rate has been approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission. It is estimated today that about 2 percent only of rates prescribed in the United States have been approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission. I wonder whether, in this day of economy, Senators across the aisle intend to give the Interstate Commerce Commission a staff 10 times as large its present staff. Certainly such an increase would be necessary. I doubt whether or not the Interstate Commerce Commission would be given an adequate staff. If it is not, then there will have been given to this $23,000,000,000 railroad monopoly in the United States a right to make rates, without having the proper machinery in the Federal Government to supervise the rate making. I hope Senators will read Mr. Kilday's statement, to see the manner in which freight rates are negotiated with major industries. It will be very enlightening.

Fifth, beginning at page 921 of the record, and extending to page 963 thereof, there appears, in fine print, a discussion of a subject matter styled "antitrust laws in connection with transportation of Federal, State, county, or municipal property by common carriers."

Sixth, in addition to the exhibits referred to in the above-mentioned descriptions and discussions, there is a vast number of exhibits, numbered 81 to 120, appearing in the record in fine print, at pages 2119 to 2381. I am calling the attention of the Senate to the exhibit numbers and the pages of the record, because I believe it to be vital that Senators read them and learn what has been taking place, and just how freight rates are made at the present time. The country is slow in awaking to a condition,, but the South and the West are beginning to awake, and shippers are going to court to obtain relief. Just at a time when shippers are obtaining relief, the railroads present to Congress a bill which would, in effect, drive shippers from the courts, putting an end to any antitrust case in which the rates may have been approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

It would be altogether proper for me and for the Senators from the State of Georgia to take the position that the pending bill can never be thoroughly understood by Senators unless we take the time to read to the Members of this body all the material to which I have referred in my numbered paragraphs. If we are to try the case here instead of allowing it to be tried in the Supreme Court of the United States and in the Federal Court at Lincoln, Nebr., then certainly it is altogether reasonable and proper that Senators hear the evidence. Every person in the United States has the right to his day and hour in court, but the bill would prevent those who have been discriminated against from appealing to the courts for their rights under the antitrust laws. I am not going to give my approval to any such legislation as that now before us. If America should ever become in danger of being destroyed, it would be because of big business in the United States.

The trouble with reading all this testimony is that when the task was completed, Senators would be under the necessity of consulting rate specialists and transportation experts in order to find out what the evidence was all about, and to determine, in the exercise of our proper discretion and judgment, what kind of a bill should be passed, to assure justice to all the people of the Nation instead of providing protection for a big business such as the railroads. This is said in no disrespect of the Members of this body, but merely as an expression of an honest view that no person, without years and years of prior study, would be able to understand properly the complexities and complications involved in all this matter which appears in fine print in language that is sometimes called transportation jargon.

In addition to all of the foregoing testimony, there is other testimony which Senators probably should read and then consult specialists about it. In the printed record on S. 492 there is a general description and discussion of the whole problem by one witness, appearing at different places between page 5 of that record and page 781 thereof. Between pages 123 and 651 of that record there is a further discussion at different places between those pages of the rate-making mechanisms, especially in the western part of the United States, as well as of different specific overt acts claimed to have been carried out under the described mechanisms. Between pages 69 and 97 of that record there is a description by another witness of the economic phases and questions involved in this legislation. At different places in that record, between pages 287 and 770 thereof, there is a description of the rate mechanisms which operate east of the Mississippi River and north of the Ohio and Potomac Rivers. At different places, between pages 461 and 535 of that record, there is a description of the activities of truckers who operate rate bureaus.

In addition, we have the record on S. 110 which contains 187 pages and which shows on its face, in effect, that the record of the prior bill, H. R. 2536, consisting of some 2,600 pages, is to be considered a part of the record on S. 110.

So it is seen that the records involving this legislation add up to a confusing and confounding mass of documents, printed matter, and exhibits, which busy Senators could never have the time even to read, much less to analyze and upon which to form a considered judgment. I

reiterate that if we are to try the Georgia case and the Lincoln case, or if we are to pass legislation vitally affecting those cases, or either of them, or the relief prayed for in them, we should in fairness to ourselves and to the people of the country read these records, or at least have available to us careful analyses thereof.

Last year I spent about four months in committee listening to the testimony given in the hearings. This year we have a new committee known as the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I wonder how many new members of that new committee have taken time to read the record of the testimony adduced in the previous hearings although that record is printed and is on our desks.

We have before us a majority report from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and minority views therefrom. No two reports could possibly be more in conflict. This shows why we should let the courts, in the American way, go on to well-considered opinions in the two pending cases.

The portions of the record to which I have referred show that, first, the railroads have a capitalization of some $23,000,000,000 and an annual income of some $9,500,000,000, which of itself, without more evidence, demonstrates their economic power in America. If we are to let the railroads out from under the antitrust laws, then why should we have any antitrust laws at all? Why show any favoritism to the railroads, especially when, by their rate-making practices, they have seen fit in the past to discriminate against two sections of our country? There should be left to the courts of our land the final determination of whether the railroads are violating the antitrust laws. Think of the huge amount of capital of the railroads, $23,000,000,000, and their annual income of $9,500,000,000. The proposal of the pending bill is to relieve the railroads from liability under the antitrust laws. Under the provisions of the pending bill the railroads would have the right to get together and say to a particular railroad, "You cannot put improved pullman cars on your line, because other railroads cannot afford it. They cannot meet the competition."

This bill affects everything that the railroads touch. Since the Sixty-third Congress the railroads have been trying to get legislation immunizing them from the antitrust laws. At about the time we in the South started on our rate case they started with the Congress their effort to get out from under the antitrust laws. It looks a little suspicious.

The Sixty-third Congress and the Seventy-eighth Congress refused. The Seventy-ninth Congress refused. In the Eightieth Congress we have the same bill, letting the railroads out from under the antitrust laws.

Mr. President, I intend to watch Members across the aisle. I intend to see whether or not they are in favor of big business. They can let the world know where they stand by their votes on the pending bill. It will probably be the most important measure affecting large corporations which will be before this Congress.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Murray
Ball	Hickenlooper	Myers
Barkley	Hill	O'Conor
Brewster	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Holland	Pepper
Bridges	Jenner	Reed
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Kem	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Kilgore	Russell
Byrd	Knowland	Saltonstall
Cain	Langer	Smith
Capper	Lodge	Sparkman
Chavez	Lucas	Stewart
Connally	McCarran	Taft
Cooper	McCarthy	Taylor
Cordon	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McFarland	Thye
Downey	McGrath	Tobey
Dworshak	McKellar	Tydings
Ecton	McMahon	Umstead
Ellender	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Malone	Wherry
Fulbright	Martin	White
George	Maybank	Wiley
Gurney	Millikin	Williams
Hatch	Moore	Wilson
Hawkes	Morse	Young

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, let me suggest to the Members of the Senate that I was about to make a unanimous-consent request relative to having the Senate vote at a day and hour certain upon the pending measure and all motions and amendments relating thereto. It has not yet been possible to get in touch with one or two Members of the Senate who are deeply interested in the bill, although I expect to get in touch with them at any moment. So I wish to say now that I expect to make the unanimous-consent request within a very few minutes. Inasmuch as the quorum call has been had for that purpose, even though we are not yet quite ready to propound the unanimous-consent request, I ask the Members of the Senate who now are present to stand by, because I expect to make the request in a very few minutes.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, in the magazine Railway Age, for August 4, 1945, the chief counsel for the railroads in the Lincoln suit, Mr. Elmer Smith, said that the railroads must be permitted to charge reasonable maximum rates. That is a startling statement, because, in many cases, reasonable maximum rates are tremendously higher than reasonable minimum rates, both being compensatory and lawful. Moreover, the zone between the maximum reasonable rate and the minimum reasonable rate is often of tremendous scope, and often brings about startling differences in dollars and cents in the charges to be paid by the people. A maximum rate is lawful; a minimum rate is lawful; all rates between the top and the bottom are lawful. Is it not clear that this spokesman and lawyer for the carriers, who now are defendants at Lincoln, made crystal-clear in his article in the Railway Age just why he wants this bill enacted? The reason is that, under this bill, the carriers could get together and by reason of the economic and coercive power of their rate bureaus, could run the rate on a given commodity up to the very top of the zone of reasonableness and then could file it with the ICC, which would nearly always have to approve it, because the Commission has little power to change these privately fixed rates when the rate is at the top, the bottom, or in the middle of the zone of reasonableness. Mr. Smith and his clients want all of them to be at the top. We should not permit them to do this to the people. However, this bill, if enacted into law, will give the railroads the right to fix the rates at the maximum reasonable figure, and then nothing could be done.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Do I correctly understand that the Interstate Commerce Commission would have no power to alter a maximum rate, once it was fixed by the railroads?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes; if the rate were between the maximum and the minimum reasonable rates. In such case the Commission's hands would be tied.

Mr. LUCAS. There would be nothing the Commission could do about altering it?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Commission could do nothing.

Mr. LUCAS. Would this bill, if enacted, permit the Interstate Commerce Commission to make any change at all along that line?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Commission would either have to approve or disapprove the rate if it came in the zone between the maximum reasonable rate and the minimum reasonable rate.

Then, if there were on the statute books a law like the pending bill, in my opinion, and in the opinion of our Department of Justice, we would have no recourse, even if a rate were established in order to put some business out of existence, so to speak. The freight rates might be so high that businesses could not continue to operate.

Fourth. The portions of the records to which I have referred show that the South claims that, because of the rate-bureau activities of northern railroads, it cannot get manufactured goods into the North in such a way as to compete with goods manufactured in the North. Naturally, this is shown, because Georgia's brief in the pending Supreme Court case is in the record.

The record shows something further. It shows what the northern railroads themselves said about this. They said it in a brief filed by them with the ICC in 1935. Here is what they said:

> Official territory lines have perhaps the most vital interest in interterritorial competitive adjustments of any single group of carriers in the country for the reason that the populous official territory provides the markets for a large part of the traffic produced elsewhere in the United States. That

territory is hemmed in on the South, the Southwest, and the West by territories, and carriers serving them, all seeking to market their products within the territory served by official lines. In many instances, such commodities, sought to be marketed within official territory, come into direct competition with the commodities produced in that territory. Official lines, therefore, are in duty bound to protect the geographical or other natural advantages possessed by shippers or producers on their lines, and as a matter of justice and equity they may not be required to join in such low bases of interterritorial rates as to nullify or neutralize these natural advantages. (*Ex parte 116*—Interterritorial Rate Bases—before the Interstate Commerce Commission.)

When Senator Burton K. Wheeler heard this amazing language at the hearings on H. R. 2536, he said:

If they carry out that policy, of course, it means the territory outside of eastern lines, official territory, cannot be developed as it should be unless you can get some competition.

If a territory, for instance, known as official territory, could by reason of their influence with railroads keep the rates higher in the western, southern, or southwestern territory, they could in fact erect a tariff wall around their territory so that the other producers could not get into that territory at all.

Fifth. The people of the South, through their elected representatives, have during too many years claimed that their processed goods were fenced off from the North by a rate wall.

Let us see what the southern railroads said about a rate wall in 1920, long before they were sued, and long before they changed their tune. Mr. Oliver, vice president of the Southern Railroad, told the ICC in 1920:

The new policy of these connections is to build a rate wall at the Ohio and Potomac Rivers which will prevent or greatly curtail the movement of southern products into official territory.

No wonder, then, there is against the South the rate discrimination which now prevails.

Sixth. And the people of the South, through elected spokesmen, have complained for too many years that the ports in the Gulf of Mexico and on the South Atlantic coast were discriminated against through the activities of these private organizations.

Let us see what J. G. Kerr, of the Louisville & Nashville Railroad, said about this in 1931, long before the suits were brought and before there was a different story. He said that when goods were brought into the southern and Gulf ports from outside the country going to the North, it was necessary to move them northward from those ports at very high and discriminatory rates, it having been found impossible to induce the (northern) lines, such as the B. & O., Pennsylvania Railroad and the New York Central Railroad, whose major interests lie in an east and west direction and serving the North Atlantic ports, to join in the establishment of competitive import rates in line with those applicable from the North Atlantic ports to the same points.

In other words, the scheme of the northern lines, according to Mr. Kerr, then with the L. & N. Railroad, and now chief of the southern rate bureau at Atlanta, who is now busy in the direction of getting this bill passed, was to force goods to come into the United States at northern ports instead of southern ports. I do not have to prove that southern ports have been discriminated against by these outfits which want immunity. The L. & N. Railroad admits it.

The northern railroads, even in time of war, through these private rate-making outfits which now want immunity, forced traffic from south Florida ports, such as Miami, to move to Baltimore, over long routes, through Cincinnati, a distance of 1,714 miles, rather than agreeing to the same rates which would allow the traffic to move over the short route, through Richmond, a distance of only 1,150 miles. The northern lines did this merely because the northern lines would get a bigger cut than if the goods followed the shorter route.

If the pending bill shall be enacted, and we find such discrimination as that I have described, there will be no recourse under the antitrust laws. It would be barred.

What I have stated the northern lines would do is shown at page 832 of the hearings on H. R. 2536. This particular part of the record has not been disputed, notwithstanding news items and editorials which took the railroads to task for such conduct.

Efforts are being made before congressional committees and the courts to contend that the railroads in the North are innocent, and that when it comes to making rates in the North, and when it comes to making rates from the South into the North, they do not control the situation.

I will let the ICC answer that contention, since those pushing this bill almost claim that the ICC is never wrong. This is what is shown on page 833—H. R. 2536—as to what the ICC said in *Alabama* v. *New York Central* (235 ICC 329):

And in addition to this we are persuaded that the northern carriers as a group actually do effectively control the rates within the North and also the northbound interterritorial rates except to points on and west of the Monon line.

The record, page 833—H. R. 2536—shows a thing which should shock any southern citizen. It is there shown that when the railroads got together to make rates to apply between the South and the North, between the West and the North, between the Southwest and the North, and generally interterritorially between any one territory and another, they got up a national convention of delegates from rate bureaus in each territory. This thing is called the Joint Conference of Contact Committees. The delegations swarmed into this convention. The setup in the convention was one delegation from the South, with one vote in the convention; one delegation from the Midwest, with one vote in the convention; one delegation from the Southwest, with one vote in the convention; three delegations from the Northeast or official territory, with three votes; and a delegation from Illinois, a sort of no-man's land called Illinois Freight Association Territory, with one vote which was controlled by the official territory lines, which had three votes of their own, a total of four votes. The result of the voting on any question that might arise may well be imagined.

In other words, there were seven votes in the convention—four for the official territory and three for the rest of the Nation. And the convention made North-South and South-North rates. It determined rates throughout the country.

How did the convention operate? Again, I will let the railroads answer, because if I answered, I would be told that I did not know what I was talking about.

Sam Mitchell, of Atlanta, the chairman of the convention, who is an assistant to J. G. Kerr, head of the southern rate bureau, writing to Mr. Kerr, described how the convention operated. He said:

The Official Classification Lines, i. e., CFA (Central Freight Association), ETL (Eastern Trunk Lines), NEFA (New England Freight Association), and IFA (Illinois Freight Association), vote separately in the joint conference of contact committees and their votes are nearly always a unit. Having four votes, necessarily they have an advantage and can often control the action of the joint conference of contact committees.

I suppose they want the present speaker, the junior Senator from South Carolina, to give the convention immunity to do a job on South Carolina. I shall be narrow-minded about giving the convention immunity. I vote "no," against the pending bill.

There is another thing shown in the record, page 833 (H. R. 2536) which the people of the South should know. When a citizen of the South goes to his local railroad or to the railroad rate bureau in the South and asks for reasonable rates on his commodities between his southern home and some point in the States of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Utah, Nevada, California, Arizona, or New Mexico, he will find, if he inquires long enough, that his southern railroad and the southern rate bureau has no worth-while voice or worth-while say-so in the adjustment of his rates. The real voice and the real say-so in the adjustment of his rates is lodged solely and far away with the nine railroads which reach the Pacific Ocean. Why? The answer is monopoly. Which monopoly? The railroad monopoly as a whole, but especially that portion of the monopoly resting in the nine East-West roads which reach the Pacific Ocean and which are the only East-West roads in a large territory eastward from the Pacific Ocean.

These nine roads have simply said, and stuck to it, that they are the only railroads reaching the Pacific-coast territory from the East; that they will make the rates on freight moving to and from that territory; and that the other railroads in the monopoly throughout the Nation, and all the people of the United States, can take the rates made by those nine, or leave them.

I do not want these nine railroads, who operate an outfit called the Trans-Continental Freight Bureau, to have immunity to do this any more. I do not think it is right. If, by the passage of the

pending bill their operations are withdrawn from the scope of the antitrust laws, shippers will receive the same treatment at their hands as in the past.

The record shows (pp. 1492 to 1519, H. R. 2536) in ABC fashion that all the rate bureaus throughout the Nation, including this Trans-Continental Freight Bureau through which the nine railroads serving the Pacific coast operate on the American people, are subject to the domination and control of the board of directors of the Association of American Railroads, composed of some twenty presidents of big railroads. The plan of operation of the AAR was written in the offices of the Pennsylvania Railroad under the guidance of Gen. W. W. Atterbury, president of that road. That plan is known as the Pennsylvania plan.

Under that plan the South has only 4 members out of the 20 members on that board of directors, each with 1 vote.

This is as bad as giving the South only one vote in a convention which has a total of seven votes.

I hope all the southern Senators will study this method of rate making, and what has been done in the past, before they give approval to the bill we are now considering, because when we pass the bill we say to the railroads, "Your convention system, your Pennsylvania plan, is proper. Continue to operate under it. The only thing you have to do is to secure the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission. Then you will be protected against any suit under the antitrust laws."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. A few moments ago when the roll call was had for the purpose of securing a quorum and presenting a unanimous-consent request, I said it was necessary to consult one or two Members of the Senate who are intensely interested in the bill. I had in mind particularly the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] who has offered important amendments to the bill and, of course, wants them considered, and they should be considered. He is now present in the Senate Chamber and in view of the fact that a roll call was just had and a quorum announced as being present, I now ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, June 18, 1947, at the hour of 4 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed to vote upon any amendment or motion that may be pending, or that may be subsequently proposed, to Senate bill 110, and upon the bill itself; and the time between the hours of 2 and 4 o'clock on that day be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of the bill, the time of the proponents to be allotted by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] and the time of the opponents to be allotted by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

I suggest further that, in the event the debate should lapse or be concluded before 4 o'clock on Wednesday, June 18, that the Policy Committee, through its chairman, or the majority leader, may ask for consideration of legislation which is already upon the calendar, and possibly ask for a call of the calendar for consideration of bills to which there is no objection, or for consideration of appropriation bills, or whatever legislation may be available for consideration at the time.

What I have just said is not a part of the unanimous-consent request, but is by way of explanation, that in the event the debate is concluded before the time referred to, the Senate may proceed with the consideration of business which is now on the calendar or which might be on the calendar at that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LODGE in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska, who asks unanimous consent that on Wednesday, June 18, 1947, at the hour of 4 p. m., the Senate proceed to vote upon any amendment or motion that may be pending, or that may be subsequently proposed, to Senate bill 110, and upon the bill; and that the time between the hours of 2 and 4 p. m. be divided equally between the proponents and the opponents of the bill, to be controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, some time ago, just before the unanimous-consent request was made, in a discussion with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and other Senators, I made the suggestion that in view of the fact that many of the amendments are of real importance the unanimous-consent agreement should also contain a stipulation to the effect that not to exceed 5 minutes on each side may be allotted by the respective allocaters of time for the explanation of any amendment that may be desired.

Mr. WHERRY. That is acceptable.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it understood that there will be no vote on any amendment or on the bill until 4 o'clock Wednesday afternoon?

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. With the addition I just suggested, which the Senator from Nebraska says is acceptable, it is made certain that it will be possible both for the advocates of certain amendments and the opponents to make brief statements, not to exceed 5 minutes in length, explaining the respective amendments or the opposition thereto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Nebraska is modified to include the suggestion of the Senator from Wyoming. Is there objection to the amended unanimous-consent request submitted by the Senator from Nebraska?

There being no objection, the modified unanimous-consent agreement, as reduced to writing, was entered into as follows:

Ordered, That on the calendar day of Wednesday, June 18, 1947, at the hour of 4 p. m., the Senate proceed to vote upon any amendment or motion that may be pending, or that may subsequently be proposed, to the bill (S. 110) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers, and upon the final passage of the bill itself: *Provided, however*, That no vote on any amendment or motion shall be had prior to the said hour of 4 p. m.

Ordered further, That the time intervening between the hours of 2 p. m. and 4 p. m. on said day be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of the said bill, to be controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and that after the said hour of 4 p. m., debate on any amendment or motion shall be limited to 5 minutes on each side, to be controlled by the above-named Senators.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Can the Senator from South Carolina give us an indication of how much longer he will speak, and whether it might be possible to take up the calendar this afternoon at a later hour?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I can speak only for myself. I understand that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] desires to speak. I do not know for how long.

Mr. TAFT. I wondered whether the Senator from Alabama wished to speak this afternoon or on Monday.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. He said he wanted to follow me this afternoon, and desired to know when I would complete my statement.

Mr. TAFT. That is perfectly satisfactory. I imagine the discussion of the bill, then, will occupy most of the afternoon.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I imagine it will.

Going back to the point at which I was interrupted, I wish to say that the South has only one vote in the convention out of a total of seven votes, under the plan now being followed, yet in the face of that situation, when it can be shown by simple arithmetic that the South is on the short end and in a hopeless minority at every "crap shooting" convention which they hold, some people—even people from the South—have the gall to come here and say that the South does all right in the meetings. They say that in spite of the fact that the South has only one vote out of the seven and that the South and the West together have only three votes out of a total of seven, official territory having four votes out of seven. In spite of that situation, some persons who really have not studied the situation think the South is doing fairly well.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER in the chair). Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. I believe the Senator was not a Member of the Senate—perhaps he was then Governor of South Carolina—at the time the Transportation Act of 1940 was passed. The Senator was then Governor of his State, if my memory is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. STEWART. That act provided for the creation of a board known as the Board of Investigation and Research, and it was directed, under the act which created it, to go into the question of freight rates as the situation existed between the different territories or zones or regions, whatever one may prefer to call them. The Board had a life of 4 years, according to the provisions of the law, and the first three nominees whose names were sent to the Senate to comprise the membership of that Board, the Board consisting of three members, all resided in the eastern territory. Members of the Interstate Commerce Commission from the West and from the South of course were very much disturbed about that, and amendments were immediately proposed to the Transportation Act of 1940 providing that no two members of that Board could come from the same region. The result was that men were selected from three different regions, one from the West, one from the East, and one from the South, which gave us a very well-rounded Board. But the Senator will further recall that that Board was not finally appointed and confirmed for more than a year, as I recall—I think I am close to be being correct about it—after the passage of the act.

So a year of the life given to them had expired before they began to function. The Senator has placed his finger on a very important point, and I relate this instance merely to emphasize it. The selection of members of the Commission should be made in such a manner to make them actually representative of all the zones or regions into which the Nation is divided for rate-making purposes. In one instance—I shall not refer to the particular Commission—a year or two ago a man was recommended for membership on a certain commission, and his residence was listed as the State of Oklahoma, as I recall, or some other western State. The truth of the matter was that he had not resided in that State for 38 years. So certainly his immediate or remote background was not such as to give him any right to claim representation on a board from a geographical standpoint, as representing any particular geographical section of the country.

I believe that the purpose of the law is to require that members of the Commission be selected in such a way as not to represent the great mass of the people, but to represent the various zones and the interests in the various zones. I think the Senator has placed his finger on a very important point and one to which we as Members of the Senate should pay more attention in the future as it becomes our duty from time to time to give the advice and consent of the Senate, as provided by the Constitution, to the appointment of members of various commissions.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am glad to have the observation of the Senator from Tennessee. It is true that a man coming from a certain territory of the United States will naturally know the conditions of the area from which he comes, and will naturally look after that section. That is nothing but human nature. The element of human nature enters into everything we do in life.

Coming back to the crap-shooting convention, with four representatives out of seven from the official territory, the record shows that in every Nation-wide meeting to fix rates the South is helpless and in a hopeless minority.

The South, acting through Georgia, has filed suits. It was slow in getting around to it, but it finally did. Now the railroads want us to pull the rug out from under the feet of Georgia on the very eve of victory.

I think we should respect Georgia; and I think we should respect the Supreme Court and allow the case to go on to final decision. That is the only thing I am asking for. There is no need for this hasty legislation. As I previously stated, our Department of Justice has said that it will not initiate any more antitrust suits pending the decision of the Georgia case and the decision in the Nebraska case.

Suppose a bill had been introduced to pull the rug out from under the Attorney General on the eve of the Court's decision in the John L. Lewis case. The Senate would have risen in arms. Every newspaper in the United States would have had emblazoned in its headlines the news that the United States Senate had endeavored to stop the suit which the Attorney General had brought against John L. Lewis. Why is it that the newspapers are not carrying big headlines to the effect that the Congress of the United States is undertaking to throw the case of the State of Georgia and the Nebraska case out of the courts? I shall tell the Senate why. Corporations with capitalization totaling $23,000,000,000 are interwoven with big business, newspapers, and other enterprises.

The Association of American Railroads, as shown on page 677 of the hearings on Senate bill 942, boasts that it imposed on the American people costs in "large figures" by persuading the western railroads not to establish grain transit privileges at cities in the Midwest. Senators from Western and Midwestern States should listen to this. A transit privilege on grain is something which is indispensable to a city if it is to have a thriving grain, milling, flour, or cereal industry. This privilege simply means that grain may move from the farms to the city, be unloaded in the city, and processed into flour, cereals, or some other grain product in the city, and that the flour, cereals, or other grain products may be reloaded in the city and moved by rail to final destination where the processed commodity is used or consumed—all on a low through rate from farm to final consuming point, this low rate being much lower than the rate on the grain without the transit privilege to the city plus the rate on the processed article from the city to the consuming point.

The Association of American Railroads boasts that it prevented midwestern cities from getting this opportunity and that the AAR's action in that regard prevented the railroads from losing money in "large figures," which is just another way of saying that the AAR cost the American people money in "large figures." The contention is that the AAR violated the Sherman Act through this persuasion. If we pass the pending bill the railroads will be immune from prosecution under the antitrust laws.

Then the Association of American Railroads want immunity to persuade more and more all the States.

The Association of American Railroads, as shown on page 677 of the record on S. 942, boasted that it persuaded the railroads serving the city of Chicago to cast a burden on the American people, especially the farmers and stock raisers, of at least $1,000,000 per annum. It is there shown that the railroads serving Chicago wanted to pay the cost or part of the cost of loading and unloading livestock at the union stockyards in Chicago—services theretofore paid for by the owner of the livestock.

Then the Association of American Railroads boasts that, but for its action in stopping this practice of the railroads' paying for loading and unloading at Chicago, the practice would have been extended to all markets in western territory.

When the Association of American Railroads did this persuading job it violated the Sherman Act; and it wants immunity further to stop individual railroads from doing things of benefit to the American people, which Congress has said the individual railroads should have a perfect legal right to do. Congress never at any time or place authorized the Association of American Railroads to persuade individual railroads from aiding American farmers and stock raisers.

Mind you, Mr. President, these individual railroads wanted to do that, but the Association of American Railroads said, "You must not do it." Yes, they persuaded them to make it cost the people, for the handling of livestock, a million dollars annually.

The Association of American Railroads, as shown on page 677 of the record on S. 942, boasted that it had persuaded southwestern railroads to change their rates on grain moving from the Southwest to Memphis in such a way that, but for the change, there would have been a saving to the American people through reductions of 40 cents per ton on all grain moving from the West into the South, including South Carolina, and on all grain moving from northwestern Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, and Illinois into the South, including South Carolina.

The Association of American Railroads there boasted that this persuasion resulted in casting burdens on the people amounting to a large sum of money.

The Association of American Railroads then and there violated the Sherman Act. Now it wants immunity from that act, so as to be able to repeatedly cast these financial burdens on the South, its people, and its industry. I solemnly protest. Mr. President, I point out that the West is in a position similar to that of the South, and the West must take equal care. If the West is not careful, it will suddenly find that it, too, has been hurt.

Mr. President, I am reminded of a story about an incident in the First World War. It seems that a colored boy from the South was in a hand-to-hand fight with

a German. They had disarmed each other, and were fighting with their fists. All of a sudden the colored boy remembered that he had an old straight razor in his pocket. So he drew it out and made a slash at the throat of the German. The German jumped back and said, "Ach, you didn't touch me." The colored boy said, "Just wait until you turn your head."

Mr. President, I say the same is true of the West. When the West turns from tilling the soil to trying to manufacture goods, it will find that its throat is cut from ear to ear; it will find that it is powerless because of the freight-rate barriers that have been built up, beneficial to the official territory. I say to all those from the West that if they do not take steps to prevent that situation from developing, they will suddenly wake up and find that they are confronted with it. The South finally woke up; and we in the South started fighting for our rights. Now, when we are beginning to make progress in the courts, the railroads come to the Congress of the United States and say, "You should give the railroads immunity from the antitrust laws, in order that they may continue to impose discriminatory freight rates in the United States." Mr. President, that is what it amounts to. We are facing a serious situation today.

As shown at page 677 of the hearings on Senate bill 942, the Association of American Railroads boasted that it had persuaded the railroads in the Southwest and in the Midwest to raise the rates on furniture. Mr. President, let us think seriously of the veteran who, after having walked in the shadow of the valley of death, not for money, but for his country's sake, now wonders why he and his bride have to pay so much for furniture.

Following that boast, the Association of American Railroads further boasted that, but for its action in telling the southwestern and midwestern railroads to raise furniture rates, the railroads in the East and in the South, including those in South Carolina, would have reduced their rates on furniture. They were willing to do it, but the Association of American Railroads would not let them do it. Mr. President, such action is in violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act, and now the railroads want immunity from it, by means of the enactment of this bill.

Mr. President, to the crippled veterans, some of whom perhaps have wounds still unhealed, to the veteran who today is seeking to furnish his little home with furniture, and is confronted with the necessity of purchasing high-priced furniture, I offer the consolation that his Government, acting through the Department of Justice, has sued those responsible for the star-chamber proceedings which resulted in raising the rates on furniture, and thereby raising the price of furniture.

However, it must be discouraging to the veterans to know that a determined effort is being made to stop the suits which the Department of Justice has instituted to get relief for the people, as against those in high places who, without notice or hearing, persuade others to do things which burden the people. Again they are coming to the Congress of the United States; and today, under this bill, they seek to obtain immunity for their actions in violation of the antitrust laws. Mr. President, is that justice? If it is, then let this bill be passed. But I do not believe it is justice.

As a southerner and a Senator and an American, I resent another of the boasts of the Association of American Railroads, as shown at page 677 of the hearings on Senate bill 942. Mr. President, everything is to be found in the records and in the hearings. The boast on the part of the Association of American Railroads to which I now refer increases my resentment against this bill. At that point in the hearings it is shown that the Association of American Railroads boasted that, through its efforts, the rates on vegetable oils moving from Gulf and South Atlantic ports, which include the ports in South Carolina, were increased from 3 to 6 cents a hundred pounds; and the Association of American Railroads again boasted that, but for its success in casting that burden on the people, the rates on vegetable oils moving from North Atlantic ports would have been reduced. Then the Association of American Railroads remembered, while speaking of vegetable oils, to boast that it also worked out a "substantial increase in the rates on domestic vegetable oils." All those things were done although the railroads were willing to lower the rates. But the Association of American Railroads had the rates increased, in violation of the antitrust laws of the United States. Now they seek to have the Congress help them. Today they are in the courts, and there they are charged with violation of the antitrust laws. But by this bill they would have the Congress give them immunity from such suits against them. Under these circumstances, Mr. President, why are not all Members of Congress opposed to the proposed legislation?

Please note, Mr. President, that I am making these points in order. The Association of American Railroads further boasted, as shown at page 677 of the hearings on Senate bill 942, that although the southern and southwestern railroads tried to reduce the rates on paper and pulpboard moving from the South and the Southwest to northern markets—just think of that, Mr. President—the Association of American Railroads put a stop to that, and adjusted the matter "by increasing by 10 percent the level of rates which had been proposed by the southern and southwestern carriers." That was a violation of law, but we are asked to put our blessing on such violations by passing the pending bill, and giving the roads immunity from the antitrust laws in the United States.

On the same page the Association of American Railroads boasts that when the Interstate Commerce Commission granted a general increase in rates effective as of a certain date the association went into action and arranged to have those increases take effect 15 days earlier than the date named as the effective date in the ICC's order; and while talking big about its activities regarding those increases the Association of American Railroads calls attention to the fact that, in cases where the increases brought about a situation where there had to be either a lowering or raising of some rates in order to restore relationships among rates which had been disturbed by the increases, it, the Association of American Railroads, ordered that the relationships be restored "by increases rather than reductions."

Yet they tell us that the ICC can prevent the private government headed by the Association of American Railroads from injuring the people. Here we see the Association of American Railroads boasting about its activities involving millions to be paid by the people carried on not only under the nose of the Commission but in connection with the effectiveness and application of the ICC's very orders.

There is need for the Interstate Commerce Commission, but there is also need that we keep the railroads under the antitrust laws. There is a place for both. The ICC is in no position to handle all the cases which will come before it. It would have to increase its staff tenfold, and can we imagine a Republican Congress giving the necessary funds to increase it to that extent when they are cutting appropriations for everything?

Mr. President, the West is going to suffer cuts in appropriations for conservation, for development of power, for flood control, and for irrigation.

This great Nation of ours needs to work as a unit. We need to develop our West. The South needs further development. But is it right for us to think in terms of sections when it comes to freight rates? Should we have three different sections of the United States? Should we be divided, having different rates in different sections, the official territory having control of all the rates, what will be charged in the other sections of the United States?

The only protection we have now against manipulation is the antitrust laws. Pass this bill, and there will be no protection for those who live outside the official territory.

On the same page the Association of American Railroads brags that it secured "an increase in the rates on rice"; and further brags that this increase was brought about through "cooperation between the common-carrier barge lines operating on the inland waterways and the competing rail lines."

In other words, Congress fixed the national transportation policy to the effect that the inherent advantages of cheap water transportation carried on as a result of tremendous public expenditures in improvement of inland waterways should be preserved to the people; yet, here we see the Association of American Railroads, under the very nose of the Commission, bringing about meetings between rail and river carriers at which the rates on rice moving either by rail or water were rigged in such fashion as to burden the people, and, without doubt, to take from them the benefits of cheap water transportation.

Under the pending bill this practice will continue with immunity, and the will of Congress will continue to be defeated and set aside.

On the same page there is bold, clear, flagrant evidence that the Association of American Railroads placed its cold monopolistic hand upon the South's greatest resource, cotton.

The statement there shown is the mere brief brag and statement and the bold boast that the Association of American Railroads secured an advance in the cotton rates in both southwestern and southern territories.

For such effrontery and for such clear violations of the law, these people have been sued, not indicted. Shall we pass this bill and turn them loose, with immunity to repeat such acts as this against the South's most basic industry, cotton?

Congress had said that the southern and southwestern cotton rates should be fixed by southern and southwestern roads, without help or suggestions from an intimidating and coercing Association of American Railroads, which is dominated by the Pennsylvania Railroad and its eastern and industrial allies, and which operates under a written constitution and bylaws called the Pennsylvania plan. That Pennsylvania plan means much. Through it, the cards have all been stacked against the South and West.

I do not want our cotton rates fixed under the Pennsylvania plan. I want them fixed under the congressional plan, by killing the pending bill and allowing the antitrust laws to operate wherever a violation takes place.

In the record on S. 942, at page 677, the Association of American Railroads boasts that it burdened the people in the field of rates on soda products. It is there stated that the Association of American Railroads rigged a deal between railroads in the North and the railroads in the Southwest under which there would be "cooperative handling—between those two groups of roads—of this rate adjustments" and under which unlawful deal there would be no competition in rates among producers of soda products in the North and soda products in the Southwest, again violating the antitrust laws. The pending bill would afford immunity for such practices.

On the same page the AAR boasts that it had been busy on the rates on fruits and vegetables and had rigged a plan under which the railroads would collect more money from the people than they had theretofore collected.

And then a boast is written out on the same page to the effect that the AAR had persuaded southern railroads not to reduce rates on citrus fruit. And then the boast goes on to say that, if the southern roads had made the reduction, as they wished, there would have been reductions on citrus fruit moving from Texas and California. The boast concludes by saying, in effect, that this persuasion carried on under the Pennsylvania plan cost the American people "well over $1,000,000 per annum."

Finally, the boast adds insult to injury by the statement that the AAR "assisted in forestalling a demand on the part of Florida and Texas shippers for an emergency reduction in rates on grapefruit which would have represented a large loss in revenue."

Shippers of grapefruit in Florida and Texas—farmers—were in a crisis and emergency. They were thinking of demanding reductions in rates on their crops. The Association of American Railroads stopped them from even making the demand—the AAR forestalled the demand.

Have Senators had enough? I will give them some more. I like to do so in the words of the railroads themselves, because if I say it, I am told that I cannot understand it, and that I am mistaken about it. I give it from their own words. That is what I have tried to do.

On page 678 of the S. 942 record the Association of American Railroads boasts that it set aside a portion of a law passed by the Congress in 1935.

In 1935 the Congress passed an act saying that any railroad, if it so desired, could make joint rates with trucks.

The AAR immediately passed a private law saying that no railroad would make joint rates with trucks. It then boasts, saying:

> AAR has been instrumental in having a policy adopted by the individual railroads not to make joint rates with trucking companies, the result of which has saved a considerable sum of money to the railroad industry.

That is a quotation from their testimony in the record. Have Senators had enough to convince them that the railroads should not be given immunity?

I will give some more based on an AAR boast on page 678 of S. 942. The quotations I am giving may be verified by anyone desiring to do so. It is there shown that the AAR "induced" southwestern lines to refrain from establishing transit arrangements on cotton—that is, low through rates from the farm to final destination with intermediate stops for storage, processing, and the like.

The AAR then boasts that if the southwestern lines had established these rates, there would have been similar aid to the people of the Southeast, inclusive of South Carolina, "which would have cost the railroads considerable money."

The AAR, as shown on the same page, admits that some eastern railroads, as they had a right to do, wanted to quit making wharfage charges on coal, but that the AAR persuaded them not to do it; and then says "which if done would have required similar action on the part of southern lines and would have represented a considerable loss in revenue."

That, again, violates the Sherman antitrust law. The pending bill gives them immunity from the Sherman antitrust law. That is what they want. Do Senators want to give them that immunity? Senators may give them immunity, or withhold it, by voting "yea" or "nay" upon the pending bill.

And, on the same page, the AAR brags that when the ICC hands down an order which is permissive in its nature and which may be complied with by an individual railroad either by the railroads making money concessions to its customers or by further burdening its customers, the AAR went into action and "induced individual lines and groups of lines to comply with orders of the ICC constructively," which meant, so the brag says in effect, that the railroads got more money "than otherwise would have been received"—always raising the rates, not lowering them.

So, we see that "permissive" acts of Congress are set aside, and "permissive" orders of the ICC are set aside by the private government known as the AAR.

It is shown that the AAR admits that it has infiltrated itself not only into the Commission, but into shipper groups and shipper organizations with the result that extra burdens have been placed upon the people. On page 678 of the record on S. 942 the AAR says, in effect, that there are times when railroads file high and increased rates with the ICC, and the AAR becomes fearful that some other railroad or someone with an interest will ask that the high rates be suspended and investigated. The AAR brags that the AAR infiltrates itself and prevents such a thing from happening. The boast is that the AAR has assisted "in avoiding suspension of increased rates by the ICC."

Yet we are told that the ICC will approve these private rate-making organizations and thereafter prevent them from raiding the people.

On the same page it is shown that the AAR has really infiltrated itself into shipper groups, such as, I assume, the NIT League and the Shippers' Advisory Boards. Those groups favor the bill. It is boasted on page 678 that the AAR had conferred with shipper groups and had obtained, as a result of the conferences, "higher rates with the retention of traffic than the shippers were originally demanding."

Shippers do not care how high the rate is so long as the rates of competitors are just as high.

Of course, the consumers were not present at the rate rigging meetings between the shipper groups and the AAR at which burdens were placed on the people.

Let us assume there are 10,000,000 shippers. There are some 140,000,000 people in the Nation. Therefore 130,000,000 people had no notice or hearing at the rate-raising meetings between the AAR and the shipper groups. But the 130,000,000 pay the burdens rigged up at these rate-raising conventions composed of delegates from the AAR and the NIT League and other shipper groups.

Between pages 1703 and 1726 of the record on H. R. 2536 appears a story in the words of the AAR and its co-conspirators about how and why the sharecroppers and other citizens of the South have to pay such a high price for gasoline to run their motor vehicles. It is there shown that—

(a) The major oil companies do not ship gasoline from Texas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Arkansas into the Old South over the railroads.

(b) Instead, the major oil companies use their own ships and boats to move Texas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Arkansas gasoline from the mouth of the Mississippi River through the Gulf of Mexico on up the east Atlantic coast to ports and unloading places on the Atlantic coast of the Old South. They also move Texas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and

Arkansas gasoline northward up the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers, dropping it off at facilities which the major oil companies maintain along those rivers.

(c) The Old South then gets its gasoline by trucks operated and owned by the majors from these places where the majors have unloaded it from the boats onto the banks of the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers and onto the shores of the Atlantic coast of the Old South.

(d) Obviously, this gives the majors a monopoly on the sale of gasoline in the Old South, undisturbed by sales in the Old South by small independent gasoline producers in Texas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Arkansas unless those independents can get low rail rates from Texas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Arkansas.

(e) The AAR and the majors have been busy ousting the independents from markets in the old South. How did they keep busy on this job?

First. The AAR and the majors have been together on a scheme to make the gasoline rates from Texas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Arkansas into the old South sky high.

Second. What was the benefit to the AAR from this scheme? Very simple. The majors were to ship gasoline solely by rail, and not by truck, from the storage tanks on the Atlantic seacoast into the interior of the old South and were to ship gasoline from storage places on the banks of the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers into the interior of the old South by rail and not by truck.

Third. What benefit were the majors to get out of a gasoline rate wall between the old South and the Southwest? Very plain and simple.

(a) The wall kept the little gasoline men in Texas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Arkansas, who did not own boats, out of the old South; and

(b) It boosted the sale price of gasoline in the old South because the majors sell gasoline, which comes to the old South by boat, in the old South at so much per gallon plus the rail rate from certain points in the Southwest, such as El Dorado, Ark.

I do not want these activities taken out from under the antitrust laws. I believe that if we pass this bill the South and the West will both suffer because of it. The question of freight rates is so important that if I were given the simple power to fix rates according to my own whims and notions, without any national standard of regulation, I could make or break any community. With this bill in my hands I could make or break any city, county, or State, or any section of this Nation.

The present inequality of freight rates in the United States is the result of unnatural manipulation, and is the result of a plan of control which punishes the South and the West, and is designed to establish and maintain industrial supremacy in the North and in the East. This unjust discrimination has created an industrial and economic empire in the northeastern section of the United States, while the industrial agencies of the South and West have been restricted, retarded, and not allowed free development.

As I have said, in November 1934, the question of discrimination was brought to the attention of the public at a southern Governors' conference held in Atlanta, Ga. It was not until November 22, 1939, that we received any relief whatever. That relief came through the Commodity Rate case. This was only a faint ray of hope. Another case originating in the South, which went its rounds after 1939, was decided by the Supreme Court only a few weeks ago. The decision in that case made mandatory a reduction of 10 percent in certain class freight rates in the South, and an increase of 10 percent in the official territory. It was the Supreme Court which offered that ray of hope. We want the courts still to be allowed to intervene if injustice is done to any section of the United States or to any person in this great Nation of ours.

In my study of this question I have found a cleverly conceived scheme in which industrial leaders in the field of transportation have conspired to center industrial control in the East. In order to perpetuate this control they have imposed on the South and the West freight-rate differentials. This system has restrained industrial development in the South and West, and will continue to do so. It has made possible the maintenance of an industrial empire in the East, and will continue to do so. Today this empire has grown so large that it has almost secured itself against competitive challenge. Knowingly and unknowingly, the Interstate Commerce Commission has aided and abetted this eastern industrial empire known as the official territory.

The plan has been to establish high shipping rates on goods manufactured in the South, and lower shipping rates on raw and semiraw materials shipped from the South, thus providing a twofold advantage to the East. Can any reasonable person say that that is fair?

The discrimination against the South and the West in connection with freight rates arises primarily from decisions of the Interstate Commerce Commission. The Interstate Commerce Commission has placed on similar traffic in the two territories, mile for mile, a higher rate for the southern than for the northern traffic. It seems that we have a long way to go in order to obtain economic freedom for our Nation when a board of American citizens vested with such power differentiates between sections of our Nation. How can we say that we are one Nation, undivided, so long as we continue to have differentials in our freight rates?

The present class rate structure in the North and in the South was promulgated nearly 20 years ago by the Interstate Commerce Commission. Under present economic conditions it discriminates against the West and the South in many ways. For example:

First. Shipping rates on many manufactured articles are higher within the South and West than within the North or the East.

Second. Shipping rates on manufactured articles are higher from the South and West to the North than are established rates within the North for the same articles.

Third. Rates on many manufactured articles are lower from the North to the South and West than the shipping rates from the South or the West.

To give an illustration, a carload of furniture, minimum weight 12,000 pounds, shipped from Sumter, S. C., to South Bend, Ind., 817 miles, is rated at $1.23, while the same amount of furniture from Gardner, Mass., to any given point is $1.05.

I could give many similar illustrations; but a study shows that mile for mile, rates fror the southern mills are higher than from the northern mills.

Cotton clothing is a commodity which is manufactured at numerous points in the South and in the North. It is sold generally throughout the country. There are many manufacturers of cotton cloth located in Nashville, Tenn., and Columbus, Ohio. Yet, if the Columbus, Ohio, manufacturers want to ship their cloth to Raleigh, N. C., a distance of 581 miles, the rate is $1.06 per hundred pounds. If the same amount of cotton cloth be shipped from Nashville, Tenn., a distance of 581 miles, to Raleigh, N. C., the rate is $1.32 per hundred pounds.

Southern manufacturers cannot expect to be able to market their products in the North in competition with manufacturers located in that section unless the rates from the South equal the rate level within the northern section.

This becomes more significant when we recognize that the southern shippers generally have a longer haul with a higher rate per hundred pounds. In some instances competitive considerations require a northern level of rates wholly within the South. This is conceded even by the southern railroads which make the claim that competitive rates are provided if necessary. This claim is, of course, untrue, and will be referred to a little later on in my speech. It is sufficient to say that the discriminatory character of the class rate structure in the South and between the South and the North is repugnant to the full economic development of the South and should be set right. What is true of the South is also true of the West, to a very large extent.

It is significant when one knows that in the past the Interstate Commerce Commission, when reviewing instances wherein this situation was the reverse, that is, that the South had the lowest rates required, that the rates be brought up to the level of the higher northern rates, and sometimes they were made higher. This was true with respect to the readjustment of the rates on such important southern products as cast-iron pipe, marble, granite, and textiles.

The Southern Governors' Conference has consistently adhered to the position that in seeking a parity of class rates with the North there was no intention of impairing the financial position of the southern railroads, but the crux of the whole matter is that if given equal rates, mile for mile, the South and the West would have an equal opportunity in affording industries a place within their borders. But it is now a known fact that industries settle almost wholly with-

in the North and the East because of the low freight rates.

It is not my intention, nor that of the southern governors, to bring financial ruin to the railroads or the industries of the East. It is our intention to bring about only fair rates so that every section will have an equal opportunity of having industries established within them.

This imaginary line is a strange thing. It does not divide the rich railroads from the poor railroads; it does not divide railroads having a heavy density of traffic from those having little traffic; it does not divide railroads having higher overhead costs from those having lower costs of operation; in fact, there seems to be on the surface no justification or reason for a line separating two large geographical sections of the country and maintaining higher rates in one section and lower rates in the other.

The South and the West will not have released themselves from the shackles of bondage until this imaginary line is abolished and the North, East, South and West are merged into one common structure.

We are not asking for any special favors; we are not petitioning for any relief. The suits which are now pending in court ask only for justice and equality to all sections of our Nation.

The South and West regard with pride the great cities of the East. We are happy to see our great cities thrive; but we do not feel that one section should succeed at the expense of another section. The South and the West realize that they are far removed from the great cities of the East, but our sections do not ask for any advantage over the East in carrying products to markets, nor do the South and the West seek to have a handicap over the East, but we do demand the right to have equal treatment and equal opportunity so that we may market our goods in these areas on the basis of rates which are no higher for similar distances than those which prevail in the North.

We can not see why a railroad which runs in both the North and the South should have rates different when it hits the South. I once asked why it was they charged more to ship back to the North some manufactured goods made in the North, when we did not like them, than it cost to ship the goods down to us. That question has not yet been answered. It involves the same goods on the same road, and it costs more to ship them back than to ship them to the South. I should like to have someone analyze that situation.

National solidarity today is imperative, but it cannot be achieved unless there is fair play on the part of Government commissions and bureaus in Washington. The North at one time fought a war against the South to erase sectionalism, but it seems now that sectionalism has been promulgated by the North through boards and commissions which set up imaginary lines which result in rate discrimination. We are demanding fair treatment for the entire world, but right here in America we have yet to achieve economic freedom, because of discriminatory freight rates. Some have been asked to explain the reason for a difference in freight rates, but up to the present time there has been no explanation. The Interstate Commerce Commission does not deny that this situation exists.

Let me say again that the Supreme Court has within the past month stated that there is discrimination between the North and the South, and it is demanding that the rates be increased on certain classes of commodities 10 percent in the North and reduced 10 percent in the South. Our Supreme Court has spoken. We want it to continue to speak.

The northern railroads do not deny the existence of discriminatory freight rates. The southern railroads do not deny the situation. Yet no one has found a sensible reason for its existence. Someone has suggested that it may cost less to transport marketable goods from the North to the South because it takes less coal to go down hill. That may be taken for what it is worth. Some have launched the theory that to allow the South and the West equal rates with those of the North would work a hardship on their competitors in the Northeast. But the South and the West are not mercenary in this matter. We ask only for ourselves as a basic and inalienable right, only equality of opportunity, and we will likewise support that right for the North, for the West, for the East, and for the South, and also for every trade area of our common country.

There are also a few southern shippers who support a status quo so to speak. This position appears to be based almost entirely on the form of statements by the railroads that the rates on raw materials of southern origin would necessarily be increased to make up for the loss of revenue which the railroads claim would come about by reductions in the rates on manufactured goods. But this position is not sound, for there is no proof that the rates on southern low-grade raw materials are lower in the South than in the North. They are lower only when they are shipped to the northern manufacturer so that he might compete to a greater advantage with the southern manufacturer. If the freight rate is equal throughout the Nation, the volume of traffic will not remain the same, but there will be development for every area of our country.

The tonnage of the southern railroads in the higher classes of freight traffic has been substantially augmented in recent years by new production in the South of such materials as paper and chemicals. In Charleston, S. C., we have recently developed an industry producing alloys. Such industries have added to the character and volume of traffic transported by the southern railroads. Although in former years the raw materials were shipped to northern markets, which processed manufactured goods out of them, today the same raw materials are being turned into the finished product at Charleston and are shipped throughout the country. The railroads in this case have received more money for the transportation of this finished product. Therefore, a prediction that equal freight rates would cause an increase on raw materials in the South is not justifiable. Equal freight rates would cause such localities which had the raw materials to work with to open industries in their own localities.

For the information of the Senate, Mr. President, let me say that it may be news that on this very day South Carolina is operating 25 percent and North Carolina approximately 25 percent of the active cotton spindles in the United States. Together, those two States have 50 percent of the active cotton spindles in the United States. Only yesterday I was talking to another Senator about this matter. He said that the cotton mills have been moved to the South because of the cheap labor there. Mr. President, it may be that some of the mills have been moved to the South because of the cheap labor there; but I think a geat many of them were taken to the South for other reasons, in addition. I believe that some of them were taken to the South because the mill owners found that taxes there were lower. Others were taken to South Carolina because the mill owners found that if the mills were located there, they would be close to the cottonfields; and, of course, it was obvious that even with the reduced rates, it cost a great deal of money to ship a bale of cotton to the New England States. So the mill owners realized that it was better to process the cotton in the South.

Mr. President, after we in the South began to weave the cotton into cloth, a great many of the experts came from the North and said to us, "You cannot bleach the cloth here, because your water is not of the right kind. It simply does not have the right ingredients. Neither can you have a dye factory here, because the water does not contain the right ingredients." They said such things in an attempt to poison the minds of the people of the South. But today there are bleacheries in North Carolina and in South Carolina, and the water is all right. It has been found that it is suitable for dyeing and also is suitable for the bleacheries.

Mr. President, as we have continued to break down such barriers, more and more mills have been established in the South. That is why I am so much interested in this freight-rate fight, for it means so much to the South. We have the raw materials, and we want them to be processed in the South so that additional employment will be made available to our people. If that is done, the South will no longer be economic problem No. 1 of the Nation, as I have previously stated, but will be advanced to an economic position comparable with that of official territory.

When discussing the rates on in-bound raw materials, the rates on the raw materials which are drawn into the South by southern manufacturers are probably ignored, because in most instances the rates on in-bound raw materials are higher than the rates which are applied when such materials are shipped to northern manufacturers. It is true that raw materials, such as cotton, can be shipped from the South to the North at lower rates than they can be shipped from the North to the South. Even so, today such raw materials are being manufactured into finished products in the

South. When cotton is manufactured into cloth in New England, it can be shipped to the South at rates lower than those which must be paid by southern mill owners when they ship cotton cloth to New England. In other words, Mr. President, it seems that the freight-rate differentials were set up for the purpose of protecting the nothern and eastern manufacturers. There is as much sense in the action of the Interstate Commerce Commission in permitting different rates to be applied to different sections of the country as there would be if the War Department were to allow New England soldiers to receive more pay than soldiers from the South and the West received. If the people of the West have not already gotten busy about these freight rates, I suggest that they do so at once, as I have said before, or some day they will wake up and find themselves in such a position that they will not be able to carry on.

Mr. President, under the freight-rate differential system, it would cost the State of Florida more money to ship a carload of white sand to Massachusetts than it would cost the State of Massachusetts to ship a carload of sand to Florida. In almost every instance the North is favored by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Numerous southern manufacturers draw a considerable portion of their raw materials from the North; the volume of this traffic is quite large. In most instances the rates on these in-bound raw material and the rates on out-bound manufactured articles are controlled by the official class-rate structure.

A great deal of stress is placed on the fact that in some instances the rates on pig iron are lower in the South than in the North; yet no mention is made of the fact that on merchantable iron, southern manufacturers who compete not only in the South but also in the North, find the rate level higher than the northern rate level. It is significant to note that the southern steel interests centered in Birmingham, Ala., are among those southern industries credited with supporting the southern railroads in this controversial matter. The reason for that can be understood when it is known that this steel industry ships little of its production out of the territory and is a large purveyor of railroad steel. A large portion of its production is sold directly to the railroads; and in order to hold a big customer, they must adopt the customer's viewpoint.

The other important iron production that is centered in the Birmingham area is that of cast-iron pipe, the largest of its type in the Nation. This industry is favored with a northern level of rates east of the Mississippi River. The rates of this important southern product are the same within the South as within the North, and apply equally whether northbound or south-bound. No imaginary line is drawn. There is no discrimination of rates. Originally the rates on this southern product were lower in the South and from the South to the North than were the rates in the North and from the North to the South; but the northern manufacturers complained to the ICC about this situation and the Commission, to satisfy the northern manufacturers, immediately prescribed a uniform level of rates between the two territories on a mileage basis so as to provide equal opportunity of distribution so far as cost of transportation is concerned in regard to cast-iron pipe. This is merely a juggling act of a Commission to satisfy certain northern interests.

There is no explanation why this should not be done in the case of other southern manufactured products. My belief is that the differences in freight rates constitute nothing more than a tariff to protect the eastern manufacturers.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, to permit me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Murray
Ball	Hickenlooper	Myers
Barkley	Hill	O'Conor
Brewster	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Holland	Pepper
Bridges	Jenner	Reed
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Kem	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Kilgore	Russell
Byrd	Knowland	Saltonstall
Cain	Langer	Smith
Capper	Lodge	Sparkman
Chavez	Lucas	Stewart
Connally	McCarran	Taft
Cooper	McCarthy	Taylor
Cordon	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McFarland	Thye
Downey	McGrath	Tobey
Dworshak	McKellar	Tydings
Ecton	McMahon	Umstead
Ellender	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Malone	Wherry
Fulbright	Martin	White
George	Maybank	Wiley
Gurney	Millikin	Williams
Hatch	Moore	Wilson
Hawkes	Morse	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I understand that several other Senators desire to debate the bill. That being true, inasmuch as we have already fixed a time for voting, I yield the floor.

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF CALENDAR

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, earlier today a unanimous consent request was entered into, that the Senate vote upon the pending bill, together with any motions or amendments offered thereto, at 4 o'clock on Wednesday afternoon, June 18. I stated at that time that debate on the pending bill would continue until it had been concluded. I gave the impression that if debate were concluded before 4 o'clock on Wednesday, there might be a call of the calendar. It was my thought afterward that the Senate might adjourn tonight, in which event there could be a call of the calendar the first thing Monday; but, inasmuch as I had made the statement, prior to the agreement, that the entire time would be used to debate the pending measure, I consider it to be only right that I should ask unanimous consent that the calendar be called on Monday rather than to move an adjournment, in order to have a morning hour on Monday.

I now ask unanimous consent that, when the Senate convenes on Monday, at whatever hour, which hour will be determined when the majority leader moves to recess, the Senate proceed to consider the legislative calendar of bills to which there is no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. HILL. In other words, as I understand the request, the Senator asks that, when the Senate convenes on Monday, the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside——

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. And that the Senate then proceed to the consideration of bills on the legislative calendar to which there is no objection?

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. President, I amend the unanimous-consent request by asking that the call of the legislative calendar begin at the point where the last call of the calendar ended, beginning with Senate bill 482, Order No. 197, on page 7.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request, as amended? The Chair hears none, and without objection, the agreement is entered into.

SHORTAGE OF STEEL SCRAP

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Steel of the Special Committee To Study the Problems of Small Business there has come to my attention a matter which is so important to the economic life of the Nation that I feel it should be made known to this body.

It has to do with the shortage of steel scrap which will probably force many open-hearth furnaces in Pennsylvania and elsewhere to shut down this fall and winter, creating a further shortage of steel and blocking the efforts of industry to speed up production.

After giving this situation considerable study I have come to the conclusion that it is within the power of the Government to relieve many of the economic ills caused by the lack of steel scrap. This could be accomplished by releasing for industrial use the vast quantity of steel held by the Government which is now serving no useful purpose.

Mr. President, there is much apprehension in Pennsylvania and other steel-producing States concerning the extremely difficult situation which will confront the steel industry in the fall and winter.

The automobile manufacturers and other fabricators of steel products, fighting to speed up production, will again be hard hit by a shortage of steel parts unless some way can be found to maintain the flow of scrap necessary to keep the Nation's open-hearth furnaces in operation.

In the early part of this year many open-hearth furnaces were forced into idleness because of the shortage of scrap. Existing high prices brought improvement in the situation, and the flow of scrap increased sufficiently to meet immediate requirements.

However, with the present consumption rate of approximately 2,000,000 tons every month, there is much question as to how long that flow can be maintained.

Breaking the steel-scrap bottleneck would mean not only more parts for fabricators of automobiles and other goods but also it would strike a sturdy blow against inflation.

It is a truism that the best way to fight inflation is to produce more goods. The converse is likewise true. If we produce less, prices will rise automatically.

Here are a few figures which clearly demonstrate the short supply of scrap. On January 1, 1940, the steel mills and foundries had 3,034,000 gross tons of scrap on hand. Figures at the end of February last showed them with only 1,760,000 tons, while the total supplies held by both dealers and consumers amounted to less than 3,000,000 tons. This was less than half of prewar levels.

The disappearance of much of our scrap stock pile is understandable. Millions of tons went to the bottom of the ocean during the war. Millions of tons were shot at our enemies and could not be recovered. Millions of tons went to our allies in the form of lend-lease armament.

But that is not the answer to the whole problem. Nor does it excuse everything.

Mr. President, the Government has it in its power to cure much of this shortage. The Government has the scrap. But the Government is not making it available.

There are three main Government sources:

First. Damaged Liberty ships, fit for nothing but junking.

Second. Surplus machine tools, which are either obsolete or were made for single war-production purposes, and hence have no current use.

Third. War matériel owned by the Nation which has either been left to rust on foreign beaches or which is under the care of foreign civilian employees of the Army and Navy. May I point out that not only is the steel being wasted, but we are paying people salaries to watch it?

Mr. President, steel may sound like a very dull subject—yes; discussion of steel scrap may even bore some people—but steel furnishes much of the lifeblood of my State of Pennsylvania; steel is the backbone of American production; and steel is the Nation's first line of defense in time of trouble.

Some of our greatest sources of iron ore are largely used up. The scrap steel which may have been expendable 25 years ago is vital to us today. We may suddenly awaken to find ourselves a have-not nation in one of the most precious of all resources.

Some time ago an order was issued that our ships, returning in ballast from foreign voyages, should use surplus war goods as ballast. I understand that this was done for a short time, and some machinery was brought back. Then the whole thing was dropped. Perhaps somebody could not be bothered.

Certainly steel scrap was never returned. It was claimed it would cost too much to ballast our vessels with steel from tanks and cannon. So the stuff is still overseas and we are still paying civilian employees of the Army and Navy to keep an eye on it.

Mr. President, when I think of the importance of steel in our economy and in our national defense, and when I consider the shortage of scrap for our mills, it seems to me it will be far more expensive not to return the available steel from abroad than to bring it back. Indeed, the cost of a newly inflated price, due to scarcity of commodities, is probably much greater than the cost of returning this vital metal as ballast.

I understand Mr. John R. Steelman pressed the scrapping of certain useless Liberty ships, but that this campaign has bogged down.

The third source of surplus is in this country. I have reports of thousands of tons of worthless machines and machine tools which should be sold and added to the pile of scrap. The Government pays heavy rental for warehousing this obsolete machinery. Here is a way to help production and at the same time save money for Uncle Sam.

And here is still another way to economize: Figures of the Byrd economy committee disclose about 48,000 employees on the pay roll of the War Assets Administration. Numerically that is more than three full Army divisions. I wonder how many of them are watching and guarding this worthless machinery. Scrap the machines and we can reduce the pay rolls.

Finally, there is the matter of great quantities of metal in this country which the armed forces have not yet declared surplus. To give an example, tanks have not been put on the surplus list. Admitting that some are needed for training, there must be thousands of tons of them which could be scrapped now. Certainly they will be obsolete before another war.

Mr. President and Members of the Senate, we will do an honest service to our country if we can get all these millions of tons of steel out of the drone class and into the worker class.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN AGREEMENTS BETWEEN CARRIERS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 110) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I should like to support legislation which would be helpful to the railroads. I am opposed to the pending bill, and, therefore, that statement may sound inconsistent. However, it is not.

I can remember from the earliest days of my childhood the important part that railroading played in my section of the country and among my own people. I remember that the lands next to where we lived belonged to the railroad—even lands that had been granted to the railroad by the Federal Government to assist in building the road. We children could hear the various trains whistle. We lived within 3 miles of the railroad. Early in our lives we learned the times when those trains were due, and we could almost distinguish them by the sound of their respective whistles. I worked for that same railroad when I was a young man. Today my only brother is an employee of the railroad. I believe that the railroads constitute one of the most important segments of the industrial backbone of this country, and I would not do anything that I felt was harmful to a healthy railroad condition.

Two or three years ago, while I was a Member of the House, I remember that some of my very best friends came to me and talked to me about the Bulwinkle bill. At that time I did not know what the Bulwinkle bill was. They knew what it was before it had ever been introduced. The first thing I knew about it was when they came to me and talked to me about it. I remember saying to them then that I would study the bill carefully, and if I found that it did not deprive the people of the country of rightful protection under the antitrust laws and other laws, and did not deprive them of the right to come in at any suitable time and question the reasonableness of rates, then I would feel inclined to support the legislation; otherwise I would not. I made that statement very frankly.

I was assured from time to time that the legislation would not take away from the people those particular rights, but later, when the Bulwinkle bill came to the floor of the House and I studied it, I came to the conclusion that there was no escape from the conclusion that the people of the country would be deprived of those rights. Therefore, I voted against the bill when it came up on the floor of the House. Only approximately 45 Members voted against it.

When the bill was introduced this year we began to receive mail about the Reed bill, Senate bill 110. I looked it up, and I found that it was the Bulwinkle bill under another name. Again I stated my objections to the bill. I was assured from time to time that those objections have been removed. I admit that some of the objections to the original Bulwinkle bill do not apply to this bill; but the great basic objection to it is still present. By this bill we would allow a great part of American industry and American economic life to operate in its field to a great extent without any protection to the citizens of the country under laws which Congress has enacted from time to time. I refer to the antitrust laws, which were enacted for the purpose of giving to citizens protection against monopoly and restraint of trade.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] has filed extremely able minority views on the bill. As I understand, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] joins in those minority views. If I correctly remember, in the last Congress other Senators joined in the minority views. I found those views so interesting that I started to study the bill more carefully. I have obtained material relating to the various parts of the report spelling out those things offered as valid objections to the

bill, which would exempt from the antitrust laws the various transportation agencies subject to regulation by the ICC, including railroads, motor carriers, water carriers, pipe lines, and freight forwarders.

The minority report states:

The obvious purpose of the bill is to deprive the courts of jurisdiction in pending cases instituted by the Department of Justice and the State of Georgia. The Department of Justice, in a suit at Lincoln, Nebr., under the Sherman Act, is seeking to enjoin powerful combination of railroads, railroad associations, and bankers from fixing arbitrary and discriminatory freight rates, limiting railroad services, suppressing improvements in railroad equipment and facilities, and preventing the development of modes of transportation competitive with the railroads.

The case is styled United States against Association of American Railroads, Western Association of Railway Executives, et al., and is popularly known as the Western Railroad case. I propose to tell the Senate what the Western case is about and why the railroads are so anxious to have it taken from the courts by this legislation.

The case was filed in August 1944 and the Government put in its evidence on April 23, 1947. As I understand, the railroads have until October to make their answer to the contention which the Government has sought to establish by the evidence which it ha placed in the record.

The United States has brought a variety of charges against the defendants, for violation of the antitrust laws, chief of which are the Association of American railroads, many of the railroads west of the Mississippi River, and two of the largest banking houses, Morgan and Kuhn, Loeb & Co. Named as coconspirators are railroads in other sections of the country, the Nation-wide net work of railroad rate bureaus, large oil companies, steel companies, other railroad organizations, and a number of individuals.

The Government charges the railroad combination with concert of action and continuing agreement to charge higher freight rates and passenger fares in the West than in the East; to prevent western railroads from granting rate reductions; to fix rates for movement of petroleum and its products both by rail and pipe line at noncompetitive levels; to withhold expedited freight and passenger service which some rail lines wanted and were able to render but for the illegal combination; to prevent the construction of spur tracks for shippers and receivers of freight in the West; to prevent the building of loading sheds for western shippers; to withhold from use improved transportation equipment and facilities; to delay and prevent the installation and use of air-conditioning equipment; to prohibit the installation of recreational equipment on passenger trains; to lessen competition by restricting the individual rail lines' right to advertise and to solicit business; and to hinder the development of motor vehicle and other modes of transportation competitive with the railroads.

Mr. President, just at this point I should like to say that the great argument which has been made by the proponents of this legislation has been that if this bill is enacted into law the railroads then will be able, through their various committees and rate bureaus, to continue to do exactly what they have been doing. That is true. This legislation will permit that. Then they go further and say that it is necessary for us to have these bureaus and committees in order to confer among themselves as to what a fair rate should be. I agree that railroads ought to have the right to confer with reference to what rates ought to be, but we fool ourselves when we limit the scope of this legislation simply to some conferences among the railroads as to what rates ought to be. The list of charges which the Government has filed against railroad combinations and outfits illustrates the wide scope of activities in which these boards and bureaus are engaged. So they do not limit their activities merely to a discussion of what would be fair and reasonable rates.

To carry out these offenses the railroads are charged with using as instrumentalities the Western Association of Railway Executives, the Association of American Railroads, and the commissioner plan, western district, in addition to the regular railroad rate-making machinery.

The commissioner plan of operation was established, it is charged, under the so-called western agreement, effective in 1932, administered by a Western Commissioner. According to the Government's complaint, the Western Commissioner considered controversies arising when a railroad, party to the agreement, desired to establish lower rates or inaugurate improved service or facilities, and any other party to the agreement protested against such changes. Under the terms of the western agreement, the changes could not be put into effect until after notification to all parties to the agreement, and in case of protest the matter was referred to the commissioner, until after formulation of a proposed solution of the controversy by the Western Commissioner. Further, in the event that the commissioner's proposed solution was not accepted, the matter was referred by him to a committee of directors, which caused the proponent of change to adopt a course of conduct satisfactory to the directors.

J. P. Morgan & Co., and its affiliates, and Kuhn, Loeb & Co., the charge states, are represented on the committee of directors established by the western agreement and take part in the collusive fixing of noncompetitive rates and elimination of competition by collaborating with other members of the committee to coerce officials of the defendant western railroads to refrain from making effective reductions of rates and improvement in services and facilities in the western portion of the United States.

It is interesting to note that although the western agreement became effective in December 1932, it was not filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission, as required by law of such an agreement, until April 1943, 11 years after it went into effect and after—bear in mind—the Department of Justice had requested a copy of the agreement. In other words, after the Department of Justice had started investigating the matter the agreement was filed in accordance with law, 11 years late. It is even more interesting that the parties to the agreement claimed to have canceled it shortly thereafter in the same month.

Measured by the breadth of the charges, financial resources of the defendants, and the size of the geographical area involved, the case against the western railroads is probably the largest antitrust suit in history. If a decision favorable to the Government is forthcoming in the case, it will no doubt result in changes in the pattern of railroad freight rates in the South and West.

The railroads have been neither silent nor idle in the face of the antitrust suits brought by the State of Georgia and the Federal Government. Their innocence has been loudly proclaimed by every device available to a group with great financial resources. Quite at variance with the charges against them, the railroads claim that the rate bureaus are merely "forums" devoted exclusively to discussion of ways and means to avoid violations of the Interstate Commerce Act. The acts charged, so the railroads aver, were performed in order to conform to the Interstate Commerce Act and with knowledge and approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission. It is also asserted that "a small clique" in the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, in an unrealistic way is endeavoring to substitute regulation under the antitrust laws for regulation by the Interstate Commerce Commission. In the nature of a counteroffensive is the assertion that the Department of Justice is endeavoring to obliterate all rate bureaus, which it is claimed would bring "chaos and confusion" to the field of transportation with shippers being forced to deal with each railroad separately. The record does not substantiate this claim.

On the contrary, the record indicates that the Department of Justice merely asked that the rate bureaus conform their activities to comply with the antitrust statutes.

What have the railroads done to warrant the charges in the Western case? I hold in my hand a list of some of the restraints accomplished under the western agreement. It, by the way, is a part of the hearings in connection with this legislation. As it is quite a lengthy list I shall read only a few of them, and then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the rest of them printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. SPARKMAN. One of the examples of activities of the western mechanism was this: In 1933 air-conditioning of passenger equipment was temporarily curtailed and temporarily stopped through the operation of the agreement. Who would question the right of any railroad, in good business and in trying to compete with other railroads in rendering good service, to do all it could to improve the service? Certainly the in-

stallation of air-conditioning machinery was to that end.

In 1933 operations under the western commissioner plan prevented absorption by the railroads of expense incident to putting heaters in cars used in the shipment of potatoes, in all movements of potatoes from Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Illinois, Missouri, Utah, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, Idaho, Colorado, Washington, Wyoming, Montana, Oklahoma, and Oregon into Chicago.

In 1933 the Chicago Great Western endeavored to reduce rates on a hundred different commodities by 30 cents per hundred pounds when moving in carloads with minimum weights of 30,000 pounds each from Chicago to Kansas City, St. Joseph, Omaha, South St. Paul, and other points. The reduction was stopped, after pressure by Messrs. DeForest, Harriman, Van Sweringen, and McCullough, members of the committee of directors.

In 1934 reductions in rates on sugar moving from New Orleans, La., and Sugar Land, Tex., to Springfield, Mo., were prevented.

In the same year reductions in rates on coal moving from Utah and Wyoming to points west of Boise, Idaho, were prevented.

In 1934, the movement of freight in baggage cars on passenger trains between Vicksburg and Shreveport was prevented. Mr. President, undoubtedly empty baggage cars were running over that course; and yet those bureaus or committees or directors would not permit the use of those baggage cars for the carrying of freight over that same stretch of railroad. I should like to say that we have heard many complaints about feather-bedding by railroad workers and workers in other lines of activity, and we condemn it, and rightfully so, when it is wasteful. But what is the difference between feather-bedding with the use of labor and feather-bedding with the use of excess equipment on railroads? Yet, although the service on a particular railroad would have been improved by permitting the use of baggage cars for hauling part of the freight traveling on that railroad, the big railroads said to that smaller railroad, "You cannot do it." They took that position because they feared that perhaps if that particular railroad were allowed to do so, some pressure might be exerted on other railroads to do likewise.

Also, Mr. President, in 1934, an unsuccessful effort was made to cause the Alton to unhook the air-conditioning on certain sleepers and to move them to St. Louis without air-conditioning, although they had reached Chicago on the B. & O. with the air-conditioning apparatus in operation.

Mr. President, I could continue to read various of the 81 cases stated in this list, which I have asked to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. If Senators will read the entire list, I think they will be impressed with the fact that the enactment of the pending bill would simply result in authorizing the continuance of such practices. Certainly we do not want that to be done. However, the proponents of the bill claim that it is merely for the purpose of permitting these boards to meet for the purpose of conferring in regard to reasonable rates to be established among the railroads. It is obvious that the bill goes far beyond that. The list to which I have been referring gives instances in which railroads have been required to slow down the movement of freight. In several cases they were faced with a decree that freight which arrived in a particular town after 5 a. m. could not be delivered to the merchants and wholesalers and jobbers in that town until after 7 p. m. of the same day. In numerous instances, railroads moving freight between different towns were required to slow down the movement of the freight. I say to the Senate, Mr. President, that when agreements of that sort are made, the public does not receive what it is entitled to receive from railroads, which are set up for the purpose of serving the public.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Is it not also true that some of the freight affected by the decrees to which the Senator has been referring was perishable?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. However, no difference whatsoever was made, regardless of whether the freight was perishable or nonperishable. A deadline was drawn; and even though the railroad delivering the freight wished to deliver it promptly, it was told that it could not deliver it until after 7 p. m.

Mr. HILL. In other words, the hierarchy which is controlling in these situations prevented the particular railroad from making delivery of the freight when it wished to deliver it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is absolutely correct.

Let me also point out that in that case those who received the freight or those who delivered the freight could obtain no relief; they could not go to the Interstate Commerce Commission for relief. In some cases the smaller railroads have tried to obtain relief from the Interstate Commerce Commission, but they have been broken down in such efforts by the larger railroads which held a sword over their heads.

Mr. President, the minority report further states that—

> The State of Georgia's suit is now being tried in the Supreme Court of the United States and seeks to enjoin combinations in the railroad industry from fixing noncompetitive and discriminatory freight rates.

The Georgia case has been discussed rather fully in the course of the debate, and I do not propose to discuss it at length. I simply wish to say a few words in order to show what the Georgia case is about and what it seeks to do for the South. For that purpose, I shall offer several examples of what the railroads, through the rate conferences, have done to affect adversely the economy of Alabama and the South. These examples are taken from the record made before Master Lloyd Garrison, appointed by the Supreme Court to hear and report on the Georgia case. Understand that not one, but all, of the Southern States have been injured by the conspiracy operating through the rates bureaus.

The first of these matters relates to the control of the monopoly group over the rates of the individual railroads making up the group.

On October 11, 1941, the Southern Railway submitted to the Southern Freight Association a proposal for a reduced rate upon logs from certain stations in Northwestern Alabama to Altavista, Va., the entire movement being over the lines of the Southern Railway. The Southern Railway in its proposal stated that it felt that the reduced rate was necessary in order to enable the logs to move from Alabama points. When the proposal was submitted by the Southern Freight Association to its members, the principal rail objection was predicated upon the dangerous competitive influences that might be set in motion by the suggested arrangement.

The proposal was disapproved initially by the General Freight Committee by majority vote. It was then appealed to the executive committee, where it was again disapproved by majority vote. Finally an appeal was taken to the traffic executive association—southern territory. On July 20, 1943, 22 months after the proposal was first filed, it was stricken from the docket of the Traffic Executive Association. Those who were seeking to ship logs from northwest Alabama into Virginia over one railroad were denied the advantage of the lower rate which the Southern Railroad tried to give them.

The illustration demonstrates that the power of defendants to coerce, prevent, hinder, and delay the filing of rate proposals is not limited to situations where the railroads confer upon the formation of joint rates. Here the entire movement was over the lines of the proponent railroad; even so its managerial judgment was subjected to the concerted judgment of defendants, none of whom were parties to the rate proposed.

The second example relates to the damage done by the rate bureaus to an industry in Florida.

This case history concerns the attempt of a shipper in Pensacola, Florida, to obtain a rate covering the movement of synthetic gums and resins from Florida to northern consuming markets on the basis of the existing rate covering such commodities in the north. The proposal was approved on May 14, 1940, by Southern Freight Association, subject to the concurrence of the northern (official) lines. Thereafter the proposal suffered the fate of all such southern attempts to penetrate the rate wall preserving northern markets for northern industries. Successively postponed in the Joint Conference of Contact Committees at the request of official territory lines from July 26, 1940, until July 24, 1941, the original proposal was finally rejected, and in substitution therefor a rate approximately 40 percent higher than the rate requested was granted. After 15 months of referring, deferring, and conferring, the shipper was compelled to

accept the high rate, being unable to secure official concurrence to anything less.

While it is sufficient here to note the arbitrary and discriminatory operation of defendants' price-fixing machinery, and while the reasonableness of the rates involved is immaterial, it is worth remarking the flexible yardstick their arbitrary power permits them to apply as the occasion demands.

When the shipper here disclosed to eastern territory roads that his products would compete with those of northern manufacturers, his proposal was rejected as injurious to northern industry.

I wish to quote just a few questions and answers from the hearing:

The CHAIRMAN. You are going to have so much consumption in official territory.

Mr. MACARTHUR. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. There must be competition with your products and others in official territory.

Mr. MACARTHUR. Perhaps we might take some business away from some people; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. To that extent, you would hurt official territory manufacturers.

When the answer showed that it would, his application was dead. He might as well never have filed it.

However, when the shipper's proposal was before Illinois Freight Association, that association was impressed with MacArthur's testimony that:

Our plants in the North are taxed far beyond capacity. We cannot produce sufficient quantities in our northern plants. That is the reason for the plant at Pensacola.

Accordingly, Illinois Freight rejected the proposal on the ground that competition did not require it:

In fact the proponent shippers' statements clearly indicate that a movement from the South under present conditions could be brought about even under the existing basis of class 55, because the demand at present appears to be greater than the production.

Obviously, northern producers do not want competition from plants located in the South. If this legislation is approved, the control of the North over the movement of southern goods to the rich markets of the North and East will be allowed to continue. This control is not a fiction. It has even been recognized by the Interstate Commerce Commission in these words:

We are persuaded that the northern carriers as a group actually do effectively control the rates within the North and also the north-bound interterritorial rates except to points on and west of the Monon Line. (Monon is the name given to the Chicago, Indianapolis & Louisville Railway) (235 I. C. C. 329.)

It goes without saying that the North has exercised its control over these rates by means of the rate bureaus to the detriment of the South.

Mr. President, in that connection, I should like to have included at this point in my remarks an excerpt from Civil No. 2311, brief for the United States, in the case of The States of New York, Delaware, Indiana, Maryland, Michigan, New Jersey, Ohio, Wisconsin, and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania against the United States of America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPT FROM CIVIL NO. 2311, BRIEF FOR THE UNITED STATES, IN THE CASE OF "THE STATES OF NEW YORK, DELAWARE, INDIANA, MARYLAND, MICHIGAN, NEW JERSEY, OHIO, WISCONSIN, AND THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA *v.* THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA."

Obviously the low income status of the South and West may be improved by removing the barriers to industrialization in those regions, and allowing industry to develop in a manner commensurate with the natural and human resources present there. To accomplish this, the products of such industrialization must be allowed movement unimpeded into the rich markets of official territory.

It has been emphasized that official territory shippers can come into other territories on lower levels of class rates, mile for mile, than shippers residing in those territories have to pay for shipping similar articles wholly within their own territories. One has here something remarkably similar to the working of a protective tariff, to the extent that certain favored interests effectively strive to protect themselves at home while retaining privileges elsewhere. The railroads in official territory are frank in recognizing this situation for the benefit of themselves and the producers on their lines. This is illustrated by the following quotation from the brief filed with the Commission by counsel for official railroads:

"Official Territory lines have perhaps the most vital interest in interterritorial competitive adjustments of any single group of carriers in the country for the reason that the populous official territory provides the markets for a large part of the traffic produced elsewhere in the United States. That territory is hemmed in on the South, the Southwest, and the West by territories, and carriers serving them, all seeking to market their products within the territory served by official lines. In many instances such commodities, sought to be marketed within official territory, come into direct competition with the commodities produced in that territory. Official lines, therefore, are in duty bound to protect the geographical or other natural advantages posessed by shippers or producers on their lines, and as a matter of justice and equity, they may not be required to join in such low bases of interterritorial rates as to nullify or neutralize these natural advantages."

Mr. SPARKMAN. The role of the South as an undeveloped economic colony is artificially perpetuated by narrowly limiting its industries to the relatively unprofitable production of raw materials; the profitable role of fabricating finished articles is reserved for the North. The relationship between the North and the South in terms of land, workers, and manufacturing is shown by a certain table—table 39 of exhibit 1, and tables 2, 5, and 6 of exhibit 9, I. C. C. Docket No. 28300, Class Rate Investigation, 1939—which I ask unanimous consent to have inserted as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Land area, gainful workers, value of manufactured products, and value added by manufacture, by freight-rate territories, as a percent of the United States total

Territory	Land area, 1940	Gainful workers, 1930	Value of manufactured products, 1939	Value added by manufacture, 1939
Official	13.5	51.1	67.8	71.4
Southern	13.3	16.8	10.0	9.4

Mr. SPARKMAN. This disparity in the economic development of the North and the South is reflected in the earnings of their workers. The difference in earnings is shown in the following table—table 6 of exhibit 76, I. C. C. Docket No. 28300, Class Rate Investigation, 1939:

Total income payments, dollar income, and relative income levels per person employed, 1940

Territory	Total income payments		Average dollar income per person employed	Relative income level per person employed
	Millions of dollars	Percent of total		
Official	49,005	64.3	$1,988	118
Southern	6,648	8.7	940	56

Mr. President, the contrast between the industrial North and the undeveloped economy of the South and West is strikingly illustrated by figures on value added by manufacture. Thus the average ton of out-bound freight from official territory represents value added by manufacture of $54.69, which is about 13 times as great as the $4.19 value added by manufacture to the average ton outbound from the South and West—I. C. C. Docket No. 28300, Class Rate Investigation, 1939, transcript of testimony, page 1375. The discriminatory freight-rate structure maintained by defendants is largely responsible for this situation. In a study of eight shipments from Southern Territory to Official Territory, for example, the rates on clay were 112 percent of the official territory rates for equal distances, while in the case of the more highly processed products of pottery and chinaware the rate was 140 percent of the official territory rate for equal distances—chart III of exhibit 76, I. C. C. Docket No. 28300, Class Rate Investigation, 1939.

The failure of the South to match the industrial development of the North results very largely from the protective trade policies enforced by the northern railroad defendants in the Georgia case. In an economy geared to mass production for a national-market, industry cannot develop in a region whose products are denied equal access to the territory which has 76 percent of the national market for industrial machinery and raw materials, 64 percent for all goods and services, 62 percent of con-

sumer luxuries, and 53 percent of consumer necessities—chart VII of exhibit 76, I. C. C. Docket No. 28300, Class Rate Investigation, 1939.

This statement is contained in the minority report, and it strikes me as being most significant:

> Cartelization of the transportation industry cannot be isolated from the national economy. Transportation costs are a major element in determining the price of goods in other industries. The power to control the cost of transportation is a power which may be used to dictate whether other businesses shall enjoy competitive success or be stifled to death.

Examination of this bill shows that it would permit the legalization of private controls over the Nation's economy not only by combinations in the field of transportation, but, under the broad terms of the bill, by industrial and financial combinations working hand in hand with transportation combinations.

One of the strongest arguments against this bill is that it would legalize a device which, while ostensibly limited to the fixing of prices in the railroad industry, actually is the keystone of a private economic power at once so vast and so subtle that it challenges Government itself. The power to fix rail freight rates is an insidious all-pervasive power which underlies and conditions the terms of existence in industries whose only connection with the railroad industry is their use of freight transportation.

The plenary power arbitrarily to fix all freight rates which the existing hierarchy vests in the railroads is easily demonstrated. Perhaps the gravest illustrations of the unlimited scope of this power was furnished during the recent war emergency, when the impotence of the National Government itself to deal effectively with the unrestrained power of the railroad rate cartel was starkly revealed. The Office of Production Management, the Office of Price Administration, and the Office of Defense Transportation were, alike, unable to cope with the railroads' power to fix the price at a level designed to procure maximum revenues for minimum services, regardless of the resulting jeopardy to the war program.

For example, in April 1942 the Office of Price Administration and the Office of Defense Transportation informed the railroads that diversion of shipping by the Maritime Commission was forcing large tonnages of sulfur onto the rails and requested the establishment of more reasonable rates realistically reflecting the tremendously increased tonnages. The Office of Price Administration pointed out the multitudinous uses of sulfur, particularly in time of war, and the vicious inflationary spiral that would be set in motion if transportation costs were trebled from the $3–$4 per ton water rate to the existing $12 per ton rail paper rate. A paper rate is one that is available but too high to move traffic. It further observed that the proposed rates would earn the carriers between 21.9 and 26.7 cents per car mile and that in many instances the carriers had voluntarily sought from the Interstate Commerce Commission rates which would produce lower car-mile earnings than those proposed. This appeal was supported by the Office of Defense Transportation, which pointed out that—

> The rates proposed are consistent with the basis of rates prescribed by the Commission. The Government departments interested in this movement, particularly the Office of Price Administration, have stated their position that the establishment of the rates upon this basis is critically necessary in order to adjust the rates to a fair basis in view of the diversion of the traffic formerly moved by water to all-rail routes, and because of the need for establishing this basis of rates to facilitate the production of sulfuric acid at reasonable prices.

Despite the inflationary results of their action upon the war program, the power of the railroads was so great that they were able summarily to reject the request of the Government agencies.

So plenary was the power of the railroads' private rate-fixing mechanisms that the various Government agencies concerned with the war program came frankly to defer to the railroads for decisions on many momentous questions seriously affecting the war effort. For example, in May 1941, when the question arose of transporting gypsum rock diverted by war from water to rail carriage, the Office of Production Management, in deference to the power possessed by the railroads, referred to the railroad price mechanisms the grave question as to whether the railroads would prefer to have interior mills enlarged or grant a reasonable rate permitting transportation to mills along the eastern seaboard. As Mr. Cleveland, vice president of the Association of American Railroads, described the question:

> The gypsum-board mills located in the interior are now running to capacity and the problem with which the Office of Production Management is concerned is whether to arrange for an increase in the capacity of the existing plants within the interior or to supply the seaboard mills with domestic rock. In order to reach a conclusion they would like to have at the earliest date possible—and they hope that it can be furnished within a week—rates between origin points and destinations as follows:
>
> * * * * * *
>
> They have also expressed the hope that the railroads will advise them whether they would prefer from their standpoint to have the production of existing gypsum-board mills in the interior increased or that these raw materials shall be supplied to the mills covering the movements that have been enumerated above. In this connection my attention was called to the fact that the principal distribution from the eastern seaboard has been by truck.

The carriers decided this important question of national policy by refusing the requested reduction in rates. This instance of the exercise of the power implicit in the railroad-rate hierarchy is significant because it discloses the real economic evil inherent in the power to fix freight rates.

The power involved in this combination is not merely the power implicit in any price-fixing agreement. These are no ordinary prices that this group has the power to fix. This is not simply the case of the butchers, the bakers, the candlestick makers getting together to fix prices in their respective trades. If no more than this were involved, it might be possible to contemplate legalizing a measure of concerted action under public control.

However, implicit in the power to fix freight rates is the power to control a basic competitive factor in every industry. This is so because transportation costs are a major element in every industrial pricing system, and power to control the cost of transportation is largely the power to dictate initially the location of every industrial enterprise and subsequently the competitive success or failure of those enterprises. Thus the power to fix freight rates conveys in a large measure the power of life and death over our competitive economy. The problem presented, therefore, is not merely a question of eliminating competition in prices for freight services, but eliminating competition to a large degree from our whole economy.

Mr. President, I think it may be well for us to keep in mind certain figures that I believe the distinguished Senator from South Carolina placed in the RECORD yesterday—I know he showed them to me—to the effect that when we lift the railroads of the country from the operation of the antitrust laws, we are lifting $23,000,000,000 worth of our industry, with an annual revenue of $9,000,000,000; that much of our national economy we are removing from the operation of the antitrust laws.

The close relation between railroad rates and prices is most apparent in industries whose systems of pricing are built upon multiple basing points. That is, industries in which delivered prices are figured on the basis of the price at established basing points to which is added freight charges from a basing point, usually the one nearest to the city of delivery. Such prices are purely arbitrary; the location of the plant from which the shipment is actually made is not taken into account and no consideration is given to the distance the product is actually shipped, or to the kind of transportation used, whether railroad, waterway, or motor truck. In practice the price is quoted on the basis of the basing-point plant and transportation is assessed on the basis of the railroad freight charges from the basing point to the destination of the goods.

It would be difficult for such price-fixing systems to survive if competitive transportation charges were permitted; so it is desirable that a basing-point system be supported by a rigid railroad rate structure.

The rate bureau set-up for maintaining an inflexible freight-rate structure is therefore of great value for certain railroads and the industries which they wish to perpetuate. Since the chief objective of basing-point systems is to maintain industrial concentration in certain parts of the Nation and to deny to competitors,

or potential competitors, in other areas the advantages of their location, the rail-rate-bureau system is a mechanism to maintain the industrial status quo often at the expense of the less powerful railroads.

Steel and cement, both of which industries use multiple-point basing-price systems, are sources of illustrations of the unholy economic alliance between railroad freight rates and industrial prices. In the Georgia case before the Supreme Court, the evidence discloses that southern rail lines were prevented from increasing traffic in steel on their lines because the rates changes proposed would result in reduced prices for steel delivered in southern territory by barge from the Pittsburgh area. This illustration is particularly interesting to me because it relates to industry in my own State of Alabama.

In 1939 southern carriers proposed reduced rates on steel from Birmingham to Mississippi and Gulf ports in an effort to attract to the rails additional steel tonnage then moving at lower rates by truck and barge. Since Birmingham, however, was a basing point, steel prices, whether the steel originated in Birmingham or Pittsburgh, were quoted on the basis of the Birmingham plant plus all-rail freight to point of delivery, irrespective of the fact that the steel actually moved from Birmingham at lower non-rail rates. Therefore, any reduction in the freight rate from Birmingham would work two results on the steel industry prices in the South: First, even though the steel was shipped from Pittsburgh and even though it moved entirely by company-owned barge lines, any reduction in the existing paper rail rate from Birmingham would automatically reduce the price of steel delivered from Pittsburgh; Second, any reduction of the paper rail rate from Birmingham to the truck or water rate on which the steel actually moved would deny the steel producers the secret rebate they obtain as a result of the quoted rail price being in excess of the actual transportation costs. This secret profit is known in the industry as "phantom freight."

Mr. President, a few years ago a new post-office building was being erected in my home town, Huntsville, Ala., just about 100 miles from Birmingham. One day I went by the place where work was being done on the post office. The workers were just beginning to put up the steel work. Birmingham, of course, is a great steel center in its own right. I said to the contractor, "I suppose this steel is from Birmingham." He said "No, you are mistaken; it is from Pittsburgh." Pittsburgh could afford to put its steel in a building a thousand miles or more away and within 100 miles of Birmingham, because of the freight rates which I have discussed here. That is a good example of how such things as that can be done. I say that such arrangements do not make for competition. We have always been taught that competition is the life of trade, and that if private enterprise in this country is to survive, it must be based upon free and untrammeled competition. Yet the working of these rate bureaus and committees which would be not only perpetuated but legalized should the bill become law, will stifle competition and make it possible for the great combinations to work their will with respect to competition or non-competition.

In the course of the debate, Mr. President, many references have been made to the Transportation Act of 1940. That was Senate bill 2009. I was in the House of Representatives when that bill came before us. I voted against the bill because it occurred to me to be a step toward stifling competition. Of course, the purpose of the bill, as we were told by the proponents, was to bring water carriers into the general transportation scheme, and that everything was all right under the bill, according to its proponents. I voted against the bill because I felt that again there were some things in it that did not meet the eye. It was not very long after the bill became law that we saw that our fears were justified. There was filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission an application from certain railroads to establish rates on grain coming into Chicago from other points to be transported to other areas. In some instances the grain was to be milled. The Interstate Commerce Commission allowed those railroads to charge a higher rate for the transshipment of grain that had come in over barge lines than they charged for the same grain that came in over rail lines. The ruling of the Interstate Commerce Commission went to the United States Supreme Court. In a split decision the United States Supreme Court held that the Interstate Commerce Commission in granting those rates had acted within the provisions of the Transportation Act of 1940. So there the people learned that they were not getting out of that act what they thought they were getting and what they were told by the proponents of the act they would get.

There was a very able dissenting opinion written in that case. That was the case of Interstate Commerce Commission et al. against Inland Waterways Corporation, et al., to be found in Three Hundred and Nineteenth United States Reports, page 671. Mr. Justice Black wrote a very strong, a very clear, and a very fine dissenting opinion. He placed the issue in just a few words, and I want to quote very briefly from his dissenting opinion. He said:

> The issue in this case is whether the farmers and shippers of the Middle West can be compelled by the Interstate Commerce Commission and the railroads to use high-priced rail instead of low-priced barge transportation for the shipment of grain to the East.

That was the issue as he stated it. He discussed the legislation contained in S. 2009 as it went through Congress. He included in his footnotes quotations from debates on the floor of the Senate and the floor of the House. One statement was that of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], who asked about this very thing, and he was assured by the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate, former Senator Wheeler, that water carriers would be protected, and that the shippers and the consumers would not be penalized by the enactment of that legislation through higher freight rates charged for hauling freight on the railroads. Unfortunately, the dissenting opinon of Mr. Justice Black did not prevail. The roads were given the right to charge those higher rates, in other words to penalize waterway shipments, and those who hoped to obtain the lower freight rates that waterway systems can afford.

I am happy to say that only recently that case, or a similar case, went back to the Supreme Court, and this time Mr. Justice Black wrote the majority opinion, in which the former majority opinion of the Supreme Court was overruled, and the right of waterway shippers under the Transportation Act of 1940 was recognized, but 7 years late.

The argument has been made on this floor many times that we could rely on the Interstate Commerce Commission to protect the shippers and the consumers and the people of this country. Mr. President, I know of no Government agency for which I have higher respect than the Interstate Commerce Commission, but here we have the example I have cited, just out of the Supreme Court of the United States, 7 years after the Transportation Act was passed, when we were assured by those who were upholding the legislation on the floor of the Senate and on the floor of the House of Representatives that the waterway shippers would be protected. But the Interstate Commerce Commission took a different view and said that they should pay the higher rate. The Supreme Court upheld the carriers, because it said they had the right to charge the higher rates, and it required 7 years to bring relief to the shippers.

In the instant case, although the proposed rate involved conduced to the interest of southern railroads by attracting additional tonnage, and although the proposed rate concerned only southern railroads, northern railroads and their northern industrial allies brought terrific pressure to bear on the southern railroads through the Association of American Railroads and the proposal was rejected.

The general traffic manager of Bethlehem Steel objected:

> I must protest the proposal with all possible vigor. It is difficult for us to see the merit in a proposal which so completely disregards the interests of the northern producer.

The vice president of Weirton Steel protested:

> Of course, we have been very much opposed to this contemplated action on the part of the southern lines, because it would be detrimental to producers in this territory, and, while it is true that these rates are to be reduced to meet water competition, in our judgment it seems to us that the southern lines should take no action of this kind until Senate bill 2009 has been finally disposed of. These reductions only tend to reduce the delivered price by reason of Birmingham being a base, and if the reductions are made we feel certain that the water carriers will reduce their rates so that the relationship now existing will continue, which action, of course, will not be beneficial to the railroads but will permit of the producers here being able to continue to do some business in that territory

As a result the southern roads were coerced to appreciate that their innocent effort to secure for the railroads a mere trickle of southern steel business threatened the foundation of the entire steel pricing system. As Mr. Tilford, vice president of the Louisville & Nashville Railroad, summarized the discussion at an Association of American Railroads sponsored conference in Chicago:

The discussion indicated very clearly that the objections of the official territory roads originated with the northern shippers now using water service to the Mississippi River crossings and Gulf ports since the delivered prices would be affected by a reduction in the rates from Birmingham, the sales practice being to use Birmingham base price, plus rail rate from Birmingham. * * * (northern carriers) insisted that the proposal of the southern carriers, even as amended, threatened the whole iron and steel adjustment, not only from the North to the South but within the North, and they were satisfied the iron and steel industry would not want these changes, nor a general disturbance of the iron and steel rate adjustment. They then suggested that a small committee of the northern lines and a small committee of the southern lines meet with a committee of the Iron and Steel Institute for a general discussion of the subject.

The southern carriers were compelled to abandon their proposal although, as Mr. Kerr, chairman of the Southern Freight Association, complained to Jones & Laughlin Steel Co.:

While the southern carriers have at all times been most considerate of the interest of producers in other sections, but who, for the most part, are moving their products to Memphis and other Mississippi River crossings by barge, frankly I do not see how they can be expected to simply forego transportation of iron and steel produced in the South by refusing to make necessary rate reductions, even though the result may be to change the selling prices.

The power to control freight charges has likewise been used to maintain uniform delivered prices for cement. In the cement industry, in much the same way as in steel, the pricing system achieves uniformity of price at any point where delivery is to be made by including the railroad freight charge from the appropriate basing point, regardless of the kind of transportation actually used. Evidence in hearings before the Federal Trade Commission shows that in meetings between rail and cement representatives, the significance of the railroads' ability to maintain an inflexible freight-rate structure was recognized as an important factor in maintaining a price structure in cement. Mr. Collyer, chairman of the Trunk Line Association (an official territory rate bureau) maintained records of a conference between official territory railroads and representatives of the National Builders Supply Association at which officials of the builders organization reviewed the success of efforts by dealers and rail lines to require shipment of cement by railroad rather than by motor carrier and "thereby stabilized price conditions in the trade, which had become demoralized because of the absence of any uniform basis of transportation charges for truck movement."

Official rail lines used their power to control freight rates in promoting an agreement with cement manufacturers. Mr. Day, vice president of the Nickel Plate, wrote to Mr. Collyer of the Trunk Line Association, after conferences with cement producers:

Medusa, Portland Cement Co. will be glad to discontinue trucking if the other cement companies will agree to do likewise.

Mr. Day, after subsequent discussions, reported that a technique had been devised for keeping cement traffic for the railroads without discriminating in too obvious a manner against motor carriers:

Mr. Walter McAdoo, of the cement association, says an agreement has been reached to quote in carload prices at markets in all large cities.

When stronger measures became necessary to discourage the price reductions arising from motor-carrier rates, sanctions against movement by truck were adopted. Mr. Duffy, of the Lehigh Valley Railroad, wrote Mr. Collyer that—

There has been an agreement among cement companies to make an arbitrary charge on all cement loaded on trucks at the mill.

A particularly startling illustration arises from an alliance between the railroads and the petroleum industry. To show the threat to the American system of free enterprise when rate-fixing power is held by monopolies, the Federal Government attorneys in the Government's suit against the AAR and the western railroads at Lincoln, Nebr., submitted documentary evidence that these groups conspired to, first, hold up retail prices on petroleum products in southern territory; second, do away with truck movements of these products from the southern seaboard to inland points in the South; third, discourage rail shipments of petroleum products into southern territory from the Southwest, thus holding the South to a single source of supply—the southern seaboard; and, fourth, discourage the operation of filling stations located on lands leased from railroads by the simple method of increasing rent. This understanding was not made into a formal agreement when the oil companies realized that the antitrust laws might be invoked against them. Counsel for one of the major oil companies so notified the president of the Association of American Railroads, Mr. Pelley. The objectives of the scheme were to some extent accomplished, however, without a formal understanding between the conspirators.

Under the proposed legislation, not only could the transportation monopoly be immunized from the antitrust laws but the door would be left open for other monopolies, banking, and other influences, participating in rate-making procedures, to escape the antitrust laws.

Another assertion in the minority report concerning the results of the passage of S. 110 is:

Competition would be eliminated, not merely among carriers of the same type or class but among the several competitive modes of transportation—the railroads, the water carriers, the freight forwarders, the pipe-line companies.

There is evidence that under the rate bureaus as now organized several forms of transportation have made progress in increasing rates.

That such progress has been made in increasing rates by joint efforts of railroads and trucks was frankly admitted by the chairman of the traffic advisory committee of the Association of American Railroads at the committee's meeting of January 27, 1937.

As recorded in the minutes:

The chairman stated that this subject was brought up at the request of the president of the American Trucking Associations, who felt that if he were furnished with examples of unduly low rates which had been made by the railroads to meet truck competition, which by joint efforts of the rails and trucks were increased, it would be helpful to him in his efforts to secure a better cooperation between the trucks and the railroads.

The business of equalizing competitive rates embarked upon by the railroad and truck associations appealed to the steamship lines which suggested that they be invited into the cooperative conferences held by the motor carriers and railroads.

On June 1, 1937, Edward K. Laux, freight traffic manager, Eastern Steamship Lines, wrote Mr. Kerr, chairman, Southern Freight Association:

Your joint letter of March 31 addressed to rail executives and accompanying copy of memorandum of conference as per caption: Conferences such as covered by the memorandum between the motor carrier industry and the rails should ultimately result in a clearer and more cooperative exchange of views between these classes of carriers and if further conferences of this nature are to be arranged, I would like to suggest that the water line representatives be invited to attend.

As you probably know, in many cases the rates of the motor carriers or all-truck rates between North Atlantic ports and southern points are predicated on the water-rail rate levels, although it has been proven repeatedly that the all-truck service is far superior to all-rail or rail-water.

Consequently, it is my thought that the water lines and the southern rail carriers might approach the southern truck industry with a view of having that class of carrier adopt the all-rail level in their rate structures between the North Atlantic ports on the one hand and Southern Freight Association Territory on the other.

Progress in getting the St. Lawrence waterway lines to increase rates to the rail level was reported to Mr. Cleveland by D. T. Lawrence, chairman of the Traffic Executive Association—Eastern Territory. Mr. Lawrence wrote on September 12, 1938:

I think that Mr. Kerr, chairman, Southern Freight Association, and I now understand each other in the matter and what I am writing to say is that we have an intimation that the steamship lines operating through the St. Lawrence waterway are getting tired of the situation and are willing to increase their rates if the rail rates from the Atlantic ports are increased. Of course, such a suggestion will have a long way to go but it may be that material reform can be effected.

The extent to which the Association of American Railroads has attempted to increase competitive rates to the highest possible levels by agreement with truckers, barge lines, coastal and intercoastal and Great Lake steamship lines, and thus

to deprive the Nation of inherently economic advantages flowing from the use of the most economical modes of transportation is indicated from the following directives from the Association of American Railroads to the railroad traffic officers in the form of a letter dated March 12, 1938, from A. F. Cleveland to chief traffic officers, member roads:

It hardly seems necessary to advise you the very great disappointment resulting from the failure of the Commission to grant in full the proposal of the railroads. The Ex parte 123 traffic executive committee fully appreciates the serious situation created by this decision and its utter insufficiency under the existing serious decline in traffic.

At the meeting last Thursday there was discussed at considerable length the obligation which rests on the railroads' individual traffic organizations as well as in their rate committees to assist management to the very fullest extent possible in obtaining increases in revenues over and above those which the Commission authorized and the imperative necessity of taking advantage of the possibilities under this decision for further increases in competitive rates and low spots wherever they may be found.

I sincerely hope that each and every chief traffic officer of the member lines fully appreciates the desperate situation that confronts railroad management and that each one will actively support and not only personally cooperate, but in addition thereto, see that his entire staff cooperates in a way to accomplish the best results as rapidly as conditions may warrant. In this connection I call your attention to the fact that I believe that with proper cooperation with truckers, with the barge lines, with the coastal and intercoastal and great steamship lines, that their officials will assure you, if they are properly approached and encouraged, that they will be very glad to proceed along similar lines and to make the same increases in cents per hundred pounds that you may determine upon. I therefore urge that every effort be made to work with your competitors to the end that there may be less hesitancy in proposing advances than there might be if competing agencies were not going to make similar increases.

In the Ex parte 123 decision, the Commission authorized a 5-percent increase on oranges and, of course, the basis authorized should be made effective. These rates are on subnormal basis and no reason exists why there should not be filed with the Commission, to take effect not much more than 30 days after the Ex parte 123 tariffs become effective, the proposal that was presented in Ex parte 123 or even something higher if the steamship companies will make similar increases in their rates.

There are possibilities of readjusting the lake-cargo rates on coal from the inner and outer crescent. Insofar as this situation is concerned it is well known that the Commission believes the present spread between the lake-cargo rates and the local rates is greater than it should be. There are other good, compelling reasons at this particular time why a further increase in these rates on statutory notice would be helpful to the railroad industry. This, of course, I appreciate is a matter to be handled exclusively by the origin roads that are involved.

The copper adjustment from intermountain territory contains great possibilities if proper cooperation is shown by all of the origin lines.

That insofar as the low spots are concerned, which to a very considerable extent are truck or water compelled rates, that these rates may be advanced to 5 or 10 percent, depending upon the commodity, above the maximum rate orders that are outstanding against such rates.

Further, that all adjustments which may be controlled by section 3 orders may be advanced to the extent desired, providing the required relationship is maintained.

There are, I believe, great opportunities available in connection with the potato adjustment in western territory. Hearsay information would indicate that there exists—and apparently the Commission from expressions made from the bench is of the opinion also—that a considerable amount of money could be picked up in connection with the anthracite adjustment where, for competitive reasons under different conditions, rates materially lower than maximum rates have been established. In several of the territories there are rates on wood pulp that could reasonably stand additional increases. This is likewise true of the furniture adjustment from Illinois producing points, from western trunk-line producing points, and from Southwestern producing points.

The suggestions that have been made herein are not intended to be conclusive, they are only illustrative.

Concerning the suggested increase in wood-pulp rates, J. A. Farmar, chairman, Western Traffic Executive Committee, wrote Mr. Cleveland October 6, 1938:

Wood pulp moving from pulp mills to paper-producing points in Wisconsin, Minnesota, and the Upper Peninsula of Michigan involves short hauls, and our lines doubt very much if we could increase the rail rates without providing an opportunity for shippers to move their tonnage by motortrucks. We receive at Lake Michigan and Lake Superior docks, import pulp which also moves to paper mills in short-haul shipments. This latter tonnage is also subject to intensive motortruck competition. Our lines are not favorable to a proposal to attempt any increase in these rates until there is some understanding that like increases will be made via motortrucks.

I opposed Senate bill 2009 for the reason that it seemed to cut down competition and to make possible just such understandings as are here referred to.

The freight forwarders, also falling in line, reached an understanding not only to equalize rates at the higher rate level but to withdraw commodity rates and exception ratings where the rail lines and motor carriers take similar action. J. V. Bugliari, vice president, Acme Fast Freight Lines, confirmed this understanding in a letter of December 12, 1939, to W. M. Miller, chairman, Standing Rate Committee, Southern Motor Carriers Rate Conference:

This will refer to your letter November 21, to which you attach copy of letter November 21 to Mr. J. G. Kerr, Southern Freight Association, Atlanta, Ga., dealing with the matter of equalization of charges by motor carriers and freight forwarders. The policy of our company in line with understanding reached in Atlanta in September briefly is that we are of the definite disposition to adjust any rates that are of a subnormal level and to withdraw any commodity rates or exception ratings provided the rail lines and the motor carriers take similar action.

I think it well at our next meeting in Atlanta, which is scheduled for December 13, that a committee representing the motor carriers, freight forwarders and Southern Freight Association meeting and endeavor to formulate a policy that will provide for the adjustment of existing differences and future procedure. We are preparing supplements in line with our understanding, placing rates in many points in the South on the basis of rail level. In a few days we will meet with Universal and National and decide the effective date.

After the passage of the Motor Carrier Act in 1935, it was apparent to the Association of American Railroads that there would be "most hearty cooperation from the truckers in an effort to keep their rates on the same basis as the railroads"; and in view of this circumstance the association's vice president of traffic, on February 6, 1936, advised the Traffic Executive Association-Eastern Territory, the Traffic Executive Association-Southern Territory, and the Western Traffic Executive Committee that—

Each rate organization ought to work toward setting up some machinery in each rate subdivision for contacts between small committees of the railroad on the one hand and small committees of truckers on the other, so that each can be kept informed as to changes in rates, rules, and regulations contemplated by either group, with the purpose in view of endeavoring to keep harmonized to the fullest extent possible the rate adjustments of the two classes of carriers.

However, it was recognized by the Traffic Advisory Committee of the Association of American Railroads that "it would be futile to enter into any agreement" with the truckers "until such time as the trucking industry is so organized as to make possible the enforcement of any joint understanding to as great an extent as would be the case in connection with the railroad industry." This is from the minutes of the Traffic Advisory Committee, Traffic Department, Association of American Railroads, dated September 11, 1936.

S. 110 would facilitate the strengthening of the organization not only of the trucking industry, but of the waterway, freight forwarders and rail industries, and would encourage the dominant type of common carrier, the railroads, to eliminate competition among the competitive forms of transportation and to suppress the development of more economical forms of transportation. Such results, of course, seriously affect the economy of the Nation and are contrary to the policy declared by the Congress in the Transportation Act "to preserve the inherent advantages of each" mode of transportation.

In the past 10 years the motor-carrier industry has made great progress in organizing the truckers into a hierarchy of rate associations. This development has not as yet reached the stage of perfection attained by railroad rate organizations, but is showing progress. I shall not attempt to cover the rate bureau situation in the motor carrier industry, but I refer to the record of the hearings before the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee in 1943 on S. 942, Seventy-eighth Congress, pages 69–77, 97–122, and 461–651.

This bill purports to guarantee to individual carriers the right of independent action in the exercise of its managerial discretion. I may say that the individual carriers already have this right under the Interstate Commerce Act. The minority report has this to say about such a purported guaranty in S. 110:

Paragraph (6) purporting to guarantee a party to the agreement the right of independent action is devoid of such guaranty. The paragraph, upon close examination, merely protects the right to take independent action after a determination or report

is made through such procedure as is provided in the agreement. The bill does not preserve independent action taken prior to the collective determination. In the face of a determination already collectively agreed upon, a carrier, desirous of deviating from the action of the association, would at once be confronted with the exercise against it of the coercive power of the entire combination. A carrier who persists in adhering to its own managerial prerogatives and rights and who persists in refusing to yield to the collective determination runs the hazard of ostracism as a nonconformist, who takes the benefits of the combination but refuses to make required sacrifices. The detailed day-by-day operations in the transportation industry are so complex and the relationships between the carriers and the industrial and financial interests are so involved as to afford numerous opportunities for retaliatory action against the nonconformist. Such retaliation may be carried out so subtly as to leave no evidence of the restraints exercised against such carrier. Under these circumstances a stipulated right to act independently is illusory. The danger is accentuated when it is considered that, by various devices, initial determinations or reports concerning proposals unsatisfactory to the dominant interests may, under approved procedures as established in the existing private system of judicature of the rate bureaus and associations, be delayed for long periods of time before acted upon.

An illustration of what happens to a carrier who persists in adhering to its own managerial prerogative and rights is shown by the experience of the management of a midwestern railroad which sought to exercise these rights conferred upon it by Congress but which the private government, headed by the Association of American Railroads, saw fit to repeal because the congressional schemes of regulation were obnoxious to the conspirators in the private government.

The means by which the congressional enactment was repealed was the resolution of the board of directors of September 20, 1935, whereby President Pelley was "directed to issue an order forbidding the establishment of joint rates as between member roads on the one hand and common carrier truck or bus companies on the other" except where such action would not invade another railroad's territory, despite the fact that the Congress of the United States had shortly before provided in the Motor Carrier Act of 1935 that railroads might establish such joint rates.

Note that language—"forbidding," not advising or requesting.

Lest there be any doubt as to the intention—

The Board explains that the prohibition in the exception does not apply to arrangements made by a railroad between points on its own operated lines where such an arrangement is for convenience or economy, but does conclusively prohibit the invasion of a territory by another line which is already served by one or more railroads.

The propriety of this private legislative repeal of an act of Congress was challenged in the only known instance of a member road questioning the authority of the association. In pursuance of the recommendation of the Federal Coordinator of Transportation, the late Joseph B. Eastman, that railroads should experiment with a uniform container adaptable interchangeably to rail or truck, the Chicago Great Western Railroad in October 1935 entered into an arrangement with the Keeshin Motor Lines contemplating the transportation by rail of loaded trucks and trailers between Chicago and the Twin Cities.

The railroad was immediately notified that its proposal constituted a violation of the resolution of September 20, and was objectionable to many other carriers in that it constituted a menace which might seriously affect their roads and possibly their territories. The management of the Great Western was summoned to a hearing before the board of directors. When the board of directors sought to delay decision in the matter unduly, the Great Western announced that the resolution of September 20 was contrary to the congressional enactment and that it proposed to publish joint rates with the trucking company.

In reply, President Pelley warned the Great Western that its contemplated action was "nothing more or less than the invasion of one railroad's territory by another railroad" and that, if the Great Western persisted, he apprehended that there could not be avoided "extensive retaliatory developments." Despite this threat, the Great Western proceeded to publish its rates, whereupon the association members, in pursuance of the common plan, moved before the Interstate Commerce Commission to suspend the rates.

The Commission, after hearings, approved the rates, demonstrating conclusively that the conspirators had delayed for months the publication of rates that were lawful and valid in every respect from the day they were proposed.

Two years later, testifying before the Senate Interstate Commerce Commitee, Joyce, of the Great Western disclosed that Mr. Pelley's threats were no idle gesture and that the revenues of his road had been gravely prejudiced by the refusal of defendants and their co-conspirators to grant him a fair division of revenues on joint-through traffic.

If that is not in restraint of trade and if it is not killing competition, I do not know what is. Yet that is the type of action which this kind of legislation would legalize and perpetuate.

He also testified that he dared not protest to the Interstate Commerce Commission for fear of being routed against and that protesting to the American Association of Railroads would in his case have been utterly futile.

The Chicago & Great Western paid a high price for its rash display of independence. The results were not such as to encourage other roads to emulate its intrepid example. When the Western Pacific Railroad was called on the carpet in June 1937, for a similar offense, involving alleged invasion of Southern Pacific territory, it decided discretion was the better part of valor, particularly as the Southern Pacific enjoyed the prerogative of having a representative on the Board of Directors whereas the Western Pacific did not.

The railroads continued to enforce the policy embodied in the Resolution of September 20, 1935, until October 25, 1939, when the United States filed a civil action against the Association of American Railroads seeking to enjoin the Association from enforcing the resolution. Thereafter, on February 23, 1940, pursuant to a consent decree, the Association formally rescinded the resolution.

Such formal rescission, however, proved merely another instance of sacrificing the shadow to save the substance. The underlying "gentleman's agreement" continued in full force and effect. Apart from substitute and feeder service, not covered by the resolution, and apart from truck-rail rates established by the Texas-Pacific Railroad in territory outside the scope of the resolution, the defendants, down to the present time, have consistently pursued a general policy of refraining from establishing joint truck-rail rates. For more than 10 years, the Association of American Railroads had successfully imposed a private veto upon an act of Congress.

Under this legislation we would allow the stamp of approval to be put upon such a private government.

The proponents of this bill say that carriers are so completely regulated under the Interstate Commerce Act that we may safely forego the protection of the antitrust laws where the Commission approves collective action by carriers.

Therefore this bill presents the important question of whether we should depend exclusively upon the Interstate Commerce Act where collective action is taken by carriers on the subjects of through routes, joint rates, on either commercial or Government traffic. A few examples show why we should retain the protection of the antitrust laws if the public is to be adequately protected.

The Congress has appropriated millions of dollars to improve the waterways of this country. The primary purpose of these expenditures is to promote the development of cheap water transportation where it is economically feasible. The objective has been realized but, as I shall show, the railroads have fought the water traffic bitterly. They have conspired and have taken concerted action designed to drive the traffic from the waterways to the rails. Up to this time, the Interstate Commerce Commission has proved itself impotent to protect the water traffic.

The grain traffic on the Illinois River grew from 137,000 bushels in 1933 to 17,076,000 bushels in 1939. This growth was due to the higher prices received by farmers shipping by barge as compared with the prices received by farmers served only by railroad. This is true because the barge rates are cheaper than the rail rates, requiring a smaller deduction for transportation charges. For example, the barge rate from Morris, Ill., to Chicago was 2 cents per hundred pounds whereas the rail rate was 9 cents. This is the result that we sought to achieve when we authorized waterway improvements.

For many years grain of like kind and grade moved outbound by rail from Chicago on the same rates regardless of the mode of transportation utilized to move the grain into Chicago. However, in 1939, the eastern railroads conferred

with their connecting western rail lines and the two groups of rail carriers decided to increase the rail rates on the barge grain from Chicago eastward by 8.5 cents without changing the outbound rates on the rail grain shipped into Chicago from points served by the barge lines. This action would have completely wiped out the 7-cent rate advantage on the barge traffic from Morris, Ill., and actually made it 1½ cents more expensive to ship grain over the barge-rail routes from Morris to New York than to use the all-rail service between the same points. The eastern railroads frankly told the Commission that they intended to charge more on the barge grain "with the hope that we could drive this business off the water and back onto the rails where it belongs"—Grain Proportionals, Ex Barge to Official Territory (248 I. C. C. 307, 321).

The barge lines, the Secretary of Agriculture, grain merchants, and others bitterly protested to the Commission against this action by the railroads. They attempted to invoke protection of the Interstate Commerce Act. They showed that it would choke water traffic on the Illinois River—as the railroads intended that it should do. But the Interstate Commerce Act was not adequate to protect the use of the waterways. The Commission held that the railroads had the right to take this action—Grain Proportionals, Ex-Barge to Official Territory (246 I. C. C. 353, 248 I. C. C. 307)—and the Supreme Court upheld the Commission—*Interstate Commerce Commission* v. *Inland Waterways Corp.* (319 U. S. 671). Fortunately in a later proceeding the Supreme Court overruled the ICC, saying that the higher rates east from Chicago could not be applied to grain moving into Chicago by barge—*Interstate Commerce Commission* v. *Mechling, et al.* (329 U. S.; decided March 31, 1947).

Surely it will not be denied that this sort of concerted action by the railroads is in restraint of trade and forbidden by the antitrust laws. The antitrust laws are intended to punish people who take such action. Railroads, like others subject to the antitrust laws, are prohibited from ganging up on a competitor to take away his business.

Under this bill the railroads would be relieved from the antitrust laws in such cases. They would be subject only to regulation by the Commission. But the Commission is apparently impotent to deal adequately with such matters.

Do you Senators from the grain States, Illinois, Kansas, Nebraska, Iowa, Missouri, Minnesota, and the Dakotas, all of which benefit from low-cost water transportation, want to go back to your people and tell them that you voted to repeal the application of the antitrust laws which now protect use of the waterways? The Government is now trying in the case at Lincoln, Nebr., to stop such antitrust violations and the railroads are here trying to get us to pass legislation that would make the case moot. Are you going to give the railroads the defense which they must have if they are not to lose the case?

Let us take another example. The records of the Commission show that Rocky Mountain Lines, a motor carrier formerly with headquarters at Lincoln, Nebr., refused to join with other motor carriers in rate bureaus except for joint rates on traffic exchanged with other carriers. In other words, Rocky Mountain charged whatever it pleased on traffic moving between points on its own line and only joined the rate bureaus for rates covering traffic to and from points beyond its own line.

The rate bureaus did not like this situation because Rocky Mountain Lines charged rates on traffic moving on its own line lower than those of its competitors. In order to force Rocky Mountain Lines to raise its rates, other carrier mempers of a rate bureau canceled joint rates in which Rocky Mountain Lines participated. This canceling of rates left Rocky Mountain Lines unable to exchange traffic with other truck lines. The Commission refused to let the carriers take this action but the other carriers, acting through their rate bureau, refused to accept Rocky Mountain Lines in any new joint rates unless it raised its rates on traffic moving on its own line. Rocky Mountain was soon bankrupt.

The Commission apparently did all that it could do in the Rocky Mountain case, but that was not enough to keep the carriers from applying a boycott on traffic to be interchanged with the Rocky Mountain lines. We should keep the antitrust laws in effect in order that those carriers that wish to offer the public lower rates may do so without fear of unfair retaliation by competitors acting in concert.

We have heard a great deal about the value of rate bureaus in negotiating rates and charges on Government traffic moving during the war. The railroads were given some relief from the antitrust laws for this purpose.

The record shows that the carriers utilized this immunity from prosecution to combine and conspire with each other to deprive the Government of land-grant benefits to which it was entitled. The land-grant statutes provided that the Government should have the benefit of certain reductions from the published rates of the railroads on military traffic.

Here is a startling example of the railroads' action. For many years the railroads have published export rates lower than domestic rates on similar traffic to the ports. The export rate on iron and steel articles from Chicago to west coast ports was 44 cents per hundred pounds, as compared with a domestic rate of $1.10 for the same movement.

The railroads made no provision in their export tariffs for shipments to be stopped en route to the ports for storage or processing. This practice is known as a transit privilege. But it was necessary for the Government to stop many shipments at inland points in order to avoid congestion at the ports. Such action was not permitted under the export tariffs; so the Government was required to pay the much higher domestic rates on its export traffic stopped in transit. Although the railroads granted transit privileges on their published rates applicable to commercial traffic, the same privileges were not extended to Government traffic. When the Comptroller General ruled that the railroads could not make this distinction, they canceled the privilege of transit on their published rates and then made the transit privilege available only in areas where there was little or no land-grant mileage, and hence no land-grant rates for Government traffic.

The Government is attacking, before the Interstate Commerce Commission, the action of the railroads in setting aside the transit privilege on the export rates. Perhaps the Commission will grant relief and eventually the Government will secure the benefit of land-grant reductions from the export rates to which it is clearly entitled by law.

The question is whether we should depend exclusively on the Interstate Commerce Act in such matters. The Supreme Court has held that the granting of transit is a matter between the shipper and the carrier granting the privilege—*Central Railroad of New Jersey* v. *United States* (257 U. S. 247). Here the railroads combined to deprive the Government of transit in order to avoid land-grant reductions from the export rates. The railroads should be prosecuted under the antitrust laws for such action. There is nothing in the Interstate Commerce Act which prohibits such combinations and apparently the ICC approves of them. The people of the United States are entitled to the protection afforded by both the antitrust laws and the Interstate Commerce Act. We should not weaken the arsenal of the people against powerful combinations of railroads by exempting railroads from the antitrust laws as proposed in this legislation.

Assume that, after enactment of the Reed bill, the western agreement which I have mentioned previously and shown a long list of misdeeds that brought on prosecution by the Federal Government, is approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission. That agreement applied to rates as well as to schedules, services, and facilities. Assume that a carrier announces a new service or more expeditious schedule and that thereupon protests by carriers competitively concerned are made to the Commissioner under the western agreement. Under the basic agreement, the proposal would be considered by the Commissioner, or the various organizations or committees. In the course of consideration by the Commissioner—the so-called western railroad czar—the committee of directors—the financiers and industrialists—and the various organizational facets set up in the plan, the proposed improvement in services could be stopped, not necessarily by a formal agreement of all the carriers, but through pressures brought about in conferences and actions taken in accordance with the approved procedures.

It would not be necessary to have a writing or record covering a single one of these. These are the types of practices that we are told by proponents of the measure are innocuous and necessary practices that must go on.

The various conferences and procedures would not constitute a supplemental agreement requiring approval by the Interstate Commerce Commission to exempt the application of the antitrust laws, but there would be "concerted action" taken pursuant to the plan of or-

ganization already approved. Such concerted action under paragraph (9) would be exempt from policing under the antitrust laws. And what sort of pressures would one expect from the Committee of Directors for the western agreement? Let us look at the membership of the committee for some clue to the pressures that would be expected from such a group.

That list was given in the course of the hearings. Without reading it, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have it inserted at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the list referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE OF DIRECTORS UNDER AGREEMENT FOR COMMISSIONER PLAN, WITH AFFILIATIONS

Stephen Baker: Bank of the Manhattan Co., 40 Wall Street, New York City, chairman of board and director; Bowery Savings Bank, New York City, trustee; Great Northern Railway, director.

Donald C. Bromfield: Garrett-Bromfield & Co., president and director; Denver & Salt Lake Railway, secretary and director; Arizona Marble Co., president and director; Denver Pressed Brick Co., vice president and director.

E. N. Brown: St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Co., chairman of board, chairman executive committee, and director; Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co., chairman of board and president.

A. L. Burford: Texarkana National Bank, director; Magnolia Ice & Coca-Cola Bottling Co., Texarkana, Ark., secretary and director; Louisiana & Arkansas Railway, general counsel; Texarkana & Fort Smith Railway, director; Port Arthur Canal & Dry Dock Co., director; Four States Grocery Co., Texarkana, Ark., director.

C. W. Cahoon, Jr.: Olney Oil & Refining Co., City National Bank Building, Wichita Falls, Tex., president, treasurer, general manager, and director; United Oil Corp., Wichita Falls, Tex., president and director.

William F. Carey: Carey, Baxter & Kennedy, Inc., New York City, president and director; International Utilities Corp., chairman of board and director; Curtiss-Wright Corp., director; Dominion Gas & Electric Co. of Canada, director; Southern Phosphate Corp., chairman of board; Siems-Carey Railway & Canal Co., president and director; Chicago Great Western Railroad, director; The China Corp., vice president; Lehigh Coal & Navigation Co., director.

F. W. Doolittle: North American Co., director; Potomac Electric Power Co., director; Illinois Terminal Railroad, director; Capital Transit Co., director; Washington Railway & Electric Co., director.

William M. Duncan: Duncan Foundry & Machine Works, Inc., Alton, Ill., president and director; Illinois Stoker Co., president and director; Litchfield & Madison Railway, vice president and director.

Allen P. Green: A. P. Green Fire Brick Co., Mexico, Mo., president and director; Mercantile Commerce Bank & Trust Co., St. Louis, director; S. A. Materiales Refractarios A. P. Green, Buenos Aires, Argentina, South America, president; Liptak Furnace Arches, Ltd., London, England, chairman and director; Bigelow-Liptak Corp., vice president and director; Ann Arbor Railroad, director; Wabash Railway Co., director; New Jersey, Indiana & Illinois Railroad, director.

James G. Harbord: Bankers Trust Co., New York, director; Radio Corp. of America, chairman of board and director; National Broadcasting Co., director; R. C. A. Communications, Inc., chairman of board and director; R. C. A. Manufacturing Co., Inc., Camden, N. J., director; R. C. A. Institutes, Inc., chairman of board of directors; New York Life Insurance Co., member executive committee and director; Marconi Telegraph-Cable Co., Inc. (New Jersey, New York), director; Employers Liability Assurance Corp., Ltd., of London, England, member of executive committee; Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway, member executive committee and director.

R. E. Harding: Fort Worth National Bank, president and director; State Reserve Life Insurance Co., director; International-Great Northern Railroad, director; Acme Brick Co., treasurer and director; Texas Pacific Coal & Oil Co., director; Texas Electric Service Co., director; Missouri Pacific Railroad, director; New Orleans, Texas & Mexico Railroad, director; Texas & Pacific Railway, director; Fort Worth Belt Railway, director; Agricultural Livestock Finance Corp., director; Citizens Hotel Co., director; Ellison Furniture & Carpet Co., director; Fort Worth Lloyds, director.

W. A. Harriman: Brown Brothers Harriman & Co., banking firm, 59 Wall Street, New York City, partner; Union Pacific Railroad, chairman of board; Illinois Central Railroad, chairman, executive committee, and director; Los Angeles & Salt Lake Railroad, chairman of board; Oregon Short Line Railroad, chairman of board; Oregon-Washington Railroad & Navigation Co., chairman of board; Yazoo & Mississippi Valley Railroad, director.

Will H. Hays: Motion Picture Producers & Distributors of America, Inc., president and director; Chicago & Eastern Illinois Railway Co., director; Continental Baking Co., director; Hays & Hays, partner.

F. T. Heffelfinger: F. H. Peavey & Co., Minneapolis, Minn., president and director; Northwestern National Bank & Trust Co., of Minneapolis, director; Farmers & Mechanics Savings Bank, director; Northwestern National Life Insurance Co., director; American Arch Co., director; Lima Locomotive Works, director; Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railway Co., director.

C. Jared Ingersoll: Girard Trust Co., manager; Western Saving Fund Society of Philadelphia, manager; Mutual Assurance Co., director; Midland Valley Railroad, chairman of board and director; Kansas, Oklahoma & Gulf Railroad, chairman of board and director; Oklahoma City-Ada-Atoka Railway, chairman of board and director; Muskogee Co., president and director; Philadelphia & Western Railway, director; Garland Coal & Mining So., president and director; Pennsylvania Co., director; Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, Chicago & St. Louis Railroad, director; Pennsylvania Railroad, director; Sebastian County Coal & Mining Co., president and director; New Almaden Corp., director.

John H. W. Ingersoll (alternate to C. Jared Ingersoll): Central-Penn National Bank, director; Midland Valley Railroad, vice president and treasurer; North Pennsylvania Railroad, director; Oklahoma City-Ada-Otoka Railway, vice president, treasurer, and director; Muskogee Co., vice president, treasurer, and director; Kansas, Oklahoma & Gulf Railway, treasurer and director; Sebastian County Coal & Mining Co., vice president and director.

B. F. Kaufmann: Bankers Trust Co., Des Moines, Iowa, president and director; Equitable Life Insurance Co. of Iowa, director; Northwestern Bell Telephone Co., director; Bankers Building Corp., Des Moines, president and director; F. W. Fitch Co., director; Chicago & North Western Railway, director; Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha Railway, director.

Thomas W. Lamont (alternate to General Harbord): J. P. Morgan & Co., Inc., chairman executive committee and vice chairman of board; Lamont, Corliss & Co., chairman of board and director; United States Steel Corp., director; Southwestern Construction Co., director; International Minerals & Chemical Corp., director; Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway, director; Santa Fe Pacific Rail Road, director.

William De Forest Manice: Manice & Rives 20 Exchange Place, New York City; Federal Terra Cotta Co., secretary and director; Federal Seaboard Terra Cotta Corp., director; Laredef Holding Corp., secretary and director; Phelps Dodge Corp., member executive committee and director; Southern Pacific Co., director.

A. Perry Osborn: Western Pacific Railroad Co., director; Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad, director; Denver & Salt Lake Western Railroad, director; Rio Grande Junction Railway, director.

E. E. Pierce: Chicago Board of Trade, member; Winnipeg Grain Exchange, member; Toronto Stock Exchange, member; Boston Stock Exchange, member; Chicago Mercantile Exchange, member; Commodity Exchange, Inc., member; New York Cotton Exchange, member; Canadian Commodity Exchange, Inc., member; New York Curb Exchange, member; Dictaphone Corp., director; Sperry Corp., director; Ford Instument Co., director; Sperry Gyroscope Co., Inc., director; Waterbury Tool Co., director; Sperry Securities Corp., director; Vickers, Inc., director; Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad, director.

J. S. Pillsbury (alternate to F. T. Heffelfinger): Pillsbury Flour Mills, Inc., cochairman of board of directors; Northwest National Bank & Trust Co., Minnesota, director; Northwest Bancorporation, director; Wayne Knitting Mills, director; Munsingwear, Inc., director; Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railway, director; Vassar Co., Chicago, Ill., director; Wisconsin Rail Road, Minneapolis, director.

J. S. Pyeatt: Missouri Pacific Railway, chairman of board and director; Rio Grande Junction Railroad, president and director; Denver & Salt Lake Western Railroad, president and director; Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad, president and director; North Kansas City Bridge & Railroad Co., president and director; North Kansas City Development Co., president and director.

Francis F. Randolph: J. & W. Seligman & Co., banking firm, 65 Broadway, New York City, partner; Investment Bankers Association of America, member, investment commission; Chase National Bank of New York, produce exchange branch, member, advisory committee; Tri-Continental Corp., chairman of board, president, member, executive committee, and director; The Broad Street Investing Co., Inc., chairman of board, president, member, executive committee, and director; Selected Industries, Inc., chairman of board, president, chairman, executive committee, and director; Union Securities Corp., chairman of board, president, member executive committee, and director; National Investors Corp., chairman of board, president, member, executive committee, and director; General Shareholdings Corp., chairman of board, president, member, executive committee. and director; American Home Fire Assurance Co., chairman of board, chairman, finance committee, member, executive committee, and director; American Re-Insurance Co., member, executive committee, and director; Capital Administration Co., Ltd., chairman of board, president, member, executive committee, and director; Insurance Co. of State of Pennsylvania, chairman, executive committee, and director; Globe & Rutgers Fire Insurance Co., chairman of board, chairman, executive committee, and director; New Palisades Corp., president and director; Union Corp. (Pennsylvania), chairman of board, president and director; Park Properties Corp., director; General Properties, Corp., director; Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., chairman, finance committee, member, executive committee, and director; Aztec Land & Cattle Co., Ltd., member, executive committee, and director; Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railroad, member, executive committee, and director.

E. D. Schuggs: Spokane International Railroad, representative, care office of treasurer, Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., New York, N. Y.

Tom K. Smith (alternate to Allen P. Green): Boatmen's National Bank of St. Louis, president and director; American Telephone & Telegraph Co., director; Curtis Manufacturing Co., director; General American Life Insurance Co., director; Ann Arbor Boat Co., director; Ann Arbor Railroad, director; Detroit & Western Railway, director; Frankfort Realty Co., director; Lake Erie & Fort Wayne Railroad, director; Manistique & Lake Superior Railroad, director; Menominee & St. Paul Railway, director; New Jersey, Indiana & Illinois Railroad, director; Toledo Central Station Railway, director; Wabash Motor Transit Co., director.

E. W. Stetson (alternate to W. A. Harriman): Guaranty Trust Co., of New York, president and director; French American Banking Corp., member of executive committee and director; Textile Banking Co., Inc., director; Coca-Cola Co., member of executive committee and director; Bibb Manufacturing Co., member of executive committee and director; McLellan Stores Co., member of executive committee and director; Selected Industries, Inc., member of executive committee and director; United Stores Co., member of executive committee and director; United States Industrial Alcohol Co., member, executive committee, and director; Air Reduction Co., Inc., director; General Shareholdings Corp., director; Tri-Continental Corp., director; McCrory Stores Corp., director; Illinois Central Railroad Co., chairman of executive committee and director; Southeastern Compress & Warehouse Co., member of executive committee and director; Yazoo & Mississippi Valley Rail Road, director.

O. M. Stevens (alternate to A. Perry Osborn): American Refrigerator Transit Co., Missouri Pacific Building, St. Louis, Mo., president and general manager; Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad, director; Denver, Salt Lake & Western Railway, director.

Silas H. Strawn: Winston Strawn & Shaw, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill., senior member; Montgomery Ward & Co., Inc., chairman, executive committee, and director; First National Bank of Chicago, member, executive committee, and director; Alton Railroad, general solicitor and director.

Edward F. Swinney: First National Bank, Kansas City, Mo., chairman of board; Loose-Wiles Biscuit Co., vice president and director; Kansas City Terminal Railway, treasurer; Kansas City Southern Railway, director; Kansas City Stock Yards Co., director; Louisiana & Missouri River Railroad, director; Southwestern Bell Telephone Co., director.

Sir William Wiseman (alternate to E. F. Swinney): Kuhn, Loeb & Co., partner; Chicago Title & Trust Co., Chicago, Ill., trust officer; Chicago Mail Order Co., member executive committee and director.

Willis D. Wood (alternate to Francis G. Randolph): Wood, Walker & Co., 63 Wall Street, New York City, limited partner; New York Stock Exchange, member; Title Guaranty & Trust Co., trustee; Corn Products Refining Co., director; Fidelity & Casualty Co., director; Fidelity-Phenix Fire Insurance Co., director; Cassidy Co., Inc., director; Missouri-Kansas-Texas Railroad, director; New York City Omnibus Corp., director; Western Pacific Railroad, director.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Thus the committee of directors under the western agreement, which meets at 40 Wall Street, New York City, with its vast concentration of economic power, would operate with complete immunity from the antitrust laws because the actions of the committee are taken "pursuant to and in conformity with" the agreement approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. President, I do not care to trespass longer on the time of the Senate, but there has been a great display made here of various organizations which have been supporting the measure. We have not seen so much of those who have been opposing it, because, as a matter of fact, those who will be adversely affected by it—and those who dare to speak out with reference to it will be adversely affected—are not of the articulate type. However, there have been some who spoke out against it.

I want to call attention to a letter which was received from the chairman of the Alabama State legislative board of the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen who have urged that everything possible be done against this legislation. They are people whose living depends upon the railroads. They work with the railroads and they know what the effect of this legislation would be upon their daily lives. They are consumers.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have that letter included at this point in my remarks, and also to have included a letter from Mr. T. J. Gray, secretary, Alabama State legislative committee, Order of Railway Conductors, in opposition to the bill.

There being no objection, the letters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROTHERHOOD OF RAILROAD TRAINMEN,
ALABAMA STATE LEGISLATIVE BOARD,
Selma, Ala., April 15, 1947.

Hon. LISTER HILL, *United States Senator,*
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. JOHN SPARKMAN, *United States Senator,*
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: I am advised that the Bulwinkle-Reed bill will come up for passage in the Senate, in the very near future.

Since these bills have been before the Congress for some time, I am sure you are familiar with their contents and the danger therein. However, we wish to point out to you that in addition to setting aside antitrust laws, the establishment of rates, fares, and many other things, these bills provide for "the settlement of claims, the promotion of safety, or the promotion of the adequacy, or efficiency of operation of service." We are fearful of what might happen in the settlement of claims and our safety rules and regulations if these bills become a law.

The railroads cry to the high Heaven, that everything they do is regulated, when as a matter of fact they make many reductions in rates to meet competition and changes in services for their own benefits without any interference.

As we understand it, in the event this bill becomes the law, the ICC would be authorized to approve basis agreements, with respect to rates, etc. and action under such agreements would be free from antitrust laws.

Therefore we hope you will use your vote and influence in the defeat of these bills.

Very sincerely yours,

J. P. KNIGHT,
Chairman and Representative.

ORDER OF RAILWAY CONDUCTORS,
ALABAMA STATE LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE,
Birmingham, Ala., June 2, 1947.

Hon. JOHN J. SPARKMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We request you make every effort possible to defeat Senate bill No. 110, the Bulwinkle bill.

Yours truly,

T. J. GRAY,
Secretary, Alabama State Legislative Committee, Order of Railway Conductors.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I ask unanimous consent to have included at this point in the RECORD a letter from Mr. Harry See, national legislative representative of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, addressed to me on June 4, 1947, in opposition to t is legislation, with which he enclosed a statement pointing out language in the bill which would allow the various committees, bureaus, and so forth, to make rules and regulations with reference to safety appliances.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROTHERHOOD OF RAILROAD TRAINMEN,
UNITED STATES LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., June 4, 1947.

Hon. JOHN J. SPARKMAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SPARKMAN: I am attaching hereto a memorandum, as per our conversation at noon today, concerning S. 110.

With reference to the railroad labor organizations supporting S. 110, the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen is opposed to this bill and I understand that several of the other organizations are indifferent and are not taking any position, and that at least one of the organizations has been supporting it at the request of the carriers.

With kind personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

HARRY SEE,
National Legislative Representative.

MEMORANDUM RE S. 110

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 4, 1947.*

The language in the second paragraph of S. 110, reading "concerning, or providing rules or regulations pertaining to or procedures for the consideration, initiation, or establishment of the interchange of facilities, the settlement of claims, the promotion of safety, or the promotion of adequacy, economy, or efficiency of operation or service," is the portion that we are fearful of. In 24 of the States, the legislature has delegated to their public utility commissions the authority to prescribe rules for the safe operation of trains in the interest of safety for the traveling public and railroad employees.

Many of the States have adopted rules or general orders governing the clearances between structures and railroad tracks, both overhead and side, the distance between the center line of parallel tracks so as to provide a reasonably safe place for railroad employees to work. Many States have also adopted regulations concerning the handling of cars of unusual width and height for the safety of the traveling public and railroad employees; and some of the States have adopted regulations concerning the loading of open-top cars, such as lumber, steel, or poles, and machinery of unusual width or height loaded on flatcars.

We are fearful that the language quoted above in S. 110 might supersede the State regulations and leave the railroad employees at the mercy of regulations prescribed by

the Association of American Railroads because in a letter from the Department of Justice to Senator TOBEY the Department of Justice intimates that could be done and that it would not be unlawful, so if the Association of American Railroads promulgated an order concerning clearances or the handling of large cars and the Interstate Commerce Commission agreed to it, we are wondering just where we would be if the carriers then took the position that it was an order of the ICC and superseded State regulation.

We have had some experience and a very sad experience with the handling of carloads of lumber loaded on open-top cars in accordance with the specifications of the Association of American Railroads, and the reports of the commissions in some of the Western States are filled with accounts of accidents as a result of such loadings. At least one of the commissions has taken very drastic action entirely contrary to the rules of the Association of American Railroads, with the result that there was a great improvement in the method of loading. This is all in addition to the monopolistic features of the bill, which would only repudiate and make legal the rate discriminations as between the various parts of the United States.

The 24 States mentioned above, as having authority to prescribe rules are Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Illinois, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania. Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, Washington, Wisconsin, and North Carolina.

Generally the language used is as follows: "Every public utility shall furnish, provide, and maintain such service, instrumentalities, equipment, and facilities as shall promote the safety, health, comfort, and convenience of its patrons, employees, and the public, and as shall be in all respects adequate, efficient, just, and reasonable."

HARRY SEE,
National Legislative Representative,
Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, because of my feeling that this bill, if enacted into law, would be a bad precedent, in that we would be taking a great segment of our industrial and economic life out from under the operation of the antitrust laws which were passed for the purpose of protecting the individual citizen; because I believe it would make for the establishment and furtherance of monopoly, which perhaps is the most dangerous force in the country today, considering the headway that monopoly is making and the threat which it holds over the heads of our people, and because I believe that the inevitable result of this type of legislation would be harmful to the great mass of the people of the country, the consumers, the shippers, the small railroads and truck lines, and all those that do not belong to the hierarchy in the establishment of bureaus, boards, and committees and who have no part in the formulation of rates, rules, and practices, I am opposing this bill. I think we ought to keep in mind that it is not confined to rates and to mere conferences, but it involves the making of rates, rules, and practices for the carrying on of the very life of all forms of transportation in this country. Because I believe it would be bad for the country if this bill is enacted into law, I am opposed to it. I believe it should be defeated.

EXHIBIT A

WESTERN MECHANISMS

Examples of activities of the western mechanisms are as follows:

1. In 1933 air conditioning of passenger equipment was curtailed temporarily and stopped temporarily through the operation of the agreement.

2. In 1933 operations under the Western Commissioner plan prevented absorption by the railroads of expense incident to putting heaters in cars of potatoes in all movements of potatoes from Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Illinois, Missouri, Utah, the Dakotas, Nebraska, Kansas, Idaho, Colorado, Washington, Wyoming, Montana, Oklahoma, and Oregon to Chicago.

3. In 1933 the Chicago Great Western endeavored to reduce rates on about 100 commodities down to 30 cents per 100 pounds when moving in carloads of minimum weights of 30,000 pounds each from Chicago to Kansas City, St. Joseph, Omaha, South St. Paul, Winona, Minn., and Des Moines, Iowa. The reduction was stopped after pressure by Messrs. De Forest, Harriman, Van Sweringen, and McCullough, members of the committee of directors.

4. In 1933 the Western Commissioner ordered certain reduced passenger fares on the Southern Pacific, in Texas, intrastate, abolished.

5. In 1933 Committeeman Arthur Curtiss James, 40 Wall Street, New York, undertook to persuade the Great Northern to abolish fares of 2 cents per mile in tourist sleepers running on five western lines. Whether he succeeded is not definitely shown.

6. In 1933 the practice of the Santa Fe of allowing single occupancy of all classes of Pullman accommodations, except drawing rooms, by the holder of one ticket, and of allowing single occupancy of a drawing room by the holder of one ticket and a half was abolished temporarily until the eastern lines adopted the practice; whereupon the western lines readopted it.

7. Intrastate and interstate excursion fares of 1½ cents per mile in Texas and Louisiana were stopped except to and from New Orleans, from and to points within a radius of 150 miles thereof.

8. In 1934 a reduction in freight rates on stone between St. Louis and Kansas City by a combination of interstate factors with the applicable intrastate rate was prevented.

9. In 1934 reductions in rates on sugar moving from New Orleans, La., and Sugar Land, Tex., to Springfield, Mo., were prevented.

10. In 1934 reductions in rates on coal moving from Utah and Wyoming to points west of Boise, Idaho, were prevented.

11. In 1934 reductions in rates on less than carload agricultural implements moving from Council Bluffs, Iowa, and Nebraska stations to points in Kansas were prevented.

12. In 1934 elimination of the absorption by St. Louis lines of the expense of trucking shipments from the rails of one line to the rails of another in St. Louis was accomplished.

13. In 1934 a shortening of running time by 24 hours on California perishables into New York was prevented.

14. In 1934 reduced excursion fares of 1 cent per mile from Montana points to Chicago and return were prevented.

15. In 1934 a reduced fare of $57.40 from El Paso to the Twin Cities by way of St. Louis, Memphis, or Vicksburg, was prevented.

16. In 1934 the movement of freight in baggage cars on passenger trains between Vicksburg and Shreveport, was prevented.

17. In 1934 the construction of a spur track to serve an industry already served by one track was prevented through pressure applied by Committeeman Arthur Curtiss James, 40 Wall Street, N. Y.

18. In 1934 an unsuccessful effort was made to cause the Alton to unhook the air conditioning and move sleepers to St. Louis, without air conditioning, which had come to it at Chicago after arriving there on the B. & O. with the air-conditioning apparatus in operation.

19. In 1935 a vigorous but unsuccessful effort was made to have the Western Commissioner prevent the C. B. & Q. from buying and operating a bus line between Chicago and Los Angeles via Omaha, Cheyenne, and Salt Lake City. The Commissioner construed the western agreement as not covering this situation. Thereupon, the committee of directors tried vigorously but unsuccessfuly to have the agreement amended so as to cover bus and truck operations by railroads and their subsidiaries.

20. In 1935 a reduction by the Milwaukee in all freight rates to 50 cents per 100 pounds was prevented.

21. In 1935 and between October 7, 1935, and May 10, 1936, a vigorous effort was made, unsuccessfully, to prevent the K. C. S. from establishing parity of rates between the Atlantic seaboard ports and southern ports, or specifically, to prevent the K. C. S. from observing at Kansas City, Mo., the rates "applicable to and from Cedar Rapids, Iowa, in I. & S. Docket No. 3718." Committeemen Will H. Hays, A. F. Cleveland, of the AAR, the Western Commissioner, and the committee of directors tried, unsuccessfully, to stop C. E. Johnston, president of the K. C. S. from putting this proposal into effect. An additional effort was made, unsuccessfuly, to find someone to protest Mr. Johnston's reduced rates before the ICC. Later, Mr. Johnston was employed as Western Commissioner.

22. Between February 18, 1935, and July 1, 1936, a vigorous but unsuccessful effort was made to prevent Patrick H. Joyce, president of the Chicago, Great Western, from making reduced rates and transporting trucks and trailers loaded with merchandise and mounted on flatcars, between Chicago and the Twin Cities. The AAR, through Mr. Cleveland, took an interest in the matter as did the committee of directors. The protestants, after failing to stop Mr. Joyce under the western agreement, fought him before the ICC, but Mr. Joyce won.

23. Over a long period extending from April 11, 1935, to June 13, 1941, a bitter contest was carried on as a result of a resolution adopted by western railroads dated September 6, 1934, providing that goods, other than livestock and poultry, arriving by rail in Denver, Colo., from the East after 7 a. m. would not be delivered until 5:30 p. m. The Denver Post, Denver receivers, the Governor of Colorado, and others joined the general protest against delayed deliveries in Denver. One shipper sued the Union Pacific for damages, claiming that delayed delivery of his goods forced him to sell at a reduced price. He recovered judgment, and on appeal the judgment was affirmed by the Supreme Court of Colorado, which held that the agreement between the railroads for delayed delivery was no defense against the plaintiff, even though he had not asked the ICC to set the agreement aside. So far as can be determined from the files available to us, the agreement for delayed or concurrent deliveries at Denver still exists.

24. On November 9, 1935, the Commissioner was involved in the making of an agreement among Texas lines that no intrastate football excursion fares in Texas would be established without the Commissioner's study thereof to determine whether they were in line with his previous opinion on the subject dated August 3, 1935. This agreement was the result of the action of the Katy in establishing a football excursion fare of $3.15, instead of $4.20, between Austin and

Dallas, Tex., in connection with a game at Dallas on October 12, 1935.

25. In 1935 a reduced $6 round-trip excursion-coach fare between St. Louis and Chicago was prevented.

26. In 1935 and thereafter, over a long period, a bitter controversy was carried on over the Santa Fe's successful efforts to procure from the California Railroad Commission certain bus operating rights and then to establish a coordinated train-bus service in California with reduced fares and with tickets good interchangeably on trains and busses. The Southern Pacific was fighting the proposal, and did so before the Transcontinental Passenger Association, before the western commissioner, before the committee of directors, before the AAR, before the California Railroad Commission, and before all the courts in California, including the supreme court in that State. This is the case in which President Bledsoe, of the Santa Fe, called attention to the violation of the anti-trust laws.

27. In 1935 an effort to make a reduction down to 40 cents per hundred on all commodities moving from St. Louis and East St. Louis to Springfield, Mo., was successful. Mr. Cleveland, of the AAR, took an interest in the case.

28. In 1936 the L. & A. successfully refused to follow the Commissioner's decision disapproving a reduction of 3 cents per hundred in rates on crude oil moving from points on the L. & A. west of the Rodessa oil field to the L. & A. stations, North Baton Rouge to New Orleans, inclusive.

29. In 1936 a controversy arose, which finally culminated on May 3, 1940, in an agreement which fixed the time of delivery of goods at El Paso out of St. Louis and Chicago. This agreement was in compromise of proposals by the T. & P. and Santa Fe to make El Paso deliveries of goods originating in Chicago on the third morning. The controversy also revolved around the question whether El Paso deliveries should be made not earlier than 5 a. m., central time, third morning, or not earlier than 7 a. m., mountain time.

30. In 1936 schedules of freight trains between Denver and southwestern points were fixed by agreements dated November 11, 1936, and January 15, 1937. By this agreement, the Burlington delays goods in Fort Worth, destined to south Texas, and the Union Pacific delays goods into Kansas City from Denver originating beyond Idaho. Also, by these agreements, bananas out of Gulf ports going to Denver by way of Fort Worth are removed from delayed shipments and may be taken into Denver prior to 7 a. m. so as not to be caught by the Denver 5 p. m. delivery agreement above mentioned.

31. In 1936 freight schedules were slowed down between Chicago, on the one hand, and Memphis and New Orleans, on the other. J. J. Pelley, of the AAR, was active in bringing about this slow-down so as to "hold this very fast service from spreading beyond the Illinois Central Railroad Co.'s territory."

32. Placing of movies on passenger trains was prevented in 1936 and in addition it was agreed that no road would put facilities for recreation on any passenger train without giving 8 months' advance notice to all other western lines.

33. In 1937 reductions in rates on rotogravure supplements to newspapers moving between Chicago and California were prevented.

34. In 1937 reductions in import sugar rates down to 34½ cents per hundred, New Orleans to Dallas, so as to put the ports of Houston and New Orleans on a parity, were prevented.

35. In 1937 30-percent reductions in rates on pulpwood, Louisiana & Arkansas stations to Spring Hill, and on wood pulp, Spring Hill to New Orleans, and reductions in rates on wood pulp, Advance, La., to New Orleans, for export, were prevented.

36. In 1937 reductions in rates on bananas, New Orleans to Shreveport, from 63 to 40 cents, were prevented, according to the Commission's letter of January 3, 1938.

37. In 1937 Frisco freight schedules, St. Louis to Fort Smith, were fixed by the Commissioner so as to speed up delivery of less-than-carload freight at Fort Smith subject to the condition that delivery of carload freight would not be speeded up to the same extent. The committee of directors was unable to induce the Frisco to the follow the decision.

38. In 1937 the Commissioner prevented the Wabash from establishing a week-end round-trip excursion fare of $3.65, Decatur to Chicago, and return.

39. In 1937 reduced winter passenger rates to Mexico City from points on the Alton, Chicago & Eastern Illinois, Missouri Pacific, and Wabash were held up to $90.30, the same as the fare from the same points to California.

40. In 1937 the Commissioner prevented the transporting of passengers going to San Antonio from points on the Wabash and Missouri Pacific on special fast trains carrying persons traveling from Chicago and St. Louis to old Mexico under the so-called escorted-tours contracts of carriage.

41. In 1938 a reduction in rates on potatoes, onions, and other root vegetables, moving out of Colorado and related rate groups, was limited and curtailed by the Commissioner's decision which was not satisfactory to the proponents, Union Pacific, Missouri Pacific, and the Katy. The matter, after being reported to the committee of directors, was sent back to the underlying rate bureau for a compromise adjustment. The final result is not definitely shown, although it is to be inferred that the reduction was limited or curtailed.

42. In 1938 the efforts of the Missouri Pacific to speed up into St. Louis the Colton perishable traffic originating in California failed on the grounds that the proposal, in the opinion of the Commissioner, violated a preexisting agreement of December 15, 1937. The proponent was dissatisfied with the decision, but Committeeman Allen P. Green persuaded President Baldwin, of the Missouri Pacific, to follow it.

43. In 1938 efforts of the Katy, Texas & Pacific, and the Missouri Pacific to speed up freight trains carrying livestock and packinghouse products from Fort Worth, going to St. Louis and beyond, were successful after the Commissioner and the committee of directors vigorously tried to stop the fast service.

44. In 1938 the efforts of the Rock Island to substitute tourist cars for standard sleepers between Memphis and Los Angeles failed when the Missouri Pacific took the position that the proposal would break down the passenger-fare structure and make it necessary for other lines to put on tourist cars.

45. Efforts of the Wabash to establish week-end reduced excursion fares between a number of important western cities failed when Committeeman Allen P. Green put the pressure on the Wabash to desist.

46. Efforts of the Wabash to establish a $6 round-trip excursion fare for the Kiwanis from St. Louis to Kansas City and return evidently failed because Committeeman Brown advised the Commissioner that the matter was being held in abeyance.

47. Efforts of the Rock Island to establish a week-end excursion fare of 1⅒ cents per mile from Iowa and Illinois points to Chicago were held to be satisfactory subject to the condition that the Wabash would not use the case as a precedent for making other reductions between other points.

48. Efforts of the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific and the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy to speed up passenger schedules between Chicago and the Twin Cities were disapproved by the Commissioner unless the minimum time was 6 hours and 30 minutes. The proponents refused to follow the decision and were turned in to the committee of directors; whereupon the matter was compromised; the details of the agreement not being shown.

49. In 1939 efforts of various western lines to reduce rates on petroleum and its products between Kansas points and Colorado points were only partly successful.

50. Efforts in 1939 of the Union Pacific to reduce rates on newsprint paper moving from International Falls and other northern mills to Colorado common points were possibly unsuccessful. The Union Pacific refused to follow the Commissioner's decision disapproving of the reduction. However, he reported this refusal to the committee of directors which approved of his decision.

51. In 1939 the efforts of the Denver & Rio Grande Western to reduce rates on western slope Colorado peaches were unsuccessful notwithstanding efforts by the Governor of Colorado, United States Senators, the Public Service Commission of Utah, and the United States Department of Agriculture to induce the Commissioner to approve the reduction in the interest of the distressed producers. There is some evidence that the proponent finally, in the face of terrific agitation, decided to act contrary to the decision, but there is also evidence that the proponent's connections refused to concur.

52. In 1939 the efforts of the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy to reduce rates on cattle and hogs in carloads moving from Illinois points and Mississippi River points in Iowa were only successful in part.

53. In 1939 the efforts of the Katy and Illinois Terminal Railroad to reduce rates on pulpboard moving Alton and Federal, Ill., to Kansas City were successful when they refused to follow the Commissioner's adverse decision.

54. In 1939 the efforts of Texas lines to assume the cost of loading carload lots of cotton were unsuccessful but they were successful in obtaining permission to load less-than-carload cotton free, all under a decision calling for strict area limitations on free loading and for further careful nonspreading reduction in cotton rates, carload and less-than-carload only where required to meet truck competition. This brought a complaint from the Oklahoma commission to the ICC that Oklahoma shippers had to pay for loading their cotton. The Texas lines fought the ICC case and lost.

55. In 1939 efforts of the Kansas City Southern to reduce sugar rates, New Orleans to Texarkana and Ashdown, Ark., were unsuccessful before the Commissioner. A. F. Cleveland, of the Association of American Railroads, got into the case, and W. Averell Harriman was also active when the Kansas City Southern and the Katy, which had joined as a proponent, refused the decision. Paul P. Hastings, of the Santa Fe, was interested in killing the proposal which seems to have finally been made effective as a result of the persistence of Matthew S. Sloan, of the Katy, who refused to desist.

56. In 1939 the efforts of the Katy to reduce soap rates Kansas City and St. Louis to southwestern points were successful despite the efforts of the Commissioner, W. Averell Harriman, and other committeemen to stop the proposal. Mr. Sloan again persisted.

57. In 1939 the efforts of the Katy to establish fourth-class rates as a maximum on all less-than-carload freight in Texas, both intra- and interstate, were unsuccessful.

58. In 1939 the efforts of the Great Northern, Union Pacific, and the Milwaukee to reduce rates 15 to 25 percent on apples and pears were successful in part despite the Commissioner's adverse decision.

59. In 1939 a controversy arose respecting the Santa Fe's freight schedules from Kansas City to Fort Worth and Dallas, Tex. It was settled by an agreement of July 31, 1939, which possibly involves a slow-down.

60. In 1939 the question of the Santa Fe's freight schedules from Chicago to Dallas, Fort Worth, Houston, Galveston, and Beaumont via Kansas City and Oklahoma City was given consideration and was settled in an agreement of January 18, 1940, which possibly involves a slow-down.

61. In 1939 the question of speeding up freight schedules from Chicago and Kansas City to Texas points and vice versa, over the Rock Island was considered. The matter was settled by agreement on March 7, 1940. This agreement involved delays to, and holding of "Colton Block" California perishables at Kansas City and Fort Worth. It also involved a slow-down on "Cotton Block" in St. Louis.

62. Efforts in 1939 to extend return time limit on round-trip excursion tickets generally to 6 months were unsuccessful.

63. In 1940 the efforts of the Katy of Texas to reduce rates on crude oil between the Shreveport group points and Texas points were unsuccessful when the Commissioner disapproved.

64. In 1940 the efforts of the Missouri Pacific to reduce rates on crude oil moving from the midcontinent field and southwestern points were disapproved by the Commissioner, who suggested, however, that all southwestern lines get together and work out a limited and curtailed reduction which they seem to have done by agreeing to reductions as between Missouri Pacific points only with the other lines cooperating to keep the reductions from spreading.

65. In 1940 the efforts of the Rock Island, Missouri Pacific, and Cotton Belt to stop the Frisco from establishing through rates and transit arrangements with common-carrier truck lines were successful. The files show that the suit of the Department of Justice against the railroads was discussed in connection with this matter.

66. Efforts of the Milwaukee to establish a reduced rate of 18 cents on crude oil, Cut Bank, Mont., to Spokane, were successful but the Commissioner required that the proponent assist in certain litigation in which the validity of certain orders of regulatory bodies was involved. These orders made the reduction necessary, according to the proponent.

67. In 1940 the efforts of the Katy to reduce interstate rates to 11 cents on crude oil, Wichita Falls and Luedens, Tex., to Houston, Galveston, and Texas City, were successful subject to the condition, among others, that the oil be used at destination for bunkerage purposes only.

68. In 1940 the efforts of the Santa Fe, Katy, and Missouri Pacific to reduce intrastate rates on refined petroleum products in Texas were partly successful when the Commissioner neither approved nor disapproved the proposal, but affirmatively suggested a compromise scale on a restricted and limited basis.

69. In 1940 efforts by the Burlington to make reduced rates on loaded trailers and semitrailers mounted on flatcars moving Chicago to Kansas City were disapproved by the Commissioner. The proponent filed the tariff with the ICC which would not accept it, holding that a tariff was unnecessary; whereupon the plan was fixed by contract between the Burlington and the trucker.

70. In 1940 the Commissioner, without any protest, took over the task of preventing reduced rates on bananas moving from Texas Gulf and Rio Grande crossings to Texas points and to Colorado common points. He disapproved the reductions on movements to Texas points but affirmatively suggested a scale to Colorado common points, which was followed.

71. In 1940 efforts of the Missouri Pacific and Kansas City Southern-Louisiana & Arkansas to reduce rates on sand and gravel moving intrastate in Louisiana and interstate Texas to Louisiana, and vice versa, were delayed, not on protest of any line, but on the initiative of the chairman of the lower rate bureau who merely wanted the Commissioner to hold up the reduction while the Texas commission had a rate structure under consideration so that the roads would not be in an inconsistent position before the Texas commission by having made this reduction while, at the same time, resisting reductions before that commission. The Commissioner dismissed this case when the Texas commission learned that he was holding it.

72. In 1940 the Commission urged railroads which were willing to comply with an order of the ICC not to do so but to fight it. The fight was successfully made. The question involved was the validity of rail-ocean rates on flour from points in Oklahoma, Texas, southern Kansas, southeastern Colorado, and New Mexico to North Atlantic ports and into interior points in Trunk Line and New England Territories. The ICC had ordered a 15-percent reduction to North Atlantic ports.

73. In 1940 the efforts of the Frisco to speed up deliveries of goods on arrival at Fort Worth and Dallas from the St. Louis-East St. Louis Switching District were partly successful under an agreement of about June 12, 1940, which involved a slow-down.

74. In 1940 the Katy failed in its efforts to establish a reduced round trip excursion fare of $5.90 from Fort Worth and Dallas to Galveston and return.

75. In 1940 the Union Pacific failed in its efforts to establish reduced intermediate class fares in Western Territory east of Ogden or Salt Lake City, Utah, and Pocatello, Idaho, on a basis of 75 percent of the one way first-class fares of 2¼ cents per mile one way and on the basis of 180 percent of the one way intermediate-class fares for the round trip.

76. In 1940 the efforts of the Illinois Central failed to establish the use of credit cards good for railroad tickets, Pullman tickets, dining and buffet service, all-expense tours and baggage charges.

77. In 1940 the Union Pacific succeeded in speeding up deliveries at California Pacific coast cities of goods coming from St. Louis and Chicago by an hour and a half under an agreement of May 28, 1940.

78. In 1940 the vigorous efforts of L. W. Baldwin, of the Missouri Pacific, and of the Katy to reduce rates temporarily on citrus fruit moving from the Rio Grande Valley in Texas to Chicago, St. Louis, and Kansas City, and to destinations in Central Freight Association Territory were successful notwithstanding the efforts of the Commissioner and the AAR to stop them.

79. In 1941 the efforts of the Kansas City Southern to disregard rate bureau procedure in making rates applicable to the Kansas City Southern and its subsidiary truck line were unsuccessful.

80. In 1941 the Missouri Pacific, by agreement of March 28, 1941, agreed to a slow-down in delivery of carloads of goods at Wichita coming from St. Louis and points east and northeast thereof.

81. The efforts in 1942, of the Missouri Pacific and the Denver & Rio Grande Western to establish "Colorado Eagle" as a streamline train between St. Louis and Denver were successful.

CREATION OF A UNITED STATES OF EUROPE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I understand that the letter from Secretary of State George P. Marshall to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, dated June 4, concerning Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 10, has not been printed in the RECORD in full. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks the letter be printed.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 4, 1947.

The Honorable ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR VANDENBERG: I refer to your letter of March 24, 1947, acknowledged by the Department on March 28 in regard to Senate Concurrent Resolution 10 introduced by Senator FULBRIGHT and Senator THOMAS of Utah. The resolution states that the Congress favors the creation of a United States of Europe within the framework of the United Nations.

I assume that the resolution has been deliberately phrased in general terms for the purpose of endorsing a principle without raising numerous important questions of detail.

I am deeply sympathetic toward the general objective of the resolution which is, as I understand it, to encourage the peoples of Europe to cooperate together more closely for their common good and, in particular, to encourage them to cooperate together to promote the economic recovery of Europe as a whole.

Of course, the United States wants a Europe which is not divided against itself, a Europe which is better than that it replaces. Only as we can inspire hope of that can we expect men to endure what must be endured and make the great efforts which must be made if wars are to be avoided and civilization is to survive in Europe.

But we should make clear that it is not our purpose to impose upon the peoples of Europe any particular form of political or economic association. The future organization of Europe must be determined by the peoples of Europe.

While recognizing that it is for the peoples of Europe to determine the kind of organized effort which may be appropriate to facilitate the peaceful development of a free Europe, the United States welcomes any initiative which may be taken by the peoples of Europe within the framework of the United Nations to insure greater cooperation among themselves to expedite the reconstruction and restoration of the economy of Europe as a whole, to improve living standards, to strengthen the general security and to promote the general welfare.

To avoid any misunderstanding as to our purpose, I believe it desirable that some of the ideas I have expressed here be embodied in the resolution. Perhaps the authors of the resolution might consider adding a preamble along these lines.

The Department has been informed by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Faithfully yours,

G. C. MARSHALL.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to state that I am greatly encouraged by the letter, although I think that under the circumstances as they now appear in Europe, it is unduly timid and cautious. It seems to me that some initiative on the part of the United States would not be inappropriate at this juncture in our affairs. I do not agree that we should as a matter of policy always leave the initiative to other nations.

Furthermore, in requesting assistance from us, as virtually every country in western Europe has done, I think they have taken the initiative. Accordingly, it does not seem to me that we shall be dictating to those countries or to any other country in any offensive sense if we suggest that under their present chaotic political and economic order they are not good risks either to repay loans or even to survive as democratic states. I am unable to see why the suggestion that they get together and form some

kind of political and economic unity as part of the bargain is dictation or undue influence. Of course, I assume they are interested, as we are interested, in creating a stable, self-governing and prosperous society for themselves, a society with which we could trade and in which our citizens would be welcome as students, professors, tourists, or business men.

In addition to having the letter of the Secretary of State printed in the RECORD, Mr. President, I wish to state that this morning I read in the New York Times with much interest that Under Secretary of State Clayton is returning to Europe to investigate the possibilities of unification. I call the attention of the Senate and the attention of the people of the country to an article by James Reston, and I should like to read several paragraphs from it:

WASHINGTON, June 12.—President Truman and Secretary of State Marshall have authorized Under Secretary of State William L. Clayton to explore in Europe the possibilities of developing a program of unified self-aid among the European states.

This will be the next move by the Administration in the formation of its plans for dealing with the dollar and raw materials shortage that is impeding the reconstruction of the Continent.

Secretary Marshall emphasized at his press conference today, however, that the initiative in the development of plans for the reconstruction of the Continent now lay with the European nations. Mr. Clayton is going to London, Paris, Brussels and perhaps other European capitals not to propose a United States economic plan for Europe (the idea has not progressed to the point where it can accurately be called a plan) but to hear what the European nations have to propose about ways and means of combining to help themselves.

Mr. President, I now ask that the entire article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of June 13, 1947]

EUROPEAN SELF-AID WILL BE EXPLORED BY MARSHALL AIDE—CLAYTON TO SEEK PROPOSALS OF STATES ON ESTABLISHING UNIFIED RECOVERY PROGRAM—DOOR OPEN FOR MOSCOW—SECRETARY SAYS UNITED STATES MAY HAVE TO SHARE IN $5,000,000,000 NEEDED YEARLY ABROAD

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, June 12.—President Truman and Secretary of State Marshall have authorized Under Secretary of State William L. Clayton to explore in Europe the possibilities of developing a program of unified self-aid among the European states.

This will be the next move by the administration in the formation of its plans for dealing with the dollar and raw materials shortage that is impeding the reconstruction of the Continent.

Secretary Marshall emphasized at his press conference today, however, that the initiative in the development of plans for the reconstruction of the Continent now lay with the European nations. Mr. Clayton is going to London, Paris, Brussels, and perhaps other European capitals not to propose a United States economic plan for Europe (the idea has not progressed to the point where it can accurately be called a plan) but to hear what the European nations have to propose about ways and means of combining to help themselves.

SOVIET INCLUDED IN PROGRAM

The Secretary made it clear that in his talks about a program of European aid he included not only the European states proper but the Soviet Union and Great Britain as well.

He also gave some indication of the size of the problem now under discussion by commenting on a statement by Benjamin V. Cohen, counselor of the State Department, that, according to experts, the rudimentary rehabilitation needs of Europe, including Britain, might require as much as $5,000,000,000 or $6,000,000,000 a year for several years.

Secretary Marshall declined to be drawn by the reporters into the arithmetic of the problem, but he said that if what Mr. Cohen had declared was the procedure, it would mean that the United States would have to contribute part of it. He did not specify what he meant by "the procedure."

MR. CLAYTON TO STOP IN LONDON

Mr. Clayton, who is the State Department's principal official on economic matters, is scheduled to return to the International Trade Conference in Geneva within the next few days. He will, however, stop in London on his way to Geneva, and he is expected to visit Paris, Brussels, and perhaps other capitals after the Geneva Conference and before returning to the United States.

Though he will take with him no plan of action, he probably will make suggestions about the kind of economic arrangements the United States would expect the several European nations to make to gain the favorable consideration, at least by the Truman administration, of large dollar grants or credits.

It is doubtful, however, whether Mr. Clayton will be in a position to make any concrete suggestions on behalf of the President or the Secretary of State. They have not even completed their own analysis of the determinate causes of the European economic situation. Indeed, they have not even discussed the idea in any detail with the leaders of Congress. Therefore, Mr. Clayton can question, listen, and explore, but he cannot put forward any official program.

Especially after Congress' action on the administration's proposals for a reduction of the wool tariff, Mr. Clayton is in no mood to predict the support of the Federal legislature for any large-scale dollar aid program.

About all he is likely to be able to tell the European nations at this point is that unless they can get together on some program that catches the imagination of the people of the United States and gives reasonable hope of a more unified European economy on the future there will be little chance of generous congressional rehabilitation appropriations.

Whether this will be enough to soften the east-west political clash in Europe or halt the present move in Britain and elsewhere toward severe import restrictions on goods that must be purchased with dollars is doubtful. The supply of dollars is now running so low in London that the labor government expects by July 1 to establish a rigid program of cutting its purchases here to hoard its remaining dollars. This is expected to be the first item on the agenda in Mr. Clayton's London talks.

DISCUSSION IN IDEA STAGE

Secretary Marshall sought at his press conference today to keep the discussion on the European aid program in the idea stage. Because of the immense scope of the idea of helping the Continent of Europe rehabilitate itself as a more unified economic entity, there is a tendency here to believe that the administration has devised a neat plan that it hopes to get accepted by both the European nations and the Congress.

At present, this is not true. Alternatives have been suggested by many persons in the State Department and out of it to the President and the Secretary of State. However, no policy has been adopted other than to urge the European nations to get together and make suggestions that the United States can consider later in the year.

Because the Executive has not yet discussed the problem with congressional leaders, rumors of the most picturesque nature regarding the so-called continental plan are current on Capitol Hill. To quell these, therefore, some of the leaders there are suggesting that in the interest of an orderly approach to an immense problem, an objective bipartisan committee should be established to study the problem and the ability of the United States to help deal with it.

A few persons in the Capital are talking about using the economic crisis to force some kind of political union of the states in Europe, but Secretary Marshall made it clear today that while he favored as much political union as possible in that part of the world, he was thinking of the immediate problem primarily in economic terms.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, let me say that I think the action now being taken by our State Department is a very hopeful step, and I am greatly encouraged by that show of initiative at least on the part of the State Department in sending to Europe Mr. Clayton, whom I regard as the best qualified man in our Government to undertake such an exploration.

However, it will be noted that the emphasis is upon economic unification. I am entirely in favor of that, but I do not think political unification should be neglected, and certainly it should not be foreclosed, by any statement of policy at this time. Without political unification, the economic agreements will break down, just as the old Zollverein among the German states, which existed for quite a long time, broke down when Bismark appeared upon the scene.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope that the State Department moves quickly and positively in the direction indicated by these developments. I think the time is short for the accomplishment of these objectives, and I can think of nothing more important to the welfare of the United States at this juncture.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, it is my purpose to move a recess in a very few minutes, but there are on the Executive Calendar two or three nominations which I think merit consideration by the Senate at this time. One is the nomination of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, in which at least one Senator on the other side has manifested an interest, and there are a number of appointments in the Regular Army which should be disposed of. I therefore move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nomination of George J. Schoeneman to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue be now considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). The clerk will state the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George J. Schoeneman to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE ARMY

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, beginning at the top of page 6 of the Executive Calendar there are a substantial number of appointments in the Regular Army of the United States. I ask unanimous consent that they may be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and, without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. WHITE. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified at once of the action of the Senate with respect to these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. WHITE. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, June 16, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 13 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE

George J. Schoeneman to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be major generals

Alvan Cullom Gillem, Jr.
Wade Hampton Haislip
Walton Harris Walker
Hoyt Sanford Vandenberg
George Edward Stratemeyer

To be brigadier generals

Joseph May Swing
Edward Hale Brooks
Wilton Burton Persons
Clements McMullen
Howard Arnold Craig

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JUNE 13, 1947

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and eternal God, who art always more ready to give than to receive, and to hear when we pray, give us an immovable faith in Thee. So abide in our souls that we may conform to the teachings of Jesus, with heart to befriend, with sincerity to shield, and with charity to be merciful to all. Hasten the day when men everywhere shall live, not by rivalry nor vanity, but in the ways of virtue and mutual fidelity. O spare us from that egotism that blinds us to our brother's rights and violates his property, his reputation and happiness. Each day help us to weave for ourselves, out of the great loom of life, characters that will stand the test of time and eternity; and unto Thee we ascribe all glory.

In the name of our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

INCOME TAX REDUCTION

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, if President Truman wants to keep his promise to cooperate with the Congress as he said he would at the beginning of this session, he will sign the tax bill which will give 48,000,000 income taxpayers a reduction of 30 percent in the lower bracket to 10 percent in the higher bracket from the present crushing wartime tax levies.

By such action he can cooperate with the members of his own party who cooperated with the Republicans in passing this tax bill by a 2-to-1 majority. By cooperating with the Congress he will be cooperating with the American people whose representatives are seeking to carry out their wishes. It is time that the President stop listening to his cheap political advisers and stop playing politics to the detriment of the entire Nation.

He can further cooperate with the Congress and the American people by approving the labor bill which through the cooperation of his own Democratic Members of Congress with the Republican Members expressed the will of the people by passing this legislation by a majority of over 3 to 1.

The President can hardly afford to set his judgment up contrary to the judgment of two-thirds of the Members of Congress and contrary to the will of the people in refusing them income-tax relief provided in this bill.

When the veto power was provided for in the Constitution the founders of our country never intended that a President should use his veto to thwart the will of the people. If the President vetoes either of these bills he will strike a serious blow against representative constitutional government in this country.

With foreign relations in their present disturbed conditions and with the tremendous debt hanging over this country and the financial relief the President continues to urge for foreign countries this is no time for the President or those who are giving him political advice for the future to encourage strife or the animosity of one group of citizens against the other or against the Congress of the United States.

There is work for 60,000,000 people in constant employment at the highest wage levels in the history of our country, to produce the things the people of our country and the world are pleading for. Our Nation and the world needs the wealth that can be produced in this country at the present time. Rather than to give out statements which are misleading and unfair with reference to the labor-management bill now before the President, which has encouraged the labor leaders of the Nation to unjustly inflame the minds of the rank and file of labor, those political advisers of the President will be doing him a service as well as all of the laboring men and all citizens of the United States if they will stop such inflammatory and false statements which, if continued, will encourage strikes and work stoppages dangerous to the laboring men's future and dangerous to the interest and future of all of the people of this Nation.

In passing the measures, the Congress has courageously put the interest of all of the American people first. The Congress has thrown politics out of the window in the consideration of this legislation. It is time the President follows the lead of Congress and keeps his pledge to cooperate with the Congress, the representatives of the people.

NATIONAL CATHOLIC WELFARE CONFERENCE

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, there is what I consider a very serious statement made in the press this morning, as is shown by the headline of the Chicago Sun, which reads as follows: "Catholics rap union-curb bill." I do not at this time wish to pass judgment on the National Catholic Welfare Conference, which organization is responsible for the headline in question, because I have not yet had an opportunity to check the facts, other than those which appeared in the newspaper this morning. However, enough has been shown to cause me to comment that when the Bill of Rights was added to the Constitution the first amendment provided that Congress shall make no law with respect to the establishment of religion or prohibit the free exercise thereof. The same amendment also provides that Congress shall make no law abridging freedom of speech. Inasmuch as the restriction concerning religion has been placed upon Congress, it appears to me that there is a duty upon organized religion to keep from interfering in any way with the regular acts and duties of Congress, except insofar as the acts of Congress might affect the moral welfare of the people. While individuals in organized religious bodies are entitled to exercise freedom of speech as contemplated in the first amendment to the Constitution, certainly a body of leaders

of any organized sect should hesitate to criticize the deliberative actions of a legislative body, such as Congress, where it has sought to exercise its considered judgment in the passage of a law such as H. R. 3020, which was the subject of the remarks purportedly made yesterday by the National Catholic Welfare Conference.

I say in all sincerity, Mr. Speaker, that I feel that I am a part of a most distinguished body of citizens, persons who have already made their mark in all walks of life, and who are here in Washington working in the interests of all the people of the Nation; in fact, of the people of all the world. Before passing H. R. 3020, a committee of 25 Members of Congress, 15 Republicans and 10 Democrats, heard testimony every day for 6 weeks, a total of over 2,000,000 words, filling 5 volumes. Thereafter, one additional week was spent in the hearing of testimony in various sections of the country by special subcommittees; and 2 weeks in the drafting of the bill. Thereafter, several days were spent by the entire committee, which went over the bill line by line and paragraph by paragraph, and then 3 days were spent in debate in the House before final passage of the bill by that body. A similar mode of operation was adopted by the other body, and after the same deliberation a bill, S. 1126, was passed subsequent to the time of the passage of the bill in the House. Because of the differences between the two measures the matter was referred to conference, and after full and careful deliberation between the conferees of the two bodies a conference report was returned which encompassed the views of the conferees and resulted in the bill which passed both bodies last week, and which is now on the desk of the President awaiting his signature. Furthermore, when the bill was considered by the House it passed slightly better than 4 to 1, and by a vote of well over 3 to 1 in the other body. In other words, between 75 and 80 percent of the total of all the Members of Congress voted in favor of the measure in question, after the bill had been reported out by the committees and by an even larger percentage in favor thereof. I do not believe that any bill was ever given more careful consideration in the history of Congress. Therefore, I believe that the National Catholic Welfare Conference has made an unfortunate mistake, not only in endeavoring to criticize the measure at a time when it is awaiting the decision of our Chief Executive as to whether he will sign or veto the measure, but also in the type of criticism which appears to be leveled at the bill in question, and at the Members of Congress. The National Catholic Welfare Conference undoubtedly represents the view of the Roman Catholic Church which has always been a wise and provident institution. It is my considered opinion that the step taken by the conference at this time is both improvident and unwise, and that it has a political tinge which should have no place in religious circles, especially at a time which is so grave in the history of our Nation. I sincerely trust that the conference will see fit to investigate more fully into the matter and reconsider the decision which it has made in the case.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TOLLEFSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two articles.

Mr. DEANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Times.

Mrs. NORTON asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

THE MOVING-PICTURE INDUSTRY OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, yesterday during the 1-minute period, I was prevented from making a statement which I shall attempt to make today.

The California Members of Congress are proud of the over-all contribution of the movie industry of California to the war effort. This great industry rendered an incalculable service during the war. They made patriotic films by the hundreds, their actors and actresses traveled hundreds of thousands of miles to entertain our troops, many times under battle conditions, millions of dollars worth of bonds were sold in their theaters. The movie personnel from prop men to stars enlisted in the armed services and fought and died against tyranny and fascism.

The speeches of the gentleman from Mississippi and other Members of the Committee on Un-American Activities presenting a few isolated cases of immorality or communistic affiliation should be considered in their true proportion and should not be accepted as representative of this great industry and its loyal American personnel.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TEAGUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a magazine article.

Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mrs. LUSK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

Mrs. LUSK. Mr. Speaker, I requested time to speak to this House on the subject of insurance, not the ordinary life policy, but a type of insurance policy which this Congress is in a position to take out for the American people. As is the case with most insurance policies, the tendency of the person who is to insure or be insured is to delay, counting the pennies which might be saved by hesitation. But when disaster strikes if there is no insurance the enormity of the loss which might have been averted is apparent too late. There begins the long and painful process of salvaging what can be salvaged from the foolish hesitation. It is then that the pennies saved become insignificant. And usually—we saw it happen only a few years ago—the process of rebuilding from the disaster is delayed by the incriminations and self-reproach that follow penny-saving short-sightedness.

The plan for the insurance to which I am referring is contained in a report with which I am sure all the Members are familiar. It lists specific recommendations for the establishment of a system of universal military training. In compiling the report the members of the Commission gave consideration to many of the same facts which this Congress considered in passing the Greek-Turkish Loan Act. There were other factors which make the adoption of the recommendations of paramount importance—those factors relating to the benefits which will come to the youth who participate in the program. At this time I urge the Members of this House to study seriously the recommendations with the view of enacting them into law as part of the general policy of insuring the integrity, sovereignty, safety, security, and progress of the United States of America.

At the outset, I should like to make it plain that I do not anticipate another war. I firmly believe that we have laid a solid foundation for lasting world peace through the offices of the United Nations. I do not believe that the adoption of an adequate defense program is inconsistent with carrying out our obligations to that body, with making it an effective agent for peace. By taking this stand on universal military training, I want to make it crystal clear that I am not advocating war as an instrument of our national policy. I repeat: I am advocating the taking out of insurance against contingencies such as those many of us doubted could happen in the 1930's.

Already, as part of the general program of insurance, this Congress has given much study to, and I trust it will adopt, the bill for the merger of the armed services. The resulting efficiency of our defense establishment, plus the savings which can and will be effected, make this legislation so essential that I do not believe reasonable men and women will differ as to its desirability. It is certainly a proper step, but it is not enough to provide the adequate defense insurance coverage which we need. I believe, however, that adequate coverage will be had when we pass a bill establishing universal military training.

Mr. Speaker, I have never until this time publicly injected my own personal situation into any controversy in which I have become involved. I do so now only to high light my reasons for advocating the adoption of this system of training, because I believe firmly that had we been adequately prepared at the beginning of the last war, the loss of life would not have been so great. I am also convinced that had we been pre-

pared, the happening of the last war could have been averted. Once the men and women of America understand that this is insurance, and not preparation for war, they will be willing to see their sons spend a year in the service of their country, for they will then realize that what is contemplated is the averting of carnage and bloodshed through training and strength.

I know from personal experience the grief and heartache a mother feels when her sons leave for military service. My three sons entered the Army in 1941 and 1942, and one did not return. They left at a time when we were still woefully unprepared for the responsibility which had been thrust upon us. I say to the parents of America today that it is far better to have their sons train now, and through that training form a reservoir of manpower, than to be called to service, unprepared, at a time when the very safety of the Nation is threatened.

It is to forget realities to say that human nature has changed so much within the past few years that a strong nation, bent upon aggression, respects anything less than equal or superior strength. It it true that the atomic bomb, now presumably solely in our control, is our best insurance at the present time; but it is also a fact that the experts, upon whom we must depend so much, predict that 4 or 5 years is the longest time that we can safely expect to have exclusive possession of this weapon. And when another nation does have it, what then? Particularly, I ask what then, if the nation obtaining it should be bent upon conquest and destruction? What nation is the most probable target? You know and I know the most probable target is the United States.

Perhaps you ask, In the event of such a war, of what avail are the best-trained troops? If an atomic war should engulf us, the most immediate result would be widespread confusion and fear and disorganization. We would then be thankful that out of such a holocaust we could gather together a group disciplined and prepared to assume the defense of our country. They would be ready because they had been trained for service under such conditions.

This is strong food for thought, but now is no time for those with queasy thought processes to deal with the self-evident facts of the twentieth century. It is by anticipation of events, however difficult they may be to consider at the time, that we safely insure for our personal and family protection. We must enlarge our conception of such insurance and apply it on a national scale.

Let us look for a moment at the cost of this insurance, for when we take out such a policy, certainly the cost has to enter into the calculations. The President's Advisory Committee estimates that it will be $1,750,000,000 a year. Does that seem too high a price to pay? If it does strike you now as being too much, then I ask you to remember that it represents the sum that it cost us to wage but 1 week of total war but a few years ago. And when we are calculating the cost, it must be borne in mind that the cost of a conflict in the future, when reckoned in terms of initial outlay and in ultimate destruction, will make paltry the sums so recently expended.

I have been discussing the obvious and most compelling considerations which point to the urgent necessity of beginning this program now. But, as with all insurance policies, there are incidental benefits which accrue to the insured. For instance, from the standpoint of physical improvement to the young men in training, the program recommends itself strongly. Not only will there be an organized and beneficial program of calisthentics, to build a strong corps, but there is available fine medical and dental care to correct defects and preserve what the training program has done for the men. In a Nation so advanced medically and scientifically, I was appalled by the statistics released showing that so many of our young and apparently able-bodied young men were unfit for military service by reason of physical defects. Certainly, many of the defects can be detected and the process of deterioration halted by the medical attention which they will receive while in uniform.

The educational feature of this program cannot be ignored, and must not be ignored when we are considering this training program. Not only will the young men receive the benefit of the smoothly functioning Army and Navy orientation program, designed to make them aware of the basic facts of national and international politics, but there will be gained the incalculable benefits of living and working together. It will tend to make the young men less provincial, in that, by working and living with others from all parts of the country, they will early learn the problems and factors influencing life in areas other than their own. Those of you who have served in the armed forces know this to be true; and I am sure that all of us have observed its truth by conversations with the young men and women so recently returned to civilian life.

When a background for understanding the problems of others, their own countrymen, is firmly established, then does it not follow that they will be better equipped to understand problems on an international scale? I suggest reflection on this point, and plead with you not to dismiss it lightly.

Mr. Speaker, I am not afraid that the adoption of this policy will lead us into the role of an aggressor nation; I am not afraid that it will be misinterpreted abroad. Any nation, anxious in good faith to cooperate with this Nation in achieving peace for the world, will be aware of our peaceful history and will not misunderstand. More important, any nation which does not act in good faith will not misunderstand that we intend to assume our burden in world affairs, that we will never again be a sitting target for their attacks.

I do not believe that we are forgetting the American democratic tradition when we enact a program of compulsory military training. It is a fundamental part of that tradition that a civilian fighting force be ever ready to defend this Nation. Formerly, there was enough time for training the civilian group before they were called to fight; but we saw how much that time has been shortened. Almost, in the recent war, we did not have the necessary time. All calculations at the present time indicate that there will be no time for training if, God forbid, an attack on our Nation should be made. We owe the duty, to the people whom we represent, to legislate wisely a program of defense within the framework of our traditions; it is not an illogical extension of that tradition to train before peril is upon us. I believe that it will save lives, and it might conceivably prevent a dispute between nations from turning into a general war.

We have it within our power to place such safeguards upon the program that it will not have some of the harmful effects predicted for it by the timorous. There will be the ever-watchful Congress of the United States to see that the program does not become something other than that which we intend. There will be liberty-loving civilian commissions to report at all times on the progress of the training. Besides these reports, the civilian commission shall be charged with the responsibility of preventing by means of publicity any attempt to indoctrinate the trainees with undue militaristic attitudes. Without these safeguards, the men and women who returned from military service only recently have not shown a militaristic attitude. On the contrary, they are serious and purposeful, full of the knowledge that we must preserve our democratic ideals. A small minority may have gone wrong, but the preponderant number are our best citizens, fighting for our ideals in civilian dress and they did while in uniform.

Mr. Speaker, on many grounds this program recommends itself for our serious and immediate consideration. Conditions are changing rapidly in this world, and safety has become a relative thing. Certainly, when we are unsure of the proper steps to take for protection, a broad and comprehensive insurance policy recommends itself strongly to our instincts of self-preservation. We can feel safe, though I have already said that safety is only relative, that we have acted within our traditions and our ideals. By educating mentally and physically the young men who will be affected by this program, we will be insuring for national safety and national progress. A nation strong and sound in mind and body is capable of producing a higher living standard for its people than one which is not; a nation strong and prepared can be alert, understanding, and progressive.

We have been charged with the responsibility of doing our utmost to keep America safe. With that responsibility ours, we can do no less than insure her safety. Every day without such insurance as we have it in our power to take out represents tragic delay. We have it in our power now to face realistically the future, and by facing it, we will have faced up to the responsibility which is ours.

COMMUNIST INFILTRATION IN THE MOTION-PICTURE INDUSTRY

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I agree to a certain extent with my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] that the motion-picture industry has made a great contribution to the war. I do not agree, however, that the people of California or the delegation in this House can take any comfort or any satisfaction in the fact that there have been exposed in the motion-picture industry certain communistic influences. The isolationist attitude, about which reference was made, however small, is growing, is infectious, and we thank the Lord that it is not any bigger than it is. As a matter of fact, the head of the Motion Picture Producers Association, Mr. Eric Johnston, made the statement that he deplores the fact that it exists, and I think it should be thoroughly investigated because there is no medium by which the population of this Nation is more influenced, outside of the educational system, than by the motion-picture industry, and it should be cleared of any communistic influence.

It must be said to the credit of Jack Warner, executive of Warner Bros., that he has said he wants communism removed from the film industry. Robert Taylor, Ginger Rogers, Edward Arnold, and many other film stars also favor cleaning the film industry of communistic influences. I think we should proceed to do this as quickly as possible.

COMMUNIST INFILTRATION OF HOLLYWOOD—MRS. ROOSEVELT NOT A CANDIDATE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], I desire to say that in my opinion the people of Los Angeles, Calif., who have petitioned the Congress to do something about the Communist infiltration of Hollywood know a great deal more about it than does the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

The moving-picture men who came and testified before the Committee on Un-American Activities know more about it than he does.

Not only that, but they have no right to make pictures that poison the minds or corrupt the morals of the youth of this Nation.

That is what is going on. I told Eric Johnston so when he appeared before the Committee on Un-American Activities here in Washington.

One expert in Hollywood said he could point out the Communist line in a vast number of the pictures now being shown.

I see that Mr. Henry Wallace says that the Committee on Un-American Activities is trying to cut down his audience when he speaks down here at the Water Gate. On yesterday there was sent to the Members of Congress a circular headed "U. S. A. vs. U. S. S. R." It was enclosed in an envelope that has a stamp on it in large red letters, "My independent ticket. President Wallace, Vice President Mrs. Roosevelt."

I see Mrs. Roosevelt says she will not run for office on any ticket.

In that circular, in which they ask everyone to send contributions, they carry a special notice reading:

> I will keep the type standing and await your answer. We should get out 100,000 and be ready for Wallace's revolution.

What is Wallace's revolution? Is that what all this drive is for? Is that what he meant by going down into Alabama and trying to stir up race trouble, where the two races are getting along so well?

If that is what they mean by the "Wallace revolution," then I submit that anyone will have the opportunity to go down to the Water Gate and get an earful of it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

INFORMATIONAL SERVICE, STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3342) to enable the Government of the United States more effectively to carry on its foreign relations by means of promotion of the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills between the people of the United States and other countries, and by means of public dissemination abroad of information about the United States, its people, and its policies.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BREHM) there were—ayes 36, noes 11.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously, a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 305, nays 28, answered "present" 2, not voting 94, as follows:

[Roll No. 79]

YEAS—305

Abernethy	Blackney	Case, N. J.
Albert	Blatnik	Chadwick
Allen, Calif.	Bloom	Chapman
Allen, La.	Boggs, Del.	Chelf
Almond	Bolton	Chenoweth
Andersen, H. Carl	Bonner	Chiperfield
Anderson, Calif.	Bradley	Clason
Andresen, August H.	Bramblett	Coffin
Andrews, Ala.	Brooks	Colmer
Angell	Brophy	Cooper
Arends	Brown, Ga.	Corbett
Arnold	Brown, Ohio	Cotton
Auchincloss	Bryson	Coudert
Bakewell	Buchanan	Cox
Barrett	Buck	Crawford
Bates, Ky.	Buckley	Crow
Bates, Mass.	Buffett	Cunningham
Battle	Burke	Curtis
Beall	Burleson	Dague
Beckworth	Byrne, N. Y.	Davis, Ga.
Bennett, Mich.	Byrnes, Wis.	Davis, Tenn.
Bennett, Mo.	Camp	Davis, Wis.
	Canfield	Dawson, Utah
	Carson	Deane
Delaney	Johnson, Tex.	Poage
Devitt	Jones, Ala.	Potts
Dirksen	Jones, N. C.	Poulson
Dolliver	Jonkman	Preston
Domengeaux	Judd	Price, Ill.
Dondero	Karsten, Mo.	Priest
Donohue	Kean	Rabin
Dorn	Kearns	Rains
Doughton	Keating	Ramey
Douglas	Keefe	Rayburn
Drewry	Kefauver	Reed, Ill.
Durham	Kerr	Reed, N. Y.
Eaton	Kersten, Wis.	Rees
Eberharter	Kilburn	Reeves
Elliott	Kilday	Richards
Ellsworth	King	Riehlman
Elston	Klein	Rivers
Engel, Mich.	Kunkel	Robertson
Engle, Calif.	Landis	Robsion
Evins	Lanham	Rockwell
Feighan	Larcade	Rogers, Fla.
Fenton	Latham	Rogers, Mass.
Fernandez	Lea	Rohrbough
Fisher	LeCompte	Rooney
Fletcher	Lewis	Ross
Foote	Lodge	Russell
Forand	Love	Sabath
Fulton	Lucas	Sadlak
Gary	Lusk	Sadowski
Gathings	Lynch	St. George
Gavin	McConnell	Sanborn
Gillette	McCormack	Sasscer
Gillie	McDonough	Schwabe, Mo.
Goff	McDowell	Scrivner
Goodwin	McGregor	Sheppard
Gordon	McMahon	Short
Gore	McMillan, S. C.	Sikes
Gorski	McMillen, Ill.	Simpson, Pa.
Graham	MacKinnon	Smith, Kans.
Grant, Ala.	Madden	Smith, Maine
Grant, Ind.	Mahon	Smith, Va.
Gregory	Maloney	Smith, Wis.
Gross	Manasco	Snyder
Gwinn, N. Y.	Mansfield, Mont.	Spence
Gwynne, Iowa	Marcantonio	Springer
Hagen	Meade, Ky.	Stefan
Hale	Meyer	Stevenson
Halleck	Michener	Stigler
Hand	Miller, Calif.	Stockman
Hardy	Miller, Conn.	Stratton
Harless, Ariz.	Miller, Md.	Sundstrom
Harris	Miller, Nebr.	Talle
Harrison	Mills	Teague
Hart	Monroney	Thomas, N. J.
Hartley	Morgan	Thomas, Tex.
Havenner	Morris	Tollefson
Hays	Morton	Trimble
Hedrick	Muhlenberg	Vail
Heffernan	Mundt	Van Zandt
Hendricks	Murdock	Vinson
Heselton	Murray, Tenn.	Vorys
Hill	Murray, Wis.	Wadsworth
Hinshaw	Nixon	Walter
Hobbs	Norblad	Weichel
Hoeven	Norrell	Welch
Holifield	Norton	West
Holmes	O'Brien	Wheeler
Hope	O'Hara	Whitten
Howell	O'Konski	Whittington
Huber	O'Toole	Wigglesworth
Jackson, Calif	Pace	Williams
Jackson, Wash.	Passman	Wilson, Tex.
Jarman	Patterson	Wolcott
Javits	Peden	Wolverton
Jenkins, Ohio	Peterson	Wood
Jennings	Phillips, Calif.	Worley
Jensen	Phillips, Tenn.	Youngblood
Johnson, Ind.	Pickett	Zimmerman
Johnson, Okla.		

NAYS—28

Banta	Harness, Ind.	Rich
Bender	Jenison	Schwabe, Okla.
Brehm	Johnson, Ill.	Simpson, Ill.
Church	Jones, Ohio	Taber
Clevenger	Knutson	Twyman
Cole, Mo.	McCowen	Vursell
D'Ewart	Mason	Wilson, Ind.
Ellis	Mathews	Woodruff
Gearhart	Owens	
Griffiths	Rankin	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Hoffman Jones, Wash.

NOT VOTING—94

Allen, Ill.	Cannon	Courtney
Andrews, N. Y.	Carroll	Cravens
Barden	Case, S. Dak.	Crosser
Bell	Celler	Dawson, Ill.
Bishop	Clark	Dingell
Bland	Clements	Elsaesser
Boggs, La.	Clippinger	Fallon
Boykin	Cole, Kans.	Fellows
Bulwinkle	Cole, N. Y.	Flannagan
Busbey	Combs	Fogarty
Butler	Cooley	Folger

Fuller	Kirwan	Rayfiel
Gallagher	Lane	Redden
Gamble	LeFevre	Riley
Gifford	Lemke	Rizley
Gossett	Lesinski	Sarbacher
Granger	Lyle	Scoblick
Hall, Edwin Arthur	McGarvey	Scott, Hardie
	Macy	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Hall, Leonard W.	Mansfield, Tex.	Seely-Brown
	Martin, Iowa	Shafer
Hébert	Meade, Md.	Smathers
Herter	Merrow	Smith, Ohio
Hess	Mitchell	Somers
Horan	Morrison	Stanley
Hull	Nodar	Taylor
Jenkins, Pa.	Patman	Thomason
Johnson, Calif.	Pfeifer	Tibbott
Kearney	Philbin	Towe
Kee	Ploeser	Winstead
Kelley	Plumley	
Kennedy	Powell	
Keogh	Price, Fla.	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Andrews of New York with Mr. Keogh.
Mr. Macy with Mr. Dingell.
Mr. Cole of New York with Mr. Courtney.
Mr. Towe with Mr. Craven.
Mr. Bishop with Mr. Lane.
Mr. Hess with Mr. Morrison.
Mr. Jenkins of Pennsylvania with Mr. Price of Florida.
Mr. Busbey with Mr. Rayfiel.
Mr. Leonard W. Hall with Mr. Smathers.
Mr. Kearney with Mr. Hébert.
Mr. Lemke with Mr. Gosset.
Mr. McGarvey with Mr. Barden.
Mr. Merrow with Mr. Clements.
Mr. Nodar with Mr. Riley.
Mr. Gamble with Mr. Stanley.
Mr. Elsaesser with Mr. Boggs of Louisiana.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Fallon.
Mr. Sarbacher with Mr. Meade of Maryland.
Mr. Ploeser with Mr. Celler.
Mr. Edwin A. Hall with Mr. Lesinski.
Mr. Clevenger with Mr. Redden.
Mr. Butler with Mr. Winstead.
Mr. Shafer with Mr. Kelley.
Mr. Seely-Brown with Mr. Crosser.
Mr. Rizley with Mr. Fogarty.
Mr. Herter with Mr. Clark.
Mr. Horan with Mr. Lyle.
Mr. Fellows with Mr. Cooley.
Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Tibbott with Mr. Folger.
Mr. Hardie Scott with Mr. Pfeifer.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Philbin.
Mr. Scoblick with Mr. Kirwan.
Mr. Fuller with Mr. Kennedy.
Mr. Gifford with Mr. Dawson of Illinois.
Mr. LeFevre with Mr. Carroll.
Mr. Martin of Iowa with Mr. Combs.
Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr., with Mr. Flannagan.
Mr. Smith of Ohio with Mr. Granger.
Mr. Hale with Mr. Boykin.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3342, with Mr. JENKINS of Ohio in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on Tuesday, June 10, there was pending the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN] to the committee amendment on section 201, page 3, of the bill.

The Clerk will again report the amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana to the committee amendment: On page 3, line 14, after the period, strike out the remainder of the line down to and including the period on line 21.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment in keeping with the amendment, which I now send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana to the committee amendment: On page 3, after the period in line 14, strike out the remainder of the line, all of lines 15 and 16 down to and including the word "when" in line 17 and insert "When"; and in line 18 strike out the word "reasonable."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN]?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I do not find the word "when" in line 18. I think the gentleman's amendment is not properly worded.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. It is in line 17.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be read again because it does not fit in with the present bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There being no objection, the Clerk again reported the amendment, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana to the committee amendment: On page 3, after the period in line 14, strike out the remainder of the line, all of lines 15 and 16 and down to and including the word "when" in line 17 and insert "When"; and in line 18 strike out the word "reasonable."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN] that the amendment be modified accordingly?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I now ask unanimous consent to offer another amendment to the first part of section 201 and I ask that the two amendments be considered together, because they go to the same objective.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana: On page 3, line 8, after the word "interchanges", insert the words "on a reciprocal basis."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes to discuss the amendments.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, when we had this bill before the committee last week, my objective was to make this interchange of students on a reciprocal basis. I have thought over the amendment which I have offered and I have decided that my amendment should be changed somewhat for clarity. Therefore, I ask that it be modified so as to strike out only that part of the committee amendment which appears to make the interchange program discretionary rather than reciprocal. The second amendment which I have offered after the word "interchanges" in line 8 on page 3 places it upon a reciprocal basis. If you will consider the two amendments together, you will find that the interchange will be placed upon a reciprocal basis. Both amendments go to the same purpose and that is why I ask that they be considered together.

This last amendment provides that the State Department will make the interchange on a reciprocal basis. That removes the discretion. I think the House wants that. If you will note, my modified amendment, which I have just offered, struck out even the word "reasonable." The committee amendment placed it on a "reasonable basis of reciprocity" but I am striking out the word "reasonable," and I am striking out the language "It is the sense of the Congress that the interchange program under this section shall be on a reciprocal basis," and so forth. In other words, instead of making it an expression of legislative hope, I am making it a positive statutory requirement.

I am putting it on a reciprocal basis and then giving the Secretary of State the right to terminate the whole thing with reference to any nation when that nation fails to carry the program out on a reciprocal basis. I do not know how much clearer it could be made than that.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I have now been supplied with a copy of the gentleman's modified amendment. I have listened to his explanation. As I understand his amendment it makes this reciprocal program a positive program, places it on an absolute reciprocal basis. That is in conformity with the thinking of the committee, it is in conformity with what every Member of Congress believes; it removes all elements of doubt; it is placed on a reciprocal basis.

The committee has no objection to the amendment.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I thank the gentleman. I do not see how any Member can object and I hope both amendments pass. As I stated earlier in discussing this bill, I am not arguing for the interchange program at all, but if it remains in the bill, then by all means it should be reciprocal, and I am glad the chairman of the committee agrees with my views.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. May we have the amendment as now modified read?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana to the committee amendment:

On page 3, after the period in line 14, strike out the remainder of the line, all of lines 15

and 16 down to and including the word "when" in line 17, and insert "when"; and in line 18 strike out the word "reasonable."

On page 3, line 8, after the word "interchanges", insert the words "on a reciprocal basis."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN to the committee amendment: On page 4, line 3, after the word "deported", strike out the balance of the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the Members will take the bill and read line 21, on page 3, they will find this language:

If the Secretary finds that any person from another country, while in the United States pursuant to this section, is engaged in activities of a political nature or in activities not consistent with the security of the United States, the Secretary shall promptly report such finding to the Attorney General, and such person shall, upon the warrant of the Attorney General, be taken into custody and promptly deported in the same manner as provided for in sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended.

The reason I have offered the amendment is that it has been demonstrated that when you try to deport a person under the sections referred to—19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of 1917—you just cannot get him out of the country.

The committee has expressed its desire that people who come here under the terms of this bill and who engage in subversive activities should be fired out without any more fuss or feathers. So do I; and in my judgment that is the considered judgment of the Congress. So why not have the bill provide for that summary procedure by adopting this amendment?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. May I say to the gentleman that the committee originally had the amendment drawn that way. We consulted with Mr. Shaughnessy of the Immigration Bureau and with representatives of the office of the legislative counsel and they thought it might be more expeditious to put it this way. On investigation of the figures we find that 170,000 have been deported.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Harry Bridges is still here.

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CHADWICK] presented an amendment very similar to the one offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] to the committee. We met with him and told him we wanted this protected. So we agreed with him we would accept his amendment. The gentleman from Michigan has beaten him to the punch and we are willing to accept it, but we want the gentleman to know that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CHADWICK] had presented the same matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not care who presents it, just so we get it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment as amended.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am not sold on all of the provisions of this bill. In its enactment we are definitely establishing a policy of the Congress. Of course, this bill has the support of the President and the administration, and the real effect of this proposal is to implement the administration policy; that is, this bill would authorize by law the doing of the things enumerated. However, the accomplishments contemplated in the bill are impossible without the money to pay the expenses. It is, therefore, argued that Congress will at all times be master of the situation because of its control of the purse strings of the Nation. Of course, that is technically true. However, if the authorizations provided in this bill are given congressional sanction, it logically follows that the same Congress will appropriate the money to carry out the objectives of the policy which it has promulgated.

Mr. Chairman, this bill allows more discretion to the administrators than should be granted. I wish it were possible to spell out more in detail the limitations intended. Much of the opposition to the bill is based on the lack of confidence in the type and character of those who will represent our Government in presenting the Voice of America to the world. A thorough house cleaning in the State Department might make this bill more palatable to the Congress and to the country.

Usually I am pretty well decided as to what my action on a bill will be when it is called up for consideration. This is not true in the instant case. It has been very difficult to arrive at a definite conclusion. It is a question as to whether the possible benefits that might accrue under the law warrant the Congress in taking the chance and expending the money authorized.

Mr. Chairman, I am definitely in favor of interchange of students and teachers provided for in section 201 which we are now discussing. The reasons for this position have been well stated by members of the committee throughout the debate and I shall not repeat. The great University of Michigan in the city of Ann Arbor is located in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent in Congress. I have received a number of telegrams from those connected with the university who are able to speak from experience and who urge me to support this section of the bill. These officials are well known to me and I have confidence in their judgment based upon their experience, and I want to present their views to the House. These telegrams read as follows:

We strongly urge you to give complete and vigorous support to section 201 of Mundt bill authorizing exchange of students, teachers, and professors between United States and other countries. As director of the English language institute of the University of Michigan I have had intimate contact with some 1,200 such foreign students, teachers, and professors who have passed through our English and orientation course during the past 7 years since our founding in the spring of 1941. From my experience with these students, teachers, and professors I believe that this is the most important method of laying the foundations of the kind of international understanding upon which to build a permanent peace. Only by this program of living intimately with our own students and staff do foreign students, teachers, and professors obtain a vivid insight into our institutions and the real spirit which makes them work. There has never been the slightest hint of communistic teaching from any of these students, teachers, and professors throughout the past 7 years. I, myself, have been thoroughly convinced of not only the desirability of this program but its necessity for world peace that I have carried all the burdens of directing the work here without salary and in addition to my full teaching schedule.

CHAS. C. FIRES,
Director, English Language Institute.

Re section 201 of the Mundt bill being attacked because of danger that foreign professors and students teach communism in American schools. We have had hundreds of foreign students and many professors in the University of Michigan and we have had no instance of subversive activity among these students or professors. We also feel that an exchange of students and professors with foreign countries at the present time is one of the most important ways by which we can establish good feeling and mutual understanding between nations.

PETER OKKELBERG,
Assistant Dean, Graduate School.

We urge your active opposition to amendment offered to eliminate program of exchange of students, teachers, professors, Mundt bill, section 201. Exchange of students, teachers, professors highly desirable for future peace cementing relations on cultural basis. Our experience foreign students usually great anti-Communist factor on campus. Future leadership of other countries friendly to United States indispensable result. Students are on temporary visas so no letting down of immigration bars as charged by RANKIN, HOFFMAN, and others. Foreign students great force for export trade as they become accustomed to American goods while here.

ESSON M. GALE,
Counselor of Foreign Students.
M. ROBERT B. KLINGER,
Assistant Counselor, University of Michigan.

Ask you to support section 201 of Mundt bill foreign student exchanges one of the most effective means of gaining friends abroad for United States. Direct contact of foreign professors without intellectual hospitality and achievement results in admiration and greater understanding of American ideals and democratic institutions. Democracy must be effectively taught through intensified programs of cultural exchanges and strong support of our cultural centers and democratic principles abroad.

SARAH E. GROLLMAN,
Language Consultant, International Center, University of Michigan.

Have used exchange teacher from England this year. Most profitable experience for her and us. Much good will and understanding has resulted. Our teacher in England sends favorable report. We throughly favor the plan. Hope you support the principle of exchange as set forth in Mundt bill 3342.

OTTO W. HAISLEY,
Superintendent of Schools.

I am also in receipt of a telegram from the president of Michigan State College at Lansing, which reads as follows:

We have a considerable number of foreign students at Michigan State College, and think they add much to our educational program in making it possible for Michigan students to learn to know individuals, people of all races, and colors and creeds. In the small world in which we now live that is an important part of our educational program. It is my personal feeling that this Nation should encourage the maximum number of the right kind of young men and women from all over the world to come here for a portion of their education and then see to it that there is incorporated in the college training an opportunity for them to see the advantages made possible by our type of governmental, social, and economic organization. They can be an invaluable source of friendliness to this Nation after they return to their countries. We feel that the Mundt bill authorizing exchange of students is very desirable.

JOHN A. HANNAH,
President, Michigan State College.

Mr. Chairman, I therefore shall vote against the amendment to strike this interchange of persons provision from the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

BOOKS AND MATERIALS

SEC. 202. The Secretary is authorized to provide for interchanges between the United States and other countries of books and periodicals, including Government publications, for the translation of such writings, and for the preparation, distribution, and interchange of other educational materials.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, unless this bill is drastically amended I shall not only vote to recommit it, but I shall vote against its passage.

Today we read of the rape, murder, and robbery, imprisonment, and slavery of innocent Christian people in Europe by the Communist criminal minority element in charge of those unfortunate countries. It seems to me not only ridiculous, but dangerous to bring into this country either students or instructors from behind that "iron curtain."

We had better get busy and get the ones out of here who are now plotting the overthrow of this Government. Every day we get letters protesting that certain institutions in America are poisoning the minds of children through these Red professors who are insidiously attacking our Government by spreading Red propaganda.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman knows, as was announced the other day, that not a single student from Communist Russia has come here under this program, not a single professor, not a single student has been sent to Russia.

Mr. RANKIN. All right, but communism is reaching out. While our representatives have been appeasing communism up in New York at the "Tower of Babel," Communists have been reaching out and taking control of the Christian countries of Europe where 98 percent of the people are opposed to them.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. What kind of instructors, teachers, and professors does the gentleman think we would get from any country that Russia dominates or from Russia itself?

Mr. RANKIN. You would get a bunch of Communists who are dedicated to the overthrow of this Government, who are dedicated to the destruction of Christianity throughout the world, who are dedicated to the destruction of our economic system, who would want to take over every particle of land and every home and every business and make every human being a slave of the state. That is what you would get.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. LODGE. I would like to ask the gentleman how many of the 377 students now in this country under this program are Communists.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not know, but it would be interesting to call the roll and take a test.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. Does the gentleman know who decides what constitutes other educational material? I want an answer to that. Who decides what constitutes other educational material? Can the gentleman from Minnesota answer that question?

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. For a question. My time is running short.

Mr. JUDD. I would like to advise the gentleman that not a single student or professor who has come here under this program has ever been charged by anybody with Communist domination, and the gentleman knows that, being, as he is, opposed to communism.

Mr. RANKIN. But this program is going to be as "broad * * * as the casing air," as Shakespeare says. I would not object to this Voice of America if you put men like General Marshall, Will Clayton, or other real Americans, that we know are Americans, to tell the people of Europe what America is like. But, if you are going to take some of these pinks or members of the Anti-Defamation League to try to tell Russia how much like communism we are, or ought to be, then I say you are wasting the people's money and doing this country infinitely more harm than good. Now, if you curb this to where it will be the real Voice of America, I will not oppose it, provided you strike out the rest of the bill. But, I can tell you now I am not going to vote for anything that will invite from behind the iron curtain those influences that are today destroying the civilization of Europe and threatening the civilization of America.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. During the World's Fair in New York, when we had the Russian people trying to teach America what was going on over in Russia, at that time they were trying to fool the American people, and does the gentleman believe we can counteract that by inculcating them with our ideas by enacting this bill into law?

Mr. RANKIN. No; I do not, and I think that this bill is dangerous. I think it ought to be recommitted to the committee, and all those provisions eliminated except the one that provides for the Voice of America, and then that should be restricted so that we will know that it is the real Voice of America that is going over the radio.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot support this bill at this point. If it was a bill providing for the Voice of America, and it was honestly to be the Voice of America, I would support it. They have not yet cleaned up that situation in the State Department, which has cried aloud for attention ever since the whole thing started. Their very first broadcast to Russia was a totalitarian philosophy broadcast. I have had in my hands, and I have in my office, 500 broadcasts, and out of the whole 500 I defy any man to find one that would do America a bit of good, and he would find many that would do a lot of harm. The management of the thing has been bad. For a year and a half, Mr. Benton has been in charge of it, and he has not cleaned it up. There is still Haldore Hansen in charge of this cultural relations subject, the same fellow under whose management all those paintings and that sort of thing were bought. There is William T. Stone, and Charles A. Thompson, in charge of the broadcasts. Neither one of them should be on any pay roll of the Government of the United States.

Mr. Stone put out a circular on the 1st day of May after the Appropriations Committee had operated on this activity because it was not the Voice of America. I have it here, and shall insert it in the RECORD. It is a circular in clear violation of the antilobbying law. I wonder if we are going to have that sort of thing going on.

I also call your attention to the way they have done business. I have before me a comparison of the salaries that were paid a group of these people at the time they came from the OWI to the

State Department and the salaries that are presently paid them, just so you can see the kind of business management they have had. The list is as follows:

MARCH 17, 1947.

Following is a list of names reported by the Office of War Information as aliens employed by that agency in 1944, and which are found to be employed by the State Department, as shown by a list recently submitted by that Department:

	Names and OWI-State classifications and titles	Salaries reported paid in OWI	Salaries reported paid in State
CD, no; SD, no	Kurt J. Dosmer (German), assistant script editor, OWI, CAF-9; feature writer, Broadcasting Division, State, CAF-11.	$3,200	$5,403.60
CD, no; SD, no	Martin J. Fuchs (Austrian), assistant language editor, OWI, CAF-7; Cfiief, Austrian Radio Unit, State, CAF-13.	2,600	7,102.20
CD, no; SD, no	Vsevoled De S. Gebrosky (French), assistant announcer, OWI, CAF-7; radio script writer, State, CAF-11.	2,600	4,902.00
CD, no; SD, no	Gertrude Hesse (German), clerk-stenographer, OWI, CAF-2; State, CAF-4.	1,440	2,544.48
CD, no; SD, no	Karel Mazel (Czech), assistant announcer-translator, OWI, CAF-7; State, CAF-12.	2,600	5,905.20
CD, no; SD, no	Gerda Misch (German), assistant clerk-typist, OWI, CAF-3; State, CAF-5.	1,620	2,770.20
CD, no; SD, no	Zdneko C. Sajovic (Slovene), assistant language editor, OWI, CAF-7; State, CAF-9.	2,600	4,400.40
CD, no; SD, no	Paul M. Segnitz (French), announcer, OWI, CAF-11; State, CAF-11.	3,800	5,403.60
CD, no; SD, no	Mira M. Zeidner (Rumanian), senior translator, OWI, CAF-5; State, CAF-11.	2,000	4,902.00
CD, no; SD, no	Elizabeth A. Zweigenthal (Hungarian), junior script editor, OWI, CAF-5; State, CAF-9.	2,000	4,400.40
CD, no; SD, no	Beyne Vince Ho (Chinese), senior language editor, OWI, CAF-9; State, CAF-11.	3,200	5,152.80

Legend: CD, followed by "yes" or "no" means name is or is not in Congressional Directory, February 1946.
SD, followed by "yes" or "no" means name is or is not in State Department Telephone Directory, August 1946.

MARCH 17, 1947.

Following is a list of names which appeared on the list of persons employed by the Office of War Information in 1944 at above $4,000 per annum and are also found to appear on a recently submitted list of employees in the Department of State:

	Names and present State Department titles	Entrance and top salaries in OWI	Present salaries in State
CD, yes; SD, yes	Eric C. Belquist, European Division Area	$5,600	$9,975.00
CD, no; SD, yes	Fred O. Bundy, Division of Occupied Areas	3,800 4,600	7,102.00
CD, no; SD, yes	Robert R. Burton, Broadcasting Division	5,600	7,581.00
CD, no; SD, yes	Nancy Chappalear, Office of Director, Policy Coordination	2,000 2,600	4,902.00
CD, no; SD, yes	Samuel R. Davenport	3,800 4,600	7,341.60
CD, no; SD, yes	John F. Depenbrock, Division of International Exchange of Persons.	2,900 3,200	6,144.60
CD, no; SD, yes	Thomas E. Goldstein, Division of Occupied Areas	2,600 3,200	5,153.00
CD, no; SD, yes	Ruth M. Hill, Director's Office, OIC Policy and Coordination	3,200 3,800	6,144.60
CD, yes; SD, yes	Victor M. Hunt, Director's Office, OIC Policy Coordinator	4,600	9,975.00
CD, no; SD, yes	Harry J. Kroukl, Office of Director, Policy Coordination	4,600 5,600	8,478.75
CD, no; SD, yes	Habib A. Kurani, Near East and Africa (ADN)	5,600	8,179.50
CD, no; SD, yes	Kurt L. London, European Division (ADE)	4,600	6,862.80
CD, no; SD, yes	Clara G. McMillan, Director's Office, OIC	4,600	6,384.00
CD, yes; SD, yes	Lawrence S. Morris, Division of Libraries and Institutes (Chief, Books, Materials and Service Branch).	5,600	8,179.50
CD, no; SD, yes	Fred H. Trimmer, Broadcasting Division	4,600 5,600	8,179.50
CD, no; SD, yes	Isabel A. Ward, Far East (ADF)	2,300 3,200	5,905.20

Legend: CD, followed by "yes" or "no" means name is or is not in Congressional Directory, February 1947.
SD, followed by "yes" or "no" means name is or is not in State Department Telephone Directory, August 1946.

NOTE.—Of the list of 1,127 persons employed in the United States by State Department's OIC, 559 receive over $4,000 per annum. Not one of the persons listed on the recent submission by the Department of State as being employed in the New York office is found on the 1944 list submitted by the Office of War Information for its New York office.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, in connection with the remarks just made by my friend from New York [Mr. TABER], may I say that what he refers to are all details that can be corrected. If we fail to pass legislation that continues the Voice of America, then the opportunity to work out conditions that might not be wholly satisfactory to some Members will not exist.

I call attention to what Secretary Marshall said before a Senate committee a day or two ago. Mark you, General Marshall was Chief of Staff during the war, a pretty substantial man, a man whose place in history is made. After we are dead and gone and he is dead and gone, he will be one of the great figures of history of all time. We cannot see what a man is symbolic of or what he stands for or his place in history when we are close to him because there is an emotional reaction in the minds of some of us if not all of us, but in the cold light of history George Marshall is going to be one of the great figures of all times. There is no question about that.

Only a day or two ago he appeared before a Senate committee in connection with getting appropriations and with reference to this particular project he definitely promised that, if the money is appropriated, the program will be, and I quote, "Very carefully administered." When he appeared before the Senate committee he made a plea. The former Chief of Staff, now Secretary of State, was making this plea, realizing the importance of this as part of a permanent action by America which was necessary in the light of world conditions. We must also bear in mind this program goes to China, India, and southeast Asia, and that it will be silenced unless we do something.

The doors of 70 libraries in 41 countries will be closed to thousands of people who seek each day to learn something about the United States. We are battling, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] well said a few weeks ago in a powerful speech, an idea, and we have to fight it with our own idea—the ideas and the fundamentals that we believe in. We cannot do it by way of negation or by taking the road of defeatism.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Does it not seem rather strange that the gentleman from Mississippi and the gentleman from New York are condemning these broadcasts and at the same time the most prominent Russian journalist in Berlin is desperately trying to counteract those broadcasts? That is strange to me.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, in reply I desire to say that I said I had no objection to the broadcasting program provided General Marshall or Will Clayton, or men of their views supervised these broadcasts. But I do object to bringing men here from behind the iron curtain who cannot come unless they get the stamp of approval of a Communist regime.

Mr. McCORMACK. We have to keep in mind the basic line of Soviet strategy, which is to isolate the United States from the rest of the world if they can do it, and they are using every means to that end. There is intense propaganda from inside Russia and from the centers of communism outside of Russia constantly stressing that America is imperialistic and following dollar diplomacy. They are constantly attacking capitalism and the capitalistic nations. Capitalism is nothing but the dignity of the individual. I would like to see the dignity of the individual stressed more on the floor of the House rather than capitalism. Ours is an individual system. When you use the word capitalism, we are playing right into their hands when, as a matter of fact, it is nothing more or less than

the dignity of the individual under the law and of individual initiative. If we used the word capitalism less, then they would have less opportunity to use that characterization of our economic institutions which we understand but which they use to create a sinister meaning in the minds of people in other countries who do not realize what we mean. When you and I use the word capitalism we mean that it is synonymous with individual initiative and individual enterprise or free competitive enterprise, or, as others would say, free enterprise.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The gentleman admits that Russia wants to isolate the United States through propaganda in those countries. How are they going to hear the Voice of America if we do provide the funds for it? By what means is it going to penetrate to these people?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I hope this bill will pass because it is in the interests of the United States and it is a means of meeting and combating a sinister influence coming from the Soviet Union and its satellites which is directed at the United States and the future peace of the world.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the majority of us agree with the minority whip in his statements that Secretary Marshall is trying to do a good job. History will record his action and weigh his services today, yesterday, and tomorrow. It takes time to evaluate such services. Personally, I have always wondered where he was the night before Pearl Harbor and why he did not use the telephones to notify the military at Pearl Harbor, which could have been done 2 or 3 hours before the devastating attack was made at Pearl Harbor. It would have saved 2,700 lives and a tremendous loss of property. He used the slow commercial methods, and the message telling of the coming attack was delivered 2 hours late. Who can explain that problem?

Now, the gentleman read a part of what Secretary Marshall said about the Voice of America. Let me read the rest of what he said about the Voice of America. I agree with him absolutely. In appearing before the Senate committee, the press reports as follows:

Mr. Marshall said it is essential to the conduct of our foreign relations that the State Department have funds and freedom to make foreign broadcasts and conduct a world-wide information program.

As I have said before, one effective way to promote peace is to dispel misunderstanding, fear, and ignorance.

Foreign people should have a true understanding of American life. We should broadcast the truth to the world through all the media of communications.

That is what the press told the American people about the Voice of America.

I agree with that 100 percent. But, my colleagues, this bill does more than that. Unless it is radically amended, the bill goes much further than disseminating information through foreign broadcasts.

I would like to have the opportunity to vote for a bill providing for broadcasting. Unless some Member of the minority offers a motion to recommit, I shall offer a motion to recommit along that line.

A letter came to me from a confidential source today showing the pressure for this bill. The letter is circulated by William T. Stone, who is under Mr. Benton in the State Department. To show you the pressure that is being put on, this is an interesting confidential letter on how to push this legislation through Congress. I think it is truly in violation of all the laws we set up for this Department. It is headed, "Memorandum for John Howe, Luther Reid, and Bill Bourne, in the State Department":

[Confidential]

MAY 1, 1947.

Memorandum for John Howe, Luther Reid, Bill Bourne.

Re: Action and recommendations of New York Alumni Committee.

At a luncheon meeting April 29, called by Louis Cowan, with Norman Cousins, Lim Linen, Harold Guinzburg, Mike Bessie, and Miss Singer present, the following recommendations were made:

1. The committee will distribute copies of our clip sheet to key people throughout the country for use in the press, radio, etc.

John Howe should send 150 to 200 copies to Miss Singer as secretary. We should also send 12 to 15 copies of the House committee hearings the moment they are available. The hearings will be used by the committee, columnists, editorial writers, etc.

Harold Guinzburg or Mike Bessie will talk to Liebling about an article in the New Yorker. (Memoirs of Hecate County article by Henning in Chicago Tribune, using Ehrenburg to show Voice of America ineffectual. Art program, etc.)

2. The committee agreed to contribute and receive funds up to $1,000 for the Washington organization, headed by Mrs. Wayne Coy and Mrs. Bell. Funds for this purpose should be sent to Louis Cowan.

3. The group favored a news story rather than an advertisement in the Washington Post to publicize the high caliber of people supporting the information program. The consensus that a paid ad would be less effective than a general news story. The ad would look like part of a costly organized lobbying campaign.

4. It was suggested that Barney Baruch could be very helpful with top leaders in Congress. John Howe should follow up with Louis Cowan to determine the best approach to Baruch. Baruch has influence with VANDENBERG, TAFT, JOE MARTIN, and many other top leaders.

5. It was suggested that General Marshall cable personally to the heads of the important missions abroad requesting them to report to him on the effect of killing OIC.

6. The Greek broadcast should be publicized.

7. Benny Goodman has offered to help in any way possible. He will be in New York next Tuesday. The group agreed that there is not much that Goodman can do in Washington, but that he should be urged to get support from top people in the show business. Thayer will see him when he arrives in New York.

WILLIAM T. STONE.

Copies to Howland Saregeant, Stew Brown.

(NOTE.—Mr. Benton's office reports that the above was copied and circulated in his office in order that employees of the office would know what had occurred at this luncheon in New York, and that it was merely informative information for the employees of OIC.)

Thus, my colleagues, the pressure is on.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] has expired.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I believe it is of prime importance that the United States use every channel of information with respect to our own country. I think now that we have become the most influential Nation in the world, it is essential that we do so.

I do not believe in passing legislation with the idea that the one holding the office at the time the legislation is passed is the one who will continue to administer it; but in view of the fact that so much has been said about the Voice of America program and how it has been administered in the past, I think it is well to remember that George Marshall served as our Chief of Staff during the war. I have seen him operate under high pressure, and I know that he is not subject to it.

Some of my friends here think that the only people with whom we will be dealing in this will be the Russians. I have heard from a high military commander in Europe who was in a position to know, that in the war the Russians made two mistakes. They let the Russian Army see the rest of the world, and they let the rest of the world see the Russian Army. I do not believe you can anticipate any Russian students or professors being permitted to see the conditions under which we live in America.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] the other day stated that the Russians had found it necessary to give an indoctrination course in the beauties of communism before returning her soldiers to their own land.

I think we ought to take example from the nation which has been the most successful of all in international politics, the British. Her great empire builders wanted to do everything in their power to build the empire. When the great empire builder, Cecil Rhodes, decided to use his fortune to help build the empire he created Rhodes scholarships under which they have siphoned off into England for indoctrination the brightest boys that we have in our colleges in America; and I say that it has paid off and paid off wonderfully. Those of you who are afraid of dealing with Britain on the ground that the British are smarter than we are ought, at least, to be willing to accept the program by which Britain has profited so much.

I come from near the Mexican border. I have seen this thing in operation down there on a small scale in the small colleges and universities, and in some of the larger ones. They have been carrying on an exchange program, primarily in the summertime, so that Americans, probably mostly school teachers, can attend Mexican universities. It has been mutually beneficial. The Americans who have gone to Mexico had never sought companionship or association with Latin-Americans of culture and education, of whom there are thousands. When they went to the Mexican universities they found there—and this is so

in the other South American countries—the same percentage of men and women of refinement and education. They found that Latin-Americans have music, art, and culture comparable to any other country; that La Cucaracha, they learned, is the equivalent of our hillbilly songs, and not representative of their cultural music; and the Mexicans who have come to the United States had judged Americans by the rowdy tourists they had seen. They had read in their histories of the large section of Mexico taken by the Texas Revolution and the larger section taken by the Mexican War, and feared further attacks upon her borders. They have heard us referred to as "Gringoes" and our country as the "Colossus of the North." After they have been in this country and visited in our homes and seen our education and finer side of our life, they no longer think of us as "Gringoes." They no longer think of us as the "Colossus of the North," but as "Norte Americanos." They also learn here beyond all doubt that this country and the people of this country do not intend to acquire any more land anywhere in the world. So the program turns out to be mutually beneficial. I am sure it can be the same in any part of the world.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman spoke of General Marshall in connection with the administration of such law as might be enacted as a result of this bill. Does the gentleman believe that General Marshall himself will administer this law if it is passed, oversee it, and take charge of it?

Mr. KILDAY. I do not so believe. The gentleman must remember that General Marshall is a trained military administrator. Like every successful general, he knows better how to pick a staff than anybody else. I know, too, that he will positively insist that the man he appoints to carry out the program carry it out just as the general in command in the field will rely upon his G–2 and insist that his G–2 get him accurate information. I know, too, that he will permit no insubordination. The American that is he will formulate a truly American plan and woe to him who fails to carry it out.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending section and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, Congress is being called upon by this administration to appropriate large sums of money to support the so-called Truman policy overseas. Behind this program is an unquestioned desire to influence the course of European history. Our Government is attempting to stem the tide of communism and state socialism in every possible way.

I regard these objectives as laudable, but the evidence accumulating every day makes it obvious that our methods are naive, wasteful, and utterly ineffective.

The administration policy is nothing but patchwork diplomacy. We are called upon one day to approve loans to Greece and Turkey as a means of stopping Communist threats in this area. The next day we are asked to furnish funds for the Voice of America in order to bring the message of American success into the homes of Europe and Asia, over radio loudspeakers. Presumably in the near future, we shall be asked to undertake additional ventures for the same purpose.

These are all demonstrations of a failure to analyze and interpret what is going on in Europe and Asia accurately and intelligently. These continents are in ferment. Because our own Government has refused to recognize the realities of the situation we have failed to complete vitally necessary treaties with the former members of the Axis and their satellites. We have allowed chaos and uncertainty to dominate the political and economic life of central Europe, a policy which has played directly into the hands of the Soviet Union.

Will the Voice of America broadcasts meet these critical issues? Will they furnish bread to the starving? Will they furnish political guidance to those who seek for stability in their governments? Will they rebuild the shattered industry or restore the ruined agriculture of devastated countries? In other words, is this appropriation the best possible use our people can make of these funds in this crucial moment in world history?

I submit that our Government is in the position of a small boy trying to protect the leaking dike. He may stop it temporarily at one place, but unless the dike is rebuilt speedily and completely, it is going to break in many more places while he is frantically plugging a tiny gap. We have been bolstering the dike of the status quo in Greece and Turkey, and now it has burst wide open in Hungary. If we spend our money and our energy repairing the break in Hungary, we may find a new threat in Italy or Korea or China.

The process is endless. I urge our Government and those who seek an effective foreign policy for our guidance to use the funds we are asked to expend for the Voice of America to provide a voice that will really be heard.

Let our Government in company with the other nations of the world provide the means of economic rehabilitation to every European and Asiatic country through the international agencies we have helped to create. Strong, self-reliant, working people will not succumb to Communist propaganda feeding on unemployment and despair. We have machines for industry; we have machines for farming. Let us provide these to the needy of the world.

Let us end this patchwork diplomacy and build a constructive foreign policy which will last longer than one edition of our newspapers. We can do it by spending our funds for a voice of America that will be heard throughout the world, the voice of American motors and tractors and harvesters.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK].

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to all of the debate on this bill, and have reached the conclusion that I will support the bill although I shall also support some of the amendments which I believe will be offered.

I have taken this time in order to ask certain questions of the chairman of the subcommittee; questions which have bothered me.

We have been told that Russia is subjecting all of its troops who served outside the limits of the Russian border to 90-day reindoctrination courses in the ideals of the Soviet Government. The State Department has been publishing this Russian language magazine called Amerika which, generally speaking, is a fine piece of work. I want to ask the chairman of the subcommittee why, on the one hand, the Soviet Government spends money to reindoctrinate its soldiers and, on the other hand, permits this sort of magazine to enter Russia.

The second question is: How do we know that these magazines are not all thrown in the ash can as soon as they cross the Russian border?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman is correct, in the first place, about the indoctrination course being given Russian soldiers returning from service in western Europe. They not only give a 90-day indoctrination course for the ordinary returning soldiers of the Red Army, but if they are members of the Communist Party of Russia they give them a 12-month indoctrination course, because they want to be sure to retain party control and party discipline over their own converts. Now, why do they take such care about indoctrinating their own men and still permit us to circulate our periodical Amerika in the U. S. S. R.? They permit us to circulate Amerika over there because from the Russian Embassy on Sixteenth Street, in Washington, every Wednesday afternoon they issue a magazine patterned after Time magazine in format, about half that big, printed on slick paper, which they circulate free every week to any American who wants to get on the list. They realize that they cannot continue to issue their paper in America should they refuse to let us circulate our publication over there. So we are getting some gratifying successful results by circulating Amerika in the U. S. S. R.

The next question you asked was "How do we know that those magazines are not all thrown in the ash can?" Remember, first of all, there are very few ash cans in Russia and they have very little to discard in the ash cans. Travelers in Russia, people in our Embassy and people in the army all have provided convincing evidence that our magazine Amerika is being circulated and read. I, myself,

circulated over 50 of those magazines in Russia in 1945. I know how eagerly they reach out for them. I personally have seen copies in hotel lobbies in Leningrad, Baku, and Moscow. I have seen them in the subway trains. They are being circulated, and they are being sold on the black market for $1 a page, in terms of our American money. The Russians want to get them. We are stupid, indeed, if we deny ourselves by our own shortsightedness the use of this important contact which we have made with the people both behind and in front of the iron curtain.

Mr. BUCK. I thank the gentleman. I come now to my third question.

The committee has said that it is the purpose this program to make certain that the American information program abroad shall be truly reflective of our American way of life. In this copy of Amerika that I hold in my hand is a story on the play The Iceman Cometh. If I recollect the argument of that play, there is not a character in it that is not a criminal, a drunkard, a prostitute, or a pervert. I also find in the hearings before the committee that Mr. Dean Acheson justifies broadcasting stories of American lynchings. I do not feel that the true American way of life is portrayed in that play or in accounts of mob lynchings. I would like to have assurance from the subcommittee chairman, if he can give it, that this program is going to sell the fine things that are America and not the seamy things.

Mr. MUNDT. We have set up a number of safeguards to insure that. We have provided for semiannual reports in detail to every Member of Congress as to what is being done on the program. Thus each Member of Congress can help monitor and formulate this new program. I regret that a play of that kind has been published in this magazine, but if my memory serves me correctly, "The Iceman Cometh" is a play by Eugene O'Neil, one of America's most noted playwrights who, unfortunately, writes shoddy plays. The Americans pay money in the boxoffice to see them, and it makes him an outstanding playwright in the area of the dramatic world. Consequently, we cannot be too critical of those preparing the copy of "Amerika" for including a review of O'Neil's "Iceman Cometh" in their discussion of the American theater. However, under the new program set up by H. R. 3342 has many congressional safeguards not now operating. I am sure we can use these new controls to make sure our American information program abroad does concentrate on the fine qualities of American life and not on lynchings, strikes, crime, and riots.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I think it is high time that we got away from this fog of opinion and into the area of fact. As I understand it, when the Congress considers a bill it likes to have a few facts.

There are an awful lot of brickbats thrown at this provision in title II for student exchange. It is very interesting to see the opinions of those who, I believe, even the opponents of this bill will consider to be very substantial people, on this subject. So I read a telegram which I have just received from the acting president of Columbia University, which is located within my district. It is as follows:

The Honorable JACOB K. JAVITS,
House Office Building:

Understand effort is being made to eliminate provision of Mundt bill authorizing promotion of exchange of students and teachers between United States and other countries. Hope very much provision will stand as such exchanges are important method of establishing international understanding. Means of handing possible abuses should be found without abolishing so important a program.

FRANK DIEHL FACKENTHAL,
Acting President of Columbia University.

I just telephoned President Fackenthal and got his permission to read this telegram into the RECORD. He said that he did not like to get into any controversy, obviously, and that he wanted it understood that he was not giving an expert opinion on the bill as a whole, but that on the matter of student and teacher exchanges he thought that it was so critically important to the fate of America and the world and to the fate of American education that he must, as a responsible person, express his views to the Congress.

There are some 4,000 students from Latin America who are studying in the United States and no students, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] has explained, who are studying here from Soviet Russia. The only reason there are 4,000 students from Latin America is that it is the only part of the world which is covered by a law which states that the United States will sponsor those student exchanges. So the Government sponsorship, which is what all these foreign governments want when they send students over here—to be sure that the matter is being handled under our Government's auspices—is making the program with Latin America work. Even the most determined opponents of this bill will admit that one of the great features in building up the good will between our country and the Latin American countries has been this exchange, and they should wish we had more of it.

Do not let us get distracted by this red herring or bogie that is being dragged across the floor here all the time. This student and teacher exchange is a program which goes to the world. It is a key element in our American foreign policy. The facts do not bear out the arguments which are being made against it that it will admit undesirable people, for there are adequate safeguards about letting them in and adequate safeguards about getting them out if they prove to be undesirable. The arguments against the bill are being made on the basis of the wishful thinking of gentlemen who want to defeat this legislation—just as they want to defeat any legislation which proposes that the United States shall do a job of reconstruction in the world, the only way in which we can protect our own security and prosperity.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am very much interested in the statement of the gentleman about what the facts bear out. I should like to advise the gentleman that in a conference with some of the officials of the State Department the day before yesterday the admission was made to me very frankly that many of these things that have been objected to on the floor of the House had been done, and the promise was made that they would be corrected in the future. So evidently the facts are not exactly as the gentleman has represented them. Either the State Department is wrong or the gentleman is wrong.

Mr. JAVITS. If the gentleman's assertion is correct, we would never have sent an army to Europe because there was some incompetence and inefficiency in the Army and Navy here. What we are arguing about in this bill is that the job ought to be done. All the Congress is doing by this bill is authorizing the job to be done. We will see that it is carried out right if the necessary machinery is provided. But if the machinery is not provided there is nothing to work with.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Who does the gentleman mean by "we?"

Mr. JAVITS. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. By "we" I mean all the American people. There is no department or bureau that can withstand their judgment, and the Congress is here to see that it is obeyed.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill. I shall favor a motion to recommit it to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. When I make that statement it is not criticism of the committee. I know that the committee has acted in good faith, but the whole philosophy accepted by that committee from the State Department is wrong.

That committee in fact is wandering around and is lost in the dismal swamps of the State Department. The time has come when Congress, as a whole, must call a halt to the foreign ideologies in the State Department and again truly represent our own philosophy.

I used to believe in the law of averages. I thought any person, according to the law of averages, would hit upon the right thing once in awhile. I believe that we must now, however, adopt the law of accident as far as the State Department is concerned, because if it ever hits it right it will be by accident.

Let us see just where we are going. We have already depleted our natural resources from 11 percent to less than 9 percent of the world's supply. The theory of the State Department is to give away the wealth we have left, so that a few international coupon clippers and manufacturers can increase their wealth at the expense of the American taxpayer.

No nation ever became great or remained great by giving away its natural resources, by denuding the nation of the raw material that belongs to unborn generations. Our Nation became great because we had an abundance of wealth—natural resources—but now we are asked

to believe in the doctrine of giving away that which belongs to future generations. To me this seems morally wrong, religiously sinful, and legally criminal. It verges on treason.

There seems to be a fatal disease rampant here in this House. It is not exactly sleeping sickness, but it does destroy our alertness and dulls our sense of responsibility. It is called "foreignology." Even my good friend from South Dakota finally caught it. I had thought that his prairie vision and robust health made him immune, but there must have been too many germs of that disease from the State Department in the Foreign Affairs Committee room.

This foreignology would ape Hitler, and proclaim to the world that America has a superior culture. It parallels Mein Kampf. It would attempt to impress the culture and questionable ideologies of the State Department upon the rest of the world. It would try to make the world believe that we have a superior civilization, and that our taxpayers must educate the world to accept our ideologies.

If permitted in its wildness, and in its insanity, it will destroy our Nation the same as it destroyed the German nation. The German people are now paying for the folly of Hitler and his followers. It is silly for any nation to undertake to force its thoughts and its ideas upon the rest of mankind, especially when they do not want them.

In place of trying to educate the world to our way of thinking—to accept our ideologies and culture—we had better pay a little more attention to the education of some of our own people. My friend from South Dakota could more profitably spend his time in educating some of the subversive element he is struggling with in the Un-American Activities Committee. He has been doing a good job. When he has finished the job at home—when he has educated and made good Americans of the subversive element within our midst—then I am sure he will be satisfied to let the rest of the world do their own educating.

Our first duty is still to educate ourselves, not foreigners. There are many things about our boasted culture—our labor problems, and our under-privileged—that need first attention. We are still far from perfect. "He who lives in a glass house should not throw stones," is still good advice. We have already gotten the hatred of many nations because of our Hitler-like attempt to boss the rest of the world.

Just of what value is broadcasting turkey in the imaginary straw of Russia. Of what help is it to the starving of the vanquished nations to send dancing girls, and questionable movies and programs to them. Naturally these nations resent it. To them it is adding insult to injury—insult because we collaborated with Stalin, and helped in their liquidation.

Again, behind the scenes of this legislation are some members of the State Department who want to put the United States Government into the broadcasting business. They have advocated a government controlled International Broadcasting Foundation to take over short wave broadcasting and disseminate American views throughout the world.

Even though the proposal is sugar coated by a vague suggestion that domestic broadcasting companies and some institutions be represented on the board of trustees, the Government would run the show just as firmly as the British Government runs propaganda through BBC.

The State Department is already up to its neck in the field of international broadcasting, with programs going out in 25 different languages at a cost of more than $8,000,000 per year. The proposed foundation would make continuation of this war-born propaganda activity a permanent part of our Government, with substantial expansion and increase in cost.

In my opinion, this is a bad and extremely dangerous proposal.

Here would be another instance of unnecessary Government competition with private enterprise, and in a field where American private enterprise has been notably successful. Imperfect as American broadcasting may be, it leads the world as a provider of entertainment and education, and, as a force for influencing popular opinion. Government-controlled broadcasting systems in other countries have never approached American commercial broadcasting in popularity—the United States has more broadcasting stations and more privately owned radio receivers than the rest of the world combined.

Long before the war American broadcasting companies, entirely at their own expense and with little prospect for financial return, erected and operated short-wave stations that sent American network programs all over the world. In countries where short-wave receivers were in general use, these American commercial programs were far more popular than the stodgy propaganda broadcasts from Germany, France, England, Italy, Spain, and so forth. They did more to sell American ideals and the American way of life than could any number of pontifical presentations of "the unvarnished truth," such as the State Department's much publicized broadcasts to the Soviets.

At the time of Pearl Harbor there were 14 licensed international short-wave stations operating in the United States. All were erected by private capital, all were operated by their owners at a total cost over the years of many millions of dollars. During the war Government funds were used in construction and operation of additional short-wave stations, just as Government money was used to construct and operate munition factories, ship yards, and so forth. Now that the war is over, these stations should be sold to private operators in the same manner, and for the same reason, that other Government-financed properties are passing into private hands.

There is no more reason for the Government to own and operate broadcasting stations than there is for it to publish newspapers and magazines. Nor is there any reason for the Government, which has neither experience nor skill in radio production, to spend millions of dollars developing radio programs.

Fairness and common sense demand that the Government pay for and use privately owned broadcasting facilities for dispatching radio programs, just as it uses railroads for dispatching freight, telegraph and cable systems for dispatching messages, our newspapers and magazines for publishing advertisements and releasing news, and so forth. Instead of setting up a system to compete with those who pioneered our international short-wave stations, any Government money used for this purpose should be spent to support those who blazed the trail with their own private funds. Any other procedure would be the rankest kind of injustice, as well as being a stupid refusal to use the world's finest creative talent in the realm of radio.

No matter what our bureaucrats choose to call Government-sponsored international broadcasts of "unvarnished truth," listeners in other lands will have just one term for them: "Yankee propaganda." Most Americans resent or laugh at foreign propaganda that infiltrates this country, and are highly skeptical of news and radio broadcasts that come through the iron curtain of censorship. To all other peoples of the world we Americans are foreigners; obviously Yankee propaganda will only serve to arouse resentment and skepticism of all things American.

The one basic idea that the United States has to sell to the rest of the world is our American system of free enterprise. What could be more futile and ridiculous than using a bureaucratic broadcasting foundation to tell our story? What profit could there be in prattling the "unvarnished truth" about free America when the listener knows that the programs he hears are themselves a violation of the basic principles of American free enterprise? Why should we adopt the very practices that we criticize in other governments?

The most effective method of persuasion is by actual demonstration. There could be no better way of demonstrating to other peoples the real meaning of American free enterprise and freedom of speech than by giving them an opportunity to hear the tremendous variety of radio programs that are aired each day over our major networks. In the year 1946 American advertisers paid a bill or $78,000,000 for the broadcasting talent alone that produced these programs. What a revelation it would be to countless impoverished millions to hear commercial announcers vying with each other to sell more soap, candy, automobiles, radios, watches, cigarettes, etc., etc. And what a demonstration of democracy in action it would be to have people of the world hear two opposing American presidential candidates tear into each other over the radio, and then hear the election results, and learn that the loser continued to enjoy life and freedom.

American radio programs, in spite of criticism leveled at them by Blue Book writers, have the happy faculty of attracting large audiences. This is true in

other countries as well as in the United States. If our daily schedules of network programs were sent out by powerful short waves, we would soon create an incredible amount of good will and understanding throughout the world. American jazz is popular from the Arctic to Timbucktu, and there is plenty of that broadcast every day. Serious music has its lovers wherever there are human beings—they reach for everything from Bach to Gershwin. American networks broadcast many hours of the world's finest music every week. Music is the only international language that needs no translation. Our dramatic programs, variety shows, news casts, commentaries, etc., have a freshness and freedom found on no other radio broadcasting system on earth. True enough, some of these programs would require translation for a good part of our audience, but many could go straight, with perhaps explanatory announcements in other languages. It must not be forgotten that in virtually all countries there is a large nucleus of English speaking people.

If we wish to do a really effective job of international broadcasting, the way to do it is to forget all about bureaucratic foundations and send by short wave a selected schedule of network programs, modifying them only as prudent commercial practice dictates. I used the words "prudent commercial practice" because I believe that the best way, as well as the most American way, of sending our commercial programs overseas is to permit American short-wave stations to sell time to advertisers just as our domestic stations do. That will automatically bring to American international broadcasting the best audience-building brains of the country, and give to the rest of the world the great musical and dramatic talent that has made radio so popular in America. Under the acid spur of commercial results, broadcasters will develop new techniques of audience building in foreign lands that will far transcend the best efforts possible for a known Government agency.

Then, if the Government still deems it necessary to enter officially the international war of words, it will find an enormous and receptive audience waiting for its programs from privately owned stations. It will also have available, and should use, the skill developed by free enterprise in radio, just as it found available and used for munition production the industrial skill developed by generations of free enterprise in manufacturing.

Both for the sake of economy and to give the rest of the world a true understanding of America, the State Department should be compelled to cease its present international broadcasting activities, and any proposal that the Government enter the broadcasting business should be defeated. The American broadcasting industry should be given an opportunity to expand in the field of commercial international broadcasting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I am taking this time in search of information. I recognize the value of bringing students in from other countries so that they can become familiar with how we do things in the United States, but I am also mindful of the fact that we are having much difficulty finding schools and rooms for American students who wish to secure an education for which we are paying a tremendous sum.

It is possible that the president of Columbia University has the facilities where they can take in a good many thousands of students from other countries, but the situation is somewhat different in other colleges and universities.

About a year ago the State Department had a plan to bring in 10,000 young foreigners to study medicine in this country. I hope the chairman of the subcommittee who handled this legislation will answer this question, and possibly also my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota. The program of the State Department was to bring in 10,000 medical students from foreign countries or students who wanted to study medicine, to train and educate them in the United States, which was, of course, a very fine thing. But in talking to one of the distinguished doctors out in my section of the country I found that this doctor, after a thorough investigation, had come to the conclusion that we did not have enough medical schools and facilities in our medical schools to educate the few American boys and girls who wanted to take up medicine. So that my first question is whether or not the State Department has the same program of bringing in 10,000 young foreign students to train them in medicine in this country?

Mr. JUDD. May I say to my friend and colleague from Minnesota that this is the first time that I have heard of such a figure as he has mentioned. We have had—or rather the State Department has had—authority under previous legislation to bring in students from Latin-American countries—graduate students, not undergraduate students—for study in medicine, as well as other fields. There are some 6,500 students from Latin America studying in the United States today. All of them are on their own resources or on scholarships, taking care of their own expenses, except 377. These are exceptional individuals who do not have sufficient resources of their own. After they qualified by competitive examination, the State Department assists them in the degree they need. Only 377 out of 6,500 receive aid under the present program.

It is contemplated, if this bill goes through and the same authority is extended to the rest of the world, that the program for Europe and Asia will be about twice as big as for Latin America. That will increase the number of students in the United States under this program from 377 to perhaps a thousand a year in all fields, including medicine.

I have never heard of any proposal to train here 10,000 a year in medicine. It would be impossible to carry out, even if it were not absurd.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That probably was one of the top secrets of the State Department that was not passed on to your committee.

I feel that it is our first duty to take care of American boys and girls who want to take up medicine and let them have an opportunity in our own institutions.

I might say with reference to the fellowships that have been granted to doctors who are coming here to be trained in our various hospitals and medical clinics that the complaint is—and I know it to be true—that after these men have spent 2 and 3 years here studying under the fellowship and getting the benefits of our American system and American training they do not want to return to the countries from which they have come. The big problem is for the men in charge of these medical institutions where these men are trained under the fellowships to get them to go back to the countries from which they come.

Mr. Chairman, I am not satisfied with this bill. It seeks to cover too much territory. Unless the bill is drastically amended, it appears to me that the State Department is given a blank check to do whatever suits the fancy of Mr. Benton or some of his associates, who have been engaged in sending to foreign countries so much propoganda giving an unfavorable picture of what American democracy means. The first step in shaping a policy to take care of propaganda should be to dismiss those in the State Department who had deliberately sought to cast reflection on our American system. After this has been done, the Congress can formulate a truly American policy, which I will gladly support. I therefore hope that this bill will be amended before a final vote is taken. To begin with, a limitation should be placed on the amount of money to be allowed to tell peoples of the world about the United States and, secondly, the bill should be redrafted so that the Congress will know what is being authorized.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS].

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I heard a humorist, some time ago, say something like this: "You know, we human beings do not have too much to get puffed up about, anyhow." He said in the first place we are made wrong. For instance, he said, you take the mouth. It is in a very unsanitary place, right under your nose. The truth of the matter is it should be on top of your head so that if you were late for work you could put a sandwich under your hat and eat it on the way. Take your leg, for instance; it is made wrong. You have your padding back here where you don't need it and here on your shins, where you do need it, you don't have any padding at all.

He said, "Take your lap. You lose it right when you need it most. When you stand up you may drop something of value and break it since your lap is gone."

"Take your toe," he said, "it is too far from your brain. You may get up in the night sometime and step on a tack, and

what happens?" The toe sends a message to the brain and says, "Toe on tack." The brain sends a message back and says, "Take toe off tack." Yet all that time you are standing on the tack waiting for the messages to go back and forth. He said, "You can sit down but one way. Why I was in a theater the other night and a lady hollered, 'Sit down in front.'" He said, "I tried to and came darn near killing myself."

The point I make is simply this: You can take most anything in the world and ridicule it and criticize it. Of course you can. Some of you very fine, able members of this committee have criticized this bill and have criticized it, I believe, far out of proportion to its actual reality. Now, surely, folk—and you are a fine bunch of folk—patriotic, intelligent, sincere American citizens—surely we should not carry our suspicions so far that we just suspicion everybody. Certainly we are against communism. Certainly we are against fascism. Certainly we are against all subversive elements in America. But let us not lose our civil liberties in our efforts against these subversive elements. Let us not abandon our civil liberties. Let us not go too far. Let us not do un-American things in our effort to combat them. Let us not suspicion everybody. I have heard suspicion directed at the Supreme Court of the United States. I have heard suspicion directed at the President. I have heard suspicion directed at the State Department. I am afraid that if some of you gentlemen are not careful, you will start suspicioning yourselves. You could carry it so far that you would finally be afraid of yourselves; afraid to read anything or afraid to hear anything lest you be improperly influenced.

Now, I think we have carried it to an absurd degree. I really do. I just believe we should not do that. If there ever was a man who lived on the face of the earth who would never be a Communist or a Fascist or anything but an American, it is I. Yet I do not have that fear that some have, because I do not believe it is justified by the facts. Certainly I do not have any suspicion that a man as patriotic as General Marshall is, a man who has shown the disposition that he as Secretary of State has shown would ever, even carelessly, permit communism to be fostered in this Department. I believe that some are carrying suspicions just a little too far.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I was very happy to hear the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] read a telegram from the acting president of the great University of Columbia because some time ago Columbia University tried to acquire from the Pacific coast a new president.

I would like to read a telegram from Dr. Robert Gordon Sproul, president of the University of California, on the subject of the interchange of students. He is one of the outstanding educators of this country, a gentleman above any suspicion or taint of un-Americanism.

The telegram from Dr. Sproul reads as follows:

BERKELEY, CALIF., *June 10, 1947.*
Hon. GEORGE P. MILLER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

In past years the University of California has trained hundreds of men and women from foreign countries and sent them home with a better understanding of the United States and of democracy to teach or to hold other positions of responsibility. It is my firm conviction that such interchange of students and teachers is a most effective way of promoting international understanding. May I urge you to see that nothing is done to prevent the promotion of such interchange by amendment of section of 201 of the Mundt bill.

ROBERT G. SPROUL,
President, University of California.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I am glad to hear that the University of California, along with the University of Columbia, and, although I did not graduate from a very big college—just a little fresh-water college in the Midwest, Carlton College, in the State of my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN]—it is a pleasure to receive from my college a telegram urging the Congress to retain 201. It is a terribly important part of the program to the people out in the Midwest. They believe that the extension and development of mutual understanding is the basis of peace.

Mr. MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman.

I wish also to read a telegram from Dr. Lynn T. White, president of Mills College, in Oakland, Calif., one of the foremost women's colleges in the United States—a college established in 1852, that has done a great deal to bring about better understanding between this country and the Orient and this country and South America.

President White wires:

MILLS COLLEGE, CALIF., *June 10, 1947.*
Congressman GEORGE P. MILLER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Would appreciate your support of Mundt bill including information program. Living experience provided by international exchange of persons best means of insuring mutual esteem. Information program sorely needed to overcome existing block in international understanding.

LYNN T. WHITE,
President, Mills College.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to draw upon our own experiences. After the Boxer Uprising in 1899 this country refused to accept indemnity from China, but we provided that the interest on the money that would have been paid us should be used in the education of Chinese students in this country. That program is now 47 years old. We have brought young Chinese to this country and have educated them and sent them back to their homeland, and they have been the greatest bond between China and this country. They are responsible for the understanding that exists between China and this country.

Again may I call your attention to something that has been brought out here—but I should like t stress it—we are not just directing this program toward Russia; there is also the great Pacific Basin, the virile part of the world, that part of the world that is demanding reform. This program is going there—going to a part of the world that respects us and looks to us for leadership. We need the good will it will generate there.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired. All time has expired.

Without objection, all pro forma amendments will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

INSTITUTIONS

SEC. 203. The Secretary is authorized to provide for assistance to schools, libraries, and community centers abroad, founded or sponsored by citizens of the United States, or serving as demonstration centers for methods and practices employed in the United States. In assisting any such schools, however, the Secretary shall exercise no control over their educational policies.

Mr. HOFFMAN (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I have a motion on the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. To what section?

Mr. HOFFMAN. To section 201, page 3.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, section 201 has been passed. Section 202 has been passed. Time has expired on 202.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired on section 202.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACKINNON] advises me that the time was not limited on amendments to the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The time was limited on section 202.

Mr. HOFFMAN. On amendments also?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, I believe if the Chairman will check the record he will find no mention was made to limit time on amendments, but only to limiting time on the bill. I observed the language very carefully when the request was submitted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman cannot be right in his observation, for the motion was not to limit debate on the bill but only to that section which had been read.

Mr. MACKINNON. I mean on the section. The motion was only to limit time of debate on the section. The words "and amendments thereto" were not included.

I make that point of order. May we have it checked?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will overrule the point of order because the motion was made to close all debate with reference to any amendments to section 202. The question now is on section 203, which the Clerk is reading.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MACKINNON. What will be the situation if the Chair is in error in the Chair's recollection according to the record?

The CHAIRMAN. We will have to decide that when we come to it.

Mr. MACKINNON. I thank the Chairman.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. May we have a copy of that part of the record?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may secure that from the reporters.

The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and forty-seven Members are present, a quorum.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 4, line 19, after the word "policies", insert the following: "And shall in no case furnish assistance of any character which is not in keeping with the free democratic principles and the established foreign policy of the United States."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment which it was desired to offer was to section 201, page 3, line 10, to strike out the words "and leaders in fields of specialized knowledge or skill." The Chairman failed to see or hear me so I did not obtain recognition.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of that proposed amendment was to prevent the State Department from bringing into this country agents of Russia or of any country that was under its domination or of any other country, which might become an enemy country, who had exceptional skill, who might desire, and who would under this bill be permitted to go into the industrial plants of our country and learn our methods and our secrets of production, the things which have enabled us in both wars to come out as winners.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS] said that we were the victims of undue fear. I am wondering just how much of truth there is in that. I will admit that I am afraid for the future of my country and I know other folks who are afraid of what the departments down here are doing or may do.

In November last the people did the best they could to get a housecleaning in the legislative branch and they relied to a certain extent upon the legislative branch to help out with a housecleaning in the executive departments. Of course, they could not directly do anything about the executive departments.

It does seem that the least those who were elected to the Eightieth Congress can do; the very least they can do, is to keep the faith of those who elected them, to refuse to give additional power, blank checks for power and blank checks for money, to these departments which refuse to carry out the will of Congress, departments which are still New Deal in thought and deed. The gentleman may not be afraid of any department's action. I am.

I recall that book written by that admitted liar, Carlson. Under Cover, the book was titled, which charged some ninety-odd Members of the Congress of the United States with entertaining seditious ideas, charged them with being guilty, if you please, of treason.

Now, I say to you that in my office I have letters from the War Department which show that the War Department purchased and circulated that book.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Not now.

Mr. MORRIS. Well, the gentleman used my name.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If everybody had to yield that used my name, calling names or something——

Mr. MORRIS. I just wanted to ask a question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Not now.

Not only that but a gentleman came in this morning and suggested that, if the chairman of his subcommittee would not go through with it, he was asking our committee to permit him to offer evidence—now listen to this—that the War Department made possible the publication and the circulation of Under Cover.

Have we reason to be afraid? There is not a Member of this House who has been here for the last 4 or 5 years who does not know from the admissions of the State Department, the individuals in it, that in that Department over the years there have been not one but dozens of Communists, and, when Congressmen, notably the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], asked that those fellows be taken out of the State Department, they got just nowhere with their requests.

Now, until the executive departments down at the other end of the Avenue clean house, we should be afraid; I am more fearful of the borers from within than I am of Russia—we should be afraid of what this State Department, or the people in it or in other departments—will do to this country of ours, because no matter what legislation we enact they take it and turn it and twist it and use it to further some purpose of their own. While on the whole, their efforts may have been all right, here and there, all through, we find the Communist trail, the Communist taint.

So, let me repeat, that the trouble with this thing always—most of this legislation, anyway—is that if the legislation is good, we know from past experience that it will be misinterpreted and maladministered, and for that reason I cannot vote for legislation of this kind giving the State Department a blank check for power and money.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am not so much concerned at the moment about the propaganda provisions of this legislation, which seems to be the chief concern of the Foreign Affairs Committee. My chief concern is the immigration features which, in my opinion, compose about nine-tenths of the bill. This is a bill to bring people into this county.

I want to direct your attention specifically to section 20 on page 3, and paragraphs 3, 4, 5, and 6 under title VII, and more particularly to title VIII.

You can well understand that my time is not sufficient to read and discuss each of these sections, but the bill is short and you can read them in a very few minutes.

It was my pleasure to serve on the Immigration and Naturalization Commitee for 4 years, and I am somewhat familiar with the antics of this Administration when it comes to dealing with immigration.

As I read this bill, it practically voids our existing immigration laws and authorizes the Secretary of State to admit persons to this country absolutely without limitation. All quotas are disregarded and the safeguards we have set up over the past 150 years becomes meaningless.

The debate on Tuesday was confined principally to the exchange of students. This bill provides for the exchange of teachers, instructors, leaders in fields of specialized knowledge or skill, and in a manner provides for the entry of an adult person who can walk or talk from any part of Europe and Asia, or any other part of the world. When we talk of teachers and students, just remember that Europe at this time is full of scientists and specialists, and the camps for displaced persons and others are full of experts. In short, this measure gives the Secretary of State authority to admit persons without any limitation as to number or length of time they are to stay in this country.

Section 801 of title 8 provides that the Secretary can accept reimbursement from any cooperating governmental or private source in a foreign country, or from State or local governmental institutions or private sources in the United States. Consequently, under this bill any racial group, political group, religious group, or any organization or society whatsoever, can support and bring people of every description to this country under this bill without number. As the bill is now written, it is possible to bring people into this country just as fast as transportation facilities will permit. It is not beyond the realm of possibility that the number may reach one million annually, regardless of the appropriation or allotment to the State Department.

Now let us look at another feature of the program. When and if any person admitted under this program is found undesirable for any reason he is delivered to the Attorney General to be deported under the Immigration Act of 1917. This change of authority alone gives cause for suspicion of the purpose of this act. The Attorney General's office in respect to deporting undesirable aliens, remind one of a slow-motion picture of the Rock of Ages.

Under the existing conditions in Europe it is quite likely that any or all of

them may become displaced persons after they enter the United States and it will be declared that he cannot be returned home because the political situation has changed in his country. So we have him or her as a visiting refugee along with the other millions.

Another fact I want to impress upon you is that if one of these visitors marries an American citizen during their stay in this country they cannot be deported, or at least that is the history of the Immigration Department, because they immediately become a hardship case. In the case of children, they are residents of this country for the remainder of their life.

I plead with you to give this bill your serious consideration. It is my firm conviction that if it becomes law it will practically nullify all of our immigration laws and permit the free flow of people into this country, a situation that not a single Member of the House wants to support. And just remember the 2 or 3 years of the OWI.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that in the further consideration of the pending bill moderation both in feeling and expression shall prevail. It is my conviction that the gentleman who has just yielded the floor is entirely mistaken as to the purposes and the effect of the bill. It is not intended, I am sure, to be used for the purpose of indiscriminate admittance of people to this country.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that by the time this debate has ended the Department of State will have realized that the deadest thing in this country at this time, at least so far as this House is concerned, is the philosophy now expounded by the Wallace group, and that the Department will proceed speedily to bring itself in line with public thinking and will never again commit the serious blunder of admitting into the Department those who have heretofore sought to use it as an instrument in the hands of the reformer to make over the world into some kind of Marxist state.

The opposition to the bill that still prevails here in the House is grounded upon a lack of confidence in the State Department to administer the measure in an Americanlike way.

The Department has brought down upon its head more criticism than is well for the country's good. While improvement has been made in the screening of personnel, I, too, share the feeling that there are still those within the Department who have no business being there. Getting rid of these objectionable people, however, is not altogether an easy thing to do and we must be patient.

The memoranda referred to and exhibited here on the floor this morning by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and apparently bearing the signature of Mr. Stone, may have been prepared with innocent intentions, but the fact remains that it was used by a group of fellow travelers in New York identifying themselves as some kind of professional group to propagandize the Congress and the country in behalf of the adoption of the bill. That, too, was a mistake. That, too, is something that the Department should hereafter avoid indulging in.

The bill probably is not as good as proponents wish. Certainly, it is not as bad as the opposition contend. I think there are some parts of the bill in addition to those already eliminated that the committee might well agree should go out. This can be done without weakening the measure and probably will be done.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the criticism of Bill Benton has largely ceased. I think the committee has the feeling that he has been unfairly dealt with. Speaking for myself, I would like to say that my interest in the bill would wane to some extent were I not confident that he will continue in charge of this informational program.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to take the floor because of the lack of time. This is an extremely important matter which we are debating here, and there has been demonstrated on the floor extraordinary ability on both sides of the question.

I do not question the motives of those who have spoken on either side of the question. I am opposed to this bill because I believe it is not at this time in the interests of the country. I expect to be open to criticism by the intolerance of those who are fanatically favorable to this bill.

I want to read a little extract to the Members of the House by a man whose patriotism I am sure cannot be questioned because he was really one of the founders of this country.

I refer to Alexander Hamilton, in the Federalist, No. 71. He said:

> The republican principle demands that the deliberative sense of the community should govern the conduct of those to whom they entrust the management of their affairs; but it does not require an unqualified complaisance to every sudden breeze of passion, or to every transient impulse which the people may receive from the arts of men, who flatter their prejudices to betray their interests. It is a just observation that the people commonly intend the public good. This often applies to their very errors. But their good sense would despise the adulator who should pretend that they always reason right about the means of promoting it. They know from experience that they sometimes err; and the wonder is that they so seldom err as they do, beset, as they continually are, by the wiles of parasites and sycophants, by the snares of the ambitious, the avaricious, the desperate, by the artifices of men who possess their confidence more than they deserve it, and of those who seek to possess rather than to deserve it. When occasions present themselves, in which interests of the people are at variance with their inclinations, it is the duty of the persons whom they have appointed to be the guardians of those interests to withstand the temporary delusion, in order to give them time and opportunity for more cool and sedate reflection. Instances might be cited in which a conduct of this kind has saved the people from very fatal consequences of their own mistakes, and has procured lasting monuments of their gratitude to the men who had courage and magnanimity enough to serve them at the peril of their displeasure.

So that those of us who who oppose some of these measures, do so because we feel we are protecting the rights of the people against the inflammatory passions of the hour, which result from propaganda poured in upon them by certain departments of Government. We must not forget that never before in the history of the entire world has there been a more powerful propaganda agency than is created right here in the United States of America, and it works day and night. People hear this propaganda. Many times they are so excited over it, and the various other legislative problems that come up, that they do not reason it clear through. I believe it is the duty of those who see danger in some of these bills, as I do in this one, to have the courage and the Americanism to stand up here and state it, without being ridiculed. I do not know just how much time I have remaining, but it is utterly impossible for me to go very far, so I shall not go further at this time because I want to discuss another phase of it. But I do want to drive home to those present here that we who take opposition to these bills, the support for which is built up by a terrific blanket of propaganda—it is the duty to analyze these bills to the very core, and to stand here and vote against them if we believe we are right in doing so, in the interest of our country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if it is not possible at this time, after those who are now on their feet have had an opportunity to speak, to limit debate on the pro forma amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. MATHEWS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I just want to be sure that I get my full 5 minutes on this section.

The CHAIRMAN. Just what is the gentleman's request?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section, and all amendments thereto, close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I spoke on this bill 4 or 5 days ago. It certainly cannot be claimed that I am unfriendly to the State Department, because I have gone down the line with them on everything that they have asked for this session. I did that as I said the other day as in the matter of the Greek-Turkish loan for one reason, because I took General Marshall and

the President at their word that it was a step towards stopping communism in Europe; but I do reserve the right to object to something like this monstrosity which comes along to us here which does not conform to its title—the Voice of America—to speak out against those provisions in it that I think are going to be inimical to our own country, such as exchanging students, professors and technicians.

Now, I think I have a right to be just a little alarmed about this thing and I can speak with just a little bit of authority. I do not feel as complacent as a lot of my friends do here. I spent 2 of my 4 years in the Army in Military Intelligence, investigating the Reds and the Pinks here in our country. I found that the people that they worked with most were those in our educational institutions and that they usually send their cookie-pushers over here from Europe. Knowing what I do of their methods I certainly am going to speak out against this thing, for it is not a good thing. Let us wait 3 or 4 years until this crisis that the President and General Marshall tell us about has settled itself somewhat, has died down. If then it appears to be a good thing we can consider it in a different aspect. Let us wait until we see how much good faith Russia shows.

These students under this program are not going to come from Russia, they are going to come from France, China and Belgium and other countries, and the ones they will send over here will be those bespectacled intellectuals they take out of their universities over there.

I think what has thrown the members of this committee off is Gen. Bedell Smith. Bedell Smith has come here and sold them a bill of goods. He said that the Voice of America broadcast was being heard by 50,000,000 Russians. I will bet you he never got out of the Embassy grounds in Moscow. There is no way in which he or anybody else can know how many short-wave radios there are in Russia or how many radios there are in Russia or how many people listen to radio programs. They do not have any Hooper rating system in Soviet-dominated countries or Russia. I will bet you further that if he ever did get out of the Embassy grounds that he was taken around or followed by an agent of the NKVD—a Russian agent was right there with him all the time. I do not believe that Bedell Smith was allowed to go through Russia and be accorded any more freedom of observation than was accorded to Wendell Willkie, Eric Johnston, and Mr. White and each of them had an NKVD agent on his trail all the time. They were shown what the NKVD wanted them to see, and nothing else.

My good friend the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS], was not scared when we debated the Greek-Turkish loan. He was not scared then about Communist aggression in the world and he is not scared now. He told us then that communism was on the wane in Europe, but I asked him what has happened in Hungary within the last week? You know what has happened there. The Communists had a gun at the head of the Prime Minister there. They were going to shoot his child if he did not abdicate. So he abdicated and fled from his country and the Communists took over.

Now, let us not, for God's sake, come in here in our enthusiasm over one aspect of the Voice of America program and put ourselves in a position where we get a lot of Pinks and Reds foisted off onto us under some exchange program. Let us wait 3 or 4 years until things have had time to settle down, until world affairs have straightened out. Then if conditions have improved and things are different I may be for such a program.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Does the gentleman believe that it would be of any benefit to America to send to Russia the type of American student who would want to go to Russia and stay there?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Certainly not.

I said the other day that it was useless to think we could influence people in Europe by sending a handful of students over there under the exchange program. I told you the other day that during the war we had many ambassadors of good will. We had two or three million ambassadors of good will over there, our own GI's.

I say to you that the people of France, the people of Belgium, the people of Luxembourg, the people of Germany and the Soviet zone in Berlin know our GI's, and they were a good cross-section of America. So if anybody on earth can tell me what better ambassadors of good will we could have, and if they think that a handful of two or three hundred students can have greater influence than our soldiers, if they think that striped-pants cookie-pushers that the State Department sends over there can do more good than 2,000,000 boys, they are crazy. I said to you the other day that the GI's made love to their girls, that they broke their windows, but the good things they did more than offset the bad. So they know us as we are—warts and all.

What influence would 300 or 400 students be? Those people already know about this country, how great it is, how wealthy it is, its aims and purposes. And as far as Bedell Smith is concerned, as I said a while ago, I doubt if he ever got beyond the grounds of the American Embassy; and if he did, he was followed by some NKVD agent or was in the care of some NKVD agent. You know in all these countries over there, France and others, with their ministers and officials, prefets and sous-prefets—they wine and dine our Ambassadors—I have seen all of them; I know how they work and what they are—and I also know our Ambassadors rarely ever have the opportunity to see and understand the common people of those countries as I did—to send a few students over there would be of no effect. I know how the Communists work.

Strike this thing out. Let the voice of America be heard here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MATHEWS].

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Chairman, under ordinary circumstances I would be entirely in accord with many of the ideas that the proponents of this legislation want to get across.

I would like to take a little time to talk about Radio Luxemburg.

During the war the American ground forces took over Radio Luxemburg, one of the strongest, if not the strongest, radio station in Europe, and used it most effectively for propaganda and psychological warfare. It was a magnificent job. The whole project was organized, directed, and operated by then colonel, now general, Clifford R. Powell.

I am proud of the job which was done by him because he is an American. I am prouder because he is a constituent of mine. I am still prouder because he was the commanding general of the division in which I was an officer when it was mustered into the Federal service, and because he has been for many years my close personal friend.

General Powell is a great statesman in his own right, besides being a great soldier. If we had had real Americans like General Powell operating this Voice of America originally, the character of that program would not have been such as to have caused the criticism which has been justly heaped upon it.

But we are not voting for ideas, under ordinary circumstances. We are voting for this specific legislation, under extraordinary conditions.

In section 203, as amended, you will see that the Secretary of State is authorized to provide for assistance to schools, libraries, and community centers abroad, but nothing that is not in keeping with the established foreign policy of the United States. In title V, section 501, the same idea is carried out in regard to the movies and radio.

What is the established foreign policy of the United States? In the first place, I will tell you one thing that will be the established foreign policy if you pass this bill. You will be bringing foreign students over here to our own universities at $10 a day, or $300 a month, for subsistence, when our own GI's get only $65 a month. So you will be establishing the foreign rate of exchange of personnel at the rate of five to one—one foreigner equals five good American veterans. That is one of the things you will be establishing as a foreign policy. You will not need to sell that one to people in foreign countries. They will grab it. But you better sell it to American veterans first. But why bother? The American veteran is only the hometown boy who saved America. He is no exotic and fascinating stranger.

What about Russian communism? Is that our enemy or is it not? If it is not, then there is no sense in the March 12 address of the President or that popgun legislation we passed called the Greek-Turk loan, or the many anti-Communist speeches made on the floor of this House or the anti-Communist legislation which has been passed. Of course, it is our enemy. Even the President admits it is our enemy in every part of the world—except in the United States, where it is only a bugaboo.

What have we done about it and what are we going to do about it?

We gave this enemy $11,000,000,000 in lend-lease during the war so it could look strong. Still fearing we might be criticized for picking on an enemy weaker than ourselves, we have given it $6,000,000,000 more since that time. Still being afraid we might be accused of bullying, we have appeased it, and have given it about everything it wanted to strengthen and spread itself. We are still doing it. Only a week ago a constituent told me his firm could not get steel piping. Yet, he said, two shiploads left this country under the Russian flag. We have stood around and wrung our hands while this enemy turned Europe into the chaos that is there now, upon which its own filthy philosophy can feed.

On last Thursday, the day before the House began debate on this measure, the other body ratified several treaties. I am not criticizing the other body. That is its responsibility. But I must point these things out to you as being some true facts of life so far as our foreign policy is concerned.

In the treaty with Italy you will find the following:

> Italy shall pay the Soviet Union reparations in the amount of $100,000,000 during a period of 7 years from the coming into force of the present treaty.

Now, listen to this: Section 2 (a), same article, provides that reparations shall be made from "a share of the Italian factory and tool equipment designed for the manufacture of war material."

The same thing applies to reparations to be given to Yugoslavia, only it is $125,000,000 taken from the same source. Now, there is something it will take more than a persuasive radio voice or a picture with glamorous movie stars to sell to the Italian people and to convince them what a wonderful nation the United States is.

In the Hungarian treaty there are $200,000,000 that are supposed to be paid to Soviet Russia and $100,000,000 to be equally divided between Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia.

Mr. Chairman, that is the foreign policy that this bill is designed to sell the world on, to teach the world about, by broadcasting and movies to make them love us. How can I vote to sell these things abroad when I cannot conscientiously try to sell them to our own people?

We are told that this bill is designed to sell America to the rest of the world. Well, that would be a change, at least. Up to date we have been giving it away.

Mr. Chairman, I want no part in voting the taxpayers' money to support, sell, and broadcast a two-headed, double-faced, reversible foreign policy of that character.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that this administration had better decide on going in one direction so far as foreign policy is concerned; it better pick out that direction and it better get started in that direction—quick.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, this is the third day we have heard the Voice of America on the floor of this House. We have heard many Members speak for it and many speak against it. But, they were unfortunate enough to bring this bill up on this the third day of debate on Friday the 13th. Think of it. Friday, the 13th, is the day that they bring up this bill and try to conclude it. It would be the unlucky bill. Well, more people in this country are skeptical of Friday, the 13th, I think, than probably any other particular day in the year. Then you hear of the black cats going across the road, and some people are afraid of that.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. Would the gentleman be for this bill if it were brought up on the 14th?

Mr. RICH. No; I would not be for it, especially at this time. I would not be for this bill, and I will tell you why. This bill is brought in here in the guise of Republican legislation, but it is only the continuation of the New Deal, and I was against everything that the New Deal tried to bring upon this country in the way of regimentation and regulation, and we are finding out now more than ever, each and every day, just how terribly bad it has been for the American people, and I want no part in it. I do not know why our Members have been so gullible as to swallow this legislation, hook, line, and sinker. I cannot understand it. I have the highest regard for the Republican and Democratic Members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, but I cannot understand what they are trying to do in furthering this legislation, in furthering the thing that the State Department has been trying to do with this country in foreign governments to sell us down the river. They sold us down the river in everything they tried to do in the last 15 years, and if we do not watch out, the first thing we know we will have a weak, disrupt, wrecked Federal Government in America, and we are not going to be able to help anybody, any place, anywhere, any time. We have wrecked our own Nation in trying to do that which the New Deal has been recommending that we should do in foreign lands.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the activities of the State Department which will be financed by this bill.

Sovereign states object to outside interference. The war has not changed that age-old principle, which most of our career diplomats adhere to.

Sponsors of this measure say that it is only $15,000,000 that is required. That will pay interest on a large amount of war debt. Once embarked on this program, it will last as long as the national debt, and, like all bureaucracies, it largely duplicates the work of the regular Foreign Service officers and of the already established Intelligence Service of the State Department. Sponsors support this measure by reference to illustrations where it is already functioning without congressional authority. In Yugoslavia they—MUNDT—saw block-long lines of natives waiting to view a cultural exhibit and a movie. Under dictatorships, no man can enter without official approval, which is not freely given where opponents of such officials seek to enlighten such natives—not in a police state anywhere.

Propaganda is a dangerous weapon. This measure affords no practical means of safely propagandizing foreigners. Language, custom, and mechanics bar the effectiveness of this measure. Who can be reached by our propaganda? How many short-wave radios are there in this country? Who would risk our propaganda libraries and movies, or read a "kept" newspaper in a political state?

To reach western Russia and eastern Europe we have to maintain a radio station in Munich, Germany. How long will we be there? The Moscow fiasco requires a separate peace which politically wise men in the State Department will bring about within 12 months. Treaty drafts were discussed at London and at Moscow. The lines of cleavage have been disclosed and points of disagreement as between the Allies have been fully explored. These points of disagreement will be separately negotiated with Austria and Germany, notwithstanding military objections reported in a recent issue of the New York Times. These military men in political jobs in Germany and Austria want to hold onto them. The American people do not want to pay the cost of supporting them in their jobs, and at the same time pay the cost of supporting relief for these peoples.

Returned travelers from Austria and Germany tell me that these peoples want to be left alone, to work out their own recovery, as they have done for centuries, without military interference from within or without.

It takes a letter 2 weeks to travel 100 miles through military channels from Vienna to Lintz by way of Sulzburg. Unemployed officers must check. No sound currency has been established by allied military authorities in the year and a half of our occupation. The Army does not want that job and cannot fill it. Only the conquered nations can bring about their own recovery from within. This bill thwarts and interferes with their recovery efforts. This bill fosters and establishes a new controversial instrumentality with which they have to contend.

Obviously, the bill stirs up political and social controversy in areas first needing recovery. Not all peoples want our political and social system. Our attempts to invade this sovereign privacy will have adverse repercussions upon us. Many of these peoples think that we want to swing our weight around like a sailor on shore leave.

Under our social system, industry seeks its own markets and brings to foreigners the benefits of our skills and abilities when and where foreigners want it. To hold out an empty picture as provided in this bill thwarts the very objective of the measure.

England and Russia may continue to propagandize as this measure provides, but neither of them, at the moment, seems to be maintaining successfully their own houses in order. Many a GI and discharged Government worker here

would like to get for study $10 a day—as this bill provides we shall pay foreign students. A good many GI's would work without study for $300 a month.

These foreigners want work and not propaganda. A writer in Birmingham, England, reports in the New York Times, on March 15, 1947:

With reference to productive efficiency, in 1936 outputs of coal per man-shift were:

	Hundredweight
Germany	33
Poland	40
Holland	35
United States of America	100
United Kingdom	23

And the writer concludes:

If the miner attended his work with the same regularity as in 1939 and exerted the same physical effort while at work, the national (United Kingdom) output of coal would be increased by no less than 50,000,000 tons per annum.

Loss of coal exports represents the value of our (United Kingdom) imports; steel production is also curtailed; chemical exports are affected to the extent of £2,500,000 per annum due to shortage of coal supplies.

Culture and information—my eye.

Now, the gentleman from Oklahoma a few minutes ago said that we should stop discussing this bill now and wait a year or two until we see how General Marshall cleans up the State Department, and then if you bring this bill up we might try to have the Voice of America go to all the countries of the world and tell them what America means. I agree with that statement. But, under the turmoil that exists in the world today, gentlemen, I do not believe you can do a thing. Then again, you are going to ask from thirty to eighty million of good, hard, American taxpayers' money to be spent on this propaganda? I would not waste my taxpayer's money in this manner. It seems to me that if General Marshall had $1,000,000—not $80,000,000—$1,000,000 and employed 8 or 10 good, high-calibered men, and let them go out and broadcast some things about America and do something that would tell the foreign nations just what we are trying to do, it would not be so bad, but these foreign countries think today that all we can do is to buy. Buy all countries of the world—a poor way to gain friends. We ought to be ashamed of ourselves for trying to buy our neighbors. It will never work. We ought to be ashamed of the things we are doing by going out and visiting these countries and then offering them everything they want in gifts—one hundred million, three hundred million, forty-three hundred million—where will you get this money? In the last 10 years we have been going to these foreign nations, and every time they ask for $50,000,000, $100,000,000 or three or four hundred million, we have a lot of fellows here in this country that say, "Pass out the money." Uncle Sam has lots of it. And they come to us for these gifts and get them. We are only suckers.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. Does not the gentleman feel that instead of spending $30,000,000 in this way, that if we want to help Europe we should provide them with tractors and harvesters and other machinery, since we are called upon to feed the world, to make them self-sufficient and feed themselves? Would not those harvesters and tractors be far more of value to all of us and to them than some books and radio broadcasts?

Mr. RICH. I tell you that if a man is hungry and he gets a loaf of bread, it is worth a whole lot more to his system than to feed him a lot of hot air. Bread will take care of the inward man and prevent starvation and gain a friend. Words are many times dangerous and many times do more harm than good; words many times are more dangerous than one realizes. So, Mr. Speaker, until we get our country settled and happy within our own midst, let us not assume the responsibility of trying to change the manners, customs, traditions, of all the nations of Europe, Asia, and Africa. We might loose more friends than we can make.

The Clerk read as follows:

ENGLISH-LANGUAGE TEACHING

SEC. 204. The Secretary is authorized to provide for the development and demonstration of better methods for teaching the English language abroad.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to approach this from a little different angle this time. There has been much said here about the question of education, the exchange of students, and the exchange of professors. I have had quite a long acquaintance with the educational systems of this country and the type of boys and girls they are turning out. I can remember the day when the professors who taught government in our great colleges specialized in emphasizing the beautiful philosophy behind our government and our system of government. They were familiar with it. I want to give you an example of the reaction that that type of teaching had upon our boys.

I knew a splendid fellow. He was an unusual athlete, very popular, a red-blooded fellow. He graduated with honors in the natural course of events. He entered the employment of a large corporation in Canada. He was killed in the service. His people were very poor. He had been sending what he earned down to his poor people. He had worked his way through the university. As soon as his death was announced, his fraternity brothers went up there to see if he left anything that they could take to his old people down in Pennsylvania. They searched, and there was nothing in his little hall bedroom except one priceless document, written in his own handwriting, entitled "My Guide." I read it to you:

To respect my country, my profession and myself. To be honest and fair with my fellow men as I expect them to be honest and square with me. To be a loyal citizen of the United States of America. To speak of it with praise and to act always as a trustworthy custodian of its good name. To be a man whose name carries weight with it wherever it goes. To remember that success lies within myself, in my own brain, my own ambition, my own courage and determination. To expect difficulties and to force my way through them; to turn hard experience into capital for future struggles. To steer clear of dissipation and guard my health of body and peace of mind as a most precious stock in trade. Finally, to take a good trip on the joys of life, to play the game like a man; to fight against nothing so hard as my own weakness and to grow in strength a gentleman, a Christian.

He was not taught by an exchange professor unfamiliar with the fundamentals of our Government, he was taught by the good old solid rock of Americanism, the type of man who is turning out just that type of boy. The professor that comes in from abroad is not grounded in the philosophy of our Government as our men here are, reared and taught and trained as teachers should be in this country. There has been too much loose teaching of the subject of government. There is one thing that alarms me very much about this whole proposal here, and that is, in regard to what we are going to sell abroad. I was perfectly astounded, and I am not criticizing Representative MUNDT personally, but I was perfectly astounded, as I think every Member who was on the floor must have been when these terrible exhibits were presented here which we were told by the chairman of the subcommittee that we were going to sell the bad features as well as the good features of the United States. I am sure that such a philosophy did not come from the chairman of the subcommittee; that came from somebody in the State Department. Exhibits to prove what they intended to do if the bill should become law.

Would it not be a wonderful thing to hear somebody bellowing over the radio, and we will have no control of it after this becomes law, "My comrades abroad: I want to tell you about our judicial system in the United States. I want to tell you about our courts, where the humblest person can get justice.

"But, of course, even though the humblest person can get justice, we also have another system. We have a system where in certain sections of the country if they want to do justice and mercy to a man they suspect of having committed the crime, they hang him or lynch him. We just use a rope. You use a firing squad, but we just use a rope and hang the man from the limb of a tree."

That is the sort of thing that goes out. There is the good and there is the bad. Then the next night:

"Fellow comrades of the world: The Voice of America is speaking to you. I want to tell you about the wonderful purity of our election system. That is why we are urging it upon you people abroad. That is why we send inspectors over there to see that you get a fair deal and that there is no bribery, fraud, or coercion in your elections. But we have another side to the story. We have the Pendergast system. We have a system which we find out in one of our great Western States, especially in the city of Kansas City, in Missouri. Anybody who wants to listen to us, that is our other system. We protect the people who vote.

We put the ballots after the people have voted in a sealed receptacle of solid steel and lock the box. So, if there is any irregularity which comes up later, the officials can then examine the ballots.

"But we want to tell you something that happened in America. Two thugs, after a number of men had been indicted for fraud in the elections, thinking that the box contained lollipops pried the box open and destroyed the evidence so that the men could not be convicted."

And so the bad and the good Voice of America will continue day after day and night after night.

Gentlemen, there is not a system of salesmanship in the world that can sell the good article by stressing the bad features of it.

The greatest sales manager in the United States prior to his retirement was William Holler, affectionately known as Bill Holler. Do you imagine he or his salesmen or dealers stressed the bad features of the Chevrolet cars and trucks? Look at his record of sales based not on the bad qualities of the Chevrolet cars, but their good qualities.

Bill Holler has been responsible for Chevrolet leadership in sales in 9 out of the last 10 car-production years.

In peacetime his vast and closely knit retail organization sells over $1,500,000,000 worth of merchandise a year.

In the 12 years of his administration he has been head of a sales and service organization employing over 90,000 people.

In these years his sales strategy has sold more than 22,000,000 automobiles—7,500,000 new cars and trucks and 14,500,000 used vehicles. This is the equivalent of almost four-fifths of all cars and trucks on the road at the present time.

He is credited with selling 50 percent of all cars and trucks produced by Chevrolet since it first began business in 1912.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, whether we like it or not, psychological programs as a part of our foreign and national policy in peace and in war are here to stay. If you have any doubt on that subject, consult the General Staff of the War Department. If you have any doubt on that subject, ascertain the extent of the operations of the Psychological Warfare Branch in World War II.

The man who recognized and identified psychological aggression at the San Francisco Conference more than any other man in the world was Herbert Hoover. He sought to have written into the Charter some provisions on that subject, but he failed to succeed. We have a responsibility to roll back not only the falsehoods and misleading things about this Nation that get abroad in the world, but to develop some good will by the interchange of students, the interchange of information, the interchange of books, and all that sort of thing.

I intend to vote for a program. I saw its effect in 1945. I came back from overseas the day that the Committee on Appropriations was marking up the war agencies bill. The committee at the time was considering the appropriation for the Office of War Information. They asked for $35,000,000. I suggested that we give it to them, notwithstanding the fact that there was much criticism of Elmer Davis, who was then director of the OWI. I was not too familiar with what was being done on the domestic front, but I did know what my senses perceived when I was abroad and I saw the excellent character of work being done and how effective it was.

This proposed cultural and informational policy, then, is in the nature of an extension of a function that began in wartime.

I share some of the apprehensions of a good many Members of the House of Representatives as to the type of personnel that will be devoted to this work. I am confident that General Marshall if given the time will take care of that. The FBI is investigating every person in the State Department right now. If you have any doubt about General Marshall, let me give you one footnote to history. Perhaps I should not disclose it, but yet I think it is interesting.

I recall the day when the Committee on Appropriations met in secret session with the General Staff in the War Department, and I remember the day in response to a question by our colleague, the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. EWING THOMASON], that General Marshall, at a time when there was so much anxiety and concern in the country, said, "If the Japanese should elect to take Alaska at this particular period, it may be necessary for us to let them have it. Just now, first things must come first."

Here is the man upon whom we pinned our every hope when the Nation was in jeopardy. Is it fair now to come into this well and to assail his patriotism and make it appear that, wittingly or unwittingly, this great patriot, upon whose shoulders we reposed the very welfare and perpetuity of this Republic, should now have such a change of heart that he would sell it down the river? Oh, for shame!

Now, of course, people get into the State Department whose loyalty is in question. Of course there is some doubt, ofttimes, about the nature of the program. I share something of that apprehension. That is why, at the proper time, I propose to offer an amendment. I hope and I believe that the committee will probably take it, because I have been discussing it with them. It proposes the creation of a 10-man commission, including the Secretary of State. It will be a bipartisan commission. It must be confirmed by the Senate. Let me say to my colleagues on this side of the aisle that since we have a majority in the Senate, if we cannot get good circumspect, competent people on that commission, it will be our fault in a Republican Senate. Among those men there must be one who has served in World War II. There must be one who has had motion picture experience. There must be one from the newspaper industry. There must be one from the radio industry. There must be a labor representative. There must be three who represent business. It would be a bipartisan commission. In the very first section of this amendment it provides that they shall formulate the policies to be followed and adhered to in connection with the exchange of persons, knowledge, skills, and the assignment of specialists to carry out all the other provisions of this act.

I want to vote for this bill, and if we have a commission of that kind that will formulate the policies that must be adhered to, then the only responsibility that the State Department has is to serve as an operating and administering agency, and to take the policies that have been formulated by the commission appointed by the President and confirmed by the United States Senate, and surely we should be able to have some confidence in the capacity of a commission of that kind.

At the proper time I shall offer that amendment and I trust it will commend itself to your good graces.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this is the second time I have risen to address this Congress. I have a deep conviction that this Congress today is discussing a bill which goes much further than the question of the Voice of America. As this debate progresses the provisions of the pending bill unfold in their true light. The body of the bill is broad and comprehensive. The caption of the pending bill certainly gives no indication of the many provisions contained in the body of the proposed legislation. The Voice of America is not represented in the present bill under consideration since that could be done only by the voice of 140,000,000 American people. I am disturbed that we should be called upon to enact into law the present legislation in view of the critical world situation.

Now that time has passed we are beginning to see the operation of the recent Greek-Turkey gift. A tricky clause was hidden in that legislation which gives the State Department together with the President the right to freeze materials, and to take any materials from the veterans of this country or from the farmers or any other group of the American population, any material deemed necessary for the completion of the Greek-Turkey gift. Our people are already beginning to suffer from the effects of the heavy drain upon the supplies and resources of this country.

What is there in this bill? In the first place, it is a blank check. There is no limitation upon the amount of money that this program could cost. Legislation so broad may lead to waste and wholesale spending of the taxpayers money. It provides for the establishment and maintenance of schools across the seas, and for the staffing of these schools. It provides for the erection of installations and for the establishing of such institutions and facilities as are necessary to carry out the far-flung provisions of the pending bill. Technicians, engineers, and all other necessary personnel may visit foreign lands and engage in the construction of public works under the provisions of the pending bill. These agents may enter into contracts with foreign governments for a period of

10 years. These contracts may deal with leasing of real property both within and without the continental limits of the United States. It is difficult to conceive of a situation that would grant such unlimited power and authority. Possibly in the consideration of this measure we have overlooked many tricky provisions that are contained in the 21-page bill. There is a provision to establish and maintain in the United States reception centers for foreign students and for visitors. All of these provisions will be paid for by American tax dollars. The Government of the United States does not provide entertainment at the expense of the taxpayers for the college students in our own country. These students, teachers, trainees, and professors who are authorized to come to this country are to be entertained and their expenses paid for by the American taxpayers. The pending bill provides that the above students and experts coming into our country shall have their transportation expenses, and not to exceed $10 per diem subsistence and other expenses paid. This is shocking to the good judgment of our people. The $10 per diem is far in excess of what we pay our own Government employees in our own country.

The above provisions are alarming when reports indicate that there are already as many as 17,000 foreign students studying here in America in our colleges and universities. Many young men who wore the American uniform with honor in the defense of this Republic cannot enroll in college or university because of overcrowded conditions. Experience has taught us that before World War II Hitler sent students and professors into other countries and thereby gained information and prepared the way for a later invasion. Under this bill we throw open the gates for thousands to come to our shores upon the representation that they are students. This Government has voted billions of dollars to prevent the spread of communism throughout the world and my prediction is we will be called upon to vote more money for that purpose. I cannot see how we are now justified in supporting the pending bill which has no limitation upon the number, nationality, or section of the world from which these students and Communist agents, slick-tongued, and smooth commentators may come to this land for no other purpose than to propagandize and attempt to change the minds of American youth. Experience has taught us that under our present deportation laws it is almost impossible to deport individuals when they once come to this country. For that reason, I am of the opinion that we should move slowly and proceed with caution. By this legislation we are moving out into a broad and uncharted sea. This bill covers practically every conceivable subject except the Voice of America.

I could never face the people of my congressional district or the people of America and explain to the good women of this country why I would vote for a bill to furnish liquor paid for by American taxpayers to support and entertain delegations and student groups from other countries who would be permitted to come to America under this bill. Under the very provisions of the pending bill the Secretary of State is authorized to delegate to other officers of the Government the power and authority to maintain and carry out the program undertaken by this act. The above provision means that the Secretary of State would have little or no supervision over the administration of this program. I shall vote against this pending bill for the reasons heretofore stated because I do not believe that it is in the interest of America. If a proper bill providing for a clearly defined and regulated American radio program should be brought before this Congress based upon the spreading of the truth about America I should be delighted to support the same. I feel that many Members of Congress share the same view.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEEFE: Page 4, line 23, strike out all of line 23 and all of section 204.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield that I may submit a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments conclude in 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object——

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my request.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I have been privileged to hear every word of debate on this pending bill and I have not heretofore taken any time to discuss it. Like most of those to whom I am privileged to speak this afternoon I should like to vote for a bill that would carry out the spirit and purpose of the Voice of America as that voice has been described to the people of America by its proponents. Therefore, along with other Members of Congress I expect to offer a number of amendments to this pending bill that will attempt as best we can on the floor of Congress, to improve this legislation so that it may at least try to carry out the purpose that its authors have told the people in America is intended.

Mr. Chairman, I have offered a simple amendment to strike out section 204. Section 204 says the Secretary is authorized to provide for the development and demonstration of better methods of teaching the English language abroad. We have an Office of Education in America. The Commissioner of Education, Mr. Studebaker, and his representatives have been abroad trying to develop a plan of education. I happen to be chairman of the Subcommittee of Appropriations that handles the appropriation for the Office of Education. Is there any reason in God's world why in this legislation we should set up the broad power in the office of the Secretary of State to develop and demonstrate better methods of teaching English abroad? If they had in here the development of better methods of teaching and demonstrating English in America I, perhaps, would be for it. But why we are turning that job over to the State Department is beyond me.

The authors of this bill will say: "Oh, well, the State Department has the power to utilize the services under this bill of any other agency of Government." Well, they have that power if they so see fit to use it, but so far as I am concerned I want any power in the field of education to remain with the Office of Education. I may say to my distinguished friend, the author of this bill, that I cannot support it unless the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois, this amendment and a number of other amendments to strike out large and sundry portions of this bill, are agreed to. I am certain that a majority of the membership of this House will not support this bill in its present form.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Upon assurance that the Office of Education has the authority to make these English demonstrations abroad, we have no objection to striking out this section.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. Would the gentleman from South Dakota object to widening this so as to teach English to some of these economists down here in the departments who have come here during the last 10 years?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, we should confine ourselves as much as possible to this bill and discuss it section by section and if it is not possible to improve the bill, and if we cannot, then we should vote to send this bill back to the committee. Let us have it rewritten and have that committee bring back a bill here that will carry out the spirit and purpose of what we have in mind. That is the only fair, decent thing to do and the only way we can be fair to the people of America. We should discuss this bill section by section and let the people of America and let the Members of this Congress know what is in the bill. There are a lot of people who do not even know what is in this bill and will not when we get through. If we discuss it section by section, perhaps we can write a pretty good bill right here on the floor of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. BANTA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BANTA. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. I would like to ask the gentleman this question: If the committee has had this bill under consideration for 2 years, and have been unable to improve it, how in the name of goodness are we going to write it on the floor of the House in a matter of 2 or 3 days? We will, in all probability, get it more confused than it now is, if that be possible.

Mr. BANTA. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is right. It appears as the debate upon this bill proceeds that the large number of men who have spoken in opposition to it would have no objection to taking a bill which would provide for a sane and sensible Voice of America. I should not oppose such a bill if someone could devise it, but even so, I doubt very much if even a gentleman with the eloquence of our distinguished colleague from Illinois, Mr. EVERETT DIRKSEN, who is one of the most persuasive debaters who speaks to this House, could win an argument with Soviet Russia in a radio broadcasting program of any length whatsoever. There are not enough radios in Russia to begin with, and, moreover, the convictions which he has with respect to America and the convictions which Soviet Russia has with respect to America are so divergent that it would be the voices of two nations wasted upon thin air, and the money which sponsored them would be wasted. We should not waste any of our money. Is it not rather paradoxical that this Nation has spent more than $12,000,000,000 of its money in Europe since VJ-day and that now there are those who advocate to the American people and to this Congress that we must hereafter spend $31,000,000 more annually for the State Department to tell them that we have spent that amount of money and what we have spent it for? Is it not paradoxical that this Congress provided $750,000,000 to feed the needy people of Greece, and incidentally to help sustain an army in Turkey, and then consider spending $31,000,000 more or some other sum to tell those people to whom we are sending that money that it is our Government and our money that is providing the relief? What kind of thing are we undertaking to put over on the American people?

Only yesterday or the day before I noted in a local newspaper the results of the Gallup poll on the Voice of America. The uninitiated and the innocent and those who know nothing about the provisions of this bill believe that this covers it. Here is what it says:

> Sentiment found about 50–50 on United States broadcasts to Russia.

Is there anything in this bill that would limit broadcasts to Russia? They polled the American people, and this is the question that was asked:

> Do you think our Government should spend money for radio broadcasts to the Russian people—giving them an honest picture of America and of our Government's policies?

Few people, at first blush, find any fault with that if they feel we can spare the money, but this bill goes far beyond that. It provides for many other things. No sponsor of the bill has ever explained to my satisfaction what the true purposes of it are. They seem to me to be anything approved by the Secretary of State.

Under the terms, Congress is being asked to give this same State Department, not only authority to broadcast its programs, but to grant to the Secretary of State the authority to bring persons from other countries, including students and professors, to the United States, and to send our citizens abroad, without limit as to number, all expenses to be paid by our Government.

It authorizes the exchange of literature and translations with other countries, without limit, and at our expense.

It authorizes the Secretary of State to provide assistance to schools, libraries, and community centers abroad, without limit, and at our expense.

It authorizes him to develop and demonstrate better methods for teaching the English language abroad and at our expense.

If any other country should want any of our citizens who are trained in scientific, technical, or professional fields, whether or not these persons are employed by our own Government, the Secretary is authorized to assign them for duty in the country requesting their services—and at our expense. The only restriction is that they cannot help any foreign country train or equip its armed forces.

The bill goes so far as to permit any person assigned to a foreign country to accept an office in that country's government, to perform official functions, and in all respects to become an officer of such foreign government—but, again, all at the expense of the United States.

That is not all. The Secretary of State is authorized, by the terms of the bill, to draw upon all other departments and agencies of our Government for personnel, technicians, and others, and to use the services and facilities of any other Government agency to carry out this super good-will program. With the agency's consent, these people can be sent abroad, or used as escorts for groups of persons from other countries to be brought here to travel throughout the United States. Our Government will pay all traveling expenses of the foreign visitors, plus the salaries and the expenses of the escorts.

What a haven this bill would provide for all the Government employees forced out as we abandon the New Deal and wartime bureaus.

The bill even authorizes the Secretary of State "to provide for and pay the expenses of attendance at meetings or conventions of societies and associations concerned with furthering the purposes of this act." There is no limit as to the number of persons who might attend, no limit on the number of conventions, and they may be held any place in the world. There are a great many societies in this country, and not all of them wholly friendly to democratic processes, who not only would happily accept this opportunity to meet at Government expense, but who would put pressure on the Department to finance their conventions in foreign countries.

And even this is not all. The bill gives the Secretary and all personnel who are to be engaged in this strange pursuit of selling America to the world, the authority to furnish "official entertainment necessary for the purposes of the act."

I wonder how many American people have any idea of what this bill the State Department is asking actually provides. The press refers to it as the Voice of America program. A Nation-wide poll conducted by the American Institute of Public Opinion asked the people this question: "Do you think our Government should spend money for radio broadcasts to the Russian people, giving them an honest picture of America and of our Government's policies?" I wonder if Mr. George Gallup, who conducted the poll, or any of his associates, ever read this so-called Voice of America bill.

Only 1 page and 3 lines of the 21-page bill deal with the broadcasting of radio programs to other countries. There are 20 pages of provisions, such as I have mentioned, yet its sponsors refer to it as authorizing the Voice of America.

It is far more than that. One Congressman remarked in debate on the House floor, "This bill is the largest, most far-reaching blank check for power and money that has ever been before this House."

I cannot approve the spending of unlimited amounts for a program as broad, as vague, and impractical as the one suggested by the State Department.

They ask that we pay for people from other countries to travel in the United States. These sightseeing jaunts around our scenic country at the Government's expense might be very pleasant, but I think you agree that this pleasure hardly is justified at the expense of our already overburdened taxpayers.

And we are to pay for official entertainment—another very elastic phrase. Does it mean we pay for champagne—or vodka if the representatives of the program ever get inside Russia? Or if they visited the Missouri Ozarks, maybe the official entertainment would include sampling some of our corn liquor. In view of the stories that come back from international meetings and diplomatic functions, we would be naive to expect that the unlimited funds requested for official entertainment are not intended to provide an ample supply of spirits.

Just how much this whole idealistic scheme eventually would cost the Government is not mentioned in the bill. But the bill merely authorizes appropriations to carry out its purposes. If the $31,000,000 estimated to be required annually proves to be inadequate, then you can rest assured Congress will be expected to agree to the spending of untold millions more.

Since VJ-day, the United States has spent more than $12,000,000,000 for relief in Europe alone. Is there any logic in a policy that says we will give the needy countries of the world the food, clothes, and equipment that they need so desperately, and then spend millions more to tell them who provided the relief? Must we pay the salaries of countless administrators of our $750,000,000 program of aid to Greece and Turkey, and then spend millions more to inform the people of those countries what those administrators are doing and whom they represent?

We are the only country in the world that is giving away anything. If these gifts do not sound a louder Voice of America than endless radio broadcasts, then we would better spend the extra money properly training the personnel of the Foreign Service and the administrators of our relief programs.

America needs no selling program. Millions would like to enter our country now if our immigration laws did not keep them out. It is known all over the world as the land of freedom and opportunity.

I feel, as I know other Americans do, deep injustice, if the very countries to which we are handing money and food and clothing are being flooded with information that attempts to discredit our country. But opening our own floodgates of propaganda will not stop this. No sensible citizen in this country today believes that we can engage to our advantage in a short-wave debate with Russia, or that anything we say over the radio will have any effect on the Russian program of aggression.

In fact there is no proof that the Voice of America broadcasts reach any significant number of listeners in Europe. Eighteen countries send radio broadcasts our way, with a total of about 37 program hours daily. Yet how many of these programs have you heard? If they have any effect on the opinions of the average American, I have yet to discover it. There is far less chance that our programs are heard by a worth-while number of people in foreign countries.

By their votes in the last election, the American people indicated they want to curb our Nation's reckless spending, and to limit the power of bureaucracy. They said then that they are not in favor of blank checks and unlimited power to any department of government.

I hope the true voice of America will be heard again, and in the Congress, before this bill becomes a law.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, an influential member of this body remarked to me just a moment ago, "Don't you think we are losing ground today? Don't you see that the committee is willing and ready to accept every amendment that is offered? They are willing to take anything that is offered. Any amendment that comes along, like the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin, will be accepted. So will Mr. DIRKSEN'S amendment. They will accept every amendment, just so they can pass the old Bloom bill, renamed the Mundt bill." They did not fare so well 2 years ago with the Republican side.

Mr. VORYS. The bill passed by a two-thirds majority.

Mr. BENDER. Today the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] referred to General Marshall in glowing terms, and I share his views of General Marshall. However, General Marshall is not infallible. General Marshall has made some mistakes, some very glaring mistakes. Any man in his position would make mistakes. He is not before us. He is not part of this bill.

Another gentleman's name was brought into the discussion, Herbert Hoover. I have observed in recent months that Herbert Hoover is in good standing again, even among Democratic Members of this House. Lauding Herbert Hoover was not so popular 3, 4, 6, or 8 years ago, but now they are paying great and glowing tributes to him. However, Herbert Hoover has not said anything about this bill. As a matter of fact, I think he is most apprehensive about the whole business, if the truth were to be known.

The gentleman who just preceded me referred to $12,000,000,000 having been spent in Europe since VJ-day. I am appealing to your common sense. If $12,000,000,000 would not change Europe's attitude what in the world will $31,000,000 do? As a Republican I was elected on an economy program, and as a member of the Committee on Public Works I know that our committee has frowned on all public works because of economy.

As I see it, all we are doing with this $31,000,000 is throwing it down a rat hole. No good will come from it. Sure, some boondoggling in Europe will be carried on. Of course, we will have radio broadcasts and publications, but who will read them and who will listen to them? If $12,000,000,000 spent in Europe since VJ-day will not change the hearts of these people as far as the United States of America is concerned, what will $31,000,000 do? As the gentleman from Oklahoma pointed out, 3,000,000 men went overseas, and billions of dollars were spent—$400,000,000,000—to sell America, to sell the heart of America. If that has not sold America, what great miracles will be wrought with this $31,000,000 boondoggle?

The world will think well of us or ill of us, depending entirely upon one thing—what we do. Perhaps sometimes we should remember the Scripture—"By their fruits ye shall know them."

By our actions we will be known—by what we do, not by what we say; not by what some radio commentator or jazz band or comedian or entertainer or some State Department bureaucrat may say. Not what we say, but what we do—this is what will gain us friendship.

Throughout modern history, tides of immigration have brought new life, new skills, and new people to build our Nation into its present greatness. For more than a hundred years liberty-loving peoples everywhere in the world have looked to the United States. More than this, whenever distress has occurred and disasters have occurred anywhere in the world, the record of the United States for generous aid has been without parallel. The plain people everywhere in the world have confidence in the American form of government, and expect us now in the present world crisis to behave in a democratic manner.

What we need is not a State Department broadcast program but a basic change in our whole foreign policy from one of military aggrandizement and military alliances and maintenance of enormous military forces. We need, Mr. Chairman, to retrace the steps which the Truman administration has taken us on the road to war. We need to come before the United Nations and present to them the problems confronting us in the building of peace. We need to advise with and work with all other nations in the world through the organization which can be the organized conscience of mankind; namely, the United Nations. And in that great forum, we need to give leadership. It is not pretty to hear General Marshall or President Truman talk and talk and talk about peace, and then send our bombers and our warships all over the world, or to hear them talk of peace and in the same breath demand universal military training and a thousand and one other wasteful military projects.

What we should do is come before the United Nations day after day after day with constructive, positive, affirmative proposals to assist in the reconstruction of the broken economies of the world and with proposals to maintain genuine democratic governments throughout the world.

The world hears us when we speak before the United Nations. The world hears us and sees what we do. Thirty millions of dollars wasted on poppycock will never hide the constant threats of war which pour from our present administration, nor will $30,000,000 in jazz records hide the fact that military adventure and military alliances are the basic theme of the present administration's foreign policy.

The substance of our foreign policy is what we need to change, Mr. Chairman. By our deeds we shall be known.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the $30,000,000 requested by the Voice of America is made in a spirit of fear. Some bright young man in the State Department bureaucracy believes that radio records and speeches can hide the substance of our present military foreign policy. Such a hope is sheer folly. Abraham Lincoln once said:

> You can fool all of the people some of the time and some of the people all of the time, but you cannot fool all of the people all of the time.

Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, our State Department should ponder those words. Thirty millions of dollars, three hundred millions of dollars, three billions of dollars spent on popaganda will not hide the fact from the people of America or from the people of the world that the present administration has launched this Nation on the path of war and on the path of unilateral military alliances with corrupt and reactionary governments everywhere on the globe.

This is the substance of the Truman foreign policy.

The blunt fact is, Mr. Chairman, that if we appropriate this $30,000,000, we will have become an accessory to the foreign policy of the Truman administration which the people of this country are going to turn out of office in 1948. If we vote for this $30,000,000, we will be voting for an endless number of similar projects all of which will be a complete waste of the taxpayers' money. The Congress of the United States as an equal branch of the United States Government has the power and responsibility to say "No" when the evidence is overwhelmingly against proposals of the executive department. This demand for $30,000,000 exhibits once again the utter disregard for the interests of the American taxpayer which the administration daily exhibits.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BREHM moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, the motion speaks for itself. Let us decide whether we are going to take this or leave it. Let us not waste any more time on it. Let us make up our minds on it now. If this committee in two years time could not decide whether they had a good bill or not and are now accepting almost every amendment that is offered to it, then I question what possible chance there is for us to decide here on the floor of the House such an important issue. Let us send this bill back to the Foreign Affairs Committee. I believe the committee can write a bill now that they know the views of Congress, but surely this bill, as presented, is a monstrosity. I sincerely trust that we may be able to amend it so that I can support it, but in my opinion the committee should have done this before reporting it to the floor of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, that is all I have to say.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion.

I shall take no more time in asking you to reject the motion than was taken in asking you to accept it.

This is the third time that this sort of dilatory tactic has been engaged in. The committee has demonstrated by our actions our determination to do what we said at the beginning of the debate and to work with you to make this bill as effective as possible. This is not perfect legislation; no legislation really ever gets that good. We have worked on it a long time and any suggestions that you can make will gladly be considered in the light of our extensive study of the problems with which this legislation deals.

Some amendments have been rejected and some have been accepted. Many have been discussed with the subcommittee in advance. That is the constructive, American, congressional procedure. Neither our committee nor the Congress is infallible but our joint efforts usually produce legislation which is practical and sound.

It is a strange behavior, however, to try to condemn a committee of the House because it is willing to consult with the membership of Congress in trying to do the best possible job in meeting a specific problem. It is even stranger behavior when such criticism comes from those who even more violently criticize committees which try to ram their legislation on through the House without amendments of any kind.

I do agree with the gentleman from Ohio, however. Let us discontinue talking about vague issues. Let us meet the problems by reading the bill section by section so we can move forward to the completion of this bill.

I ask you, please, to reject the preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREHM].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BREHM) there were—ayes, 55, noes, 95.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could not facilitate the procedure for all of us and not inconvenience anyone if I were to obtain unanimous consent to consider title III as read and that it and all other sections be open for amendment. Then, Members can offer amendments to specific sections, and each Member could talk on his own amendment and not run into the danger of any Member being prevented from speaking on any amendment that he wishes to speak on. I believe that would be a fair procedure.

I make that as a unanimous consent request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I object. I think this bill ought to be read word by word.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III—ASSIGNMENT OF SPECIALISTS

PERSONS TO BE ASSIGNED

SEC. 301. The Secretary is authorized, when the government of another country is desirous of obtaining the services of a person having special scientific or other technical or professional qualifications, from time to time to assign or authorze the assignment for service, to or in cooperation with such government, any person in the employ or service of the Government of the United States who has such qualifications, with the approval of the Government agency in which such person is employed or serving. Nothing in this act, however, shall authorize the assignment of officers or enlisted men of the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps for service relating to the organizations, training, operation, development, or combat equipment of the armed forces of a foreign government.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 5, line 15, strike out the words "or Marine Corps" and insert "Marine Corps, or Coast Guard."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we cannot agree on a limitation of the debate? I see two Members standing. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I modify my request and ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I shall probably not take 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, to put it mildly, I am of the opinion, with many Members, that this bill needs considerable overhauling. I have heard a lot of Members express themselves as to what was wrong with the bill, that this was wrong with it, that that was wrong with it, and suggesting amendments they thought might well be adopted. It reminds me of an experience I had as a boy on the farm. We had a neighbor who thought he was a great horse trader. One day he went out with a horse and brought back the most decrepit, sad-looking animal you ever saw, whereupon all the neighbors gathered around to advise him what should be done to make a horse out of this newly acquired creature. One said he should do this, someone else said, no, he should do that. Finally, an old fellow came along who really understood horses. They asked his opinion. He said: "My friend, there is only one thing that horse needs, and that is a darned good burial."

I would not go that far about this bill but I think recommital would help the situation a great deal. This bill to my mind violates many principles which I thought had been firmly established in the American thinking. First, is it not rather violative of our policy of economy in Government spending? When the depression was on and we did not know quite what to do to solve it we ran hither and yon and we spent money first on one patent medicine and then on another. We have now abandoned that policy, I trust, and have returned to sound principles of economy and government. I am glad to note that the Appropriations Committee of this House is doing its full duty, is doing a great service to the country, in scrutinizing every request for every dollar that is appropriated for domestic purposes. We have trimmed down everything including Agriculture, in which I have a great and peculiar interest. We make some savings there and yet when any untried scheme that has to do with our foreign relations is brought in here, in the name of unity we think we are called upon to furnish whatever money they need, and we have poured millions of dollars down the rat holes of Europe and Asia. I think the people are getting a little restive, and look to the Republican Party to do its full duty in this matter. Of course, unity is a good thing. Unity is a great thing in support of any policy if that policy happens to be right. But there is all this propaganda for unity. Does that excuse our party, does it excuse your party from exercising sound judgment in determining whether a policy is or is not right?

The next thing the bill does is to violate our well-established principle and views in regard to education. I have always opposed any Federal Government aid to schools and I have done that because I do not want under any circumstances the Federal Government dominating the schools of our country. Yet what do you do in this bill? I will call your attention to a few things.

On page 3 the Secretary may provide orientation courses and other appropri-

ate services, and so forth. You will find on going through the bill that so far as the exchange of these professors is concerned what we teach them and what they teach us will not be dominated by the superintendent of your schools, not by your school board, but by the Secretary of State, who, by any test, is not required to be an expert on education.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. I cannot yield right now. I make the statement that this proposal flies in the face of our well-established educational policy and I stand on that.

It also violates our well-established immigration policy. Some years ago we thought it was in the interest of our Nation to establish a quota system, and we did that. We have tried to live up to it. We have screened carefully individuals who come to this Nation. I think the statement made by the gentleman from West Virgina [Mr. ELLIS] is entirely correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BRADLEY: Page 5, lines 15 and 16, strike out line 15 and line 16 up to and including the word "corps" and substitute therefor the words "of such personnel."

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, it is my purpose today, as the gentleman from South Dakota has suggested, merely to pick out some of those parts of this bill with which I find myself in disagreement and to bring them to your attention. You will note that this section 301 is a very broad section. It provides for the detailing of personnel having special scientific or technical or professional qualifications. In that part where I have suggested the amendment it is stated, "Nothing in this act, however, shall authorize the assignment of officers or enlisted men of the United States Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard for service relating to the organization, training, operation, development, or combat equipment of the armed forces of a foreign government."

I realize that the personnel of the military forces in uniform is in a special category; yet it seems to me that this particular provision is merely a subterfuge as far as we are concerned. You are providing for specialists to go abroad. Those specialists may be Reserve officers of the Army, Navy, Coast Guard, or any other military branch of the Government. Mr. Chairman, I may say that we have plenty of Reserve officers who are just as good as the Regulars along these lines. Are we going to turn around and embark upon the project of helping various nations of the world organize and increase their defense equipment, or equipment for aggression, whatever you want to call it? Are we going to do like we did recently when we took a considerable number of Reserve aviators of the Army and put them on inactive duty and then sent them over to fight the Japs in China? It is exactly the same thing. I bring this to your attention because we have certain military missions to do just the things which might be done under the present language of this bill. I understand a bill is going to be brought in for more military missions. I think we should clarify this language.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Let me see if I understand the amendment. We retain the limitation but add language which is broad enough so that it includes the Reserve officers, or something of that type; is that the point?

Mr. BRADLEY. That is my specific point. However, there are many people who are civilians. Are we going to send our civilians abroad under governmental authority and at governmental expense, we will say, for the purpose of instructing foreign nations in matters of defense or offense, or are we going to leave that to our military or naval missions which have been duly authorized by Congress?

Mr. MUNDT. We most definitely are not under this bill. As the gentleman knows, before another committee of the House there is legislation on that point.

Mr. BRADLEY. Exactly.

Mr. MUNDT. That is, specifically, why we bar it here. Does the gentleman feel that his language will make that a stronger barrier?

Mr. BRADLEY. By all means. I thank the gentleman from South Dakota for his comments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to inflict myself on the committee for the full length of time. Had it not been for a statement made here on the floor this afternoon that with many Members of the House fear had reached the stage of absurdity, I would not take the floor now. I think it was the gentleman from Oklahoma, for whom I have a very high regard, who suggested that perhaps many of us are unduly apprehensive about the effect of this bill.

Let me call your attention to the fact that today the newspapers of this country are carrying the news that the Communists are offering $100,000 to have the trial of Mr. Eisler delayed until next October. That is No. 1.

Not long ago the President of the United States suggested that the infiltration of Communists in the departments of the Government was so serious that he thought $50,000,000 would be required to eradicate them from our Government. That is No. 2.

For the benefit of the many new Members on the floor, let me again repeat that while we were at war with Germany and Japan, we had people inside the departments of the Government here in Washington who were dangerous enough to enter into a conspiracy, those within with those from without, to steal some of the most important war, highly confidential, and top secret files affecting our national security out of the State Department, naval intelligence, and two or three other agencies of the Government. Where were they found? Two hundred and fifty miles away from Washington, in a pro-Communist magazine office in the city of New York. Let us beware and be careful what we do. There are some reasons why we should have fear of the further infiltration in our Government by people coming to our shores who seek to destroy this Government.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, they were not adequately punished either.

Mr. DONDERO. No. They were arrested by the FBI. We have great confidence in the ability of the FBI to round up these peope. They do not move against criminals until they have the evidence against them. After they were arrested, it is disappointing to know that the FBI in this case functioned only 33⅓ percent efficiently, because only two of them, who pleaded guilty and paid nominal fines suffered any punishment. The other four were dismissed without a trial. No criticism should attach to the FBI. Other influences, I believe, were brought to bear in these cases.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to say at this point that I agree with the gentleman that this is a matter of great importance that we are presenty considering. As suggested earlier in the debate, this is the third day it has been before the House for consideration. It is obvious to everyone that there are differences of opinion between individual Republicans and between individual Democrats as to what ought to be done.

The fact yet remains that the measure was reported from the Committee on Foreign Affairs without adverse voice, as I understand. It has been brought here for consideration. My view is that we should proceed with that consideration as we have been doing, considering each section or each title as we come to it. I certainly am not going to challenge the integrity or the sincerity of any Member who expresses his views in respect to this legislation. To my mind, each Member is being conscientious in what he says about it. However, I certainly am not going to admit the impotence of the House of Representatives, sitting in the Committee of the Whole, to consider a matter of this sort, as we consider many other matters of great importance. As we proceed amendments may be offered, debated, and voted upon. Then I suppose a motion to recomit will be offered, and then, if that motion is not adopted, a vote on final passage will be had. I trust that we can proceed with reasonable expedition.

Mr. DONDERO. I think if I had not gone to Europe 2 years ago and come in personal contact with the people of the Old World I might feel very much different toward this bill. But let me say again as I said the other day, you do not have to spend any money to sell the United States to the people of Europe, because in every country except one, and I repeat it, we were asked to do something

that they might come to the United States. They have heard about us, they know about our Government of freedom and justice. They do not have it over there.

Do you think the people of Russia are going to hear this broadcast, the Voice of America? Do not deceive ourselves. Over there the Government owns everything. The people can hear what the Government wants them to hear, and nothing more. They can read only what the Government wants them to read, and nothing more. They can see only what the Government wants them to see, and nothing more. When it comes to using the power of the Government they will print in a Russian newspaper only that which is critical of the United States, such as strikes and unemployment, and nothing else. They will show nothing in their theaters except films which show the United States at a disadvantage, like the Grapes of Wrath. Do you think they are going to accept a program such as this bill carries and let their people know about it? Even if they did, I understand there are only some 50,000 radio sets in all of Russia, in a population of more than 200,000,000 people.

I do not think you can amend this bill good enough so I can vote for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BRADLEY) there were—ayes 87, noes 24.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

STATUS AND ALLOWANCES

SEC. 302. Any person, while assigned for service to or in cooperation with another government under the authority of this act, shall be considered, for the purpose of preserving his rights, allowances, and privileges as such, an officer or employee of the Government of the United States and of the Government agency from which assigned and he shall continue to receive compensation from that agency. He may also receive, under such regulations as the President may prescribe, representation allowances similar to those allowed under section 901 (3) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 999). The authorization of such allowances and other benefits and the payment thereof out of any appropriations available therefor shall be considered as meeting all the requirements of section 1765 of the Revised Statutes.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, when the amendment offered by the gentleman from California was voted on, I had on the Clerk's desk an amendment to strike out the last three or four lines of that paragraph. Was that amendment out of order?

The CHAIRMAN. No. In answer to the inquiry of the gentleman, the Chair will state that the Chair has no information as to amendments on the Clerk's desk or what they contain. That information is brought to the attention of the House and the Chair when a Member sends up the amendment, rises and addresses the Chair stating that he offers an amendment. The gentleman from Michigan did not do that or at least the Chair did not hear him.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, the point is the Chair neither saw nor heard me, but I was on my feet seeking recognition when the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] said that the time had been fixed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair assumes that that is true.

The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES: On page 6, line 3, after the word "agency", strike out the remainder of section 302.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, section 302 reads as follows:

Any person, while assigned for service to or in cooperation with another government under the authority of this act, shall be considered, for the purpose of preserving his rights, allowances, and privileges as such, an officer or employee of the Government of the United States and of the Government agency from which assigned and he shall continue to receive compensation from that agency. He may also receive, under such regulations as the President may prescribe, representation allowances similar to those allowed under section 901 (3) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 999).

In other words, any person who is assigned for service may also have representation allowances similar to the allowances that have been allowed our representatives abroad.

About 2 weeks ago the House approved of a half million dollars for so-called representation allowances. I think it was generally understood on the floor of the House, and brought out in the hearings, that that fund or at least 75 percent of it goes for entertainment and to buy liquor and things of that kind, which are unnecessary and uncalled for.

This bill would spend $31,000,000 and then you also give these employees or representatives funds in addition to the $500,000 that you provided for the other representatives to buy liquor and such things.

The whole thing was a serious matter. We are going to have men and women representing this country who can handle this thing without having to go out and buy liquor and things of that kind to entertain these foreigners abroad. We are getting into the same old situation that we did in these other bills. I refer to a policy that in order to get along with foreigners abroad you have to buy liquor and have parties and give extravagant dinners and have all that sort of flurry and fuss. A certain amount of funds for food is all right, of course, but not just run it into the ground. There is no limitation here. Let us save a part of this money. Let us use a little common sense. Use a little sobriety and strike this out of the bill.

I trust you will go along with me and support this amendment. If you are serious about it, you will adopt this amendment. There is no good reason for granting this allowance in addition to their salaries, ranging as high as $16,000 to $18,000 per year. They are getting a liberal allowance of $10 a day, but on top of that, under this bill, they will get this further allowance for representation, as they call it, most of which is for liquor and things of that kind. We ought to be above that sort of thing, and not follow such procedure in order to try to get along with foreigners.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield.

Mr. MASON. In the other bill, it was limited to a specific amount, but this bill has no limit.

Mr. REES. That is right. The other bill was limited to half a million dollars. I think last year they spent over $600,000 for the same thing in Foreign Service. Here there is no limitation at all, except as may be approved by officers in the Department.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Committee will adopt my amendment.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be defeated because I believe it is important for the people whom we send overseas to have some representation allowance. In my own experience I know what it is like not to have such an allowance. I know how important it can be to be able to entertain and to be able to invite people to dinner and talk over matters of common interest. I think it is an important part of our entire representation overseas, whether it occurs in the diplomatic service, in the Army, or in the Navy. I suggest to you that we in this Congress have not been remiss in accepting entertainment from time to time when it has come our way. It seems to me that we should look upon this question with a great deal more sympathy than we do. It is not my idea that people should have unlimited funds to squander, but I simply say that other nations have these representation allowances and it puts the greatest Nation in the world in a rather peculiar position for its representatives to have no such allowance when the other nations have liberal allowances along this line. If this practice is abused, if these funds are squandered, then the personnel in question should be replaced.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. REES. Does the gentleman think just because foreign countries spend their money entertaining at liquor parties that we have to follow along their line?

Mr. LODGE. I did not say liquor parties.

Mr. REES. Does not the gentleman think that after all we can get along without that sort of thing?

Mr. LODGE. I know that I personally spent a great deal of my own money during the last war entertaining members of foreign navies overseas. I think it was a useful thing to do. I think such encouragement to friendly cooperation helped to win the war. They will aid in winning the peace.

Mr. REES. I regret that the gentleman finds it is necessary for the prosecu-

tion of the peace that we have to do this sort of thing.

Mr. LODGE. I do not say necessary. I say it is desirable for such American representatives to have an entertainment allowance for the prosecution of the peace. It responds to a factor in human nature. I imagine that most of the Members of this Congress have from time to time had occasion to appreciate the value of this sort of thing.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Is it not true that the Congress voted themselves $2,500 expense allowance and part of the argument given on the floor was the expense of entertaining constituents?

Mr. HOFFMAN. O Mr. Chairman, now will the gentleman yield? Was it to purchase liquor?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE] has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we can reach some agreement as to time on this amendment. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section, and all amendments thereto, close in 12 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to add some new testimony to corroborate what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] said a few minutes ago about whether or not these broadcasts would be heard in Russia.

Here is the report of an interview with one who recently escaped from behind the iron curtain. Cholly Knickerbocker in the New York Journal-American on June 10 reports it as follows:

A gaunt, gray-haired man, the terror of what he had left behind still in his eyes, sat across our desk. * * * He was a Catholic priest from Croatia, and a former professor of economics at one of the universities there. * * * The man had only escaped from Russian-dominated Europe only a few weeks before. * * *

Here is a condensation of what he told us: American radio broadcasts to Russia are absolutely worthless. There are only a few people in Russia—all top party members—who can receive an American broadcast. All other radio sets in Russia are fixed so they can only tune in Soviet stations.

That is the testimony of one who has been behind the iron curtain about broadcasts to Russia. Then here is a report by Karl Von Wiegand, American correspondent of the New York Journal-American in central Europe:

A well-known former Austrian diplomat telephoned me today that there is "great uneasiness in the American, British, and French zones of Austria. What good to us are the daily broadcasts to Austria Voice of America telling us of peace, prosperity, and freedom in your democracy? The Allies promised us peace, independence, and freedom. Two long years we have waited and we see no sign of your promises being made good. Our faith in the west is sinking fast."

That is a testimonial last week from Austria.

This bill reminds me of the time when a fish peddler came down the street with his little cart. He stopped at a house and the lady came out and took one of his fish out of the wagon to inspect it. Then she was afflicted with that indecision that sometimes characterizes feminine shoppers and she was unable to make up her mind. The peddler in exasperation shouted: "Lady, lady, if you don't like the fish, put him back in the wagon."

From all we have heard here about this proposal it seems we might better put it back in the wagon by sending it back to the committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. The gentleman referred a moment ago to a report sent back by Knickerbocker with regard to how many people in Russia heard this program. In the committee hearings I asked Gen. Bedell Smith specifically about that very matter.

I read from the hearings as follows:

Mr. MANSFIELD. You have answered part of my next question which is, are these radio sets geared to Russian stations only, or are they capable of picking up outside stations?

General SMITH. Most of them are sets capable of handling short wave. You see, the Soviet Union is a country of vast distances, and a great deal of broadcasting from Moscow is done by short wave. The majority of the ones that I have mentioned will handle short wave and receive our broadcasts without any difficulty.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is there any attempt being made to jam our broadcasts?

General SMITH. None whatsoever.

Mr. BUFFETT. You can interpret that testimony in several ways. Personally, I normally would prefer the testimony of one who has lived among the rank and file of the people over that from the embassies, where the thinking may be somewhat influenced by what the State Department desires.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

The gentleman from California [Mr. MCDONOUGH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I have tried to take a fair and impartial view of this whole situation throughout the days we have been debating the bill, a practical view as to what value it is to the United States, and the amount of money we shall be called upon to appropriate to meet the situation.

As I recall the $31,000,000 in the original budget request that was knocked out on a point of order did not include the broad aspects of the present bill that is before us at all; it was merely in there as the recommendation of the Secretary of State for broadcasting. As a result of its being knocked out a bill was presented to the Foreign Affairs Committee—and from what source I do not know; evidently the State Department had something to do with it—to broaden it so as to permit the bringing into this country of students for exchange for educational purposes and, as you all know, for many other purposes, including associations, agencies, and societies, and I quote from title 7:

TITLE VII—ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

THE SECRETARY

SEC. 701. In carrying out the purposes of this act, the Secretary is authorized, in addition to and not in limitation of the authority otherwise vested in him—

(1) In carrying out title II of this act, within the limitation of such appropriations as the Congress may provide, to make grants of money, services, or materials to State and local governmental institutions in the United States, to governmental institutions in other countries, and to individuals and public or private nonprofit organizations both in the United States and in other countries;

(2) to furnish, sell, or rent, by contract or otherwise, educational and information materials and equipment for dissemination to, or use by, peoples of foreign countries;

(3) in carrying out title V of this act, to purchase, rent, construct, improve, maintain, and operate facilities for radio transmission and reception, including the leasing of real property both within and without the continental limits of the United States for periods not to exceed 10 years, or for longer periods if provided for by the appropriation act;

(4) to furnish official entertainment when provided for by the appropriation act;

(5) to establish and maintain in the United States reception centers for foreign students and for visitors representative of the fields listed in section 201 above;

(6) to provide for printing and binding outside the continental limits of the United States, without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111);

(7) to employ, without regard to the civil-service and classification laws, when such employment is provided for by the appropriation act, (i) persons on a temporary basis, and (ii) aliens within the United States, but such employment of aliens shall be limited to services related to the translation or narration of colloquial speech in foreign languages when suitably qualified United States citizens are not available; and

(8) to create such advisory committees as the Secretary may decide to be of assistance in formulating his policies for carrying out the purposes of this act. No committee member shall be allowed any salary or other compensation for services; but he may be paid his actual transportation expenses, and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses, while away from his home in attendance upon meetings within the United States or in consultation with the Department under instructions.

GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

SEC. 702. In carrying on activities which further the purposes of this act, subject to approval of such activities by the Secretary, the Department and the other Government agencies are authorized—

(1) to place orders and make purchases and rentals of materials and equipment;

(2) to make contracts, including contracts with governmental agencies, foreign or domestic, including subdivisions thereof, and intergovernmental organizations of which the United States is a member, and, with respect to contracts entered into in foreign countries, without regard to section 3741 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 22);

(3) under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, to pay the transportation expenses, and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses, of citizens or subjects of other countries, without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and the Subsistence Act of 1926, as amended;

(4) under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, without regard to the

Standardized Government Travel Regulations and the Subsistence Act of 1926, as amended, to provide for planned travel itineraries within the United States by groups of citizens or subjects of other countries, to pay the expenses of such travel, and to detail, as escorts of such groups, officers and employees of the Government, whose expenses may be paid out of funds advanced or transferred by the Secretary for the general expenses of the itineraries;

(5) to make grants for, and to pay expenses incident to, training and study; and

(6) to provide for, and pay the expenses of, attendance at meetings or conventions of societies and associations concerned with furthering the purposes of this act when provided for by the appropriation act.

These are very broad powers.

Insofar as delivering the Voice of America to that part of Europe and Asia that will receive it, I have no objection, although even that has certain restrictions and inhibitions. I am not convinced that the Voice will be heard by the people we hope it will be heard by. What assurances do we have that the Voice of America going into the satellite countries of Russia will not be monitored by the Russian Government and rebroadcast to suit their own purpose? If it is received directly by any receiving set in that area, there can be contradictory statements made over their own broadcasting system to discount ours. That is the practical view I am taking of this thing. It may take several million dollars to do it.

The bill is too broad and I think not thought out sufficiently by the Foreign Affairs Committee to be passed in its present form. It should be recommitted. It should be brought down to the point where those of us who feel from a practical point of view we could support it if it were a broadcast proposition, rather than having it on the broader scale which includes the many other things it now contains. I am told that there are—and I note from press reports that there are—some 17,000 students in the United States from foreign sources at the present time. I am also told by a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee that this bill would regulate that situation to the point that perhaps there would be less than 17,000 students in this country under the bill. If they want to exchange students, then the Foreign Affairs Committee ought to be broad enough to realize that the restriction in the bill will cut down this number and there will be less benefit from the exchange of students from foreign countries if the bill is passed.

There is now a broad exchange. Another aspect of the bill is that we are endeavoring to have the people of Europe and Asia believe in freedom, liberty, and independence, which, incidentally, in my opinion, are virtues to be acquired, not to be sold. You cannot tell any country because they do not have independence that they ought to acquire it. They know that without being told. Freedom is something they have to work for. We do not have it to sell over the radio. These students who are here now on their own resources, in my opinion, are far more respectable in the fact they are here on their own, rather than if they were here through the benevolence of this country. The type of students you would get otherwise would be those that their government desired to be here, not those who desired on their own part to come here, as the 17,000 who are in this country at the present time. I do not object to broadcasting, as limited as it may be in reaching the sources we hope to reach, but I certainly believe that the bill in its broad aspects should be recommitted and revised by the Foreign Affairs Committee before being finally approved by the House.

We should be thinking and doing more for our veterans who are in educational institutions in this country, who need additional aid to carry on their studies and take care of their families. We have many obligations here at home to look after before we add more benefits to foreign countries, which have reached into billions of dollars.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] is recognized.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask a question of the Committee as to what it considers the representation allowance to be? Something was said about the salaries of individuals outside this country. I note in the State Department hearings, page 397, that the individuals under this program of the OIC draw the following salaries: At Moscow, $18,600; Paris, $17,360; London, $16,960; Rome, $16,000; Ankara, $15,200; Nanking, $15,060. I suppose that includes the representation allowance?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. May I say to the gentleman that those are figures which include your change in living costs because of the highly inflationary conditions overseas. In justice to our employees over there, as the gentleman knows, because he has traveled abroad, we provide these allowances. It really does not give a true picture as to your representation account, for it includes money with which to supply food to people, if you invite them to dinner to discuss a problem, the same as if you were a salesman for an American business concern. It is a legitimate, well-established practice. It certainly does not involve drinking bouts, or licentious parties of any kind. I can set the gentleman's mind at rest in that respect.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. On page 13, section 4, money is provided to furnish official entertainment. At the proper time I hope the gentleman will explain what official entertainment is.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes; for instance, a public dinner given in honor of a distinguished visiting guest would be official entertainment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MUNDT) there were—ayes 45, noes 59.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ACCEPTANCE OF OFFICE UNDER ANOTHER GOVERNMENT

SEC. 303. Any person while assigned for service to or in cooperation with another government under authority of this act may, at the discretion of his Government agency, with the concurrence of the Secretary, and without additional compensation therefor, accept an office under the government to which he is assigned, if the acceptance of such an office in the opinion of such agency is necessary to permit the effective performance of duties for which he is assigned, including the making or approving on behalf of such foreign government the disbursement of funds provided by such government or of receiving from such foreign government funds for deposit and disbursement on behalf of such government, in carrying our programs undertaken pursuant to this act.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN: Page 6, strike out section 303.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, it must be evident to the members of the committee that this bill as brought in by the committee does not meet with the approval, at least, of the majority Members though it has the support of our political opponents.

Now, undoubtedly the committee did its best. It brought in a bill which, at the time, it thought was the best bill that could be written. But someone put something over on the Republican members of that committee. Subsequently, and since the discussion and debate on the floor, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] in charge of this bill has suggested several times that he wanted this bill debated section by section and amendments offered, and we are pursuing that policy. In behalf of his committee he has accepted several amendments—evidently seeking support for the bill.

We all know the difficulty of writing a good bill on the floor. Where a bill is as bad as is this bill, it is almost impossible to correct its faults on the floor. It would seem to me that it would be for the benefit of the party, at least it would be party wisdom, for the majority members of the committee to withdraw this bill, ask to have it recommitted to the committee, and then call in, after reading the RECORD of the last 3 days' debate, those gentlemen who might wish to appear and offer amendments and rewrite the bill in committee. Let us wash our white linen, if you wish to call it that, the Republican linen, in committee, either through a conference of the Republican members of that committee or a conference of all the Republicans, and see where we stand. Many a vote on amendments has shown that the Republicans are not in favor of this bill. A small group of Republicans, backed by a united Democratic Party, are putting across a New Deal measure.

I recall distinctly the other day that an overwhelming majority of the Republicans wanted to strike the enacting clause of this bill. Of the Republicans 87 voted to kill the bill; 53 Republicans, with Democratic support, kept it alive. Why should we not now take the bill back to the committee and let the committee, as suggested, rewrite it?

Now, to go back a moment. The committee is headed by a distinguished former clergyman. But he either forgot to tell the committee or the committee disregarded the suggestion made long, long years ago that no man can serve two masters. If you will turn to page 5 you will find in section 302 that—

> Any person, while assigned for service to or in cooperation with another government under the authority of this act, shall be considered, for the purpose of preserving his rights, allowances, and privileges as such, an officer or employee of the Government of the United States.

So he has one master there in that section.

Then, over in this section where I seek to strike certain words, it provides that when he is so assigned his duties will include the making or approving on behalf of such foreign government of the disbursement of funds or receiving such funds from that government. He may become an officer of that government and may, at the discretion of his government agency, with the concurrence of the Secretary, accept an office under the government to which he is assigned.

How is a fellow going to serve two masters? How is an officer of the United States to be assigned to another government and then serve under that government? Can a man serve as an officer of two governments at the same time. You see my point?

It does seem to me that in all fairness, having the welfare of the Republican Party as well as the welfare of the country at heart, and I regard them as synonymous, that this bill might well voluntarily be taken back by the committee. Accepting that suggestion, the committee would have the grateful and heartfelt thanks of the majority of the Republicans. Then let the committee rewrite the bill.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. The gentleman has propounded this question about a man serving two masters. We have a concrete example of it in five instances, involving five employees of the State Department during the war, when the Germans were killing our boys and the Japs were killing our boys. These men in the State Department, who took an oath of office to faithfully and loyally serve this country, stole the secrets of the State Department and of the Navy Department and sold them to a Russian sympathizer, and they went scot free.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; and the administration lightly tapped them on the wrist.

Mr. JENNINGS. You have a concrete illustration there of how no man can serve two masters. They served one and betrayed it to another.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; but that is no reason why we should attempt to legalize the practice, and the gentleman's statement is forewarning of what is apt to happen under the bill if accepted as written.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes; not on the section, because there are other amendments to the section.

Mr. GAVIN. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment cease in 15 minutes, and I will include myself in that. The chairman can divide up the time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal of talk——

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. Yes; I will yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What is this change of voice due to?

Mr. GAVIN. I am trying to appear as a statesman.

There has been a great deal of talk about this exchange of students. I have a letter from Mr. Benton, the Assistant Secretary of State, under date of the 29th of January, in which he submits to me a speech that he made before the Conference of Patriotic Women's Organizations for National Defense, at the Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., Saturday, January 25. He discussed this matter relative to the interchange of students and he refers to UNESCO, which means United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization.

He said:

> UNESCO will seek to eradicate illiteracy everywhere, and to lift educational standards. Illiterate men are pawns in a power struggle. UNESCO will seek to reduce barriers to the free flow of ideas and information everywhere. The most literate peoples can be led and bullied into aggression when they are cut off from a full and steady account of development among other peoples, and fed on lies and distortions. UNESCO will seek to diagnose the social and psychological tensions that lead to conflict, as urged in Congressman DIRKSEN's bill. And UNESCO will stimulate the exchange of students, teachers, scholars, and experts on the widest possible scale. In such ways UNESCO will strive to lay that solid foundation of understanding among peoples which is the best hope of peace. As UNESCO succeeds, our security, and the world's security, will be strengthened. The operating budget for all of UNESCO for 1947 is $6,000,000. This is, I should guess, one ten-thousandth of the world's military and naval expenditures this year.

Then he goes on to say:

> The exchange of students is an example. I know of no surer method of increasing understanding of the United States, for the long run, than to bring foreign students to live among us for a year or two.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. I wonder if the gentleman would permit me to complete these few lines? I would appreciate it very much. I thank the gentleman, my friend and colleague from Pennsylvania for consideration given me.

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman, my able colleague from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. As I was saying, he goes on to say:

> If this is true, and if the understanding they acquire contributes to our security, then we should invite such students not in terms of a few score or a few hundreds but in terms of thousands. And we should widen the area from which we assist such students, not limit it to Latin America. We must widen our horizons and raise our sights. This will require the basic legislation, to which I have referred, and it will then require a budget.

Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] very much.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, on this particular section 303 I am going to agree with the gentleman from Michigan because I have an amendment on it myself. I do not like the provision of this language on line 20 which says, "including the making or approving on behalf of such foreign government the disbursement of funds provided by such government or of receiving from such foreign government funds for deposit."

The language is too general. We receive their funds into the hands of our employees for deposit and disbursement on behalf of such government and disburse it for them.

Unless the committee accepts the amendment striking out everything beginning with the word "including" on line 20 so that it cuts out this financial set-up, I am going to vote for the amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN because I have such an amendment myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, back in December 1945, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], who was then chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, introduced H. R. 4982. That bill was reported 4 days later by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Because of the opposition of some of us in the Rules Committee, the bill was not reported to the floor of the House until late in 1946—I think in July. It finally passed the House on July 22. I have a copy of that bill before me. It is quite similar to the measure H. R. 3342 which is now before the House. I have been rather amazed that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], the ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, who introduced the original bill, has not been heard in support of H. R. 3342, nor has he participated in debate thereon, to my knowledge. I am just

wondering if there has been some new information, or some reason, which has come to the gentleman from New York for his not supporting this measure which is so similar to the bill which he originally introduced, and which has been reintroduced in the House by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No. I am addressing my questions to others, thank you. It is rather difficult for me to understand why the outstanding Democratic leader of the Committee on Foreign Affairs is not supporting this measure at this time by his voice. Why has his voice been stilled, I ask?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes, I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Perhaps he thinks he can slip it through with a Republican label.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No. I think such a surmise is a challenge to the honesty of purpose of the gentleman, with which I do not agree.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No, I do not yield at this time. I think perhaps the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] has some significant information, or has some other good reason why he has withdrawn his support from this measure, and has not spoken out in favor of it.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. RICHARDS. In all fairness to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], the author of the bill last year, to which the gentleman refers, and who is not present today——

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. But the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] is present today. He has great influence in this body. He has great influence with me. I am sure there are many Members of this House who would like to hear from the gentleman from New York. It seems to me very peculiar and very strange that the gentleman has been silent all through this debate.

Mr. RICHARDS. Well, the debate is not over yet, I can assure the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And this bill is not yet law, I can, in turn assure the gentleman from South Carolina.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I do not know of anything that could be more dangerous in a troubled House than to have a provision in a bill such as section 303, which would certainly be an incentive to create many Benedict Arnolds. It seems to me the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has very properly presented a motion to the House which should be supported, to strike this language from the bill. I have not heard any argument against it. Perhaps the genteman from South Dakota, the author of the bill, may speak against it, but I would like to ask him just now why it is necessary for an employee of our Government, working for the Government in this type of work, who would certainly be reasonaby well paid, to accept or take pay from a foreign government. Under what theory, in the name of common sense, is that done?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Not a part of the salary but the entire salary and expenses are to be paid by the foreign government because the man must become attached to that government, and the reason he should become attached to that government is so that in some official capacity he has some regulation over the particular division, department, or activity assigned to him by that government.

I have the concluding 3 minutes of the debate and I do not want to infringe on the gentleman's time. I hope he will listen to my further explanation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is all right, but if you look at the top of page 6 you will see the following language:

> And of the Government agency from which assigned he shall continue to receive compensation from that agency.

Mr. O'HARA. It has always been fundamental to me that an officer of the government, whether it be municipal, State, or Federal, certainly could not serve two masters.

I agree with the gentleman from Michigan wholeheartedly. I think it is a situation that no matter how well-intentioned the language may be, is going to make for trouble sooner or later. I hope it will be stricken.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, may I say at the outset that this is not a new departure in American policy. It is something we have been doing for a long while in special cases. We had in this House some years ago a very distinguished Representative from Illinois by the name of Charles Dewey. After World War I, under special emergency legislation he was assigned to a specific phase of a similar program in which he served as a member of the Polish Cabinet and he was doing that in connection with the correction of the finances of that government.

It so happens that in many joint enterprises such as the operation of a weather bureau and certain other things which are the joint responsibility of two countries, this would enable the director of that station under the jurisdiction of the two countries to be an American. It permits him as well to have authority within that country so he can work with effectiveness.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. In a moment.

I think it is important that we have clearly in mind the language on which we are voting.

I would like to say that if we keep this section in the bill, the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY] has put his finger on a very important point. He has discussed it with our subcommittee and we have agreed to accept an amendment which he will propose. His amendment prohibits any American from taking an oath of loyalty to any foreign country or any foreign government, even though serving temporarily in an official capacity for that government. With that safeguard I am convinced it is an important extra safeguard in this legislation. It is not a basically essential part of the bill, of course, but it is important because it does give one additional tool to those to whom we look to fight our battle for the peace. It gives them one additional shell in their ammunition kit, one additional approach and avenue whereby we can work together in a friendly, constructive manner with countries friendly to us and whose friendship we propose to preserve.

I ask for a vote, Mr. Chairman, to defeat this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time having expired, the question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan to strike out section 303.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KEEFE) there were—ayes 64, noes 70.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. BRADLEY: Page 6, line 25, after the word "act", substitute a comma for the period and add the following: "*Provided, however,* That such acceptance of office shall in no case involve the taking of an oath of allegiance to another government."

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, some few days ago in speaking on this bill I offered criticism of the provision which would allow any official or appointee of this Government to accept an office under some other government, and I objected to it because there seemed to be no provision there which would keep that official from taking an oath of allegiance to the other government. Having spoken with the subcommittee chairman, I find the committee agreeable to accepting the amendment just offered. I see no reason to take up any more time in this argument. I appreciate that present laws may be considered to preclude the taking of the oath of allegiance by one of our people to another government, but I am afraid that the present wording here might be considered as a change in present law.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I want to thank the gentleman for his constructive thinking on that matter. There never has been a case of one of our officials taking such an oath, but I agree with the gentleman we better be doubly safe than sorry and we are happy to accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON: On page 6, line 20, strike out all after the word "assigned."

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment I am offering is really a compromise amendment. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], was to strike out the whole of section 303. I do not want our employees over there in foreign governments, who are given money by foreign governments, to disburse on behalf of foreign governments and be responsible to foreign governments and then have our taxpayers in this country take the final responsibility that these employees did the right job.

If you will notice, this particular section does not say how much these Americans can dispense for foreign governments. We could take their whole budget and dispense it under this section or we could take over all the import or export duties, the customs of a country, for example, and disburse the funds through our employees. The language is too general. Under one interpretation, it would be the start of imperialism to me. I do not want to handle the budget of any foreign government.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I ask this question not in hostility to the gentleman's amendment. As I read the amendment, the adoption of it would do away with the amendment which the Committee of the Whole just agreed to.

Mr. FULTON. I have discussed that with the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY] and I believe that the two amendments can be made to conform.

Mr. WADSWORTH. His has already been adopted.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BRADLEY. Will not the gentleman modify his amendment to strike out the part between the word "assigned" in line 17 down to and including the word "Act" in line 25, which would leave the amendment just adopted effective in case the gentleman's amendment should be adopted?

Mr. FULTON. I will do that because that will make the gentleman's amendment complementary to mine. First, our employees cannot take an oath of allegiance to a foreign government; and second, our employees are not going to run the government of the country, which may happen if they run the money power of that country. You cannot set up people in foreign governments without limit and have them run the disbursements of a foreign government. This section has no limit in it.

Mr. Chairman, I am for this information bill and will vote for its passage, because I think it is necessary, but there are several places that the provisions need revision. I am a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee and have had amendments that I have not put in that would tighten this bill, because I felt that at times certain people speaking were merely trying to delay and cut out the main purpose of the bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I am sure the gentleman is not aware of the facts I am about to give him, but will the gentleman take my word for it that in the agreements consummated through the inter-American Coordinator, the Latin-American countries have contributed their own funds in a very substantial measure, and if a provision like this had not been available and not written in this bill, exchange restrictions, in other words, the money could not be sent up here and sent back, which would result in our not getting that protection at all.

Mr. FULTON. Let me say this: If that is all you intend, why is it not written in this bill that there is a limit on it, because the provisions of this bill are so broad you could go in and run the customs of the country and nobody could stop you. I have confidence in the State Department, but unless you put a specific limitation in here saying that is the purpose, you do not have adequate legislation.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. Was the gentleman's amendment and the other amendments to which he refers brought up and discussed in the committee and if so, why were they not adopted there?

Mr. FULTON. They were not discussed at the time of the committee hearing as I have been working hard on the Philippine rehabilitation bill.

Mr. BREHM. My question is not meant as a reflection on the gentleman's integrity. He is a hard-working and sincere Member of Congress.

Mr. FULTON. Thank you for your comment as I value your judgment as another hard-working Member of Congress. I discussed them personally with certain committee members, but I do not want in any way to endanger by amendment the purposes of the information bill that I am for, but I want it tightened.

Mr. BREHM. So do I, and I dislike to be accused of not being for a bill because I take exception to certain parts of it.

Mr. FULTON. The Committee on Foreign Affairs is 100 percent for this bill. I am for it, but that does not mean that 100 percent of the time I am for every provision in the bill. I am not and I have not been. I am one of the moderate, practical members of the Foreign Affairs.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The gentleman just stated that the bill is broader than he expected it to be.

Mr. FULTON. Broader than I first expected it to be.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired. Does the gentleman wish to modify his amendment? If so, in what respect?

Mr. FULTON. I agree to modify my amendment as suggested by the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I object to the modification of the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FULTON. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to modify my amendment, and I ask the gentleman to withhold his objection, because it is doing what he wants.

I modify my amendment by striking out on page 6, line 17, all after the word "assigned" down to and including the word "act" in line 25, for which I ask unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. VORYS. I object.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as has just been said by the chairman of the subcommittee the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], this is not a life or death matter. It is certainly not the most important part of the bill. On the other hand it does not authorize anything new. We have been doing it effectively in the Latin-American program for a long time. Americans did it in Poland and Iran after the First War. This section merely makes this available to other parts of the world, including Europe, Asia, and Africa, the sort of assistance from American experts which we have been extending to South America.

Therefore it seems wholly unnecessary and too bad, when we are trying to develop a program where members of our Government and members of other governments can work in closest cooperation for the benefit of both, for us to hog-tie and handcuff them.

Before this world has pulled out of the mess it is in, it is going to be necessary for financial experts and medical experts and technical experts from America to help right down at the grass roots in many of these countries; yes, right in their governments. Some of them are already appealing for such American assistance as they did after World War I. This section merely permits the American expert or technician or professional man to do the job that they want him to come and do right in their government, and which we in our own interest want him to be able to do.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Is it not true that years and years ago Morgan Shuster, an American, went to Persia and, by going into their government and being their finance officer, put their finances in order, and that the greatest contribution that Americans could make in many of these countries is in their fiscal policies and helping them in their disbursement of funds?

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman is wholly correct.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I think the gentleman is correct in the observation he has made, but I asked the gentleman to yield in order to propound an inquiry. If the committee does not complete consideration of the bill during the afternoon, is it contemplated that the House will sit tomorrow?

Mr. JUDD. I must refer that question to the chairman of the committee. But it is my hope that we will stay here and finish it tonight. I believe we are through the worst of the difficulties, and I think that we can bring these sections up one by one, offer amendments, and vote them up or vote them down, and proceed with the disposition of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Committee will reject the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman cannot do that at this time.

Mr. FULTON. Then I stand on my original amendment, to strike out the part after the word "assigned."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN: Strike out section 303 as now amended.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, let us see where we are. Turn to page 5, title III, down on line 14:

Nothing in this act, however, shall authorize the assignment of officers or enlisted men of the United States Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard for service relating to the organization, training operation, development, or combat equipment of the armed forces of a foreign government.

That is the exception. Otherwise men in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard could be assigned by the Department of State for military service in other countries under section 302, and remain American officers under that section. Yes; and under subsequent sections become an officer of another country—to me an impossible situation.

Then turn over the next section and you learn that it provides that when so assigned he shall become an officer of the foreign government. The Committee just sought to cure that by adopting the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY], but the Committee did not cure it. If he is assigned as an officer of another government, how can this Government tell the other government what qualifications or requirements it shall make? We lose all control of him if he is assigned over there, or his assignment is null and void until he accepts the qualifications put on by the other government.

I am asking you this now: Under our Constitution and our form of government, how can any officer or private in the Army or an enlisted man in the Navy become an officer of another government? You see where we are getting? I go back to the original argument, how can an officer so assigned serve two masters? There are men here sitting before me who served in this war as officers of our Government.

They are still on the reserve list if they are not on the active list. Yet, the Secretary of State can assign those officers to other governments, and there they may become officers of that government. The only way you can cure this situation is to strike out this section. We came within six votes of doing it before. It should be stricken now, and then the committee, if the bill goes back to the committee, can rewrite the bill, or if it goes to a conference they can fix it in conference. I hope when they are considering this bill in conference they will have better luck than the House conferees on the labor legislation had when they came back with a report.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I was sitting over here a few moments ago listening to the gentleman from Ohio make his statement. I was wondering how I was going to answer it. Mr. Chairman, I have been a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs for a great number of years. The other day there was a rule which was brought before the House and which was adopted, providing that the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the ranking minority member should have control of the time. If the Chair remembers, I was sitting in my seat and the Chair recognized me to have control of the time. The gentleman from South Dakota made the statement that the time was to be controlled by the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member of the minority of the subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, I did not want to at that time say anything or do anything that would give the impression to the House or to the committee that there was any dissension in the Committee on Foreign Affairs with reference to this legislation. So I politely acquiesced and left the table.

I do not know by what authority or by what right any Member can change a rule adopted by this House at a moment's notice and say who is to be in control of the bill on the floor or what the purpose was, but naturally I was out. The chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs automatically was out also.

You have been debating this bill not under the authority of the rule as adopted by the House, but under some legerdemain that I cannot quite understand.

My principal object in arising at this time, Mr. Chairman, after listening to this debate is to say this. I am 100 percent in favor of this legislation. I think we here, 435 Members of the House, are considering a piece of legislation that will determine the whole future and success of this country.

I have been a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs for a number of years. I have traveled all over and I know what is going on or at least I think I do.

Never mind all these trivial amendments or suggestions being made, but let us pass this bill. Let us put it into action because if we do not, and if you think you are trying to amend this bill so as to make it more perfect you will destroy it. If you should lose after the 1st of July all that the Government of the United States has within its hands and within its breast you will have lost it forever and will not get it back.

Now, that is all there is to it. Now, please pass this legislation, and pass it now. Let us leave it to the State Department or leave it to somebody to make a perfect bill, and not write this bill the way you are doing on the floor. Let us put this bill into action and let the Secretary of State, or whoever has charge of it, make it perfect in operation. I have objected to a great many things that they have been doing under the legislation heretofore, but please, gentlemen, do something that the United States will not lose control to do the things we want to do. If you want to make this country of ours successful in the future, this is the only way to do it, and do it now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section, and all amendments thereto, do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan to strike section 303 as amended.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CRAWFORD) there were—ayes 70, noes 81.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. MUNDT and Mr. HOFFMAN to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 87, noes 105.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE IV—PARTICIPATION BY GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

GENERAL AUTHORITY

SEC. 401. The Secretary is authorized, in carrying on any activity under the authority of this act, to utilize, with their approval, the services, facilities, and personnel of the other Government agencies. Whenever the Secretary shall use the services, facilities, or personnel of any Government agency for activities under authority of this act, the Secretary shall pay for such performance out of funds available to the Secretary under this act, either in advance, by reimbursement, or direct transfer. In utilizing the Government agencies, it is the sense of the Congress (1) that the best available and qualified Government services, facilities, and personnel shall be sought, in order to ensure professional competence and avoid duplication; and (2) that the Secretary shall consult the appropriate technical agencies of the Government concerning any activity authorized by titles II, III, and IV of this act which comes within the competence of such agencies.

TECHNICAL AND OTHER SERVICES

SEC. 402. A Government agency, at the request of the Secretary, may perform such

technical or other services as such agency may be competent to render for the government of another country desirous of obtaining such services, upon terms and conditions which are satisfactory to the Secretary and to the head of the Government agency, when it is determined by the Secretary that such services will contribute to the purposes of this act. However, nothing in this act shall authorize the performance of services relating to the organization, training, operation, development, or combat equipment of the armed forces of a foreign government.

POLICY GOVERNING SERVICES

SEC. 403. In authorizing the performance of technical and other services under section 402 above, it is the sense of the Congress (1) that the Secretary shall encourage through the Government agency with appropriate legislative authority the performance of such services to foreign governments by qualified private American individuals and agencies; (2) that if such services are rendered by a Government agency, they shall demonstrate the technical accomplishments of the United States, such services being of an advisory, investigative, or instructional nature, or a demonstration of a technical process; (3) that such services shall not include the construction of public works or the supervision of the construction of public works, except as may be accessory to such investigation, instruction, or demonstration, and that, under authority of this act, a Government agency shall render engineering services related to public works only when the Secretary shall determine that the national interest demands the rendering of such services by a Government agency, but this policy shall not be interpreted to preclude the assignment of individual specialists as advisers to other governments as provided under title III of this act, together with such incidental assistance as may be necessary for the accomplishment of their individual assignments; (4) that such services shall not be undertaken for a foreign government if, in the opinion of the head of the Government agency, such services will impair the fulfillment of domestic responsibilities of that agency; and (5) that the Department shall invite outstanding leaders, both within and outside the Federal Government, in the various fields of engineering in the United States, to review and extend advice on the Secretary's policies in rendering engineering services to another government pursuant to section 402 of this act.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I am unable to follow the Clerk. He seems to be missing very important sections of the bill. I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may return to section 403 and read as printed in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again read the section.

(The Clerk again read the section.)

With the following committee amendments:

Page 8, line 11, strike out "section 402 above" and insert "this title."

Page 9, line 13, after the word "leaders", insert "in the United States."

Page 9, line 14, strike out "various fields of engineering in the United States" and insert "various fields of activity covered by this title."

Page 9, line 17, strike out "engineering" and insert "technical and other."

Page 9, line 18, strike out "section 402 of this Act" and insert "this title."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FELLOWS: Page 8, lines 22 and 24, after the words "public works", line 22, strike out the words "except as may be accessory to such investigation, instruction, or demonstration."

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment. On page 8, section 403, line 22, after the words "public works" it strikes out the words "except as may be accessory to such investigation, instruction, or demonstration."

My objection to this is it would permit the State Department to construct public works in a foreign land if it sees fit to do so and I do not think that that power should be in this bill.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FELLOWS. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman has discussed this amendment with the subcommittee and we accept it as an additional worth-while safeguard to the bill.

Mr. FELLOWS. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. FELLOWS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

TRAINING

SEC. 404. Any Government agency, at the request of the Secretary, is authorized to provide to citizens of other countries.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 9, line 23, after the word "countries", insert "and to citizens of the United States going to other countries in connection with the carrying out of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

INTERCHANGE OF SPECIALIZED KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS

SEC. 405. A Government agency, at the request of the Secretary, is authorized to promote the interchange with other countries of scientific and specialized knowledge and skills, within the fields in which such agency has competence, through publications and other scientific and educational materials.

INTERDEPARTMENTAL COORDINATION

SEC. 406. In order that the activities of Government agencies authorized by titles II, III, and IV of this act may be effectively coordinated and interdepartmental relationships as authorized by this act may be clearly defined, the Secretary may establish upon direction of the President an interdepartmental committee to advise the Secretary on the development and administration of these activities.

TITLE V.—DISSEMINATING INFORMATION ABOUT THE UNITED STATES ABROAD

GENERAL AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 501. The Secretary is authorized, when he finds it appropriate, to provide for the preparation, and dissemination abroad, of information about the United States, its people, and its policies, through press, publications, radio, motion pictures, and other information media, and through information centers abroad.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 11, line 3, after the word "centers", insert "and instructors."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania: Add the following to section 501:

"All such press releases and radio scripts shall, in the English language, be made available to press associations, newspapermen, radio systems and stations in the United States within 15 days after release as information abroad."

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, one of the mysteries that must concern anyone listening to the debate here is just what is this Voice of America? From early youth each of us has in song and story heard of the Voice of America as being the voice of the worker, the hum in the factory, the happy home life, private enterprise, individual effort, and the reward for the best a man can do here. Those of us who have had the privilege of seeing some of the samples of the so-called art of America which have been sent abroad; those of us who have had occasion to look over some of the broadcasts which have been made purporting to be the Voice of America, have properly wondered just what phase of American life is portrayed by the State Department as the Voice of America. Is it the voice of the real America, or the voice of the minority?

I respectfully suggest, Mr. Chairman, that after these Voice of America broadcasts have been made available overseas, that the information be made available to our various means for dissemination of knowledge here in the United States.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. May I say what the gentleman proposes is completely consistent with what the committee has in mind in making the reports available to Congress. The gentleman's amendment makes them available to other public-service groups as well, and the committee will be happy to accept the amendment.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

POLICIES GOVERNING INFORMATION ACTIVITIES

SEC. 502. In authorizing international information activities under this act, it is the sense of the Congress (1) that the Secretary shall encourage and facilitate by appropriate means the dissemination abroad of information about the United States by private American individuals and agencies, shall supplement such private information dissemination where necessary, and shall reduce such Government information activities whenever corresponding private information dissemination is found to be adequate; (2) that nothing in this act shall be construed to give the Department a monopoly in the production or sponsorship on the air of short-wave broadcasting programs, or a monopoly in any other medium of information; (3) that the Department

shall invite outstanding private leaders of the United States in cultural and informational fields to review and extend advice on the Government's international information activities; and (4) that all printed matter, films, broadcasts, and other materials in the fields of mass media shall, when disseminated by the Government, be identified as to Government or private source.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the period at the end of the section. I do not want to strike out even one word of this section because, in my judgment, it is an important section of the bill, possibly because I wrote it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, last year when a similar bill was pending for 7 months it did not get to the floor of the Congress until the State Department agreed to take the amendment which I offered. When that amendment was accepted the bill was brought up and passed, under suspension of the rules, receiving a two-thirds vote of the House. The exact text of that amendment is contained in section 502 of the present bill.

I do not wish to reread section 502, which has just been read. The gist of it is that this whole information program is to encourage and facilitate the dissemination abroad of information by private sources, to supplement such sources when necessary, and the State Department is to reduce the Government program whenever it is possible; that there shall be no Government monopoly in any medium of information; that outstanding leaders in private life shall be called in to review and monitor the programs, and that in all such Government propaganda all information shall be identified as to Government or private source.

I feel, as the rest of you do, that nothing is more abhorrent to us in America than a Government propaganda machine. On the other hand, after intensive study of this for nearly 2 years, I am convinced that we need such a propaganda machine in a world where a battle of ideas is now going on, and totalitarian states have the powerful weapon of government propaganda in their arsenals. I personally abhor the use of atomic bombs, of poison gas, of bacteriological warfare, but I have voted for funds to have them ready, if our national security requires their use. Our enemies sometimes force on us the choice of weapons. We need whatever weapons others may use against us, in order to survive. We need not in the future, but right now, an efficient propaganda machine in order to survive in a warfare of ideas that is going on, not in the future, but now.

I read the current Saturday Evening Post last night. There is an article in there, "The True Meaning of the Iron Curtain," by Ernest O. Hauser, who spent 3 years in Europe. He is one of the Post editors. I do not have time to read you all of it, although I commend it all to your attention, but let me read these sentences to you. Hauser says:

> Ideas will have to be fought with ideas. It is hard to convey to Americans that the people of Europe are more starved for ideas than for bread, but it is nevertheless true. In our attempt to hold the line against Russia in Europe, we have not even begun to use ideological weapons.

Then he goes on:

> While most of our ideological outposts in Europe, thus far, consist of tucked-away, inadequately staffed and supplied information centers and reading rooms, struggling along on puny budgets, the sledge-hammer blows of Soviet propaganda fall everwhere.

I visited our reading room in Istanbul this spring. They have 1,200 reference books. Four hundred of them are taken out every month—a record for any library. They have 50 library visitors a day, 80 percent students, 10 percent press, and 10 percent government officials. This little whisper of the Voice of America is very effective, but the sledge hammer of Soviet radio across the Turkish border was also potent.

Mr. Hauser goes on to say in his article:

> Moscow is currently reported as spending as much on political advertising—mostly in Europe—as the rest of the world combined, and every ruble pays dividends.

Going on further to discuss ideological warfare he concludes his article with these words:

> Barring another war, this is the only manner in which the West can hope to push the Iron Curtain back to where it belongs—the Russian border.

This present bill, the Mundt bill, would authorize the continuation of the American information program, which is our only Government propaganda machine in this psychological warfare.

Bill Benton, who made a great fortune as an advertising genius, and who is heading up this program, has oversold it in one respect. This program is not the Voice of America, as it has been advertised. The Voice of America wells from 140,000,000 American minds and hearts and throats. Bill Benton believes that, too. As provided in section 502 that has just been read, and Bill Benton approves of that section, this program is only a very small adjunct to the real Voice of America. This program is only for the purpose of supplementing the Voice of America where the Voice of America does not reach. It is only for the purpose of piercing the iron curtain where the Voice of America cannot be heard. It is only a small program supplemental to the great Voice of America that is welling over the world, but a very necessary program, a propaganda machine, if you please, in an age when propaganda is so important, when, as Hauser says in the article I mentioned:

> Barring another war, this is the only manner in which the West can hope to push the iron curtain back to where it belongs.

I now withdraw my pro forma amendment. I am in favor of this section, unamended. I am for this bill.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the amendment to this title in section 501 which was offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON] in which it was required that copies of broadcasts and other information sent abroad should be made available to the press and radio of this country.

I wanted to submit an amendment to his amendment, but when the committee quickly accepted the Simpson amendment I did not have that opportunity. My amendment to the amendment would have provided that the Members of the Congress of the United States, upon request, should also be furnished with this information.

I am now serving notice that while I understand an amendment of that nature will be offered; that, if not, I expect to offer an amendment to section 209 which will provide that the Members of the Congress of the United States, who represent the people, shall upon request be furnished with a copy of any broadcast, publication or statement put out under the provisions of this act, if it should become law.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I regret that our acceptance of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON] cut the gentleman from Ohio off. His amendment is eminently a fitting part of this program, and if he will ask unanimous consent that his amendment be considered at this time, if there is no objection, it can then be passed.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. RICHARDS. As a matter of fact, I agree with the gentleman from South Dakota about the fairness of this proposition, but the State Department, it should be recorded here, has never refused to give information to Members of Congress.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am glad to have that information, but I think it should be a part of the law of the land that the Congress of the United States be entitled to receive this material upon request.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we return to section 501 so that I may offer an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I had had an amendment prepared for page 11, line 24, covering almost the same thing. I am a member of the committee, and I was going to submit it here for the committee to see. It would provide proper channels for giving to the Congress, that is, the House of Representatives and the Senate, this information. I will give the amendment to the gentleman if he wants to look at it. It would provide that the material disseminated shall be made available by the Secretary of State to the Foreign Relations Committee and the Foreign Affairs Committee and their duly authorized designees at least 24 hours prior to the issuance thereof, and so forth.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That does not take care of the average Member of the

House. I might possibly want to see some of these broadcasts myself.

Mr. FULTON. But they would be on record here and the State Department would not have to give so many out.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROWN of Ohio as an amendment to the amendment offered by Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania: After the words "United States", add a comma and the following: "and to the Members of the Congress of the United States upon their request."

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out that this does not require the State Department to send every Member of Congress a bale of material, but they shall be, by law, required to furnish copy to any Member of Congress who requests it.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. OWENS. I am worried about this amendment. The State Department has never refused to give me any information, although the Army has.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Perhaps if there had been such a section of law which required the Army to furnish the information upon request the gentleman would have received that information. We may not always have the same officials in the State Department. So it is well to write this requirement into the law.

Mr. OWENS. If they put that into the bill at this point, in another instance they will say they do not have to give it to us because there is no law covering it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I do not think so. They have already said that to you in the Army.

Mr. OWENS. I know. I am going to bring that up at a later time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 11, after line 24, insert the following title, and change the title numbers, section numbers, and cross-references in other titles of the bill accordingly:

"TITLE IX—ADVISORY COMMISSION TO FORMULATE POLICIES

"FORMULATION OF POLICIES

"SEC. 601. There is hereby created a United States Information and Educational Exchange Advisory Commission (hereinafter in this title referred to as the Commission) to be constituted as provided in section 602. The Commission shall formulate and present to the Secretary of State the policies to be followed and adhered to in connection with the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills, the assignment of specialists, the preparation and dissemination of information about the United States, its people, and its policies, and the carrying out of the other provisions of this act.

"MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION; GENERAL PROVISIONS

"SEC. 602. (a) The Commission shall consist of 10 members, not more than six of whom shall be from any one political party, as follows: (1) Nine members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and (2) the Secretary of State or such officer in the State Department as may be designated by such Secretary.

"(b) The members of the Commission shall represent the public interest, but of the persons appointed under clause (1) of subsection (a) of this section, one shall be selected from among educators, one from among individuals formerly in active service in the armed forces of the United States, one from representatives of labor, one from the newspaper business, one from the motion-picture industry, one from the radio industry, and three from persons having general business experience. All persons so appointed shall be persons of national reputations in their respective fields. No person holding any compensated Federal or State office shall be eligible for appointment under clause (1) of subsection (a) of this section.

"(c) The term of each member appointed under clause (1) of subsection (a) of this section shall be 3 years except that the terms of office of such members first taking office on the Commission shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, three at the end of 1 year, three at the end of 2 years, and three at the end of 3 years from the date of the enactment of this act. Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor is appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term. Upon the expiration of his term of office any member may continue to serve until his successor is appointed and has qualified.

"(d) The President shall designate a chairman and a vice chairman from among members of the Commission.

"(e) The members of the Commission shall receive no compensation for their services as such members but shall be entitled to reimbursement for travel and subsistence in connection with attendance of meetings of the Commission away from their places of residences.

"(f) The Commission is authorized to adopt such rules and regulations as it may deem necessary to carry out the authority conferred upon it by this title.

"(g) The Commission is authorized, without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to appoint and fix the compensation of such clerical assistants as may be necessary in carrying out the provisions of this title.

"RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORTS

"SEC. 603. The Commission shall meet not less frequently than once each month and shall from time to time prepare and transmit to the Secretary and to the Congress its recommendations for carrying out the various activities authorized by this act, and shall submit to the Congress a quarterly report of all programs and activities recommended by it under this act and the action taken to carry out such recommendations."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I asked the gentleman to yield in the interest of saving time.

I might advise the House that the gentleman from Illinois with a great deal of forethought brought this matter before our committee. We held at least two sessions on it. We worked with him on every section of it, on every aspect of it, and the language was finally evolved in such form that it is now mutually acceptable both to Mr. DIRKSEN and our committee.

The committee is in complete agreement with the amendment he has offered. If, therefore, the gentleman so desired, he might extend his remarks in the RECORD at this point and we could adopt the amendment unanimously.

Mr. DIRKSEN. To that I have no objection.

Mr. Chairman, I belabored this matter earlier this afternoon endeavoring to set it up clearly in the hope that the apprehensions of the Members on this question might be mollified and there might be a semblance of control reposed in the Congress. That is so manifestly because this Commission is bipartisan in character and must be confirmed by the Senate. If it gets out of hand it is only because we fail to exercise our own responsibility in passing upon those who are members of the Commission.

I am grateful to the chairman of the committee for his indulgence in the matter and for his acceptance in the name of the committee of this amendment.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin to the amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: Strike out "10" and insert "11"; and after the word "labor" insert the words "one farmer."

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the reasons that I offer this amendment are as follows:

First. In the first place the farmer and the rural people of America and in fact in the world are the most peace-loving people to be found anywhere on the face of the earth.

Second. The rural people of America, though less than 25 percent of the people of our country, raise nearly 50 percent of the children of our country. The bill is offered as a peace-promoting agency of Government. Should not the rural people be represented on this board? I say yes, a thousand times yes.

Third. Rural America is called upon to produce the food and fiber in time of war. They are deserving of a place at the table of the group whose objective is to maintain peace.

Fourth. We already have the world Food and Agricultural Organization, known as FAO. Rural America is most assuredly entitled to a place on this board to be in contact with FAO and its activities. We have at this hour our own farm organizations, the Farm Bureau, the Grange, the Farmers Union and the national cooperatives meeting with the world farm organizations.

Fifth. Many students from other lands have and no doubt will continue to attend agricultural colleges of our land in great numbers. The development of agriculture in many countries is going to be all-important, if certain sections of

the world are to feed themselves. Surely American farmers are entitled to this representation.

Sixth. I have been conservative in asking for only one farmer to be included. The history of the peaceful position of the farmers of the world would justify a greater representation. The farmer is close to nature and close to his Maker. If all the members of all of the boards of all the countries were farmers, a great step would be taken to prevent any future wars.

Mr. Chairman, I trust this amendment will be adopted unanimously.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Indeed, I would have no objection to the amendment and I am reasonably confident the committee would not.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Certainly the committee would have no objection. We are for the farmers.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am extremely glad that this Commission is provided for and that there is to be a screening of the personnel. I remember that I started in the last session of Congress a rather bitter fight in the Foreign Affairs Committee in urging the adoption of provision for a Commission to screen the personnel to be employed by UNESCO. I remember at that time many considered it very important that voluntary organizations be given a chance to express their opinion on the personnel to be taken, such as recommendation for personnel from the Federation of Labor and under the amendment by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] one from Agriculture. While the Department fought that provision very bitterly at the time it is one of the things that the Secretary of State now boasts about. He boasts that the United States is the only country that has a screening commission on personnel. The American public wants to be informed on what is being done in appointments. They feel this screening does it. I rejoice that this committee has accepted this amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

Section 3 of Public Law 565, Seventy-ninth Congress, which shows the observation of UNESCO screening of personnel:

SEC. 3. In fulfillment of article VII of the constitution of the Organization, the Secretary of State shall cause to be organized a National Commission on Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Corporation of not to exceed 100 members. Such Commission shall be appointed by the Secretary of State and shall consist of (a) not more than 60 representatives of principal national, voluntary organizations interested in educational, scientific, and cultural matters; and (b) not more than 40 outstanding persons selected by the Secretary of State, including not more than 10 persons holding office under or employed by the Government of the United States, not more than 15 representatives of the educational, scientific, and cultural interests of State and local governments, and not more than 15 persons chosen at large. The Secretary of State is authorized to name in the first instance 50 of the principal national voluntary organizations, each of which shall be invited to designate one representative for appointment to the National Commission. Thereafter, the National Commission shall periodically review and, if deemed advisable, revise the list of such organizations designating representatives in order to achieve a desirable rotation among organizations represented. To constitute the initial Commission, one-third of the members shall be appointed to serve for a term of 1 year, one-third for a term of 2 years, and one-third or the remainder thereof for a term of 3 years; from thence on following, all members shall be appointed for a term of 3 years each, but no member shall serve more than 2 consecutive terms. The National Commission shall meet at least once annually. The National Commission shall designate from among its members an executive committee, and may designate such other committees as may prove necessary, to consult with the Department of State and to perform such other functions as the National Commission shall delegate to them. No member of the National Commission shall be allowed any salary or other compensation for services: *Provided, however,* That he may be paid his actual transportation expenses, and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses, while away from his home in attendance upon authorized meetings or in consultation on request with the Department of State. The Department of State is authorized to provide the necessary secretariat for the Commission.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to call the attention of Congress to what will be virtually a lock-out in the shipping industry. It will take place at midnight tomorrow.

I wish to give the Congress the facts. These facts are very revealing as a preview of the effect of the Hartley-Taft bill on industrial relations in the United States. Labor organizations have been meeting with representatives of the shipowners. The representatives of the shipowners have throughout these meetings taken an intransigent position. The labor organizations on the west coast have made a very simple and what must be considered by everyone as a very fair proposal. They have asked that the existing contracts be continued. Representatives of labor on the east coast have asked for a discussion of wage rates. The shipowners have refused to accept the proposal to continue existing contracts on the west coast and, as far as the east-coast shipowners are concerned, this afternoon they notified the representatives of labor that the only proposals they will consider are wage cuts.

It is significant that Mr. Frank J. Taylor, chairman of the Merchant Marine Institute, throughout the discussions informed representatives of organized labor that he and his associates were depending on the inevitable operations of the Taft-Hartley bill. They have broken off the meetings, they have left the conference. Labor organizations have sent a telegram to Secretary Schwellenbach asking him to intercede so as to prevent this lockout in the shipping industry of the United States.

The question that may be raised in your mind is: Well, perhaps these shipping companies cannot afford to continue existing contracts; perhaps they are justified in demanding wage cuts.

Mr. Chairman, I have before me excerpts from the testimony of Under Secretary Will Clayton before the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of February 7, 1947. In discussing the profits of the shipping companies, I read the following excerpts.

Page 200:

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Chairman, I don't know what the profits are in the shipping business. I think they are much too large. I would like to say that I think they act as a restraint and a limitation, a limiting factor on world trade. I think if we had more of these ships out of the rivers and harbors where they have been laid up we would have a little more competition, perhaps, in the shipping business and we would get these rates down somewhat to the advantage of this country and every other country, particularly the countries of Europe that are struggling to reconstruct and get back on their feet again. I think shipping rates are much too high.

Mr. WEICHEL. Do you think the American merchant marine should have more competition?

Mr. CLAYTON. I think we should have, if we have rates too high, and I state it as my considered opinion, and I have been in this game for 40 years, I state it as my considered opinion that rates are much too high now.

Mr. WEICHEL. You mean world rates or American rates?

Mr. CLAYTON. World rates, and American rates are part of world rates. If we had more of these ships broken out of the rivers and harbors where they have been laid up and put into service, I think we would get rates down to where they would be reasonable.

Page 241:

Mr. CLAYTON. I am speaking, Mr. Bradley, as to the competitive aspects of this matter and the influence it may have on the profits of the shipping companies. I tell you they are making plenty of money and they are not complaining on that score. They would be laughed out of court if they should. If they brought in their balance sheets along with their complaint they would be laughed right out of court.

* * * * * *

Mr. CLAYTON. No, sir. But I do think companies making enormous profits, unheard of profits in peacetime, absolutely unheard of, that anybody making profits on that scale should have a right to come in and complain about competition.

Mr. Chairman, when we charged that this legislation was going to bring about intransigeance on the part of industry, wage cuts, complete disruption of peaceful industrial relations and negation of collective bargaining, we were correct. The events of today and tomorrow are supporting that contention.

This lock-out in our merchant marine, the operation of which is so essential in the program of world reconstruction, is being brought about by the shipowners

who have placed their feet on the table and who are relying on the Taft-Hartley bill not only to destroy organizations of labor but to destroy the wage standards that labor has acquired. Not only do they refuse to negotiate, mediate, or arbitrate revision of wage standards upward, but they refuse and continue present wages and demand that wages be cut. They refuse to continue existing contracts, they demand that wages be cut, they walk out of negotiations, walk out of conferences, and rely on the Taft-Hartley bill.

What is happening in this industry will happen in the next few weeks in many other industries in these United States. This lock-out in the shipping industry is a preview of labor relations under the Taft-Hartley law. It is the pattern that the monopolies will follow.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the word "farmer" in my amendment be changed to read "one farmer."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE VI—APPROPRIATIONS

GENERAL AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 601. Appropriations to carry out the purposes of this act are hereby authorized.

TRANSFERS OF FUNDS

SEC. 602. The Secretary may authorize the transfer to other Government agencies for expenditure in the United States and in other countries, in order to carry out the purposes of this act, any part of any appropriations available to the Department for carrying out the purposes of this act, for direct expenditure or as a working fund, and any such expenditures may be made under the specific authority contained in this act or under the authority governing the activities of the Government agency to which a part of any such appropriation is transferred, provided the activities come within the scope of this act.

TITLE VII—ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

THE SECRETARY

SEC. 701. In carrying out the purposes of this act, the Secretary is authorized, in addition to and not in limitation of the authority otherwise vested in him—

(1) In carrying out title II of this act, within the limitation of such appropriations as the Congress may provide, to make grants of money, services, or materials to State and local governmental institutions in the United States, to governmental institutions in other countries, and to individuals and public or private nonprofit organizations both in the United States and in other countries;

(2) to furnish, sell, or rent, by contract or otherwise, educational and information materials and equipment for dissemination to, or use by, peoples of foreign countries;

(3) in carrying out title V of this act, to purchase, rent, construct, improve, maintain, and operate facilities for radio transmission and reception, including the leasing of real property both within and without the continental limits of the United States for periods not to exceed 10 years, or for longer periods if provided for by the appropriation act;

(4) to furnish official entertainment when provided for by the appropriation act;

(5) to establish and maintain in the United States reception centers for foreign students and for visitors representative of the fields listed in section 201 above;

(6) to provide for printing and binding cutside the continental limits of the United States, without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111);

(7) to employ, without regard to the civil-service and classification laws, when such employment is provided for by the appropriation act, (i) persons on a temporary basis, and (ii) aliens within the United States, but such employment of aliens shall be limited to services related to the translation or narration of colloquial speech in foreign languages when suitably qualified United States citizens are not available; and

(8) to create such advisory committee as the Secretary may decide to be of assistance in formulating his policies for carrying out the purposes of this act. No committee member shall be allowed any salary or other compensation for services; but he may be paid his actual transportation expenses, and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses, while away from his home in attendance upon meetings within the United States or in consultation with the Department under instructions.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 13, line 9, after "(3)", insert "whenever necessary."

Page 13, line 16, after the word "entertainment" strike out the balance of the line and all of line 17, and insert "necessary for the purposes of this act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MASON: Strike out all of title VII.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, a few days ago I offered a very drastic amendment to strike the enacting clause. I knew it was a drastic amendment. I did not offer it as dilatory tactics but I did offer it to test the sentiment of the committee, and I succeeded in doing it. I cited as a basis for offering that amendment some foolish provisions that I consider were in the bill, and I read them.

I am offering this amendment to strike title VII, and I want to read part of the bill as a basis for the reason for offering this amendment, and I want to perhaps carry on from where the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GWYNNE] left off when he was discussing the educational provisions in this bill and when he stated definitely that they were contrary to the educational policies of this Nation as we have known them in the past. I also say they are absolutely in violation of the educational policies of the United States since we have known them, over 150 years. As a basis for my opinion, I read the exact wording in title VII, section 701:

In carrying out the purposes of this act, the Secretary is authorized, in addition to and not in limitation of the authority otherwise vested in him, to make grants of money, services, or materials to State and local governmental institutions in the United States, to governmental institutions in other countries, and to individuals and public or private nonprofit organizations both in the United States and in other countries.

In other words, this is a blanket authorization of funds in any amount, in the billions of dollars, that the Congress might appropriate, a blanket authorization to grant Federal aid to States, to local communities, and to individuals in the United States, and to States and private individuals in foreign countries.

During the past few days many of the provisions carried in this bill have been presented to us. If we do not know by this time that this bill should be recommitted, then I say we are impossible in our attitude toward it. I warn you now that no matter how much is accepted by this committee and how many amendments and changes are made in order to get the bill passed by the House, that does not mean those will be the final provisions of this bill and we all know it. It will give authority to another body to place back in the Appropriations Committee the amount that we struck out on a point of order.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, as I understand, the gentleman from Illinois has moved to strike out all of title VII. He has placed special emphasis upon the language beginning at the bottom of page 12 and running over to line 4 on page 13, which is the first paragraph of section 701. Had his amendment been confined to that particular paragraph, I think it might well have been worthy of debate, but his amendment actually strikes out the entire title.

If that should prevail, it will mean the end of the broadcasting effort completely, for on page 13, commencing at line 9, we find language which authorizes the purchase, rental, construction, including maintenance and operation of facilities for radio transmission.

The gentleman from Illinois moves to strike that out completely and make our Government withdraw from that field altogether so as to make the American people say in effect, "We quit."

I am not sure that the gentleman intends to do that but that is the effect of his amendment. On many an occasion during this debate I have heard Members say that if this bill is confined more especially to the broadcasting feature they would be glad to give it more enthusiastic support. Here is their opportunity to decide whether or not they want to broadcast, because the gentleman from Illinois is offering an amendment to strike it out completely.

Moreover, under this paragraph on page 13, commencing at line 5, we find the language authorizing the furnishing, selling, or renting, by contract or otherwise, educational and informational materials and equipment for dissemination.

As I gather it, that would prevent the State Department from distributing the educational material in that paper, "America," in Moscow.

It would prevent the Department of State from maintaining the libraries, of which there are 170 now in existence. It may be stated that these libraries are managed, generally speaking, and are under the control of the American Ambassador or under the American consulate office in or near the cities in which the libraries are established and maintained.

In these libraries we find copies of American magazines and a number of American books largely of a technical or engineering character. All the evidence shows that foreigners flock into them to read not only the magazines, if they can read the English language, but to

get hold of the technical books and learn more about American progress in engineering and scientific achievement. Incidentally, that is good business for the United States because when knowledge of that kind is distributed to a foreign country it makes a market for our exports.

The gentleman from Illinois would strike all that out completely by his amendment to strike out all of title VII. In other words, his amendment means that there is nothing left to this bill worthy of the name.

It may not surprise members of this committee to know that I have been very heartily in favor of this kind of legislation for 2 years. I am in favor of it in view of what I see going on in the world today. I am in favor of it because I am convinced that it will help make America strong, and we need strength.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] may be read again.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the amendment.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is perfectly obvious to me that the very thoughtful, sympathetic consideration of this legislation is going to reach a point after awhile, it now being 5 minutes to 5, when we are going to start rushing through the consideration of the balance of the bill. I hope you will not do that. There are some very important amendments that have been very well thought out and considered, which the committee will accept and which perhaps ought to be explained before we rush through this bill.

The distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] just addressed the House with respect to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON]. In connection with his remarks he properly took the position he did with respect to the particular section to which he referred, but I confess I am very much in the dark. I have an amendment before me that I propose to offer to strike out sections 1, 4, and 5 of title 7. I would like to find out, if I can, as a matter of information, just what it is contemplated to do under section 1 of title 7. If I read it correctly, it means that you are authorizing the Secretary of State, within the limits of any appropriation that may be granted, to inaugurate a system of grants-in-aid; grants of money, services, or material to local governmental institutions.

What do you mean by "a governmental institution"? What is a governmental institution within the meaning of this language? What is a governmental institution in a foreign country? Is a parochial school or a privately supported institution of learning a governmental institution? Is an institution to which you may send these students, under the exchange programs, for training a governmental institution? May I ask the chairman of the committee or some member of the committee just what you mean by that?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield. What are the governmental institutions that are expected to be aided under subparagraph 1?

Mr. MUNDT. Those which we have in mind and those which come under the program are such Government institutions as the Smithsonian Institution, such local governmental institutions as the University of Minnesota, perhaps, or the University of California, where, through contractual arrangements, they work out a program for the exchange of foreign students.

Mr. KEEFE. Then, do I understand the gentleman to say it means a college or school that is publicly supported? Is that a governmental institution?

Mr. MUNDT. That would be a local governmental institution.

Mr. KEEFE. Then you authorize them to make grants to individuals, public or private nonprofit organizations, both in the United States and in other countries. It seems to me clearly that is a very comprehensive and broad grant of power that has not been explained, and seems to open up the field to controversy and before you get through it seems to me you are going to get into uncharted seas.

Mr. MUNDT. With private institutions, you have the church school and the local private school in the same category as the State university. The whole thing is tied to title II.

Mr. KEEFE. I understand it refers to the student-exchange program. It would permit the endowment of a privately supported sectarian school, to which people would come from abroad. Is that true?

Mr. MUNDT. That is not correct, because it says "in connection with carrying out title II," which is another way of saying it covers the exchange of students.

Mr. KEEFE. But if you have a privately supported school, supported from private funds, it may be sectarian or nonsectarian in character, and you have an exchange of students for that school, that school would be entitled to receive aid under that section, would it not?

Mr. MUNDT. Not aid. It is a contractual arrangement with a scholarship which the State Department might extend to a South American student. He then selects his school. He might select Harvard University, for instance, which is a private school. We would not want to deny Harvard and Yale, for instance, participation in the program.

Mr. KEEFE. I do not want to interfere with this program. I want to be helpful if I can understand it, and to be sure that we have got a program that will work and one that will not rise up to haunt us and torment us later on.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEEFE: Page 12, line 22, strike out subparagraphs 1, 4, and 5.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, may I say to my colleagues, does not in any sense curtail the activities that were suggested as necessary by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH]; in fact, in his remarks he referred to these specific paragraphs as being open to discussion and debate perhaps.

I think we are getting into very dangerous waters when we attempt to invest in the State Department the right to make grants-in-aid for education in America or in foreign countries, and that is the reason I am taking the floor now, in order that when the question comes up for interpretation as to what the Congress meant when it passed such legislation as this there will be something in the RECORD to indicate at least the idea that the Congress had in mind when it passed this kind of legislation.

I believe it is dangerous to say to the State Department: "You shall have the right within the limit of appropriations granted to you for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of title II"—which is the exchange of students provision of this bill—"to make grants of money to local institutions without regard and without investigation." I think you will be violating a constitutional provision and a policy of this Government that has been inherent in our Government since it was founded.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I wonder if the gentleman would be kind enough to comply with a request to divide his amendment? It strikes at three different points, three different matters. We do not have the objections to two that we have to No. 1, section 701, for example. It is in a different category. As I explained to the gentleman No. 1 involves the tuition of students at schools such as Harvard, Yale, and so forth.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. COX. I wish to inquire if it is the purpose of the gentleman to try to defend that part of the gentleman's amendment which goes to sections 4 and 5?

Mr. MUNDT. No; I have no disposition to resist that if he will permit his amendment to be divided as to each of the three points involved.

Mr. KEEFE. I understand then, that the gentleman would have no objection if it were limited to sections 4 and 5? Is that right?

Mr. COX. That is correct.

Mr. KEEFE. I personally would have no serious objection to permitting language such as is contained in section 1 to remain in this bill with the thorough and distinct understanding that the Congress is not committing itself to any great big program of grants-in-aid, and that when the appropriation comes be-

fore this Congress, the Department is not going to insist that it was the intent that they should ask and put into an appropriation bill money to carry on a great big grant-in-aid program in education.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. COX. The committee has no objection; in fact it has conceded the point the gentleman has been making, and in view of what is stated I wonder if the gentleman would not be willing to amend his amendment by confining it to sections 4 and 5?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, in view of the statement of the chairman of the subcommittee as made I ask unanimous consent to amend the proposed amendment by striking out subparagraph 1 and leaving subparagraphs 4 and 5 to be eliminated.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman feel this money would go for instance to shoe industries, textile industries and so forth abroad, such as the Bata Co. that was in operation in Czechoslovakia and then during the war was operated in this country by a Czechoslovakian? It also had schools. Would that be considered in connection with these grants to other countries?

Mr. KEEFE. I may say I do not know and the hearings are almost barren on that subject. I would like to have some one on the committee answer that.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. What is involved in grants of money and materials and services to institutions is illustrated by what we have been doing under this program in South America. There are in South America almost 300 American schools. The State Department puts up about $182,000 a year to provide the salaries of about 70 Americans, as I recall, who teach in those schools. Many are the principals. The governments and the people of South America, including the patrons of the schools put in $3,500,000 a year. They provide $20 for our $1 to maintain American schools which have great influence in developing the minds and molding the attitudes of the youngsters of South America into attitudes favorable to our country. That is the sort of thing authorized in subparagraph 1. I am glad the gentleman has agreed to its remaining in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, my question has not been answered and I think it is very important.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, we ought to have orderly procedure. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts can be taken off her feet by anyone demanding the regular order. I do not intend to do so, but I think the gentlewoman should move to strike out the last word, so we will be going along in an orderly way.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I will be very glad to move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. There is a unanimous-consent request pending. Does the gentlewoman from Massachusetts object?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin, to strike sections 4 and 5 on page 13 of the bill. That is as the gentleman requested his original amendment to be amended. The motion is to strike sections 4 and 5 on page 13 of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's amendment need not be a substitute. The gentleman may offer that as an amendment, if he wishes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentlewoman. Will not the gentlewoman from Massachusetts withdraw her objection and move to strike out the last word?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the gentlewoman, she withdraws her objection to the unanimous consent request made a moment ago.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the proposal of the gentleman from Wisconsin to modify his amendment?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I may say to the Chair there is no objection if I may have the opportunity to ask a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentlewoman object, or does she not object?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I do not object to it, but I want my question answered first.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentlewoman will permit the request to be agreed to, she may then move to strike out the last word. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modified amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEEFE: On page 13, strike out subparagraphs 4 and 5.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make this very clear to the House. I think it is their impression that this money will only be given to educational institutions, I would like to state to them that in places like Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia there has been, in conjunction with industrial plants, educational teaching, especially communistic, and I want to make sure that it is the understanding of the committee that none of that money shall be sent to institutional shops or factories, like the Bata shoe factory in Czechoslovakia and other industrial factories. For instance, I understand today this system is being followed in countries dominated by the Communists.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I will be glad to yield. I am sure it is the impression of the House that it cannot be done under this bill, but I want to make sure.

Mr. MUNDT. I am sure the gentlewoman is concerned, of course, because we do not want that to happen and I am sure that there is no danger of it under the provisions of this bill. In the first place, a very tight reciprocal clause has been written in on page 3 of the act, which provides that these interchanges of any type have to be on a reciprocal basis. As the gentlewoman knows, we are not going to have that with Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia and Russia.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I will say to the gentleman that that still does not answer my question.

Mr. MUNDT. As to the other part of the question, the grants that the gentlewoman is talking about are exclusively for educational institutions, because they deal exclusively with title II. A library might not be considered an educational institution, but I suppose it is close enough to come under that heading.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I speak with knowledge of that, because I suppose I was largely responsible for closing the nearby Maryland establishment which was operated by the Bata Shoe Co. While it was supposed to be a shoe factory, in effect they were taking children into slavery. It was dominated by Nazi influence.

Mr. MUNDT. There is a reciprocal safeguard against that, because we have safeguards in this program so that it will not happen.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee this question in connection with the matter he had attempted to answer. What assurances or specific safeguards are there in the bill to guarantee that educational institutions for training in trades, such as we have established in this country, and that are entitled to the GI bill of rights, and that are so recognized by a government in Europe, cannot receive grants under this bill? There is no such language in the bill that I can find that does that.

Mr. MUNDT. There are some contingencies that we did not provide against, but we have provided for a control board, and we can repeal, by concurrent resolution, any section of the bill in toto. Now, we have additional control under the Dirksen amendment which, I think, is an additional safeguard, and it can be made to operate unless the whole world goes cockeyed.

Mr. McDONOUGH. But if such an institution for training men in precision

machinery and other things is recognized as an educational institution in Europe or Asia, then they would come under the terms of this bill, as I read it.

Mr. MUNDT. Not under any mandatory provision.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the motion has not been submitted in writing.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, a preferential motion of this character does not have to be submitted in writing.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

The question was taken; and Mr. ANGELL demanded a division.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. REED of New York moves that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RAYBURN) there were—ayes 93, noes 95.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. MUNDT and Mr. REED of New York.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 101, noes 110.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that before the motion was made that the Committee do now rise the question was being taken on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]. There was a voice vote and then a division was requested.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCORMACK. The Chair had stated that a standing vote had been requested, but I think the Chair failed to state that the Chair announced the "ayes" had it on the voice vote.

The CHAIRMAN. No. No announcement was made on the division. The preferential motion intervened.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

The question was taken; and on a division there were—ayes 145, noes 1.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARNESS of Indiana: On page 12, line 22, strike out all of subsection 1.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, this amendment has been fully debated for 3 or 4 days. This has to do with subsection 1 on page 12. It strikes out the authority granted to the Secretary of State to make these various contributions. I think it is the most vicious part of this bill. I think it would be a dangerous precedent for this House to establish.

Without taking any more time of the Committee, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. WELCH. In what particular respect is the subsection vicious?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I said I think it would be a dangerous precedent for the Congress to establish. It would give the Secretary of State a blank check to make contributions to governmental agencies, to private and public schools and universities, not only in this country but in foreign countries; and to individuals.

Mr. WELCH. Has not a precedent been established?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. It occurs to me this proposed grant is without precedent.

Mr. WELCH. Of course it is not establishing precedent. Under the GI bill of rights a veteran can choose any institution of learning or vocational-training school, public or private, in the United States. That is his privilege. The amendment would deny that which is already granted in the bill of rights.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Do you mean to the servicemen? To the veterans?

Mr. WELCH. Yes.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Why, it has nothing whatsoever to do with the GI bill of rights, except that its enactment could hardly be pleasing to our deserving veterans receiving educational benefits under that measure.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Yes, I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In answer to the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH], the paragraph expressly says it is limited to title II, which has not anything to do with veterans.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. That is perfectly true.

But as I was about to remark when the gentleman from California intervened, this grant of authority to the Secretary of State can hardly be justified to our American veterans who are trying, with Government assistance, to complete educations which were interrupted by military service. We offer them $65 per month single, or $90 per month if they are married and struggling to hold families together. Yet here it is proposed to authorize payment of expenses of about $10 per day for foreign students.

I urge that this amendment be adopted.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if this amendment were to be adopted it would be almost equivalent to striking title 2 from the bill because, of course, if the Secretary of State is not permitted to make the necessary grants to institutions to enable them to train the students and professors to be sent to them, or to give books and money for travel and maintenance to the individuals to enable them to carry out their studies, then I do not see how he could properly administer title 2 of the bill.

With respect to the statement just made by the gentleman from Indiana that this would interfere with the GI's education, may I say that not a single undergraduate student will come to this country to study under this bill; only graduate students, and our graduate schools are not overcrowded, with the exception of a few like medical schools.

With respect to the question the gentleman raised as to the $10 a day per diem for subsistence, that is a maximum figure and applies only during the time of traveling. Under the regulations of the State Department published in the Federal Register of August 23, 1944, the highest ranking visitors, professors, persons of influence or possessing special qualifications in a technical, professional or other specialized field, are allowed an expense account of $10 a day when traveling. Students under the regulations receive not to exceed $7 a day for food, lodging, and incidentals while they are traveling to and from America except that it is $3.50 a day while they are on shipboard. We can best judge the future of this program by what has happened in the past. We have gone over the figures of how it has been operated heretofore, and the amounts spent have not been excessive.

If you want to weaken title 2 and make the program of student exchange more difficult to administer, which program in my judgment is one of the most important in the whole bill, and in the long run, more valuable even than the information service, then you will accept this amendment.

If the subsection in question were to permit the Federal Government to make grants-in-aid to private institutions or to governmental institutions in the manner feared by some who have expressed themselves on the floor, I would oppose it. My votes have shown I am as vigorously opposed to Federal subsidy or control of our educational institutions as any man can be. All the subsection does with respect to educational and training institutions is to authorize that tuition and related fees when not available from other sources will be paid by the State Department "on behalf of the grantee direct to the institution concerned upon presentation of an itemized voucher countersigned by the grantee." Those are the words of the regulations.

This question of student interchange has already been discussed at great length and it has been approved by a majority of the Committee on several votes. It is my hope that this amendment, too, will be voted down.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. All I wish to say is that this particular subsection does not create a precedent but is already in force with Latin-American countries.

Mr. JUDD. Yes, all that this section does is to permit the Secretary to do in the new areas of Europe, Asia, and Africa what he has been doing all along under existing law with respect to Latin America.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Then if the gentleman's statement he just made to this Committee is true, they do not need this section in the bill. The gentleman says they have been doing it. All right; let them do it the way they have been doing it before without giving them specific blanket authority.

Mr. JUDD. The answer to the gentleman is that they are doing it now with respect to Latin America because they have legislation for Latin America. They do not have it for the rest of the world; this section is for the very purpose of giving it to them, otherwise the Appropriations Committee properly will provide no funds. The authority for Latin America was given in the legislation that set up the so-called Rockefeller program. This section does not expand the Secretary's power. It merely extends the area over which he will have such authority.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. MATHEWS. Can the gentleman point out in the bill where there is any restriction on the $10-a-day subsistence allowance?

Mr. JUDD. There is not anything in the bill.

Mr. MATHEWS. No.

Mr. JUDD. But here are the regulations that have been issued and from which I have read. As I say, you can only judge the program in the future by the way it has been handled in the past; and I can assure the gentleman that in the past the outside limit for students has been $7 a day when they were traveling on land and $3.50 when they were on shipboard.

Mr. MATHEWS. This is an entirely new bill, an entirely new piece of legislation.

Mr. JUDD. But it is the same sort of program for other countries that has long been provided by law and is already being carried out in the Western Hemisphere.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt; the Committee divided, and there were—ayes 106, noes 96.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. JUDD and Mr. HARNESS of Indiana.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 106, noes 113.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do this for the purpose of making an announcement. It is a quarter to 6 now on Friday. We have had a long and hard day since 11 o'clock this morning. I want to say on behalf of the Committee on Foreign Affairs that I appreciate your patience and your diligence and your thoughtful attention to this measure. We have now gotten down almost through title VII and all the vital decisions on this legislation have been made affirmatively. We appreciate that. We thank the House for its cooperation and support.

I see no reason, therefore, why we should sit here and argue about the remaining sections, which are pretty much administrative in detail, and which are largely in the nature of correcting safeguard amendments and directives. I think it would be more agreeable to the House to rise at this time and take our final action on this legislation the first part of next week, since it might require from 60 to 90 minutes at this late hour to wind up the details remaining to be considered and to explain fully the administrative safeguards they include. There also remain a number of amendments to which the committee has agreed, but each of them will require some time. Consequently, I move, Mr. Chairman, that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. MICHENER] having assumed the Chair, Mr. JENKINS of Ohio, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3342) to enable the Government of the United States more effectively to carry on its foreign relations by means of promotion of the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills between the people of the United States and other countries, and by means of public dissemination abroad of information about the United States, its people, and its policies, had come to no resolution thereon.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1948

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 3839) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 589), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. RAYBURN reserved all points of order on the bill.

RENT CONTROL BILL

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the bill H. R. 3203, relative to maximum rents on housing accommodations; to repeal certain provisions of Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress, and for other purposes, may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to announce the program for next week.

On Monday we will call the Consent Calendar, and it is possible that there may be some motions to suspend the rules. Then we propose to take up the conference report on the so-called wool bill. I do not know how soon that might be concluded. The measure we have been considering today is unfinished business, of course, and if there is time it could be called up for further consideration at that time.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. I note that the conference report on the so-called rent-control bill will be ready on Monday. Does the gentleman believe that that might go over until Tuesday?

Mr. HALLECK. I have discussed that matter with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] and others. Instead of calling it up Monday, we propose to call it up on Tuesday.

Mr. RAYBURN. It is not absolutely certain yet that there will be suspensions on Monday?

Mr. HALLECK. That is right. It is not absolutely certain. Of course, that is within the discretion of the Speaker.

Mr. RAYBURN. Would it not appear to the gentleman, then, that within a couple of hours on Monday we might get back to this bill? The Consent Calendar usually takes 30 or 40 minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. That might be possible; yes.

On Tuesday we will call the Private Calendar and begin the consideration of the independent offices appropriation bill. On Wednesday and Thursday we will continue with the independent offices appropriation bill, if that is not concluded earlier.

We also have for consideration, and hope to dispose of during the week, the bill (H. R. 1389) to amend the Veterans' Preference Act, and another measure to amend the Veterans' Preference Act (H. R. 9666); also the bill (H. R. 2298) to amend the Interstate Commmerce Act.

We hope that on Friday we shall be able to take up and dispose of the legislative appropriation bill.

Conference reports and urgent rules may be called up at any time.

If a veto message comes to the House on Monday, in all probability the vote on that bill will be had on Tuesday.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Is it the gentleman's thought to schedule the housing bill, H.

R. 3492, which we were discussing yesterday and which has not been completed, at some convenient time next week?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes; that, of course, is also unfinished business of the House, and that will be called up at any time when it is possible to dispose of it.

I might suggest to the membership that there is considerable work to be done before we conclude this session of Congress, a session of Congress which we hope to conclude before too late in the summer.

Of course, the membership has been working diligently and conscientiously and consistently in taking care of the business that has been coming before us.

As to the programs to be announced from now on until the end of the session, I think it might be well to say that the membership generally might be holding themselves in readiness to meet such requirements of the program as may arise in order that the work of this session of the Congress may be concluded.

AMENDING INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 246, Rept. No. 590), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immeditely upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2298) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include the proceedings of the National Board of Underwriters, including an address by Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. PATTERSON (at the request of Mr. SADLAK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution passed by the General Assembly of Connecticut.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. PLOESER (at the request of Mr. BENNETT of Missouri) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain excerpts.

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting an article by Andrew Bernhard, editor of the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette entitled "Visitors to Moscow Stress Need of United States Information Program."

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances in the RECORD, in one to include Congressmen's voting records, in the second to include an editorial from the Youngstown Vindicator, and in the third to include the second part of a speech he made last Monday before the National Federation of Catholic Students in New York City.

Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include in one instance a letter from the Commissioner of the HOLC and in the other a letter and petition from the city clerk of the city of Clairton.

Mrs. DOUGLAS asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DURHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Dr. T. J. Woofter.

Mr. HAYS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, this Congress is faced with a very important problem of determining whether the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which was established under date of January 22, 1932, should be continued. There are many who believe that curtailment of its powers is a desirable thing to do. There are many others who believe that this Corporation of the Government has proven to be a bulwark of economic defense in the most difficult period in our Nation's history. We of the Congress, realizing the difficult foreign and domestic situation confronting us, keenly appreciate the importance of maintaining domestic tranquillity in a fast-changing world.

The continued or increased employment of labor, the rehabilitation of our returned soldiers, the maintenance of an organization in the event of catastrophe, cyclone, fire, or flood, the making available to industry working capital when normal credit is denied, have a very great bearing upon not only this generation but the generations which will follow us.

Never before in the history of this Nation have we been called upon to plan more wisely, to seek truth more assiduously, or to prepare more fully for what may be the eventuality of tomorrow. It seems as if there is nothing certain on the domestic scene. Certainly there is no permanency on the foreign scene. With the whole world in a state of flux, with the economic flotsam and jetsam of two wars piled throughout the length and breadth of this Nation, with millions homeless, with impending strikes at home, with the veterans desperately seeking shelter for their growing families, we should pause to consider the elimination of an organization which for a period of 15 years has been rightfully called the "financial Red Cross of the depression."

There are many who would highlight the mistakes made by this organization. It is unfair to judge either organizations or men by weaknesses to which we are all prone. Organizations are composed of men and are only as strong as those who lead them. Our cities, our States, our Nation, and those of the whole world, are dependent upon human beings in administration, and, so long as we remain human, we will have cardinal virtues and serious weaknesses.

It is in the maintaining of balance between good and evil, personally or in an organization or nation, that we achieve progress. We do not condemn our friends merely for an occasional weakness. To do so is intolerant. Even you and I have our weaknesses, and I defy any man to indicate either the perfect product, the perfect human being, or the perfect state. Have we the right, therefore, to demand perfection when we cannot give it?

The elimination, therefore, of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, admitting that certain weaknesses existed, in view of the marvelous record of achievement it has maintained, can render a very serious economic blow to this Nation at a time when we need this corporate body more than ever before in our economic history.

We know that this Nation is composed primarily of small-business enterprises. We see credit tightening now, with unemployment mounting, with confusion and frustration facing many business enterprises, and, yet, there are some who would summarily eliminate this organization which has had for its formal object the preservation of business enterprises in this country when credit was not available. Hundreds, aye, thousands of concerns played a very potent part in the winning of the war because the economic life blood—working capital, if you will—was made available to them in the depression years.

The banks of this Nation, some 15,000 strong, turned to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for counsel and advice. Preferred stock and debentures were issued so that they too could remain as an important part of the economic life of this country, to give stability to the communities that they serve, and to make credit continually available to those who needed it.

We are asked to determine whether this organization shall continue beyond June of this year, or whether the banks of this Nation shall carry on without regard to Federal aid of normal credit is denied.

We believe in private enterprise. We believe that this is the greatest nation on earth because of the system that has

been promulgated throughout the years whereby each individual is given an equal opportunity to work with his hands. To others is given the opportunity to guide and direct, and, in a business enterprise, the normal flow of capital makes labor and capital a working team for the common good. There is not a single man in this assembly that can tell with assurance what will happen 6 months or 2 years hence.

There is only one way to judge the future, and that is from the past and present. In the past we have seen repeated depressions following a cycle of war where millions of human beings were dependent upon public aid because positions were not available to them. There are many who believe that at the present time we are in the throes of a recession. Many believe that this recession will be corrected within a period of several months, while there are others who believe that the recession may well become a depression, depending upon the planning and thinking of our national leaders.

During the period of the war, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation carried a greater burden than would normally be asked of a peacetime organization. It did it willingly, faithfully, conscientiously, and more and more responsibility was placed in this organization because of its reputation for doing a job along a businesslike way for the common good. The Army, the Navy, the Maritime Commission, even the Congress have made mistakes. To be human is to err. It is unjust now to high light weaknesses only and not give credit where credit is due to the over-all achievements of an organization which has helped this Nation weather a depression and is composed now of experts obtained through 15 years of practical experience to withstand whatever economic blow may be facing the 142,000,000 people who comprise this Nation.

There is an erroneous concept that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has assisted big business. It has been their province to assist big business as well as little business because private enterprise, as we know it in this Nation, is not composed either of banks or business or agriculture or labor. It is the composite of these that makes our Nation great. While loans were made to railroads and banks and large business industries, the airplane industry and the automobile industry, nevertheless the majority of all of the loans made to assist private enterprise were made to small business. As a matter of fact, the record shows that over 90 percent in dollars and in loans made were extended to assist small business as we know it.

The economy of this Nation, supplemented and enforced as it is by big business, is mainly in the hands of the small business enterprise employing from 50 to 350 employees. There are over 3,000,000 small business enterprises in this Nation.

In those areas of the Nation which are composed primarily of small business enterprises—and New England falls into that category—we need the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for what it has done, because of the kind of organization it is, and because we see in the horizon difficult years ahead. Economically, there is no stabilization abroad. Even now the Congress is asking for legislation intended to preserve our freedom through military education of youth because, forsooth, no man can tell what tomorrow will bring.

It is a paradox, therefore, to face an unknown future on a national plane where the best minds in America are concerned about peace and the generations to follow, and, at the same time, consider the elimination of an organization which is the only stabilizing force in Government today to assist the majority of our business enterprises when credit is not normally available.

There is a distinction between the credit made available by banks and that by the Federal Government in cooperation with the banks. There is a mistaken concept that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is in competition with banks. This is not so. Every time a loan is made some bank has denied the application or participates with this Corporation of the Government to extend credit so that that industry might live.

We have erected an economic clinic where ills of industry can be analyzed and a sound formula prescribed so long as there is an opportunity to preserve this industry for the common good. It is that kind of union between Government, banks, and industry for the benefit of labor, for the benefit of capital, for the benefit of this Nation, that we can preserve our ideals as a Nation and continue to operate as a private enterprise country.

Look around you. England, France, Italy, Austria, Hungary, Sweden, even many of our South American countries are turning away from the private enterprise system, and we, almost alone, are fighting the battle for a republican form of Government and the retention of our democratic way of life. The bulwark against recession and depression, for the preservation of the banks, industry, labor lies along the road traveled by this organization which has demonstrated, through capability and initiative, the confidence placed in this organization in 1932 under a Republican President, Herbert Hoover.

I will not bore you with statistics concerning the achievements of this organization. Much has been written and said in this regard; some good, some bad. In any event, we of the Congress must determine the issue—and remember, what we do will have a very important bearing upon the economic good or evil of the sections that we are fortunate to represent. We represent all of the people. We represent the banks, education, utilities, big business and little business, labor, all of our people. We represent the cotton grower and the farmer, the fellow who runs a haberdashery or a drug store. These are part of the industril mosaic which makes America. Put them all together working as a team and you epitomize what our forefathers properly said in the preamble to our Constitution: "We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union."

I, for one, choose to champion the cause of the average citizen of America who has been and still is given the opportunity to establish his own business enterprise as distinguished from the caste system which remains in so many nations of this earth.

The solution of financial difficulties because of lack of capital, restoration of confidence, the offering of counsel and advice when it is needed most, have been the contribution of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to our national well-being for a period of approximately 15 years. We can ill afford to ignore the fact that when the economic fabric of our Nation was torn apart, these Government representatives worked day and night to bring the seams together in order that others might have the opportunity guaranteed under our form of government. We will be asked within the next fortnight to make our decision on this important issue. Let us do it forthrightly by giving credit where credit is due. Let us keep faith with the future of America. Let us preserve our private-enterprise system, and let us give all an equal opportunity to be proud of their Government—the Government which we, the Congress, serve.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered I may address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCONNELL asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Philadelphia evening paper.

Mr. FARRINGTON (at the request of Mr. MUNDT) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MUNDT asked and was granted permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole today and include certain extraneous matter.

Mr. MUNDT asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include certain telegrams in connection with the bill H. R. 3342.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MICHENER). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

ANTICOMMUNISM POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, we have what is considered to be an anti-Communist policy all over the world. Recently we appropriated $400,000,000 to help the Greeks and Turks stem the cause of communism. Today we are engaged in a life-and-death struggle with the Voice of America, to get behind the iron curtain. I think it is high time that we

find out in just what direction we are going. Are we adopting an anti-Communist policy or are we really only giving lip-service to the anti-Communist policy?

While we were adopting the Greek-Turkish loan there was a convention of 500 leading Communists in the United States, and incidentally they held their meetings on Federal Government property.

Next Monday, at the Water Gate, which is Federal Government property, under the Department of the Interior, the Southern Conference on Human Welfare, which is among the most pinko-red organizations in the United States of America, will have a conference or mass meeting which they are holding at that place. If we are going to spread the Voice of America throughout the world and adopt an anti-Communist policy, and send $400,000,000 to Greece and Turkey to stop communism, it appears to me that we look stupid and silly all over the world when we are asking other people of the world to combat communism and then find that our Government officials permit the use of Federal buildings and Federal Government sites for the use of Communist organization meetings. Now, do we not look silly all over the world with that kind of a policy? I think it is high time for a show-down. For that reason, an organization, of which I am president, has issued a motion for a temporary restraining order against the use of that property. We have served the papers on Julius A. Krug, Secretary of the United States Department of the Interior, and he has acknowledged those papers. The case comes up in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia. It is high time that we have a show-down. Is our Government truly anti-Communist or is it not? This case will bring the thing to a head.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therewith a copy of the motion for a restraining order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

JUNE 13, 1947.

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AMERICAN ANTI-COMMUNIST ASSOCIATION, INC., 1025 CONNECTICUT AVENUE NW., WASHINGTON, D. C., *v.* JULIUS A. KRUG, SECRETARY, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, WASHINGTON, D. C.

MOTION FOR TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER

1. The plaintiff is an educational, nonprofit, nonsectarian, nonpartisan patriotic organization, incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia.

2. The defendant is an agency of the Executive branch of the Government of the United States of America, under whose control and jurisdiction is found a certain property known as and referred to as the Water Gate, Washington, D. C.

3. The defendant did grant a permit for the use of the said Water Gate to the Southern Conference for Human Welfare as sponsors for an address by one Henry Agard Wallace on the 16th of June 1947. In the Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, Union Calendar No. 660, House Report No. 2233, being a report of the Committee on Un-American Activities pursuant to H. Res. No. 5, on page 28 is found a partial listing of Communist and Communist-front organizations, and among them is listed the Southern Conference for Human Welfare. Henry Agard Wallace found it impossible to subordinate his political philosophies and beliefs to those of the administration of President Truman, and it was, therefore, necessary for the President of the United States to summarily discharge him or request his resignation. The said Wallace was during the first few months of this year invited to Paris by the Communists, and, while there, was the guest of leading Communists in Paris, indicating a strong sympathy with the cause of Communism.

4. The plaintiff respectfuly requests this honorable court to take judicial notice of the opinion of former Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, Charles Evans Hughes that "communism has as its objective the overthrow of the United States Government by force and violence." And also, to take judicial notice of the executive directive issued by the President of the United States on or about March 23, 1947, requesting that all members of the Communist Party be removed from employment by the United States Government, which was a restatement of the law of the United States found in the Hatch Act, section 9A, paragraphs 1 and 2.

5. The defendant's outright and absolute disregard for the welfare of the people of the United States in granting a permit for the use of public property by a Communist group sponsoring a speaker whose methods incite human emotions toward riot and insurrection is a violation of the spirit, and intent of the laws of the United States and the said executive directive.

Whereupon plaintiff prays that a temporary restraining order issue from this honorable court to restrain the use of the said permit heretofore granted by defendant to the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, and that such restraining order run until the issues herein may be fully determined by this court.

FRANKLIN T. MILES,
Attorney for Plaintiff,
Washington, D. C.
PAUL V. ROGERS,
Attorney for Plaintiff,
Washington, D. C.

Service acknowledged this _____ day of _____, 1947, and consent to hearing on ____ day of _____, 1947, at 10 a. m., or as soon thereafter as counsel may be heard.

_____.

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES, FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AMERICAN ANTI-COMMUNIST ASSOCIATION, INC., 1025 CONNECTICUT AVENUE NW., WASHINGTON, D. C. *vs.* JULIUS A. KRUG, SECRETARY, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, WASHINGTON, D. C.

TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER

Upon consideration of the motion filed herein this 13th day of June 1947, it is by the court this _____ day of _____, 1947.,

Adjudged, ordered, and decreed, that the defendant herein be restrained from permitting the use of Government-owned property under its control by persons or organizations in any way affiliated with or associated with the Communist Party, and more particularly that the defendant render null and void the permit heretofore issued to the Southern Conference for Human Welfare for use on June 16, 1947, of the property known as the Water Gate.

_____,
Justice.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. WILLIAMS, for Monday and Tuesday, June 16 and 17, on account of official business.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 69. Joint resolution to prepare a revised edition of the Annotated Constitution of the United States of America as published in 1938 as Senate Document No. 232 of the Seventy-fourth Congress.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 16, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

785. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated April 19, 1946, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on the Red River, La., Ark., Okla., and Tex., and on a preliminary examination and survey of the Jefferson-Shreveport waterway, Texas and Louisiana (H. Doc. No. 320); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

786. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 7, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of a barge channel in the vicinity of Baton Rouge, La., extending from the Mississippi River through Devils Swamp, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 321); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

787. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting report and findings on an investigation of the Cody Dam and power plant, Wyoming, together with related data and correspondence; to the Committee on Public Lands.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HAND: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 72. A bill to increase the number of authorized aviation stations operated by the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 586). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAND: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 3539. A bill to authorize the construction of a chapel at the Coast Guard Academy, and to authorize the acceptance of private contributions to assist in defraying the cost of construction thereof; with an amendment (Rept. No. 587). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOPE: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 452. A bill to amend the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act relating to marketing agreements and orders; with an amendment (Rept. No. 588). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 3839. A bill making ap-

propriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 589). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 246. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 2298, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 590). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 3825. A bill to amend section 2402 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, and to repeal section 2402 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 3826. A bill to authorize and direct the Federal Power Commission to grant a license to the Savannah River Electric Co. to construct, own, operate, and maintain the powerhouse of the Clark Hill Reservoir project; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. R. 3827. A bill to establish a Weed Division in the Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering of the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana:

H. R. 3828. A bill to provide that the Legislative Reference Service shall compile and make available the voting records of the Members of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 3829. A bill relating to the employment by the United States of citizens of the Republic of the Philippines; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 3830. A bill to provide for the promotion and elimination of officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 3831. A bill to incorporate United States Navy Veterans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MITCHELL (by request):

H. R. 3832. A bill to extend to the veterans of the Mexican border service of 1916 and 1917 and their widows and minor children all the provisions, privileges, rights, and benefits of laws enacted for the benefit of veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. LUSK:

H. R. 3833. A bill to authorize a project for the rehabilitation of certain works of the Fort Sumner irrigation district in New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 3834. A bill to authorize a project for the rehabilitation of certain works of the Fort Sumner irrigation district in New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MILLER of Connecticut:

H. R. 3835. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EATON:

H. R. 3836. A bill to contribute to the effective maintenance of international peace and security pursuant to the objectives and principles of the United Nations, to provide for military cooperation of the American states in the light of their international undertakings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MALONEY:

H. R. 3837. A bill to extend the Federal income tax to the Panama Canal Zone; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3838. A bill to tax citizens of the United States employed by the United States in its possessions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 3839. A bill making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 3840. A bill providing for the continuance of compensation or pension payments and a subsistence allowance for certain children of deceased veterans of World War I or II during education or training; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 3841. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 so as to provide full annuities for persons who complete 30 years of service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GEARHART (by request):

H. R. 3842. A bill to equalize Federal income, estate, and gift taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to control the manufacture and sale of inflammable materials; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. R. 3843. A bill for the relief of Rita Anderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3844. A bill for the relief of Anna Malone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 3845. A bill for the relief of George J. Hiner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEFFERNAN:

H. R. 3846. A bill for the relief of the estate of Arthur F. Saladino, Joseph Spivack, and Irving Weinberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NODAR:

H. R. 3847. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Marincola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POTTS:

H. R. 3848. A bill for the relief of the estates of Arthur F. Saladino, Joseph Spivack, and Irving Weinberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

H. R. 3849. A bill for the relief of Domingo Gandarias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

632. Mr. CANNON presented a petition signed by 169 representative citizens of Albion, Nebr., protesting elimination of Federal cooperation in the farm conservation program, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 16, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We confess, our Father, that we know in our hearts how much we need Thee, yet our swelled heads and our stubborn wills keep us trying to do without Thee.

Forgive us for making so many mountains out of molehills and for exaggerating both our own importance and the problems that confront us.

Make us willing to let Thee show us what a difference Thou couldst make in our work, increasing our success and diminishing our failures. Give us the faith to believe that if we give Thee a hearing Thou wilt give us the answers we cannot find by ourselves.

In Jesus' name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of Friday, June 13, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on June 14, 1947, the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

S. 566. An act to amend sections 3533 and 3536 of the Revised Statutes with respect to deviations in standard of ingots and weight of silver coins;

S. 1073. An act to extend until June 30, 1949, the period of time during which persons may serve in certain executive departments and agencies without being prohibited from acting as counsel, agent, or attorney for prosecuting claims against the United States by reason of having so served;

S. 1135. An act to extend for . year certain provisions of section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, relating to the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to enter into leases for periods not exceeding 5 years; and

S. J. Res. 115. Joint resolution authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to continue and establish offices in the territory of the Republic of the Philippines.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 69) to prepare a revised edition of the Annotated Constitution of the United States of America as published in 1938 as Senate Document 232 of the Seventy-fourth Congress, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

CALL OF THE ROLL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of the Senate of Friday last, the

unfinished business, Senate bill 110, will be temporarily laid aside and the Senate will proceed to the consideration of unobjected-to bills on the calendar beginning with Order No. 197.

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Millikin
Ball	Hawkes	Moore
Barkley	Hayden	Morse
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Murray
Bridges	Hill	O'Conor
Brooks	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Buck	Holland	Overton
Bushfield	Jenner	Pepper
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Revercomb
Cain	Kem	Robertson, Va.
Capper	Kilgore	Robertson, Wyo.
Chavez	Knowland	Russell
Connally	Langer	Saltonstall
Cooper	Lucas	Smith
Cordon	McCarran	Sparkman
Donnell	McCarthy	Taft
Downey	McClellan	Taylor
Dworshak	McFarland	Thye
Eastland	McGrath	Vandenberg
Ecton	McKellar	Watkins
Ellender	McMahon	Wherry
Ferguson	Magnuson	White
Flanders	Malone	Wiley
George	Martin	Williams
Gurney	Maybank	Wilson

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is necessarily absent on public business.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] is absent because of a death in the family.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate for the remainder of today and tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

MEETING OF COMMITTEE DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. FERGUSON. I ask unanimous consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary may sit during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letter, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED PROVISION PERTAINING TO AN EXISTING APPROPRIATION FOR FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY (S. DOC. NO. 62)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 for the Federal Works Agency, in the form of an amendment to the budget for said fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF FEDERAL BUREAU OF NARCOTICS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics entitled "Traffic in Opium and Other Dangerous Drugs," for the calendar year ended December 31, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

PETITIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following petitions, which were referred as indicated:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 12

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing Congress to enact legislation to control the manufacture and sale of inflammable materials

"Whereas the uncontrolled manufacture of wearing apparel and other articles from natural or synthetic materials of a highly inflammable character constitutes a Nationwide risk of fire and hazard of injury to persons and property; and

"Whereas the unrestricted use of highly inflammable materials in the clothing and other manufacturing industries permits the transportation of the finished product in interstate commerce, thereby spreading the attendant risks and hazards into all the States; and

"Whereas it is impossible for any one of the several States to effectively control the manufacture and use of natural and synthetic materials of an inflammable character; and

"Whereas it is in the interest of the public health, safety, and welfare of the Nation that the manufacture and use of highly inflammable articles should be controlled: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the President of the United States and the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States be memorialized to enact legislation to effectively control the manufacture and use of articles from inflammable materials, both natural and synthetic; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this joint resolution to the President of the United States, to the President pro tempore of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Senators and Representatives from the State of California."

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of San Luis Obispo, Calif., favoring the enactment of the Senate bill 866, to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to facilitate sustained progress in the attainment of such objective and to provide for the coordinated execution of such policy through a National Housing Commission, and for other purposes; ordered to lie on the table.

REPEAL OF FEDERAL GASOLINE TAX

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and myself, I ask unanimous consent to present a resolution passed by the Rhode Island General Assembly and approved by His Excellency, Gov. John O. Pastore, memorializing Congress to eliminate the taxation of gasoline by the Federal Government, and request that it be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Finance, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 121

Resolution memorializing Congress of the United States of America to eliminate the taxation of gasoline by the Federal Government

Whereas, the Congress of the United States of America has imposed a tax on all sales of gasoline used for the propulsion of motor vehicles on the public highways; and

Whereas, the State of Rhode Island and all other several States of the United States have likewise imposed taxes upon such sales; and

Whereas the Federal tax on such sales of gasoline is clearly an invasion of the field of taxation reserved for the State of Rhode Island and other States of the Union; and

Whereas the Federal gasoline tax when first enacted was represented to be a temporary financial measure which would be repealed, but which on the contrary has persisted and has become larger and more burdensome: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby respectfully memorialized to enact with all convenient speed such legislation as may be necessary to abolish the Federal gasoline sales tax and to surrender to the States exclusively the power to tax such sales in the future; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States and to each Member of Congress elected from the State of Rhode Island and that the latter be urged to use their best offices to procure the enactment of such legislation as will accomplish the purpose of this resolution.

COMMUNISTIC ACTIVITIES IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Green Bay Diocesan Union of Holy Name Societies, Shawano, Wis., relating

to communistic activities in the Federal Government.

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas, with diabolic zeal and vehemence, the Communist powers are insidiously carrying on their avowed determination to dominate the earth, to destroy every vestige of Christian civilization, and to substitute for it their own Satanic system; and

Whereas in ideology, philosophy, theory, and practice, the whole of the communistic program is inimical to our welfare as Americans and as God-fearing Christian men, in that in every way it is diametrically opposed to the precious ideals and natural and political rights which we must treasure, preserve, and defend as our sacred heritage; and

Whereas we observe that while some of our national leaders seem to be increasingly aware of our country's grim responsibility in this tremendously vital conflict, a woeful and dangerous tendency is to be seen on the part of many in high places to evade, hedge and compromise in these tragic circumstances, opportunistically seeking by equivocation, chicanery, and sophistry to make personal or partisan political capital out of catastrophic misfortune of the modern world; and

Whereas clear-thinking men must everywhere recognize that the future happiness of our country and truly of the whole human race depends in large measure on the wholehearted, united, and vigorous defense of Christian principles and ideals by our own Nation and our own generation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved:

1. That the individual members of our society be urged and exhorted to be vigilant and keep close watch over the attitude, conduct, and record of their elected representatives especially in this field of governmental activity; that they exercise their rights and privileges as citizens by becoming articulate and giving voice to their convictions and that from time to time they inform their representatives of their alert interest;

2. That we formally, in convention assembled, take this opportunity to approve and commend the recent action of the Chief Executive in demanding a loyalty test of all Government employees and officials;

3. That we rejoice in what seems to be the determination of the new Secretary of State to set a pattern for American diplomacy which seems to be taking the initiative in China, Korea, Japan, the Middle East, and virtually throughout the world, thus putting communism on the defensive;

4. That we commend the industry, patriotism and foresight of the FBI under the leadership of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover in providing and amassing information of the subversive activities of known Communist agents and fellow travelers;

5. That we praise and extol those statesmen, including, happily, our own Representatives in the present Congress, who give evidence that they are keenly alert to expose and oppose every vicious activity of Communist enemies;

6. That we pray frevently and faithfully, invoking the special blessings of Heaven on our national leaders in these trying times and begging Divine Providence that the spirit of wisdom may enlighten their minds, strengthen their wills, and enkindle the fire of their devotion to truth and justice.

7. That a copy of this resolution be sent to Hon. JOSEPH MCCARTHY, Senator from Wisconsin, with the request that he extend it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Adopted by the Green Bay Diocesan Union of Holy Name Societies in session in Shawano, Wis., May 25, 1947.

REV. MARTIN J. VOSBEEK,
Diocesan Director.

ADMINISTRATION OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, there is now pending before the Congress legislation providing for a greater degree of self-government for the people of Puerto Rico. In connection with that legislation, I have received a letter from Hon. R. Arjona Siaca, a member of the senate of Puerto Rico, in which he requests that hearings on the legislation be held in Puerto Rico before action is taken. He also requests that this letter be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENADO DE PUERTO RICO,
Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico, June 6, 1947.

The Honorable Senator GUY CORDON,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CORDON: Distinguished Members of Congress are actively endeavoring to help the Puerto Rican people by trying to obtain approval of the administration bill granting to our local community the right to elect our own governor, and having him appoint a few officers of our own government which are now appointed by the President with the consent of the United States Senate. We do not doubt of their good faith in that endeavor. Allow me, though, to call your attention to the evident fact that almost all our community is cold and indifferent to the measure. Locally, it is considered as a political maneuver to quench the island's anxiety for a final solution of our political problem. It is also looked—and frowned—at as a diversionary operation intended to deviate local attention from a sad state of affairs which is fast reaching a critical climax. I do not say that that is its purpose. I say only that it is generally so considered.

I absolutely disagree with the few Puerto Ricans who have appeared before the congressional subcommittee which considered the matter. The measure is, paradoxically though it may appear, generally suspected of being an ill omen to the basic problem of our life. And it is so because we feel that what you seem to do as an act of mercy and political munificence is just a tiny part of our full democratic rights, unjustly and unreasonably held from us by the might of the United States President and Congress. And because, furthermore, we have the moral conviction that after the implicit acknowledgment that the bill involves of our right to elect and appoint, according to our government, Congress will feel relieved of its sinful neglect to do us full political justice, and justified in submitting us to further procrastination in the matter for many years more.

Speaking as a member of the Presidential committee appointed to study amendments to our organic act, the Honorable Luis Muñoz Marín, then and now president of the insular senate and of the local majority party, voiced in unequivocal terms that opinion in the following words:

"After we get legislation from Congress on this general matter of reforms to the Organic Act, we are not likely to get legislation from Congress again for a long time. And the problem of Puerto Rico, of course, goes much beyond the election of a governor, and we certainly do not want to, by our recommendation, contribute—that is, I do not want to contribute—to postpone a final solution for 20 or 25 years." (Hearings on Senate bill 1047, November and December 1943, p. 313.)

He also voiced our general skepticism when he asked, as we are all asking now, all except the gentlemen who expressed only their personal and circumstantial opinion in the matter:

"Are we going to let something that is an improvement but is not a solution create a psychological situation where it will postpone the final solution for a quarter of a century or many years? Is it worth while? Are those improvements worth that almost certain delay?" (Hearings on Senate bill 1947, November and December 1943, p. 496.)

America has the right, sir, to have the last vestige of an odious colonial system, with fundamental wrongs equal in magnitude to those which kindled the fires of the War of Independence in the patriots of the American Revolution, finally swept from the democratic panorama of America. It is here, in Puerto Rico, where the sweeping must take place. It is up to you, the Members of the United States Congress, to do it, eradicating its stain from the present history of your Nation. How can you feel at peace with your own conscience, fighting undemocratic regimes in other distant lands, regimes which, nevertheless, are created by the will of the people in said lands, while you voluntarily and arbitrarily maintain the people of Puerto Rico submitted to a government which does not derive its powers from the express consent of the governed? How can you?

Be not deluded, sir. You were not acting democratically respecting Puerto Rico, when you held the hearings regarding the bill now under your consideration, in Washington. Who could go there from Puerto Rico to express the popular feeling about it? Only the men of sufficient financial means and well endowed administrative officers on the government pay roll with all expenses bountifully paid by the Public Treasury. The people of modest means could not go. And, believe me, sir, you cannot judge the real state of our public opinion under those circumstances. Should you have held the hearings on our island, a different situation would have developed. And you would have had a real basis, not a delusive one, to guide your action regarding the bill.

It is still time to correct the error; to give to the Puerto Rican people, not an illusory but a real opportunity to express itself, in Puerto Rico, where rich and poor alike, governmental officers as well as private citizens, could be able to appear before you and make themselves heard regarding a matter which is to them the supreme problem of their life.

If that could be done I do not doubt that your action would be generally appreciated by the great majority of our population. And I am sure that it would work for the better understanding and relations between our respective peoples.

May I ask you that this letter be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that, in all fairness, the people of the United States, at large, may know also the expressions it contains regarding the attitude of the people of Puerto Rico about the matter?

I have the honor, sir, to remain,

Yours very respectfully,

R. ARJONA SIACA,
Senator at Large.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WHITE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 616. A bill to authorize the creation of a game refuge in the Francis Marion National Forest in the State of South Carolina; with an amendment (Rept. No. 287);

S. 682. A bill to regulate the interstate transportation of black bass and other game fish, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 288); and

H. R. 2654. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to grant to the mayor and city council of Baltimore, State of Maryland, a permanent easement for the purpose of installing, maintaining, and servicing a subterranean water main in, on, and

across the land of the United States Coast Guard station called "Lazaretto depot", Baltimore, Md.; without amendment (Rept. No. 286).

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming, from the Committee on Public Lands:

H. R. 577. A bill to preserve historic graveyards in abandoned military posts; without amendment (Rept. No. 283);

H. R. 2411. A bill to authorize patenting of certain lands to Public Hospital District No. 2, Clallam County, Wash., for hospital purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 284); and

H. R. 2655. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant to the mayor and City Council of Baltimore, State of Maryland, a permanent easement for the purpose of installing, maintaining, and servicing two subterranean water mains in, on, and across the land of Fort McHenry National Monument and Historic Shrine, Md.; without amendment (Rept. No. 285).

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 16, 1947, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 69) to prepare a revised edition of the Annotated Constitution of the United States of America as published in 1938 as Senate Document 232 of the Seventy-fourth Congress.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming:

S. 1445. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Idaho and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact for the divison of the waters of the Snake River and its tributaries originating in either of the two States and flowing into the other; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WHITE (by request):

S. 1446. A bill to authorize the leasing of salmon trap sites in Alaskan coastal waters, and for other purposes; and

S. 1447. A bill to prohibit the importation of foreign wild animals and birds under conditions other than humane, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1448. A bill directing the Secretary of the Interior to sell and lease certain houses, apartments, and lands in Boulder City, Nev.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 1449. A bill relating to the citizenship of Dr. Isaac S. Kiehm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REVERCOMB (by request):

S. 1450. A bill to amend the immigration laws relating to stowaways; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 1451. A bill for the relief of Perfecto M. Biason and Joan Biason; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. SPARKMAN):

S. 1452. A bill to provide for aid in industrialization of underdeveloped areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

INVESTIGATION OF SHORTAGES OF CERTAIN BUILDING MATERIALS

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, there continues to be a very definite shortage in building materials, and particularly in certain materials. My attention has been called specially to a shortage of gypsum products and such building materials as sheet rock and metal lath. Also, it has been called to my attention that there are practices in the distribution of these products which have prevented the smaller builders and the individuals from obtaining possession of them for use in construction. I have therefore prepared a resolution, and I now ask unanimous consent to submit it for appropriate reference.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 126) was received and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

Resolved, That the special committee appointed pursuant to Senate Resolution 20, Eightieth Congress, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed, in connection with its study of problems of American small-business enterprises, to make a full and complete study and investigation of shortages in, and trade and pricing practices currently engaged in with respect to, gypsum products and building materials such as sheet rock and rock and metal lath. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN AGREEMENTS BETWEEN CARRIERS—AMENDMENT

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 110) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

MINERAL POSITION OF THE UNITED STATES (S. DOC. NO. 63)

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to ask that there may be printed as a Senate document a paper which has been prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, by Mr. B. L. Ruggles, of the General Research Section, entitled "Mineral Position of the United States." In making the request, Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that a subcommitee of the Committee on Public Lands, under the chairmanship of the distinguished junior Senator from Nevada, is currently studying the same problem.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the paper referred to by the Senator from Wyoming will be printed as a Senate document.

FLAG DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Flag Day address delivered by him at a Flag Day celebration in Milwaukee on June 15, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

YOUR CHANCES OF GETTING AHEAD—ARTICLE BY JAMES H. McGRAW, JR.

[Mr. HAWKES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Your Chances of Getting Ahead," by James H. McGraw, Jr., from the Washington Post of June 5, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE LABOR POLICY OF THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS—ARTICLE BY REV. BENJAMIN L. MASSE

[Mr. McGRATH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Labor Policy of the Eightieth Congress," written by Rev. Benjamin L. Masse, and published in America for June 14, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

CHARITY MEDICAL CARE OR NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MURRAY

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Charity Medical Care or National Health Insurance," prepared by him for delivery in Montana, which appears in the Appendix.]

CYRUS S. EATON'S ADMONITIONS TO CAPITAL—ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Cyrus S. Eaton Bids Capitalists to Placate Labor," from the New York Herald Tribune of June 15, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

PICK-SLOAN PLAN—OR MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY?—EDITORIAL FROM DENVER POST

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Pick-Sloan Plan—Or MVA?" written by Hon. Leif Erickson, of Montana, and published in the Denver Post of June 3, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE TRANSPLANTABILITY OF THE TVA—ARTICLE BY DR. C. HERMAN PRITCHETT

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Transplantability of the TVA," written by Dr. C. Herman Pritchett and published in the Iowa Law Review for January 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

PURCHASE OF WAR BONDS BY FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

[Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Truth Revealed—F. D. R. Bought Limit in Series E War Bonds," published in the Anderson (S. C.) Independent of June 13, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEVASTATING STORMS AND FLOODS IN MISSOURI

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, there have occurred recently in the State of Missouri two catastrophies of a devastating character. On April 29 the town of Worth, Mo., was completely wiped out by a cyclone or tornado that struck like a thief in the night. Few houses were left standing in the entire community.

A blow involving a far greater area, and far more people, has now struck. There is today occurring one of the worst floods in the history of the State. The Mississippi River and the Missouri River and their tributaries, are out of their banks over great stretches. Large amounts of the best farm land in Missouri, as well as surrounding States, are now under water. Houses, livestock, farm machinery—everything has been swept away in the great onrush of water.

A new rise in the Missouri River is now predicted with protecting levees already washed out by the earlier flood. Army engineers report, according to the press,

"There won't be much that we can do except try to persuade families driven from their homes not to return. Those farms are going under again."

There are no stricken areas anywhere in the world that have been more thoroughly and completely devastated in the past few years than these parts of the State of Missouri are today. Our people are asking: "What is the Federal Government going to do?"

A large part of the devastated area lies in that part of Missouri known as Little Dixie, the part of the State in which I was born and reared. I remember as a boy hearing the old-timers tell of the distress that followed the War Between the States. During the period of reconstruction, the people lifted themselves up by their own boot straps. The only farm machinery consisted of home-made plows drawn by dairy cows and saddle horses. Some foreign countries during that period may have been enjoying unexampled prosperity, but there is no record, Mr. President, of any loans or grants or gifts to the people of our State, ravaged as they were by war, from any foreign state.

That the need is dire is shown by the large amount of letters and other communications that I am receiving by mail, by telegraph, by telephone, from people asking prayerfully for assistance. Without encumbering the RECORD with a large number of these, I should like to read one from the county agent of Cooper County:

BOONVILLE, MO., *June 13, 1947.*

Senator JAMES P. KEM,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Missouri River flood has broken practically all levees in the Boonville, Mo., area. Thousands of acres of growing crops are being completely destroyed. Need extra equipment including tractors, plows, discs and cultivators to rush emergency planting of corn and soybeans after water recedes. Have called W. E. Dillon, manager, Allis Chalmers, at Kansas City branch, phone Victor 5876, and A. A. Patterson, branch manager, International Harvester at St. Louis, phone Central 2420, for help. We have no definite aid promised but the need for extra machinery of any make is urgent.

HENSLEY HALL,
County Agricultural Agent.

I should like to pose two questions for the earnest consideration of the Senate:

First. If farm machinery is not readily available at once, should not the President exercise his authority under the War Powers Acts to prohibit export until the pressing necessities of our people at home are satisfied, and should not the President's powers in this respect, which expire June 30, 1947, be extended?

Second. What steps should the Federal Government take for relief and rehabilitation of the devastated territory consistent with our general policy at home and abroad?

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, may I say to the distinguished Senator from Missouri that it would seem to me the essential thing to do, in view of the situation existing in Missouri where such damaging floods have recently occurred, would be to get busy and hold hearings on the bill to create a Missouri Valley Authority, which was introduced by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] on behalf of himself, myself, and a group of other Senators. I think establishment of a Missouri Valley Authority to deal with that area represents the only way, and the sensible way, to handle the recurrent floods in the Mississippi and Missouri Valleys.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from Idaho that one cannot eat hearings and one cannot plow with bills. What our people in Missouri are interested in today is the distressing necessity of their daily lives.

REPORT OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF PANAMA RAILROAD CO.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the ninety-sixth annual report of the Board of Directors of the Panama Railroad Company for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 16, 1947.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received see the end of Senate proceedings.)

SUPPLY OF WATER FOR FALLS CHURCH, VA., ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will proceed to call the calendar beginning with Order No. 197, Senate bill 482.

The bill (S. 482) to authorize the Secretary of War to permit the delivery of water from the District of Columbia and Arlington County water systems to the Falls Church or other water systems in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia in Virginia was announced as first in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill, the title of which has just been stated, is the same as Calendar No. 230, House bill 310. Is there objection to the House bill being substituted for the Senate bill and being considered at this time?

There being no objection, the bill H. R. 310) to authorize the Secretary of War to permit the delivery of water from the District of Columbia and Arlington County water systems to the Falls Church or other water systems in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia in Virginia, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 482 is indefinitely postponed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 1179) to aid in defraying the expenses of the seventeenth triennial convention of the World's Woman's Christian Temperance Union to be held in this country in June 1947, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McGRATH. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

MARKETING OF ECONOMIC POISONS AND DEVICES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1237) to regulate the marketing of economic poisons and devices, and for other purposes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, this bill was considered by, and received the unanimous approval, of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The bill passed the House of Representatives without objection and with little discussion. The bill is intended to replace and expand the protection afforded by the present Insecticide Act of 1910. Such a bill is necessary because of the vast progress made in recent years pertaining to the development of many new insecticide poisons. The measure protects those who use such poisons, and also the public in general, by compelling those who handle them for sale and distribution to follow certain rules and regulations.

If the Senator will look at page 2 of the report, he will see the reasons advanced for broadening the act of 1910.

It is primarily due to the fact that today many more poisons are used by farmers and others. When the present law on the subject was enacted insecticides and fungicides were comparatively simple, consisting largely of paris green, pyrethrum, bordeaux mixture, and similar materials. We have added many new poisons, including DDT which is one of the more important additions. As I have just stated one of the main considerations for the enactment of the measure is to insure that poisons shall be labeled so as to show what they are and how they should be used. In recent months the use of some of the new poisons has caused a good deal of damage to livestock as well as growing crops in the locality where used. Permit me to say that other important improvements over the present laws are as follows:

1. A provision requiring the registration of economic poisons prior to their sale or introduction into interstate or foreign commerce.

2. The inclusion of provisions for protection of the public against poisoning by requiring prominently displayed poison warnings on the labels of highly toxic economic poisons.

3. A provision requiring the coloring or discoloring of dangerous white powdered economic poisons to prevent their being mistaken for flour, sugar, salt, baking powder, or other similar articles commonly used in the preparation of foodstuffs.

4. A requirement that warning or caution statements be contained on the label of the economic poison to prevent injury to living

man, other vertebrate animals, vegetation, and useful invertebrate animals.

5. A provision requiring instructions for use to provide adequate protection for the public.

6. A provision declaring economic poisons to be misbranded if they are injurious to man, vertebrate animals, or vegetation, except weeds, when properly used.

7. A provision requiring information to be furnished with respect to the delivery, movement, or holding of economic poisons and devices.

One of the principal provisions of the bill is the one providing for the registration of economic poisons prior to their being marketed. It is believed that this provision will provide additional protection for the public, assist manufacturers in complying with the provisions of the bill, and at the same time hold administrative costs to a minimum. Under the existing law, the Administrator has no means of ascertaining or knowing what economic poisons are being marketed, except by having a force of inspectors circulating through the country picking up samples here and there, wherever they may be found. Frequently, serious damage is suffered by agricultural producers and other users of economic poisons through the use of misbranded or adulterated economic poisons before the enforcement officials have any knowledge of the existence of such articles, or of their being offered to the public. Under this bill, any economic poison subject to the provisions thereof will be brought to the attention of the enforcement officials who will have an opportunity to become familiar with the formula, label, and claims made with respect to any such economic poison before it is offered to the public. It should be possible, therefore, in a great majority of instances, to prevent false and misleading claims, and to prevent worthless articles from being marketed, and to provide a means of obtaining speedy remedial action if any such articles are marketed. Thus, a great measure of protection can be accorded directly through the prevention of injury rather than having to resort solely to the imposition of sanctions for violations after damage or injury has been done. Registration will also afford manufacturers an opportunity to eliminate many objectionable features from their labels prior to placing an economic poison on the market.

The bill in most of its provisions is in accord with and supplements the provisions of the proposed uniform State Insecticide, Fungicide, and Dodenticide Act which has been recommended for adoption by the Council of State Governments. It is believed that the enactment of this bill will greatly facilitate the coordination of work in this field among the States and with the Federal Government. It is highly desirable that laws governing economic poisons be as nearly uniform as possible consistent with the need for the protection of the public, so that manufacturers may have Nation-wide distribution with a minimum of conflict between the labeling requirements of the various laws.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, since the bill deals with the use of poisons for agricultural purposes, I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONSTRUCTION OF RURAL POST ROADS

The bill (H. R. 1874) to amend the act entitled "An Act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads and for other purposes," was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SCHOOL BUILDING AT MOCLIPS, WASH.

The bill (S. 1318) to provide funds for cooperation with the school board of the Moclips-Aloha District for the construction and equipment of a new school building in the town of Moclips, Grays Harbor County, Wash., to be available to both Indian and non-Indian children, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The House bill 2545, Order No. 231, is identical with the Senate bill. Is there objection to the substitution of the House bill for the Sente bill and its present consideration?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2545) to provide funds for cooperation with the school board of the Moclips-Aloha District for the construction and equipment of a new school building in the town of Moclips, Grays Harbor County, Wash., to be available to both Indian and non-Indian children.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. BUTLER. This bill would authorize the appropriation of Federal funds for construction of a school building in Moclips, Wash., on a cooperative basis with the local school authorities. It follows the usual pattern of bills of this type. Construction of the school is apparently necessary, and, when erected, it will take care of about 90 Indian children, as well as the white children, in the neighborhood.

The Senate bill has a minor amendment clarifying the language so as to make sure that the Secretary of the Interior will have adequate control over the expenditure of the money. It is in the usual form of bills of this kind.

Mr. LUCAS. Are there precedents for this type of appropriation?

Mr. BUTLER. I was not informed about that.

Mr. LUCAS. Is this for an Indian school?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; a joint Indian and white school.

In order to make the House bill conform with the Senate bill as reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I move to amend, on page 1, line 5, after the word "for", by inserting the words "expenditure under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior for."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 1318 is indefinitely postponed.

LANDS FOR PARK PURPOSES, HILL COUNTY, MONT.

The bill (H. R. 2353) to authorize the patenting of certain public lands to the State of Montana or to the Board of County Commissioners of Hill County, Mont., for public-park purposes was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STANDARDIZATION OF GEOGRAPHIC NAMES

The bill (S. 1262) to provide a central authority for standardizing geographic names for the purpose of eliminating duplication in standardizing such names among the Federal departments, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, hereinafter called the Secretary, conjointly with the Board of Geographic Names, as hereinafter provided, shall provide for uniformity in geographic nomenclature and orthography throughout the Federal Government. The Secretary may exercise his functions through such officials as he may designate, except that such authority as relates to the final approval or review of actions of the Board on Geographic Names shall be exercised by him, or his Under or Assistant Secretaries.

SEC. 2. There is hereby established a Board on Geographic Names, hereinafter called the Board. The membership of the Board shall include one representative from each of the Departments of State, War, Navy, Post Office, Interior, Agriculture, and Commerce, and from the Government Printing Office, and the Library of Congress. The Board may also include representatives from such Federal agencies as the Secretary, upon recommendation of the Board, shall from time to time find desirable, even though these agencies are in the departments otherwise represented on the Board. The members of the Board shall be appointed by the respective heads of the departments or independent agencies that they represent. Each member shall be appointed for a 2-year term but may be reappointed to successive terms. The members of the Board shall serve without additional compensation. The Board shall nominate a Chairman to be appointed by the Secretary, and shall establish such working committees as are found desirable.

SEC. 3. The Board, subject to the approval of the Secretary, shall formulate principles, policies, and procedures to be followed with reference to both domestic and foreign geographic names; and shall decide the standard names and their orthography for official use. The principles, policies, and procedures formulated hereunder shall be designed to serve the interests of the Federal Government and the general public, to enlist the effective cooperation of the Federal departments and agencies most concerned, and to give full consideration to the specific interests of particular Federal and State agencies. Action may be taken by the Secretary in any matter wherein the Board does not act within a reasonable time. The Board may make such recommendations to the Secretary as it finds appropriate in connection with this act.

SEC. 4. The Secretary shall cause such studies and investigations to be made and such records to be kept as may be necessary or desirable in carrying out the purposes of this act, and he shall provide a place of meeting and staff assistance to the Board. The staff shall be responsible to the Secretary, who shall prescribe its relations to the Board and the committees of the Board. The Secretary may establish from time to time, upon recommendation of the Board, advisory committees of United States citizens who are recognized experts in their respective fields to assist in the solution of special problems arising under this act.

SEC. 5. For the guidance of the Federal Government, the Secretary shall promulgate in the name of the Board, from time to time and in such form as will carry out the purposes of this act, decisions with respect to geographic names and principles of geographic nomenclature and orthography. The Secretary shall also furnish such additional information with respect to geographic names as will assist in carrying out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 6. With respect to geographic names the pertinent decisions and principles issued by the Secretary shall be standard for all material published by the Federal Government. The United States Board on Geographical Names in the Department of the Interior created by Executive order, is hereby abolished, and the duties of said Board are transferred to the Board herein created, and all departments, bureaus, and agencies of the Federal Government shall refer all geographic names and problems to the said Board for the purpose of eliminating duplication of work, personnel, and authority.

SEC. 7. Nothing in this act shall be construed as applying to the naming of the offices or establishments of any Federal agency.

SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

DISPOSAL OF MATERIALS ON PUBLIC LANDS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1185) to provide for the disposal of materials on the public lands of the United States.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill? I should like to know what materials are to be disposed of.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the authority in the bill is to dispose chiefly of forest products on the unappropriated public domain. It may include other types of materials which are available, but there has been no authority heretofore for the disposal, particularly, of merchantable timber on public lands which are unappropriated and unreserved. The purpose of the bill is to give such authority to the Secretary of the Interior.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, may dispose of materials including sand, stone, gravel, and timber or other forest products, on public lands of the United States if the disposal of such materials (1) is not otherwise expressly authorized by law, including the United States mining laws, (2) is not expressly prohibited by laws of the United States, and (3) would not be detrimental to the public interest. Such materials may be disposed of only in accordance with the provisions of this act and upon the payment of adequate compensation therefor, to be determined by the Secretary. Where the lands have been withdrawn in aid of a function of a Federal department or agency other than the Department of the Interior or of a State, Territory, county, municipality, water district, or other local governmental subdivision or agency, the Secretary of the Interior may make disposals under this act only with the consent of such Federal department or agency or of such State, Territory, or local governmental unit. Nothing in this act shall be construed to apply to lands in any national forest, national park, or national monument or to any Indian lands, or lands set aside or held for the use or benefit of Indians, including lands over which jurisdiction has been transferred to the Department of the Interior by Executice order for the use of Indians.

SEC. 2. Where the appraised value of the material exceeds $1,000, it shall be disposed of by the Secretary to the highest responsible qualified bidder by competitive bidding and publication of notice of the proposed disposal once each week for a period of at least 30 days in a newspaper of general circulation in the county in which the material is located. Where the appraised value of the material is $1,000 or less, it may be disposed of by the Secretary upon such notice and in such manner as he may prescribe.

SEC. 3. All moneys received from the disposal of materials under this act shall be disposed of in the same manner as moneys received from the sale of public lands.

CORRECTION OF ERROR IN NATIONALITY ACT

The bill (H. R. 2237) to correct an error in section 342 (b) (8) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FLATHEAD INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECT

The bill (S. 753) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to defer the collection of certain irrigation construction charges against lands under the Flathead Indian irrigation project, Montana, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any provisions of the act entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and adjust irrigation charges on irrigation lands within projects on Indian reservations, and for other purposes," approved June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1803), the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to defer the collection of irrigation construction charges on the Flathead Indian irrigation project until January 1, 1949.

ARTHUR ALEXANDER POST, NO. 68, AMERICAN LEGION, BELZONI, MISS.

The bill (H. R. 1412) to grant to the Arthur Alexander Post, No. 68, the American Legion, of Belzoni, Miss., all of the reversionary interest reserved to the United States in lands conveyed to said post pursuant to act of Congress approved June 29, 1938, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELWOOD L. KEELER

The bill (H. R. 765) for the relief of Elwood L. Keeler was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LIABILITY FOR DEATH BY WRONGFUL ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1265) to amend sections 1301 and 1303 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia relating to liability for causing death by wrongful act, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments in section 1, page 2, line 12, after the word "the," to strike out "widow" and insert "spouse"; on line 14, after the word "That", to insert "if there be a surviving spouse"; and on line 17, after the word "kin", to insert "*Provided*, That if in a particular case the verdict is deemed excessive the trial justice or the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, on appeal of the cause, may order a reduction of the verdict", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1301 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1301. Liability: Whenever by an injury done or happening within the limits of the District of Columbia the death of a person shall be caused by the wrongful act, neglect, or default, of any person or corporation, and the act, neglect, or default is such as would, if death had not ensued, have entitled the party injured, or if the person injured be a married woman, have entitled her husband, either separately or by joining with the wife, to maintain an action and recover damages, the person who or corporation which would have been liable if death had not ensued shall be liable to an action for damages for such death, notwithstanding the death of the person injured, even though the death shall have been caused under circumstances which constitute a felony; and such damages shall be assessed with reference to the injury resulting from such act, neglect, or default causing such death, to the spouse and next of kin of such deceased person; and shall also include the reasonable expenses of last illness and burial: *Provided*, That if there be a surviving spouse the jury shall allocate the portion of its verdict payable to the spouse and next of kin, respectively, according to the finding of damage to said spouse and next of kin: *Provided further*, That if in a particular case the verdict is deemed excessive the trial justice or the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, on appeal of the cause, may order a reduction of the verdict: *And provided further*, That no action shall be maintained under this chapter in any case when the party injured by such wrongful act, neglect, or default has recovered damages therefor during the life of such party."

SEC. 2. Section 1303 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1303. Distribution of damages: The damages recovered in such action, except the amount specified by the verdict of judgment covering the reasonable expenses of last illness and burial, shall not be appropriated to the payment of the debts or liabilities of such deceased person, but shall inure to the benefit of his or her family and be distributed to the spouse and next of kin according to the allocation made by the verdict or judgment, or in the absence of such allocation, according to the provisions of the statute of distribution in force in said District of Columbia."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADMISSIBILITY OF CERTAIN TESTIMONY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1266) to amend section 1064 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, relating to admissibility of testimony by a party to a transaction when the other party is incapable of testifying, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments, on page 2, line 3, after the word "of", to insert "a deceased person or of"; on line

8, after the word "the", to strike out "incapable persons", and insert "deceased or incapable person"; line 12, after "the", to insert "deceased or"; and at the beginning of line 14, to insert "deceased or", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1064 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1964. Testimony of surviving party: In any civil action against a person who, from any cause, is legally incapable of testifying, or against the committee, trustee, executor, administrator, heir, legatee, devisee, assignee, or other representative of a deceased person or of the person so incapable of testifying, no judgment or decree shall be rendered in favor of the plaintiff founded on the uncorroborated testimony of the plaintiff or of the agent, servant, or employee of the plaintiff as to any transaction with or action, declaration or admission of the deceased or incapable person; and in any such action, if the plaintiff or any agent, servant, or employee of the plaintiff testifies as to any transaction with or action, declaration, or admission of the deceased or incapable person, no entry, memorandum, or declaration, oral or written, by the deceased or incapable person, made while he was capable and upon his personal knowledge, shall be excluded as hearsay."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DISTRICT SCHOOL TEACHERS' SALARIES—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1346) to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LUCAS. May we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I ask that that bill be passed over. I have an amendment to offer.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the Senator from South Carolina objecting to present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I object, for the present.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, to what bill is the Senator objecting?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina is objecting to Senate bill S. 1346.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have an amendment which I intend to offer. I send it to the desk. It is signed by several Senators. I shall want to take some time to discuss it, so I object to the consideration of the bill at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that at the earliest opportunity I shall move the consideration of Senate bill 1346.

TAX-EXEMPT PROPERTY IN THE DISTRICT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1125) to amend the act entitled "An act to define the real property exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia," approved December 24, 1942, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments, on page 2, after line 17, to strike out.

SEC. 3. Paragraph (p) of section 1 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(p) The building, or portion thereof, owned by a church and actually occupied and used as the episcopal residence of a bishop of such church."

And to renumber the sections.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, not very long ago, the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] had certain questions about the bill, and it was my understanding with the Senator from Nevada that no action would be taken on the bill until his inquiries were satisfied. I wonder if, before making a further explanation of the bill, the Senator from Nevada would care to have the bill go over?

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, there has been a very slight amendment offered to me. I do not want to hold up the bill, but I should like to have it go over until I can send to my office and get the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be temporarily passed over.

BELMONT PROPERTIES CORP.

The bill (S. 851) for the relief of Belmont Properties Corp., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Belmont Properties Corp., Arlington, Va., the sum of $667.50. Such sum represents the amount of a fee paid by the said corporation to the Federal Housing Administration in connection with an application, made on October 20, 1941, to such Administration for mortgage insurance on an apartment-house project in Arlington, Va. While such application was pending the land on which such project was to be constructed was condemned by the United States: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary nothwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

CLAIMS ARISING IN LAKE LANDING TOWNSHIP, N. C.

The bill (H. R. 888) for the relief of certain owners of land who suffered loss by fire in Lake Landing Township, Hyde County, N. C., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 3611) to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. This bill is similar to Calendar No. 213, Senate bill 1346. The bill will be passed over.

SOUTHEASTERN SAND & GRAVEL CO.

The bill (H. R. 2257) for the relief of Southeastern Sand & Gravel Co. was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

GUARDIAN OF HUNTER A. HOAGLAND

The bill (H. R. 723) for the relief of the legal guardian of Hunter A. Hoagland, a minor, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF THOMAS GAMBACORTO

The bill (H. R. 1065) for the relief of the estate of Thomas Gambacorto was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BLANCHE E. BROAD

The bill (H. R. 620) for the relief of Blanche E. Broad was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

J. F. POWERS

The Senate proceed to consider the bill (H. R. 811) for the relief of J. F. Powers, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$500" and insert "$400."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

PERSHING HALL, A MEMORIAL IN PARIS, FRANCE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 358) to provide for settling certain indebtedness connected with Pershing Hall, a memorial in Paris, France, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 7, after "$14,717" to strike out ", together with interest at the rate of 4 percent per annum from September 15, 1936", and insert a period, so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, from the Pershing Hall memorial fund, to Julian M. Thomas, of Oakland, Calif., for legal services and expenses in connection with Pershing Hall, a memorial in Paris, France, the sum of $14,717.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1032) for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of that bill?

Mr. LUCAS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

POLICEMEN AND FIREMEN'S RELIEF FUND, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 924) to credit active service in the military or naval forces of the

United States in determining eligibility for and the amount of benefits from the policemen and firemen's relief fund, District of Columbia, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment, on page 2, line 10, after "Congress", to strike out "upon his payment into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of such fund of a sum equal to the aggregate amount which would have been deducted from his pay for credit to such fund if such active employment had continued, for the period of his active military or naval service, at the monthly rate of pay received for the last pay period preceding his entry into such active military or naval service", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That in determining eligibility for and the amount of benefits from the policemen and firemen's relief fund, District of Columbia, each member of the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia, the United States Park Police force, the White House Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and each member of the United States Secret Service who has actively performed duties other than clerical for 10 years or more directly related to the protection of the President, who shall have left active employment in any such department, force, or service to perform active service in the military or naval forces of the United States, shall be credited with all periods of honorable active military or naval service performed on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to the termination of the war as declared by Presidential proclamation or concurrent resolution of the Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PAYMENT OF CERTAIN ALLOWANCES TO THREE METROPOLITAN POLICE INSPECTORS

The bill (H. R. 1624) to authorize payment of allowances to three inspectors of the Metropolitan Police force for the use of their privately owned motor vehicles, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHANGES IN CERTIFICATE OF INCORPORATION OF THE METHODIST HOME OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1191) to authorize the Methodist Home of the District of Columbia to make certain changes in its certificate of incorporation with respect to stated objects, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Methodist Home of the District of Columbia, a corporation organized under the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to the District of Columbia, by certificate of incorporation filed on January 11, 1889, is authorized to make such changes in the object clause of such certificate of incorporation as may be considered necessary to make such clause correspond with the present organization of The Methodist Church without changing in any respect the charitable character of such corporation. The procedure followed by such corporation for effectuating such change shall be that prescribed in section 602 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1284), as amended, for changing the name of a benevolent, charitable, educational, musical, literary, scientific, religious, or missionary corporation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate bill is identical with House bill 3604, which is pending in the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia. Does the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH] wish to ask unanimous consent that the committee be discharged from further consideration of the House bill, and that the House bill be substituted for the Senate bill?

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia be discharged from further consideration of the House bill 3604, and that the House bill be substituted for the Senate bill which is on the Calendar, and I ask for the immediate consideration of the House bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia will be discharged from further consideration of H. R. 3604 and, without objection, the House bill will be substittued for the Senate bill and will be presently considered.

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3604) to authorize the Methodist Home of the District of Columbia to make certain changes in its certificate of incorporation with respect to stated objects, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 1191 will be indefinitely postponed.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT BOILER INSPECTION ACT

The bill (S. 1124) to amend the Boiler Inspection Act of the District of Columbia was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the Boiler Inspection Act of the District of Columbia, approved June 25, 1936, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. No person shall use or cause to be used, without first having obtained a certificate of inspection from the boiler inspector, any boiler or pressure vessel operating at a pressure in excess of 15 pounds per square inch, except (1) boilers in single-family dwellings, (2) such heating boilers as may be exempted from inspection pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Commissioners by reason of the limited occupancy of the buildings in which such heating boilers are located, and (3) such nondangerous pressure vessels as may be exempted from inspection pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Commissioners."

SEC. 2. The Boiler Inspection Act of the District of Columbia, approved June 25, 1936, is amended by striking out the words "steam" and "unfired" wherever they appear therein, except in section 15.

DISTRIBUTION OF SURPLUS PROPERTY AMONG DISTRICT EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

The bill (S. 966) to authorize the establishment of the District Educational Agency for Surplus Property in the Municipal Government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of supervising and controlling the distribution of surplus property among the tax-exempt and nonprofit educational institutions and schools in the District of Columbia in accordance with the laws and regulations relating to surplus property, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to establish in the municipal government of the District of Columbia an agency to be known as the District Educational Agency for Surplus Property. The Agency shall consist of not more than 10 members, who shall be appointed and be subject to removal by the Commissioners. The members so appointed shall serve without compensation.

SEC. 2. The Agency may employ such persons and incur such expenses, including expenses for necessary travel of members and employees outside the District of Columbia, as may be necessary for the proper execution of its duties and functions as prescribed in this act.

SEC. 3. There is authorized to be appropriated, out of the revenues of the District of Columbia, such sums, not exceeding $10,000 per annum, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

VETERANS' SENIORITY BENEFITS IN DISTRICT POLICE AND FIRE DEPARTMENTS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1997) to provide seniority benefits for certain officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia who are veterans of World War II and lost opportunity for promotion by reason of their service in the armed forces of the United States, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment.

In section 1, page 1, line 3, to strike out:

That (a) any officer or member of the Metropolitan Police force or of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia whose name appeared (as a result of a regular competitive examination for promotion) on any civil-service register with respect to such force or department for promotion to a higher rank or grade, while he was serving in the armed forces of the United States during the period beginning May 1, 1940, and ending December 31, 1946, shall, for the purpose of determining his seniority rights and service in such rank or grade, be held to have been promoted to such rank or grade as of the earliest date on which an eligible standing lower on the same promotion register received a promotion, either permanently or temporarily, to such rank or grade.

And insert:

That (a) any officer or member of the Metropolitan Police force or of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, who served in the armed forces of the United States during the period beginning May 1, 1940, and ending December 31, 1946, and (1) whose name appeared during such service (as a result of a regular or reopened competitive examination for promotion) on any civil-service register with respect to such force or department for promotion to a higher rank or grade, or (2) whose name appeared on such a register as a result of a reopened examination taken subsequent to his release but which he was eligible to take at the time of his entry into the armed forces, shall, for the purpose of determining his seniority rights and service in such rank or grade, be held to have been promoted to such rank or

grade as of the earliest date on which an eligible standing lower on the same promotion register received a promotion either permanently or temporarily to such rank or grade.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I offer an amendment on page 2, lines 19 and 20, to strike out of the committee amendment the words "but which he was eligible to take at the time of his entry into the armed forces."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MEMORIAL TO DEAD OF FIRST INFANTRY DIVISION

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 188) authorizing the erection on public grounds in the city of Washington, D. C., of a memorial to the dead of the First Infantry Division, United States forces, World War II, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MEMORIAL TO THE MARINE CORPS DEAD OF ALL WARS

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 113) authorizing the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to the Marine Corps dead of all wars was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to grant authority to the Marine Corps League, Inc., to erect a memorial on public grounds in the District of Columbia in honor and in commemoration of the men of the United States Marine Corps who have given their lives to their country.

SEC. 2. The design and the site of such memorial shall be approved by the National Commission of Fine Arts, and the United States shall be put to no expense in or by the erection thereof.

SEC. 3. The authority conferred pursuant to this joint resolution shall lapse unless (1) the erection of such memorial is commenced within 5 years from the date of passage of this joint resolution, and (2) prior to its commencement funds are certified available in an amount sufficient, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior, to insure completion of the memorial.

MARINE CORPS MEMORIAL IN GRANT PARK, CHICAGO

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 112) to establish a commission to formulate plans for the erection, in Grant Park, Chicago, Ill., of a Marine Corps memorial, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby established a Commission, to be known as the Marine Corps Memorial Commission, and to be composed of three Commissioners to be appointed by the President of the United States. The Commission shall consider and formulate plans for the erection upon a suitable site in Grant Park in the city of Chicago, Ill., of an appropriate memorial to the members of the United States Marine Corps who have given their lives in the service of their country.

SEC. 2. The Commission may accept from any source, public or private, money or other property for use in carrying out its functions under this joint resolution; and is authorized to cooperate with interested public and private organizations in carrying out such functions.

SEC. 3. Upon the request of the Commission, the heads of the Federal departments or agencies may designate such personnel of their respective departments or agencies, or of the Marine Corps, as the case may be, as may be necessary to assist in carrying out the purposes of this joint resolution.

SEC. 4. Members of the Commission shall serve without compensation except that their actual expenses in connection with the work of the Commission may be paid from any funds available for the purposes of this joint resolution, or acquired by other means herein authorized.

SEC. 5. The members of the Commission shall select one of their number as chairman and another as secretary.

SEC. 6. The Commission shall report its recommendations to Congress at the earliest practicable date.

ISSUANCE OF A PATENT IN FEE TO RAYMOND WESLEY DOYLE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 394) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Raymond Wesley Doyle, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with an amendment, on page 1, line 3, after the word "That", to insert a comma and the words "upon application in writing,", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, upon application in writing, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Raymond Wesley Doyle a patent in fee to the following-described land situated in Big Horn County, Mont.: (1) The north half of the northwest quarter and the north half of the south half of the northwest quarter of section 27; the east half of section 28; and lots 3 and 4, the northeast quarter, and the north half of the southeast quarter of section 33; township 9 south, range 36 east, Montana principal meridian; and (2) the south half of the south half of the south half of the southeast quarter of section 19; and lot 1 and the northeast quarter of section 30; township 8 south, range 37 east, Montana principal meridian.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ISSUANCE OF A PATENT IN FEE TO RICHARD JAY DOYLE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 395) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Richard Jay Doyle, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with amendments, on page 1, line 3, after the word "That", to insert a comma and the words "upon application in writing"; in line 4, after the words "issue to", to insert Kathleen Doyle Harris, sole devisee of"; and in line 5, after "Doyle", to insert "deceased", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, upon application in writing, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Kathleen Doyle Harris, sole devisee of Richard Jay Doyle, deceased, a patent in fee to the following-described lands situated in Big Horn County, Mont.: The south half of the northwest quarter, and the southwest quarter of section 29; the southeast quarter of section 30; lots 6 and 7, the northeast quarter, and the north half of the southeast quarter, of section 31; and lots 1 and 2, the northwest quarter, and the north half of the southwest quarter of section 32; township 9 south, range 36 east, Montana principal meridian.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I notice at least six bills of the same nature on the calendar. I wonder why it is necessary to have the Congress pass bills authorizing the issuance of land patents. Why cannot the General Land Office do so? Will the Senator who introduced the bills please make the explanation?

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I received a report from the Department of the Interior respecting the bills, and the Department agreed that in these particular cases, so far as the Doyle family was concerned, it was necessary to have individual consideration by Congress of the claims.

Mr. ELLENDER. In these cases special legislation is necessary?

Mr. ECTON. Yes.

ISSUANCE OF A PATENT IN FEE TO THURLOW GREY DOYLE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 396) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Thurlow Grey Doyle, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with an amendment, on page 1, line 3, after the word "That", to insert a comma and the words "upon application in writing" and a comma; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, upon application in writing, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Thurlow Grey Doyle a patent in fee to the following-described lands situated in Big Horn County, Montana: The northeast quarter, the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter, the northeast quarter of the southeast quarter; and the south half of the southeast quarter, of section 17; lots 3 and 4, the south half of the south half of the northeast quarter, the east half of the southwest quarter, and the southeast quarter, of section 19; and the north half of the northeast quarter, the northeast quarter of the northwest quarter, the south half of the northwest quarter, and the southwest quarter of section 20; township 9 south, range 36 east, Montana principal meridian.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ISSUANCE OF A PATENT IN FEE TO LAWRENCE STANLEY DOYLE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 397) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Lawrence Stanley Doyle, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with an amendment, on page 1, line 3, after the word "That", to insert a comma and the words "upon application in writing," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, upon application in writing, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Lawrence Stanley Doyle a patent in fee to the follow-

ing-described lands situated in Big Horn County, Mont.: (1) the west half of section 28; the north half of the northwest quarter of section 29; lots 1 and 2, the northwest quarter, and the north half of the southwest quarter of section 33; township 9 south, range 36 east, Montana principal meridian; and (2) lots 3 and 4, the north half of the southeast quarter, and the north half of the south half of the south quarter, and the north half of the south half of the south half of the southeast quarter, of section 19, township 8 south, range 37 east, Montana principal meridian.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ISSUANCE OF A PATENT IN FEE TO SPENCER BURGESS DOYLE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 398) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Spencer Burgess Doyle, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with an amendment, on page 1, line 3, after the word "That", to insert a comma and the words "upon application in writing," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, upon application in writing, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Spencer Burgess Doyle a patent in fee to the following-described lands situated in Big Horn County, Mont.: The south half of the south half of section 20; the west half of the east half of the northeast quarter, the west half of the northeast quarter, the south half of the north half of the souhwest quarter, the south half of the southwest quarter, and the southeast quarter of section 21; the south half of the southwest quarter of section 22; the north half of the northwest quarter of section 27; the north half of the northeast quarter of section 28; and the west half of the east half of the west half, and the west half of the west half of section 29; township 8 south, range 37 east, Montana principal meridian.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ISSUANCE OF A PATENT IN FEE TO GLADYS MAY DOYLE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 399) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Gladys May Doyle, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with an amendment, on page 1, line 3, after the word "That", to insert a comma and the words "upon application in writing,"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, upon application in writing, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Gladys May Doyle a patent in fee to the following-described lands situated in Big Horn County, Mont.: The south half of the southwest quarter of section 10; the west half of section 15; the northeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 16; the east half of the east half of the northeast quarter of section 21; and the north half, and the north half of the south half of section 22; township 8 south, range 37 east, Montana principal meridian.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The resolution (S. Res. 121) prohibiting under certain conditions the printing in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of matter offered as a part of the remarks of a Senator, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the resolution?

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish an explanation of it.

Mr. LUCAS. Over.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, may I make a request? I have been trying to find the resolution. It is not contained in my files.

Mr. LUCAS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be passed over.

GUARDIAN OF FRANCIS EUGENE HARDIN

The bill (H. R. 360) for the relief of the legal guardian of Francis Eugene Hardin, a minor, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

J. B. McCRARY CO., INC.

The resolution (S. Res. 122) referring to the Court of Claims the bill (S. 708) for the relief of the J. B. McCrary Co., Inc., was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 708) entitled "A bill for the relief of the J. B. McCrary Co., Inc.," now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the Court of Claims pursuant to section 151 of the Judicial Code, as amended; and the said court shall proceed expeditiously with the same in accordance with the provisions of such section and report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform Congress of the nature and character of the demand, as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

ISSUANCE OF PATENT IN FEE TO JOSEPH J. PICKETT

The bill (S. 484) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Joseph J. Pickett a patent in fee to certain lands, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Joseph J. Pickett, Crow Indian allottee numbered 372, a patent in fee to the southwest quarter, north half southeast quarter and southeast quarter southeast quarter section 15, township 8 south, range 32 east; east half southeast quarter section 16 and northwest quarter section 34, township 8 south, range 32 east; north half southwest quarter, west half west half southeast quarter, section 4, township 9 south, range 32 east; southwest quarter, northwest quarter southeast quarter section 27, east half southeast quarter, southwest quarter southeast quarter, section 28, township 8 south, range 32 east; north half southwest quarter section 26, northwest quarter southeast quarter, southeast quarter southeast quarter section 23, south half southwest quarter section 24, township 8, south, range 32, Montana principal meridian, containing 1,200 acres.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 758) to promote the national security by providing for a national defense establishment, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

PROCEDURE FOR FACILITATING PAYMENT OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT CHECKS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1316) to establish a procedure for facilitating the payment of certain Government checks, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments with amendments, on page 5, line 13, to strike out "(b)" and insert "(d)", in line 15, after "(c)", to insert "and", and on page 6, line 15, after the word "by", to strike out "an" and insert "any", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, with the exception of checks issued on account of public-debt obligations and transactions regarding the administration of banking and currency laws, the amounts of all original and substitute checks drawn on the Treasurer of the United States, including those drawn by wholly owned and mixed-ownership Government corporations, or drawn by authorized officers of the United States on designated depositaries, which have not been paid prior to the close of the fiscal year next following the fiscal year in which the checks were issued, shall be transferred from the account of the drawer or the account then available for the payment thereof to a special-deposit account or accounts on the books of the Treasurer of the United States.

(b) With the exception of checks issued on account of public-debt obligations and transactions regarding the administration of banking and currency laws, any original or any substitute checks heretofore or hereafter drawn on the Treasurer of the United States, including those drawn by wholly owned and mixed-ownership Government corporations, or drawn by authorized officers of the United States on designated depositaries which have not been paid prior to the close of the fiscal year next following the fiscal year in which the checks were issued and checks issued in payment of claims settled by the General Accounting Office on account of any of such checks shall be payable from the special-deposit account or accounts established pursuant to this section: *Provided*, That in the following classes of cases any original or substitute check shall be payable from the special-deposit account or accounts only after settlement by the General Accounting Office: (1) Where the check is drawn on a designated depositary, (2) where the owner or holder of the check has died or is incompetent, (3) where on presentation of the check for payment the Treasurer of the United States is on notice of a doubtful question of law or fact, and (4) where the check is over 10 years old: *And provided further*, That the limitation imposed in respect to certain claims or demands against the United States by the act of October 9, 1940 (54 Stat. 1061; U. S. C., title 31, secs. 71a, 237), shall not be deemed to apply to original or substitute checks heretofore or hereafter drawn on the Treasurer of the United States, including those drawn by wholly owned and mixed-ownership Government corporations, or drawn by authorized officers of the United States on designated depositaries, but nothing contained in this act shall be deemed to affect the limitation imposed in respect to claims on account of certain checks by section 2 of the act of June 22, 1926 (44 Stat. 761; U. S. C., title 31, sec. 122).

SEC. 2. The balances deposited to the credit of the outstanding-liabilities account of any fiscal year pursuant to section 21 of the

Permanent Appropriation Repeal Act, 1934 (48 Stat. 1235; U. S. C., title 31, sec. 725t), and which have not been covered into the surplus fund of the Treasury shall be transferred to the foregoing special-deposit account or accounts and together with the amounts transferred thereto under the provisions of section 1 shall be available to pay any check payable from such account or accounts.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to take such action as may be necessary to transfer at appropriate intervals from the foregoing special-deposit account or accounts to the appropriate receipt account or accounts on the books of the Treasury any amounts not required to effect the purposes of this act and with the concurrence of the Comptroller General to make such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary or proper for the administration of the provisions of this act.

SEC. 4. (a) Sections 306, 307, 308, 309, and 310 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (U. S. C., title 31, secs. 149, 150, 151, 152, 153), and section 21 of the Permanent Appropriation Repeal Act, 1934 (48 Stat. 1235; U. S. C., title 31, sec. 725t), are herey repealed.

(b) Section 5 of the act of July 1, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., title 31, sec. 154), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"At the termination of each fiscal year the General Accounting Office shall report to the Secretary of the Treasury all checks issued by any disbursing officer of the Government or its wholly owned or mixed-ownership corporations, as shown by his accounts rendered to the General Accounting Office, or otherwise, which shall then have been outstanding and unpaid for one full fiscal year after the fiscal year in which issued, stating in such report the date, number, and amount of each check and the symbol on which it was drawn."

(c) Subsection (a) of section 3646 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. V, title 31, sec. 528 (a)) is further amended by deleting the phrase "before the close of the fiscal year following the fiscal year in which the original check was issued" and inserting in lieu thereof the phrase "prior to the expiration of 10 years from the date on which the original check was issued" and by inserting immediately following the phrase "from the account of the drawer" the phrase "or the account available for payment of the original check."

(d) Subsections (c) and (e) of section 3646 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. V, title 31, secs. 528 (c) and (e)), are respectively, further amended by deleting the phrase "before the close of the fiscal year following the fiscal year in which the original check was issued" and inserting in lieu thereof the phrase "prior to the expiration of 10 years from the date on which the original check was issued."

(e) Subsection (f) of section 3646 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. V, title 31, sec. 528 (f)) is further amended to read as follows:

"(f) Substitutes issued under this section drawn on the Treasurer of the United States, except those for checks issued on account of public-debt obligations and transactions regarding the administration of banking and currency laws, shall be deemed to be original checks and shall be payable under the same conditions as original checks. Substitutes for checks issued on account of public-debt obligations and transactions regarding the administration of banking and currency laws shall be payable directly by the Treasurer of the United States without limitation of time."

(f) Subsection (g) of section 3646 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp V, title 31, sec. 528 (g)) is further amended by deleting the phrase "by any corporation or other entity" and inserting in lieu thereof "by any wholly owned or mixed-ownerhip Government corporation or by any entity."

SEC. 5. This act shall take effect on July 1, 1947.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 544) to further amend section 3 of the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHITE. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 140) to create an executive department of the Government to be known as the Department of Health, Education, and Security, was announced as next in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

PUBLIC SCHOOL BUILDINGS, OWYHEE, NEV.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 686) to provide for the construction, extension, and improvement of public school buildings in Owyhee, Nev., which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of not to exceed $300,000 for the construction, extension, improvement, and equipment of school buildings in Owyhee, Nev.: *Provided*, That plans and specifications for the construction, extension, and improvement of the said school buildings shall be furnished by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs: *And provided further*, That the said school buildings so constructed, extended, and improved shall be the property of the United States and shall be turned over to the Owyhee Public School District under the provisions of the act of April 16, 1934 (48 Stat. 596), as amended by the act of June 4, 1936 (49 Stat. 1458), and shall be made available to all Indian children of the said district on the same terms, except as to the payment of tuition, as to other children of said school district.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ISSUE OF PATENTS TO SETTLERS, PYRAMID LAKE INDIAN RESERVATION, NEV.

The bill (S. 30) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for certain lands to certain settlers in the Pyramid Lake Indian Reservation, Nev., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to issue patents for certain lands entered pursuant to section 1 of the act of June 7, 1924, entitled "An act for the relief of settlers and town-site occupants of certain lands in the Pyramid Lake Indian Reservation, Nev.," upon the payment of unpaid balances based upon reappraisals made in 1934 as follows: J. A. Ceresola, $4,595.89; W. J. Ceresola, $4,376.11; Domenico Ceresola, $4,926.63; M. P. Depaoli, $4,878.56; and the Garaventa Land & Livestock Co., $2,951.51: *Provided*, That the foregoing amounts, together with interest at 3½ percent per annum from date of reappraisals made in 1934, shall be paid within 90 days from the date of the passage and approval of this act: *And provided further*, That in the case of the death of any of the entrymen, payments may be received from and patents be issued to the heirs or legal successors of the entrymen herein named.

ERIC SEDDON

The bill (S. 1360) for the relief of Eric Seddon, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General is hereby authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Eric Seddon as of June 26, 1946, and the said Eric Seddon shall, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, be deemed to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Spanish quota of the first year that the said quota is available.

GUARDIAN OF GILDA COWAN

The bill (H. R. 1482) for the relief of the legal guardian of Gilda Cowan, a minor, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 1514) for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

EVA BILOBRAN

The bill (H. R. 1221) for the relief of Eva Bilobran was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ILLINOIS AND MICHIGAN CANAL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1628) relinquishing to the State of Illinois certain right, title, or interest of the United States of America, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with an amendment, on page 2, line 1, after the name "Grundy", to insert "DuPage."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

SHILOH NATIONAL MILITARY PARK

The bill (H. R. 2207) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands within the Shiloh National Military Park, Tenn., and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

OTTER CREEK RECREATIONAL DEMONSTRATION AREA, KENTUCKY

The bill (H. R. 2852) to provide for the addition of certain surplus Government lands to the Otter Creek Recreational

Demonstration Area, in the State of Kentucky was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MANCOS WATER CONSERVANCY DISTRICT

The bill (H. R. 3197) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Mancos Water Conservancy District increasing the reimbursable construction cost obligation of the district to the United States for construction of the Mancos project and extending the repayment period was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COACHELLA DIVISION OF ALL-AMERICAN CANAL IRRIGATION PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

The bill (H. R. 3348) to declare the policy of the United States with respect to the allocation of costs of construction of the Coachella division of the All-American Canal irrigation project, California, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LAND AND WATER RIGHTS IN CLARK COUNTY, NEV.

The bill (H. R. 3151) to grant a certain water right and a certain parcel of land in Clark County, Nev., to the city of Las Vegas, Nev., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PAONIA FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECT, COLORADO

The bill (H. R. 3143) to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Paonia Federal reclamation project, Colorado, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. LUCAS subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 262, House bill 3143, in order that we may have an explanation from the able Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the vote by which House bill 3143 was passed will be reconsidered.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, this is a project which was authorized back in 1939 or 1940. After authority was given for the project there were resurveys, and it was decided that the dam sites and certain of the works originally contemplated ought to be changed. The project is a very sound one. The amount involved is modest, and the Department of the Interior finds that it will be fully reimbursable. It not only serves to supply water for irrigation, but it also has flood-control incidents. There has been no objection to the bill in committee, and none in the House.

Mr. LUCAS. May I inquire what the cost of the project will be?

Mr. MILLIKIN. The cost of construction will be approximately $3,030,000. Two million three hundred and twenty thousand dollars will be allocated to water users; $600,000 will be allocated to the reservoir, which will be managed by the Bureau of Reclamation and from which the reclamation fund will derive revenues; $78,000 will be allocated to the Fish and Wildlife Service; and $32,000 will be allocated to flood control.

I should add that in view of the increased costs which will have to be assumed by the users of the water, we are asking for a 68-year repayment period.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, this is outside and beyond the President's budget.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator. I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SAN JACINTO-SAN VICENTE AQUEDUCT

The bill (S. 1306) relating to the construction and disposition of the San Jacinto-San Vicente aqueduct, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Congress hereby (1) ratifies the action taken by various departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government in planning for and proceeding with the construction of an aqueduct running from a connection with the Colorado River aqueduct of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California near the west portal of San Jacinto tunnel in Riverside County, Calif. to San Vicente Reservoir in San Diego County, Calif.; (2) authorizes the completion of such aqueduct in accordance with existing Government plans for the completion thereof; and (3) ratifies the action of the Navy Department in disposing of the aqueduct to the city of San Diego, Calif., pursuant to contract NOy–13300 which provides, among other things, for the leasing of such aqueduct to such city.

SUSPENSION OF ANNUAL ASSESSMENT WORK ON CERTAIN ALASKAN MINING CLAIMS

The bill (H. R. 2369), providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the Territory of Alaska was announced as next in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, during the war years the requirement that $100 worth of development work be done on each mining claim was suspended because of the difficulty of obtaining efficient help and because of the need of diverting all available labor to the production of essential minerals such as lead, copper, and zinc. It is deemed advisable to continue during the next fiscal year the suspension of the requirement for doing this development work.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is it merely an extension for a period of 1 year?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Only for 1 year.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with an amendment, on page 1, at the beginning of line 9, to insert "United States, including the."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

AMENDMENT OF ACT RELATING TO CIVIL GOVERNMENT FOR ALASKA

The bill (H. R. 174) to amend section 26, title I, chapter 1 of the act entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1900 (31 Stat. 321), as amended by the act of May 31, 1938 (52 Stat. 588), was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY subsequently said: Mr. President, my attention was diverted a moment ago when Calendar No. 265, House bill 174, was called. I desire to make a few comments with respect to the bill, and I wish to ask the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] about it. I therefore ask unanimous consent to revert to that bill at the conclusion of the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the vote by which House bill 174 was passed is reconsidered, and the bill will be returned to the calendar, for subsequent attention before the call of the calendar is completed.

SPACE FOR DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 451) to authorize the Federal Works Administrator through the Commissioner of Public Buildings to provide space to accommodate the needs of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That pending the completion of a new Federal Courts Building within the District of Columbia, the Federal Works Administrator, through the Commissioner of Public Buildings, is hereby authorized to provide such additional space in Government-owned or leased buildings within the District of Columbia under the custody and control of the Public Buildings Administration as is necessary to meet the needs of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia without cost to such court.

SEC. 2. Jurisdiction for all purposes (including those specified in section 1 hereof) is hereby transferred to the Public Buildings Administration over the property formerly known as the Capitol Park Hotel, located at 500 North Capitol Street, and specifically described as being all of lot 836 (originally divided and described as lots 159, 160, 161, and 162), in square 628, of the District of Columbia, along with the adjacent parking lot specifically described as lots numbered 156, 157, 158, and 845, in square 628, District of Columbia, situated on the west side of North Capitol Street between E and F Streets, which was acquired by the Federal Works Administrator pursuant to title II, Public Law 849, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved October 14, 1940, as amended.

GIDEON PEON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 403) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Gideon Peon, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with an amendment, on page 1, line 3, after the word "That," to insert "upon application in writing," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, upon application in writing, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Gideon Peon, Flathead Allottee No. 33, of Butte,

Mont., a patent in fee to the following-described lands situated in Lake County, State of Montana: The north half of the southwest quarter of section 33, township 19 north, range 19 west, Montana principal meridian, containing 80 acres.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1218) to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military Establishment of the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. An explanation is requested. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], who introduced and reported the bill, is not in the Chamber at the moment. Is any other member of the Committee on Armed Services available? Does the Senator from Minnesota wish the bill passed over?

Mr. BALL. Let the bill be passed over temporarily.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over temporarily.

MAINTENANCE OF DOMESTIC TIN-SMELTING INDUSTRY

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 125) to strengthen the common defense and to meet industrial needs for tin by providing for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry was announced as next in order.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the joint resolution?

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, the joint resolution calls for continuance of Government operation of the tin smelter in Texas. Before the war we bought all our tin from foreign production. The only smelters in this country went out of operation 2 years after the First World War. In 1940 it was determined to be necessary, for the national defense, to establish a tin smelter in this country. It is largely working on ores from Bolivia, which are available to this country. Some of the higher alluvial ores are coming from the Orient, but the production in foreign countries, in Holland, in the Orient, in Britain, and in France, has not yet risen to the point where it can take care of the needs of this country. Even with the operation of this plant, we are not supplying more than about three-fourths of the real demand for tin in our own industrial needs. The joint resolution calls for the continuation of the operation of the smelter, which was built for war purposes, during the reconstruction era until June 30, 1949, at which time we can take a further look at the tin situation. The authority for the present operation ends on June 30 of this year. It is agreed by all departments of the Government involved that it is necessary to continue this operation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved etc., That (a) tin is a highly strategic and critical material of which insufficient ore reserves exist in the United States and of which an adequate supply is vital to the Nation's industrial, military, and naval requirements for the common defense.

(b) Tin is now and for the immediate future will remain in short supply of the requirements of this country's industrial, military, and naval needs.

(c) It is necessary in the public interest and to promote the common defense that Congress make a thorough study and investigation regarding the advisability of the maintenance on a permanent basis of a domestic tin-smelting industry and to study the availability of supplies of tin adequate to meet the industrial, military, and naval requirement of the Nation in time of national emergency.

SEC. 2. The powers, functions, duties, and authority of the United States heretofore exercised by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation (1) to buy, sell, and transport tin, and tin ore and concentrates; (2) to improve, develop, maintain, and operate by lease or otherwise the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex.; (3) to finance research in tin smelting and processing; and (4) to do all other things necessary to the accomplishment of the foregoing shall continue in effect until June 30, 1949, or until such earlier time as the Congress shall otherwise provide, and shall be exercised and performed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation while that Corporation has succession, and thereafter by such officer, agency, or instrumentality of the United States as the President may designate.

SEC. 3. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation or the officer, agency, or instrumentality of the United States subsequently designated by the President shall render a full report to Congress on all its activities under this joint resolution not later than December 31, 1947, and at the end of each 6 months thereafter.

EXTENSION OF CERTAIN POWERS UNDER SECOND WAR POWERS ACT

The bill (S. 1297) to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act was announced as next in order.

Mr. BALL. Let the bill go over.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Minnesota to withhold his objection until I make an explanation of the bill?

Mr. BALL. I am perfectly willing to withhold any action on it, but I would still like to object.

Mr. REED. I should like to make an explanation of the bill. It proposes to extend the powers of the President under the Second War Powers Act in the matter of allocating domestic equipment. The freight car shortage has reached desperate proportions. As soon as the crops begin to move out of the West there will be a greater car shortage than we had last year. The Office of Defense Transportation has been a very useful instrumentality in allocation, handling, and quickly moving equipment. It is true the Interstate Commerce Commission has ample powers, but it is an administrative body which moves slowly. Here is a place where quick action is always desirable, and without it the car shortage will be worse than it was last year. The bill has been amended to make it expire on January 31, 1948, instead of continuing it for 1 year. I want to assure the Senator from Minnesota that, in my judgment——

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Is it not true that the Interstate Commerce Commission has affirmatively recommended the legislation?

Mr. REED. The Interstate Commerce Commission has made an affirmative recommendation in favor of this bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, this matter formerly has gone to the Committee on the Judiciary. The Second War Powers Act was handled by that committee. The committee is now considering amendments to the Second War Powers Act, and it seems to me we ought to consider the whole question at one time. So I should be disposed to object to the consideration of the bill at this time until we have the whole problem of the Second War Powers Act before us.

Mr. REED. I give notice that I shall move at the proper time to take up this bill and consider it. I do not want to interfere with the Senator from Nebraska in handling the Interior Department appropriation bill, so I shall not move at the close of the call of the calendar, but at some proper time I shall move the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

INTERSTATE OIL COMPACT TO CONSERVE OIL AND GAS

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 122), consenting to an interstate oil compact to conserve oil and gas, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby given to an extension and renewal for a period of 4 years from September 1, 1947, of the Interstate Compact to Conserve Oil and Gas, executed in the city of Dallas, Tex., the sixteenth day of February 1935, by the representatives of Oklahoma, Texas, California, and New Mexico, and thereafter recommended for ratification by the representatives of the States of Arkansas, Colorado, Illinois, Kansas, and Michigan, and subsequently ratified by the States of New Mexico, Kansas, Oklahoma, Illinois, Colorado, and Texas, which said compact was deposited in the Department of State of the United States, and thereafter such compact was, by the President, presented to the Congress and the Congress gave consent to such compact by H. J. Res. 407, approved August 27, 1935 (Public Resolution No. 64, 74th Cong.), and which said compact was thereafter extended and renewed for a period of 2 years from September 1, 1937, by an agreement executed in New Orleans, La., the tenth day of May 1937, by the representatives of the States of Oklahoma, Texas, Kansas, and New Mexico, and was duly ratified by the States of Oklahoma, Texas, Kansas, New Mexico, Illinois, and Colorado, and was deposited in the Department of State of the United States, and thereafter such extended and renewed compact was, by the President, presented to the Congress and the Congress

gave consent to such extended and renewed compact by Senate Joint Resolution 183, approved August 10, 1937 (Public Resolution No. 57, 75th Cong.), and which said compact was thereafter extended and renewed for a period of 2 years from September 1, 1939, by an agreement duly executed and ratified by the States of Oklahoma, Texas, Kansas, Colorado, New Mexico, and Michigan, and was deposited in the Department of State of the United States, thereafter such extended and renewed compact was, by the President, presented to the Congress and the Congress, gave consent to such extended and renewed compact by House Joint Resolution 329, approved July 20, 1939 (Public Resolution No. 31, 76th Cong.), and which said compact was thereafter extended and renewed for a period of 2 years from September 1, 1941, by an agreement duly executed and ratified by the States of Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, Colorado, New Mexico, Illinois, Michigan, Arkansas, Louisiana, New York, and Pennsylvania, and was deposited in the Department of State of the United States, and thereafter such extended and renewed compact was, by the President, presented to Congress and the Congress gave consent to such extended and renewed compact by House Joint Resolution 228, approved August 21, 1941 (Public Law 246, 77th Cong.), and which compact was thereafter extended and renewed for a period of 4 years from September 1, 1943, by an agreement executed and ratified by representatives of the States of Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Colorado, New Mexico, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Kentucky, and was deposited in the Department of State of the United States and thereafter such extended and renewed compact was, by the President of the United States, presented to Congress and the Congress gave consent to such extended and renewed compact by House Joint Resolution 139, approved July 7, 1943 (Public Law 117, 78th Cong.), and thereafter the representatives of the States of Montana, West Virginia, Alabama, Illinois, Michigan, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Florida, Tennessee, and Indiana, executed counterparts of said agreement, and said counterparts so executed were deposited in the Department of State of the United States. The extended and renewed compact dated the first day of February 1947, duly executed by the representatives of the States of Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Kansas, Louisiana, Montana, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Texas, West Virginia, Tennessee, and Indiana, and which extended and renewed compact has been deposited in the Department of State of the United States, reads as follows:

"AN AGREEMENT TO EXTEND THE INTERSTATE COMPACT TO CONSERVE OIL AND GAS

"Whereas on the 16th day of February 1935, in the city of Dallas, Tex., there was executed 'An interstate compact to conserve oil and gas' which was thereafter formally ratified and approved by the States of Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, Illinois, Colorado, and Kansas, the original of which is now on deposit with the Department of State of the United States, a true copy of which follows:

"'AN INTERSTATE COMPACT TO CONSERVE OIL AND GAS

"'*Article I*

"'This agreement may become effective within any compacting State at any time as prescribed by that State, and shall become effective within those States ratifying it whenever any three of the States of Texas, Oklahoma, California, Kansas, and New Mexico have ratified and Congress has given its consent. Any oil-producing State may become a party hereto as hereinafter provided.

"'*Article II*

"'The purpose of this compact is to conserve oil and gas by the prevention of physical waste thereof from any cause.

"'*Article III*

"'Each State bound hereby agrees that within a reasonable time it will enact laws, or if laws have been enacted, then it agrees to continue the same in force, to accomplish within reasonable limits the prevention of:

"'(a) The operation of any oil well with an inefficient gas-oil ratio.

"'(b) The drowning with water of any stratum capable of producing oil or gas, or both oil and gas, in paying quantities.

"'(c) The avoidable escape into the open air or the wasteful burning of gas from a natural gas well.

"'(d) The creation of unnecessary fire hazards.

"'(e) The drilling, equipping, locating, spacing or operating of a well or wells so as to bring about physical waste of oil or gas or loss in the ultimate recovery thereof.

"'(f) The inefficient, excessive or improper use of the reservoir energy in producing any well.

"'The enumeration of the foregoing subjects shall not limit the scope of the authority of any State.

"'*Article IV*

"'Each State bound hereby agrees that it will, within a reasonable time, enact statutes, or if such statutes have been enacted then that it will continue the same in force, providing in effect that oil produced in violation of its valid oil and/or gas conservation statutes or any valid rule, order or regulation promulgated thereunder, shall be denied access to commerce; and providing for stringent penalties for the waste of either oil or gas.

"'*Article V*

"'It is not the purpose of this compact to authorize the States joining herein to limit the production of oil or gas for the purpose of stabilizing or fixing the price thereof, or create or perpetuate monopoly, or to promote regimentation, but is limited to the purpose of conserving oil and gas and preventing the avoidable waste thereof within reasonable limitations.

"'*Article VI*

"'Each State joining herein shall appoint one representative to a commission hereby constituted and designated as "The Interstate Oil Compact Commission," the duty of which said Commission shall be to make inquiry and ascertain from time to time such methods, practices, circumstances, and conditions as may be disclosed for bringing about conservation and the prevention of physical waste of oil and gas, and at such intervals as said Commission deems beneficial it shall report its findings and recommendations to the several States for adoption or rejection.

"'The Commission shall have power to recommend the coordination of the exercise of the police powers of the several States within their several jurisdictions to promote the maximum ultimate recovery from the petroleum reserves of said States, and to recommend measures for the maximum ultimate recovery of oil and gas. Said Commission shall organize and adopt suitable rules and regulations for the conduct of its business.

"'No action shall be taken by the Commission except (1) by the affirmative votes of the majority of the whole number of the compacting States represented at any meeting, and (2) by a concurring vote of a majority in interest of the compacting States at said meeting, such interest to be determined as follows: Such vote of each State shall be in the decimal proportion fixed by the ratio of its daily average production of the compacting States during said period.

"'*Article VII*

"'No State by joining herein shall become financially obligated to any other State, nor shall the breach of the terms hereof by any State subject such State to financial responsibility to the other States joining herein.

"'*Article VIII*

"'This compact shall expire September 1, 1937. But any State joining herein may, upon 60 days' notice, withdraw herefrom.

"'The representatives of the signatory States have signed this agreement in a single original which shall be deposited in the archives of the Department of State of the United States, and a duly certified copy shall be forwarded to the Governor of each of the signatory States.

"'This compact shall become effective when ratified and approved as provided in Article I. Any oil-producing State may become a party hereto by affixing its signature to a counterpart to be similarly deposited, certified, and ratified.'

"Whereas the said interstate compact to conserve oil and gas has heretofore been duly renewed and extended with the consent of the Congress to September 1, 1947; and,

"Whereas it is desired to renew and extend the said interstate compact to conserve oil and gas for a period of 4 years from September 1, 1947, to September 1, 1951;

"Now, therefore, this writing witnesseth:

"It is hereby agreed that the compact entitled 'An Interstate Compact To Conserve Oil and Gas' executed in the city of Dallas, Tex., on the 16th day of February 1935, and now on deposit with the Department of State of the United States, a correct copy of which appears above, be, and the same hereby is, extended for a period of 4 years from September 1, 1947, its present date of expiration. This agreement shall become effective when executed, ratified, and approved as provided in article I of the original compact.

"The signatory States have executed this agreement in a single original which shall be deposited in the archives of the Department of State of the United States and a duly certified copy thereof shall be forwarded to the Governor of each of the signatory States. Any oil-producing State may become a party hereto by executing a counterpart of this agreement to be similarly deposited, certified, and ratified.

"Executed as of the 1st day of February 1947, by the several undersigned States, at their several capitols, through their proper officials as duly authorized by statutes and resolutions, subject to the limitations and qualifications of the acts of the respective State legislatures."

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal the provisions of section 1 is hereby expressly reserved.

PARTICIPATION IN WORK OF UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 124) to enable the President to utilize the appropriations for United States participation in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration for meeting administrative expenses of United States Government agencies in connection with United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation administrative liquidation, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That in order to provide necessary administrative expenses for executive departments, agencies, and independent establishments of the United States Government incident to the liquidation of activities undertaken prior to June 30, 1947, in connection with participation of the United States

in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $2,370,000 of the unobligated balance as of June 30, 1947, of the appropriation "United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration" provided under the Third Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1946.

REVOLVING FUND FOR BENEFIT OF CERTAIN VETERANS

The bill (H. R. 2368) to amend paragraph 8 of part VII, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) as amended, to authorize an appropriation of $3,000,000 as a revolving fund in lieu of $1,500,000 now authorized and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DATES FOR DETERMINING ELIGIBILITY OF VETERANS FOR VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

The bill (S. 1392) to prescribe certain dates for the purpose of determining eligibility of veterans for vocational rehabilitation, and for education, training, guaranty of loans, and readjustment allowances under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) subsection (f) of section 1, title I, Public, No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, approved March 20, 1933, as amended, is amended by striking out the words "the termination of hostilities in the present war" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "September 1, 1947."

(b) Paragraph 1 of part VII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as added by Public Law No. 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved March 24, 1943, as amended, is amended by striking out the words "the termination of the present war" in both places in such paragraph where such words appear and substituting in lieu thereof the following: "September 1, 1947."

SEC. 2. Part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended; title III and title V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, are respectively amended by striking out the phrases "the termination of hostilities in the present war," "the termination of the present war," and "the termination of the war," wherever such phrases appear, and inserting in lieu thereof in each instance the following: "September 1, 1947": *Provided*, That in the case of any individual the date of termination of such individual's first period of enlistment or reenlistment contracted within 1 year after the date of enactment of the Armed Forces Voluntary Recruitment Act of 1945, Public Law No. 190, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved October 6, 1945, shall be applicable instead of the aforesaid date "September 1, 1947," unless such latter date is subsequent in time in which event it shall be controlling.

SEC. 3. The amendments provided by section 11 of the Armed Forces Voluntary Recruitment Act of 1945, to part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), and to sections 500 and 700 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 are hereby repealed.

SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1056) to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, so as to permit adjustment of benefits authorized by section 1506 thereof and similar benefits extended by governments allied with the United States in World War II.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of this bill?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, this bill was before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Its purpose is to make it possible for an American veteran who is entitled to benefits under the GI bill of rights to enjoy those benefits in the United States, diminished only to the extent that he may have received the same or comparable benefits in some other country. The bill arose out of this kind of a situation: A boy who was a citizen of New Jersey but had served in the Canadian Army during the war was, under the GI bill of rights, entitled to the benefits which that bill confers in the United States. But, having served in the Canadain Army, he went up to Canada and applied for school privileges in Canada and took 1 year's benefits there. It developed that the climate was unfavorable to his wife's health and he could not continue his training there. He came back to the United States and applied for training in a college in the United States. Then the Veterans' Administration construed the GI bill of rights as denying him the remaining benefits to which he was entitled in the United States because he had applied for and had received a part of his benefits in Canada. This bill simply makes it clear that under the present GI bill of rights—and no substantive rights are added to it whatever by this bill—a veteran who is entitled to 3 years of college in the United States and takes 1 year in Canada, having served in the Canadian forces, may, if he comes back to the United States, have an opportunity to get the other 2 years of training. In other words, his benefits under the GI bill of rights are diminished only to the extent that he has received comparable benefits in some other country. The bill does not add a single benefit to the rights heretofore conferred upon an American citizen.

Mr. RUSSELL. In the case mentioned by the Senator from Florida did the Government of Canada pay for the year of college training which he received?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes. Under the bill he will receive only what he is entitled to in this country, less what he actually got in Canada.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask if the bill in any wise affects the benefits of dependents of American citizens who lost their lives while serving in the Canadian Army?

Mr. PEPPER. No.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was hoping that the bill applied to cases of that nature, because I know of at least one case, and possibly two, involving two aged citizens of my State, each of whom lost a son while he was serving in the Canadian Army as a flier in the Royal Canadian Air Force. I think the benefits received from the Canadian Government are only $12 or $13 per month. They are not sufficient to defray the actual living expenses of those old people. I was hoping that this bill went sufficiently far to make up the difference between the benefits paid by the government under which the American citizen served and those he would have received had he served only the United States in the war.

Mr. PEPPER. That may be a deserving case, and it seems to be a deserving case, but this bill affects only the rights that are now bestowed under the GI bill of rights.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I merely want to make clear that if an American citizen served in the British Army for 2 years and then transferred to the American Army he may receive benefits under the GI bill of rights. Under the existing law, if he first applies to Canada or to the British he is barred from applying in the United States. The purpose of this bill is to provide that if he has applied to the British and received some benefits he may apply to the United States and receive GI rights as well as what he has already received from the British or the Canadians. So I think there can be no question about the justice of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1506 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended by section 10 of the act of December 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 631, 38 U. S. C. 697f), is amended by amending the proviso thereof so that the section will read as follows:

"SEC. 1506. Persons who served in the active military or naval service of any government allied with the United States in World War II and who at time of entrance into such active service were citizens of the United States shall, by virtue of such service, and if otherwise qualified, be entitled to the benefits of titles II, III, IV, and V of this act or of Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, in the same manner and to the same extent as persons who served in the active military or naval service of the United States: *Provided*, That any such benefit shall not be extended to any person who is not a resident of the United States at time of filing claim and the eligibility of any person for a benefit under titles II, III, and V of this act, as amended, and under Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, as amended, shall be reduced to the extent he has received the same or similar benefit from the government of the nation in whose active military or naval service he served: *Provided further*, That reductions of eligibility for purposes of this section shall be made in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the Administrator which shall provide that the period of time during which the person received the same or similar benefit shall be controlling in making reductions with respect to claims under titles II and V of this act, as amended."

ADMISSION TO AMERICAN REGISTRY, ETC., OF FERRY "CROSLINE"

The bill (H. R. 1344) to admit the American-owned ferry *Crosline* to American registry and to permit its use in coastwise trade was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR RELEASE, FREE OF ESTATE AND GIFT TAX, OF CERTAIN POWERS OF APPOINTMENT

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (H. J. Res. 210) to extend the time for release, free of estate and gift tax, of certain powers, and for other purposes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the resolution extends the time for the release, free of estate and gift tax, of certain powers of appointment under the Revenue Act of 1942. The resolution also amends section 1000 (e) of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to certain discretionary trusts, by extending the time within which certain powers may be relinquished. The subject of taxability of powers of appointment has been a very difficult one for a long time. The Senator will recall that it used to be customary for donors of gifts and decedents in their wills to give someone the power to dispose of the property with power to change beneficiaries. In other words, the powers would be granted to others, sometimes retained by the donor. The Treasury ruled that release of such powers by death or by action during the lifetime of the donor subjected the whole transaction to the gift tax. There are obvious inequities in that kind of a ruling, and it produced a series of laws, including this proposed one, giving the persons who have such powers of appointment the right to relinquish them tax-free within a stated period of time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Can the Senator state the amount involved?

Mr. MILLIKIN. No; I do not have any information on that point, but I do not think it is highly important. I may say that the Treasury has approved the idea. The Treasury would rather have it in more comprehensive form at this time and hopes that the matter will be given complete consideration in connection with the general revision bill. It has no objection to what the pending bill proposes to do.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. —. That subchapter C of chapter 30 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the tax on transportation of persons) is hereby repealed. This amendment shall apply to amounts paid after the date of the enactment of this act for transportation after such date.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this amendment would add a new section to the pending joint resolution. The Senate will recall that sometime ago it passed an act providing for an excise tax of 15 percent on travel. In other words, persons traveling within the United States and to certain points outside of the United States pay a 15 percent excise tax on their transportation charges. If one is traveling from New York to the city of Mexico, he pays an excise tax of 15 percent for the whole distance. If he is traveling from New Orleans to Quebec, he pays the excise tax for the whole distance. If, however, he is traveling to South American points, he pays the excise tax only to the point or port of exit from the United States.

The matter has been investigated and studied by the Executive Committee on Economic and Foreign Policy, of which the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Clayton, was chairman, and Mr. Willard Thorp, Assistant Secretary of State, is deputy chairman. Their report is that they would foster and encourage the repeal of this 15 percent excise tax because, in the first instance, it is discriminatory as against the countries of Mexico and Canada; and in the second place, they believe, and it seems reasonable to believe, that at this time, after the war, when our people are seeking to travel throughout the United States, this excise tax has a retarding effect on travel.

So, Mr. President, I submit the amendment for the consideration of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, let me say I hope the distinguished Senator from Nevada will not press for the adoption of his amendment. It goes to the whole subject of transportation excise taxes. It involves an enormous amount of money. The taxes on airplane travel alone, I am informed, amount to approximately $250,000,000 a year. I do not believe that the Senate should make an offhand reduction of that amount in the Government's revenues.

Moreover, the amendment ties into the whole subject of excise taxes, which will be thoroughly sifted in connection with the forthcoming general tax revision bill.

The amendment has no germaneness to the pending joint resolution. It is very necessary that we pass the joint resolution, because many servicemen, for example, have returned home and have been confronted with the taxation problems incident to powers of appointment. They have not had time to decide what they want to do about it or how to proceed under the protections which the law has given in the past, and which we hope to continue.

Therefore, I appeal to the Senator from Nevada not to press for the adoption of his amendment in connection with this particular measure.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, let me say that the amendment appeals to me as being a proper amendment to be adopted at a very early time. I certainly would not wish to defeat the pending joint resolution by an attempt to tie the amendment onto it, if I could have the amendment considered later on. I had hoped that perhaps the Senator from Colorado would see fit to look with favor upon the amendment and let it go through. However, if the Senator from Colorado is of the frame of mind he has indicated, I shall not press for adoption of the amendment at this time.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, let me say, with the permission of the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Nevada, that the joint resolution now before the Senate is a measure of importance. If the power to release the powers of appointment is to be extended for another year, it must be extended by July 1; and any amendment to this particular joint resolution would necessitate a conference, which probably would carry the matter over beyond July 1.

Mr. McCARRAN. Then I understand it to be the attitude of the able Senator from Colorado, as well as the attitude of the able Senator from Georgia, that they do not look with favor upon, and would not favor the inclusion of, this amendment in this joint resolution at this time.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I regret that at this time that attitude is compelled by the circumstances surrounding the joint resolution.

Mr. McCARRAN. Then, Mr. President, I withdraw the amendment.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada has withdrawn the amendment.

The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLARIFICATION OF PUBLIC DEBT ACT OF 1941

The bill (H. R. 2872) to amend further section 4 of the Public Debt Act of 1941, as amended, and clarify its application, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DISTRIBUTIONS BY PERSONAL HOLDING COMPANIES

The bill (H. R. 468) to amend section 115 of the Internal Revenue Code in respect of distributions by personal holding companies was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REVENUE—BILL PASSED OVER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3737) to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from New Mexico that this is the tax bill for the District of Columbia. Its provisions assume a balanced budget for the years 1948 and 1949. In view of the brief time which obviously is permitted to us at this hour, I think the bill should go over temporarily. I should like to give notice of an intention to move the consideration of this bill at the proper and earliest possible opportunity.

Therefore, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1421) to provide for the appointment of one additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, let me inquire from what Senator the objection to present consideration of the bill came.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California objected.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I may say to the majority leader that I

have asked that the bill go over, on behalf of a Senator who had to leave the Chamber. If he returns in time, I shall be glad to withdraw the objection I have made.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL

The bill (H. R. 3123) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I now ask that this bill be passed over. However, I should like to state that I have consulted with Senators who are interested in the Bulwinkle bill and with those who are intensely interested in the Interior Department appropriation bill. I have conferred with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], as well as with Senators on this side of the aisle, including the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. I am assured of their help in connection with the request which I now make for unanimous consent that when the call of the calendar is concluded, the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3123, the bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948.

I should like to say to those who may be somewhat apprehensive about the amount of time which consideration of the bill will take, that this bill, as it has been reported, comes from the subcommittee with a unanimous report, and it comes from the full Appropriations Committee with a unanimous report, except that the full committee has added two small amendments, one in the amount of $25,000, and one with respect to the location of an anthracite research laboratory in Pennsylvania. In view of that fact, I do not anticipate that the consideration of the bill will take long.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska that at the conclusion of the call of the calendar the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3123, the Interior Department appropriation bill?

The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN MINERS' OBLIGATIONS

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to revert to Calendar No. 5, Senate bill 27, to provide for suspending the enforcement of certain obligations against the operators of gold and silver mines who are forced to cease operations because of the war, so that I may make a motion in regard to the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Calendar No. 5 is not within the purview of the unanimous-consent agreement, which was that the calendar should be called commencing with order of business 197.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Will there be time immediately after the call of the calendar when this measure may be taken up?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Not under the order just made.

Mr. MCCARRAN. And no other bill that precedes the point on the calendar where the call started this morning may be taken up?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is the situation under the existing unanimous-consent agreement. When the appropriation bill is out of the way, motions will be in order. The Senator will understand that such a motion would displace the unfinished business.

The clerk will state the next business on the calendar.

ESTATE OF ROBERT W. ALEXANDER

The bill (H. R. 651) for the relief of the estate of Robert W. Alexander was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THERESE R. COHEN

The bill (H. R. 925) for the relief of Therese R. Cohen was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CARRYING OF MAIL ON STAR ROUTES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 263) to provide for the carrying of mail on star routes, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Civil Service with amendments.

The amendments were, on page 1, after line 4, to strike out section 2, as follows:

SEC. 2. There shall be placed in charge of the star-route service in the Post Office Department a superintendent of star-route service.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 3, on page 2, line 7, after the word "exceeding", to strike out "ninety days" and insert "six months."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendments were, in section 4, page 2, line 14, at the beginning of the section, to insert "(a)"; on line 15, after the word "route", to insert a comma and to strike out "or upon the creation of a new class A route;" and on line 18, after the word "may", to strike out "negotiate therefor" and insert "enter into a new contract"; on page 2, after line 20, to strike out "(b) Upon the expiration of an existing contract on a class B route, or within ninety days after the enactment of this act, the contractor on the route, if otherwise qualified, shall be given a noncompetitive civil-service examination for appointment as carrier on such route under the provisions of this act, the appointment to be without term, except as hereinafter provided," and insert: "Upon the expiration of an existing contract on a class B route, the contractor on the route, any contractor for the route during the preceding contract term, and any honorably discharged veteran of World War II who was a contractor for the route between September 16, 1940, and the effective date of this act, if otherwise qualified, shall be given an examination by the United States Civil Service Commission, and the applicant attaining the highest passing grade, under such rules as may be prescribed by the Commission, shall be appointed as carrier on such route under the provisions of this act. Persons so appointed shall be entitled to all the rights and benefits provided by law for employees in the field postal service."; and on page 3, line 18, after the word "passes", to insert "or of an adjoining county."

The amendments were agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 5, page 4, line 7, after the word "herein", to strike out "except that a present contractor capable of performing the duties of his route shall be permitted to carry the route for a period after reaching his seventieth birthday not exceeding the expiration date of his present contract."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 6, page 4, line 21, after the words "for a", to strike out "one-half ton" and insert "less than one ton."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 11, page 6, line 10, after the words "changing the" to insert "schedules and"; and on line 11, to strike out "schedules" and insert "trips."

The amendments were agreed to.

The sections were ordered to be renumbered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of this act shall apply to the carrying of mail on star routes within the United States.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of fixing rates for the transportation of mail on star routes the Postmaster General shall divide such routes into classes A and B and shall have authority to establish new routes or reclassify any route if, in his opinion, changed conditions justify or require a reclassification: *Provided*, That if any star route cannot be classified prior to being established, such route shall be established as a temporary contract for a period not exceeding 6 months. Prior to the expiration of such temporary contract the route shall be classified by the Postmaster General. Class A shall consist of those routes on which the mail service is performed by aircraft or by common carrier by motor vehicles. Class B shall consist of those routes not included in class A.

SEC. 3. (a) Upon the expiration of an existing contract on a class A route, the Postmaster General may, in his discretion, advertise for proposals for the transportation of mail on such route, or may enter into a new contract with the present contractor without advertising, for a contract period not exceeding 4 years.

(b) Upon the expiration of an existing contract on a class B route, the contractor on the route, any contractor for the route during the preceding contract term, and any honorably discharged veteran of World War II who was a contractor for the route between September 16, 1940, and the effective date of this act, if otherwise qualified, shall be given an examination by the United States Civil Service Commission, and the applicant attaining the highest passing grade, under such rules as may be prescribed by the Commission, shall be appointed as carrier on such route under the provisions of this act. Persons so appointed shall be entitled to all the rights and benefits provided by law for employees in the field postal service.

(c) To be eligible as a class B carrier under this act a person must be a citizen of the United States; a resident of the county or counties through which the star route passes or of an adjoining county; of good moral character; between the ages of 18 and 55 years; in good health, except that a present contractor may be considered eligible to take

the examination if capable of performing the duties required on the route which he has been serving and provided he has not attained the age of 70 years. Vacancies shall be filled by the Postmaster General upon certification by the Civil Service Commission from registers of eligibles resulting from examination.

SEC. 4. At the end of the month in which a class B carrier serving under the provisions of this act attains his seventieth birthday he shall be relieved of the duties of his appointment and the vacancy thus created shall be filled as provided herein.

SEC. 5. Class B carriers who have acquired a classified status under the provisions of this act shall be paid for the time actually employed on a schedule of the route, to be fairly established by the Postmaster General, which shall not be computed for pay purposes as less than 1 hour in any case, at the rate of $1.20 per hour; and in addition thereto shall be paid for equipment maintenance for horse, horse and vehicle, dogs and sleds, boat, passenger motorcar, or lesser type of equipment, a sum equal to 6 cents per mile or major fraction of a mile traveled in performing star-route service; for a less than 1-ton truck, station wagon, or closed-body delivery truck, 7 cents; for 1-ton truck but less than 2-ton, 8 cents; and for 2- and 2½-ton truck, 9 cents; and for larger equipment, 10 cents: *Provided*, That the Postmaster General shall determine the size of equipment necessary to transport the mail over the route with certainty, celerity, security, and economy. Payment of equipment maintenance shall be at the same period and in the same manner as payments for regular compensation.

SEC. 6. Each class B carrier shall designate a substitute carrier acceptable to the postmaster at the head of the route to act in the absence of the carrier. The substitute shall receive for his services the same amount as is paid to the carrier for such services: *Provided*, That if the substitute carrier uses the equipment of the carrier to perform the services of the route the equipment maintenance allowance for the use of such equipment may be paid to the carrier.

SEC. 7. Every class B carrier and substitute carrier shall take the official oath prescribed in section 30, Postal Laws and Regulations, and shall execute bond in the sum of $1,000 with acceptable sureties, the bond to be forwarded to the Postmaster General; the amount of bond required on each class A route to be determined by the Postmaster General.

SEC. 8. Wherever the Postmaster General is unable to procure mail service on a class B route under the provisions of this act he may enter into a temporary contract for the performance of mail service on such route at a rate in excess of the fixed rate until such time as he is able to procure such service at the rate scheduled herein.

SEC. 9. Carriers on all routes shall furnish equipment sufficient for transportation of the mails and the proper handling of all postal business on the route with certainty, celerity, security, and economy.

SEC. 10. Nothing in this act shall restrict or prevent the Postmaster General from creating, extending, curtailing, or discontinuing star routes together with the services of the classified carriers or changing the schedules and frequency of trips thereof in accordance with the needs of the service as determined by him. The Postmaster General is also authorized to prescribe rules and regulations for the administration of this act, or any part thereof, that are not in conflict with its provisions. All existing laws or parts of laws in conflict with this act are hereby repealed.

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 816) to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That the Post Roads Act of 1866, as amended (Revised Statutes, secs. 5263–5269, inclusive; U. S. C., title 47, secs. 1–6, inclusive, and 8), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. Nothing in this act shall limit the authority of the Federal Communications Commission under the provisions of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to prescribe charges, classifications, regulations, and practices, including priorities, applicable to Government communications.

SEC. 3. This act shall take effect on the tenth day following the enactment date thereof.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to repeal the old Post Roads Act of 1866, which gives to Government agencies a special rate on domestic communications.

The only company that is affected by the bill is the Western Union Telegraph Co. The bill would place the Western Union on the same basis as the telephone companies and other communication companies with respect to fixing of rates by the regulatory agency. It does not mean the Government may not impose a preferential rate by classification; the bill merely repeals that part of the act which makes a special rate mandatory. A similar provision was adopted when the domestic telegraph merger bill was before the Senate, but it was dropped in conference.

The enactment of the bill would mean that if the Government got a special rate someone would have to pay for it, and that someone necessarily would have to be the public—those sending messages.

I think everyone will admit that any communications company has a hard time these days competing with the subsidized air mail, on one hand, and the telephone companies, on the other.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to repeal the Post Roads Act of 1866, as amended, and for other purposes."

THE GILA RECLAMATION PROJECT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 483) to relocate the boundaries and reduce the area of the Gila reclamation project, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with amendments, on page 1, line 8, after the word "approximately", to strike out "sixty-six" and insert "forty"; on line 9, after the word "land", to strike out "situate on the Yuma Mesa and within the North and South Gila Valleys" and insert "(twenty-five thousand acres thereof situated on the Yuma Mesa and fifteen thousand acres thereof within the North and South Gila Valleys), or such number of acres as can be adequately irrigated by the beneficial consumptive use of no more than three hundred thousand acre-feet of water per annum diverted from the Colorado River"; on page 2, line 10, after the word "land", to insert "or such number of acres as can be adequately irrigated by the beneficial consumptive use of no more than three hundred thousand acre-feet of water per annum diverted from the Colorado River"; on page 2, line 18, after the word "diversion", to insert "transportation, delivery"; on line 21, after the words "subject to", to strike out "and controlled by"; on line 23, after the numerals "1922", to insert a colon and the words "*And provided further*, That the above limitations contained in this section are for the sole purpose of fixing the maximum acreage of the project and shall not be construed as interpreting, affecting, or modifying any interstate compact or contract with the United States for the use of Colorado River water or any Federal or State statute limiting or defining the right to use Colorado River water of or in any State," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of reclaiming and irrigating lands in the State of Arizona and other beneficial uses, the reclamation project known as Gila project, heretofore authorized and established under the provisions of the reclamation laws, the act of June 16, 1933 (48 Stat. 195), and various appropriation acts, is hereby reduced in area to approximately 40,000 irrigable acres of land (25,000 acres thereof situated on the Yuma Mesa and 15,000 acres thereof within the North and South Gila Valleys), or such number of acres as can be adequately irrigated by the beneficial consumptive use of no more than 300,000 acre-feet of water per annum diverted from the Colorado River, and as thus reduced is hereby reauthorized and redesignated the Yuma Mesa division, Gila project, and the Wellton-Mohawk division, Gila project, comprising approximately 75,000 irrigable acres of land, or such number of acres as can be adequately irrigated by the beneficial consumptive use of no more than 300,000 acre-feet of water per annum diverted from the Colorado River, situate within the Wellton, Dome, Roll, Texas Hill, and Mohawk areas, is substituted for the land eliminated from the Yuma Mesa division and is hereby authorized: *Provided, however*, That the waters to be diverted and used thereby, and the lands and structures for the diversion, transportation, delivery, and storage thereof, shall be subject to the provisions of the Boulder Canyon Project Act of December 21, 1928, and subject to the provisions of the Colorado River compact signed at Santa Fe, N. Mex., November 24, 1922: *And provided further*, That the above limitations contained in this section are for the sole purpose of fixing the maximum acreage of the project and shall not be construed as interpreting, affecting, or modifying any interstate compact or contract with the United States for the use of Colorado River water or any Federal or State statute limiting or defining the right to use Colorado River water of or in any State.

SEC. 2. The Secretary is hereby authorized to acquire in the name of the United States, at prices satisfactory to him, such lands, interests in lands, water rights, and other property within or adjacent to the Gila project, which belongs to the Gila Valley Power District or the Mohawk Municipal Water Conservation District, as he deems appropriate for the protection, development, or improvement of said project: *Provided, however*, That the prices to be paid for the lands owned by the Gila Valley Power District, of Arizona, and heretofore officially appraised at the direction of the Commissioner of Reclamation, for the existing facilities of said district and of the Mohawk Municipal Water

Conservation District, of Arizona, heretofore officially appraised at his request and determined by him to be useful to said project, shall not, in the aggregate, exceed $380,000, and no portion thereof shall be paid until said districts have made arrangements satisfactory to the Secretary for the liquidation of their respective bonded, warrant, and other outstanding indebtedness.

SEC. 3. The Secretary is hereby authorized, to the extent, in the manner, and on such terms as he deems appropriate for the protection, development, or improvement of the Gila project, to sell, exchange, or otherwise dispose of the public lands of the United States within said project, the lands acquired under this act, and any improvements on any such lands and to lease the same during the presettlement period only, provided such lands shall be disposed of to actual settlers and farmers as soon as practicable; to establish town sites on such lands; and to dedicate portions of such lands for public purposes. Contracts for the sale of such lands shall be on a basis that, in the Secretary's judgment, will provide the return in a reasonable period of years of not less than the appraised value of the land and the improvements thereon or thereto. Such lands may be disposed of in farm units of such sizes as the Secretary determines to be adequate, taking into consideration the character of soil, topography, location with respect to the irrigation system, and such other factors as the Secretary deems relevant: *Provided*, That the area disposed of to an individual shall, so far as practicable, not exceed 160 acres. Sales to any individual shall be of not more than one farm unit. Any sums received by the United States from the disposition of said lands and improvements shall be covered into the reclamation fund, and credited to construction costs.

SEC. 4. Beginning at such date or dates and subject to such provisions and limitations as may be fixed or provided by regulations which the Secretary is hereby authorized to issue, any public lands within the Gila project and any lands acquired under this act shall be, after disposition thereof by the United States by contract of sale and during the time such contract shall remain in effect, (i) subject to the provisions of the laws of the State of Arizona relating to the organization, government, and regulation of irrigation, electrical, power, and other similar districts, and (ii) subject to legal assessment or taxation by any such district and by said State or political subdivisions thereof, and to liens for such assessments and taxes, and to all proceedings for the enforcement thereof, in the same manner and to the same extent as privately owned lands: *Provided, however*, That the United States does not assume any obligation for amounts so assessed or taxed: *And provided further*, That any proceedings to enforce said assessments or taxes shall be subject to any title then remaining in the United States, to any prior lien reserved to the United States for unpaid installments under land-sale contracts made under this act, and to any obligation for any other charges, accrued or unaccrued, for special improvements, construction, or operation and maintenance costs of said project.

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the general repayment obligation of any organization which may hereafter enter into a contract with the United States covering the repayment of any portion of the costs of construction of the Gila project may be spread in annual installments over such reasonable period, of not exceeding 60 years, as the Secretary may determine. For the purpose of predicating the repayment obligations of the various lands within said project on their respective ability, as determined by the Secretary, to share the burdens thereof, he may provide for the equitable apportionment of said general repayment obligation to the lands benefited on a unit basis in accordance with the extent of the benefit derived from the project, the character of soil, topography, and such other factors as he deems relevant, and he may provide for a system of variable payments under which larger annual payments will be required during periods of above-normal production or income and lesser annual payments will be required during periods of subnormal production or income.

SEC. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, from time to time, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such moneys as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 7. The Secretary is authorized to perform such acts, to make such rules and regulations, and to include in contracts made under the authority of this act such provisions as he deems proper for carrying out the provisions of this act; and in connection with sales or exchanges under this act, he is authorized to effect conveyances without regard to the laws governing the patenting of public lands. Wherever in this act functions, powers, or duties are conferred upon the Secretary, said functions, powers, or duties may be performed, exercised, or discharged by his duly authorized representatives.

SEC. 8. This act shall be deemed a supplement to and part of the reclamation law. Nothing in this act shall be construed to amend the Boulder Canyon Project Act of December 21, 1928, as amended by the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act of July 19, 1940.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That completes the calendar.

NURSERIES AND NURSERY SCHOOLS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. WHERRY obtained the floor.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, last Thursday in the Committee on the District of Columbia, Senate bill 751 was approved and ordered to be reported. I do not wish to delay the Senator from Nebraska, but I should like to ask unanimous consent that the report be received and the bill immediately considered.

The bill provides for the extension of the day-care nurseries in the District of Columbia, authorization for which will end on June 30, and I am asking unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill for that reason. It is a matter of urgency. The full committee has approved the bill, and if there is no objection, I should like to have unanimous consent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. From the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Senator from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to report a bill, which will be stated by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 751) to permit the use of appropriations of the National Capital Housing Authority for the maintenance and operation of buildings and grounds used for nurseries and nursery schools established by the Board of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia within projects under the jurisdiction of such Authority.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and the report will be received.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That section 2 of the act entitled "An act to authorize and direct the Board of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia to establish and operate in the public schools and other suitable locations a system of nurseries and nursery schools for day care of school-age and under-school-age children, and for other purposes," approved July 16, 1946 (Public Law 514, 79th Cong.), is amended by striking out the date "June 30, 1947" and inserting in lieu thereof the date "June 30, 1948."

SEC. 2. Such section is further amended by striking out "or who are so handicapped that they cannot otherwise provide for the day care of their children"; and by adding at the end of such section the following new sentence: "Appropriations made under the authority contained in section 4 of this act shall be available for the maintenance and operation of such of the buildings and grounds (as may be designated and approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia under the provisions of this section) in and on which such nurseries and nursery schools may be established, maintained, and operated."

SEC. 3. Section 4 of such act is amended by striking out "$500,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$150,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to continue a system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of school-age and under-school-age children in the District of Columbia through June 30, 1948, and for other purposes."

REGISTERS OF LAND OFFICES AND DIRECTOR AND ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR OF BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider at this time Calendar No. 166, Senate bill 28. I wish to say that the bill was reached during the calling of the calendar previous to the last call, when the Senator from Nevada was absent, and the Senator from Illinois objected. Later the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Nevada conferred on the bill, and there is now no objection on the part of the Senator from Illinois, who does not seem to be present at the moment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 28, which the clerk will state by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 28) to supersede the provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1946 by reestablishing the offices of registers of land offices, and providing for appointment of the Director and Associate Director of the Bureau

of Land Management, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to make an explanation. The bill was before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. That committee unanimously opposed the bill, but, out of deference to the Senator from Nevada and the members of the Public Lands Committee, we reported it, without recommendations. It was then rereferred to Public Lands Committee. I want to make that clear, that after examination the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments felt it could not report the bill favorably.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 403 of Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1946—

(a) The offices of all registers of the district land offices, abolished by subsection 403 (d) of such plan, are hereby reestablished, subject to all provisions of law applicable thereto prior to the effective date of such plan: *Provided*, That registers of all land offices shall hereafter be under the Bureau of Land Management of the Department of the Interior: *Provided further*, That any register of a land office duly commissioned and serving at the time the offices of all registers of the district land offices were abolished by subsection 403 (d) of Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1946 shall continue in office as the register of such land office, under this act, in the same manner and for the same period as if appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, on July 15, 1946, for a term expiring upon the date on which the commission held by such register on July 15, 1946, would have expired if Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1946 had not become effective; and a new commission shall be issued to such register in accordance with the provisions of this subsection.

(b) The Director of the Bureau of Land Management of the Department of the Interior, and the Associate Director of such Bureau, shall be appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate. Such Director shall receive a salary at the rate of $12,000 per year; and such Associate Director shall receive a salary at the rate of $10,000 per year.

(c) The Director of the Bureau of Land Management shall perform, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, all executive duties appertaining to the surveying and sale of the public lands of the United States, or in anywise respecting such public lands, and, also, such as relate to private claims of land, and the issuing of patents for all grants of land under the authority of the Government; together with such other and further duties as the Secretary of the Interior shall designate.

(d) The Associate Director of the Bureau of Land Management shall be authorized to sign such letters, papers, and documents and to perform such other duties as may be directed by the Director, and shall act as Director in the absence of that officer, or in case of a vacancy in the office of Director. The Associate Director shall also perform such other and further duties as the Secretary of the Interior shall designate.

SUSPENSION OF CERTAIN MINERS' OBLIGATIONS—MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, as to Order No. 5, Senate bill 27, the motion I was going to make, and which the Chair held would not be in order, I now renew. I move that Senate bill 27, Order No. 5, be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary. I wish to say that I am making that motion with the idea of moving, in the Committee on the Judiciary, to postpone the bill indefinitely.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair suggests to the Senator that even now his motion is not in order, in view of the pending unanimous consent order, and that a unanimous consent request at the moment is what the Senator should present.

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask unanimous consent.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, in view of the fact that certain of the members of the committee who could not vote to report the bill favorably are not present, I shall have to object. I think there should be some notice given.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made.

STIMULATION OF VOLUNTEER ENLISTMENTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if there is no objection, I should like to have the Senate recur to Calendar No. 268, Senate bill 1218, a bill to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military Establishment of the United States. I make the request in the absence of the chairman of the committee, who unfortunately cannot be here this afternoon. I make it because unless the bill is passed, the Army, after June 30 of this year, will not be able to accept enlistments except on a basis of the duration of the war plus 6 months. This is a bill to stimulate the voluntary enlistment of young men in the Army. It reduces the minimum age from 18 to 17, and it makes it possible to enlist men for 2, 3, 4, or 6 years. Enlisted men in the first three grades, including master sergeants and two other grades of sergeant, may reenlist for an unspecified period of time on a career. The bill also offers certain bonuses for reenlistment. It strikes out a provision in the law at the present time, limiting the Army to 280,000 enlisted men. These I believe are the principal provisions of the bill. I hope that the Senate may act upon it on the present call of the calendar, because of the necessity of taking care of the situation before June 30.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I should like to ask the able Senator from Massachusetts a question with respect to the provision of the bill allowing the enlistment of 17-year-olds? Does it provide that a youth of 17 must obtain the written consent of his parents?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Massachusetts will answer the question in the affirmative.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, is it not a fact that the bill is directed toward the interest of the taxpayers and of the Treasury? The most expensive enlistment in the world is the short-term enlistment. What is needed are long-term enlistments, if possible. There is in the bill a provision in the interest of the Treasury and of the taxpayers, intended to save millions of dollars, is there not?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The answer to that unquestionably is, yes. As I understand, any enlistment of 2 years or less, which is possible at the present time, is not an economical enlistment from the point of view of the taxpayer, because the man hardly receives his training before he is out again.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to revert to Senate bill 1218, which the clerk will report by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1218) to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military Establishment of the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 4, after line 17, to strike out section 3, as follows:

SEC. 3. Section 2 of the National Defense Act, as amended (10 U. S. C. 4, 602), is further amended by deleting the last sentence thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 21, to change the section number from "4" to "3."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 10, to change the section number from "5" to "4."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 14, to insert the following new section:

SEC. 5. Subsection 1 (b) of the Mustering-out Payment Act of 1944 (38 U. S. C., Supp. V. 691a) is amended by striking out the word "and" at the end of the subsection (7) thereof, inserting a semicolon in lieu of the period after subsection (8) thereof, and adding the following "and (9) any person entering upon active service, or enlisting, on or after the first day of the first month after the approval of the act adding this subsection."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 22, to insert the following new section:

SEC. 6. Sections 57 and 58 of the National Defense Act, as amended, are further amended by striking out the words "eighteen" therefrom and substituting therefor the words "seventeen" in each of the said sections.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first paragraph of section 27 of the National Defense Act, as amended (10 U. S. C. 627, 628), is hereby further amended as follows:

"Effective July 1, 1947, the Secretary of War is authorized, notwithstanding the provisions of the last paragraph of section 127a

of this act, to accept original enlistments in the Regular Army from among qualified male persons not less than 17 years of age for periods of 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6 years, and to accept reenlistments for periods of 3, 4, 5, or 6 years: *Provided*, That persons of the first three enlisted grades may be reenlisted for unspecified periods of time on a career basis under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe: *Provided further*, That anyone who serves three or more years of an enlistment for an unspecified period of time may submit to the Secretary of War his resignation and such resignation shall be accepted by the Secretary of War and such person shall be discharged from his enlistment within 3 months of the submission of such resignation. Except if such person, other than an enlisted member of a Regular Army Puerto Rican unit, submits his resignation while stationed overseas or after embarking for an overseas stations, the Secretary of War shall not be required to accept such resignation until a total of 2 years of overseas service shall have been completed in the current overseas assignment, and in the case of anyone who has completed any course of instruction pursuant to paragraph 13 of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended (10 U. S. C. 535), or pursuant to section 2 of the act of April 3, 1939 (53 Stat. 556), as amended (10 U. S. C. 298a), the Secretary of War shall not be required to accept such resignation until 2 years subsequent to the completion of such course. The Secretary of War may refuse to accept any such resignation in time of war or national emergency declared by the President or Congress, or while the person concerned is absent without leave or serving a sentence of court martial. The Secretary of War may refuse to accept a resignation for a period not to exceed 6 months following the submission thereof if the enlisted person is under investigation or in default with respect to public property or public funds: *Provided further*, That no person under the age of 18 years shall be enlisted without the written consent of his parents or guardian, and the Secretary of War shall, upon the application of the parents or guardian of any such person enlisted without their written consent, discharge such person from the military service with pay and with the form of discharge certificate to which the service of such person, after enlistment, shall entitle him: *Provided further*, That nothing contained in this act shall be construed to deprive any person of any right to reenlistment in the Regular Army under any other provision of law. No person who is serving under an enlistment contracted on or after June 1, 1945, shall be entitled, before the expiration of the period of such enlistment, to enlist for an enlistment period which will expire before the expiration of the enlistment period for which he is so serving: *Provided further*, That any enlisted person discharged from the Regular Army who upon such discharge is recommended for reenlistment shall be permitted to reenlist with the rank held by him at the time of his discharge if he reenlists within a period to be specified by the Secretary of War but not to exceed 3 months from the date of such discharge: *And provided further*, That any enlisted person discharged from the Regular Army by reason of acceptance of his resignation shall not be entitled upon subsequent reenlistment to the rank, rating, or grade held at the time of discharge."

SEC. 2. Any person who enlists or reenlists in the Regular Military Establishment on or after June 1, 1945, in the seventh grade, upon the completion of recruit training, but not later than 4 months subsequent to the date of enlistment, shall, unless sooner promoted, be promoted to the sixth grade, provided he meets such qualifications as may be prescribed in regulations promulgated by the Secretary of War: *Provided*, That no back pay or allowance shall accrue to any person by reason of enactment of this section.

SEC. 3. Paragraph 4 of section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 is hereby amended by substituting a colon for the period at the end of such paragraph and by adding immediately after such colon the following: "*Provided further*, That in addition to such enlistment allowance, any person enlisting for an unspecified period of time shall be paid the sum of $50 upon the completion of each year of service of such reenlistment, and any person who resigns or is discharged from such enlistment for an unspecified period of time shall not thereafter be entitled to any additional enlistment or reenlistment allowance based on any period served in such enlistment for an unspecified period of time."

SEC. 4. Effective July 1, 1947, sections 653 and 653a of title 10, United States Code, are repealed and all other laws and parts of laws insofar as they are inconsistent with or in conflict with the provisions of this act are likewise repealed.

SEC. 5. Subsection 1 (b) of the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 (38 U. S. C., Supp. V, 691a) is amended by striking out the word "and" at the end of subsection (7) thereof, inserting a semicolon in lieu of the period after subsection (8) thereof, and adding the following: "and (9) any person entering upon active service, or enlisting, on or after the first day of the first month after the approval of the act adding this subsection."

SEC. 6. Sections 57 and 58 of the National Defense Act, as amended, are further amended by striking out the words "eighteen" therefrom and substituting therefor the words "seventeen" in each of the said sections.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military Establishment of the United States, and for other purposes."

INVESTIGATION OF APPOINTMENT OF POSTMASTERS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, after the Interior appropriation bill is disposed of, Calendar No. 78, Senate Resolution 81 shall be considered by the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota, that at the conclusion of the consideration of the pending appropriation bill, the unfinished business shall further be temporarily laid aside, for the consideration of Calendar No. 78, Senate Resolution 81?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, may I ask what the resolution is?

Mr. LANGER. It authorizes an investigation of the appointment of first-, second-, and third-class postmasters, and provides an appropriation therefor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent order entered during the call of the calendar, the Interior Department appropriation bill is the next business in order.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3123) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, after I make a brief general statement, relative to the pending measure, I shall ask that the committee amendments be stated and acted upon.

If the Senators will turn to the report—No. 278—of the Senate Appropriations Committee on House bill 3123, there will be found on the first page an over-all statement of the appropriation bill. By way of preface to my remarks, I should like to say that the subcommittee that considered the bill sat for 23 days, including Saturdays, meeting as early as 9 o'clock in the morning, and sitting many nights as late as 7 o'clock. The committee took nearly a week to mark up the bill, giving consideration to each and every item, on its merits. At the conclusion of its deliberations the subcommittee unanimously reported the Interior Department appropriation bill to the full Appropriations Committee for its consideration.

When the full committee considered the bill, there were suggested only two amendments both of which were adopted by the committee. One was an amendment in the increased amount of $25,000, for a fish-market news service which had been eliminated entirely. The Senate reinstated approximately 75 percent of the estimate. Because of the fact that fisheries produced so much revenue, and, of course, income tax is paid on the income from that source, it was felt that the amount of $25,000 should be reinstated, and the full Senate committee did so.

The other amendment establishes an anthracite research laboratory in Pennsylvania, for which purpose $450,000 is appropriated. The House had stricken out the provision establishing the laboratory, and also rescinded the previous appropriation. After the bill came to the Senate the members of the Pennsylvania delegation got together and requested reinsertion of the language stricken by the House. The Senate committee amended the bill by locating the research laboratory as suggested, and also deleting the rescission, which means that we had to increase the appropriation contained in the bill by $450,000.

The over-all amount of the Interior Department appropriation, as it passed the House, was $161,413,513, together with unexpended or unobligated funds that would go along with the cash money. As will be noted by the Senate committee report, the committee added to that amount in cash money $54,116,840, making the total amount of the bill, as reported by the committee to the Senate, in cash money, $215,530,353.

For a moment I shoud like to digress from the report and give the Senate the over-all picture again, because I think the Senate will be interested in the figures. As I mentioned a moment ago, the amount of the cash money the House ap-

propriated was $161,413,513. For the Bureau of Reclamation budget alone the money which the House thought it had made provision for, which was frozen or unexpended and which could be used as free money for 1948, as set forth in the House committee report, totaled $85,826,767. The House committee also in its report set out that there was an unexpended balance for Bonneville of $11,755,000. Those are the big items in the House appropriations of unexpended or unobligated funds, as they were designated, which were to be added to the $161,413,513, which would make a grand total appropriated under the House bill for the fiscal year 1948 of $258,995,280 to be spent on the entire Department of the Interior.

Here are some more figures which I think the Senate would like to have. These figures have to do with new money. The Senate committee appropriated new money in place of the $161,413,513, in the amount of $215,530,353, or an increase of $54,116,840, which is the second group of figures in the Senate committee report.

That $54,116,840 is made up of two figures in which I know the Senate is interested. They include new money which the Senate committee provided, which the House did not provide. I shall come to those figures later in my remarks. But for the moment, if Senators will add the true unobligated balances in the amount of $56,244,357, the sum at which the Senate committee finally arrived by harmonizing the figures obtained from the Bureau of Reclamation, the Department of the Interior, and the Bureau of the Budget, to $215,530,353, the over-all total amount of new money recommended by the Senate committee, it will be found that the Senate committee recommended a total amount of $271,774,710, which is $12,779,430 more than the House thought it had appropriated when its grand total reached the figure of $258,995,280.

Some Senators are interested exclusively in reclamation, and for their benefit I should like to give the over-all figures briefly. It will be found in the House committee report that provision was made for new money in the amount of $67,892,600. Unexpended balances, as set out in the report, a figure which I have already mentioned, amount to $85,326,767, which makes the grand total the House thought it had appropriated, including the new money, $153,718,367.

On examination by the Senate committee in its hearings, the unobligated balances, as I have already mentioned, were found to be $56,244,357. That figure, added to the new money the Senate committee recommended for reclamation alone, which is in the amount of $104,730,532, makes a grand total recommended by the Senate committee for reclamation of $160,974,889. That is $7,255,522 more than the House appropriated for reclamation, that is, the free money the House appropriated, and the money the House thought was frozen and was unobligated—the figure I have already mentioned.

So, Mr. President, instead of the unobligated and frozen funds amounting to $85,826,767, we find that the true amount is $56,244,357, or a difference of $29,582,410.

To restate, Mr. President, the House thought it had provided the whole amount referred to above, as being unobligated balances, which was, however, not the true amount of the unobligated balances. So the Senate committee recommended the second figure shown in the committee report, $54,116,840; of that amount $29,582,410 had to be recommended by the Senate committee to provide new money for that which the House thought existed in unobligated balances, but which did not exist. That is for the Reclamation Bureau exclusively.

We come now to Bonneville. The Senate committee recommended $16,222,400 for the over-all program for 1948 at Bonneville. The House appropriated $6,907,800 plus a carry-over which the House thought remained unobligated in the amount of $11,755,000, which makes a total of $18,655,000 appropriated by the House. The Senate committee increased that in the amount of $9,314,600 of new money, which the Senate committee found it necessary to place in the Bonneville appropriation to bring the grand total only to the figure of $16,222,400. That $11,775,000 is the second part of the $54,116,840.

To put it in another way, the Senate committee took care of $29,582,410 of money in reclamation which the House thought was unobligated, but which was obligated, and the Senate committee had to put back that much money. The same thing was done with respect to the Bonneville project, to the extent of $11,755,000, which makes a total in the two projects of $41,337,410. If we subtract the figure of $41,337,410 from $54,116,840, the second figure in the committee report, we find that the actual net increase which the Senate committee makes over the House version is in the amount of $12,779,430.

Mr. President, if there are any questions I shall be glad to try to answer them. Of the $54,116,840, please remember that more than $41,000,000 is new money which the Senate committee found it necessary to add to the House figures because there was not the amount in unexpended balances which the House thought there was. So we are appropriating the House estimate of $41,337,410, but we are actually increasing the appropriations over the House estimate only by $12,779,430 in the appropriations which we recommend for the Interior Department for the fiscal year 1948.

At the bottom of page 1 of the report will be found the following language:

> Based on the foregoing comparative figures, the bill as passed by the House is 38 percent under the appropriations for the current fiscal year, and, as passed by the House, the bill is 45 percent under the budget estimates for the fiscal year 1948. As recommended by the committee, the bill is 17 percent under the appropriations for the current fiscal year and is 27 percent under the 1948 budget estimates.

The budget estimate for this year was $296,135,420. The amount of the bill as reported to the Senate by the Committee on Appropriations is $215,530,353. Therefore the appropriation recommended by the Senate committee is $80,605,067 under the budget estimate, and it is $43,021,733 under the 1947 appropriation.

Mr. President, I ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the amendments of the committee be first considered.

ADEQUATE APPROPRIATIONS MUST GO HAND IN HAND WITH A POLICY OF VISION AND COURAGE

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am very happy that the distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate is presiding over this body today, because I desire to make a few comments upon the statement which he issued last Friday and which was published in the press of the Nation on Saturday morning, as well as upon the statement which was issued to the press last week by former President Hoover and printed in the newspapers of the Nation this morning, and their relation to the appropriation bill which is before us.

Let me say first, however, that I desire to compliment the Senator in charge of the bill, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] for the manner in which he handled this very important matter. As the bill came over from the House it carried sums which had been materially reduced below the budget estimates.

Many of us—I in particular—felt that those appropriations had been so reduced that they would seriously cripple the effort of our Government and of our people to replenish the resources which we shot away during the war. As the Senator from Nebraska has said, the bill which is now before the Senate has been reported without a minority report, and with the general understanding that those of us who are on the committee would not offer amendments from the floor. That agreement, if it was in fact an agreement—and I think it was—was reached, however, before the statement of the distinguished Presiding Officer of this body and the statement of former President Hoover. Therefore, I feel that it is incumbent upon the committee to invite the attention of the Senate, as I did the attention of the full Committee on Appropriations, to the fact that the sums which are allowed in the bill, as reported, to support the activities of the Geological Survey, the Bureau of Mines, and the Bureau of Land Management may be altogether inadequate to enable them to carry out the policy which it is recognized by the leaders of all parties should be carried out if the United States is to meet the challenge of preserving world peace and providing economic rehabilitation without destroying its own fiscal and economic soundness in the process.

The distinguished Senator from Michigan in his statement of last Friday said:

> I endorse the importance of facing this problem on an over-all basis instead of dealing with unanticipated crises, one by one.

I recognize that intelligent American self-interest demands that we meet the situation with vision and courage. But equally I recognize that intelligent American self-interest immediately requires a sound over-all inventory of our own resources to determine the latitudes within which we may consider these foreign needs. This comes first because if America ever sags, the world's hopes sag with her.

I think it would be impossible to state the problem which confronts the leadership and the people of America in a briefer span or with greater clarity. I compliment the Senator from Michigan on having issued this statement. I completely agree with it, and particularly with his statement that there ought to be a bipartisan movement to determine what our resources are and what our capacities to perform may be.

BIPARTISAN MOVEMENT TO DETERMINE OUR RESOURCES IS TODAY'S NEED

A former President of the United States, who has himself recommended that American aid be extended to foreign nations, takes the same view. In his statement, as printed in the Washington Post of this morning, he wrote:

While the world situation requires that we do our best, my own view is that unless we can undertake to increase our productivity or decrease our consumption of goods, we must seriously reduce the volume of exports below the rate of the last 2 years with a corresponding reduction in the gifts and loans for which we supply goods.

Again, he said, giving implied support to the Truman doctrine of foreign affairs:

We should concentrate our limited resources in the areas in which western civilization can be preserved.

If anything is clear now upon the horizon of world events, it is that economic rehabilitation of the world must be accomplished if we are to win permanent peace.

Until permanent peace is achieved no one can say that the war is over or even that the war has been won. Misery, pestilence, and hunger which now stalk Europe and Asia will produce the chaos out of which dictatorship grows. It seems to me that nobody can deny that unless we take the leadership in helping the inhabitants of the war-ridden countries to restore their own capacity to support themselves, it will be impossible to prevent the American ideals of freedom in our economy and in our Government from facing the most serious trial they have ever had. This, Mr. President, means that we must concentrate our efforts upon production. This was apparent long before we entered the war.

TNEC REPORT ANTICIPATED PRESENT SITUATION—NATIONAL RESOURCES WERE SUMMARIZED

I had the privilege of presiding as Chairman of the Temporary National Economic Committee, and on March 31, 1941, before we were involved in the war, I presented the final report of that committee. I desire to read one or two paragraphs from that report:

Looking to the postwar period—

Of course, when we wrote that report we were writing about a war in which we had not as yet become involved but to which we were then contributing of our resources to prevent the totalitarian Fascists and Nazi dictators from gaining complete control of Europe.

Looking to the postwar period, we all know that business and Government will be confronted with a new, complex, and difficult situation. We shall be able to make the necessary adjustments and keep the economy functioning at a high level only if we anticipate and provide the factual requirements which are essential for intelligent appraisal and proper action. Fact gathering must be continuous so that essential economic information will be available to businessmen, to Government, and to the public.

We recommend, therefore, that the work of the Department of Commerce in the field of business and economic research be developed to provide for an adequate flow of current data on our national economy—on production, orders, inventories, productive capacity and resources, and related matters; for the investigating and tracing the movement of goods from the producer of raw materials through the manufacturing and distributing processes to the ultimate consumer; for the study and dissemination of information on efficient business practices and techniques; for the study of trade and business fluctuations and conditions which affect the national economy. Should adequate powers not be in existence to provide the basic data essential for this program, provision should be made to remedy this deficiency, but it is not intended to recommend that the subpena power be made available.

Mr. President, at approximately the time I filed that report I also introduced in the Senate a resolution, which was Senate Resolution 53 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, authorizing the Committee on Public Lands or any subcommittee thereof to conduct an investigation with respect to the development of the mineral resources including oil and gas, of the public lands and providing for more effective administration of existing laws which relate to such development.

The hearing under that resolution began on July 23, 1941, and this volume [indicating], which is available to all Members of Congress and to the public, contains a general summary of the natural resources of the United States. Not only was that sort of study going on, Mr. President, but the National Resources Planning Board which had been created by Mr. Roosevelt under the authority which he had to fight the depression, conducted a broad study of our natural resources. The preliminary work was done. The results have been published. I do not intend to take the time of the Senate to read from it again, but I should like to call to the attention of Members of this body the volume entitled "American Economy," which was published in 1939. This is a broad study of the structure of our economy as well as of the resources, agricultural and mineral, of which we are possessed.

It was evident to many leaders in the United States that because of the tremendous contribution which we were making to arm and to equip the armies of the United Nations, to build their sea fleets and their air fleets, as well as to provide weapons for their armies, a terrific drain was being made upon our own resources—resources which are as essential for the promotion of industry as for the promotion of war. At the end of the war, in 1945, it was clear to the leadership that the problem of inflation now mentioned by former President Hoover in his release today, and its relationship to production would have to be solved.

BERNARD BARUCH WARNS WE MUST SURVEY OUR RESOURCES—DIVIDE THEM WISELY—REPLENISH THEM QUICKLY

An eminent citizen of the United States who was signally honored last week at the Army War College—Mr. Bernard Baruch—on October 25, 1945, wrote a letter to Representative GORE, which was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 14, 1945, and which may be found on page A4872. I want to read two paragraphs from the letter. After referring to our debts and our obligations, particularly our international obligations, Mr. Baruch wrote Congressman GORE as follows:

Then we ought to examine our productive capacity and determine how to divide that production: First, to see that enough of what is produced remains in the United States to avoid disastrous inflation, and then how much to allocate for the rehabilitation of Europe, China, the Philippines. Unless this dividing is done wisely, we will sink and the whole world will go down with us. We should direct our aid to foreign countries by giving priority to those who need the most and who will use it to help them set themselves on their own feet.

Then, again, in the same letter:

While examining our production here, we must survey all our mineral, agricultural, and other natural resources. We should not dispose of raw-material surpluses unless they really are surplus for the whole United States, not simply surplus for some one government department. On everything else, on all that is really surplus, sell, sell, sell. We cannot go on depleting our soil and mineral resources as we have in the past 7 years without tragic results to our whole economy and national life. A study of our resources and modern scientific methods to replenish them must be undertaken quickly.

SHALL WE WASTE OUR SUBSTANCE BY FALSE ECONOMY?

Mr. President, no one can dispute the wisdom of that declaration. Yet we have before us various appropriation bills providing reduced amounts for such purposes; for instance, the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill which reduces by 45 percent the money which is allocated to soil conservation. We read statements in the press, and every day we hear radio broadcasts about the floods that are tearing away the topsoil of vast areas in the West, and also in the East. The topsoil is now going down the rivers; it is going down the Potomac River, the Missouri River, the Mississippi River, and the rivers in Iowa. Wherever there is a great river which is filled with floods occasioned by the rains, the topsoil which should be conserved is being carried out to the sea. Yet, Congress, with a false idea of economy, undertakes to reduce the appropriations for the conservation of our soil, the agricultural land from which we shall produce the crops which

are necessary if we are to feed ourselves and the starving peoples of the world. That appropriation is being cut to the bone.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to agree with what the able Senator from Wyoming is saying, and I desire to call his attention to what the Senate did today in regard to Senate Joint Resolution 125, a measure which seeks to strengthen the common defense and to meet industrial needs for tin by providing for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry. Tin is a strategic and critical material which is vitally necessary for the national defense and common security of the American people. Today the Senate has unanimously passed that bill, authorizing the Government of the United States to continue providing for the maintenance of domestic tin-smelting in this country. I mention that bill merely in light of the able presentation which the Senator from Wyoming is making, in order to show what Congress will do when a necessity arises—in that instance, a necessity growing out of the lack of ore from which to produce the tin we need in this country. That measure was Senate Joint Resolution 125, Calendar No. 269.

But, Mr. President, unless we protect the natural resources which today are to be found in the United States—including the natural resources the Senator from Wyoming has been discussing—we shall find that eventually, perhaps when it will be too late, an attempt will be made to have the Congress do in respect to the Nation's other natural resources what has been done today in respect to the tin industry in the United States. I mention the joint resolution relative to the tin industry as an illustration of what the Congress will do when it is necessary to meet a critical issue. Nevertheless, Mr. President, it is obvious that the time to meet the issue is long before the crisis develops. I wish to say that what the able and distinguished Senator from Wyoming has said with respect to the appropriations for agriculture is absolutely correct, in my humble opinion.

Several days ago I returned from Illinois, and I know what the rains are doing to the topsoil of acre after acre of some of the finest farm land in the world.

To my mind, the soil conservation program is one of the most important, if not the most important, of all the laws which have been enacted for agriculture. The appropriation requested by the President of the United States for the continuation of sound soil practices in this country, under a program which was inaugurated under the Roosevelt administration, is absolutely justifiable and necessary if in the future we are to continue to produce for this Nation and the world as we are doing at the present time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from Illinois for his statement. What he has said with respect to agriculture is also true with respect to minerals.

On October 30, 1945, as chairman of a subcommittee of the Military Affairs Committee, I conducted a hearing on the so-called stock-piling bill, which now is a law. At that time, Dr. Allen M. Bateman, a consultant for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, had this to say:

> Now those of us who sweated through those hectic days of 1942 and 1943 when shipload after shipload of our mineral cargoes each week was finding a place down at the bottom of the ocean, swore that it seemed almost criminal that our Nation had not been foresighted enough to have had stocks of these strategic materials sufficient for our needs ahead of time.

LET US NOT REPEAT THE MISTAKES WE MADE FOLLOWING WORLD WAR I

Mr. President, he said it was almost criminal, and of course it was, because after World War I the same Bernard M. Baruch, who wrote the letter I read a few minutes ago, and who during that conflict had been head of the War Industries Board, recommended that Congress should enact a stock-piling bill. However, it was not enacted. During the war we imported not less than 65 different critical minerals and materials from abroad, in order that we might defend ourselves and our allies.

On November 25, 1945, I filed a report of the Military Affairs Committee, recommending the passage of the stock-piling bill. Let me read a few sentences from that report:

> The need for stock piling of strategic and critical materials was recognized by Congress prior to the entry of the United States into World War II by the passage of the act of June 7, 1939, which the present stock-piling bill, herein reported favorably by your committee, is intended to amend.
>
> As long ago as December 24, 1919, in a report to the President, Mr. Bernard Baruch, as a result of the trying experiences of World War I, urged that steps be taken at once to assure adequate supplies of raw materials for any future emergencies. It was not until 1930 that a small appropriation of $4,000,000 was made to the Navy for the purchase of strategic materials, followed in 1939 by enactment of the present law and by an appropriation of $100,000,000 to be spent by the Procurement Division of the Treasury.

Mr. President, I skip a little of the report, and then read this sentence:

> An adequate stock pile must be built up and maintained because mineral and other raw materials are the very foundation of the industries which more, perhaps, than anything else we have, have enabled the United States to win the victory in World War II.

Not only did we pass the Stock Piling Act, authorizing the purchase of these minerals, but we provided in the act a direction to the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to undertake scientific, technologic, and economic investigations concerning the extent, mode of occurrence, development, mining, preparation, treatment, and utilization of ores and other mineral substances found in the United States or its territories or insular possessions, which are essential to the common defense or the industrial needs of the United States.

Here we have the legislative enactment which is necessary to carry out the program suggested by the able Presiding Officer of this body. Yet when we turn to the bill before us, we find that even after the Senate committee has increased certain appropriations, we are still falling far short of what should be done.

The report filed by the able chairman contains a list, on page 2, which shows the budget estimates, the amount provided in the bill as it passed the House, and the amount now recommended by the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

WE HAVE THE NEEDED LEGISLATION—BUT MUST BACK IT UP WITH FUNDS

For the Bureau of Land Management the Budget estimated $5,007,800; the amount provided in the House was only $3,619,500. The Senate committee increased that appropriation by $458,940. Yet the Bureau of Land Management passes upon the applications for oil and gas leases, coal leases, potash leases, and other mineral leases upon the public domain. By cutting down the appropriation for the Bureau of Land Management we make it more difficult to obtain the supplies of minerals which we need.

Mr. President, I have no hesitancy in saying that in the public land States there are available resources, as indicated by developments which have already taken place, but at this moment of great international need, at this moment when the needs of peace demand that we expend only a fraction of what we expended for war, in order that we may have these resources—at this moment we are turning back and lagging; we are sagging, to use the words of the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

What I have said about the Bureau of Land Management is true with respect to the Geological Survey, for which the Budget Bureau recommended an appropriation of $18,104,900. The House allowed $9,113,230. The Senate committee has increased that to $10,256,340, the increase being $1,143,110. The Geological Survey is one of the agencies through which the Interior Department will work to find the location of new deposits of minerals which we sadly need.

Then there is the Bureau of Mines. The budget estimate was $16,834,000. The House allowed $10,533,875. The Senate committee has increased that by $1,892,975. But it is still below the budget estimate.

I repeat, for the Bureau of Land Management the budget estimate was $5,007,800; the Senate bill recommends an appropriation of $4,078,440.

For the Geological Survey the budget estimate was $18,104,900. The amount recommended by the Senate committee is only $10,256,340.

The budget estimate for the Bureau of Mines was $16,834,000. The Senate committee recommends $12,426,850.

Fortunately, however, Mr. President, we have written into the bill, in our report—and I am sure the Senator from Nebraska will confirm what I now say—an expression of our opinion that none of these mineralogical activities of the Bureau of Mines should be closed down for lack of appropriations. I pause to

obtain the assurance of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I confirm the statement of the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do this, Mr. President, because I realize that the Senator from Nebraska will be leading the Senate conferees in the conference, and it will be essential for him to wage a vigorous fight there to preserve even the gains which we have made.

What I have said with respect to the Geological Survey and the Bureau of Mines and the Bureau of Land Management applies with equal force to the Bureau of Reclamation. The great public power projects, against which so much criticism has been directed, were in many instances started during the war in order to provide the power which was necessary to develop the materials and the equipment and the production which we needed. Public power is essential now, and those who are urging that we save a few dollars with respect to these enterprises at this moment, when civilization itself is standing in the balance, are not opening their eyes to what is wrong with the world, or what the United States must do.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator practically answered a question I was about to ask him, in the last statement he made.

Let me say to the able Senator that what disturbs me is the fact that we can forget so soon lessons we learned during the war, when we were practically shut off from the rest of the world by the Japanese Fleet, and the German submarines. At a time when we needed rubber and other critical materials, for a supply of which we were depending on the outside world, we rushed madly along spending billions of dollars in order to create and produce the things that were essential in order that we might win the war.

As soon as the war is over we forget, apparently, the lessons we learned, and, as I see it, are moving along on the theory that we are going to remain at peace forever. I hope those who entertain that belief are right, but in view of world conditions as they exist at the present time, I do not see how the United States of America in this critical period of rehabilitation and reconstruction, knowing how sick this old world is, can possibly, for the sake of a few million or even a few billion dollars, lag behind in this experimental and research work. We must look to the production in great quantities of these critical and strategic materials which are so vital to our defense in case of a great national or international emergency.

SHALL WE PUT A PRICE ON PEACE?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator. The question which every Member of Congress in the Senate and the House must ask himself, which every citizen of the United States must ask himself, is, how much am I willing to spend in order to preserve peace? If we do not equip the United States with these essential minerals which are the wherewithal of industrial and productive leadership, as well as the wherewithal of war, then it will be impossible for America to make the loans and make the grants to sustain and rehabilitate the faltering economy of Europe.

We sent our resources abroad to destroy the productive capacity of Europe and of Asia because we wanted to win the war and preserve a free world, but that objective will not be attained until we write the peace treaties upon a final basis, until we secure the agreement of all nations, including Soviet Russia, an agreement under which the peoples of the world can live together in peace.

I know that the Senator from Nebraska is anxious to go forward with the appropriation bill, and I shall not presume further upon his time; but I should like to have unanimous consent, Mr. President, that there be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the following:

A statement which was issued just before his death by former Governor Gifford Pinchot, of Pennsylvania, on conservation as a foundation for permanent peace.

Portions of a report which I filed last year on the stock-piling law.

The supplemental estimate which has been sent to the House of Representatives by the President (H. Doc. 280), recommending an appropriation of $150,000,000, together with a contract authorization of $50,000,000 for the Treasury Department, in order that the strategic materials may be purchased.

A letter which I have received from the Secretary of the Interior, and a letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, dealing with the carrying out of the domestic phase of the stock-piling law.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSERVATION AS A FOUNDATION OF PERMANENT PEACE

(By Gifford Pinchot, Washington, D. C., former Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania)

Thirty-two years ago there was held in the city of Washington a conference which was the first of its kind. It was the first not only in America but in the world. It was also the first conference in the history of this country of the governors of all the States and Territories with the President of the United States. Since it included also the Congress, the Cabinet, the Supreme Court, scientific experts, representatives of national associations, and outstanding citizens, it was one of the most distinguished gatherings ever brought together in this country.

But no one of these was the essential reason for its epoch-making importance. The reason why the meeting of the Governors with President Theodore Roosevelt in the White House in May 1908, may well be regarded by future historians as a turning point in human history, the reason why it exerted and continues to exert a vital influence on the United States, on the other Nations of the Americas, and on the nations of the whole world, is this: It was called to introduce, and it did introduce, to mankind the newly formulated policy of the conservation of natural resources.

Even at that time the profound significance of conservation was beginning to make itself felt. In announcing his intention to call the conference, the President said: "The conservation of natural resources is the fundamental problem. Unless we solve that problem it will avail us little to solve all others. * * * It (the conference) ought to be among the most important gatherings in our history, for none have had a more vital question to consider."

In his opening address to the conference the President made this striking statement:

"So vital is this question, that for the first time in our history the chief executive officers of the States separately, and of the States together forming the Nation, have met to consider it. It is the chief material problem that confronts us, second only—and second always—to the great fundamental questions of morality. * * *

"This conference on the conservation of national resources is in effect a meeting of the representatives of all the people of the United States called to consider the weightiest problems now before the Nation."

This conference set forth in impressive fashion, and it was the first national meeting in any country to set forth, the idea that the protection, preservation, and wise use of the natural resources of the earth are not a series of separate and independent tasks but one single problem. As the President said: "The various uses of our natural resources are so closely connected that they should be coordinated, and should be treated as parts of one coherent plan."

The conference asserted that the conservation of natural resources is the one most fundamentally important problem of all. It drove home the basic truth that the planned and orderly development of the earth and all it contains is absolutely indispensable to the permanent prosperity of the human race.

It spread far and wide the new proposition that the purpose of the conservation of natural resources is for the greatest good of the greatest number for the longest time.

And it taught the people of the United States, and other peoples, the new meaning of the word conservation, which in its present application to natural resources was then generally unknown.

By defining, describing, and making known the new word and the new policy, by endowing it with the approval and support of the leaders of all the States, of the great industries, and of the Nation itself, the Governors' Conference put conservation in a firm place in the knowledge and in the thinking of the people. From that moment conservation became an inseparable part of the national policy of the United States.

It is worth mention that this brilliant example of national foresight occurred not in a time of scarcity, not in a depression, but in a time of general abundance and well-being. The unanimous declaration of the Governors ended with this descerning admonition: "Let us conserve the foundations of our prosperity."

You may find it difficult today, when conservation is accepted almost as widely as the Ten Commandments, to realize that only a generation ago there was no such thing as the conservation policy. The very word conservation, as we use it today, had no existence. But that is the truth.

The conception which we know as conservation originated and was formulated in the United States Forest Service in the early winter of 1907. Conservation grew out of forestry. It was a contribution from the foresters of America to the permanent policy and the democratic principles of their country.

Like many another child of flesh or brain, conservation was born without a name. But it had to be given a name before it could be introduced to the people.

After discussion among perhaps half a dozen men, the name Conservation was tentatively decided on. Thereupon it was submitted to and approved by Theodore Roosevelt, and the infant was christened accordingly. We know the growing youngster, 33 years old but growing still, by that same name today.

The hold conservation has gained in these 33 years upon the civilized people of the world is little less than amazing. Today the soundness of the conservation policy is everywhere accepted as a matter of course.

The Conference of Governors recommended and was followed by the appointment of conservation commissions by a majority of the States, and of the National Conservation Commission, which later in January of 1909 submitted to the President the first national inventory of natural resources ever made. In February of the same year the North American Conservation Conference, the first international conference to consider the policy of Conservation, met in Washington at the invitation of President Theodore Roosevelt.

In his address at the opening of the Conference in the White House the President made this highly significant statement.

"In international relations the great feature of the growth of the last century has been the gradual recognition of the fact that instead of its being normally to the interest of one Nation to see another depressed, it is normally to the interest of each Nation to see the others elevated. * * *

"I believe that the movement that you this day initiate is one of the utmost importance to this hemisphere and may become of the utmost importance to the world at large."

The North American Conservation Conference declared that the movement for the conservation of natural resources on the continent of North America "is of such a nature and of such general importance that it should become world-wide in its scope." Therefore it suggested to the President "that all nations should be invited to join together in conference on the subject of world resources and their inventory, conservation, and wise utilization."

What the conference thus recommended was, however, already under way. The President had foreseen that the North American Conference would be the precursor of a world conference. Accordingly, to quote Elihu Root, then Secretary of State:

"By an aide-memoire in January last (1909), the principal governments were informally sounded to ascertain whether they would look with favor upon an invitation to send delegates to such a conference. The responses have so far been uniformly favorable, and the conference of Washington has suggested to the President that a similar general conference be called by him. The President feels, therefor, that it is timely to initiate the suggested world conference for the conservation of natural resources, by a formal invitation."

Secretary Root continued:

"As was said in the preliminary aide-memoire 'the people of the whole world are interested in the natural resources of the whole world, benefited by their conservation, and injured by their destruction. The people of every country are interested in the supply of food and of material for manufacture in every other country, not only because these are interchangeable through processes of trade but because a knowledge of the total supply is necessary to the intelligent treatment of each Nation's share of the supply.' * * *

"Reading the lessons of the past aright it would be for such a conference to look beyond the present to the future."

These statements make it evident that the President and the men in whose minds the plan for a world inventory was born regarded the proposed conference only as a first step. They believed that international cooperation between nations for the conservation of natural resources and for fair access to necessary raw materials would greatly reduce the danger of war and work powerfully for permanent peace. Such a result was a definite part of their plan.

With the concurrence of the Netherlands, invitations were sent to 58 nations to meet at the Peace Palace in the Hague in September 1909. Thirty of the nations, including Great Britain, France, Germany, Canada, and Mexico, had already accepted when President Taft, who succeeded Theodore Roosevelt on March 4, 1909, killed the plan.

Two attempts have been made to revive it. At the end of the World War President Wilson, at the suggestion of Colonel House, took steps toward securing world-wide cooperation in the conservation and distribution of natural resources. Unfortunately nothing came of it.

During President Hoover's administration a group of nearly 200 leading citizens from all parts of this country urged him in a public petition to take action along the same general line. Again nothing came of it.

But these checks notwithstanding, the conservation problem remains the fundamental human problem. Without natural resources no human life is possible. Without abundant natural resources civilized life can neither be developed nor maintained.

To the human race land is the basic natural resource. The demand for new territory, made by one nation against another, is a demand for additional natural resources. And I need not point out to you how many times this demand has plunged the nations into war.

In view of the foregoing, I have a definite plan to suggest—a plan for permanent peace through international cooperation in the conservation and distribution of natural resources.

THE PROPOSAL

National life everywhere is built on the foundation of natural resources. Throughout human history the exhaustion of these resources and the need for new supplies have been among the greatest causes of war.

A just and permanent world peace is vital to the best interests of all nations. When the terms which will end the present war are considered, the neutral nations should be in position to assist in finding the way to such a peace. That being so, it would be wise to prepare in time.

The proposal is that the nations of the Americas prepare now for an endeavor to bring all nations together, at the right moment, in a common effort for conserving the natural resources of the earth, and for assuring to each nation access to the raw materials it needs, without recourse to war.

In all countries some natural resources are being depleted or destroyed. Needless waste or destruction of necessary resources anywhere threatens or will threaten, sooner or later, the welfare and security of peoples everywhere. Conservation is clearly a world necessity, not only for enduring the prosperity but also for permanent peace.

No nation is self-sufficient in essential raw materials. The welfare of every nation depends on access to natural resources which it lacks. Fair access to natural resources from other nations is therefore an indispensable condition of permanent peace.

War is still an instrument of national policy for the safeguarding of natural resources or for securing them from other nations. Hence, international cooperation in conserving, utilizing, and distributing natural resources to the mutual advantage of all nations might well remove one of the most dangerous of all obstacles to a just and permanent world peace.

The conservation of natural resources and fair access to needed raw materials are steps toward the common good to which all nations must in principle agree. Since the American Nations are less dependent on imported natural resources than European Nations, and since they are already engaged in broadening international trade through negotiated agreements, their initiative to such ends would be natural and appropriate.

The problem of permanent peace includes, of course, great factors which the foregoing proposal does not cover. But it does cover that factor which is certainly, in the long run, the most potent of them all.

FACTS REQUIRED

If the foregoing proposal is adopted, facts in support of it will be needed, and a plan for assembling them. The formulation of a general policy and a specific program of action would follow.

Facts for each nation separately, for groups of nations, and for the whole world might well be assembled under the general classes of forests, waters, lands, minerals, and wildlife. In very brief outline they should include:

As to conservation—resources in existence, consumption, probable duration, waste, conservation if any, necessary reserves, and available surplus.

As to fair access—present interdependence of nations in natural resources (raw materials), with the origin, destination, and quantities of imports and exports, present barriers to fair access; and sources of pressure upon nations to acquire natural resources.

A WAY TO ASSEMBLE THE FACTS

The information just outlined undoubtedly exists in sufficient detail for the present purpose, and can be put togther without original investigation. It could well be done through a Commission appointed for that purpose representing all of the American Nations.

The gathering of information through the creation of such a Commission might, I believe, properly be recommended by the Eighth American Scientific Congress to the Governments of the American Nations.

Formulation by the Commission of a plan and of recommendations to the American governments for a general policy and a specific program of action, including the presentation of the plan when prepared to neutral and belligerent nations, would follow.

Such a Commission would be of immense and lasting value of the American Nations. It could not but advance their interests, both individual and mutual, in addition to opening a road toward a workable basis for permanent peace.

Finally, the situation in Europe and in Asia suggests that action for the purpose cutlined above was never more necessary than at present.

Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, submitted the following report (to accompany S. 752):

* * * * *

"The need for stock piling of strategic and critical materials was recognized by Congress prior to the entry of the United States into World War II by the passage of the act of June 7, 1939, which the present stock-piling bill herein reported favorably by your committee is intended to amend. As long ago as December 24, 1919, in a report to the President, Mr. Bernard M. Baruch, as the result of the trying experiences of World War I, urged that steps be taken at once to assure adequate supplies of raw materials for any future emergencies. It was not until 1938 that a small appropriation of $4,000,000 was made to

the Navy for the purchase of strategic materials, followed in 1939 by the enactment of the present law and by an appropriation of $100,000,000 to be spent by the Procurement Division of the Treasury.

"The accumulation of the stock pile got under way very slowly. When war broke out in Europe certain sources of supply were closed, shipment was tight and prices were soaring, and only a small percentage of the materials thought to be needed had been accumulated. Some of the materials, as for example, tin, could not then be acquired. The delay, confusion, and exorbitant cost was in many ways a repetition of the experience of the United States in the First World War. These two experiences are the compelling reason to enact now legislation to assure preparedness in case of another emergency.

"The need is greater now than ever because the tremendous consumption of strategic materials during the recent war effort has resulted, according to the Department of the Interior, in an appalling depletion of our own domestic resources. It is essential to take steps now to recoup our losses not only by the acquisition of adequate stock piles but by the development of new sources of domestic supply.

"While your committee supports in every way the effort to create an effective United Nations organization for the preservation of peace, it believes that the security of the United States requires the maintenance of an adequate stock pile. An adequate stock pile must be built up and maintained because mineral and other raw materials are the very foundation of the industries which more perhaps than anything else have enabled these United States to win the victory in World War II."

EIGHTIETH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, DOCUMENT NO. 280—SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATION TOGETHER WITH A CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION FOR THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT—COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TRANSMITTING SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATION FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1947 IN THE AMOUNT OF $150,000,000, TOGETHER WITH A CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION IN THE AMOUNT OF $50,000,000, FOR THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 27, 1947.

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit for the consideration of the Congress a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of $150,000,000, together with a contract authorization in the amount of $50,000,000 for the Treasury Department.

The details of this estimate, the necessity therefor, and the reasons for its submission at this time are set forth in the letter of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, transmitted herewith, in whose comments and observations thereon I concur.

Respectfully yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington 25, D. C., May 26, 1947.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House.

SIR: I have the honor to submit herewith for your consideration a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of $150,000,000, together with a contract authorization in the amount of $50,000,000, for the Treasury Department, as follows:

"TREASURY DEPARTMENT

"BUREAU OF FEDERAL SUPPLY

"Strategic and critical materials: For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions of the Strategic and Critical Material Stock-Piling Act of July 23, 1946, including personal services in the District of Columbia; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 600); and printing and binding; $150,000,000, to be available until expended, and in addition thereto contracts may be entered into for the purposes of said act in an amount not in excess of $50,000,000: *Provided*, That any funds received as proceeds from sale or other disposition of materials on account of the rotation of stocks under said act shall be deposited to the credit, and be available for expenditure for the purposes, of this appropriation."

This supplemental appropriation and contract authorization will enable the continuation of present activities in carrying out the provisions of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock-Piling Act. While the quantities of materials to be procured from the appropriation recommended herein will not permit the accumulation of the stock pile at the rate which would be desirable in the interests of national defense, the conditions apparent at this time indicate that an additional $200,000,000 can be utilized prudently for the stock-piling program. Further acceleration of procurement for the stock pile should be anticipated when lessening scarcity of many of the strategic and critical materials will permit more extensive efforts to strengthen this phase of our preparedness for industrial mobilization in the event of a future national emergency.

This supplemental estimate was not reflected in the budget for 1948, as considerable doubt then existed as to the availability of strategic and critical materials for procurement at reasonable prices. In view of the unobligated balances of funds remaining from appropriations previously made, the provision of an additional appropriation for this purpose could not then be recommended. At this time there is evidence that materials are becoming more readily available in the world supply to meet the balance of our stock-pile objectives. In order that the time required to effectuate the objectives of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock-Piling Act may be minimized, it is essential that funds be available to advance this program as it becomes possible to acquire strategic and critical materials on reasonable terms. It is believed that this stock-piling program can and will be carried out in accordance with your policy that procurement by Government agencies will not stimulate price increases or prevent price reductions. As delivery of some of the materials to be procured is not expected until after June 30, 1948, the provision of contract authority for $50,000,000 as part of this procurement program is practicable.

I recommend that the foregoing supplemental estimate be transmitted to the Congress.

Respectfully yours,

JAMES E. WEBB,
Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, May 15, 1947.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: I have your letter of April 25, in which you inquire concerning the steps that have been taken by the Department of the Interior to carry out the provision of section 7 (a) of the Stock Piling Act of 1946.

As I see it, the function of the bureaus of this Department under section 7 (a) is to improve the domestic situation with respect to those metals and minerals in which we are not self-sufficient. This objective may be achieved (1) by finding new deposits of the minerals, (2) by determining feasible methods of mining and treating ores now considered to be noncommercial, and (3) by perfecting substitutes from domestically adequate materials. Underground stock piles of marginal materials not presently commercial should be developed and tested, for example, so that they can be brought into production promptly when needed.

This section of the act, as you know, is practically identical with section 7 (a) of the Strategic Materials Act of 1939 (Public, 117, 76th Cong.). Both these acts make provision for the acquisition of stock piles of strategic minerals and other materials to tide us over the period of gearing our industries to emergency production levels, and both recognize, through section 7 (a), that stock piles alone are not a complete remedy for mineral shortages. We must be prepared to speed up our production of metals and minerals to meet emergencies; hence, we must have, in addition to stock piles, an adequate supply of known domestic deposits of every strategic mineral that it is possible to find. If, in certain commodities, there is none to be found, we must know that in advance so that particularly large stock piles or substitutes may be provided.

After the passage of the act of 1939, Congress appropriated a limited amount of funds to the Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey to investigate and develop domestic deposits of the ores of seven metals that were then known to be strategic. Congress soon recognized, however, that even for developing ores of these seven metals the original appropriations were much too small. In 1941, therefore, before the entrance of the United States into the war, the appropriations made available to this Department for these studies were upped to slightly over $3,500,000. Wartime experience soon demonstrated, however, that many more metals and minerals were in such short supply as to be termed "strategic," and again the appropriations to the Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey were increased, until at the wartime peak the amounts spent by these agencies on strategic mineral and petroleum studies amounted to a rate of approximately $10,360,000 per year. After VJ-day a considerable portion of the wartime funds for this purpose was quite properly rescinded. The activities were continued on a limited scale, however, largely as a normal part of our minerals investigation program. During the current fiscal year (1947) funds totaling approximately $4,100,000 are being spent on investigations directly related to this work. These amounts were appropriated prior to the passage of the Stock Piling Act.

The enactment of the act of July 23, 1946, therefore, found the Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey funded on a scale approximately equal to that of the prewar year 1941, and manned by a staff which, after 7 years of experience, had become expert in this highly technical field. No funds have been appropriated by Congress specifically to enable Interior to carry out its responsibilities under this act, but in the summer of 1946 the programs of these bureaus were reviewed, and a considerable part of them aimed at carrying out the provisions imposed by the Stock Piling Act. Moreover, the programs of the two agencies dealing with this problem were closely coordinated and correlated to insure the most efficient use of funds and personnel.

When the estimates of appropriations for fiscal year 1948 were made serious consideration was given to requesting sizable increases to meet the responsibilities imposed by section 7 (a). The engineers and geologists of Mines and Survey fully realize the magnitude of the task before them and how imperative it is that we do not again lapse into indifference to mineral supply. Nevertheless, in view of the President's economy order, the budget estimates for fiscal 1948 were made with restraint. Despite the fact that the minerals now listed as strategic number 50 in contrast to the 7 listed in 1941, the funds asked for in

the 1948 estimates are approximately one-half that expended at the wartime peak, or 35 percent above that spent for strategic minerals in 1941. The estimates for 1948 provide $5,500,000 which, if appropriated, will be expended on investigations designed to carry out our responsibilities under section 7 (a) of the Stock Piling Act. This includes funds for geological and geophysical investigations and exploratory activities to be carried on by the Geological Survey, and funds for developmental, beneficiation, metallurgical, and pilot plant investigations by the Bureau of Mines.

The House action on the Interior appropriation bill, however, has reduced these amounts to less than one-half the estimate. Accordingly, if the House version of this bill is enacted, not over $2,600,000 will be available for these vital mandatory functions. This is roughly 30 percent less than that considered essential for this purpose in 1941 and 36.6 percent less than the amount being expended during the current year. If the House action prevails, it will mean that certain of the more expensive but essential portions of the program, such as the proving of mining methods of portions of marginal "underground stock piles" of strategic minerals will have to be discontinued entirely and plans for exploratory work greatly curtailed. The valuable resource of knowledge and experience painstakingly acquired by many of the engineers and scientists now engaged in the program will be irretrievably lost through reduction in force.

We in Interior are good soldiers. We will carry out the responsibilities placed upon us by Congress to the best of our ability with the funds provided, but it is our considered opinion that the amounts included in the budget estimate for the functions directed by section 7 (a) of the Stock Piling Act of 1946 are the minimum for really effective work.

Sincerely yours,

J. A. KRUG,
Secretary of the Interior.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C. May 6, 1947.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: This is in reply to your letter of April 25, which asked that you be advised as to steps taken by the Department of Agriculture to carry out the provisions of section 7 (b) of the act of July 23, 1946, the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act.

We enclose a copy of Secretary's memorandum 1175, dated October 4, 1946, which outlines briefly general procedures within this Department relating to its duties and responsibilities under this act.

Representatives of this Department have discussed with representatives of the Army and Navy Munitions Board current and prospective research activities having application to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act. A copy is enclosed of a statement furnished the Army and Navy Munitions Board on activities of the Department of Agriculture having application to the provisions of section 7 (b) of this act. There is also enclosed copy of a statement with respect to activities of the Department regarding the production of strategic and critical materials in Latin America.

As indicated in the enclosures, the Department's present research program having application to the provisions of section 7 (b) of Public Law 520 includes investigations of possible domestic production, storage problems, and possible substitutes for certain agricultural materials which have been designated as strategic and critical pursuant to section 2 (a) of the act. Several of the items are receiving little or no attention in present research projects, but work on these items will be considered in connection with research contemplated pursuant to the Research and Marketing Act of 1946 (Public Law 733, 79th Congress). It is believed that except for natural rubber all strategic and critical materials of agricultural origin either are being made the subject of research in the Department, or will be so studied incident to other Department activities contemplated in the 1948 budget estimates.

The 1948 budget estimates include an item for research on the domestic production, extraction, and processing of natural rubber-from guayule, kok-saghyz and other rubber-bearing plants, pursuant to section 7 (b) of the Stock Piling Act. This item of $349,000 appears under the heading "Research on Strategic and Critical Agricultural Materials," on page 282 of the printed 1948 budget.

We greatly appreciate your interest in this matter and shall be glad to furnish any additional information you may wish.

Sincerely,

N. E. DODD,
Under Secretary.

MEMORANDUM No. 1175—STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS STOCK PILING ACT

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., October 4, 1946.

The Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (Public Law 520, 79th Cong., approved July 23, 1946) places certain important duties and responsibilities upon the Department of Agriculture. Section 7 (b) of this act provides: "The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed to make scientific, technologic, and economic investigations of the feasibility of developing domestic sources of supplies of any agricultural material or for using agricultural commodities for the manufacture of any material determined pursuant to section 2 of of this act to be strategic and critical or substitutes therefor."

The responsibilities given the Department by the act will require the cooperation of a number of our agencies. In view of the fact that the act relates primarily to procurement of materials, the Production and Marketing Administration will assume general leadership with respect to activities under the act. The Production and Marketing Administration, will undertake, or will request the Bureau of Agricultural Economics or other appropriate agency of the Department to undertake, or to assist in, economic investigations under section 7b of the act quoted above. The Production and Marketing Administration will consult with the Agricultural Research Administration and other appropriate agencies of the Department as to scientific and technological investigations to be undertaken under section 7 (b) of the act. The Administrator, PMA, will submit recommendations to the Secretary, accompanied by the findings and recommendations of the head of any agency which undertook or assisted in making investigations.

Matters arising in the Department generally in connection with the implementation of this act should be referred to Mr. Carl Farrington, Assistant Administrator, Production and Marketing Administration, who is designated as the representative of the Secretary of Agriculture in connection with this act.

N. E. DODD,
Under Secretary.

DECEMBER 4, 1946.

ARMY AND NAVY MUNITIONS BOARD,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: This is in reply to your letter of October 4, 1946 (ANMB 401.1) regarding scientific, technologic, and economic investigations contemplated by this Department with respect to agricultural materials determined to be strategic and critical, pursuant to the provisions of section 7 (b) of Public Law 520, Seventy-ninth Congress.

Representatives of this Department have discussed with representatives of the Army and Navy Munitions Board current and prospective research activities having application to strategic and critical materials. We also have considered budgetary problems involved in carrying out the provisions of section 7 (b) of the act.

We enclose a statement which outlines work which we are doing or propose to do, including for each material a brief description of the character of the research. With respect to rubber, it has been necessary to submit a request for additional funds, using as a basis therefor the provisions of Public Law 520 and the special interest of the Army and Navy Munitions Board. In the case of all items except rubber, it appears at this time that no additional funds will be required in the fiscal year 1948 beyond those contemplated in budget requests under other authorizations.

We shall be glad to have the benefit of review and comment by the Army and Navy Munitions Board upon the research program contemplated by this Department under section 7 (b). We shall plan to continue to keep in close touch with the Board, and shall be glad to develop such cooperative procedures as may appear desirable in furtherance of these activities.

A separate communication is being forwarded to you with respect to activities of this Department regarding the production of strategic and critical materials in Latin America.

Sincerely yours,

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Secretary.

DECEMBER 2, 1946.

ACTIVITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE HAVING APPLICATION TO THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 7 (B) OF THE STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS STOCK PILING ACT

The program of research contemplated under this head for the fiscal year 1948 will involve in part a continuation and expansion of work now in progress and in part the initiation of new research on materials of military interest. These investigations would include possible domestic production, storage problems, and possible substitutes derived from domestic agricultural crops. The scope of the work will be dependent upon the availability of funds. The commodities investigated would be among those listed under "Group A" of the "Current List of Strategic and Critical Materials" issued by the Army and Navy Munitions Board under date of January 14, 1946, as follows:

CASTOR OIL

Brazil, India, Manchuria, and Haiti are the principal producers of castor oil. For several years the Department has been engaged in the introduction and breeding of varieties of castor beans adapted to commercial production in this country and to the culture of this oil-seed crop. The use of castor oil derivatives in the control of certain animal parasites is also under investigation. It is proposed to continue these lines of work.

COCONUT OIL

Owing to the tropical origin of copra from which coconut oil is derived, the direct production of this oil from domestic sources is not feasible. Its principal uses are in the production of soaps, glycerol, and foods.

Chemical research has indicated that glycerol may be obtained through the application of chemical technologies to nonfat agricultural crops, and through the modification of long-chain fatty acids it is possible

to obtain derivatives from which soaps may be made, similar to soaps made from coconut oil.

We are studying methods for the production of derivatives from unsaturated fatty acids to yield soaps with lathering qualities equal to those from coconut oil.

We are also studying methods to prevent rancidity in vegetable oils and animal fats and the methods developed may possibly be found to be applicable to the prevention of deterioration in storage of coconut oil and copra.

CORDAGE FIBERS

Abaca and sisal, the hard fibers in which the Army and Navy Munitions Board is particularly interested, are produced principally in the Philippines and the Dutch East Indies. Haiti is a secondary source for sisal and Cuba and Mexico are sources of henequen which is used to some extent as a substitute for sisal.

About 20 years ago work was initiated in the department to encourage the commercial production of abaca fiber in Central America, with the result that an important secondary source of this fiber is now developing in the Western Hemisphere. We are cooperating with the commercial producers in the technical phases of this work.

Investigations are also being carried on with sansevieria as a possible substitute for sisal or abaca.

LEAD, MERCURY, ETC.

The value of synthetic organic insecticides is an important phase of the department's present research program, applicable to military as well as agricultural needs. It now appears that the use of these compounds promises to reduce greatly the need for lead, mercury and other metals in insecticides and fungicides. This work will be vigorously pursued.

OPIUM

China, U. S. S. R., Iran, and Turkey are the principal sources of opium. There are sections of this country, as in western Idaho and certain parts of the arid Southwest where, from an environmental standpoint, the opium poppy can be grown successfully. Some work has been done by the department in determining its cultural and harvesting requirements and a start has also been made in the breeding and selection of high-yielding varieties. The production of opium involves much tedious hand labor and is therefore expensive. It has been found that morphine, the product for which opium is principally used, can be extracted directly from the dry poppy straw, which indicates that domestic production of this drug may become entirely practicable when adaptable high-yielding varieties of poppies are available. The Opium Poppy Control Act of 1942 places restrictions on common culture but adequate supplies to meet domestic needs of morphine could doubtless be obtained from relatively small acreage.

It is proposed to continue the present breeding and variety testing program to develop poppy strains of superior plant type having high morphine content and resistant to disease. Further studies will also he undertaken, if possible, on proper conditions for handling, storage, and transportation of the poppy straw, and the best storage conditions for maintaining seed of high viability for planting.

PALM OIL

This oil is of tropical origin, and is used in the production of glycerol and soaps and in tin-plate manufacture. Research in the department has indicated that by modifications of certain domestic vegetable oils, suitable substitutes for palm oil in tin-plate manufacture may be developed. It is proposed to continue these investigations.

PYRETHRUM

British East Africa (Kenya) and the Belgian Congo furnish the bulk of our high-test pyrethrum raw stocks. Lower-test material is derived in considerable quantity from Brazil. The principal use of pyrethrum is in the production of insecticides.

Investigations have shown that pyrethrum flowers may be produced in certain sections of the United States, particularly in northern and Pacific Coast States, but there are practical problems concerned with proper harvesting, drying of the flowers, and handling so as to avoid serious losses of the active principle under storage. A breeding program is already under way in the Department to develop strains of greater potency and possessed of high resistance to diseases and other qualities essential to the successful production of the crop. The Department is also making extensive investigations on means of increasing the effectiveness of pyrethrum and on substitute insecticides to reduce the need for pyrethrum.

QUEBRACHO

Quebracho is imported from South American sources—Argentina and Paraguay principally—and comes in the form of a solid extract. It is used in the tanning of hides, the production of heavy leathers, etc. Quebracho is indigenous to South America and there are no domestic sources. Our own principal sources of tannin, namely, chestnut wood and oak bark, are gradually being depleted and the best our agricultural research can do is to develop new or previously little used tannin-bearing plants to supplement our short supply.

Work is under way in the Department on sumac, Western hemlock, and canaigre, and search is being made for other possible sources of tanning material. This work will be continued. Of these plants investigated, canaigre seems to offer most promise. While it can under no circumstances provide all the tannin required, it can be made to supplement substantially other sources of supply. Proposed work on canaigre includes selection and breeding of plants having high tannin content, study of best cultural conditions, further trials on methods of shredding and drying of the tannin-bearing roots, determination of best conditions for storage of the material, and development of efficient methods for the extraction of the tannin.

QUININE AND QUINIDINE

Cinchona bark is the source material of these drugs. The Netherlands Indies were formerly the principal producers but war conditions forced the development of other sources. Production is being developed in tropical America.

The present activities of the Department in this field are carried on primarily at the Federal Experiment Station in Puerto Rico, with funds made available by the Defense Supplies Corporation. These funds will expire on December 31, 1946. The work has involved the investigations of problems concerned with the general aspects of growing cinchona from seed and selected clone seedlings developed under Puerto Rican conditions, and studies on temperature, moisture, light, and fertilization requirements of the tree. Almost no work has been done with problems of plant breeding, pathology, or physiology of the cinchona tree, which is needed if substantial progress is to be made in this direction.

RUBBER

Estimates have been submitted covering proposed research on rubber, and copies have been submitted informally to representatives of the Army and Navy Munitions Board. A copy of the statement describing this project is attached.

TUNG OIL

This oil, which is particularly important as a drying oil for use in paints and varnishes, was formerly imported from the Orient. Tung groves have now been established in the Gulf coast region of this country.

For some years the Department has had under way a vigorous research program on the production phases of tung culture, including breeding for superior high-oil-yielding varieties, studies on the mineral nutrition of the trees, maintenance of fertility in tung orchards, control of diseases, and related work. This work will be continued, and it may be possible to expand the investigations somewhat to include studies on (1) the effect of methods of harvesting, pretreatment; and extraction on the quality of the oil; (2) the components of the oil which affect its storage life and use; and (3) the development of methods for the prevention of deterioration during storage.

OTHER MATERIALS

The Department is concerned in the possibilities of developing, from American agricultural products, substitutes for such materials as agar, shellac, and sperm oil; and of exploring the practicability of producing rapeseed oil in this country. While little work is being done in these fields at present, such work will be considered in connection with research contemplated pursuant to the Research and Marketing Act of 1946 (Public Law 733, 79th Cong.).

DECEMBER 17, 1946.

ARMY AND NAVY MUNITIONS BOARD,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: This will supplement our letter addressed to you with respect to investigations pursuant to section 7 (b) of Public Law 520.

In addition to the projects described in the foregoing, which are aimed at developing domestic sources of strategic and critical materials or substitutes therefor, the Department of Agriculture is operating a program of foreign technical collaboration. This is being done through the Interdepartmental Committee on Scientific and Cultural Cooperation of the Department of State. Funds for the program are allocated to this Department from congressional appropriations made to the Department of State.

Foreign experiment stations are operated in cooperation with the Governments of Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Nicaragua, and Peru. A cooperative research project on kenaf fibers is being carried out in Cuba. There is an agricultural mission for Colombia in process of formation. The Department has a corps of technicians serving as field service consultants in all Latin American countries.

Among the items upon which research is being conducted are coconut oil and palm oil, manila, sisal, and kenaf cordage fibers, emetine (ipecac); pepper, pyrethrum, quinidine and quinine, and rubber. In view of the natural adaptation of many of the Latin American countries to produce castor oil and tung, most of the stations are conducting research designed to stimulate the production of these products.

The objective of this program of international cooperative research is a long-range stimulation of production in nearby areas affording the maximum of military security. Emphasis is upon "living" stock piles in the form of the stimulated production, rather than short-range holdings of harvested stocks.

It is suggested that the Board may wish to investigate the research now under way to determine its adequacy as regards the strategic and critical commodities. Attached

is a short statement on each commodity, giving the problem and current research activity.

Sincerely yours,

CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Secretary.

SOME RESEARCH PROBLEMS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE PROGRAM OF THE TECHNICAL COLLABORATION BRANCH OFFICE OF FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL RELATIONS

FIBER CROPS

Fibers research has been undertaken in Peru, Nicaragua, El Salvador, Guatemala, and Cuba. Most of the effort and progress has been accomplished in El Salvador and particularly in Cuba and there with crops yielding jutelike fiber. Of these, kenaf has been singled out as a new crop likely to become established in this hemisphere. Research in its production and primary processing has proceeded to the point where, in Cuba, commercial production is expected in 1947. The research has developed means of complete mechanizing kenaf fiber production, from seeding in the fields through to the baled fiber. This is in contrast to the much hand work involved in jute production. Further improvements in some of the processes will be pursued in subsequent research.

Sisal and sisal-like fibers are being produced in many of the American Republics. Attention is being given to solving current problems affecting these plants such as insects or diseases. Station or field service staff of the Technical Collaboration Branch have been consulted at various times to solve some problems threatening production. Such advisory work will be continued.

In the case of abáca very limited work has been done directly by the Technical Collaboration Branch. However, the United Fruit Co. has engaged in large commercial experiments on abandoned banana plantations in Costa Rica and Panama, and TCB is planning to collaborate in continued research. With the shortage of manila fiber due to the war in the Pacific this development assisted the United States in adjusting to the serious shortage of cordage fibers. Besides keeping in close contact with this work TCB is assisting abaca producers in Ecuador in their production problems.

RUBBER

Research work on the production of natural rubber is being carried on in the other American Republics by the Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering. Where possible the work of the BPISAE has been intergrated with the experiment stations of TCB. Details of the work accomplished and problems to be faced may be obtained from the BPISAE.

MEDICINALS

Included under this heading are quinidine, quinine, and emetine (ipecac). In this hemisphere nearly all the production of these products have come from wild sources, although quinine and quinidine have been obtained from cinchona bark produced in plantations in the Netherland East Indies. Research work is being done in Guatemala, Peru, and Ecuador designed to assist farmers in growing cinchona commercially. Studies are being made to determine the proper species, grafts, soil type, and climatic environments for most rapid growth and production of cinchona bark with a relatively high alkaloid content.

In accordance with recommendations of the Army-Navy Munitions Board, the OFAR expects to be given responsibility for determining the scope of actual operations at the American Cinchona Plantation in Costa Rica. It may be that operations at this plantation can be so managed that a living expanding stock pile of cinchona bark will be maintained available on fairly short notice in an emergency period.

Selection and introduction work with emetine (ipecac) have been made on a small scale in several countries in Central America.

INSECTICIDES

Pyrethrum is obtained from the flowers of a chrysanthemum plant, native of Dalmatia but well adapted to high level areas of Africa, Central and South America. Considerable work has been done in trying to establish the plant commercially in the United States, but the large amount of labor required has seriously hampered its development. Adapted highland areas of Mexico, Guatemala, and Peru are heavily settled and labor can be obtained at low cost.

The cooperative agricultural experiment station in Ecuador has introduced the plant, made seed available to farmers and has helped them to prepare the material for market. Small-scale commercial production has begun. Similar developments are under way in Guatemala and the station is cooperating in this work. It appears to be a promising cash crop for the highland areas with abundant labor supplies.

FATS AND OILS

Many of the experiment stations are located in areas where shortage of certain food crops is serious. In order to strengthen the program of the stations and to assist local farmers in a greater proportion of their production problems, limited research has been carried on to provide a basis for improving local production practices. Improved varieties of several fats and oils have been introduced, among them being the African oil palm. If the research is successful in stimulating production, it may be that additional supplies of palm oil, palm-kernel oil, coconut oil and sesame oil could be obtained as a result of this work. If desirable, greater emphasis could be given to this work with good prospects for quick results.

OTHER PRODUCTS

Loefa sponges have been grown in a number of countries in which TCB personnel are working. With proper cultural methods a good grade of loefa can be grown quickly in the lowland tropics. If market outlets were organized in producing countries, there seems to be little doubt but that a much higher quality product could be produced.

Some introductory plantings and studies have been made of pepper, particularly in Nicaragua, in order to study its adaptability and productivity under different environmental conditions.

Work is being done with many other crops not listed as strategic and critical but which are imported on a large scale by the United States from areas better able to grow these commodities. Prominent among them are cacao, coffee, tea, and rotenone.

MAY 6, 1947.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: This is in reply to your letter of April 25, which asked that you be advised as to steps taken by the Department of Agriculture to carry out the provisions of section 7 (b) of the Act of July 23, 1946, the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act.

We enclose a copy of Secretary's Memorandum 1175, dated October 4, 1946, which outlines briefly general procedures within this Department relating to its duties and responsibilities under this act.

Representatives of this Department have discussed with representatives of the Army and Navy Munitions Board current and prospective research activities having application to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act. A copy is enclosed of a statement furnished the Army and Navy Munitions Board on activities of the Department of Agriculture having application to the provisions of section 7 (b) of this act. There is also enclosed copy of a statement with respect to activities of the Department regarding the production of strategic and critical materials in Latin America.

As indicated in the enclosures, the Department's present research program having application to the provisions of section 7 (b) of Public Law 520 includes investigations of possible domestic production, storage problems, and possible substitutes for certain agricultural materials which have been designated as strategic and critical pursuant to section 2 (a) of the act. Several of the items are receiving little or no attention in present research projects, but work on these items will be considered in connection with research contemplated pursuant to the Research and Marketing Act of 1946 (Public Law 733, 79th Cong.). It is believed that except for natural rubber all strategic and critical materials of agricultural origin either are being made the subject of research in the Department, or will be so studied incident to other Department activities contemplated in the 1948 budget estimates.

The 1948 budget estimates include an item for research on the domestic production, extraction, and processing of natural rubber from guayule, kok-saghyz and other rubber-bearing plants, pursuant to section 7 (b) of the Stock Piling Act. This item of $349,000 appears under the heading "Research on Strategic and Critical Agricultural Materials," on page 282 of the printed 1948 budget.

We greatly appreciate your interest in this matter and shall be glad to furnish any additional information you may wish.

Sincerely,

N. E. DODD,
Under Secretary.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I desire to commend the excellent remarks made by the Senator from Wyoming with respect to the necessity of a broad inventory of our natural mineral resources. I am no better satisfied than he is with the progress that is being made. We did the best we could under all the circumstances in reporting this bill to the Senate. I also want to second what the Senator said with respect to the chairman of the subcommittee the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] on the manner in which he conducted hearings, the fairness that he exhibited to witnesses and all concerned, in the preparation of the bill. I think I can speak with some authority, because I handled the bill for a number of years, as Senators are well aware. When I first took charge of it, we were in the midst of a depression. We were seeking sound, substantial, wealth-producing projects, to give work to the unemployed, instead of engaging in boondoggling. Then the war came on, and the committee was among the first to include in its report that any appropriations made for any public works contained therein would not be expended if the materials or manpower required for it were needed for the war. So that my task was comparatively easy compared to that of the Senator from Nebraska, because here we are faced with a sincere and earnest desire to reduce public expenditures. Nobody wants to have a dollar spent in these times that does not bring a dollar's return, and therefore Senators must be exceedingly careful in

passing a great appropriation bill of this kind, to see that there is no waste in it. I can assure the Senate that the Senator from Nebraska probed every angle and corner of that problem before we finally arrived at the figures contained in the bill. He has done an excellent job, being faced with the dilemma first of reducing expenditures as far as it is possible, and at the same time, to see that no essential public activity is destroyed. I compliment him upon that, and I commend the bill, the result of his work, to the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I express my sincere gratitude for the remarks just made by the senior Senator from Arizona. Without appearing to be trading complimentary remarks, I want to express on the Senate floor my deep appreciation of the value of the information which the senior Senator from Arizona continuously gave us, to help us arrive at the worth-while projects. The distinguished Senator from Arizona knows the projects, forward and backward. No matter where they may be located, he knows the basic law under which the projects were created. He knows the ones which really and truly should be continued. I personally want to express my heartfelt gratitude for his assistance to the subcommittee and to the full committee in arriving at the amounts that have been provided for the construction contracts, and also the amounts necessary to continue the different bureaus under the Department of the Interior.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the committee amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Office of the Secretary—Salaries," on page 2, line 4, after the word "of", to strike out "$50" and insert "$55"; in line 5, before the word *"Provided"*, to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,103,000"; and in line 8, after the word "Congress", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso: *"Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the Division of Power under the Office of the Secretary" and to insert in lieu thereof a colon and the following: *"Provided further*, That not to exceed $42,500 of this appropriation may be used for the Division of Information or for publicity and public relations activities."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Office of Solicitor," on page 2, line 21, after the word "field", to strike out "$200,000" and insert "$215,460."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Oil and Gas Division," on page 3, after line 1, to strike out:

Oil and Gas Division: For necessary expenses of administering and enforcing the provisions of the act of February 22, 1935, as amended (15 U. S. C., ch. 15A); and for the liquidation of the Petroleum Administration for War; including not to exceed $15,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia; and printing and binding; $124,000.

And insert in lieu thereof the following:

Oil and Gas Division: For expenses necessary for coordinating and unifying policies and administration of Federal activities relative to oil, gas, and synthetic fuels, including cooperation with the petroleum industry and State authorities in the production, processing, and utilization of petroleum and petroleum products, natural gas, and synthetic fuels and the compilation of technical reports thereon, for administering and enforcing the provisions of the act of February 22, 1935, as amended (15 U. S. C., ch. 15A); and for the liquidation of the Petroleum Administration for War; including personal services in the District of Columbia; not to exceed $10,000 for employment of a director without regard to the civil-service and classification laws; contract stenographic reporting services; and printing and binding; $324,730.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I very deeply regret that the committee did not include the item for enforcement of the so-called Connally Hot Oil Act in the amount which the administrative authorities enforcing the act say is absolutely essential as a minimum. The House appropriated $124,000 for the enforcement of the act. The act provides for regulation of transportation of interstate oil. The committee of the Senate, however, raised the appropriation for that agency to $169,000 annually. Upon receiving news of that action I went before the committee and made an argument. I telegraphed the authorities who are administering the act, and they telegraphed back that $200,000 was a minimum upon which they could efficiently operate.

I regret very much that the Committee on Appropriations did not give us that much money. But I do not want to delay the passage of the bill. I have no disposition to get into an argument with the Appropriations Committee, with which we have to deal every year—almost every day—and I shall refrain from offering an amendment at this time. But I want to impress upon the chairman of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee the vital necessity which exists in this situation, and urge him in conference to stand pat for the Senate action and, if possible, secure a larger amount, because the appropriation is merely a lump sum for two purposes, and within that appropriation the situation might be adjusted. I wanted to say that much, Mr. President, for the RECORD, and I shall rely on the Senator from Nebraska to take care of the Oil and Gas Division, because it is vitally necessary to do so.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Texas for his attitude in not offering an amendment on the floor. I wish to assure him that since he permits the matter to be taken to conference without his offering an amendment we will do our level best to see that his needs are taken care of.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment beginning at the top of page 3.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 4, to insert:

DIVISION OF GEOGRAPHY

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses in performing the duties imposed upon the Secretary by Executive Order 6680, dated April 17, 1934, relating to uniform usage in regard to geographic nomenclature and orthography throughout the Federal Government, including personal services in the District of Columbia, stationery and office supplies, and printing and binding, $12,956.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Soil and moisture conservation operations," on page 4, line 19, after the word "of", to insert "not to exceed"; and in line 21, before the word *"Provided"*, to strike out "$1,500,000" and insert "$2,100,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Contingent expenses, Department of the Interior," on page 5, line 22, after the word "binding", to strike out "$215,000" and insert "$220,430."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 7, after the numerals "1944", to strike out "$185,000" and insert "$136,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bonneville Power Administration," on page 7, line 5, after the word "aircraft", to strike out "$6,907,800" and insert "$16,222,400"; in line 7, after the word "exceed", strike out "$2,500,000" and insert "$3,290,000"; in line 11, after the word "including", to strike out "12,000" and insert "$24,000"; in line 12, after "District of Columbia", to insert a colon and the following proviso: *Provided*, That in addition to this appropriation the Administrator is authorized to contract in the fiscal year 1948 for materials and equipment for power transmission facilities in an amount not in excess of $6,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 16, after the amendment heretofore stated, to strike out the colon and the following proviso: *"Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for work performed on a force account basis" and in lieu thereof to insert the following additional proviso: *"Provided further*, That no part of any construction appropriations for the Bonneville Power Administration contained in this act shall be available for construction work by force account, or on a hired labor basis, except for management and operation, maintenance and repairs, engineering and supervision, routine minor construction work, or in case of emergencies, local in character, so declared by the Bonneville Power Administrator."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 25, after the amendment heretofore stated, to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: *"Provided fur-*

ther, That not exceeding $21,500 of funds available for expenditure under this appropriation shall be used for salaries and expenses in connection with informational work."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Southwestern Power Administration," on page 8, after line 13, to strike out:

Construction: For construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations, and appurtenant facilities, and administrative expenses connected therewith; including purchase of 10, and hire of passenger motor vehicles; for temporary services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 600), but at rates not exceeding $50 per diem for individuals; and printing and binding; $1,246,000, which amount, together with the unexpended balance of the appropriation for this purpose contained in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1947, is hereby continued available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Land Management," on page 9, line 9, after the word "proceedings", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,218,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 3, after the word "of", to insert "not to exceed"; in line 4, after the words "salary of", to strike out "$5" and insert "$6"; in line 9, after the word "building", to strike out "$1,888,000" and insert "$2,084,640"; and in line 11, after the word "exceeding", to strike out "$373,000" and insert "$398,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, line 16, after the word "of", to insert "not to exceed."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 12, line 2, after the word "of", to insert "not to exceed"; and in line 3, after the word "vehicle", to strike out "$425,000" and insert "$469,300."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Indian Affairs," on page 14, line 7, after the word "binding", to strike out "$700,000" and insert "$500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 20, after the word "service", to strike out "$3,250,000" and insert "$3,650,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 1, after the word "Arizona", to strike out "$8,000,000" and insert "$11,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 15, after the word "binding", to strike out "$6,830,570" and insert "$7,240,570."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 20, after the word "festivals", to strike out "$488,910" and insert "$498,710."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 9, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$801,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 17, after the figures "$12,000", to insert a comma and "which amount shall be available also for meeting obligations of the preceding fiscal year."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 16, after "Arizona", to insert "California"; in line 17, after "Colorado", to strike out "Montana"; in the same line, after "New Mexico", to insert "South Dakota"; in the same line, after "Utah", to strike out "Washington"; in line 19, after the word "reservations", to insert "except that so much of the sum herein appropriated as may be required may be used for the acquisition of land for the Alamo Band of the Puertocito Indians in the State of New Mexico"; in line 24, after the word "of", to strike out "Nevada and Oregon" and insert "Montana, Nevada, Oregon, and Washington"; and on page 19, line 1, after the word "reservations", to insert "except such sum as may be necessary to purchase in the name of the United States in trust thirty-four and one-half acres of land at Celilo Falls, Oreg., for the use of the Yakima Indian Tribes, the Umatilla Indian Tribes, the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation, and other Columbia River Indians affiliated with the aforementioned tribes and entitled to enjoy fishing rights at their old and accustomed fishing sites at or in the vicinity of Celilo Falls on the Columbia River."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 16, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$12,000" and insert "$15,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 3, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$337,833" and insert "$406,000, of which $337,333 shall be."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, after the words "Colorado River", to strike out "$400,000" and insert "$500,000"; and in line 18, after the words "New Mexico", to strike out "$150,000" and insert "$210,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, after line 20, to insert:

Idaho: Fort Hall, $40,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, after line 23, to insert:

New Mexico: United Pueblos, $17,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 5, after the words "In all", to strike out "$875,000" and insert "$1,092,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 20, after the word "quarters", to strike out "$160,000" and insert "$400,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 21, after the word "improvements", to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$20,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 12, after the word "expenses", to insert "private architect and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 15, after the words "In all", to strike out "$1,572,000" and insert "$1,822,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Miscellaneous Indian tribal funds," on page 25, line 1, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$294,800" and insert "$304,800."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, line 19, after the word "Wisconsin", to strike out "$135,000" and insert "$147,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 13, after the word "Museum", to insert "at a salary of $1,954"; in line 16, after the word "officers", to strike out the comma and "including the employment of a tribal attorney at the rate of $4,500 per annum to be appointed with the approval of the Osage Tribal Council under a contract to be entered into between said tribal attorney and the Osage Tribal Council, which contract shall be approved by the Secretary of the Interior"; in line 22, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$1,500" and insert "$2,000"; and on page 27, line 8, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$6" and insert "$10."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 14, after the word "provided", to strike out "$35,000" and insert "$73,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 21, before the word "land", to strike out "non-Indian owned"; and in line 22, after the word "of", to strike out "Nevada and Oregon" and insert "Montana, Nevada, Oregon, South Dakota, and Washington."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Reclamation," on page 34, line 18, after the word "binding", to strike out "(not to exceed $239,000)" and insert a semicolon; and in line 19, after the word "of", to insert "not to exceed."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General offices," on page 36, line 9, after the word "functions", to strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "$3,260,000"; in line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$6,500,000" and insert "$9,100,000"; and in line 21, after the word "exceeding", to strike out "$150,000" and insert "$50,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General investigations," on page 37, line 11, after the word "Commission", to strike out "$125,000" and insert "$2,000,000"; and in line 16, after the word "costs", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: *"Provided further*, That the expenditure of any sums from this appropriation for investigations of any nature requested by States, municipalities, or other interests

shall be upon the basis of the State, municipality, or other interest advancing at least 50 percent of the estimated cost of such investigations."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Construction," on page 38, line 1, after the word "reimbursable", to strike out "except as otherwise provided by law" and insert "under the reclamation law, except as provided in the act of August 14, 1946 (Public Law 732), Seventy-ninth Congress."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, after line 6, to strike out:

Gila project, Arizona, $1,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, after line 7, to strike out:

Davis Dam project, Arizona-Nevada, $6,200,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, after line 8, to strike out:

Central Valley project, California: Joint facilities, $690,000; irrigation facilities, $5,134,980; power facilities, Shasta power plant, $427,800, Keswick Dam, $100,740, Keswick power plant, $218,040; transmission lines, Shasta to Delta, via Oroville and Sacramento, 230 kilovolt, $256,680, Contra Costa Canal extension, 69 kilovolt, $71,760; in all, $6,900,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, after line 15, to strike out:

King River project, California, $100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, after line 16, to strike out:

Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado, $6,815,000; Pine River project, Colorado, $175,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, line 22, after the name "Idaho", to strike out "$876,000" and insert "$930,750."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, after line 22, to strike out:

Hungry Horse project, Montana, $1,550,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, line 8, after the figures "$1,000,000", to insert "and in addition to this appropriation the Commissioner of Reclamation is authorized to enter into contracts in an amount not in excess of $430,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, after line 11, to strike out:

Columbia Basin project, Washington: For continuation of construction and for other purposes authorized by the Columbia Basin Project Act of March 10, 1943 (57 Stat. 14), $11,435,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, after line 16, to insert:

Total, construction, from reclamation fund, $11,876,750.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Operation and maintenance," on page 39, line 20, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$700,000" and insert "$2,140,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 12, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$1,300,000" and insert "$1,326,000"; and in line 16, after the word "thereto", to insert a comma and "and the payment to the school district or school districts serving Mason City and Coulee Dam, Wash., as reimbursement for instruction during the 1947–48 school year in the schools operated by said district or districts of each pupil who is a dependent of any employee of the United States living in or in the vicinity of Coulee Dam, in the sum of $25 per semester per pupil in average daily attendance of said schools, payable after the term of instruction in any semester has been completed, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was under the subhead "General provisions", on page 43, line 15, after the word "fund", to strike out "$50,461,000" and insert "$18,475,750."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, after line 15, to insert:

GENERAL FUND, CONSTRUCTION

For continuation of construction of the following projects in not to exceed the following amounts to be immediately available, to remain available until expended for carrying out projects (including the construction of transmission lines) previously or herein authorized by Congress, and to be reimbursable under the reclamation law, except as provided in the act of August 14, 1946 (Public Law 732, 79th Cong.):

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, after line 24, to insert:

Gila project, Arizona, $1,600,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 44, to insert:

Davis dam project, Arizona-Nevada, $13,500,000, and in addition to this appropriation the Commissioner of Reclamation is authorized to enter into contracts in an amount not in excess of $4,500,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I think it appropriate at this time to say in connection with the appropriation for the Davis Dam project that we are suffering from a very serious drought in Arizona, and a desperate need for hydroelectric power. The provision in the bill for $13,500,000 plus the contract authorization $4,500,000 will be a sufficient sum of money, according to the estimates of the engineers, to insure that power from the Davis Dam will be brought to central Arizona early in 1950. We in Arizona are more concerned about this particular item than any other item in the bill because of our desperate situation with respect to the shortage of power.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the Senator inadvertently mentioned central Arizona alone. I think he brought out before the committee that the power shortage is very acute not only in Arizona, but in sections of Nevada and California.

Mr. HAYDEN. I was about to state that the situation in Nevada and southern California also demands increased power. We depend upon the waters in our Arizona reservoirs, which supplied a certain amount of power. They are now practically dry, because of the drought. We have had a long period of drought. So I believe my people are more aroused over the situation than the people of any other section. However, there is no question that the need is common to the three States.

I think I should also invite the attention of Senators to the following statement contained in the committee report:

The committee approves the obligation in the fiscal year 1948 of $60,000, the Budget estimate, for the transmission line identified in the justification as the "Wickenburg extension." This amount will provide funds to complete surveys and designs and order materials to start construction on the 230-kilovolt transmission line extending from Davis Dam power plant through Prescott to Phoenix.

Unless that transmission line is finished by the time the power plant produces the power, we again cannot obtain power in central Arizona, so the two things go together.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment at the top of page 44.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, after line 4, to insert:

Central Valley project, California: Joint facilities, $690,000; irrigation facilities, $5,622,028; power facilities, Shasta power plant, $427,800, Keswick Dam, $100,740, Keswick power plant, $218,040; transmission lines, Shasta to Delta, via Oroville and Sacramento, 230-kilovolt, $256,680, west side lines Shasta to Delta, 230-kilovolt, to a point opposite and connecting with Shasta substation, $2,160,000, Keswick tap line, 230-kilovolt, $160,000, Sacramento to Antelope, 115-kilovolt, $170,000, Contra Costa Canal extension, 69-kilovolt, $118,000; substations, Contra Costa, $48,000, Antelope, $45,000; in all, $10,016,288.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, after line 17, to insert:

Kings River project, California, $100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, after line 18, to insert:

Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado, $10,471,908.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, after line 20, to insert:

Hungry Horse project, Montana, $3,285,353.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, after line 21, to insert:

Columbia Basin project, Washington: For continuation of construction and for other purposes authorized by the Columbia Basin Project Act of March 10, 1943 (57 Stat. 14), $20,354,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, after line 2, to insert:

Total, general fund, construction, $59,327,549.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Fort Peck project," on page 45,

line 8, after "(16 U. S. C. 833)", to strike out "$1,250,000" and insert "$1,575,058."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Missouri River Basin," on page 45, line 12, after the word "except", to strike out "as otherwise provided by law" and insert "as provided in the Act of August 14, 1946 (Public Law 732), Seventy-ninth Congress"; and in line 21, after the word "development", to strike out "$9,786,600" and insert "$18,535,000."

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in connection with the Missouri River Basin item it should be understood that the Bureau of Reclamation has programed approximately $2,000,000 for construction phase A of the Canyon Ferry unit in 1947, as referred to by Assistant Commissioner Warne in recent hearings before the Appropriations Committee in connection with the Canyon Ferry Unit.

Mr. Warne's statement this year was based on the Bureau of Reclamation's program for 1947, published on page 442, part II, of the House hearings on the Interior appropriation bill for 1947. That is a project in the State of Montana. It is anticipated that that amount will be available for this project in the fiscal year 1948. Under the Bureau's program for 1948, the Canyon Ferry unit continues in phase A, and the $2,000,000 allotted and set up for 1947 remains available for 1948 for work on this unit under phase A.

Many points of difference over water rights and other matters are now being adjusted. It seems that, because of some disputes which existed in reference to this project, the project was delayed. Now those disputes are being adjusted, and, as I understand, the Bureau hopes it can now go ahead with the construction of this project. Consequently, the funds previously programed for this work will remain available in fiscal year 1948.

The Canyon Ferry Dam is a key unit of the Bureau's plan for full, orderly, and coordinated development and utilization of the water resources of the Upper Missouri River Basin. It is primarily intended to permit the development of additional irrigated areas above Great Falls, Mont., and the provision of supplemental water to large areas, now irrigated, which are not adequately supplied at present. Additional water consuming projects cannot be developed above Great Falls without impairing the output of the private power plants on the Missouri River. With Canyon Ferry reservoir and power plant in operation, additional upstream irrigation development can be undertaken and total power production will be increased at the same time.

After Canyon Ferry Dam and power plant are constructed, it will be possible to construct irrigation units—including additional storage reservoirs—which will provide a full supply to over 300,000 acres of land above Great Falls that is not now irrigated. It will likewise be possible to provide supplemental water to about 180,000 acres of land above Great Falls now irrigated but inadequately supplied. The power plant to be installed at Canyon Ferry Dam will produce about 250,000,000 kilowatt-hours of energy annually. A substantial portion of the resulting power revenues will be available to assist in the repayment of construction costs of other units of the Missouri River Basin development. Flood control benefits will also be realized.

These are briefly the considerations which led the Reclamation Bureau to include Canyon Ferry Dam in their plan for development of the Missouri River Basin, as set forth in Senate Document 191, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session. They are also the compelling reasons for their recommendation that this structure be authorized as one of the units to constitute the initial stage of construction. The Congress accepted this recommendation and authorized the construction of the initial stage in the Flood Control Act of 1944.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 45, beginning in line 12.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, before proceeding further, I wish to make a comment upon the amendment on page 45, lines 12 and 13. When the committee adopted the amendment striking out the words "as otherwise provided by law," and inserting "as provided in the act of August 14, 1946 (Public Law 732), Seventy-ninth Congress" it did so in the belief that it was acting in accordance with the recommendation of witnesses for the Bureau of Reclamation. I am now advised that there was some sort of an error. The Missouri River Basin project was authorized by the act of December 22, 1944.

On behalf of a group of Senators representing the Missouri River Basin I offered the amendments at that time. So the authorization act is the act of December 22, 1944; and the reimbursability or nonreimbursability of these items is governed by the language not only of the act of August 14, 1946, but by the act of December 22, 1944. It has been suggested that the House language might be restored, but I do not intend to offer an amendment at this time, since it is quite obvious that the matter can be handled in conference. However, I desire to call attention to the question at this time, so that the conferees on the part of both Houses may be fully advised.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. As I understood, the exception was contained in the act of August 14, 1946, Public Law 732, of the Seventy-ninth Congress, chapter 965, which had to do with wildlife. We asked the direct question as to whether that was the exception, and were told that that was the exception that was desired, so we wrote it in. If there is any dispute about it, we shall be glad to take it to conference and iron out the difference satisfactorily.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think it can be straightened out.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Colorado River Dam fund," on page 46, line 6, after the word "project", to insert "and payment to the Boulder City School District as reimbursement for instruction during the 1947–48 school year in the schools operated by said district of each pupil who is a dependent of any employee of the United States, living in or in the immediate vicinity of Boulder City, in the sum of $50 per semester per pupil in average daily attendance at said schools, payable after the term of instruction in any semester has been completed, under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary"; and in line 15, before the word "payable", to strike out "$1,500,000" and insert "$1,533,300."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Advances to Colorado River Dam fund," on page 46, line 19, after the word "the", to strike out "Boulder" and insert "Hoover"; and on page 47, line 3, after "(43 U. S. C., ch. 12A)", to strike out "$400,000" and insert "$475,575."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, line 7, after the word "dam" to strike out "and main canal (and appurtenant structures including distribution and drainage systems) located entirely within the United States connecting the diversion dam with the Imperial and Coachella Valleys in California", and insert "main canal (and appurtenant structures) located entirely within the United States connecting the diversion dam with the Imperial and Coachella Valleys in California, and distribution and drainage systems."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Colorado River development fund," on page 48, line 3, after "(54 Stat. 774)", to strike out "$250,000" and insert "$500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Colorado River front work and levee system", on page 48, line 19, after the numerals "1946", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,063,300."

The next amendment was, on page 48, after line 20, to insert:

For the purpose of effecting settlement of war veterans on public land reclamation projects and to provide facilities for veteran employment in construction and operation of reclamation projects, the property, buildings, equipment, material, and acquired lands heretofore or hereafter declared surplus at the Yuma Army air base, Yuma, Ariz., shall be transferred to the Bureau of Reclamation by any Federal agency having custody or ownership, without exchange of funds, and to be available for the same purpose and to be disposed of in the same manner as the war relocation centers and the prisoner-of-war camp transferred to the Bureau of Reclamation in the Interior Department Appropriation Act of 1946, act of July 1, 1946, Public Law 478.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in connection with this amendment, we were duplicating what was done last year with respect to some Japanese relocation centers and abandoned prisoner-of-war camps. It was my understanding that under the provisions adopted last year it would be possible again this year to transfer to other reclamation projects, for operation and maintenance and for

other purposes, transmission lines, substations, and other facilities. All that was done by the Reclamation Service on other projects last year may be repeated under this provision.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 48, after line 20.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 49, after line 9, to strike out:

No part of any appropriation to the Bureau of Reclamation contained in this act shall be available for work performed on a force-account basis.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, after line 12, to insert:

No part of any construction appropriation for the Bureau of Reclamation contained in this act shall be available for construction work by force account, or on a hired-labor basis, except for management and operation, maintenance and repairs, engineering and supervision, routine minor construction work, or in case of emergencies, local in character, so declared by the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in clarification of the provision in the reclamation sections of the bill limiting the performance of work on a force account or hired-labor basis, it was the opinion of the committee that it was providing sufficient authority for the Reclamation Service to carry out work normally done by Government forces in connection with the installation of heavy items of equipment which could not be effectively and adequately scheduled for installation in the construction contracts. The committee understood that these instances constitute only minor items, and that this is the customary practice in both public and private projects.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 49, after line 12.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Geological Survey," on page 49, line 23, after the word "of", to insert the words "not to exceed."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 50, line 17, after the word "That", to strike out "$400,000" and insert "$517,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 50, line 22, after the word "thereto", to strike out "$1,690,000" and insert "$2,374,500"; and in the same line, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$450,000" and insert "$580,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 51, line 7, after the word "resources", to strike out "$2,578,680" and insert "$2,625,000"; in line 10, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$250,000" and insert "$265,000"; in line 20, after the word "That", to strike out "$1,570,000" and insert "$1,586,500"; in line 23, after the word "for", to strike out "cooperative or noncooperative ground water activities" and insert "the drilling of water wells for the purpose of supplying water for domestic use:" and on page 52, line 8, after the word "tributaries", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: *"Provided further*, That, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law to the contrary, the President is authorized to appoint a retired officer of the Army as such representative without prejudice to his status as a retired Army officer who shall receive such compensation and expenses in addition to his retired pay."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 52, line 22, after the word "Commission", to strike out "$139,000" and insert "245,000"; and in the same line, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$35,000" and insert "$56,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 53, line 4, after the word "journals", to strike out "$120,000" and insert "$130,000"; in the same line, after the word "illustrations", to strike out "$32,000" and insert "$36,000"; in line 6, after the word "maps", to strike out "$237,000" and insert "$313,500"; and in the same line, after the words "in all", to strike out "$389,000" and insert "$479,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 53, line 18, after the word "thereto", to strike out "$434,210" and insert "$650,000"; and in the same line, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$65,000" and insert "$78,600."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, after line 17, to insert:

In the event that the Director of the Geological Survey deems it advantageous to the Government, the Geological Survey is authorized to contract for the furnishing of topographic maps made from aerial photographs, or for the making of geophysical or other specialized surveys.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, after line 22, to insert:

The Geological Survey is hereby authorized to acquire by transfer without exchange of funds, for two years beginning July 1, 1947, from the War Department, the Navy Department, or the War Assets Administration, equipment, materials, and supplies of all kinds, with an appraised value of not to exceed $500,000 from the surplus stores of these agencies: *Provided*, That the authorization in this paragraph shall not be construed to deny to veterans the priority accorded to them in obtaining surplus property under Public Law 375, approved May 3, 1946;

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 55, line 9, after the word "Survey", to strike out "$9,113,230" and insert "$10,256,340."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Mines," on page 55, line 13, after the word "including", to strike out "$93,000" and insert "$118,000"; and in line 14, after the word "and", to strike out "$65,000" and insert "$85,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, line 13, after "District of Columbia", to strike out "$302,285" and insert "$416,500"; and in the same line, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$80,000" and insert "$97,600."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, after line 22, to insert:

Anthracite Research Laboratory: For the construction and equipment of an anthracite research laboratory at Schuylkill Haven, Pa., including not to exceed $25,000 for employment by contract, or otherwise, at such rates of compensation as the Secretary may determine, of engineers, architects, or firms or corporations thereof necessary to design and construct said laboratory; and the purchase, maintenance, and operation of not to exceed one passenger automobile, $450,000.

The agreement was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 58, line 16, before the word "two", to insert "not to exceed."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 59, line 17, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$30,000" and insert "$40,000"; and in line 18, after "District of Columbia", to strike out "$360,090" and insert "$440,300."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 5, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$30,000" and insert "$39,200"; and in line 6, after "District of Columbia", to strike out "$800,000" and insert "$1,120,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 15, before the word "one", to insert "not to exceed"; in line 18, after the word "exceed", strike out "$5,000" and insert "$9,800"; and in line 19, after "District of Columbia", to strike out "$57,000" and insert "$100,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, line 8, after the word "of", to insert "not to exceed"; in line 12, before the words "of which", to strike out "$579,000" and insert "$634,550"; and in the same line, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$40,000" and insert "$43,300."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, line 16, after the word "of", to insert not to exceed"; in line 19, after "30 U. S. C. 8)", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,120,000", and in line 20, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$37,000" and insert "$40,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 62, line 8, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$25,000" and insert "$31,200"; and in line 9, after "District of Columbia", to strike out "$600,000" and insert "$1,120,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 62, line 20, after the word "improvements", to strike out "$150,000" and insert "$140,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 63, line 8, after the word "foregoing", to strike out "$555,000" and insert "$755,000"; and in line 9, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$480,000" and insert "$637,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 63, line 16, after the word "of", to insert "not to exceed."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 66, after line 4, to insert:

The Department of Commerce is authorized to transfer to the Department of the Interior for the use of the Bureau of Mines, without compensation therefor, full jurisdiction, possession, and control of the United States Weather Bureau Station at Mount Weather, in the counties of Loudoun and Clarke, State of Virginia, together with all buildings, improvements, furniture, and fixtures now in or upon the land.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 66, after line 11, to insert:

The Bureau of Mines is hereby authorized to acquire by transfer without exchange of funds, for 3 years, beginning July 1, 1947, from the War Department, the Navy Department, or the War Assets Administration, buildings, equipment, materials, and supplies of all kinds with an appraised value of not to exceed $3,000,000 from the surplus stores of these agencies, for use in performing its functions by the Bureau of Mines or by any office of the Bureau in the United States and Alaska: *Provided*, That the authorization in this paragraph for transfer of surplus property to the Bureau of Mines shall not be construed to deny to veterans the priority accorded to them in obtaining surplus property under Public Law 375, approved May 3, 1946.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, we have now completed the items on land management, the Geological Survey, and the Bureau of Mines, to which I alluded earlier in the day. I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed at this point in the RECORD the tables which appear at pages 1221, 1222, and 1223 of the hearings on the Interior Department appropriation bill, which show what the Bureau of Mines has already done in the utilization of this fund in the development of quantities of very important materials.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Tabular summary of tonnages developed by Bureau of Mines projects, fiscal years 1940 to 1946, inclusive

Commodity	Number of deposits	Tonnage of crude material	Grade	Contained metal or useful mineral	Remarks
Alunite	9	11,000,000	21.5 percent Al_2O_3		Possible source of alumina.
		7,000,000	14.0 percent Al_2O_3		
Antimony	5	29,000	10.0 percent Sb		
		3,200,000	1.7 percent Sb		
Asbestos	4		No. 1 fiber	3 tons	
			No. 2 fiber	150 tons	
			No. 3 fiber	400 tons	
			No. 4 fiber	14,000 tons	
Barite	2	11,000	45 percent Ba		
Bauxite	250	21,500,000	A		Aluminum ore.
		9,000,000	B		
		10,500,000	C		
		33,000,000	D		
Bismuth	1	10,000	0.68 percent Bi		
			0.76 percent Cu		
Optical calcite	3			Several hundred pounds	
Chromite	25	5,600,000	22.4 percent Cr_2O_3		
		3,700,000	9.3 percent Cr_2O_3		
Alumina clay	21	382,000,000	26.7 percent Al_2O_3		
Cobalt	1	4,400,000	0.54 percent Co		
			1.40 percent Cu		
Copper	46	2,219,000	2.55 percent Cu		
		39,000,000	0.88 percent Cu		
Corundum	7	6,000	Fair		
Industrial diamonds	1			Small amount	
Fluorspar	25	730,000	51 percent CaF_2		
Flake graphite	5	26,000,000	3 percent C		
Iron	67	530,000,000	40.3 percent Fe		
Lead-zinc	66	[1] 14,430,000	4.3 percent Zn		
		[1] 7,490,000	3.0 percent Pb		
Manganese	56	[2] 21,000,000	12.8 percent Mn		
Magnesium	2			1,600,000 tons carnallite, 265,000 tons sylvite.	
		144,000	37.5 percent MgO		
Mercury	40	1,800,000	5 pounds Hg per ton		
Molybdenum	4	3,000,000	0.23 percent MoS_2		
		550,000	0.54 percent MoS_2		
Nickel	10	27,000,000	0.50 percent Ni		
Pegmatite minerals	200	[3]			
Quartz crystals	2			None	
Sulfur	1	33,600	23.6 percent S		
Talc	1			Several hundred tons of block talc	
Tin	10	310,000	1.1 percent Sn		Lode deposits.
			0.24 percent WO_3		
		4,000,000	0.3 percent Sn		Low-grade lodes
Tungsten	27	[4] 2,200,000	½ pound Sn per cubic yard		Placer deposits.
		4,200,000	0.69 percent WO_3		
Vanadium	10	50,000	2.3 percent V_2O_5		
		45,000,000	0.9 percent V_2O_5		

[1] Much of crude tonnage is duplicated.
[2] Exclusive of large submarginal deposit in South Dakota.
[3] Approximately 1,000,000 tons containing usable quantities of mica, beryl, lithium, and tantalum.
[4] Cubic yards.

Tabular summary of tonnages developed by Bureau of Mines projects, fiscal year 1947 (through Feb. 1, 1947, only)

Commodity	Number of deposits	Tonnage of crude material	Grade	Contained metal or useful mineral	Remarks
Lead-zinc	24	1,042,000	2.83 percent Zn	29,563 tons	
			3.12 percent Pb	29,854 tons	
Do	1	827,000	0.67 percent Zn	5,541 tons	
			1.59 percent Pb	13,149 tons	
Zinc-lead	1	900,000	18.5 percent Zn	166,680 tons	
			8.6 percent Pb	77,400 tons	
Lead	1	125,000	10.0 percent Pb	12,500 tons	
Do	1	200,000	0.80 percent Pb	1,600 tons	
Iron	6	13,750,000	24.6 percent Fe	3,388,750 tons	Magnetite.
Do	1	1,200,000	45.6 percent Fe	540,000 tons	Hematite.
Molybdenum	1	424,000	0.42 percent MoS_2	1,781 tons	
Copper	3	500,000	2.1 percent Cu	10,500 tons	
Heavy sands	2	80,000,000	3.8 percent	304,000 tons	50 percent of contained metal is ilmenite with smaller amounts of zircon and other rare metals.
Fluorspar	3	535,575	52.4 percent CaF_2	280,442 tons	
Ceramics	1	41,500	Good		Usable material.

A priority list of proposed projects is constantly being revised in the light of the shifting emphasis on the numerous commodities under investigation and in view of additional information continually being made available by the preliminary examinations. The projects to be conducted during the fiscal year 1948 will be selected from the highest priority list as most recently revised at the time of allotment of funds. The present list of highest priority can be summarized as follows:

Commodity	Number of proposals	Estimated cost, fiscal year 1948
Antimony	2	$85,000
Asbestos	1	80,000
Bauxite	1	60,000
Chromite	2	50,000
Copper	4	260,000
Fluorspar	1	50,000
Iron	5	225,000
Lead-zinc	16	565,000
Manganese	3	195,000
Mercury	3	75,000
Nickel	1	150,000
Pegmatite products	5	190,000
Tin	1	75,000
Tungsten	1	20,000
Vanadium	2	140,000

The information made available through this appropriation is primarily intended, under the terms of the Stock Piling Act, for the use of the Secretaries of War, Navy, and Interior, and the Army-Navy Munitions Board in making stock-pile policy and in planning for future emergencies. It is also of value to the mining industry in general and to the owners of the deposits investigated. These latter benefits, however, are incidental to the primary purpose of the appropriation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Park Service," on page 67, line 13, after the word "Washington", to strike out "$3,350,000" and insert "$3,637,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 68, line 3, after the word "agencies", to strike out "$197,000" and insert "$260,400."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 69, line 19, after the word "areas", to strike out "$30,000" and insert "$43,400."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 71, line 16, after the word "Columbia", to strike out "$2,650,000" and insert "$2,150,000"; in line 17, after the word "which", to strike out "$1,750,000" and insert "$1,415,000"; and in line 22, before the words "for the", to strike out "$900,000" and insert "$735,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Fish and Wildlife Service—Salaries and expenses," on page 74, line 17, after the word "resources", to strike out the comma and "including not to exceed $20,000 to investigate and eradicate the predatory sea lampreys of the Great Lakes as authorized by joint resolution of August 8, 1946, Public Law 672"; and in line 22, after the word "stations", to strike out "$275,000" and insert "$790,040."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I notice that on page 74, line 22, the amount authorized by the House has been increased from $725,000 to $790,040. May I ask the Senator from Nebraska whether or not that increase was made in order that various stations recently closed by the Department may be reopened?

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. Furthermore, I should like to point out that on page 36 of the report there will be found the following language:

Within the total appropriation recommended, the committee expect the various stations financed under this appropriation to be kept in operation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Did the committee give any study to the proposition of putting that language in the bill itself, rather than only in the report?

Mr. WHERRY. It is a lump-sum appropriation out of which a number of projects were financed. If we started figuring in each particular one, there would be difficulty, so we took it the other way and made it a lump sum and stated what we expect to do on construction projects. The legislative committees are to report monthly on the expenditure of the appropriations.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator has no doubt that it can be carried out in proper order?

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 72, line 23, after the word "of", to insert "not to exceed."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 75, line 10, after the word "services", to strike out "$200,000" and insert "$280,700."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 75, line 16, after the word "market", to insert "prices of fishery products"; and in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$125,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I should like to inquire with respect to page 75 of the bill, under the title "Alaska Fisheries", for which there is an item of $850,000. Is that the same as the House item? Was any increase made by the Senate?

Mr. WHERRY. That is the same amount the House appropriated. The estimate is $872,000. The amount they had this year was $855,007, and the amount which the Senate committee approved is the same amount that the House had in its bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. How much is that under the so-called budget estimate?

Mr. WHERRY. The budget estimate is $872,000. The amount for the fiscal year 1947 was $855,007, and the amount the House allowed, and in which we concurred, was $850,000. It is practically the same.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In regard to the next item, beginning in line 24 of the same page, the item in regard to Alaska fur-seal investigations, I presume the facts are similar.

Mr. WHERRY. For that item the exact amount of the estimate is appropriated. This year $69,300 will be available.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 76, line 17, after the word "Alaska", to strike out "$241,000" and insert "$280,700."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 77, line 7, after "(16 U. S. C. 667)", to strike out "$750,000" and insert "$900,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 79, line 1, after the word "amended", to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$245,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 79, line 3, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$6,110,320" and insert "$6,615,760."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal aid in wildlife restoration," on page 79, line 22, after the word "Service", to strike out "$5,960,320" and insert "$6,615,760"; on page 80, line 1, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$1,028,100" and insert "$1,098,200"; in line 5, after the word "of", to strike out "one hundred", and insert "not to exceed fifty"; and on page 81, line 6, after the word "appropriation" and the period, to insert "The War and Navy Departments, the Civil Aeronautics Administration, and the War Assets Administration are authorized to transfer to the Fish and Wildlife Service aircraft for replacement purposes only (but not necessarily of the same size or type or at the same locations), and such other equipment, materials and supplies, surplus to the needs of such agencies, as may be required by said Service, such transfers to be without charge therefor; and in addition the Navy Department, the Coast Guard, and the Maritime Commission are authorized to transfer without charge therefor vessels for replacement purposes only (but not necessarily of the same size or type or at the same locations), marine engines, parts and accessories surplus to the needs of such agencies."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Government in the Territories—Government of the Virgin Islands," on page 86, line 11, after the word "of", to insert "not to exceed."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "General provisions," on page 87, line 18, after the word "Survey", to strike out "$2,000" and insert "$3,000"; in line 19, after the word "Mines", to strike out "$2,000" and insert "$3,000"; and in line 20, after the word "Service", to strike out "$1,750" and insert "$3,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 89, after line 20, to strike out:

SEC. 8. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used, transferred, or allocated for the expenses of any regional, field, or other office or committee for which approval has not been given by the Congress prior to the establishment of such activity.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 90, to insert:

SEC. 8. Appropriations herein made shall be available for payment of dues, when authorized by the Secretary, for library membership in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 90, after line 5, to insert:

SEC. 9. Appropriations in this act shall be available for health service programs as authorized by the act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 658).

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 90, after line 8, to insert:

SEC. 10. Not to exceed a total of $1,000,000 of the appropriations contained in this act shall be available for expenditure for the compensation of employees engaged in personnel work.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That completes the committee amendments.

The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, again I wish to state to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], that I have not made any objections to the amendments as they have been reached and acted upon because I appreciate how much work the committee has done in regard to the so-called western reclamation and power projects. The Senator told me the other day that he was sure I would be satisfied with these items. In view of all the circumstances, I wish to say that I think the committee has done some good insofar as the western reclamation projects are concerned. However, I am not satisfied with what has been done in connection with the bill, because in my opinion the estimates of the Bureau of the Budget represented a sufficient trimming and as much of a reduction as would be consistent with the minimum of progress on these projects. As a matter of fact, in some cases it seems to me that some additions should have been made to the budget estimates.

I wish to say to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that when the bill goes to conference, I hope the conferees on the part of the Senate will make every attempt to insist upon the Senate amendments and the amounts they provide for, and will not give in to the false economy and drastic cuts which were made by the House of Representatives, and will not agree to compromises as between the position of the Senate and the position of the House of Representatives. If such proposed compromises are rejected and the Senate conferees insist on the Senate amendments, progress can be made with some of those projects. If, on the other hand, the Senate conferees recede from the position taken by the Senate in regard to some of these items, and agree to lesser amounts of appropriation than those the Senate has now provided, I am sure the result will be not only false economy but a severe blow at the West.

Mr. President, let me say that I appreciate very much the treatment the Senate committee has given these matters. It is my understanding that the committee has heard probably more witnesses than any other committee has heard in the course of a hearing.

I conclude my remarks by saying that when the bill goes to conference, I hope the conferees on the part of the Senate will not agree to any reductions in the amounts provided by the Senate amendments. If the Senate amendments are insisted upon, it will be possible to show some definite progress on these projects by next year.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in reply to the remarks of the Senator from Washington, let me say that the members of the committee heard more than 100 witnesses in addition to witnesses from the various Government departments and agencies. I assure the distinguished Senator from Washington that we took up each project and considered it seriously and had the wholehearted cooperation of the governmental agencies and departments. I believe that the Senator from Washington will be satisfied with the fight which we shall make in the conference, relative to the amounts provided by the Senate amendments, because they are based upon merit, not upon some figure taken out of the sky. I wish the Senator to know that the subcommittee is wholeheartedly in support of the program, and the full committee is likewise wholeheartedly in support of it, and we expect that the conferees on the part of the Senate will insist upon the Senate amendments.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I should like to join in the comments which have just been made by the Senator in charge of the bill, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. Although I am not from the West I have had occasion to make a study of reclamation projects in the West and other projects, especially in connection with the consideration of the Missouri River Authority bill and as former chairman of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. I heartily endorse what both Senators have said.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. OVERTON. I think it would be not only unsound but almost disastrous for the Congress to reduce the appropriations below the amounts carried in the Senate amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there are no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H. R. 3123) was passed.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. WHERRY, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BALL, Mr. CORDON, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, and Mr. O'MAHONEY conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to call attention to the fact that the distinguished Senator from Wyoming has referred to the statement made by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the former President of the United States, Herbert Hoover. Following the remarks of the Senator from Wyoming, I wish to call attention to a press release relative to that matter and also to four leading statements contained in a newspaper article on the same subject, which show why Mr. Hoover made his over-all statement to the public generally. The release to which I refer has been issued by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I agree with it in toto; and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD, inasmuch as it relates to the Hoover report.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Discussing reports, he (Mr. Hoover) asserted: "It must be recognized that we cannot safely, through gifts and loans, export more goods than our surplus." He added:

"The immediate result of exporting more than a surplus in our free economy is to raise prices. From that we get a dangerous spiral of increased costs of living and wages.

"I would not contend that the whole rise in living costs, with its inflation spiral, has been due to our large exports. But it cannot be denied that with fewer exports that increase would not have been so great."

EXPORTS ESTIMATED

"The conclusion seems to me irrefutable that as a result of our rate of giving and lending we are overexporting and cannot continue at such a rate with our present production and consumption without further evil consequences to our stability."

The letter estimated United States exports at $13,500,000,000 for the 1945–46 fiscal year and $15,500,000,000 for 1946–47. Imports were placed at $7,200,000,000 and $7,700,000,000, respectively, for the two periods. Thus, Hoover said, there was an excess of almost $14,000,000,000 in exports for the 2 years, which was met through gifts and loans.

He analyzed American commitments for the next 12 months and concluded the United States would have to export in that period at about the same rate as in the last 2 years, or between $14,000,000,000 and $16,000,000,000 annually, to pay for probable imports and meet promises for gifts and loans.

"Any study of our international balance sheet," he remarked, "taking into account, on one hand, our commitments in loans, foreign deposits, and investments in the United States, etc., and on the other hand probable returns from previous loans and lend-lease, including our citizens' greatly impaired foreign investments, will likely discover that the United States is today a debtor rather than a creditor nation."

THE LIMITS OF AMERICAN AID TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 15, 1947.*

The Honorable STYLES BRIDGES,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have your letter asking me to give you and your associates my views upon the following points:

1. What are the limits of relief and loans that we can reasonably give to foreign nations annually without seriously impairing our resources in a free economy?

2. Are there methods by which we could increase our gifts and loans above those now available from our present production?

3. What policies should be adopted to make our resources more effective in world rehabilitation?

THE PROBLEM

As a background to this appraisal I wish at the outset to state:

Upward of a billion people in the war-torn areas of western Europe and Asia are asking for help. In these nations some have not recovered one-third of their prewar industrial production; most of them have not recovered over 75 percent of their prewar food production.

There is greater danger of political and economic chaos in the world today than at any time since the war ended. There is more hunger and want today than there was during the war.

In the face of this threatening situation the American people must continue to do the utmost to prevent starvation in the world. We must do our utmost to aid nations in the recovery of their own productivity. That underlies peace and progress on earth.

But the greatest danger to all civilization is for us to impair our economy by drains which cripple our own productivity. Unless this one remaining Gibraltar of economic strength is maintained, chaos will be inevitable over the whole world.

To discover the common sense course requires clear objectives and organization on our part. The burden is beyond our resources unless there is immediate unity and cooperation among other nations to lessen our unnecessary burdens and thus enable the application of our resources to the most effective use.

THE ECONOMICS OF THE PROBLEM

Too often gifts and loans to foreign peoples are visualized as just money transactions. The only way money of important volume can be transferred from one nation to another is by goods (including gold) and services. Therefore, when we make a gift, credit, or loan, it is not money that we transfer; it is goods and services. There is thus a direct relationship of exports to the volume of loans and gifts.

While exports to pay for our imports cause us no difficulty, it must be recognized that we cannot safely, through gifts and loans, export more goods than our surplus. And the surplus applies to specific commodities, for we do not produce a surplus in all kinds of goods. If we ship more than our surplus we are taking it from the standard of living of the American people. Further, the immediate result of exporting more than a surplus in our free economy is to raise prices. From that we get a dangerous spiral of increased costs of living and wages.

OUR PRESENT ECONOMIC SITUATION

To appraise our present national situation, it is necessary to examine our experience in the 2 years since the war. In so doing, many debit and credit items must be estimated. We must estimate the exports, including army supplies to foreign civilians, and we must estimate imports of the last months of the present fiscal year. Until full data is available many months hence, the sums given must be considered as illustrative of the situation.

Our exports of goods and services in dollars were about as follows:

	1945–46	1946–47
Exports	$13,500,000,000	$15,500,000,000
Imports	7,200,000,000	7,700,000,000
Excess of exports over imports	6,300,000,000	7,800,000,000

We have provided for the excess of exports over imports by loans or gifts.

An examination of the sources and amounts of these loans and gifts for the combined 2 years since the war shows about as follows:

We have provided about $4,500,000,000 in gifts from our Government through relief; we have provided about $1,500,000,000 in gifts by our citizens for relief and by way of remittances to relatives abroad.

We have provided about $5,500,000,000 in credits by Government agencies including the Export-Import Bank loans, subscription to the World Bank and the Stabilization Fund. Loans by these institutions are, in the final analysis, largely drafts on American dollars and are dependent upon us for resources to maintain their operations. We have provided about $1,500,000,000 in private credits and loans.

Thus we have provided in the last 2 years about $6,000,000,000 in relief and gifts together with about $7,000,000,000 in loans or credits, or a total of $13,000,000,000. The differences between these amounts and the trade deficits given above are no doubt accounted for by drawing upon previous foreign dollar balances in the United States.

OUR COMMITMENTS FOR THE NEXT 12 MONTHS

The estimated unexpended balances of appropriations and various credit commitments to foreign nations on July 1, 1947, are not included in the above. They already amount to over $5,000,000,000. We should add further probable loans and expected private gifts of $1,000,000,000. And we must add unknown further calls from the World Bank and Stabilization Funds.

There is also a further liability of the United States in the shape of the foreign deposits in American banks, including earmarked gold and foreign ownership of American securities. These aggregate at least $14,000,000,000. We must at all times be prepared to meet their withdrawal. Some withdrawals are likely to be used to pay for exports during next year, thus increasing the total volume of exports required from us. And to all these commitments and liabilities we must add the exports necessary to pay for our imports amounting to probably $7,500,000,000.

Any study of our international balance sheet, taking into account, on one hand, our commitments in loans, foreign deposits, and investments in the United States, and so forth, and on the other hand probable returns from previous loans and lend-lease, including our citizens' greatly impaired foreign investments, will likely discover that the United States is today a debtor rather than a creditor Nation.

There is another angle of our national situation that we cannot ignore. These gifts and loans to foreign nations are spent in current purchase of goods. These gifts are an immediate burden on the taxpayer. The goods furnished under loans also must be paid for immediately while the repayment is deferred for years. This has a bearing upon our tax burdens. Including local government expenditures, they now amount to about 35 percent of our national income. No free nation can continue at that rate for long without impairing its productivity.

To pay for our imports and to satisfy the probable gift and loan commitments already made for the next fiscal year, and assuming present prices, we would need export at about the same ratio as during the past 2 years $14,000,000,000 to $16,000,000,000 annually of goods and services.

A TEST OF THE LIMITS OF LOANS AND RELIEF

The most definite test of the extent of our ability to aid foreign nations is whether we have been overexporting our resources during the past 2 years, and thus unduly straining our economy. For example, we have exported gigantic amounts of agricultural products. During the past 12 months the index of our cost of living has advanced more than 20 percent. Increases in the cost of agricultural products were responsible for about 70 percent of this increase. This has contributed greatly to set in motion the inflation spiral of increasing wages with more increases in prices. A good deal of economic disorder and waste was created by interruptions in production in making these adjustments.

Other examples could be cited. Some of our exports have been taken from our own possible railway, factory, and housing reconstruction. Some part of the rise in prices of these materials is due to exports. So much have prices risen in the construction industries with the accompanying wage spiral and costs that we now have considerable unemployment in these trades while at the same time the country is crying for homes and buildings.

I would not contend that the whole rise in living costs, with its inflation spiral has been due to our large exports. But it cannot be denied that with fewer exports that increase would not have been so great.

The conclusion seems to me irrefutable that as the result of our rate of giving and lending we are over-exporting goods and cannot continue at such a rate with our present production and consumption without further evil consequences to our stability.

We cannot estimate how much the curtailment in exports, and hence in giving and lending to finance the trade deficit, might be for the next year until we are able to estimate our next year's surplus in agriculture and other major commodities.

While the world situation requires that we do our best, my own view is that, unless we can undertake to increase our productivity or decrease our consumption of goods, we must seriously reduce the volume of exports below the rate of the last 2 years with a corresponding reduction in the gifts and loans for which we supply goods.

Various proposals have been made for expansion of loans by fifty or more billion dollars. The impracticability of these ideas with our present rate of production must be obvious.

STRAIN ON OUR NATURAL RESOURCES

There is a further question of the impairment of our natural resources involved in the export of such materials as iron, oil, metals, lumber, and some other items. As our resources in this sort of commodities are not renewable, their shipment abroad is a depletion of our resources and a charge against our future economy. While such exports may be necessary to restore the world, we cannot ignore the consequences.

POSSIBILITIES OF INCREASING OUR AIDS AND MAKING THEM MORE EFFECTIVE

There are certain measures which have been suggested as enabling us to better bear the load or to increase our exports and to make more effective our aid to foreign countries.

Exporting gold

1. It has been suggested that we can export gold from our seeming large stocks and thus enable other nations to buy elsewhere than in the United States. With our present requirements for currency and bank reserves, and to cover the very large foreign demand deposits in our banks, it is necessary that we hold a large stock in reserve. The amount of gold that we have free of such necessities is not material in this situation.

Increasing imports by stock piling

2. One proposal is that we at once import more goods and thus diminish the amount of gifts and loans necessary to furnish. This is a very minor help in the immediate world situation. It would be no help to the world to import materials into the United States which are needed elsewhere. Nor would it help to import goods which we our-

selves produce economically. That would create unemployment in the United States and weaken our productivity.

There is, however, a method of increasing our imports which should have serious consideration. We could import and stock pile for national defense many commodities, both those we do not produce and those in which our natural resources are being depleted. We do not have enough of such resources to assure our national defense. Commodities of this kind are tin, manganese, iron ore, mercury, copper, lead, zinc, tungsten, chromite, nickel, and rubber. There are few immediate surpluses of these commodities abroad, but such surpluses will be available within a reasonable time. It happens that few of such commodities are produced by our direct debtors, but our purchase of them would, through multilateral trade, strengthen the whole international financial structure and we would be receiving commodities instead of obligations.

Reestablishment of wartime control measures

3. Another proposal is that we reestablish wartime control measures to increase our productivity or reduce our consumption and thus increase our ability to export more goods. The seeming warranty of this idea arises out of the fact that we exported in goods and services over $15,000,000,000 in some war years in addition to many billions in supplies to our armies. But we must remember that war-purpose production was greatly expanded and consumption restricted through war-inspired patriotic impulses.

The restoration of these controls would require again the abolition of the production of important commodities; the restoration of longer work hours in labor; the return of women to industry and agriculture, rationing of most commodities, and total Government control of all economic activities. That is a form of totalitarian economy which the American people are not likely to accept in peace for it would do violence to our whole concept of freedom. Moreover, without emotional background of fighting for national defense, such measures would more likely decrease than increase our productivity.

A method of increasing food exports

4. Should the next world harvest indicate dangerous shortages, it is possible to increase our food exports for limited periods by voluntarily reducing our own food consumption and altering certain food manufacturing practices. We have here a great spiritual impulse to save starving people. And we may be called upon to do it again unless there is a world increase in food production.

Cooperation of other nations vital to salvation

5. A most productive field of action by which the limited American economic resources can be made more effective for world reconstruction lies in cooperation of foreign nations in the political field.

The obstruction of the Soviet Government to peace has, during the past 2 years, imposed billions in expenditures upon us through support of occupation armies and relief to starvation which would not otherwise have been required. However, we can apparently expect little cooperation from that quarter.

But if there were full mutual cooperation from the other nations, it would lessen our burdens and divert much of our dead loss expenditures to more constructive channels abroad.

For instance, cooperation in the three western zones in Germany and in Japan to abolish the inhibitions on their productivity due to wrong concepts of reparations, and levels of industry, would increase their productivity and exports, and thus would greatly reduce the drains upon us for food and other supplies. Restoration of their productivity would aid all other nations. Cooperative action to speed peace, such as I recently outlined in a letter to Congressman TABER would greatly reduce demands upon us.

Such cooperation would allow our resources to flow into channels more beneficial to all the world.

POLICIES TO BE ADOPTED

In my view we need to develop or expand the following policies, some of which are already partially in action.

1. We must have in our own foreign economic relations single, coordinated action in all direct and indirect agencies of Government—the relief funds, the Export-Import Bank, the World Bank, the Stabilization Fund, the Federal Reserve System, and all those agencies which administer our exports. We must consolidate our front if we are to succeed in our policies.

2. We must prevent excessive exports and by so doing reduce excessive prices. In the matter of food we should begin about August 1 with the new harvest.

3. If necessary to prevent starvation we should increase our available export surplus volume by voluntary reduction of consumption by the public and alteration of some trade practices.

4. We should periodically estimate the goods and services which we can safely export and limit purchases of our commodities by limiting gifts and loans.

5. We should prepare to stock-pile for national defense certain commodities from abroad when they are available in surplus.

6. We should bluntly insist that in return for our sacrifices, which are inherent in all loans and gifts, that all nations recipient of our economic aid cooperate with us in measures to reduce the burdens upon us, to promote productivity and bring peace for the world at large.

7. We should insist upon certain principles in operation of gifts and loans, whether directly from our Government or through Government-supported agencies. These principles involve important questions of security, inspection of use, and application to the utmost in increase of productivity.

8. We should concentrate our limited resources in the areas in which western civilization can be preserved.

This problem can be solved if there is prompt unity and mutual aid between other nations, resolution on their part to build back their productivity, and if we act, on our side, with sense and devotion in this great crisis of mankind.

Yours faithfully,

HERBERT HOOVER.

NAVY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement which I propose to make before the Senate Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations. Let me say that we have just passed the Interior Department appropriation bill. The Senate committee very carefully examined the individual items relating to that bill. I say again that although I do not entirely agree as to the amounts contained in the Senate amendments, at least the committee studied those items and did something about them.

Now we find that in considering the Navy Department appropriation bill the House has acted in somewhat the same way it acted on the Interior Department appropriation bill. For instance, the House has reduced by approximately 5 percent the over-all figures in the Navy Department appropriation bill. The House Subcommitee on Naval Appropriations has decreased by approximately 17.5 percent the items for ship maintenance for the Navy. Such action represents the worst kind of false economy, because when ship repairs are postponed, the eventual result is that the costs are increased. Let us bear in mind that the items which the House decreased are budget estimates which the Navy itself has worked out in accordance with the congressional direction that the fleet be maintained at its authorized strength. The budget estimates represent appropriations in the very minimum amounts consistent with maintaining the ships in a proper manner.

Let me say that I hope the Senate committee handling the naval appropriation bill will give it consideration similar to that which has been given the Interior Department appropriation bill, in respect to some of the drastic cuts which have been made by the House of Representatives without regard to the necessity for maintenance and without regard to the general welfare.

So, Mr. President, I submit the statement to which I have referred, and ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BEFORE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON NAVY DEPARTMENT BUDGET, BUREAU OF SHIPS, FISCAL YEAR 1938, BY SENATOR WARREN G. MAGNUSON

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I am very much concerned over the ability of the Bureau of Ships to discharge its heavy obligations to the citizens of this Nation if the budget reductions administered by the House are permitted to stand. It is that deep concern which impells me to appear here today to discuss with you the House action in regard to the appropriations for maintenance, Bureau of Ships, and salaries, Bureau of Ships.

MAINTENANCE, BUREAU OF SHIPS

The request for funds for maintenance, Bureau of Ships approved by the Bureau of the Budget for fiscal 1948 was $431,150,000. In the computations of the Navy Department and the budget this request was made up of two major items, a $50,000,000 transfer from the naval stock fund and a $381,150,000 appropriation by Congress.

Subsequent to the date on which the Navy Department budget was transmitted to the House, the President addressed a communication to the Speaker of the House revising a number of items in the budget. Included in these revisions was a decrease for maintenance, Bureau of Ships, in the amount of $6,400,000. This reduction is explained in House Document 85. Taking this decrease into account the revised budget of the Bureau of Ships for 1948 is $424,750,000. Contained in this latter figure is an item of $8,500,000, which was included in the budget but is not for the direct use and benefit of the Bureau of Ships. Deducting this amount gives a net request for funds for use by the Bureau of Ships of $416,250,000. This request, $416,250,000, was to come from two sources, a $50,000,000 transfer from the naval stock fund and a congressional appropriation of $366,250,000. It is important to remember that the $374,750,000 listed by the House committee on page 8 of its report as the budget estimate for 1948 includes the $8,500,000 item I have just mentioned and that it represents only the amount to be appropriated by Congress. For an explanation of the $8,500,000 included in the $374,750,000 appropriations request of the Bureau of

Ships, I refer the committee to page 983 of the House hearings.

Now the House committee, starting from the $374,750,000 figure, recommended an appropriation of $300,000,000 for 1948. This represents a 20 percent reduction. On page 8 of the House report the committee states:

"The committee has reduced the request for Maintenance, Bureau of Ships, from $374,750,000 to $300,000,000 and in addition has authorized the transfer, as proposed by the Budget, of not to exceed $50,000,000 from the naval stock fund so that there will actually be new funds in the amount of $350,000,000 available for the program of this Bureau in the fiscal year 1948. In addition to this, the Bureau will have for expenditure in 1948 $14,800,000 from 1947 appropriations. * * *

"This makes a total of $364,800,000 available for 1948."

From this language and from the language used on page 9, one gathers the definite impression that the House intended to cut funds for the Bureau of Ships by approximately $10,000,000, the difference between $374,750,000, the committee's starting figure, and the $364,000,000, the amount the committee says will be available. This would represent a cut of about 3 percent.

As I indicated earlier, however, the actual reduction by the House represents a 20 percent cut. The Bureau requested $374,750,000 of new funds. The House allowed $300,000,000. To judge the true effect of the House reduction it is necessary to examine in more detail the composition of the Maintenance, Bureau of Ships, budget and relate that to the House action.

Contained in the Bureau's request is a $40,000,000 item listed on page 918 of the House hearings as project No. 5, investigations and tests. The House committee states on page 6 of its report, "While the committee has reduced the items for Maintenance, Bureau of Ships, Ordnance and Ordnance Stores, Maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks, and Medical Department, such reductions are not to be applied to research allocations."

Here in specific language the House prohibits the Bureau of Ships from applying any of the percentage reduction in the over-all maintenance budget to the $40,000,000 item. Taking this into account, it means that the remaining five projects listed on page 918 as composing the Bureau's request must absorb the full reduction amounting to 17½ percent. (Seventeen and one-half percent obtained by deducting $40,000,000 from the $416,250,000, which is the amount included in the Budget for the direct use of the Bureau of Ships. This subtraction produces the figure $376,250,000. This is divided into $66,250,000, which represents the difference between the $300,000,000 granted by the House and the $374,750,000 of new funds requested, minus the $8,500,000.)

It is important to remember that no appreciable amount of money can be saved from the 1948 appropriation by a reduction in the active fleet. At the present time our active and inactive fleet consists of approximately 9,000,000 tons, roughly 4,000,000 in the active fleet and 5,000,000 in the inactive. If we deactivate any of the tonnage now included in the active fleet, the money saved must immediately be expended in preservation measure to place them in the reserve fleet. The cost of decommissioning and preservation of these ships will approximate the cost of maintaining them in active status. Unless the Congress wishes simply to let our fleet, both active and inactive, deteriorate, there is no way we can escape these costs. The amounts cleared by the Bureau of the Budget for projects No. 1 and No. 2 were barely sufficient to provide a minimum standard of maintenance. Unless the Senate restores all or a very substantial part of the funds requested, the material condition and fleet support will be very definitely jeopardized.

In my judgment, the House action represents a penny-wise, pound-foolish policy. The Bureau of Ships has responsibility for maintaining either in active or inactive status 9,000,000 tons of fighting ships, in number about 6,000 of all types. The taxpayers of this Nation have invested close to $20,000,000,000 in these ships. Unless they are maintained, that investment is jeopardized and those 6,000 ships upon which we must rely in large measure for national defense will serve merely to lull the Nation into a false sense of security. As compared to this $20,000,000,000 investment, the funds the Bureau of Ships has requested for maintenance represent less than 5 percent. Failure on the part of Congress to appropriate this minimum amount is certainly wide deviation from sound business practice. What industrial concern would invest $20,000,000,000 in machinery and equipment and then refuse to maintain its plant in operating condition?

Today there is great unrest in the world. None of us can foresee what the future will bring, but I submit to the committee that prudence dictates that the Congress not dissipate the tremendous fighting strength which we built up during the war by failure at this juncture to provide sufficient funds properly to safeguard that investment. In my judgment, this committee should add at least $64,000,000 to the figure granted by the House for Maintenance, Bureau of Ships, bringing the total appropriation of new funds to $364,000,000. This, plus the $50,000,000 transfer from the naval stock fund, would, in my judgment, give the Bureau an opportunity to protect the $20,000,000,000 this Nation has invested in fighting ships and auxiliary craft.

SALARIES, BUREAU OF SHIPS

I wish to discuss briefly House action in regard to salaries for the Bureau of Ships. On pages 1004 and 1005 of the House hearings there appears the justification summary for this item. That summary contains some very interesting facts.

It shows that on July 31, 1945, the Bureau had 6,468 employees, consisting of 1,513 officers, 1,017 enlisted personnel, and 3,938 civilians. By December 31, 1946, this staff of 6,468 persons had been reduced to 37.7 percent of its former size. On December 31, 1946, the Bureau had 2,439 employees, consisting of 300 officers, 28 enlisted personnel, and 2,111 civilians. This represents an over-all reduction of 62.3 percent and a reduction in civilian personnel of 46 percent. These figures demonstrate conclusively that the Bureau of Ships on its own initiative has accomplished an outstanding job of reducing personnel.

Now with these figures in mind, let me call your attention to the action taken by the House in regard to the Bureau's request for salary funds. The Bureau estimated its obligations for 1948 at $7,267,500. The House reduced this figure, as shown on page 22 of the House report, to $5,450,000—a reduction of $1,817,500, or a cut of a little over 23 percent. Inasmuch as the Bureau had already cut its over-all personnel by 62.3 percent and its civilian personnel by 46 percent, it cannot without seriously impairing its efficiency absorb an additional 23 percent reduction. To require the Bureau to do so is to penalize it for having done an effective job on its own initiative.

Let me explain a bit more fully why I believe this additional 23 percent cut would be disastrous. In 1941 the total number of vessels under the control of the Navy was 1,356, having a total tonnage of 2,240,300. On May 1, 1947, there remained under the control of the Navy almost 6,000 ships of all types with a tonnage of nearly 9,000,000, as I explained earlier, about 4,000,000 tons in the active fleet and about 5,000,000 tons in the reserve fleet.

In October 1941 the Bureau had in its employ 2,150 civilians. On May 1, 1947, the Bureau was employing 2,142 civilians. These figures must impress the committee with the fact that the responsibilities of the Bureau of Ships, as indicated by tonnage under its jurisdiction, have quadrupled since 1941. In spite of these responsibilities four times as heavy, the Bureau, even if the committee restores its salary request in full, will be able to employ approximately the same number of civilians it had in 1941.

Approximately 80 to 85 percent of the personnel in the Bureau of Ships are either technical personnel or are assigned to technical work. Less than 15 percent of the Bureau's total complement are civilians in a stenographic and clerical category. The most serious aspect of the severe cuts imposed by the House lies in the loss of skilled technical personnel. If the Bureau is forced to discharge them from a group already overloaded with work, it will mean that important work must be left undone and there will be insufficient personnel for the proper planning, coordination, and analysis of the Bureau's technical responsibilities in the field.

It is certain that the restoration of the $1,800,000 cut by the House could well save $10,000,000 to $12,000,000 in expenditures in the field through proper planning and coordination. Here again I think the policy adopted by the House is penny-wise and pound-foolish. I sincerely hope the committee will make full restoration of the 23 percent, $1,817,000 cut administered by the House.

I do not wish to leave this subject without saying a few words about the effect the House action will have upon the navy yard located at Bremerton in my own State. The Bremerton Navy Yard is one of the finest installations for repair and maintenance of ships the Navy possesses. For a well-balanced operation the Navy needs yards on both coasts, well dispersed to minimize the effect of a possible attack, and so located as to minimize the distance damaged ships must travel.

Admiral Mills in his testimony before the House committee pointed out, on page 979, that there is a minimum personnel which must be maintained at a yard to insure efficient operation. As in a manufacturing plant, if the number is too small, overhead increases unit costs inordinately. He stated to the committee, "I would not hesitate to recommend the closing of certain yards if we got to a total employment that was less, we will say, than 50,000. If the number was less than 50,000, I would recommend the closing of one or more yards." He made it clear that there is no immediate intention on the part of the Navy of closing yards in view of the fact that the present work load is staying at around 80,000 to 82,000 employees.

The employment ceiling for the Bremerton Navy Yard in the first quarter of fiscal 1948 has been announced as 8,800. If the House reduction in the maintenance item is not restored, employment at Bremerton Navy Yard, on a proportionate basis, would be decreased by about 1,500. In the main the 1,500 employees who would be released are highly-trained, skilled individuals. Once they leave the shipyard and obtain other employment it is almost impossible to reassemble them. A modern fighting ship is an extremely complicated mechanism. You cannot train shipyard workers overnight. The Congress must take these and related facts into account in considering the appropriation for the Bureau of Ships, if we are to avoid dissipation of those trained workers who, in the event of another emergency, will constitute the indispensible nucleus around which an expanded program must be built.

I feel certain that your committee will weigh all the facts in this situation and that

in the process of so doing you will come to the conclusion that the Bureau of Ships, both as to maintenance and salaries, has been cut far too deeply by the House of Representatives.

INVESTIGATION OF APPOINTMENTS OF CERTAIN POSTMASTERS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Chair lays before the Senate Senate Resolution 81.

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 81) which had been reported from the Committee on Civil Service with amendments and subsequently reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with additional amendments.

The amendments were, on page 2, line 5, after the word "investigation", to strike out "as to why few if any Republicans have been appointed to the offices of first-, second-, and third-class postmasters for the last 14 years, how many Republicans have been removed," and insert "as to political activities in the civil service in the appointment of postmasters of first-, second-, and third-class postmasters"; on page 3, line 8, after the word "exceed" to insert "$35,000", and in the same line after "$35,000", to strike out "in addition to the cost of stenographic services to report such hearings"; so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Senate Civil Service Committee, which has the jurisdiction over all civil-service matters in connection with the post office, or any duly authorized subcommittee, is authorized and directed to make a complete investigation as to political activities in the civil service in the appointment of postmasters of first-, second-, and third-class postmasters, and whether any postmasters on threat of losing their positions have been compelled to pay tribute financially or otherwise to anyone or to a group of politicians. Also whether there has been an attempt to compel men and women occupying the position of postmaster to violate the Hatch Act and to investigate any and all collateral matters which the testimony may develop.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production and impounding of books, papers, and documents, to administer oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, which shall not exceed $35,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

Mr. LANGER obtained the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield for that purpose?

Mr. LANGER. Yes; I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Moore
Ball	Hickenlooper	Morse
Bricker	Hill	Murray
Bridges	Hoey	O'Conor
Brooks	Holland	O'Mahoney
Buck	Jenner	Overton
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Reed
Byrd	Kem	Revercomb
Cain	Kilgore	Robertson, Wyo.
Capper	Knowland	Russell
Chavez	Langer	Saltonstall
Connally	Lodge	Sparkman
Cooper	Lucas	Taft
Cordon	McCarran	Taylor
Donnell	McCarthy	Thye
Downey	McClellan	Vandenberg
Dworshak	McFarland	Watkins
Eastland	McGrath	Wherry
Ecton	McKellar	White
Ellender	McMahon	Wiley
Ferguson	Magnuson	Williams
Flanders	Malone	Wilson
George	Martin	Young
Gurney	Maybank	
Hatch	Millikin	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a majority of the Senate Civil Service Committee voted to report the resolution in these words:

Resolved, That the Senate Civil Service Committee, which has the jurisdiction over all civil-service matters in connection with the post office, or any duly authorized subcommittee, is authorized and directed to make a complete investigation as to political activities in the civil service in the appointment of postmaster of first-, second-, and third-class postmasters, and whether any postmasters on threat of losing their positions have been compelled to pay tribute financially or otherwise to anyone or to a group of politicians. Also whether there has been an attempt to compel men and women occupying the position of postmaster to violate the Hatch Act and to investigate any and all collateral matters which the testimony may develop.

Then follows the usual provision about hearings, the employment of assistants, and so forth.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Presiding Officer announced, just before a quorum was called, that by unanimous consent it had been agreed that the Senate would take up the resolution which the Senator from North Dakota is now discussing. My inquiry is, does that in any way conflict with the unanimous consent agreement which is printed on the calendar today with respect to the so-called Bulwinkle bill, S. 110?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That depends upon what the Senator means by the word "conflict."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It was ordered by unanimous consent agreement entered into last week that on Wednesday, June 18, the time intervening between the hours of 2 p. m. and 4 p. m. on said day be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of said bill—namely, the Bulwinkle bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That still stands.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. So that the present unanimous consent agreement does not modify the arrangement already made that on Wednesday the Bulwinkle bill will be restored, at 2 o'clock p. m., to its position as the unfinished business?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is entirely correct. The Bulwinkle bill will be restored the moment the Senate finishes the consideration of the pending resolution.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Chair, because I wanted to be sure the restoration would take place at 2 p. m. on Wednesday, since there may be some doubt as to whether the business now before the Senate may be disposed of by that time.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I want to make it clear to the Senate that the resolution is entirely nonpolitical. I call attention to the fact that over 3 years ago I proposed a similar resolution before the then Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and upon the Senate floor I stated why I believed the resolution should be adopted. However, it was not adopted by the committee at that time. I have therefore offered it. By a majority vote of the Senate Committee on Civil Service, it has now been reported.

After the resolution was submitted, and after it was ordered reported, a subcommittee of the Civil Service Committee, consisting of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], and myself prepared a budget, which was submitted to the committee as a whole. I wish to read that budget:

Estimated budget for period of 4 months for the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Salaries	Annual		Monthly gross
	Basic	Gross	
Counsel	$8,000	$10,000.00	$803.33
INVESTIGATIVE DIVISION			
1 chief investigator	5,460	7,628.08	635.66
3 investigators	4,020	5,695.66	474.64
4 assistant investigators (1 for each investigator in field):			
As needed (at $10 per day).			
If permanently needed	3,600	5,116.32	426.36
CLERICAL DIVISION			
1 secretary	3,000	4,288.68	357.39
2 stenographer-clerks	2,040	2,964.65	247.05

Expenditures exclusive of salaries	1 month	4 months
Field investigations:		
Per diem (8 men as indicated above)	$1,440.00	$5,760.00
Travel at $100 per man per month (8 men)	800.00	3,200.00
Office expenses:		
Phone, telegraph, supplies, postage, etc.	100.00	400.00
Clippings, mimeographing, multigraphing, etc.	250.00	1,000.00
Recording proceedings, in field and in Washington	250.00	1,000.00
Total expenditures, exclusive of salaries	2,840.00	11,360.00
Add salaries, total per month and for 4 months	5,419.84	21,679.31
Total estimated budget required	8,259.84	33,039.36

Estimated budget required for 4 months, $35,000.

We believe we can perform this work within 4 months, if the budget is adopted. I desire to say Mr. President, that if it develops that all the money is not needed, the committee is most certainly going to do everything it possibly can to keep down the cost. If the work can be accomplished with an expenditure of $15,000, $20,000, $25,000, or $30,000, I want the Senate to understand that most certainly we shall be glad to do it within that amount. In this connection I might say that the Senate, of course, is going to adjourn or recess before the expiration of the 4 months' period, with the result that if there is insufficient money, with an appropriation of only $15,000, $20,000, or $25,000, the Senate of course would not be in session and consequently the investigation would stop.

Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 10, 1947, at which time I presented this matter upon the floor of the Senate. Since that time there have been additional first-, second-, and third-class postmasters appointed. Today, there is a total of 22,350 postmasters of the first, second, and third class. In addition to that, though not covered in the resolution, there are 19,400 fourth-class postmasters. I might say in passing that one of the things the committee proposes to investigate is why, suddenly, so many fourth-class post offices have developed into third-class post offices. It may be entirely right, just, and proper; there may be no ground for criticism at all, but lately, in the estimation at least of one or two members of the Civil Service Committee, for some reason or other, suddenly, an unusually large number of fourth-class post offices have become third-class post offices.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. A perfectly logical explanation may be given. When the receipts rise to a sufficient amount of money, the post office automatically passes from fourth to third class. There can be no possible favoritism involved in it.

Mr. LANGER. That is true. It will not do any harm, however, to investigate it now, and that will not take very long.

Mr. President, in this session of Congress, for the first time in 16 years the Republican Party is in control of both Houses. By virtue of seniority on the Senate Civil Service Committee, of which I have been a member for 6 years, I became chairman of the committee which has charge of all civil service and post office matters. There are today 2,296 first-class post offices, 5,844 second-class post offices, 14,210 third-class post offices, making a total of 22,350 first-, second-, and third-class post offices, and altogether there are over 400,000 employees in the Post Office Department. Without egotism or undue modesty, I wish to say to the Senate and to the country that I frankly believe I am the best qualified chairman for this committee available in the Senate, for the following reasons, namely, that because of my experience in my State in dealing with State-owned and controlled institutions, of which practically no other State has any. First as attorney general and then as Governor of the State. I believe that I understand how to run Government-owned institutions better than any other Member upon this floor. North Dakota is the only State that has a State-owned bank. The bank was established by vote of the people. The late Senator Frazier as Governor, and myself as attorney general, together with the commissioner of agriculture, were chosen to establish that bank. It opened for business on August 19, 1919. It has been in operation nearly 30 years. It is today undoubtedly the strongest and largest institution between Minneapolis, Minn., and Seattle, Wash. It not only has paid off the original appropriation to establish it, but has earned on an average of nearly one-half million dollars a year. It is today the hub of the State's splendid financial record and integrity. Likewise, the late Senator Frazier as Governor, and myself as attorney general, and Mr. Hayden, were chosen by the people to establish the various forms of State insurance—fire, tornado, fidelity, workmen's compensation, and hail insurance, all of which have been successful beyond the fondest hopes of State-owned and controlled insurance. Millions of dollars are available in the surpluses, and over $100,000,000 has been saved to the people because of extremely low rates—far, far below those charged by private corporations. In addition to that, Senator Frazier and myself were chosen to establish a State mill and elevator, which with an appropriation of $3,000,000, in one single year, 1937, saved the farmers and consumers over $12,000,000 in the securing of fair prices, which Senator Ladd chose to call D-feed wheat. This mill and elevator are now an integral part of our agricultural program in the State.

Mr. President, when these industries were established the great cry was that they would be operated by politicians; that when Democrats came in they would fire all the Republicans, and that when the Republicans came in they would fire all the Democrats, but experience has shown just the contrary. We have had men at the head of these institutions, some of whom have served under five or six governors, and a large number of the employees of these institutions today have been in these institutions since they began operations, and it is because of this fact that men of ability, honesty, and integrity were selected and can be retained. They were men like Mr. Frank A. Vogel, who served as head of that bank under three Governors of different political fields, and men like Robert M. Stangler, manager of the State mill and elevator, who served under seven different governors and is still in charge of the State mill and elevator.

Mr. President, today we are dealing with the United States Post Office, the greatest Government-owned business in the United States. As chairman of the Post Office Committee, I bring to the Senate nearly 30 years' experience in dealing with the State-owned and State-operated institutions. Besides that, for 6 years I have served my apprenticeship as a member of the Post Office Committee. So I say in all sincerity and with all due modesty that I believe I am thoroughly equipped to discuss the past, the present, and the future of this great business institution, the United States Post Office.

Now, first of all, I think we all agree on one thing, and that is that no department of the United States Government so touches the lives of every citizen as does the Post Office Department. In some capacity or other it reaches every individual, both in the continental United States and its possessions, and all over the world. Therefore, if any business should be kept out of politics, it is the Post Office Department of the United States of America, and I announce now, as I did when I assumed the chairmanship of this committee, that under my chairmanship this great institution will be kept free of partisan politics if it is within my power to do so.

Everyone upon this floor knows that prior to 1938, whenever the Democrats won a national election that these thousands of postmasters were considered patronage, and no matter how good a man's record as postmaster may have been, he was usually automatically out. We saw the spectacle of well-trained men of experience removed and in many instances supplanted by incompetent political hacks who had been able to deliver a few hundred votes to their party, or they may have been broken-down relatives of some Representative or Senator, or some ward heeler. When the Republicans got in, we saw a repetition of just exactly what had happened for 8 or 12 years before. The result was that the post office suffered, and with the exception of a few years, it has continually been in the red. Last year, according to the report of the Postmaster General, there was a deficit of nearly $300,000,000. That is disputed, some persons claiming it is $225,000,000, others saying it is $250,000,000. In any event, the Postmaster General himself said at the beginning of the present session of Congress that it was about $300,000,000.

Mr. President, it is to change that kind of situation, to take the Post Office Department out of politics, that the Congress in 1938 passed the civil-service act blanketing postmasters of first, second, and third class into civil service, giving them what amounts to life appointments. That is the law and has been the law since 1938, and under my oath it is my duty to support that law until it is changed.

Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent to place the law of 1938 in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the law was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(Public—No. 720—75th Cong.; ch. 678—3d sess.)

H. R. 1531

An act extending the classified civil service to include postmasters of the first, second, and third classes, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That postmasters of the first, second, and third classes shall hereafter be appointed in the classified service without term by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate: *Provided*, That postmasters now serving may continue to serve until the end of their terms, but they

shall not acquire a classified civil service status at the expiration of such terms of office except as provided in section 2 hereof.

SEC. 2. Appointments to positions of postmaster at first-, second-, and third-class post offices shall be made by the reappointment and classification, non-competitively, of the incumbent postmaster, or by promotion from within the Postal Service in accordance with the provisions of the Civil Service Act and Rules, or by competitive examination, in accordance with the provisions of the Civil Service Act and Rules. No person shall be eligible for appointment under this section unless such person has actually resided within the delivery of the office to which he is appointed, or within the city or town where the same is situated for 1 year next preceding the date of such appointment, if the appointment is made without competitive examination; or for 1 year preceding the date fixed for the close of receipt of applications for examination, if the appointment is made after competitive examination.

SEC. 3. Appointments of acting postmasters in all classes of post offices shall be made by the Postmaster General: *Provided*, That acting postmasters shall serve not to exceed 6 months from the date of their designation, except that the Postmaster General may extend the period of service of any acting postmaster beyond such 6 months' period with the permission of the Civil Service Commission.

SEC. 4. All acts or parts of acts inconsistent herewith are hereby repealed.

Approved, June 25, 1938.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I might add that I have upon my desk the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for 1938 containing the debates upon this very subject, which show that it was the intention of the Congress at that time to do away with political patronage and to make the Post Office a great, fine, business institution. There are Senators present today who voted for the act blanketing postmasters into the civil service in 1938.

As I said a moment ago, that is the law, and has been the law since 1938. Under my oath it is my duty to support that law, and it is the duty of the entire membership of the Civil Service Committee of the Senate to support that law until it is repealed.

Mr. President, who has been in control of this Government since the Civil Service Act of 1938 has been passed? It has been under the control of the Democratic Party, and therefore, the people of this country are entitled to an accounting of the stewardship of the Democratic Party in their supervision and handling of the Post Office Department for the last 9 years. Today we are interested in knowing what their record is. Have they complied with the Civil Service Law of 1938 which they themselves put upon the statute books, and which as the debate upon this floor showed, was passed for the purpose of taking the Post Office Department out of politics, or have they violated that promise?

The distinguished Senator from Illinois took occasion during my absence and in executive session to berate the committee of which I am chairman for failure to pass out of the committee post-office appointments now in the hands of the Civil Service Committee.

Remember, the party to which the Senator from Illinois belongs has had complete control of all post-office appointments for a period of 16 years. Postmasters are presumed to be appointed on the basis of efficiency and standing in the community, yet the fact is that during those years only a few hundred Republicans were appointed as against thousands of Democrats. Is it reasonable to suppose that only Democrats have the necessary qualifications for post-office jobs? It would appear so from the record.

There is one distinguished Senator on the other side of the aisle, the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who has filed minority views. Of course, one who is chairman of a committee, as the President of the Senate himself so well knows, can only do the best he can, and it has been a source of intense regret to me as chairman of the committee that the Democratic members, both in the Civil Service Committee and later in the Committee on Rules and Administration, did not join in welcoming this investigation. I do not believe any Senator upon the floor is more capable, more honest, and, as we say out West, a squarer shooter than is the distinguished senior Senator from the State of Arizona. Certainly the minority views he prepared could not be any fairer than they are. No statement I have ever seen has given the facts more clearly than the minority views presented.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the RECORD as a part of my remarks in full the minority views submitted by the Senator from Arizona because they represent a magnificent piece of work.

There being no objection, the minority views were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINORITY VIEWS TO ACCOMPANY SENATE RESOLUTION 81

The minority members of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration have noted with regret that both the preamble of the original Langer resolution and the recitals in the body of the resolution show beyond question that its purpose is to make available contingent funds of the Senate in the amount of $35,000 for a general political investigation of all appointments of postmasters of the first, second, and third classes which have been made within the past 14 years, and particularly of all postmaster appointments which now await confirmation by the Senate to a total number of 639. The investigation as proposed is predicated upon the complaint that during the years in question "very few, if any, Republicans" had been appointed as postmaster and is designed to produce an answer as to "why few, if any, Republicans have been appointed * * * for the last 14 years" to said position. The author of the resolution stated at the committee hearing that he would not report favorably a single nomination for postmaster until the funds he requested for said general investigation were made available.

The minority feels that it is both unnecessary and unfair to hold up longer the confirmation of the pending appointments, of which a great majority are included within the following four groups, namely: (1) Appointees who were in first place on the civil-service lists where only one examination was held, (2) appointees who are veterans and who were on the civil-service lists, (3) appointees who were civil-service employees promoted to postmaster off of the regular existing civil-service register, and (4) appointees whose post offices have been raised in classification and who have simply been reappointed to the posts which they previously held.

The undersigned have no objection whatever to an investigation made in good faith to determine whether in any particular instance a qualified person has been nominated for appointment as postmaster in an office of the first, second, or third class. We do object to a purely political investigation by the majority of the Senate Committee on Civil Service which would seek to deny to the President the authority conferred on him by law to select any one of the three highest qualified eligibles to be appointed as a Presidential postmaster.

There is no sound reason why the Senate, by refusing to confirm postmaster nominations, should deny to the President the same discretion which is granted, under the long-established civil-service laws, to the heads of all departments, bureaus, and agencies of the Government. As President Harding well said when issuing his Executive order of May 10, 1921, directing that postmasters be selected from among the three highest qualified eligibles:

"This leaves in the appointing power, who has the ultimate responsibility for efficient administration, the necessary, constitutional right of choice. This right of selection is the kind of responsibility which cannot legally be and is not abridged by act of Congress, and is in exact harmony with the spirit of the civil-service principle."

HISTORY OF POSTMASTER APPOINTMENTS

To keep the record straight let us examine the history of the appointment of Presidential postmasters where confirmation by the Senate is required by law.

During the 16 years from 1897 to 1913, when William McKinley, Theodore Roosevelt, and William H. Taft occupied the White House, postmaster appointments were considered political patronage and, whenever practicable, none but Republicans were selected.

During the first 4 years of the Wilson administration it was the usual practice to allow Republican postmasters to serve out the remainder of the 4-year terms to which they had been appointed and then to replace them with "deserving" Democrats.

If a vacancy occurred in a congressional district represented by a Democrat, the Member of Congress was asked to recommend a successor to the Republican postmaster whose term was about to expire. If there was no Democratic Representative from the district, then the Democratic Senators from the State made the recommendation. When there was no Democratic Senator, the Democratic national committeeman of the State was asked for advice as to who should be appointed.

This entire procedure was an exact duplication of the method of selecting postmasters which prevailed during the McKinley, Roosevelt, and Taft administrations except that Democrats, instead of Republicans, were consulted.

Shortly after his second inauguration, President Wilson, by Executive order of March 31, 1917, directed that open competitive civil-service examinations be held to fill vacancies in the position of postmaster in offices of the first, second, and third class and when the papers were rated "said Commission shall certify the result thereof to the Postmaster General who shall submit to the President the name of the highest qualified eligible for appointment to fill the vacancy."

This Executive order was in effect for the next 4 years during which time Representatives in Congress, United States Senators, and the Democratic national committeemen were not asked for advice as to whom should be appointed. The selection of the eligible with the highest civil-service rating had the effect of eliminating political considerations in the choice of postmasters.

THE HARDING EXECUTIVE ORDER

Early in the administration of President Harding, on May 10, 1921, an Executive order was issued which retained the requirement that a civil-service examination be held, as originally established by President Wilson, but provided that the Postmaster General "shall submit to the President the name of one of the highest three qualified eligibles for appointment to fill the vacancy." President Harding also gave out an explanatory statement from which the following is quoted:

"There are more than 400,000 men and women participating in governmental work who are in classified service. All of these are under the permanent provisions of the civil-service law and rules.

"These permanent rules provide for the certification of the highest three eligibles, from which list of three each necessary appointment is made. The successful operation of the principles of civil-service law has demonstrated the wisdom of this provision. This leaves in the appointing power, who has the ultimate responsibility for efficient administration, the necessary, constitutional right of choice. This right of selection is the kind of responsibility which cannot legally be and is not abridged by act of Congress, and is in exact harmony with the spirit of the civil-service principle.

"Under this order, the kind of test and plan of investigation and examination which shall be provided for shall be approved by the President and shall be based on the applicant's business training, experience, fitness, organizing and executive ability, and general qualifications for an efficient administration, and shall in no sense be a cloistered, scholastic examination which might result in a high grade in theory, but not a guaranty of efficiency in fact.

"This order applies to all present incumbents of post offices whose terms have expired, and will apply to all other incumbents as their present terms expire."

THE NATIONAL CIVIL-SERVICE REFORM LEAGUE

On May 18, 1921, the executive committee of the National Civil Service Reform League issued a statement objecting to the right of selecting one out of three on the eligible list instead of the first name in every instance, which reads in part:

"On May 10, 1921, President Harding issued a revised order for the appointment of postmasters of the first, second, and third classes. With the exception of that provision which permits the Postmaster General to select one out of the first three on an eligible list for submission to the President, the substance of this order was approved by representatives of the league at a conference in the office of the Postmaster General. Under the postal laws and regulations, the President must continue merely to nominate persons for appointment to post offices of the first, second, and third classes, such nomination being subject to confirmation by the Senate.

"Experience has shown that the appointment of the first name on the eligible list has worked well and to the advantage of the service, and has done away very largely with political manipulation. Investigation has shown that as a result of nearly 2,000 examinations in the Northern States over 800 Republicans were chosen and only 600 Democrats under a Democratic administration.

"The examination as conducted and as it will continue to be conducted, as President Harding has very well said, is based on the applicant's business training, experience, fitness, organizing and executive ability, and general qualifications for an efficient administration, and is in no sense a cloistered, scholastic examination which might result in a high grade in theory but not a guaranty of efficiency in fact. As long as the examinations continue to be conducted along these lines there could be little fear that the best man will not be found at the head of the eligible list.

"The league fears that the announcement that the selection will be made from the first three may be interpreted by possible candidates as notification that only Republicans with political influence will be appointed, with the result that no Democrats will make the effort, and that many Republicans not active in politics will also be deterred. The league therefore hopes and urges that the Postmaster General will adopt as a general policy the selection of the first name for submission to the President."

EFFECT OF THE HARDING EXECUTIVE ORDER

That the fears of the National Civil Service Reform League were well justified is shown by an article entitled "Appointment of Presidential Postmasters" which was printed in the June 1922 issue of its magazine, Good Government, from which the following extracts are taken:

"A special committee of the National Civil Service Reform League, appointed to investigate the operation of the Executive order of President Harding on May 10, 1921, which provides for the appointment of Presidential postmasters, has issued a series of reports showing that politics still plays a major part in the selection of postmasters. The committee consists of Hon. William Dudley Foulke, chairman, Walter H. Buck, Lewis H. Van Dusen, and Henry M. Waite.

"The report of the committee as a whole is based on investigation of appointments in 20 States in all parts of the country.

"During the period covered by the report the Civil Service Commission issued 1,072 certificates for promotion to postmasterships of persons in the classified civil service in accordance with the Executive order, out of a total of 4,661 appointments. This was 23 percent of the whole.

"Of the balance of 3,589 appointments made after competitive examinations, 2,165, or 60.3 percent, have been made of the first person on the eligible list; 927, or 25.8 percent, have been of the second person on the eligible list; and 497, or 13.9 percent, have been of the third person on the list.

"But in 1,061 cases out of the 2,165 appointments of the highest man there was but 1 person on the eligible list, although there were others who competed and failed. The committee believes that the appointment of this one man was, therefore, inevitable unless a new examination was ordered.

"Out of 2,528 cases in which there was any choice the highest man was appointed in 1,104 cases only, or less than 44 percent, and a lower man in 1,424 cases, or over 56 percent. Where, as in the present case, the first man is set aside in a far greater number of cases, the presumption is very strong that political influence controlled.

"It is an essential absurdity to have competitive examination for the purpose of eliminating spoils and still to admit patronage by Congressmen.

"For the Post Office Department to invite such recommendations is to invite the demoralization of that which should be the greatest business organization of the Government, and yet under the system which prevails they are systematically invited, received, considered, and in a great majority of cases they are controlling.

"That they are systematically invited is shown by a typewritten form prepared by the Post Office Department and sent to the Congressmen in the district just after the competitive examination has been held and the eligible list reported, and that this congressional interference prevents many capable men from competing at all is abundantly shown by our correspondence.

"Hence the only real effect of the rule of three in such cases is to permit other matters outside the qualifications of the applicant, such as political or personal favoritism to control, and thus lead to the appointment of an inferior man over those who rank higher in the qualities essential for a good postmaster.

"We have already seen that this has been the actual result of the President's order allowing the choice of one out of three, that Congressmen have generally dictated and controlled these appointments, principally for political reasons, and often for their personal advantage, irrespective of the qualifications of the applicants to perform the duties of the office."

PRESIDENTS COOLIDGE AND HOOVER CARRY ON

Executive orders were issued by President Coolidge relating to the appointment of postmasters in offices of the first, second, and third classes on November 5, 1926, and June 22, 1928, in both of which the Postmaster General was directed to submit to the President for appointment "the name of one of the highest three qualified eligibles," and the same method of selection was specified in an Executive order signed by President Hoover on May 1, 1929. The several Executive orders issued by Presidents Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover are a complete explanation of why comparatively few Democrats were appointed to the office of first-, second-, or third-class postmaster during the 12 years from 1921 to 1933.

When he first became President, Franklin D. Roosevelt had it within his power, by Executive order, to wipe out any reference to civil-service examinations in connection with the appointment of Presidential postmasters. He could have directed a return to the method of political selection which prevailed during the administrations of McKinley, Theodore Roosevelt, Taft, and the first 4 years of the Wilson administration which frankly recognized postmasterships as party patronage. He did nothing of the kind.

THE FIRST ROOSEVELT EXECUTIVE ORDER

On July 12, 1933, President Roosevelt issued an order to supersede all previous Executive orders affecting the appointment of postmasters to offices of the first, second, and third class which amended the Hoover order by increasing the age limit for appointment from 65 to 66 years, added 5 points to the ratings of candidates who were veterans of the World War, the Spanish-American War, or the Philippine Insurrection, waived the age limit as to such candidates, but provided that the Civil Service Commission "shall furnish a certificate of not less than three eligibles, if the same can be obtained, to the Postmaster General, who shall submit to the President the name of one of the highest three for appointment to fill such vacancy."

Three years later, on July 20, 1936, President Roosevelt went back to the method originally adopted by President Wilson and by Executive order directed the Postmaster General to "submit to the President for appointment to fill the vacancy the name of the highest eligible." This method of appointment remained in effect for nearly 2 years until Congress enacted H. R. 1531, approved June 25, 1938 (Public Law No. 720), which is the present law applicable to the selection of postmasters for offices of the first, second, and third class.

THE PRESENT LAW

One reason for the enactment of that legislation was a desire on the part of Congress to fix by law the method of selecting postmasters of the first, second, and third classes within the classified service rather than to leave it within the power of any President to change the procedure at his discretion. The bill, H. R. 1531, passed the House of Representatives on January 28, 1937, was amended and passed by the Senate on April 11, 1938. As rewritten in conference, the bill was reported to the Senate by Senator O'MAHONEY on June 14, 1938. Before the conference report was adopted, he made the following replies to inquiries addressed to him by the senior Senator from Massachusetts:

"Mr. WALSH. Does the conference report contain a provision giving the Executive the right to make a selection of any one candi-

date for postmaster among the three eligibles certified by the Civil Service Commission?

"Mr. O'MAHONEY. The bill itself does not contain that provision, because it is unnecessary. As the Senator knows, under the civil-service law whenever an eligible register is established the Civil Service Commission, under the regulations now in force, certifies to the appointing officer the names of the three highest persons. That practice will, I understand, be followed under this bill if it becomes a law.

"Mr. WALSH. So the conference report, if it becomes a law, will operate to nullify the Executive order now requiring the first eligible to be named?

"Mr. O'MAHONEY. It will have that general effect. In a press conference last week the President indicated his acceptance of that theory. Of course, civil-service regulations may be altered, but it was the understanding here and in the House that the selection would be made by the President from among the three highest eligibles, as in the case of all other civil-service appointments."

THE PENDING NOMINATIONS

In answer to a request by Senator HAYDEN, the First Assistant Postmaster General, on March 19, 1947, supplied the following information relative to the nominations that have been referred to the Senate Committee on Civil Service during the present Congress and upon which no action has been taken:

"Your questions will be answered in the order in which they have been submitted:

"1. Since January 3, 1937, 639 nominations have been submitted by the President to the Senate of persons to be appointed postmasters at Presidential offices—that is, post offices of the first, second, and third classes.

"2. Of the 639 nominations, 349 were selections of the highest eligible on the register submitted by the Civil Service Commission. Of this 349, 156 have military preference.

"3. Eighty-one selections were made of the second eligible on the register submitted by the Civil Service Commission and of this 81, 48 have military preference.

"4. The third eligible on the registers submitted by the Civil Service Commission was selected in 38 instances and, of this number, 21 have military preference.

"5. Of the total number of 639 nominations submitted to the Senate, 253 have military preference.

"6. Of these 639 nominations, 128 involve the reappointment of the incumbent postmasters where the offices have been advanced from fourth to third class. These reappointments were made under the act of May 20, 1944. Of the 128 postmasters nominated for reappointment, 13 have military preference.

"7. The promotion of a classified employee is involved in 40 of these nominations. That is, 40 nominations are for the promotion of employees in the classified postal service, and of this 40 so recommended for promotion, 15 have military preference."

CONCLUSIONS

Of the 639 nominations to which the Senate Committee on Civil Service has as yet given no consideration, we are convinced that no basis for criticism will be found for the selection of the 349 highest eligibles, the reappointment of the 128 incumbent postmasters because their offices were advanced in grade, and of the promotion to postmaster of 40 employees in the classified postal service. In the 119 instances where the second or third eligible has been nominated, of which number 69 have veterans' preference, we are confident that a fairly conducted investigation will disclose no violation of the civil-service laws and regulations applicable to postmasters.

Neither do we hesitate to assert that a complete investigation of all postmaster appointments from 1921 down to the present time will disclose that a greater proportion of Republicans have been appointed during the Roosevelt and Truman administrations than there were Democrats appointed during the Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover administrations.

The minority feels strongly that it is unwise and unjust to the hundreds of servicemen and other unchallenged men and women, and to their families, whose appointments have already been before the Senate Civil Service Committee for long periods of time, to longer withhold their confirmations pending a general political investigation. Without reflecting in the slightest upon the other appointees, the minority simply points out by this report that the scope of any political investigation approved by the Senate and for which contingent funds of the Senate are appropriated, should not be made applicable to appointees to whom the investigation can have no possible proper application.

The minority is unwilling to support the course of action proposed by the Langer resolution under which discrimination will be continued indefinitely against the present appointees, many of whom have already awaited confirmation for weeks and in some instances for months.

CARL HAYDEN.
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN.
BRIEN MCMAHON.
FRANCIS J. MYERS.
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to read a portion of the minority views:

The minority members of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration have noted with regret that both the preamble of the original Langer resolution and the recitals in the body of the resolution show beyond question that its purpose is to make available contingent funds of the Senate in the amount of $35,000 for a general political investigation of all appointments of postmasters of the first, second, and third classes which have been made within the past 14 years, and practicularly of all postmaster appointments which now await confirmation by the Senate to a total number of 639. The investigation as proposed is predicated upon the complaint that during the years in question "very few, if any, Republicans" had been appointed as postmasters and is designed to produce an answer as to "why few, if any Republicans have been appointed * * * for the last 14 years" to said positions. The author of the resolution stated at the committee hearing that he would not report favorably a single nomination for postmaster until the funds he requested for said general investigation were made available.

Mr. President, we have a situation in which 22,350 men are holding office. Already 900 nominations have been sent to us by the President. The chances are that during the next month or two there will be additional nominations, and that the number will then be roughly a thousand.

It so happens that I am a member of the Committee on the Judiciary. When the President sends to the Senate the nomination of a man to be United States Marshal or United States district judge, or circuit judge, the fullest investigation is made. If a single member of the committee of 13 insists upon it, the FBI makes a report. When that report is received, any member of the subcommittee can have the report produced.

Nothwithstanding all the expense that is entailed, the fact nevertheless remains that occasionally even the FBI, with all the resources and all the trained experts at its command, makes a mistake, and we find that a certain nominee for United States judges or for United States marshal is rejected. For example, I invite the attention of the Senate to the nomination of a man from the State of Oklahoma. At first both Senators from Oklahoma recommended him. It was a nomination which I alone held up. The vote was 17 to 1. I held it up for a period of months. As the investigation proceeded, the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma withdrew his support and wrote a letter to the Judiciary Committee asking that the man be not recommended for confirmation by the Senate Judiciary Committee. So, as I say, no matter how careful we are, things like that occasionally happen.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I am somewhat familiar with the instance to which the Senator is now referring. If I am correctly advised, the nomination was reported favorably by the committee and was acted upon favorably by the Senate, and the gentleman referred to has proved to be a most excellent judge in the State of Oklahoma.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I had not intended to talk about that man at all, but in view of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico I am compelled to discuss the case. As I interpret the Senator's remarks, he is no friend of the Federal judge. Much as I regret it, it is necessary for me once more to discuss the case of the nomination of that Federal judge from the State of Oklahoma. It is too bad that it must be injected once more, but I am perfectly willing to discuss it.

This man was nominated to be a Federal judge. As the investigation proceeded, a distinguished Member of this body said, "I am for him because he contributed the most money to my campaign." The statement was published in newspapers all over Oklahoma and it is a part of the record. The Senator stated, "Because he contributed $2,500, I cannot get away from him."

Mr. President, I regret to have to say this, and I would not have thought of saying it if it had not been made necessary by the statement of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico.

What do we find? We find that one night, after 10 o'clock in the evening, four lawyers were meeting. All four lawyers left the office and a young girl 19 years of age was left in the office to do some typewriting to finish up what had been agreed upon. The undisputed testimony shows that 15 minutes later the man who was nominated to be a judge was back in that office. The undisputed testimony shows that that man, who was nominated to be a judge, attacked that girl. In the fight which followed, the telephone was torn off the wall. The young girl finally escaped and saw a doctor. She had no father. The next morning at 7 o'clock her mother obtained a lawyer, and a few minutes later the business partner of the man who was nominated to be a judge was there trying to settle the case, and he did settle it. He settled it by paying $3,500.

Those are the undisputed facts. I call the attention of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico to the fact that

when this information was brought out on the floor of the Senate, although in the Judiciary Committee the vote had been 17 to 1 in favor of recommending confirmation, every single Republican but one voted against the confirmation of that nomination. I may add that certain Senators on the Democratic side could not stomach the nomination, and they voted "no." That is the record on that judgeship.

Mr. President, there are roughly 22,500 cases to be investigated. I do not anticipate that very many lengthy investigations will need to be made. I believe that within a short time after the funds are made available, as the distinguished Senator from Arizona states in the minority views, many of the nominations can be approved.

However, we are confronted with this problem: We want to know what the United States Civil Service Commission has been doing. The Civil Service Commission is in charge, and yet we find that in some States, over a period of 9 years scarcely any Republicans have been appointed. I am informed by Senators that in some cases not a single Republican has been appointed. What has the United States Civil Service Commission been doing?

The minority views further state:

> The minority feels that it is both unnecessary and unfair to hold up longer the confirmation of the pending appointments.

I do not agree that it is unfair, because of the peculiar condition, but I agree that it is almost unnecessary. It should be possible to screen through a great many of these appointments within a very short time.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator must realize, first, that there is a provision of law to the effect that an acting postmaster, having been nominated, can serve only 6 months. In the case of a person appointed acting postmaster last January, his 6 months will be up very soon, and he will be absolutely barred from office. That is a clear provision of law, in section 3 of the act approved May 20, 1944, to which the Senator referred. That is factor No. 1.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished Senator a question?

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly.

Mr. LANGER. Suppose the Senator discovered that during the past 3 months an acting postmaster had become a hopeless drunkard. Would he still say that he ought to continue to be a postmaster?

Mr. HAYDEN. I am not saying that a hopeless drunkard should be appointed postmaster. There is a time limit running against his ability to occupy the office, and unless the Senate acts within 6 months, he cannot be postmaster. The other proposition is that the present session of Congress by law is supposed to adjourn sine die not later than July. What I am concerned about is this: According to the best figures the Senator has, there are 927 nominations pending before the committee of which he is chairman. When a nomination for postmaster is transmitted—formerly to the old Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, and now to the Senator's committee—the custom has been to advise and consult the two Senators from the State involved of the nomination, and if they approved of it they send a written notice that the nomination is entirely agreeable to them. Unless there is some evidence brought before the committee that the person nominated is unfit, certainly the nomination ought to be submitted to the Senate.

Mr. LANGER. Of course. It would take only a few days or a week.

Mr. HAYDEN. Then why has there been all this delay.

Mr. LANGER. In view of the fact that the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] made a motion I took occasion to look up some of the men he mentioned in his resolution, to ascertain whether we could proceed and approve them. I will give the Senator some of the instances.

In the State of Illinois there is a post office at Springerton. The main argument is that postal matters, according to the Senator from Illinois, are delayed and hampered by failure on the part of the Civil Service Committee to pass upon nominations. Let us see who is responsible for the delay in the efficient operation of this particular post office at Springerton, Ill.

I have the record here, in case anyone wants to see it. On February 9, 1945, Miss Joyce Cushman, as the result of an earlier examination, was certified as the only eligible. A new examination was held on May 26, 1945, to fill the register. Mind you, Miss Cushman was certified. She did not take the examination, as it was assumed she was standing on her eligibility as the result of the first examination. In the second examination Harry Corcoran and Harold R. Carter were first on the list, but for some reason unknown to the committee a third examination was held March 8, 1946. There were eight applicants for this examination, and four of them passed, among them Roy Martin who has been certified to the Civil Service Commission.

In a letter from the applicant, read into the record of the Senate by the Senator from Illinois, applicant Martin states that prior to entering the service he was receiving $300 per month, yet in his sworn statement he disclosed that the highest salary he had ever drawn was $200 a month.

So we have these two applicants, one of whom has passed two previous examinations with a rating of 80.63; another applicant passing one examination with a rating of 76.50, which was increased to 86.50 by reason of disability preference.

In the case of Mr. Corcoran, five inquiries were made regarding his standing in the community. Of these five, four gave him a rating of very good, and one was fair. There was no criticism of his ability to handle the office.

In the case of the applicant about whom the Senator from Illinois seemed so much concerned—Roy Martin—we find six inquiries were made. Of the replies, three of them were good, one noncommittal, and two poor. Here are the two poor statements. "He has no business training, suitability very poor." "He drinks too much; just fair experience; unsuitable."

Roy Martin served in the armed forces from May 6, 1944, to November 27, 1945, as a repair crew chief. There is no indication that he ever saw any combat service. He was discharged for a nervous stomach condition, and no doubt received disability payments because of this condition.

Mr. Roy Martin took one examination, Mr. Corcoran took two, and was eligible in both.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Has the Senator looked up the Civil Service examination of the applicant?

Mr. LANGER. I have it here on the table.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator knows that he was No. 1 on the list, does he not?

Mr. LANGER. No; I did not tell the Senator that.

Mr. LUCAS. Is he not No. 1 on the list?

Mr. LANGER. Let me read it to the Senator again. I am talking about the Springerton, Ill., post office.

Mr. LUCAS. I am talking about the last examination.

Mr. LANGER. I do not want any mistake on the part of the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not want any mistake, either, but does not the Senator know that under the civil-service rules where there is not an eligibility list of three, another examination can be called for?

Mr. LANGER. Apparently the Senator did not listen to what I said, because there was an eligibility list of three.

Mr. LUCAS. That is what the Senator said, but the Civil Service Commisison held differently.

Mr. LANGER. I have it right here with me.

Mr. LUCAS. Very well.

Mr. LANGER. On February 9, 1945, Miss Joyce Cushman, as a result of an earlier examination, was certified as the only eligible. A new examination was taken to fill the register on May 26, 1945. Miss Cushman did not take this examination. It was presumed that she was standing on her elibility. On the second examination there was a register of three eligibles——

Mr. LUCAS. Who makes the statement that that made three eligibles?

Mr. LANGER. Here is the list.

Mr. LUCAS. But the Senator definitely said the lady did not take an examination the second time. She was eligible only if the examination was taken. The Senator knows, if he knows anything about the civil-service rules at all—and I am sure he does, because he is a very able gentleman—that another examination can always be called for when there is only one eligible or two eligibles.

Mr. LANGER. Or three eligibles. So they called for a third examination on

March 6, 1946, when there were three eligibles on the list.

Mr. LUCAS. Who is on that list?

Mr. LANGER. Eight applicants took the examination and four passed, among them being Roy Martin.

Mr. LUCAS. He is No. 1?

Mr. LANGER. I did not say that. I can look it up. I do not believe the Senator gets my point.

Mr. LUCAS. I get the Senator's point.

Mr. LANGER. In the Senator's talk the other day he stated there had been a great delay on the part of Civil Service officials. The Senator picked out Springerton, Ill. That was in 1945. No one was appointed in 1946, and here we are in 1947. The Senator wanted to know who was to blame for that delay. It was certainly not the Civil Service Committee of the United States Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator missed my point entirely. I picked out that individual for a particular reason. He had a 20-percent disability as the result of the war. He was living on social-security payments. He had a family of four. He was No. 1 on the eligible list, he was a World War veteran of World War II. For the life of me, I cannot see why the Senator from North Dakota continues to hold up the nomination of such a man as that and not report the nomination for confirmation. In other words, am I to understand that it is the purpose of the Republican Party to hold up the nominations of postmasters this year and next year on the theory that perhaps in 1948 a Republican President will be elected and that the Republicans will have the say-so as to who shall be appointed postmasters?

Mr. LANGER. I will answer that question so that there may be no misunderstanding about it. The position of the Republican Party is, first, to take the Post Office Department out of the red, and for once to have it run like a business institution.

Mr. LUCAS. That is marvelous.

Mr. LANGER. That is what the Democrats have not been doing. Mr. President, so long as I am chairman of the Civil Service Committee, we are going to enforce the Civil Service Act which the Democrats passed in 1938. They did a good job in passing that good law, but they have not enforced it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator from North Dakota is doing his best to do that when he appoints investigators to go out on smelling investigations all over the United States. I am sure that will result in economy. In other words, we in the Congress have been hammering the executive branch of the Government ever since January 1 about economy in Government; and yet here in the Senate of the United States, under a Republican majority, more money has been spent in the Senate than at any similar period in the history of the Congress. In other words, we do not practice what we preach.

The Senator from North Dakota has offered a resolution providing for the expenditure of $35,000 for an investigation as to why Democrats have been appointed postmasters. That is a simple matter, Mr. President; the Senator should know that. When the Republicans were in power, they never appointed anyone but Republicans; it is an old, old story. Yet the Senator from North Dakota wants to spend $35,000 to find out why Democrats have been appointed under a Democratic administration. He has all the power he needs under the resolution which was adopted many months ago. This new resolution is not needed now, to enable him to find out about that matter. The expenditure of $35,000 is not needed in order to have that done. The Senator from North Dakota can call the Civil Service Commission tomorrow and can find out from the Commission exactly what he wishes to know about the post-office appointments and about how the appointments have been made. If there have been violations of the law, I am in favor of finding out about them; but, Mr. President, let us not hold up the appointments of ex-servicemen who are waiting for jobs they need if they are to earn a living and support their families. The Senator from North Dakota, as chairman of the Senate Civil Service Committee, should not hold up these appointments without rhyme or reason. If there are any valid reasons why the nominations of these men should not be confirmed, they should be ascertained immediately.

But I challenge the Senator from North Dakota to find out anything objectionable about any of these nominees either from Illinois or from any other State.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in view of that challenge, I shall state some objections.

Mr. LUCAS. Oh, of course, Mr. President——

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I refuse to yield further until I respond to the challenge the Senator has made to me. The Senator from Illinois has asked me to name some objections, and I shall name some. I shall show how unfair the distinguished Senator from Illinois was in the case of one veteran he has been talking about. Senate executive resolution 34 calls for the discharge of the Senate Civil Service Committee from the further consideration of the nomination of a certain person to be postmaster at Flora, Ill. That is a second-class post office. The Senator from Illinois contends that the appointment should be given to James P. McGannon.

Let me state that, in contrast to what has been stated by the Senator from Illinois, this case involves a situation just opposite to that in the case of the person nominated to be postmaster at Springerton, Ill. In this case only one applicant was eligible. Yet, for some mysterious reason, no further examination was called. Mr. President, contrast that case with the case at the Springerton post office, where, as a result of the first examination, there was one eligible; and then a second examination was called, and as the result of it there were two more eligibles; and then a third examination was called, and it produced four eligibles. Undoubtedly the Senator from Illinois can explain why three examinations were held in that case, whereas only one examination was held at Flora.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in the case at Flora, Ill., two veterans took the examination. Here is the record in regard to inquiries made concerning James P. McGannon, about whom the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] is so concerned.

His entire military service was spent as an instructor at Fort Sill, Okla., and Camp Forrest, Tenn. I quote from comments made to investigators:

> I question he has the experience to handle the job. As to training, all I know is hearsay. No business experience. No personality. Lacks ambition to go out and do things.

Here is his previous business experience: Auto work, store clerk, Army and his job before becoming acting postmaster was custodian of a club building, mostly tending bar.

Mr. President, thus we find that a part of his experience was mostly in tending a bar at a club.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. On the other hand, Mr. President, the second applicant was rejected because of lack of business experience.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I refuse to yield at the present time.

As I have just said, the second applicant was rejected because of lack of business experience, although his written examination was 9½ points above that of the successful applicant. Thus we see that two veterans were applicants for that position in the post office, and one of them stood 9½ points higher in his examination that the other one; one was apparently a good businessman and the other had been tending a bar in a club. Yet the distinguished Senator from Illinois has submitted a resolution asking that the Civil Service Committee be discharged from the further consideration of the nomination; that it be discharged from investigating and finding out the situation in that case.

Mr. President, let me refer to another case which has been presented by the Senator from Illinois. In Senate Executive Resolution 13, the distinguished Senator from Illinois wishes to have the Civil Service Committee discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Charles J. Murphy, to be postmaster at Oak Park, Ill. That post-office position pays $5,300 a year. In that case we find that the examination for that post-office position was held on November 20, 1945. Mind you, Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois wishes to have our committee discharged from the further consideration of this nomination, because, the Senator from Illinois says, we have not been acting on it. Let me point out that we took charge only in January 1947, and we have had charge of these appointments for only a few months. However, I point out that the examination for this position was held in 1945. The register was made up on July 30, 1946—a delay in that case of over 8

months. Three eligibles were placed on the roll, as follows: Harry L. Busse, assistant postmaster; Joseph E. White, acting postmaster; and Charles J. Murphy. Only a short time later, Joseph E. White, the acting postmaster, died. So the fourth man, Lyon J. Walther, was moved into third place.

Let us consider this post office from the standpoint of postal efficiency. Mr. President, Lyon J. Walther, who was moved up from fourth place to third place and was given an eligible rating, is a veteran. The first applicant, Harry L. Busse, began his post office experience in that post office as assistant carrier on May 18, 1931. Mind you, Mr. President, he has had nearly 17 years of experience in that post office. He was transferred to substitute clerk in the same post office on July 13, 1931, and was promoted to regular clerk on October 31, 1935, and was advanced to special clerk on July 1, 1937, and was promoted to assistant postmaster on September 16, 1941. His entire record is without a blemish of any kind.

Here is a comment by the investigator:

Made an excellent impression on the investigator. Has run the post office for 3 years during the illness of the postmaster. Applicant's carrying load during illness of postmaster has been recognized.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I do not yield now; I shall yield a little later.

Mr. President, I have before me, in the files, more than 100 letters from attorneys, retail associations, park boards, wholesalers, members of chambers of commerce, business institutions of various kinds, doctors, bankers, real-estate men, and school authorities recommending Mr. Busse very highly for this appointment. However, for some reason, probably best known to the Senator from Illinois, Charles J. Murphy, who was third on the roll until he was moved up to second place, due to the death of the second applicant, received the approval of the Democrats for this position.

Mr. President, who is Mr. Murphy? We find that he came to Oak Park in 1942. Mind you, Mr. President, we are talking of making the post-office service efficient; and yet we find that the other man, Mr. Busse, in 1931 already was working in the post office, and was repeatedly promoted thereafter. Mr. Murphy did not even come to Oak Park until 1942, 11 years later.

His business experience has been as a personnel director in department stores in Chicago. His last known position was interviewer for an employment agency, working on a commission basis. There is not one letter in the files in support of his nomination for this position. In his list of five recommendations, however, I find the name of George B. Kells, of Chicago, Ill., who lists his occupation as alderman. An alderman in Chicago has more to say about the man who is to be postmaster in Oak Park than a hundred people representing the people in that city.

Again I leave it to the discretion of Senators whether or not the Post Office Department is best served by a politician of this class, or by a man who has 17 years' service to his credit, and who for the past several years has been in truth the postmaster, and who, by competitive examination, was placed first on the list of eligibles.

But, Mr. President, let us take another post office in Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he gets to the next one?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. May I inquire of the Senator who this investigator is he has out investigating at the present time?

Mr. LANGER. I have no investigator out.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator has been talking about an investigator.

Mr. LANGER. I have taken time from my other duties to send for these files, and I sat up at night, after this resolution was offered, attempting to find out what the situation was in Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I know the Senator said an investigator had looked into this matter and said so-and-so.

Mr. LANGER. That is true. The investigator I have reference to is the investigator who investigated for the Post Office Department, and has his report in the files.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator deny that we have a right, under the civil-service law, to select either No. 1, No. 2, or No. 3 from an eligibility list?

Mr. LANGER. We have no right to select anybody. The list goes from the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. LUCAS. Is it not the fact that the Civil Service Commission, or the Post Office Department, can recommend either No. 1, No. 2, or No. 3 on the eligible list, unless there are veterans?

Mr. LANGER. But, Mr. President——

Mr. LUCAS. Is not that the truth?

Mr. LANGER. Of course it is the truth. The Senator knows it. But, regardless of what the Civil Service Commission does, who makes the appointments in the State of Illinois? The Senator from Illinois makes them. They enter politics. The Senator from Illinois says here in the RECORD—and I quote his own words, uttered on May 14, 1947, as they appear on page 5269:

Only yesterday I appointed as No. 1—

Mr. LUCAS. That is right.

Mr. LANGER. "To a little post office in my State a man who was a Republican, and there was a Democrat on the list who was a veteran I could have appointed."

The Senator, who loves veterans, says he could have appointed a veteran, but he appointed a man who was not a veteran.

Mr. LUCAS. Oh, yes; he is a veteran. The Senator does not know the facts.

Mr. LANGER. He says he is "a fine, upstanding citizen," and, if he is a Republican, of course, he must be.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, the Senator is going to stand up for Republicans, but when I stand up for a Democrat, I am playing politics. Is not that the fact?

Mr. LANGER. But the Senator says, "I appointed," when under the Civil Service Act, Mr. President, no Senator has a right to appoint anybody.

Mr. LUCAS. A Senator has a right to approve, and therefore he has something to say about it.

Mr. LANGER. Oh, yes, of course, after the Civil Service Commission names three, the Postmaster General names one of the three, and it comes to the Senate for approval. But the Senator from Illinois appoints—he selects. He said, "Only yesterday I appointed as No. 1 to a little post office in my State a man who was a Republican."

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

Mr. LANGER. I refuse to yield at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota declines to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish the Senator would quote the facts instead of drawing upon his imagination.

Mr. LANGER. I would like to know why the Senator from Illinois appointed Murphy over the man who had been in the post office over 17 years.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall be glad to tell the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. I shall be delighted to know.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator knows—he has been in politics longer than I have, and has had much more experience up and down than I have——

Mr. LANGER. I have been in longer, but I have not had the experience.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator has had much more experience in politics than I have had. When the Senator rises in the Senate and makes the kind of argument he does, as a result of his long experience in Republican politics in North Dakota, he is not doing his political party very much good. He knows, if he knows anything at all, how postmasters have been appointed over all these years, by both Democrats and Republicans. He knows that when the Republicans were in power they never appointed any Democrats if they could keep from it, and he knows that when the Democrats are in power they follow the same policy. There is nothing sinister about it.

Mr. LANGER. What the Senator said about the political practice is absolutely true, but in 1938 Congress passed a law to build up the Post Office Department. It passed the civil-service law, and it said, "No longer shall the Republicans appoint Republicans, when they get into power, and throw out all the Democrats, and no longer shall the reverse take place." The trouble with the Democrats is that they ignored that law. They ignored it, just as the distinguished Senator and his colleagues on the other side ignored every single plank in the Democratic platform adopted in 1932, except one, and that was about prohibition. That was the only one they did not ignore, and they would have ignored that, in my judgment, if some people had not gotten together in the various States and had seen to it in various legislatures that prohibition was repealed.

I challenge the Senator to name one single promise that was made in the platform of 1932 that was kept. The Democrats were going to reduce the number of bureaus, they were going to reduce taxes, they were going to reduce the number of commissions, they were going to place the Government in the hands of the people, they were going to protect

the Negro, they were going to protect the Indian, they were going to restrain the rich and help the poor; they were going to do many things, but unfortunately nothing was done. Oh, yes, they were also going to reduce the debt of this country. When they came in, the national debt, as I remember, amounted to thirty or thirty-five billion dollars, and when they went out it amounted to $260,000,000,000. That is how they kept that promise.

Certainly the distinguished Senator from Illinois, with that record, having supported the man who was elected President of this country with the help of the distinguished Senator from Illinois, certainly would be the last to complain when we ask that the Democrats carry out the law of the land. The law is that the three high men are placed on the eligible list from which selection is made. We find the law ignored, and the distinguished Senator getting up on the floor of the Senate and boasting, "Only yesterday I appointed so and so as No. 1 to a little post office in my State." "I appointed." The Senator very well knows that under the law he had no right to appoint. Yet he boasts that he appointed.

It is immaterial to me what the political aspirations of the distinguished Senator may be. I understand he is a candidate for Vice President, and a candidate for governor. That is all right with me. But, Mr. President, I am interested in the Post Office Department. I want to get rid of the postal deficit. That is my interest in the matter. It seems to me that a man who has been in the post office for 17 years, who has worked his way up, and who has letters of endorsement from nearly every reputable organization in Oak Park, Ill., should be entitled to some consideration; but when we find no one recommending Mr. Murphy except an alderman in Chicago, the distinguished Senator says that is all right; he would rather take the recommendation of the alderman in Chicago than the recommendations of all the residents of Oak Park. I simply do not agree with him.

I believe it is a part of the job of the Civil Service Committee to endeavor to see to it that the Post Office Department is operated honestly and efficiently, so that the debt may be reduced.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. LANGER. I refuse to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois——

Mr. LANGER. I refuse to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has made a point of order. The Senator from Illinois will state his point of order.

Mr. LUCAS. The point of order is: When a Senator rises and addresses the Chair, and asks another Senator to yield, can the Senator continue to ignore the request and proceed to talk incessantly, apparently about nothing?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In one instance, the Senator from North Dakota, during his remarks, refused to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes, that is correct. I have requested the Senator to yield, two or three times, and I have not been recognized. I contend seriously that, under parliamentary law, when a Senator addresses the Chair and asks another Senator to yield, and he declines to yield, he cannot continue to ignore the request made by the Senator asking him to yield without saying so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the opinion of the Chair that the Senator from North Dakota has a right, while holding the floor, either to accede to or refuse to accede to the request for——

Mr. LANGER. Now, Mr. President, let us take another post office in Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, another point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. I think the Senator from North Dakota ought to be courteous enough to allow the Chair to finish his statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would be his idea, the Chair may say to the Senator from Illinois——

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I decline to yield at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That, with reference to his observation, a matter of that character obviously should be settled between the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from North Dakota, at some place other than the floor of the Senate. The Senator from North Dakota has the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. I am sure I do not follow the Chair's ruling.

Mr. LANGER. Senate Resolution 28, offered by the Senator from Illinois, covers the post office at Thompsonville, Ill., third class. The Senator from Illinois, who thinks the committee should be discharged from further consideration of the matter, might be able to give the Senate the full particulars of how this particular situation was handled. The record discloses that the first examination was held on September 25, 1943, almost 4 years ago. Mind you, Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois is criticizing the committee, because within the last few weeks we have not acted fast enough to suit him. From the examination in 1943, at Thompsonville, Ill., no eligible was secured; only one person took the examination. A second examination was held on July 22, 1944, at which time no eligibles were secured. A third examination was held March 3, 1945. There were nine applicants, only one of whom was a veteran, William Harvey Edwards who was first on the list of eligibles with a rating of 86.25. The second-high rating was 74.38, the third was 71.25; the second applicant was the acting postmaster.

It seems that about this time the Senator from Illinois appears in the picture. The Senator's letter does not appear in the files, but the following letter in reply to his letter does appear, dated August 16, 1946:

Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of August 9, 1946, with which you submitted several affidavits and other material making serious charges against the fitness of Harvey Edwards, eligible No. 1 in the examination held on March 24, 1945, for the position of third-class postmaster at Thompsonville, Ill.

You request that a very careful investigation be made of the charges placed against Mr. Edwards in these affidavits, with particular reference to the indictment against him in the county court of Williamson County, Ill., for larceny, and the circumstances surrounding his entry into military service.

A personal investigation was made in September 1945 of the qualifications and suitability of all candidates in this examination. As soon as a review can be made of the material submitted by you, together with the other information in the file, you will be advised as to whether additional investigation may be necessary in order to reach a final decision as to Mr. Edwards' suitability for this position.

WILLIAM C. HULL,
Executive Assistant.

Bear in mind that the distinguished Senator from Illinois was protesting the eligibility of the only veteran on the list. His reason for this was the fact that this man, when 19 years of age, had been indicted for stealing a calf. This delinquency had occurred over 20 years ago. The calf was valued at $22.50 and the boy's parents paid the money the following day. Mr. Edwards then entered the Marine Corps, where he served 4 years, receiving an honorable discharge; he returned to his home town, and, from information available, he has been of excellent character ever since. In checking, post-office investigators withheld the appointment until a thorough investigation had been made, as evidenced in the letter just quoted from Mr. Hull. On September 13, 1946, we noted another letter written to the Senator from Illinois, signed by William C. Hull, executive assistant:

Further reference is made to your letter of August 9, 1946, concerning the charges filed against the fitness of Mr. William Harvey Edwards, applicant for the position of postmaster at Thompsonville, Ill.

The Commission has decided to make further personal investigation in this case concerning all the eligibles with particular reference to the suitability of Mr. Edwards.

We shall be pleased to advise you as soon as the investigation is completed and a review made.

This investigation was no doubt prompted by a letter from the Senator from Illinois. The interest of the Senator from Illinois again appears in a letter written by William C. Hull, executive assistant, on January 16, 1947. Mr. Hull in no uncertain terms states that, as will be noted from the letter, the Post Office Department intends to retain William Harvey Edwards with a veterans' preference on the eligible list. I quote from the letter:

Further reference is made to your letter of August 9, 1946, and my replies of August 16, 1946, and September 13, 1946, in which you were advised that a further personal investigation would be made of the applicants for the position of postmaster at Thompsonville, Ill., an office of the third class.

A very careful investigation has been made and the results of that investigation have now been reviewed. Inasmuch as there is no evidence to show present unsuitability of Mr. Harvey Edwards, and since the incident involving the indictment of a person of the same name for alleged theft occurred more

than 20 years ago, at which time the applicant was only 19 years of age, there does not appear to be any reason for disqualifying him in this examination. The review of the results of the personal investigation has resulted in no change in the eligibility of those persons whose names appeared on the register as originally established. However, since the original register was established, the Commission has given a delayed examination to a veteran. This veteran attained an eligible rating and his own name now appears on the eligible register, as follows:

William Harvey Edwards, 86.25, preference;
Mrs. Anna May Droit, 74.36;
Herbert M. Bowman, 71.25.

An amended certificate, containing the names of the first three eligibles, was submitted to the Post Office Department on January 7, 1947. It is further found that on August 9, 1946, the Senator wrote the first letter of protest against the appointment of Mr. Edwards, and included a list of letters of protest from the Department. It is apparent that the Post Office Department has carried on a very thorough investigation of this, and I quote some of their comments:

Any trouble he might have had was before he entered the Marine Corps, and he has held a responsible job on road work for a period of years. Applicant has an honorable discharge from the Marine Corps and has had no unfavorable testimony since.

On February 11, 1946, a copy of an indictment was sent in showing that on February 26, 1924, applicant was indicted for the theft of a calf valued at $22.50. This occurred 21 years before, and the applicant was only 19 years old at the time. It is not material at this time. Several others sent in affidavits to the Senator from Illinois, one of whom stated:

The acting postmaster came out here with two other fellows. They wrote down what they wanted to know, and I just signed it and said I had been before the grand jury in the case.

Another said:

Tom Marville brought me up a statement I read it and signed it.

Another said:

The acting postmaster presented the affidavit to me.

Another said:

The evidence had something to do with his going to see Mr. Harris. I had no personal knowledge of the trouble Edwards was in.

Another reports:

A suggested affidavit was made out for me, and I made alterations or corrections on it myself. I haven't heard anything unfavorable to Edwards since the indictment was gotten several years ago.

Another said he heard he was on the register from the committeeman and submitted the statement to the Civil Service Commission voluntarily.

Now begins the politics. I quote the following letter from W. A. McCoy, Chief, Examining and Personnel Utilization Division, to Hon. Jesse M. Donaldson, dated January 16, 1947:

Reference is made to the Commission's letter of September 4, 1946, in which you were requested to withhold action on certificate No. 7407, issued January 4, 1946, for consideration for appointment for third-class postmaster at Thompsonville, Ill.

The personal investigation initiated at that time has now been completed and the rating of Mr. William Harvey Edwards, eligible No. 1 on the certificate, has been allowed to stand. However, on July 26, 1946, a delayed examination was given to Mr. Herbert M. Bowman, a veteran, and since he made an eligible rating in the written examination, he was included in the above-mentioned investigation. Mr. Bowman was assigned a final eligible rating of 74, including five-point preference, which places his name among the highest three on the register. Therefore, the enclosed amended certificate is submitted for your use in filling the vacancy at Thompsonville.

Please return certificate No. 7407, previously issued for filling this vacancy.

We find that on July 26, 1946, a delayed examination was given to Mr. Herbert M. Bowman, a veteran. Just why this was done the record does not show. Mr. Bowman received a 74-point rating as against an 86.25 rating for Mr. Edwards.

This man Bowman is the man whom the distinguished Senator from Illinois is so much concerned about that he submitted a resolution upon the Senate floor respecting him, although Bowman's position was more than 13 points lower than the No. 1 applicant on the eligible list.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. LANGER. I refuse to yield at this time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. LANGER. No; I refuse to yield at this time.

Mr. LUCAS. I think the Senator is unfair in not yielding after making such statements as he has made.

Mr. LANGER. Now I want to take up a few more letters.

Mr. LUCAS. I will be heard on this matter sooner or later.

Mr. LANGER. I will take up a few more letters. Before I do that, Mr. President, I want to say something respecting what is happening in my own State of North Dakota. As I previously said, 3 years ago I made a demand for an investigation, but could not obtain it. Three years ago I placed in the RECORD what took place at Marion, N. Dak. I told how a man by the name of Cleo Flugga, postmaster at Marion, a third-class office, on the 1st of each month was visited by a Democratic collector. I have his canceled checks with me. On the 1st of each month he donated a portion of his salary. He kept that up year after year, and when he finally refused to continue making further donations he was removed as postmaster at Marion, N. Dak. As a result thereof I was obliged to speak about the matter on the floor of the Senate. I am here to tell the Democratic Party which collected $10 a month from him, that I have the checks made payable to the chairman of the Democratic Party in North Dakota, and I have checks made payable to the Democratic National Administration, under Democratic chairman Mr. Farley at that time, canceled and endorsed by the Bank of Manhattan, of New York City.

This poor man had been contributing since September 4, 1934. If anyone has any doubt about this matter, here [exhibiting] are all the checks and receipts. He had been donating $10 per month, Mr. President. How much will $10 a month amount to if the same thing occurs all over the country? If the Democratic Party has been receiving $10 a month from the postmasters every month, as I charged 3 years ago when I could not secure an investigation because the Democrats were in control, then they have been collecting on the basis of $88,000,000 a year. I find that in these jobs the more they are paid the greater percentage they contribute.

At the time I sought to have the investigation made I obtained a number of letters. I have letters which show that those who were collecting tried to hold up a poor widow for $75 a month, a poor widow who was supporting three or four children. Suppose a poor little orphan were to be appointed postmaster somewhere; they would then proceed to take the bread out of that poor orphan's mouth.

I have a letter signed by a Democratic Senator. He is not here right now. Here is a letter which he wrote, dated August 27, 1945, 7 years after he had voted for the civil-service law. He writes to a lady—I shall not name the State or the town:

Since I consult the various Democratic county central committees before making any recommendation on any postal vacancies, may I suggest—

Here is a woman who was No. 1 on the list, mind you. The Senator says:

May I suggest that you endeavor to secure the endorsement of your own Democratic committee and thereafter you may be assured I shall be glad to consider you for this appointment.

Mind you, Mr. President, here is a Senator who voted for the Civil Service Act of 1938, and after the woman had taken the examination, after she was high on the list, when this woman wrote in and said, "I want my appointment which I won," the Senator said:

Since I consult the various Democratic county central committees before making any recommendation.

Mr. President, think of that. After the three eligible names are sent in, the one who is named and selected writes in and asks why she is not appointed, and even then the Senator would not recommend her. He would not recommend her, but said he would have to take up the matter with the Democratic county organization in his State.

Mr. President, I have letters here from the One Thousand Club of Nebraska. These are very interesting letters. They are so interesting that I shall ask unanimous consent to place them in the RECORD, because, Mr. President, forsooth, some young man in some State who knows nothing about politics may want a farm whereby he can collect $25 a month from all those who hold Federal jobs, postmasters included. So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place these four letters written by the One Thousand Club of Howells, Nebr., in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). Is there objection?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I inquire what the Senator is doing? Did the Senator make a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. LANGER. I did not hear what the Senator said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois asked whether or not the Senator from North Dakota had made a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. LANGER. Yes; I requested that certain letters be placed in the RECORD.

Mr. LUCAS. What are the letters?

Mr. LANGER. They are letters from the One Thousand Club, of Howells, Nebr.

Mr. LUCAS. What is that?

Mr. LANGER. All they ask is $25 apiece from Democrats holding jobs.

Mr. LUCAS. What is the One Thousand Club?

Mr. LANGER. I have the original letters before me. One letter is signed by Paul R. Busch, executive assistant to the State treasurer. Another letter is signed by two men, James C. Quigley, national Democratic committeeman for the State of Nebraska, and William Ritchie, State chairman of Nebraska.

Mr. LUCAS. What has that to do with the discharge of the committee from further consideration of the nominations of these postmasters?

Mr. LANGER. I want to show that they are soliciting $25 apiece from all the postmasters.

Mr. LUCAS. What has that to do with the issue before us?

Mr. LANGER. The resolution provides that we shall look into all the graft that these postmasters have to pay. Why should any postmaster be obliged to pay $1, $10, or $25 or, in the case of one poor woman to whom I referred, $75, in order to hold a job with the United States Government?

Mr. LUCAS. I am sure that when the Senator was Governor of North Dakota, no employee ever contributed to his campaign.

Mr. LANGER. Of course not.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course not.

Mr. LANGER. Of course, the governor did not have any postmasters under him.

Mr. LUCAS. No; but he had plenty of employees.

Mr. LANGER. So far as that is concerned, I am perfectly willing to place my record as governor alongside the record which the Senator will make when he is elected Governor of the State of Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I do not see the materiality of these letters. Let me say to the Senator that I do not care how much he investigates the Post Office Department and the Civil Service Commission, and the Democratic politicians throughout the country. He is welcome to do so. I do not care if it costs $100,000 to do it. The only thing I am talking about is the discharge of the committee from further consideration of the nominations of 900 postmasters, which nominations the Senator is holding up. Certainly there must be 1 or 2 or 3 good ones among the 900. They cannot all be bad in the estimation of the Senator. I know that they are not. What amazes me is that the Senator is depicting himself on the floor of the United States Senate as a paragon of political virtue in connection with the handling of these postmaster nominations. That simply does not jibe with any Member of the United States Senate who understands Republican and Democratic politics.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not object. Let the Senator place a bushel basket of letters in the RECORD if he so desires.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE,
Valentine, Nebr., October 15, 1946.

Recently you were invited to aid the Democratic Party in financing its present campaign by joining the Nebraska One Thousand Club. In making a check of the One Thousand Club members we were surprised and disappointed to find that your name was not listed.

We trust that this has been an unintentional oversight on your part and that you will apply for membership today. The annual membership fee is certainly reasonable and the Democratic Party has every right to expect cooperation from all its members and especially those who have received the benefits of its patronage.

Personal solicitation is slow and expensive and should not be necessary in our family circle. The party will appreciate your immediate reply to this request.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES C. QUIGLEY,
National Committeeman.
WILLIAM RITCHIE,
State Chairman.

ONE THOUSAND CLUB,
Howells, Nebr.

DEAR FRIEND: The Democratic Party of Nebraska is making bold plans for the brighter days that lie ahead and these plans must have a solid financial base upon which to stand. To that end the party officials have authorized the organization of the One Thousand Club, a fellowship of loyal Democrats, each of whom will contribute a minimum of $25 per year.

With this steady monetary support it will be possible for cornhusker democracy to discard half measures and to proceed unfalteringly to its rightful place of leadership and influence. This letter is an invitation to you to join your fellow Democrats in an act of loyal devotion and become a charter member of this inner-party organization.

All worth-while organizations, the home, the church, the school, and the party must have financial support in order to exist. The opposition party is able to keep its treasury overflowing with gifts from big business and special interests. But the Democratic Party is the party of the people and it is to you, as one of the people who make our party great, we turn at this critical hour and ask for your loyal financial assistance. We have faith that you will do your full part in unfurling the banners of democracy that they may fly triumphant over Nebraska.

As a charter member of the One Thousand Club you will not only receive a membership card for your wallet, but also an attractive certificate of membership, suitable for framing, with your name in large letters and signed by National Committeeman James C. Quigley and by the State chairman. Please fill out the enclosed application card and your promptness in returning it will be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

H. B. "COUNT" RILEY,
Democratic State Treasurer.
PAUL R. BUSCH,
Executive Assistant to the State Treasurer.

ONE THOUSAND CLUB,
Howells, Nebr., October 30, 1946.

Next week is election week and on Tuesday we expect a request from party officials for a complete list of persons who have financed the present campaign by their membership in the One Thousand Club and also a list of those persons who were invited to join, but who did not do so.

The minimum annual membership fee is $25 and it is our sincere hope that you will join the One Thousand Club. The party has been fair with you and I know you want to be fair with the party.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL R. BUSCH,
Assistant State Treasurer.

DEMOCRATIC STATE COMMITTEE,
Fairbury, Nebr., January 18, 1947.

DEAR POSTMASTER: A meeting of the Democratic State Policy Committee was held at the Cornhusker Hotel at Lincoln the first week of this month. At that session the committee authorized the One Thousand Club to continue its successful activities as the official collection agency of the Democratic Party in Nebraska. The committee members also instructed the One Thousand Club, acting as an agency of the State Treasurer's office, to undertake other activities on behalf of the party.

In preparation for these assignments, we need your help in correcting and enlarging our mailing list. Will you please list on the back of this letter all the employees in your postoffice, giving the name, address, and position of each? An envelope is enclosed for your convenience and your prompt cooperation will be deeply appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

H. B. RILEY,
State Treasurer.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, Democratic policy has nothing to do with the question. The Democrats passed this law in 1938. They went before the people of America, including the distinguished Senator from Illinois, and said, "Look how pure we are. Look at our snow-white complexion and our wings. We are asking everybody to vote for the Democratic ticket, because we have wiped out forever the iniquitous practice of throwing everybody out of the Post Office Department." They went before the country as a great reform party. They talked about Albert Fall and his little bag, and many other things which they said the Republicans had done that were wrong; but they were going to reform things.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield.

Among other things they said when they passed the Civil Service Act blanketing in the postmasters was that from that time on, when the Democrats got in, they would not throw out Republicans and when the Republicans got in they would not throw out the Democrats. I have the debates before me. In 1938, when this act was passed, they said, "We are going to have a real Post Office Department. We are going to rate the employees on efficiency and ability, and not

on politics." I have before me a letter which shows that in one town a little more than $8,000 was paid in a short time. The letter reads in part as follows:

I am in receipt of a letter which reads as follows:

"During the past 3 years 254"—

I shall not read the name of the town—

"254 ——— post office supervisory officials and employees have purchased 329 Jackson Day dinners for a total of $8,225."

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am a member of the committee of which the Senator from North Dakota is the fine chairman. The committee has decided to investigate post-office appointments. I did not vote for that procedure, but the committee voted to investigate the subject. I intend to vote for the resolution reported by the committee. I shall vote to provide the money for this investigation. I believe that if we can only reach a vote on the resolution, we can get the money.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in view of the statement of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, who is the ranking Democratic member of my committee, I shall follow his advice and relinquish the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think if we can only vote, we can get the money.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the resolution which is before the Senate seeks an appropriation of $35,000 to investigate the Post Office Department and some of the political activities of the Democratic Party during the past 8 or 10 years. It is desired to ascertain "whether any postmasters on threat of losing their positions have been compelled to pay tribute financially or otherwise to anyone or to a group of politicians."

Suppose we should discover that to be the case. What are we to do about it after we find it out?

Also it is desired to determine "whether there has been an attempt to compel men and women occupying the position of postmaster to violate the Hatch Act and to investigate any and all collateral matters which the testimony may develop."

Suppose we should find that someone had tried to compel some of these postmasters to violate the Hatch Act? What would we do about it? I have been in the Congress of the United States for a long time, at least it seems like a long time. In that time I have never run across a resolution just like this one. In this economy-minded Congress an appropriation of $35,000 is asked to investigate the appointment of postmasters in the past 8 or 10 years. Every other day in the Senate or in the House of Representatives we hear Members of Congress condemning the President of the United States because he has requested a budget of thirty-seven and a half billion dollars.

They are doing everything they can with a meat ax, whether it be right or wrong, to place the President of the United States in a bad light, as far as these recommendations are concerned. And yet there has not been a time in the history of the Senate of the United States—and I shall have the figures—where we have appropriated and spent as much money in this body in an equal number of months as has been spent since the Republican control. Here we come along with another $35,000 resolution to provide for sending out 11 investigators throughout the United States. For what reasons? For political reasons, of course; and nothing else—to send them out in order to make some headlines. We shall be paying 11 investigators to go out and snoop around and find out from a disgruntled fellow why he did not get a job as postmaster. They will try to find out something that is detrimental to some Democrats in the country.

I have never seen as many investigations in all my life as we are witnessing at this time. Some of these days before we get through we shall have to appoint a committee of investigators to investigate the investigators.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I want to cooperate with the Senator from Illinois and prove to the country that Democrats are honest.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is not going to get me to quit.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the Senator is so solicitous about getting some postmasters confirmed, the sooner he quits the sooner he will get them confirmed.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is not going to delay me by a threat of that kind.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am not talking about a threat, but about sincerity of purpose.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator does not need to question my sincerity of purpose at all in reference to what I am saying about postmasters.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think the Senator from Illinois knows what he is doing also in connection with playing politics.

Mr. LUCAS. I would not attempt to discuss that question with the Senator from New Mexico, where they play politics 365 days in the year.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LUCAS. I will not yield at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois declines to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. These investigators are to be paid a monthly salary of $833.33. A lawyer is going to represent the committee of investigators—this crowd of snoopers who are going after the Democrats. There is a chief investigator who is going to be paid $7,628 a year, and another investigator to be paid $5,696. There are four assistant investigators. Each investigator in the field is to be paid at the rate of $5,116.32. Then there is a secretary. They have to have a secretary to run this show, and they are going to have two stenographic clerks. The secretary will receive a salary of $3,000 and the stenographic clerks $2,040. In addition to that, they must have some field investigations. They must pay office expenses. They must set up a big office as a result of some Democrats appointing some Democratic postmasters in the last 8 or 10 years. Of course, the Republicans never appointed Republicans while they were in power. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has been in the Senate a long time, and he knows that Republicans never play any politics in connection with Republican postmasters. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], that great paragon of political virtue, has the temerity to stand on the floor of the Senate this afternoon and tell about the many Democrats who have been appointed postmasters throughout the country, as though that were an evil and a sin.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad to yield to my friend from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. We have some Republican counties in Georgia and the State officers in those counties are Republicans. When the Republicans are in power certain persons can be seen removing from the Republican counties to counties where there are no Republicans in order that there may be some Republican there to be the beneficiary of an appointment as postmaster.

Mr. LUCAS. It bears out what I thought the Republicans would do when in power. I never had any experience with them when they were in power. They always consulted my Republican friends in my county. I thought that was all right. I never expected them to talk to me about postmasters.

I am satisfied that the great Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], in his zeal to get at the truth about this situation, has no politics in mind at all. He just wants to investigate the matter for the purpose of cleaning up the Civil Service Commission and the Post Office Department. Of course, it will in no wise relate to the Republican Party. He has no political motive in mind.

The Senator from North Dakota has some other things in this resolution. There will be a clipping service to take care of clippings all over the country. I imagine that if the newspapers say anything about this little debate, there will be a couple of fellows with scissors clipping it out and putting it into the scrapbook of the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sure that the Senator from North Dakota will employ some Democrats in connection with these other positions.

Mr. LUCAS. Oh, there is no doubt about that. I am sure that 60 percent of the investigators and assistant investigators will be Democrats.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. With respect to what the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] said a moment ago, I am glad that he made the statement that there are some Republican officeholders in some counties in Georgia. I had always

had a different impression. It seems to me that the Senator from Vermont said that it was his impression last year that they let a few Republicans vote in Georgia, and at the next election they are thinking about counting their votes. I am glad to know that there are some Republican officeholders in Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I doubt not that there are as many Republican officeholders in Georgia as there are Democratic officeholders in the State of Iowa. I am sure that there are more than there are in the State of Vermont. We in Georgia have been letting the Republican vote and have been counting their votes always, but I understand the only times Democratic votes were ever counted in Iowa were in 1932 and 1936. Neither before nor since that time have they done more than estimate them.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I will say to the Senator from Georgia that his State does not work any harder to keep Republicans from holding office there than we work in Iowa to keep the Democrats from holding office. So I think we have something in common.

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad that the Senators have something in common.

Mr. President, in this budget a multigraph machine and a mimeograph machine are also provided for. What are they going to do with those machines? What will they do after they get one of these big stories about Oak Park or some other post office in Illinois? I suppose they will multigraph it and mimeograph it and send it out through the country hoping to do something detrimental to the Senator from Illinois. They are quite free to go into every post office in the State of Illinois and send individuals out there to examine the Senator from Illinois. They can send all their investigators out there and keep them there for the next 4 months, as far as the Senator from Illinois is concerned.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. It occurs to me that these machines may be the means of providing the fodder for the clipping service.

Mr. LUCAS. There may be something in the Senator's suggestion. There may be a connection there. I am not quite able to understand it.

As we examine this estimated budget we find that it is a wonderful one. I have never before seen anything like it.

Mr. RUSSELL. The multigraph machine could be used in connection with press releases, and the clipping service would clip the press releases and put them into a scrap book.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator has discovered something here which has probably been hidden in the brain of the Senator from North Dakota. I think he has made a valuable contribution. But so much for this budget. Let me say to the Senator and to the minority leader, who seems to be tremendously interested in this debate, that so far as the Senator from Illinois is concerned, he does not care too much about the $35,000 which is to be spent in this matter. If that is the way you want to spend it you have the votes to pass the resolution. However, I say it is another foolish expenditure upon the part of the Republicans. They will not get anything out of it other than a few meager headlines for the Republican Party next year.

I am saying in all seriousness that the Republican Party should permit these people, many of them veterans, who have qualified under the civil service rules and regulations, to be appointed postmasters in their communities. The confirmation of these appointments should not be delayed longer. You do a great injustice to 900 deserving and patriotic Americans. You forget the 350 servicemen who fought that a United States Senate might continue.

Mr. President, I say that those on the other side of the aisle are making a monumental political mistake if they continue to put off action on these postmaster nominations, and if they think they will be able to put them off until the Congress adjourns and then, when the Congress convenes next year, do the same thing again. I say that the people of the United States will not stand for that kind of political treatment.

Mr. President, I am surprised that those who are tremendously interested in the civil service, including the various national organizations which are interested in seeing that civil-service laws are properly administered, have not taken up the cudgel for these 900 or 1,000 persons who have passed the civil-service examination for postmaster, and now are either No. 1, No. 2, or No. 3 on the eligible list. Even though they stand in that position, their nominations are held up for months and months by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota because he has a peeve on Jim Farley as a result of something that happened 7 or 8 years ago.

Mr. President, sooner or later the people who are interested in this Government and who wish to see that the civil-service laws are enforced, will begin to demand of the Senate that something be done to bring about the reporting of the nominations of these men. There are no charges against these applicants who have been selected by the Civil Service Commission and whose names have been submitted to the Senate for its approval. No complaints are filed against them before the committee. But the Senator from North Dakota talks about two or three cases in Illinois because someone who was No. 1 on the eligible list was not appointed. The Senator from North Dakota is all hot and bothered about that. However, he knows that under the law, either the No. 1 or the No. 2 or the No. 3 person on the eligible list can be appointed, provided a veteran is not passed over. The Senator from North Dakota knows that as well as anyone else does. It is pure balderdash to think that the Senator from North Dakota, if he had the opportunity to select postmasters in his State, would not exercise that judgment of his on either the No. 1 or the No. 2 or the No. 3 person on the eligibility list. O Mr. President, that great political philanthropist would give the appointment to the person who was No. 1 on the list, and he would turn down his friend who was No. 2 on the list. He is just that kind of a fellow. Certainly he would do that if he ever had an opportunity to do it, because I know that the Senator from North Dakota is one of those fellows who wants to be a stickler for law and order, and he is going to have the man who is No. 1 on the list appointed to the position, regardless of who he is.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I was going to state that at the time when the act of 1938, which has been referred to by the Senator, was passed and when the conference report on it was taken up on the floor of the Senate, the following colloquy occurred:

Mr. WALSH. Does the conference report contain a provision giving the Executive the right to make a selection of any one candidate for postmaster among the three eligibles certified by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. O'MAHONEY—

Who had charge of the bill—

The bill itself does not contain that provision, because it is unnecessary. As the Senator knows, under the civil-service law, whenever an eligible register is established, the Civil Service Commission, under the regulations now in force, certifies to the appointing officer the names of the three highest persons. That practice will, I understand, be followed under this bill if it becomes a law.

In other words, the procedure with respect to the selection of postmasters is exactly the same as the procedure in connection with the selection of any other civil-service employees. The list is sent to a Department official, and he has the list, and he may select any one of the three that he pleases. That practice applies to postmasters as well as to all other appointees for any other civil-service positions.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course that is so. It is astounding that any Senator would attempt to intimate that the matter is handled in any other way, or that a person who selects No. 3 instead of No. 2 has almost committed a crime, and that such a procedure is not correct. It is scarcely worth while to comment about such a position, Mr. President.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Let me say that the distinguished Senator from Illinois, that in his nonpartisan speech on this subject——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I know I shall hear such a speech now.

Mr. BRIDGES. And in his great speech about why national organizations who are interested in the civil service should have rushed forward to protest about these nominations, perhaps he has overlooked what may be the reason for the situation. Could it be that all three on the list were rejected because they were not good, top Democrats, and so another examination was held? Could that be the reason?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am surprised at the Senator's question. I am utterly astounded that my good friend does not know about the eligible list. I am sure that if he had conferred with the Senator from North Dakota, his distinguished brother, he could have told

him all about that situation. Much has been said about the holding of another examination when there are three eligibles. I challenge any Senator to find a case where there have been three eligibles on the register submitted by the Civil Service Commission and where there has ever been another examination, unless one of the three eligibles resigned or withdrew or died or moved out of the State, or became ineligible for some such reason. Of course, if one of the eligibles died or withdrew, leaving only two eligibles on the list, another examination could be called. But as long as there are three persons on the eligible list, under the civil-service law it is not possible to order another examination.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, does the Senator from Illinois suggest, then, that unless one of the persons on the eligible list dies or unless some other terrible thing happens to him, the Civil Service Commission never orders a new examination?

Mr. LUCAS. Insofar as my knowledge goes—and I have had considerable experience with this matter during the 14 years I have been a Member of the House of Representatives and the Senate—that is the case.

Mr. President, there is no use beating around the bush about this matter. Everyone knows that when the Republicans are in power, the Republican Senators control the postmaster nominations.

Since the Democrats have been in power, they have taken corresponding action, subject to the civil-service restrictions in the law of 1938. The Senate certainly has the right to control the nominations and to take the recommendations of either the Republican or the Democratic organization in connection with such matters.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, is it not a coincidence that in connection with all the examinations which have been given, such a relatively few Republicans have been placed on the eligible lists?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, there is no doubt that under a Democratic administration, if a Democrat is on the eligible list and if he can be appointed, he will be appointed. A similar or corresponding situation exists under Republican administrations. That is true, and it is clearly understood.

Yet, I stated the other day that out of the 900 persons involved, at least 54 of them, as I recall, had held post-office appointments prior to 1932, which would indicate that most of these postmasters are Republicans.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator has said that, of course, this is true and it is what the Republicans did under this law and it is what the Democrats did. It is my understanding that this law was not in effect when the Republicans were in control of the administration. Is that correct?

Mr. LUCAS. The 1938 law is a more stringent law. It removes post-office appointments further away from the political field, and places them under the same rules which govern all Federal civil-service appointments.

The Democrats passed it. In other words, if there are three on the eligible list, and they are all Republicans, there is not a thing the Senator from Illinois can do except to appoint a Republican, and just recently I did that very thing. If a qualified Democrat had been on the list, I probably would have appointed the Democrat.

Mr. BRIDGES. I congratulate the Senator from Illinois for approving a Republican. I knew he had some nonpartisan feeling.

Mr. LUCAS. I have approved a number of Republicans in my State for appointment as postmasters.

Mr. BRIDGES. I congratulate the Senator, because it shows that he is not actuated by partisanship.

Mr. LUCAS. I get along pretty well with the Republicans.

Mr. BRIDGES. The main purpose of the 1938 change was to give life jobs to all deserving New Deal Democrats who were in office; was it not? That was the principal reason for Mr. Roosevelt's advocacy and the passage of that act by an overwhelming New Deal Democratic Congress, to give all the deserving New Deal Democrats life jobs, was it not?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not believe that is a correct statement of the facts.

Mr. BRIDGES. Can the Senator think of any other reason?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator and his Republican colleagues have the power to repeal this law now if they do not like it, and the chances are they will do it some of these days. Senators on the other side keep talking about New Deal measures, and I have yet to see a single Republican in this Congress offering a measure to repeal outright a single New Deal law that has been put on the statute books. They should start pretty soon asking for repeal, or stop talking about it.

Mr. BRIDGES. I agree with the Senator, and if the Republican majority has not done it in some instances, they are certainly a little negligent.

Mr. LUCAS. They certainly are, because they have talked enough about it, and it is time for action.

Mr. BRIDGES. I agree with the Senator; I think we should have some action on it.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if the Senator from Illinois will yield, will the Senator from New Hampshire advise us which New Deal measures he thinks should be repealed?

Mr. BRIDGES. I have run across a number of them in the Committee on Appropriations which I should be very glad to see repealed, and there are many more. I will not give the answer now, but let me tell Senators one little example that came before me a few days ago. This relates to the Civil Service, too. It involves the matter of pensions.

Under the New Deal there was passed an act providing that workers on the Panama Canal who were American citizens should receive pensions for life. Whether or not that was right or wrong, it was done. I personally was not for it, but it was done. Then they put through a little innocuous act. It was to amend section so and so, chapter so and so of public act so and so, by providing that it shall apply to those who became American citizens after such and such a date.

An item of some $578,000 came before the Committee on Appropriations, and when we started to look into it, we found that little innocuous act granting pensions for life to many who had become American citizens since the passage of the act, so that the people from some foreign countries would come to the United States and qualify for citizenship, qualify for a pension for life, and then go back home to their former countries and live like kings.

Mr. LUCAS. I am surprised the learned and careful Senator did not find out about that long before now.

Mr. BRIDGES. It just came up. I cite it as the type of legislation that was passed by an overwhelming New Deal Congress, and what we are up against.

I personally think we could profitably put a corps of able lawyers to work just reviewing the legislation of the last 15 years, to look into it and to recommend to the next Congress the acts and parts of acts which should be repealed. It would be one of the best things that could be done for the Nation.

Mr. LUCAS. I think that would be very much more constructive than the resolution the Senator is about to support. I think I would support a resolution of the kind the Senator suggests. I think the laws should be reviewed every so often. If the Senator wants to get up a list of the New Deal measures which he feels should be repealed, I should like to take a look at it some time.

I wish the Senator from now on would refer to the Roosevelt administration as it was and not as the "New Deal" unless he advocates by action the repeal of all those so-called obnoxious measures.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am sorry the Senator is getting touchy about the term "New Deal."

Mr. LUCAS. I am not touchy about it.

Mr. BRIDGES. If it gets on the Senator's nerves for me to refer to it as the "New Deal," I certainly do not care to offend him.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator could not offend me at all, because I like him too much.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota was kind enough to include in the RECORD the minority views that were filed on the resolution. On page 6 of the minority views appears an answer to a letter I addressed to the First Assistant Postmaster General, in which he stated that at the time the report was filed 639 nominations had been submitted. I should like to bring that table down to date by including in the RECORD as part of my remarks a statement showing that since January 3, 1947, 927 nominations have been filed. The statement is in exactly the same form as that which appears in the report, and it brings the information down to date. I should like to have the statement in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. Since January 3, 1947, 927 nominations have been submitted by the President to the Senate of persons to be appointed postmasters at Presidential offices, that is, post offices of the first, second, and third classes.

2. Of the 927 nominations, 501 were selections of the highest eligible on the register submitted by the Civil Service Commission. Of this 501, 243 have military preference.

3. One hundred and twenty-five selections were made of the second eligible on the register submitted by the Civil Service Commission and of this 125, 82 have military preference.

4. The third eligible on the registers submitted by the Civil Service Commission was selected in 61 instances and, of this number, 39 have military preference.

5. Of the total number of 927 nominations submitted to the Senate, 417 have military preference.

6. Of these 927 nominations, 148 involve the reappointment of the incumbent postmasters where the offices have been advanced from fourth to third class. These reappointments were made under the act of May 20, 1944. Of the 148 postmasters nominated for reappointment, 20 have military preference.

7. The promotion of a classified employee is involved in 81 of these nominations. That is, 81 nominations are for the promotion of employees in the classified postal service and of this 81 so recommended for promotion, 33 have military preference.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to make some reference to the amendment I intend to offer. It provides a time limit to the resolution. It has been a practice of the Rules Committee, when special committees were authorized to put a time limit on them. I have submitted the amendment to the Senator from North Dakota, and he has no objection to it, and I ask that it be stated by the clerk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is aware of the fact, is he not, that several committee amendments are yet to be considered?

Mr. HAYDEN. There was no unanimous-consent agreement that the committee amendments were to be considered first.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. HAYDEN. Let the clerk read it. There may be some objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to insert the following at the end of the resolution:

The authority conferred by this resolution shall expire on January 15, 1948, and the report of the committee shall be filed with the Senate on or before said date.

Mr. LANGER. I have no objection, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from Maine what his purpose is as to taking a recess? I do not think we can finish with the resolution tonight.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I was about to make an inquiry of Senators on the other side as to whether we could not dispose of this matter this evening. I think the amendment which has just been offered by the Senator from Arizona, and which has been accepted, must remove many of the objections which Senators may have had. Could we not vote on the resolution at this time?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not think so. I think there are other Senators who desire to speak on it tomorrow. I should like to have the Senate take a recess until tomorrow.

Mr. WHITE. I think we had better continue in session for a while, then, and see if we can come to some conclusion later.

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Millikin
Ball	Hayden	Moore
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Morse
Bridges	Hill	Murray
Brooks	Hoey	O'Conor
Buck	Holland	O'Mahoney
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Overton
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Pepper
Byrd	Kem	Reed
Cain	Kilgore	Revercomb
Capper	Knowland	Robertson, Wyo.
Chavez	Langer	Russell
Connally	Lucas	Saltonstall
Cooper	McCarran	Sparkman
Cordon	McCarthy	Taft
Donnell	McClellan	Taylor
Downey	McFarland	Thye
Dworshak	McGrath	Vandenberg
Eastland	McKellar	Watkins
Ecton	McMahon	Wherry
Ellender	Magnuson	White
Ferguson	Malone	Wiley
Flanders	Martin	Williams
George	Maybank	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, as I understand, the Senator from Illinois does not wish a vote tonight on the pending measure.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is not present. The resolution was taken up by unanimous consent this afternoon during my absence. I am sure that the Senator from Maryland wishes to make a statement on the resolution; indeed, three or four other Senators wish to discuss it. As I understand, there is nothing to do tomorrow.

Mr. TAFT. Would the Senator be willing to agree to a vote at some hour tomorrow?

Mr. LUCAS. Certainly.

Mr. TAFT. What hour does the Senator suggest? Would 2 or 3 o'clock be agreeable to him?

Mr. LUCAS. Three thirty or four o'clock in the afternoon would be agreeable to me.

Mr. TAFT. Would the Senator make it 3 o'clock? In that event, any Senator who wished to speak on the Reed bill could do so after 3 o'clock.

Mr. LUCAS. I believe 3:30 would allow plenty of time.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 3:30 o'clock p. m. tomorrow the Senate proceed to vote on Senate Resolution 81 and any amendments or motions relating thereto, and that the time be equally divided between the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the order is made.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as reduced to writing, is as follows:

Ordered, That on the calendar day of Tuesday, June 17, 1947, at the hour of 3:30 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed, without further debate, to vote upon any amendment or motion that may be pending, or that may be proposed to, the resolution (S. Res. 81) authorizing the Committee on Civil Service to investigate the appointment of first-, second-, and third-class postmasters, and upon the question of agreeing to the resolution as amended.

Ordered further, That the time intervening between the meeting of the Senate on said day and the hour of 3:30 o'clock p. m. be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of the resolution, to be controlled, respectively, by the Senator from North Dakota, Mr. LANGER and the Senator from Illinois, Mr. LUCAS.

MEETING OF SUBCOMMITTEE DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce begins hearings tomorrow morning on a communications bill. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee be granted permission to sit during the remainder of this week while the Senate is in session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, permission is granted.

RECESS

Mr. WHITE. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 17, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 16 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Herschel V. Johnson, of North Carolina, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister of the United States of America.

Ellis O. Briggs, of Maine, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Uruguay.

William J. Sebald, of the District of Columbia, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 2, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

Donald D. Edgar, of New Jersey, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 3, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

Charles D. Withers, of South Carolina, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 5, a vice consul of career, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6,

vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Thomas Boylan, Jr., of Pennsylvania
David C. Cuthell, of Connecticut.
Robert D. Davis, of Oklahoma.
John B. Dexter, of Maryland.
Leon G. Dorros, of New York.
John N. Gatch, Jr., of Ohio.
Andrew W. Green, of Pennsylvania.
Norman B. Hannah, of Illinois.
Gergory Henderson, of Massachusetts.
William W. Kaufmann, of New York.
John Keppel, of the District of Columbia.
Richard M. McCarthy, of Iowa.
Francis T. McCoy, of Florida.
Ellwood M. Rabenold, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
John W. Rozier, of Georgia.
Samuel O. Ruff, of North Carolina.
William E. Scott, of Illinois.
Ernest L. Stanger, of Utah.
William Perry Stedman, Jr., of Maryland.
Philip H. Valdes, of New York.
Theodore A. Wahl, of New York.
Stephen Winship, of Massachusetts.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Irving J. Higbee, of New York, to be United States attorney for the northern district of New York. (Mr. Higbee is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired April 16, 1947.)

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Loomis E. Cranor, of Kentucky, to be United States marshal for the western district of Kentucky. (Mr. Cranor is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires June 14, 1947.)

DISTRICT ATTORNEY, DISTRICT COURT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Francisco Corneiro, of the Virgin Islands, to be district attorney for the District Court of the Virgin Islands, vice James A. Bough, resigned.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidate for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

To be surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of oath of office:

Lydia B. Edwards

The following-named candidates for promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

Surgeon to be senior surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel):

Hiram J. Bush

Senior dental surgeon to be dental director (equivalent to the Army rank of colonel):

Stanmore P. Marshall

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO ADJUTANT GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Lt. Col. Cranford Coleman Bryan Warden, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from August 4, 1944.

Maj. Robert Loomis Anderson, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 13, 1946.

Maj. Thomas Edward Pickett Barbour, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1943.

TO ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

Maj. Nelson Marquis Lynde, Jr., Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 13, 1946.

TO AIR CORPS

Lt. Col. Gilbert Hayden, Signal Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 14, 1945.

Maj. George Harold Graham, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from November 9, 1946.

Maj. Harold Elworthy Todd, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 20, 1945.

Capt. Henry James Heuer, Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from January 13, 1947.

Capt. Robert Muirhead Reed, Quartermaster Corps (temporary major), with rank from December 17, 1940.

First Lt. Earl Morse Bradford, Ordnance Department (temporary major), with rank from January 11, 1943.

First Lt. William Kneedler Cummins, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 11, 1944.

First Lt. Frederick Charles Engelman, Finance Department (temporary major), with rank from December 7, 1944.

First Lt. Edgar Max McGinnis, Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 10, 1944.

First Lt. Edward Blakslee Reed, Quartermaster Corps (temporary captain), with rank from March 14, 1944.

First Lt. Milton Frederick Ritterbush, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from May 11, 1941.

First Lt. Joe Neal Swanger, Quartermaster Corps (temporary captain), with rank from November 10, 1945.

First Lt. Robert Andrew Wys, Chemical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from October 26, 1944.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 16, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

To Thee, our Father, out of the busy voices of life, we lift our breath in prayer. In Thy providential guidance Thou hast not dealt more tenderly with any other nation; therefore, make us humble and grateful, and lift us to the realization that, if our country is to be saved, it must serve with emphasis the spiritual and moral values. Keep in our remembrance that life consists not in the abundance of things we possess.

Today, bowed in the shadows of tragic sorrows, we see many hopes and prospects tragically shattered. We pray for Thy special comfort and peace to abide with the valiant ones who suffer from the inexorable uncertainties of fate. In the viewless light of stricken homes, O nourish them with all Thy goodness, and when their sunset pales to dusk, give them Thy hand that bids all weary ones to rest.

"There is a Power whose care
Teaches thy way along that pathless coast,
The desert and illimitable air,
Lone wandering, but not lost.

* * * * *

He who, from zone to zone,
Guides through the boundless sky thy certain flight,
In the long way that I must tread alone,
Will lead my steps aright."

Hear us, O Lord, and give us Thy peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 13, 1947, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On April 28, 1947:

H. R. 2102. An act to provide for a 6 months' extension and final liquidation of the farm labor supply program, and for other purposes, and

H. R. 2413. An act to amend the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes.

On April 30, 1947:

H. J. Res. 140. Joint resolution to restore the name of Hoover Dam.

On June 14, 1947:

H. R. 1288. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant a private right-of-way to Roscoe L. Wood.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Times-Herald.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Daily Jefferson County Union of Fort Atkinson, Wis.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper item.

Mr. ROBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Minneapolis Tribune.

Mr. BUFFETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include some editorial and news material.

Mr. RAMEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address made by Edward F. Poss, past grand worthy president of the Fraternal Order of Eagles.

Mr. JONES of Washington asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Seattle Times.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial entitled "A Fairy Tale Forms."

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE NATIONAL HOUSING SHORTAGE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a resolution calling for the appointment by the Speaker of a select committee to investigate the national housing shortage. It is shocking and inexcusable that the critical housing shortage should be allowed to go unchallenged almost 2 years after the ending of the war. I believe that the vast majority of the American people are tired of labor, industry, and government bickering about who is guilty in "the case of the missing home."

Mr. Speaker, I am the sponsor in the House of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill, H. R. 2523, the only comprehensive housing measure seeking to do something about the housing shortage, but I am by now convinced that the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House does not plan to hold hearings on this measure this session—though I asked for them as long ago as April 26—and in any case the facts developed by the proposed investigation are essential to the effective functioning of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill when enacted.

The Committee on Banking and Currency may well believe that private enterprise will within the next 6 months make the turn upward from the disastrously low point of housing construction where we now stand. Whether or not this be a vain hope, whether excessive costs of building materials and labor and unduly restrictive municipal building codes make it impossible for private enterprise to do the job under present conditions for the moderate- and low-income groups, will be determined while Congress is in recess. Unless we authorize this investigation, we will be charged with completely neglecting America's No. 1 domestic problem at a time when its solution hangs in the balance. We will be coming back here, not to enact a high-priority emergency program if the situation continues to be as catastrophic as it is now, but we will be arguing about where to place the blame.

Mr. Speaker, this investigation of America's No. 1 domestic problem is Congress' No. 1 domestic must.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and that they be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MILLER of Nebraska addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

TERMINAL-LEAVE BONDS

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, it is rumored that the President intends to veto the tax bill, and it is also the general understanding that it will not be possible to override his veto; therefore I want to make a suggestion, particularly to the leadership on my side of the aisle, and that is this, that we immediately arrange to pay or make negotiable the terminal-leave bonds that were given to the GI's who served this country during the war. That is an obligation of the Government, it is an obligation that should be met, and we can make them negotiable so that those who need the money can cash in their bonds and those who want to retain the bonds and draw interest for the 5 years can do so. In that way we will be paying off on the debt and we will be meeting the obligations of the men who served in the armed forces.

On January 3, I introduced H. R. 170 which provided for the payment of terminal leave bonds for those who need the money. I am urging that the bill introduced by myself or some similar measure be reported by the committee and submitted to the House for action before the adjournment of the present session of Congress. This law should be enacted before we adjourn.

CONFERRING OF HONORARY DEGREE UPON SPEAKER MARTIN

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Tufts College bestowed upon our distinguished and beloved Speaker the honorary degree of doctor of laws. Two weeks ago he was awarded the same degree by the Pennsylvania Military College, and last month he was made a doctor of civil law by Boston University.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to extend to you congratulations on these academic honors that recently have been bestowed upon you.

Such honors come to few men. They are a recognition of the outstanding contribution you have made, and continue to make, to the welfare of our great country. They attest to your ability. And, more than that, Mr. Speaker, they attest to the intellectual honesty, high purpose, and devotion to God and country with which you have applied the exceptional talents that are yours.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure I express the unanimous sentiment of this House when I say we are proud of you. It is a great privilege to serve in this body, as a Representative of the people. And we can be sure that so long as men of your character and ability are selected to preside there will always be a House of Representatives where the rights of all the people, of whatever political faith, will find protection.

In the fullest sense of the word, Mr. Speaker, you are one of the Nation's great. Those who honor you bring honor to themselves. In congratulating you we are congratulating ourselves in having you as our presiding officer.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I take this moment to say that every word uttered by the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], is echoed by me and every Member on this side of the aisle. It makes us proud of the institution of which we are a part that we have as the head of that institution a man who deserves these high and distinguished honors.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am particularly pleased with the honors conferred upon our Speaker, and more particularly because of the honor conferred by Boston University, because that makes the distinguished Speaker and myself both honorary degree men of that great university.

As the gentleman from Indiana well said, the honor conferred upon the Speaker is one that is, in fact, conferred upon the entire House. The gentleman from Massachusetts, our distinguished Speaker [Mr. MARTIN], is beloved by every Member of the House regardless of party. Throughout the many years of our association, myself a Democrat and the Speaker a Republican, there has been a most profound feeling of respect on my part for him and a strong feeling of friendship, which I know is reciprocated by him.

I join with our distinguished majority leader in the fine words of commendation that he has expressed, and in the expression of appreciation to these great universities for the deserved recognition that they have conferred upon our distinguished and beloved Speaker.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. I have had the honor, pleasure, and distinction of serving under nine different Speakers. They were all great Americans, patriotic, honorable men. I did not at all times agree with all of them, but I feel that they were fair and conducted themselves as real men. With all the love that I have had for many of the Democratic Speakers, I want to say that our present Speaker, JOE MARTIN, undoubtedly will be recognized by history as a fair and firm presiding officer who reflects credit on his high office. I join with the gentleman from Indiana, the gentleman from Texas, and the gentleman from Massachusetts in congratulating the Speaker upon the honor that has been given him, and I hope it will not be the last one that will be his.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to add just a word to what has been said. I have never known a man to preside over this House with more ability and impartiality than our present Speaker.

He is a great American. He is rendering a great service to his country and he richly deserves the honors that have been bestowed upon him.

AIR ACCIDENTS

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce whose unhappy duty it is to make investigations of air accidents, may I say that we are very much concerned over the accident which occurred last Friday evening. Let me also say for the benefit of the Members of the House that in these three accidents which have occurred recently there is no apparent similarity. I, myself, cannot see as yet any apparent reason for condemning any aircraft or personnel. However, the subcommittee of which I have the honor to be chairman will do what it can to learn as rapidly as possible the cause of this third of a series of accidents and to make any recommendations that we may feel desirable.

AIR SAFETY

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, President Truman yesterday named a five-man special fact-finding board to make an investigation into air safety. The members of the board are Dr. Jerome C. Hunsaker, Chairman of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; Brig. Gen. M. W. Arnold, vice president of the Air Transport Association; James M. Landis, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board; H. B. Cox, American Air Lines pilot; and Theodore P. Wright, Civil Aeronautics Administrator.

As chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I should like to call the attention of the House to the fact that in the course of the committee's extensive hearings on air safety the committee has had occasion to hear the testimony of all of these men or representatives of the organizations which they represent. The committee heard both Mr. Landis and Mr. Wright, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board and Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Authority, respectively. Mr. John W. Crowley, Jr., acting director of research, appeared before the committee on behalf of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. General Arnold, as well as Mr. Ramspeck, a former Member of this House, appeared on behalf of the Air Transport Association. Finally, the Air Line Pilots Association was represented by its president, David L. Behncke, and members of the association employed by different air lines appeared; Ernest A. Cutrell, American Airlines; Robert N. Buck, Transworld; J. E. Wood, Eastern Air Lines, in addition to John M. Dickinson and Brant W. Phillips, appeared before this committee and gave testimony.

It will be the purpose of this committee to make available to the new investigating board appointed by the President all of the testimony and other information supplied to this committee by over a hundred witnesses who appeared in the course of the committee's air-safety investigation. It is my fervent hope that the new board will be able to further add to our knowledge as to how to prevent recurrences of these accidents.

I assure the House that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will continue its own investigation, of all air accidents in recent months, and, of course, include those that have so recently happened.

It is expected that the committee will be in a position to make a report on the over-all study it has made within the next 2 weeks or so.

WEATHER OVER THE WATER GATE

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, today is a most unusual day in the history of weather. At the risk of infringing upon the prerogatives of the Weather Bureau, I should like to give an entirely unofficial but likely prognostication of the meteorological conditions to be expected in this city for the next 24 hours.

A low-pressure area is expected to reach Washington early this evening, accompanied by mounting temperatures. It will center at Water Gate, on the Potomac, and will be accompanied by high winds, blowing alternately hot and cold. Freezing temperatures can be expected in the vicinity of 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue and on the minority side of the House of Representatives. Silver clouds will be in evidence, turning a deeper red about nightfall. Gentle variable winds emanating in eastern Europe will increase to tornado proportions and all loose items in the way of foreign policy and dollar credits should be battened down. Tomorrow, fair and warmer.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address made by our colleague, the gentleman from Texas, Hon. SAM RAYBURN, at the annual dinner of the New Jersey Bar Association last Saturday evening.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Rotarian.

LEWIS DESCHLER, DOCTOR OF LAWS

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, on June 6, 1947, the honorary degree of doctor of laws was conferred upon the Honorable Lewis Deschler, Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives, by the National University School of Law. The ceremony conferring this degree upon Mr. Deschler was held at the United States Chamber of Commerce Building, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C.

George P. Barse, as chancelor of the National University, in conferring upon Mr. Deschler the honorary degree of doctor of laws, had the following to say:

At this point I take pleasure in presenting the Honorable Lewis Deschler, Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives, as a candidate for the honorary degree of doctor of laws.

Mr. Deschler has held the office of Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives for more than 20 years. Appointment to that high office is personal with each Speaker elected by the House, and the fact that Mr. Deschler has served continuously during a period of more than 20 years demonstrates his outstanding ability and qualifications for that office and the efficiency with which he performs his duties. During his term of office and up to the present time the following have been Speakers of the House: Hon. Nicholas Longworth, Hon. John N. Garner, Hon. Henry T. Rainey, Hon. Joseph W. Byrnes, Hon. William B. Bankhead, Hon. Sam Rayburn, Hon. Joseph W. Martin.

Some of the outstanding phases of his record as parliamentarian are:

He is editor and coauthor of Rules and Practices of the House of Representatives, which, combined with an edited Jefferson's Manual and an annotated Constitution of the United States, constitute an official publication of the House of Representatives.

He is the source of the additional material used in maintaining the present and future editions of Hind's Precedents, which in parliamentary law, occupies a place similar to the Reports of the Supreme Court.

He is recognized in the United States as an expert in parliamentary law, and, in addition to his services as Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives, his opinions and interpretations of problems of a parliamentary nature arising in the States of the United States are often requested, respected, and followed.

His services to this country during the past two decades have been of great importance in that during that period there developed unusual legislative and parliamentary problems arising from the prolonged depression of the late 1920's and the early years of the next decade; the reconstruction period thereafter; the prewar period of the last world war and the years of that war, as well as the reconstruction phases following the war, which have not as yet been completed.

Mr. Deschler is no stranger to National University. He was formerly a student here and took the required courses leading to the degree of J. D. and M. P. L., which were conferred upon him in 1932. In order to receive these degrees he had to attain and maintain better than average grades in the subjects and courses pursued by him. I may say at this point, that I had the pleasure of having

Mr. Deschler as a student in some of the courses taught by me at this university during the years he was working for his degrees.

Mr. Deschler, by authority of the board of trustees of National University, I take pleasure in conferring upon you the degree of doctor of laws.

AMERICAN POLICY TOWARD COMMUNISM

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, following the remarks of the gentleman from California, I wish to state that we are now spending $400,000,000 to stop communism in Greece and Turkey while the Secretary of State is now preparing a program whereby it has been announced that in a few years we are going to spend $25,000,000,000 more. While we are doing that overseas in all of the countries in the world, tonight one of the leading Communist-front organizations is using Federal Government facilities to propagate their propaganda. They are being allowed to use a Federal facility for a springboard so that throughout the world they will be recognized as speaking officially for the Government of the United States of America.

A few days ago we had a report by the Committee on Un-American Activities describing the true character of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, one of the most leading and most conspicuous Communist-front organizations within our borders. Yet that organization today, this evening, is using Federal property and Federal facilities at the expense of the taxpayers to propagate their propaganda to the people of America and to the people of the world.

To me, it appears that we are the laughing stock of the universe, spending billions of dollars to stop communism abroad, but embracing them in official circles and allowing them to use Federal Government facilities for their propaganda. What a travesty on the taxpayers of America to dish out billions to stop communism everywhere except in the United States of America. This is proof that the present demonstration hates communism in Europe—but it loves communism in the United States of America.

FATHER O'DONNELL AND NOTRE DAME

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an article from the South Bend Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, a telegram, late Thursday evening, from Father John J. Cavanaugh, president of the University of Notre Dame, brought the sad announcement that had been expected for several days.

The Reverend J. Hugh O'Donnell, wartime president of Notre Dame, had passed away at the infirmary on the campus that he loved so well.

From prep-school days, through the university as an outstanding student and athlete during the undergraduate days of the immortal Knute Rockne, during his years in the priesthood, culminated by his two illustrious terms as president of the university, the life of Father O'Donnell is the history of the growth of Notre Dame during the past 35 years.

In his passing, Notre Dame and the Nation have lost one of the truly great men of our times, and at a time when we can ill afford to lose them.

The life of Father O'Donnell is best portrayed in the following story from the South Bend Tribune of June 13, 1947. It follows:

DEATH CLOSES O'DONNELL'S LONG CAREER—NOTRE DAME UNIVERSITY'S WARTIME CHIEF DIES AT 52

Rev. J. Hugh O'Donnell, C. S. C., former president of the University of Notre Dame, who guided the institution through the trying period of World War II and saw it reach its largest enrollment in history, died in the infirmary at the university at 5 p. m., Tuesday.

Details of the funeral had not been worked out early this afternoon except that it will be held at 10 o'clock Monday morning in Sacred Heart Church on the campus with burial in the community cemetery at Notre Dame.

The body of Father O'Donnell was taken to the McGann funeral home. It will be returned to the university Saturday afternoon and will lie in state in the parlors in the main building until the hour of the funeral. Members of the lay faculty club and the Knights of Columbus are arranging an honor guard.

Death came to the 52-year-old administrator, scholar, and orator after a long illness, the seriousness of which first became apparent last February. At that time his ill health halted his preparations to embark on a mission for the Congregation of Holy Cross to visit its establishments in South America.

EXAMINED AT CLINIC

A subsequent examination in a clinic in Rochester, Minn., disclosed that Father O'Donnell was suffering from cancer. He returned to the university and had remained bedfast most of the time as his health steadily declined.

At his bedside when death came were members of his immediate family, Mrs. Gertrude Graziani, a sister, of Chicago; Dr. Frank J. O'Donnell, a brother, and Mrs. O'Donnell and their two children, Patricia and Michael O'Donnell, all of Alpena, Mich.

Also in the room were a number of the clergy, including the recently consecrated Bishop Lawrence L. Graner, C. S. C., of Dacca, India; Rev. Thomas Steiner, C. S. C., provincial of the Congregation of the Holy Cross; Rev. Christopher O'Toole, C. S. C., and Rev. Kerndt Healy, C. S. C., assistant provincials; Rev. Matthew Walsh, C. S. C., former president of Notre Dame; Rev. John H. Murphy, C. S. C., vice president of the university; Rev. Thomas P. Irving, C. S. C., professor of religion, and Rev. Richard J. Grimm, C. S. C., superior of Holy Cross Seminary. Rev. John J. Cavanaugh, C. S. C., president of the university, was in Providence, R. I., where he gave the commencement address at Providence College. He left immediately for South Bend.

Last rites of the church were administered to Father O'Donnell about 10 days ago when his condition took a sudden turn for the worse. Father O'Toole gave the last blessing to him as he died.

COGNIZANT OF CONDITION

Father O'Donnell was fully cognizant of his condition and accepted his fate stoically. He was in Detroit, Mich., when first stricken with what appeared to be an attack of jaundice. Upon the advice of his brother he went to the Mayo clinic in Rochester, where an operation disclosed that he was suffering from cancer of the pancreas.

Because of the shock of the operation to his system he was not told that he was suffering from cancer until after his return to the infirmary at Notre Dame a few weeks later. Then two of his closest friends, Father Steiner and Father Walsh, visited him one day and as sparingly as possible told him the nature of his disease and that he had only a few months to live.

Father O'Donnell told them that he had suspected his condition, but had hoped that it was not true. Then after a few moments he asked the two priests to accompany him to the infirmary chapel while he made an act of resignation.

From that time until his death he maintained a cheerful outlook and welcomed visitors to his room. During his illness he kept up a steady correspondence with the hundreds of friends, former students, members of the clergy and business associates who wrote him messages of cheer. Until several weeks ago he dictated personal replies.

AT NOTRE DAME 35 YEARS

With the exception of 3 years when he was president of St. Edward's university, Austin Texas, Father O'Donnell was associated practically uninterruptedly with Notre Dame's activities for 35 years. Leaving St. Edward's in 1934, he came to Notre Dame as vice-president. He served in that capacity until January, 1940, when he was advanced to the acting presidency.

At that time he succeeded Most Rev. John F. O'Hara, C. S. C., D. D., who resigned to become supervising bishop of the United States army and navy diocese. Father O'Donnell was appointed president by the provincial council of the priests of the Congregation of Holy Cross in July, 1940, and was renamed for another 3-year term in July 1943.

Father O'Donnell relinquished the presidency in July, 1946, and was succeeded by Father Cavanaugh, who had been serving as vice-president. Since his retirement Father O'Donnell had served in an advisory capacity to university officials. In recognition of his many years of service he was awarded an honorary doctor of laws at the recent commencement exercises.

LED NEW ACTIVITY

Under the leadership of Father O'Donnell, Notre Dame embarked on an entirely new phase of educational activity during the war. More than 25,000 of the Nation's young men received training on the campus for service as officers in the United States Navy. Nearly 12,000 were commissioned as ensigns, a total greater than the officer strength of the Regular Navy at the start of World War II.

It was chiefly through Father O'Donnell's efforts that the naval reserve officers' training corps, the V–12 program and the midshipmen school were established on the campus and utilized facilities of the university in their training.

Meanwhile, the laboratory facilities of the university were employed for special research in atomic energy, chemistry, metallurgy, aeronautics, and other scientific endeavors in behalf of the Government. Thirty-six

members of the faculty left Notre Dame either to join the armed forces or for research in direct connection with the war effort.

PROBLEMS COMPLICATED

From the end of the war until his retirement, Father O'Donnell's postwar problems at the university were complicated by a large influx of war veterans seeking to begin or continue their educations. Notre Dame's normal enrollment of 3,200 jumped to 4,500 in his last semester as president, mainly because of students returning from the war.

As a private institution, Notre Dame normally receives no aid from the Federal or State Governments. Therefore, it must depend on the generosity of its friends, both Catholic and non-Catholic, to help meet its annual deficits.

To aid in increasing the university's endowment, smallest for any institution of comparable size in the United States, Father O'Donnell directed the establishment of a department of public relations in 1941. The endowment was increased from $1,000,000 to $3,650,000 in his presidency.

Father O'Donnell also worked toward the expansion of Notre Dame's graduate school. In the spring of 1946 the medieval institute was established to provide a medium of study for graduate students in the early civilization and Christian culture of the Western World. He appointed Rev. Gerald B. Phelan, founder and director of the Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, Toronto, Canada, at the director of the institute at Notre Dame.

BORN IN GRAND RAPIDS

Father O'Donnell was born June 2, 1895, in Grand Rapids, Mich., and entered Notre Dame in 1912 as an undergraduate student. He was the son of the late Edward J. and Sarah A. (O'Grady) O'Donnell.

Father O'Donnell was a star athlete and honor student in his undergraduate career at Notre Dame. He won a monogram on the football team in 1915.

After receiving a bachelor of literature degree at Notre Dame in 1915 he entered the seminary of the Congregation of Holy Cross. On December 28, 1921, he was ordained to the Catholic priesthood in Sacred Heart Seminary, Grand Rapids, by Most Rev. Edward D. Kelly, D. D., then bishop of that diocese. The next year Father O'Donnell received a doctor of philosophy degree at Catholic University, Washington, D. C., where he specialized in American church history.

In the spring of 1923 he was named rector of Badin Hall on the Notre Dame campus. In 1924 he became prefect of discipline and supervisor of student activities, a post which he held until 1931, when he went to St. Edward's to become president.

ON NATIONAL BROADCAST

Father O'Donnell was a pioneer in the early work of the Catholic Students Mission crusade, which antedated the current Catholic Youth Organization in this country. He was an active member of the American Catholic Historical Association, serving on its executive council 2 years. He also was a contributor to the Catholic Historical Review and other periodicals. He spoke on the Catholic Hour and Church of the Air radio programs and other national broadcasts during his presidency and addressed various clubs and forums.

Father O'Donnell was named by the late President Roosevelt to serve on the Board of Visitors of the United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., in 1942 and 1943. He was a member of the Federal Government's Committee on Postwar Science and was a trustee and member of the executive council of the Nutrition Foundation.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. POULSON asked and was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks and include therein three editorials.

CONDUCT OF EMPLOYEES OF COMMON CARRIERS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege from time to time to travel about this country and unofficially arrive on busses, planes, trains, and boats as an ordinary common citizen. I am convinced that common carriers, hauling human cargo, have lost a considerable degree, and perhaps an overwhelming percentage, of their respect for the traveling public. The personnel from the low to high in those industries, in my opinion, no longer look upon the traveling public as a great part of their institution. There is too much carelessness, there is too much inattention, there is too much ignoring of the fact that handling human cargo is a delicate operation which requires sobriety, above all, and common sense, and a friendly attitude to those who travel. This applies all the way along the line from the ground crews to the pilots who fly at the highest levels. All I know about the airplane industry is to ride a plane and pay my fare. I am afraid that when you get to the bottom of these accidents you will find a great deal of it is due to bad personnel. I hope the committees will not overlook that phase in their investigation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

FLOODS IN IOWA

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the most disastrous flood in the history of the State of Iowa came in torrents down several rivers in Iowa last week, reaching flood stage above the high-water mark, with a loss of at least 6 lives at the city of Ottumwa, Iowa. That city of thirty-five or forty thousand is suffering a recurrence of that flood at this very moment, with one-third of the city under water, and 10,000 people driven from their homes.

In 1944, the Army engineers made a survey of the Des Moines River valley and estimated that floods could be controlled at an outlay for dams and levees of $15,000,000. Probably the estimate now would go to $20,000,000, but the property loss alone in the city of Ottumwa is $10,000,000 at the present moment, with uncounted millions of dollars lost to crop lands in the rich Des Moines River valley. I ask the Appropriations Committee to consider the situation at this very time. I have invited the chairman of the Committee on Public Works and members of this committee to visit Iowa and see the destruction from flood waters at this very moment.

Other towns, notably Eddyville, a flourishing community of 1,000 persons, is entirely under water, with every man, woman, and child forced to higher ground.

The American Red Cross, as well as the Navy personnel stationed at the Ottumwa Naval Air Station, has performed valuable service in this emergency with first-aid equipment and with serum to prevent an epidemic. The city water supply of Ottumwa has been cut off entirely and drinking water has been supplied by towns from as far away as 75 miles.

Millions of acres of cropland in southern Iowa will have to be almost entirely replanted and this is the area that produces a great deal of the food of the country, notably corn, hogs, cattle, sheep, and poultry. Undoubtedly the effects of this disaster will be felt throughout the country.

I repeat that this country cannot afford a repetition of the flood disaster in this rich producing area of our country. We must proceed with flood control measures.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

VETO OF THE TAX BILL

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I am told there lies upon the Speaker's table the President's veto message of the tax bill. If this is true, then there remains but one thing for the President to do to completely dissipate the cloud upon which leans his ladder of hope, and that is to veto the labor bill.

RETIREMENT FOR FBI PERSONNEL

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, within a short time the House will consider H. R. 2826, to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for investigatory personnel of the Federal Bureau of Investigation who have rendered at least 20 years of service.

Every Member of this House knows of the efficiency of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. In a matter of a few years it has become the greatest law-enforcing body in the world. It has served the country well both in peace

and in war. It is a law-enforcing organization with character.

The House should bear in mind that the entrance requirements both physical and mental for the Federal Bureau of Investigation are much higher than those of either West Point or Annapolis. Not only must the applicant be a college graduate, he must also be the possessor of a life that will stand the most rigid investigation. The work, itself, for both Director and agents, requires a 24-hour day and a 7-day week. The Federal Bureau of Investigation agent and his family know no holidays. They have become acquainted with the fact that they cannot plan any leisure or social life 24 hours in advance. The work requires long and frequent absences from the family fireside. The morning never knows what the night will bring. It is a life of peril and sacrifice. I have not the slightest doubt that the men in this Bureau with 10 years of service have worked more hours in that time than the average Federal worker will in 30 years of service. It is a field for youth and youth alone. The men who are in the service know that after they reach the age of 45 or 50 their usefulness to the Bureau and to the country is limited. It is but natural that these men must look to their future and for the security of their families. Due to the fine reputation that the Bureau has, private industry is constantly trying to recruit Federal Bureau of Investigation men. Each time that a member of the Bureau resigns and goes into private industry, it is a distinct loss to our people. We are losing the training and valuable experience of a man who is absolutely needed in the firing line in the ever-present war against the criminal elements. Many of the men who leave the service, leave solely because of the lack of security they have under the existing pension system. They like the work and they know that they will miss the wonderful esprit de corps that has been developed by their Chief, J. Edgar Hoover, yet they know the limitations of the service and feel that they must protect their families.

If this bill is passed it will keep many good men in the service, for they will know that middle age will no longer mean insecurity. It is my sincere hope that this House will pass the bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PASSMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement by John L. King, radio and research director of the Washington State Grange.

Mr. KEOGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address delivered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] at a rally in Brooklyn last Wednesday.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. FORAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution from the General Assembly of Rhode Island.

Mr. LANHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Atlanta Journal.

Mr. ENGLE of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include this morning's broadcast by George E. Reedy relating to air accidents.

Mr. TRIMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Southwest American published at Fort Smith, Ark.

Mr. KERR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a very able editorial from the News Observer of Raleigh, N. C.

Mr. SHEPPARD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from the former head of the Petroleum Administration, Mr. Ralph K. Davies.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 15 minutes today following the order of business for the day and the special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

DR. FRANK P. GRAHAM

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to give testimony to the patriotism, the high character, and splendid worth of Dr. Frank Porter Graham, president of the University or North Carolina.

I say, without hesitation, mental reservation, or secret evasion of mind that he is one of the outstanding men of the Nation. He is not a Communist nor a fellow traveler, nor a Communist sympathizer. He is a great American, a man of the highest caliber and character, and as patriotic as will be found anywhere. He measures up to the highest standards of citizenship.

SOUTHERN CONFERENCE FOR HUMAN WELFARE

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to read a message I received from Clark Foreman, president of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare.

* * * * *

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand that those words be taken down. He cannot get up on the floor of the House and read a vicious attack on Members of Congress like that. If he is not willing to withdraw it and take it out of the RECORD, I am going to move that it be stricken from the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from California ask consent to withdraw the telegram?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I do not consider that this message should be withdrawn.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand that the words be taken down.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman objecting to the words in the telegram?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; the words read from the telegram.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk read the words objected to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair feels that the last sentence is unparliamentary. It says, "We completely repudiate the lies and half-truths of the report that was issued and consider it un-American." Those words reflect upon the character and integrity of the membership of a committee and, the Chair feels, are unparliamentary.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the entire statement from the RECORD, and on that I ask for recognition.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay that motion on the table.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have already been recognized.

The SPEAKER. A motion to table is preferential and not debatable.

The question is upon the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] that the motion be tabled.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand a division.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York had previously asked for a division.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO) there were—ayes 10, noes 147.

So the motion to table was rejected.

REPORT ON SOUTHERN CONFERENCE FOR HUMAN WELFARE—HENRY WALLACE'S SPEECH

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, this is the second time within the last few days

the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] has taken the floor to directly or indirectly attack the Committee on Un-American Activities; a committee that has taken more abuse from the un-American elements in this country than any other committee that has ever been created by the Congress of the United States; a committee that is rendering one of the greatest services this House has ever known.

Mr. Speaker, I want to read from a speech that has been much publicized. Tonight, Henry Agard Wallace will probably repeat his attacks made in California down here at the Water Gate. Looking down on that will be the monuments of George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, Thomas Jefferson, and Robert E. Lee. I would love to know their reactions. If they could all speak, I am sure they would all manifest their disapproval—especially if he followed his usual line.

Mr. Wallace went out to California recently and made a speech, and somebody had it rebroadcast over the radio. I sent for the transcript, and I want to read you just a few words from that speech to let you know what kind of a battle we are in in this country:

Among other things, Mr. Wallace said—now listen to this:

We branded ourselves forever in the eyes of the world, for the murder by the state of two humble and glorious immigrants—Sacco and Vanzetti.

He is referring to those two criminal anarchists that were executed by the State of Massachusetts after they had been convicted in a fair and impartial trial, and after the State had leaned backward and had the case reinvestigated by impartial judges. Then he goes on and he proceeds to say:

We had to relearn—

This is Mr. Wallace speaking—

We had to relearn the meaning of democracy from the contrast between our own cowardice and the courage of these men.

These acts today fill us with burning shame—

Says Mr. Wallace:

Now other men seek to fasten new shame upon America.

I speak of only one source of shame to decent Americans who want their country to be admired by the world. I mean the group of bigots first known as the Dies committee, then the Rankin committee, now the Thomas committee—three names for Fascists the world over to roll on their tongues with pride.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether I would send for a psychiatrist or not if a man made that statement in my presence, but it sounds like the ravings of a maniac. I cannot understand how anybody could make that statement in the light of what is going on and what has gone on in the past.

He brands me as being the very opposite of Sacco and Vanzetti; and I am delighted to acknowledge the soft impeachment.

What we are trying to do is to save our country from being undermined by those communistic elements that are today trying to debase America, destroy our Government, destroy Christianity, destroy freedom, and reduce Americans to communistic slavery as they have done elsewhere.

They make an attack on us for trying to turn back the tide in Hollywood, where attempts are being made by some elements to drag the American moral standard down to the level of Sodom and Gomorrah.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER] gets up here and defends Mr. Frank Graham. I say to him that all the Members from North Carolina do not share his illusion about Mr. Graham, neither do the white people throughout the Southern States and the better elements of the Negroes in the South share that illusion. If he were the great patriot he claims to be, he would not be mixed up with this red front organization that is stirring race trouble all over the Southern States.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The man, Clark Foreman, referred to in the telegram the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] read, hails from my State. If he is not a Communist or a fellow traveler, he performs like one; and that which I say with respect to him I say with respect to Dr. Graham of the University of North Carolina.

Mr. RANKIN. The South has gone through many travails in the last 85 years. She has known the terrors of war and the bitterness of defeat. She has known the horrors of reconstruction and the struggles through depressions. In those old days of reconstruction, the worst enemy the South had was what we called the scalawags, the local men who turned against us and tried to make personal or political capital by abusing and misrepresenting and undermining the people of the Southern States.

That is exactly what this Southern Conference for Human Welfare is doing today. It is full of these scalawags. This committee branded it correctly when they said it is a Communist-front organization. It is trying to undermine and destroy everything on which this Government is based, trying to undermine and destroy the American way of life, and using the high-sounding names of a few men like Clark Foreman, Frank Graham, and Aubrey Williams and others who ought to know better, and do know better, to deceive the public.

Mr. Speaker, from this statement of Henry Wallace you can see that it is not sectional. He turns and maligns the State of Massachusetts, and in other portions of his speech he maligns the Southern States. If that is what we are going to have at the hands of these mugwumps, these parlor pinks, these left-wing fellow travelers, and these scallawags, it is about time that we turned the pitiless sunlight of merciless publicity upon them and let the American people know who they are and what they are up to. Let the American people know that our brave boys who fought and died in this war to preserve our freedom and our form of government did not die in vain; let them know that these boys who have come back wounded, maimed, and blind, and disabled have not offered their services in vain; let them know that the suffering fathers and mothers did not shed their tears in vain when we told them that we were fighting to preserve American institutions and the American way of life.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. COX. While it is true that the Committee on Un-American Activities has been subjected to much abuse, should not the gentleman find comfort in the fact that no committee of the House of Representatives in all of its history ever carried on more completely supported by the membership of the House? I want the gentleman's committee given money sufficient to investigate communism in our public schools and colleges.

Mr. RANKIN. There has never been a committee, a controversial committee, in all the history of Congress that has been more thoroughly supported by patriotic Democrats and patriotic Republicans than has the Committee on Un-American Activities.

It is not a pleasant job for us. It is not a pleasant job for our investigators. But when you read the testimony that they have taken and when you find what is going on, you will realize that it is one of the most necessary committees in the American Congress.

We expect to carry on the fight to save America for Americans, to save our country from destruction at the hands of these Communists, crooks, pinks, punks, stooges, crackpots, and fellow travelers; and I do not care whether they are camouflaged as members of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare or outspoken members of the Communist Party.

Under permission granted me to extend my remarks, I am inserting at this point the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities on this so-called Southern Conference for Human Welfare.

The matter referred to follows:

REPORT ON SOUTHERN CONFERENCE FOR HUMAN WELFARE

(Southern Conference for Human Welfare, formerly 212½ Union Street, Nashville, Tenn., now 808 Perdido Street, New Orleans, La.)

1947–48 officers: Frank P. Graham, honorary president; Clark Howell Foreman, president; James A. Dombrowski, administrator; Frank C. Bancroft and Mrs. Edmonia Grant, assistant administrators.

Vice presidents: Paul R. Christopher, Roscoe Dunjee, Virginia Durr, Lewis W. Jones, William Mitch, Harry W. Schacter.

Board of representatives: E. L. Abercrombie, Mary McLeod Bethune, Charlotte Hawkins Brown, Louis Burnham, Sam Freeman, Helen Fuller, Percy Greene, R. L. Hickman, Myles Horton, J. C. Jacques, Lucy Randolph Mason, Mortimer May, George S.

Mitchell, Frank Prohl, Samuel Rodman, Mrs. A. W. Simkins, Alva W. Taylor, John B. Thompson, Charles Webber.

Ex officio: Henry Fowler,[1] Mrs. Harry M. Gershon, Joseph L. Johnson, Lee C. Sheppard, Aubrey Williams.

Advisory associates: Melvyn Douglas, Mrs. Marshall Field, Kenneth DeP. Hughes, Michael M. Nisselson, Channing H. Tobias, Henry A. Wallace, Palmer Weber.

Tarleton Collier, secretary; J. Daniel Weitzman, treasurer.[2]

The Southern Conference for Human Welfare is an organization which seeks to attract southern liberals on the basis of its seeming interest in the problems of the South. In the early history of the organization, some well-intentioned persons were misled into joining. Many of them have since severed their connections on learning its true character.

Careful examination of its official publication and its activities will disclose that the conference actually is being used in devious ways to further basic Soviet and Communist policy. Decisive and key posts are in most instances controlled by persons whose record is faithful to the line of the Communist Party and the Soviet union.

ORIGIN

In reporting to its constituents, the conference is extraordinarily vague as to the exact origin of the organization. "It was born in the hearts and minds of a large group of devoted southerners known as the Southern Policy Committee." No names are given. This nondescript group met several times early in 1938 in Birmingham, Ala. "Several other persons were asked to attend a meeting on July 21, and the idea of a Southern Conference was presented to them." The report does not say who presented the idea or who was present. "The persons present voted themselves in as sponsors and members of the arrangements committee" and subsequently a permanent organization meeting was called at Birmingham on September 6, 1938. (Report of the Proceedings of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, November 22, 23, 1938, pp. 3 and 4.) Its claim to represent any significant proportion of southern opinion is, therefore, entirely self-assumed.

While the conference has suceeded in confusing certain elements in the North by its pretentions, representative southerners harbor no illusions as to its real character. The Democratic Women's Club, of Alabama, an organization of long standing in the South, publicly demanded the disclosure of the names of the initiators of the conference, who provided the necessary finances, and who appointed the delegates. They charged that the conference was of "questionable origin and purpose" (Birmingham News, November 25, 1938).

In their own inner circles the Communists were not nearly so reticent in claiming responsibility for the Southern Conference for Human Welfare. In his article in the Communist of January 1939, official monthly organ of the Communist Party, Robert Fowler Hall, then secretary of the Communist Party, of Alabama, and speaker at the April 1940 session of the conference, reveals the moves behind the scenes. Referring to an earlier speech of Earl Browder, at that itme general secretary of the Communist Party, Mr. Hall wrote:

"Comrade Browder's remarks thus anticipated the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, held in Birmingham, November 20–23 * * *. Let us estimate the Southern Conference in the light of Comrade Browder's remarks at the tenth convention of the Communist Party * * *. In this sense, we can say that the Southern Conference was a brilliant confirmation of the line of the democratic front advanced by Comrade Browder at the tenth convention * * *. Our comrades * * * naturally watched the conference preparations closely and helped wherever possible * * *. Southern State organizations of the Communist Party were represented at the conference by five southern Communist delegates. Our party contributed in a modest but constructive manner to the success of the conference * * *. In strengthening this movement, our party has before it a great task. On this basis, our party can and must proceed to recruit from the progressive ranks many hundreds of members" (pp. 57, 60, 61, and 65).

In other words, the Communists were using the conference as a specific application of the so-called popular-front policy in the South. This line had been adopted by the Communist International at its seventh congress in Moscow in 1935 and was being applied by the Communist parties throughout the world prior to the signing of the Stalin-Hitler pact. The honest liberals drawn into the conference were merely the most convenient guinea pigs.

While the Communist Party as such boasted of few delegates, it must be remembered that the bulk of the Communist supporters came from front organizations under their control, which participated in the conference. This was ultimately proven by test votes on various controversial issues.

Communist Party writers made every effort to emphasize the significance of the Conference for Human Welfare. Robert F. Hall, who today is Washington correspondent for the Daily Worker, called it a "representative of the new forces" in the South, working for the "development of a powerful movement of the southern masses for peace, democratic rights, and security" (Communist, August 1940, pp. 690–702). Thus the conference supplemented the activity of the American League for Peace and Democracy, the chief Communist front during this period.

James W. Ford, Negro Communist candidate for Vice President, speaking of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare and the Southern Negro Youth Conference, declared, with considerable pride, that "The Communists, through their pioneering work in the South, may justly claim to have laid the foundation for these great social movements" (Communist, September 1938, p. 828).

In a radio address delivered on November 27, 1938, over Station WOL, Earl Browder expressed the opinion that the Southern Conference for Human Welfare was one of the signs of the awakening of the American people. In a public hearing before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities he identified it as one of his party's "transmission belts."

Evidence before our committee indicates that the central committee of the Communist Party was intimately concerned with the affairs of the conference from its very inception. William Weiner, former treasurer of the Communist Party, testified that a subsidy of $2,000 had been paid to the Communist Party of Alabama in 1938, when the Southern Conference for Human Welfare was founded, that this conference had been discussed with Robert F. Hall, when he was in New York, and that it had also been discussed by the central committee of the Communist Party. Mr. Browder publicly admitted that the Communist Party had "suffered great hardships to maintain the growing southern movement."

Communist manipulation

Not only do the Communists claim the conference as their own product, but they even disclose how they pulled the strings. Mr. Hall, apparently the chief moving spirit, points out that the main work of the conference was carried out through sections or panels and that resolutions adopted in the panels were usually adopted by the conference as a whole (Communist, January 1939, p. 58). Here is how this plan actually operated.

A resolution on education was presented by Paul Crouch for the Communist Party of Alabama and unanimously adopted (Daily Worker, November 22, 1938, p. 6). Crouch was a member of the editorial staff of the Southern Worker, official organ of the Communist Party in the South. Associated with him on this board were Robert F. Hall and Ted Wellman, Communist Party State secretary for Tennessee. Crouch was convicted for treasonable activities within the armed forces of the United States in Hawaii on June 8, 1925. He subsequently made a pilgrimage to Moscow where he paraded in a Red Army uniform (Daily Worker, May 1, 1928, p. 5).

Members of the resolutions committee of the November 20–23, 1938, conference were: Chairman, Clyde M. Mills, Georgia; Prentiss M. Terry, Alabama; William Mitch, Alabama; George Googe, Georgia; R. R. Moore, Alabama; Lucy Randolph Mason, Virginia; Father Rambouts, Louisiana; Donald Comer, Alabama; Stanton E. Smith, Tennessee; Virginia Henry Mayfield, Alabama; Dr. Arthur Raper, Georgia; Myles Horton, Tennessee; Roy Lawrence, North Caroina; Julia F. Allen, Kentucky; Barry Bingham, Kentucky; Elizabeth Hawes, South Carolina; W. C. Kelley, Florida; Edwin A. Elliott, Texas; F. D. Patterson, Alabama; Leonard Logan, Oklahoma; Mrs. D. D. Terry, Arkansas; George McLean, Mississippi.

There is no record in the proceedings or elsewhere of their opposition to the activities within the conference of such outstanding Communists as Paul Crouch, Robert F. Hall, Ted Wellman, John P. Davis, and Edward E. Strong. The committee adopted the following Communist Party line resolutions: Demand for the release of the Scottsboro boys, endorsement of the Communist-dominated Congress of Mexican and Spanish-American Peoples, and condemnation of the Dies committee.

Joseph Gelders was active in the conference's committee on plans for a permanent organization. Representing the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, Gelders was also the secretary of the strategy committee in the campaign for the Geyer anti-poll-tax bill. He was formerly secretary of the National Committee for Defense of Political Prisoners, which has been cited as subversive by Attorney General Biddle. Gelders personally accompanied Earl Browder on a visit to the Scottsboro boys (convicted of rape in Alabama) (Daily Worker, September 15, 1936, p. 3). He raised his voice in protest against the arrests of Communists in Chattanooga (Daily Worker, April 6, 1938, p. 3). He was also leader of a lobby for the American Peace Mobilization, which conducted a picket line about the White House and denounced President Roosevelt as a "war monger" (Sunday Worker, September 8, 1940, p. 3).

John P. Davis, identified as a leading member of the Communist Party by testimony before our committee and former secretary of the National Negro Congress, cited as a subversive organization by the Attorney General, was a leading speaker in the panel on constitutional rights of the first conference in 1938, and the 500 delegates applauded his report. He was also vice president of the conference (Daily Worker, November 22, 1938, p. 6; April 17, 1940, p. 4).

[1] See p. 10.

[2] The Southern Patriot, December 1946.

Yelverton Cowherd, signer of a resolution against the Dies committee in 1939, who appeared before the La Follette committee in 1937 to defend the case of Joseph Gelders, was a member of the nominating committee at the first conference, according to its official proceedings.

Edward E. Strong, described by James W. Ford, Communist Vice Presidential candidate, as "a coming leader of the Negro people," present secretary of the National Negro Congress, contributor to the Communist youth magazine, the Champion, and signer of a statement in March 1941 defending the Communist Party, was a prominent speaker in the panel on youth problems in the 1938 conference, together with Howard Lee, attorney for Oscar Wheeler, Communist candidate for Governor of West Virginia. Strong was elected a member of the executive committee of the Council of Young Southerners, described on its letterhead as having "its origin at the Youth Commission of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare." He has been cited as a member of the special branch of the Young Communist League.

Dr. Herman C. Nixon was elected executive secretary of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare in 1938. He had been forced out of Tulane University for his social views. He had been cochairman of the Citizens Committee To Investigate Vigilantism in Gadsden, Ala., an offshoot of the International Labor Defense, and a member of the National Committee for People's Rights and the provisional committee of the National Conference on Constitutional Liberties. The International Labor Defense, as well as the last two committees named, have been cited as subversive by the Attorney General. Nixon's book, Forty Acres and Steel Mules, has been highly praised by Robert F. Hall, then Communist secretary for Alabama, in the New South of February 1939 (p. 10).

Two known Communist Party members who have supported the conference in recent years are Don West, poet and professor; Langston Hughes, writer. Paul Robeson, who has frequently defended the Communist Party and attended its meetings, voiced an appeal for the release of Earl Browder at the conference's meeting in 1942. His appeal was echoed by Frank P. Graham in a statement sent to the President.

James Dombrowski

At the April 1942 sessions of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, James Dombrowski was elected executive secretary. He was the signer of a statement defending the Communist Party in March 1941 and a speaker for the National Conference for Constitutional Liberties in 1940. The latter organization has been cited as subversive by the Attorney General.

Dombrowski, together with Myles Horton, a member of the present board of representatives of the conference, helped launch a joint Socialist-Communist united-front movement in the South in 1935. As Socialist Party leaders in Tennessee, the two men endorsed a united-front plan of action which included campaigns against the AAA and for a "rank-and-file" movement in the American Federation of Labor (Chattanooga Times, January 28, 1935, p. 5). They have both been charged with operating as stooges for the Communist Party within Socialist circles.

A clue to Dombrowski's political views is given in his book, the Early Days of Christian Socialism in America (1936). Dombrowski asserts that the Reverend George D. Herron, whom he considers "by far the most able man" in the early days of the Christian Socialist movement, pointed out in the last decade of the nineteenth century, "That class lines were becoming more sharply defined, that the logic of the inherent contradictions within capitalism was leading inevitably to more and more concentration of wealth, to the enrichment of the few at the expense of the masses" (p. 30).

Dombrowski goes on to defend Herron's views on violence. Herron, he says, "did not think that violence was inimical to a religious approach to social change. Peace at the expense of justice was not a religious solution to social problems. And resorting to his social interpretation of the cross, according to which all moral progress is made at the expense of suffering and sacrifice, he looked upon a revolution by violence, provided it promised a more just society, as a possible technique for social change worthy of the sanction of religion (p. 193):

"In his acceptance of the fact of the class struggle went the implicit recognition of the necessity for coercion" (p. 192).

Frank P. Graham, head of the University of North Carolina, was the first chairman of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare and today remains as its honorary president. He is not a Communist and no doubt on occasion has had some differences with the Communist Party. He is, however, one of those liberals who show a predeliction for affiliation to various Communist-inspired front organizations.

Graham urged freedom for Earl Browder and served as sponsor for a dinner which the publication, Soviet Russia Today, held to celebrate the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Red Army. He also was associated with the International Labor Defense, legal arm of the Communist Party; American League for Peace and Democracy; American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born; American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom; American Friends of Spanish Democracy; China Aid Council; China Aid Council of the American League for Peace and Democracy; Committee for Boycott Against Japanese Aggression; Conference to Lift the Embargo; Coordinating Committee to Lift the Embargo; Medical Bureau; and North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy.

Other officers

The roster of conference officers for 1947–48 shows that pro-Communists and fellow travelers still hold the reins of the organization. James Dombrowski continues to occupy his same key position under the new title of administrator. Serving as his associate and also as editor of the conference organ, the Southern Patriot, is Frank C. Bancroft, who has a lengthy record of Communist Party front activity.

Bancroft defended the Communist Party on March 5, 1941, and April 26, 1947, and also defended Sam Darcy, a Communist Party candidate for Governor of California, who was convicted of perjury. Bancroft signed an open letter calling for closer cooperation with the Soviet Union and held the responsible post of managing editor with Social Work Today, a publication which promulgated Communist propaganda among social workers.

His other Communist front associations incude the American Peace Mobilization, which picketed the White House during the Stalin-Hitler Pact; the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, which defended Communist cases; the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, which defended Communist teachers; People's Institute of Applied Religion, headed by Claude C. Williams, Communist Party member; and the Social Workers Committee for Russian War Relief.

Rounding out the administrative staff of the conference is Mrs. Edmonia Grant, also an associate to Dombrowski. A member of the conference since its inception, she defended the Communist Party on April 26, 1947, and supported the front organization, National Negro Congress.

Clark Howell Foreman

Clark Howell Foreman, president of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, has no open affiliation with the Communist Party. He has frequently denied any such affiliations or connections. He has been most successful in confusing the people as to the Communist-front character of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare.

Foreman has written a book entitled "The New Internationalism" in which his understanding of the international Communist movement and his sympathies with it are reflected on almost every page. The book displays marked contempt for European democratic Socialists and reformists, who are equivalent in this country to liberals who prefer democratic rather than revolutionary methods. Foreman does not hesitate, however, to exploit and deceive such liberals to the limit in the Southern Conference for Human Welfare. And although he ventures certain mild criticisms of Soviet policy, he has not recently expressed any such strictures toward either the Soviet Government or the American Communists.

We cite certain passages from Foreman's book to illustrate his views:

"Karl Marx arose as the great philosopher for the laboring man" (p. 26).

"Lenin correctly described the Russian bourgeoisie as the weakest link in the capitalist chain" (p. 44).

After showing the break-down of capitalist internationalism, Foreman quotes G. M. Stekloff, well-known Russian Communist writer, as follows:

"But whereas the internationalism of the bourgeoisie is continually frustrated by the mutual competition of national capitalism, the internationalism of the proletariat is nourished and strengthened by the active solidarity of the interests of all the workers, regardless of their dwelling place or nationality" (p. 74).

"* * * The Paris Commune stands next to the Russian revolution as an achievement of the Socialist theory" (p. 77).

Criticizing the reformist Socialist leaders, Foreman quotes J. Lenz, a leading Communist writer:

"The overwhelming majority of the party and trade-union leaders drew from the experiences of the Russian revolution the opposite conclusion—that of retreat from decisive conflicts with the class enemy, of avoiding struggles which demanded sacrifice as the struggles in Russia had done, of adaptation to the bourgeois order of society, of limiting the movement to parliamentary methods of struggle" (p. 79).

"In an appeal to the Socialists of all countries, the Petrograd Soviet said: 'This war is a monstrous crime on the part of the imperialists of all countries who, by their lust for annexations, by their mad race for armaments, have prepared and made inevitable the world conflagration'" (p. 83).

"The militant leaders of the Marxian bolsheviks, under the cry of 'Peace, Bread, and Land,' appealed to the popular desires of the masses" (p. 84).

"To all the colonial and semicolonial peoples, however, Russia's successful break from the capitalist system was a great inspiration" (p. 88).

"* * * the more powerful Stalin had banished Trotsky and his friends and had eloquently announced to the world his 5-year plan of industrialization" (p. 90).

"Internally, the Russians, despite their liberality to the minorities in the U. S. S. R., were almost inevitably bound to consider their success in nationalist terms" (p. 90).

"With such a set-up it is patent that the U. S. S. R. is potentially capable of being both self-sufficient in case of war and prosperous in times of peace" (p. 139).

Foreman is associated with the Progressive Citizens of America, an alledgedly liberal organization which believes in cooperating with Communists. He has also been affiliated with the following Communist-front groups: The Win-the-Peace Conference; the Washington Committee for Democratic Action, which defended Communist cases before the United States Civil Service Commission; and the National Citizens Political Action Committee.

FOREIGN POLICY

The most conclusive proof of the Communist domination of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare is to be found in the organization's strict and unvarying conformance to the line of the Communist Party in the field of foreign policy. It is also a clear indication of the fact that the real purpose of the organization was not human welfare in the South but rather to serve as a convenient vehicle in support of the current Communist Party line.

In 1938, when the Communist Party was advocating collective security of the democracies against the Fascist aggressors, a letter of greeting from President Roosevelt brought 2,000 conference delegates to their feet cheering (Daily Worker, November 22, 1938, p. 1). The conference voted to endorse "an American peace policy, such as proposed by President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Hull, to promote the national security of our country, to curb aggression, and assist the democratic peoples of the world to preserve peace, liberty, and freedom."

The change of the Communist line resulting from the signing of the Stalin-Hitler pact invoked a bitter struggle in the Southern Conference for Human Welfare at its meeting in April 1940. Robert F. Hall, secretary of the Communist Party of Alabama, acting as the Communist whip, presented an eight-point program which demanded "an uncompromising peace policy." The liberals led by Frank P. Graham and W. R. Couch, of the University of North Carolina, supported the policy of the Roosevelt administration. At one stage in the battle there was a threat of fisticuffs. But the liberals were no match for the Communist steam roller, which castigated them with the high crime of being anti-Soviet. The thousand delegates denounced war and pro-Allied propaganda, as threatening America with war. They declared themselves "unalterably opposed to loans to the Allies and other belligerents" and denounced war appropriations "at the expense of the welfare of the American people at home." The only consolation which the liberals salvaged from the fracas was a mild resolution condemning aggression by "Nazis, Communists, or imperialists." The Communists could grant their opponents this convenient sop since in their eyes the Soviet invasion of Finland and Poland was not aggression but liberation (Daily Worker, April 17, 1940, p. 4).

The rift between the Communists and the liberals was quickly healed as soon as Hitler invaded the Soviet fatherland and the Communists suddenly relinquished their "unalterable" opposition to the war. Wholehearted agreement marked the sessions of the conference held on April 19, 20, and 21, 1942, devoted to "the South's part in winning the war for democracy." The convention demanded that all "join in a great offensive now, to work, to produce, to sacrifice, to win." (Daily Worker, April 23, 1942, p. 3.)

With the end of World War II, the attitude of the conference on foreign policy veered once more in line with the new policy of the Communist Party. A resolution supported by the Southern Conference for Human Welfare and several other organizations, in April 1947, declared: "Monopoly corporations' profits are draining dry the Nation's purchasing power; and this lust for profits is not only threatening our Nation with early economic disaster but is leading, behind the smoke screen of the false issue of communism, to imperialist adventures and more profit hunting abroad, and may yet pile a war on our heads as well as an economic depression." (Daily Worker, May 6, 1947, p. 5.)

Eugene Dennis, general secretary of the Communist Party in America, voiced exactly the same idea in his pamphlet, What America Faces, March 1946 (p. 14): "We are witnessing how the monopolists and their reactionary congressional coalition, aided by the administration, are reconverting. Theirs is a reconversion * * * as they hope, to union busting and the open shop, to soaring profits and prices and sinking wages and living standards, to aggression upon the democratic rights of the people here and upon the democracies abroad; theirs is a reconversion which, if they are permitted to pursue their course, is the road to the Hoover years of the great crisis, and to a new world war as the 'way out' of capitalist crisis."

The new Communist Party doctrine is critical of any American "interference" in foreign politics but entirely favorable toward Russian expansionism. The conference organ, the Southern Patriot, clings closely to this line in its April 1946 issue. It quotes a leading conference spokesman as saying: "It was easy to gang up on the Russians * * * while the Czars were fighting the people of the country with their perfidious policies and police. It was easy to gang up on the Russians during the days of the Russian revolution. It has been easy for the rest of us to gang up ever since. I do not want to be a party to such a process" (p. 3).

"* * * It comes with ill grace for certain world powers whose troops are stationed in every nation from Egypt to Singapore to make a world conflagration out of the movement of a few troops a few miles into a neighboring territory to resist an oil monopoly which they enjoy. And if American foreign policy is made the scapegoat for such imperialism it is more stupid than I thought it possible for it to be * * *" (p. 5).

"* * * Before us then is the choice, war or peace, poverty or plenty, hopelessness or hope. If this decision were left to a free choice of the people of America, to the people of the Big Three, to the Russians whose faces were wreathed in smiles and friendship when one said, "Amerikanski" to them, I know what the decision would be" (p. 5).

The Southern Patriot editors suggested that readers could get full copies of this "strong and brilliant" appeal from the National Council for American-Soviet Friendship—and went on to recommend the council's biweekly propaganda sheet, Reported on American Soviet Relations, as presenting "many facts not often available in the daily press."

President Truman's foreign policy in Greece and Turkey came in for abuse at the annual meeting of the conference's Washington committee in Washington, D. C., on April 7, 1947.

J. Raymond Walsh, a "frank apologist for the Communist line," according to Prof. John H. Childs, of Columbia University, speaking for the Southern Conference in Washington, flayed President Truman's foreign policy in Greece and Turkey.

Insisting that America is a "radical nation," Walsh called upon the members to "defy fear and defy the forces who made the empty tables here tonight." "Some were afraid to come," he admitted.

Entertainer at the Washington meeting was Susan Reed, employed by Cafe Society, a night club owned by Barney Josephson, brother of Leon Josephson, leading Communist, Soviet Secret Service operative, charged with passport frauds. Mrs. Leon Josephson also owns an interest in this enterprise. Barney Josephson has been a supporter of the New York branch of the Southern Conference.

Conference President Clark Foreman, as toastmaster at the Washington meeting, denied that "anyone is afraid of communism."

The Washington committee of the conference obtained Henry Wallace, foremost critic of President Truman's foreign policy, for a public speech in the Nation's Capital, June 16, 1947. The committee scheduled on the same program Zero Mostel, a favorite entertainer at Communist affairs and member of the American Youth for Democracy, formerly the Young Communist League.

The Washington committee's executive secretary is Robert Ware Straus, Information Director for the Office of Emergency Management, who tried to get an OEM job for Ruth McKenney, well-known writer for the Communist publications, the Daily Worker and New Masses. Sponsors of the Washington group include Morris and Samuel Rodman, brothers, associated with the pro-Communist Metropolitan Broadcasting Co.; and Mrs. Gifford Pinchot, a delegate to the Communist-controlled Women's International Democratic Federation in Paris in 1945.

At the South-wide fourth biennial convention of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, held in New Orleans, November 28–30, 1946, the chief speaker devoted most of his talk to a defense of Russia as a "misunderstood" Government which will continue to remain at peace with the United States (Washington Daily News, November 29, 1946, p. 3, and New York Daily Worker, November 30, 1946, p. 4).

In January of that year the Southern Patriot listed a Senator who calls for a strong Germany as one of the "Representatives of the South in Congress, whose abandonment of the program the people voted for in 1944 should be remembered by their constituents when they come up for reelection" (p. 7). This position is in line with the discredited Morgenthau plan which has received enthusiastic Communist support.

The stand of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare on various other issues in which the Communist Party has been primarily concerned serves to clinch the charge that the organization is merely a pliable instrument in the hands of pro-Communist wire pullers behind the scenes.

Public record fails to reveal that the conference has ever officially denounced communism or opposed Soviet policies.

The chairman of the committee for Virginia, Mr. Henry H. Fowler, after seeing the preliminary press announcement of the committee's report, requested the committee to include by any mention of his name in the report, a notation that he had resigned from all affiliations with the southern conference as of April 15, 1947, after a membership of 1 year. His letter of resignation was duly acknowledged on April 28, 1947, by James A. Dombrowski, administrator. The reason he assigned for his resignation was stated in his letter as follows:

"The decisive factor in my present decision is the absence in the southern conference of any clear and positive stand against communism and the inclusion of Communists in the working organization and the unwillingness of my own State committee to initiate steps which would require a facing of this issue."

Elsewhere in his letter of resignation it appears that the State committee had rejected a resolution proposed by Mr. Fowler which expressed opposition to totalitarianism, be it Fascist or Communist, and would require each applicant for membership to assert by written pledge that he or she was "not a member of the Communist Party, or the Ku Klux Klan, or any other group or

organization which to his knowledge, is opposed to the purposes and ideals of the organization as stated in this pledge."

JOINT ACTIVITY WITH COMMUNIST FRONTS

The Southern Conference for Human Welfare has further revealed itself as a Communist front organization by its cooperation with other Communist-dominated front groups.

Among these groups following the lead of the Communist Party in support of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare are the University of Virginia Chapter of the American Student Union (Student Almanac, p. 44), International Labor Defense (Yearbook 1939–41, p. 25), New South (October 1938, p. 15), Workers Alliance (Daily Worker, November 21, 1938, p. 1), Labor Research Association (pamphlet, Southern Labor in Wartime, p. 22), and the American Federation of Teachers at that time under Communist control (American Teacher, December 1938, p. 7).

In recent years, cooperation has also come from these Communist-controlled organizations: National Federation for Constitutional Liberties (April 4, 1946); United Office and Professional Workers of America, CIO (April 4, 1946); International Workers Order (February 1, 1947); League of Women Shoppers (September 8, 1946); United Public Workers of America, CIO (February 1, 1947); United Negro and Allied Veterans (September 8, 1946).

Samuel Neuburger, attorney for the Communist Party and for Leon Josephson, Soviet Secret Service operative charged with passport frauds, was one of the chief speakers at a mass meeting sponsored in Washington, D. C., April 4, 1946, by the local organizations of the Southern Conference, National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, and United Office and Professional Workers of America.

The president of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare (Clark H. Foreman) was a member of the initiating committee of the Congress on Civil Rights, which met in Detroit, April 27–28, 1946, and which is now defending Gerhart Eisler, Comintern agent.

When the New York committee of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare held a 3-day street collection called Lend a Hand to Dixie Land, September 19–21, 1946, the Communist-controlled American Labor Party of New York announced that its Bronx County clubs would hold street rallies in support of the drive. (Daily Worker, September 21, 1946, p. 5.)

The Daily Worker of May 27, 1947, publicized with approval the stand taken on southern issues by the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, the New Jersey State secretariat of the Communist Party, Civil Rights Congress, and the Progressive Citizens of America. Activities of the Southern Conference are generally featured prominently in the Daily Worker.

It is also interesting that funds totaling $1,500 were received by the conference in 1942 from the Robert Marshall Foundation—an organization which has donated heavily to the support of Communist-front groups.

The Southern Patriot gives publicity to activities of such other front organizations as the Southern Negro Youth Congress and the National Committee to Abolish the Poll Tax.

In June 1947 the conference organ also urged readers to demand local radio-station outlets for a new weekly union radio broadcast, sponsored by the Communist-controlled United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, CIO (p. 7).

Other publications recommended to Southern Patriot readers significantly include Facts and Fascism, by George Seldes, who edits the pro-Communist gossip and scandal sheet known as In Fact. Seldes' views have received high commendation from the Soviet press.

The Southern Patriot editor also has offered as reading suggestions: We Have Seen America, a collection of addresses by three Soviet journalists who toured America and bitterly criticized it, appropriately published by the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship; The Races of Mankind, a eulogy of Russia's treatment of minority groups that was condemned by the War Department; All Brave Sailors, a eulogy of the leftist National Maritime Union, written by John Beecher; and How Is Your Health? published by the Physicians Forum, a Communist front.

The conference publication in addition has defended the book, Our Good Neighbors in Soviet Russia, which was taken off the Texas school textbook list because of its pro-Soviet bias. The Southern Patriot has printed quotations from War Department orientation fact sheet No. 64—a fact sheet so suited to the Communist cause that the International Labor Defense, legal arm of the Communist Party, had it reprinted. The War Department subsequently withdrew this pamphlet from circulation.

NEGROES

In allying themselves with the Communists and in permitting the Communists to control policy and strategic positions, the non-Communists in the Southern Conference for Human Welfare are wittingly or unwittingly promoting the following fundamental principles of the Communist Party in dealing with the Negro question:

1. The Communists are not interested in the long-range welfare of the Negro. They are interested rather in using the issue as explosive and revolutionary tinder in destroying American democracy.

2. They have placed themselves on record as favoring an independent Negro Soviet Republic in the southern Black Belt which in essence is a call to civil war in which the Negro population would be the unhappy victims and in which all their social gains made in recent years would be sacrificed.

DENOUNCED BY SOUTHERNERS

The pro-Communist bias of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare has been publicly attacked on several occasions. This committee formally cited the organization as a Communist front on March 29, 1944.

CIO leaders in April 1946 renounced the aid of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare in the union's southern organizational campaign, declaring: "No crowd, whether Communist, Socialist, or anybody else, is going to mix up in this organizing drive" (Baltimore Sun, April 19, 1946, p. 17).

The Daily Worker quickly sprang to the defense of the conference and denounced the CIO for a "red baiting" attack (Daily Worker, April 20, 1946, p. 5).

The Young Men's Business Club of New Orleans adopted the following resolution on November 14, 1946:

"Be it resolved, That the Young Men's Business Club of New Orleans go on record as being opposed to the activities of the organization known as the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, that the press and city officials be notified that many of the national officers of this group have definite communistic tendencies."

INTERLOCKING WITH COMMUNIST CAUSES

One could reasonably conceive of a group of individuals motivated by a desire to form an organization to promote human welfare in the South and with no trace of Communist sympathy or affiliation. One could even conceive of a group of well-intentioned but non-Communist individuals being enticed by camouflaged Communists into an enterprise strictly limited to this humanitarian cause. In the light of the fact that a significant number of the leading lights of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare are associated with organizations or campaigns for the defense of the Communist Party or individual Communists, or with organizations defending the Soviet Union, or its policies—issues which have nothing to do with the South—one is forced to the conclusion that, by and large the common bond among its supporters is a certain degree of sympathy for the Soviet Union and/or the Communist Party, rather than any primary interest in human welfare in the South. One is further forced to conclude that the professed interest in southern welfare is simply an expedient for larger aims serving the Soviet Union and its subservient Communist Party in the United States.

Southern Conference for Human Welfare (name and position)	Statement defending Communist Party	Support or defense of individual Communists	Organizations defending Communists	Pro-Soviet relief or propaganda organizations	Organizations defending Soviet foreign policy
Ameringer, Oscar, sponsor			NFCL		ALWF, APM, CDAKOW.
Bancroft, Frank C., editor	Mar. 5, 1941	Darcy	ACDIF, NFCL	RWR	APM.
Bethune, Mary McLeod, member, board of representatives.		F. Smith, Herndon	ACPFB, NFCL	NCASF	ALPD.
Blanchard, Myles D., speaker			NFCL		ALPD
Brown, Charlotte Hawkins, member, board of representatives.	Apr. 26, 1947	Mar. 18, 1945, Schappes	NFCL		WPC.
Buckmaster, Henrietta, member, New York, executive board.		Dimitrov, Schappes	JARC, WCDA	NCASF	
Burnham, Louis, member, board of representatives.		Browder	NFCL, ILD		APM.
Clement, Rufus E., member, executive board.			ACDIF, ACPFB	ACSR	
Coffee, John M., sponsor		Bloor	NFCL, NYCIR, ILD, JARC, WCDA, WTMC.	NCASF	ALPD.
Davies, Joseph E., sponsor			JARC	NCASF	
Davis, John P., sponsor, vice president		Herndon	NFCL, NYCIR, IJA, ILD, JCDBP, CRF, NLG, WCDA.		ALPD, APM.
De Lacy, Hugh, sponsor		Browder, Bridges, Schappes.	NFCL, ACPFB, ILD, ACDIF	NCASF	APM.
DeLaney, Hubert T., sponsor		F. Smith, Herndon	NLG		
Dinwiddie, Courtenay, sponsor		Browder			
Dobbs, Malcolm Cotton, Alabama executive secretary.			NFCL		APM, CDAKOW.
Dombrowski, James, executive secretary, administrator.	Mar. 5, 1941		NFCL		
Douglas, Melvyn, advisory associate					ALPD.
Dunjee, Roscoe, vice president	Apr. 26, 1947	Schappes, Herndon			

Southern Conference for Human Welfare (name and position)	Statement defending Communist Party	Support or defense of individual Communists	Organizations defending Communists	Pro-Soviet relief or propaganda organizations	Organizations defending Soviet foreign policy
Durr, Virginia Foster, vice president			NCPR		
Emerson, Thomas I., sponsor			NLG, IJA		
Ezekiel, Lucille, supporter			WCDA, WTMC		
Feinberg, William, member New York executive board.		Dimitrov	JARC	RWR	
Foreman, Clark H., president			WCDA		WPC.
Frazier, E. Franklin, sponsor		Browder	WCDA		
Gelders, Joseph	Apr. 6, 1938		NCDPP, ILD, NFCL		APM.
Graham, Frank P., honorary president		Browder	ACDIF, ACPFB, ILD	NCASF	ALPD.
Grant, Edmonia, associate administrator.	Apr. 26, 1947				
Granger, Lester, sponsor		Prestes	ILD		
Hall, Robert F., congress delegate, 1940[1]					
Harriman, Mrs. J. Borden, supporter			JARC	ASCRR, NCASF	
Harris, Gerald, member, executive board.			NFCL	ACASF	APM, CDAKOW.
Hastie, William H., sponsor			NFCL, ILD, WCDA		
Hawes, Elizabeth, sponsor		Bloor, Flynn	NECDR	ACSR, NCASF	
Houston, Charles H., sponsor	Mar. 5, 1941 Apr. 26, 1947	Schappes, Herndon	ACPFB, WCDA, NFCL	NCASF	
Hughes, Langston, sponsor		Browder, Foster, Schappes	NCDPP, NFCL	FSU, NCASF	ALWF, APM.
Ickes, Harold L., speaker				NCASF	ASC.
Jernagin, William H., sponsor			NFCL, WCDA, WTMC		ALPD.
Jones, David D., sponsor	Apr. 26, 1947	Schappes	NFCL		
Josephy, Robert, sponsor		Browder	ACDIF, NFCL	ARI	
Kirchwey, Freda, sponsor		Schappes, Stamm, Bloor	ACDIF, LDC, NFCL	RWR	AAAIL.
Lee, Canada, sponsor		Schappes, F. Smith	ACPFB, ILD, SLDC		APM.
Lindeman, Eduard C., member, New York executive board.		Browder	JARC, NYCIR	ACSR	ALPD.
Mays, Benjamin, member, nominating committee, 1947–48.	Mar. 18, 1945 Apr. 27, 1947	Bridges		NCASF	
McAvoy, Clifford, supporter	Mar. 5, 1941	Bridges, Browder, Darcy, Schappes.	ACDIF, NFCL, ACPFB, ILD	ACSR, NCASF	ALPD, CDAKOW.
McMichael, Jack, member, New York executive board.	do Apr. 29, 1947		NFCL		ALPD, APM, CDAKOW, WPC.
Mollegan, Albert T., sponsor	Mar. 19, 1940	Browder	NFCL, WTMC		ALPD.
Nixon, Herman C., executive secretary			NFCL, ILD, NCPR		
Parker, Dorothy, member, New York executive board.			ACPFB, NYTMC, HLDA, JARC, CRC.	ACSR	ALPD.
Peters, E. C., sponsor			ILD	ACSR, NCASF	
Pressman, Lee, sponsor			IJA, NFCL, WCDA, NLG		
Reid, Ira DeA., speaker	Apr. 26, 1947	Browder	ACPFB, NFCL		ALWF.
Robeson, Paul, member, New York executive board.	July 23, 1940 Sept. 23, 1940 Mar. 5, 1941 Apr. 26, 1947	Bridges, Browder, Schappes, F. Smith.	ACDIF, NFCL, ACPFB, JARC	RWR, NCASF	APM, WPC.
Smith, Lillian, sponsor		Browder			APM.
Smith, Mason, speaker		Browder, Schappes			APM, CDAKOW.
Spottswood, Stephen G., sponsor	Apr. 26, 1947				
Strong, Edward E., sponsor	Mar. 5, 1941				ALPD, APM, CDAKOW.
Taylor, Alvah W., member, board of representatives.	Mar. 18, 1945	Schappes, Bridges		ACSR	
Thompson, John B., member, board of representatives.			ACPFB		APM, CDAKOW.
Tobias, Channing, advisory associate		Dimitrov	NFCL	NCASF	ALPD, WPC.
Wallace, Henry A., advisory associate	May 29, 1947		ACPFB, ACDIF	ARI	
Walsh, J. Raymond, speaker	Dec. 14, 1939		ACPFB, NFCL	ACSR	
Webber, Charles C., member, nominating committee, 1947–48.		Bridges	ACSR, JARC, NFCL		ALWF.

[1] Member, national committee, Communist Party, USA.

TABLE OF SYMBOLS

AAAIL	All American Anti-Imperialist League.
ACDIF	American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom.
ACPFB	American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born.
ACSR	American Committee for Soviet Relations.
ALPD	American League for Peace and Democracy.
ALWF	American League Against War and Fascism.
APM	American Peace Mobilization.
ARI	American Russian Institute.
ASC	American Slav Congress.
ASCRR	American Society for Cultural Relations with Russia.
CDAKOW	Committee to Defend America by Keeping Out of War.
CRC	Civil Rights Congress.
CRF	Civil Rights Federation.
FSU	Friends of the Soviet Union.
HLDA	Hollywood League for Democratic Action.
IJA	International Juridical Association.
ILD	International Labor Defense.
JARC	Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee.
JCDBP	Joint Committee for the Defense of Brazilian People (Prestes).
LDC	Labor Defense Council.
NCASF	National Council of American-Soviet Friendship.
NCDPP	National Committee for Defense of Political Prisoners.
NCPR	National Committee for People's Rights.
NECDR	National Emergency Conference for Democratic Rights.
NLG	National Lawyers Guild.
NYCIR	New York Conference for Inalienable Rights.
NYTMC	New York Tom Mooney Committee.
RWR	Russian War Relief.
SLDC	Sleepy Lagoon Defense Committee.
WCDA	Washington Committee for Democratic Action.
WPC	Win-the-Peace Conference.
WTMC	Washington Tom Mooney Committee.

CONCLUSION

The Southern Conference for Human Welfare is perhaps the most deviously camouflaged Communist-front organization. When put to the following acid test it reveals its true character:

1. It shows unswerving loyalty to the basic principles of Soviet foreign policy.

2. It has consistently refused to take sharp issue with the activities and policies of either the Communist Party, USA, or the Soviet Union.

3. It has maintained in decisive posts persons who have the confidence of the Communist press.

4. It has displayed consistent anti-American bias and pro-Soviet bias, despite professions, in generalities, of love for America.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 146, noes 7.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and nineteen Members are present, a quorum.

So the motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WALTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio broadcast by George E. Reedy.

Mrs. DOUGLAS asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one instance with reference to a bill which she is introducing today on migratory farm labor.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, so that no one will have to wonder and no one will have to make a report, I take this opportunity of informing the House that

I am going to avail myself of the opportunity tonight of going to hear our former Secretary of Agriculture, our former Vice President, our former Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Henry A. Wallace, a distinguished American, when he addresses the Southern Conference at Washington, D. C.

The American way is to listen, to read, to try to think for yourself, and then come to some conclusion. God help America if freedom of speech or freedom of assembly is ever seriously threatened.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from California has expired.

COMMUNIST PARTY LINE

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, here is a remarkable illustration that the Communist Party line is working in perfect coordination to accomplish the veto of the Taft-Hartley bill. It will be interesting to see what effect the party line will have on President Truman when he finally decides what to do with the bill on Friday of this week.

I have here a copy of a radio speech made in New York City by William Z. Foster, chairman of the Communist Party in the United States, over the Nation-wide Mutual radio network on June 10 at 10:15 to 10:30 p. m. Among other things he said, and I quote:

> The workers don't want merely a formal veto, the workers * * * demand that President Truman besides vetoing the Taft-Hartley bill should also, as Democratic Party leader, mobilize the Democrats in Congress to sustain his veto.

I also have a copy of the Labor Herald, official California CIO newspaper dated June 10, the same date as the broadcast in New York City and, of course, published before 10 p. m. on that date, which states, and I quote:

> The Los Angeles CIO Council warned President Truman this week that a formal veto of the Taft-Hartley bill will not satisfy labor, as head of the Democratic Party we urge you to use the full force of party leadership to bring the Taft-Hartley bill to sure and final defeat.

The striking similarity of the two statements, one uttered over the radio by William Z. Foster, head of the Communist Party in New York City, the other published in the CIO newspaper in California 3,000 miles away and on the same day, shows that the Communist Party line is working in perfect cooperation to defeat the Taft-Hartley labor bill.

I wonder if the President of the United States will yield to this kind of demand and warning pressure. I wonder if he will have as much courage as Ramadier, Premier of France, who successfully resisted such pressure when he told the Communists to go to. Or I wonder if the Communist Party have a pipe line into the White House.

I hope not. We do not intend to paint the White House red in order to accommodate Mr. Foster and others. I hope I am right in my belief that President Truman will not yield to the demands and threats of the Communist Party. I cannot believe he will after his recent urgent demand for $400,000,000 to stop the advance of communism in Greece.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some radio comment by Mr. George E. Reedy.

TODAY WAS TO BE DEBT-FREE DAY

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD briefly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, today, June 16, 1947, was to have been the day when the United States would be out of debt. That was the program adopted by the Congress back in 1922, believe it or not. We are reminded of the fact by the following words which appeared in the Omaha World-Herald of yesterday:

TODAY IS DEBT-FREE DAY

The time is the period just after World War I. Congress was wrestling with the problems arising from the cost of the Nation's biggest war. About ten billions was owed to holders of Government bonds and about nine and one-half billions had been loaned to other nations.

To put the retirement of this debt on a businesslike basis, Congress came up with the Sinking Fund Act of March 3, 1919, and the War Foreign Debt Funding Act of 1922. The domestic and foreign debts were divided into two categories, and orderly provision was made for their retirement.

That's what Congress did, back in the pre-European default, predepression and pre-World War II days of the early twenties. By 1945 the entire domestic debt was to be paid off. By 1947 the foreign debt was to be wiped off the books. Then United States dollars, to coin a phrase, were to be sound as a dollar.

That happy day was to have been reached on June 15, 1947. And June 15, 1947, finds the United States debt around $260,000,000,000.

Howdy, taxpayers.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a commencement address by Hon. KARL STEFAN delivered on June 6 before the law class of National University Law School.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

THE WHISKER'S CLUB

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, my congressional district has been acclaimed far and wide for its outstanding accomplishments and I want to call the attention of the House today to another achievement for which we are gaining added fame.

I am referring to the Waynesboro Beards, better known as the Whisker's Club. In anticipation of Waynesboro's one hundred and fiftieth anniversary, July 6–11, 1947, the Sesqui Whisker's Club was organized last February. Since then hundreds of men have joined the rolls. The beards will not be shaved off until after the sesquicentennial celebration. Waynesboro's beards will be the official and genuine old-time dress of local men for the celebration.

As a preliminary to the sesquicentennial anniversary 200 members of the Whisker's Club and a band will be in Washington on Sunday, June 22 next, at 11 o'clock on the Capitol steps, and I am authorized to extend this invitation to the membership of the House to come out and meet these men.

Members of the Whisker's Club are coming to Washington 200 strong in six chartered busses, headed by Waynesboro's burgess, Harry C. Funk, who has good naturedly been raising a beard since February, and Edward V. Kotserba, publicity manager of the beards. They will pose on the Capitol steps for newspapers and newsreel cameramen before they embark for Griffith Stadium where they will attend the double-header between the Washington Senators and the St. Louis Browns.

During sesquicentennial week you are all invited to come to Waynesboro where a daily pagent will be held each evening in Fairview Avenue Stadium. There will be firemen's contests, float parades, band contests, shirt-tail and bearded-men's parades. Prizes amounting to $6,000 will be awarded.

Tom Breneman, who hails from Waynesboro, will be on hand to present his radio show Breakfast in Hollywood daily at 11 o'clock from Fairview Stadium.

We expect upward of 100,000 people to attend the Waynesboro celebration. Governor Duff, of Pennsylvania, Senator EDWARD MARTIN, and our own Speaker JOE MARTIN have been officially invited by the sesquicentennial committee.

Now do not forget, it is next Sunday, June 22, at 11 o'clock, on the Capitol steps. Come out and join us. If you look for me I will be there, probably behind an ersatz beard.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made previously today and include the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement prepared by Joseph Leib, relative to the recent air crashes.

FREEDOM OF SPEECH

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I voted against the motion to table that was presented a few minutes ago and voted for the motion to strike, but I want you to know that I can see some danger creeping into this thing.

I thought the telegram went too far, especially the last part that was called to our attention by our distinguished Speaker. I thought that was highly improper, but I am not sure about all of the telegram being of unparliamentary language. Certainly we must recognize the fact that we are not perfect and all we do is not sacrosanct; that people do have a right to criticize us the same as we have a right to criticize others; and we must be careful, Mr. Speaker, that we do not trespass upon the right of freedom of speech in this great country of ours.

I definitely expect to always be found, to the full strength of my soul, fighting to maintain freedom of speech.

THE LATE HONORABLE WILLIAM R. GREEN

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot entertain that request but without objection will recognize the gentleman for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have the sad duty of announcing to the Members of Congress the passing of a former Member of this body, the Honorable William R. Green. At the time of Mr. Green's resignation from Congress he was chairman of the important Ways and Means Committee of this House. Some who sit on this floor today remember well the valuable, patriotic, unselfish service which Mr. Green rendered to this country. I listened with a heavy heart to the last words spoken at the grave this morning when this great American was laid to rest in a beautiful silent valley in Rock Creek Cemetery here in the District of Columbia.

We who know him best recognized him as one of the most outstanding public servants and loyal Americans who ever graced the floor of this House.

Mr. Green was a resident of my home county, Audubon, when I was a boy, and I can truly state that he has always been an inspiration to me. I have the honor of representing in this Congress the same district which this great patriot represented so ably for 17 years. The editor of the Council Bluffs Nonpareil had this to say about Hon. William R. Green:

A FAITHFUL PUBLIC SERVANT

William R. Green, who served as district judge from 1894 to 1911, Member of Congress from this district for 17 years, and member of the Federal court of claims for 12 years, died the other day at the age of 90.

Judge Green was well known to many of the older residents of Council Bluffs and Southwest Iowa. As a district judge he held court in many counties. As a Member of Congress he became chairman of the Ways and Means Committee which drafts the tax laws. He helped determine the taxes which paid for the First World War. After it was over he helped work out the reductions which brought about relief to the taxpayers but brought in sufficient revenue to reduce the national debt at a rapid rate.

He retired from Congress to become judge of the Court of Claims which was busy dealing with suits brought against the Government resulting from the war.

The last time we saw Judge Green, we believe it was in 1939, the court had comparatively little to do. He retired in 1940 and made his home with his daughter in New York.

Judge Green was a gentleman of the old school, who served his country in many capacities, always with distinction, and to the satisfaction of the public.

Southwest Iowa has reason to be proud of his long and distinguished record.

I know I have expressed the feeling in the hearts of those who knew the Honorable William Green. We extend our heartfelt sympathies to his bereaved family. God rest his soul.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. One of the first men I met when I came to Congress was William R. Green. He and his elegant wife and daughter lived in the same hotel that we did. I served with him from that time until he resigned to take a place on the bench. I certainly join in everything the gentleman from Iowa has said about him. He was one of the finest characters I have ever known. He was a great American, an able Representative of the great State of Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. It was not my good fortune to be personally acquainted with Hon. William R. Green, although I feel I know him because of the praise of his service which I have heard from the lips of so many folks back home long before I came to Congress.

Since coming to Congress many Members of this House of Representatives who served with Mr. Green have told me of his great ability, statesmanship, and high purpose. I join with my colleague from Iowa in what he has said. Iowa and America have lost a great citizen.

LYNCHING BEING LYNCHED

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, the editorial entitled "Good Mayor," in the Washington Post last Saturday, is worthy not only of the perusal of every Member of the Congress, but also it challenges the best thoughtful pondering of every citizen.

It is important enough to enjoin the prayerful attention of everyone who has ears to hear.

GOOD MAYOR

Just as a community which tacitly encourages a lynching deserves the full impact of public scorn, so officials who act sensibly to avert a lynching merit commendation. Hurtsboro, Ala., nearly had a lynching Tuesday. A mob had a rope all ready for a Negro youth accused of attempted attack on a white woman. The mayor, Hurt Vann, appeared in time to persuade the crowd to release the prisoner because he said, "That is the best way—we ought to let the law take its course." This enlightened conception of basic justice implies no sympathy with the alleged crime. It does, however, indicate a growing sensitivity to government by law instead of by mob. That in itself is a step forward. The more public officials can be induced to see their duty as did Mayor Vann, the more their example will serve to put resort to primitive torture on the wane.

Not only does this editorial turn the powerful spotlight of enlightened cordial approval upon a good man incarnating his righteous thought into effective action, but also it again points the moral that such conduct is the only way the crime of lynching is being or can be stopped. Whether demonstrated by officers or by private citizens it is the way, and the only way, that the number of lynchings has been reduced about 99 percent. In 1892, 1 citizen in every 300,000 was lynched. Fifty years later there was 1 in 15,000,000. In 1945 there was none.

Of course, there have been many other murders. Some are called gangster killings, or, if not in the South, they have been described as "done by a group of 500 righteously indignant citizens." But wherever human life is taken, except by due process of law, it is murder or some lesser degree of homicide.

The challenge is to every good citizen so to live that no life may be jeopardized or taken lawlessly.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include editorials and newspaper articles.

Mr. JENISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Danville (Ill.) Commercial News.

NINETY-SIXTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE PANAMA RAILROAD COMPANY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the Ninety-Sixth Annual Report of the Board of Directors of the Panama Railroad Company for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 16, 1947.*

REDUCTION IN INCOME TAX PAYMENTS—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 322)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 1, entitled "An act to reduce individual income-tax payments."

The right kind of tax reduction, at the right time, is an objective to which I am deeply committed. But I have reached the conclusion that this bill represents

the wrong kind of tax reduction, at the wrong time. It offers dubious, ill-apportioned, and risky benefits at the expense of a sound tax policy and is, from the standpoint of Government finances, unsafe. Proposals for tax reduction must be examined in the light of sound and carefully related fiscal and economic policies. Unless they are consistent with the demands of such policies, they should not be approved.

In my budget message of January 10, 1947, I said:

> As long as business, employment, and national income continue high, we should maintain tax revenues at levels that will not only meet current expenditures but also leave a surplus for retirement of the public debt. There is no justification now for tax reduction.

Developments since January do not warrant a change in that conclusion. Total employment in May increased by a million and a half over that in April, and the total number now employed is over 58,000,000. The number of unemployed is now less than 2,000,000, practically a peace-time minimum. Income payments to individuals are estimated to be at the record annual rate of $176,000,000. Department store sales in May were up 6 percent over April, and equaled the all-time high in dollar volume. The number of houses begun by private enterprise in May was the largest in any month since VJ-day. Despite many gloomy predictions, there is no convincing evidence that a recession is imminent.

Ample evidence points to the continuation of inflationary pressures. Tax reduction now would increase them. If these pressures are long continued, and if essential readjustments within the price structure are long deferred, we are likely to induce the very recession we seek to avoid.

Reductions in income-tax rates are not required now to permit necessary investment and business expansion. There is no shortage of funds for this purpose in any wide sector of our economy. As a matter of fact, the amount of liquid funds in the hands of corporations and individuals at the present time is nearly $200,000,000,000. Under these circumstances, tax reduction is not now needed to provide additional funds for business expansion.

The argument is made that the funds added to consumer purchasing power through this tax reduction are needed to maintain employment and production at maximum levels.

It is true, as I have pointed out many times, that the purchasing power of large groups of our people has been seriously reduced. We must take every step possible to remedy the disparity between prices and the incomes of the rank and file of our people, so as not to put brakes on our continued prosperity and lead us toward a recession. Tax reduction as proposed in H. R. 1 is not the proper way to remedy the current price situation and its effect upon consumers and upon prospective employment. Necessary adjustments in incomes, production, and prices should be made by wise policies and improved practices of business and labor, not by hastily invoking the fiscal powers of Government on a broad scale.

The time for tax reduction will come when general inflationary pressures have ceased and the structure of prices is on a more stable basis than now prevails. How long it will take for this point to be reached is impossible to predict. Clearly, it has not been reached as yet. Tax reduction now would add to, rather than correct, maladjustments in the economic structure.

Sound fiscal policy also requires that existing tax rates be maintained for the present. I have always been keenly aware of the necessity for the utmost economy in government and of the need for a progressive reduction in Government expenditures to the greatest extent possible consistent with our national interests. However, necessary expenditures for essential Government operations are still high. We are still meeting heavy obligations growing out of the war. We continue to be confronted with great responsibilities for international relief and rehabilitation that have an important bearing on our efforts to secure lasting peace. We are still in a transition period in which many uncertainties continue. In the face of these facts, common prudence demands a realistic and conservative management of the fiscal affairs of the Government.

A time of high employment and high prices, wages, and profits, such as the present, calls for a surplus in Government revenue over expenditures and the application of all or much of this surplus to the reduction of the public debt. Continuing public confidence in Government finances depends upon such a policy. If the Government does not reduce the public debt during the most active and inflationary periods, there is little prospect of material reduction at any time, and the country would, as a result, be in a poorer position to extend supports to the economy should a subsequent deflationary period develop.

With the present huge public debt, it is of first importance that every effort now be made to reduce the debt as much as possible. If H. R. 1 were to become law, the amount available for debt retirement would be entirely too low for this period of unparalleled high levels of peacetime income and employment.

The integrity of the public debt is the financial bedrock on which our national economy rests. More than half of the American people are direct owners of Government securities. A major portion of the assets of banks, insurance companies, and trust funds is invested in Government bonds. To maintain the integrity of the public debt, we must now reduce it by substantial amounts.

In addition to the fact that this is not the time for tax reduction, there is a fundamental objection to this particular bill. An adjustment of the tax system should provide fair and equitable relief for individuals from the present tax burden, but the reductions proposed in H. R. 1 are neither fair nor equitable. H. R. 1 reduces taxes in the high income brackets to a grossly disproportionate extent as compared to the reduction in the low income brackets. A good tax reduction bill would give a greater proportion of relief to the low-income group.

H. R. 1 fails to give relief where it is needed most. Under H. R. 1, tax savings to the average family with an income of $2,500 would be less than $30, while taxes on an income of $50,000 would be reduced by nearly $5,000, and on an income of $500,000 by nearly $60,000.

Insofar as take-home pay is concerned under H. R. 1, the family earning $2,500 would receive an increase of only 1.2 percent; the family with an income of $50,000 would receive an increase of 18.6 percent; and the family with an income of $500,000 would receive an increase of 62.3 percent.

If H. R. 1 were to become law, the inequity of its provisions would be frozen into the tax structure. The reduction in Government receipts resulting from this bill would be such that the Government could ill afford to make fair tax reductions at the proper time in the form of a carefully considered revision of our entire tax structure.

Now is the time to plan for a thoroughgoing revision of the tax system. We should consider not only individual income tax rates, but also the level of personal exemptions and many other adjustments in the personal income-tax structure. We should also consider changes in excise tax laws, gift, and estate taxes, corporation taxes, and, in fact, the entire field of tax revenues. Such a program of tax adjustment and tax reduction should be geared to the financial and economic needs of this country. It will be an important contribution to economic progress. The timing of such a program is highly important to achieve economic stability, to promote the investment of capital, and to maintain employment, purchasing power and high levels of production.

For the compelling reasons I have set forth, I return H. R. 1 without my approval.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 16, 1947.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further consideration of the veto message on the bill H. R. 1 be postponed until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

MAKING CRIMINALLY LIABLE PERSONS WHO NEGLIGENTLY ALLOW PRISONERS IN THEIR CUSTODY TO ESCAPE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 26) to make criminally liable persons who negligently allow prisoners in their custody to escape.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 138 of the Criminal Code (35 Stat. 1113; 18 U. S. C. 244) be, and it hereby is, amended to read as follows:

"Whenever any marshal, deputy marshal, ministerial officer, or other person has in his

custody any prisoner by virtue of process issued under the laws of the United States by any court, judge, or commissioner, and such marshal, deputy marshal, ministerial officer, or other person voluntarily suffers such prisoner to escape, he shall be fined not more than $2,000, or imprisoned not more than 2 years or both. Whenever any marshal, deputy marshal, ministerial officer, or other person has in his custody any prisoner by virtue of process issued under the laws of the United States by any court, judge, or commissioner, and such marshal, deputy marshal, ministerial officer, or other person negligently suffers such prisoner to escape, he shall be fined not more than $500 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOVERY OF UNDERCHARGES AND OVERCHARGES BY CERTAIN COMMON CARRIERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2759) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to provide limitations on the time within which actions may be brought for the recovery of undercharges and overcharges by or against common carriers by motor vehicle, common carriers by water, and freight forwarders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. SPRINGER, and Mr. KEAN objected.

JUDICIAL CODE AND JUDICIARY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3214) to revise, codify, and enact into law title 28 of the United States Code entitled "Judicial Code and Judiciary."

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF VETERANS' PREFERENCE ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 966) to amend section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of June 27, 1944 (58 Stat. 387).

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SECRETARIES FOR CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2746) to provide secretaries for circuit and district judges.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DEANE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the gentleman who considered this bill what appropriation will be necessary to carry it into effect?

Mr. GRAHAM. At the present moment every Federal judge has a secretary. The purpose of this bill is to provide that each circuit judge and each district judge may appoint a secretary and also to provide that each senior circuit judge and each senior district judge in districts where there are five or more district judges for law clerks for the senior district judges to assist in the expedition and handling of the business. So far as salaries are concerned, there will only be an increase in the salaries of these extra clerks. All other judges have secretaries and clerks at the moment, but due to the action of the Committee on Appropriations, there being no basic law, it was necessary to enact this legislation in order that they may be paid.

Mr. DEANE. How much over and above the amount that was included in the State, Justice, and Commerce appropriations?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am not familiar with that. I am not able to answer the gentleman.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MICHENER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

PROMOTING UNIFORMITY OF GEOGRAPHIC NOMENCLATURE IN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1555) to promote uniformity of geographic nomenclature in the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to make a brief explanation.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will give legal sanction to an important function of the Federal Government which has been carried on for 57 years under an Executive order originally issued by President Benjamin Harrison in 1890. It was introduced by me at the request of the Department of the Interior and has the backing of the Department of State, the War Department, the Navy Department, the Post Office Department, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, the Government Printing Office, the Library of Congress, and the Central Intelligence Group.

The enactment of this legislation will eliminate duplication of effort in various executive departments and result in a saving to the Government. The Central Intelligence Group, which is charged with the planning and coordination of Government intelligence activities in the United States, asks the passage of the bill for security and national defense.

I have taken advantage of this opportunity to explain the purpose of the meritorious measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE]?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2938) to amend section 1 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 497; 5 U. S. C., sec. 488), fixing the price of copies of records furnished by the Department of the Interior.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object.

CAIRO BRIDGE COMMISSION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1610) to amend the act of June 14, 1938, so as to authorize the Cairo Bridge Commission to issue its refunding bonds for the purpose of refunding the outstanding bonds issued by the commission to pay the cost of a certain toll bridge at or near Cairo, Ill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the Cairo Bridge Commission, or the successors of said commission, to acquire by purchase, and to improve, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Cairo, Ill., approved June 14, 1938 (Public, No. 601, 75th Cong., 52 Stat. 679), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. The power granted to the commission by this act to issue its negotiable bonds for the payment of the cost of said bridge and its approaches and the necessary lands, easements, and appurtenances thereto, shall include the power to refund said bonds, including the payment of any redemption premium thereon, by the issuance of negotiable refunding bonds of the commission, bearing interest at a lower rate or rates, in an aggregate principal amount not in excess of the principal amount of outstanding bonds to be refunded plus the amount of the redemption premium payable on said outstanding bonds at the date of the redemption thereof. All of the provisions of sections 4 and 5 of said act of April 13, 1934, relating to the bridge constructed, to the bonds issued, and to the trust agreement entered into under the authority of said act, and relating to the collection of bridge tolls and to the application of such tolls, shall apply to the bridge acquired and to the bonds issued or to be issued under the authority of this act."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRESPASSING ON NATIONAL FORESTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1826) making it a petty offense to enter any national-forest land while it is closed to the public.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have some explanation of what this bill embraces.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, this bill reduces the penalty now provided by law for illegal entry into national forests. At present the law provides that the penalty for illegal entry shall be a fine of not more than $500 and imprisonment for not more than one year. Obviously, that penalty is too severe. So at the request of the Forest Service, this bill

has been introduced, to make the penalty not more than 6 months. That is all there is to the bill.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. How about the fine?

Mr. HOPE. The fine is left just as it is. The fine has been $500 and it is left at $500.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. In other words, it does not change the law as it stands except as to lessening the imprisonment.

Mr. HOPE. It changes the law as to the maximum imprisonment that may be imposed.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, did I understand the gentleman to say the maximum penalty is $500?

Mr. HOPE. The maximum penalty is $500 and one year in jail at present. This bill does not change the maximum penalty as far as the fine is concerned but it does reduce the imprisonment term from 1 year to 6 months.

Mr. HARRIS. Does it have a minimum fine attached to it?

Mr. HOPE. No. There is no minimum.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it was not until the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, indicated that this bill amended existing law that we of the committee were aware of that fact. Certainly the bill itself does not indicate that existing law relating to penalties for trespass is modified in any respect. The report itself does not comply with the rule of the House, known as the Ramsayer rule, if the bill actually does modify existing law. While there is no objection to the bill itself, in order that the report may be complete and everybody understand the full import of the bill, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE]?

There was no objection.

EXTENDING RECLAMATION LAWS TO THE STATE OF ARKANSAS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1274) to extend the reclamation laws to the State of Arkansas.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HARRIS, Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. GATHINGS, and Mr. LARCADE objected; and the bill was stricken from the calendar.

VACANCY IN THE OFFICE OF DISTRICT JUDGE IN THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1436) to repeal the prohibition against the filling of a vacancy in the office of district judge in the southern district of New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to state it seems rather difficult there should be any opposition to this bill which provides for the filling of a vacancy created by the resignation of a district judge in the southern district of New York. The bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on the Judiciary. It has the approval of the Judicial Conference. It has the approval of the Administrator of the United States Courts. It has the approval of all bar associations having jurisdiction in the southern district of New York. It has the approval of the Department of Justice. It is rather difficult, therefore, to understand why there is objection. I hope, therefore, the gentleman from New York instead of objecting will permit the bill to be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. COLE of New York. That was my request that the bill be passed over.

Mr. CELLER. Excuse me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York that the bill may be passed over without prejudice?

There was no objection.

INCREASING MINIMUM ALLOWANCE PAYABLE FOR REHABILITATION IN SERVICE-CONNECTED CASES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3308) to increase the minimum allowance payable for rehabilitation in service-connected cases.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill involves too much money for consideration on the Consent Calendar.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE ORGANIC ACT OF PUERTO RICO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3309) to amend the Organic Act of Puerto Rico.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 12 of the Organic Act (48 U. S. C., sec. 771) is hereby amended by repealing the second sentence thereof and substituting the following: "At the general election in 1948 and each such election quadrennially thereafter the Governor of Puerto Rico shall be elected by the qualified voters of Puerto Rico and shall hold office for a term of 4 years commencing on the 2d day of January following the date of the election and until his successor is elected and qualified. No person shall be eligible to election as Governor unless at the time of the election he is a citizen of the United States, is at least 30 years of age, is able to read and write the English language, and has been a bona fide resident of Puerto Rico during the immediately preceding 2 years. Such election shall be held in the manner now provided by law for the election of the Resident Commissioner."

SEC. 2. Section 12a is hereby added to the Organic Act to read as follows:

"SEC. 12a. The Governor shall be removed from office on impeachment for, and conviction of treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors. The House of Representatives of Puerto Rico shall have the sole power of impeachment. Impeachment shall require the concurrence of two-thirds of all the members of the house of representatives. The senate shall have the sole power to try all impeachments. When sitting for that purpose they shall be on oath or affirmation. When the Governor of Puerto Rico is tried, the chief justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico shall preside. No person shall be convicted without the concurrence of three-fourths of all the members of the senate. Judgment in cases of impeachment shall not extend further than to removal from office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any office of honor, trust, or profit under the Government of Puerto Rico. The person convicted shall, nevertheless, be liable and subject to indictment, trial, judgment, and punishment according to law."

SEC. 3. Section 13 of the Organic Act (48 U. S. C., sec. 775) is hereby amended by repealing the second, third, and fourth sentences and substituting the following therefor: "The heads of all executive departments and agencies shall be appointed by the Governor by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of Puerto Rico. Each shall hold office during the term of the Governor by whom he is appointed and until his successor is qualified, unless sooner removed by the Governor"; and the following is hereby added at the end of the section: "In the event of a vacancy in the office of Governor, or if for any reason the Governor is temporarily absent from Puerto Rico or unable to perform his duties, the attorney general shall act as Governor with all the powers and duties of the office for the remainder of the term in case of a vacancy, or during such temporary absence or disability. If the attorney general is unable to act, the treasurer, the auditor, and such other person as may be provided by the laws of Puerto Rico, in that order, shall act as Governor."

SEC. 4. Section 40 of the Organic Act (48 U. S. C., sec. 861) is hereby amended by changing the colon in the second sentence to a period, by deleting the words following through "States," and by substituting therefor the following: "All vacancies occurring in the offices of the chief justice and associate justices shall be filled by appointment of the Governor by and with the advice of the Senate of Puerto Rico. All justices of the supreme court shall hold office during good behavior."

SEC. 5. All laws or parts of laws inconsistent herewith are repealed to the extent of their inconsistency.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

"That section 12 of the Organic Act of Puerto Rico (48 U. S. C., sec. 771) is hereby amended by repealing the second sentence thereof and substituting the following:

"At the general election in 1948 and each such election quadrennially thereafter the Governor of Puerto Rico shall be elected by the qualified voters of Puerto Rico and shall hold office for a term of four years commencing on the second day of January following the date of the election and until his successor is elected and qualified. No person shall be eligible to election as Governor unless at the time of the election he is a citizen of the United States, is at least thirty years of age, is able to read and write the

English language, and has been a bona fide resident of Puerto Rico during the immediately preceding two years. Such election shall be held in the manner now or hereafter provided by law for the election of the Resident Commissioner."

"SEC. 2. Section 12a is hereby added to said Organic Act to read as follows:

" 'SEC. 12a. The Governor shall be removed from office on impeachment for and conviction of, treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors. The House of Representatives of Puerto Rico shall have the sole power of impeachment. Impeachment shall require the concurrence of two-thirds of all of the members of the House of Representatives. The Senate of Puerto Rico shall have the sole power to try all impeachments. When sitting for that purpose they shall be on oath or affirmation and the chief justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico shall preside. No person shall be convicted without the concurrence of three-fourths of all the members of the Senate. Judgment in cases of impeachment shall not extend further than to removal from office, and disqualification to hold and enjoy any office of honor, trust, or profit under the government of Puerto Rico. The person convicted shall, nevertheless, be liable and subject to indictment, trial, judgment, and punishment according to law.'

"SEC. 3. Section 13 of said Organic Act (48 U. S. C., secs. 773, 775) is hereby amended by repealing the second, third, and fourth sentences and substituting the following therefor: 'The heads of the executive departments set forth in the first sentence of this section shall be appointed by the Governor by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of Puerto Rico. Each shall hold office during the continuance in office of the Governor by whom he is appointed and until his successor is qualified, unless sooner removed by the Governor.'

"SEC. 4. Section 24 of said Organic Act (48 U. S. C., sec. 772) is amended to read as follows:

" 'SEC. 24. In case of a vacancy in the office of the Governor, the person holding the position of Attorney General at the time the vacancy occurs shall succeed to the office of the Governor, and to all the duties and emoluments for the remainder of the term. If for any reason the Governor is temporarily absent from Puerto Rico, or unable to perform his duties, the Attorney General shall act as Governor, with all the powers and duties of the office during such temporary absence or disability. If in such event the Attorney General is unable to act, the Treasurer shall act as Governor, and if the Treasurer is unable to act, such other person as may be provided by the laws of Puerto Rico shall act as Governor during such temporary absence or disability. In the event that because of death or any other reason a newly elected Governor is unable to take office, a temporary successor shall be elected by a majority vote of the full House and Senate of Puerto Rico meeting at a joint session of the legislature at the next succeeding term thereof, who shall hold office until a successor is elected and qualified at a special election to be held within 120 days from the date of adjournment of said session.'

"SEC. 5. Section 40 of said Organic Act (48 U. S. C., sec. 861) is hereby amended by changing the colon in the second sentence to a period, by deleting the words following through "States", and by substituting therefor the following: "Until otherwise provided by the Legislature of Puerto Rico, all vacancies hereafter occurring in the offices of the chief justice and associate justices of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico shall be filled by appointment by the Governor by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of Puerto Rico. Until otherwise provided by the Legislature of Puerto Rico, all justices of the supreme court shall hold office during good behavior."

"SEC. 6. Section 50 of said Organic Act (48 U. S. C., sec. 797) is hereby amended by deleting the following words from the third sentence thereof: 'appointed by the President and also those appointed by the Governor of Puerto Rico.'"

Mr. COLE of New York (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment may be considered as read, and that for purposes of amendment the committee amendment may be considered as an original bill.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to know what the amendment is. I am a member of the committee, but I do not know what the amendment is.

The SPEAKER. It is in the committee print of the bill. If the gentleman has a copy of the bill, he can see what the amendment provides.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Is this H. R. 3372?

The SPEAKER. This is H. R. 3309.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I did not object to the present consideration of this bill, because it is of small value to the people of Puerto Rico and utterly meaningless. I do, however, want to expose its empty and illusory character. It will be utilized by imperialist elements in the United States and by opportunists in Puerto Rico as a means by which to evade and postpone the determination of the basic issue—the status of Puerto Rico. This bill is not a reform in any real sense. The mere election of a Governor of Puerto Rico does not grant to the people of Puerto Rico any sovereignty. It merely adds an embellishing facade on an ugly and rotten colonial structure.

This Puerto Rican question, the question of the political status of that island, has been talked about in this Congress for many years. Last year the President of the United States made a recommendation to Congress requesting that Congress act on the proposal of submitting to the people of Puerto Rico four propositions: The question of independence, the question of present status, the question of statehood, and the question of commonwealth. The President also stated that before submitting any of these questions to the people of Puerto Rico for a choice, Congress should first state in advance which status Congress would be willing to give. He advised us that it would be unfair to present to the people of Puerto Rico certain propositions and then have Congress refuse to grant them that which they had chosen. I took the position then, and reiterate it now, that the only just and realistic referendum that can be submitted is one granting the choice between independence and colonial status.

The President's recommendation was presented to Congress, a bill was introduced in both Houses, hearings were held, but nothing has happened. Now we have this bill. Let no one be deceived. It is offered for the sole purpose of bypassing the issue raised in the President's recommendations. It is offered to avoid granting self-determination to the people of Puerto Rico.

This bill leaves Puerto Rico just where it has been: Subject to the shipping monopolies, subject to the tariff, subject to colonial exploitation, subject to the colonial regime that has been taking the lifeblood out of the people of Puerto Rico.

The people of Puerto Rico want an opportunity to determine for themselves their status in this world. It seems to me that at a time when we speak so much of self-determination and freedom for peoples throughout the world, that we are holding ourselves up for severe condemnation before the people of the world when we refuse to grant to the people of Puerto Rico the right to choose for themselves their own form of government.

Puerto Rico is an island two-thirds the size of Connecticut with a population of 2,000,000 people. Those people have been subjected to the worst kind of exploitation on the part of Wall Street sugar monopolies and various other imperialist groups. The economy of Puerto Rico has been destroyed by that exploitation. The people of Puerto Rico have been deprived of their freedom. Today they are clamoring for it and all we do is to give them this bill, this exhibition of hypocrisy which, again I say, will be used for one purpose and one purpose alone; that is, to evade our responsibility at this time to grant to the people of Puerto Rico the right to self-determination.

I have not objected to the consideration of the bill because I recognize it as an empty gesture. It is not even a realistic reform within the colonial system, but I do not want to deprive the people of Puerto Rico of even this gesture after we have deprived them of so much and so often. Mr. Speaker, we must not permit this bill to be used as a device by which we can escape our responsibility of granting freedom to a people who have a desire for freedom as strong as ours, a tradition for freedom as great as ours, a culture as old as ours, a right to be free which this bill, this gesture must not negate. We must act on the question of Puerto Rico's status now. The people of Puerto Rico, I sincerely believe, want independence — a free Puerto Rico. I am confident that the American people agree with them. Let Congress therefore not evade or postpone. Congress must keep faith with both the people of Puerto Rico and of the United States by granting to Puerto Rico its freedom now.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert as a part of my remarks a declaration unanimously approved by the Central Committee of the Independence Party of Puerto Rico on May 15, 1947, with respect to this bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

A DECLARATION UNANIMOUSLY APPROVED BY THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE INDEPENDENCE PARTY OF PUERTO RICO ON MAY 15, 1947, AND ADDRESSED BY THEM TO CHAIRMEN OF THE COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC LANDS AND TERRITORIES OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES, RESPECTIVELY

The Puerto Rican reform bill now pending consideration by the Congress of the United States, is clearly unsubstantial. In no way does it alter the colonial nature of the regime established in Puerto Rico, to wit: under its provisions, the undemocratic quality of the regime, imposed upon the Puerto Rican people and revocable at the will of the United States Congress, would continue to be.

The amendments thereto additioned do not change the existing economic colonial structure, not one single concession being made to Puerto Rico through them. We would remain exactly as at present, lacking powers to legislate on the question of the coastwise laws, tariff and customs regulations; to protect the development of our industries against outside competition or to interfere in the drafting of commerce affecting our economy; lacking powers, in sum, of facing our great economic problem with any possibilities of success.

The amendments only aim toward the reorganization of the executive branch of the present government; and there is a probability of having the powers now held by the Governor transferred to the hands of some new officer whose post may be created by Congress and who would act as a direct link between the President of the United States and our colonial government, as well as coordinator of the numerous federal agencies which might then function and their activities.

The authority of our legislative assembly is in no way increased under the bill, nor is its jurisdiction, nor is permanent character conferred the scant powers granted. Our legislative remains as it is now, without even being recognized those simple powers enjoyed by legislative bodies the world over—the right to go over the veto power of the executive and to enact by a two-thirds majority of its members fundamental legislation.

Besides, the powers granted the officers concerned by the amendments proposed are fixed by the Congress of the United States, in whose powers it remains to increase, reduce, or totally eliminate them at will, just as it may also create a new officer, to be known as coordinator, commissioner, auditor, or by any other title, who could declare void, or control or postpone action of the powers to be exercised by officers elected by the people of Puerto Rico.

In no way does the bill increase the powers of the colonial governor to affect the functions of the multiple federal agencies and officers which now are all powerful in Puerto Rico. Nor does it increase the judicial jurisdiction of our courts, while the Federal court continues to act with absolute independence and on the other hand, our "Supreme" Court remains submitted to the jurisdiction of the Boston circuit court and of the Supreme Court of the United States, and—this yet of greater importance—the Congress of the United States continues to exercise its authority over the territory of Puerto Rico and over its people just as if we were chattels, and continues to hold the power to amend, repeal or substitute any laws enacted by our Legislature. Congress likewise retains the powers to legislate for Puerto Rico and the power therewith to deprive us of any concessions which we may now enjoy and to modify the present regime in such a way it may all result a joke.

The amendments proposed are all of a colonial nature, just as the present Jones Act which they pretend to amend is, since they are not to be freely adopted by our parliament, and they must be passed upon and adopted at its sole discretion by the Congress of the United States, the feelings and will of the Puerto Rican people to the contrary notwithstanding, while they are the most concerned party; and since they may be likewise modified or repealed by that same Congress.

The people of Puerto Rico want irrevocable powers. The powers which only full sovereignty guarantees, in the economic, judicial, social, and cultural orders, so that our collective life may be adequately organized.

Every power which is revocable is thereby of a colonial nature and is likewise unsubstantial. Every revocable power is a mere cheat, an inexcusable cheat, thrust in the face of honest, noble people which through its long history has fought and hoped, while it has received nothing but indifference and disdain from the dominating nation and treason at the hands of politicians whom it trusted.

If this bill were accepted by us without our protest and without a declaration to the effect that the highest interests of the Puerto Rican people demand a definite solution to its problem of sovereignty, may result in postponing that solution for still another 50 years.

The people of Puerto Rico are a highly civilized people, who for at least a century have been worthy of assuming the responsibilities entailed by full sovereignty. In 1897, Spain granted us an autonomous chart by which we were essentially guaranteed such powers of sovereignty as placed our destiny in our own hands. With the American occupation in 1898, we saw those rights trampled upon. First the Foraker Act (1900) and later the Jones Act (1917 up to date), established and maintained on our soil an iniquitous, backward, unjust, overpowering, anachronic regime, which violates our rights and is as much unworthy of the nation which forcefully imposes it, as to those who in the domineered country, patiently suffer and support it.

The history of Puerto Rico from 1900 up to date, has the character of a tenacious, continued fight to end the colonial regime imposed upon us and for the establishment of a regime founded on right, directly emanating from the will of our people and from the clear principles contained in a constitution freely framed by the people through its legal representatives and ratified in a free election by the voters.

From 1900 up to date our people have resisted the efforts of a minority group of political leaders who have taken shelter under the wing of Puerto Rican independence and pretended to defend our liberties but who really have tried to satisfy the people with what they call reforms liberalizing the regime, in order to come into favor with Washington bureaucrats and settle themselves in the saddle of colonial power, caring nothing about the anguish and agony of the Puerto Rican masses. The Campbell bill, sovereignty within American sovereignty and other such inventions, have been some of the new formulae contrived by colonial politicians in order to reach their objectives of personal profit and power.

Nevertheless, the Puerto Rican people have always defeated these appeasers and selfish men. In recent times, within the old Puerto Rican Liberal Party, the present claudicating leaders of the Popular Democratic Party fought against proposed riders to the independentist platform, to procure the granting of measures liberalizing the regime, jointly with the demand for political independence. The present Popular Party chief, Señor Luis Muñoz Marin, proclaimed at that time and fixed it into the party's platform that more reforms to the regime were not to be sought for. The rest is present-day history. Señor Luis Muñoz Marin split the Liberty Party and pitilessly anathematized and fought the then Liberal chief, Don Antonio R. Barceló, under the pretext of defending independence and of attacking the colonial regime and any proposed patch to it. Señor Muñoz Marin then said that seeking an elective governor by those having a right to demand independence looked like a man who, having a house to rent, hung this sign on the front door: "To rent for $200. Will accept $25." Would any prospective tenant offer more than $25? was the question then put up to the Puerto Rican people by the one-time independence fighter.

After that Señor Muñoz Marin, while calling himself "president of the Genuine Liberal Party," accused Señor Barceló and Mr. Walter McJones, at that time national committeeman of the Democratic Party of the United States, of seeking reforms in violation of the Liberal Party's platform. In those days Muñoz Marin was self-proclaimed champion of independence and the chief leader of the forces fighting against colonial reforms.

It was at this time that, on the occasion of a document being submitted to the consideration of a United States Senate Commission investigating the general situation in Puerto Rico over the signatures of Don Rafael Martinez Nadal, president of the Puerto Rican Republican-Union Party, and Don Antonio R. Barceló, in which the right to elect our governor and a plebiscite between the solutions of independence and statehood for the future were demanded, that Muñoz Marin accused Martinez Nadal and Barecló of seeking for an alliance which, according to Muñoz Marin, constituted a coalition of reactionary forces. Señor Barceló was accused by Muñoz Marin of "compromising once more arbitrarily and on his own account when his country's destiny was at stake," for seeking the elective governor jointly with the plebiscite promise.

Judging upon the action taken by Barceló and Martinez Nadal, Señor Muñoz Marín then declared:

"I only wish to point out briefly two points in the nature of this pact: (1) That it does not contain any claim for economic powers (the authors of the pact, he added, hastily corrected this revealing defect; but the fact that they overlooked it in the beginning indicates how unsubstantial their real position was); and (2) that it places the cart before the oxen—an old defect in our public life—asking for dilatory reforms of the colonial regime firstly and feebly demanding a plebiscite to solve the political status lastly. Afterward—always afterward. Always later—at any time but not now. Such is the reason to which Puerto Rico has been a victim so many times."

"The logical, the sincere, the intelligent, the honest way," he goes on to say, "is for the people of Puerto Rico to decide before upon its future sovereignty and then upon the basis of such popular decision and in harmony thereto any reforms considered convenient were transitorily established. Any reform which is revocable by the United States Congress is useless to Puerto Rico, unless it be proceeded by a decision by the Puerto Rican people itself, based upon a promise by Congress, which would amount to taking an irrevocable decision upon the definite destiny of Puerto Rico, with the consent and by a mandate of the Puerto Rican people themselves.

"The all-important thing is," he then added, "for the people to decide upon its future by itself and without any further delay."

Afterward Señor Muñoz Marin, first in 1940 and later in 1944, sought a popular mandate to definitely and permanently end the colonial regime and agreed to consult the people directly, not later than the moment when world peace would be structured, as to the final political status. Señor Muñoz Marin and with him his most conspicuous coleaders in his party, declared themselves at that time against the elective governor and against any other colonial reforms.

All that belongs now to the past. It was the prologue. The present is different. Their labor now is quite another. Señor Muñoz Marin today commits "the old treason to which the Puerto Rican people have been a victim so many times." The present chief of colonial government rides against his own history and forgetting the party he split and the men he indicted, asks for, without any authority to that effect, "the sincere backing of every Puerto Rican" for a bill less ample than that backed by Messrs. Barceló and Martinez Nadal and makes ready to go to Washington to ask for amendments which fall short of those he fought against in the past.

That is treason, committed by a leader who delivers his people for a few crumbs of colonial power, forgetting his promises and violating the mandate he received from the people. This is treason. But the people cannot hark to the voice of treason.

The present moment is not—cannot be—the proper one to demand reforms of a minimum, unsubstantial nature. The moment is the right one to demand, clearly and definitely, the liquidation of the present colonial regime and the establishment in Puerto Rico of a sovereign government resulting from the will of the people, for the people, and by the people.

The pledge of the present-day leaders of the Puerto Rican government is that they would demand a definite solution to our political status now. If instead of backing minimum reforms those leaders would rise upon their feebleness and their petty affairs and would courageously and honestly demand the solution of our sovereignty problems, we hold no doubts that their demand would be granted. But if they limit themselves to saying that it is well to get what is given us and they assume an undignified, weak position, they will be doing the same as the landlord who announced he wanted to rent his house for $200 but would accept $25.

The position of the Puerto Rico Independence Party, born to political life to bring about the independence of the country, is that nothing should be sought short of recognition of our full sovereignty. Any other position would be contrary to our right, to our dignity, and to this moment of world vindications brought about with the blood and suffering of thousands of Puerto Ricans.

We shall not seek nor ask for colonial reforms. And if, despite the plain right owed us, the present reform bill should be enacted, we shall tell the Congress and the people of the United States, and the entire world likewise, that the concession of an elective governor shall not solve any of our substantial problems. And that we shall continue to demand that we shall use any concessions of a colonial nature given unto our hands to go on demanding political independence and to disclose at every international meeting wherein there may be the occasion so to do, the way in which the right of the Puerto Rican people is trampled under the foot by the leaders of the Nation which tries to assume at this very moment world's democratic leadership.

A governor elected by the Puerto Rican people, under the insignia of the Independence Party, would be in duty bound to be the speaker, before the people and the Government of the United States and before the entire world, for the majority independence forces in Puerto Rico; and would likewise be in duty bound to consider, upon making every appointment to office and on approving all legislative matter submitted to him, that his outstanding obligation as our executive officer would be to bend his every effort to promote, insure, guarantee, and defend the independence of Puerto Rico.

Considering all the aforesaid, we invite the people of Puerto Rico to address themselves to the United States Congress in a lofty, patriotic demand to the effect that our political status be solved now, at once, and that a government be established in Puerto Rico which may be called a regime of freedom, in harmony with justice owed our people, and with the respect which the United States owes itself.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of New York to the committee amendment:

On page 7, line 8, strike out the words "Until otherwise provided by the Legislature of Puerto Rico, all" and insert "All."

Page 7, line 13, strike out "until otherwise provided by the Legislature of Puerto Rico, all justices of the Supreme Court shall hold offices during good behavior."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CRAWFORD to the committee amendment:

On page 7, line 20, after section 6, insert:

"SEC. 7. Section 3360 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended to read as follows:

"'(c) Deposit of internal-revenue collections: Not to exceed 75 percent of all taxes collected under internal-revenue laws of the United States on articles produced in Puerto Rico and transported to the United States, or consumed in the islands, shall be deposited in a special fund of the Treasury of the United States to be available for appropriation by Congress for the construction of public works, hospitals, roads, sewage and water systems, and other public works and for public relief and other public purposes in Puerto Rico.'"

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane. The amendment is with respect to the collection of customs. The bill is limited solely to the political aspects of Puerto Rico and solely for the election of a governor and members of the Supreme Court. Furthermore, this amendment is one another committee of the House has jurisdiction over and our committee has not had anything to do with this amendment.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the point of order. This bill seeks to amend the organic act of Puerto Rico. The amendment deals with the tax laws and, consequently, it comes under the jurisdiction of the Ways and Means Committee. I submit it is not germane, and therefore clearly out of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule.

Unquestionably the amendment proposed is a matter that comes within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means; therefore not germane to the pending amendment or to the bill. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EASEMENT TO LONG BEACH, CALIF., FOR STREET PURPOSES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3252) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Long Beach, Calif., for street purposes an easement in certain lands within the Navy housing project at Long Beach, Calif.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the author of the bill if he would give me a more definite explanation of what is involved in this transaction?

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I would like to say to the gentleman that the purpose of H. R. 3252 is to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Long Beach, Calif., for street purposes, an easement in certain lands within the new housing project at Long Beach, Calif.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Perhaps we can expedite this. Was there any consideration on the part of Long Beach to the Navy for the easement that was granted?

Mr. ELSTON. There is no consideration passing from the city to the Navy Department, and the Navy Department itself will benefit from the improvement.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is there in the easement, if anything, that would obligate an expenditure on the part of the Navy to keep up the streets or any appurtenances thereto?

Mr. ELSTON. There is no obligation on the Navy Department to keep up the improvements. That is the obligation of the city.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Was this requested by the Navy Department or the city of Long Beach?

Mr. ELSTON. It was requested by the Navy Department. The Navy Department appeared before our committee and requested the legislation.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he hereby is, authorized to convey to the city of Long Beach, Calif., on such terms and conditions as he may deem proper, a perpetual easement for street and public-utility purposes, in, over, under, and across two strips of land within the boundaries of Navy housing project CAL-4904N at Long Beach, Calif., said strips being 20 feet in width and 600 and 300 and 30 feet in length, respectively, and being adjacent to the west side of Santa Fe Avenue in the city of Long Beach, the metes and bounds descriptions of which are on file in the Navy Department.

SEC. 2. This grant shall be at no cost to the Government.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EASEMENT FOR PUBLIC HIGHWAY, HAWAII

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3053) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Territory of Hawaii an easement for public highway and utility

purposes in certain parcels of land in the district of Ewa, Territory of Hawaii.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized to convey to the Territory of Hawaii a perpetual easement for public highway and utility purposes in, over, under, and across 28 parcels of land, containing thirteen and eighty-eight one-thousandths acres of land, situated in the vicinity of Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard in the district of Ewa, island of Oahu, Territory of Hawaii, the metes and bounds description of which are on file in the Navy Department.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EASEMENT FOR GEORGIA PUBLIC ROAD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3056) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Macon, Ga., and Bibb County, Ga., an easement for public road and utility purposes in certain Government-owned lands situated in Bibb County, Ga., and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he hereby is, authorized to convey to the city of Macon, Ga., and Bibb County, Ga., under such terms and conditions as he may deem in the Government's interest, a perpetual easement for public road and utility purposes, in, under, over, and across a 50½-foot strip of land at the naval ordnance plant, Macon, Ga., containing approximately ninety-one one-hundredths acre of land, metes and bounds description of which is on file in the Navy Department: *Provided*, That said grant shall be at no cost to the Government: *Provided, further*, That such conveyance shall contain an express provision that neither the city of Macon, Ga., nor Bibb County, Ga., shall at any time build any residences or other customarily occupied buildings within 1,000 feet of the present south boundary of the naval ordnance plant, Macon, Ga.: *And provided further*, That such conveyance shall contain an express provision that the said grantees shall not dispose of the property owned by them within such a distance without first giving the United States an opportunity to purchase the property, on such terms and conditions as may then be agreed upon by the parties.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RETIRING BOARDS TO CONSIDER CASES OF CERTAIN OFFICERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3251) to amend the act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 603), as amended, so as to authorize naval retiring boards to consider the cases of certain officers, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the gentleman in charge of this bill would explain to the House just what it consists of? It seems to be very meritorious, but it carries an estimated cost of $52,500. Would the gentleman explain it, please?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. LYNDON JOHNSON, to answer.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this is general legislation, but I have an individual case that is covered by this bill. Under existing law a temporary officer of the Navy or Marine Corps, who was an enlisted man of the Regular Navy before he became an officer, cannot be retired for physical disability unless he appears before a retiring board within 6 months from the date of his discharge. There are some 50 former enlisted men who, at the time of their retirement, were temporary officers but who were unable to appear before retiring boards because in many instances—and in the individual case in which I am interested—the officer was bedridden. Further, the 6 months' limitation applies to enlisted men but does not apply to officers of the Regular Navy. This bill is endorsed by the Navy Department, by the Bureau of the Budget, and unanimously by the Armed Services Committee. I understood there would be no objection from the objectors on either side of the House.

Mr. BROOKS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this is an excellent bill. It removes the discrimination against the enlisted man. Where the officer has an opportunity to file his application, the enlisted man is denied it because of the lapse of time. I think that is one reason this is an excellent bill.

Mr. DEANE. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection 8 (d) of the act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 604; 34 U. S. C. 350g (d)), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(d) An officer of the retired list of the Regular Navy or Marine Corps who incurs physical disability while serving on active duty in the same rank as that held by him on the retired list shall, if not otherwise entitled thereto, receive 75 percent of the active-duty pay to which he was entitled while serving in that rank."

SEC. 2. Subsection 8 (e) of the act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 604; 34 U. S. C. 350g (e)), as amended, is hereby further amended by striking out the words "the next" as they appear in line 4 thereof and substituting therefor the word "such."

SEC. 3. Subsection 8 (g) of the act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 605; 34 U. S. C. 350g (g)), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(g) The provisions of this section shall not apply in any case if the proceedings of the naval retiring board be commenced subsequent to a date 6 months after the termination of the temporary appointment or release from active duty of the individual concerned, whichever may occur later, except in the case of an individual whose temporary appointment shall have been terminated prior to the date of enactment of this amendment, or who, prior to such date, shall have been released from active duty."

SEC. 4. This act shall become effective as of August 10, 1946, and no back pay for any period prior thereto shall accrue to any person by reason of enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 13, strike out "six months" and insert "one year."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADMISSION OF ALIEN SPOUSES AND CHILDREN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3149) to amend the act approved December 28, 1945 (Pub. Law 271, 79th Cong.), entitled "An act to expedite the admission to the United States of alien spouses and alien minor children of citizen members of the United States armed forces."

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved December 28, 1945 (Pub. Law 271, 79th Cong., ch. 591, 1st sess.) (59 Stat. 659; 8 U. S. C. 232–236), is amended by adding a new section thereto, to be known as section 6, and to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. The alien spouse of an American citizen by a marriage occurring before January 1, 1947, shall not be considered as inadmissible because of race, if otherwise admissible under this act."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 1, strike out "January 1, 1947" and insert "30 days after the enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADMISSION OF ALIEN FIANCÉES OR FIANCÉS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3398) to extend the period of validity to the act to facilitate the admission into the United States of the alien fiancées or fiancés of members of the armed forces of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JAVITS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, I call attention to an unusual situation which arises as a result of this bill, and perhaps to the growth of a practice of which many of us will disapprove heartily. It amounts to this:

By rulings now in effect, German girls who are engaged to American soldiers may also take advantage of the provisions not of this bill, but of similar provisions, on the theory that American soldiers engaged to German girls should have the benefit of this immigration procedure for their fiancées. This bill, which is here on the Consent Calendar, does not apply to these German girls as it relates only to nationals of countries whose immigration quota has been exhausted, while the German quota is open. German citizens other than DP's and refugees are generally not receiving visas. But—and this is the big point—these German girls get not temporary visas, as do other nationals under the pending bill, but permanent visas; so that when they get into the United States, and if their plans for marriage fail—and they are required, before getting their visas, to submit proof that they are seriously expecting to marry when they get here—

they may stay here as permanent residents. Thus they can get a preference over Germans other than German DP's and refugees, despite the fact that it is our national policy to keep such Germans out at the present time.

I would, therefore, urge the Committee on the Judiciary to look into this question very carefully with a view to determining if an amendatory law is required, in order to avoid giving these German girls a better opportunity in entering the United States than is given to the fiancées of GI's from other countries which were our allies in World War II whose quotas are exhausted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the authority conferred upon the Secretary of State and the Attorney General under the provisions of the act approved June 29, 1946 (60 Stat. 339), shall be extended to December 31, 1947, midnight.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PLAN FOR HOUSE OFFICE BUILDINGS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3072) to authorize the preparation of preliminary plans and estimates of cost for the erection of an addition or extension to the House Office Buildings and the remodeling of the fifth floor of the Old House Office Building.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will my colleague from New Jersey explain the bill?

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. I will be very glad to.

This bill authorizes the Architect of the Capitol to draw up preliminary plans for an increase in office space in the Old House Office Building or the erection of a new House Office Building for the accommodation of our Members' offices. The demand for offices is so great right now that there is no extra space available for anyone or any committee. This makes it imperative that something be done to relieve the situation. A similar measure has been passed by the Senate to relieve the office congestion over there. It is hoped that if this bill is passed and favorably acted upon we may soon be able to have some concrete plans worked out for this relief.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I think the gentleman left the wrong impression with the House. The bill provides for plans for remodeling of the Old House Office Building rather than the construction of a new House Office Building.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. The construction of a new House Office Building was one of the plans submitted, if the gentleman will recall, to the committee when this matter was considered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Architect of the Capitol, subject to the direction and supervision of the House Office Building Commission, is authorized and directed to prepare preliminary plans and estimates of cost for (1) the erection of an addition or extension to the House Office Buildings for the use of the United States House of Representatives, including accommodations for parking of automobiles; (2) the remodeling of the fifth floor of the Old House Office Building to provide additional office accommodations for Members of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. The Architect of the Capitol is authorized to make such expenditures as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for such purpose the sum of $25,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 4, after the semicolon insert "and (3) the renewal of plumbing in the Old House Office Building."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NAVAL AVIATION CADET ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2314) to amend section 12 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942, as amended, so as to authorize lump-sum payments under the said act to the survivors of deceased officers without administration of estates.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 12 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 738), as amended by the act of October 25, 1943 (57 Stat. 574), as so amended, is hereby further amended by striking out that part of the said section which appears before the first proviso thereof and substituting therefor the following: "When officers commissioned pursuant to this act or the Naval Aviation Reserve Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 819) are released from active duty that has been continuous for one or more years, they shall be paid a lump sum of $500 for each complete year of continuous commissioned active service, or, in the event of the death of such officers, after continuous active duty for one or more years, the beneficiaries specially designated in the manner prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy may be paid such sum, or, if no beneficiary has been specially designated and no demand is presented by a duly appointed legal representative of the deceased officer's estate, the decedent's widow, or legal heirs may be paid such sum in the following order of precedence: First, to the widow; second, if the decedent left no widow, or the widow be dead at the time of settlement, then to the children or their issue, per stirpes; third, if no widow or descendants, then to the father and mother in equal parts; fourth, if either the father or mother be dead, then to the one surviving; fifth, if there be no widow, child, father, or mother at the date of settlement, then to the brothers and sisters and children of deceased brothers and sisters, per stirpes; and in the event of the death of such officers not the result of their own misconduct, or if released from active duty otherwise than upon their own request or as a result of disciplinary action, this lump-sum payment shall be prorated for fractional parts of each year of such service."

With the following committee amendments:

On page 2, line 5, after the word "officers", add a comma, and strike out the words "after continuous active duty for 1 or more years."

On page 2, line 7, strike out the word "may" and substitute in lieu thereof the word "shall."

On page 2, line 11, strike out the word "may" and substitute in lieu thereof the word "shall."

Add a new section, numbered section 2, as follows:

"SEC. 2. Section 2 of the act of June 16, 1936 (49 Stat. 1524), as amended by section 2 of the act of April 3, 1939 (53 Stat. 559), as amended by section 6 of the act of June 3, 1941 (55 Stat. 240), as so amended, is hereby further amended by adding at the end of the section the following: '*Provided*, That in the event of the death of such officer, the beneficiaries specially designated in the manner prescribed by the Secretary of War shall be paid such sum, or, if no beneficiary has been specially designated and no demand is presented by a duly appointed legal representative of the deceased officer's estate, the decedent's widow or legal heirs shall be paid such sum in the following order of precedence: First, to the widow; second, if the decedent left no widow, or the widow be dead at the time of settlement, then to the children or their issue, per stirpes; third, if no widow or descendants, then to the father and mother in equal parts; fourth, if either the father or mother be dead, then to the one surviving; fifth, if there be no widow, child, father, or mother at the date of settlement, then to the brothers and sisters and children of deceased brothers and sisters, per stirpes; and in the event of the death of such officer, not the result of his own misconduct, this lump-sum payment shall be prorated for fractional parts of each year of such service.'"

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend section 12 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942, as amended, and to amend section 2 of the act of June 16, 1936, as amended, so as to authorize lump-sum payments under the said acts to the survivors of deceased officers without administration of estates."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATES IN THE SENATE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 125) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to extend the benefits of such act to the Official Reporters of Debates in the Senate and persons employed by them in connection with the performance of their duties as such reporters.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 (a) of the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended by adding at the end of such subsection the following:

"For the purposes of this act, the Official Reporters of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and persons employed by them in connection with the performance of their duties as such reporters shall be deemed to be officers or employees in or under the legislative branch of the Government, and service heretofore or hereafter rendered as an Official Reporter of Debates of the Senate

or as a person employed by the Official Reporters of Debates of the Senate in connection with the performance of their duties as such reporters shall be deemed to be service as an officer or employee in or under the legislative branch of the Government. The provisions of this act shall not apply to any such Official Reporter or person employed by them until he gives notice in writing to the said Official Reporters of his desire to come within the purview of this act. In the case of any such Official Reporter or person employed by them who is in service on the date of enactment of this subsection, such notice of desire to come within the purview of this act must be given within 6 months after such date. In the case of any such Official Reporter or person employed by them who enters the service subsequent to the date of enactment of this subsection, such notice of desire to come within the purview of this act must be given within 6 months after the date of such entrance into the service. No provision of this or any other act relating to automatic separation from the service shall be applicable to any such Official Reporter or person employed by them."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMANENT CENSUS OFFICE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1045) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for a permanent Census Office," approved March 6, 1902, as amended (the collection and publication of statistical information by the Bureau of the Census).

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Senate has passed an identical bill, S. 614, which is on the Speaker's table. I ask unanimous consent that the identical Senate bill, S. 614, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 7 of the act entitled "An act to provide for a permanent Census Office," approved March 6, 1902, as amended (U. S. C., title 13, sec. 111), is amended by adding at the end of the first sentence thereof the words: *"Provided,* That where the doctrine, teaching, or discipline of any religious denomination or church prohibits the disclosure of information relative to membership, such information shall not be required."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 1045) was laid on the table.

CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3511) to extend the provisions of section 1 (e) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, until June 30, 1948.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would ask the author of the bill if this is the bill which extends the provisions of the bill sponsored last year by me and which was signed by the President on August 2, which takes care of those Federal employees who are discharged or demoted as a result of the reduction of personnel in Federal departments?

Mr. JONES of Washington. It is, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. FORAND. There is another bill pending that would strike out the age clause of 55. This does not strike out the age clause requirement of 55 in the bill, does it?

Mr. JONES of Washington. No; it does not.

Mr. FORAND. It merely extends the date?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes; for 1 year.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope the committee will see fit to take up the other bill striking out the 55-year clause and also eliminate the termination date because we are gradually throwing out of the Government people who have had 25, 28, and 30 years of service who have not yet reached the retirement age.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 (e) (1) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended by striking out "June 30, 1947" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1948."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MILITARY LEAVE FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1845) to amend section 371, title 10, United States Code (military leave for Federal employees).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 371, title 10, United States Code, be amended by adding the words "and the Enlisted Reserve Corps" following the words "the Officers' Reserve Corps" wherever the latter appears in said section.

With the following committee amendment:

2. Strike out all after the enacting clause and add the following:

"(a) That the third and fourth paragraphs under the subheading 'Ordnance stores and equipment for Reserve Officers' Training Corps' in the act entitled 'An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes,' approved May 12, 1917 (40 Stat. 72; 10 U. S. C. A. 371), are hereby amended by inserting in each such paragraph, after the words 'the Officers' Reserve Corps', the words 'or the Enlisted Reserve Corps.'

"(b) The fourth paragraph under the subheading 'Ordnance stores and equipment for Reserve Officers' Training Corps' of the act of May 12, 1917, as amended, as it appears on page 72, volume 40, Statutes at Large, is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end of the said paragraph, substituting a colon therefor, and adding the following proviso: *'Provided further,* That no existing law shall be construed to prevent any member of the Officers' Reserve Corps or the Enlisted Reserve Corps from accepting employment in any civil branch of the public service nor from receiving the pay incident to such employment in addition to any pay and allowances to which he may be entitled under the laws relating to the Officers' Reserve Corps and Enlisted Reserve Corps, nor as prohibiting him from practicing his civilian profession or occupation before or in connection with any department of the Federal Government.'

"SEC. 2. Section 80 of the act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 203; 32 U. S. C. 75), is hereby amended by striking out the period as it appears at the end of the said section, substituting a comma therefor, and adding the following: "for periods not to exceed 15 days in any one calendar year: *Provided,* That all members of the National Guard who are in the employ of the United States Government or of the District of Columbia and who are ordered to duty by proper authority shall, when relieved from duty, be restored to the positions held by them when ordered to duty: *And provided further,* That no existing law shall be construed to prevent any member of the National Guard from accepting employment in any civil branch of the public service nor from receiving the pay incident to such employment in addition to any pay and allowances to which he may be entitled under the provisions of law relating to the National Guard, nor as prohibiting him from practicing his civilian profession or occupation before or in connection with any department of the Federal Government.'

"SEC. 3. Section 9 of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 1177; 34 U. S. C. A. 853g), as amended, is hereby further amended by striking out the period as it appears at the end of the said section, substituting a colon therefor, and adding the following proviso: *'And provided further,* That all members of the Naval Reserve who are in the employ of the United States Government or of the District of Columbia and who are ordered to duty by proper authority shall, when relieved from duty, be restored to the positions held by them when ordered to duty.'

"SEC. 4. The words 'officers and employees of the United States or of the District of Columbia' as used in the third paragraph, subheading 'Ordnance stores and equipment for Reserve Officers' Training Corps,' of the act of May 12, 1917 (40 Stat. 72; 10 U. S. C. A. 371), as now or hereafter amended, as used in that part of section 80 of the act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 203; 32 U. S. C. 75), as now or hereafter amended, which precedes the proviso, and as used in the first proviso of section 9 of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 1177; 34 U. S. C. A. 853g), as now or hereafter amended, shall be construed to mean all officers and employees of the United States or of the District of Columbia, permanent, or temporary indefinite, without regard to classifications or terminology peculiar to the Federal Civil Service System."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend existing laws relating to military leave of certain employees of the United States or of the District of Columbia so as to equalize rights to leave of absence and reemployment for such employees who are members of the Enlisted or Officers' Reserve Corps, the National Guard, or the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2826) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for investigatory personnel of the Federal Bureau of Investigation who have rendered at least 20 years of service.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

AMENDING INTERNAL REVENUE CODE WITH RESPECT TO MANUFACTURE OF WINES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1945) to amend sections 2801 (e) (4), 3043 (a), and 3045 of the Internal Revenue Code.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have the gentleman from California explain this bill, and he might also make a brief reference to the next two bills on the calendar.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, this bill comes to the floor with the unanimous endorsement of the Ways and Means Committee. It is what you might call a wine industry modernization bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. California wine?

Mr. GEARHART. Affecting California wine, yes. The changes which will be effected are all technical in their nature. The bill was prepared by representatives of the Wine Institute, to which nearly all wine concerns belong, in collaboration and consultation with the Internal Revenue Bureau. The Treasury has no objection to the bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. And briefly about the next two bills.

Mr. GEARHART. The next two bills are of the same character. They are industry bills which have been prepared in consultation with the Treasury, and the Treasury has no objection to their enactment.

Mr. McCORMACK. What particular industry do the other two relate to?

Mr. GEARHART. The same favored industry.

Mr. McCORMACK. Wine?

Mr. GEARHART. Wine, the finest of wine.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am well acquainted with it during my 10 years' experience on the Ways and Means Committee.

I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, until the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] undertook to answer the inquiries of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] it had been my understanding that this bill had relationship to wines produced all over the continental United States. I did not realize that it was directed primarily and principally to the wines made in California. I should like to inquire of the gentleman from California if this and the next two succeeding bills will not apply to wines made in New York State as well as those made in California?

Mr. GEARHART. If I have given any impression that the bill is confined in its operation to California such was not my intention. The bill will apply to all of the States of the Union, as is customary with legislation passed in this House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The inference was drawn from my friend's observations and mine; wine and California. The gentleman comes from California. So he is, with usual zeal, looking after the interests of his people, which in the case of any Member, properly exercised, is an important duty.

Mr. GEARHART. I must add that in the minds of a great many people the words wine and California are synonymous, both in fame and excellence.

Mr. COLE of New York. That is why I took the floor, to make sure that New York was also considered as a wine-producing State and covered by the legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Internal Revenue Code be, and it is hereby, amended as follows:

1. Section 2801 (e) (4) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended (a) by deleting from the second sentence thereof the words "having no interior communication with any other department or part of such premises", and (b) by adding immediately at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The provisions of this paragraph shall apply in the same manner and to the same extent to aperitif wines other than vermouth."

2. Section 3045, Internal Revenue Code, is amended by deleting the period at the end thereof and adding the following: ": *Provided*, That in the case of wines produced from loganberries, currants, or gooseberries, respectively, having a normal acidity of twenty parts or more per thousand, the volume of the resultant product may be increased more than 35 per centum but not more than 60 per centum by the addition of sugar and water solution under such regulations as the Commissioner of Internal Revenue may prescribe."

3. Section 3043 (a), Internal Revenue Code, is amended by deleting the colon in the second sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ", nor to apply to or prohibit the fermentation of grape wine retsina with resin on bonded winery premises."

4. Section 3044 (b), Internal Revenue Code, is amended by deleting the words "and not more than 13 per centum of alcohol after complete fermentation," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "and not more than 13 per centum of alcohol after complete fermentation of, if sweetened, after complete fermentation and sweetening."

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, there was an amendment. If it is not in the bill, I offer it at this time.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GEARHART as a committee amendment: In the title of the bill insert after the figure "3043 (a)," the figure "3044 (b)."

On page 2, rearrange sections 2, 3, and 4 in their correct order, renumbering section 3 section 2; renumbering section 4 section 3; and renumbering section 2 section 4.

On page 2, line 22, in section 4, as the bill is now drawn, prior to the foregoing amendment, strike out the word "of" following the word "fermentation" and insert in lieu thereof "or."

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. That request comes too late. We have already read amendments to the bill.

Mr. CORBETT. Then I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The objection comes too late.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended.

PERMITTING THE BLENDING AND AGING OF BRANDIES IN BOND

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1946) to amend section 2801 (e) of the Internal Revenue Code.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (e) of section 2801 of the Internal Revenue Code be, and it is hereby, amended by adding the following new numbered paragraph:

"(5) Blending of beverage brandies: Fruit brandies distilled from the same kind of fruit at not more than 170 degrees proof may, for the sole purpose of perfecting such brandies according to commercial standards, be mixed or blended with each other, or with any such mixture or blend, by the distiller thereof in any internal revenue bonded warehouse operated by him exclusively for the storage of brandy or wine spirits, and the provisions of this section and of sections 2800 (a) (5) and 3254 (g) relating to rectification or other internal revenue laws of the United States shall not be held to apply to or prohibit such mixing or blending, and brandies so mixed or blended may be packaged, stored, transported, transferred in bond, withdrawn from bond tax-paid or tax-free, or be otherwise disposed of, in the same manner as such brandies not so mixed or blended: *Provided*, That, in addition to the tax imposed by this chapter on the production of distilled spirits, there shall be paid a tax of 30 cents as to each proof gallon (and a proportionate tax at a like rate on all fractional parts of such proof gallon) of brandy so mixed or blended (except when withdrawn tax-free and accounted for or when lost and allowance is made therefor), such tax to be paid by rectified spirits stamps affixed to the packages at the time of withdrawal. The Commissioner, under rules and regulations to be by him prescribed with the approval of the Secretary, upon the presentation of proof to his satisfaction of the loss by leakage, evaporation, theft, or otherwise of fruit brandies so blended or mixed, not occurring as the result of any negligence, connivance, collusion, or fraud on the part of the warehouseman or his agents, is hereby authorized to remit or refund the taxes assessed or paid upon such lost brandies: *Provided, however*, That such remission or refund shall be allowed only to the extent that the warehouseman is not indemnified or recompensed for such tax, and that losses of fruit brandies occurring prior to any such mixing or blending shall be allowable in accordance with section 2901. The term 'distiller' as used herein shall include any one or more distillers associated as members of

any farm cooperative, or any one or more distillers affiliated within the meaning of section 17 (a) (5) of the Federal Alcohol Administration Act, as amended, or any fruit distiller for whose account, recorded with the district supervisor at the time of production, the brandy to be blended was produced. The Commissioner may, with the approval of the Secretary, make such rules or regulations as he may deem necessary to carry these provisions into effect."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LIMITING LIABILITY OF STOCKHOLDERS AND OTHERS IN REGISTERED DISTILLERIES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1947) to amend section 2800 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2800 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code is amended to read as follows:

"(d) Every proprietor or possessor of any still, distillery, or distilling apparatus, and every person in any manner interested in the use of such still, distillery, or distilling apparatus, shall be jointly and severally liable for the taxes imposed by law on the distilled spirits produced therefrom: *Provided*, That in the case of a registered distillery or registered fruit distillery any person so interested other than the proprietor, shall be liable under this subsection for such taxes only if such person (1) has defrauded, or aided or abetted in defrauding, the United States of such taxes, or (2) has profited, directly or indirectly, by the receipt of dividends or otherwise, from any defrauding or evading of payment of such taxes, in which event he shall be liable only to the extent of such profits."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS, WASHINGTON, D. C.

The Clerk called the bill (H. J. Res. 193) to grant authority for the erection of a permanent building for the American National Red Cross, District of Columbia Chapter, Washington, D. C.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to ask the chairman of the Committee on Public Works if he will kindly undertake an explanation of this bill, for the reason that it appears to me to be a very unusual measure in that the Congress is giving consent to a local charitable institution to construct out of its own funds a building upon public ground and that after the building is erected the title to the building shall be in the United States Government.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, the American Red Cross appeared before our committee, indicating that they desired to erect a building here that would cost probably a million and a half dollars, on property which belongs to the United States.

It may be somewhat new to many Members to know that the title to the property on which the present Red Cross Buildings stand here in the District of Columbia is in the name of the United States. The Red Cross has its own money but they cannot build without the consent of the Congress of the United States.

Every agency of Government to which this bill has been submitted has reported favorably. There is no objection whatever, and there is no cost to our Government. The Government has the land. Because of certain recent developments in the District the Red Cross is forced to vacate some buildings which they have occupied rent free for a long period of time. They must move out. They are preparing the plans to build the building. Consent of Congress is needed to facilitate the construction of this "workshop" as the Red Cross calls it, a workshop badly needed here in the District of Columbia for this particular organization.

Mr. COLE of New York. But why is it necessary to have the consent of Congress as a prerequisite to the construction of the building?

Mr. DONDERO. Because it is going to be on land title to which is in the United States Government, and they are not permitted to erect a building on that land without the consent of Congress.

Mr. COLE of New York. If it is possible for them to put up a building on public land others might likewise get the consent of Congress.

Mr. DONDERO. That might be possible. I am in no position to answer that, but I presume the gentleman is correct.

Mr. COLE of New York. I can understand that it is entirely worth while for a charitable or eleemosynary institution of a Nation-wide character; but when we grant this authority to a local chapter of a national organization it seems to me we are establishing a precedent which may someday rise up to plague us. I want to make sure that the Committee on Public Works has considered the possible danger from that source.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. I should like to call the gentleman's attention to a committee amendment which will add section 10 to the bill and which takes care of the very question the gentleman raises.

Mr. COLE of New York. That still will not make it impossible for a person in future years to say that this is a precedent in spite of the fact that the bill itself says it shall not be construed as a precedent.

Mr. DONDERO. Being here in the Nation's Capital, however, we think it deserves special consideration over any other chapter throughout the United States.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That authority be, and is hereby, given to the American National Red Cross to erect upon the south half of square 104 in the city of Washington, District of Columbia, a permanent building for the use of the District of Columbia Chapter, American National Red Cross in connection with its work, in cooperation with the Government of the United States and its responsibilities under its charter granted by the Congress of the United States.

SEC. 2. That the plans of the proposed building shall first be approved by the American National Red Cross, the Commission of Fine Arts, and the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and the erection and design thereof shall be under the supervision of the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency in accordance with the provisions of the Public Buildings Act of May 25, 1926, as amended and as hereby further amended.

SEC. 3. That the cost of the removal of the buildings on this site shall be borne by the American National Red Cross, District of Columbia Chapter, without expense to the United States.

SEC. 4. That said permanent building shall remain the property of the United States but under the supervision of the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency and the American National Red Cross, District of Columbia Chapter, shall, at all times be charged with the responsibility, care, keeping, and maintenance of said building without expense to the United States.

SEC. 5. That moneys of the American National Red Cross, District of Columbia chapter, available for the construction of the aforesaid building, including any amount administratively determined necessary for the payment of salaries and expenses of personnel engaged upon the preparation of plans and specifications, field supervision, and general office expenses, may be transferred to and expended by the Public Buildings Administration of the Federal Works Agency, and such funds may be consolidated on the books of the Treasury Department into a special account for direct expenditure in the prosecution of said work, and the Commissioner of Public Buildings is authorized to prepare drawings and specifications for this building prior to the approval by the Attorney General of the title to such acquisition.

SEC. 6. That said building shall be appropriate in design and character and shall be used by the American National Red Cross, District of Columbia chapter, and shall cost not less than $1,000,000: *Provided*, That this expenditure shall include complete equipment.

SEC. 7. That the person, firm, or corporation which the Commissioner of Public Buildings shall select to furnish professional architectural and engineering services required for the project shall be chosen from nominations made by the American National Red Cross, District of Columbia chapter.

SEC. 8. That the National Capital Housing Authority is hereby authorized and directed to transfer to the jurisdiction of the Federal Works Administrator such part of the site for said building as is now under the jurisdiction of said Authority: *Provided*, That the Treasurer of the United States is authorized and directed to credit said Authority with the fair market value, at the date of transfer, of the property so transferred: *Provided further*, That the Federal Works Administrator is hereby authorized to utilize the property so transferred, as well as that part of the site already under his jurisdiction, for the purposes of this act.

SEC. 9. That the Federal Works Administrator, through the Public Buildings Administration, is hereby authorized to furnish steam from the central heating plant for the heating of said building, such steam to be paid for for by the American National Red Cross, District of Columbia chapter, at such reasonable rates, not less than cost, as may be determined by the Federal Works Administrator: *Provided*, That the Federal Works Administrator, through the Public Buildings Administration, is authorized to prepare plans and specifications and to super-

vise and to contract for the work necessary to connect said building with the Government mains and to pay the cost of such work and services, including administrative expenses, from the funds consolidated into the Treasury pursuant to section 5 thereof.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 4, after line 21, add a new section as follows:

"SEC. 10. The enactment of this joint resolution shall not be construed as establishing a policy of the United States Government to furnish building sites for Red Cross chapters or any eleemosynary institution at any other place."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEATH GRATUITIES FOR SERVICE PERSONNEL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1380) to amend the laws relating to the payment of 6 months' death gratuity to dependents of naval personnel.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provision contained in the act approved June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 824), as amended (34 U. S. C., Supp. 943), is hereby further amended by striking out the words "not the result of his or her own misconduct," wherever appearing therein.

SEC. 2. The act of May 12, 1930 (46 Stat. 268, 34 U. S. C. 944), entitled "An act authorizing payment of 6 months' death gratuity to beneficiaries of transferred members of the Fleet Naval Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve who die while on active duty," is hereby amended by striking out the words "and not as a result of their own misconduct," appearing therein.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, after line 4, insert the following:

"SEC. 3. The act of December 17, 1919, chapter 6 (41 Stat. 367), entitled 'An act to provide for the payment of 6 months' pay to the widow, children, or other designated dependent relative of any officer or enlisted man of the Reguar Army whose death results from wounds or disease not the result of his own misconduct,' as amended (10 U. S. C. 903), is further amended by striking out the words 'not the result of his own misconduct,' wherever appearing therein."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended to read as follows: "A bill to amend the laws relating to the payment of 6 months' death gratuity to dependents of naval and Army personnel."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUDIT OF RECORDS OF ACCOUNTABLE OFFICERS OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3138) to provide for the periodic audit of the records of the accountable officers of the Senate and House of Representatives.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States shall, not less frequently than once each year, detail assistants to audit the fiscal records of accountable officers of the House of Representatives and of the Senate of the United States and shall report to the respective Houses on the results of each such audit.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FOREST PEST CONTROL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1974) to provide for the protection of forests against destructive insects and diseases, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the author of this bill will give us some indication as to the possible cost.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Speaker, having introduced this bill I am very glad indeed to answer the gentleman's inquiry. I may say that no new appropriation is expected to be requested at this session under this bill, which is designed to provide cooperation between the Federal Government, the States, and private agencies in controlling infestations of our forests by insect pests.

One of the basic reasons for submitting the bill is that in the infestation of forest areas by defoliators, bark beetles, and other destructive forest insect pests often the area infested includes private timber lands, State timber lands, and also Federal timber lands. This Congress earlier in the session, due to a heavy infestation by the tussock moth, a defoliator, in northern Idaho, my district, made an appropriation to eradicate this pest. It was provided in that appropriation bill for cooperation with State and private owners. This provision for cooperative effort might have been subject to a point of order on the floor had such point been raised, but it was not, and the control campaign is now going on.

The State of Idaho appropriated $210,000 to combat the pest, the private owners put up something over $100,000, this Congress $375,000, and joining efforts DDT is being sprayed by airplane. When one of these infestations comes it is hardly effective to just fight the pest on Federal land or State land or private land for the control measures must cover the whole of the infested area.

The bill provides that when any Federal money is used the Forest Service may provide what cooperation will take place from the other owners that are interested. May I say also that I claim no pride of authorship because the same bill was introduced in the Senate and I invite attention to No. 176 on today's calendar, an identical bill, which passed the Senate and is over here for consideration. Thus this bill has the unanimous approval of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senate and our own committee on Agriculture. The procedures outlined by the bill are not only of the highest importance to my own State but to the future protection of every forest area in the United States.

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOFF. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE of California. May I say for the benefit of the Members of the House, in answering the inquiry of the gentleman, that the present appropriation—the one for the present fiscal year—is $480,000. In other words, that is the amount which is now being appropriated for the sort of thing which this bill seeks to do. The bill, however, authorizes a more efficient use of that money because it will permit the Federal Government to cooperate with State and private owners. At the present time the Federal Government has no authority at all to go into a cooperative deal, even where land ownerships are mixed. You can appreciate the inefficiency of trying to control insects on Federal land, where the adjacent private landowner is not doing anything or where the State is not doing anything on contiguous land. This bill would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to go into a cooperative agreement with the other landowners for the purpose of fighting those insects on a cooperative basis. It does not provide any money. It merely provides for a more efficient use of the money which the Congress may see fit to make available for this purpose.

Mr. GOFF. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 597, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to protect and preserve forest resources of the United States from ravages of bark beetles, defoliators, blights, wilts, and other destructive forest insect pests and diseases, and thereby enhance the growth and maintenance of forests, promote the stability of forest-using industries and employment associated therewith, aid in fire control by reducing the menace created by dying and dead trees injured or killed by insects or disease, conserve forest cover on watersheds, and protect recreational and other values of forests, it shall be the policy of the Government of the United States independently and through cooperation with the governments of States, Territories, and possessions, and private-timber owners to prevent, retard, control, suppress, or eradicate incipient, potential, or emergency outbreaks of destructive insects and diseases on, or threatening, all forest lands irrespective of ownership.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized either directly or in cooperation with other departments of the Federal Government, with any State, Territory, or possession, organization, person, or public agency, subject to such conditions as he may deem necessary and using such funds as have been, or may hereafter be, made available

for these purposes, to conduct surveys on any forest lands to detect and appraise infestations of forest insect pests and tree diseases, to determine the measures which should be applied on such lands, in order to prevent, retard, control, suppress, or eradicate incipient, threatening, potential, or emergency outbreaks of such insect or disease pests, and to plan, organize, direct, and carry out such measures as he may deem necessary to accomplish the objectives and purposes of this act: *Provided*, That any operations planned to prevent, retard, control, or suppress insects or diseases on forest lands owned, controlled, or managed by other agencies of the Federal Government shall be conducted with the consent of the agency having jurisdiction over such land.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Agriculture may, in his discretion and out of any money made available pursuant to this act, make allocations to Federal agencies having jurisdiction over lands held or owned by the United States in such amounts as he may deem necessary to retard, control, suppress, or eradicate injurious insect pests or plant diseases affecting forests on said lands.

SEC. 4. No money appropriated to carry out the purposes of this act shall be expended to prevent, retard, control, or suppress insect or disease pests on forest lands owned by persons, associations, corporations, States, Territories, possessions, or subdivisions thereof until such contributions toward the work as the Secretary may require have been made or agreed upon in the form of funds, services, materials, or otherwise.

SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this act such sums as the Congress may from time to time determine to be necessary. Any sums so appropriated shall be available for necessary expenses, including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, printing and binding, and the purchase, maintenance, operation, and exchange of passenger-carrying vehicles; but such sums shall not be used to pay the cost or value of any property injured or destroyed. Materials and equipment necessary to control, suppress, or eradicate infestations of forest insects or tree diseases may be procured without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5) under such procedures as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture, when deemed necessary in the public interest.

SEC. 6. The provisions of this act are intended to supplement, and shall not be construed as limiting or repealing, existing legislation.

SEC. 7. This act may be cited as the "Forest Pest Control Act."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 1974) was laid on the table.

INCLUSION OF CERTAIN LANDS IN ANGOSTURA PROJECT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2167) to authorize the inclusion within the Angostura water conservation and utilization project of certain lands owned by the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to add to and make a part of the Angostura water conservation and utilization project, situated in Custer and Fall River Counties, S. Dak., and established pursuant to the provisions of the act of August 11, 1939, as amended (16 U. S. C. (and Supp.) 590y–590z–11), any lands of the United States acquired under the provisions of the National Industrial Recovery Act, approved June 16, 1933 (48 Stat. 195), the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, approved April 8, 1935 (49 Stat. 115), or title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm-Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1010–1013), within the Bad Lands-Fall River land utilization project, administered by the Secretary of Agriculture, which are found to be suitable for water conservation and utilization purposes. All lands so added to and made a part of the Angostura water conservation and utilization project shall thereafter be subject to all laws applicable to agricultural lands acquired under the provisions of section 5 (a) of the act of August 11, 1939, as amended (16 U. S. C. 590z–3 (a)); the costs incurred by the United States in acquiring such lands, as well as the costs incurred in the improvement thereof for water conservation and utilization purposes, shall be returned in the same manner as though such lands had been acquired under the provisions of said section 5 (a).

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, following the word "Angostura", strike out the words "water conservation and utilization" and substitute in lieu thereof "unit of the Missouri Basin."

Page 2, line 7, following the word "for", strike out the words "water conservation and utilization purposes." and substitute in lieu thereof "such transfer."

Page 2, line 9, following the word "Angostura" strike out the words "water conservation and utilization project" and substitute in lieu thereof "unit."

Page 2, line 15, following the word "for", strike out the words "water conservation and utilization" and substitute in lieu thereof "irrigation."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time and passed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota to the title of the bill: Strike out "water conservation and utilization" and insert "unit of the Missouri Basin."

The amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSERVATION OF FISH AND WILDLIFE OF UPPER MISSISSIPPI

The Clerk read the bill (H. R. 2721) to amend the act of March 10, 1934, entitled "An act to promote the conservation of wildlife, fish, and game, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have this bill explained.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, this bill simply provides and directs full consideration and recognition of the needs of fish and other wildlife on the part of the United States Engineer Corps in maintaining certain pool levels in the upper Mississippi River during the wintertime. The bill does not apply to the navigation season and only requires cooperation during the winter months of the year when we have several feet of ice on the river. It was the practice during the wartime for the War Department to draw down the pools and virtually drain some of the pools during the winter months, and thousands of tons of fish were destroyed or smothered at the time because the water was removed leaving the fish in pockets without water. Now the War Department has agreed to cooperate in the maintenance of the pool levels during these months. It does not affect navigation in the lower Mississippi River or any other part of the Mississippi because the provisions of this cooperation do not relate during the period of the navigation season.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACKINNON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Where does it say that it applies only during the winter?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It says: "Shall operate and maintain pool levels as though navigation was carried on throughout the year."

Of course, the pool levels are maintained during the navigation season. The bill provides for the maintenance of adequate water in pools during the winter months to stop destruction of fish.

Mr. JUDD. Of course, the gentleman knows what our concern is, that there are certain seasons of the year in dry years when the water is so low over the chain of locks above St. Louis that unless there is some draw-down the navigation cannot be carried on. May I ask the gentleman, have the navigation people on the Mississippi River expressed any objection to this bill?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The navigation people, headed by one of the gentleman's constituents, Mr. Strong, are strongly in favor of this bill, and have agreed to it.

Mr. JUDD. That is what I want to know.

Mr. MACKINNON. Why did the War Department object to this bill?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The War Department has agreed to cooperate in maintaining pool levels during the winter months to save fish and other wildlife. Because they agreed to do it, they raised an objection to the passage of the bill and said it was not necessary. This bill simply seals the agreement with the War Department.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACKINNON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. TALLE. I repeat what I have said to the very able and distinguished gentleman from Minnesota privately on many occasions, that very many people in my district are keenly interested in this legislation, and I urge its immediate enactment.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman from Iowa has been very active for this bill. I might say that a similar bill affecting almost the whole country passed the House by unanimous consent last year and was stricken out in the Senate. This bill has been restricted to the Mississippi River between Rock Island, Illinois, and Minneapolis, where most of the damage was done during the war years as a result of the draining of pools in the wintertime.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, I feel it is very necessary to preserve a proper balance between the conflicting interests

involved. We should give each his due but not permit either to operate to the destruction of the other. The divergent interests are the two groups, one concerned with the preservation of our wildlife, and the other concerned with navigation on the river. I am pleased to hear my colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] say that these groups have compromised their differences and agreed on this bill. In view of the gentleman's statement that this does not operate during the navigational season, I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I can assure my colleague from Minnesota that there is no conflict of interest so far as this legislation is concerned, as it simply provides for cooperation on the part of the War Department in the conservation of fish in the upper Mississippi River. The War Department has agreed to cooperate in accordance with the provisions of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of March 10, 1934 (48 Stat. 401), as amended by the act approved August 14, 1946 (Public Law 732, 79th Cong.), is hereby amended to include the following new section:

"SEC. 5A. In the management of existing facilities (including locks, dams, and pools) in the Mississippi River between Rock Island, Ill., and Minneapolis, Minn., administered by the United States Corps of Engineers of the War Department, that Department is hereby directed to give full consideration and recognition to the needs of fish and other wildlife resources and their habitat dependent on such waters, without increasing additional liability to the Government, and shall operate and maintain pool levels as though navigation was carried on throughout the year."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUPPLYING UTILITIES TO PERSONS NEAR ARMED ACTIVITIES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3055) to permit the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War to supply utilities and related services to welfare activities, and persons whose businesses or residences are in the immediate vicinity of naval or military activities and require utilities or related services not otherwise obtainable locally, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of War, or their designees within their respective establishments, are authorized to sell, under such regulations and at such prices as the Secretary concerned may prescribe, to welfare activities and private persons in the immediate vicinity of naval activities such utilities and related services as are not otherwise available from local, private, or public sources.

SEC. 2. The utilities and related services authorized to be sold under this Act are (1) electric power, (2) steam, (3) compressed air, (4) water, (5) sewage and garbage disposal service, (6) gas (natural, manufactured, or mixed), (7) ice, and (8) mechanical refrigeration: *Provided*, That any utility or related service provided and sold under the authority of this Act shall not be so provided unless it is determined by the Secretary concerned that the utility or related service is not available from a private or other public source, and that the furnishing thereof is in the public interest.

SEC. 3. As may be required by the local needs, the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War, in carrying out the purposes of this act, are authorized to effect minor expansions and extensions of the necessary distributing systems or facilities within the naval or military activity for those activities which it is determined may supply local services and utilities as described by section 2 herein.

SEC. 4. The act of June 13, 1940 (54 Stat. 383, 34 U. S. C. 553), is hereby repealed.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 2, before "activities" insert "or military."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RETURN OF REMAINS OF THOSE BURIED IN FOREIGN LANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3394) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the evacuation and return of the remains of certain persons who died and are buried outside the continental limits of the United States," approved May 16, 1946, in order to provide for the shipment of the remains of World War II dead to the homeland of the deceased or of next of kin, to provide for the disposition of group and mass burials, to provide for the burial of unknown American World War II dead in United States military cemeteries to be established overseas, to authorize the Secretary of War to acquire land overseas and to establish United States military cemeteries thereon, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of May 16, 1946, entitled "An act to provide for the evacuation and return of the remains of certain persons who died and are buried outside the continental limits of the United States" (Public Law 383, 79th Cong.), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That the Congress hereby declares it to be in the public interest to provide for the interment of the remains of certain persons who died on or after September 3, 1939, and whose remains are buried in places located outside the continental limits of the United States and could not be returned to their homeland for burial due to wartime shipping restrictions, by authorizing their permanent interment outside the continental limits of the United States or their evacuation and return either to their homeland or to the homeland of their next of kin, and to centralize in one agency the task of accomplishing the purpose of this act.

"SEC. 2. All activities herein provided for are hereby made a responsibility of the Secretary of War.

"SEC. 3. The Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed upon application by the next of kin in the case of individual identified remains to return such remains to the homeland of the decedent or of his next of kin for interment at places designated by the next of kin, including national cemeteries provided such remains are entitled to interment therein; and he is further authorized at his own discretion in the case of group of mass burials, which include the remains of one or more known individuals, to cause them to be interred in such places as he may direct: *Provided*, That this act shall apply only to the remains of persons who died on or after September 3, 1939, and are buried outside the continental limits of the United States, and who were—

"(a) members of the armed forces of the United States and who died in the service;

"(b) civilian officers and employees of the United States;

"(c) citizens of the United States who served in the armed forces of any government at war with Germany, Italy, or Japan and who died while in such service and who were citizens of the United States at the time of such service;

"(d) citizens of the United States whose homes are in fact in the United States and whose death outside the continental limits thereof can be directly attributed to the war or who died while employed or otherwise engaged in activities contributing to the prosecution of the war; and

"(e) such other citizens of the United States, the disposition of the remains of whom under the provisions of this act would, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, serve in the public interest.

"SEC. 4. With respect to the remains of all persons who are included in the categories set forth in the preceding section of this act, the Secretary of War is further authorized and directed upon application by the next of kin in the case of individual identified remains, and authorized at his own discretion in the case of unidentified remains and in all cases of identified remains which are not returned to the homeland under the provisions of this act to inter the remains in United States military cemeteries established outside the continental limits of the United States.

"SEC. 5. The Secretary of War is hereby authorized to acquire by purchase, gift, or devise, without submission to the Attorney General of the United States under the provisions of section 355 of the Revised Statutes (34 U. S. C. 520; 40 U. S. C. 255), land or interest in land in foreign countries necessary for the purposes of this act, and to establish thereon United States military cemeteries. Cemeteries established by the Secretary of War under the authority of this act are subject to the provisions of section 12, Public Law 456, Seventy-ninth Congress.

"SEC. 6. The Secretary of War is authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes and provisions of this act.

"SEC. 7. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated from time to time such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, said sums to be made available for civil functions administered by the War Department, 'Cemeterial expenses, War Department,' to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War.

"SEC. 8. This act and the authority granted therein and all rules and regulations promulgated thereunder shall terminate on December 31, 1951, or upon such earlier date as may be specified in a proclamation by the President, or in a concurrent resolution by the two Houses of Congress as the date beyond which further continuance of the authority granted by this act is not necessary in the public interest, whichever date is earliest: *Provided*, That as to any applications provided for under sections 3 and 4 filed prior to such termination date, the provisions of this act and such rules or regulations promulgated pursuant thereto shall be treated as remaining in force for the purpose of providing for the return or overseas burial of remains in the proper cases."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSFERRING VESSEL "JOSEPH CONRAD"

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3333) to authorize the transfer of the *Joseph Conrad* to the Marine Historical Association of Mystic, Conn., for museum purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Maritime Commission is authorized to give and deliver to the Marine Historical Association of Mystic, Conn., the *Joseph Conrad* for use by the Marine Historical Association of Mystic, Conn., as a museum to be in large part devoted to creating interest in the merchant marine and maritime matters. The transfer of said ship to carry a provision that in the event the Maritime Commission should need the ship for training purposes, then it shall be transferred to the Maritime Commission. The Maritime Commission is also authorized to place in the museum pictures, relics, flags, displays, and documents, for the purpose of creating interest in the American merchant marine and maritime matters.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, after "deliver" insert "(at her present location, St. Petersburg, Fla.)."

Line 7, after "museum" insert "and for youth-training purposes."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PETERSON: Page 2, at the end of line 7 insert the following: "In the event the Marine Historical Association of Mystic, Conn., should fail to accept under this act, the Maritime Commission is authorized to deliver the said ship to the city of St. Petersburg, Fla., for museum and youth-training purposes."

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, the amendment contemplates that in the event that for any reason the Historical Association at Mystic, Conn., could not take the vessel up there and should decline the authorization contained in this bill, the city of St. Petersburg would like to have the opportunity to have it turned over to the city.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BRADLEY. The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, before which this bill was heard, considers this amendment as advisable and meritorious. The committee recommends that it be accepted by the House and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. PETERSON. I am grateful to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think this amendment should carry because the city of St. Petersburg has had the opportunity already to accept the ship and has turned it down. There are a number of other historical bodies, some in my own district, that are interested in this ship. I do not think this matter ought to be passed over so lightly.

Mr. PETERSON. The only reason we are putting this amendment in the bill is that, as stated, originally we had contemplated and would have liked to have it in St. Petersburg. The ship is located there now.

Then the question of raising that thirty-five or forty thousand dollars came. It is now contemplated that the *Conrad* may not be seaworthy, so that it could not be taken somewhere else, and in that event, that it could not be taken to Mystic, they could take it elsewhere.

Mr. POTTS. I think it should be ironed out in some way later on when the whole situation should be considered.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of the consideration of the disposition of this ship the city of St. Petersburg asked for the custody of the *Joseph Conrad* as a historical memento or for a museum. Finding that the cost would be considerable, the city of St. Petersburg withdrew its request. Shortly thereafter the Marine Historical Association, of Mystic, Conn., made request for the ship, and the committee gave it full consideration. There have been several requests from organizations, some in the vicinity of New York, and in each case the organization has been asked to appear before the committee and make a presentation of its desires. In every case, such organization has failed to appear and has made no effort whatsoever to present its case.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY. I yield.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, in this particular instance this constituent of mine asked me to see if this ship could not be obtained for the Bluejackets Patriotic Organization, and the reason nothing was done on it, although my suggestion was transmitted to the authorities, was that there was a bill pending in the Congress and, therefore, their request could not be considered until this bill was disposed of. But I do not think they ought to be turned down so abruptly. They ought to have a chance to put in a bid for the ship.

Mr. BRADLEY. In several instances I informed the inquirers from the gentleman's district that the ship was available and of what the probable cost would be to make the ship seaworthy. In no case did they see fit to follow up on their inquiries. Even at the present time it appears that the cost of moving this ship may be so great that the museum of Mystic, Conn., will not accept it, and that is the reason that the city of St. Petersburg has requested that this bill be amended as now proposed. I think the amendment should be accepted. We have fooled around with this thing for the past 4 months and I hope that we can get somewhere with it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. If the Mystic, Conn., people should not accept the ship, what harm is done by voting down the amendment and allowing the New York people or any other people to have their say at some time in the future?

Mr. BRADLEY. May I say to the gentleman that the Maritime Commission has had this ship available for disposal for a long time. It is alongside a dock at St. Petersburg, Fla., and is costing the Government money to keep it up every single day it is there. It is about time that we got rid of it and got it off our expense account. We have given various groups 3 or 4 months to present their cases in order to get this ship off our hands, and no one has appeared to actually ask for it except these two organizations.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Will not this ship be declared surplus property on June 30 if it is not taken now?

Mr. BRADLEY. This ship will be declared surplus at any time that we can find somebody to take care of it. Nobody wants to buy it. It cost the Government $1; nobody really wants it now except as a souvenir. It will cost close to $40,000 to put it in condition to be used as a training ship of any kind, and I do not know of any private organization which is going to be willing to spend that much money on it.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the transfer of the Joseph Conrad to the Marine Historical Association of Mystic, Conn., for museum and youth-training purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING GREAT LAKES NAVIGATION RULES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2293) to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate navigation on the Great Lakes and their connecting and tributary waters," approved February 8, 1895.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subdivision (a) of rule 3 in the first section of the act entitled "An act to regulate navigation on the Great Lakes and their connecting and tributary waters," approved February 8, 1895, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 33, sec. 252 (a)), is amended to read as follows:

"(a) On or in front of the foremast, or if a vessel without a foremast, then in the fore part of the vessel, a bright white light so constructed as to show an unbroken light over an arc of the horizon of 20 points of the compass, so fixed as to throw the light 10 points on each side of the vessel, namely, from right ahead to 2 points abaft the beam on either side, and of such a character as to be visible at a distance of at least 5 miles. Such light shall be at a greater height above the water than the side lights required by subdivisions (b) and (c)."

SEC. 2. Subdivision (e) of rule 3 in the first section of such act (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 33, sec. 252 (e)) is amended to read as follows:

"(e) A steamer of over 100 feet register length shall carry also, when under way, a bright white light so fixed as to throw the light all around the horizon, and of such a character as to be visible at a distance of at least 3 miles. Such light shall be placed in line with the keel at least 15 feet higher

than, and more than 50 feet abaft, the light mentioned in subdivision (a); or in lieu thereof two such lights of the same character and height as herein described placed not over 30 inches apart horizontally, one on either side of the keel, and so arranged that one or the other or both shall be visible from any angle of approach."

SEC. 3. Rule 3 of such act (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 33, sec. 252) is amended by adding the following:

"(f) A steam vessel not more than 100 feet in length shall carry also a bright white light aft to show all around the horizon. Such light shall be placed in line with the keel higher than the light required by subdivision (a)."

SEC. 4. Subdivision (e) of rule 14 in the first section of such act (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 33, sec. 271 (e)) is amended to read as follows:

"(e) A vessel at anchor and a vessel aground in or near a channel or fairway shall at intervals of not more than 2 minutes ring the bell rapidly for from 3 to 5 seconds and, in addition, at intervals of not more than 3 minutes shall sound on the whistle or horn a signal of one short blast, two long blasts, and one short blast in quick succession."

SEC. 5. The first section of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"RULE 30. (a) Between sunrise and sunset every vessel over 65 feet in length when at anchor shall carry forward, where it can best be seen, one black ball not less than 2 feet in diameter.

"(b) A vessel over 65 feet in length which is not under command shall carry where they can best be seen and, if a steam vessel, in lieu of the white light required by rule 3 (a), two red lights in a vertical line one over the other not less than 3 feet apart, and of such a character as to be visible all around the horizon at a distance of at least 2 miles. By day such vessel shall carry in a vertical line one over the other not less than 3 feet apart, where they can best be seen, two black balls, each 2 feet in diameter. Such vessel, when not making way through the water, shall not carry the side lights required by rule 3 (b) and (c), but when making way shall carry them.

"(c) A vessel aground over 65 feet in length shall carry by night the white light or lights prescribed for a vessel at anchor and in addition shall carry, where they can best be seen by approaching vessels, two red lights in a vertical line one over the other, not less than 3 feet apart, visible all around the horizon at a distance of at least 2 miles. By day such vessel shall carry in a vertical line one over the other not less than 3 feet apart, where they can best be seen, three black balls, each 2 feet in diameter."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING SECTION 107 OF TITLE 2 OF THE CANAL ZONE CODE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1260) to amend section 107 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, approved June 19, 1934.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the report does not indicate the cost of this bill, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE]?

There was no objection.

AMENDING NAVIGATION RULES FOR THE WESTERN RIVERS AND INLAND WATERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3350) relating to the rules for the prevention of collisions on certain inland waters of the United States and on the western rivers, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, this is a rather long and involved bill and requires explanation more extended than can be given to it on the Consent Calendar. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE]?

There was no objection.

AMENDING INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2298) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ESTABLISHING A FISH HATCHERY AT ROGERS CITY, MICH.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 210) to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery at or near Rogers City, Mich.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is with hesitancy that I question the consideration of the next three bills on the calendar, due to the fact that they are close to and dear to the heart of the former chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, who is held in high regard not only by the members of the committee but by the membership of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the fact that these four bills authorize the establishment of rearing ponds, fish hatcheries, and laboratories that are not in existence. In calling attention to the establishment of these fish hatcheries and laboratories, I refer to the recent appropriation bill which so drastically curtailed the appropriation for the Fish and Wild Life Service in the Department of the Interior that it practically caused the closing of one of the finest laboratories and fish hatcheries on the Atlantic coast at Beaufort, N. C.

The following facts will support this hatchery:

Congress in 1900, during the administration of President Theodore Roosevelt, authorized the construction of this biological station which was completed and opened to investigators for the first time in 1902.

It is located in the center of the greatest fish- and shellfish-producing country in the United States where over 150,000,000 pounds are caught annually and ideal conditions exist for studies of an unusually large variety of marine plants and animals, many of which are of great economic importance in the Atlantic and Gulf coastal fishery resources.

Facilities have been provided here for conducting marine scientific research and practical experiments by hundreds of scientists from universities, military agencies, State and Federal institutions, and private concerns, the majority of which have contributed exceedingly valuable information for the conservation and development of our fishery resources, national health, and for protection of the United States Navy, at virtually no expense to the Beaufort laboratory.

It served as a naval radio station during World War I, and since 1938 conducted special marine investigations concerning fouling of ships' bottoms, prevention of corrosion and marine growth on flying ships, studies of submarine sounds, examination of sunken U-boats, cooperation in Naval Intelligence, and other problems of World War II. The Civil Air Patrol was also provided with quarters in 12 of the laboratory rooms during its valuable wartime functions in this region.

The Beaufort laboratory is also the world's greatest hatchery for the diamond-back terrapin, and has produced over 240,000 eggs and young of this valuable species for restocking of coastal waters, and for biological and medical research. The annual crop now being produced there has a value of over $5,000.

Since 1931 the present director of the laboratory has arranged for over 275 scientific studies and experiments to be conducted here at virtually no expense to the Federal Government by outside investigators which have yielded biological and technological information of vital importance to the health and safety of the Nation that is worth many times the cost of operating this field station.

In addition to the 15 regular oyster investigations conducted here in the 10 years prior to World War II, the laboratory rendered emergency service on 24 special problems in the States of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, and Louisiana involving damage to the oyster resources and other fisheries by hurricanes, pollution, natural enemies, new waterways, and unusual climatological conditions. The expense of these was taken care of by special arrangements with State conservation departments and commercial fishery interests.

In 1941 the first and only experimental oyster farm in this country was designed and constructed by the Beaufort Laboratory with funds provided by the State of North Carolina. The State has just appropriated $5,000 for research operations at the North River oyster farm and $100,000 for rehabilitation of its oyster resources in accordance with its special cooperating agreement with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service. Also for shrimp investigations $50,000 has been appropriated. All the Federal

Government has provided for these projects is advisory plans, programs, and supervision of research operations.

During the depression the Beaufort Laboratory established and supervised many work-relief projects involving expenditures of over $1,000,000 for our southern fisheries whereby the seafood resources might be improved in quantity and quality and yield fair returns to our low-income fishermen. Several cooperative freezing, processing, and storage plants were constructed along the coast.

The 11 acres of property adjacent to the Beaufort Laboratory on Piver's Island was donated to Duke University by the director, and a fine marine laboratory erected there in 1938 for education of students in the biological sciences and for fundamental research.

In 1943 the director of the laboratory received a war assignment as Coordinator of Fisheries for the Chesapeake Bay and North Carolina region where continued production of its 550,000,000-pound fish crop was greatly needed in an extremely complicated military area. A high yield was obtained by our commercial fishermen who operated at considerable risk and rendered special service as observers for the Navy's Eastern Sea Frontier. The laboratory also handled most of the war problems of our great menhaden industry, which after contributing half of its best vessels to the United States Navy came through with better than average production from dangerous coastal areas on the Atlantic and Gulf coasts, and in 1946 was our No. 1 commercial fishery which converted over 900,000,000 pounds of fish into the fish meal and oil that was greatly needed by the agriculture and many important industries.

I hope that when this bill reaches the other body they will restore certain amounts of this fund so as to permit established institutions to continue to serve the purpose for which they have been created. They truly have been rendering a great service to the Fish and Wildlife Service, particularly in the matter of the production of more edible fish and seafood for the people of this country. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa has already made that request.

The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FISH HATCHERY AT ST. IGNACE, MICH.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 214) to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery at or near St. Ignace, Mich.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I have said before, my reservation applies to four bills—178, 179, 180, and 181. I think we could deal with them all at the present time.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

FISH HATCHERY AT CHARLEVOIX, MICH.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 215) to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery at or near Charlevoix, Mich.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

FISH HATCHERY ON THE ANNA RIVER, ALGER COUNTY, MICH.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 216) to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I desire recognition to make a statement regarding these bills.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can do it under a reservation of objection if he so desires.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there is nothing I can do, of course, regarding the passing over of these bills, but I do want the House and the country to know that within my service in this body every Federal fish hatchery in Michigan, a State located in the very midst of the Great Lakes fishing area, was taken out of the State with the exception of one, a battle had to be waged to save even one Federal fish hatchery in a State that has more coast line than any other State in the Union, a State prominent in the Great Lakes area and the great fresh water seas of this country. It does seem to me in view of the importance of Michigan in this area the State is entitled to more than one fish hatchery. I would assume that the author of these bills had in mind to reestablish at least one of the Federal fish hatcheries in the State.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, as I stated in my previous remarks, I am very reluctant to object to the authorization contained in these four bills, because I am in hearty accord with the development of the fish and wildlife resources of this country, and I know that this is the way to do it but on account of the conditions I have pointed out, the meager amount of money that was authorized in the appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior, I see no reason why we should authorize the establishment of new hatcheries when we simply do not have enough money to operate the hatcheries which have proven their success and the worthiness of their existence. Unless, Mr. Speaker, the bills are passed over without prejudice, I will object to their present consideration.

Mr. DONDERO. I cannot quarrel with the gentleman from North Carolina on the question of trying to economize in the expenses of government.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

KENDUSKEAG STREAM, PENOBSCOT COUNTY, MAINE, DECLARED NONNAVIGABLE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 599) declaring Kenduskeag Stream, Penobscot County, Maine, to be a nonnavigable waterway.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Kenduskeag Stream, a minor tributary of the Penobscot River, located in Penobscot County, in the State of Maine, be, and the same is hereby, declared to be a nonnavigable waterway within the meaning of the Constitution and laws of the United States of America.

SEC. 2. That the right of Congress to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

TRANSFERRING REMOUNT SERVICE FROM THE WAR DEPARTMENT TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3484) to transfer the Remount Service from the War Department to the Department of Agriculture.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the interests of economy and efficiency, the records, property, real and personal, and civilian personnel of the Remount Service of the Quartermaster Corps, War Department, are hereby transferred to the Department of Agriculture, effective July 1, 1947. Prior to that date, the Secretary of War and the Secretary of Agriculture shall enter into a written agreement on the property and the personnel covered by this transfer.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to receive the property transferred by this act and is directed to administer it in such manner as he deems will best advance the livestock and agricultural interests of the United States, including improvement in the breeding of horses suited to the needs of the United States; the acquisition by purchase in the open market, exchange, hire, or donation of breeding stock; and necessary land, buildings, and facilities; the use of horses in the improvement of the supply of horses available in agriculture; the demonstration of the quality and usefulness of horses through participation in and lending for use in fairs, shows, and other events, or otherwise; the loan, sale, or hire of animals or animal products through such arrangements and subject to such fees as are deemed necessary by the Secretary to accomplish the purposes of this act, and, in carrying out such program, the Secretary is authorized to cooperate with public and private organizations and individuals under such rules and regulations as are deemed by him to be necessary.

SEC. 3. Until June 30, 1948, the Secretary of War may detail to the Department of Agriculture such military personnel, including officers in the Veterinary Corps of the Medical Department, as he may determine with the Secretary of Agriculture, to be desirable to effectuate the purposes of this act or to safeguard the interest of the United States. Notwithstanding the limitations contained in existing law, retired officer personnel of the War Department, if employed by the Department of Agriculture for the purposes of this

act only, may receive in addition to their retired pay, civilian salary to the extent that the total from both sources does not exceed the pay and allowances received by such persons in the permanent grade last held by them prior to retirement.

SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Agriculture such funds as may be necessary to carry out this act. The authority of the War Department to conduct a remount breeding program is hereby abolished. Funds appropriated pursuant to this act shall be available for necessary administrative expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia, printing and binding, and purchase or hire of passenger motor vehicles.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 8, strike out "stock;" and insert "stock."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, this bill, H. R. 3484, represents an agreement between the Department of War and the Department of Agriculture on the best way to handle the Remount Service in the light of the decision of the War Department to terminate the program as far as the military budget is concerned. This decision was taken following the elimination of horse cavalry from the Army.

To those who have taken pride in the program as it has been conducted by the War Department, may I say that I did not introduce a bill to handle this matter until the Secretary of War stated to me in a letter dated March 25, 1947, that "steps had been taken to terminate the program" and that he saw "no other alternative" in view of the fact that an effort to transfer the service of the Agriculture Department by agreement between the secretaries had been ruled by the Attorney General to be beyond the powers of the President under either the First War Powers Act or the Reorganization Act.

Thereupon I wrote and introduced the bill H. R. 2868 which was discussed informally with representatives of both the War and Agriculture Departments and officials of the American Remount Association and many Members of Congress. The bill now before us, H. R. 3484, is a revised version of the first bill, drafted in conformity with suggestions of the two Deparments, and, as far as I know, represents complete agreement by all concerned.

Both Departments recommend enactment of this bill, and it is before the House with the endorsement of the Committee on Agriculture as well as the Committee on Armed Services. Their statements appear in the report on the bill.

It will be noted that the bill calls for a written agreeement between the Secretary of War and the Secretary of Agriculture on the property and personnel covered by the transfer prior to July 1, 1947.

Members of the Committee on Agriculture have said to me that they desire to have a clear-cut understanding with the Department upon the program that will be followed in the administration of the Remount Service. That certainly should be provided, and I urge that the Department take immediate steps to confer with the committee prior to the drawing of the agreement with the Secretary of War.

To the many members who have collaborated in this matter, I express the appreciation of the many people throughout the country who are interested in the continuation of the Remount Service for the improvement of the light horse industry.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ORGANIC ACT OF THE UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3106) to reenact and amend the Organic Act of the United States Geological Survey by incorporating therein substantive provisions confirming the exercise of long-continued duties and functions and by redefining their geographic scope.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

CENSUS ROLL OF THE INDIANS OF CALIFORNIA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2878) to amend the act approved May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602), as amended, to revise the census roll of the Indians of California provided for therein.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of May 1928 (45 Stat. 602), as amended by the act of April 29, 1930 (46 Stat. 259), be, and the same is hereby, amended as follows:

That section 1 of the act of May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602), be amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. That for the purposes of this act, the Indians of California shall be defined to be all Indians who were residing in the State of California on June 1, 1852, and their descendants now living."

SEC. 2. That section 7 of the act of May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602), be amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. That the Secretary of the Interior, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, is hereby authorized and directed to revise the census roll of the Indians of California, made by him in accordance with the provisions of the act of May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602), as amended, by removing from said roll the names of persons who have died since May 18, 1928, and by adding the names of children, and their descendants, now living, born since May 18, 1928, to enrollees whose names are on said roll, and by adding to said census roll the names of Indians not now on said roll and who come within the definition provided for in section 1 of this act. The Indians of California in each community may elect a committee of three enrollees who may aid the enrolling agent in any matters relating to the revision of said roll. Any person claiming to be entitled to enrollment may, within 1 year after the approval of this act, make an application in writing to the Secretary of the Interior for enrollment. After the expiration of such period of time, the Secretary of the Interior shall have 6 months to approve and promulgate such revised roll, after which the roll shall be closed and thereafter no additional names shall be added thereto: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior shall prepare and distribute to the Indians of California not less than three thousand copies of an alphabetical printed list, consisting of the name of each Indian on the census roll approved May 17, 1933, giving name, address, age at time of enrollment, and such other factual information, if any, as the Secretary may deem advisable as tending to identify each enrollee."

With the following committee amendments:

On line 3, page 1, the phrase "Section 7 of" should be inserted immediately following the word "That."

Lines 6, 7, 8, and 9 of page 1 should be deleted.

Lines 1, 2, 3, and 4 of page 2 should be deleted.

On line 7 of page 2, the word "census" should be deleted.

On line 13 of page 2, the phrase "qualified under section 1 of the act of May 18, 1928," should be inserted following the word "enrollees."

On line 13 of page 2, the comma and the phrase "and by" should be deleted and a period substituted therefor.

On line 13 of page 2, the word "are" should be deleted and the word "appear" substituted therefor.

Lines 14 and 15 on page 2 should be deleted.

On line 16 of page 2, the words "section 1 of this act." should be deleted.

On line 20 of page 2, the words "as herein amended," should be inserted following the word "act."

On line 23 of page 2, the words "six months" should be deleted and the words "one year" substituted therefor.

On line 4 of page 3, the word "census" should be deleted.

On line 8 of page 3, the quotation mark (") appearing thereon should be deleted.

Beginning with line 9 of page 3, the following paragraph should be added:

"SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California, the sum of $25,000 to remain available until expended, to be used to defray the expenses incurred by the Secretary of the Interior in revising the roll, as provided herein."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the act approved May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602), as amended, to revise the roll of the Indians of California provided therein."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROMOTING THE MINING OF COAL, PHOSPHATE, SODIUM, POTASSIUM, OIL, OIL SHALE, GAS, AND SULFUR ON LAND ACQUIRED BY THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3022) to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, sodium, potassium, oil, oil shale, gas, and sulfur on lands acquired by the United States.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice in order that the membership of the House may be given a greater opportunity to study the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and for the information of the House, the purpose of this

bill is to promote and encourage the development of the ore, gas, and other minerals on the acquired lands of the United States on a uniform basis under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior. In the interest of economy, it eliminates several agencies now engaged in the leasing of acquired lands for oil, and gas, and centralizes this function in the Department of the Interior.

The report on this bill has been carefully considered by a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands of the House, it has been carefully considered by the full committee and unanimously reported by the subcommittee and also by the full committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

HELIUM-BEARING GAS LANDS IN THE NAVAJO INDIAN RESERVATION, N. MEX.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3372) authorizing certain agreements with respect to rights in helium-bearing gas lands in the Navajo Indian Reservation, N. Mex., and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I take this time so that I may explain an amendment which will be offered on behalf of the Committee on Indian Affairs, of which I am a member.

The purpose of this bill is to ratify certain agreements entered into between the Government, through the Interior Department, and Continental Oil Co. and the Santa Fe Corp., on the one hand, and between the Government and the Navajo Indian Tribe in New Mexico, on the other, so that the Government may obtain, develop, and conserve valuable helium deposits in the Navajo country, all of which are described in House Document No. 212, Eightieth Congress.

The bill has to be passed by the end of this month, because the agreement between the Government and the oil companies, which has taken over 4 years of investigation and negotiation, would become null and void unless this bill became law by the end of this fiscal year.

It seemed to the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs and also to the Public Lands Committee that the objectives related in House Document No. 212 are sound in seeking to separate the production of helium from the production of oil and other gases so that the Government could hold in reserve the largest deposit of helium now known in the world today.

However, the proposed contracts with the Navajo Indians, the Continental Oil Co., and the Santa Fe Corporation, are highly complex. The Navajo Tribe is to receive a cash consideration of $147,799. The Government has a total plant investment of nearly $4,000,000—inclusive of the second helium well—and yet it is to pay the Navajos for this remarkable helium deposit the sum of $147,799.

The oil companies involved, having expert legal and other advice, are quite able to conduct their own transactions and no special equities apply to them, but all valuation factors for the Indians have been determined by the Geological Survey in conjunction with the Bureau of Mines. All the advice which the Indians received has been from the Indian Bureau or from representatives of these two agencies of the Government pursuant to which the tribal council approved the helium transaction.

There is not the slightest doubt in the minds of committee members, I am sure, but that these determinations of value were all honestly arrived at on the part of the Government agents, and yet the fact remains that the Government as guardian of the Indians is buying out the interests of its own wards and dependents in one of the greatest natural resources the Navajos possess. The nature of the Government's obligation requires that the highest degree of care be utilized to see that we deal fairly and equitably with the Navajo Indians. The questions of valuation are highly complex. A few of these questions are as follows:

First. In reducing the anticipated future payments to the Navajos to present worth in order to pay the entire consideration now, is it fair to apply a discount rate of 4 percent? There is no better security than a commitment from the Government. Long-term Government bonds pay only 2½ percent interest. If a 2 percent discount rate is used in this case, the income to the Navajos would be greater by about $30,000.

Second. If a familiar equation of determining capital value is used, whereby income is anticipated as it is here, and deductions are made for operating expenses and risk, and the net return is capitalized at an appropriate rate, the consideration payable to the Indians would be very much greater even without questioning the price paid for the gas or the royalty rate. What is the correct method of valuation which should be applied to this case?

Third. This is not just a case of determining just compensation. There are clearly equitable factors here which should be considered. When the Government is dealing with its own wards, and perhaps as a matter of legal rights on the merits quite outside of that relationship. For example, when helium was discovered, as reported in House Document No. 212, on July 1, 1942, it was considered "a find." The Indians had not leased their lands for helium production. They had leased them for oil and gas production in both the 1923 and 1942 leases. Is it possible that the former arrangements by contract should have been revised in the light of this new discovery and the subject treated anew? Certainly the production of helium gas was a separate and distinct business enterprise undertaken by separate and distinct parties requiring a $3,600,000 plant of its own.

Should the discovery of helium have required a new rental arrangement in respect to the lands?

Is a price of 12 cents a thousand cubic feet adequate for gas having 7.63 percent of helium—the highest helium content yet discovered and in the greatest helium deposit known in the world?

Fourth. We should also be quite sure in dealing with the Indians that the royalty is adequate. Is one-eighth royalty enough for a proven field? It is, I believe, a generally accepted royalty for unproven fields, but this was a proven field after July 1, 1942. For example, in the Rio Vista gas field, the Amerada Oil Co. and Standard Oil Co. of California, pay the Government over 50 percent in royalties on production from Government lands. Royalties in proven gas fields run as high as 60 percent. What should be the royalty in this unique case?

I do not know and I do not think that members of the committee know what the answers to these questions should be, but it is quite clear that these and any other questions which study will reveal, should not be unilaterally answered against the Indians without independent legal or other advice if they desire to have it, and I think they should have such advice. They should have the opportunity to assert any claims for additional compensation which they consider appropriate after receiving such advice, and if such claims are not recognized and paid then to have them adjudicated in the Court of Claims.

I have, therefore, submitted, and the Indian Affairs Subcommittee has approved an amendment to be added at the end of the first paragraph of this bill which will permit the Indians to assert such a claim and to go into court within 3 years after the effective date of the act, this being considered as an adequate time in which to secure expert assistance on this problem and to assert any additional claim that they may have for adequate compensation. The Department of the Interior has approved the amendment, and an identical amendment was adopted this morning by the Public Lands Committee of the Senate on consideration of the companion bill pending in that body.

There is every reason for the greatest possible precaution in seeing that the assets of the Navajos which remain to them today are conserved and developed for the maximum benefit of the tribe. This is particularly true in view of the well-known plight of the Navajos whose grazing resources have been so sharply curtailed as to virtually destroy the native economy of the tribe, curtailing their income and resulting in deplorable living conditions among the Navajos.

In view of the time limitations in the agreements—June 30, 1947—it is deemed impractical for Congress to go further into the details of these transactions but instead to provide a forum in which the Indians may advance any claims in respect to these matters which on independent advice they consider proper.

As a matter of fact, since the Government in this transaction necessarily is dealing with itself as guardian for the Indians, the transaction reduced to its simplest elements is, irrespective of the fairness and care of the officials involved, a taking equivalent to the taking of property by eminent domain, and it is well established that in such cases a judicial determination of the fairness and adequacy of the consideration after the taking is always in order.

To have attempted a thorough determination of the adequacy of the consid-

eration here would have taken weeks of testimony. We reported the bill out, and I supported it only on the assurance that the Indians could submit the matter to the Court of Claims under section 26 of the Indian Claims Commission bill. Thereafter a careful study of that bill comvinced us that that act was not broad enough, and it is for this reason that I presented this amendment to the Indian Affairs Committee for consideration and obtained the approval of the Interior.

With this statement, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of the right to object, with the hope that there will be no objection to the amendment, as there could not be any, I am sure, if the matter is understood by all. It is the only fair thing we can do for the Indians under the circumstances.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman has made a good statement explaining the matter. I hope the amendment he offers will be adopted. It is simply a precaution safeguarding the Navajo Indians so that we may see to it that the wards of the Government are justly treated by the Government in case there should be any necessary adjustment to be made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Mines, and the Navajo Tribe of Indians are authorized to enter into an agreement dated December 1, 1945, entitled "An agreement severing certain formations from oil and gas leases and substituting new leases as to those formations" and an amending agreement, affecting lands in the Navajo Indian Reservation, N. Mex., copies of which are published in House of Representatives Document No. 212, Eightieth Congress, first session; and said agreements are ratified and approved.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Mines, is authorized to enter into an agreement dated September 19, 1946, with Continental Oil Co. and Santa Fe Corp. entitled "Agreement for assignments of interests in oil and gas leases and for operations on the leaseholds," and two agreements supplemental thereto, affecting lands in the Navajo Indian Reservation, N. Mex., copies of which are published in House of Representatives Document No. 212, Eightieth Congress, first session; and said agreements are ratified and approved.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FERNANDEZ: After the period at the end of section 1, insert the following: "If said Navajo Tribe of Indians shall, after investigation, deem the total consideration payable to it by the United States pursuant to such agreement dated December 1, 1945, as amended, to be in any respect less than reasonable, fair, just, and equitable, said tribe shall be entitled within 3 years after the date of enactment of this act to institute suit against the United States in the Court of Claims for the recovery of such additional sum as may be necessary to compensate said tribe for the reasonable, fair, just, and equitable value of all right, interest, and property passing from said tribe to the United States under such agreement, as amended. Jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine any suit so instituted and to enter final judgment against the United States therein for such sum, if any, in excess of the total consideration payable pursuant to such agreement, as amended, as such court may determine to be necessary to provide consideration in all respects reasonable, fair, just, and equitable. Appellate review of any judgment so entered shall be in the same manner, and subject to the same limitations, as in the case of claims over which the Court of Claims has jurisdiction under section 145 of the Judicial Code, as amended (28 U. S. C., sec. 250). Notwithstanding any contract to the contrary, not more than 10 percent of the amount received or recovered by said tribe in satisfaction of any claim asserted under this section shall be paid to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with such claim."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF TITLE I OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT, AS AMENDED

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1230) to amend sections 2 (a) and 603 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out in the first sentence the following: "and prior to July 1, 1947."

Sec. 2. Section 603 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out of the second proviso "June 30, 1947" in each place where it appears, and inserting in lieu thereof "January 31, 1948."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out section 2.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEAN:

Page 1, line 4, after the word "sentence", strike out the following: "and prior to July 1, 1947" and insert "'1947' and inserting '1949'."

The bill will then read:

"That section 2 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out in the first sentence '1947' and inserting '1949'."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the title of the bill just passed (S. 1230) be amended. I call attention to the fact that the title presently carried in the bill contains surplus language, inasmuch as the committee struck section 2 from the original bill. In order that the title may be appropriate, I ask unanimous consent that it be amended to read as follows: "To amend section 2 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended."

The amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PENSIONS TO SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR VETERANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 969) to provide increases in the rates of pensions payable to Spanish-American War veterans and their dependents.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be stricken from the Consent Calendar. We have reported out of our committee a bill, the O'Konski bill, H. R. 3516, that takes in a few additional veterans. Our committee has been promised a hearing before the Committee on Rules in a few days on that bill, which takes in another group of veterans, the remaining Civil War veterans, of whom there are only 93 left, and some of their dependents. I realize it will not go through on this calendar anyway. I am sure the rule on our bill will be reported unanimously by that committee and will pass the House unanimously.

Mr. McCORMACK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, as I understand the situation set forth by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, another bill has been reported out of her committee or is about to be reported out.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It has been reported out. It includes the few remaining Civil War veterans.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does that bill also include the group covered in this bill?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It has the same provisions for the Spanish-American War veterans and includes this other very small and pathetic group. They are dying at the rate of 5 or 6 a month. There are only 93 alive today. The Civil War veterans are not organized and have no one to fight for them. The Spanish-American War veterans were glad to help them and have them included in their bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentlewoman is satisfied a rule will be granted?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I feel satisfied a rule will be granted. Of course, no one is ever sure of anything today, but the chairman of the committee has promised a hearing, and I do not know a single person on the Rules Committee or on the floor of Congress who will object to the passage of the bill or will vote against it.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is true there is nothing certain in life, and that might be particularly true in relation to the rule. That is the reason I ask if that was the gentlewoman's own personal assurance or whether she had assurance from other directions.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I have had indications, I will say to the gentleman, from other directions.

Mr. McCORMACK. Indications in this body are very weak evidence to me. I withdraw my reservation of objection, but I hope that the gentlewoman's confidence will be confirmed by a rule being reported by the Rules Committee.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would be greatly surprised if the O'Konski rule were not granted and if the bill did not pass the House and the Senate unanimously. The bill was passed unanimously out of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and is a better bill than the one on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sure none of us would want to have the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, whom we all like,

be mistaken. I hope her leadership will keep that in mind.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I hope my leadership will keep that in mind also.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is what I said.

Mr. MURDOCK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is the bill which the gentlewoman mentions that is before the Rules Committee the same as this with respect to the groups covered?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes; and it includes a few more veterans.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is well; but I think this bill ought to remain a while longer on the calendar.

Mr. CARROLL. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, does not the gentlewoman think her request to strike this bill from the calendar is premature until such time as the Rules Committee does report out a rule on the bill she has in mind?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Then I shall ask that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. CARROLL. I think that would be better.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. My original request was to strike this bill from the calendar.

Mr. KEAN. We have no objection to the first request as yet.

The SPEAKER. What is the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be stricken from the calendar. The O'Konski bill includes the provisions of this bill and adds others.

Mr. BROOKS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, has the gentlewoman considered the possibility that we might take up this bill and amend it so as to include the other group? That might possibly expedite this legislation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That might be true; but it would be subject to a point of order. I did not feel that that would be fair to the objectors, in view of their rule that they will not consider bills involving large amounts. I like to have my own committee respected in these matters, so I respect the viewpoint of the objectors. I am positive the bill, H. R. 3516, I have referred to will go through. I believe in doing unto others as I would have them do unto me. I have been assured by the leadership that veterans' legislation will be taken up and passed a little later. I believe veterans' legislation should be considered early, not late, in a session of Congress. Unfortunately, veterans' legislation has always been considered last instead of early in the Congress. However, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Congress already have passed in this session some bills which have become law.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

Mr. CARROLL. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

REGULAR MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3303) to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military Establishment of the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first paragraph of section 27 of the National Defense Act, as amended (10 U. S. C. 627, 628), is hereby further amended as follows:

"Effective July 1, 1947, the Secretary of War is authorized, notwithstanding the provisions of the last paragraph of section 127a of this act, to accept original enlistments in the Regular Army from among qualified male persons not less than 17 years of age for periods of 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6 years, and to accept reenlistments for periods of 3, 4, 5, or 6 years: *Provided*, That persons of the first three enlisted grades may be reenlisted for unspecified periods of time on a career basis under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe: *Provided further*, That anyone who serves three or more years of an enlistment for an unspecified period of time may submit to the Secretary of War his resignation and such resignation shall be accepted by the Secretary of War and such person shall be discharged from his enlistment within 3 months of the submission of such resignation. Except if such person, other than an enlisted member of a Regular Army Puerto Rican unit submits his resignation while stationed overseas or after embarking for an overseas station, the Secretary of War shall not be required to accept such resignation until a total of 2 years of overseas service shall have been completed in the current overseas assignment, and in the case of anyone who has completed any course of instruction pursuant to paragraph 13 of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended (10 U. S. C. 535), or pursuant to section 2 of the Act of April 3, 1939 (58 Stat. 556), as amended (10 U. S. C. 298a), the Secretary of War shall not be required to accept such resignation until 2 years subsequent to the completion of such course. The Secretary of War may refuse to accept any such resignation in time of war or national emergency declared by the President or Congress, or while the person concerned is absent without leave or serving a sentence of court martial. The Secretary of War may refuse to accept a resignation for a period not to exceed 6 months following the submission thereof if the enlisted person is under investigation or in default with respect to public property or public funds: *Provided further*, That no person under the age of 18 years shall be enlisted without the written consent of his parents or guardians, and the Secretary of War shall, upon the application of the parents or guardians of any such person enlisted without their written consent, discharge such person from the military service with pay and with the form of discharge certificate to which the service of such person, after enlistment, shall entitle him: *Provided further*, That nothing contained in this act shall be construed to deprive any person of any right to reenlistment in the Regular Army under any other provision of law. No person who is serving under an enlistment contracted on or after June 1, 1945, shall be entitled, before the expiration of the period of such enlistment, to enlist for an enlistment period which will expire before the expiration of the enlistment period for which he is so serving: *Provided further*, That any enlisted person discharged from the Regular Army who upon such discharge is recommended for reenlistment, shall be permitted to reenlist with the rank held by him at the time of his discharge if he reenlists within a period to be specified by the Secretary of War but not to exceed 3 months from the date of such discharge: *And provided further*, That any enlisted person discharged from the Regular Army by reason of acceptance of his resignation shall not be entitled upon subsequent reenlistment to the rank, rating, or grade held at the time of discharge."

SEC. 2. Any person who enlists or reenlists in the Regular Military Establishment on or after June 1, 1945, in the seventh grade, upon the completion of recruit training, but not later than 4 months subsequent to the date of enlistment, shall, unless sooner promoted, be promoted to the sixth grade, provided he meets such qualifications as may be prescribed in regulations promulgated by the Secretary of War: *Provided*, That no back pay or allowance shall accrue to any person by reason of enactment of this section.

SEC. 3. Section 2 of the National Defense Act, as amended (10 U. S. C. 4, 602), is further amended by deleting the last sentence thereof.

SEC. 4. Paragraph 4 of section 10 of the Pay Adjustment Act of 1942 is hereby amended by substituting a colon for the period at the end of such paragraph and by adding immediately after such colon the following: "*Provided further*, That in addition to such enlistment allowance, any person enlisting for an unspecified period of time shall be paid the sum of $50 upon the completion of each year of service of such reenlistment, and any person who resigns or is discharged from such enlistment for an unspecified period of time shall not thereafter be entitled to any additional enlistment or reenlistment allowance based on any period served in such enlistment for an unspecified period of time."

SEC. 5. effective July 1, 1947, sections 653 and 653a of title 10, United States Code, are repealed and all other laws and parts of laws insofar as they are inconsistent with or in conflict with the provisions of this act are likewise repealed.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 5, add a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 6. Sections 57 and 58 of the National Defense Act, as amended, are further amended by striking out the word 'eighteen' therefrom and substituting therefor the word 'seventeen' in each of the said sections."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That is the last bill on the calendar eligible to be called.

THE NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to a bill on the Consent Calendar, Calendar No. 195 (H. R. 3769) to provide that membership in the National Guard shall not disqualify a person from serving as a part-time referee in bankruptcy.

Mr. Speaker, in making this request, I might state that I have cleared the matter with the majority leader and the minority leader and the objectors on both sides of the aisle. If this bill is passed over for another 2 weeks there would be no purpose in passing the bill. It must become law before the 1st of

July or the purpose of the bill will be defeated.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3769) to provide that membership in the National Guard shall not disqualify a person from serving as a part-time referee in bankruptcy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the proviso to clause (2) of section 35 of the act of Juy 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," as amended, is amended by inserting after "notaries public," the following new language: "members of the National Guard of the United States and of the National Guard of a State, Territory, or the District of Columbia."

With the following committee amendments:

Line 7, after the quotation marks and before the word "members" insert "retired officers and enlisted men of the Regular and Reserve components of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, members of the Reserve components of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard."

Line 9, after the comma insert "except the National Guard disbursing officers who are on a full-time salary basis."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to qualifications of part-time referees in bankruptcy."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING SECRETARIES FOR CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to a bill on the Consent Calendar, Calendar No. 102, H. R. 2746, to provide secretaries for circuit and district judges.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 2746) to provide secretaries for circuit and district judges.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the reason the bill was passed over a few moments ago was due to the fact that the approximate figures of the cost were not known. Those figures have now been made available. The salaries are approximately $929,580, and travel expenses approximately $85,000.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That each circuit judge and each district judge may appoint a secretary, and each senior circuit judge and each senior district judge in districts having five or more district judges may also appoint an assistant secretary, who shall, subject to appropriations to be made by the Congress, receive compensation to be fixed from time to time by the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States courts and shall be reimbursed for their actual traveling expenses and expenses incurred for subsistence, within the limitations prescribed by law, when necessarily absent from their designated posts of duty on official business.

SEC. 2. Within the meaning of this act the District of Columbia shall be deemed to be both a circuit and a district, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia a circuit court of appeals, and the chief justice and associate justices of that court the senior circuit judge and circuit judges thereof, and the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia a district court, and the chief justice and associate justices of that court the senior district judge and district judges thereof.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 4, after the word "each" and before the word "district", insert the word "senior."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

MISSING PERSONS ACT

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 3191) to amend Public Law 301, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved February 18, 1946, so as to extend the benefits of the Missing Persons Act, approved March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143), as amended, to certain members of the organized military forces of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the sentence under the heading entitled "Transfer of Appropriations," contained in title II of the First Supplemental Surplus Appropriation Rescission Act, 1946 (Public Law 301, 79th Cong., approved February 18, 1946), is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end of the sentence and inserting the following: ", and (3) the Missing Persons Act, approved March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143), as amended."

SEC. 2. The Secretary of War is authorized to reconsider claims upon which payment has been denied by reason of section 1 of this act having been omitted from the First Supplemental Appropriation Rescission Act of 1946 (Public Law 301, 79th Cong., approved February 18, 1946).

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded? [After a pause.] There being no demand for a second, the question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill (H. R. 3818) to amend the Federal Insurance Contributions Act with respect to rates of tax on employers and employees, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PAY READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1942

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 321) to amend section 17 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, so as to increase the pay of cadets and midshipmen at the service academies, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 17 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 368; 37 U. S. C. 117), is hereby amended by striking therefrom the figures "$780" and substituting therefor the figures "$936."

SEC. 2. The increases in pay provided by this act shall become effective on the first day of the first month following its enactment, and no increase in pay for any period prior thereto shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second is considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the rules, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] is recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 20 minutes.

The gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, this bill raises for the first time the allowance for cadets and midshipmen at the two Academies. There were objections to consideration of the bill on the Consent Calendar.

I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BLACKNEY], chairman of the subcommittee which handled this bill.

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, the bill before us today, S. 321, a bill to increase pay for cadets and midshipmen of service acadamies, is, in my judgment, an especially important one because it concerns those young men now in the service academies who will soon be actively in the armed services of our country.

It comes before the House today with the unanimous approval of Subcommittee No. 10 on Pay and Administration, and with the unanimous approval of the Armed Services Committee. This bill has previously passed the Senate.

In these days, when it has become necessary to reduce the potential strength of the Army and Navy, it is all

the more important that our cadets and midshipmen be thoroughly and efficiently trained in order to take their active place in our armed services.

I desire first to call your attention to the fact that at the present time we have 2,496 cadets at the Military Academy, 3,043 midshipmen at the Naval Academy, 300 additional midshipmen appointed under Public Law 729, Seventy-ninth Congress, and 385 cadets at the Coast Guard Academy—totaling 6,224.

The bill under consideration provides for an increase of pay of these cadets and midshipmen. Under section 17 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, cadets at the Coast Guard and Military Academies and midshipmen at the Naval Academy are entitled to pay at the rate of $65 per month, or $780 per annum. The present bill amends section 17 of the Pay Readjustment Act and increases the pay to $78 per month, or $936 per year; an increase of $13 per month or $156 per year.

The law establishing the rate of pay of midshipmen and cadets went into effect on July 11, 1919, and there has been no increase in pay since that time—a period of 28 years—although other members of the Armed Services have received pay increases since that year.

The sharp increases of living costs have created a serious handicap in maintaining the cadets and midshipmen at the respective academies. It is not considered practical to eliminate or curtail the various items and activities which make up the expenses chargeable to cadets and midshipmen, as these activities and items have been customary for many years and their elimination or curtailment would be harmful to the attainment of the ends sought by the academies.

It has been the policy of these academies, since their inception, not to permit cadets and midshipmen to draw on outside resources, except when necessary and then in minor amounts. It has been the Government policy that our boys entering the service academies should be placed on the same par socially and economically; and for that reason, each draws the same amount for living expenses and is not allowed to draw from outside resources, except, as stated above, in a very small amount.

Therefore, it is not deemed advisable to change the time-honored rules of these academies and compel the boys to draw funds from home which would immediately result in inequity for the reason that some of these boys come from wealthy homes and the most of them come from the average American home.

The finest thing we can say about these service academies is that the boys represent the rank and file of the American homes and we do not want to see a group within each service academy entitled to greater financial benefits than other groups there located.

I also want to call your attention to the fact that the pay of cadets and midshipmen is under the completed budgetary control of the superintendents of the three academies and is used to cover the cost of uniforms, books, laundry, personal necessities, shoe repair, barber shop, tailor shop, cultural development, leave, and entertainment.

Based on the present pay scale, a certain percentage is saved over the period of 4 years so that there will be available, at the time of graduation, enough money to enable the graduates to purchase their initial minimum officers equipment.

Let me call your attention to the fact that when the cadet or midshipman enters the Academy, he is required to deposit $100. He can voluntarily deposit in addition $250, or a total of $350. This amount is for his initial outfit, but it is well to remember that if the cadet or midshipman does not have the $250 to deposit, the Government does it for him. It is a loan from the Government which, of course, must be paid back to the Government.

Commander Craighill of the Naval Academy testified that only 10 to 15 percent of the midshipmen were able to deposit the $350 at the beginning; the balance making the required deposit of $100 only.

I have no desire to tire you with figures, but it is necessary for me to call your attention to the fact that the midshipmen and cadets have certain required expenses, which must be deducted from their monthly salaries. Let us take a midshipman in his plebe year.

His first item of expense is the payment on his initial outfit for which he has deposited himself $100 or, with the aid of the Government, $250 more. This monthly payment is $32.85 or a total of $394.20 for the year. His second item of expense is for additional uniforms for which $21.18 is deducted monthly, or $254.16 for the year. The next item of expense is for books and drawing material which amounts to $2.39 monthly, or $28.68 annually. Next is his expense for services—barber shop, cobbler, and the tailor—which costs $3.50 a month, or $42 annually. The next item is his laundry which has been steadily increasing but actually is now $8 monthly, or $96 annually.

One item of expense that has materially increased is laundry. Formerly, the Academy used prisoners of war as civilian personnel in laundries and in services. With the change to the 40-hour week, and with an increase of 18 cents per hour in pay for 290 civil-service employees, the added expense per week for the laundry is $2,088.

These necessary items total $815.04 annually, or $67.91 a month.

Now I want to discuss for a moment the optional expenses. Take a fourth classman for illustration. He is allowed $2 cash per month, or $24 annually. He is allowed $9 per month credit at the midshipmen's store, or $108 annually, and from which amount he makes his purchases of toilet articles, cigarettes, and miscellaneous items. Next is his extracurricular expenses of $5.24 monthly, or $62.88 annually—this money is for tickets to athletic events, subscription to Loga magazine, tickets for entertainment programs, and so forth. Next comes his credit to leave of $1.73 monthly, or $20.76 annually. This totals $215.64.

Therefore the total expenses, both optional and required for the first year, are $1,030.68. It is, therefore, apparent that the midshipman will be in debt at the end of his first year.

It is well to remember that a midshipman, during his first year gets only $2 in cash per month and has a credit of $9 per month in the midshipmen's store, totaling $11; in the second year, he receives $4 in cash with a credit of $10, totaling $14; in the third year, he receives $7 in cash and $11 in credit, totaling $18; and during his year of graduation, he receive $11 in cash and $12 in credit, totaling $23.

In addition to his monthly payment, the midshipman is allowed 84 cents a day for food and subsistence.

I desire at this time to call your attention to the fact that the question of increase in pay for cadets and midshipmen, as well as service personnel, was considered by the joint Army-Navy Pay Board in their recommendation to the Seventy-ninth Congress, which recommendation, however, was not included in Public Law 474, Seventy-ninth Congress, which authorized certain increases in the pay of other service personnel. Recently, however, the matter was referred for further study and recommendation to the joint Army-Navy Personnel Board. As the result of which, the War and Navy Departments and the Coast Guard jointly approved the provisions of the bill under consideration.

It is estimated that the enactment of the proposed legislation would result in an additional cost of $970,944 for the fiscal year 1948 as follows:

2,496 cadets at the Military Academy	$389,376
3,043 midshipmen at the Naval Academy	474,708
300 additional midshipmen by Public Law 729, Seventy-ninth Congress	46,800
385 cadets at the Coast Guard Academy	60,060

It is further estimated that the cost of the proposed legislation for the fiscal year of 1948 would be increased to $1,392,144 for the fiscal year of 1949 and thereafter, by reason of the fact that an estimated increase of 2,700 midshipmen will be appointed under Public Law 729, Seventy-ninth Congress.

I realize full well that it is imperative on the part of Congress to economize in every way possible without destroying the efficiency of any agency of Government, and I share in that view. However, inasmuch as these 6,200 young men will soon be in the active service of our country, it would be false economy to refuse to grant them their additional $13 a month which is absolutely necessary if they conform to the present rules and regulations of the three service academies, which have proved so successful in the past.

According to the testimony of Admiral Holloway, the so-called pay of midshipmen is really a means of paying their personal expenses while they are midshipmen and to defray the cost of their original outfit as an officer.

Most of their ordinary running expenses are spent through the midshipmen's store, midshipmen's service facilities, and laundry. Fortunately, these activities were in excellent condition

when prices began to rise, and since then they have been squeezed between the rising cost of materials and pay of employees and the fact that the midshipman's budget has not been increased through additional pay for midshipmen.

Accordingly, the recent pay increase granted civil service employees reflects directly against midshipmen in the same manner as the rising cost of materials. The laundry and midshipmen's store have gone backward financially and the midshipmen service facilities are losing about $3,000 a quarter. The reserves in these services have carried the load up to date but cannot continue to do so indefinitely. The only solution appears to be an increase in the amount that midshipmen can spend. This must be obtained through the pay increase or from outside sources.

I do not wish the midshipmen and cadets to be dependent upon outside sources. We wish them to come from all types of families, and not only from families who can contribute to their education but from poor families as well, and all to be on the same social and economic level.

In the first year of a cadet's or midshipman's service in the Academy it is apparent, because of the first year's heavy expenses, that the cadet or midshipman will be in debt. In the Naval Academy statistics show a debt of $215 the first year. In his second year he attains a credit of $40; in his third year a credit of $200; and in his fourth year a credit of $470, which enables him to buy the necessary uniforms and equipment which he needs on graduating and entering service.

I have been asked repeatedly by my colleagues whether or not our cadets and midshipmen remain in service after they have been graduated from the academies at Government expense. Let me reply by stating that the records of the West Point Academy and the Naval Academy show clearly that the cadets and midshipmen, in the main, after graduation remain in service as a life career. Let me illustrate.

In West Point from 1930 to, and including 1939, the percentage of all graduates from West Point who resigned in the first 4 years of their service after graduation amounted to only 3 percent. From 1941 to 1946, the West Point record shows only three men—one of the class of 1940, one of the class of 1942, and one of the class of 1945—resigned voluntarily. The record of the Naval Academy bears out the truth of the above statement, because from 1932 to 1947, a period of 15 years, only 5.7 percent resigned.

Another question which has arisen is with reference to the cost of educating a cadet at West Point or a midshipman at the Naval Academy, and some very exaggerated statements have been made with reference thereto. The average cost for educating a cadet at West Point for 4 years is $18,958; but you must remember that that includes all overhead.

The average cost of educating a midshipman at the Naval Academy for 4 years, counting overhead, is $16,000. If you should deduct the overhead, then the cost for the 4 years' education of a midshipman is $8,000 or $2,000 per year.

It is well to remember that education in these academies is practically continuous and different from our colleges and universities where education is confined to 9 or 10 months a year.

In conclusion, let me urge my colleagues to support S. 321 which is so vital to the maintenance of our present service academies. The history of America is replete with the fine services performed, in time of war and in time of peace, by our graduates of these academies.

Every Member of Congress is proud of his appointments to the Naval and Military Academies, and I am sure that none of you have let wealth alone play any part in the appointment of your cadets and midshipmen. If this increase in pay is not made, it is going to place a premium on those boys whose families are able to assist them financially. We want our cadets and midshipmen appointed on their ability, their integrity, and their desire to serve. When they obtain their appointment, we do not want any feeling of social caste to enter into academy life. We want our boys to be appointed from American homes, regardless of financial status.

It will follow of necessity that the graduates of these institutions will become a part of the Army and Navy and will become leaders therein, bringing as they will, the splendid instruction which is imparted to them in the academies, and with a love for the service, they will become invaluable to the maintenance of our Government and its preservation.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, the amount which the Government allots to these cadets at the two service academies is intended to take care of the necessary expenses of these young men we appoint from time to time. They come from the families of both rich and poor, without discrimination. When those men go to the academies, they have these necessary costs. Unless we increase the amount which they are entitled to draw as an allowance each month, the time will come when a boy from a poor family will not be able to attend the academy, he will not be able to bear the necessary expenses of the academy, he will not be able to afford to go there. It was with those thoughts in mind that I supported this measure when it was before the Committee on the Armed Services.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. When these boys are appointed to Annapolis and West Point and get 4 years free schooling, does the gentleman think he will have anybody objecting to going there to school?

Mr. BROOKS. I will answer the gentleman in this way, the present bill does not contemplate his needs beyond the 4-year period, but it does try to take care of his immediate needs while he is a student, not a soldier, but a student in the service academy. I may answer the gentleman further by saying that last year I appointed from my district a young man from a poor family. I have had occasion to examine into the matter and I find that boy is not able to carry on with the amount that we give him at the present time. If we are going to make those service academies rich men's academies, then we can afford to eliminate these allowances, but if we want to put it on a fair basis to the poor and wealthy boy alike, we have to give them enough to go along on.

Mr. RICH. Do any of the boys going to West Point or Annapolis try to earn any money on the side to help defray their expenses?

Mr. BROOKS. I will say to the gentleman that they do not have the time to do anything extra.

Mr. RICH. Do you not have any poor boys from your district that go to college, and who obligate themselves, that earn a great part of their money to pay their college tuition?

Mr. BROOKS. Certainly. I do not yield any more to the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. Every boy in the United States who tries to get an education has a hard time.

Mr. BROOKS. I will say to the gentleman that it is entirely different in the service academies. All the time that those young men have is allotted during the week, and even on Sunday, and at times they only have about 3 or 4 or 5 hours during the entire week that they can do what they want to. It is not physically possible for them to go out and earn their living on the side, or take a side job. I do not think it would be consonant with the policies of the academies or the intention of Congress to permit them to go out and try to earn a living while they are going through the service academies.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to say here that when you Members of Congress appoint a boy to West Point or Annapolis you give him an opportunity for a 4-year course of the best education that any boy or girl in the United States could possibly receive. He has the opportunity of getting an education that costs the taxpayers of this country at least $20,000 to $25,000. Now, I think that that is a pretty good scholarship to give any boy. Would any boy reject such a scholarship? You have in your own district hundreds and hundreds of boys that are out striving to get an education who obligate themselves for hundreds of dollars a year to help get that education They work their way through colleges, trying to earn money on the side to pay their college tuition. They are poor boys, the same kind of boys that we appoint to West Point and Annapolis, who get their tuition, board, and expenses free. I do not know of any boy that would object to that. They want to get these appointments; every one of them, no boy turns it down on account of it not being worth a thousand times more than it cost.

What this bill is going to do, it is going to ask you to get the taxpayers to pay

$970,944 more this year, and next year you are going to ask your taxpayers to raise $1,392,144. Are you justified in passing a bill like this. I say you are not. I had an army official come to see me and talk about this bill. I objected to this bill several times on the Private Calendar. When the Army officer came up and talked to me about, he gave me a chart, and I am sorry I did not know that this bill was coming up today or I would have been here loaded to give you some data on this bill. A West Pointer or Naval Cadet is only going to be about $140 out after they get their uniforms to start them in business, after they get a 4-year education by your appointment to the Military Academy, when the United States pays $20,000 to $25,000 to educate them; the greatest institution and education in the United States. Then you come in here now and want to spend $1,392,000 more of the taxpayers' money to pass this legislation. You are going to pass it when you fellows in the House here vote for it, but not with my consent, because I tried to stop this legislation, and I think it is time for you fellows to come in here now and try to stop some of the legislation they are trying to pull over the eyes of the taxpayers of this country. It is about time that we wake up. Be wise and economize.

You talk about vetoing the tax bill here a while ago. President Truman never said a word about economies in Government. I hope he vetoes this bill if it passes. How many of you fellows are talking about economies in Government? We talk about trying to save the taxpayers' money. But no, every dog-gone one of you here votes time after time to spend money. Now, it is time to stop it, and I tell you right now that there is nothing better that you can do than to stop this legislation. There is no need for it. It is not justified, and I cannot find out where anybody in Congress would be satisfied, or could satisfy his own conscience under present-day conditions who would vote for legislation of this kind. It just does not make sense. You might say you are going to help some poor boys that go to West Point and Annapolis, but there are thousands of poor boys back home that will have to pay for the education they get. These boys at West Point or Annapolis get the finest education we give to any boy or girl in the whole land, they get it for nothing, all board paid, tuition, expenses to football games, yes, everything free.

For the life of me, I cannot see why we should bring this bill up now. Certainly you have no right to bring it in here now and ask the taxpayers to pay $1,340,000 more after this year for the purposes contained in this legislation. Who wants it? Some men of the Army want to feather-bed some of the soft jobs we have got for the men you and I appoint. I am happy to appoint boys to West Point and Annapolis, and I know the boys that get those appointments are quite glad to receive them. I have never had one of them questioned for a minute about such a generous scholarship. They get their expenses paid all the time they are at the Academy. Oh, its grand to hollo "economy" and write back to your taxpayers that you are for economy, but if you vote for this bill I cannot see how you can honestly say you are for economy in Government. Congressmen, let us cut down on this operation of Government—not increase the operation of our Government.

Be wise and economize—vote against this bill.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS].

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, certain material has come to the attention of our Subcommittee on Government Publicity and Propaganda regarding the activities of the Social Security Board in this country and abroad, which seek to further the cause of socialized medicine in the United States.

All these activities in the Social Security Board appear to head up in the Bureau of Research and Statistics, which is under the immediate direction of Mr. Isadore S. Falk.

Mr. Wilbur J. Cohen is Assistant Director of the Bureau of Research and Statistics.

It is a matter of record, in the Senate hearings last year on S. 1606, that Mr. Falk was one of the principal authors of the bill presented pursuant to President Truman's national health program. That bill contemplated compulsory health insurance, and embodied every recognized feature of socialized medicine.

It has now come to the attention of our subcommittee that Mr. Falk, under date of May 14, 1947, sent a memorandum to Mr. Mitchell, Acting Commissioner for Social Security, urging that one Jacob Fisher, a member of Mr. Falk's staff, be sent to New Zealand to study compulsory health insurance in that country.

We find that this same Jacob Fisher has been documented by the House Committee on Un-American Activities for almost uninterrupted association since 1939 with various Communist-front and fellow traveler organizations. At various times Jacob Fisher has been identified with seven different groups or organizations avowedly sponsoring the Moscow party line in the United States. He has published at least one report on socialized medicine in New Zealand, in the Social Security Bulletin—a report which has been described by several reputable authorities as extremely biased and dishonest.

Our information is that Mr. Fisher would be ready to sail about June 15—that would be yesterday.

I bring this matter to the attention of the House today, because it affords a timely instance of how the taxpayers' money is being used in the executive agencies for propaganda and promotional activities never authorized by Congress.

These international junkets are an item of considerable expense. Such activities have never been authorized, directly or indirectly, in the appropriation bills. The reports which come from such junkets often are withheld from the public until they have passed through a refining process in the Social Security Board's Bureau of Research and Statistics.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced from our investigations that the time has come for Congress to put a stop at once to all such unauthorized propaganda activities.

We are convinced that it is not the function of the Federal Government to send people around the world to bring back reports presuming to dictate a system of socialized medicine in the United States. If such a proposition were placed honestly before this Congress, I am certain it would be rejected overwhelmingly.

I conceive it to be the duty of our committee to stop such extravagant operations wherever possible.

We hold it unlawful for any executive agency to use funds for purposes beyond those contemplated by Congress in the appropriations. Here is one such case, and a peculiarly flagrant one.

I am asking Mr. Altmeyer, the Director of the Social Security Board, for a later report on Jacob Fisher's mission to New Zealand; but I deem it my duty, in the meantime, to bring this matter to the attention of the House.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER].

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, the hearings before the Committee on Armed Services, as well as the very full and able statement by my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BLACKNEY], chairman of the subcommittee, fully justify this small raise as provided in this bill. It seems to me we are losing time in dealing in pocket change when we realize that the men in the service academies are receiving today the same as they received some 28 years ago. Over a period of a quarter of a century, while everything else has gone up, they are receiving the same amount as they have for 28 years to pay for certain expenses.

This merely increases the cadet's allowance approximately $13 a month in the two academies. Their expenses have gone up for such things as laundry, tailoring, and many other items. This modest amount of $13 a month for the men in these two service academies is not only fully justified but it seems to me should be agreed to by the House without any great ado.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH].

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I find myself somewhat in the same position as our distinguished friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], in not having known that this bill was going to be called up on a motion to suspend the rules. But since surprise is such an important element in military tactics, I suppose it is well for us to get used to the Committee on Armed Forces indulging in it.

I had intended to offer a couple of amendments to the bill when it was on the Consent Calendar, but I think per-

haps the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee might clarify the record for me and obviate the necessity for offering the amendments.

As I read the bill and the report, I note you refer only to the cadets and midshipmen at the service academies. I realize that the bill is an amendment of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942. We have another great service academy at Kings Point, N. Y., the United States Merchant Marine Academy. That Academy was created and has been maintained under authority of the Shipping Act of 1936, and the pay and adjustment allowances of its cadets are not governed by the provisions of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942. I should like to have the chairman of the committee assure me that, in the omission of the Merchant Marine Academy from this bill and report, the committee had not purposely refrained from considering that Academy, but rather had no jurisdiction over it. Is that not true?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The gentleman has stated it correctly. Legislation for the Merchant Marine Academy should go to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. We have no jurisdiction over it whatsoever.

Mr. KEOGH. And, therefore, by not including them in this bill, it is not intended as an expression of your opinion that they should not be similarly treated?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Certainly not. I am quite certain that if the situation were otherwise the committee would have considered the Merchant Marine Academy in the same category.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] has expired.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I previously made, as well as the remarks I am about to make.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose to speak either for or against this particular bill but rather to give you a little personal experience, from which you can draw your own conclusions.

I attended the Naval Academy some years ago. I realize it is a great institution, one of the finest in the country, and any young man should be happy to go there. However, the amount of money you get has nothing to do with what you take home. The Superintendent controls all that you get in practically every detail.

During my first year at the Academy I received the munificent sum of $1 a month to spend. The second year, $2 a month, and I think for the following years it went up until it was $5 a month during my last year. Each time, as the leave period came around, my father had to send me the money to go home. At the end of this course, one which I would not have missed, and for which I am thankful to the United States and the gentlemen of the then Congresses, I owed over $1,200 for uniforms to go out into the service. I realize that today uniforms are not quite so magnificent as they were then, but as individual items they are more expensive.

Mr. Speaker, I give you these remarks and ask you to draw your own conclusions.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the bill has been carefully discussed and ably analyzed. It encountered very little opposition in the committee, and had there been serious weaknesses in the bill, they would have been brought out during the deliberations of the great Committee on Armed Services. This measure permits the academies to operate without a loss. In substance that is its main objective. If they did operate at a loss, we would have to make an appropriation under another name to take care of it. Cost increases all along the line make this necessary. It also provides a small additional cash allowance to cadets and midshipmen—a very small one.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield.

Mr. RICH. You say this is to make good to the Academy for a loss?

Mr. SIKES. In the final analysis, this act prevents the academies from operating at a loss. If they did operate at a loss, we would have to make an appropriation under another name to take care of the loss. We would not be saving money for the Government.

Mr. RICH. You mean after the great appropriations we are giving to the Army and the Navy that they are operating anything at a loss? The taxpayers are paying for all of this.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I move the previous question on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RICH) there were—ayes 71, noes 16.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and thirty-six Members are present, not a quorum. The roll call is automatic.

The Clerk called the roll and there were—yeas 304, nays 53, not voting 72, as follows:

[Roll No. 80]

YEAS—304

Abernethy	Boggs, Del.	Chiperfield
Albert	Bonner	Clason
Allen, Calif.	Boykin	Clevenger
Allen, Ill.	Bradley	Clippinger
Allen, La.	Bramblett	Coffin
Almond	Brehm	Cole, N. Y.
Andersen, H. Carl	Brooks	Colmer
Anderson, Calif.	Brophy	Cooley
Andresen, August H.	Brown, Ga.	Cooper
Andrews, Ala.	Brown, Ohio	Corbett
Andrews, N. Y.	Buchanan	Cotton
Angell	Buckley	Courtney
Arends	Bulwinkle	Cravens
Auchincloss	Burke	Crow
Bakewell	Burleson	Cunningham
Bates, Ky.	Byrne, N. Y.	Dague
Bates, Mass.	Camp	Davis, Ga.
Battle	Canfield	Davis, Tenn.
Beall	Cannon	Davis, Wis.
Beckworth	Carroll	Dawson, Utah
Bennett, Mich.	Carson	Deane
Blackney	Case, N. J.	Delaney
Blatnik	Celler	Devitt
	Chadwick	D'Ewart
	Chenoweth	Dingell
Dolliver	Johnson, Calif.	Peden
Domengeaux	Johnson, Ill.	Peterson
Dondero	Johnson, Ind.	Phillips, Tenn.
Donohue	Johnson, Okla.	Pickett
Dorn	Johnson, Tex.	Ploeser
Doughton	Jones, Ala.	Plumley
Douglas	Jones, Ohio	Potts
Drewry	Jones, Wash.	Preston
Durham	Judd	Price, Fla.
Eberharter	Karsten, Mo.	Price, Ill.
Elliott	Keating	Priest
Ellis	Kee	Rabin
Elston	Keefe	Rains
Engel, Mich.	Keogh	Ramey
Engle, Calif.	Kerr	Rankin
Evins	Kersten, Wis.	Rayburn
Fallon	Kilday	Rayfiel
Feighan	King	Redden
Fellows	Kirwan	Reed, Ill.
Fenton	Klein	Reeves
Fernandez	Knutson	Richards
Fisher	Kunkel	Riehlman
Flannagan	Landis	Riley
Fletcher	Lane	Rivers
Fogarty	Lanham	Rizley
Foote	Larcade	Robertson
Forand	Latham	Robsion
Fulton	Lea	Rockwell
Gary	LeCompte	Rogers, Fla.
Gathings	Lemke	Rogers, Mass.
Gavin	Lesinski	Rohrbough
Gearhart	Lewis	Ross
Gillette	Lodge	Russell
Gillie	Love	Sabath
Goff	Lusk	Sadlak
Goodwin	Lyle	Sadowski
Gordon	Lynch	St. George
Gore	McConnell	Sanborn
Gorski	McCormack	Sasscer
Gossett	McCowen	Scott, Hardie
Graham	McDonough	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Granger	McGarvey	Seely-Brown
Grant, Ala.	McGregor	Short
Grant, Ind.	McMillan, S. C.	Sikes
Gregory	Macy	Simpson, Ill.
Gwynne, Iowa	Madden	Simpson, Pa.
Hagen	Mahon	Smathers
Hale	Manasco	Smith, Maine
Hall, Leonard W.	Mansfield, Mont.	Smith, Va.
Halleck	Marcantonio	Snyder
Hardy	Martin, Iowa	Spence
Harless, Ariz.	Meade, Md.	Stigler
Harness, Ind.	Merrow	Stratton
Harris	Michener	Talle
Harrison	Miller, Calif.	Taylor
Havenner	Miller, Conn.	Teague
Hays	Mills	Thomas, N. J.
Hébert	Mitchell	Thomas, Tex.
Hedrick	Monroney	Thomason
Heffernan	Morgan	Tibbott
Hendricks	Morris	Tollefson
Herter	Morrison	Towe
Hess	Morton	Vail
Hill	Muhlenberg	Van Zandt
Hinshaw	Mundt	Vorys
Hobbs	Murdock	Walter
Hoeven	Murray, Tenn.	Weichel
Holifield	Nixon	Wheeler
Holmes	Norblad	Whitten
Hope	Norton	Whittington
Horan	O'Brien	Wigglesworth
Howell	O'Hara	Wilson, Tex.
Jackson, Calif.	O'Konski	Wolverton
Jackson, Wash.	Owens	Wood
Javits	Pace	Worley
Jenison	Passman	Youngblood
Jenkins, Ohio	Patterson	Zimmermann

NAYS—53

Arnold	Hoffman	Rich
Banta	Huber	Rooney
Barrett	Hull	Schwabe, Mo.
Bennett, Mo.	Jarman	Schwabe, Okla.
Bryson	Jonkman	Scrivner
Buck	Kean	Smith, Kans.
Buffett	McMillen, Ill.	Smith, Wis.
Byrnes, Wis.	MacKinnon	Springer
Case, S. Dak.	Mason	Stefan
Church	Meyer	Stevenson
Cole, Mo.	Miller, Md.	Sundstrom
Crawford	Miller, Nebr.	Taber
Curtis	Murray, Wis.	Trimble
Folger	O'Toole	Twyman
Griffiths	Poage	Vursell
Gross	Poulson	Wilson, Ind.
Hart	Reed, N. Y.	Woodruff
Heselton	Rees	

NOT VOTING—72

Barden	Bolton	Cole, Kans
Bell	Busbey	Combs
Bender	Butler	Coudert
Bishop	Chapman	Cox
Bland	Chelf	Crosser
Bloom	Clark	Dawson, Ill.
Boggs, La.	Clements	Dirksen

Eaton	Kefauver	Powell
Ellsworth	Kelley	Sarbacher
Elsaesser	Kennedy	Scoblick
Fuller	Kilburn	Shafer
Gallagher	LeFevre	Sheppard
Gamble	Lucas	Smith, Ohio
Gifford	McDowell	Somers
Gwinn, N. Y.	McMahon	Stanley
Hall,	Maloney	Stockman
Edwin Arthur	Mansfield, Tex.	Vinson
Hand	Mathews	Wadsworth
Hartley	Meade, Ky.	Welch
Jenkins, Pa.	Nodar	West
Jennings	Norrell	Williams
Jensen	Patman	Winstead
Jones, N. C.	Pfeifer	Wolcott
Kearney	Philbin	
Kearns	Phillips, Calif.	

So two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended, and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Sarbacher with Mr. Cox.
Mr. Wadsworth with Mr. Mahon.
Mr. McDowell with Mr. Lucas.
Mr. Coudert with Mr. Somers.
Mr. Butler with Mr. Kefauver.
Mrs. Bolton with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Scoblick with Mr. Williams.
Mr. Kearney with Mr. Kennedy.
Mr. Kilburn with Mr. Norrell.
Mr. Le Fevre with Mr. Clements.
Mr. Busbey with Mr. Chapman.
Mr. Jenkins of Pennsylvania with Mr. Philbin.
Mr. Bishop with Mr. Jones of North Carolina.
Mr. Kearns with Mr. Pfeifer.
Mr. Dirksen with Mr. Chelf.
Mr. Ellsworth with Mr. Boggs of Louisiana.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Stanley.
Mr. Gamble with Mr. Vinson.
Mr. Cole of Kansas, with Mr. Barden.
Mr. Meade of Kentucky, with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Nodar with Mr. Clark.
Mr. McMahon with Mr. Patman.
Mr. Maloney with Mr. Sheppard.
Mr. Elsaesser with Mr. Bloom.
Mr. Jensen with Mr. Crosser.
Mr. Hartley with Mr. Mansfield of Texas.
Mr. Hand with Mr. Dawson of Illinois.
Mr. Eaton with Mr. Bland.
Mr. Mathews with Mr. Winstead.
Mr. Bender with Mr. Kelley.
Mr. Gwinn of New York, with Mr. Combs.
Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall with Mr. West.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The doors were opened.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following resolution (H. Res. 248) for printing in the RECORD:

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3839) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, all points of order against the bill or any provisions contained therein are hereby waived; and it shall also be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order any amendment to said bill prohibiting the use of the funds appropriated in such bill or any funds heretofore made available, including contract authorizations, for the purchase of any particular site or for the erection of any particular hospital.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

PROVIDING SUPPORT FOR WOOL

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 814) to provide support for wool, and for other purposes; and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 814) to provide support for wool, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 1, 2, and 3.

And agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

On page 3 of the House engrossed amendments, beginning with the word "That" in line 16, strike out through and including the period in line 18, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That no proclamation under this section with respect to wool shall be enforced in contravention of any treaty or international agreement to which the United States is now a party."

And the House agree to the same.

CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUG. H. ANDRESEN,
ANTON J. JOHNSON,
WILLIAM S. HILL,
STEPHEN PACE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

GEORGE D. AIKEN,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
ELMER THOMAS,
HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 814) to provide support for wool, and for other purposes submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate recedes from its disagreement to the amendments of the House Nos. 1, 2, and 3.

Under the amendment of the House numbered 4, the "Wool Act of 1947" was brought within the scope of the provisions of Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (of 1933), as reenacted and amended, with the exception that no quantitative limitations could be imposed by the President under the authority of section 22 upon the total quantities of wool or products thereof which may be entered or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption in the United States. The Senate receded from its disagreement to this amendment with an amendment which deleted the provision placing a limitation upon the power of the President to impose quantitative restrictions upon the amount of wool or products thereof which may be imported and which provided that no action could be taken under the authority of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (of 1933), as reenacted and amended, with respect to wool which would be in contravention of any treaty or international agreement to which the United States is a party on the date of the enactment of the Wool Act of 1947.

The bill (S. 814), as agreed to in conference, would empower the President to protect any program conducted under the Wool Act of 1947 in the same manner and by the same methods as he is now authorized to protect programs conducted under the Agricultural Adjustment Act (of 1933), as reenacted and amended, the Social Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, and section 32 of Public Law 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935, as amended.

Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (of 1933), as amended, was first enacted on August 24, 1935. It was subsequently reenacted in 1937 and has been amended twice, the last time being on January 25, 1940. The provisions of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (of 1933), as reenacted and amended, are designed to protect programs conducted to aid domestic agriculture by empowering the President, whenever he has reason to believe, and finds after an investigation conducted by the Tariff Commission, that any one or more articles are being, or are practically certain to be, imported into the United States under such conditions and in sufficient quantities as to render, or tend to render, ineffective or materially interfere with any program conducted under the provisions of the laws enumerated above, to impose such fees on, or such limitations on the total quantities of, any article or articles which may be imported as he finds to be necessary in order that the importations of such article or articles will not render, or tend to render, ineffective or materially interfere with programs conducted under the specific laws enumerated above.

Since the date of the enactment of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (of 1933) in 1935, the President has on several occasions made effective use of the authority granted herein to protect certain agricultural programs. That authority was exercised as recently as February 1, 1947, when harsh or rough cotton having a staple length less than ¾ inch was made subject to an import quota.

The amendment providing "That no proclamation under this section with respect to wool shall be enforced in contravention of any treaty or international agreement to which the United States is now a party" makes it clear that there can be no conflict in any action authorized to be taken under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (of 1933), as reenacted and amended, with respect to wool and any international agreement or treaty to which the United States is a party on the date of the enactment of this act.

CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUG. H. ANDRESEN,
ANTON J. JOHNSON,
WILLIAM S. HILL,
STEPHEN PACE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, several changes have been made in the wool bill during the course of its consideration by Congress. During this period, sensational and exaggerated statements have been made as to the effect it might have on the reciprocal trade agreement program and the current meeting at Geneva to set up an International Trade Organization. In my

opinion, the legislation in the form adopted by the conferees is entirely in harmony with the policies which has been followed by this administration with reference to foreign trade and domestic price supports.

In view of the changes which have been made, I desire to call attention to just what the bill does in its present form:

First. It is emergency legislation expiring on December 31, 1948, and provides that during that period the price of wool shall be supported by the Commodity Credit Corporation at the same price it supported wool in 1946. The effect is to give wool the same protection which has been given numerous other agricultural commodities in the way of support prices during the so-called Steagall period.

Second. The bill authorizes the Commodity Credit Corporation to dispose of its present stocks of wool, notwithstanding any restriction at present imposed upon such disposition by law. Under existing law, the Commodity Credit Corporation is prohibited from selling wool at less than parity. This has resulted in the accumulation of stocks approximating 460,000,000 pounds. To this will be added the 1947 and 1948 clips, each of which it is estimated will run about 300,000,000 pounds. Thus, if Commodity Credit should find it necessary to produce these clips and could not dispose of any of its stocks at prevailing prices, it would find itself at the end of 1948 with over a billion pounds of wool. In the meantime, domestic requirements would have been met from imports. It is hoped, through the provisions of this bill, to liquidate these stocks without substantial loss, and it is the hope also that much of the 1947 and 1948 clips can be purchased in the normal course of trade and will not have to be handled by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Third. Section 4 of the bill as approved by the conferees brings wool within all the provisions of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, legislation which has been on the statute books ever since 1935, and which applies to a number of agricultural commodities upon which price supports are in effect. Under the provisions of section 22, if the President has reason to believe that imports are rendering a price support program ineffective or are materially interfering with the same, he shall refer the matter to the Tariff Commission for an investigation and report. If, as a result of that report, he finds that imports are interfering with the program, then he is authorized to impose either a quota or an import fee in order to make the price support program effective.

Section 22, sponsored and proposed by the Roosevelt administration, has been amended by Congress and approved by the President several times since 1935, and action under its provisions has been taken on various occasions by both Presidents Roosevelt and Truman. The latest action in this respect was on February 1, 1947, when quotas were imposed upon imports of harsh cotton. In all cases so far quotas, rather than fees, have been used. The legislation has operated concurrently with, and supplemental to, the reciprocal trade agreement program. It has been used to harmonize and reconcile the administration's domestic price support program on price support commodities with its foreign trade policy. Something of this sort has been and is necessary because there is a considerable measure of inconsistency between the two policies.

The inclusion of wool in section 22 is entirely in harmony with the letter and spirit of the law as it has been applied in the past. It merely gives the President the authority and machinery to protect a price support program if he finds it is endangered by imports.

The bill in its final form, like most bills on controversial subjects, makes an effort to harmonize conflicting viewpoints. I think that has been done to the maximum extent in this instance.

There is general agreement that because of conditions arising out of the war emergency, and particularly because of the great accumulation of wool stocks in this country and in the world, some stabilization measures are necessary. In the case of domestic wool, the most effective measure seems to be to continue the 1946 price supports until December 31, 1948. In this instance, just as in any effort to support prices above current market quotations, the cost is likely to reach excessive proportions unless there can be some control over the quantity coming on the market from either domestic or foreign sources. This has been recognized in all our price support legislation and is the basis of section 22.

A special effort has been made by the conferees to make sure that the bill is not out of harmony with the administration's foreign trade policy. We have provided that no proclamation issued by the President under this act shall be enforced in contravention of any treaty or international agreement to which the United States is now a party. This protects the rights and interests which any other nation may have by reason of existing trade treaties.

The provisions of the bill are in entire harmony with the proposed charter of the International Trade Organization of the United Nations. Paragraph I of article 25 of that document provides for a general limitation of quantitative restrictions; however, with a number of exceptions, among which is the following:

2. The provisions of paragraph I of this article shall not extend to the following:

(a) Prohibitions or restrictions on imports or exports imposed or maintained during the early postwar transitional period which are essential to—

(iii) The orderly liquidation of temporary surpluses of stocks owned or controlled by the government of any member or of industries developed in the territory of any member owing to the exigencies of the war which it would be uneconomic to maintain in normal conditions.

The situation which exists in this country with reference to wool stocks clearly comes within the provisions of subsection (a) (iii).

The bill is also in harmony with the spirit of article 34 of the charter of the International Trade Organization relating to emergency action on imports of particular products.

The legislation is also in entire accord with the Executive Order dated February 25, 1947, which directs that every trade agreement hereafter entered into shall include an escape clause. This Executive order was issued after consultation with Senators VANDENBERG and MILLIKIN, and pursuant to an agreement reached between them and the Secretary of State. Part I of this Executive order reads as follows:

1. There shall be included in every trade agreement hereafter entered into under the authority of said act of June 12, 1934, as amended, a clause providing in effect that if, as a result of unforeseen developments and of the concession granted by the United States on any article in the trade agreement, such article is being imported in such increased quantities and under such conditions as to cause, or threaten, serious injury to domestic producers of like or similar articles, the United States shall be free to withdraw the concession, in whole or in part, to modify it, to the extent and for such time as may be necessary to prevent such injury.

2. The United States Tariff Commission, upon the request of the President, upon his own motion, or upon application of any interested party when in the judgment of the Tariff Commission there is good and sufficient reason therefor, shall make an investigation to determine whether, as a result of unforeseen developments and of the concession granted on any article by the United States in a trade agreement containing such a clause, such article is being imported in such increased quantities and under such conditions as to cause or threaten serious injury to domestic producers of like or similar articles. Should the Tariff Commission find, as a result of its investigation, that such injury is being caused or threatened, the Tariff Commission shall recommend to the President, for his consideration in the light of the public interest, the withdrawal of the concession, in whole or in part, or the modification of the concession, to the extent and for such time as the Tariff Commission finds would be necessary to prevent such injury.

3. In the course of any investigation under the preceding paragraph, the Tariff Commission shall hold public hearings, giving reasonable public notice thereof, and shall afford reasonable opportunity for parties interested to be present, to produce evidence, and to be heard at such hearings. The procedure and rules and regulations for such investigations and hearings shall from time to time be prescribed by the Tariff Commission.

On the same day that this order was issued, the Under Secretary of State gave out a statement that the escape clause so authorized would be along the lines of the escape clause in the Mexican agreement. That escape clause in effect provides for the imposition by the President of quotas or other customs treatment when he finds that the same is necessary to prevent serious injury to domestic producers because of concessions granted in reciprocal trade agreements.

It is my opinion that if the wool bill becomes a law, the provisions of section 22 will never have to be used. Practically all the world's wool which is in competition with our own is in the hands of the British Empire sales organization known as JO—joint organization. Although it has wider powers, JO corresponds roughly to our Commodity Credit Corporation when it comes to handling

Australian, New Zealand, and South African wool stocks, which accumulated during and since the war. Both Under-Secretary Clayton of the State Department and Under-Secretary Dodd of the Agriculture Department stated to the conference committee that these countries have advised that they would be glad to sit around the table and work out a plan for the orderly disposition of surplus wool stocks. That is the sensible thing to do. However, it has not been done and probably will not be done if this legislation is not passed.

If we give the President the authority to protect our wool price support program through the use of quotas or other customs treatment, as recognized in the ITO charter and the escape clause in our reciprocal trade agreements, and as have been in effect on other commodities through section 22 for many years, I predict that an agreement will soon be reached between the British Empire countries and the United States for the orderly liquidation of these troublesome wool stocks. Such an agreement would be to the benefit of all countries concerned and would enable us to liquidate our wool stocks with little, if any, loss to the Treasury. At least, it would greatly lessen the losses.

Since this bill does not in any way increase or decrease the domestic supply of wool, it cannot affect the quantity of ultimate wool imports. Whether this legislation becomes a law or not, we are going to consume the wool now owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation as well as the clips of 1947 and 1948. Whatever we need in addition we will have to import. The only question involved is the sale of the accumulated stocks in an orderly manner and in such a way as to cause the least loss to the United States Treasury.

Wool is a strategic material—so recognized by the Army. In the present state of international affairs, it is essential that we mainain a domestic wool industry. Even with price supports, it has been declining. This legislation does not attempt to solve the long time problem of the wool industry. It merely seeks to bridge the present emergency, due in the main to market dislocations and stock accumulations during the war. There has been no wool market since April 15. Practically all of the 1947 clip is unsold.

It is essential that the conference report be adopted and that the bill become a law at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. With reference to the wool which the Commodity Credit Corporation holds, you stated that if they were directed to they would dispose of the wool. Is it contemplated that they will dispose of the wool at a loss which will have to be made up by the Federal Treasury?

Mr. HOPE. Under this bill it is hoped that it will not be necessary to dispose of the wool at a loss. We hope there can be some orderly arrangement made whereby this country will not be flooded with imports and that the wool on hand at the present time and that which may be brought under this act may be disposed of in an orderly way without any loss to the Treasury.

It is possible, of course, that there may be some loss, but we are authorizing the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell the wool to the best advantage. The thing to do is to get the wool out of the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporaion and get it into trade channels.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman regard the authority conferred upon the President under section 22 to impose quotas or an import fee as mandatory or as discretionary with the President?

Mr. HOPE. The authority is certainly discretionary; the President, of course, must act upon the findings that are laid before him by the Tariff Commission, but it is still up to the President to determine whether or not imports are interfering with the domestic price-support program.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. If it is left that way, does the gentleman think that under the law it is discretionary with the President?

Mr. HOPE. It is up to the President to determine whether or not the facts as found by the Tariff Commission reveal a situation which calls upon him to act.

Mr. McCORMACK. Then, if in his judgment such a situation is revealed, then no matter what his personal views may be, under the law he should act; should he not?

Mr. HOPE. If in his judgment the President felt that the facts were such as required him to act, certainly I would expect him to act in good faith.

Mr. McCORMACK. In the first place, the words "whenever the President has reason to believe" does not leave anything to his discretion. If you and I were President, even if we did not want to act in a certain way, but we had reason to believe a certain thing, then under that language it would be our duty to act; would it not?

Mr. HOPE. If the President has reason to believe, then he should submit the matter to the Tariff Commission for a finding as to the facts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Then, if he believes the recommendation of the Tariff Commission is correct on the evidence he should act, should he not?

Mr. HOPE. If he believes that it calls for action, certainly he should act.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is, he should act whether or not his opinion is otherwise.

Mr. HOPE. Let me give the gentleman an illustration. The question might come up in the President's mind as to whether the fact that the United States Treasury was losing money in supporting the price of wool constituted an interference with the price-support program. That would be a question which the President would have to decide in his own mind. The gentleman from Massachusetts might say that the fact that the Treasury of the United States was losing money on this transaction constituted an interference. I might say it did not. There is certainly plenty of room there for the President to exercise discretion.

Mr. McCORMACK. But that would not be discretion. That would be judgment, I submit to the gentleman, who is very fair. The question of discretion and judgment are two different things.

Mr. HOPE. Well, the gentleman can use whichever word he prefers to use in that connection, but I say it is finally up to the President to make his decision based upon the facts as submitted by the Tariff Commission.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The law specifically states that the President must find the existence of such facts; so that he can use his independent judgment on the situation, irrespective of the findings of the Tariff Commission.

Mr. HOPE. Yes. After the report of the Tariff Commission is laid before the President, he must make an independent finding that facts exist which would require him to issue a proclamation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman would yield the minority one-half of the time.

Mr. HOPE. I think I have too many calls for time. I would not be able to yield the gentleman from North Carolina half of the time.

Mr. COOLEY. So that we have half of the time on this side for discussion.

Mr. HOPE. I will be glad to yield the gentleman 10 minutes at this time, if he desires it.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, during the war, the world's greatest crisis, a rather magnificent spirit of cooperation permeated the Allied world. As a result of that grand world-wide spirit of cooperation and under the urgent spur of necessity, gallant men won many great victories on the battlefields of the world. This great spirit of cooperation was in all respects nonpartisan. Men of all parties and of many countries died in a common cause. VE-day and VJ-day have come and gone, and we are now living in the postwar world. Frankly, I am shocked to know that apparently some people now seem to regard world cooperation as a matter of little importance. Unless we solve the problems of peace in this postwar world, the great victories which have been won will have been won in vain. The fruits of those victories will be lost in the burning and consuming flames of economic isolation.

I do not believe that the average American today fears atomic warfare. Fortunately our great Nation has the secrets of the atomic bomb. I do believe, however, that intelligent men everywhere very greatly fear the dangers of economic warfare which may be just as devastating to the hope of peace as atomic warfare could possibly be. This measure is the first overt act. It is economic warfare. The great issue involved here is the issue of economic

isolation against world cooperation. In the proper solution of this great problem, you have just as great interest as I could possibly have. I am influenced not by editorials which have been written, but because of my own firm belief that the problems of this distressed and devastated world can only be solved by cooperation on a world-wide basis.

Economic isolation means economic warfare. Economic warfare certainly does not mean peace. We have experienced the tragic results of economic isolation. Twice in our day and generation the earth has been bathed in human blood. I am fortified and strengthened in my belief by the opinions of eminent statesmen—statesmen of different political faiths, yet statesmen all of whom are true Americans. I have before me a communication written by the Honorable Cordell Hull, former Secretary of State, a great Democrat, and a great American. I also have here a communication from another distinguished former Secretary of State, the Honorable Henry L. Stimson, a distinguished Republican, and a great American. And here is a communication from a great soldier, a great statesman, and a great American, the present Secretary of State, Gen. George C. Marshall. To the list of these witnesses we can add the present Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, the Honorable Will Clayton, our able and distinguished representative at the Geneva Conference; and the honorable and distinguished Secretary of Agriculture, our former colleague, Clinton Anderson; and the Under Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable N. E. Dodd; all of whom agree that no action should be taken here which would violate either the letter or the spirit of the charter of the Geneva Conference and jeopardize the hope for world cooperation in the field of world trade and commerce.

Please consider these communications:

NAVAL HOSPITAL,
Bethesda, Md., June 4, 1947.

The Honorable GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
Secretary of State.

MY DEAR SECRETARY MARSHALL: I have been very disturbed to learn of Mr. Clayton's return from Geneva in connection with the possibility of action by the Congress intended to increase the tariff on wool. I believe that such action would seriously endanger the success of the negotiations now going on in Geneva for the reduction of trade barriers under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and for the establishment of an international trade organization, embodying the basic principles of mutually beneficial international economic relations for which we have striven so long.

After more than a decade of successful operation under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, and at a time when the principal trading nations of the world are prepared to follow our lead in carrying out a program of economic disarmament, it would be tragic indeed if any action of ours should endanger that program.

I do not wish to pass judgment on whether or not the growers of wool in this country are entitled to additional assistance. That is for the Congress to decide. I do feel very strongly, however, that such assistance, if given, should not be in a form which would preclude or nullify the comprehensive negotiations in which we are now engaged with other countries for the reciprocal reduction of tariffs and other trade barriers. The success of these negotiations is indispensable to our own economic stability and prosperity and for the creation of a climate favorable to the preservation of world peace.

The form in which domestic wool producers receive price support must not jeopardize our international relations. As the President said in his address at Waco, Tex., on March 6: "The negotiations at Geneva must not fail."

Faithfully yours,

CORDELL HULL.

[Copy of telegram dated June 4, 1947, from the Honorable Henry L. Stimson to the Secretary of State]

The Honorable GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am deeply concerned regarding the pending wool legislation in Congress. In the form proposed by the House of Representatives, this legislation would increase the tariff on wool.

It is my considered opinion that to enact the House measure at any time would be most unwise. It would amount to a repudiation of the whole structure of American economic policy developed in the Congress and the State Department during the 15 years since Cordell Hull began his great work for trade agreements. And such repudiation now, when American leadership has been so largely responsible for the Conference on World Trade at present proceeding in Geneva, would not fail to have serious and immediate international effect, both economic and political. To other nations now watching for proof of American sincerity and unity it would be a shocking indication that the policy of the United States can at any time be shackled by the sort of economic short-sightedness for which all the world has paid so dearly in recent years.

After World War I, the American people and others executed an economic and political retreat from world affairs. These policies were in large part responsible for the great economic break-down which followed both here and in Europe. Now we are engaged in effort to reconstruct a world shattered by the war which grew out of that economic break-down. In this effort of reconstruction greater freedom of world trade is indispensable. No such freedom can be achieved if this country retreats behind tariff walls higher than ever.

To enact any provision raising the wool tariff would be a clear first step toward the disastrous repetition of our former error. If the Congress should determine that the price of wool must be supported, a question on which I do not here offer any judgment, it can accomplish this purpose at relatively small cost by employing the method of subsidies contained in the Senate bill. But to support these prices by raising the tariff on wool should be to give financial assistance to a few at the cost of a large share of this Nation's hope for world prosperity and peace.

Very sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, June 4, 1947.

The Honorable GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR AIKEN: I wish to express appreciation to the Senate and House conferees in hearing the Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs with respect to pending legislation on wool. I am sure Mr. Clayton made clear the serious issues involved from the point of view of our foreign policy. However, I wish to summarize the position of the Department of State in this matter.

The Senate bill directs the Commodity Credit Corporation to continue until December 31, 1948, to support a price to domestic producers of wool at the same price at which it purchased domestic wool in 1946. It authorized the Commodity Credit Corporation to dispose of wool owned by it at market prices.

The House added to this bill a provision intended to result in an increase in the high tariff on wool, and thus enable the Government to give this support to domestic wool producers without financial loss to this Government. The cost of such support would thus be passed on to the consumer of woolen goods.

The critical importance of this action, as it bears on our foreign relations, arises from the fact that there is in progress at this very time in Geneva, an international conference on trade and employment called by the United Nations on the initiative of this country. The United States delegation, of which Mr. Clayton is chairman, is taking a leading part in this conference.

The object of the conference is to negotiate reciprocal trade agreements for the reduction of barriers and the elimination of discriminations in international trade. A further object is to agree upon a draft of a charter for an international trade organization to be set up under the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

Some 50 or 60 negotiations are actually taking place between the different countries represented at this conference, and it is expected that eventually some 70 or 80 agreements will be entered into. The participation of the United States in this aspect of the proceedings derives from the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act last extended by Congress in 1945.

While wool constitutes a relatively small part of our domestic economy, being only one-half of 1 percent of agricultural income, it is a highly important commodity in other countries. For example, it forms 90 percent of the value of all of the exports of Australia to the United States.

The question here is whether the best interests of the United States will be served by the passage of the Senate wool bill which affords protection to the domestic wool producers at a relatively small cost to the United States Treasury, or by the adoption of the House version of the bill which would provide this protection by further raising barriers to international trade. The Department of State is strongly of the opinion that the Senate bill provides the only acceptable course of action open to us not wholly inconsistent with our current efforts to remove the cause of serious conflicts in the world economic field.

I am taking the liberty of passing on to you herewith the views on this subject of our most distinguished elder statesmen—Mr. Stimson and Mr. Hull.

Faithfully yours,

G. C. MARSHALL,
Secretary of State.

(Enclosures: Letter to Secretary Marshall from Hon. Cordell Hull dated June 4, 1947. Copy of telegram to Secretary Marshall from Hon. H. L. Stimson dated June 4, 1947.)

MAY 22, 1947.

The Honorable HAROLD D. COOLEY,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. COOLEY: I take pleasure in this opportunity to answer your inquiry of May 19 concerning the views of the Department of State with respect to proposed wool legislation. I refer to S. 814, a bill to provide support for wool and for other purposes, as passed by the Senate and reported favorably with amendments by the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives.

The bill in the form in which it was reported was not under consideration by the Committee on Agriculture when representatives of the Department testified before that body. We have not had a formal opportunity to present our views on the legislation, as it has been reported.

S. 814, as reported with amendments, is intended to achieve three main objectives. First, it directs the Commodity Credit Corporation to support a price to wool producers at the 1946 level until December 31, 1948. This provision is consistent with the proposed long-run program for wool submitted by the President in his memorandum to Senator O'MAHONEY on March 11, 1946. The Department of State believes this section of the bill accomplishes the essentials of the administration's plan which recognizes that wool should receive support comparable to that granted to other agricultural commodities.

Secondly, S. 814 authorizes the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell its stocks of wool without regard to restrictions imposed upon it by law. That is necessary because Commodity Credit Corporation must be able to sell wool at the market if it is to dispose of its stocks. This is also consistent with the President's program in the opinion of the Department of State.

Thirdly, an amendment to section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act has been added to provide for the imposition of fees on any imported article by the Secretary of Agriculture if he finds that imports of said article interfere materially with the wool-support program. The accompanying report shows that the purpose of the fee is to increase the price of imported wool to equal the support level for domestic wool. The Department of State advises against the adoption of this amendment. I understand from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that it is proposed to modify this import-free amendment by directing the President, rather than the Secretary of Agriculture, to impose the fees after investigation by the Tariff Commission. This does not remove the fundamental objections to the provision.

If import fees, which are actually increases in the tariff, are levied, they would be harmful to the interests of the United States in the following ways.

First, the cost to the public in increased prices for woolen manufactures would far exceed the increased returns to the wool growers. The President's memorandum, previously referred to, pointed out that "it will be more desirable from a national point of view and more dependable for growers to have the Government absorb losses on sales of domestic wool rather than to raise additional trade barriers against imports." The cost of supporting returns to wool growers must be borne by the public of the United States regardless of the form that support takes. The tariff itself is a subsidy which is collected, like a sales tax, from consumers through raised prices and conveyed to producers by the same means. To talk about avoiding cost to the Treasury is to evade the issue, for the public, and not the Treasury, pays the bill.

A fee will raise the cost of the raw material. This, in turn, cumulatively increases the cost of doing business at every stage of the production process. Therefore, the final cost to the public as a consumer is far greater under the fee than it would be if raw material prices were not increased by fees and the public, as a taxpayer, paid the subsidy.

In the second place, new import fees on wool would injure the interests of the United States through their effect on our foreign relations. We all recognize the responsibility of this country for leadership, both political and economic, in the postwar world. The United States has taken the initiative in promoting the adoption of principles of economic conduct among nations which would require each country to consider the impact of the economic measures it undertakes on world economic progress. If the proposed amendment providing new import barriers is adopted, the moral leadership of the United States in world affairs will suffer a serious blow.

If at this time, when we are actually negotiating with other countries at Geneva for the lowering of trade barriers, we raise new barriers as this bill proposes, we stand convicted of insincerity.

Wool is a critical item in our current negotiations for an International Trade Organization for the expansion of world trade and employment. Although wool raising accounts for less than one-half of 1 percent of our agricultural income, it is very important in world trade. It is the most important import into the United States from Australia, New Zealand and South Africa. It is by far their most important source of the dollars they need so badly to buy our exports. If we impose new barriers to this trade, we cannot expect them to cooperate wholeheartedly in creating the type of postwar world we want to have. Without such cooperation, the other British Commonwealth nations would have difficulty joining with us in a mutually advantageous program. Other nations would question the sincerity of our protestations that we do not intend to retreat to economic isolationism.

Let me summarize by saying the Department approves support to wool growers and authority for Commodity Credit Corporation to sell its wool below parity. The Department therefore hopes that the Congress will adopt the proposed bill as passed by the Senate without amendment.

Sincerely yours,

CLAYTON.

Mr. Speaker, although I do not have before me communications from the Secretary of Agriculture or the Under Secretary, there can be no misunderstanding as to their position concerning this important matter. During the conference, Under Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Dodd, addressed a letter to Senator AIKEN in which the position of the Department of Agriculture was clearly indicated.

America has taken her rightful place among the nations of the earth. The question is: "Shall we be able to hold that great place of leadership?" We were the first to sponsor world cooperation. Our Nation renounced economic isolation, but now we are about to embrace the evil vulture again. The question before us is one of paramount importance. I hope that I am not unduly alarmed and I also hope that I do not overrate the importance of the matter before us. Certainly the great statesmen whom I have quoted seem to regard the matter as one of great importance. As we approach a vote on this conference report, we are conscious of the fact that a conference of world-wide importance is going on at Geneva, but America, the greatest of all nations, is not represented there. Our representative, Mr. Clayton, was forced to abandon, temporarily at least, the great work which he had undertaken at Geneva and all because of this pending wool bill. Mr. Clayton has been anxious to return to Geneva, but he dares not return until this issue has been settled. How could he sit at the conference table and attempt to negotiate reciprocal agreements looking toward the revival of world trade conscious of the contents of this bill which supplies the president with a sword with which to destroy every agreement which might be reached and written?

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. When Mr. Will Clayton returned from Geneva and when the letters to which the gentleman refers from Mr. Stimson, Mr. Hull and General Marshall were written, the conference commitee had not met; no conference report had been made. I will ask the gentleman if they were not referring to an entirely different bill than the one we have before us at this time?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. I might say in answer to the gentleman from Kansas that Mr. Clayton and the State Department are just as opposed to this conference report and the bill in its present form as they were to the bill reported by the House committee. They would have no objection; Mr. Clayton would not be in the United States today, if the House committee had reported and the House itself had passed the bill that the Senate passed, which was what we thought the wool people wanted—that was a support for the price of wool.

Mr. COOLEY. That is exactly what the wool producers wanted.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield that I may answer?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Clayton is certainly a very hard man to please. We have come a long way trying to please him.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. It is not a question of pleasing Mr. Clayton, I might say. Yes; I will yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. That is exactly what I desire to say; it is not a question of pleasing Mr. Clayton. It is whether or not we are going to cooperate with the remainder of the world in order that they may take our surplus. They cannot take our surplus goods unless we take theirs. Money does not cross the ocean to balance trade; it is goods for goods, now as it has always been.

Mr. COOLEY. May I add that on June 12, 1947, just last Thursday, General Marshall issued this statement:

I am disappointed in the reported action of the Senate and House conference with respect to the wool bill. I am making public my letter to the conferees together with a telegram from Mr. Stimson and the letter from Mr. Hull referred to therein.

The truth is the officials of the State Department were not given an opportunity to be heard about this all important matter affecting our foreign economic policy. The House amendment was not written by the Members of the House Committee on Agriculture and no hearings on the proposal were held. It is unfortunate that this matter originated as it did and came before the House Committee on Agriculture. Our Committee deals entirely with agricultural problems, but this bill vitally affects world trade and commerce and the foreign economic policy of our Nation, and is in fact a revenue measure attached to a bill which originated in the Senate. Under our Constitution, revenue measures must originate in the House of Representatives. The constitutional question involved seems to be of very slight importance to the ardent

advocates of "false economy." If you by your vote approve this conference report, you have in effect delegated to our committee the right and function to fix and impose tariffs and to delegate that authority as we may determine. If we are to provide for a tariff on wool, why not on potatoes, tomatoes, cucumbers, cauliflowers, and every other vegetable and product of agriculture?

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. Our committee has had that right ever since 1935 when we got the first tariff containing section 22. Since that time, potatoes, tomatoes and all other commodities have been under that bill any time the President chooses to exercise his authority to deal with them.

Mr. COOLEY. Not with import duties as here provided. The gentleman must know that he is not accurate.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman says I know that is not accurate. The fact is that the import fee provision has been in the bill ever since 1940.

Mr. COOLEY. Has it been used on any commodity other than a surplus crop upon which we have a definite program? Certainly not, because the language of section 22 so provides.

Mr. HOPE. It has been in the bill ever since 1940. It has not been used as yet, but it has been available for use at any time.

Mr. COOLEY. Here is one test of what this bill involves. If it is not the purpose to destroy reciprocal trade agreements now in existence or hereafter to be negotiated, then why do the House conferees object to this language which is written in a bill sponsored by my distinguished and beloved friend, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], introduced on February 10, 1947, in which he provides in clear, unambiguous language the following:

> No proclamation under this section shall be enforced in contravention of any treaty or other international agreement to which the United States is or hereafter becomes a party.

If it is not the purpose to destroy the reciprocal trade program, why do we not send this bill back to conference and insist that the conferees put that savings clause in this bill? I say it is nothing more nor less than an insidious effort to undermine the reciprocal trade treaty program.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the Members in this House who are interested in the farm program that when you destroy the support program for wool you are undermining and will ultimately destroy the entire agricultural support program because the two things are certainly going in opposite directions. You can support the wool industry of America better than you can any other agricultural commodity grown in the country. The whole wool crop produced in America is worth approximately $120,000,000. We produce only about one-third of the wool we consume. In round figures, we produce about 300,000,000 pounds annually. This could be subsidized to the extent of even 5 cents a pound and it would only involve $15,000,000 a year. If we abandon the support program and lift trade barriers the public will pay not just $15,000,000 but probably $150,000,000. Do not you believe that the extraction will be painless. It will be long remembered and very painful to the consuming public. It is estimated that the public will pay 10 times more than the direct subsidy involved.

The issue of economic isolation involved in this legislation cannot be compromised. We either believe in world cooperation or we believe in economic isolation. We cannot divorce this bill from the reciprocal trade treaty program. The effect of this bill will be to drive this Nation into the tragic arms of economic isolation which means economic ruin. If economic isolation is to be the policy of America, the people of America should know it and the people of the world should know it. If the President signs this bill, our diplomats will be damned in the eyes of the people of the world and the integrity, the prestige, power, and influence of our Nation will be irreparably impaired. I hope, therefore, that this report will be recommitted or defeated.

Here is a statement by the Secretary of State, issued on May 29, 1947:

> The State Department is opposed to the House amendment to the wool legislation now under consideration. Wool is the key commodity in the Geneva negotiations to expand trade through the reduction of trade barriers. It is by far the most important export and source of dollars of Australia, New Zealand, and the Union of South Africa. We cannot expect them to cooperate with us in reducing trade barriers if we increase duties on their wool. Without their participation, the remainder of the British Commonwealth cannot, as a practical matter, join with us in a mutually advantageous program.
>
> Wool is also a symbol of our intentions in foreign trade. If we adopt higher tariffs in the present bill, other nations will conclude we cannot or will not live up to our professed policy of international cooperation. They will turn to trade restrictions and bilateralism to protect themselves. On the other hand, expanding trade between the United States and other nations will not only help us sell our surplus products but also will allow them to earn the dollars they need to reconstruct their economies and to protect their democratic institutions.
>
> The wool bill as passed by the Senate would protect the wool industry in the United States by direct payments from the Commodity Credit Corporation. The indirect cost of these payments to the public as taxpayers would be far less than the cost of the increased tariff provided by the House amendment to the public as consumers.

I am anxious for the wool producers of America to be protected. I favor the passage of the Senate bill, but even though I am greatly interested in the welfare of the wool producers I am not willing to permit my interest in them to bring about a devastating collapse of the Geneva Conference and of the hope for a revival of world trade and commerce by world cooperation and reciprocity. The sponsors of this measure are making goats out of the sheep growers of America, and as a direct result of the politics involved the wool market has dropped 14 cents a pound below the support price of 42 cents a pound, which would have been guaranteed under the Senate bill. If the wool producers of America end up with no support program whatever, I believe they will know exactly where to place the responsibility. It is easy enough for Members to say we want to protect the wool growers, and yet, at the same time, attach provisions in the form of amendments which they know will defeat the very thing that they say they actually want to do.

As some evidence of the politics involved, I call your attention to an AP report under a Washington date line of May 13:

> WILL DRAFT WOOL BILL—GOP GROUP NAMED TO EXPEDITE ACTION
>
> WASHINGTON, May 13.—A special committee on wool legislation was appointed today by the House Republican steering committee.
>
> Representative HALLECK, of Indiana, said that an effort will be made to draft a bill to satisfy all wool men.
>
> "There are a number of difficult decisions to be made," HALLECK told reporters. "We are anxious to satisfy everyone and will try to expedite action."
>
> The Senate has passed legislation to provide price support at the 1946 level, and permit the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell its stocks of wool at prices competitive with foreign wool. The House added a provision for an import fee, to apply on excess foreign imports and floor stocks.
>
> The new provision, particularly the floor-stock tax, has drawn opposition from the wool dealers and fabricators.
>
> HALLECK said the committee will meet tomorrow morning. Its members are Representatives HOPE, of Kansas, MURRAY of Wisconsin, SIMPSON of Pennsylvania, JENKINS of Iowa, CASE of South Dakota, HERTER, of Massachusetts, and HALLECK.

You will note that not a single member of the Democratic Party was named as a member of the Halleck committee.

It is unfortunate that the wool growers of America must be made scapegoats by the Republican steering committee. This is the little black sheep of the Republican Party, a wolf in sheep's clothing which will destroy the farm program and the hope of world cooperation.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, after all of the arguments are stripped down, there is but one issue before the House this afternoon and that is whether or not we will accord to the commodity wool the same rights and the same privileges that some 20 or 30 other agricultural commodities now enjoy. That is the issue, because the sole purpose of amending section 22, as set out in the conference report, is to bring wool under that section.

Now, let me read to you some of the commodities that now have the protection that is proposed here to give to wool, and please do not smile when I tell you those commodities extend from noodle soup to wheat and cotton. I want to read you from a list of the commodities that are now protected under section 22, and the issue here is whether or not you will bring wool under section 22.

Now, here are some of the commodities. The President has not acted on all of them. He has acted only on two, wheat and cotton, but here are the ones on which the President could act. My distinguished friend, the gentleman from North Carolina, is frightened that we will wreck the reciprocal-trade treaties of this Nation. There is no such thing involved here. Here are some of the commodities now under section 22:

Beans, beets, cabbages, carrots, onions, Irish potatoes, sweetpotatoes, spinach, noodle soup, orange juice, tomato flakes, cotton, wheat flour, wheat, milk, eggs, apples, peaches, kale, peas, squash, and grapefruit juice.

Every one of them are under section 22, and if those commodities are imported into this country in large quantities the President can initiate an investigation and can do one of two things, that is, establish import quotas or import fees on the imports.

Now, I want to be helpful if I can. Let me give you just a little history. It has been stated here that section 22 was intended only to protect surplus commodities and therefore was not intended to protect wool, because wool is largely an import commodity. I have gone back to 1935 when section 22 was first enacted. This is the committee report dated June 15, 1935, filed in this House by Marvin Jones, then chairman of the Agricultural Committee, and with reference to section 22, then new legislation, here is what the committee said:

Efforts to restore agricultural prices in this country will not be wholly successful if competitive foreign imported articles are allowed to take the domestic market away from the domestic products.

Further, it says:

Congress cannot now ascertain and provide specifically for the varieties of circumstances under which, and the commodities the importation of which, will endanger the effort to attain parity prices.

In this bill before the House we are proposing to support wool at the parity price and section 22 was enacted for that specific purpose.

Now, the original section 22 authorized only import quotas; that is, we could limit the amount coming into this country. In 1939 this Congress amended that act and added the right to impose import fees up to 50 percent ad valorem. And here is what the committee report, also filed by Marvin Jones, dated July 14, 1939, had to say about this section and the need for including import fees:

It is clearly necessary for the successful operation of such programs that some means, such as is provided in section 22, be available to prevent a backwash of low-priced exports into a higher-priced domestic market. * * * It is known to a point of overwhelming certainty that a particular farm program will be ineffective in the absence of some protection against increased foreign importations. Consequently, the bill provides that restrictions (either an importation fee or an importation quota) against foreign importations may be imposed under the provisions of section 22 whenever it appears to be reasonably certain that such importations would increase and affect a farm program adversely.

It has been stated here that the President must act and has no discretion in these cases. I say that neither the law nor the practice requires such a thing. In the first place, under section 22, under which it is proposed to bring wool, no action can be taken unless it is initiated by the President of the United States, and then subsection (d) states that the decision of the President on the fact is final.

The newspapers have published throughout this country that this bill imposes a 50-percent ad valorem on the import of wool. It does no such thing. The maximum the President could impose is 50 percent, as the law says it shall not be in excess of 50 percent. The President could impose a fee of 1 percent, 10 percent, or 50 percent, as he saw fit.

Then, mind you, the act specifically provides that if the President should impose a fee he may at any time revoke it, suspend it, or modify it.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] said that probably the President must necessarily act. Let us look at it. Right now we are supporting Irish potatoes at 90 percent of parity, just as you propose in this wool bill to support wool at 100 percent of parity. During the last 6 months, so the Department of Agriculture reports, they have destroyed approximately 22,000,000 bushels of Irish potatoes as part of their effort to support the price to growers at 90 percent of parity. Do not forget that Irish potatoes are now under section 22. They are under it today. While we have supported Irish potatoes at 90 percent of parity, while we have dumped about 22,000,000 bushels we have imported into this country from Canada between 4,000,000 and 5,000,000 bushels, but the President has not acted. The President has not asked the Tariff Commission to make an investigation. The President has not found that those imports of Irish potatoes from Canada have materially affected the support program. I submit that under the authority which the President has under section 22 there is no compulsion for him to impose an import fee or quotas on wool if wool is included in section 22. So I say that there must be complete discretion in the President of the United States, when we have been importing Irish potatoes into this country for the last 6 months and Irish potatoes are now covered by section 22.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. If the gentleman says there must be discretion in the President, I should like to know why it is that he objects so violently to providing in plain language that the President shall be free to exercise his sound discretion in this matter.

Mr. PACE. The gentleman has made no such proposal.

Mr. COOLEY. Those proposals have been made time and again since this controversy started. If the gentleman does not know now, if he is not conscious of the fact that he is undermining the reciprocal trade agreements, why is he not willing to accept this protective clause which was in the bill of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE]?

Mr. PACE. Because, as I told the gentleman before when the bill was on the floor, if the amendment which the gentleman offered in the House, receiving only 26 votes, was adopted, it would put Mr. Will Clayton in charge of the farm program of this country, and I do not intend to put it there if I can help it.

Let me say one more thing. There is only one big issue here, and that is whether you will accord wool the same protection as is accorded the other commodities I have read off to you. Then, there is one more issue here, and that may prove to be the biggest issue of all to me. That is whether the House will start the practice, as is proposed here when they urge us to accept the Senate bill, of supporting a commodity in the farm program up here at around parity and then dump it down there at any price that the market might bear in competition with foreign commodities. If you do that, your farm program is gone and the farmers of this country will have no protection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that I have only 2 minutes to speak in opposition to this conference committee report.

The bill which was returned from the conference committee is, of course, identical with the bill that went out of the House except for one provision, which to my mind makes it very much worse than it was before it left here. That provision allows the President, and it is done, I believe, in order to contravene the possibility of this bill violating certain existing treaties, to use the import-quota system in order to prevent foreign wools coming into this country.

I would not mind that in the least if we did not have to import wool and were dealing with a commodity of which we had a surplus. But we are going to have to continue to import wool. The minute you begin using the import-quota system you open up regulatory bodies to the worst type of corruption that I can imagine. Any individual who receives a license to import, whether he be a manufacturer or an importer, is given a special privilege on which he can cash in. Every nation which is given permission to ship wool to this country—and there are some 20 nations shipping wool to this country—receives something of value for which they are willing to pay. You will completely demoralize every purchaser of wool in this country and I am speaking primarily because in my own section of the country there are dealers in wool and we have, roughly, 65 percent of the manufacturers of wool in the textile mills. They will not know where they stand from day to day if this bill is enacted.

I will also repeat what I have said previously when the bill came up here in the House. I think the price that has been set means that the Government is going to have to continue to purchase the entire commodity, and so-called free enterprise in dealing in that commodity will be gone.

I hope the conference committee report will not be accepted.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER].

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I regret that we have had to have this controversy over this report. The problem before us seems to me to be so simple and so just that it neither deserves the criticism we have had in the press nor the criticism we have had here on the floor of the House. It is just a very simple matter.

There is only one other country in the world which is concerned with this legislation, and that is the British Empire. For the last 3 years this Congress, by legislation, has excluded the local producer of wool from our local markets and has handed it over, principally to Australia and New Zealand, in its entirety.

We are now in a position of pleading with them to allow us to use our own market to sell this surplus of wool that we have acquired as a result of giving the market to them.

That is the whole question that is involved here. The question is very simple. If you farmers who are interested in the support program want to wreck it entirely, you just add the cost of this stock pile of wool to the Irish potatoes and you will certainly do it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I join with my good friend from the West [Mr. GRANGER] in saying he is sorry this controversy arose. It would not have been here if the House Committee on Agriculture and the House itself had followed the Senate bill which I, among others, thought was what the wool people wanted. There is no man in this House who is a greater friend of the wool people than I. I think my State probably produces more wool than any other State in the Union. I think this House bill and the conference report have gone too far. I think it is going to be desperately troublesome to the people of the United States, to our representatives abroad, who are trying to bring about these reciprocal trade agreements.

Let me say to you people who have farm surpluses, who have manufacturing surpluses, we must trade our surpluses to somebody for their surpluses or there will not be any trading. Money does not cross the ocean to balance trade between countries. It is goods for goods.

It has been said that Mr. Clayton came back to the United States. He did. He was negotiating in Geneva, getting along fine. He could have gotten along under the Senate bill, because there was nothing in there to scare the Australian, the New Zealander, or the South African, but when this bill was reported by the House Committee on Agriculture he came back here and said, "I am through in Geneva as long as this thing is pending in its present form and as long as it has a chance to pass."

Cordell Hull, who could not have anything but a patriotic interest in this, wrote a letter to Secretary Marshall. I have only time to read one paragraph:

> After more than a decade of successful operation under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and at a time when the principal trading nations of the world are prepared to follow our lead in carrying out a program of economic disarmament, it would be tragic, indeed, if any action of ours should endanger that program.

He says in his letter that this does endanger that program.

Another great ex-Secretary of State, Mr. Henry L. Stimson, in a letter to the Secretary of State, among other things, says this:

> It is my considered opinion that the enactment of the House measure at any time would be most unwise.

Then listen to this statement:

> It would amount to a repudiation of the whole structure of American economic policy developed in the Congress and in the State Department during the 15 years since Cordell Hull began his great work on trade agreements.

You have all seen the statement by Secretary of State Marshall. You have heard read into the RECORD letters by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], from Under Secretary of State, Mr. Clayton, who is deeply distressed, who knows that in the situation in which we find ourselves now as the greatest creditor nation in all the history of the world, with exports of from fifteen to sixteen billion dollars last year and with imports of less than eight billion, how long can our economy stand when goods must be traded for goods?

I say to you that in my opinion this House this afternoon—and I am going to give them an opportunity to do it—should by a vote express itself that the conferees should reconsider this bill, re-refer it to the conference committee in order that they may bring something in here that will be a support to the price of wool, do what the wool grower in the United States desires, which will keep him in business; but we must remember that out of the 1,000,000,000 pounds of wool that we manufacture in the United States of America only about 300,000,000 pounds is produced in the United States.

I want the support price. I want our wool growers to stay in business, but I do not want the great program of the United States getting together with the other parts of the world ruined, a program under which we can sell them our surplus if we will take some of theirs. I do not want that program done up, destroyed, thrown out, as I believe it will be under this bill.

They say the President has the power to do this, that, and in the other. It is a question of psychology with these people. That sword is hanging over their heads all the time, that the President may raise this tariff by 50 percent.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I call attention to the fact that official figures show that our rate of exports during March was $20,000,000,000 a year, whereas for the first quarter the figures show our imports are $5,600,000,000. How long can that go on without a bust?

Mr. RAYBURN. Trade, commerce, agriculture, manufacturing—no business can stand a situation like that.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it will mean the destruction of the full effectiveness of the Hull reciprocal trade agreements program. This bill should mean a lot to the people of America. It has great significance. From this fact that the Republican Party is responsible for its passage the commentators of the country and our people should realize that with a Republican victory in 1948—which looks very doubtful now—that reciprocal trade agreements will be scrapped.

If this bill becomes law it will have serious international economic repercussions.

The world will construe it that we are renewing the days of the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act.

The old and dangerous journey of economic nationalism will be started again.

From our own economic angle it is unwise.

Exports for March, including services, relief, and other shipments to occupied areas were at an annual rate of $20,000,000,000. This is in accordance with the National City Bank's June letter.

This is more than we shipped abroad at the height of the war, even when lend-lease accounted for almost four-fifths of our total shipments.

It is vitally important for our own national economy that we sell from 10 to 15 percent of goods produced here abroad.

We know that from our experiences of the last depression.

Our exports play an important part in our employment?

Our imports for the first quarter of 1947 were at the rate of $5,600,000,000 a year?

This is very disconcerting.

What does it mean? It means that foreign buyers are incurring a deficit in their dealings with us.

That cannot keep up long.

A continuance of that situation means a "bust."

It is apparent from actual business figures that gold and dollar positions of other countries are bad, and getting worse. Their reserves are on the downward trend, and their reserves are not healthy.

Even those countries—outside of the United States—who profited from the war are witnessing a dissipation of their gold and dollar reserves.

While the gift and dollar loans bring relief, that is only temporary, and partially artificial, unless the countries who buy from us develop a better balance of trade.

It is amazing how many persons ignore the indisputable fact that a country that buys must sell.

Even individuals must have a balance of trade with others.

Countries must.

No country can keep on buying more than it sells or exchanges in goods or services.

When the point is reached where a country cannot carry on — due to an unfavorable balance of trade—unnatural, unhealthy, artificial, expedient means are used in an attempt to meet the situation.

When one country starts—another follows—and the road of economic nationalism, such as followed the passage of the iniquitous Hawley-Smoot bill, is the result.

The important part of this bill is that for political reasons the domestic producer of wool is being sold down the river.

We all know a support-price bill until December 31, 1948, would be signed by the President.

And yet, this provision is inserted by the leadership of the Republican Party.

The domestic wool producers are being used in this preliminary step to the scrapping of the Hull reciprocal trade program.

The domestic wool producers are being used to bring about an acute international situation.

The Senate bill did not have the objectionable provisions. They were inserted by the Republican policy committee in the House.

I wonder if the domestic wool producers are going to let themselves be fooled by this exhibition of political hyprocrisy.

To the people of the country this is a definite message that if the Republicans should by any chance win next year that the Hull reciprocal trade agreement program will be scrapped, and the world will again take a tailspin into the vicious journey of high trade barriers of economic nationalism.

In connection with the support-price provisions of this bill, to which there is no serious objection, the Member of the House who is entitled to primary credit is the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER].

While I cannot support this bill for the reasons I have stated, mainly because of the import provisions, I believe in giving credit where credit is due, and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] is entitled to that credit.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this conference report, as I was to the original bill before us. The editorial from the New York Times set forth below points out clearly and succinctly the principal reasons for my opposition. Under leave granted, I cite this editorial and one from the Washington Star in support of the position which I feel compelled to take in this matter:

[From the New York Times]

WOOL OVER THEIR EYES

In directing the President to increase the tariff or to impose quotas on wool, in order to carry out a price-support program, the House and Senate conferees, in their effort to increase the profits of a handful of wool growers in this country, have voted to accomplish the following things:

1. To hold up or increase the price of woolen clothing for all American consumers.

2. To alienate Australia, our gallant and vitally important war ally. Wool makes up 90 percent of the value of all Australian exports to this country. The effect of the conferees' action, if enacted into law, must be to push Australia and New Zealand more definitely into an empire-preference system, and away from freer trade with the United States.

3. To sabotage the reciprocal-trade program and the negotiations at Geneva with 16 other nations. To lead the world back toward protectionism, bilateralism, and economic isolationism.

4. To set an example in price control and in increased governmental barriers at a time when it is vitally necessary in the interests of this country to try to get Europe back to a system of freedom of trade and enterprise if world economic revival is to be made possible.

All this is being done by men who have repeatedly protested against governmental economic controls and declared their devotion to free enterprise.

[From the Washington Evening Star]

A BAD BILL

At a time when foreign nations are critically in need of dollars to buy things from us, nothing could seem more unrealistic than the Senate-House conference agreement on the tariff-boosting features of the wool support bill. Nor could anything be better calculated to wreck the American led international meeting at Geneva to work out a program for freer world trade.

As far as the dollar shortage abroad is concerned, this bill would have the effect of intensifying it. Wool represents about 95 percent of Australia's dutiable exports to us, and it is an important part of our trade with New Zealand and South Africa. In moving now to subject it to a tariff that could run 50 percent higher than the present high rate of 34 cents a pound, the Senate-House conferees have in effect moved to make more difficult than ever the effort of vital segments of the British Commonwealth to acquire the wherewithal they must have to pay for all the imports they need from us. This seems little short of folly, especially when related to the fact that one of the most serious problems of our time—in terms both of our own prosperity and the recovery of the world—is the lack of dollars in foreign lands.

From the long-range viewpoint, moreover, the effect of this measure on the objectives of the Geneva conference could be disheartening in the extreme. The United States has been seeking to spread the doctrine of reciprocal trade as one of the essentials of a sound peace—a doctrine aimed at a mutual lowering of friction-breeding tariff barriers in an ever-expanding area. Without such a program, as our Government leaders have said over and over again to the world, we can have only economic warfare, which in turn can sow the seeds of armed conflict. Wool is a symbol of our sincerity in this respect; if we now move to increase the duty on it, our fine words will have a hollow and mocking ring at Geneva, and other nations, fearing the beginning of a congressional assault on our past reciprocity policy, will have good reason to accuse us of saying one thing and doing the exact opposite.

The wool-support bill can be attacked on other grounds besides these, but its implications as regards dollars and reciprocity are enough to make clear that it ought not to be enacted in its present form. If Congress as a whole adopts the Senate-House conference version, then the President will be justified in vetoing it. It simply cannot be reconciled with the role the United States must play in an economically sick world.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial from the New York Times and one from the Washington Star.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART].

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, the adoption of this conference report is exceedingly important to the economy of the West and to my State in particular.

Mr. Speaker, with all the hue and cry that has been raised about wool legislation, one might think that it contained some new and radical departure from established practices. A careful examination of the legislation reported by the conference committee shows that the opposite is true. There is only one provision in the bill that authorizes the President or his agents to do anything they are not already doing or have done with respect to wool and certain other commodities.

Most of the clamor in the press has concerned itself with the provision of this bill which permits the President, if he deems it wise and necessary, to raise the tariff as much as 50 percent of the value of imported wool or wool articles, or to establish import quotas. This action is not mandatory, but is optional if the President thinks that imports are imposing an unwarranted burden on our Treasury by their interference with the operation of the other provisions of the bill which set a price for wool and a domestic program to support the price. The President already has authority to raise duties on a long list of commodities, and he has exercised that authority. The price and support program has been in effect before this time for wool, and is in effect now for many other agriculture commodities. There is nothing new, no departure from long established precedent, in either of these provisions of the legislation.

The new provision is the authorization which is given the Commodity Credit Corporation to dispose of its wool holdings at a price less than parity in competition with other wools.

All of us have read and heard lengthy discussions of this legislation in which it has been said that the wool bill would break down our hopes of a profitable international trade by ending wool shipments from the British dominions. It is said that Australia has nothing to ship us but wool; that with passage of this

legislation she will no longer be able to ship wool to us, and the resulting breakdown in trade will hamper our efforts to build world peace. These are most irresponsible statements. From them one might come to think that it was our duty to buy all of the wool Australia and New Zealand can produce, and that failure to do so will mean disaster. Nothing could be more foolish.

In the first place, Australia and the other wool-producing countries will continue to ship wool to us, no matter what we do with our tariffs. At the present time we produce less than one-third of the wool we consume. It is not expected that we will ever produce more than one-half of our requirements. We will always need sizable imports of wool to supply the balance of our consumption. Wool will continue to come to this country, and we will continue to trade with Australia, regardless of the action taken on this legislation.

In the second place, for the same reasons, our imports of foreign wool will never be as large as the exporting countries might desire. Our ability to use foreign wool is strictly limited, and nothing that we do in this legislation will greatly alter the consumption of wool or the amount of foreign wool which we can use. In normal times we use about a half billion pounds of wool per year. Last year, because of pent-up wartime demand, we used nearly 1,000,000,000 pounds. We are not expected to maintain that rate of consumption this year.

Of course, we can, if we wish, let the wool industry of this country go out of existence, and we can become completely dependent upon foreign wool. The folly of such a procedure in the event of war is terrible to consider. During the last war we were very fortunate that we could keep open the supply lines to Australia, although for a time it appeared that they might be cut almost at will. I need only remind you that one of the principal causes of the defeat of the German drive at Stalingrad was the fact that Germany had not sufficient wool clothing to keep its army functioning in the severe Russian winter. Can we allow our domestic source of wool to disappear at a time when the next war, if there should be one, might well be fought across the Arctic regions?

It would be equally foolish so far as peacetime conditions are concerned to let this domestic industry wither. Some opponents of this measure are concerned with the possibility of a small increase in the price of woolen articles as a result of this bill. Whether there would be such an increase is highly problematical. It certainly would not be significant. But consider, if you will, the price we might have to pay for wool if all our wool came from abroad. Needless to say, the British Empire wool cartel is not an altruistic organization. Let me call to your mind the situation which existed when we had to depend wholly upon imports of rubber. The British and Dutch combined and pushed the price of rubber up out of all reason. It was only with the greatest of difficulty that we were able to extricate ourselves from that position. The same thing can happen with the price of wool. We had a foretaste of it when production of American woolen garments was virtually strangled by OPA, and the imported woolen garments, shoddy as they were in many cases, sold at unbelievably high prices.

I would like to emphasize also that the price of wool has risen only 13 percent since September 15, 1941. Compare this, if you will, with other commodities. Under the plan envisioned in this bill, it is not intended to raise the price of wool above the present level, but to maintain it at that level so that the producer in this country may continue to exist. You have been given adequate statistical information to prove that the wool grower is no profiteer.

This bill means a very great deal to the State of Montana. The wool industry is one of the most important in our State. Montana is vast in area, but many thousands of acres are suitable primarily or solely for grazing livestock. If the livestock industry declines, our entire economy, not only in Montana but throughout the West, declines with it. The wool industry is by no means the insignificant little industry that is portrayed by the press, the State Department, and the others who are all too ready to sacrifice it for their own purposes. Already in Montana our sheep population has declined from about 5,000,000 to 2,000,000 head, and our wool production from 38,000,000 to 20,000,000 pounds. Our annual income from wool has varied from $15,500,000 to $3,000,000.

In this connection I would like to bring home to you the fact that you are doing away with much more than one western industry if you let the sheep business collapse. You are setting a precedent whereby jobs in the handling, processing, and manufacture of wool and woolen garments are taken from this country and transported to other countries. Such a precedent would bring disaster to a great many industries if it is carried to its logical conclusions.

The decline of the wool industry, the facts that have been brought out in our debate on this legislation, demonstrate better than anything I can call to mind the effect of the reciprocal trade agreements upon our economy. We have seen what can happen, not only to the producers of the raw material, but also to the workers in our cities who are engaged in the many steps of processing and manufacturing which turn the raw wool into the finished product, and deliver it to the ultimate consumer. The jobs of all these people, jobs that we can do efficiently in this country, will be exported if we follow the precedent advocated by those who would sacrifice our American wool industry to the interests of foreign producers.

The wool industry, if it is to survive, must have a firm program for the future. We require not only the actual support given in this legislation, but in addition the moral support which comes from the knowledge that we are interested in providing a helping hand to the industry. For these reasons, I hope that the conference report on the wool bill will pass this House with a large majority today.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, there appears to be a great deal of shadow-boxing going on in connection with this bill, both on the floor and through the press of this country. This is not a tariff bill. The legislation does not fix any tariff rates one way or the other. In simple language all that the bill proposes is to place wool under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, with all other farm commodities, and to vest in the President discretionary power to impose import quotas or an import fee on wool in the event he deems such action advisable after finding that excessive importation of wool is interfering with a governmental program. This authority which he now possesses for all other commodities, is discretionary power in his hands.

The main issue involved in the controversial provisions of the wool bill is whether or not the President intends to exercise the authority conferred upon him by this bill. The Tariff Act of 1930 gives him the same authority which he has refused to exercise up to the present moment. Should the President find that the placing of a quota or import fee on wool is contrary to his foreign-trade policy, I am satisfied that he has no intention whatsoever of exercising the authority conferred upon him in section 22.

The gentleman from Georgia mentioned what the President had failed to do in the case of potatoes. Potatoes and other vegetables are amongst the products placed in section 22 more than 10 years ago by the Congress. At the present time there is a vital need for a quota or import fee on potatoes, but the President has elected not to exercise his discretionary power in this respect, and therefore, between four and five million bushels of potatoes have been imported from Canada during the past 7 months. Such a policy is being pursued by the President at a time when the Government has spent around $85,000,000 to support the price of potatoes produced in this country. During the past 6 weeks representatives of the Department of Agriculture have been pouring kerosene on thousands of bushels of new potatoes in the southern States to destroy them in order to carry out the price-support program. This indefensible action has created a scarcity of potatoes which attracted imports of potatoes from Canada, but the President did not act or use the authority conferred upon him by section 22 to stop the injurious effect that imported potatoes were having on the Government's price-support program.

Since no additional authority is conferred upon the President by placing wool under section 22, we can only assume that he will treat wool in the same manner as he has potatoes, by not using his discretionary power to either place wool under a quota or import fee for the remainder of the 2-year period. It is clearly within his discretion to act as he sees fit.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am sorry; my time is limited.

The letter to which our former Speaker referred as coming from the great Secretary of State, Mr. Hull, was written before this conference report was agreed to and presented to the House. The letter from Mr. Marshall came before the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. Clayton appeared before the conference committee and begged the committee not to include wool under section 22. He did not say that he came home from Geneva because of the House bill. As a matter of fact, he came home because he was not feeling well or for some other purpose. We might as well be honest about this matter. I do not think this is any secret. He said to the conference committee that he had been in the hospital and was having a rest. He stated further that he just got up out of his bed to come before the conference committee a day or so before we acted.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman state to this House that Mr. Clayton stated to the conference committee he came home because he was sick? As a matter of fact he has stated every time that he came home on account of this bill.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. He said he was sick, and he did not state that the conference broke up on account of the wool bill. Now, let me explain about the conference at Geneva. The Geneva conference was not broken up as a result of the House wool bill, because even to the day when Mr. Clayton came before the conference committee, the conference was in session and the various committees are in session at Geneva negotiating trade agreements. When I asked Mr. Clayton if he proposed to cut the duty on wool he said he did not know because he had not discussed it with the President. When I asked him if he was going to cut the duty on butter, cheese, or any other item, he stated "that this was highly confidential" which he could not even discuss with the Members of Congress on the conference committee. It would be much better for Congress and the American people to learn the facts, rather than to be used as poker chips in an international poker game.

Mr. Clayton and his associates are dealing with the rights of the American people, and Members of Congress are entitled to receive honest answers to important questions dealing with such rights. It looks to me as though they are dealing away the rights of American workers and American farmers. What are we here for? We are here to legislate in the interests of the American people. If we are going to protect the economy of this country and the future of American workers and farmers, yes, even our American way of life, we had better find out what is being done at the Geneva Conference. Furthermore, it should be the duty of officials in the executive branch of the Government to be honest with the American people.

I believe that I have fully discussed the controversial provisions of the wool bill. The balance of the bill provides for the disposal of around 460,000,000 pounds of Government-owned wool, which was purchased by the Government during the war as a strategic material, in competition with imported wool. The British wool cartel or syndicate controls approximately 80 percent of all of the wool produced in the world. The reason that our Government has not been able to dispose of its domestic wool is due to the fact that the British syndicate has undersold foreign wool in our domestic market at a price below parity. The bill places the Government in a position to dispose of its wool in competition with British wool, and the Treasury will stand the loss. This loss will no doubt exceed $50,000,000, and it is not a subsidy to wool growers, because the Government is the owner of the wool. The bill also proposes the continuation of the present price support program for wool for 1947 and 1948 in accordance with the provisions of the Steagall amendment which assures a support price for all farm products until December 31, 1948.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much this legislation has resulted in all of this controversy that is so needless. I cannot help but wonder where Mr. Cordell Hull was when this present administration raised the duty by 50 percent, under section 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930, on crabs and crab meat. I wonder where he was when they put an embargo on tobacco seed going out of this country. I wonder what he was doing when the embargo was placed on wheat imports, and what he was thinking when the first embargo was placed on cotton. I wonder what he was thinking when millions of dollars were used as an export subsidy for cotton and other crops. He was Secretary of State at the time. He gave no vocal or written protest at the time. Why his sudden interest in wool? How does Mr. Clayton explain that to the world? Here is an administration that went so far as to prohibit the exportation of tobacco seed, and there are other commodities in the same category. Now, all at once the poor little sheep is the cause of all the disturbances there are in this whole wide world. If the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] had not had the patience of Job, he would have thrown this wool proposition and the wool bill out of the window. The gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] has worked on this problem for 2 years. The wool is not asking any more consideration than is accorded a dozen other commodities, as was brought out here this afternoon.

There is one thing I would like to say to the distinguished minority leader, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, of Texas: We cannot put someone in the sheep business and take him out of the sheep business at the same time. We have to do one or the other. And if you want to get higher meat prices you just vote against this conference report. You have about one-third of the sheep industry liquidated now. Go ahead and liquidate the other two-thirds and then keep right on hollering about the price of meat. That is one of the fundamental reasons we are in trouble today with meat in this country. We have been catering too much to the politicians. We have not given the livestock industry of the country the consideration it is entitled to. Then we have to listen to the New Deal propaganda about soil conservation, even at this hour when we are determining whether or not to liquidate the sheep industry. If they had not paid so much attention to some of these experts from the Wharton Schools of Finance and a few more in that position, we would not be in the mess we are in today so far as food is concerned.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I would just like to call the attention of the Members to the fact that this matter has been under consideration in both Houses of the Congress for a long time. It is my understanding that both Committees of Agriculture gave the matter long and careful consideration, listening to all who wanted to be heard. The measure has been passed by both Houses, and it is now out of the committee of conference, after careful consideration of that body. It is my view that this legislation should be enacted, and I trust that the conference report will be adopted.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

THE CONFERENCE REPORT ON THE WOOL BILL SHOULD BE ADOPTED BY THE HOUSE

Mr. Speaker, in connection with this wool bill some people, including some metropolitan newspapers, should obtain some facts and not deal so much in fiction. The conference report is preferable to the bill passed by the House.

First. The wool bill as passed by the House did not give the President any powers that he does not already have. President Roosevelt used these powers found in section 336 of the Tariff Act of 1930, when on August 22, 1941, he increased the duty on crab meat and crab-meat products. This proclamation can be found on page 55 of the United States Tariff Committee Report No. 147. After the bad things the New Deal has said about the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, it is pleasant to note that they made use of it when they so desired.

Second. The conference report, my colleagues, does not give the President any power that he does not already have under section 22 of the AAA Act so far as a half dozen other agricultural commodities have at this very hour. In other words wool is added to the list of crops or products that have been included in this preferred list, which are cotton, corn, wheat, rice, tobacco, and peanuts. You ask if any of these crops have been extended preferential consideration under this section 22? The answer is "Yes." An embargo was put on wheat imports and two embargoes have been placed on cotton imports, the last having been put into effect February

1, 1947. The reason given for placing this embargo on wheat and cotton was that the imports of these crops were disrupting the domestic farm program for these "special privilege" crops, wheat and cotton.

Third. This brings up then the question of what would be the procedure if the peanut growers are compelled to take a reduction in duty of from 7 to 3½ cents per pound duty. The 7 cents per pound duty is more than the crop brought in the marketplace for 25 years before the war. Under the present situation peanuts being under section 22 would be protected without any special legislative consideration by the Congress. I am sure you realize that something was disturbing farm prices in 1939 when the whole New Deal agricultural program bogged down. In August 1939 the farmer received as low as 54 cents a bushel for wheat when 27 cents per bushel was being paid for an export subsidy on wheat and when cotton was only 8.6 cents per pound. The remedy used to correct this situation was: The Smoot-Hawley import duties in effect did not prevent imports, and the New Deal just placed an embargo on imports right on top of the Smoot-Hawley duty and called it reciprocity and a good-neighbor policy. While this set-up has only been used for cotton and wheat, the other four agricultural products on the "preferred" list could be protected, and wool wishes to be included in the same group.

Fourth. Do you believe in special privileges? If a half dozen agricultural commodities are under section 22, why should not all crops or farm products have equal consideration, and why is it so sinful to add wool to the list under section 22? I wish some Member would answer this question. In fact, if wool had been included and had had consideration under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act it would not be necessary to even give legislative consideration to wool at this time.

Fifth. Although tobacco already is under section 22, has this section been used to give added protection to this product? The answer is "No." Tobacco, although it has been placed in the preferred class under section 22, has had other ingenious legislative devices that give the product more protection than was offered in the much criticized Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act. The fact is a wall higher than the Washington Monument has been placed around this commodity. What are these devices? First, the high duties under the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act were maintained. In addition the import quota has been put into effect for certain kinds of tobacco. Some of the crop also enjoyed an export subsidy. But these were not the real special privileges. The real special privilege for tobacco was when the exportation of tobacco seed was prohibited and prevented. Why was this done? The Secretary of Agriculture's office in a letter to me states it was done to keep China and other countries from raising tobacco and interfering with United States exports. This is an example of the hypocrisy of the reciprocal trade program and the good neighbor policy. Countries like China may not protest this discrimination when they are operating on United States loans, but when and if repayment time comes, they may wish to send tobacco instead of dollars. Another scheme or special privilege is the "Fascist" scheme of tying tobacco acreage to the land or farm. This scheme has made lands with tobacco allotments sell away out of proportion to its real value and prevents new farmers from raising and marketing their crops. This is special privilege to the *n*th degree.

Sixth. If the wool bill is defeated and the "Voice" bill passed, the people of other lands who are to be provided $10 per day for traveling on the "Cook's Tours" will not see sheep on the prairies of South Dakota, Montana, Texas, and Wyoming, but will have to find them on exhibit in the zoos like the buffaloes at the present time. That is exactly what you will have if the sheep business is liquidated.

Seventh. The State Department propagandists have deceived the American people about reciprocity long enough. The Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act might have been criticized but the New Deal added insult upon injury and has added additional trade barriers although they have been most vocal as well as deceitful in their propaganda about them. Some universities will not even distribute State Department propaganda because it is not factual.

Eighth. Surely the NAM follows along with these propagandists. Manufacturers want plenty of protection for manufactured products but little or none on raw material. Their testimony before the Ways and Means Committee is conclusive proof of this statement.

A VOTE AGAINST THE CONFERENCE REPORT

First. A vote against the conference report is a vote for higher meat prices in the United States. Do you wish to go on record for higher prices at this time? Already one-third of the flocks of sheep in this country have been liquidated. If you vote against this conference report you are taking the position that you wish to liquidate the sheep industry of this country completely and put yourself on record to do so.

Second. A vote against this conference report is a vote not only against the American sheep farmer, but also a vote against providing a domestic supply of strategic material.

Third. A vote against this conference report is a vote for special privileges for certain crops and a vote to have special privileges for the few.

Fourth. A vote against this conference report is a vote to let the State Department dominate the agricultural economy of this country.

Fifth. A vote against this conference report is a vote to support a set-up to cooperate with a foreign-wool cartel or monopoly that does not dare set up shop within the United States.

Sixth. A vote against this conference report then aligns you definitely and ties you right up with the group of monopoly and cartel advocates.

Seventh. A vote against this conference report makes you a party to wrecking the sheep industry of our country.

Eighth. A vote against this conference report places the American wool consumer in the clutches of a foreign-wool monopoly.

A VOTE FOR THE CONFERENCE REPORT

First. A vote for this conference report is a vote to maintain the sheep industry of the United States.

Second. A vote for this conference report is a vote to produce strategic material—wool—and not add wool to the long list of deficit commodities.

Third. A vote for this conference report is a vote to prevent foreign monopolies from dictating to the American consumer how much he must pay for woolen products.

Fourth. A vote for this conference report is a vote to fulfill wartime commitments made to the American sheep men.

Fifth. A vote for this conference report is a vote to indicate that you represent your people without dictation from the State Department or any other administrative branch of the Government.

Sixth. A vote for this conference report indicates that you are for a bill sent to the Congress by a member of the President's cabinet, the Secretary of Agriculture.

Seventh. A vote for this conference report indicates that you are voting to include wool with a half dozen other farm commodities that have exactly the same legislative consideration.

Eighth. A vote for this conference report is a vote to produce more meat as well as wool in the United States and make the United States more self-sufficient so far as meat supplies are concerned.

The consideration of this wool bill indicates the position that the Congress is going to take in regard to the general support price program. Some agricultural commodities have not been supported in accordance with the law. I realize that only 20,000,000 people out of the total of 140,000,000 people in the United States live on farms and I realize how difficult it is to secure economic justice for the rural people.

The League of Women Voters have been deceived far too long. The New Deal embargoes added to the Smoot-Hawley duties have shown the deception of the New Deal reciprocity program.

The President is now asking for legislation to control exports. If the President disapproves of legislation to control imports when the legislation only provides legislation already provided other agricultural products, how or why should he expect a continuation of his powers to control exports?

United States wool imports

[Dutiable wool]

Year	Actual weight	Clean content	Value
	Millions of pounds	*Millions of pounds*	*Millions of dollars*
1942	525.8	306.9	150.3
1943	624.6	380.8	191.0
1944	529.7	332.5	158.2
1945	657.1	406.1	201.1
1946 [1]	807.5	468.9	228.5

[1] Duty collected for the year of 1946 was $147,200,000.

NOTE.—See total unmanufactured wool imports on next table.

U. S. Tariff Commission June 16, 1947.

Note that 30 percent of this $147,200,000 provides forty-four millions for section 32 funds. Forty millions were provided in the agricultural appropriation bill for use in 1947 under section 32. These section 32 funds are being used to find new uses for cotton. The new uses have been overshadowed by a surplus cotton racket to provide cheaper insulating material and to provide a $1.20 subsidy per automobile manufactured.

United States wool imports

[Total unmanufactured wool]

Year	Actual weight	Clean content	Value
	Pounds	*Pounds*	
1942	1,089,631,780	622,374,267	$311,337,735
1943	963,269,618	569,804,144	295,763,310
1944	636,544,352	410,233,944	186,234,078
1945	819,905,493	517,259,146	241,173,644
1946	1,062,701,937	650,057,334	299,725,993

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, in the minds of some people it is high treason to protect agriculture and the American farmer. It is about time we are protecting the American wool industry or there will not be any such industry to protect in the years to come. Our sheep industry is now being reduced at the rate of approximately 4,000,000 head a year. Statistics show that in 1943 we had approximately 49,000,000 head; 45,000,000 in in 1944, 41,000,000 in 1945; 37,000,000 in 1946 and 32,000,000 in 1947. Thus we have had a reduction of approximately 17,000,000 head in the past 5 years. At this rate it is very apparent that in about 10 years from now there will be very few sheep left in this country. Perhaps we should take time to stop, look, and listen before it is too late. The conference report should be adopted.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I earnestly hope that this conference report will be adopted. The tariff issue has been stressed far out of proportion to its importance as it applies to this measure. I am one of those who has confidence that, before he invokes the provisions of section 22 in defense of the wool program, the President of the United States will use good, sound judgment and discretion. With respect to the making of section 22 of the AAA law apply to wool, we seek only to apply to wool the same identical treatment that for the past 12 years has been accorded to some 20 or 30 agricultural products.

The SPEAKER. All time has expired. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. RAYBURN. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RAYBURN moves to recommit the conference report on the bill S. 814 to the committee of conference.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 166, nays 191, not voting 72, as follows:

[Roll No. 81]

YEAS—166

Albert	Gore	Norton
Andrews, Ala.	Gorski	O'Brien
Andrews, N. Y.	Grant, Ala.	O'Toole
Auchincloss	Gregory	Patterson
Bakewell	Hale	Peden
Bates, Ky.	Hardy	Peterson
Bates, Mass.	Harris	Pickett
Battle	Harrison	Plumley
Beckworth	Hart	Poage
Blatnik	Havenner	Potts
Bloom	Hays	Price, Fla.
Bonner	Heffernan	Price, Ill.
Brooks	Hendricks	Priest
Bryson	Herter	Rabin
Buchanan	Heselton	Rains
Buck	Holifield	Ramey
Buckley	Huber	Rankin
Bulwinkle	Jackson, Wash.	Rayburn
Burke	Jarman	Rayfiel
Byrne, N. Y.	Javits	Redden
Canfield	Johnson, Okla.	Richards
Cannon	Johnson, Tex.	Riley
Carroll	Jones, Ala.	Rivers
Case, N. J.	Judd	Rogers, Fla.
Celler	Karsten, Mo.	Rogers, Mass.
Chadwick	Kean	Rooney
Church	Keating	Sabath
Clason	Kee	Sadlak
Colmer	Keogh	Sadowski
Cooley	Kerr	Sasscer
Cooper	King	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Corbett	Kirwan	Seely-Brown
Cotton	Klein	Sheppard
Courtney	Lane	Sikes
Cox	Lanham	Smathers
Davis, Tenn.	Lesinski	Smith, Maine
Deane	Lodge	Smith, Va.
Delaney	Lusk	Spence
Devitt	Lyle	Stigler
Dingell	Lynch	Sundstrom
Donohue	McConnell	Taylor
Doughton	McCormack	Thomas, N. J.
Douglas	McMillan, S. C.	Thomas, Tex.
Durham	MacKinnon	Thomason
Eberharter	Madden	Tollefson
Evins	Manasco	Towe
Fallon	Marcantonio	Trimble
Feighan	Meade, Md.	Walter
Fogarty	Merrow	Whittington
Folger	Miller, Calif.	Wigglesworth
Foote	Miller, Conn.	Wilson, Tex.
Forand	Mills	Wolverton
Fulton	Monroney	Wood
Gary	Morgan	Zimmerman
Goodwin	Morris	
Gordon	Morton	

NAYS—191

Abernethy	Case, S. Dak.	Fenton
Allen, Calif.	Chenoweth	Fernandez
Allen, Ill.	Chiperfield	Fisher
Allen, La.	Clevenger	Flannagan
Almond	Clippinger	Fletcher
Andersen, H. Carl	Coffin	Gathings
Anderson, Calif.	Cole, Kans.	Gavin
Andresen, August H.	Cole, Mo.	Gearhart
Angell	Cole, N. Y.	Gillette
Arends	Cravens	Gillie
Arnold	Crawford	Goff
Banta	Crow	Gossett
Barrett	Cunningham	Graham
Beall	Curtis	Granger
Bender	Dague	Grant, Ind.
Bennett, Mich.	Davis, Ga.	Griffiths
Bennett, Mo.	Davis, Wis.	Gross
Blackney	Dawson, Utah	Gwynne, Iowa
Bradley	D'Ewart	Hagen
Bramblett	Dirksen	Hall, Leonard W.
Brehm	Dolliver	Halleck
Brophy	Domengeaux	Harless, Ariz.
Brown, Ga.	Dondero	Harness, Ind.
Brown, Ohio	Dorn	Hedrick
Buffett	Drewry	Hess
Burleson	Elliott	Hill
Byrnes, Wis.	Ellis	Hinshaw
Camp	Elston	Hobbs
Carson	Engel, Mich.	Hoeven
	Engle, Calif.	Holmes
	Fellows	Hope
	Horan	Martin, Iowa
	Howell	Mason
	Hull	Meyer
	Jackson, Calif.	Michener
	Jenison	Miller, Md.
	Jenkins, Ohio	Miller, Nebr.
	Jennings	Mitchell
	Jensen	Morrison
	Johnson, Calif.	Muhlenberg
	Johnson, Ill.	Mundt
	Johnson, Ind.	Murdock
	Jones, Ohio	Murray, Tenn.
	Jonkman	Murray, Wis.
	Keefe	Nixon
	Kilday	Norblad
	Kunkel	O'Hara
	Landis	O'Konski
	Larcade	Owens
	Latham	Pace
	Lea	Passman
	LeCompte	Phillips, Calif.
	Lemke	Phillips, Tenn.
	Lewis	Ploeser
	Love	Poulson
	McCowen	Preston
	McDonough	Reed, Ill.
	McGarvey	Reed, N. Y.
	McGregor	Rees
	McMillen, Ill.	Reeves
	Macy	Riehlman
	Mahon	Rizley
	Mansfield, Mont.	Robertson
		Robsion
		Rockwell
		Rohrbough
		Ross
		Russell
		Sanborn
		Schwabe, Mo.
		Schwabe, Okla.
		Scott, Hardie
		Scrivner
		Short
		Simpson, Ill.
		Simpson, Pa.
		Smith, Kans.
		Smith, Wis.
		Snyder
		Springer
		Stefan
		Stevenson
		Stratton
		Taber
		Talle
		Teague
		Tibbott
		Twyman
		Vail
		Van Zandt
		Vorys
		Vursell
		Weichel
		Wheeler
		Whitten
		Wilson, Ind.
		Woodruff
		Worley
		Youngblood

NOT VOTING—72

Barden	Gwinn, N. Y.	Meade, Ky.
Bell	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Nodar
Bishop		Norrell
Bland	Hand	Patman
Boggs, Del.	Hartley	Pfeifer
Boggs, La.	Hébert	Philbin
Bolton	Hoffman	Powell
Boykin	Jenkins, Pa.	Rich
Busbey	Jones, N. C.	St. George
Butler	Jones, Wash.	Sarbacher
Chapman	Kearney	Scoblick
Chelf	Kearns	Shafer
Clark	Kefauver	Smith, Ohio
Clements	Kelley	Somers
Combs	Kennedy	Stanley
Coudert	Kersten, Wis.	Stockman
Crosser	Kilburn	Vinson
Dawson, Ill.	Knutson	Wadsworth
Eaton	LeFevre	Welch
Ellsworth	Lucas	West
Elsaesser	McDowell	Williams
Fuller	McMahon	Winstead
Gallagher	Maloney	Wolcott
Gamble	Mansfield, Tex.	
Gifford	Mathews	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Boggs of Louisiana for, with Mr. Williams against.

Mr. Chapman for, with Mr. LeFevre against.

Mr. Philbin for, with Mr. Busbey against.

Mr. Kennedy for, with Mr. Gwinn of New York against.

Mr. McDowell for, with Mr. Bishop against.

Mr. Hand for, with Mr. Ellsworth against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Hartley with Mr. Kelley.

Mr. Eaton with Mr. Winstead.

Mr. Scoblick with Mr. Powell.

Mr. Gamble with Mr. Mansfield of Texas.

Mr. Nodar with Mr. Combs.

Mr. Mathews with Mr. Barden.

Mr. Kearney with Mr. Norrell.

Mr. Hoffman with Mr. Lucas.

Mr. Boggs of Delaware with Mr. Chelf.

Mr. Wolcott with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Coudert with Mr. Dawson of Illinois.

Mr. Smith of Ohio with Mr. Patman.

Mr. Meade of Kentucky with Mr. Clark.

Mr. McMahon with Mr. Pfeifer.

Mr. Knutson with Mr. Somers.

Mr. Jones of Washington with Mr. West.

Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall with Mr. Crosser.

Mr. Rich with Mr. Stanley.

Mr. Sarbacher with Mr. Hébert.

Mr. Shafer with Mr. Bland.

Mrs. Bolton with Mr. Clements.

Mr. Butler with Mr. Boykin.

Mr. Elsaesser with Mr. Kefauver.

Mr. GEARHART, Mr. VAN ZANDT, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. COLE of Kansas changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mrs. SMITH of Maine changed her vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an excerpt from the Wall Street Journal.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs may be permitted to sit tomorrow and Wednesday during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today following any special orders heretofore entered. I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. OWENS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a news editorial.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article on postage rates.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and in each to include some printed material.

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the bill H. R. 3342, the unfinished business before the House, and to include some extraneous material.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. ELLIS, from June 27 to July 2, on account of official business.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

BUYING AGENCIES USE TAX MONEY TO INFLATE HOUSEWIFE'S PRICES BY NOT UTILIZING SURPLUS CANNED FOODS

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, the remarks of our colleague the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MILLER] which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD recently in regard to the problem of surplus canned goods in the United States which are not being utilized by our Government agencies in our relief and other programs, has attracted Nation-wide attention. Failure of our Government to utilize these hundreds of millions of dollars of canned foods, much of which is in the hands of the packers will affect the economy of the country, and our farmers will suffer by reduced prices when new crops are harvested. With warehouses flooded throughout the country there will be no demand for these canned foods and as a consequence the prices will go down to almost nothing.

Many millions of dollars have been appropriated by the Federal Government for foodstuff to send to Europe and other war areas. Most of these appropriations in the past have specified that cereal grains only could be bought for export, in spite of the fact that the Government has had to buy and, in many cases, destroy, one of the largest potato crops ever produced in this country.

The results have been that grain prices have skyrocketed while other agricultural products have had to battle a glutted market, and the price of bread is twice its prewar price. Of course, we are in favor of buying grains as far as possible, however. Other millions of dollars have had to be spent for vitamin pills to make up the deficiency found in grain, so that the starving multitudes would not starve while eating.

The canners of America are faced with the largest carry-over in history of many foods, such as sweetpotatoes, that are both high in food value and also contain more than the necessary amount of vitamins, but to date the officials in Washington merely shrug and say that they will continue to buy grain.

As of April 1, 1947, which is the beginning of the year as far as canners are concerned, there were 192,195,000 cases of canned goods in the hands of United States packers and distributors—2,465,000 cases of this were canned sweetpotatoes.

Mr. Speaker, sweetpotatoes is only one of the foods that could be utilized in our relief programs, and while this is one of the principal products of my district, which produces more sweetpotatoes than any other section of the country—sweetpotatoes are grown all the way from New Jersey to California in the coastal States—and this is only one of the canned foods which could be utilized which is rich in vitamin content. Sweetpotatoes are rich in vitamin content and are delicious and delectable and require no additions in preparation for consumption, whereas grains require many other scarce and costly products to be added before they can be consumed.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I include a table showing the food and vitamin values per pound of Puerto Rican sweetpotatoes—which is the variety grown in the United States—as follows:

Food and vitamin values per pound of Puerto Rican sweetpotatoes

	Canned	Fresh
Calories	720	567
Carbohydrates ..... grams	174	127
Protein ..... do	3.48	8
Fat ..... do	1.05	3
Calcium ..... do	54.3	159
Iron ..... do	3.9	3.2
Vitamin C (ascorbic acid) ..... milligrams	95.2	113
Vitamin B-1 (thiamin) ..... do	.113	.45
Vitamin B-2 (riboflavin) ..... do	.127	.32
Niacin ..... do	2.01	5.9
Carotene ..... do	12.5	24.5
Phosphorus ..... do	----------	222

Canned analysis from Quartermaster, Chicago, Ill.; fresh from National Research Council.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to include at this point statistics in terms of money, the value of the United States and Louisiana sweetpotato crop as follows:

Value of production multiplied by season average price:
- United States $146,107,000
- Louisiana 17,496,000

Value of sales—estimate of quantities sold:
- United States $64,169,000
- Louisiana 10,627,000

Figures published by the USDA Crop Reporting Board in a publication entitled "The Farm Production Farm Disposition and Value of Principal Crops, 1945–46" for May 1947.

Mr. Speaker, of the total United States sweetpotato crop about 5,000,000 cases were canned in the 1945–46 season and Louisiana canners packed about 1,250,000 cases of last year's crop. Production of sweetpotatos was increased in the United States along with other food crops at the request of the Department of Agriculture during and after the war, and surpluses have accumulated, hence, I feel, that the Department of Agriculture and the Government have an obligation in the disposition of these foods, otherwise, millions of dollars will be lost by our people.

At present, wholesalers are selling to retailers at prices that are about 50 percent of November 1946 wholesale prices, and much cheaper than the packers can replace the items in their own warehouses.

The prospects of any permanent long-range benefit from the hundreds of millions of dollars that are being wasted in feeding strategic areas are nil under our present Pollyanna policy. Small countries of Europe and Asia have learned, through the centuries, that they must be agreeable to their powerful neighbors—and force alone is the determining factor. We have excellent examples of this policy in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, and now Hungary.

It is up to our Representatives and Senators in Washington to see that this money is spread more evenly over the Nation. By insisting that the export agencies buy surplus canned foods, our Congressmen and Senators can do much to relieve the glutted market and insure fair prices to the farmers for the 1947

crops, without the aid of a Production and Marketing Administration buying program aimed at destroying foodstuffs.

Most of our politicos still remember the little pigs—let us remind them again.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Maryland, Representative MILLER, and myself plan to call a meeting of our colleagues from the States which produce canned foods for the purpose of ascertaining if there is a way to have our Government agencies purchase a part of this valuable and desirable food for relief purposes, as well as to feed our armies of occupation in Japan and Europe, and we ask that all interested Members of Congress attend this meeting when announced.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MUNDT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

AIR-LINE CRASHES

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, air crashes in the United States in the past 16 days have taken 145 lives. It is a grim and awful thing to contemplate that these crashes could have been prevented by the Civil Aeronautics Administration. Mr. Speaker, many hundreds of other innocent victims will be added to those already dead unless this House demands the necessary action from the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

The husband of my secretary, coming home to a family reunion after being in the field at work for the past 6 weeks, died in the crash of the Capital air liner in the Blue Ridge Mountains on Friday. The young daughter of one of my closest friends was on her way to Washington and died in that crash. In the past two and a half weeks more than a score of Clevelanders have been killed in commercial air line crashes.

Mr. Speaker, the time is long past for this House to take action and I propose that we take action. Today I am introducing a joint resolution which instructs the Civil Aeronautics Administration to require immediately the installation of radar altimeter equipment in all licensed commercial aircraft. This joint resolution also instructs the Civil Aeronautics Administration to require immediately the installation of ground control approach equipment at all airports from which commercial aircraft are licensed to operate. My resolution, Mr. Speaker, also requires that the Civil Aeronautics Administration immediately order the establishment of omnidirectional system of radio beams on all commercial airways. In addition, the resolution calls for a prompt report from the Civil Aeronautics Administration on their safety regulation service.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the House take prompt action on this resolution. The Civil Aeronautics Administration has the authority and the power to prevent the kind of disasters that have taken place in the last 2 weeks. It has an obligation to use that power. The House should demand that it use that power.

Just a moment ago I received a telegram from the father of a beautiful 18-year-old girl who was killed in the latest crash here in Virginia:

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *June 16, 1947.*

Congressman GEORGE H. BENDER:

GEORGE, suggest all air lines keep track of all planes in the air by ground-controlled radar along route similar to Army-Navy ground-controlled radar systems. If planes are all grounded suggest regular inspection service similar to existing steamship regulations.

HARRY W. HOSFORD.

Here is a father, even though he lost his youngest child in this disaster, who is considerate of the children of others who may experience a similar fate. He asks that something be done rather than just appoint committees. The President has appointed the committee, but he appointed the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, which, in my opinion, is responsible for this condition. If you are going to have any kind of a commission to report or any kind of a committee, it should be a committee of this House.

Mr. Speaker, Howard Hughes has voluntarily begun the installation of radar altimeter equipment in all the TWA planes. It is his statement that four of the six recent airplane disasters could have been prevented if the planes had been equipped with proper radar altimeter equipment. The Army Air Forces employed this equipment throughout the war. There is no reason whatsoever that this equipment cannot be installed. I am confident that the great electrical manufacturing industry would give priority to the manufacturing of such equipment. Why, Mr. Speaker, does not the Civil Aeronautics Administration act?

Mr. Speaker, throughout the war the Army employed ground-control approach equipment. It has been said that the installation of such equipment at airports would be expensive. This consideration dwindles into insignificance when we realize that human lives are at stake, that the airplane industry is a great and growing one, and before all else must guarantee the safety of its passengers. The Civil Aeronautics Administration has the authority. It can refuse to license the operation of commercial aircraft from any field which does not have such equipment. The Civil Aeronautics Administration has the authority; let the Civil Aeronautics Administration act.

Mr. Speaker, there were several plane crashes in southwest Virginia during the present year in which the pilots were blown off their radio beam and were lost. These crashes occurred at night. The investigators of these crashes stated that if the proper radio directional equipment, namely, the omnidirectional system, or radio beams, had been in use, these plane crashes could have been averted.

The Civil Aeronautics Administration has the power to require the installation of this improved system. Why, Mr. Speaker, does not the Civil Aeronautics Administration take action?

More than 50 people, Mr. Speaker, lost their lives in the Eastern Air Lines crash in Maryland on May 30. The report on that air crash indicated that some machinist had unwittingly filed a connecting bolt when he should not have done so. The Civil Aeronautics Administration is responsible for the adequacy of maintenance work. I myself was on a plane 2 days ago, looked out of the window and noticed four screws on the cowling of the port engine bouncing up and down. At our first landing I suggested to the ground crew that they get a screwdriver and go up and screw those loose cowling screws into their proper places. Mr. Speaker, the air lines have expanded rapidly; they have introduced new equipment but they have failed to keep their ground maintenance work up to proper standards. It is time, Mr. Speaker, that the Civil Aeronautics Administration cracked down on ground-crew maintenance work.

Mr. Speaker, the pilot of the American Airliner which crashed at LaGuardia Airfield on May 29 stated that he could have used a longer runway but that the longer runway had undulations and many bumps in it and, in his opinion, should not be used. Mr. Speaker, the Civil Aeronautics Administration is responsible for the checking of airport conditions. It is past time, Mr. Speaker, for the Civil Aeronautics Administration to crack down on airports whose maintenance is in this sloppy condition. Mr. Speaker, when we remember that this experienced pilot chose to take a shorter runway rather than one which he knew to be of adequate length because the longer runway was in bad condition, when we remember that 40 people lost their lives because that runway was in such shape that the pilot chose to use another one—a shorter one—it fills me personally with intense rage. The Civil Aeronautics Administration has got to be made to face its responsibilities. If the Truman administration is unable to get competent people to run the Civil Aeronautics Administration or if the Truman administration thinks that the establishment of investigating committees meets the needs of the present situation, then something is terribly wrong.

In the past 10 years the aircraft industry and the airplane industry have received more aid from the Federal Government than any other industry probably in American history, with the exception of railroads. The Government has financed airports throughout the country. The Government has financed aircraft research and development work. An entire generation of Americans has been sold by the Government during the war on the romance and glamor of the aviation industry. During the war the Government trained 2,000,000 young men either as pilots, mechanics, ground crew, or service personnel. Equipment has been sold to the air lines. In every possible way the Government has assisted the aviation industry, actually with what amounts to billions of dollars either in terms of publicity, research, training of the labor supply, building of airports, transfer of equipment. There is no industry in the country today that has had so many of the things necessary to it underwritten by the Government or pro-

vided by the Government and probably there is no industry in the country which will make as much money or has such a tremendous future before it.

It is absolutely imperative that the Government exercise its authority and guarantee safety insofar as this is humanly possible within the aviation industry.

The Civil Aeronautics Administration has the authority required. The Congress must demand that the Civil Aeronautics Administration act. There is no reason why a procrastinating and dilatory Civil Aeronautics Administration should lead to the death of a single person more in an unnecessary aircraft disaster.

I trust that the House will give prompt consideration to the joint resolution which I herewith read and introduce:

Joint resolution to provide for the installation of radar and other safety equipment in commercial aircraft and airfields, and for other purposes

Resolved, That the Civil Aeronautics Administration is authorized and directed to order the immediate installation of—

(1) radar-altimeter equipment in all commercial aircraft licensed by the Civil Aeronautics Administration;

(2) ground-control approach equipment in all airfields from which such commercial aircraft are permitted to operate; and

(3) omnidirectional systems of radio beams on all commercial airways.

SEC. 2. The Civil Aeronautics Administration shall, within 60 days after the date of enactment of this joint resolution, submit to the Congress a complete report on the status of the safety-regulation service of the Civil Aeronautics Administration with particular reference to the maintenance work of commercial air lines and the condition of airports.

I want to say this to you: Another beautiful girl of my acquaintance, a young girl who was to be married today, was buried in her wedding gown last week; a girl, whose father is one of my very, very best friends, died, was roasted to death on that plane.

You can understand, Mr. Speaker, why I am keeping you here tonight. Over 20 persons from Cleveland have died in the past two and a half weeks as a result of the carelessness of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, people with many of whom I have been closely associated.

I went to a funeral parlor today with my secretary to view the remains of her husband, a fine young man who was killed in Virginia last Friday night. I tell you, when you go through this experience, as I have during these last 2 weeks, you can appreciate why I am as deeply concerned about this thing as I am.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 17, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

788. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed provision pertaining to existing appropriations for the fiscal year 1947 and supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of $223,500 for the Post Office Department (H. Doc. No. 323); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

789. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of $1,490,000 for the Federal Security Agency (H. Doc. No. 324); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

790. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to designate the Air University Library, Army Air Forces, as a public depository for Government publications; to the Committee on House Administration.

791. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the Annual Report of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics for the calendar year ended December 31, 1946; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

792. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a report of the Federal Trade Commission, entitled "The Sulfur Industry and International Cartels" (H. Doc. No. 325); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed.

793. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of $710,660 for the District of Columbia (H. Doc. No. 326); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

794. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of $73,361,400 for the Department of State to enable United States participation in the International Refugee Organization (H. Doc. No. 327); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

795. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 for completing the liquidation of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, in the amount of $90,000 (H. Doc. No. 328); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey: Committee on Un-American Activities submits a report on Southern Conference for Human Welfare; without amendment (Rept. No. 592). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 248. Resolution waiving points of order against H. R. 3839, a bill making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 593). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. REED of New York: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 3818. A bill to amend the Federal Insurance Contributions Act with respect to rates of tax on employers and employees, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 594). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 3850. A bill to declare certain rights of citizens of the United States, and for the better assurance of the protection of such citizens and other persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLACKNEY:

H. R. 3851. A bill to provide additional inducements to physicians and surgeons to make a career of the United States military, naval, and public health services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 3852. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the retirement of public-school teachers in the District of Columbia," approved August 7, 1946; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3853. A bill to repeal provisions of certain acts of Congress relating to free tuition for nonresidents in the public schools of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SANBORN:

H. R. 3854. A bill to provide for the conveyance of the Boise Barracks Military Reservation, Boise, Idaho, to the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 3855. A bill to provide for the appointment of one additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 3856. A bill relating to migratory farm labor; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 3857. A bill to authorize the parishes and congregations of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the District of Columbia to establish bylaws governing the election of their vestrymen; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PICKETT (by request):

H. R. 3858. A bill to provide retirement annuities for certain former rural letter carriers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 3859. A bill to authorize the leasing of salmon-trap sites in Alaskan coastal waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana:

H. R. 3860. A bill to amend sections 3108 and 3250 of the Internal Revenue Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENKINS of Ohio:

H. R. 3861. A bill to allow to a successor railroad corporation the benefits of certain carry-overs of a predecessor corporation for the purposes of certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCONNELL:

H. R. 3862. A bill to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to grant and convey to Montgomery County, Pa., a certain parcel of land of the United States in Norristown Borough, Montgomery County, Pa., for the purpose of erecting an additional annex to the present courthouse; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 3863. A bill to amend section 3673 of the Internal Revenue Code to facilitate the procuring of certificates releasing tax liens; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'HARA (by request):

H. R. 3864. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act with respect to contribution rates after termination of military service; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3865. A bill to exempt the personal property of veterans' organizations incorporated by acts of Congress from taxation by the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 3866. A bill to exempt from admissions tax admissions to recreation facilities and activities operated or conducted by the Federal Government, the several State governments, or political subdivisions thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. J. Res. 217. Joint resolution to provide for the installation of radar and other safety equipment in commercial aircraft and airfields, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. Res. 247. Resolution to create a select committee to investigate the national housing shortage; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

H. Res. 249. Resolution making H. R. 3488, a bill to declare certain rights of citizens of the United States, and for the better assurance of the protection of such citizens and other persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes, a special order of business; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Rhode Island, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to eliminate the taxation of gasoline by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 3867. A bill for the relief of Hal W. Cline; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 3868. A bill for the relief of Morris Gordon, Dorothy Gordon, Leo Gordon, and Louis H. Oppenheim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 3869. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Julia Porter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

633. By Mr. BENDER: Petition of the City Council of Chicago, petitioning the President to veto the Hartley-Taft bill, and in the event of a Presidential veto that the Senators and Members of Congress from Illinois vote to sustain the veto; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

634. By Mr. FORAND: Resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to eliminate the taxation of gasoline by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

635. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of a group of residents of Beloit, Wis., and vicinity, urging veto of the Hartley-Taft labor bill; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

636. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the New York State Association of Retail Meat Dealers, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to exportation of meat to foreign countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

637. Also, petition of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Boston branch, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of housing bill S. 866 and H. R. 2523; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

638. Also, petition of Mrs. Maggie Goldsmith, Orlovista, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

639. Also, petition of John Heather, Lakeland Townsend Club, No. 1, Lakeland, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

640. Also, petition of Mrs. B. F. Crane, Townsend Club No. 1, Zephyrhills, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

641. Also, petition of T. S. Kinney, Orlando, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 17, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou must be grieved, O Lord, that, after nineteen hundred years, mankind never seems to learn how to live by faith, and still prefers worry to trust in God. We know what worry does to us, yet are all too reluctant to discover what faith could do. Since we strain at gnats and swallow camels, give us a new standard of values and the ability to know a trifle when we see it and to deal with it as such. Let us not waste the time Thou hast given us.

So help us God. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, June 16, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on today, June 17, 1947, the President had approved and signed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 69) to prepare a revised edition of the Annotated Constitution of the United States of America as published in 1938 as Senate Document No. 232 of the Seventy-fourth Congress.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 26. An act to make criminally liable persons who negligently allow prisoners in their custody to escape;

S. 125. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to extend the benefits of such act to the Official Reporters of Debates in the Senate and persons employed by them in connection with the performance of their duties as such reporters;

S. 321. An act to amend section 17 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, so as to increase the pay of cadets and midshipmen at the service academies, and for other purposes;

S. 597. An act to provide for the protection of forests against destructive insects and diseases, and for other purposes; and

S. 614. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for a permanent Census Office," approved March 6, 1902, as amended (the collection and publication of statistical information by the Bureau of the Census).

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1230) to amend sections 2 (a) and 603 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, with amendments in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 814) to provide support for wool, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 599. An act declaring Kenduskeag Stream, Penobscot County, Maine, to be a nonnavigable waterway;

H. R. 1380. An act to amend the laws relating to the payment of 6 months' death gratuity to dependents of naval and Army personnel;

H. R. 1610. An act to amend the act of June 14, 1938, so as to authorize the Cairo Bridge Commission to issue its refunding bonds for the purpose of refunding the outstanding bonds issued by the commission to pay the cost of a certain toll bridge at or near Cairo, Ill.;

H. R. 1945. An act to amend sections 2801 (e) (4), 3043 (a), 3044 (b), and 3045 of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 1946. An act to amend section 2801 (e) of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 1947. An act to amend section 2800 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 2167. An act to authorize the inclusion within the Angostura unit of the Missouri Basin project of certain lands owned by the United States;

H. R. 2293. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate navigation on the Great Lakes and their connecting and tributary waters," approved February 8, 1895;

H. R. 2314. An act to amend section 12 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942, as amended, and to amend section 2 of the act of June 16, 1936, as amended, so as to authorize lump-sum payments under the said acts to the survivors of deceased officers without administration of estates;

H. R. 2721. An act to amend the act of March 10, 1934, entitled "An act to promote the conservation of wildlife, fish, and game, and for other purposes," as amended by the act approved August 14, 1946;

H. R. 2746. An act to provide secretaries for circuit and district judges;

H. R. 2878. An act to amend the act approved May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602), as amended, to revise the roll of the Indians of California provided therein;

H. R. 3053. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Territory of Hawaii an easement for public highway and utility purposes in certain parcels of land in the district of Ewa, Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 3055. An act to permit the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War to supply utilities and related services to welfare activities and persons whose business or residences are in the immediate vicinity of naval or military activities and require ultilities or related services not otherwise obtainable locally, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3056. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Macon, Ga., and Bibb County, Ga., an easement for public road and utility purposes in certain Government-owned lands situated in Bibb County, Ga., and for other purposes;

H. R. 3072. An act to authorize the preparation of preliminary plans and estimates of cost for the erection of an addition or extension to the House Office Buildings and the remodeling of the fifth floor of the Old House Office Building;

H. R. 3138. An act to provide for the periodic audit of the records of the accountable officers of the Senate and House of Representatives;

H. R. 3149. An act to amend the act approved December 28, 1945 (Public Law 271, 79th Cong.), entitled "An act to expedite the admission to the United States of alien spouses and alien minor children of citizen members of the United States armed forces";

H. R. 3191. An act to amend Public Law 301, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved February 18, 1946, so as to extend the benefits of the Missing Persons Act, approved March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143), as amended, to certain members of the organized military forces of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines;

H. R. 3251. An act to amend the act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 603), as amended, so as to authorize naval retiring boards to consider the cases of certain officers, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3252. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Long Beach, Calif., for street purposes an easement in certain lands within the Navy housing project at Long Beach, Calif.;

H. R. 3309. An act to amend the Organic Act of Puerto Rico;

H. R. 3333. An act to authorize the transfer of the *Joseph Conrad* to the Marine Historical Association, of Mystic, Conn., for museum and youth-training purposes;

H. R. 3372. An act authorizing certain agreements with respect to rights in helium-bearing gas lands in the Navajo Indian Reservation, N. Mex., and for other purposes;

H. R. 3394. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the evacuation and return of the remains of certain persons who died and are buried outside the continental limits of the United States," approved May 16, 1946, in order to provide for the shipment of the remains of World War II dead to the homeland of the deceased or of next of kin, to provide for the disposition of group and mass burials, to provide for the burial of unknown American World War II dead in United States military cemeteries to be established overseas, to authorize the Secretary of War to acquire land overseas and to establish United States military cemeteries thereon, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3398. An act to extend the period of validity of the act to facilitate the admission into the United States of the alien fiancées or fiancés of members of the armed forces of the United States; and

H. R. 3769. An act to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to qualifications of part-time referees in bankruptcy.

CALL OF THE ROLL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of yesterday, the Chair lays before the Senate Senate Resolution 81.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Millikin
Baldwin	Hatch	Moore
Ball	Hayden	Morse
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Murray
Bridges	Hill	O'Conor
Brooks	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Buck	Holland	Overton
Bushfield	Ives	Pepper
Butler	Jenner	Reed
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Cain	Kem	Robertson, Wyo.
Capehart	Kilgore	Russell
Capper	Knowland	Saltonstall
Chavez	Langer	Sparkman
Connally	Lodge	Stewart
Cooper	Lucas	Taft
Cordon	McCarran	Taylor
Donnell	McCarthy	Thye
Downey	McClellan	Tydings
Dworshak	McFarland	Umstead
Eastland	McGrath	Vandenberg
Ecton	McKellar	Watkins
Ellender	McMahon	White
Ferguson	Magnuson	Wiley
Flanders	Malone	Williams
Fulbright	Martin	Wilson
George	Maybank	Young

Mr. WHITE. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] and the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed members of the commission to attend the Princeton University bicentennial celebration.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed members of the commission to attend the Princeton University bicentennial celebration.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT RELATING TO THE SULFUR INDUSTRY AND INTERNATIONAL CARTELS

A letter from the Acting Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a report of that Commission entitled "The Sulfur Industry and International Cartels" (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1923

A letter from the President of the United States Civil Service Commission, recommending the enactment of legislation to further amend the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; to clarify the meaning of references in the act to number of employees supervised and size of organization unit; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, requesting Congress to amend the act entitled "An act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii", approved April 30, 1900, as amended, known as the Hawaiian Organic Act, by amending section 73 thereof, and also the approval of amendments of chapter 78 of the revised laws of Hawaii, 1945, and to approve the making, insuring, or guaranteeing of certain loans; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from the agricultural and labor advisory committees of the Democratic State Central Committee of Nebraska, Grand Island, Nebr., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing reductions in appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, etc.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A petition signed by 30 members of the Citizens' Protective League, Inc., New York, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to permit 5,000,000 German nationals to enter the United States during the next 5 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AIKEN:

A resolution adopted by the Vermont Farm-Labor Conference, at Plainfield, Vt., protesting against the enactment of legislation providing reductions in appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, etc.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. REVERCOMB, from the Committee on Public Works:

H. R. 3792. A bill to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 290).

By Mr. WATKINS, from the Committee on Public Lands:

S. 1315. A bill authorizing certain agreements with respect to rights in helium-bearing gas lands in the Navajo Indian Reservation, N. Mex., and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 289).

By Mr. CAIN, from the Committee on Public Works:

S. 1251. A bill authorizing and directing the Commissioner of Public Buildings to determine the fair market value of the Fidelity Building in Kansas City, Mo., to receive bids for the purchase thereof, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 291).

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 17, 1947, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 26. An act to make criminally liable persons who negligently allow prisoners in their custody to escape;

S. 125. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to extend the benefits of such act to the Official Reporters of Debates in the Senate and persons employed by them in connection with the performance of their duties as such reporters;

S. 321. An act to amend section 17 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, so as to increase the pay of cadets and midshipmen at the service academies, and for other purposes;

S. 597. An act to provide for the protection of forests against destructive insects and diseases, and for other purposes; and

S. 614. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for a permanent Census Office," approved March 6, 1902, as amended (the collection and publication of statistical information by the Bureau of the Census).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 1453. A bill granting to married persons living in non-community-property States who file joint returns the same income-tax treatment as if they lived in community-property States; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. TAFT. I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference four bills. These bills were prepared by the departments, and I am introducing them at their request, without having studied them, in order that the committee may give proper and prompt consideration to them.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bills will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 1454. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act in regard to certain matters of personnel and administration, and for other purposes;

S. 1455. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide grants to postgraduate schools of public health;

S. 1456. A bill to transfer to the employees' compensation fund the payment of benefits in certain cases arising under the civilian war-benefits program; and

S. 1457. A bill to amend the act of September 7, 1916, to authorize certain expenditures from the employees' compensation fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. McFARLAND:

S. 1458. A bill providing for the continuance of compensation or pension payments and a subsistence allowance for certain children of deceased veterans of World War I or II during education or training; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(Mr. CAIN (for himself and Mr. RUSSELL) introduced Senate bill 1459, to provide for the expeditious disposition of certain housing, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce two bills, and ask that they be appropriately referred. They refer to the extension of the Export-Import Control Act and the Second War Powers Act. They are prepared by the departments, but they are now being studied by the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bills will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. COOPER:

S. 1460. A bill to continue in effect section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), as amended, relating to the exportation of certain commodities; and

S. 1461. A bill to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCK (by request):

S. 1462. A bill to authorize the official reporters of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia to collect fees for transcripts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(Mr. HOLLAND introduced Senate bill 1463, to amend section 12 of the Immigration Act of 1917, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 1464. A bill to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BUCK (by request):

S. J. Res. 129. Joint resolution to provide for the appropriate commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the seat of the Federal Government in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

EXPEDITIOUS DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN HOUSING

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill providing for the expeditious disposition of housing or assets owned by the United States which is presently under the control of the Federal Public Housing Authority and United States Housing Authority. It covers the disposal of Lanham Act housing, both permanent and temporary, also the subsistence and Greenbelt towns and other housing transferred to the Federal Public Housing Authority by Executive Order 9070.

Because of World War II our Nation faced the problem of providing housing for military and war workers. The task of supplying this needed housing under the Lanham Act was assigned to the Federal Works Administrator, when the act became law October 14, 1940.

Because of the Federal Works Agency's broad knowledge of this housing the subject bill will transfer for disposal purposes the United States Housing Authority together with all its functions, powers, assets, and duties, together with the functions, powers, assets, and duties of the Federal Public Housing Authority.

I have reason to believe that the FPHA is incapable of disposing of these properties. I refer the Senators to House Document No. 229 which is a report from the Comptroller General of the United States, the Honorable Lindsay C. Warren, who says in his letter of transmittal to the Speaker of the House of Representatives dated April 30, 1947:

The Director of Corporation Audits, General Accounting Office, in transmitting the report of survey to me states that the accounting of the Authority—Federal Public Housing Authority—was found to be inadequate, inaccurate, and otherwise deficient for the fiscal year 1945 and prior years.

He further states that unless Congress takes specific affirmative action that an audit and report for the fiscal year 1945 be made, regardless of the time and cost involved, that none is contemplated.

The bill introduced by the Senator from Georgia and myself provides for—

First. The transfer of housing in the United States Housing Authority together with all the functions, powers, assets, and duties of the Federal Public Housing Authority, to the Federal Works Agency;

Second. Sale and disposal of this housing for cash as expeditiously as possible on or before December 31, 1948;

Third. An amendment to title VI of the National Housing Act to provide for eligibility for insurance under section 603 or 608 of this title;

Fourth. Preference to veterans in the purchase of this housing; and

Fifth. Continuance of the policy provided for by the Congress in the Lanham act that this housing is to be disposed of as expeditiously as possible, and that it cannot be conveyed to any public or private agency for subsidized housing without express approval of the Congress.

I am of the firm opinion that the FPHA has not complied with, nor does it show any intention of complying with, the clear intent of the Lanham Act to sell and dispose of these properties as expeditiously as possible. The record of the agency speaks for itself.

The House Banking and Currency Committee, in its report accompanying H. R. 3492, recommending that permanent Lanham act housing be transferred to the Federal Works Agency, said in part:

The committee is compelled to recommend the transfer of such duties (of FPHA in disposal) back to the Federal Works Administrator, who originally had such jurisdiction prior to Executive Order 9070 of 1942. Illustrative of the policy of FPHA in this regard (disposal of properties) is the fact that they have reserved many more units for transfer to low-rent public housing and slum clearance use than they have actually disposed of. Moreover, of the 10,167 units disposed of up to the present time, approximately one-half have been off-site demountables and about one-third have been transfers to the Army and Navy. Of the remainder only 400 units have been cash sales, while sales of 1,185 units were made on long-term credit ranging from 40 to 45 years. It is evident to the committee (House Banking and Currency) that the Federal Public Housing Authority has shown little intention of disposing of these thousands of housing accommodations in a manner which would result in home ownership by the ultimate occupants.

The subject bill, in providing veterans' preference in the purchase of these housing accommodations, will make available reasonably priced housing for veterans of World War II. To aid veterans in financing the purchase of these properties, the bill amends the National Housing Act to make such properties eligible for FHA insurance of 90 percent of the appraised value, on a mortgage up to 25 years.

The junior Senator from Washington and the junior Senator from Georgia feel

strongly that the bill in question will be of constructive assistance in seeking further solutions for our national housing problem.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1459) to provide for the expeditious disposition of certain housing, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CAIN (for himself and Mr. RUSSELL), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION ACT OF 1917

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 12 of the Immigration Act of 1917 and request that a written explanation of the contents of the bill may be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the explanation presented by the Senator from Florida will be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1463) to amend section 12 of the Immigration Act of 1917, introduced by Mr. HOLLAND, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

There being no objection, the written explanation presented by Mr. HOLLAND was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION ACCOMPANYING BILL AMENDING EIGHTH UNITED STATES CODE, PAGE 148

This bill in no way lets down the bars on immigration. It merely puts steamship lines on a parity with air lines so far as elimination of unnecessary duplication of information on alien manifests is concerned.

The bulk of transocean passenger travel today is by air, and the great mass of passengers coming to America today, both aliens and nationals, come by plane. There were almost 300,000 civilian passengers arriving in the United States by air during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946 (the last year for which reports are available), considerably in excess of those arriving by ship.

The paper work required of steamships bringing aliens to this country was set up 30 years ago by section 12 of the 1917 Immigration Act (8 U. S. C. 148). Although the act was supplemented in 1924, to require immigration visas, no provision was made to eliminate duplication of records so that the same information is required twice, in the visa and on the manifest (sec. 7, act of 1924, 8 U. S. C. 207 (a) to 207 (h)).

The 1940 acts (Nationality Act of 1940, 8 U. S. C. 728, and the Alien Registration Act of 1940, 8 U. S. C. 451) came along and created still a third duplication of the same information on arriving aliens.

When provision was made for air travel regulations by the Air Commerce Act of 1926 (49 U. S. C. 177 (e)), Congress very sensibly provided that the Attorney General was "authorized * * * by regulation to provide for the application to civil air navigation of the laws and regulations relating to the administration of the immigration laws to such extent and upon such conditions as he deems necessary." Accordingly, the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, with the approval of the Attorney General, has by up-to-date regulations eliminated the unnecessary duplication of records on alien passengers arriving by air. He has been able to simplify and improve the method of controlling the arrival and departure of alien visitors arriving by air.

The purpose of the attached bill is simply to bring up to date the procedure as to steamship passengers, and to give to the Attorney General the authority to handle the documentation of steamship passengers on the same basis as he handles airline passengers.

The Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization recently made still further advances in the handling of air-line alien travel so as to better control such aliens while in the United States. In a prepared statement on this general subject before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in Washington on June 10, 1947, the Commissioner said:

"We desire to make a similar simplification in the manifesting of aliens arriving by steamship but are prevented from taking such action by the rather explicit provisions of section 12 of the Immigration Act of 1917 (act of February 5, 1917). This section sets forth 34 specific questions which must be answered on the manifest for each arriving alien passenger. The Immigration Act of 1924 and the Alien Registration Act of 1940, require that the same information as is required by the 1917 act and some additional must be included in the alien's visa which he is required to surrender to our Service at the time of such alien's admission to the United States. This has resulted in unnecessary duplication of records and annoyances to the traveler.

"The Congress may wish to consider the amendment of section 12 of the act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 874) so that the Commissioner of Immigration, with the approval of the Attorney General, may by regulation prescribe the form and content of the manifest of aliens arriving by vessel thus putting travel by water on the same basis as travel by air insofar as documentation is concerned."

It will be observed, therefore, that this bill will in no way lessen or remove any of the bars on immigration. It simply puts air and steamship passengers on the same basis so far as the paper work of documentation is concerned.

PROPOSED RULE REGARDING PRINTING OF MATTERS IN THE RECORD

Mr. JENNER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 127), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That hereafter no written or printed matter shall be received for printing in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of the remarks of any Senator unless such matter (1) shall have been read orally by such Senator on the floor of the Senate, or (2) shall have been offered and received for printing in such manner as to indicate clearly that the contents thereof were not read orally by such Senator on the floor of the Senate. All such matter shall be printed in the RECORD in accordance with the rules prescribed by the Joint Committee on Printing. No request shall be entertained by the Presiding Officer to suspend by unanimous consent the requirements of this resolution.

CAROLYN CRUM ORBELLO

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit a resolution to pay a gratuity to Carolyn Crum Orbello.

Let me say that Mrs. Elsie M. Orbello was appointed a telephone operator for the Senate on July 1, 1933. After having served 13 years, Mrs. Orbello died on November 13, 1946, while still employed by the Senate.

In line with the custom, which has always been followed, the resolution has been prepared. It would give Mrs. Carolyn Crum Orbello, her daughter-in-law, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death.

Mrs. Elsie M. Orbello's only child, a son, died on March 12, 1946, leaving his wife and two daughters, Carol Ann, who is now 3 years and 9 months of age, and Frances Patricia, 2 years and 6 months of age. As the two grandchildren are the only living blood relatives of Mrs. Orbello, it is felt that their mother should be the logical beneficiary of the attached resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 128), submitted by Mr. BUSHFIELD, was received and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Carolyn Crum Orbello, daughter-in-law of Elise M. Orbello, late an employee of the Senate, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN AGREEMENTS BETWEEN CARRIERS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. RUSSELL and Mr. TAYLOR each submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the bill (S. 110) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FACILITY AT CLARKSBURG, W. VA.—AMENDMENTS

Mr. KILGORE submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1369) to authorize the Veterans' Administration to acquire certain land as a site for the proposed Veterans' Administration facility at Clarksburg, W. Va., and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed.

DISTRICT SCHOOL TEACHERS' SALARIES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD], and myself, I ask unanimous consent to submit amendments intended to be proposed to the bill (S. 1346) to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred or ordered to be placed on the Calendar, as follows:

H. R. 599. An act declaring Kenduskeag Stream, Penebscot County, Maine, to be a nonnavigable waterway;

H. R. 1610. An act to amend the act of June 14, 1938, so as to authorize the Cairo Bridge Commission to issue its refunding bonds for the purpose of refunding the outstanding bonds issued by the commission to pay the cost of a certain toll bridge at or near Cairo, Ill.;

H. R. 2293. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate navigation on the Great Lakes and their connecting and tributary waters," approved February 8, 1895;

H. R. 2721. An act to amend the act of March 10, 1934, entitled "An act to promote the conservation of wildlife, fish, and game, and for other purposes," as amended by the act approved August 14, 1946; and

H. R. 3333. An act to authorize the transfer of the *Joseph Conrad* to the Marine Historical Association of Mystic, Conn., for museum and youth-training purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1380. An act to amend the laws relating to the payment of 6 months' death gratuity to dependents of naval and Army personnel;

H. R. 2314. An act to amend section 12 of the Naval Aviation Cadet Act of 1942, as amended, and to amend section 2 of the act of June 16, 1936, as amended, so as to authorize lump-sum payments under the said acts to the survivors of deceased officers without administration of estates;

H. R. 3053. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Territory of Hawaii an easement for public highway and utility purposes in certain parcels of land in the district of Ewa, T. H.;

H. R. 3055. An act to permit the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War to supply utilities and related services to welfare activities, and persons whose business or residences are in the immediate vicinity of naval or military activities and require utilities or related services not otherwise obtainable locally, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3056. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Macon, Ga., and Bibb County, Ga., an easement for public road and utility purposes in certain Government-owned lands situated in Bibb County, Ga., and for other purposes;

H. R. 3191. An act to amend Public Law 301, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved February 18, 1946, so as to extend the benefits of the Missing Persons Act, approved March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143), as amended, to certain members of the organized military forces of the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines;

H. R. 3251. An act to amend the act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 603), as amended, so as to authorize naval retiring boards to consider the cases of certain officers, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3252. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Long Beach, Calif., for street purposes an easement in certain lands within the Navy housing project at Long Beach, Calif; and

H. R. 3394. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the evacuation and return of the remains of certain persons who died and are buried outside the continental limits of the United States," approved May 16, 1946, in order to provide for the shipment of the remains of World War II dead to the homeland of the deceased or of next of kin, to provide for the disposition of group and mass burials, to provide for the burial of unknown American World War II dead in United States military cemeteries to be established overseas, to authorize the Secretary of War to acquire land overseas and to establish United States military cemeteries thereon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1945. An act to amend sections 2801 (e) (4), 3043 (a), 3044 (b), and 3045 of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 1946. An act to amend section 2801 (e) of the Internal Revenue Code; and

H. R. 1947. An act to amend section 2800 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 2167. An act to authorize the inclusion within the Angostura unit of the Missouri Basin project of certain lands owned by the United States;

H. R. 2878. An act to amend the act approved May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602), as amended, to revise the roll of the Indians of California provided therein; and

H. R. 3309. An act to amend the Organic Act of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2746. An act to provide secretaries for circuit and district judges;

H. R. 3149. An act to amend the act approved December 28, 1945 (Public Law 271, 79th Cong.), entitled "An act to expedite the admission to the United States of alien spouses and alien minor children of citizen members of the United States armed forces";

H. R. 3398. An act to extend the period of validity of the act to facilitate the admission into the United States of the alien fiancées or fiancés of members of the armed forces of the United States; and

H. R. 3769. An act to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to qualifications of part-time referees in bankruptcy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3072. An act to authorize the preparation of preliminary plans and estimates of cost of for the erection of an addition or extension to the House Office Buildings and the remodeling of the fifth floor of the Old House Office Building; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 3138. An act to provide for the periodic audit of the records of the accountable officers of the Senate and House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

H. R. 3372. An act authorizing certain agreements with respect to rights in helium-bearing gas lands in the Navajo Indian Reservation, N. Mex., and for other purposes; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and withdrawing a nomination, which nominations were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary may conduct a hearing this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

THE SOUTH, ITS PROBLEMS AND ADVANCEMENT—ADDRESS BY SENATOR SPARKMAN

[Mr. SPARKMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The South, Its Problems and Advancement," delivered by him before the Federal Bar Association, at Washington, D. C., on May 21, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

DECENTRALIZATION OF GOVERNMENT

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD correspondence between him and the Bureau of the Budget regarding decentralization of government, together with a statement prepared by him on the subject, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE TAX VETO—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Tax Veto," from the New York Times of June 17, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

GERMAN FOREIGN TRADE—ADDRESS BY M. S. SZYMCZAK

[Mr. COOPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Our Interest in German Foreign Trade," delivered on June 13, 1947, by M. S. Szymczak, of the Office of Military Government for Germany, which appears in the Appendix.]

MEMORIAL DAY STATEMENT BY LT. GEN. JAMES H. DOOLITTLE

[Mr. COOPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by Lt. Gen. James H. Doolittle for the Memorial Day services at Union College, Barbourville, Ky., and read in his behalf by Hon. T. C. Sizemore, which appears in the Appendix.]

CAUSES OF THE HIGH COST OF LIVING—ARTICLE BY EDSON B. SMITH

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relative to causes of the high cost of living, written by Edson B. Smith and published in the Boston Herald, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO HON. THOMAS BUTLER PEARCE

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a tribute to the memory of the late Thomas Butler Pearce, of Columbia, S. C., prepared under the direction of the South Carolina Research, Planning and Development Board, which appears in the Appendix.]

INVESTIGATION OF APPOINTMENT OF CERTAIN POSTMASTERS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 81) authorizing the Committee on Civil Service to investigate the appointment of first-, second-, or third-class postmasters.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The first committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 5, after the word "investigation", it is proposed to strike out "as to why few if any Republicans have been appointed to the offices of first-, second-, or third-class postmasters for the last fourteen years, how many Republicans have been removed", and insert "as to political activities in the civil service in the appoint-

ment of postmaster of first-, second-, and third-class postmasters."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair calls the attention of the Senator from North Dakota to what seems to be a typographical error.

Mr. LANGER. I was about to ask that that be corrected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the words "postmaster of", in line 9, will be deleted, so that the amendment will read "as to political activities in the civil service in the appointment of first-, second-, and third-class postmasters."

Under the order of the Senate, the time from now until 3:30 is divided equally, under the control respectively, of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]. To whom does the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. LANGER. If he desires to do so, the Senator from Illinois may proceed. I will ask the Senator how long he wants.

Mr. HAYDEN rose.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I want to inquire of the Senator from North Dakota, in charge of the resolution, whether he really wants the full $35,000 which is provided by the resolution?

Mr. LANGER. Yes; I think that amount will be required.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands the Senator from Illinois yields to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield 10 minutes, or such time as he may desire, to the Senator from Arizona.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I inquire as to the amount of money to be expended, because, if, as provided in the resolution there is to be an investigation as to why so few Republicans have been appointed postmasters between 1933 and 1947, it would be a perfect waste of time and public money to undertake such an investigation. The answer to such an inquiry is well known and completely understood before such investigation could be started. The obvious answer is that there have been Democratic national administrations during the past 15 years which have followed the precedents firmly established by the Republican administrations during the 12 years from 1921 to 1933 when very few Democrats became postmasters.

I have here some very interesting statistics as to postmaster appointments. This is a tabulation which I shall place in the RECORD. It shows that in the year 1920, which was the last year of the Wilson administration, 3,847 postmaster nominations were confirmed by the Senate. In 1921, the first year of the Harding administration, 76 postmaster nominations were confirmed by the Senate. In 1922, after President Harding issued an Executive order providing that any one of the three highest eligibles might be selected, making it possible to have a political choice among the three, the nominations jumped from 76 the year before, when they were all tied up pending a determination of that matter, to 7,492. In other words, the Republicans appointed the postmasters at that time. I shall continue the tabulation down through the years.

We come to 1932 when a similar situation existed. In that year, the last year of the Hoover administration, there were 4,840 confirmations of postmasters by the Senate. In 1933, with the advent of the Roosevelt administration, there were 90 confirmations. As Senators will remember, the session which met on December 5, 1932, and adjourned on March 3, 1933, was the last so-called short session of Congress. Nothing was done with respect to the nominations which were sent up during that December session. They all went over; they all lapsed, all having failed of confirmation, and the appointees all had to be renominated under the new administration.

While the difference in number, as compared to 1921, was not quite so radical, yet in 1934 the number of nominations under the Roosevelt administration increased to 4,698. That has been going on all the years since the plan was adopted of permitting the selection of any one of the three highest eligibles. We allowed for political selections all during the Republican administration. What happened then was that when a civil-service examination was held, and the names of one or two or three eligibles were sent over to the Post Office Department, a letter was written to the Republican Representative, or if there were no Republican Representative from the district, then to the Republican Senator, and if there were none, then to the Republican national committeeman, stating: "The Civil Service Commission has certified these names. We would like your advice as to who should be appointed"; and the Post Office Department always followed the advice.

I ask unanimous consent that the tabulation to which I have referred may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERESTING STATISTICS

This tabulation of the number of Presidential postmasters appointed during the fiscal years, 1920 to 1946, is significant:

Fiscal year ended June 30:	*Presidential offices*
1920	3,847
1921	76
1922	7,492
1923	3,140
1924	4,289
1925	1,881
1926	6,177
1927	3,591
1928	4,503
1929	2,290
1930	5,653
1931	3,077
1932	4,840
1933	90
1934	4,698
1935	3,369
1936	5,752
1937	933
1938	4,076
1939	1,133
1940	7,935
1941	1,630
1942	1,974
1943	3,322
1944	1,856
1945	2,752
1946	3,348

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the National Civil Service Reform League looked into this matter back in June 1922, after the Harding administration was well established in power, and complained that there were political selections. They appointed a committee to investigate the matter. I read from a committee report printed in Good Government, the monthly publication of the National Civil Service Reform League, which states:

POLITICAL WORKERS PREFERRED

The committee has abundant proof as to the motives which animate the Congressmen to whom this patronage is given. The report says:

"He uses it in many cases for his own political purposes. He takes the man recommended by his district committee or his county committee or whatever political organization it is upon which he has himself depended for his election. Congressman John Jacob Rogers, of Massachusetts, writes to President Dana, of the League, November 9, 1921: 'I feel it my duty to comply with every request of the Post Office Department for a recommendation.' But this duty has its profitable side."

This same Congressman, the report shows, explained in a letter to the leading candidate for postmaster at Woburn, Mass., a man who had served 8 years in the post office, and who had sacrificed his business to go to the front in the late war, that he had recommended another, the lowest man on the list, one Sam Highley, because:

"He has been my principal Woburn representative in each of my five congressional contests. He has always been in charge of my nomination papers in Woburn, and has been the man to whom I have always turned first in every campaign. Thus I feel under unusual obligations to Sam, who has never in 9 years asked me for anything for himself."

Congressman Rodenberg, of Illinois, wrote to the highest man on the list for postmaster at Nashville, Ill., as follows:

"I have always made it a rule to follow the recommendation of the regularly elected organization in matters of this kind. The members of the committee recommended the appointment of Mr. Henley (the second man on the list)."

In the office at East Chicago, Ind., a Democrat headed the list. The second man, a Republican, was appointed upon the recommendation of Congressman Will R. Wood who thus explained the reason:

"I was prompted to give my endorsement to Mr. Spencer because the entire organization, insofar as I know, insisted upon my doing it."

In regard to the appointment of a postmaster at Long Eddy, N. Y., Senator WADSWORTH wrote:

"I always rely to a great extent upon the advice of the Congressman from the district, who it is presumed seeks the advice of the leading local Republicans and the county Republican committee."

Senator Frank B. Willis, of Ohio, in answer to an inquiry why women are not appointed, wrote:

"Then because we believe in party, not personal, government, we have asked the successful candidate to secure the endorsement of the Republican committee, who is the body upon which the party must depend for its work back home * * *. As time goes on, more and more women will be considered and appointed, but just now it is most natural that more men should be, for they have longer done political work which deserves reward."

I am sure that, so far as the present situation is concerned, the proposed investigation will disclose nothing done by

any Democratic Representative or any Democratic Senator that was not duplicated many times by Republican Representatives and Republican Senators during the 12 years the Republicans were in control of the Government.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Did not the Democratic Party, however, cover into the civil service a large number of appointees in 1937 and 1938, and was that not done so as to remove them from this general treatment?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; the change in the law did not require a covering in. It required that if a civil-service examination were held the one selected to be postmaster would receive an appointment without term. So the effect of the change in the law is that, instead of permitting the Republicans, if they should gain control of the Government, to take advantage of a situation whereby when a post-office commission should expire they could appoint a Republican to the office, if he happened to be among the three highest on the list, there will be no examination.

Mr. TAFT. The whole spirit of the law was the idea of placing postmasters under fair civil-service requirements and decreasing the amount of political influence in the appointment of postmasters. Was not that the very purpose of the act—at least the alleged purpose of the act?

Mr. HAYDEN. All I know is that Congress did what ought to have been done a long time ago. Postmasters were placed under civil service. Before that law was passed it was entirely within the power of any President to take all the postmasters out of civil service any time he saw fit to do so. President Wilson, in his second term, placed them all under civil service and required that the high man be appointed.

Mr. TAFT. The purpose certainly was not to give the Democrats a life tenure so that they never could be removed after the Republicans came in. Was not the purpose to make them subject to civil-service requirements and rules, so that the influence of politics would be largely diminished in the appointment of postmasters?

Mr. HAYDEN. But so long as there is no change in the law which provides that any one of the three highest may be selected, political considerations are bound to enter into the picture. Instead of following the precedent set by President Wilson, who said that all postmaster appointments should all be under Civil Service, and that the highest person on the list should be selected without further choice, President Harding, by Executive order—there was no law on the subject—provided that there should be a choice among the three highest eligibles. The result was, as I have stated, that when three names were submitted from the Civil Service Commission, the Postmaster General immediately notified the Republican Representative or Republican Senator, or the Republican national committeeman, as the case might be, and they made a recommendation; and during the 12 years practically all appointments were of Republicans, where Republicans could be found.

When the situation changed, the Democrats, following that Republican precedent, did the same thing. That is what the law provides for now. The only way to change it would be to provide by law that there should be a civil-service examination, and that the No. 1 eligible should be selected. It is a debatable question whether we should rely wholly on the judgment of the Civil Service Commission or whether there should be some choice in the hands of the administrative officer, if he desires someone other than the highest eligible.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator does not suggest, does he, that the provision allowing a selection from among the first three was purposely made in order to permit political appointments? Surely the purpose was to give the administrative officer discretion in choosing among the two or three at the top of the list, and deciding who might be the better postmaster. Was not that the purpose of the law? The only purpose of this resolution is to find out whether the spirit of that law has been complied with. I can say to the Senator that in cases in which we find that it has been complied with, we certainly propose to recommend confirmation of the nominations. On the other hand, I do not recognize the Senator's suggestion that the selection of postmasters from among the first three can be made solely on the basis of political considerations. The committee certainly will not accept that theory in its investigation.

Mr. HAYDEN. All I am reciting is history. I am telling the Senator exactly what happened during the 12 years of Republican administration, and I am telling him what has happened up to now. When there was a choice, the Democratic administration consulted the Democratic Representative, the Democratic Senator, or the Democratic national committeeman; and until the law is changed, undoubtedly that will continue to be the practice. If the judgment of the Senator, Representative, or national committeeman is worth anything, there probably will be better appointments than otherwise would be made.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand from the Senator's remarks, it was under President Wilson's administration that all postmasters were placed under civil service by Executive order; and the No. 1 eligible on the list received the appointment, regardless of any political recommendations.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is exactly true.

Mr. LUCAS. When the Republicans came into power under the Harding administration in 1920, President Harding, by Executive order, removed the ban which had been placed on politics by throwing the post offices back into the political arena again.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is exactly what happened.

Mr. LUCAS. Giving the Republican organization throughout the country—county, State and Nation—the right to select one of the three eligibles.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. President Harding provided, as President Wilson did, that no postmaster could be appointed except as the result of a civil service examination. However, any one of the three highest eligibles might be selected. President Harding stated in his Executive order that this followed the precedent established throughout the Government generally with respect to civil service.

Mr. LUCAS. That is exactly what we are doing today under a Democratic administration. The only difference between postmasters serving at that time and those serving now is that at that time postmasters served for a term of 4 years, and under the law passed in 1938 they now serve a life term.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Am I to understand from the Snator's statement that, as he understands, political considerations in the appointment of postmasters are perfectly proper, and have always been, and are a part of the picture today, and that we are not entitled to raise the question as to whether such considerations are proper?

Mr. HAYDEN. I am not denying to the Senator from Ohio the right to raise any question he may desire to raise.

Mr. TAFT. As I understand, the Senator says that since three are certified, so long as that practice continues appointments will be made on a political basis, affected by the recommendations of Senators and Representatives who are members of the party making the appointments? Is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. I am addressing myself to the Langer resolution, which seeks to spend $35,000 to find out why few, if any, Republicans have been appointed to the offices of first-, second-, or third-class postmasters for the past 14 years. I can tell the Senator why. Instead of costing $35,000, it will not cost 35 cents. I know the answer.

Mr. TAFT. The answer is that these appointments are made on a political basis.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. If they are to be made on a political basis, why should the two Senators from Ohio approve any Democratic appointments made on a political basis? If they are to be made on a political basis, why should not Republican Senators have the appointments? I deny the whole thesis of the Senator. I say that the latitude given in the selection of one of the three highest eligibles is intended to enable the administrative officer to make the best possible selection on a nonpolitical basis. If the Senator admits that the appointments are made on a political basis, there is no reason for confirming any appointments made on a political basis.

Mr. HAYDEN. The method of making postmaster appointments was changed during the Harding administration, and

the precedent then established was followed during the Republican administrations of President Coolidge and President Hoover.

Mr. TAFT. I am not saying that there was no politics. I am saying that the system contemplates that there shall be none. If the Senator says there is, and should be, then I see no reason why the Senate should confirm any Democratic appointments on that basis. I say that that is not the proper basis for appointments. We are trying to find out whether appointments are being made in accordance with the letter and spirit of the civil service laws; and I am saying that when appointments are made on that basis they will be confirmed.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. What amazes me is the unusual political virtue being displayed by the Senator from Ohio. The late President Harding came from his State. He took civil service absolutely out of the picture so far as postmasters were concerned. Now the able Senator from Ohio gives us a solemn lecture on morality in connection with the appointment of postmasters. Why was the law so framed as to give the right to select from the eligible register the first, second, or third? If we had wanted to do what the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] says he thinks should have been done, we would have passed a law making No. 1 the selection. But under the law the Civil Service Commission and the Post Office Department have the right to select the first, second, or third on the list unless a veteran has preference. Certainly what is being done today is following a political pattern that was set by the Harding administration; and it is amazing and unusual to find another great Ohioan practically denying that the Republicans have ever practiced politics in the appointment of postmasters.

Mr. HAYDEN. The interesting thing about the situation is this: There are now 927 appointments being held up in the Committee on Civil Service. Of that number there are 501 who are first on the list. There should be no necessity at all for holding those 501 nominations in committee. If we are to adopt as a principle that the No. 1 man or woman is the only one who can be appointed, then the nomination of any person who is No. 1 on the list, and who has been recommended, should be promptly confirmed.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Maryland such time as he may wish to use.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland is recognized for such time as he may desire to use.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, in discussing this matter I think the first thing to do is array the facts in their proper order and, as nearly as possible without dispute.

During the administration of President Wilson the President issued an Executive order which said in effect that henceforth persons taking competitive civil-service examinations would be eligible for appointment to office in accordance with their standing on the register. Therefore if a man stood first in a competitive examination and received the appointment, it did not make any difference whether he was a Democrat or a Republican. The position went to the man who was best qualified, regardless of political party.

That order remained in effect until Mr. Harding became President of the United States. He modified the order and said that the same principle would prevail, with the qualification that henceforth the three highest on the list would be selected—not the first highest, as Mr. Wilson had provided—and from the three highest a person could be selected and the position filled. The net result of that was that Mr. WADSWORTH, of New York, a very distinguished Member of the House of Representatives and for a long time a distinguished Member of the Senate, freely admitted in the testimony which has been referred to that when he received three names he immediately wrote to the Republican political committeeman in the county affected and took the recommendation of the Republican organization in that county in filling the office.

If there is any criticism of this system, it is a Republican system which stems from the fact that President Harding struck down the qualifications prescribed by Woodrow Wilson that the first man on the eligible list, whether he was a Democrat or a Republican, was entitled to the office. So if there is anything wrong, if there is anything lacking in good morals or good government or good civil-service practice, then my friends on the other side of the aisle are fouling their own nest, because they created the situation against which they are now complaining. I think that pretty well presents the facts as they appear in this picture.

As for myself, I would rather never have within my control a political appointment for any office in the gift of the Government. There is nothing I hate more than the dispensation of patronage. The postmaster in my home town of Havre de Grace, Md., is a Republican. He had worked in the Post Office Department all his life. He comes from a partisan Republican family—a very fine family, but a Republican family. He stood first on the list, and when the time came I said that if he passed first he would get the job. He did pass first, and no Democrat on the list was considered for the position.

During my early service in this body the postmaster of Baltimore City was a Republican, and a fine man. His name was Woelper. He held the position for a while, and on his demise the next in line was a gentleman named Green, who was the first assistant postmaster, with 30 years' service in the post office. My colleague and I, former Senator Radcliffe, joined in making Mr. Green the successor to Mr. Woelper. When Mr. Green resigned not long ago we chose the first assistant postmaster under Mr. Green, another career man, with 30 years or more of service, and made him the postmaster of Baltimore City.

So I think I can come before this body with reasonably clean hands in this matter and not as a hypocrite who denounces politics in one breath and then connives to have the situation so arranged that politics may reenter it under the aegis of party practices.

There is nothing to be ascertained by this resolution that we cannot find out without the expenditure of a single dollar. We can send down to the Civil Service Commission and ask for the examination results in each of the post offices. We can ask who stood first, second, and third in any examination and find out whether or not the top man, the second man, or the third man was selected. If we want to adhere to the philosophy that only the first man shall be selected, we can ask the Civil Service Commission which of all these nominees stood first on the list, which of all of them stood second on the list, and which of all of them stood third on the list; and then if we want to employ the policy that no one but the top man shall hereafter be a postmaster, we can confirm all of those who stood first in the competitive-examination list and reject all those who stood second and third. I think it will be found that in some cases men who stood second were nominated largely because they were ex-servicemen with fine war records. Some of them were wounded; a few of them were seriously disabled. I, myself, would not hesitate, if it were a reasonably close choice, to throw the position in favor of the man who had gone forth to serve his country in her hour of need, rather than to choose the first man on the list, who had made no great contribution of a similar character to the service of his country.

What information is sought by this resolution that cannot be ascertained without the expenditure of a dollar? I can write to the Civil Service Commission this afternoon and inquire, "Of all the nominations for postmasters sent to the Senate, which ones stood second and third on the list?" I would presume that all the others whose names have been sent here stood first on the list. If that is to be the program of our friends on the other side of the aisle, then we can confirm the nominations of all those who stood first on the list and end it. Then both we and the country will know that in the future the Senate will not confirm the nomination of anyone who does not stand first on the list, as Woodrow Wilson decreed. But President Harding changed that system to the present system when he came into the office. It was Wilson who said that no one but the highest eligible should receive a postmaster appointment. It was President Harding who said that the appointment might be given to any one of the top three men on the list, and that is the system that now is being condemned.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I point out to the Senator, in view of the remarks he has made, that of the 927 nominations sent to the Senate by the President, 501 were selections of the highest eligibles from the registers submitted by the Civil Service Commission, and of those 501, 243 have military preference. So more than one-half are No. 1 on the eligible register.

Mr. TYDINGS. Then, certainly, there is no reason for holding up confirmation of the appointments of the 501 who stood first on the list.

Mr. President, if we are to act in good faith in an attempt to eliminate those who were not first on the eligible list, and to subject them to some sort of an investigation, a plausible case might be made out under that circumstance. But if it is the wish, as I supose it is, on the part of the able chairman of the committee, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and those who serve with him on the Civil Service Committee, not to attack those who stood first on the list, then in good faith the 501 persons who stood first on the list should have their nominations confirmed.

My friend, the Senator from Ohio, a moment ago said, "What justification have I as a Republican Senator in voting for Democratic postmasters in the State of Ohio?" Mr. President, I admire the Senator from Ohio. He is perhaps as industrious a man in this body as I have ever encountered. His contributions to the welfare of the Government are much greater, in my opinion, than he has generally received credit for. But that remark was beneath the great Senator from Ohio. If things are to have a political complexion and if the power of appointment resides in the occupant of the White House, does the President have to take a second position, and say to the Senator from Ohio, "I should like to know whom you would like me to appoint in Ohio, so that I may carry your favor and support in the Senate"?

Mr. President, under the Constitution the appointing power resides in the President of the United States.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland whether he has been consulted by the administration in regard to any appointments that have been sent to the Senate.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; I have. What does the Senator mean by "consulted by the administration"?

Mr. BALDWIN. I mean by the White House or by the Post Office Department.

Mr. TYDINGS. Personally?

Mr. BALDWIN. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. No.

Mr. BALDWIN. That is to say, the opinion of the Senator from Maryland on any of these nominations has not been asked in any way, shape, or manner?

Mr. TYDINGS. I cannot recall that the Post Office Department has ever discussed them with me personally.

Mr. BALDWIN. Or the White House?

Mr. TYDINGS. Or the White House. I have not received a single, solitary piece of patronage, bar two positions, I may say, one in a foreign field and one high up in the Government where special qualifications were required.

But as to the Post Office Department, I say now, and I mean it, that I do not want to be consulted. I do not have time to fool with 2,000 or 3,000 pieces of patronage, and neither does any other Senator. The job here in the Senate demands a Senator's entire time; and if he becomes a dispenser of patronage, he will only rob his constituents by devoting to such extraneous matters time which must, perforce, be taken from the more important pieces of legislation coming before the Government.

Mr. BALDWIN. I have asked the question because I have understood that some Senators have been consulted in regard to appointments. I wish to say that I, for one, have never been; and I also wish to say that I, for one, share the views of the distinguished Senator from Maryland on the subject of patronage.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am glad the Senator from Connecticut does.

Mr. BALDWIN. I wish we had nothing to do with it.

On the other hand, it was apparent to our committee, from complaints which were made to individual members of the committee, that in some cases there was a possibility that favoritism had been shown, and in some cases repeated examinations had been held, and in some cases temporary appointees had held office for as long as 13 years. Our committee, since it is the Committee on Civil Service, felt that we were under the duty of investigating the effectiveness of the civil-service system with regards not only to this field of appointments, but to others, as well. That is the main purpose of the resolution.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think we can only make progress by conceding the obvious. There is no doubt in my mind that some political tinge and complexion creeps in here and there in these appointments. But what do we suppose other than that could have happened when President Harding issued his order which says that no longer would the No. 1 man on the list receive the appointment, but that anyone who stood in the first three positions on the list could be appointed. So, to be perfectly fair—and all I want to be is fair—I ask the Senator whether he will admit that by that act, President Harding struck down the top and sole issue of efficiency, and opened the door to political considerations. Is not that a fact?

Mr. BALDWIN. I would not say it is a fact. I would say it is a possibility.

On the other hand, having had some experience with the civil-service system, I am inclined to believe that sometimes, although the top man on the list may be able to make the highest score on a written examination, some other man, who might be second or third in the written examination, might have other qualifications which would fit him preeminently for the post.

Mr. TYDINGS. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. BALDWIN. What President Harding did may have been wrong; but I should like to remind the Senator from Maryland that in 1938, when the Senator's party was in control of both branches of Congress, an act was passed freezing into office every postmaster, first class, second class, and third class, in the entire country; and I have heard members of the distinguished Senator's own party find fault, themselves, with that sort of program.

Let me say to the Senator that two wrongs never made a right. They will not do so in this particular case. But it seems to me that if we are going to have effectiveness in the administration of the civil-service system, we had better find out now what is wrong with it.

Only this morning, in a discussion which we had in the Civil Service Committee, it appeared that under the present civil-service law a temporary appointment may be made for an indefinite period. If that is a fact, then that power under the act gives wide latitude and possibility for political manipulation, and in the end will entirely destroy the civil-service system. If that possibility exists, then I think the law should be amended in that particular regard.

I also think, in addressing myself to the pending resolution, that if there has been any misuse or misapplication of the law in connection with the appointment of postmasters, now is the time to find it out. If we find out that there has not been any misapplication, I shall be the first man to admit it as a member of the committee.

On the other hand, if we find that there are weaknesses in the law, I shall use my best efforts to try to correct them, not in the interest of partisan policies, but in the interest of public service; and that is the reason why I support this resolution.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Connecticut for his contribution; but let me say to him that the matter of freezing the postmasters under the civil-service system in 1938 is not embraced in this resolution. That is simply a sort of red herring that is dragged in from the outside as a counterpoise to the very devastating position the majority party has gotten itself into by now denouncing the very system which one of their great Presidents forced on the country when he struck down the right of a man to be appointed to public office if he stood in the No. 1 position on the eligible list. There is nothing in this resolution which deals with the freezing into office all postmasters in 1938. All the resolution relates to is the matter I have been discussing, namely, whether the first, second, or third man on the eligible list was selected without political coercion or influence. That is what is before us. I respectfully submit that what the Senators on the other side of the aisle are doing is denouncing a system which their own leader created, and trying to erect a system which their own leader struck down as ostensibly standing for the thing which Woodrow Wilson gave to the country, although they took it away but a few years thereafter.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. Does the Senator think that if the system which was inaugurated by a former Republican President was wrong, the fact that it was inaugurated by a Republican President ought to bind us on this side of the aisle indefinitely to its preservation? If that system was wrong, then let us find out about it, I, for one, care not whether it was inaugurated by a Republican or Democrat, if it is wrong let us find out why it is wrong and where it

is wrong, and change it. In the discussion now we are dealing with the dead hand of the past. Let us bring the matter up to the present, and let us find out what is going on, and why; and that is the purpose of the resolution.

Mr. TYDINGS. I always like to engage in reasoning with my genial friend from Connecticut. I serve on some committees with him, and I enjoy it, and he is very constructive—as a rule. I am going to say that in this particular case "Methinks the lady doth protest too much." I have an idea that in the subconscious mind of my good and able friend from Connecticut there are visions of 1948 and perhaps, perhaps, perhaps, all these fine arguments about detachments, all these fine arguments about putting the able man up, regardless of party—

> Like snow upon the desert's dusty face,
> Lighting a little hour or two—is gone.

I have no idea at all other than that, with the election of a Republican President, we will never hear another word about political influence in this august body from the other side of the aisle. Rather, to be frank about it, the criticism will likely come from this side of the aisle.

We should not get into that frame of mind. A post office may not mean much to a Senator, or Representative, or governor, but it means a great deal to the little fellow who was first on the eligible list and got the President of the United States to endorse him. His nomination probably has been before the Senate for many months, and his wife probably says to him at the supper table.

"John, have you heard anything from Washington?"

"Yes; I got a letter today from my Senator."

"What did he say?"

"He admitted that I stood first on the list. He said it was true that I had a good military record. He said it was true that the President had actually named me, had sent my nomination to the Senate, but he says that for some reason he has not yet been able to define, notwithstanding I am first on the list, a veteran with preference, and the Democratic President has nominated me, there are men on the other side of the aisle who will not let me have the job."

She must say, "What do you have to do to get appointed postmaster? Doesn't the law say that the first man shall have the preference?"

"Yes, Mary, it does say that."

"Doesn't the law say that these veterans, who only a few years ago were called heroes, shall have preference?"

"Yes, it says that."

Who are the Americans, where are they from, what do they stand for, who will not let a man who stands No. 1, and who is a veteran, get the office to which the President has nominated him? Where are the great numbers of young men who left all the little towns and countrysides of America, with the school children standing along the highways, the speaker of the day, perhaps my good friend Senator Watson, of Indiana, or myself, standing in the bandstand in front of the courthouse and saying, "Boys, our hearts go out with you. We will pray for you, we will think of you every moment, we are depending on you, and when you come back, nothing on God's earth will be too good for you."

Now they are back, the emotionalism is all worn off. In the list of nominees, standing first on the eligible list, are the names of 243 men who served in the armed forces, men who faced Hitler's legions, men who bear shrapnel in their bodies, and the great United States Senate has sunk to such a depth, in its appreciation of their service, that notwithstanding they stand first on the list, notwithstanding there is nothing against their records, they wait here month after month after month while their nominations, whether for postmaster at Fargo, N. Dak., or Aberdeen, Md., lie unacted upon. I wish they could sit in the galleries here. I wish they could grasp the spirit of this debate. There is nothing back of it, Mr. President, except things which we should put out of our minds.

If the system is a wrong one, pray, then, who inaugurated it? Pray, then, who followed it through all the years of Harding and Coolidge and Hoover? Senators on the other side of the aisle have the power, without a single, solitary investigation, to rewrite the law. Now, let us rewrite it in good faith.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall yield in a moment. Let us rewrite it in good faith, and say that hereafter no one except the man who stands first shall hold the office. But Senators on the other side know, as I know, that that is not going to be done, because if the gods should be so unkind as to foist upon this great Nation another Republican administration, those on the other side of the aisle would muscle right in behind this system, and milk the old political cow dry of the last drop of postmastership milk. [Laughter.]

I now yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. Let me say, in reply to the Senator's remark, that the milk has been extremely thin for the past 14 years [laughter], the old cow has been pretty thoroughly milked, and I am convinced that she is pretty dry. So the problem is to find ways and means to feed the old cow and get her going again and producing some more milk.

But that is not the question I intended to raise. The learned and able Senator, my genial friend from Maryland, asked this question, with reference to political appointments. Who started this whole system?

Mr. TYDINGS. Harding.

Mr. BALDWIN. As a small boy in school I remember these words that came from a very eminent Democrat, "To the victors belong the spoils." That is when it started, and politics have been played with it ever since. It is about time that we adopt this resolution so as to get the postal system back on the track, and make the civil-service law really effective. That is our real, genuine purpose, I say to my distinguished friend from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I say to the Senator from Connecticut that if he will bring in a bill providing that first place shall be given to the highest man on the list, he will not only get my vocal support, but he will get my footwork on this side of the aisle to help make it a success.

The miracle is that those on the other side—and I say this without any rancor or desire to belittle—are not in this body with clean hands. They have a majority of votes in the House of Representatives, they have a majority in the Senate. If they want the first man on the list to be nominated regardless of political affiliation, they have the votes to amend the law. But when I ask, Who will lead the fight for it? there wells up a thunderous volume of silence. It is possible to accomplish that result without an investigation. I know the Senator from North Dakota would like to introduce such a bill. He has not gotten around to it, yet. All that his colleagues upon the other side of the aisle have to do is to tell the Senator they will go down the line with him. That will be the acid test of sincerity. Then we will know they are interested, not in politics but in efficiency in the civil service. But in this effort the system is not being attacked at all. All that is being attacked is that part of the system which seems to be unfair to Republicans. Now, let there not be formed a picket line in front of my genial friend, who occupies the rostrum and say that Harry Truman is unfair to Republicans, for, if truth be told, Harry Truman, like all previous Presidents, loves both the Republicans and the Democrats.

Mr. President, a few days ago the able Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] read a letter from a veteran who had been wounded in the service of his country; he was receiving a considerable pension from the Government, through the agency of the Veterans' Bureau, because he had been incapacitated by wounds to pursue the normal tasks of life. He took the examination, and he stood first on the list. I think his name was sent to the Senate, as I recall, either in January or February. This was the case of a seriously disabled veteran and a man who stood first on the eligible list. And, lo and behold, that veteran, with a family, as I recall, of three or four children, was living on relief, unemployment insurance, in Ohio, because the Senator on the other side of the aisle would not allow his nomination to come before this body for confirmation. To tear the sham from this whole situation, to strike down the pretense with which it is enshrouded, to face the real truth of the matter, what can that be called but politics? In the face of the facts as I have presented them, who, in God's name, will defend the withholding of this small office from this disabled veteran, a man who stood first on the list, a man with a wife and children, a man out of work since last February, and dependent upon relief checks to clothe and feed and shelter his family? I say to the Senate it is difficult to sink below zero, but in my opinion that comes very close to achieving the impossible. It is hard to get down on a smaller political plane than that.

Those of us who are lawyers have long ago learned the difference between fraud

and legal fraud. Legal fraud is the kind that sends one to the penitentiary; but life is full of the other kind of fraud, for which only God Almighty can pass laws of good conduct, and before Whom finally we perhaps will answer for more of these extra-legal crimes than for violations of the statutes of mankind. I say we are wreaking a fraud on this veteran. He passed first; he was a disabled veteran, shot to pieces in the war, living on relief; and there is no law to punish anybody for doing what is being done to him. It is the same as if, deserving the job, he were working, and we broke into his house and rifled his life's savings—the same in end result, except that we are clothed here with the right to commit this fraud, which does not violate the statute of frauds, either in Florida or Maryland or the other States of the Union.

I shall make one final appeal. It will probably fall on deaf ears; I hope it will not. I appeal to the Senators on the other side of the aisle to sift the nominations and, first of all, report the 501 of men who passed first on the list, and confirm them. That can be ascertained by a mere telephone call to the Civil Service Commission. Then, look into those who come later, in the second and third classes, and see how many of them are disabled veterans, and, if they are veterans, or disabled veterans, the balance ought to be resolved in their favor and their names ought to be confirmed.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. By that simple process Senators will reduce to the irreducible minimum the harm which politics perhaps has done to some applicant for public office. I hope the able Senator from North Dakota—and I make this suggestion in good faith—will consider this proposal and see if he cannot remove the bars for the men who rightly are entitled to the offices. I now yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I wanted to point out again to the Senator, with respect to those who stand second on the eligible list, that on the register submitted by the Civil Service Commission 125 selections were made of the second eligible, and of this 125, 82 have military preference. As to third eligibles the register submitted by the Civil Service Commission shows 61 selections, in one instance, of whom 39 have military preference.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is a powerful statement in favor of confirmation. In a way, I wish Senators on the other side of the aisle could get this patronage. Heaven knows it is not a pleasant thing to dispense. I think it was a certain predecessor of mine in this body who said that every time a Senator filled a political office he rewarded one ingrate and offended nine honest and good men, alienating them and causing friends to become enemies. I am reminded, too, of the story that the senior Senator from Kentucky tells. On one occasion, hearing that a man was against him, he went to see the man. He said, "Bill, you remember when I helped you, away back there, to be postmaster—or whatever it was—in Kentucky?" The fellow said, "Yes." "You remember later on, when your daughter came along, I helped her get a job in the Internal Revenue Bureau?" "Yes." "You remember when you said you needed to keep at least one boy on the farm, and I went to the front for you and testified that you could not run your farm without that boy?" "Yes," he said, "I remember that." "Well," he said, "I have always tried to help you every time you called me. I have been able, and I am happy to say it, to serve you on 8 or 10 different occasions. I do not think I ever asked anything of you. But the boys tell me you are not with me this time." The man said, "That is right, Senator." Then the Senator said to him, "Well, how is that?" "Well," he said, "Senator, you have not done anything for me lately." [Laughter.]

Certain of the Senators who have come here since the Democrats have been in control probably feel that they are missing much by not sharing in patronage problems. I am sure that Senators who have been here for a period of 10 or 15 or 20 years wish to high heaven that some system had been devised that would preclude a United States Senator from having any political patronage. If it had been, tenure in this body probably would be much longer. I think that, after the next Presidential election—I do not mean 1948, because we Democrats will probably remain in power for 8 years more, at least; but I mean after the one, when the Republican Senators come in—maybe some who are on the floor today will remember these humble remarks of mine and say, "I wish we had passed a bill to prevent anyone being appointed postmaster who did not pass first on the list."

Finally I say, as I take my seat, I know the warm qualities of the Senator from North Dakota. I know that there is nobody who would sooner do the serviceman a good turn than he, and I think that, while he has gone off on a tangent, he wants to be fair. I repeat my suggestion that the resolution be defeated, and I ask the Senator from North Dakota if he will not revise the list of postmaster nominations, select those who passed first and the veterans who passed second and third, and examine to see if they are not worthy, and report to the Senate at least that great group of postoffice nominations so that they may be confirmed at this session of the Congress. It means a great deal to these poor families. The heads of some of them are veterans, and they must think our words of yesteryear are nothing more than hollow echoes as they realize they are veterans and stand first on the list, yet cannot secure confirmation by the great United States Senate of their nominations for the little office of postmaster in some of the towns of America.

I hope the eminent Senator from North Dakota will find some merit in my suggestion. I want to say to him that if he does find merit in it and acts on it I think he will have done a very fine thing for his country, and will have earned the commendation of veterans everywhere.

I yield back my remaining time to the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. To whom does the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I desire to take some time myself.

When I was out on the plains of North Dakota and listened to the arguments of the New Dealers, I thought that everything that was good for the poor man, everything that was good for the man who needed help, was being done by the New Deal. Senators can imagine my surprise when I came to the Senate and found that the New Deal, for example, did not initiate the law which guaranteed bank deposits.

In my State in 1929, 1930, and 1931, 651 banks had closed. The people in my State had lost $60,000,000. We heard the cry later on that at last deposits in banks up to $5,000 were guaranteed because of the fact that the New Deal came into power. But lo and behold, Mr. President, when I came here to the Senate I found that the guaranty of bank deposits was initiated by the Republicans, headed by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], who now occupies the chair, the President pro tempore.

Likewise, when it comes to the matter of civil service, after listening to the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], I will say frankly that if I had not looked up the record I would have thought that it was the Democratic Party and not the Republican Party which had initiated the civil-service law respecting postmasters.

Mr. President, let me quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 11, 1938. There Senators will find who is responsible for the civil-service law. We find on that day the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] speaking as follows:

> The only difference between what the Republicans did—
>
> Referring to postmasters—
>
> and what the Democrats are now doing is that the Democrats are far more agile and efficient in their general management of spoilsmanship. We were just as eager, but not so effective. But that does not justify the continuation of the situation for the future, and if my good faith in connection with this proposition is in any point involved, as might be indicated by the very subtle suggestions of the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Alabama, I should like to say that for 8 years I have offered, year after year, a bill that provides a real career service in the Post Office Department from top to bottom, so that a pavement-pounding letter carrier, if he has the capacity, could aspire to become First Assistant Postmaster General of the United States without consulting any Senator or any Representative in Congress, but proceeding on his own inherent merits.

In other words, Mr. President, here we find the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan in 1929, and again in 1930, 1931, 1932, 1933, 1934, 1935, 1936, 1937, and 1938 pleading—for what? For exactly what the majority members of the Civil Service Committee are pleading for today, namely, to make the Post Office Department of the United States, which is today the biggest business in the en-

tire United States of America, or, for that matter, in the entire world, a really honest and efficient organization. So all the majority members of the Civil Service Committee are doing today is to follow in the footsteps of our distinguished leader of the Republican Party.

A few moments ago I was greatly distressed when the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] talked about the poor veteran. He referred to the promises which were made to them when, as he said, we stood upon the reviewing stand and watched march by the men who went across the waters to offer all they had, the men who went over to fight Hitler and all his legions. I am sorry the distinguished Senator from Maryland has left, because I have here a post-office appointment with respect to which he submitted a special resolution the other day asking that the Senate Civil Service Committee be discharged from its further consideration. I refer to the town of Ocean City, Md. In Maryland, the great State represented in part by the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland, there is a little town by the name of Ocean City. The acting postmaster of that town is E. Raymond Bounds. This is a second-class post office. Mr. Bounds has been acting postmaster since June 1944, more than 3 years. Where was the distinguished Senator from Maryland, who says we are taking too much time in the few weeks during which our committee has had under consideration the nominations for postmasters—where was he during the 3 years 1944, 1945, and 1946?

When the first examination was held in 1945 no eligibles were secured. Mr. Bounds himself failed to pass with a grade of 67.88. He received 53.75 on written examination and 82 on business training. These two percentages were added, then divided by two, to arrive at the average.

In the second examination Mr. Bounds received 62.50 on written examination and 84.40 in business experience, for an average of 73.45.

Mr. President, I am sorry the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland is not present. His heart is bleeding for the veterans. He ought to be here to find out what took place in Ocean City, Md., in 1945, 1946, and 1947. Two veterans took this examination. No. 2 received 78.75 on written examination and No. 3 received 67.50; as against 62.50 for the acting postmaster. Both veterans, for some reason undisclosed, were eliminated from eligibility due to lack of business experience.

Let us compare the business experience of these three gentlemen, two of whom are veterans who saw actual service and for whom the heart of the distinguished senior Senator from Maryland is bleeding so profusely. Mr. Rayne, one of the veterans, is a graduate of Washington College in Maryland. He is 25 years old and spent 4 years in the United States Coast Guard. He was employed for several months as a clerk for Bethlehem Steel. Naturally, with 4 years in the service, even though he was a college graduate, he had little opportunity to make use of his education.

What about the third eligible, the other veteran, Mr. Wallace? He had a bachelor of arts degree and was a prelaw student at Duke University in North Carolina. He is 28 years old. He served more than 4 years in the Marine Corps, and finished as a first lieutenant. During his war service he had charge of personnel matters and handled 240 men. During his college years he was employed by his father.

Let us look at the man whose nomination we are asked to approve. This is the man on whose behalf the distinguished Senator from Maryland has submitted a special resolution, as against the two veterans with college educations, the two veterans with 4 years' experience in the service of their country. Who is the man in whose behalf the distinguished Senator from Maryland is interested? What is his experience?

The nominee completed the seventh grade, and spent 3 months in a business college. He is 47 years of age. He has been a farmer, mechanic, garage owner, and lately has been raising chickens. With respect to his ability the following comments are noted by the post office inspectors:

> Probably a very mediocre postmaster. He does not state what functions he performs, in application or interview, and post office employees do not state either. If rated a few points high immaterial.

I am very sorry that the distinguished Senator from Maryland is not present, because I wanted to find out the reason why two World War veterans who served 4 years each in the Marine Corps or the Coast Guard, both of them college graduates, should be barred from being placed on the eligible list, and why the acting postmaster, whom I have described, should be given the position.

Here is another case from Maryland. Again I am sorry the distinguished Senator from Maryland is not present. However, I am sure he can read this information in the RECORD tomorrow, and can make reply if he wishes to do so. This case involves the little post office at Brandywine, Md., a third-class office. An examination was held on May 26, 1945, more than 2 years ago. Can the Civil Service Committee be accused of delay in this case? Yesterday, a certain Senator stated that there was need for haste in connection with these appointments, because many of the nominees had been appointed as acting postmasters for a period of 6 months only, and if their nominations were not confirmed those offices would be without a postmaster. I might advise the distinguished Senator that at Brandywine, Md., which is in the jurisdiction of the distinguished Senator from Maryland, who finished speaking a few minutes ago, Mrs. Carrie E. Outten has been acting postmaster since July 1943. So what becomes of the argument we heard yesterday from the distinguished expert on the other side of the aisle, who said that an acting postmaster could hold office for only 6 months? In Brandywine, Md., there is an acting postmaster who has held office for half a year in 1943, all of 1944, all of 1945, all of 1946, and is still acting postmaster. In other words, an appointment of acting postmaster is made for 6 months; and if no eligibles are secured, the acting postmaster is again named for an additional period of 6 months.

Three eligibles were secured for this office on May 26, 1945. There has been a delay of 2 years in making a choice among the eligibles, for which the Senate Civil Service Committee certainly is not responsible.

The first is a veteran—one of the veterans so eloquently described only a few minutes ago by the distinguished Senator from Maryland. This veteran is No. 1 on the list. The examination was held in May 1945. The third eligible, the acting postmaster, finally resigned, leaving only one on the register. This one, Milton T. Holt, is the man on whose behalf the distinguished Senator has now introduced a resolution to discharge the Committee on Civil Service.

I may add, Mr. President, that we found that very few veterans of World War II were fully advised as to their preference or rights in connection with post-office appointments. Moreover, the impression is Nation-wide, as evidenced by letters in the files of the committee, that only Democrats have any chance of appointment. The record of the past 9 years bears out the correctness of this impression.

This is one post office with respect to which the distinguished Senator from Maryland could have done the veterans a service. He can do it yet. He could have done it at any time during the past 2 years. Since only one name appears on the register, why not call for another examination? The Senator himself can then advise the veterans' organizations in that area as to the rights of veterans. If the Senator from Maryland is so concerned about the veterans, he has a golden opportunity to show his interest in his own State.

Yesterday I was very much intrigued by the arguments made by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS]—so much so that I checked back into the appointment at Oak Park. It will be remembered that in 1931 a poor man went to Oak Park and started in the post office at the very bottom. As the years went by he was promoted because of his efficiency and good service. He served from 1931 until 1942. Mr. Murphy, whom the distinguished Senator from Illinois is supporting, did not even live in Oak Park, Ill. The man whom I have described, who went there in 1931, worked his way up until, when the postmaster became ill, he took the job of acting postmaster, and held it for 3 years. He had the endorsement of all the service organizations, and of the leading business people of Oak Park. He had more than 100 letters endorsing him. Mr. Murphy had only one real endorsement, that of an alderman in Chicago; and yet we find the distinguished Senator from Illinois supporting the man with the endorsement of the alderman.

Mr. President, in view of what these two distinguished gentlemen, the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Illinois have said about how their hearts are bleeding for the veterans, may I not call the attention of the distinguished

Senator from Illinois, who, unfortunately, is not present at this time, and the other Members of this body to the fact that at Oak Park, Ill., not only was a man passed by who had served 17 years in the Post Office Department, but there is another on the eligible list, a veteran, and the distinguished Senator passed by that veteran in order to give Mr. Murphy the position because he was endorsed by an alderman in Chicago.

I discovered other Illinois cases in which I am sure the distinguished Senator from Illinois would be very much interested. I am sorry that he is not upon the floor at this time. I want to speak about the postoffice at Trivoli, Ill., a third-class office. We find the Senator from Illinois demanding that action be taken immediately; it is so important, Mr. President, that he wants the committee discharged; he wants action taken on the appointment of Mr. Glassford, who became acting postmaster upon the resignation of his daughter. He was first on the list, with a rating of 79. The second eligible was Laura G. Williamson, with a rating of 76.88.

Let us compare these two applicants. It will be recalled that, contrary to the action taken with respect to the postmaster at Springerton, only two applicants are involved, yet no third examination was held. What about these two applicants? Mr. Glassford is 59 years of age. This is the candidate who has been endorsed by the distinguished Senator from Illinois. He has no veteran's preference, no veteran is involved in this case. Here are the comments received by investigators sent out by the Post Office Department to inquire from patrons with respect to this man, the candidate of the distinguished Senator from Illinois. Here they are:

He does not get along with the public too well; no ability; gruff. His daughter was formerly acting postmaster. He ran a pool hall, and it was so dirty that the dirt had to be scraped out with a shovel. Never did attend to business. The last 2 years on the farm he did not pay his rent. He is very lazy. He is a smart aleck; knows more than anybody else.

Mr. President, that is the result of the investigation by the Postmaster General of the United States, a Democrat. It is not something that I prepared. I want to read it again. It is with reference to the man whose nomination the distinguished Senator from Illinois says should be confirmed immediately, although as to another candidate, a very fine lady and a bookkeeper by profession, the Postmaster General's files show that out of six inquiries made four were very good, two noncommittal, but none were poor. Yet the distinguished Senator, who does not want an investigation, says that although not a single complaint has been made against this lady, and when she was interviewed four persons out of six said she would be a very good postmistress, he wants this man's nomination confirmed. I repeat the reports on him are, as follows:

He does not get along with the public too well, has no ability, he is gruff. His daughter was the former acting postmaster. He ran a pool hall and it was so dirty that the dirt had to be scraped out with a shovel. He never did attend to business. The last 2 years on the farm he did not pay his rent. He is very lazy. A smart aleck, knows more than anybody else.

That is the kind of postmaster, apparently, that the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois is so anxious to have appointed.

Of course, I looked up several post offices, in view of the fact that the distinguished Senator does not want an investigation. I looked up the post office at Royalton, Ill. It is a third-class office. There were eight applicants for the position. Of the eight, Mr. President, seven are veterans. The Senator from Illinois insists upon immediate employment of the applicant Hardcastle, who is first on the eligible list. Here is his experience:

Shoe salesman, windov trimmer, a sergeant major at Fort Warren, Wyo., later truckmaster in the Army. Saw no active foreign service.

Here are the comments on this candidate by the post-office inspector:

A good boy, but not qualified. Poor, very poor.

Second on the list, and second only because of veteran preference rating, is a man who has been acting postmaster since October 15, 1945. Certainly, the Senate Civil Service Committee cannot be accused of delay in this matter. He has worked as clerk, assistant, and acting postmaster since 1934—11 years and 5 months.

The third on the roll is also a veteran with 18 months of service prior to his entrance into the armed service. Of the 4½ years' service in the Canal Zone 4 years were spent in the post office in the gathering and distribution of mail throughout the central zone and South American countries.

I leave it to the senior Senator from Illinois to say which of these three is best qualified to handle the postal business in that place.

I want to go back for a minute to the State of the distinguished Senator from Maryland. I shall take the case of Bishopville, Md. We find that the first examination was held on November 9, 1945, more than 16 months ago. The reason for the examination was the advancement of the post office from fourth to third class. For 16 months that office has had an acting postmaster. Nothing has been done about it by the distinguished Senator, yet he is in a hurry to have the committee discharged so that he can make an appointment.

There were two other applicants, both of whom failed to pass. Bear in mind that Mr. Ringler was first appointed postmaster at Bishopville, Md., February 13, 1913. He has served different post offices for 32 years, and yet in 1945 he could not pass the examination for a position in Maryland.

Ten months later another examination was held, and Mr. Ringler scraped through with a grade of 71.25. It took the Post Office Department and the Civil Service Commission 10 months to call for a second examination. Certainly no one will contend that the postal service is being limited through the failure of the Committee on Civil Service to put this eligible through sooner.

Yesterday I referred to the case of Thompsonville, Ill., in connection with which the senior Senator from Illinois was so solicitous about having a veteran disqualified because over 20 years ago he stole a calf. He was 19 years of age at that time.

In view of what happened at Thompsonville, let us look at what took place at Posen, Ill. In that case three veterans made up the list, and their standings on the examination were 72.75 percent, 71.25 percent, and 70.38 percent—a very small difference in standing. Investigation discloses that the Senator is highly indignant because Joseph J. Smaron is not approved by the committee. The Senator is so indignant that he has introduced Executive Resolution No. 22 to have this committee immediately discharged, so that his friend, Joe Smaron, can immediately be appointed and have his nomination confirmed. Mr. President, please remember that all three of the men on the eligible list are veterans. Mind you, the morality of the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois is so great and so high that he says that a man who, when a boy 19 years old, stole a calf—20 years ago—should not be postmaster, even though he has made a fine record ever since that time, and even though he has served in the Army. However, now that the Senator from Illinois likes this fellow Smaron, what do we find? Remember that all three of the eligibles are veterans. Yet the Senator from Illinois demands that this man Smaron, who is the lowest on the list of three, must immediately be appointed; but the man himself said on his application covering his military service:

Charged with the Sixty-first and Ninety-sixth Articles of War. Sentenced to 6 months' confinement. Served 120 days.

Yet the Senator from Illinois hastens to recommend him over two other veterans with higher ratings. But in the case of the postmaster at Thompsonville the Senator from Illinois moves heaven and earth to have the Senate remove a veteran from office because 20 or more years ago he was indicted for stealing a calf.

In the case at Posen, Ill., Mr. President, the committee is awaiting an Army report on the offense committed, but the Senator from Illinois is so anxious that his man be appointed that he wants to have the committee discharged from the further consideration of the nomination and wishes to have the man he favors appointed at once.

Now, Mr. President, let us consider the situation at Oakland, Md., where under Executive Resolution No. 44, the distinguished Senator from Maryland says he wants something done right away, quick. Mr. President, how are veterans treated there? The tears came to my eyes as I listened to the eloquent speech the Senator from Maryland made today in behalf of the veterans. So, I say, let us consider the situation at Oakland, Md., where there is a second-class post office. As a result of the examination which was held on March 8, 1946, there were two eligibles, William Spoerlein, with a rating of 80.33 percent, and Paul Turney, with a rating of 78.93 percent.

Mr. Spoerlein was appointed acting postmaster on April 1, 1945. In his application he states: "Member of Democratic committee, 1938–46."

The second on the list is a veteran who had several years of postal experience both before and during his Army service. He was vice commander of the American Legion in 1945 and 1946, and he now is commander of the American Legion. Dozens of letters of recommendation are in the files from attorneys, public officials, members of the State legislature, members of the board of education, and even a letter from a mayor of Oakland, supporting the veteran Paul Turney. No doubt he lost because one letter in the file was from the editor of the Republican, at Oakland. Just how does the appointment of a Democratic member of the county committee, as against a veteran, square with all the oratory which was turned loose upon us today about the poor veteran?

Mr. President, I now refer to the speech which was made upon the floor of the Senate during my absence by the distinguished Senator from Maryland, very shortly after the distinguished Senator from Illinois, who was a Member of the Senate, I think, at the time when the Civil Service Act was passed in 1938, or if he was not, at any rate he has been a stanch defender of it, yesterday afternoon told us that under this Democratic administration we are going to have a civil service in which politics is going to be eliminated. If anyone doubts that, it is only necessary to read the record relative to the bills which have been passed. Shortly afterward the Senator from Illinois said, on May 14, as shown at page 5269 of the RECORD:

> Only yesterday I reported as No. 1 to a little post office in my State a man who was a Republican, and there was a Democrat on the list who was a veteran I could have appointed, but the man I appointed had a great war record in World War II.

Mr. President, in other words, there we come right to the point: The Senator appointed him, and the civil service examination meant nothing.

What did the distinguished Senator from Maryland say at that time on the floor of the Senate? We find, as shown on page 5266 of the RECORD, that the distinguished Senator from Maryland said:

> In Baltimore we had a postmaster named Benjamin Woelper, who was an active Republican. He was appointed to the office before the Democrats came in in 1933. My colleague, Senator Radcliffe, and I decided that he was an efficient man, and we let him hold that office—

Mr. President, please note that they let him hold that office. This man Woelper held it through the kindness of the distinguished Senator from Maryland and his colleague at that time, George Radcliffe.

I read further from the Senator's statement and speech:

> We let him hold that office until he resigned many years thereafter, showing that where there was good service in the Post Office Department, even though a man had been an active Republican worker and officeholder, two Democratic Senators from Maryland thought the office was being well conducted, and ought not to be disturbed.

Mr. President, what was said at that point in the RECORD intrigued me so much that I decided to look up the record in regard to the post office which the distinguished Senator from Maryland was discussing. In a moment I shall read what the actual transaction there was.

Mr. President, I have before me, in case any Senator wishes to look at them, the original files, containing all the quotations I have given. They are the original files, and I have secured them from the office of the Civil Service Commission, and they are here for all the cases I have mentioned. Senators will find the originals right here.

As I said a moment ago, I have on my desk at this time some letters which I think are most interesting. Senators may remember that yesterday I told about a poor woman in Wisconsin who had six children and was trying to make a living, and I told of how they had written her, asking her for $75. At this time I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a letter which, according to my information—and I secured it from one of the Senators from the State of Wisconsin—was sent out by Arthur Henning, chairman of the Jefferson Day Campaign Committee for 1947.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JEFFERSON DAY CAMPAIGN
COMMITTEE OF 1947,
Milwaukee, Wis.

DEAR FELLOW DEMOCRAT: By this time you have doubtless heard of the tremendous gains made since last November by the Democratic Party in the Second Congressional District of Wisconsin. You know, too, how young Carl Thompson came within 800 votes (1 percent) of being elected Congressman.

But the special election in the Second District has wider significance beyond the five counties concerned or even the State of Wisconsin.

The results are symptomatic of what is happening all over the country. The American people have indeed had enough of that mountain of Republican promises that brings forth only a molehill of accomplishment.

We have today a real opportunity to regain majority control. To take advantage of that opportunity, however, we must have funds to strengthen our present organization and build up campaign treasuries for 1948.

The Jefferson Day Campaign Committee has been designated as the official fund-raising organization for the Democratic Party in Wisconsin by National Committeeman Robert E. Tehan.

The committee will conduct its drive during the coming months, a drive which will culminate in a dinner on October 4 at the Pfister Hotel, Milwaukee. It will be a gala affair, at which Gael Sullivan, executive director of the Democratic National Committee, and Mrs. Chase Going Woodhouse, former Congresswoman from Connecticut, will be the principal speakers. Attendance at the dinner will be by invitation only.

Won't you make your contribution now? Make your check or money order payable to the Jefferson Day Campaign Committee, and mail it to 259 East Wells Street, Milwaukee. A pledge card is enclosed for your convenience.

Very truly yours,
ARTHUR HENNING,
Chairman.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I now hold in my hand a letter showing how extensive is this matter of holding up civil-service or post-office employees for such contributions. This letter is from Phillips, Nebr., and it was sent directly to me:

> I have talked to the carrier and subcarrier at this office, and both have received word or been asked to pay $25 for the Democratic campaign fund. They are both Republicans, and the subcarrier only carries about 12 days a year. He says he will not pay it, but the carrier says if they insist he will pay it. He says he doesn't want to lose his job. But I don't think it would make his job secure if he did pay it. Also the temporary clerk in the office received word to pay $25. I do not know if she is going to pay or not. It was to have been paid.

I shall not give this man's name, but if any Senator wants to see the signature, I have no objection to showing it.

Here is a letter from Maine. I shall not put it into the RECORD. The statements in it are somewhat like those in the letter I have just read.

I have here a letter from the State of Kansas. Because the hearts of some Senators have been bleeding so much for disabled veterans, I am going to read this letter. It is from the Labette County Community High School, and reads:

JANUARY 11, 1947.

The Honorable SENATOR CAPPER.

DEAR SENATOR: Reference is made to the appointment of the postmaster at Altamont, Kans.

According to an Associated Press dispatch Earle F. Hill has been nominated by President Truman as postmaster at Altamont, Kans.

This is passing over the heads of disabled 10-point veterans, and ignoring the veterans' preference law.

Anything you can do to help get a square deal for all would be appreciated.

I am at the top of the eligible list and have had some communications with you in regard to this matter before.

Most cordially.

I have the consent of the Senator from Kansas to read the name. It is Ralph E. Traster.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator knows that what this gentleman is talking about simply cannot be done. In other words, the President of the United States would not send a name—and I know that he has not—ahead of a veteran with 10 points, when that veteran is No. 1 on the list. This gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I interrupt to say that we want to find out if it has been done. That is why we want this investigation. I do not know whether this took place, and the Senator from Illinois does not know whether it took place. This is what this veteran says happened.

Mr. LUCAS. I know that it did not happen.

Mr. LANGER. How does the Senator know? He has not been to Altamont, and I have not.

Mr. LUCAS. From my experience I know that the Civil Service Commission will not send up the name of a man who is No. 2 or No. 3 on the list over a veteran with 10 points' preference. That is not done in the Government today. In the investigation the Senator will not find a single case that will prove that.

Mr. LANGER. This is a letter signed by a man who permits me to read his name.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator further yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. What is the date of the letter?

Mr. LANGER. January 11, 1947.

Mr. LUCAS. Has the Senator made any inquiry through the Post Office Department to ascertain whether the Post Office Department has appointed that man?

Mr. LANGER. The Senator from North Dakota has been exceedingly busy with a thousand things, and that is why he wants counsel and clerks to do the work. I certainly cannot go chasing around to see about post offices in Kansas, or Nebraska, or Florida, or any other State.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is now using this as an argument on the floor of the Senate, and he is taking more time in reading this letter than it would have taken him to pick up the telephone and receive definite information upon this appointment. The argument now being made is utterly unfair.

Mr. LANGER. In connection with the suggestion as to being unfair, so long as the distinguished Senator has brought that up, let me say that I have never impugned the integrity or the fairness of the distinguished Senator from Illinois. I wish to give public testimony that there is not a fairer, squarer man, so far as the Democratic Party is concerned, in the whole United States of America. In the morning when he gets up, this man is so fair that he says to himself, "What can I do for my party? What can I do today to help out the Democrats of the United States of America?" [Laughter.]

At night, as he lies in bed after he has said his prayers, as his eyes gradually close, he murmurs and murmurs to himself, "Oh, Lord, what can I do during the night for the Democratic Party, to help the head of the Democratic Party, and the rest of the Democrats?"

Certainly, Mr. President, I would never impugn the motives of my distinguished friend from Illinois. I say that of all the Democrats upon this floor I do not know a single one who would go further to help out the Democratic Party than my distinguished friend SCOTT LUCAS.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. LANGER. Certainly.

Mr. LUCAS. I am very grateful, and I deeply appreciate the subtle and ironic testimony the Senator from North Dakota has given in my behalf. I am sure I shall be able to use it in the future.

Mr. LANGER. I hope the Senator will use it when he is running for Governor next year in the State of Illinois. I understand from the Chicago Sun that he is being considered for the governorship. I assume that in the great State of Illinois the people appreciate the value of a great man, even if he is a Senator, and they would like to have him run for Governor. It is different in North Dakota. In North Dakota we have thousands of men who are fit to be either Governor or Senator. So we have not the situation there that a man who occupies the senatorial office has to run for Governor, because we have all kinds of material. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I have here some more letters. Here is one from North Carolina. It is nice to get one from the South. This was written, not to me, but to another. It was dated April 4, and says:

> I am hoping to be pardoned for this long letter for the following mitigating circumstances. I was raised in a community where most everybody was fire-eating Democrats and so ignorant that they never heard about the rule of reason. In this environment I grew to be a man. The first ballot that I cast was for William Howard Taft for President and all the Republican ticket and I have repeated this performance every 2 years since that time. But this letter has reference to the post office at La Grange, and the acting postmaster here. As you very well know, when the New Deal took the Government over in 1933 we had a Republican postmaster here. Soon after they took over they began to put the pressure to him and it was not long until he had to resign or be kicked out. This he did, but considered it a kick-out. Then they selected another Democratic postmaster here. Last May he retired caused by age. Now they have an acting postmaster here whose name is Sam D. McCullen, and I understand that they are pressing to have him permanently appointed as postmaster here. The better class of the people here don't want him.

Now, wait a minute, Mr. President. Some say they do not want an investigation of the acting postmasters. This is what this distinguished citizen says:

> Sometimes his friends have to carry him so drunk that he cannot get home without being taken home. Sometimes he lies out in public drunk. If his appointment can be blocked until the proper time a Republican can be found that will give this office the old-time service to which it is entitled.

I ask my distinguished friend whether he would want the Civil Service Committee to go ahead and recommend for confirmation the nomination of a man who is so drunk that he is lying out on the street in public? Is that the kind of Post Office Department that is wanted? Yet Senators are trying to do all they can to prevent the Civil Service Committee from having money to enable it to carry out the purposes for which it was created. I repeat, Mr. President, what I said yesterday, that if $35,000 is too much, the Civil Service Committee will not spend it. If it is needed in order to investigate cases of this kind, then most certainly we shall spend it. I might add further that I concur entirely with what was said by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. As soon as the investigation is begun, if there are fine meritorious persons acting as postmasters, men and women who are well qualified, who were appointed in accordance with the civil-service law, their appointments will not be delayed longer than the time that may be required to make an investigation. But when a man who is acting as postmaster lies around the streets of La Grange, N. C., in a drunken condition, where little children may see him, and he is carried home at night to his wife and children, within the view of other children, then most certainly, Mr. President, I, for one, as chairman—and I know that I have the support of every member, both Democratic and Republican, on the committee—will not tolerate that kind of thing.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to my distinguished friend, the ranking Democratic member of the Committee on Civil Service.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I of course want to go ahead and cooperate with the Committee on Civil Service in handling the nominations. I have always tried to do that. I have tried to be fair with the chairman of the committee, and I have tried to be fair with the majority. In my opinion, probably 95 percent of the nominees should be reported to the Senate and confirmed. That, however, is neither here nor there; but there is a point I want to make so far as the charges are concerned. All we want to do is to be fair. Anyone can make charges. The fact that someone might have an ax to grind and say that a certain man is drunk, in my opinion, does not necessarily prove the man to be drunk. We want to be fair, too, with the man who is charged with being drunk. After all, it is a serious charge to make. I shall go along with the majority of the committee, notwithstanding the fact that I voted against the majority when the resolution was considered by the committee. If it is desired to investigate, I am confident that the committee which is investigating these matters will find that those who were selected were properly selected.

I am willing, Mr. President, to go ahead and to have the Senate appropriate $35,000, but I hope the chairman of the committee will also cooperate with us, who desire to cooperate with him, to the extent that in those instances, which in my opinion comprise 95 percent of the nominees, where there are no charges, where there are no complaints, where No. 1 was selected, where an exserviceman was selected, or, where an acting postmaster was before the Commission merely for the reason that he passed from one grade to another, those nominees may be reported to the Senate; and then as to the others let the committee proceed, and we shall investigate to our hearts' content.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I may say that one of the pleasures of being the chairman of the Committee on Civil Service has been the fact that the distinguished Senator from New Mexico has been the ranking member on the Democratic side. I may say further that the subcommittee dealing with post offices consists of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and myself. The budget was prepared by the subcommittee before presentation to the entire committee. When the $35,000 appropriation is made, of course, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and I will sit down together. We will see that the Democrats have recognition through someone chosen to assist in the investigation. I have privately so assured the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, have I not?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; but I am not so much interested in obtaining recognition as a member of the subcommittee as I am in trying to have confirmed the nominations of those who were properly selected by the Civil Service Commission. I do not mind investigating. I want to investigate anything that is wrong, whether committed by the Republicans or by the Democrats; but I feel that in justice to the committee itself, in justice to the Senate, to the country, and to the postmasters who were nominated, some action should be taken following the passage of the resolution.

Mr. LANGER. I may ask the distinguished Senator, how can we proceed any faster than by giving the Democrats something to say about who is going to conduct the investigation? We will name the men. If Democrats are included, the investigation can be expedited.

Mr. CHAVEZ. We cannot expedite it, no matter how much we may desire to do so, if the majority of the committee opposes the confirmation of nominations which should properly be confirmed. I do not know the nominees; I do not know whether they are Republicans or Democrats; but, for the life of me, I cannot think of any reason why the nomination of a person from North Carolina or Georgia, against whom there is no opposition whatever, from one side or the other, should not be confirmed. There are four nominations to post offices in New Mexico, including one very fine lady and three men, who are on the eligible list. I have not been asked about their confirmation. Until I know differently, I shall think and I shall take it for granted they were selected because they took the civil-service examination. I know one of them that I should not have recommended who took the examination and passed. I will say that I would have objected to him, from a personal standpoint, but he took the examination prescribed by law, and I think it is very unfair for us to hold the nominations back any longer.

Mr. LANGER. I may say to the distinguished Senator that no one wants to expedite the matter more than I do. No. 1 on a certain list is a gentleman from Hartford, Conn., a Democrat, I understand, appointed under President Truman. I have been chafing at the bit to have his nomination confirmed; I have been anxious to have it confirmed.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, at one particular place, No. 1 on the list is a boy who opposed me at the last election. I now want him confirmed.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator is the ranking member of the committee. Let the Senator send the names to the committee, let the Senator cooperate in the investigation, and they will be investigated.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I know, from an investigation that I made, that the person of whom I speak opposed me, and voted for my opponent. Nevertheless, according to the law, he fits into the picture, and I should like to have his nomination confirmed.

Mr. LANGER. I may say that if anyone opposed the Senator, I should be inclined to oppose him. If anyone failed to recognize the sterling ability of the Senator from New Mexico I should be inclined to be against him. I do not see how I could possibly vote to confirm him.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I do not intend to object to the appointee of whom I speak. He took the prescribed examination and qualified. The fact that he voted against me is merely incidental. That was his business.

Mr. LANGER. Would not the Senator think it showed him to be a man of very poor judgment?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Irrespective of that, he has a right to exercise his judgment, and while I may not agree with his political judgment, the fact that he passed a civil-service examination and qualified for the place entitles him to consideration. I should not feel compelled to oppose him, merely because he voted against me. I favor the confirmation of the boy's nomination.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. McMAHON. I may say to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota that I had no intention of entering the debate. I am prompted to do so by reason of the fact that the Chairman has mentioned the case of Mr. Dillon, of Hartford. Mr. Dillon is supported unitedly by the citizenry of Hartford. In my experience I have never seen more united support. My colleague, the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], is very much in favor of him. The Senator is a member of the committee. Mr. Dillon has been for a long time a career employee of the post office. I think he has been acting postmaster for about 2 years. I appreciate the assurance given by the Senator that he will see that his nomination is favorably reported. He is No. 1 on the civil-service list, and is highly qualified. Frankly, I have come in for criticism in certain circles in Hartford, because Mr. Dillon's nomination has not been confirmed. I appreciate therefore the Senator's assurance that his nomination will be reported to the Senate and that we may succeed in getting him into the job, beceuase I think it wrong, I may say to the chairman, the Senator from North Dakota, to hold up the nomination any longer.

As I said, I had no intention of entering the debate, but the Senator's reference to Mr. Dillon caused me to say what I have said.

Mr. LANGER. I want to say that if all those appointed to be postmasters in Connecticut are as good as is Mr. Dillon, a man who worked his way up in the post office, I think Senators will find the Senate Civil Service Committee anxious to endorse them all.

Mr. McMAHON. I will say in reply to the Senator that, so far as I am aware, the appointments that have been made to the post offices in Connecticut are beyond reproach.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish to say that there is another reason why I shall vote for the resolution. It is a practical reason. The nominations for postmasters have been pending for quite a while, and the individuals in question deserve to have action taken on their nominations by the Senate. The matter is a practical one. Talking about them does not confirm them. What confirms them is a vote by the Senate to confirm. Arguments could continue from now until the 31st of July respecting whether the Republicans took advantage of the civil-service law or whether the Democrats took advantage of the civil-service law, and still no postmasters would be confirmed. For practical political considerations I am convinced that the sooner we adopt the resolution the sooner the Senate will act upon the nominations.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in conclusion I want to be very explicit about these post-office appointments. Every post-office appointment now pending before my committee will have action taken on it prior to adjournment. Of that I have been assured by the majority members of the Senate committee. As fast as investigation by the civil-service staff is completed and there appears to be no justifiable reason to withhold confirmation, recommendations for such confirmations will be made to the Senate.

Only those confirmations will be held up where it appears that the civil-service law has been violated or circumvented, or where complaints against the selection by citizens of the community are of sufficient weight to be worthy of attention.

The committee itself would indeed be derelict in its duty if it complied with the demands of the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Maryland without even scrutinizing appointments presented to the committee in huge blocks.

Just why were the appointments referred to the committee? Is this referral simply a buck-passing procedure to remove responsibility from some Senator or protect some Senator from having the heat applied to him? Or is it a serious effort at improving and guarding the civil-service laws of the Nation?

I want to make the situation clear and definite. In years gone by, little, if any, attention was paid to these confirmations by the Civil Service Committee. It was a routine buck-passing procedure. With the help of Senators, my committee intends to take this job seriously, complete it with dispatch, and refuse only to confirm nominations when we feel confirmations are not in the interest of the public, who are paying the bill.

With that statement, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois has 34 minutes remaining. The Senator from North Dakota has 32 minutes remaining.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President and Members of the Senate, I noted that in beginning the debate yesterday the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, the able chairman of the Civil Service Committee, began with this sentence: "Mr. President, I want to make it clear to the Senate that this resolution is entirely nonpolitical."

The Senator from North Dakota has many fine qualities, for which we all honor him, and I think perhaps one of his finest qualities is his delightful sense of humor. I must say that in my acquaintance with him, which has been a happy one, I have found no occasion on which he has indulged that sense of humor to a greater advantage than in making that statement, because if there ever has been a matter brought up in any legislative body which was essentially and wholly and brazenly political, this resolution is that matter.

Mr. President, I ask at this time, as a basis for what I am about to say, to have printed in the RECORD the original resolution as reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, which shows on the face of it, in the lines stricken by the committee, some of the facts which I am going to mention, which show so clearly the completely political nature of the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Whereas concrete evidence has been presented to the Senate Civil Service Committee that during the years 1933 to 1947, inclusive, very few if any Republicans have been appointed to the positions of first-, second-, or third-class postmasterships; and

[Whereas evidence is also presented which warrants a full and complete investigation as to whether the Veterans Preference Act of 1944 has been violated with the result that very few veterans have been appointed to the office of first-, second-, or third-class postmaster; and

[Whereas undisputable evidence has been presented that postmasters on threat of losing their positions have been compelled to pay systematic tribute to a group of politicians;

[Whereas approximately 500 appointments to post offices have been made within the last 6 weeks and are now pending; and

[Whereas within the next few months several hundred more vacancies will likely occur either by resignation, retirement, or death: Therefore be it]

Resolved, That the Senate Civil Service Committee, which has the jurisdiction over all civil-service matters in connection with the post office, or any duly authorized subcommittee, is authorized and directed to make a complete investigation [as to why few if any Republicans have been appointed to the offices of first-, second-, or third-class postmasters for the last 14 years, how many Republicans have been removed,] *as to political activities in the civil service in the appointment of postmasters of first-, second-, and third-class postmasters*, and whether any postmasters on threat of losing their positions have been compelled to pay tribute financially or otherwise to anyone or to a group of politicians. Also whether there has been an attempt to compel men and women occupying the position of postmaster to violate the Hatch Act and to investigate any and all collateral matters which the testimony may develop.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production and impounding of books, papers, and documents, to administer oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, which shall not exceed *$35,000* [in addition to the cost of stenographic services to report such hearings,] shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

Mr. HOLLAND. Adverting now to some of the wording in the resolution, I want to call attention to the first paragraph of the preamble, which is a recital:

Whereas concrete evidence has been presented to the Senate Civil Service Committee that during the years 1933–47, inclusive, very few if any Republicans have been appointed to the position of first-, second-, or third-class postmasterships.

I think the distinguished Senator's sense of humor was operating to a maximum degree when he spoke of the resolution and that particular recital of it as being nonpolitical.

Then in the body of the resolution, Mr. President, I notice that the meat of the resolution, as submitted, was contained in these words: The Civil Service Committee "is authorized and directed to make a complete investigation as to why few if any Republicans have been appointed to the office of first-, second-, or third-class postmasters for the last 14 years, how many Republicans have been removed."

I note that in the consideration of this resolution, for some reason—probably to sort of sugar-coat the political pill which was included herein—the recitals which I mentioned in the preamble and this portion of the body of the resolution, have all been stricken, but, Mr. President and Senators, the essence of the resolution remains political, because the words inserted by the committee amendment for the words which included three times reference to the Republican Party, the majority party, were these words: "That the committee is authorized" to investigate "as to political activities in the civil service in the appointment of postmasters of first-, second-, and third-class postmasters."

So that it is clear that the essence of the resolution remains as it had been in the beginning, wholly political, because the direction given to the Civil Service Committee under the rewritten resolution requires an investigation as to political activities with reference to the appointment of postmasters, and that is the whole purpose of the investigation as set up here.

I call attention further, Mr. President and Senators, to the fact that the resolution had to be considered in two committees, the first, the Civil Service Committee itself, from which the resolution was reported out on a strictly party line basis, in other words, the Republican members voting to report it out favorably, and the Democratic members voting against reporting it out favorably.

The same experience was had, Mr. President and Senators, in the Rules and Administration Committee, of which I happen to be a member. I want the Senate to know that in the Rules and Administration Committee—I do not know what transpired in the Civil Service Committee—the minority members made it very plain that they were perfectly willing by their votes to support the making of an investigation providing the distinguished chairman of the Civil Service Committee, the Senator from North Dakota, who urged favorable action upon the resolution before the Committee on Rules and Administration, would see to it that those who had no objections made to them, and those who were in the first place, and particularly the veterans, were immediately reported for confirmation.

We called the Senator's attention to the fact that there were many who were suffering hardships, but I must say that the distinguished chairman of the Civil Service Committee showed himself to be stubbornly willing to maintain the objective under which he had submitted the resolution, because he made statements to the Rules and Administration Committee that he not only would not agree to our proposal, but he served notice at that time that not one single postmaster would be reported for confirmation by his committee to the Senate as a whole unless and until the resolution was adopted and the $35,000 made available for the checking of all, regardless of whether there was any complaint filed against them or not.

Mr. President, I do not know anything about the history of the civil service laws. I have left that discussion to those who are older in experience in the Senate. However, I do know a little about how this particular resolution has operated in my State to do grave injustice to good people. I do not believe that distinguished Senators on the other side of the aisle have realized what grave injustice has been done under this political resolution to good people, and particularly to veterans of World War I and World War II.

Before commenting on the situation in my State I may say that the distinguished chairman of the Civil Service Committee has been most affable and courteous. He has been willing to do everything for me except report these nominations. I have not had a thing in the world to do with any of the nominations. I did not know that any of these persons were to be nominated until the nominations were submitted. Of the eight nominees involved, I am acquainted with four, and am not acquainted with the other four.

In talking with the chairman of the committee I had the opportunity to ask him twice as to whether a single objection had been lodged against any nominee for a postmastership in the State of Florida. The first time the Senator answered me by saying, "No" categorically. He stated that no objection of any kind had been filed. The second time he was in a hurry on the floor of the Senate, and he stated that he did not believe that up until that time—a short while ago—there had yet been filed any objection to any of these eight nominees. I think that is still the situation. If it is not, the distinguished chairman may, of course, call the attention of the Senate to any objections which he has lately received. But I do not believe that he has received any, because of the character of those who have been nominated for postmasterships in Florida. A great hardship has been occasioned to them by reason of this resolution and the inaction of the Civil Service Committee.

On April 1 or thereabouts, when I asked for a list to be made, there were eight nominations. The Senate will realize that this resolution was submitted on February 10. It was favorably reported on March 28. It has been on the calendar for a long time. The suffering on the part of those nominees, who have been faced with uncertainty and indecision due to no fault of their own, has been going on all this time, simply because under this political resolution those who were responsible—the majority in the committee and the chairman—were not willing to bring this matter to a head.

I desire to call attention to the eight nominees from the State of Florida for two reasons. First, because I still believe it to be the fact, as I stated awhile ago—and if I am in error by reason of any late objections having been filed, I invite the distinguished chairman of the Civil Service Committee to bring them to the attention of the Senate—that so far as I know not a single criticism or objection has been leveled against any one of these nominees.

Also I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that in all eight of these cases the postmasterships involved are in small communities where the positions would not be eagerly sought after anyway. In each case the nominee has been subjected to uncertainty during all these months simply because of a political question which has made it inadvisable, in the judgment of the majority, to allow these good people to have knowledge as to whether or not they are to be allowed to serve in the positions for which they took examinations as a result of which, in six instances out of the eight, the nominees ranked No. 1 on the list.

The first thing I wish to mention in connection with these eight nominees is that there are six men and two women. Of the six men, five are veterans of very high standing. I do not know all of them. Two whom I know hold decorations for bravery on the field of battle in the defense of our Nation.

Mr. President, I think it is a very sorry spectacle when the Senate of the United States is held up all these months, and when individuals who have demonstrated their patriotism on the field of battle are held up simply in order that some individuals may play a little political game. Those who are playing that game seem to place the importance of the game ahead of serving the people of the Nation and showing justice to these nominees.

As to the five soldiers and the other man, I want to mention them first, not because they come ahead of the good ladies, but because it happens that five of the six are servicemen. They are nominees for the following small posts in the State of Florida:

Henry S. Thompson, for the little town of Perry. He is the only nonveteran of the six.

Louis C. Wadsworth, for the little town of Live Oak.

Robert O. Seaver, for the little town of Clermont.

Clyde L. Hillhouse, for the little town of White Springs.

Robert H. Morgan, for the little town of Fort Ogden.

Chandos W. McMullen, for the little town of Bay Pines, a veterans' facility outside the city of St. Petersburg. I dare say that most Senators have never heard of these good communities. Some Senators may have heard of as many as one or two of them, but most Senators have never heard of any of them. Senators who are veterans may have heard of Bay Pines, because it is a well known veterans' facility. I should like to take up that case first.

The nominee for that post happens to be a 50-percent-disabled veteran of the First World War. He was No. 2 on the list. The No. 1 man on the list was also a disabled veteran of the First World War, but he was eliminated at the request of the Post Office Department because of the fact that the Department felt that he was not strong enough physically to fulfill the responsibilities of this office.

This 50-percent disabled veteran who has been nominated for this position, at an office which, in general, serves only veterans at the Bay Pines Facility of the United States Government, has had his nomination held up since some time in January or February.

I do not care what our political faith may be, I do not believe there is a Member of the Senate who believes that this is fair or just or American, or who wants by his vote to approve this kind of mishandling of the business of the United States.

The second nominee is Robert H. Morgan, a veteran, who has been nominated to be postmaster at Fort Ogden. Anything good that could be said about anybody could be said about this fine citizen, whom I have known all my life, and I have also known Clyde L. Hillhouse, of White Springs, who has been decorated for service on the battlefield.

The next nominee is Robert O. Seaver, of Clermont, a veteran.

The next on my list is Louis C. Wadsworth, of Live Oak. He is the last of the five servicemen. I have known him since he was a youngster. He went into the war as a subaltern, and spent five and a half years in the service. He came out as a lieutenant colonel, full of honors, and with a very fine record of patriotic service. He came back to his community and bought a country newspaper. Then when the opportunity came along he took the examination and ranked first, and was appointed in January to be postmaster in Live Oak.

I have received several letters from Louis Wadsworth, whom I happen to know well. I did not know that he was interested in the postmastership until I found his name on the list when the nominations were submitted to the Senate. He tells me that he is suffering from a grave handicap. He finds it difficult to locate anyone who can handle his small country newspaper. He realizes that when his nomination as postmaster is confirmed—if indeed it is to be confirmed—he must have someone to operate that little newspaper, in which his entire savings are invested. He has been held up, defeated, and disappointed in the hope of securing anyone for that post, and does not know what to do in looking ahead.

Mr. President, I repeat what I said a little while ago. I do not believe that there is a Republican or Democrat in the membership of this body who likes to see that kind of practice, or who for a moment would apologize for it or speak in support or justification of it. It is simply indefensible. It is unsupportable. It is so unjust, inequitable, and unpatriotic that no citizen, much less any Senator, would seek for a moment to justify such a practice or such a procedure. Yet that is what we have had to suffer in the State of Florida.

Since April 1 or thereabouts, when this list was prepared, 4 or 5 additional nominations have been submitted; and the comments which I have made could be equally well applied to the nominations which have been submitted since that time.

With reference to the two good ladies whose names appear on this list, I do not happen to have the privilege of knowing them. However, they have been nominated for postmasterships at the little towns of Foley and Lake Harbor. I cannot see why their nominations should have been held up for 5 or 6 months. This is June 17. I do not see why the modest appointments which they were receiving should have been held up.

I want to call attention to the fact that several of these nominations are promotions from postmasterships of lower class postmasterships to a higher classification. There is certainly no justification for that kind of practice.

So, Mr. President, while it is not for me to judge the objectives or the conscience of any Senator here—and I certainly do not attempt to do so—I want to say, in all candor, that those people within my State who know about this situation, and particularly veterans—and there are many who do know about it—think that the party in power has been playing petty partisan politics of the most puny sort in connection with this particular resolution and their insistence upon it.

So I hope, not that this resolution will be defeated, because we have seen those on the opposite side of the aisle march right up the hill too often in this type of matter on which they make a party issue, but I hope that there will be found in the membership on the other side of the Chamber, in the very splendid membership which is there, Senators who will insist to the chairman of the Civil Service Committee and to the members of that committee of their party that at once and without further delay, because there is no need for investigating the qualifications of the appointees when there are no objections filed, where persons who are first on the list have been appointed, and particularly when they are veterans—I say I hope that without further delay this matter will be cleared up. If there is to be a long, noisy, and noxious investigation going on, let us, in the name of justice, confine it at least to those cases where there are objections and where there is some ground for belief that something wrong has been done. I think that by that course we shall serve not only the cause of our own citizens in every State in the

Union—I assume some such situation as this applies in the other States—but we shall be serving the cause of our Government and of the veterans who are not a bit pleased with this showing of the ingratitude of the Nation for which they fought ably. Let us get this job done with the maximum of speed and without additional delay.

Mr. President, I cannot think of anything better calculated than this delay to break the morale of the young men who have come back fresh from the making of sacrifices which have been great. There has not been any generation in the history of our Nation which has been called away from their own tasks for as many years, for as long a time, to as grave dangers as have these young veterans. As I say, there is nothing that I can think of that would more greatly break their morale than when they have received appointments to which they are fully entitled to hold them up for a period of months solely for the reason that someone may play a petty political game in Washington. There is nothing fair, reasonable, or right in that, and I hope the Senate will frown upon the continuance of any such practice.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BALDWIN in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. How much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has 21 minutes.

Mr. LUCAS. I will yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I wish to inquire of the chairman of the Committee on Civil Service regarding certain appointments in my own State. I preface my remarks by this statement: If there has been any charge made against any one of these appointees, I have not learned of it and have no record of it in my office. No complaints have reached me regarding any one of them.

I call the distinguished chairman's attention to the fact that in each case in Georgia, so far as my records show at the moment, the person standing No. 1 on the eligible list has received the appointment.

In Arlington the first on the list is Calvin C. Ray, a veteran of distinguished service.

In Georgetown, James C. Griffin, another veteran with a distinguished Army career.

At Jefferson, J. Storey Ellington, No. 1 on the eligible list, and a veteran.

At Odum, Jeane B. Butler, No. 1 on the list, and a veteran.

At Whigham, W. Cecil Crew, No. 1 on the list, and a veteran with a distinguished service record.

At Fort Valley, Louis L. Brown. Fort Valley is a prosperous city in the peach belt of my State, near my own home. Mr. Louis L. Brown is No. 1 on the eligible list. He was named postmaster sometime ago, and his appointment slip has been before the committee for some time. Mr. Brown is personally known to me. He is a distinguished lawyer and a man of the finest character and of very great ability. He entered the Army in the opening days of the war, immediately after Pearl Harbor, and achieved an enviable record in the military service of his country.

There are certain nonveterans, Mr. President, who are first on the eligible list.

At Desota, William C. Dalton.

At Meis, Vetna P. Pittman.

At Midland, Myrtice T. Skinner.

At Morganton, George T. Love, Jr.

At Pembroke, Jessie N. Hope.

At Thunderbolt, Edna M. McDonnell.

There are two reappointments. The persons involved happen to be veterans. One is at Chester. George A. Bowen is the appointee. He is a veteran of World War I, and this is a reappointment after serving as postmaster at his own home office.

At Newington, Miss Lena T. Woods has been reappointed. She was also in the military service of the country. Both of those cases are reappointments.

Certain promotions have been made in the service. At Vidalia, Sam D. Williams, a veteran with a distinguished Army record, is recommended for promotion.

At Culloden there is a nonveteran, Carrilee O. Sanders. These latter two are promotions within the service itself.

As I have already stated, I have not received any complaints regarding any one of these nominations. If I had received any complaints I would have transmitted them to the Committee on Civil Service and would aid and assist that committee in making any investigation that might be necessary to clarify the charges made against these veterans and nonveterans alike.

So far I know every appointment on this present list—a few appointments have come in from my State since this list was compiled—stands No. 1 on the eligible list, and, to my own knowledge, many of them are veterans of World War I, but most of them are veterans of World War II. They surely are entitled to have their nominations considered by the committee. If there are charges, I stand ready to cooperate with the committee in examining the charges and going into them thoroughly. I would not want the committee favorably to report, nor the Senate to confirm, the appointment of any person who has been named to a postmastership in Georgia, either by promotion or by way of reappointment or as an original appointment, if there be any charges against them. If the chairman of the committee has any charges against these appointees from my State, I shall be very glad to have him take the matter up with me now or hereafter.

I cannot see, Mr. President, why men and women who have performed distinguished service for their country and stand No. 1 on the eligible list, and who have no charges against them, so far as I have the slightest knowledge or information, should be held up indefinitely by the committee and be thrown into a batch of approximately 900 appointees for examination by the committee.

So I am adding my voice in protest against that procedure, although I have no objection to any examination of any appointee in a case where there is any irregularity or where there are any charges against the appointee, or irregularities in the method of his appointment or selection.

Under the present administration, post-office appointments in Georgia are made entirely by the Representative of the district in Congress, who is familiar with every post office and with every applicant for a postmastership in any office in his district. The appointments are not made by the Senators from Georgia. The names of appointees are submitted to my distinguished colleague [Mr. RUSSELL] and myself, but only for the purpose of ascertaining whether we have received any objections or whether we have any to offer against the appointees.

So I am inviting the distinguished chairman of the committee, if he has any charges against any of these appointees or has any evidence of irregularity in regard to the method by which they have been selected, to furnish me with that information, either now or hereafter, either here on the floor of the Senate or at his convenience. Mr. President, I think there can be no excuse whatever for withholding the confirmation of appointments to minor post-office positions in the circumstances which I have detailed.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I inquire if the Senator from Illinois has any time left?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; and I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I do not think I shall require 10 minutes. There are only one or two matters which I desire to discuss, and which seem to me to be of some importance.

On yesterday it had been my halfway decision to vote in favor of the resolution. I must confess that my reason for making even a halfway decision to vote for it was not a very good one. The only reason that I knew for supporting the resolution was that I knew there were in the Civil Service Committee approximately 900 or more appointments, and I had been told that notwithstanding that many of those appointments had been pending for many months and notwithstanding that not a single, solitary charge has been made against the appointees, nevertheless for some reason—and I shall not now discuss reasons or motives—the Committee on Civil Service had more or less arbitrarily refused to take any action, either favorable or unfavorable, on those nominations, and intended to continue to hold the nominations within the committee until the Senate had acted on this resolution and, more than that, until the Senate had adopted the resolution and authorized the requested expenditures. So, Mr. President, following the line of least resistance—which is not a very admirable course to take at any time—I had almost made up my mind to vote for the resolution and let the committee have the money which the resolution would authorize, and let the nominations be reported.

Mr. President, I am not proud that I even thought about making that decision, for after listening to the discussion

on the floor of the Senate, I find not a single, solitary reason for the committee to withhold the reporting of the nominations, and I shall not be a party to being clubbed into voting for the adoption of a resolution in which I do not believe.

Mr. President, if the majority party in this body wants to take the responsibility of saying, and wishes to say to the people of the various States, "Without cause, wtihout charge, and without reason, we are not going to report to the Senate, either favorably or unfavorably, 900 postmaster nominations, and we are going to let the Congress expire without having the nominations reported or acted upon, and we are going to let these men be deprived of the offices to which they have been appointed," if that is the policy of the majority party and if that is what the majority party wishes to do, if it wishes to establish that rule and precedent, let it do so. Mr. President, I shall not support a resolution of this nature simply in order to have reported from the committee nominations which should have come forth from the committee in the discharge of senatorial committee duty.

Mr. President, there is another reason why I shall not vote for this resolution: I think it perhaps absolutely contradicts and violates in intent and purposes the rules of the Senate as adopted in the Reorganization Act. As we all know, when that act was passed the most generous allowance to standing committees that had ever been made in the history of this country was made. Each standing committee was allowed a staff of four experts, to be paid a base salary of $8,000 a year, which actually amounts to $10,000 a year. I am assuming that the Committee on Civil Service has complied with or has followed the Reorganization Act in that respect and has employed such experts. The act also provides for a staff of six clerks for each standing committee. I think the salaries range from perhaps $2,000 to $6,000 a year. Never before in the history of the United States had any Congress made such a generous provision for official help for standing committees. The purpose was to get away from the employment of temporary help and to put the employees of the standing committees on a permanent basis. That provision is written into the rules and regulations, and it contains the words "not more," in each instance relating to the professional staff and to the clerical staff. The words "not more" are used.

Furthermore, Mr. President, the Reorganization Act gives each standing committee all the power and authority that are provided in the pending resolution. The resolution does not contain one word which would confer on the Civil Service Committee any authority which it does not now possess. At the present time the committee could conduct, as it could have conducted ever since the nominations came to the Senate, every examination it thinks necessary, using its trained staff of professional experts, four in number, receiving $10,000 a year, and using all the authority that is called for in this resolution. Such investigations could have been made, and, more than that, they should have been made.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The only difference between this resolution and the standing rule is the fact that this resolution provides another $35,000 and an additional 11 employees to be attached to the present Civil Service Committee. That is the real reason for this resolution.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Senator says it provides for eleven additional employees. I am not sure that it does. I am certain that the chairman of the committee submitted to the Rules Committee a budget which called for a general counsel at $10,000 a year, and others at from $2,000 to $6,000 a year, and some from $7,000 to $8,000 a year. He has said they are going to be employed. There is nothing in the resolution which would give him authority to employ them—not a word; and under the rules of the Senate, his standing committee is limited to the number specified there.

Mr. President, I now propound a parliamentary inquiry: Under the Reorganization Act, without specific authority from the Senate, can any standing committee employ additional help, other than that provided for in the Reorganization Act?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BALDWIN in the chair). In answer to the parliamentary inquiry, the Chair holds that the question the Senator from New Mexico has propounded partakes more of the nature of a question which requires a judicial or legal interpretation than of a question which involves rulings in proceedings in the Senate. The present occupant of the Chair thinks it is a proper question to be propounded to the chairman of the committee, or to anyone else who may be prepared to answer it, but it does not seem to the Chair it is within the province of the Chair to answer the question.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I had anticipated that the Chair might rule that the question which I just submitted as a parliamentary inquiry was in truth not a parliamentary inquiry. I wanted the Chair to rule and to determine whether or not it was a parliamentary inquiry. He has held that it is not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that it is not.

Mr. HATCH. I am not arguing about the correctness of the Chair's decision. Then it remains a question which I raise, and I pose it as a serious question. It is a judicial question which cannot be determined by a parliamentary inquiry. Nor can it be determined by the chairman of the committee. But I say, Mr. President, that if the pending resolution shall be agreed to, and if additional help shall be employed, the question will be submitted for proper legal interpretation.

Mr. President, I submit that under the Reorganization Act and under the language of the resolution the committee will not have the legal power to go beyond the terms of the Reorganization Act and employ all this additional help.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All the time of the Senator from New Mexico, and two minutes more, has expired.

Mr. HATCH. I thank the Chair.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. I think that from the point of view of history it might be well to include in the RECORD a further extract from the work called Good Government, published by the National Civil Service Reform League during the Harding administration. I read from page 78:

APPOINTEES PARTY WORKERS

The report—

That is, the report of the committee appointed by the National Civil Service Reform League to investigate postmaster appointments—

The report then goes on to indicate the attitude of those who received their appointment through the recommendations of their local political leaders and Congressmen. The appointee at Dale, Ind., was reported to have secured his appointment because of his political activity. In a letter to the committee he writes:

"I was not only precinct committeeman last year during the campaign but, with the exception of two campaigns, have been serving as such for the past 20 years. I have no way of knowing whether my Congressman endorse me or not, but I do know that I had the endorsement of about 80 percent of the patrons of this office. As for the backing of the county organization, I suspect that I had the majority of them. You will permit me to say further that very few men in political life would be where they are if it had not been for the work of the precinct committeemen; and further, a party would be very ungrateful if it would ask its committeemen to do the work they have to do and then give the reward to someone who has done nothing."

In answer to the allegation that she had the backing of Congressman Sanders and that it was through his influence that she received the appointment, Mrs. Dooley, the appointee at Montezuma, Ind., writes the committee:

"I presume I received the appointment of postmaster because I took the postmaster examination and was one of the three highest, all of my family having been Republicans from time immemorial."

In further support of the point that Congressmen control the appointments the report quotes a letter written to the committee by Congressman B. Carroll Reece, of Tennessee, as follows:

"The post office appointees in my district are from time to time sending me letters from the National Civil Service Reform League, making inquiry as to their appointments. If you desire any information at any time concerning any appointments in my district, I shall be glad to furnish it to you if it is of such a nature as to entitle you to receive it."

For the postmastership at Benton, Tenn., there were three candidates on the list and the second man was appointed. Congressman Joe Brown wrote to the first man on the list:

"The organization in your county endorsed Mr. Harrison, and I could see no reason to depart from their recommendation in this case.

"A political party cannot succeed without organization. You have some good ideas and I should like to see you put them into practice. The thing for you and your friends to do is to take an active part in the primaries in the election of chairman, etc."

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Is that the same Mr. Reece who is now chairman of the Republican National Committee?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is.

In regard to the postmastership at Malverne, N. Y., Senator Calder wrote to G. J. O'Flynn, of that place, on April 11, 1922:

"Under an arrangement here, Senator WADSWORTH and I have agreed to let each of the Congressmen from New York have complete authority in their district, where, of course, the district is represented, as in Malverne, by a Republican, and I am, therefore, referring your communication to Congressman Hicks."

My only reason for citing this is that whatever may be found as a result of the examination with respect to the use of political influence in the selection of postmasters, it can be nothing but a duplication of what took place during the Harding and Coolidge and Hoover administrations.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I may say, first of all, that before this resolution was drawn, I conferred with the National Committee on Reform of the Civil Service. I have been in touch with them constantly. The article which has just been quoted by the distinguished Senator from Arizona is a quotation from that organization and from former Senator George Norris, which the Senator did not put in the RECORD. I want to read what the late Senator Norris said about this, on April 11, 1938, when the question was asked if Senators or Representatives were to name the postmasters, why not pass a law saying so, instead of having it camouflaged by going through the Committee on Civil Service? Senator Norris said:

Assuming the statement that the Senator has just made, to be accurate—

That is the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR]—

and assuming that Congress believes it to be accurate and desires to carry out such a program, why should we not have the courage to say by law that the list from which the appointment is to be made shall be made out by the Representative of the district, instead of putting the burden on someone else? In other words, why should we not provide by law for what we want to see brought about indirectly by somebody else?

That was the attitude of the late distinguished Senator from Nebraska.

One of the Senators who has spoken says he can see no reason why an investigation should be made. I say to my distinguished friend from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], if he occupied now the position of chairman of the committee, or if he were in the place of one of my colleagues who voted for the resolution, I ask him, if complaint was made that the Civil Service Committee of the Senate had not carried out the law that was signed by the late President Roosevelt, after passage by a two-thirds vote in the House and a similar vote in the Senate, and had not made any pretense of carrying it out, and if, in a strong Republican State, for example, such as Michigan, in 9 years, not a single Republican had been appointed to a post office, would not the Senator believe in all honesty and sincerity that somebody ought to make an investigation?

The distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] states he intends to bring a lawsuit to see to it that no money is expended, even though the resolution be passed. Mr. President, mind you, he makes that statement after he himself, time and time and time again, before the Legislative Reorganization Act was passed, was chairman of subcommittees that were sent out by the Committee on Judiciary, to do what? To investigate whether a certain man would be fit to be a United States marshal or a United States judge; or, that were sent out time and again to find out whether a new judge was actually needed in a particular State.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I am not yielding to the Senator from New Mexico, for reasons with which the Senator is very familiar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. LANGER. In the 15 minutes that I have remaining, I simply want to say that so long as I am chairman of the committee, and so long as men like the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] are on the committee, we are going to carry out the purposes of the Legislative Reorganization Act to the very best of our ability. If a man is acting as postmaster, who, as evidenced by letters, is so drunk that he must be carried home at night, we do not propose to pass the name without an investigation; and the investigation cannot be made without money. The distinguished Senator from Illinois was not on the floor when I read that a postmaster whom he recommended is running a pool hall, in which there is so much dirt, according to the report, that it has to be shoveled out; and yet the Senator preferred him to a veteran who had a 10-point preference. I do not propose to be on a committee that passes a man of that kind.

There has been talk about Chicago. Here is a letter, dated May 21, 1947. Is it said there it no need for investigation? Let the Senators listen to this letter:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF LETTER CARRIERS,
Washington, D. C., May 21, 1947.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Chairman, Senate Civil Service Committee, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: Service conditions in the Chicago, Ill., post office have become so unbearable that the employee morale is at an all-time low. Because of that fact, the officers of Branch No. 11, National Association of Letter Carriers, recently concluded a city-wide survey wherein all letter carriers participated.

A questionnaire was filled out by each individual and as a result of their painstaking effort, the attached brief was prepared. Any impartial investigation will readily reveal that the problem is acute. It is one that needs immediate remedial action.

Branch No. 11, National Association of Letter Carriers, has prepared identical briefs for submission to the President of the United States; the Postmaster General; the chairman, Senate Civil Service Committee; and the chairman, House Post Office Civil Service Committee. Your brief is attached hereto.

In supporting the contentions made by branch No. 1, N. A. L. C., it is the considered opinion of this association that a sweeping investigation should be conducted without further delay. Such an investigation will be in the best interest of both public service and employee morale.

Therefore, the undersigned officers respectfully request that such an investigation be ordered immediately and that proper action be taken against those culpable of this improper supervision and gross mismanagement.

Sincerely yours,

W. C. DOHERTY,
President.
D. R. SULLIVAN,
Vice President.
J. J. KEATING,
Secretary.
R. B. KREMERS,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the result of the survey, as set forth in a letter from the president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, together with exhibits A, B, C, and D, may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter, together with the exhibits, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAS. D. DUFFEY BRANCH, NO. 11,
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS,
Chicago, May 16, 1947.

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Chairman, Senate Civil Service Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LANGER: As an introduction to the accompanying brief upon the subject matter, the officers and members of branch 11, National Association of Letter Carriers respectfully submit the following information which we maintain is fundamentally the cause for an inferior delivery service in the Chicago Post Office.

We also claim that the conditions described have definitely contributed to a lowered morale throughout the letter-carrier force and undermined the health and welfare of these employees because of the unreasonable burdens of employment which have steadily been imposed upon them during the past decade, as attested to by those affected, in whose behalf proof of these complaints is respectfully referred to you for our consideration.

We therefore urgently request that a proper investigation be instituted at the earliest possible moment to the end that an improved delivery service and better working conditions for letter carriers may result.

Fraternally,

FRED O. ANDREWS,
President.

EXHIBIT A

SUMMARY OF CONDITIONS IN THE DELIVERY SERVICE IN THE CHICAGO POST OFFICE WHICH HAVE EXISTED WITHOUT LET-UP FOR THE LAST 10 YEARS

The letter carriers of Chicago have been working under harsh and conflicting rules that are both an exhausting experience and a puzzle for the last 10 years. The stress is not in conflict with the P. L. & R., not in the good sense of discipline, but orders and counter orders work against the grain in a design that forces 48 hours of work out of a man during a 40-hour week.

Eight years ago, during an economy drive instituted in the Chicago office, service was slashed without consideration in an attempt to save money on operation. Under it, in the residential and outlying business sections, three-trip (or two-trip special) service was cut to two straight trips and carriers received an addition to take up the gap where a route was eliminated in order to save money—strictly on the basis of a carrier's salary. The system introduced was plainly not to improve delivery, but to try to make it workable with as little manpower and service to the public as possible. The small businessman lost the delivery on the second trip, and all classes of patrons were lucky to receive even a second trip when a heavy, unmanageable mail, due to the addition the carriers received, made it impossible to get around fully on the last trip. The post office saved money on travel time to and from the office, route eliminations, and various other short cuts. But, they also rendered the service to its patrons entirely inadequate and uncertain.

New schedules were outlined, stretching the office and field time tighter. Second and third class that ordinarily was cleared up by the end of the workday lay around for the next day's one full trip and part of a second. Heavy mail that could be handled with occasional overtime on a route of lesser territory became an anchor and a slow-up in handling that no man could contend with, and possibly expect to clean up in an ordinary day's tour. The introduction of the new economy system was placed squarely on the back of the city letter carrier.

Firms that requested it got the second trip's delivery via parcel-post truck, the mounted carrier having to stop the delivery of fourth class, return to the station, pick up firm mail that belonged to the foot carrier, and spend approximately one-half hour of his own field time delivering first class to firms spread out over a 2-mile-square area. This called for daily auxiliary on parcel post, involved an extra truck being put into service and a sub to man it. Soon, even some of the firms considered for a second-trip service were dropped. Meanwhile, downtown carriers were making four full trips a day.

Several experiments were tried, using subs in what would ordinarily be a regular man's assignment, the saving to be on a salary basis, on temporary collection routes. The two-bundle system of mail separation, used successfully in other cities was applied to the Chicago office and was so retarding that it was later taken out, and the usual separation restored. Where routes were considered fluid enough to be handled adequately by the regular man on the basis of his seniority, they now became a nightmare to both the regular and the substitute unfamiliar with the casing and delivery of the day-to-day runs of heavy mail.

Books, fourth class, that once were delivered by truck at a low mailing rate, and have now become so popular through book-of-the-month subscriptions, were now given to the foot carrier to deliver, the basis of this being that each weight less than 5 pounds had to be carried, no matter how many pieces of fourth-class matter you handled each trip. Heavy subscribing to second-class matter of all sizes, shapes, and weights added to the load. And the number of pieces of all classes handled by the postal employees have increased over 50 percent in the last 10 years.

The leaving time on the morning trip, once taken for granted and readily complied with, now became a race against time and the ability of each carrier to exert himself to the limit to get it in, get out, and get back on time under the threat of being demerited. He was half spent even before starting the hardest part of his work—street delivery. During the war an order from Washington came through to the effect that all undeliverable first class must be worked up before carriers left the office. Time spent working up undeliverable first class had to be squeezed in alone with the regular office time. It usually amounts to about 10 minutes. Failure to do so calls for reprimand, but no office allowance is given in the morning with the leaving time approaching. This means speed up.

The general outlook on the part of all supervisory grades is to stretch the carrier's working day tight as it will stand it and holding the man to it under the threat of being written up or having to write himself up. They uphold the carrier to the point of getting it in, and humping it out, and expect it to be a day-to-day performance. First-class-mail, mail matter, like telephone and gas bills, are distributed to the routes a block at a time over a given period. But on the same days there is a house to house run of circular mail and a good deal of monthly second-class subscriptions thrown in. This runs from day to day. Thus, there is no such thing as a light day, and the carrier is disposed to believe that the mail is governed in flow either by agreement with the mailer in the case of first class, or the delivery division downtown in the case of second and third class.

Substitutes who got high intelligence ratings in competitive examinations, and who intend, from a respectful view of the service, to make it a life work, are quitting because of the inhuman standards expected of them. This opens the job to an inferior man.

Restoration of the service to the point where it was 10 years ago will alleviate the conditions outlined. The skyrocketing overtime and auxiliary, and sick-leave absences will be cut down immeasurably. The service to the public will be better and surer. The working employee will be able to conserve himself, instead of burning himself out trying to make an impossible route. His morale will be improved and he will be able to properly handle his district and render a higher standard of service to the patrons.

EXHIBIT B

COMPARISON OF WORKING SCHEDULES

In 1937:
Three trip (or two-trip special) route:
Begin: 6:20, 10:30, 1:10.
Leave: 7:30, 10:40, 1:30.
Return: 10:20, 12, 3:10.
End: 10:30, 12:10, 3:20.
Two-trip route:
Begin: 6:10, 1:10.
Leave: 7:30, 1:30.
Return: 11, 4.
End: 11:10, 4:10.
In 1947:
Two-trip route:
Begin: 6:10, 1:20.
Leave: 8, :40.
Return: 11:50, 3:20.
End: 12, 3:30.

The increased office time on the morning in comparison with that of 10 years ago with the cutting down of field time in the afternoon tend to overload the cases with mail and result in curtailment on the part of carriers on the second trip.

Conditions affecting the collection and parcel-post service:

Two thousand eight hundred street collection boxes were removed from the streets of Chicago during the war. They have not been restored. Collections in residential sections are now made at intervals of from 6 to 12 hours.

Trucks, in service over a period of 25 years, are used over a period of 16 to 18 hours daily. Army trucks brought into service this other antiquated equipment are impractical and work a hardship on the men. This fact is recognized by an unwritten order that all assignments to Army trucks be confined to young and able-bodied men. The original order, when these trucks were first introduced was to supply a driver (a substitute employee) to assist the delivery man. This arrangement is not in effect at this time because of a shortage of subs, which aggravates the situation to the extent that a number of the mature carriers have been forced to seek other postal employment.

Due to a heavy increase in express rates the parcel-post mail has increased to a marked degree (at least 25 percent), which imposes this additional burden on the mounted carriers. It may be also noted that all available building space is now occupied, as compared with about 60 percent tenancy before the war. This additional work which inevitably follows the increased occupancy of loop property must be assumed by the same quota of men who formerly served this territory.

EXHIBIT C

CHARLES D. DUFFY BRANCH, No. 11,
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS.

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER: In replying to the enclosed questions confine your statements strictly to the truth, which will bear investigation. Do not exaggerate or draw on your imagination in any respect.

In addition to replying to the questions which appear in the questionnaire form, you are, of course, at liberty to make separate additional comments upon matters which appear to be of importance pertinent to this effort to render a better delivery service and relieve working conditions for letter carriers.

Collectors, parcel-post, and mounted carriers, whose duties are somewhat of a different nature, can furnish us with additional information in space allotted for remarks.

Cordially and fraternally yours,

FRED O. ANDREWS,
President.
M. A. MCGOVERN,
Secretary.

The following questions are being referred to Chicago letter carriers by their association for the purpose of securing a referendum upon conditions in the delivery division from the standpoint of the carrier force. It is our opinion that present-day inferior service may be definitely charged to the "pressure" and "speed-up" with which letter carriers have to contend. Information is desired upon all instances where carriers appear to be working beyond their normal capacity and are possibly penalized for failure to conform with a specified work pace. All information will receive careful consideration with due appreciation from the officers of Branch 11, National Association of Letter Carriers.

1. How are the physical conditions of swingrooms, washrooms, floors, carrier cases, lighting facilities, and so forth, maintained at your unit? Good, 818, or 47 percent Government buildings. Bad, 575, or 33 percent private buildings. Indifferent, 349, or 20 percent private buildings.

2. Have you noted instances of prolonged sick leave and disability retirement of letter carrier which may be directly traced to overwork and the "speed-up" system? Yes, 984, or 61 percent. No, 630, or 39 percent.

3. Do you believe that the average letter carrier can cope with today's harsh requirements and standards conscientiously and maintain his health and morale? Yes, 87, or 5 percent. No, 1,656, or 95 percent.

4. Have there been instances at your station where demerits were imposed upon carriers for failure or inability to return upon schedule regardless of weather or traffic conditions? Yes, 462, or 28 percent. No, 1,153, or 72 percent.

5. How does your route today compare with your route of prewar times? Blocks added, all routes. Buildings added, same. Floors added, same.

6. Is it apparent during a 5-day count that all classes of mail are less in volume

than you ordinarily handle? Yes, 1,193, or 81 percent. No 280, or 19 percent.

7. How many pieces and pounds of mail do you actually deliver daily? No regularity to the replies to No. 7.

8. Is the sack system of carrier distribution from main post office unpopular with the letter carriers? Yes, 889, or 66 percent. No, 457, or 34 percent.

9. Is official time allowed for the following duties? (a) Dumping sacks for second-class, third-class, and fourth-class mail matter? Yes, 249, or 18 percent. No, 1,134, or 82 percent. (b) Noting clerical errors upon facing slips? Yes, 204, or 16 percent. No, 1,068, or 84 percent. (c) Marking up first class before leaving for route? Yes, 409, or 30 percent. No, 956, or 70 percent.

10. What is the average time given at your station between the tie-out bell and your scheduled leaving time each morning? Less than 15 minutes.

11. What are your orders upon leaving time? Are you subject to one of the following alternatives? Leave at 8 a. m. "regardless," 1,202, or 88 percent. Get mail in "regardless," 103, or 7 percent.

12. Is "pressure" used to require you to handle a large accumulation of mail within an outlined schedule? Yes, 653, or 47 percent. No, 736, or 53 percent.

13. Is 'doubling-up" which was employed during the war still used at your station to fill in on an unmanned case? Yes, 318, or 23 percent. No, 1,068, or 77 percent.

14. What disposition is made of mail for afternoon delivery on your route when you are "grouped" on an absentee's case?

It remains in office $\frac{446 \text{ or } 98 \text{ percent}}{10 \text{ or } 2 \text{ percent}}$

It is delivered by sub $\frac{405 \text{ or } 99 \text{ percent}}{4 \text{ or } 1 \text{ percent}}$

15. If mail is not delivered are you given auxiliary assistance the following day? Yes, 529, or 51 percent. No, 512, or 49 percent. Overtime: Yes, 146, or 17 percent. No, 712, or 83 percent.

Remarks ----------

EXHIBIT D

COMMENTS AND COMPLAINTS OF LETTER CARRIERS NOT INCLUDED IN QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Afternoon reporting time under new compensatory time system is very unpopular with the letter carrier.

2. Shortage of carriers' satchels, shoulder straps, and relay boxes.

3. Route tests are not fair. If the mail is too heavy the tests are called off until a lighter day.

4. The supervisors apply pressure on the men to maintain a work pace.

5. First-class mail is left on the ledge undistributed in time for carriers leaving on first trip.

6. Foremen mark up undeliverable mail for carriers while they are out serving their districts.

7. Mounted carriers are given orders to report early to distribute first class on an absent foot-carrier's case, then cannot complete their own tour of duty in the allotted 8 hours.

8. Subs ordinarily used for sick leave on foot routes are put on parcel post to help handle increased fourth class.

9. Outmoded trucks and equipment, poorly maintained, are a proven hazard to the public as well as detrimental to the health and welfare of the drivers. Seepage of carbon monoxide fumes alone has resulted in several cases of illness.

10. Station maintenance is poor.

11. Washrooms are unsanitary and filthy. Toilet tissue is rationed.

12. Lighting facilities are poor; 25-watt bulbs have replaced 40-watt.

13. The heat is frequently shut off and windows kept closed to conserve coal. When the men report for work in the morning, they are obliged to work in the cold station filled with stale, dust-laden air.

14. Sacks of second- and third-class mail sent out to the stations from the centralized distribution in the main post office, when emptied, result in soiling the uniforms and creating excessive dust.

15. The sack system of centralized distribution of second- and third-class matter from downtown entails 16 clerical operations, whereas it only required 4 when night sets at stations handled it.

16. The clean-up order on Saturday, a non-working day, results in handling circular and paper mail far too heavy for normal delivery.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask, what would the Senator from Illinois do, were he to receive such a letter as the one I now hold in my hand, which came to me from California? It reads as follows:

VENICE, CALIF., *May 12, 1947.*

Mr. MCINTYRE FARIES,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR SIR: Confirming telephone conversation of recent day, re postmaster appointment at Venice, Calif., now before the Senate for action.

This is the sixth time that I have placed at the top of the list in an examination by the United States Civil Service Commission and according to the news release from Washington an appointment will be made. Mrs. Letitia D. Winn has been acting postmaster at Venice; she was not qualified in the first five examinations because of her age, overage that is, but for some reason she is on the list.

I am a veteran of the First World War and was chief of camouflage in the southwest in this war and later chief of camouflage in the northwest division, Canada and Alaska.

Your support is requested in my behalf, as I will need a lot of good citizens to ask the Senator for his action.

Most sincerely yours,

HARRY K. BOONE.

Mr. President, someone must investigate such a situation as that. I have a letter from a man in my own State, and I exhibit to Senators a bunch of receipts issued to him, month after month, year after year, commencing in 1934, ending in 1942, when the man was fired because he would no longer contribute. Every month, a collector comes on the 1st day of the month, just as he does in the city of Marion, N. Dak. Mr. President, I asked for this investigation 3 years ago. At that time the Democrats were in the majority. They had the right, if they wanted to investigate, to stop what has been taking place in the country. I said at that time, and I repeat now: Here is a pay roll of $88,000,000. These receipts show that $10 a month is being collected, making five or six million dollars a year that is taken from the pockets of the poor letter carriers and clerks, who are working for the postmasters. The Senator from Florida says it is all politics. I say that I am in the same position as that occupied by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], who now occupies the chair, when for 8 years, year after year, he pleaded upon the floor of the Senate and introduced one bill after another to do exactly what we are now asking to have done. Certainly, a large business such as the Post Office Department of the United States, the greatest business in the country, ought not to have a deficit of $300,000,000 a year.

I come back to my own State. I received a letter from North Dakota dated May 17, in which the writer said:

It is a generally accepted fact, without any legal proof, however, that the postal positions in many North Dakota communities are being sold to the highest bidder. The qualification of being a Democrat is secondary.

That is written by one of the most reputable citizens of North Dakota.

I have here a letter which comes from Indiana. I may say that I have received complaints from every single State of the Union, without exception. I checked up to find if there were any States from which no complaints had come, but found none. This letter is from Indiana, and the writer says:

The attached clippings are self-explanatory. What I wish to know is if May Reiff is one of the 600 postmasters being held up, and not as yet confirmed by the Senate.

The administration has called two examinations to get her through. She has taken three examinations for postmistress, and this one on April 19, 1946, is the only one she has been able to pass.

I shall not read the remainder of the letter. I now read a paragraph from a letter from Maine:

This is a small office. A postmaster and two clerks are ample. Only one train a day. But he, a poor sickly specimen of humanity, not being able to come down to the office half the time, the Government furnished an extra clerk to take his place, and for Mr. Hannegan to call for more money for such cases as this (no doubt universal), I call it highway robbery and abuse to the public. We need less personnel and more efficiency.

Mr. President, as I said when I began speaking on this subject, the Civil Service Committee is determined to take the Post Office Department out of politics. If we can secure enough votes, and I think we can on the floor, because it is favored by a sufficient number of Democrats, headed by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], who is the ranking Democratic member of the committee and who has announced that he is going to vote for the resolution, we are going to take the United States Post Office Department out of politics. Now is the time to do so if we are ever to do it.

I want to repeat what I said 3 years ago on the Senate floor: I think it is a disgrace that letters should be sent out asking for contributions of $25, $50, $75 from postmasters. A Senator yesterday was unkind enough to say that perhaps we collected some of that money in North Dakota. I want to say to my distinguished Democratic friends that in North Dakota we do not raise campaign funds in that way. In North Dakota the common people do the contributing to political campaign funds. They join a political organization. In North Dakota they have a league. That league charges a certain amount for membership. The farmers belonging to it pay $12, $15, or $16 a year. The farmers go to meetings and conventions. They nominate candidates. They do so by secret ballot. The league has sent to the Senate such Senators as Senator Frazier and Senator Nye, and has sent to the House such Representatives as Representative Burdick and Representative Lemke. We do not go to corporations for money. We

do not go to poor people working for the Government and ask them for money. We do not sell post offices in North Dakota, in spite of the letter which said that some Democrats are doing so.

I say simply and finally, in conclusion, that personally I am proud of the attitude the Republicans took at the time the Civil Service Act was passed. I was never prouder in my life than I was last night when I read the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] now presiding over the Senate, who contended that nominations for postmasters should be made from the ranks, that the men in the post offices should work their way from the bottom and advance year after year, and finally from such individuals should be chosen postmasters, as is done in any good business. I am proud too, Mr. President, of the attitude which was taken by the late Senator George Norris. I am proud indeed of the record of the Republican Party. I believe that my Democratic friends who today are looking askance because we are trying to have the pending resolution adopted, will at the end of 4 months, after adoption of the resolution, say that it has been the means of obtaining good, competent men as postmasters, and that one of the finest jobs along that line in the history of the country will have been done by reason of the adoption of the resolution which is sponsored by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], myself, and other members of the committee, the purpose of the resolution being that the Civil Service Act, passed in 1930, shall be honestly lived up to for the benefit of the common people of America.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that suggestion for a moment while I make a brief statement regarding the comment he made about me?

Mr. LANGER. I do not withhold the suggestion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota declines to withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	Millikin
Baldwin	Hatch	Moore
Ball	Hayden	Morse
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Murray
Bridges	Hill	O'Conor
Brooks	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Buck	Holland	Overton
Bushfield	Ives	Pepper
Butler	Jenner	Revercomb
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Cain	Kem	Russell
Capehart	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Capper	Knowland	Sparkman
Chavez	Langer	Stewart
Connally	Lodge	Taft
Cooper	Lucas	Taylor
Cordon	McCarran	Thye
Donnell	McCarthy	Tydings
Downey	McClellan	Umstead
Dworshak	McFarland	Vandenberg
Eastland	McGrath	Watkins
Ecton	McKellar	White
Ellender	McMahon	Wiley
Ferguson	Magnuson	Williams
Flanders	Malone	Young
Fulbright	Martin	
George	Maybank	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment, as amended, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 5, after the word "investigation" it is proposed to strike out "as to why few if any Republicans have been appointed to the offices of first-, second-, or third-class postmasters for the last fourteen years, how many Republicans have been removed," and insert "as to political activities in the civil service in the appointment of first-, second-, and third-class postmasters,".

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is on agreeing to the second committee amendment, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 8, after the numerals "$35,000" it is proposed to strike out "in addition to the cost of stenographic services to report such hearings."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the final passage of the resolution as amended.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHITE. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are necessarily absent. The Senator from Nebraska, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] and the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed members of the Commission to attend the Princeton University Bicentennial celebration. The senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. The senior Senator from New Jersey, if present and voting, would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kentucky, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. The junior Senator from New Jersey, if present and voting, would vote "yea," and the Senator from Virginia, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] is unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] who is detained on committee business has a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER].

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent by leave, having been appointed members of the Commission to attend the Princeton University bicentennial celebration.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] is absent because of a death in his family.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] is paired on this vote with the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay," and the senior Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea."

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] is paired with the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay," and the junior Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea."

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED].

If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 35, as follows:

YEAS—44

Aiken	Donnell	Millikin
Baldwin	Dworshak	Moore
Ball	Ecton	Morse
Bricker	Ferguson	Revercomb
Bridges	Flanders	Robertson, Wyo.
Brooks	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Buck	Ives	Taft
Bushfield	Jenner	Thye
Butler	Kem	Vandenberg
Cain	Knowland	Watkins
Capehart	Langer	White
Capper	Lodge	Wiley
Chavez	McCarthy	Williams
Cooper	Malone	Young
Cordon	Martin	

NAYS—35

Byrd	Holland	Murray
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor
Downey	Kilgore	O'Mahoney
Eastland	Lucas	Overton
Ellender	McCarran	Pepper
Fulbright	McClellan	Russell
George	McFarland	Sparkman
Green	McGrath	Stewart
Hatch	McKellar	Taylor
Hayden	McMahon	Tydings
Hill	Magnuson	Umstead
Hoey	Maybank	

NOT VOTING—16

Barkley	O'Daniel	Tobey
Brewster	Reed	Wagner
Gurney	Robertson, Va.	Wherry
Hawkes	Smith	Wilson
Johnston, S. C	Thomas, Okla.	
Myers	Thomas, Utah	

So the resolution (S. Res. 81), as amended, was agreed to.

The amendment of the committee striking out the preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, as agreed to, is as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate Civil Service Committee, which has the jurisdiction over all civil-service matters in connection with the post office, or any duly authorized subcommittee, is authorized and directed to make a complete investigation as to political activities in the civil service in the appointment of first-, second-, and third-class postmasters, and whether any postmasters on threat of losing their positions have been compelled to pay tribute financially or otherwise to anyone or to a group of politicians. Also whether there has been an attempt to compel men and women occupying the position of postmaster to violate the Hatch Act and to investigate any and all collateral matters which the testimony may develop.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee of any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production and impounding of books, papers, and documents, to administer oaths, and to take such testimony as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, which shall not exceed $35,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

The authority conferred by this resolution shall expire on January 15, 1948, and the report of the committee shall be filed with the Senate on or before said date.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House having proceeded to reconsider the bill (H. R. 1) entitled "An act to reduce individual income-tax payments," returned by the President of the United States with his objections, to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, it was—

Resolved, That the said bill do not pass, two-thirds of the House of Representatives not agreeing to pass the same.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 26. An act to make criminally liable persons who negligently allow prisoners in their custody to escape;

S. 125. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to extend the benefits of such act to the Official Reporters of Debates in the Senate and persons employed by them in connection with the performance of their duties as such reporters;

S. 321. An act to amend section 17 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, so as to increase the pay of cadets and midshipmen at the service academies, and for other purposes;

S. 597. An act to provide for the protection of forests against destructive insects and diseases, and for other purposes; and

S. 614. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for a permanent Census Office," approved March 6, 1902, as amended (the collection and publication of statistical information by the Bureau of the Census).

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY PROJECT

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial from the June 11, 1947, issue of the Hartford Courant, of Hartford, Conn., entitled "St. Lawrence Seaway." It is a very fair editorial and is quite significant, coming from a newspaper which has been traditionally opposed to the St. Lawrence seaway. I should like to call attention to one sentence of the editorial, which reads as follows:

Unquestionably the opposition will come forward with its usual arguments based on sectionalism and self-interest. That is not to say that they are without merit. But the determining factor should be the public welfare, the interests of the whole country.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Headed by former-President Herbert Hoover and Secretary of State George C. Marshall, the proponents of the St. Lawrence seaway have been presenting their case before a Senate subcommittee. The economic arguments have a most familiar ring—cheaper transportation for goods being exported from the Middle West, cheaper electrical power for New York State and New England excepting the State of Maine, and self-liquidation of the cost through tolls for ships and power sold. Nor should one overlook Mr. Hoover's refutation of the contention of the railroads that competition would ruin them. He placed the loss of freight at less than 5 percent of the volume now handled.

It remained for Secretary Marshall to introduce two new arguments for the plan. He asserted that the War Department elected to establish some industries in other regions because of the lack of electrical power in New York and New England. And he placed special emphasis on the desirability of a canal permitting ocean-going ships and submarines to enter the Great Lakes in time of war for loading and for repairs, and also for the inland construction of such ships. In this atomic age, he argued, such facilities would be especially desirable if not imperative. Unquestionably the opposition will come forward with its usual arguments based on sectionalism and self-interest. That is not to say that they are without merit. But the determining factor should be the public welfare, the interests of the whole country.

Historically the St. Lawrence seaway has had a long and almost continuous legislative history, beginning more than 30 years ago. The 113 miles between Ogdensburg, N. Y., and Montreal that would have to be improved have received a lot of attention from Congress and various other groups surveying its possibilities for power and changes for navigation. As Secretary of Commerce Mr. Hoover headed the first commission making an exhausive study of the project. He is as firm in his conviction of its merits today as he was then. Two private studies, one by the Brookings Institution and the other by the Niagara Frontier Planning Board, have made unfavorable recommendations. The last six Presidents and four Governors of New York, including Thomas E. Dewey, have favored the plan. Mr. Dewey secured certain concessions concerning the sale of power that are favorable to his State.

In Congress the St. Lawrence seaway has come to a vote only twice. Submitted as a treaty in 1934 it won a majority in the Senate, but not the required two-thirds necessary for approval. In 1941 an attempt to tack it on as an amendment to a rivers and harbors bill was defeated, 56 to 25. This vote was not on the merits of the measure. Since the initial defeat the idea of a treaty with Canada that would require a two-thirds vote of the Senate has been abandoned for ratification of an agreement with Canada, for which a majority of both Houses would be required. Just where the line between a treaty and an agreement lies has never been satisfactorily explained. It would seem to lie in the minds of those who wish for an easier way to gain their ends than that provided in the Constitution.

Whether the joint plan with Canada takes the form of a treaty or an agreement, it is probably well to reexamine the proposal to develop the St. Lawrence River. Secretary Marshall last February placed it on his list of "urgent" measures. He recognizes the military value of the seaway—an aspect that before the Second World War and the atomic bomb received minor consideration.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON WOOL BILL

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to state that tomorrow I will submit to the Senate the report of the conference committee on the wool bill, so-called. I shall not submit it and attempt to get action on it today, because of the absence of the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and others who are interested in it and who desire to take part in the discussion.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. There was so much confusion in the Chamber that I could not understand what the Senator said about the conference report on the wool bill. Did he say it was his intention to have it taken up tomorrow?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. HATCH. Did the Senator indicate as what time he would have it taken up? As I recall, there is a unanimous-consent agreement that the Senate shall vote at 4 o'clock tomorrow on the Bulwinkle bill. Is it the Senator's intention to have the conference report taken up after the vote is had on the Bulwinkle bill?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me.

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the time will be limited only between 2 o'clock and 4 o'clock. So if no Senator wishes to speak on the Reed bill before 2 o'clock, we can take up the conference report and consider it until that time. There are two conference reports to be taken up, one on the wool bill and the other on the rent-control bill. I am quite willing to accommodate Senators, but I think probably we had better take up either one or the other conference report at 12 o'clock tomorrow, and see if we can conclude action on it by 2 o'clock. If not, it will go over until after 4 o'clock, for the time between 2 o'clock and 4 o'clock will be devoted to the final remarks on the Reed bill.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have no particular desire one way or the other. I simply wished to know what the situation was.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, let me say that I intended to submit the conference report on the wool bill at this time; but due to the absence of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and other Senators who are interested in that

measure, it seemed to be only courteous to postpone it until tomorrow. But I shall present it at the first opportunity tomorrow.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if that is the intention of the Senator from Vermont, I think we may assume that we shall proceed at 12 o'clock tomorrow to consider the conference report on the wool bill and shall continue to consider it until 2 o'clock. If a vote is not obtained on it by that time, it will go over until after 4 o'clock, when its consideration will be resumed.

JOHN C. CROCKETT

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, within the last few minutes I have received certain information of which I should have been aware some time ago. For my failure to report it, I apologize to the Members of the Senate. It relates to a very distinguished Iowan who has long served this body. He is a native of my home State. He learned his politics in his public service in north central Iowa in a county office. He later came to the city of Des Moines to serve in the Iowa Legislature, I believe, as a reading clerk. Then he became clerk of the Supreme Court of the State of Iowa; and a good many years ago, I think approximately 40 years ago, when our late famous Senator William B. Allison graced the Senate, he brought this public servant to the city of Washington to serve the Senate of the United States, where he has served vigorously and well over the years. This is his 83d birthday. I am sorry that I cannot say the exact number of years he has served the Senate and the people of the United States.

Mr. President, in commemoration of this day I fondly salute, on behalf of the State of Iowa and, I hope, on behalf of my colleagues on this side of the aisle, the long public service of the Chief Clerk of the United States Senate, John C. Crockett, and I wish him many happy returns of this anniversary. [Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I desire to join my felicitations with those just spoken by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]. I am not sure about the age of John Crockett, but whatever the calendar says, he does not look it. He has served for more than 40 years in the Senate of the United States and has been kindly, gracious, diligent, and honorable at all times. I join in the expressions of every good wish for him.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, because our distinguished Chief Clerk is not only an outstanding gentleman but a citizen of my State, I should like to join most cordially in the felicitations tendered him by the able Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

My tribute to him will be short: He is a man of unimpeachable integrity. He is a man whose convictions are stronger than any barricades which might be erected in their path. He is a man who is an American before he is a partisan. If I may paraphrase the words of the poet, let me say that I consider John Crockett great in every attribute that doth become a man.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I want to join the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] in a few words about John Crockett.

I have known Mr. Crockett perhaps as long as any member of this body has. I first met him in the year 1911, and I have known him ever since. We became friends at our first meeting, and we have been close and intimate and steadfast friends ever since; and I believe he is one of the purest, most upstanding, and most upright characters I ever knew. I have never known him to make a dishonorable statement about anyone. He is a man of the highest character; one of the manliest and straightest characters I have ever known in all my life. He is as honest as the day is long—courteous, efficient, clean-minded, liberal-hearted, kind, and a gentleman through and through. He has all the attributes of uprightness that any real man ought to have.

He has made one of the finest clerks it is possible for the Senate or any other body to have.

When I first came here, he told me he was a Republican. I was a strong Democrat, and still am, and always will be, and I suppose he is still a strong Republican, but the circumstance of our belonging to different parties has never made any difference in our relations or the transaction of his duties as an officer of this body. He made a fine officer during Republican days and he made an equally fine officer during Democratic days. I was strong for him in Republican administrations, and in like manner strong for him in Democratic administrations.

I wish for him many more years of service and of usefulness and of happiness. I have profited tremendously by the association I have had the good fortune to have had with him. I wish for him every good thing in life.

There was never a purer, or better, or higher minded, or finer American citizen than John Crockett, and I wish for him everything that is good.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I wish to join with all my associates in the Senate in wishing for our distinguished friend, John Crockett, many more years of health and service to the Nation. In the little more than 8 years it has been my privilege to know him, I have found him to be friendly, cooperative, and understanding, and I know of no better criterion for a public servant.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN AGREEMENTS BETWEEN CARRIERS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 110) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers.

RECESS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, in the absence of the majority leader, I move that the Senate recess until the hour of 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 18, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 17 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

James Bruce, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Argentina.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

John M. Moore, of Kentucky, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Kentucky. (Mr. Moore is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired June 14, 1947.)

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The following-named employee of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to the position indicated:

To be lieutenant (junior grade) in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, from the date indicated:

Lewis V. Evans III, May 1, 1947.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers for appointment in the United States Navy in the Corps, grades, and ranks hereinafter stated.

The following-named officers to the ranks indicated in the line of the Navy:

(*Indicates officers to be designated for EDO and SDO subsequent to acceptance of appointment)

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

*Stearns, George F., Jr.

ENSIGNS

*Barahal, George D.
*Burnett, Collins W.
*Fisher, Guin M.
Graham, Horace E.
Hartley, Cecil M.
Hedges, William D.
*Kenner, Jack L.
*Maloney, John M.
McKenzie, Lawrence H.
Nutter, Paul "M"
*O'Malley, George F.
*Potter, James A., 3d
Stansell, Herman J. Jr.
*Thornton, William H., Jr.
*Vranicar, Raymond N.
Ward, John F.
Willett, Charles F.

The following-named officers to the grade and rank indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

ASSISTANT SURGEONS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Basilicato, Gennaro K.
Faaland, Halvdan G.
King, Robert L.
Mayer, William E.
Orr, William S.
Quilter, Thomas N.

The following-named officers to the grade and rank indicated in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

ASSISTANT PAYMASTERS WITH THE RANK OF ENSIGN

Batterson, Robert E.
Davis, Albert S.
Ferris, Robert H.
Fink, William W.
Shepard, John C.
Tucker, Oscar G.
Becker, Charles
Chance, Carl
Cherryman, Rexford R.
Depew, Robert W.
Desanto, James V.
Forlenza, Vincent A.
Fowler, George O.
Moon, Ralph E.
Oller, William M.
Rehberg, Jerome A.
Shenk, Eugene M.
Woody, Ellis A.

The following-named officers to the grades and rank indicated in the Civil Engineer Corps of the United States Navy:

ASSISTANT CIVIL ENGINEERS WITH THE RANK OF ENSIGN

Kwinn, Edward S.
Lee, James J.

The following-named officers to the grades and rank indicated in the Dental Corps of the United States Navy:

ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEONS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Grossman, Frank D.
McCrory, John J.
Rupp, Nelson W.
Staples, William R.

The following-named officers to the rank of commissioned warrant officers in the Navy in the grades indicated:

CHIEF RADIO ELECTRICIAN

Holt, Robert L.

CHIEF PAY CLERKS

Day, Donald J.
Harter, August J.
Hiatt, Donald A.
Kroger, Raymond M.
McKenney, Charles V.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate June 17 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Lewis V. Evans III, junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer, with rank of lieutenant (junior grade), from April 29, 1947.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 17, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, the author of light and power, with whom there is no variableness, neither shadow of turning, as the duties of another day await us, send forth the spirit of Thy truth upon our pathways. As Thou dost encamp about us, be Thou the guardian of our thoughts and keep us with unswerving fidelity at the altar of the sanctities of public office and private life. As custodians of our Government, inspire us with courage, that we may rekindle confidence in the breasts of all faithless and mistaken men.

O God, let Thy manifold blessings be upon our beloved Speaker and all others who share the responsibilities of the Congress. Unfold unto us Thy long, long purpose for humanity, that our land may be led into Thy righteous morning.

In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 310. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to permit the delivery of water from the District of Columbia and Arlington County water systems to the Falls Church or other water systems in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia in Virginia;

H. R. 360. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Francis Eugene Hardin, a minor;

H. R. 468. An act to amend section 115 of the Internal Revenue Code in respect of distributions by personal holding companies;

H. R. 620. An act for the relief of Blanche E. Broad;

H. R. 651. An act for the relief of the estate of Rubert W. Alexander;

H. R. 723. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Hunter A. Hoagland, a minor;

H. R. 765. An act for the relief of Elwood L. Keeler;

H. R. 888. An act for the relief of certain owners of land who suffered loss by fire in Lake Landing Township, Hyde County, N. C.;

H. R. 925. An act for the relief of Therese R. Cohen;

H. R. 1065. An act for the relief of the estate of Thomas Gambacorto;

H. R. 1221. An act for the relief of Eva Bilobran;

H. R. 1237. An act to regulate the marketing of economic poisons and devices, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1244. An act to admit the American-owned ferry *Crosline* to American registry and to permit its use in coastwise trade;

H. R. 1412. An act to grant to the Arthur Alexander Post, No. 68, the American Legion, of Belzoni, Miss., all of the reversionary interest reserved to the United States in lands conveyed to said post pursuant to act of Congress approved June 29, 1938;

H. R. 1482. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Gilda Cowan, a minor;

H. R. 1624. An act to authorize payment of allowances to three inspectors of the Metropolitan Police force for the use of their privately owned motor vehicles, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1874. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2207. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands within the Shiloh National Military Park, Tenn., and for other purposes;

H. R. 2237. An act to correct an error in section 342 (b) (8) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended;

H. R. 2257. An act for the relief of Southeastern Sand & Gravel Co.;

H. R. 2353. An act to authorize the patenting of certain public lands to the State of Montana or to the Board of County Commissioners of Hill County, Mont., for public-park purposes;

H. R. 2368. An act to amend paragraph 8 of part VII, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to authorize an appropriation of $3,000,000 as a revolving fund in lieu of $1,500,000 now authorized, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2852. An act to provide for the addition of certain surplus Government lands to the Otter Creek recreational demonstration area, in the State of Kentucky;

H. R. 2872. An act to amend further section 4 of the Public Debt Act of 1941, as amended, and clarify its application, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3143. An act to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Paonia Federal reclamation project, Colorado;

H. R. 3151. An act to grant a certain water right and a certain parcel of land in Clark County, Nev., to the city of Las Vegas, Nev.;

H. R. 3197. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Mancos water conservancy district increasing the reimbursable construction-cost obligation of the district to the United States for construction of the Mancos project and extending the repayment period;

H. R. 3348. An act to declare the policy of the United States with respect to the allocation of costs of construction of the Coachella division of the All-American Canal irrigation project, California;

H. R. 3604. An act to authorize the Methodist Home of the District of Columbia to make certain changes in its certificate of incorporation with respect to stated objects;

H. J. Res. 188. Joint resolution authorizing the erection on public grounds in the city of Washington, D. C., of a memorial to the dead of the First Infantry Division, United States Forces, World War II; and

H. J. Res. 210. Joint resolution to extend the time for the release, free of estate and gift tax, of certain powers, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 811. An act for the relief of J. F. Powers;

H. R. 1628. An act relinquishing to the State of Illinois certain right, title, or interest of the United States of America, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1997. An act to provide seniority benefits for certain officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia who are veterans of World War II and lost opportunity for promotion by reason of their service in the armed forces of the United States;

H. R. 2369. An act providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the Territory of Alaska; and

H. R. 2545. An act to provide funds for cooperation with the school board of the Moclips-Aloha District for the construction and equipment of a new school building in the town of Moclips, Grays Harbor County, Wash., to be available to both Indian and non-Indian children.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 28. An act to supersede the provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1946 by reestablishing the offices of registers of land offices, and providing for appointment of the Director and Associate Director of the Bureau of Land Management, and for other purposes;

S. 30. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for certain lands to certain settlers in the Pyramid Lake Indian Reservation, Nev.;

S. 263. An act to provide for the carrying of mail on star routes, and for other purposes;

S. 358. An act to provide for settling certain indebtedness connected with Pershing Hall, a memorial in Paris, France;

S. 394. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Raymond Wesley Doyle;

S. 395. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Richard Jay Doyle;

S. 396. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Thurlow Grey Doyle;

S. 397. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Lawrence Stanley Doyle;

S. 398. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Spencer Burgess Doyle;

S. 399. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Gladys May Doyle;

S. 403. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Gideon Peon;

S. 451. An act to authorize the Federal Works Administrator through the Commissioner of Public Buildings to provide space to accommodate the needs of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 483. An act to relocate the boundaries and reduce the area of the Gila Federal reclamation project, and for other purposes;

S. 484. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Joseph J. Pickett a patent in fee to certain land;

S. 686. An act to provide for the construction, extension, and improvement of public-school buildings in Owyhee, Nev.;

S. 751. An act to continue a system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of school-age and under-school-age children in the District of Columbia through June 30, 1948, and for other purposes;

S. 753. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to defer the collection of certain irrigation construction charges against lands under the Flathead Indian irrigation project;

S. 816. An act to repeal the Post Roads Act of 1866, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 851. An act for the relief of Belmont Properties Corp.;

S. 924. An act to credit active service in the military or naval forces of the United States in determining eligibility for and the amount of benefits from the policemen's and firemen's relief fund, District of Columbia;

S. 966. An act to authorize the establishment of the District Educational Agency for Surplus Property in the Municipal Government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

S. 1056. An act to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, so as to permit adjustment of benefits authorized by section 1506 thereof and similar benefits extended by governments allied with the United States in World War II;

S. 1124. An act to amend the Boiler Inspection Act of the District of Columbia;

S. 1185. An act to provide for the disposal of materials on the public lands of the United States;

S. 1218. An act to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military Establishment of the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 1262. An act to provide a central authority for standardizing geographic names for the purpose of eliminating duplication in standardizing such names among the Federal departments, and for other purposes;

S. 1265. An act to amend sections 1301 and 1303 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, relating to liability for causing death by wrongful act;

S. 1266. An act to amend section 1064 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, relating to admissibility of testimony by a party to a transaction when the other party is incapable of testifying;

S. 1306. An act relating to the construction and disposition of the San Jacinto-San Vicente aqueduct;

S. 1316. An act to establish a procedure for facilitating the payment of certain Government checks, and for other purposes;

S. 1360. An act for the relief of Eric Seddon;

S. 1392. An act to prescribe certain dates for the purpose of determining eligibility of veterans for vocational rehabilitation, and for education, training, guaranty of loans, and readjustment allowances under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended;

S. J. Res. 113. Joint resolution authorizing the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to the Marine Corps dead of all wars;

S. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate oil compact to conserve oil and gas;

S. J. Res. 124. Joint resolution to enable the President to utilize the appropriations for United States participation in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration for meeting administrative expenses of United States Government agencies in connection with United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration liquidation; and

S. J. Res. 125. Joint resolution to strengthen the common defense and to meet industrial needs for tin by providing for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3123. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. WHERRY, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BALL, Mr. CORDON, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, and Mr. O'MAHONEY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ARNOLD and Mr. SEELY-BROWN asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. FOOTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD relating to H. R. 1.

Mr. BUSBEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Saturday edition of the Chicago Daily News entitled "Press Did Duty in Picturing Destruction of Potatoes."

Mr. MORTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some extraneous material.

Mr. WEICHEL (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the Stratton bill and to include an editorial.

Mr. McCONNELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD concerning an investigation last year by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and include a letter from the Comptroller General.

Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. KENNEDY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two letters.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Lawrence Sullivan.

Mr. SANBORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an item from the Idaho Daily Statesman.

Mr. CROW, Mr. BRYSON, Mr. FLANNAGAN, Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, and Mr. KEATING asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I was granted permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will take 3 pages of the RECORD and will cost $213, but I ask unanimous consent that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

REDUCTION IN INCOME-TAX PAYMENTS

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the further consideration of the veto message of the President on the bill (H. R. 1) to reduce individual income-tax payments.

The question is, will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I know of no measure that has been before Congress in years that has been more discussed in the press and in the Halls of Congress than the bill H. R. 1. I think we are pretty well agreed that the message we are about to act upon is more or less unusual, and filled with sophistry, but I do not think anything is to be gained by further discussion. Therefore, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Under the Constitution, this vote must be determined by the yeas and nays.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 268, nays 137, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 82]

YEAS—268

Allen, Calif.	Devitt	Johnson, Ill.
Allen, Ill.	D'Ewart	Johnson, Ind.
Allen, La.	Dirksen	Jones, Ohio
Anderson, Calif.	Dolliver	Jones, Wash.
Andresen, August H.	Domengeaux	Jonkman
Andrews, N. Y.	Dondero	Judd
Angell	Donohue	Kean
Arends	Dorn	Kearney
Arnold	Elliott	Keating
Auchincloss	Ellis	Keefe
Bakewell	Ellsworth	Kersten, Wis.
Banta	Elsaesser	Kilburn
Barrett	Elston	Kilday
Bates, Mass.	Engel, Mich.	Knutson
Beall	Engle, Calif.	Kunkel
Bender	Fallon	Landis
Bennett, Mich.	Fellows	Lane
Bennett, Mo.	Fenton	Larcade
Bishop	Fletcher	Latham
Blackney	Foote	Lea
Boggs, Del.	Fulton	LeCompte
Bolton	Gamble	LeFevre
Boykin	Gathings	Lemke
Bradley	Gavin	Lewis
Bramblett	Gearhart	Lodge
Brehm	Gillette	Love
Brooks	Gillie	McConnell
Brophy	Goff	McCowen
Brown, Ohio	Goodwin	McDonough
Buck	Graham	McDowell
Buffett	Grant, Ind.	McGarvey
Bulwinkle	Griffiths	McGregor
Burke	Gross	McMahon
Busbey	Gwynne, Iowa	McMillen, Ill.
Butler	Hagen	MacKinnon
Byrnes, Wis.	Hale	Macy
Canfield	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Maloney
Carson	Hall, Leonard W.	Martin, Iowa
Case, N. J.	Halleck	Mason
Case, S. Dak.	Hand	Mathews
Chadwick	Harness, Ind.	Meade, Ky.
Chenoweth	Hartley	Meade, Md.
Chiperfield	Hébert	Merrow
Church	Hedrick	Meyer
Clason	Herter	Michener
Clevenger	Heselton	Miller, Conn.
Clippinger	Hess	Miller, Md.
Coffin	Hill	Miller, Nebr.
Cole, Kans.	Hinshaw	Mitchell
Cole, Mo.	Hoeven	Morrison
Cole, N. Y.	Hoffman	Morton
Corbett	Holmes	Muhlenberg
Cotton	Hope	Mundt
Coudert	Horan	Murray, Tenn.
Cox	Howell	Murray, Wis.
Crawford	Jackson, Calif.	Nixon
Crow	Javits	Nodar
Cunningham	Jenison	Norblad
Curtis	Jenkins, Ohio	Norrell
Dague	Jenkins, Pa.	O'Hara
Davis, Ga.	Jennings	O'Konski
Davis, Tenn.	Jensen	Owens
Davis, Wis.	Johnson, Calif.	Passman
Dawson, Utah		Patterson
		Peterson

Philbin	Sadlak	Taber
Phillips, Calif.	St. George	Talle
Phillips, Tenn.	Sanborn	Taylor
Ploeser	Sarbacher	Thomas, N. J.
Plumley	Schwabe, Mo.	Thomas, Tex.
Potts	Schwabe, Okla.	Tibbott
Poulson	Scoblick	Tollefson
Preston	Scott, Hardie	Towe
Price, Fla.	Scott,	Twyman
Ramey	Hugh D., Jr.	Vail
Redden	Scrivner	Van Zandt
Reed, Ill.	Seely-Brown	Vorys
Reed, N. Y.	Shafer	Vursell
Rees	Short	Wadsworth
Reeves	Simpson, Ill.	Welchel
Rich	Simpson, Pa.	Welch
Riehlman	Smith, Kans.	West
Rizley	Smith, Maine	Wigglesworth
Robertson	Smith, Wis.	Wilson, Ind.
Robsion	Snyder	Wilson, Tex.
Rockwell	Springer	Wolcott
Rogers, Fla.	Stefan	Wolverton
Rogers, Mass.	Stevenson	Wood
Rohrbough	Stockman	Woodruff
Ross	Stratton	Youngblood
Russell	Sundstrom	

NAYS—137

Abernethy	Gary	Mills
Albert	Gordon	Monroney
Almond	Gore	Morgan
Andersen,	Gorski	Morris
H. Carl	Gossett	Murdock
Andrews, Ala.	Granger	Norton
Barden	Grant, Ala.	O'Brien
Bates, Ky.	Gregory	O'Toole
Battle	Hardy	Pace
Beckworth	Harless, Ariz.	Peden
Blatnik	Harris	Pfeifer
Bloom	Harrison	Pickett
Bonner	Havenner	Poage
Brown, Ga.	Hays	Price, Ill.
Bryson	Heffernan	Priest
Buchanan	Hendricks	Rabin
Buckley	Hobbs	Rains
Burleson	Holifield	Rankin
Byrne, N. Y.	Huber	Rayburn
Camp	Hull	Rayfiel
Cannon	Jackson, Wash.	Richards
Carroll	Jarman	Riley
Celler	Johnson, Okla.	Rivers
Chapman	Johnson, Tex.	Rooney
Chelf	Jones, Ala.	Sabath
Clark	Karsten, Mo.	Sadowski
Colmer	Kee	Sasscer
Cooley	Kennedy	Sheppard
Cooper	Keogh	Sikes
Cravens	Kerr	Smathers
Dawson, Ill.	King	Smith, Va.
Deane	Kirwan	Somers
Delaney	Klein	Spence
Dingell	Lanham	Stanley
Doughton	Lesinski	Stigler
Douglas	Lusk	Teague
Drewry	Lyle	Thomason
Durham	Lynch	Trimble
Eberharter	McCormack	Vinson
Evins	McMillan, S. C.	Walter
Feighan	Madden	Wheeler
Fernandez	Mahon	Whitten
Fisher	Manasco	Whittington
Flannagan	Mansfield,	Worley
Fogarty	Mont.	Zimmerman
Folger	Marcantonio	
Forand	Miller, Calif.	

NOT VOTING—24

Bell	Fuller	Kelley
Bland	Gallagher	Lucas
Boggs, La.	Gifford	Mansfield, Tex.
Clements	Gwinn, N. Y.	Patman
Combs	Hart	Powell
Courtney	Jones, N. C.	Smith, Ohio
Crosser	Kearns	Williams
Eaton	Kefauver	Winstead

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recapitulation of the vote.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will grant the recapitulation.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, a Member having voted one way or the other cannot change his vote on the recapitulation?

The SPEAKER. A Member may correct his vote, but cannot change it.

The Clerk will call the names of those voting "yea."

The Clerk called the names of those voting "yea."

The SPEAKER. Are there any corrections to be made where any Member was listening and heard his name called as voting "yea" who did not vote "yea"? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk will call the names of those voting "nay."

The Clerk called the names of those voting "nay."

The SPEAKER. Is there any Member voting "nay" who is incorrectly recorded? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

So (two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof) the veto of the President was sustained and the bill was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Gifford and Mr. Eaton for, with Mr. Kelley against.

Mr. Gallagher and Mr. Kearns for, with Mr. Clements against.

Mr. Fuller and Mr. Smith of Ohio for, with Mr. Williams against.

Mr. Gwinn of New York and Mr. Hart for, with Mr. Crosser against.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The message and the bill, together with the acompanying papers, are referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

The Clerk will notify the Senate of the action of the House.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, the President's message of June 16, 1947, should go a long way to allay the fears of those who voted against the tax bill because of the fear that there would not be a sufficient surplus to provide both for tax relief and debt retirement. The President states that income payments to individuals are running at the record annual rate of $176,000,000,000 and that "Despite many gloomy predictions, there is no convincing evidence that a recession is imminent." Assuming income payments of $176,000,000,000, our present revenue is estimated by the staff to yield $42,800,000,000, so this would leave a surplus of $8,100,000,000 if expenditures were only reduced $3,000,000,000 below the budget estimate.

The President states that income-tax reduction is not required now to permit necessary investment and business expansion. In making such a statement, he is flying into the teeth of the experience of businessmen throughout the country. Furthermore, the President is overlooking the fact that an increase in take-home pay, through tax reduction, will act as a deterrent to inflation which might be caused by wage increases.

When the President opposes a tax cut because it is inflationary, he must mean that he is afraid of an excess of purchasing power. And yet he argues that "the purchasing power of large groups of our people has been seriously reduced." He goes on to state that "adjustments in income production and prices" are "necessary." This is pretty vague language, but it seems to mean that the President is in favor of going into individual plants and industries and forcing prices and wages down in order to maintain business at its present levels. His ability to carry out a policy of this sort without reinstituting the onerous system of wartime economic controls is open to very serious question.

It seems to me much better to maintain the flow of purchasing power by a tax cut which will put money in people's pockets and stimulate them to greater productive effort. This approach would leave with the worker the right to determine how his purchasing power shall be disposed of, which seems much more consistent with our American way of life. It is high time we followed a consistent policy of letting the people act for themselves instead of having the Government act for them.

The President would not act until our economic house is afire. He forgets that one of the primary purposes of tax reduction is to act as a stimulus to prevent a recession and that his Secretary of the Treasury testified that it takes at least a year for tax reduction to become fully effective.

The President stresses the size of the present huge public debt, and argues that every effort should now be made to reduce the debt as much as possible. The President overlooks the fact that debt reduction alone is not sufficient. The present economic situation requires tax reduction as well as debt retirement.

I wonder if the President has ever read the speech of Hon. Douglas Abbott, Minister of Finance, advocating individual income-tax reduction for Canada, effective July 1, 1947. Mr. Abbott emphasizes the point that quite apart from economic consideration tax reduction is necessary because of the resistance of the people to the further continuance of oppressive war taxation. He said:

> Had our taxes been raised gradually and under normal conditions to their present levels, had they been increased for the productive, peacetime purposes of national development and social security rather than for the unproductive purposes of war, then the present levels might perhaps have been acceptable and tolerable as continuing levels. Instead, however, they represent a position to which we have returned after a sudden and unpleasant excursion into painful wartime levels of income tax, and people are still smarting so much from their wartime experience that even after the substantial reductions made in the last two budgets, the present levels of personal income taxes are regarded as excessive by a large proportion of the public. Therefore, what may be argued from the point of view of immediate economic effects or long-term debt policy, one must reach the conclusion that those who must bear them are not ready to support income taxes on the present scale. In fact, I am sure that were our present levels of personal income tax to be continued, they would constitute a serious impediment to a full working effort and a brake upon the drive and initiative of men and women in all groups and classes.

The American people spoke last November for tax reduction too. Why is the President deaf to their mandate?

The President complains that H. R. 1 gives a larger take-home pay to the family earning $50,000 than to the family earning $2,500. He does not bring

out the reason for this, namely, that taxes take only 3.8 percent of the take-home pay of a $2,500 man, while they take 48 percent of the take-home pay of a man with $50,000. Nor does he indicate why he did not raise this objection with reference to the Revenue Act of 1945 which brought a much larger increase in the take-home pay of the higher income groups than it did in the case of the lower income groups. This is shown by the following table:

Increase in take-home pay under the Revenue Act of 1945

MARRIED PERSON—2 DEPENDENTS

	Amount	Percentage increase
$2,500	$65	2.8
$4,000	125	3.6
$6,000	207	4.1
$8,000	293	4.6
$10,000	383	4.9
$25,000	1,184	7.7
$50,000	2,754	11.9
$100,000	6,264	19.9
$1,000,000	61,150	61.2

Note that under the act of 1945 the family with an income of $2,500 received an increase in take-home pay of only 2.8 percent. The family with an income of $50,000 got an increase of nearly 12 percent.

The President asks us to refrain from granting tax relief until a study of a long list of technical tax problems has been completed. He does not say how long this will take. However, the Secretary of the Treasury at the recent hearings before the Ways and Means Committee made it abundantly clear that the topics were difficult and the work would be time-consuming. Moreover, it is evident from the list of topics suggested for study that the individual income taxpayer is to be asked to wait for relief until satisfactory relief measures can be drawn up for corporations which were granted substantial relief under the Revenue Act of 1945.

As a matter of fact the President is merely fighting a delaying action. He does not want tax reduction now. He alleges that his reason is that it would be unwise to take hasty action. Yet in 1945 his party showed no such reluctance to act. In that year the Congress was asked to put through a bill in short order which included the elimination of the excess profits tax and substantial reductions in both corporate and individual income taxes. In 1945, the President and his party were willing to make a tax cut of $6,000,000,000 in the face of a deficit of $50,000,000,000 in the previous fiscal year. Now they are fearful of a cut of $3,300,000,000 in the face of a surplus of $1,250,000,000 predicted by the President himself for 1947, and anticipated revenues which will approach $43,000,000,000 in 1948 if the economic forecast contained in the President's message is fulfilled.

In view of the President's warning against hasty action now, it should be recalled that in 1945 the administration recommended as a part of its tax reduction program the repeal of the war tax rates on excises which alone involved a revenue loss of $1,100,000,000. Congress rejected this proposal on the ground that it represented an illogical selective approach to the problem of entire excise revision. Yet the administration which made that proposal is now unwilling to accept a general reduction of the extremely burdensome individual income tax rates which are still very near their wartime peak.

The inconsistencies which exist in the President's tax veto messages are shocking to observe. After carefully considering the President's arguments, in a sincere effort to determine whether the executive or the legislative branches of our Government are right in this economic measure, I have come to the conclusion that we are talking about two different things.

Apparently two sets of figures are being provided by the Government experts—one set to the President and an entirely different set to Congress.

First. The President justifies his veto on his budget statement January 10, 1947. He then proceeds to say that employment is at a peak and the national income has reached the rate of $176,000,000,000. But in the budget estimate that national income was only $166,000,000,000. Here for the first time we have proof from the executive branch that the national income will be closer to the figure set by the House Ways and Means Committee in calculating this tax reduction than the figure released by the President and his staff in the official budget statement.

Second. The President tells us that tax relief now will add to inflationary pressures. It will put money in the hands of the people and produce that pressure. Yet he seeks to take advantage of the unnatural price situation in this country to constantly advocate increased wages. That is good politics. But what is a tax reduction if it is not an increase in take-home pay?

Third. The President tells us that if tax reduction is voted now the amount available for reduction of the national debt would be entirely too low for this period of unparalleled high levels of peacetime income and employment. That is an admission that the President had no intention of making a substantial payment on the national debt until the Republican Congress began to cut his budget estimates for 1948.

It must not be overlooked that we are not depriving the President of money to make a substantial payment on the national debt. We are merely returning to the American taxpayers that amount of money which we will not spend on their Government in 1948. We are doing that by reducing the President's estimated budget for the next fiscal year—not by taking the money from the national debt payments. In addition, we are going to make a very large payment on the debt. The President forgets this little fact—the tax relief is coming exclusively through a reduction in Government expenditures, insisted upon by the Republicans in Congress.

Fourth. The President says the greatest relief is given the largest taxpayers. That is true in a dollar sense, but not in a percentage way. If we are ready to turn to totalitarianism, an even division of the wealth of this Nation, so that no one would be able to operate a private business and everything will have to be owned and operated by the Government, that is the only way tax relief can be equal. And under those circumstances, it would not make a bit of difference whether we received any tax relief or not because none of us would be receiving our money from private resources; none of us would have enough dollar income to make it worth while to even consider a tax bill in Congress.

The President belied his own statements while he was serving in the United States Senate. He voted to override President Roosevelt's veto of the 1944 tax bill, and less than 2 years ago he accepted, while President, a $6,000,000,000 tax relief bill for corporations. We now seek to aid 49,000,000 taxpayers by relieving them of just $4,000,000,000 in taxes and the President rejects the plan on the basis that it is not an equitable tax program. Why is it equitable to vote tax relief for corporations one year and not equitable to give individuals some consideration in another year?

The real excuse will be found buried in the President's veto message where he says "we continue to be confronted with great responsibilities for international relief and rehabilitation." It is at that point that the President reveals the money we are saving by cutting Government costs will be used, not to help those who pay the bill, but to send overseas. It is simply a case where the President is afraid to be honest about our foreign commitments. Let him give us all the facts.

A HOT CHESTNUT

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in furtherance of the Truman doctrine, which, being interpreted, means "Truman in '48," the administration last week suggested that to insure our continued existence as a nation, it might be necessary to spend some twenty-four billion—not million—dollars to aid other nations threatened by communism.

The President was backed in this plan by Secretary of State General Marshall, a no mean politician in his own right. General Marshall, you may remember, has been something of a New Dealer. Roosevelt jumped him over his superiors in rank in order to get him to the top. He was Chief of Staff from September 1939 to November 1945.

Prior to that, he accompanied President Roosevelt to the sea conference in August of 1941 where the Atlantic Charter was formulated. He was personal representative of the President in China with the rank of ambassador. He participated in the conferences at Casablanca, at Quebec, at Cairo and Tehran, at Yalta, and at Potsdam.

Now, as Secretary of State and a part of the administration, the President's supporters cite his statements as being uncontradictable when they want to pressure Congress into action, forgetting that the general, with all his great knowledge and vast experience, which we all acknowledge, still can possibly make mistakes or have a lapse of memory, as he did when appearing before a

Senate committee and was unable for a long time to remember where he was just prior to and at the time of the receipt of the bad news from Pearl Harbor.

At long last, the political significance of the President's foreign policy is becoming recognized for what it is—a part, and no small one, of President Truman's campaign for renomination and election. Even those Republicans who, calling it bipartisan, claiming it was for the good of the Nation as a whole, swallowed it hook, line, and sinker, are now a little nauseated.

Internationally minded "me too" Republicans took a look at the President's $24,000,000,000 trial balloon, a glance at their mail from home, put an ear to the ground, listened to the rumble coming in from the grass roots and belatedly—after the horse had been stolen—ventured a suggestion that the barn door should be locked, or at least that we take a look to see if we still had a horse.

Some announced in resounding oratorical phrases that, there being a possibility of national bankruptcy, we might well take an inventory and ascertain what we had left before we swallowed this latest tax-and-borrow-and-spend-in-other-countries political program which comes to us from Drs. Truman and Marshall, sugar-coated with the old pink or red label covering that we must like it and take it or Joe Stalin and the Communists will get us.

We have been frightened into two wars with political advantage to some, financial advantage to the money changers and munitions makers, but with grief, suffering and death to millions of the little people.

There is no satisfaction in saying "I told you so," but it is true that, for the past 2 years and more, many Republicans in Congress and individuals elsewhere, some timidly, others rather nastily, have suggested that, if the give-away boys continued stripping America, we might shortly find ourselves incapable of helping any other nation and might have a difficult, if not impossible, task of supplying our own people with jobs, homes, the necessities and comforts of life to which they have been accustomed, with things we must have if we are to defend ourselves.

While our protests and warnings have gone unheeded, at last we have distinguished company. The Press of June 16 captions its story on ex-President Hoover's letter to Senator BRIDGES "Loans imperil United States economy." In his letter, Mr. Hoover wrote:

> But the greatest danger to all civilization is for us to impair our economy by drains which cripple our own productivity. Unless this one remaining Gibraltar of economic strength is maintained, chaos will be inevitable over the world.

A self-evident truth which we have called to the attention of Congress and spenders and internationalists many, many times during the past 5 years.

Can it be that at long last we are to have an awakening? That some of the internationalists have finally realized that there is a bottom in the barrel? That our supply of dollars and materials, including farm machinery which our own people need, is not inexhaustible? That our parents have grown weary of sending their sons and daughters to fight and sometimes to die in the wholly destructive game of war played by world politicians? Have they at last discovered that you cannot with dollars buy everything—in this instance, peace?

Do they begin to see that Uncle Sam has been a sucker for every panhandling foreign nation which accepts all it can wheedle out of us, then behind our backs, sometimes openly, curses us as Shylocks because we are not being more generous? Have these statesmen learned that "the people" are getting on to the fact that, under the guise of a bipartisan foreign policy, we have been pulling some very hot chestnuts out of the fire for other countries?

Are some Republican "statesmen" beginning to feel foolish because the New Deal is outsmarting them—using them to win the '48 election while knocking the foundation from under our economy? Do they still fear deep down in their hearts that they might be classed as isolationists or nationalists if they thought and acted first in the interest of America instead of attempting to solve the problems of the whole world?

Do they fear the displeasure and the ostracism of the intelligentsia, the one-worlders, the do-gooders, and the internationalists? Of the throneless kings and queens?

To put it in a nutshell, are some of the world statesmen, whose words to me seem but as "sounding brass and tinkling cymbals," honestly and sincerely now convinced that it is a good thing if we first, in a common-sense, practical way, take a look at the whole picture with the thought that we do first and always the thing that will best protect our present and future national welfare, or are they just trimming their sails to the shifting political breeze?

Let us hope it is not the latter, and that the statesmen, the "big boys," have at last concluded that it might be well to take a look at the home front and keep here first the solid foundation on which our efforts to better and save the whole world may securely rest.

Judging by what some of them are now saying, they are not quite sure that our resources are inexhaustible—that our ability to tax and borrow and give is limitless. That a look at what we have left—at our ability to give—might be helpful.

Whether the present suggestion that we take an inventory is due to sound, if belated, thinking, or the good advice from the home folks, which at last has reached the ears of the statesmen, is immaterial. The suggestion is a good one.

Let us have an inventory of what we have left; an inventory not only of our natural resources, of materials, of our ability to produce, but an inventory of how much of our vaunted freedom and liberty, of our constitutional government, still remains.

Then let us think and act on the theory that our first allegiance is to the United States of America.

Before raking any more political chestnuts out of the European fireplace, before continuing to burn our fingers in that process, why not once more at least consider the admonition of the Father of our Country, or, if we are to disregard it, count the cost and ascertain our ability, our willingness, to pay.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, in a statement released on March 27, when H. R. 1, the so-called tax-reduction bill, passed the House, I said:

> Today as the tax bill is before the House for final action, there is no definite assurance that sufficient cuts will be made in appropriations to provide for a moderate reduction in our national debt, or that adequate funds will be available to take care of the proposed $3,800,000,000 reduction in taxes.

Democrats in the House have so consistently and effectively fought against any cuts in appropriations that today, as we near the completion of our work on the appropriation supply bills, we find that we will be fortunate if we do achieve a $3,000,000,000 saving rather than the hoped-for $6,000,000,000 below the President's budget of $37,500,000,000.

Today we are also faced with the fact that the foreign situation is such that nobody knows how much will be required during the coming year in appropriations to stave off the further encroachment of communism. We may be forced to vote additional hundreds of millions of dollars whether we like it or not as aid to foreign nations.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot conscientiously vote, at this time, for any tax-reduction bill, with the picture as it is.

I have voted consistently to slash expenditures even where it has hurt. My vote against triple A individual payments is evidence of that fact. To me, the balancing of the budget, coupled with a moderate reduction of the national debt, are imperative. Neither are assured.

The requirements for our national defense and the necessary appropriations for the veterans of our Nation, will not permit us at this time, in my opinion, to reduce taxes.

This tax-reduction bill is based entirely upon the hope that we will have a certain income during the coming fiscal year. Personally, I want to know definitely that that income is assured. The need for a tax reduction at this time is not so urgent but that such action can be delayed until next January or February, at which time the picture of our fiscal situation will be far more clear than it is today.

THE PRESIDENT'S VETO MESSAGE IS PURELY POLITICAL

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the President's veto of H. R. 1, commonly known as the tax-reduction bill, is no surprise to me. When the Ways and Means Committee called for hearings on this bill early in January 1947, it was only natural that the first witness to be called before the committee would be John Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury. At that time Mr. Snyder opposed the reduction of personal income taxes and opposed the reduction of any taxes. His reason or his excuse at that time was that it was not the right kind of a tax-reduction bill and that it was not the right time to reduce taxes. I felt at that time that he was the spokesman of the President and the New Deal

administration, and that he had the full approval of the President when he made that statement, and that the President would veto any tax-reduction bill that Congress might adopt. I cross-examined Mr. Snyder extensively at the time he appeared before our committee, and I was strengthened in my belief that the President would veto any tax bill. It was evident to me, and I think to every other person who was giving the matter any attention, that the President and Mr. Snyder would prevent tax reduction by a Republican Congress this year of 1947 because they were bound and determined that any tax reduction made should be made in 1948 because 1948 would be a Presidential election year. In other words, there was no doubt in my mind last January, and there never has been any doubt in my mind, that the President and his administration were putting off all tax-reduction plans until 1948, when he would come forward with a tax plan of his own and insist on its passage and claim credit for tax reduction.

At no time since this tax-reduction program has been before the people has the President or his Secretary of the Treasury come forward with any plan of tax reduction. And neither of them has made any effort to reduce taxes in this year of 1947.

In his veto message he did not make any recommendation as to when or how he expects to reduce taxes. He makes some references in his message to the method of tax reduction employed in H. R. 1, and these references are demagogic, because they leave an unfair impression. For instance, he says:

> H. R. 1 reduces taxes in the high-income brackets to a grossly disproportionate extent as compared to the reduction in the low-income brackets. A good tax-reduction bill would give a greater proportion of relief to the low-income group.

As a matter of fact, H. R. 1 does reduce taxes in the low-income brackets at a very much greater percentage rate than the taxes are reduced in the higher-income brackets.

Under the Constitution the Congress is given control of the purse strings of the Nation. It was always intended that the Congress should provide the revenues and that the expenditures of the revenues should be left to the Executive under the directions laid down by Congress through the passage of laws.

Not from the foundation of the Republic had any President vetoed a tax bill passed by Congress until the days of Franklin D. Roosevelt. It will be remembered that in February 1944 President Roosevelt vetoed the tax bill passed in that year in very insulting language. This language was so caustic and unfair that Senator BARKLEY, who was then the Democratic leader in the Senate, resigned his position as majority leader and declined to follow the President, and made a very castigating speech in which he became very personal in his denunciation of the President and his efforts to cast a reflection upon the Congress. After Senator BARKLEY had made his speech, President Roosevelt wrote the famous "Dear ALBEN" letter.

Both branches of Congress immediately and overwhelmingly voted to override President Roosevelt's veto. At that time Mr. Truman was a Senator, and he voted with his colleagues to override that veto. No doubt at that time he felt that this tradition against vetoing tax bills should not be broken.

By reason of the fact that the House of Representatives today failed by three votes to override President Truman's veto by the required two-thirds majority, the income taxpayers of the country have been denied the tax reduction to which they are justly entitled. The fact that a large number of Democrats voted with the Republicans to override the President's veto is very significant. It indicates that in the minds of the great majority of the Representatives of the people, the President's position is not the right position.

In the Senate, H. R. 1 was passed by a large majority, but because the House failed to override the President's veto, the Senate will not take a vote on the veto.

The Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives and likewise the Finance Committee of the Senate and the membership of the Senate have worked long and faithfully in an effort to bring to the people the tax relief which they deserve. H. R. 1 would have given a substantial reduction to persons making small incomes and would have given a smaller reduction to those who made large incomes. Both branches of the Congress were anxious that this bill should become a law because they felt that it was for the best interest of the people and for the Nation generally that Congress take from the people a part of the heavy burden of taxation that Congress was compelled to place upon the people to carry on the war. In other words, Congress felt that now that the war is over the burdens of the war should be removed from the people who are carrying a terrifically large load of taxation.

The responsibility of keeping this burden upon the people will rest upon the President. I prophesy that his insincerity in this respect will be proven conclusively and that early in 1948 he will recommend the passage of a law carrying a reduction of personal income taxes. In his veto message which he sent to the Congress on yesterday, he says:

> The right kind of tax reduction, at the right time, is an objective to which I am deeply committed. But I have reached the conclusion that this bill represents the wrong kind of tax reduction at the wrong time.

No doubt early in 1948, just a few months from now, he will think that that is the proper time to reduce taxes and he will proceed to recommend a program. I dare say that there will be no material difference in the economic situation of the country at that time as against what it is at this time. The President has shown clearly that he expects to take political advantage of this situation.

I feel that the House of Representatives has today failed to measure up to the standard heretofore set for it by all preceding Congresses. Never before in the history of the Nation has any President been able to take from the Congress the control of the purse strings. Today Congress, by its failure to repel the President's incursion into the constitutional rights and prerogatives of the House of Representatives, has permitted a blot to be placed on its escutcheon. To those who voted to sustain the President in his usurpation of the right of Congress to control the purse strings of the Nation, will surely come a sense of self-condemnation. No more can they proudly claim that they have always defended the Congress against the unjust and unreasonable usurpation of the rights of the legislative branch of the Government by the executive branch. I cannot see how those who come from those States which have boasted so proudly of their championship of State rights, can square themselves with their vote in sustaining the President.

The Republican Party, supported by many loyal Democrats, has every right to be proud of the fight that it has made to bring to the people fair tax relief. The President must assume the full responsibility for his actions. The Republican Party will continue its efforts to cut down Government expenditures and to reduce taxes.

The President may think that by his veto of the tax bill he will be able to carry on the old tax, tax, tax—spend, spend, spend—elect, elect, elect, program of Mr. Roosevelt and his extravagant New Deal. This extravagance will not be tolerated nor encouraged by the Republicans in Congress. On the contrary, the people may expect to see the Republicans continue to slash extravagances and to encourage economical and efficient Government.

VETO OF TAX BILL

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, when the President transmitted the 1948 budget to the Congress, he recognized that under the wartime tax system "millions of taxpayers with small incomes are called upon to pay high taxes. When the time comes for taxes to be reduced these taxpayers will have a high priority among the claimants for tax relief." The response to that recommendation of the President was the rich man's tax reduction bill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the President has vetoed this measure as tax reduction of the wrong kind at the wrong time. I certainly concur that this is the wrong way to reduce taxes. The only equitable way to reduce income taxes is to increase exemptions, and when the time does arrive when it is advisable to consider tax reduction, I shall urge the enactment of my bill H. R. 2577, which would increase personal exemptions by $200. As has been pointed out, H. R. 1 would give the most to those who need it the least. Who can justify voting to

override the veto of the President in order to provide a $19 an hour increase in take-home-pay of the fourteen hundred and one taxpayers with incomes of more than $300,000, while providing an increase in take-home-pay to the 47,000,000 taxpayers in the $5,000 bracket of less than 5 cents an hour.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, H. R. 1 is openly a rich man's bill. The Republican proponents admit that it is intended to stimulate managerial incentive and the investment of venture capital and they urged that this can best be done by granting tax windfalls to persons with incomes above $10,000. H. R. 1, standing alone, is a bill which the President, in good conscience, could not sign. But how much worse does H. R. 1 seem in view of the present drive of the majority to impose a host of excise taxes, which in reality are Federal sales taxes. An effort has been made to disguise the shift in tax burden by calling the sales tax a special war-debt-retirement tax, and the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means himself, in the current hearings now under way, has referred to this scheme in the words I have used. Moreover, he has appointed the Wall Street lawyer, Mr. Magill, and the New York banker and multimillionaire, John Hanes, to advise the Committee on Ways and Means on tax matters. An able assistant will be Mr. J. Cheever Cowdin, the tax counsel for the National Association of Manufacturers. The financial journals of Wall Street have referred to the Magill appointment as underscoring the Republican trend to a sales tax. The Wall Street Journal of June 11, 1947, says:

> The emphasis in Congress is shifting from tax relief to tax-law revision, meaning redistribution of the tax burden.

Mr. Speaker, the House has just voted on more than the veto message of the President today. It has passed on the program of the Republican Party to reduce income taxes upon the rich and replace them with sales taxes upon the poor.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, no truer words were ever written than those of the President that H. R. 1 "represents the wrong kind of tax reduction at the wrong time."

H. R. 1 passed the House over the protests of the Democratic Members that it is economically unsound, inequitable, and untimely legislation; that it cuts taxes at a time when any possible budgetary surplus should be devoted entirely to debt retirement; and "it gives greatest relief to those who need it the least."

Events that have transpired since H. R. 1 was passed by the House substantiate the views of the minority on this ill-advised Republican tax grab for the rich. The record of employment for May is the highest in our peacetime history. Mr. Speaker, if at a time of highest national income and highest employment we cannot begin substantial debt retirement when will we be able to do so?

And the expenditures side of the Federal budget are no more certain for 1948 than they were on March 27. At that time the Democrats urged that it was foolish to cut taxes without knowing what our foreign commitments would be. After Secretary Marshall's speech at Harvard on June 5, it appears to me that tax reduction now along the lines of H. R. 1 might very well amount to scuttling the bipartisan foreign policy which has been the singular achievement of the Eightieth Congress.

Moreover, the Wall Street Journal for June 11, 1947, admits the defeat of the Republican majority in making any substantial reductions in the President's budget. Under the heading "Tax report—a special summary and forecast of Federal and State tax developments," the Journal says:

> Big budgets threaten to hamper tax reduction for at least 2 years.
>
> Despite strenuous Republican trimming, it now appears that Federal spending in the 1948 fiscal year will not be less than $34,000,000,000 and may be closer to $35,000,000,000. Enthusiastic economy advocates hope to trim two or three billion dollars from this figure in the following fiscal period. This assumes no new large demand for foreign aid—and that is a big assumption.

Under these circumstances, how can it be questioned that now is the wrong time for tax reduction?

Now, it is even more apparent that H. R. 1 is the wrong kind of tax reduction. This bill was bad enough when presented to the Congress simply as a bill to reduce income taxes primarily upon the rich. You cannot escape the facts. The President says in his veto message:

> Under H. R. 1 tax savings to the average family with an income of $2,500 would be less than $30, while taxes on an income of $50,000 would be reduced by nearly $5,000, and on an income of $500,000 by nearly $60,000.

And again:

> Insofar as take-home pay is concerned under H. R. 1, the family earning $2,500 would receive an increase of only 1.2 percent; the family with an income of $50,000 would receive an increase of 18.6 percent; and the family with an income of $500,000 would receive an increase of 62.3 percent.

But while H. R. 1 stands naked before us in its inequity, let us see what is coming up to replace the revenues lost by its enactment. As I stressed on the floor of the House a week ago, the Knutson theory of taxation is to provide this bonanza for the rich by substituting a host of Federal excise or sales taxes—which everyone knows falls heaviest on those least able to pay.

The conclusive evidence that this is the plan is the frequent reference of Republican Members to the sales tax and expansion of excise taxes in the current hearings of the Committee on Ways and Means, while Roswell Magill and John Hanes, of Wall Street, both sales-tax men have been selected to advise the committee to write the 1948 tax bill. Mr. Speaker, a vote to sustain the President's veto is a vote against a sales tax.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARCANTONIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a speech delivered by Mr. Henry Wallace last night at the Water Gate.

Mr. REDDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a recent radio speech.

Mr. SADLAK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEEFE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article on the retirement of General Eaker.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

NATURALIZATION OF CERTAIN ARMY PERSONNEL—YUGOSLAV FLIERS

The Clerk called the first bill on the Private Calendar, H. R. 1652, to provide for the naturalization of certain United States Army personnel—Yugoslav fliers.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That upon compliance with all other provisions of section 701 or section 702 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended (56 Stat. 182–183; 8 U. S. C. 1001–1002), Vojislav N. Skakich, Army of the United States, Army serial No. O–2039144; Milosh M. Jelich, Army of the United States, Army serial No. O–2039139; Zivko T. Miloykovich, Army of the United States, Army serial No. O–2039141; Dejan D. Radich, Army of the United States, Army serial No. T–223285; Viktor A. Starc, Army of the United States, Army serial No. O–10600769; Momchilo M. Markovich, Army of the United States, Army serial No. O–884223; and Sava J. Milovanovich, Army of the United States, Army serial No. O–2039140, may be naturalized pursuant to either of said sections as may be applicable, notwithstanding the facts that at the time of their enlistment or induction into the military forces of the United States none of them had been lawfully admitted to the United States and none was a resident thereof, notwithstanding the fact that Momchilo M. Markovich did not serve in the military forces of the United States prior to December 28, 1945, and notwithstanding the further fact that the time for filing a petition for naturalization expired December 31, 1946.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, after line 15, insert the following: "Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the quota for Yugoslavia of the first year that the said quota is available in behalf of Viktor A. Starc and Sava J. Milovanovich."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSIS M. NICHOLS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1162) for the relief of Persis M. Nichols.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Persis M. Nichols, Grand Rapids, Mich., the sum of $954.38. Such sum represents the amount to which the said Persis M. Nichols would have been entitled, for annual leave accumulated in the course of her employment in the judicial branch of the Government during the period beginning January 1, 1932, and ending August 24, 1946, in the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide for vacations to Government employees, and for other purposes", approved March 14, 1936, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 5, secs. 29a, 30b–30e, 30l, and 30m), had been held applicable to her employment during such period: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. LULA WILSON NEVERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1508) for the relief of Mrs. Lula Wilson Nevers.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Lula Wilson Nevers, of Mount Pleasant, Iowa, the sum of $20,298.67, in full settlement of all claims against the United States as the result of renting one Link-Belt crawler crane under equipment rental agreement No. 75, to the Iowa ordnance plant and Kansas ordnance plant of the War Department, said agreement entered into April 29, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$20,298.67" and insert in lieu thereof "$10,100.43."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ISSUANCE OF A PATENT IN FEE TO SPENCER BURGESS DOYLE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1148) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Spencer Burgess Doyle.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF GLENNA J. HOWREY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 254) for the relief of the legal guardian of Glenna J. Howrey.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the legal guardian of Glenna J. Howrey, a minor, of Pueblo, Colo., the sum of $500, in full satisfaction of the claim of the said Glenna J. Howrey against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by her as a result of an accident which occurred when she was struck by a United States mail truck at the intersection of East Fourth and Erie Streets in Pueblo, Colo., on December 27, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$500" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALVA R. MOORE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 361) for the relief of Alva R. Moore.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Alva R. Moore, of Section, Ala., the sum of $2,000, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him on March 11, 1943, at the Huntsville Arsenal, Huntsville, Ala., as a result of handling in the course of his employment certain salvaged materials which were contaminated with mustard gas, after having been advised by a commissioned officer in charge of the salvage yard at the arsenal that the materials were not so contaminated: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN B. BARTON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 423) for the relief of John B. Barton.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the case of John B. Barton, of South Chicago, Ill., whose disability compensation under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act of March 4, 1927, as amended, was terminated as of August 16, 1931, by a compensation order filed January 16, 1932, the Federal Security Administrator, in the administration of such act, is authorized and directed to review such case in the manner prescribed in section 22, as amended, of such act, and in accordance with such section to issue a new compensation order which may terminate, continue, reinstate, increase, or decrease such compensation notwithstanding the provisions of section 22 which limit the time for seeking review of an order.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COL. FRANK R. LOYD

The Clerk called the bill (S. 425) for the relief of Col. Frank R. Loyd.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Col. Frank R. Loyd, of Laramie, Wyo., (1) the sum of $604.49, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for the difference between (a) the amount he was actually allowed as compensation for the value of the personal property which he lost as a result of the invasion of the Philippine Islands by the Japanese, and (b) the amount which the War Department has now determined should have been allowed to the said Col. Frank R. Loyd as compensation for the value of such property: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to, or received by, any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. IDA ELMA FRANKLIN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 620) for the relief of Mrs. Ida Elma Franklin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Ida Elma Franklin, of Phoenix, Ariz., the sum of $1,000, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by her and for reimbursement of hospital, medical, and other expenses incurred by her, as a result of an accident which occurred when she was struck by a United States Government vehicle, driven by an employee of the Department of Agriculture, on North Stone Avenue, Tucson, Ariz.,

on November 3, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be find in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. AND MRS. EDWARD H. ISENHART

The Clerk called the bill (S. 664) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edward H. Isenhart.

Messrs. SMITH of Wisconsin and DOLLIVER objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COLUMBIA HOSPITAL OF RICHLAND COUNTY, S. C.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 431) for the relief of the Columbia Hospital of Richland County, S. C.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Columbia Hospital of Richland County, Columbia, S. C., the sum of $3,414.90. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of such hospital against the United States on account of hospital care and medical attention provided by such hospital, for the period beginning September 18, 1942, and ending December 31, 1945, to one Halsford V. Sharpe, a prisoner of the Bureau of Internal Revenue of the Department of the Treasury. The said Halsford V. Sharpe was placed in such hospital, on March 7, 1942, by two officers of the Bureau of Internal Revenue upon the agreement that the Department of the Treasury would pay all claims of such hospital relating to such care and attention, but such claims have not been paid. The Department of Justice assumed responsibility for and paid all such claims which accrued during the period beginning March 7, 1942, and ending September 17, 1942, but disclaimed further liability. No part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BEN W. COLBURN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 645) for the relief of Ben. W. Colburn.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ben. W. Colburn, of Tulare, Calif., the sum of $4,529.55. The said Ben. W. Colburn, under contracts dated May 12, 1944, purchased certain smoke generators from the Treasury Department, and the amount above specified represents loss suffered by him by reason of the fact that, notwithstanding representations made as to the usable condition of such generators, most of them were so rusted, broken, or bent as to be beyond repair for any use.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill insert "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFER JURISDICTION UPON CERTAIN KENTUCKY CLAIMS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 988) to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of certain property owners adjacent to Fort Knox, Ky.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction conferred upon the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky to hear, determine, and render judgment for the respective amounts of such damages as may be found to have been sustained or suffered by landowners who owned land in the vicinity of Fort Knox, Ky., prior to the time the Government acquired that site: *Provided*, That no claims shall be considered by the court of any landowner who acquired the property after the acquisition by the Government of this military reservation: *Provided further*, That such action or actions will be brought within 1 year from the date that this act shall become effective.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OWEN R. BREWSTER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1737) for the relief of Owen R. Brewster.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Owen R. Brewster, Burnet, Tex., the sum of $5,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Owen R. Brewster against the United States on account of the death of his minor daughter, Francis N. Brewster, who died on September 19, 1943, as the result of personal injuries received on September 18, 1943, when the automobile in which she was riding was in collision with a United States Army truck on State Highway No. 281, near Lampasas, Tex.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DAVID HICKEY POST

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1800) for the relief of David Hickey Post, No. 235, of the American Legion.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the David Hickey Post, No. 235, of the American Legion, of St. Louis, Mo., the sum of $292.50, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for expenses incurred in the buying and erecting in David Hickey Park, St. Louis, of a memorial monument, which later had to be removed from David Hickey Park, at the expense of said American Legion Post, No. 235, when such park was commandeered by the United States Government: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$292.50" and insert "$275."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GROWERS FERTILIZER CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1930) for the relief of the Growers Fertilizer Co., a Florida corporation.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

J. C. BATEMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2056) for the relief of J. C. Bateman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $3,096.98 to J. C. Bateman, of San Jose, Calif., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damage to an International pick-up truck and an Allis-Chalmers tractor and loader, sustained as the result of the crash of a United States Navy plane at the naval auxiliary air station, Alameda, Calif., on June 27, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or

attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$3,096.98" and insert "$1,145."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MYRTLE RUTH OSBORNE ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2306) for the relief of Myrtle Ruth Osborne, Marion Walts, and Jessie A. Walts.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Myrtle Ruth Osborne, widow of Levi Osborne, deceased, the sum of $9,000; to Marion Walts and Jessie A. Walts, father and mother of Beverly Gale Walts, deceased, the sum of $2,000; to pay to Marion Walts $1,500, and to Jessie A. Walts the sum of $2,500, all of Louisville, Ky., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of Levi Osborne and Beverly Gale Walts, and for injuries sustained by Myrtle Ruth Osborne, Marion Walts, and Jessie A. Walts, as the results of a collision between the automobile in which they were riding and a United States Army truck on State Highway No. 60, near Grahampton Bridge in Meade County, Ky., on November 6, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$9,000" and insert "$7,000."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "$1,500" and insert "$1,000."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "$2,500" and insert "$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEPH W. BEYER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2399) for the relief of Joseph W. Beyer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Joseph W. Beyer, the sum of $50,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries incurred in an accident involving a Government lumber carrier which occurred on pier 1, Brooklyn Army Base Terminal, Brooklyn, N. Y., on August 25, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$50,000" and insert "$5,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RUTH A. HAIRSTON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2434) for the relief of Ruth A. Hairston.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $500 to Ruth A. Hairston, of Urbancrest, Ohio, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and loss of earnings sustained as the result of an accident involving a United States Army vehicle on United States Highway No. 62, near Urbancrest, Ohio, on May 13, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$500" and insert "$255."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF GEORGE WESLEY HOBBS, A MINOR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2607) for the relief of the legal guardian of George Wesley Hobbs, a minor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,500 to the legal guardian of George Wesley Hobbs, a minor, of Weaver, Ala., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses, and loss of earnings sustained as a result of an explosion of a grenade fuze in or near his home, which grenade fuze apparently had been thrown or dropped near Weaver, Ala., by some unidentified trainee of the Thirteenth Battalion, Fourth Training Regiment, IRTC, Fort McClellan, Ala., which explosion occurred on May 26, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNA MALAMA MARK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1493) for the relief of Anna Malama Mark.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Anna Malama Mark, of Honolulu, T. H., shall be considered to have been lawfully admitted on September 7, 1928, to the United States for permanent residence.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARSENIO ACACIO LEWIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 553) for the relief of Arsenio Acacio Lewis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Arsenio Acacio Lewis as of June 21, 1945, the date on which he was temporarily admitted to the United States. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Philippine quota of the first year that such quota is available.

SEC. 2. The said alien shall be permitted to be naturalized in any court of naturalization jurisdiction upon the taking of the oath of allegiance prescribed in section 335 of the Nationality Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 1157; 8 U. S. C. 735).

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, strike out section 2.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALICE SCOTT WHITE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1486) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Alice Scott White a patent in fee to certain land.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Alice Scott White, a Crow Indian, allottee No. 953, a patent in fee to the north half and the north half of the south half of section 10, township 6 south, range 28 east, Montana principal meridian, containing 480 acres.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, upon the written application of Alice Scott White, Crow Indian allottee numbered 953, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to sell to the highest Crow Indian bidder, or the Crow Tribe, under such terms and conditions as may be prescribed, that part of the homestead land of the said allottee described as the north half and the north half of the south half of section 10, township 6 south, range 27 east, Montana principal meridian, containing 480 acres."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ERLE E. HOWE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2151) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Erle E. Howe.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Erle E. Howe a patent in fee to the following-described lands allotted to him on the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.: The west half of section 10 and the north half of the northwest quarter of section 15, township 5 south, range 28 east, containing 400 acres; and the east half of the southwest quarter and the north half of the southeast quarter, and the north half of the south half of the southeast quarter of section 21; and the southwest quarter of section 22, township 8 south, range 38 east, Montana principal meridian, containing 360 acres.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out lines 3 and 4 and insert the following: "That, upon the written application of Erle E. Howe, Crow Indian allottee No. 1555, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to sell, for not less than the appraised value, to the highest Crow Indian bidder, or the Crow Tribe, under such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, the following."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEPH OCHRIMOWSKI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 50) for the relief of Joseph Ochrimowski.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Joseph Ochrimowski, who arrived at the port of New York on January 22, 1946, as a stowaway, shall, upon the payment of the required head tax, be considered for the purpose of immigration and naturalization laws to have been lawfully admitted into the United States. Upon the enactment of the act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Polish quota for the first year the Polish quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANTONIO BELAUSTEGUI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 649) for the relief of Antonio Belaustegui.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Antonio Belaustegui as of December 21, 1929, at New York City from the steamship *Cabo Sta. Maria*, the date and place he entered the United States. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Spanish quota of the first year that the Spanish quota is hereafter available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KUO YU CHENG

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 379) for the relief of Kuo Yu Cheng.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Kuo Yu Cheng, a native of Java and subject of the Netherlands, who entered the United States at Seattle, Wash., on October 6, 1931, and that he shall, for all purposes under the immigration laws, be deemed to have been lawfully admitted as an immigrant for permanent residence as of that date.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill add the following: "Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for the Chinese of the first year that the said quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT B. JONES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 317) for the relief of Robert B. Jones.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Robert B. Jones shall be considered to have been commissioned ensign, United States Naval Reserve, and placed on active duty as of December 8, 1941, to have continued on active duty in that rank until February 23, 1945, to have been promoted to the rank of lieutenant, junior grade, as of February 23, 1945, and to have served on active duty in that rank until February 28, 1946.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Robert B. Jones a sum of money equal to the active-duty pay and allowances due him by reason of the provisions of section 1 of this act: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN H. GRADWELL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 470) for the relief of John H. Gradwell.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John H. Gradwell, of Meriden, Conn., the sum of $211.30 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for damage to his automobile resulting from a collision with an Army vehicle in Hamden, Conn., on January 4, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF SYLVIA DE CICCO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 514) for the relief of the legal guardian of Sylvia De Cicco.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the legal guardian of Sylvia De Cicco, a minor, of Jersey City, N. J., the sum of $2,000, in full satisfaction of the claim of the said Sylvia De Cicco against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by her as a result of an accident which occurred when she was struck by a United States Army sedan at 228 Princeton Avenue, Jersey City, N. J., on June 8, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT C. BIRKES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 561) for the relief of Robert C. Birkes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Robert C. Birkes, of Portland, Oreg., a former member of the

Navy, the sum of $98, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for payment of the amount which the Price Administrator recovered from the former landlord of the said Robert C. Birkes because of overcharges for rent for the premises at 30 Linnaean Street, Cambridge, Mass., during the period March 1, 1945, to July 31, 1945; recovery of such sum by the said Robert C. Birkes having been prevented by the fact that he was ordered by the Navy to make a change of station soon after the overcharge was determined by the Office of Price Administration: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARION O. CASSADY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 824) for the relief of Marion O. Cassady.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Marion O. Cassady, of Louisville, Ky., a deputy United States marshal in the western district of Kentucky, the sum of $276.30, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damages sustained by him on and about January 3, 1942, while in the discharge of his official duties as a deputy United States marshal: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A. A. PELLETIER AND P. C. SILK

The Clerk called the bill (S. 882) for the relief of A. A. Pelletier and P. C. Silk.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to A. A. Pelletier and P. C. Silk, of Great Falls, Mont., the sum of $334.72, in full satisfaction of their claim against the United States for compensation for reporting and transcribing certain hearings held at Helena, Mont., during the period July 8 to July 16, 1946, by the Special Committee To Investigate Senatorial Campaign Expenditures, 1946, pursuant to Senate Resolution No. 224, Seventy-ninth Congress.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRITZ HALLQUIST

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 710) for the relief of Fritz Hallquist.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,000 to Fritz Hallquist, in full compensation for injuries sustained and damages suffered by him as a result of an accident which occurred June 16, 1944, on Elmwood Avenue, in the city of Warrick, R. I., and which accident involved the operation of a motor vehicle belonging to the United States Navy then and there being operated by an enlisted man in the United States Navy.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$3,747."

Line 6, strike out "compensation" and insert "settlement of all claims against the United States."

Line 10, strike out "Warrick" and insert "Norwood."

At the end of the bill, insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLARENCE J. WILSON AND MARGARET J. WILSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 718) for the relief of Clarence J. Wilson and Margaret J. Wilson.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by Senator WAGNER, of New York.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND ON THE TAX BILL

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days within which to extend their remarks on the tax bill, H. R. 1.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

HOUSING AND RENT ACT OF 1947

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3203) relative to maximum rents on housing accommodations; to repeal certain provisions of Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 83]

Bell	Engel, Mich.	Lyle
Bender	Fellows	Lynch
Bland	Fuller	Mansfield, Tex.
Bloom	Gallagher	Miller, Calif.
Boggs, La.	Gifford	Patman
Butler	Granger	Powell
Byrne, N. Y.	Harless, Ariz.	Richards
Byrnes, Wis.	Hart	Rivers
Celler	Hartley	Robsion
Clements	Hill	Smith, Ohio
Cole, Kans.	Jackson, Calif.	Thomas, N. J.
Combs	Jensen	Thomason
Courtney	Jones, N. C.	Vinson
Crosser	Kearns	Vursell
Dawson, Ill.	Kefauver	Williams
Dawson, Utah	Kelley	Winstead
Dorn	King	Zimmerman
Eaton	Lucas	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 374 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

HOUSING AND RENT ACT OF 1947

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3203) relative to maximum rents on housing accommodations; to repeal certain provisions of Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2 and 4.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

Strike out the word "and" following the comma at the beginning of said amendment.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"(5) the Housing Expediter shall prescribe by regulations: (i) the manner in which such housing accommodations shall be publicly offered in good faith for sale or rental to veterans of World War II or their families in accordance with the provisions of this section, and (ii) exceptions to this section for hardship cases, including appropriate exceptions from the operation of paragraphs (3) and (4): *Provided*, That nothing contained in this Act shall affect or remove any veteran's preference requirements heretofore established under Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress, and outstanding with respect to housing accommodations completed prior to the date of the enactment of this title."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"(c) For purposes of this section (1) the Housing Expediter shall prescribe by regulations the time as of which construction of housing accommodations shall be deemed to be completed, and (2) the term 'person' shall have the meaning assigned to such term in section 1 (b) (3) of this Act."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SEC. 201. (a) The Congress hereby reaffirms the declaration in the Price Control Extension Act of 1946 that unnecessary or unduly prolonged controls over rents would be inconsistent with the return to a peacetime economy and would tend to prevent the attainment of the goals therein declared.

"(b) The Congress therefore declares that it is its purpose to terminate at the earliest practicable date all Federal restrictions on rents on housing accommodations. At the same time the Congress recognizes that an emergency exists and that, for the prevention of inflation and for the achievement of a reasonable stability in the general level of rents during the transition period, as well as the attainment of other salutary objectives of the above-named Act, it is necessary for a limited time to impose certain restrictions upon rents charged for rental housing accommodations in defense-rental areas. Such restrictions should be administered with a view to prompt adjustments where owners of rental housing accommodations are suffering hardships because of the inadequacies of the maximum rents applicable to their housing accommodations, and under procedures designed to minimize delay in the granting of necessary adjustments, which, so far as practicable, shall be made by local boards with a minimum of control by any central agency.

"(c) To the end that these policies may be effectively carried out with the least possible impact on the economy pending complete decontrol, the provisions of this title are enacted.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 202. As used in this title—

"(a) The term 'person' includes an individual, corporation, partnership, association, or any other organized group of persons, or a legal successor or representative of any of the foregoing.

"(b) The term 'housing accommodations' means any building, structure, or part thereof, or land appurtenant thereto, or any other real or personal property rented or offered for rent for living or dwelling purposes (including houses, apartments, rooming- or boarding-house accommodations, and other properties used for living or dwelling purposes) together with all privileges, services, furnishings, furniture, and facilities connected with the use or occupancy of such property.

"(c) The term 'controlled housing accommodations' means housing accommodations in any defense-rental area, except that it does not include—

"(1) those housing accommodations, in any establishment which is commonly known as a hotel in the community in which it is located, which are occupied by persons who are provided customary hotel services such as maid service, furnishing and laundering of linen, telephone and secretarial or desk service, use and up-keep of furniture and fixtures, and bellboy service; or

"(2) any motor court, or any part thereof; or any tourist home serving transient guests exclusively, or any part thereof; or

"(3) any housing accommodations (A) the construction of which was completed on or after February 1, 1947, or which are additional housing accommodations created by conversion on or after February 1, 1947, except that contracts for the rental of housing accommodations to veterans of World War II and their immediate families, the construction of which was assisted by allocations or priorities under Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved May 22, 1946, shall remain in full force and effect, or (B) which at no time during the period February 1, 1945, to January 31, 1947, both dates inclusive, were rented (other than to members of the immediate family of the occupant) as housing accommodations.

"(d) The term 'defense-rental area' means any part of any area designated under the provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, prior to March 1, 1947, as an area where defense activities have resulted or threaten to result in an increase in the rents for housing accommodations inconsistent with the purposes of such Act, in which maximum rents were being regulated under such Act on March 1, 1947.

"(e) The term 'rent' means the consideration demanded or received in connection with the use or occupancy or the transfer of a lease of any housing accommodations.

"TERMINATION OF RENT CONTROL UNDER EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL ACT OF 1942

"SEC. 203. (a) After the effective date of this title, no maximum rents shall be established or maintained under the authority of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, with respect to any housing accommodations.

"(b) On the termination of rent control under this title all records and other data used or held in connection with the establishment and maintenance of maximum rents by the Housing Expediter, and all predecessor agencies, shall, on request, be delivered without reimbursement to the proper officials of any State or local subdivision of government that may be charged with the duty of administering a rent control program in any State or local subdivision of government to which such records and data may be applicable: *Provided, however*, That any such records or data shall be so made available subject to recall for use in carrying out the purposes of this title.

"RENT CONTROL UNDER THIS TITLE

"SEC. 204. (a) The Housing Expediter shall administer the powers, functions, and duties under this title; and for the purpose of exercising such powers, functions, and duties, and the powers, functions, and duties granted to or imposed upon the Housing Expediter by title I of this Act, the Office of Housing Expediter is hereby extended until February 29, 1948.

"(b) During the period beginning on the effective date of this title and ending on the date this title ceases to be in effect, no person shall demand, accept, or receive any rent for the use or occupancy of any controlled housing accommodations greater than the maximum rent established under the authority of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and in effect with respect thereto on June 30, 1947: *Provided, however*, That the Housing Expediter shall, by regulation or order, make such adjustments in such maximum rents as may be necessary to correct inequities or further to carry out the purposes and provisions of this title: *And provided further*, That in any case in which a landlord and tenant, on or before December 31, 1947, voluntarily enter into a valid written lease in good faith with respect to any housing accommodations for which a maximum rent is in effect under this section and such lease takes effect after the effective date of this title and expires on or after December 31, 1948, and if a true and duly executed copy of such lease is filed, within fifteen days after the date of execution of such lease, with the Housing Expediter, the maximum rent for such housing accommodations shall be, as of the date such lease takes effect, that which is mutually agreed between the landlord and tenant in such lease if it does not represent an increase of more than 15 per centum over the maximum rent which would otherwise apply under this section. In any case in which a maximum rent for any housing accommodations is established pursuant to the provisions of the last proviso above, such maximum rent shall not thereafter be subject to modification by any regulation or order issued under the provisions of this title. No housing accommodations for which a maximum rent is established pursuant to the provisions of the last proviso above shall be subject, after December 31, 1947, to any maximum rent established or maintained under the provisions of this title.

"(c) The Housing Expediter is hereby authorized and directed to remove any or all maximum rents before this title ceases to be in effect, in any defense-rental area, if in his judgment the need for continuing maximum rents in such area no longer exists due to sufficient construction of new housing accommodations or when the demand for rental housing accommodations has been otherwise reasonably met.

"(d) The Housing Expediter is authorized to issue such regulations and orders, consistent with the provisions of this title, as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this section and section 202 (c).

"(e) (1) The Housing Expediter is authorized and directed to create in each defense-rental area, or such portion thereof as he may designate, a local advisory board, each such board to consist of not less than five members who are representative citizens of the area, to be appointed by the Housing Ex-

pediter, from recommendations made by the respective Governors. Each such board shall have sufficient members to enable it promptly to consider individual adjustment cases coming before it on which the board shall make recommendations to the officials administering this title within its area. The local boards may make such recommendations to the Housing Expediter as they deem advisable with respect to the following matters:

"(A) Decontrol of the defense-rental area or any portion thereof;

"(B) The adequacy of the general rent level in the area; and

"(C) Operations generally of the local rent office, with particular reference to hardship cases.

"(2) The Housing Expediter shall furnish the local boards suitable office space and stenographic assistance and shall make available to such boards any records and other information in the possession of the Housing Expediter with respect to the establishment and maintenance of maximum rents and housing accommodations in the respective defense-rental areas which may be requested by such boards.

"(3) Within thirty days after receipt of any recommendation of a local board such recommendation shall be approved or disapproved or the local board shall be notified in writing of the reasons why final action cannot be taken in thirty days. Any recommendation of a local board appropriately substantiated and in accordance with applicable law and regulations shall be approved and appropriate action shall promptly be taken to carry such recommendation into effect.

"(4) Immediately upon the enactment of this Act the Housing Expediter shall communicate with the governors of the several States advising them of the provisions of this subsection and of the number and location of defense-rental areas in their respective States, and requesting their cooperation in carrying out such provisions.

"(f) The provisions of this title shall cease to be in effect on February 29, 1948.

"RECOVERY OF DAMAGES BY TENANTS

"SEC. 205. Any person who demands, accepts, or receives any payment of rent in excess of the maximum rent prescribed under section 204 shall be liable to the person from whom he demands, accepts, or receives such payment, for reasonable attorney's fees and costs as determined by the court, plus liquidated damages in the amount of (1) $50, or (2) three times the amount by which the payment or payments demanded, accepted, or received exceed the maximum rent which could lawfully be demanded, accepted, or received, whichever in either case may be the greater amount: *Provided*, That the amount of such liquidated damages shall be the amount of the overcharge or overcharges if the defendant proves that the violation was neither willful nor the result of failure to take practicable precautions against the occurrence of the violation. Suit to recover such amount may be brought in any Federal, State, or Territorial court of competent jurisdiction within one year after the date of such violation. For the purpose of determining the amount of liquidated damages to be awarded to the plaintiff in an action brought under this section, all violations alleged in such action which were committed by the defendant with respect to the plaintiff prior to the bringing of action shall be deemed to constitute one violation, and the amount demanded, accepted, or received in connection with such one violation shall be deemed to be the aggregate amount demanded, accepted, or received in connection with all violations. A judgment in an action under this section shall be a bar to a recovery under this section in any other action against the same defendant on account of any violation with respect to the same plaintiff prior to the institution of the action in which such judgment was rendered.

"PROHIBITION AND ENFORCEMENT

"SEC. 206. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person to offer, solicit, demand, accept, or receive any rent for the use or occupancy of any controlled housing accommodations in excess of the maximum rent prescribed under section 204.

"(b) Whenever in the judgment of the Housing Expediter any person has engaged or is about to engage in any act or practice which constitutes or will constitute a violation of subsection (a) of this section, he may make application to any Federal, State or Territorial court of competent jurisdiction, for an order enjoining such act or practice, or for an order enforcing compliance with such subsection, still upon a showing by the Housing Expediter that such person has engaged or is about to engage in any such act or practice a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, or other order shall be granted without bond.

"MAINTENANCE OF ACTIONS FOR CERTAIN ALLEGED PAST VIOLATIONS

"SEC. 207. No action or proceeding, involving any alleged violation of Maximum Price Regulation Numbered 188, issued under the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, shall be maintained in any court, or judgment thereon executed or otherwise proceeded on, if a court of competent jurisdiction has found, or by opinion has declared, that the person alleged to have committed such violation acted in good faith and that application to such person of the 'actual delivery' provisions of such regulation would result or has resulted in extreme hardship.

"PROPERTY, PERSONNEL, AND APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 208. (a) The records, property, personnel, and funds, relating primarily to rent control, transferred to the Housing Expediter by or pursuant to Executive Order Numbered 9841, dated April 23, 1947, may be used for the purpose of carrying out the powers, functions, and duties of the Housing Expediter under this title; except that any personnel so transferred who are found to be in excess of the needs of the Housing Expediter for the exercise of such powers, functions, and duties shall be separated from the service.

"(b) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Housing Expediter such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

"EVICTION OF TENANTS

"SEC. 209. (a) No action or proceeding to recover possession of any controlled housing accommodations with respect to which a maximum rent is in effect under this title shall be maintainable by any landlord against any tenant in any court, notwithstanding the fact that the tenant has no lease or that his lease has expired, so long as the tenant continues to pay the rent to which the landlord is entitled unless—

"(1) under the law of the State in which the action or proceeding is brought the tenant is (A) violating the obligation of his tenancy (other than an obligation to pay rent higher than rent permitted under this Act or an obligation to surrender possession of such housing accommodations) or (B) is committing a nuisance in such housing accommodations or using such housing accommodations for an immoral or illegal purpose or for other than living or dwelling purposes;

"(2) the landlord seeks in good faith to recover possession of such housing accommodations for his immediate and personal use and occupancy as housing accommodations;

"(3) the landlord has in good faith contracted in writing to sell the housing accommodations to a purchaser for the immediate and personal use and occupancy as housing accommodations by such purchaser;

"(4) the landlord seeks in good faith to recover possession of such housing accommodations for the immediate purpose of substantially altering, remodeling, or demolishing them and replacing them with new construction, and the altering or remodeling is reasonably necessary to protect and conserve the housing accommodations and cannot practically be done with the tenant in occupancy, and the landlord has obtained such approval as may be required by Federal, State, or local law for the alterations, remodeling, or any construction planned; or

"(5) the housing accommodations are nonhousekeeping, furnished housing accommodations located within a single dwelling unit not used as a rooming or boarding house and the remaining portion of which is occupied by the landlord or his immediate family.

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the United States or any State or local public agency may maintain an action or proceeding to recover possession of any housing accommodations operated by it where such action or proceeding is authorized by the statute or regulations under which such accommodations are administered: *Provided*, That nothing in this subsection shall be deemed to authorize the maintenance of any such action or proceeding upon the ground that the income of the occupants of the housing accommodations exceeds the allowable maximum unless such income, less any amounts paid to such occupants by the Veterans' Administration on account of service-connected disability or disabilities, exceeds the allowable maximum.

"ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT INAPPLICABLE

"SEC. 210. Section 2 (a) of the Administrative Procedure Act, as amended, is amended by inserting after 'Selective Training and Service Act of 1940:' the following: 'Housing and Rent Act of 1947;'.

"APPLICATION

"SEC. 211. The provisions of this title shall be applicable to the several States and to the Territories and possessions of the United States but shall not be applicable to the District of Columbia.

"EFFECTIVE DATE OF TITLE

"SEC. 212. This title shall become effective on the first day of the first calendar month following the month in which this Act is enacted.

"SHORT TITLE

"SEC. 213. This Act may be cited as the 'Housing and Rent Act of 1947'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
JOHN C. KUNKEL,
HENRY O. TALLE,
PAUL BROWN,
MIKE MONRONEY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

C. D. BUCK,
JOE MCCARTHY,
HARRY P. CAIN,
JOHN SPARKMAN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3203) relative to maximum rents on housing accommodations; to repeal certain provisions of Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: Section 1 (a) of the House bill repealed sections 1 through 9 of Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress.

The Senate amendment modified this provision so that section 2 (a) of such Act (providing for the Office of Housing Expediter) would continue in effect. The House recedes. By action on Senate amendment No. 14 the Office of Housing Expediter is extended, for purposes of this legislation, until February 29, 1948. Under the language of section 1 (a), the Housing Expediter will have the authority to administer and liquidate the existing obligations of the Government with respect to market guarantee agreements and premium payment regulations, including a premium payment regulation for merchant pig iron issued prior to the enactment of this act and extending through the calendar year 1947. Any such premium payment plan shall be within the $65,000,000 estimated by the Housing Expediter as the total amount required of the $400,000,000 authorization under section 11 of Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress.

Amendment No. 2: This amendment made available $10,000,000 for the construction and maintenance of access roads to standing timber on lands owned by or under the jurisdiction of an agency of Government, in addition to the sum made available for these purposes by subsection (c) of section 11 of Public Law 388. The Senate recedes, without prejudice to the consideration of this matter as a separate legislative proposal.

Amendment No. 3: Section 1 (b) of the House bill provided that its provisions were to be administered by the head of the department or agency designated to administer title II of the House bill. The Senate amendment provides in lieu thereof that the Housing Expediter shall administer section 1 (b). In view of the fact that under the conference agreement the Housing Expediter is to administer title II of the bill, the House recedes.

Amendment No. 4: Section 1 (b) of the House bill granted authority, upon the determination that there is a shortage, or that there is likely to be a shortage of building materials, for requiring a permit as a condition of constructing any building or facilities to be used for amusement or recreational purposes. The Senate amendment adds to the buildings or facilities for which such a permit could have been required those to be used for commercial other than housing purposes. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 5: This amendment excepts from the buildings or facilities for which a permit could have been required (see statement under amendment No. 4) buildings or facilities for use in conection with State or county fairs or agricultural, livestock, or industrial expositions or exhibitions, the net proceeds from which are used exclusively for improvement, maintenance, and operation of such expositions or exhibitions. The House recedes with a clerical amendment.

Amendment No. 6: Section 1 (b) (3) of the House bill incorporated by reference a definition of the term "person" for the purpose of the subsection. The Senate amendment sets forth this definition in full in section 1 (b) (3), and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 7: Section 2 of the House bill provided that title III of the Second War Powers Act, insofar as it authorized the making of allocations of building materials and of facilities relating to the utilization of building materials, should cease to be in effect on the date of enactment of this legislation. The Senate amendment strikes out this section. Since by recent legislation Congress has provided for the termination of the allocation authority under such title III on June 30, 1947, the House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 8, 9, 10, and 11: These amendments make clerical changes, and the House recedes.

Amendment No. 12: Section 5 of the House bill provided for a preference or priority to veterans of World War II or their families in connection with the sale or rental of certain housing accommodations completed after the enactment of this legislation and prior to March 31, 1948. Paragraphs (1) and (2) prohibited rental or sale prior to the expiration of 30 days after completion of construction, for occupancy by persons other than such veterans or their families. Paragraph (5) of subsection (a) of this section contained requirements with respect to the advertising of the availability of such housing accommodations to veterans or their families. The Senate amendment strikes out paragraph (5) and substitutes a paragraph providing that the Housing Expediter shall prescribe by regulation: (1) The manner in which such housing accommodations shall be publicly offered in good faith for sale or rental to veterans of World War II, and (2) exceptions for hardship cases. The Senate amendment also contains a proviso to the effect that nothing in the Act shall affect or remove any veterans' preference requirements heretofore established under Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress, and outstanding with respect to housing accommodations completed prior to the date of the enactment of this legislation. The House recedes with clarifying amendments, including an amendment to make it clear that the authority to make exceptions for hardship cases includes the power to make appropriate exceptions from the operation of paragraphs (3) and (4) of the subsection, which impose restrictions upon sale or rental at a price less than the price for which the housing accommodations referred to are offered to veterans or their families.

Amendment No. 13: The section described in the discussion of amendment numbered 12 above contained a subsection (c) providing that for the purposes of the section the head of the department or agency designated to administer title II should prescribe regulations as to the time as of which construction of housing accommodations shall be deemed to be completed; and also incorporated by reference the definitions of "person" and "housing accommodations" contained in title II. The Senate amendment substitutes the Housing Expediter for the head of the department or agency referred to in the House bill and incorporates the same definitions of the terms "person" and "housing accommodations", but without reference to title II of the House bill. The House recedes with an amendment eliminating the definition of "housing accommodations".

Amendment No. 14: This amendment is a complete substitute for the provisions of title II of the House bill, relating to maximum rent regulation. Title II of the House bill did not provide for further extension of the rent control provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 (which expire June 30, 1947) but provided for new basic authority for rent regulation to continue until December 31, 1947, unless further extended, pursuant to determination by the President as to necessity for extension, until March 31, 1948. The Senate amendment, on the other hand, provides for continuance in effect of the rent control provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 until February 29, 1948, but contains a number of amendments to the rent provisions of that act. The House recedes with a substitute amendment which follows the pattern of title II of the House bill. The substantive differences between title II of the House bill and the conference agreement on this amendment are explained below.

Period of continuation of controls: The difference between the House bill and the Senate amendment with respect to the period of continued rent control are explained above. Under the conference agreement (see sec. 204 (f)) rent control authority will terminate at the close of February 29, 1948.

Administration by Housing Expediter: Title II of the House bill provided for the designation by the President of the head of a department or agency of the Government (other than the Office of Price Administration or any other temporary agency) to administer the provisions of the title. The Senate amendment provides for administration of the continued rent authority by the Housing Expediter, and provides for continuing the Office of Housing Expediter until February 29, 1948, for purposes of the exercise of the rent control authority. The conference agreement on this amendment provides for administration of title II by the Housing Expediter, and, for such purpose, and for purposes of the exercise of the functions granted to the Housing Expediter by title I, continues the Office of the Housing Expediter in existence until the close of February 29, 1948.

Decontrol of certain housing accommodations: Section 202 (c) of the House bill, in the definition of "controlled housing accommodations", contained provisions exempting from rent control (1) those housing accommodations, in any establishment commonly known as a hotel in the community in which located, which are occupied by persons who are provided customary hotel services such as thoe therein specified; (2) motor courts, and tourist homes serving transient guests exclusively, (3) housing accommodations the construction of which or the conversion of which from existing residential use into housing use providing additional housing accommodations, is completed after the date of enactment of this legislation, and (4) housing accommodations which at no time during the period February 1, 1945, to January 31, 1947, both dates inclusive, were rented (other than to members of the immediate family of the occupant) as housing accommodations. These exemptions as contained in the House bill are retained without change under the conference agreement on this amendment, except that the provision referred to in clause (3) above has been changed, by adoption of language from the Senate amendment, so that the description of the property referred to is housing accommodations "the construction of which was completed on or after February 1, 1947, or which are additional housing accommodations created by conversion on or after February 1, 1947."

Increase in maximum rent through lease: Section 204 (b) of the House bill contained a proviso under which a tenant and landlord could voluntarily enter into a written lease in good faith, with respect to housing accommodations, providing for an increase of not more than 15 percent over the maximum rent which would otherwise apply under the rent control provisions of the section; but only (1) if the lease was entered into prior to March 31, 1948, (2) if the lease was one which was to expire on or after December 31, 1948, and (3) if a true and duly executed copy of such lease is filed, within 15 days after its execution, with the officer administering the rent control provisions. It was provided that, from the effective date of the lease, the maximum rent for the housing accommodations would be the amount so agreed on by the tenant and landlord; and that such maximum rent should not thereafter be subject to modification by any regulation or order issued under title II. It was further provided that no housing accommodations for which a maximum rent is established by such a lease should be subject, on or after the date the lease takes effect, to any maximum rent established or maintained under other provisions of section 204. The Senate amendment contains a provision similar to the House provision above described, but there were certain differences. The conference agreement on this amendment follows the House provision except that provisions from the Senate amendment have been adopted which make the following changes: (1) The lease must be entered into on or before December 31, 1947, and (2) in the case of

housing accommodations as to which a lease conforming to all the specified requirements is entered into, it is provided that such housing accommodations shall not be subject, after December 31, 1947, to any maximum rent established or maintained under the provisions of title II.

"Authority to issue regulations and orders: Section 204 (d) of the House bill gave the administering officer authority to issue such regulations and orders, consistent with the provisions of the title, as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of section 204. Under the conference agreement this authority also includes regulations and orders to carry out the provisions of section 202 (c).

Local boards: By the conference agreement on this amendment there has been included, as subsection (e) of section 204, a provision from the Senate amendment directing the Housing Expediter to create, in each defense-rental area, or such portion thereof as he may designate, a local advisory board which is to have jurisdiction to (1) make recommendations to the officials administering title II within its area with respect to individual adjustment cases, and (2) make recommendations to the Housing Expediter with respect to decontrol in the area; the adequacy of the general rent level in the area; and the operations generally of the local rent office, with particular reference to hardship cases. The members of such local boards are to be appointed by the Housing Expediter from recommendations made by the respective governors; and each board is to have sufficient members to enable the board promptly to consider individual adjustment cases coming before it. Recommendations of a local board must be approved or disapproved within 30 days after receipt thereof, or the local board shall be notified in writing the reasons why final action cannot be taken within 30 days. It is directed that any recommendation of a local board appropriately substantiated and in accordance with applicable law and regulations shall be approved and appropriate action shall promptly be taken to carry such recommendations into effect. Recommendations which are not approved will not, of course, be given any force or effect. The Housing Expediter is to furnish to local boards appropriate office space, stenographic assistance, records, and information. The Housing Expediter is directed to notify the governors of the several States of the enactment of this provision, advise them of the number and location of defense-rental areas in their States, and request their cooperation.

Local decontrol authority not included: Section 204 (e) of the House bill contained a provision that the governing body of any county, city, or town could in their discretion terminate rent control by a finding that the necessity therefor no longer exists. The Senate amendment did not include any such provision, and in the conference agreement on this amendment this provision has been omitted.

Records, personnel, and appropriations: The conference agreement on this amendment contains a provision that the records, property, personnel, and funds, relating primarily to rent control, transferred to the Housing Expediter by or pursuant to Executive Order No. 9841, dated April 23, 1947, may be used for the purpose of carrying out the powers, functions, and duties of the Housing Expediter under title II; and provides that personnel so transferred who are found to be in excess of the needs of the Housing Expediter for the exercise of such powers, functions, and duties shall be separated from the service. This is an adaptation of a provision in the Senate amendment, but with appropriate changes to conform to the pattern of title II as agreed to in conference.

Protection of tenants against eviction: The conference agreement retains the provisions of title II of the House bill relating to protection of tenants against eviction, but there is included a provision from the Senate amendment, with modifications, providing that the United States or any State or local public agency may maintain an action or proceeding to recover possession of any housing accommodations operated by it where such action or proceeding is authorized by the statute or regulations under which such accommodations are administered. This authority is subject to the qualification, however, that such an action or proceeding will not be authorized on the ground that the income of the occupants exceeds the allowable maximum unless such income, less any amounts paid to such occupants by the Veterans' Administration on account of service-connected disability or disabilities, exceeds the allowable maximum.

Administrative Procedure Act: The House bill contained no exemption of functions from the Administrative Procedure Act. The Senate amendment contains a provision exempting from that act functions under the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended. Functions under the latter act are now exempt from the Administrative Procedure Act. Since the conference agreement does not provide for extension of the rent provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act, the conference agreement on this amendment provides for exempting from the Administrative Procedure Act the functions conferred by the legislation here proposed. This exemption is made because the functions are temporary.

TEXT OF THE BILL

For the convenience of the House there is set forth below the complete text of the bill as it will read pursuant to agreements reached in conference.

"An Act relative to maximum rents on housing accommodations; to repeal certain provisions of Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress, and for other purposes.

"Be it enacted, etc.—

"TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO EXISTING LAW

"SECTION 1. (a) Sections 1, 2 (b) through 9, and sections 11 and 12, of Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress, are hereby repealed, and any funds made available under said sections of said Act not expended or committed prior to the enactment of this Act are hereby returned to the Treasury: *Provided*, That any allocations made or committed, or priorities granted for the delivery, of any housing materials or facilities under any regulation or order issued under the authority contained in said Act, and before the date of enactment of this Act, with respect to veterans of World War II, their immediate families, and others, shall remain in full force and effect.

"(b) (1) Whenever the Housing Expediter determines that there is a shortage, or that there is likely to be a shortage, of building materials, he may by regulation or order require of any person or persons a permit as a condition of constructing any building or facilities to be used for amusement or recreational purposes, other than a building or facilities constructed for use in connection with a State or county fair or an agricultural, livestock, or industrial exposition or exhibition, the net proceeds from which are used exclusively for improvement, maintenance, and operation of such exposition or exhibition.

"(2) It shall be unlawful for any person to do or omit to do any act in violation of any regulation or order prescribed under authority of this subsection. Any person who willfully violates the provisions of this paragraph shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to a fine of not more than $5,000, or to imprisonment for not more than two years, or to both such fine and imprisonment.

"(3) As used in this subsection, the term 'person' includes an individual, corporation, partnership, association, or any other organized group of persons, or a legal successor or representative of any of the foregoing.

"SEC. 2. Section 603 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by striking out 'June 30, 1947' wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof 'March 31, 1948'.

"SEC. 3. Title VI of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by adding the following new section at the end thereof:

"'SEC. 609. (a) In order to assist in relieving the acute shortage of housing which now exists and to promote the production of housing for veterans of World War II at moderate prices or rentals within their reasonable ability to pay, through the application of modern industrial processes, the Administrator is authorized to insure loans to finance the manufacture of housing (including advances on such loans) when such loans are eligible for insurance as hereinafter provided.

"'(b) Loans for the manufacture of houses shall be eligible for insurance under this section if at the time of such insurance, the Administrator determines they meet the following conditions:

"'(1) The manufacturer shall establish that binding contracts have been executed satisfactory to the Administrator, providing for the purchase and delivery of the number of houses to be manufactured with the proceeds of the loan;

"'(2) Such houses to be manufactured shall meet such requirements of sound quality, durability, liability, and safety as may be prescribed by the Administrator;

"'(3) The borrower shall establish to the satisfaction of the Administrator that he has or will have adequate plant facilities, sufficient capital funds taking into account the loan applied for, and the experience necessary, to achieve the required production schedule;

"'(4) The loan shall involve a principal obligation in an amount not to exceed 90 per centum of the amount which the Administrator estimates will be the necessary current cost of manufacturing such houses, exclusive of profit. The loan shall be secured by an assignment of the aforesaid purchase contracts for the houses to be manufactured with the proceeds of the loan, and of all sums payable under such purchase contracts, with the right in the assignee to proceed against such security in case of default as provided in the assignment, which assignment shall be in such form and contain such terms and conditions, as may be prescribed by the Administrator; and the Administrator may require such other agreements and undertakings to further secure the loan as he may determine, including the right, in case of default or at any time necessary to protect the lender, to compel delivery to the lender of any houses manufactured with the proceeds of the loan and then owned and in the possession of the borrower. The loan shall have a maturity not in excess of one year from the date of the note, except that any such loan may be refinanced and extended in accordance with such terms and conditions as the Administrator may prescribe for an additional term not to exceed one year, and shall bear interest (exclusive of premium charges for insurance) at not to exceed 4 per centum per annum on the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any time.

"'(c) The Administrator may consent to the release of a part or parts of the property assigned or delivered as security for the loan, upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe and the security documents may provide for such release.

"'(d) The failure of the borrower to make any payment due under or provided to be paid by the terms of a loan under this section, or the failure to perform any other covenant or obligation contained in any assignment, agreement, or undertaking executed by the borrower in connection with such loan, shall be considered as a default

under this section, and if such default continues for a period of thirty days, the lender shall be entitled to receive the benefits of the insurance hereinafter provided upon assignment, transfer, and delivery to the Administrator within a period and in accordance with the rules and regulations prescribed by the Administrator of (1) all rights and interest arising with respect to the loan so in default; (2) all claims of the lender against the borrower or others arising out of the loan transaction; (3) any cash or property held by the lender, or to which it is entitled, as deposits made for the account of the borrower and which have not been applied in reduction of the principal of the loan; and (4) all records, documents, books, papers, and accounts relating to the loan transaction. Upon such assignment, transfer, and delivery, the Administrator shall, subject to the cash adjustment provided for in section 604 (c), issue to the lender debentures having a face value equal to the unpaid principal balance of the loan.

"'(e) Debentures issued under this section shall be issued in accordance with the provisions of section 604 (d) except that such debentures shall be dated as of the date of default as determined in subsection (d) of this section and shall bear interest from such date.

"'(f) The provisions of section 207 (k) and 603 (a) of this Act shall be applicable to loans insured under this section, except that as applied to such loans (1) all references in section 207 (k) to the "Housing Fund" shall be construed to refer to the "War Housing Insurance Fund" and (2) the reference in section 207 (k) to "subsection (g)" shall be construed to refer to "subsection (d)" of this section; (3) the references in section 207 (k) to insured mortgages shall be construed to refer to the assignment or other security for loans insured under this section; and (4) the references in section 603 (a) to a mortgage or mortgages shall be construed to include a loan or loans under this section.

"'(g) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Administrator shall have the power to assign or sell at public or private sale, or otherwise dispose of, any evidence of debt, contract, claim, personal property, or security assigned to or held by him in connection with the payment of insurance heretofore or hereafter granted under this section, and to collect or compromise all obligations assigned to or held by him and all legal or equitable rights accruing to him in connection with the payment of such insurance until such time as such obligations may be referred to the Attorney General for suit or collection.

"'(h) The Administrator shall fix a premium charge for the insurance granted under this section, but such premium charge shall not exceed an amount equivalent to 1 per centum of the original principal of such loan, and such premium charge shall be payable in advance by the financial institution and shall be paid at such time and in such manner as may be prescribed by the Administrator. In addition to the premium charge herein provided for, the Administrator is authorized to charge and collect such amounts as he may deem reasonable for examining and processing applications for the insurance of loans under this section, including such additional inspections as the Administrator may deem necessary.'

"SEC. 4. (a) In order to assure preference or priority to veterans of World War II or their families—

"(1) no housing accommodations consisting of a dwelling designed for a single family residence, the construction of which is completed after the date of enactment of this title and prior to March 31, 1948, shall be sold or offered for sale, prior to the expiration of thirty days after construction is completed, for occupancy by persons other than such veterans or their families; and

"(2) no housing accommodations, designed for occupancy by other than transients, the construction of which is completed after the date of enactment of this title and prior to March 31, 1948, shall be rented or offered for rent, prior to the expiration of thirty days after construction is completed, for occupancy by persons other than such veterans or their families; and

"(3) no housing accommodations consisting of a dwelling designed for a single-family residence, the construction of which is completed after the date of enactment of this title and prior to March 31, 1948, shall be sold or offered for sale to any person at a price less that the price for which it is offered to veterans or their families; and

"(4) no housing accommodations, designed for occupancy by other than transients, the construction of which is completed after the date of enactment of this title and prior to March 31, 1948, shall be rented or offered for rent, at a price less than the price for which it is offered for rent to veterans and their families; and

"(5) the Housing Expediter shall prescribe by regulations: (i) the manner in which such housing accommodations shall be publicly offered in good faith for sale or rental to veterans of World War II or their families in accordance with the provisions of this section, and (ii) exceptions to this section for hardship cases, including appropriate exceptions from the operation of paragraphs (3) and (4): *Provided*, That nothing contained in this Act shall affect or remove any veteran's preference requirements heretofore established under Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress, and outstanding with respect to housing accommodations completed prior to the date of the enactment of this title.

"(b) This section shall cease to be in effect whenever the President proclaims that the protection to such veterans and their families provided by this section is no longer needed.

"(c) For purposes of this section (1) the Housing Expediter shall prescribe by regulations the time as of which construction of housing accommodations shall be deemed to be completed, and (2) the term 'person' shall have the meaning assigned to such term in section 1 (b) (3) of this Act.

"(d) Any person who willfully violates any provision of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to a fine of not more than $5,000 or to imprisonment for not more than one year, or to both such fine and imprisonment.

"TITLE II—MAXIMUM RENTS

"DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SEC. 201. (a) The Congress hereby reaffirms the declaration in the Price Control Extension Act of 1946 that unnecessary or unduly prolonged controls over rents would be inconsistent with the return to a peacetime economy and would tend to prevent the attainment of the goals therein declared.

"(b) The Congress therefore declares that it is its purpose to terminate at the earliest practicable date all Federal restrictions on rents on housing accommodations. At the same time the Congress recognizes that an emergency exists and that, for the prevention of inflation and for the achievement of a reasonable stability in the general level of rents during the transition period, as well as the attainment of other salutary objectives of the above-named Act, it is necessary for a limited time to impose certain restrictions upon rents charged for rental housing accommodations in defense-rental areas. Such restrictions should be administered with a view to prompt adjustments where owners of rental housing accommodations are suffering hardships because of the inadequacies of the maximum rents applicable to their housing accommodations, and under procedures designed to minimize delay in the granting of necessary adjustments, which, so far as practicable, shall be made by local boards with a minimum of control by any central agency.

"(c) To the end that these policies may be effectively carried out with the least possible impact on the economy pending complete decontrol, the provisions of this title are enacted.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 202. As used in this title—

"(a) The term 'person' includes an individual, corporation, partnership, association, or any other organized group of persons, or a legal successor or representative of any of the foregoing.

"(b) The term 'housing accommodations' means any building, structure, or part thereof, or land appurtenant thereto, or any other real or personal property rented or offered for rent for living or dwelling purposes (including houses, apartments, rooming- or boarding-house accommodations, and other properties used for living or dwelling purposes) together with all privileges, services, furnishings, furniture, and facilities connected with the use or occupancy of such property.

"(c) The term 'controlled housing accommodations' means housing accommodations in any defense-rental area, except that it does not include—

"(1) those housing accommodations, in any establishment which is commonly known as a hotel in the community in which it is located, which are occupied by persons who are provided customary hotel services such as maid service, furnishing and laundering of linen, telephone and secretarial or desk service, use and upkeep of furniture and fixtures, and bellboy service; or

"(2) any motor court, or any part thereof; or any tourist home serving transient guests exclusively, or any part thereof; or

"(3) any housing accommodations (A) the construction of which was completed on or after February 1, 1947, or which are additional housing accommodations created by conversion on or after February 1, 1947, except that contracts for the rental of housing accommodations to veterans of World War II and their immediate families, the construction of which was assisted by allocations or priorities under Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved May 22, 1946, shall remain in full force and effect, or (B) which at no time during the period February 1, 1945, to January 31, 1947, both dates inclusive, were rented (other than to members of the immediate family of the occupant) as housing accommodations.

"(d) The term 'defense-rental area' means any part of any area designated under the provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, prior to March 1, 1947, as an area where defense activities have resulted or threaten to result in an increase in the rents for housing accommodations inconsistent with the purposes of such Act, in which maximum rents were being regulated under such Act on March 1, 1947.

"(e) The term 'rent' means the consideration demanded or received in connection with the use or occupancy or the transfer of a lease of any housing accommodations.

"TERMINATION OF RENT CONTROL UNDER EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL ACT OF 1942

"SEC. 203. (a) After the effective date of this title, no maximum rents shall be established or maintained under the authority of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, with respect to any housing accommodations.

"(b) On the termination of rent control under this title all records and other data used or held in connection with the establishment and maintenance of maximum rents by the Housing Expediter, and all predecessor agencies, shall, on request, be delivered without reimbursement to the proper officials of any State or local subdivision of government that may be charged with the duty of administering a rent control program in any

State or local subdivision of government to which such records and data may be applicable: *Provided, however,* That any such records or data shall be so made available subject to recall for use in carrying out the purposes of this title.

"RENT CONTROL UNDER THIS TITLE

"SEC. 204. (a) The Housing Expediter shall administer the powers, functions, and duties under this title; and for the purpose of exercising such powers, functions, and duties, and the powers, functions, and duties granted to or imposed upon the Housing Expediter by title I of this Act, the Office of Housing Expediter is hereby extended until February 29, 1948.

"(b) During the period beginning on the effective date of this title and ending on the date this title ceases to be in effect, no person shall demand, accept, or receive any rent for the use or occupancy of any controlled housing accommodations greater than the maximum rent established under the authority of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and in effect with respect thereto on June 30, 1947: *Provided, however,* That the Housing Expediter shall, by regulation or order, make such adjustments in such maximum rents as may be necessary to correct inequities or further to carry out the purposes and provisions of this title: *And provided further,* That in any case in which a landlord and tenant, on or before December 31, 1947, voluntarily enter into a valid written lease in good faith with respect to any housing accommodations for which a maximum rent is in effect under this section and such lease takes effect after the effective date of this title and expires on or after December 31, 1948, and if a true and duly executed copy of such lease is filed, within fifteen days after the date of execution of such lease, with the Housing Expediter, the maximum rent for such housing accommodations shall be, as of the date such lease takes effect, that which is mutually agreed between the landlord and tenant in such lease if it does not represent an increase of more than 15 per centum over the maximum rent which would otherwise apply under this section. In any case in which a maximum rent for any housing accommodations is established pursuant to the provisions of the last proviso above, such maximum rent shall not thereafter be subject to modification by any regulation or order issued under the provisions of this title. No housing accommodations for which a maximum rent is established pursuant to the provisions of the last proviso above shall be subject, after December 31, 1947, to any maximum rent established or maintained under the provisions of this title.

"(c) The Housing Expediter is hereby authorized and directed to remove any or all maximum rents before this title ceases to be in effect, in any defense-rental area, if in his judgment the need for continuing maximum rents in such area no longer exists due to sufficient construction of new housing accommodations or when the demand for rental housing accommodations has been otherwise reasonably met.

"(d) The Housing Expediter is authorized to issue such regulations and orders, consistent with the provisions of this title, as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this section and section 202 (c).

"(e) (1) The Housing Expediter is authorized and directed to create in each defense-rental area, or such portion thereof as he may designate, a local advisory board, each such board to consist of not less than five members who are representative citizens of the area, to be appointed by the Housing Expediter, from recommendations made by the respective Governors. Each such board shall have sufficient members to enable it promptly to consider individual adjustment cases coming before it on which the board shall make recommendations to the officials administering this title within its area. The local boards may make such recommendations to the Housing Expediter as they deem advisable with respect to the following matters:

"(A) Decontrol of the defense-rental area or any portion thereof;

"(B) The adequacy of the general rent level in the area; and

"(C) Operations generally of the local rent office, with particular reference to hardship cases.

"(2) The Housing Expediter shall furnish the local boards suitable office space and stenographic assistance and shall make available to such boards any records and other information in the possession of the Housing Expediter with respect to the establishment and maintenance of maximum rents and housing accommodations in the respective defense-rental areas which may be requested by such boards.

"(3) Within thirty days after receipt of any recommendation of a local board such recommendation shall be approved or disapproved or the local board shall be notified in writing of the reasons why final action cannot be taken in thirty days. Any recommendation of a local board appropriately substantiated and in accordance with applicable law and regulations shall be approved and appropriate action shall promptly be taken to carry such recommendation into effect.

"(4) Immediately upon the enactment of this Act the Housing Expediter shall communicate with the governors of the several States advising them of the provisions of this subsection and of the number and location of defense-rental areas in their respective States, and requesting their cooperation in carrying out such provisions.

"(f) The provisions of this title shall cease to be in effect on February 29, 1948.

"RECOVERY OF DAMAGES BY TENANTS

"SEC. 205. Any person who demands, accepts, or receives any payment of rent in excess of the maximum rent prescribed under section 204 shall be liable to the person from whom he demands, accepts, or receives such payment, for reasonable attorney's fees and costs as determined by the court, plus liquidated damages in the amount of (1) $50, or (2) three times the amount by which the payment or payments demanded, accepted, or received exceed the maximum rent which could lawfully be demanded, accepted, or received, whichever in either case may be the greater amount: *Provided,* That the amount of such liquidated damages shall be the amount of the overcharge or overcharges if the defendant proves that the violation was neither willful nor the result of failure to take practicable precautions against the occurrence of the violation. Suit to recover such amount may be brought in any Federal, State, or Territorial court of competent jurisdiction within one year after the date of such violation. For the purpose of determining the amount of liquidated damages to be awarded to the plaintiff in an action brought under this section, all violations alleged in such action which were committed by the defendant with respect to the plaintiff prior to the bringing of action shall be deemed to constitute one violation, and the amount demanded, accepted, or received in connection with such one violation shall be deemed to be the aggregate amount demanded, accepted, or received in connection with all violations. A judgment in an action under this section shall be a bar to a recovery under this section in any other action against the same defendant on account of any violation with respect to the same plaintiff prior to the institution of the action in which such judgment was rendered.

"PROHIBITION AND ENFORCEMENT

"SEC. 206. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person to offer, solicit, demand, accept, or receive any rent for the use or occupancy of any controlled housing accommodations in excess of the maximum rent prescribed under section 204.

"(b) Whenever in the judgment of the Housing Expediter any person has engaged or is about to engage in any act or practice which constitutes or will constitute a violation of subsection (a) of this section, he may make application to any Federal, State or Territorial court of competent jurisdiction, for an order enjoining such act or practice, or for an order enforcing compliance with such subsection, and upon a showing by the Housing Expediter that such person has engaged or is about to engage in any such act or practice a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, or other order shall be granted without bond.

"MAINTENANCE OF ACTIONS FOR CERTAIN ALLEGED PAST VIOLATIONS

"SEC. 207. No action or proceeding, involving any alleged violation of Maximum Price Regulation Numbered 188, issued under the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, shall be maintained in any court, or judgment thereon executed or otherwise proceeded on, if a court of competent jurisdiction has found, or by opinion has declared, that the person alleged to have committed such violation acted in good faith and that application to such person of the 'actual delivery' provisions of such regulation would result or has resulted in extreme hardship.

"PROPERTY, PERSONNEL, AND APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 208. (a) The records, property, personnel, and funds, relating primarily to rent control, transferred to the Housing Expediter by or pursuant to Executive Order Numbered 9841, dated April 23, 1947, may be used for the purpose of carrying out the powers, functions, and duties of the Housing Expediter under this title; except that any personnel so transferred who are found to be in excess of the needs of the Housing Expediter for the exercise of such powers, functions, and duties shall be separated from the service.

"(b) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Housing Expediter such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

"EVICTION OF TENANTS

"SEC. 209. (a) No action or proceeding to recover possession of any controlled housing accommodations with respect to which a maximum rent is in effect under this title shall be maintainable by any landlord against any tenant in any court, notwithstanding the fact that the tenant has no lease or that his lease has expired, so long as the tenant continues to pay the rent to which the landlord is entitled unless—

"(1) under the law of the State in which the action or proceeding is brought the tenant is (A) violating the obligation of his tenancy (other than an obligation to pay rent higher than rent permitted under this Act or an obligation to surrender possession of such housing accommodations) or (B) is committing a nuisance in such housing accommodations or using such housing accommodations for an immoral or illegal purpose or for other than living or dwelling purposes;

"(2) the landlord seeks in good faith to recover possession of such housing accommodations for his immediate and personal use and occupancy as housing accommodations;

"(3) the landlord has in good faith contracted in writing to sell the housing accommodations to a purchaser for the immediate and personal use and occupancy as housing accommodations by such purchaser;

"(4) the landlord seeks in good faith to recover possession of such housing accommodations for the immediate purpose of substantially altering, remodeling, or demolishing them and replacing them with new construction, and the altering or remodeling is reasonably necessary to protect and conserve the housing accommodations and cannot

practically be done with the tenant in occupancy, and the landlord has obtained such approval as may be required by Federal, State, or local law for the alterations, remodeling, or any construction planned; or

"(5) the housing accommodations are nonhousekeeping, furnished housing accommodations located within a single dwelling unit not used as a rooming or boarding house and the remaining portion of which is occupied by the landlord or his immediate family.

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, the United States or any State or local public agency may maintain an action or proceeding to recover possession of any housing accommodations operated by it where such action or proceeding is authorized by the statute or regulations under which such accommodations are administered: *Provided*, That nothing in this subsection shall be deemed to authorize the maintenance of any such action or proceeding upon the ground that the income of the occupants of the housing accommodations exceeds the allowable maximum unless such income, less any amounts paid to such occupants by the Veterans' Administration on account of service-connected disability or disabilities, exceeds the allowable maximum.

"ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT INAPPLICABLE

"SEC. 210. Section 2 (a) of the Administrative Procedure Act, as amended, is amended by inserting after 'Selective Training and Service Act of 1940;' the following: 'Housing and Rent Act of 1947;'.

"APPLICATION

"SEC. 211. The provisions of this title shall be applicable to the several States and to the Territories and possessions of the United States but shall not be applicable to the District of Columbia.

"EFFECTIVE DATE OF TITLE

"SEC. 212. This title shall become effective on the first day of the first calendar month following the month in which this Act is enacted.

"SHORT TITLE

"SEC. 213. This Act may be cited as the 'Housing and Rent Act of 1947'.

"TITLE III—SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

"SEC. 301. If any provision of this Act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this Act and the applicability of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby."

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
JOHN C. KUNKEL,
HENRY O. TALLE,
PAUL BROWN,
MIKE MONRONEY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, it will be noted from a study of the statement of the managers on the part of the House with respect to the housing-rent bill, H. R. 3203, that there are no major differences between the conference report now and the bill as it passed the House.

It will be recalled that in title I we decontrolled the allocation of all materials excepting those which might be used to construct recreational and amusement facilities. The Senate exempted all commercial facilities, so that under the Senate bill the Expediter could have controlled the allocation of materials for facilities incident to all commercial as well as recreational and amusement facilities. That was stricken out in the conference. So the language in that respect is substantially the same as it was when the bill passed the House.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Would that cover construction on farms—the construction of buildings, barns, and so forth on farms?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes, sir. You will note on page 9, amendment No. 5, so that there is an additional guaranty or assurance in certain respects, the amendment excepts from the buildings or facilities for which permits would be required, that is, recreational or amusement facilities, the buildings or facilities for use in connection with State or county fairs or agricultural, livestock, or industrial expositions or exhibitions, the net proceeds from which are used exclusively for improvement, maintenance, and operation of such expositions or exhibitions.

The reason for that was that we thought perhaps the interpretation placed upon the broad term "amusement" or the broad term "recreation" might include these facilities, so we expressly exempted them.

Answering the gentleman's question directly, unless the building on the farm is for recreation or amusement facilities it is exempted and they will no longer have to have priorities for those materials.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. I talked with the Senator's office a few days ago—Senator KNOWLAND, of California, who introduced the amendment dealing with this subject. I was told that that was his interpretation, that it did not apply to farm construction.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As I understand it, then, as of June 30 all of these restrictions are terminated on building with the exception of recreational and amusement buildings.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman is correct, except that the controls over the allocation of materials, except as I have stated here, will cease with the enactment of the law, not June 30.

In title 2, having to do with rent control, we provide that title 2 shall be effective on the first of the month succeeding the enactment of the act.

The provisions in this bill in respect to rent controls take effect on July 1, 1947, but the provision of decontrol of the allocation of materials takes effect on the enactment of the act.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. That means all materials that go into the construction of a home, barn, or a building except for these amusement places.

Mr. WOLCOTT. All materials which go into any kind of construction except in respect of amusement or recreational facilities.

To me that is the most important part of this legislation. It decontrols our economy, it gives the building industry of our country a free hand to plan to build, to go out and lick the housing shortage, and make it unnecessary finally to control rents.

In respect to the rent-control provisions, the language of the conference report follows substantially the language of the House bill in its major particulars. If this bill becomes law, after July 1, there will be no rent controls on new construction, there will be no rent controls on properties converted for rental purposes, there will be no rent control on properties which were not rented except to members of the immediate family between February 1, 1945, and January 31, 1947.

Rent controls are continued substantially as they were provided for in the House bill under the terms of this act.

OPA provisions will no longer apply after this bill becomes law.

We do, however, freeze all rents established under OPA as of June 30, 1947, and then provide that the Expediter may adjust these rents to correct hardship cases and for other reasons from that base, and that thereafter rents will be controlled on existing properties under the provisions of this act.

A change which in my opinion is not considered materially, but which stands out quite prominently, is in respect to the Administrator of the law and we yielded to the Senate in this respect: Under the House bill we provided that the President might designate the head of any permanent agency of the Government to administer both title 1 and title 2 of this act.

The Senate had provided for continuance of the Expediter's office as the agency through which rents would be controlled and permits would be granted to construct recreational and amusement facilities. We yielded to the Senate in that respect. The Senate appeared to have a great deal of confidence in the integrity and ability of Mr. Frank Creedon, the Expediter, which I personally think is justified. His office is continued for the purpose and the only purpose of administering this act.

The Appropriations Committee has refused to grant the Expediter's office any funds until this bill has been passed. The Appropriations Commitee will, of course, as is usual in these cases, go over the program of the Expediter to determine what his needs are and then it will be governed accordingly.

The other change which appears to be material but probably not too important is the change in date. The House provided that rent control would expire on December 31, 1947, unless previous to December 15, 1947, the President found it necessary to continue it, in which event it might continue under the House bill to March 31, 1948. The Senate provided that rent control should expire on February 29, 1948. The importance of the date is only in respect to the fact that it be extended some time beyond the time when the new session of Congress will convene in January so that we will have an opportunity to review the situation at that time. So the February 29 date and the March 31 date is not too material.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself eight additional minutes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I understand there is a provision providing for an increase of rent in the amount of 15 percent by agreement between the landlord and tenant. Does that still remain in the bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes. The language of the Senate bill and the language of the House bill are quite similar. The provision remains in the bill and in the conference report that where the landlord and the tenant voluntarily enter into a valid lease which must run beyond December 31, 1948, then by agreement the rent may be increased not to exceed 15 percent. There is nothing in the law to compel a tenant to sign a lease, and it should be definitely understood that it is up to the tenant himself as to whether he enters into this lease. It is a purely voluntary matter on his part as to whether he enters into this lease or not. If the tenant does not enter into the lease then the accommodation which he has rented remains under rent control until February 29, next year.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Suppose a landlord wants to evict a tenant; under the present regulations it takes 6 months to terminate occupancy. Is any change made in that so that the laws in respect to the States may be followed?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The ouster or eviction provisions are substantially the same as they were in the House bill. We provide for evictions only in certain cases where the owner of the property wants to occupy it himself or where he is going to demolish it, and so forth. The provisions are quite long. I will refer the gentleman to section 209 which is found on page 19 of the conference report. For the convenience of the Members you will notice we have printed the bill in full. There are the conditions under which the landlord can get possession, but, as a general rule, I may say that a tenant cannot be evicted so long as rent control is in force and so long as he pays the legal rent.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. And just as soon as the 29th of February arrives, it all goes off?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Then the State law applies.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON. The gentleman stated there would be no controls on property constructed after February 1947. Does that mean as to that newly constructed property there are no rent controls for either veterans or others?

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is right.

Mr. ELSTON. So that if the veteran wants to rent newly constructed property he is obliged to pay the same rental that the landlord might charge any others?

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is right.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Is there anything in the conference report which would require the tenant to agree with the landlord prior to February 28, 1948, to enter into such a voluntary lease?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes. He must enter into this lease before December 31, 1947.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. In cases where the States have rental laws, how does it operate?

Mr. WOLCOTT. It does not apply. There was a provision in the Senate bill which seemed to give the States authority to take over rent control, and it was stricken out. The closest thing to that in the bill now is that there is a provision for the setting up of local boards by the Expediter upon recommendation of the governors of the States. These local boards can make certain recommendations to the Expediter in respect to increase of rents or the decontrol of areas or housing facilities. The Expediter does not have to follow the recommendations, but he must give his reasons for not doing so.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. I would like some information regarding item (3), paragraph (C), section 202, on page 3 of this report, which reads:

(3) Any housing accommodations (A) the construction of which was completed on or after February 1, 1947, or which are additional housing accommodations created by conversion on or after February 1, 1947—

And so forth.

Suppose an owner of a large house has converted it into apartments after February 1, 1947?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Those would not be under control.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Would a house that had been remodeled and modernized by extensive improvements after February 1, 1947 be under control?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The criterion is whether they were new accommodations as the result of the remodeling or conversion, and the new facilities are decontrolled.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. What I have in mind is this: Would a house upon which $2,000 or $3,000 or more had been expended for remodeling after February 1, this year, to rent to one or more families be decontrolled?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Not if the property had been under control before that and there were no new units provided by the remodeling. The property would still be under control.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. How about the money expended?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The OPA had some rule that they told us they applied—I do not know whether they ever did or not—where there were substantial improvements on the property; that they would authorize an increase in the rent, and I would assume under those circumstances that might be considered by the Expediter a hardship case, and he must give relief to that situation if good faith was used.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. TALLE. I should like to have my chairman emphasize once more one point which he dealt with at the beginning of his explanation of the pending conference report. The point I would like to have reemphasized has to do with allocations of building materials—controls that have as a matter of fact retarded the progress of building. Some Members believe that if no legislation is enacted at this time both rent control and allocations of materials will stop on the 30th of June; but is it not true that without such legislation allocations of building materials will continue throughout this year; that is, through December 31, 1947, and that, therefore, the construction industry will not be free to operate without controls unless this conference report is enacted into law?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am glad the gentleman emphasized that. Let me repeat in substance what he said. Unless this bill becomes law, then the authority to allocate building materials continues until December 31, 1947, but rent control expires on June 30 of this year.

Mr. TALLE. It is therefore very important in order that the building industry may proceed to build houses to relieve the shortage that this conference report be adopted. Is that not correct?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have in mind a tenant who rents a private apartment, in what is generally known as a hotel. This tenant furnishes his own furniture, his own telephone, he has his own cook and his own maid. Is it the intent of the gentleman and his committee to decontrol such an apartment?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes; if the property is run as a hotel and if the person is furnished the customary hotel services such as maid service, furnishing and laundering of linen, telephone and secretarial or desk service, use and upkeep of furniture and fixtures. I might say to the gentleman that the Expediter is given the authority to make regulations in respect to that particular provision, and probably can be expected to interpret it in accordance with these provisions to give relief to the person who does not receive all of those services.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I voted against this bill when it passed the House. I thought it was a bad bill. When it passed the other body I thought it was a worse bill. The conferees adopted some of the most objectionable amendments incorporated in the bill passed by the other body. I do not like to oppose the action of the committee,

for whom I have a very high regard, but I feel that my duty impels me to give you the reasons which have caused my opposition.

This bill is not a rent-control bill, it is a decontrol bill, it seems to me, under conditions favorable to the landlord and unfavorable to the tenant. The bill provides that the tenant and the landlord may enter into a lease after the effective date of this act which may expire at any time after December 31, 1948, for an increase in rent not to exceed 15 percent. We know the housing conditions that prevail in this country today and we know that the demand cannot be supplied as the demand for consumer goods may be supplied in a few weeks or a few months. We know this condition is going to exist for a long time. When the landlord comes to the tenant and says, "I want to increase your rent 15 percent," the tenant knows what powers the landlord can exert and what he can do to that tenant after the expiration of rent control, so I assume tenants throughout the country are going to agree to this 15 percent increase. Certainly every tenant who considers his best interests and who is not entirely oblivious to what might happen to him otherwise will sign the lease. I think this bill has enunciated a national policy that rents should be increased 15 percent. After the rent is increased 15 percent under the lease provided for herein, that property is never under control again. It is decontrolled permanently. I think this provision will result in decontrolling almost all of the housing accommodations in the United States.

The bill does give to veterans certain preferences and priorities to get into the property as tenants, but it gives the landlords the power in many, many cases to evict the tenants for various and unsubstantial causes. What are the causes for eviction under this law? The causes for eviction are all of the causes now prescribed in State laws where the action may be brought. In addition to these causes for eviction, it is provided by this act that if the tenant uses the property for immoral or illegal purposes, or, if he commits a nuisance, these shall be causes for eviction and they are perfectly legitimate causes; but in addition he may be evicted if he uses the property for any other purpose than living or dwelling purposes for his family. Now, what does that last provision mean? I apprehend that many veterans will want to conduct some little business in their homes, such as tailoring or watchmaking or shoe repairing or many other businesses that can be conducted in the home. I think under a fair interpretation of this law, that would be using the housing for other than living or dwelling purposes.

In addition to that, if the landlord in good faith wants to obtain the property for his own use or if he in good faith wants to sell it and has a contract for sale, or if in good faith he desires to remodel the property, although he does not have to have a contract to remodel the property, he can obtain possession of the property, and all of these are causes of eviction. Now, good faith is an intangible thing. How are you going to search the conscience of a landlord to ascertain whether or not he in good faith wants it for his own purposes? He may in good faith evict the tenant and after he gets possession of the property he may see some objection to using it for his own purposes. There is no penalty against him for that, but he does get the tenant out. He may have a contract in good faith to sell the property and upon examination of the title some defect may be found in the title, and the sale may never be consummated, but he does get the tenant out anyway. He may in good faith want to remodel the property, but after he gets possession he may find that remodeling costs so much or he is unable to obtain the materials that are necessary; but the tenant is out, and there is no penalty against the landlord.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Assuming there is good faith in attempting to secure possession of the property, is it the gentleman's understanding that the 6 months' procedure must be followed, or does the State law govern?

Mr. SPENCE. I think the eviction will be pursuant to the State law and the causes for eviction mentioned in this act are in addition to those prescribed by the State. It says he may be evicted for any of the causes prescribed in the State law and the causes stated in this act are additional causes of eviction.

Under this 15-percent increase, you shackle the tenant and you give the landlord a club. Duress invalidates a contract. When the minds of men do not meet without undue influence being exerted on either side, when men cannot come to a conclusion freely, it is a defense to the carrying out of the contract in favor of the person upon whom the undue influence was exerted. But this act makes duress legal because there will always be duress when the landlord deals with the tenant under present conditions.

I am not here to say that all tenants are right and all landlords are wrong. I think that justice ought to be done on both sides. I think probably many landlords are not getting as much as they deserve for their property, but this act is somewhat similar to the action of a court having cases involving many different questions and consolidating them and writing one opinion. It does not seem to me it is reasonable or right or proper in any respect. It does not seem to me it is in accordance with sound public policy.

The argument advanced in favor of this act is that we are now right up at the dead line; that we must act now; that on June 30 all controls go off. Well, that is a poor argument. The Congress is still in session, and if that is an argument for this bill it would be an argument for any other bill, however bad it might be. We are still functioning, and if this is not a good act, the Congress should treat it without any regard as to whether or not we are at the dead line. We all know this is a very important question. I think housing is one of the most vital problems presented to the American people at this time for settlement. I think it not only is an important question because of the necessity for shelter—civilized man needs a home as much as he needs food and air—but I do think that we should approach this measure in an endeavor to do justice to both sides. It is regrettable that an act has not been passed that will provide some reasonable method for the solution of the housing problem. I think in this bill there will be many repercussions that you will regret. The bill is so involved, so technical, that it is difficult to see the forest for the trees.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] has expired.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Kingfish Bodfish and the powerful real-estate lobby continue to ride high and mighty, and to the detriment of the millions of our citizens who will become the victims of this rent-decontrol legislation. When this Wolcott bill was originally before us on May 1 last, I was one of the 189 Members of this House who voted to recommit H. R. 3203 to the Committee on Banking and Currency. When this motion did not prevail and when it became apparent that the Republican-controlled House was disposed to give us either the bill in its then form or nothing at all insofar as rent control was concerned, I reluctantly voted for its passage in the hope that the Senate or the conferees between the two Houses would delete the black-jack clause which permits the landlords to say to the tenants: "Sign for a 15-percent increase or we will slug you," and the many other objectionable features of the bill. We now have before us a conference report which I as one who feels that rent controls must be continued for the present, cannot support. I am going to vote against this conference report as well as to recommit it to the conferees.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT].

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, unless this proposal contains genuine incentives to those who might supply rental units, rent control should not be extended.

Until honest treatment to investors is provided, the shortage of rental housing for veterans and others will not be solved. Lacking a square deal to landlords squeezed by rising costs and fixed rentals, the extension of rent control only prolongs and intensifies the stringency in rental housing.

When this problem came before the House, I urged the Members to obtain during the debate, if they could, some evidence that the stringency in rental housing was being overcome.

No such evidence was produced.

Because the rent situation, as pictured by competent witnesses, was getting worse instead of better, many of us urged that the House agree to the 10-percent blanket increase recommended by the American Legion housing committee. We found, as the Legion committee did, that some gesture of fairness and hope to present owners of rental housing was

imperative. But the Legion recommendation was defeated.

Since that time I have still been trying to get an accurate picture of the rental housing outlook. I wanted to find if any real progress was being made in restoring a normal supply of rental units.

The factual evidence is very disturbing. It indicates that the rental housing stringency is getting worse instead of better. If that is the case, this House should not hold its nose and pass this bill with a gesture of resignation. We might better under those circumstances reject this proposal, and get to work with new legislation that will adequately recognize the economic realities.

I have secured the figures on rental units authorized for the first five months of 1946 and 1947 for my own State of Nebraska.

During the first 5 months last year in Nebraska the FHA reports permits issued for 1,090 private rental units. For the same 5 months this year the total was 226 units, or only one-fourth as many.

The FHA figures for the whole country are almost as bad. Last year from January 15 through May 31, 149,580 privately financed nonfarm rental units were authorized.

For a somewhat longer period this year, from December 24, 1946, to May 30, 1947, only 47,203 private rental units were authorized. This means that private rental construction in 1947 is running at about 30 percent of the rate achieved early last year, before the so-called Veterans Housing Act was in effect.

Consider this fact. When permits for new rental housing are only 30 percent of what they were when the Emergency Housing Act was passed, the House is passing a rent-extension bill that continues to discourage the ownership of rental property. Total housing units authorized for this period were less than 50 percent at the same period in 1946.

Add this near stoppage of private rental construction to the disappearance from the rental market of an estimated 2,000,000 units of rental housing by discouraged property owners since VJ-day, and you get to the real question.

What kind of a rental housing problem situation may Congress have on its hands next March?

Perhaps it does not require a crystal ball to suggest that we might have another housing crisis with both parties scrambling to evade the responsibility for ill-conceived action in June 1947.

Some Members have faith that the provisions of the present bill, plus hoped-for declines in construction costs, will furnish adequate incentive for a large-scale increase in rental housing.

I earnestly hope they are right and that my fears are unwarranted.

However, the substantial financial advantage now enjoyed by those occupying price-frozen rental housing will not be given up quietly. If the consequences of inflation take more effect between now and next March—a prospect that foreign hand-outs seem to almost guarantee—tenants will resist a free market on rents even more vigorously than heretofore. Why? Because their special advantage will be that much greater.

So, Mr. Speaker, if we temporize with this problem now, as the bill seems to do, we may have a much hotter potato in our hands next year—plus an explosive demand for communistic and socialistic housing projects.

My alarm on this problem is partly based on what happened in the housing field in Europe after World War I.

I hold in my hand a worthless bond, given me some years ago by a disillusioned investor. The bond is labeled: "Dwellings building loan of the city of Vienna."

It was issued in 1922 for the following stated purpose:

> This loan is solely destined for building purposes in order to alleviate the scarcity of lodgings in the city of Vienna caused by the general conditions due to the war.

Austria had rent control because of the housing stringency. They then succumbed to public housing, and they wound up with national socialism. That did not help tenants.

And for the property owners, reports a study of the International Labor Office in 1930, the result was:

> Through inflation and rent control, property owners and mortgagees have been expropriated without compensation.

American property owners, in many instances, have been getting a mild dose of expropriation now. I hope this bill provides enough incentive to encourage private capital to do the building that will end the stringency of rental housing for those who must rent living quarters. Without the measure of encouragement provided by a 10-percent-across-the-board increase, I do not believe it does so, and I urge its rejection.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, this bill comes before us presenting one of the most unhappy choices I have ever seen offered to the Congress.

In the first place the bill, I believe, is thoroughly bad. I believe every Member of the House is going to be terribly disappointed when he starts hearing from the millions of people who rent houses across this country of ours. You have not heard from those people during these war years because their rents have been held stable.

You have heard from the landlords in large numbers, you have heard about their trials and their tribulations; but after this bill is passed and becomes law you are going to begin hearing from the hundreds of thousands of tenants who are going to be dissatisfied with this bill.

You might ask then why did I sign this conference report and why am I going to vote for the final passage of this bill?

Simply because I feel that even a bad bill, a bill that is almost unworkable, a bill that is going to raise a great many hundreds of thousands of rents throughout the country by 15 percent is better than no bill at all.

Even a 15-percent increase is a lot less difficult for the millions of people who have to rent than a hundred percent increase would be; and even to have weakened protection against eviction is better than no protection at all against eviction.

The only Members in this House I know of who can dare risk the luxury of a protest vote against this bill are the Members from the State of New York, who have adequate protection under their own State rent control law.

If you expect to protect the people in your home district who must rent their housing for the next year, then I think you are compelled, whether you like this bill or not, to vote for the final passage of this act.

I presented no less than 8 or 10 amendments to the bill to try to make it more workable, to try and protect the tenants a little more than we were protecting them in this bill. Each one was voted down by the heavy Republican majority in this House.

The bill went to the Senate and most of the errors and the defects of the House bill were repeated in the Senate bill. So the conferees had nothing to work on except two bad bills. But at the same time bills which would be better than no bill at all.

I hate to disagree with my distinguished former chairman that the House should vote this conference report down and trust that the House will pass another rent control bill. I know and you know that the House and Senate will not pass another rent-control bill. Either we take this bill as we have it before us today, liking it or not, or we have no rent control whatsoever.

We might have done this with the OPA bill last year. Just about a year ago this time we listened to the same arguments that if we turned down the bill, the House would enact a good bill. You saw the inflation and the wreckage of OPA that resulted as we rounded that dangerous corner.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SPENCE. The gentleman seems to go on the theory that we had nothing when we started and we have nothing now. To quote the words of Job, and paraphrase a little: "Naked I came into this world, and naked I shall go thither. The Lord has given and the landlord has taken away."

Mr. MONRONEY. I may say to my distinguished friend that protection against more than an increase of 15 percent is some protection at least for the tenants of this country. It is a poor compromise but it is some compromise in a way.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. This bill is not satisfactory to me at all. It was not satisfactory when the House considered it. I thought we would get a better bill from the Senate. But it is this bill or nothing and I think we ought to support this bill because, as the gentleman says, it is either this or nothing, and I think this is a little better than nothing.

Mr. MONRONEY. I agree completely with the gentleman from Georgia. We

have worked as hard as we can, particularly the minority members on this committee, in this body and in the other body, and this is the best possible bill we can bring out and get through Congress.

Do not make any mistake, there will be a lot of votes against this bill by people who do not want any rent control at all. If the people who want real effective rent control join with the people who do not want any rent control at all, you will probably wind up by not having rent control. Then you will hear the cries of misery that will come in from the four corners of this country from people who will be trying to find housing in the present extreme shortage without any control or protection against eviction.

Mr. Speaker, this bill does give some protection. It is weak in many respects. I do not know why this bill should include a virtual repeal of the Veterans' Housing Act, but it takes away practically all of that act which was designed to help the veterans get houses. However, I think we have to vote to support this bill, bad though it is, as more people would be seriously injured by our failure to act—than by its passage.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK].

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I think it most unfortunate that a bill which contains provisions which will stimulate housing construction and thus help meet one of the most severe problems confronting the country also contains a provision which, in our great cities and their environs, will increase rentals 15 percent on existing housing and thus positively implement the upward spiral in the cost of living.

As a Representative from a city where 15 percent more for rent will be a body blow to the family budgets of tens of thousands of tenants, I must vote against this conference report.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE].

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I am a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency that has had charge of the drafting of this so-called rent-control bill. While I have the greatest of affection and respect for the chairman and members of the committee, and while I also know the vast amount of time and effort that was put into this bill, I cannot support it. I must disagree with the statement just made by my colleague from Oklahoma when he says that this is a poor bill, but since it is the best we can get we must vote for it. I could never apologize for a bill and then vote for it. Legislation is either right or wrong, and if it is wrong then an effort must be made to defeat it. The rent-control issue is too important to permit of compromise.

I now say on the floor of this House, as I said when the bill was originally before us and as I said in the minority report drawn by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN] and myself, that this is not a rent-control bill; it is the beginning of the end of rent control.

Every Member of this House knows that we are confronted with the greatest housing shortage in the Nation's history. Millions of our citizens, including hundreds of thousands of newly married veterans, are living in circumstances that are a disgrace to a nation that regards itself as civilized. Homes and apartments are the least obtainable of any commodity in the Nation. Lift controls or loosen their tightness and the greedy real-estate interests will start a wave of rent increases that will engulf the whole Nation. This Congress has been doing everything that is legislatively possible to prevent inflation. Loosen your rental restrictions, my colleagues, and you will start a spiral of inflation that will be unstoppable. If you raise the rent, the workingman must have a salary increase to meet it. If he has an increase, then the manufacturer must raise his price to the consumer in order to meet increased costs of production. The consumer must have his salary raised to meet increased cost of living and so the vicious circle is begun with disastrous effects to our populace.

This measure is the pet of the National Real Estate Board and the national building and loan associations. These groups, who maintain one of the most powerful and effective lobbies here in the Nation's Capital, have not been satisfied with the enormous profits of the war years. They would now create a condition of pandemonium in the real-estate rental field that might rock the Nation, but which they would ignore as long as immense profits went into their pockets. Their highly paid and smooth lobbyists have been operating here in Washington since the beginning of this session, trying to wipe out rent controls. They have been the only groups anxious to create the inflation that all thinking people fear. Their chief spokesman, Morton Bodfish, registered last night at the Mayflower Hotel so that he could be present today at the kill. Mr. Bodfish is truly ubiquitous whenever an opportunity presents itself to put a little heavier burden on the working people of this country. It would be very interesting, Mr. Speaker, if the people of this country could learn just how much the real-estate interests have spent in their efforts to end rent control.

I repeat that I do not feel that this bill should be voted for because it is the best bill that can be brought out. I know that this has been a long and hard session and that many of the Members are anxious to go home. Gentlemen, permit this bill to pass and you will find your recess at home will not be a happy one. This measure affects the existence of 70 percent of our people and the economic stability of the entire Nation. We cannot allow a rise in rents and then hope to cut prices down.

Mr. Speaker, I beg of the membership of this House to vote to recommit this bill to the Committee on Banking and Currency. As a member of this committee, I feel sure that even if we have to stay a few extra weeks we can report out a bill which will guarantee stability of rents to the people of our Nation plus economic stability, which we will lose if this bill is passed.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, in my studied opinion there is one way and one way only to get more houses built, more houses for home ownership, and more houses for rent in this country of ours, for veterans and for everyone else, and that is to take the Government entirely off the backs of the people. Just so long as private capital is afraid that tomorrow or next week or next month or next year Congress may again impose on them controls that will not justify the spending of their own money to build apartment houses and homes, we will have far too few homes and apartment buildings built for rent.

During the past 15 years this administration has spent over $14,000,000,000 of the American people's money on dozens of schemes to build homes of every kind, way back from the days of Tugwell, after he dreamed up his home-building program, and what do we have? We are still in the middle of a housing shortage. We have not only spent over $14,000,000,000 to build federally financed houses, but we have also spent many hundreds of millions of dollars for administrative expenses for a group of people most of whom knew nothing about the building business. So I say, stop this thing now and let us get all the way back to the American way of doing things.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I understood that this conference report decontrolled construction except for recreational and amusement places, and that there was no rent control on the new construction.

Mr. JENSEN. But private capital never knows when Congress will again be told that a great emergency exists and that we must put all the controls back on. That is what is scaring private capital away from building apartment buildings and homes for rent.

The Government Corporations Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, of which I have the honor to be chairman, decided after hearings and full consideration that the Office of the Expediter should be liquidated as of June 30 this year. This bill gives it new life. I cannot speak for the other members of the Committee on Appropriations but certainly I am not going to change my mind, because I am sure the committee acted properly when we decided not to continue the Office of the Expediter, even though I hold Mr. Creedon in high regard. I stood on the floor of this House early last year when the President was asking for $400,000,000 to expedite production of materials and homes and all it did was to create less production of materials and homes. It finally fell flat as I predicted it would. So I say again that if you want homes, if you want apartment houses, if you want cheaper rent in the near future, cut off

all Government controls and let America do the job the American way. This problem will be with us time without end, so long as we play around with this kind of legislation.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill has been aptly referred to as bad legislation. I heartily concur in that statement. When the bill was originally offered, I submitted a minority report that pointed out several of the discriminatory features in this bill. This bill is not a rent-control bill, but has been referred to as a save-the-landlords bill.

This is what would happen: Over the past several weeks, and even this morning, we had under discussion the bill H. R. 1. Had the veto been overridden, a person earning, let us say, $2,500 a year in 1947 would have paid something like $335 in taxes, and under that "trickle-down" tax bill would have saved some $34 this year on his current 1947 income tax.

In this particular bill there is contained a clause, the hidden 15-percent clause, which is referred to as the "blackjack" clause, that would tip the scales and give the balance to the landlord in that he may offer a new lease and the tenant either accepts that lease or else. That 15-percent increase would mean to a person paying, let us say, $40 a month, or an annual rental of $480 a year, an annual increase of $72 in rent. So wherein would there have been any savings?

This bill will not give us effective rent control. Certain legal restraints are shifted and eviction safeguards are weakened. I do not subscribe to the argument that we should accept this legislation, even though it is bad legislation. I contend that no legislation at all is better than ill-conceived legislation.

I believe it is the responsibility of this Congress to turn out good legislation, legislation that is aboveboard and with a reasonable sense of balance. I do not think that any hidden rent increase or "blackjack" provision should be inserted in this legislation.

The housing and rent-control bill, H. R. 3203, agreed to by the conference committee, puts one in a dilemma.

It is very similar to that posed by the first OPA bill last year. The OPA bill extended price control, but it had so many crippling amendments authorizing price increases that the President felt compelled to veto it.

There resulted a hiatus of uncontrolled prices while the Congress debated a second OPA bill. The Congressional Quarterly of June 17, 1947, makes the following comment:

> The 1947 housing situation is similar. Authority for Government control of rents and building materials will expire June 30. The Wolcott bill ends most of the material controls and extends the others, as well as those on rents, only to February 29, 1948, instead of to June 30, 1948 as requested by the President. The Wolcott bill also takes rent controls off all housing units completed after February 1, 1948, and permits rent increases on other units up to 15 percent if the tenant agrees and if a lease is made extending until January 1, 1949.
>
> This permissive 15 percent would be computed on the basis of rents existing when the bill becomes effective. Thus, if tenants were agreeable, it could mean increases from prewar rents of considerably more than 15 percent in many instances. OPA and the Housing Expediter have already granted a good many rent increases, and the voluntary 15-percent boosts would be on the basis of existing rents after these other increases.
>
> The only building controls retained in the Wolcott bill are those on construction for amusement or recreation, so that industrial and other commercial construction could go ahead without Federal clearance. Opponents of this provision declare that there is now a backlog of something more than $2,000,000,000 in deferred nonresidential construction which would burst upon the market if controls were removed. With this kind of competition for materials and labor, the opponents say, residential building would not stand a chance.
>
> On the other side, however, real-estate men point out that there is a duplication of only 3 percent in materials which are used in both residential and nonresidential construction, so that there can be no real conflict. It is admitted that there is somewhat more duplication in use of labor, but even in this case, the realtors say, the amount of duplication has been exaggerated. Structural steelworkers, for example, are used in much greater numbers on industrial construction than on home building.

I am going to offer a motion to recommit this conference report. I opposed the original legislation, and I shall oppose this measure on the same basis.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, considering what has occurred in landlord-tenant relations, and in housing since the House first acted on H. R. 3203, the bill dealt with in this conference report, I feel I must oppose the report. As a tenant myself, I think it should be clear that I do not intend to sign a lease if this bill should become law, as I consider it unnecessary. So long as Federal rent control continues, I need no lease to guarantee continued occupancy of my apartment. Should such Federal rent control go off on February 29, 1948, as provided by the terms of this bill—which would not be justified as long as the critical housing shortage continues—I will have the New York State rent-control law to fall back on, and will still need no lease. The New York State law expires June 30, 1948, but I believe that we must, and therefore shall continue to have rent control in New York until the housing shortage is relieved sufficiently to allow freedom of negotiation between landlord and tenant. That is not the case now and will probably not be the case by the date provided in this bill, February 29, 1948.

I trust that it will be made clear to all the people, if this bill should become law, that they are under no compulsion to enter into a lease with their landlords and to accept an increase of 15 percent, or any other increase in rent in that way; and that they should not permit themselves to be talked into signing such a lease if they do not wish to do so. It is extremely important that this be made clear so that tenants should not be coerced by unscrupulous landlords, and honest landlords should not be prejudiced by those who may seek to take unfair advantage of this bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that when this bill came back from the other body, I would be able to vote for it. I have a high regard for the members of the committee and I would have liked to support them in what has been a very difficult discussion. It is not a question of whether or not we should have had rent control. It was necessary. It was not necessary to have the poorly administered control we have had and still have. The evidences of this are too well known to require discussion. The only satisfactory solution would be to increase local control and local administration. The House tried to do that when the bill was before us. Unfortunately, the conference report shows that this provision was taken out. The provisions to protect the tenant and the owner are worthless, if we are to have the same kind of administration we have had before. It continues until March the extravagantly useless Office of Housing Expediter, who has expedited nothing, and without which there might be some practical expedition in the building of houses. Veterans cannot live in blueprints, they must have houses, and nonveterans too, for that matter. This report makes a political football, in 1948, out of the housing problem. I shall vote to return the report to the conference committee for further study.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes to call attention to the fact that no legislation has ever been presented on the floor which has been entirely satisfactory to every Member of the House or Senate.

I think this bill is the best compromise that could have been effected between the two extremes—between those who advocate no rent control at all and those who advocate continuance of rent control as it is.

We started out with the original purpose of encouraging the production of rental properties in order that we might take rent controls off gradually. This bill does just that. The principal objective is to give such encouragement to private enterprise, but not under Government control, to produce rental properties fast enough and in quantities enough so that we can gradually take off these rent controls, and it is to be hoped that by the time February 29 comes around, because of the adjustments which will be made under this program, and the increase in production as the result of the program will enable us to lick the housing shortage. That is our objective.

The majority of the members of the committee felt that that was a good objective. The majority of the members of the Senate committee thought likewise. The majority of the Members of the House followed the advice of the committee and voted for this bill. The majority of the Members of the Senate did

likewise. The conferees met and ironed out little differences, and now we have before us a bill which will effectuate the primary objective of licking the housing shortage.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BUCHANAN moves to recommit the bill H. R. 3203 to the committee of conference.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to recommit the conference report.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER (after counting). Thirty-two members have risen. Not a sufficient number.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BUCHANAN) there were—ayes 87, noes 114.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After a pause.] Two hundred and thirty-four Members are present, a quorum.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SPENCE) there were—ayes 163, noes 73.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 53) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Clerk of the House of Representatives, in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 3203) relative to maximum rents on housing accommodations; to repeal certain provisions of Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress, and for other purposes, is authorized and directed, in section 4 (a), to strike out "March 31, 1948", wherever such date occurs and insert in lieu thereof "March 1, 1948."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke on the conference report just considered may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

RULE WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER ON INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 248 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3839) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, all points of order against the bill or any provisions contained therein are hereby waived; and it shall also be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order any amendment to said bill prohibiting the use of the funds appropriated in such bill or any funds heretofore made available, including contract authorizations, for the purchase of any particular site or for the erection of any particular hospital.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], and at this time I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution serves only one purpose in connection with the consideration of the appropriation bill for the independent offices; namely, to waive points of order against certain legislative provisions in the bill. Ordinarily, I would oppose the writing of legislation into appropriations bills, but in this instance it is the only way we can make the savings we are seeking to make here and handle the measure expeditiously. The over-all savings to the Government proposed in this appropriation bill approximate $1,400,000,000. Something more than $800,000,000 of this money we seek to save the taxpayers of this country might be lost on points of order if we do not adopt this rule.

The testimony before the Rules Committee established the fact that the two legislative committees directly concerned with the legislative provisions in the appropriation bill were the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. The chairmen of both of those committees were consulted by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations in charge of this bill. We are assured that they have no objection to writing these legislative provisions into the bill. Each of these legislative provisions has to do only with the saving of the taxpayers' money.

Another provision in the rule makes in order amendments that may limit the expenditure of moneys already appropriated, moneys appropriated in this bill or contract authorizations for the acquisition of sites for veterans' hospitals and for the construction of such hospitals. This gives any Member of the House the opportunity to offer amendments in that connection without the intervention of a point of order.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That means any Member, if he objected to any site in any part of the country, could object to a hospital being built there?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. No; not necessarily. It means they might limit the funds to be expended on a particular project.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think that would pretty nearly prohibit the building of hospitals.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I think the gentlewoman will find that no Member of this House wants to stop the construction of any necessary facilities already authorized. He may properly seek to save money in their location and construction.

He may seek to stop the Government from wasting money, but it is not going to interfere in the slightest with the program of the Veterans' Administration in the construction of the necessary hospital facilities.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understood General Hawley to say that it would be very difficult to operate his hospital program if the bill should be enacted.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I think he is rather extravagant in that statement.

The Members may find in the record, on pages 32 and 33, the particular legislative provisions involved in this rule. Because the House and the Committee later are going to be so pressed for time in connection with the consideration of this vitally important appropriation bill, we are hoping that we might pass this resolution without waste of the time. I request my distinguished friend on the Rules Committee to utilize as little time as possible so that we might get into the debate on the bill.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, as has been stated, this rule waives points of order on an appropriation bill. For several years I have called attention to the fact that the Committee on Appropriations is assuming jurisdiction that properly belongs to the legislative committees, and notwithstanding the assurances that have been given to the Committee on Rules at various meetings for some time past, they still continue to request waivers of points of order on appropriation bills.

Now, the resolution before us waives points of order on many items in the independent offices appropriation bill that properly should have been considered by our legislative committees. If the Committee on Appropriations will continue in its course and usurp the power of the legislative committees,

within a few years we might abolish the legislative committees and turn the legislative jurisdiction of these committees over to the Committee on Appropriations. There are some Members here today that served in the House years ago when we took the appropriation power away from the jurisdiction of the legislative committees. We thought then that it was a good move and that legislation would be handled more expeditiously and judiciously and that the appropriations of the various departments would be more carefully considered and acted upon by one committee having sole jurisdiction on appropriations. Unfortunately, the great Committee on Appropriations, the membership of which has been so tremendously increased under the provisions of the Reorganization Act, is not satisfied with its authority to submit and report appropriation bills for the various departments, but in every appropriation bill it has reported thus far in the present session has actually assumed jurisdiction on legislative matters.

In this bill it is claimed that the points that are being waived are for the purpose of bringing about economy. I have heard that word before, and I doubt very much if that will be accomplished, because notwithstanding the cuts and the reductions that have been made by the committee, I feel the committee will cone in here in a few months and ask for an increase in these reduced appropriations in a deficiency bill.

The bill is loaded with legislative riders. Riders that attempt to nullify the Classification Act; to dictate administration of surplus property and civil-service acts, Atomic Energy Commission Act, and others.

The agencies cut the worst are the "watchdogs" set up by Congress, saying nothing of the wiping out of the appropriation for the Office of Government Reports which has been one of the most efficient and most helpful to Congress.

The Federal Trade Commission, the "watchdog of the consumers" has had its budget estimate reduced by one-third—by $1,122,880.

The budget of the Public Roads Administration has been reduced $36,000,000. Its grade crossing elimination program to save lives has been wiped out but what are a few hundred human lives compared to $5,000,000?

The National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics—"watchdog of the air" has had its budget estimates reduced by $390,000. Instead of increasing the service and efficiency of this branch of the service, appropriations are limited at the expense of safety and the safeguarding of lives of millions of our air travelers.

And so on with many other important functioning agencies of our Government.

SAVINGS

Mr. Speaker, on page 45 of the committee report, I notice the astounding statement and claim that there has been a total savings of $1,400,000,000 due to reductions in budget estimates, revised estimates, rescissions, reductions in expenditures, and increase in revenue.

The first savings claimed is three hundred and thirty million in reductions in revised budget estimates. Well, well, well. So that is a saving, when every Member of this House should know that there has never been a single appropriation passed that carried the full amount of budget estimates—they have always carried less.

The next item covers expenditure reductions of seventy-three million for the Maritime Commission and forty-seven million for UNRRA. Yes; the war is over and we are not building additional ships and the forty-seven million allocation from UNRRA is not longer required—so is it but natural that these expenditures be reduced and not used if no longer necessary. Anyone with one ounce of business sense knows that yet the Republican gentleman on the left would try to fool the people into believing that this is a saving.

Under "Rescissions of appropriations" the majority would take credit for a "savings" of $5,000,000 that is being returned to the Treasury because war housing is no longer being constructed. Yes; the war is over and it is but natural that this money be returned to Uncle Sam's pocket.

They also attempt to take credit for a saving of $108,000,000 of United States Maritime Commission receipts and other funds that have been covered into the Treasury—a mere bookkeeping transfer from one department to another department. How can they sum up the courage to foist the impression upon the country that this is a saving?

Next on their "savings" chart appears an item of fifty million covering appropriations to the Veterans' Administration for construction of hospitals and domiciliary facilities. It so happens that the Veterans' Administration has taken over and remodeled a certain number of Army and naval hospitals which has not made necessary the construction of additional hospitals and, therefore, it will not be necessary to use this $50,000,000. Yes; common business sense would dictate that this money remain in the Treasury and not be used for unnecessary construction.

Their next claim to alleged savings covers pensions and compensations for the Veterans' Administration being a reduction in original budget estimates. Time has not permitted me to check into this reduction of $269,000,000, but I hope the veterans will not suffer by reason of it or that the Veterans' Administration will be forced to adopt a hard policy in rejecting meritorious claims in order to keep within the appropriations that will be authorized. This is one appropriation that I shall watch during the fiscal year and the Republican Congress will be held to account for any hardships that our deserving veterans may suffer if it is found that the appropriations are not sufficient.

Most of the cuts that has been made are in departments and bureaus of our Government that have been created by this Congress. They are the watchdogs of Congress, if I may express myself that way, over which Congress has jurisdiction. I believe they have performed their duty fairly well. It appears to me that some of the departments and agencies have been cut most unfairly. One agency especially, the Securities and Exchange Commission, has had its appropriation cut $750,000 below the budget estimate. I happen to know something about that because only a few weeks ago, after I learned that short sales had increased 295,000 shares, reaching a total of 1,341,000 by May 15, I requested certain information from that agency and was told that it was impossible for them to obtain it because they did not have sufficient personnel to perform the investigating and clerical work involved.

You may recollect that about 3 weeks ago I made a speech against short selling and it was then that I demanded that the Securities and Exchange Commission as well as the stock exchange furnish me with not only the number of short sales but also the names of the sellers who were responsible for the unfair, unjustifiable, and unwarranted activity in the New York Stock Exchange, the curb, and other exchanges that resulted in a break and drop in prices of stocks generally. Despite two or three requests I was unable, for the reasons stated, to obtain the names of the professionals that were manipulating the market to the disadvantage of the commerce of the Nation and the price value of securities. Not that I condone the bulls in the stock exchange any more than I do the bears, the bears being the short sellers. At least, the bulls do not destroy the values as the short sellers do. I am very pleased to say to you that since that time the value of stocks, I believe, has gone up from two to three billion dollars, and has been going up ever since, not to any great degree, but nevertheless prices have not fallen.

Many thousands of owners of these stocks have written me expressing their approval of my action in calling the attention of the country to the short-selling activities that were responsible for the unwarranted drop in the prices of the stocks which they acquired for investment in good faith. I feel that the honest and legitimate investors are entitled to and should have information on short sales from day to day, or at least weekly. The daily publication of short sales would serve as a deterrent to manipulative practices and be of real benefit to legitimate investors and the businessmen of the country in judging investments and the real trend of business. I repeat, I am going to insist that the Congress and the public have the names of the manipulators who are selling stocks they do not own and which they do not even possess.

Mr. McGARVEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McGARVEY. The information the gentleman is talking about that he has been trying to secure from different sources can be obtained from the Securities and Exchange Commission right now. They have it on hand right now.

I want to say that short-selling never broke the market. If you are informed about it you know that it has not been possible to sell stocks short over the last 5 years.

Mr. SABATH. I thank the gentleman for the information, but regret to say he

is in error. I have been unable to obtain the information which I have requested and shall continue to insist that it be furnished. In view of the fact that the gentleman was formerly in the brokerage business I am amazed that he should make such a statement. May I ask, Do they sell short to boost prices? Is it not a fact that short selling is done to force prices down to enable those selling short to buy the stock back later on at a lower price? In view that I have heretofore explained my position, I do not deem it necessary to rehash the explanation.

I have given thought and study to this matter for about 25 years. I know that since short selling stopped in the last 2½ weeks the prices of stocks have gone up in the aggregate from two to three billion dollars and from 1 point to 10 points on individual stocks. In this connection I insert excerpts from one of many newspaper reports which should convince any doubting Thomas as to the correctness of my statement. The excerpts are from an article appearing in the Washington Post, as follows:

STOCKS SCORED GOOD GAINS

NEW YORK.—The stock market, during the past week, enjoyed one of the best rallies of the year and, on balance, held a good net gain for the four sessions.

Shorts ran to cover Wednesday and gave the big board its widest upswing since February 7, but the day's aggregate reached only 890,000 shares. Advances of 1 to 3 or more points, however, were numerous.

Some day I will point out to you and convince you that short selling is the worst practice that can be indulged in on the stock exchanges of the country. I know that many countries are now devising methods to stop this gambling which, after all, is conducted by a very few men as against the interests of millions of American investors, the country at large, and elsewhere. I could go on further in bringing the unfair practices of short selling to light, but wishing to expedite the consideration of the independent offices appropriation bill now before us, I shall comply with the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS], to limit my remarks, especially in view of the fact that my Republican colleagues pay no heed to my warnings or avail themselves of my advice.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. May I ask the gentleman for this information? Has any such rule been granted to the Committee on Appropriations, for instance, which was considering the appropriation for post offices? I will read it. It is as follows:

It shall be in order to offer any amendment to the bill to prohibit the use of funds appropriated in this bill or any funds heretofore made available, including contract authorization for the purchase of any particular site for the erection of any particular hospital.

Has anything of the kind ever been done so far as a rule being reported out regarding this sort of action being taken for the erection of post offices? I think this is a very far-reaching precedent, if it be a precedent. The House should be fully informed.

Mr. SABATH. I fully appreciate that. I do not recollect that we have ever adopted any such provision, but it is up to the House to pass upon it. If any amendment is offered, you will be at liberty, and the Members will have the right, to vote for or against it. This especially broad provision in the rule was agreed to by the Committee on Rules, and I will explain to you why it was done.

We were informed in the hearing in the Committee on Rules that there are certain sites that are being considered and the prices are perhaps 8 or 10 times higher than for adjoining pieces of property. Because of that, we felt that these gentlemen who selected the sites, and I have had my experience during the war with some of them, should be restricted in their price agreements and that we ought to know what they are negotiating and whether or not they are paying more for the sites or agreeing to construction contracts at figures higher than they should, especially in such cases where the cost of sites and contracts appear outrageously high.

I think the House is entitled to restrict any such action for the protection of our Government and save the taxpayers as much money as possible.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman, but it would seem to me that if the gentleman feels that way about it and if the Committee on Rules feels that way about it, it would be very advisable to have that same provision in every rule regarding any authorization for appropriations for any Government building.

Mr. SABATH. As I stated before, the Committee on Appropriations is going far afield. The Committee on Rules has been extremely liberal, more so than I as former chairman of the committee was willing to grant and I cannot muster enough votes to deny the granting of these special rules which take away the jurisdiction of legislative committees. I feel that if the Committee on Appropriations will continue to usurp the powers of legislative committees that some day the legislative committees will join in protest of the usurpation of their legislative powers.

I think we must stop the granting of these exceptions or the waiving of points of order on appropriation bills which contain so much legislation. That power belongs to our standing committees which have the jurisdiction of matters of that kind.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include therewith a resolution.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH asked and was granted permission to revise and extend the remarks he expects to make in Committee of the Whole and include certain tables and a letter.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3839) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate continue throughout the day, the time to be equally divided between the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH]?

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that the debate continue throughout the day. It is not intended that we shall close debate today, unless we come to the place where nobody desires to speak, because our time is a little short and I do not know how many requests will be made.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am intending to leave that matter open.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Very well.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3839, with Mr. SPRINGER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill has a very wide scope, covering some 33 different agencies or items. Three of those agencies, the General Accounting Office, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Civil Service Commission touch every activity of the Government.

It carries within it appropriations of over $8,167,000,000, and also authority to expend by the Maritime Commission up to $207,100,000.

I may mention in passing that 85 percent of this over-all total is for the Veterans' Administration, and that of that 85 percent about 85 percent is for bene-

fits which the Congress has provided for our veterans.

This bill comes to you with a united front from the subcommittee handling the bill; and I want at this time to express for myself and for the majority members of the committee sincere appreciation of the cooperation and helpfulness of the three Democratic members of the subcommittee who have handled this bill: the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS], former chairman of this subcommittee; the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS]. The committee has worked harmoniously, and, as I have said, the bill comes to you with its unanimous recommendation.

I also want the RECORD to show my appreciation of our clerical staff and particularly of our very able, very hard working, and very tactful executive secretary, Bill Duvall, whose work has been most helpful to every member of this committee.

I want also to express my thanks to the committee investigators whom we have had authority to employ for the first time this year under the Reorganization Act, and to state that the committee has been most fortunate in the investigators it has been able to secure to help it in connection with this bill. They have included expert accountants of the highest possible standing. Their work has been invaluable. I am sure they have convinced every Member of the subcommittee of the value of the investigating force which has been established for the first time this year.

TOTAL REDUCTIONS

As you will note from the report, this bill carries with it reductions in items classified technically as appropriations of over $330,000,000. It also carries with it reductions in original budget estimates made in accordance with recommendations by committee investigators, reductions in Maritime expenditure out of its revolving fund carried in the President's budget, and rescissions of prior appropriations amounting to over $576,000,000.

The committee is also able to report to the Congress that as the result of the work of its investigators there has been discovered additional revenues not included in the President's budget, amounting to over $505,000,000.

In other words, I think it is a fair and conservative statement to make that if the recommendations of your committee are approved, the over-all situation from the standpoint of the United States Treasury, compared with the President's budget estimates, will be improved to an extent of over $1,411,000,000.

There are several general matters on which I should like to touch before turning to specific agencies. These matters are brought out in the committee hearings.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE TESTIMONY

The General Accounting Office gave testimony which to my mind was amazing. It stated in effect that in the opinion of that Office there is almost no semblance whatsoever of proper cost accounting anywhere in this Government of ours; that literally billions of dollars have been spent that can never be accounted for, that there is no proper conception in the Government of the value of accounting, that nobody ever thinks about accounting until long after the money is spent.

Mr. Chairman, that statement strikes at the very heart of the whole problem of controlling expenditures. It is almost inconceivable that proper control can be hoped for under such conditions.

Incidentally, the General Accounting Office also reported that it had found no less than 395 cases of waste and extravagance during the past 2 years and no less than 1,011 erroneous payments and failure to protect the Government's interest.

The General Accounting Office was particularly critical of the Maritime Commission, the War Shipping Administration, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Commodity Credit Corporation, and the Federal Public Housing Administration.

It appears that the General Accounting Office has encountered great difficulty in getting established in various agencies of the Government, accounting systems believed by it to be essential. The bill before you tries to help out somewhat in that connection.

BUREAU OF THE BUDGET TESTIMONY

The testimony of the Bureau of the Budget is also interesting. It shows that we are confronted not only by a direct public debt of over $259,000,000,000 but by a direct public debt, including contingent liabilities, of almost $432,000,000,000.

Under permission to extend my remarks I include certain tables from the hearings in this connection.

Public debt and other liabilities of the U. S. Government as of Dec. 31, 1946

Direct public debt:	
Interest-bearing debt	$257,649,121,076.59
Matured debt on which interest has ceased	394,794,518.51
Debt bearing no interest	1,104,850,390.73
Total direct public debt	259,148,765,985.83
Contingent liabilities:	
Obligations guaranteed by the United States	338,564,942.14
Obligations issued on credit of United States:	
Tennessee Valley Authority	2,000,000.00
Funds due depositors by Postal Savings System	3,217,192,461.00
Federal Reserve notes (face amount)	24,151,175,536.39
Total contingent liabilities	27,708,932,939.53
Unliquidated obligations incurred against appropriations and contract authorizations	22,895,000,000.00
Loan guaranties outstanding:	
Insured housing loans—Federal Housing Administration:	
Primarily for repair, alteration, or improvement of property—Title I insurance	355,355,694.00
Secured by mortgages on structures designed primarily for residential use:	
Loans to improve housing standards—Title II insurance:	
Small-home mortgage insurance	2,485,595,688.00
Multifamily structures built for rental occupancy	52,453,827.00
War and veterans' emergency housing loans—Title VI insurance	1,344,921,678.00
Guaranteed war production and termination loans (V and T loans)—War and Navy Departments and U. S. Maritime Commission	17,454,000.00

Public debt and other liabilities of the U. S. Government as of Dec. 31, 1946—Con.

Loans guaranties outstanding—Con.	
Guaranteed loans secured by agricultural commodities—Commodity Credit Corporation	$111,979,000.00
Agreements to participate in loans by commercial banks to business enterprises—Reconstruction Finance Corporation (including Smaller War Plants Corporation)	331,673,000.00
Acceptances and loans by private banks under "take-out" agreements with the Export-Import Bank of Washington	182,193,000.00
Guaranteed loans to veterans of World War II under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended—Veterans' Administration:	
Home loans	1,165,640,670.65
Business loans	53,297,074.67
Farm loans	31,090,838.32
Guaranteed premiums on life-insurance policies and guaranteed interest on policy loans to military personnel under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940—Veterans' Administration	8,492,680.00
Total loan guaranties outstanding	6,140,147,150.64
Insurance in force:	
Life insurance:	
United States Government life insurance	2,349,925,688.00
National service life insurance	34,249,680,000.00
Property insurance—War Damage Corporation	500,000,000.00
Marine and war-risk insurance—War Shipping Administration	673,767,968.00
Insured deposits in commercial and mutual savings banks—Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	72,000,000,000.00
Insured savings and loan association share accounts and creditor obligations—Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation	6,254,345,000.00
Total insurance in force	116,027,718,656.00
Total public debt including contingent liabilities	431,920,564,732.00

The testimony also shows some 2,286,000 persons on the Federal pay roll as of February last, or about 400,000 more than predicted by the Civil Service Commission a year ago.

It indicates little, if any, progress in eliminating duplication and overlapping between Federal departments and agencies. It will be recalled that the General Accounting Office not so very long ago stated that there were no less than 29 agencies engaged in lending Government funds, 3 insuring deposits, 34 in the acquisition of land, 16 in wildlife preservation, 10 in Government construction, 9 in credit and finance, 12 in home and community planning, 10 in materials and construction, 28 in welfare matters, 14 in forestry matters, 4 in bank examinations, and 65 in gathering statistics.

The testimony also shows the extent to which personnel of war or emergency agencies recently terminated has been transferred to other pay rolls of the Government.

Incidentally, the record also indicates a greater staff at the White House than ever before; a travel item for the White House 100 percent in excess of that 2 years ago and under emergency funds, provision for extra White House staff to the number of 14, part, if not all, of whom were previously carried on the rolls of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion which the country was led to believe had been abolished.

INCREASE IN PERSONNEL FORCE

I call your attention to the enormous increase in the personnel force throughout the Government. There are 29,397 persons engaged in this work today as compared with 4,197 in 1938, an increase of 700 percent. On the basis of the yardstick which the Bureau of the Budget suggested to your committee as fair in this connection, 1 personnel worker to 150 employees, it is at least double in size that required to service the present pay roll.

TOO MANY GENERALS

I mention also in passing that agency after agency appearing before your committee showed a very top-heavy set-up in terms of personnel. The committee has included in its report a recommendation that subsequent reductions in force be made with this in mind. The Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission should help in this connection. The Congress does not intend that reductions in force be taken exclusively out of the lower-paid personnel.

Mr. Chairman, it is impossible in the time available this afternoon to go into detail with respect to every agency provided for in this bill. We have, I think, a very good report which covers the action of the committee pretty carefully in respect to the various agencies involved. I am going to limit myself to just three or four of the agencies in question, particularly those into which we sent committee investigators. I shall leave discussion of other agencies to other speakers or to discussion under the 5-minute rule.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Let us take a look at the Veterans' Administration request to start with, because I think we are more interested in that item than any other item in the bill.

Somewhat over $7,075,000,000 was requested by the Administration. Your committee recommends an appropriation of over $6,944,000,000, or a reduction in the revised budget estimates of something over $130,000,000, as well as a rescission of $50,000,000 which the Veterans' Administration finds it will not require in the fiscal year 1948.

I want to emphasize as the report emphasizes that no recommendation made contemplates any cut in any benefit which has been provided by the Congress for our veterans; that no recommendation contemplates any cut in financial assistance to the disabled, to the widowed, to the orphaned, or in medical care for those who are eligible.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I want to ask the gentleman about the cuts in the Administrative Medical Hospital and Domiciliary Service, a decrease of $38,959,200 compared to the 1948 budget.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. If the gentlewoman will be patient and will permit me to make my statement as a whole, I think it will cover that question and others that she has in mind.

What the committee has been primarily concerned with has been the administrative expenditure and policies of the Veterans' Administration which have been under fire in the past by national veterans' organizations, by national publications, and by other groups and individuals.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to be too critical of existing conditions in the agency. I realize full well that the Veterans' Administration has had a very difficult job, particularly during the period of heavy demobilization. I am sure that General Bradley will do his utmost to straighten out conditions which prevail at this time.

Nevertheless, I think I ought to state and state frankly that I, for one, am very much disturbed by facts disclosed in the committee hearings.

There appears to be no proper central control over personnel. I think that control was lost back in December of 1945 when the heads of branch and regional offices were authorized and directed to take over the function of hiring and firing. You will find the letter carrying those instructions in the hearings. You will find that no less than 47,000 employees were added to the rolls in the period of 6 months immediately after that letter was written, and you will find today a disproportion as between different branch offices, as between different regional offices, and as between the administrative and maintenance personnel in different hospitals, which just is not reasonable. There is today in the central office, our investigators inform us, no proper record of positions and salaries in the various field offices.

There also appears to be no proper central control over supplies. There are supplies at the central level, at the branch level, at the regional level, and at the subregional level and an absence of proper control here in Washington.

In the real estate and construction field there is evidence of delay, of lack of efficiency, and of waste. Only 22 sites for hospitals out of the 76 hospitals last authorized have been selected. Only seven of them are under construction. Purchase price and appraised value seem to be out of line. The policy now pursued would seem to drive up the cost of desirable real estate inevitably. The costs which we have paid and are paying for construction are far out of line with construction in other fields.

Our investigators are of the opinion that decentralization has not worked out as it was hoped, that it has resulted in duplication and confusion in many instances at the several levels of control.

The General Accounting Office tells us that no less than $30,000,000 of overpayments have been made by reason of negligence in the Veterans' Administration regional offices.

In the insurance field the picture is such that those in charge tell us it will take at least a year to straighten things out. There has been no actuarial work for many months. There is no real information as to the status of insurance funds, as to surplus, as to reserve, and there are no less than 1,200,000 premium payments which have been paid which it has been impossible to allocate to the proper policies because those policies are at present located in any one of 14 different places, and nobody knows in which of them. Perhaps I might quote just a couple of paragraphs from our investigators' report in this connection:

> Our studied opinion of the Veterans' Administration is that it is badly disorganized and greatly over-staffed. In many respects approaches have been impractical and out of harmony with generally accepted and approved business procedures. The decentralization program initiated on December 10, 1945, has been ineffective, extremely costly, and confusing. It is clearly evident that there is a great need for firmer control and deeper appreciation of the responsibility for conducting Veterans' Administration affairs at a much higher level of efficiency and in a more economical manner.
>
> We are deeply appreciative that with few exceptions the persons we contacted during the review were most cooperative and helpful. We observed that many of these people were cognizant of the unsatisfactory conditions but were powerless to correct the situation and are themselves working under severe handicaps.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to be too critical of the Veterans' Administration, but the conditions I have referred to must be straightened out. They must be straightened out in the interest of every veteran in this country of ours. Nobody wants to see a repetition of such conditions as we had in the Veterans' Administration after World War I. Nobody wants to see the foundation laid for another act slashing service-connected disability compensation such as we had under President Roosevelt in 1933.

It has been impossible for your committee to do a careful or complete piece of work in the time available. The work of our investigators has been necessarily limited to the central office in Washington, and essential information simply was not there.

I believe, however, that the cuts which are recommended are fully justified, and I want to point out that in terms of personnel the reduction made by your committee is much less than that recommended by committee investigators. The committee preferred to be conservative, particularly in view of the fact that they believe General Bradley has a full appreciation of the importance of proper central control over personnel and already has studies under way in that connection.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 additional minutes.

The Members will find the reductions made in respect to the Veterans' Administration on page 22 and on page 44 of the committee report.

You will see in the first place that we made a reduction of about $27,000,000 in respect to personnel. This means a reduction of about 10,000 in a request for 215,000, or about 5 percent, and it is made in the light of the statement by General Bradley that the peak of administrative work has now been passed.

The committee has made certain specific suggestions as to where it seems reductions of personnel can be made,

notably in the personnel set-up, where there is one personnel worker for every 52 people on the rolls; notably in coordination and planning, which I think has long been recognized by veterans' organizations as overstaffed; and notably in public relations, which was carried on a basis of 300 and which the committee has restored to a basis of 100 in accordance with the action of the House 2 or 3 months ago.

Personally, I think the claims service, special services, contact services, and other services should be carefully scrutinized by General Bradley, particularly where the work in question can be efficiently done by one or more of the existing national veterans' organizations.

You will find two tables in the hearings referring to branch and regional offices—that in respect to branch offices indicating a variation in personnel between offices of 258 percent; that in respect to regional offices indicating a variation between offices of 450 percent. Of course, certain variations are understandable, but General Bradley himself has admitted that the variations in question are not reasonable and has stated to us that he is now in the process of adjusting those offices along the lines that the committee has suggested.

Taking a middle ground yardstick for the branch and regional offices our investigators arrived at a possible reduction of about 21,000 in Veterans' Administration personnel. This was over and above any possible reductions in maintenance and administration personnel in hospitals, in supply depots, and in the central office here in Washington.

The committee has indicated, as you will note from the report, that it does not intend the reduction in personnel in this bill to apply to hospitals in any way, shape, or manner.

The other items of reduction are in respect to other obligations which you will see listed on page 22 of the report; in regard to certain office buildings requested for regional offices, 11 all told, in regard to which the committee adopted the general policy of postponement in view of the high prices and in view of the need of hospital construction, in the absence of compelling considerations.

Provision is made for 4 of the 11 offices in the bill as reported to you.

It has also cut printing and binding, putting it back to where it is this year. The record indicates among other things in this connection that over 3,674,000,000 blank forms are requested or about 200 for every veteran or 30 for every person in the United States. Also that some 303,000,000 letterheads are requested which would allow every Veterans' Administration employee to write about 1,348 letters in the fiscal year 1948. There are three warehouses in contemplation for this printing and binding—one in Washington, one in Missouri, and one in California. There appears to be no record of the value of the inventories on hand.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Has the gentleman made reference to the fact or does he intend to point out that there are on hand great quantities of these forms which he is suggesting are planned to be bought by the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Yes; I think there are something like 390,000,000 items in the Washington office alone at this time.

There is a small reduction in the amount requested for operation of canteens, because they are paying better than was originally anticipated.

There are two other reductions—one with respect to Army and Navy pensions, and one with respect to the hospital and domiciliary request.

For Army and Navy pensions, the committee recommends about $2,172,000,000 or $25,250,000 more than in the current fiscal year.

You will recall that this item was overestimated this year by the Veterans' Administration. Two hundred million dollars was rescinded, and there appears to be even on that basis a carry-over of $20,000,000 into the next fiscal year.

The investigator recommended a reduction of $362,000,000 in this item by a very careful mathematical formula based on experience.

The revised estimates took out about $269,000,000 of that, leaving a balance of $93,000,000. Your committee has effected a further reduction of $50,000,000 instead of $93,000,000. Of course, it is a matter of mathematics, and whenever the pensions are actually payable, the money will be forthcoming.

As to hospital and domiciliary facilities, we have authorized the 15 new hospitals requested, which will give us a total, over all, of 152,000 beds, and we have withheld $30,300,000 and rescinded $50,000,000 because of a recomputation by the Veterans' Administration in the light of the actual rate of construction which is less than anticipated, making it possible to make the reduction with the full approval of the Veterans' Administration.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It seems to me, in listening to the suggestions that the investigators have made to this committee, that my argument that it is very important to have a Department of Veterans' Affairs is vindicated and justified. You ought to have one huge building here in Washington where veterans' affairs can be taken care of; where their files can be kept, so that you will know where the insurance policies of these poor men are. I know of many beneficiaries who have not received any insurance checks. If you had one big central office, the files could be kept there. At least, they would know where the papers were. It has been inexcusable that the Insurance Division has been allowed to go on in this way. Does not the gentleman feel so?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think it is a very unfortunate situation. I will say to the lady that I am advised it is the practice of every big insurance company in this country to centralize its records.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And also every big insurance company presents the person who is insured with an insurance policy. As it is today, sometimes the veteran does not even have a slip of paper to prove that he has insurance. With the papers lost or misplaced, a man has no record that he has taken out insurance. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs has investigations going on at the present time and hopes soon to have some recommendations that will solve some of the difficulties. I know General Bradley has a difficult job, one of the most difficult jobs in the country, and I know he would welcome help. It is obvious that he needs it.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think the lady is correct.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would like to ask the gentleman this question: I notice there is a decrease of $30,000,000 for automobiles for amputees, but that was taken out because it was passed in the first Supplemental Appropriations Act; is that not true?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. There was no request submitted by the President for that purpose.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And there is a $500,000 decrease for the vocational rehabilitation revolving fund. The House passed the bill some time ago. Will that make any difference now that the Senate has passed that bill? The House passed the bill authorizing an additional $500,000 as a revolving fund for loans to veterans.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That is in the same category. No request was embodied in the budget recommendations.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The President will undoubtedly sign that bill. There will probably be an appropriation made in a deficiency bill or when this bill reaches the Senate.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. If there are additional funds required, they will be provided for either in the Senate or in a supplemental appropriation bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understand there is no decrease in the personnel for hospitals. Is that correct?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That is correct.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. There will be the same number of doctors and nurses?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I may say in that connection that although there have been various reports circulated throughout the country to the contrary, the record is clear that the Appropriations Committee and the Congress have not denied one cent or one employee requested for the hospitals, and that, as a matter of fact, General Hawley's personnel is not yet up to the personnel ceilings allowed by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I should like to ask the gentleman another question, and that is if his committee did not find in many of the offices that the rating boards are very much overworked? I know in the Boston office the chairman of the Rating Board had a very serious break-down, a heart attack, because he worked Saturday afternoons and Sundays. I think the gentleman will find that the Rating Boards

are generally undermanned, understaffed, yet it is one of the most important departments of the work of the Administration because it means the real compensation for veterans in many instances and justice under the act.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I may say to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that there seems to be a tremendous amount of review work.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It has been my experience that there is no real decentralization, that the branch office goes through the motions of approving contracts, personnel, and so forth. Then they go back to the Washington office for approval. It seems to me much of the fault is right here at the central office in Washington. Does not the gentleman find that so?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I hope things can be put on a really efficient basis at the earliest possible date.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think it would be very helpful if the Appropriations Committee and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs got together on recommendations for permanent improvement.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. As I understand it, in the 1947 fiscal year a certain allowance was made to provide cars for amputees, but that if that money is not spent in the year 1947 it is not available to be expended in the year 1948. I have a couple of amputees in my district who are still in the hospital and therefore cannot make application for cars as yet, and I am interested in knowing whether there is any provision in this bill to take care of them; and, if not, what the factual situation is as to whether anything was requested.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The fact of the matter is that the President made no request whatsoever for funds for this purpose in this bill. If further funds are required I assume they will also be taken care of in connection with a deficiency appropriation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I will yield, but I want to say something about one or two other agencies.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. As the gentleman knows, that bill expires on the 30th of June. The Senate has already reported out of the subcommittee a bill which would take in additional amputees, extending the time for filing for the cars; and on Thursday the Rules Committee has promised me a rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MATHEWS], the author of the so-called amputee-car bill in the House will appear before that committee; and the chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], has asked certain amputees to appear.

It was felt when the bill went through as a rider to a deficiency appropriation bill in the Senate there were certain things that were very unjust, certain discriminations. It left out certain arm amputees, such as double-arm amputees. Such persons can drive cars very well, but they cannot go on street cars, they cannot hang on to straps, they cannot get money out of their pockets, they are jostled and sometimes knocked down.

Many Members of Congress feel that the blind should be furnished with cars.

The cost would be very small. The office felt it would be less than $48,000,000 throughout 4 or 5 years, which is a mere bagatelle; and these men as a result of having cars go to work; they go to and from work. Double amputees go about the country selling things. They go to college. They will be taxpayers. They will bring money in to the Government; and also I would say to the gentleman that it is a saving because if a man can save his stumps so they do not get sore he does not have to go back to the hospital. Every day he is in the hospital costs from $5 to $7 or $10. So there will be money coming back, there will a saving, as a matter of fact, to the Government.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. If the lady will yield, I should like to proceed.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The lady will be delighted to yield now.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I may say to the lady, that I am sure we are all very sympathetic with the unfortunate veterans to whom she refers. I think, however, that the specific matter the lady refers to is a matter for the Legislative Committee rather than for the Appropriations Committee which now has the floor.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I notice that there has recently been a lot of interest manifested in psychoanalysts—not psychiatrists but psychoanalysts. I am wondering if the gentleman and his subcommittee gave any consideration to that question in relation to the Veterans' Administration or any other agency, the Public Health or any other department.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I may say to the gentleman that I think he will find that there is in contemplation considerable assistance from psychologists, from psychiatrists, and possibly from psychoanalysts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would like to get what information I can on this question. I understand that there is a hospital out West that is contemplating or has been giving some training to psychoanalysts. Can the gentleman give us any information in relation to that?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I do not recall that particular hospital.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. If my memory serves me correctly, General Hawley in his presentation stated that he was taking these young medical graduates and at the same time they were practicing within the hospitals he was also sending them to school. The upshot of it is he has been teaching these young doctors to be fine specialists in mental health. There are quite a number of them.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is he teaching them as psychoanalysts or as psychiatrists? Is the gentleman advised on that?

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I may say that General Hawley said he was teaching them to be psychiatrists—psychiatrists—not psychoanalysts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I know there are two schools of thought among psychiatrists regarding psychoanalysts. One school of thought is the psychiatrist who does not believe in psychoanalysis. The other school believes in it. There is a question in some people's minds whether people should be psychoanalyzed or not. I think that is something that should be given careful consideration. General Hawley is to appear before the Committee on Veterans Affairs shortly and we expect to ask him questions—at least I do—on that matter.

I have been told that the Veterans' Administrator ruled against the psychoanalysis of veterans.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, there are one or two other agencies in this bill I want to say a word about before my time expires.

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

The first is the Maritime Commission because your committee has taken very strong measures in respect to this agency with the hope of clearing up conditions which have existed in the agency for many years.

The General Accounting Office has been particularly critical in its testimony this year of that agency. The older Members of this body will recall the charges that have been made on the floor in respect to the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Agency year after year.

I have personally stood on this floor as they will recall, year after year and while emphasizing my strong interest in an adequate merchant marine for this country, and while paying my tribute to the magnificent work that was done during the war by the workers and management of the ship construction industry, I have pointed out again and again the scandalous conditions apparently existing in this agency, calling for a thoroughgoing investigation with a view to clearing up the situation there.

You will recall that the General Accounting Office found officially as of July 1, 1943, that no less than $8,100,000 had been spent and improperly accounted for by that agency.

The testimony of the General Accounting Office this year shows that it has completed audits for the fiscal years

1944 and 1945; that these audits show a continuance of previous shortcomings, with little or no change in conditions; that the War Shipping Administration, now part of the Maritime Commission, has refused to supply pertinent data with respect to vessels acquired under the terms of section 902 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936; and that a proper system of accounting, demanded as far back as 1937, has not yet been installed.

The record also indicates the following extracts from a report by the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries published as late as January 3 of this year in reference to the Comptroller General's report for fiscal year 1943. I quote:

One of the most distressing features of your committee's findings regarding the chaotic condition of the accounting systems of the United States Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration is that knowledge of the inadequacies of these accounts were long known and still uncorrected.

The failure by the Commission and the War Shipping Administration to take adequate measures during the following years to rectify a known condition is not understandable.

Duplicate payments by the Government could and did occur. Erroneous payments could be and were made. Amounts owed the Government might not be and were not collected promptly, if at all.

Failure to keep accurate current accounts and complete accounts resulted in very serious losses to the Government.

So far as we are able to discover those at the head of these two agencies made no substantial effort to install and maintain an accounting system adequate to the expanded tasks of the two agencies. As a result of this failure the Government is in the unfortunate position of having little or no practical opportunity of determining the propriety of expenditures amounting to billions of dollars. The action of the heads of these agencies in failing to require the installation of an adequate accounting system is not understandable.

I doubt if any Member of this body has seen more confusion or more conflict in testimony at any hearings than appears in the record of the hearings on this agency in connection with this bill.

Your committee, however, was fortunate in having a team of expert accountants who went into the agency, who went through its records, who reconstructed its whole budget picture, who brought us out information as the basis for intelligent analysis.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

In the light of their investigation, which incidentally showed that some $37,000,000 subject to recapture had never been reported by the Commission, and that further revenues to the extent of over $505,000,000 had been overlooked by the Commission, and in the light of the conditions to which I have referred, your committee decided that it was imperative to establish strict control over the financial operations of this agency.

In previous years, as the Members know, the agency has operated out of a revolving fund. This, in my opinion, has been the heart of the troubles referred to. So, your committee, in effect, recommends the discontinuance of that fund and the placing of this Commission on the same basis as practically every other agency of this Government.

In A-B-C terms, what your committee has done is, first, to prescribe definite limitations for each and every form of obligational authority the Commission must enter into in the fiscal year 1948; second, to prescribe one over-all limitation on the amount the agency can expend in 1948 in reference to either 1948 obligations or the obligations of prior years; and third, to provide for covering into the Treasury any balance in the revolving fund over and above that limitation and any receipts accruing to the fund during fiscal year 1948.

You will find in the report in detail the limitations on obligations and on expenditures.

If the recommendations of your committee are approved, the agency will be compelled to submit detailed estimates for the fiscal year 1949 and subsequently. The net result in dollars and cents is a reduction in proposed expenditures as carried in the President's budget, of $120,900,000, and a rescission of funds either in the revolving fund or accruing to that fund during 1948 of $108,000,000.

The committee is also assuring the possibility of disposal of ships on an "as is" basis through the allowance to purchasers of amounts necessary to put vessels "in class." It is believed that the work can be done better and cheaper in this manner with considerable relief to the finance department of the agency.

The committee also recommends that in the adjustment of sales prices under the Ship Sales Act no cash payment shall be made to any recipient who at the time is already indebted to the Government on account of ship transactions. In other words, existing indebtedness is to be reduced before cash payments are to be made.

WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION

Passing to the War Assets Administration, which is the third agency in which the committee's investigators worked most extensively, I may say that your committee made little or no attempt to go in detail into the charges that have been leveled at the agency. The reason for this is that, as the Members know, there is already a select committee working on that problem. I may say, however, that it did appear that up to October last the agency had no over-all inventory, that even today they have an inventory which the Administrator characterizes as only 75 percent correct; that a series of inaccurate figures have been submitted to the Congress by the agency, and that there seems to be an admission to some extent, at least, of the charges of corruption, waste, and inefficiency that have been made in the past.

The record indicates that the agency expects in the end to have received about $30,000,000,000 of surplus property to dispose of. To date it has received about $25,000,000,000. Out of that $25,000,000,000, $16,000,000,000 has been disposed of, $5,700,000,000 by gift or transfer and $10,600,000,000 by sale; $2,700,000,000 has been realized, the equivalent of an 18.3 percent net return on the property as a whole or a 21.3 percent return on the property sold.

For the fiscal year 1948 the agency expects to realize about $1,191,000,000, and for that purpose asked us in its revised estimates for $306,000,000, or about 25 cents for every dollar expected to be collected.

The original estimates called for $327,500,000. After our committee investigators had worked with the agency for some weeks, that figure was reduced to $306,750,000. Your committee recommends $257,149,000, or a reduction of $49,600,000 compared with the revised estimates, a reduction of $70,350,000 compared with the original estimates, and a reduction of $70,350,000 compared with the recommendation by our investigators amounting to $78,200,000.

You will find a break-down of the reductions made in the report at page 6 in terms of personnel and other obligations.

No reductions were made in respect to the other agencies engaged in the disposal of surplus property because of the reductions made in the revised estimates.

Attention may be called in passing to the enormous amount of expenditure by the agency for advertising and to the commissions paid, ranging as high as 40 percent with respect to aircraft components, as high as 35 percent with respect to electronic supplies and cutting tools, and as high as 12½ percent with respect to other broker-dealer sales.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Just a word with respect to the Atomic Energy Commission. That agency came before us asking for $250,000,000 in cash and $250,000,000 in contract authorization.

At its first appearance it literally could give us hardly any information as to the funds available, as to obligations, as to personnel now on the job or the salaries paid to that personnel, as to additional personnel requested in 1948 or their jobs and salaries. In fact, we got no intelligent financial picture whatsoever.

Your committee told the Agency it was impossible to go before the House under such conditions.

Those representing the Agency thereupon went away and appeared a second time before your committee about 4 weeks later. All I can say is that we got a little but not much more out of their second appearance than out of the first.

One quotation from page 1521 of the committee hearings in this connection:

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The truth of the matter is you do not know how many people are on the rolls or what they are doing now, and you do not know what you need in 1948 and you are just making an over-all curbstone guess in dollars pending the time you hope to get things straightened out. That is about the size of it, is it not?

Mr. WILSON—

Who is the general manager—

That is part of it.

I might add that one of those who accompanied Mr. Lilienthal when he appeared before your committee told me

a few days afterward when I happened to meet him that every morning as he had awakened since the hearings he had hung his head in shame.

But for the vital importance of this activity, I doubt if the committee would have been willing to make any appropriation. Under the circumstances, however, it was decided to allow the contract authorization requested in full and to allow the $175,000,000 of cash they requested, allowing the future to establish what the actual needs of this agency are.

I may state that the committee also authorized the Atomic Energy Commission to use up to $25,000,000 of the appropriation for work in the field on cancer.

I may also add that the only excuse put forward by the Commission for its lack of knowledge and unsatisfactory presentation was embodied in a statement to the effect that the War Department had conducted this giant undertaking through the years with almost no financial records. It is difficult to believe that this can be true.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

The Federal Communications Commission has long been charged with favoritism to its friends and adverse action toward others.

On February 7, 1946, the Commission issued what is commonly referred to as its Blue Book referring, among other things, to the utilization of different types of programs by licensees. The Blue Book has been severely criticized as indicating that the Commission, under the guise of granting and refusing broadcast licenses, intends to control radio programs in violation of the provisions of the Communications Act prohibiting the censorship of programs.

In referring to standards and criteria, including those embodied in the Blue Book guiding Commission action, the Chairman of the Commission states on page 1225, part I, of the hearings that they "comprise the gloss which the Commission's decisions have written around the words 'public interest, convenience, and necessity.'"

It is to be hoped that the meaning and intent of the statute will not be lost sight of under the "gloss."

The Commission's request and the action taken in respect to it is referred to in the committee report.

Attention is invited to the criticism of this agency referred to in the survey by the Bureau of the Budget of the personnel, pay roll, and tabulating sections of the Commission under date of April 1, 1946, indicating, among other things, duplication and triplication of effort within and between sections, lack of coordination and clumsy and time-consuming procedures.

Further criticism of the Commission's personnel practices, job classifications, promotions, utilization of workers, and the like is embodied in the letter to the Commission from the Civil Service Commission under date of April 21, 1947.

This letter has only recently come to my attention and under leave to extend my remarks is included at this point in the RECORD:

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., April 21, 1947.

Hon. CHARLES R. DENNY,
Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR DENNY: We are enclosing a copy of the report of inspection conducted during the period January 30 and February 28, 1947, in your Commission, with respect to personnel activities under rules, regulations, and instructions of the Civil Service Commission.

We have considered very carefully the report of our inspectors and, as a result, have arrived at the following conclusions:

1. There does not exist within your agency an effectively placed responsibility to act for you in connection with personnel transactions, and to check up and inform you as to whether or not personnel transactions are being consummated in accordance with applicable laws, rules, and regulations.

This is a matter which gives us very real concern. As you know, we have delegated considerable authority to act to the departments and agencies. We have done this with the understanding, however, that the heads of agencies will take every possible step to make sure that there is adherence to these standards.

This situation should be cleared up within the next 30 days. In the meantime, as indicated below, it will be necessary for us to withdraw certain delegations of authority to act.

2. There is a very serious question as to whether or not the positions in your Personnel Office are properly classified.

We understand that a classification survey of these positions is now underway. We are instructing our Personnel Classification Division to make sure that this survey has been finished, and appropriate action taken, not later than May 15.

3. Many of your positions do not appear to be classified in the proper manner.

As a result, we are instructing our Personnel Classification Division to get in touch with you, or your designated representative, in order to make arrangements for taking action which will bring most of these positions into line with the Commission's standards not later than May 15.

4. Our specific attention has been called to the fact that Mr. John L. Gittins is occupying a position as chief of section, which has been set up as an identical additional position to that held by Morton Z. Hunt.

This is clearly in violation of our regulations for setting up identical additional positions. There will be no authority for continuing both Mr. Hunt and Mr. Gittins in this particular position beyond May 15.

5. Until such time as our Personnel Classification Division certifies that your personnel office is in a position to handle classification matters in accordance with Civil Service Commission standards, all vice actions and all identical additional actions should be transmitted to the Personnel Classification Division for preaudit before becoming effective.

6. Prompt action should be taken to put into effect the recommendations in the attached report relative to efficiency ratings.

7. Prompt action should be taken to put reduction in force records in such shape that accurate determinations can be made of such matters as status and length of service.

8. Proper records and other safeguards have not been set up in connection with the making of temporary appointments.

This situation was called to the attention of your Commission in July 1946. It has not yet been corrected.

As a result, until such time as the matter has been corrected, no temporary indefinite appointments should be made until a representative of the Civil Service Commission has checked the appropriate files and has certified in advance that the proposed appointment is in accord with the provisions of Executive Order 9691 and the regulations of this Commission.

9. Our specific attention has been called to the fact that a former nonveteran monitoring officer was appointed to a position as radio operator when you had in your files qualified 10-point-preference applicants.

We cannot authorize the continuance of this person in this position beyond May 15.

10. There does not exist within your agency a well-defined promotion policy.

We believe that it is very important for such a policy to be in existence in each agency of the Federal Government. We urge that one be worked out and called to the attention of all of your employees just as soon as possible.

11. We concur in your decision to take prompt action to insure that there is complete compliance with both the letter and spirit of the laws, rules, and regulations dealing with the rights of veterans.

12. Our attention has been called to the case of a career employee who was honorably discharged from service in the armed forces in September 1945. She immediately applied for restoration in accordance with the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act. After more than 8 months of corresponding with your Commission, she finally presented her resignation, giving as her reason the failure of your agency to restore her.

We believe that, even at this late date, a definite offer of a job should be made to this career veteran even though it may require the displacement of someone else in your organization.

We would appreciate it if you would advise us of the action taken in this case.

13. We concur in the other recommendations contained in the report of inspection.

We are informed by our representatives that you are very desirous of improving the situation in your agency insofar as the handling of personnel matters is concerned. We want you to know that we will be delighted to help and assist you in every possible manner.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY B. MITCHELL,
President.

Over 2 years ago an investigation of the Federal Communications Commission and its activities by a select committee terminated with the Seventy-eighth Congress.

The RECORD makes it plain that important matters under consideration at that time, including those involving alleged derelictions by Commission licensees have not been dealt with by the Commission in the meantime. Attention is invited to the testimony in respect to specific stations included in the hearings.

The investigation should not have been allowed to terminate when it did. It should be completed with a view to remedial legislation.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Attention is invited to the testimony of the Civil Service Commission indicating, among other things, that 1,313 persons have been rated ineligible in cases where the question of loyalty has been the major factor between July 1, 1940, and March 31, 1947.

The testimony also indicates that there are at present some 7,220 names in the Barr file of the Commission and some 86,124 names in the Flag file of the Commission, both files referring to names in respect to which the question of loyalty is involved.

Attention is also invited to the following statement by Commissioner Fleming included in the committee hearings:

I know that there is a general feeling that if you can surround yourself with twice as many, or three times as many people as you have got, you will get a higher grade. In practice it does not work that way.

I doubt if many Members of the Congress will agree that in practice it has not worked that way. In fact, another member of the Civil Service Commission indicated disagreement with Commissioner Fleming's statement to this effect.

The fact, however, that the Commission now goes on record in opposition to the practice so widely believed to have been in effect, and recommends legislation to make it clear that the Congress does not intend that it shall continue in effect, is highly important to those interested in efficient government at a minimum cost.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

The committee did not include in the bill an item of $1,000,000 proposed to enable the General Accounting Office to begin performance of the new duties imposed upon it by section 206 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. This section requires the Comptroller General to make a special expenditure analysis in the departments and establishments in the executive branch of the Government and report the results of his findings to the Committees on Appropriations and Expenditures in the Executive Departments and to the appropriate legislative committees of the two Houses, to enable Congress to determine whether public funds have been economically and efficiently administered and expended.

The Comptroller General met and discussed this new duty with a group of members of Committees on Appropriations and Expenditures of both the Senate and the House on March 1. On that occasion and again when he appeared before this committee he explained that he could make only general and tentative plans for the work in advance of an appropriation therefor. In asking for an initial appropriation of $1,000,000, the Comptroller General was proposing only a modest beginning and explained that this amount would permit the covering of only a few selected agencies at the start.

The committee feels that with the assistance already being furnished by the General Accounting Office in its regular reports and otherwise to Congress and to many of its committees and with the additional help now available in the augmented committee staffs, no additional appropriation to enable the General Accounting Office to begin its new duties under section 206 of the Legislative Reorganization Act can be justified at this time.

The committee believes that if such expenditure analyses are to be made on such a scale by a permanent staff it should be done by the General Accounting Office. I have discussed this matter with the Comptroller General and he does not object to the elimination of this item of $1,000,000, under all the circumstances involved, provided it is understood his Office cannot begin work pursuant to this new function unless and until an appropriation is made therefor at some later time. I think this, of course, will be clearly understood.

Mr. Chairman, there are other agencies that I might comment on, but I am not going to take up any more time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, first I want to take this opportunity to say that I have never worked with a finer group of men than the members of this subcommittee. I want to pay my compliments to the chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] for his splendid attitude toward the minority. At no time did we make any reasonable request that was not granted. We were treated as gentlemen, and treated just the same as the majority, except where a decision had to be made and there was some disagreement.

I also want to say that the gentleman from California, [Mr. PHILLIPS], the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] were all fine men to work with, and of course the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS].

The chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH], indicated that we came in here with a bill in which we had the unanimous support of the committee. In a way that is true, but I would like to point out that only on one occasion did we take a vote, and the chairman was the dissenting member of the committee at that time. So there was one dissent in our group.

Mr. Chairman, as a whole, we are unanimously behind this bill. As far as I know, I do not expect any amendments from the committee. I cannot speak for other Members of the House, but at this time I do not expect any amendments to be offered by the committee.

This is a very difficult bill. You may note it is the largest appropriation that has been brought before the House of Representatives this year, something over $8,000,000,000. It was only $5,000,000,000 last year in its original form. of course, it was increased later by deficiencies.

There are about 30 or 33 agencies, depending on the way you count them and divide them up. Of course, the Veterans' Administration, as the chairman has pointed out to you, is the largest portion of this bill, amounting to about 85 percent of the entire appropriation, and of course almost 85 percent of that being for benefits for the veterans. So if the cut in this appropriation bill does not seem to please some people, it may be simply because we could not afford to cut these benefits to the veterans.

The chairman has covered rather thoroughly the agencies in this bill, in fact the controversial ones. In a way, I am not in entire accord with the report and some of the cuts. There are one or two agencies that I felt we did perhaps cut too much.

First, I want to discuss with you, briefly, the Veterans' Administration and some of the constructive criticisms that were offered by the chairman of this committee and have been offered by others. I do not want to discuss it in detail, but I will say to you that the amount we have allowed the Veterans' Administration this year is close to $7,000,000,000.

Now, you take any man and make him president or chairman of the board of any corporation worth $7,000,000,000 and certainly he is going to have a great deal of difficulty. So I am not one of those who will go along with the criticism of General Bradley and the Veterans' Administration. General Bradley came before us and rather openly admitted his mistakes, particularly in regard to the handling of the veterans' insurance. I had some criticism to offer about that in specific instances, and I have others. But General Bradley has been on that job for only about 2 years. I have no doubt but that the Veterans' Administration is going to correct its errors, and I have no doubt but what General Bradley is perfectly willing for us to point out his errors, but I want everybody to understand in the meantime that they really have a big job on their hands. That is a $7,000,000,000 corporation at the present time.

We cut other agencies. For instance, we completely cut out the Office of Government Reports. I was one of the very few, it seemed, who thought they served a good purpose. That, however, was eliminated entirely.

Then we come to the Federal Communications Commission and a 17-percent cut. I believe it was too great a cut in the bill. Of course, I am well aware of the fact that last year when I was chairman of this subcommittee we warned every agency that we expected them to reduce their expenditures in the coming years and that we were not going to continue to increase appropriations. On the other hand, the Federal Communications Commission is one of those commissions which has been created to handle work which is increasing every day. I wish I could go over with you the amount of detail, the amount of new work they have to handle. I think they made one error in freezing all applications not long ago and turning out so quickly so many of the applications which the lawyers and the engineers had already acted upon, because some of the members of the subcommittee drew the conclusion that since they had done such a good job in such a short while they did not need as much money as requested. So we cut the Federal Communications Commission, I think, too much. I am

not, however, going to offer any amendment on that. If they can convince the Senate that we have cut them too much perhaps they will get something back; I do not know.

All along the line we might have made some errors. We did some things that I disagreed with, but on the whole, I think we have done a rather good job in the reductions in this bill and I was a little surprised at the modesty of our reduction in most of the agencies. I thought from some of the things I had heard that we were really going to slaughter some of them.

Some time ago when we were called before the gentleman from New York [Mr TABER] in regard to the ceilings to be put on the budget, my chairman suggested at that time that we might be able to cut the Veterans' Administration $500,000,000. I reserved all opinion at the time because I had not seen the justifications. I find now that we have cut them only $130,000,000, and I think I can allay any fears the gentlewoman from Massachusetts may have in regard to any benefits to which a veteran is entitled. We have not cut any benefits. The Veterans' Administration where it shows they need funds to carry out a veterans' program is not going to be denied the funds, I am sure, by any Member in this House.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I know the committee has been extremely anxious not to cut them in any way, and I am sure the veterans appreciate it, and I know the entire membership of the House appreciates it.

Mr. HENDRICKS. As was pointed out a moment ago, the total in this bill for 1938 is $8,167,869,027. This is the largest bill that has been brought before the House this session and it is a rather large bill.

The reductions that we made under the budget estimate are $330,540,732. I do not know just what percentage that is.

Had we stopped there, I would have been perfectly satisfied and I would not have offered any criticism of our report. We did not, however, stop there; we added a table, and in that table there are a few jokers. Perhaps if I had been in the position of my chairman, I might have used these jokers myself, I do not know; but the point is that we did not use them last year when we had an opportunity to. In other words, if you will look at the table on page 45 of the report, the grand total of executive offices and independent establishments appears at the top of the page. It gives you the total of appropriations, plus the total of the cuts under the budget estimate. Then there is a line drawn and below that you have "Total savings due to reductions in original budget estimates, revised estimates, rescissions, reductions in expenditures, and increases in revenues." The total of that is $1,411,690,732, including the amount that we reduced this under the budget estimate. I know the chairman of the subcommittee is going to ask me to yield and I will be glad to later, but let me go through these figures for a moment. I want it to be clearly understood that there is nothing personal in this. The chairman and I are very close friends.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I want the Members to examine certain pages in this report. If you will turn to page 35 of the report, you will notice there a reduction in the amount requested by the Atomic Energy Commission of $75,000,000. Mr. Chairman, that is counted as a saving, and I suppose it is all right, but we do not actually commit ourselves to a saving on that item. In fact, if you will turn to to page 9 and see what the report says, you will see what I am getting at. On page 9 we have the following language in the report:

In view of this situation—

Referring to the Atomic Energy Commission

and in order that research and development will not be delayed, the committee has determined that funds in the amount of $175,000,000 should be provided for operation in connection with this important project on a part-year basis, additional funds to be provided during the early part of the next session to whatever extent developments at that time indicate such additional funds are required.

So we have not committed ourselves to take that $75,000,000 out of the budget as yet. We have only said we will take it out, but you may come back later and request it. That cannot be counted as exactly a saving. If we were to say, "Under the Budget estimate" and stop, that might be one thing, but when we say "savings" we cannot call that a saving.

If you will turn to page 42 of the report you will find an item of $20,000,000 there taken from the Philippine War Damage Commission. That is an obligation that we have made to those people of $400,000,000. We simply say: "We will give you a portion of what you request now. If you need more later, you can come back." They can get $20,000,000 more.

Turn to page 44 of the report and you will find an item of $30,300,000 for hospital and domiciliary facilities that we took from the Veterans' Administration and on page 45 under the same item $50,000,000 more, all of which totals to $175,300,000. If you subtract that from the total reduction in this bill, $330,540,732, you will find that the actual reduction in the bill is $155,240,732.

Now, of course, we realize when we lower the budget estimate in the line there on page 45, where I give the total, that is all right, but we carried that on into savings and are putting it into the $1,411,690,000. So we cannot call that a saving. That is the point I am getting at. The saving in the bill, less some other amounts I could name, is actually $155,240,732 or less.

Let me show you the fallacy of some of the figures on page 45 in that table. We actually name them there. There is an item "Expenditure reductions" which includes the United States Maritime Commission, reductions in specific budget items and allocations from UNRRA amounting to $120,900,000. We go on down and we have the Federal Works Agency, United States Maritime Commission, Veterans' Administration, where we have rescinded appropriations to the extent of $163,100,000.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that if the Democratic Congress in the last administration had wished to take credit for the rescissions made during the fiscal year 1946 in our fiscal 1947 budget, we would have absolutely nullified the budget and cut it over 100 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has again expired.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

As I recall the 1947 fiscal budget was around $45,000,000,000, and we actually rescinded about $65,000,000,000, so we rescinded more than the budget, but we did not apply that as a credit against the budget, which is being done here.

Then we come down to a third item, printing and binding, reduction in original budget estimate $1,500,000.

Pensions and compensation, reduction in original budget estimate $269,825,000.

War Assets Administration, reduction in original budget estimate $20,750,000, a total of $292,075,000.

Now, we claim credit for that when we actually see in the report here that this was a reduction in the original budget estimates and came to us before we marked up the bill. We had no right to claim that as credit. In fact, it may be some saving. Some of these other funds may be a saving only to the extent that somebody might have exercised his authority in using these funds improperly, because those funds, with one or two exceptions, which remained there, were subject to return to the Treasury of the United States, regardless of what we did about it, at the end of the fiscal year. I concede there is some argument there in the way we might have made savings, because perhaps the Maritime Commission could have spent some funds that we did not want them to, and perhaps somebody else might have, but certainly the savings cannot possibly be substantiated.

In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, this is another bustle on the anatomy of the Republican economy. The truth of the matter is that if we were a concern which was issuing stocks and we issued a prospectus with these figures in it, one of two things would happen. The public, if they could interpret these figures, would not buy a single share of our stock; either that, or the Securities and Exchange Commission would suspend us and we would be prosecuted for fraud, because if we are misleading the people into thinking that we had either saved $1,411,690,732 or that we had bettered the position of the Treasury to that extent, then we should not have, because we have not done so. Many of these funds would have reverted to the Treasury anyway. Many of them are not savings. Many of them are rescissions of funds that we knew were there and we wanted to take them back. Many, I think, are funds which are simply deferred. Many of them are contractual obligations.

I just wanted to make those figures clear, Mr. Chairman. I still say that the

chairman of this subcommittee did an excellent job. We have not really hurt anybody. We have not hurt the Veterans' Administration, I do not think, even though we took 10,000 employees away from them. If they think they need more employees in the future, we certainly will give them to them. I do not know what we have done exactly to the Maritime Commission. I think they will operate just as well under the provisions we have in this act, and sometimes I think the Maritime Commission asked for a scolding. I do not know what we have done to the Federal Communications Commission. There are one or two others that I would not cut quite as heavily as we did. However, I think the committee did an excellent job down to the top line of page 45 where they state that under the budget estimate we have reduced it by $330,540,732. I think from there on we are making sort of a self-serving declaration, because we did not save $1,411,690,732, and neither did we put the Treasury in a better position to that extent.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. The gentleman has very sweepingly and very completely disposed of the whole committee's position. I wonder if the gentleman was well advised in doing that? Does the gentleman deny that the point of departure, the point of comparison in this whole budget question, was the original Presidential budget that came down to Congress from the Bureau of the Budget? That is so, is it not?

Mr. HENDRICKS. Well, if the gentleman will go ahead and ask the rest of his question, I will answer it.

Mr. COUDERT. Let us take one step at a time.

Mr. HENDRICKS. That is true. I will clarify it later.

Mr. COUDERT. I take it the gentleman's position is that if subsequent to the inquiry started by this subcommittee one of those departments put on its hat and got on its horse and came charging down to Congress and said, "We have made a mistake, we have asked you for far too much money. We are going to submit a revised, reduced budget," those figures then are not proper to be added to any further reductions made to determine the difference between the original Presidential budget and the ultimate appropriation for the purpose of determining how much difference there is between those totals in the budget estimate originally and those finally adopted?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

I may say to the gentleman from New York that in the last question he is carrying an assumption, and I cannot answer the question until I clarify the assumption.

Mr. COUDERT. Let me clarify it this way. Did not the committee's investigators investigate the Veterans' Administration, the Maritime Commission, and the War Assets Administration?

Mr. HENDRICKS. Right.

Mr. COUDERT. Did they not come in to us with specific recommendations for substantial reductions?

Mr. HENDRICKS. Correct.

Mr. COUDERT. Did not subsequently those administrations come to us and voluntarily say, "We are reducing our budget estimates"?

Mr. HENDRICKS. Correct.

Mr. COUDERT. And did we not subsequently reduce them even further?

Mr. HENDRICKS. Right.

Mr. COUDERT. Then why are we not entitled to claim the full amount?

Mr. HENDRICKS. Let me answer both the gentleman's questions. I said if we had taken the position that we were reducing it below the President's budget estimate then we would have been on safe ground, but look at the bottom line, "Total over-all savings from all sources including additional receipts not shown in the budget, $1,411,000,000." It is not a saving. It is not a saving any way you can look at it. There are contractual obligations, there are deferred expenditures, there are even statements in the report that "If you need it, come back and we will give you more." If you had said "below the budget estimate" in that last line you would have had me, but I anticipated the gentleman's question. I also anticipated the question that our investigators scared the agencies into reducing their budgets. I have inquired of a number of the agencies, of qualified men, men whom we can trust, and they have told me that in some instances the investigators did help them reduce. In other instances they were reducing them anyway. So we cannot claim it all.

I will say that the investigators did give us a good picture, they gave us a lot of helpful information.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The gentleman feels it was just a coincidence that the figures of reduction were the same as the figures of our investigators?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I do not want to say it, I do not mean to say it, and I have no intention of saying that. I say that a portion of it was caused by our investigators and a portion already had been planned before our investigators went in there.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. The gentleman said that the committee had been somewhat broad in stating its credit for savings. Would not the gentleman think that if the committee sent its investigators into an agency and discovered an item of, shall we say, $37,000,000 that had not been reported to the committee by the Bureau of the Budget as income for that agency during the year, the committee would have the right to take credit for that as having been the result of the committee's efforts?

Mr. HENDRICKS. Yes; and the committee discovered a lot of them through their investigators, but they did not discover all of them. What I am saying is that if you can properly interpret this bottom part of this page, all right, but certainly it is no $1,411,000,000 saving, nor can we take credit for it.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. So long as the taxpayer gets the benefit, I think most of us would care very little who gets the credit.

Mr. HENDRICKS. That is right.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. But I have one further question which has to do with the gentleman's statement that if we say an expenditure is not to be made this year but can be made in the following year, we do not properly call that a saving. That is, if we say you are building a certain number of hospitals or you are buying this or that and you are not going to spend the money this year although it is in the President's budget to be spent, we are not necessarily entitled to call it a saving. It seems to me, putting the matter in very simple terms, that if the gentleman wished to buy a suit and decided he would buy it in the following year rather than this year, he would not call it a saving in his own personal budget for this year. I think I would call it a saving, and I think the committee is entitled to call it a saving.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I do not see how it can be a saving just because you have not bought the suit and are going to buy it next year. You can figure that you have to pay for it and sometimes interest.

But the point I am getting at is this. When you name one of these items and say this is cut under the budget, then nobody can quarrel with you about that, but when you name one of these items on which there is a contractual obligation and then say you can come back later this fiscal year and get the money if you want it, then I say you are not making any saving. What I am trying to point out is that part of this report is not altogether as it looks. It certainly is not by any means.

I will agree with you that $330,540,732 is a cut under the budget estimates, but not all of that is a saving because $75,000,000 is committed and we said, "You can come back and we will give it to you if you need it." Also many other things which I have pointed out.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COUDERT. This present discussion is very reminiscent of the long days that we spent in the sub-basement discussing this budget for 3 months.

Does the gentleman question this simple proposition that the figures shown on the table on page 45 reflect the difference between the final results with respect to those agencies and the original sum set up in the Presidential budget?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I would like to ask the gentleman a question in answering that question. Will the gentleman look at the last line above the drawn line on that page?

Mr. COUDERT. Yes.

Mr. HENDRICKS. If that had said "total below the President's budget estimate", would that have been correct?

Mr. COUDERT. The gentleman is begging the question.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I am not begging the question. The gentleman is not answering the question. If the gentleman had said on that last line, "the

total below the Presidential budget estimate, $1,411,690,732", I could not have taken issue with him at all, but if the gentleman says, "total over-all savings from all sources including additional receipts not shown in the budget", it is not a saving and I can and do take issue.

Mr. COUDERT. Would the gentleman accept that total figure if the word "savings" were stricken out and the word "reduction" included instead?

Mr. HENDRICKS. Yes, provided you explain the top portion, the portions above that.

Mr. COUDERT. Does the gentleman find it very difficult to understand that what we state in this schedule, on the one hand, is the total requested by the President originally, and, on the other hand, the differences or reductions from that total which came out of this bill?

Mr. HENDRICKS. No. I might ask the gentleman a question. Was it difficult to put that in the bottom line there and say, "reduction under the budget" instead of "total savings"? That is what I am getting at. We are not making a total savings. Why bring it right down to total savings as indicated by the committee and about five lines from the top of the page in which we say and give the actual truth and the columns to show it is that much below the President's estimate? Then we go on to take credit for money that we have rescinded. Of course, if you want to say that the President did not put that in and call it a saving, all right, that is the way you interpret it. But I do not interpret it that way. It is not a saving when it would revert back to the Treasury anyway except perhaps somebody might have misspent funds, and we do not know that to have happened.

We take $75,000,000 from the Atomic Energy Commission, but you say we do not know whether we should have done this or not and if you want to come back at the beginning of the next session we will give that back to you, and still you call it a savings. It is all right to say it is a reduction below the President's budget but we should not call it a saving. And in this case it cannot properly be called a reduction according to page 9 of the report. In other words, as I said, this is a bustle on the anatomy of Republican economy.

Mr. COUDERT. Is not the gentleman really engaging in a little game of semantics?

Mr. HENDRICKS. Not at all. I am engaging in a discussion of your figures which you cannot deny. If you will explain them to me differently, I might be glad to agree.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has again expired.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this bill represents on the part of the subcommittee between 7 and 8 weeks of long, hard work, and, I might add, very pleasant work. During that time I do not think I have ever seen a group of men work more harmoniously together than did this subcommittee.

The meat ax was not used on this bill or on any agency in the bill. Each agency was given fair consideration, and the amounts arrived at. Even though all of us did not agree in all instances, still the bill was based upon fair consideration, reasoned judgment, rather than any wholesale over-all cut.

I would like to pay respects to the distinguished subcommittee chairman and the majority members. I think I bespeak the sentiments of the minority members 100 percent. We have a very fine chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH]. I do not think there is a harder-working Member of Congress than the gentleman from Massachusetts. He is a gentleman at all times, and very considerate and very fair. Although we disagreed on many items, certainly no fair-minded man will fall out with another fair-minded man over any fair disagreement.

I certainly want to commend the other gentlemen on the majority, the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT], the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS], and the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ROBERTSON]. All three of those gentlemen were new members on the Appropriations Committee. I think I can say with every degree of accuracy that when this bill was completed they knew just as much about it as any of the older members. Their work on the committee was most helpful, and we enjoyed working with them very much.

I think perhaps the chairman has written one of the finest reports I have ever read. It is exhaustive, and I think if the House wants to really understand this bill, if they will take the speech the gentleman delivered this afternoon and read his extension in the RECORD tomorrow and study his report, they will get a very fair understanding of this bill. I think it might be helpful to point out that this bill covers some 26 independent agencies of this Government. I think it might be well to mention, to clarify some of our recollections, just what those agencies are.

We start off, of course, with the Executive Office of the President, and then his Bureau of the Budget, and the Veterans' Administration, and the War Assets Administration. Then we come to a little agency like the American Battle Monuments Commission, but still a good one; it is doing good work. And then the Atomic Energy Commission, Civil Service, and the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Power Commission and the Federal Trade Commission, and Federal Works Agency, and so forth and so on, down until we have some 26 of them.

It is not my purpose to quibble with the report of the chairman. I doubt if I could have written one as good and as complete; and it is not my purpose to quibble over the accounting and the use of figures, because, after all, we have had a lot of expert budget men through the years come before our committee. When you pin them down, the figures may be the same, but the way they scatter them around you may get a little different result.

The budget estimates for the fiscal year 1948 are about eight and one-half billion dollars, which is almost as much money as this entire Government cost in the fiscal year 1940.

The committee recommended a reduction of about $330,000,000. It should be pointed out that the budget estimates for the Veterans' Administration alone total about 87½ percent of this entire bill, and the Veterans' Administration requested about $7,075,000,000. Think of it.

And then of the budget estimates for the Veterans' Administration, 85 percent is for pensions and benefits which the Congress has heretofore passed and which the country has practically endorsed 100 percent; namely, fixed charges which we cannot cut. But the point is, with those factors in mind we cannot expect any large and substantial cut in this budget. I doubt if we save in the long run $330,000,000-plus in the way of reductions and estimates. I am not going to quibble, because someone said figures do not lie; of course not, but good accountants can certainly make them dance around. My point is simply this: What we really save, to be perfectly frank about it, and mean save in the sense that the taxpayers not only this year but in years to come will not have to make an expenditure of money—that is a saving—when you put it back that is not a saving; and that figure levels off at approximately $120,000,000. I think the committee did a good job in saving that much. We could have blindly shut our eyes, got out the meat ax, and chopped without rhyme or reason, and destroyed essential services that this country wants and demands; but we did not. I will break down my estimate, and I think it is reasonable, and I think we perhaps can all agree on it.

As for the $75,000,000 that we have taken off of the Atomic Energy Commission, the committee did not in truth and in fact intend a reduction there; it is merely a deferment. This is not a special touch-me-not commission, not by any means. If we find anything wrong with it—and certainly we have not in the slightest—be assured we will make some reductions.

On the other hand, I think this agency is entitled to special dispensation at the hands of this committee and the Congress for the simple reason its work is secretive, and we must maintain that secrecy. The remainder of the world have their eyes on the United States as far as this bomb is concerned, and our activities in the production and manufacture of it. I need not tell you that some nations would like to know what we are doing and how we are doing it. So, after all, that is not a saving. We invited them back in January, and after taking another look at them we will give them what they are entitled to for the fiscal year 1949.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HENDRICKS. This bill last year was a little over $5,000,000,000, and the deficiency appropriations were something over four billion. I am wondering if it would not be interesting to watch the

deficiency appropriations on this bill in the coming fiscal year?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Why, of course. If we have been severe in any item, that is the purpose and the function of the deficiency subcommittee; but I, for one, am very much opposed to some items that have been called heretofore deficiencies when in truth and in fact they were not deficiencies at all. I will not belabor this point because I think it has been argued pro and con on each side very well.

Let me say something about the Veterans' Administration which, as I have heretofore said, covers 87½ percent of the total dollars for the whole bill. It was not the intention of the committee to reduce by one penny any of the benefits of the veterans. We have reduced the personnel of the Veterans' Administration by about 10,000 employees at a total cost of about $27,000,000; but after that reduction they will have about 205,000 employees. General Bradley's testimony showed that about 30 percent of its employees quit their jobs annually. Think of that. Such a heavy percentage of job turnover is perhaps the greatest waste in personnel and personnel dollars that one can imagine. That waste, however, cannot fairly be attributed to General Bradley or his staff. The cause must come from many factors, namely, unrest, lack of competition for employment brought about by a high national level of employment, and so forth. We believe that during the fiscal year 1948 the loss of several hundred million dollars caused by turnover in jobs will cease and that those who remain on their jobs will increase their efficiency to such a degree that the reduction of 10,000 employees will not be missed. And in directing this personnel cut, the committee was careful to state that no reduction in personnel should come in any of the hospitals nor in any of the personnel who were taking care of sick veterans.

In the discussion this afternoon with my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], who serves on the Veterans' Legislation Committee, he stated to me that in a recent hearing before the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I believe this morning, General Hawley, Chief of the Medical Staff of the Veterans' Administration, testified that he needed about 28,000 more employees and an additional $1,000,000. The committee had no such information before it. If General Hawley had made that statement before the Appropriations Committee I know we would have gone into it carefully and if he could have made the justification we would have granted him the money.

Perhaps what the general had in mind was this: As his hospital program is brought into effect and more hospitals are built and more beds put into use, then he will need that money, and if so, certainly the committee will grant it to him.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. May I ask the gentleman if he recalls the testimony of Dr. Hawley disclosed on pages 502 and 503, part II, of the hearings:

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. General, can you not give us for the record the number of veteran hospitals we have in the country, broken down into general medical and surgery, tuberculosis, NP, and domiciliary; and the number of beds available in each one of those classifications of hospitals, and the present occupancy, percentagewise or otherwise, in each call of hospitals?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Yes; I recall that question being asked.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. And the answer by Dr. Hawley is:

We have 74 general medical and surgical hospitals in operation, with a total standard capacity of 42,680 beds, and the average daily occupancy during March of 1947 was 38,404. We have 19 tuberculosis hospitals with standard capacity of 10,214 beds, and with an average occupancy during March of 6,869 patients.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Yes; I remember that testimony. And, I recall some later testimony of the general when he had more recent information to the effect that in the month of April he had 20,000 veterans waiting for hospital beds and he was not able to supply the beds.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. TEAGUE. What the gentleman has just stated answers the statement that figures can be made to tell different stories. If the gentleman will turn to page 508, at the bottom of the page, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] stated:

You have 126 hospitals with, roughly, 99,000-bed capacity.

What the gentleman stated on page 503 is just a very small part of what has been done.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. May I say to my colleague from Texas, a veteran of this war, a fine outstanding fighting officer, a man that was in the thick of it, and was severely wounded, and he will carry that wound to his grave, you can depend upon this, that your committee is not going to let the veterans down in any aspect of their program, hospital or otherwise, and when they need the money they are going to get it.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. TEAGUE. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] stated that the Veterans' Administration had not reached their current ceiling on personnel. I am sure that he wishes to be fair, and to be fair he should have told us the other side of that. General Bradley's answer to him was that it is not up to the current ceiling allowance but "I was reluctant to build it any higher than it is at the present time until I find out just how much I am going to have for fiscal 1948 because I do not see any use opening up additional hospitals and taking on additional personnel, and then having to cut down later."

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. That is right. Well, the ceiling is one thing that is set by the Budget, and what the committee does is usually try to go along.

Mr. TEAGUE. Congress is not bound by the Budget at all; is not that correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Neither is the Congress nor the committee; that is right. We write the bill, and the Members of the House either approve it or reject it.

General Bradley and his staff have done an outstanding job. I might say they have done that fine job under most difficult conditions. The only possible exception is in the insurance division. I am confident that that division will show great improvement during the coming year. The insurance division has had a hard row, and I doubt if they are entirely responsible for it.

A large number of the independent agencies have a tremendous amount of work to do. The committee was deeply and favorably impressed with the way these agencies are performing their duties, such as the Federal Power Commission, under the able leadership of its dynamic chairman, Nelson Lee Smith; the Federal Communications Commission, whose work has quadrupled since 1940; the Securities and Exchange Commission; the Federal Works Agency, which has one of the finest records of any agency in the Government; the Tariff Commission; the Bureau of the Budget, under its new Director, James E. Webb, is bringing about needed changes in some agencies—good work; and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, upon whom the American public rely to keep the United States not abreast with other countries of the world, but ahead of them in aeronautical developments for national defense. The committee has great confidence in this agency, and we expect from it great things.

We have not disturbed the President's emergency funds, although there was some question in the committee about them. Personally, I think the President—Democrat or Republican—should have such funds even in normal times, more especially now, as many governors have. Nor did we cut the funds for his office staff, which is greatly overworked.

The General Accounting Office is digging from under a tremendous load of war work. We can depend upon Comptroller General Lindsay Warren and his cooperative staff to protect the taxpayers by seeing that Federal funds are spent as the Congress directs. The Federal Trade Commission and the Interstate Commerce Commission have heavy schedules, and are doing good work. The committee raised the budget $35,000 for railroad safety. We realize the Trade Commission's hands need to be strengthened by amending the Clayton Act to prohibit business monopolies. We hope the legislative committee will consider the matter soon.

We reduced the War Assets Administration about $49,500,000, leaving $257,149,000, which probably is too severe in view of drastic reductions by the Budget. General Littlejohn, the Administrator, has his hands full. He inherited a most deplorable situation. The great improvement in War Assets in the last 60 days is

a personal tribute to him and his staff, yet there remains much room for further improvement. I believe the General will obtain it.

The report shows the over-all cut for the entire bill to be $330,540,732. To be exactly accurate, that figure should be about $120,000,000, which is a reduction in the over-all budget of all agencies of slightly less than 1½ percent. The difference between $120,000,000, the true cuts, and the figure listed as true cuts, namely, $330,540,732, is made up of items of $75,000,000 for the Atomic Energy Commission, which the committee did not intend as a reduction but a temporary deferment, and 80 million for Veterans' Administration, which is no true cut, because contractual authority was granted in equal amount, and 20 million for Philippine War Damage Commission, which we are obliged to pay, and 36 million for Public Roads Administration, which the Government must pay to the States.

However, the committee should receive credit for several rescissions and for clarifying certain deposits in the Federal Treasury which have not heretofore been listed, and which can be used to help liquidate our debts. These sums—$5,100,000 from the Federal Works Agency, $108,000,000 from the United States Maritime Commission, $47,700,000 in allocations from UNRRA, and $505,075,000 revenues available from the sale and charter of vessels by the United States Maritime Commission—make a total of $665,875,000.

Mr. Speaker, by and large, this is a good bill. Perhaps several agencies have been cut a little too much, namely, the Federal Works Agency, the Federal Communications Commission, and the Federal Power Commission, and others, but at that, these agencies will be able to bear up under the cuts. After all, the taxpayers must have some relief, and the only way to obtain it is by cutting Federal expenditures.

The committee is particularly impressed with the high caliber of personnel of the Atomic Energy Commission. Chairman David E. Lilienthal, Admiral Lewis L. Straus, Commissioner Robert F. Bacher, Commissioner Sumner K. Pike, and Commissioner W. W. Waymack are truly outstanding Americans. Chairman Lilienthal, Admiral Straus, and Commissioner Pike are well known in Governmental circles as each of them has heretofore rendered invaluable service to the Government.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I take this time only to express my personal regard for the chairman, for the other members of the committee on both sides, and for the two members of the staff who worked so closely with us during the time the subcommittee held hearings on this bill. That amounted to something over 10 weeks, as I recall. This is a very difficult budget problem. It is difficult because of the ramifications of the funds, because of the number of agencies involved, and, as the chairman of the committee has already pointed out, because of the failure on the part of many agencies to provide accounting systems which are comparable or to provide certain features of accounting, such as cost accounting or inventory accounting, which would make it an easier matter for the committees which have to approve their appropriation requests. Better accounting and budget practices will make it easier for the taxpayer in the long run. So while there are matters that have come up today that suggest some comment, it would seem better to reserve those comments until tomorrow when the bill will be read and discussed again.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, as a new member on the Committee on Appropriations, it is a matter of great personal satisfaction to be able to say in presenting the Independent Offices bill that we come before you with a unanimous report. It was of equal pleasure to me to be able to say this at the time the subcommittee presented the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill.

I commend the Honorable Richard B. Wigglesworth for his leadership in piloting the work of this committee through the tedious hours and weeks required in holding these hearings. His fine sense of humor and his complete and absolute respect for the judgment of every Member, regardless of party, was a matter of genuine inspiration. He has been ably supported by the Members of the majority, and equally well supported by the Members of the minority. Congressmen HENDRICKS, ANDREWS, and THOMAS all are experienced men on the Committee on Appropriations, and at all times they, together with the Members of the majority, set about the task of bringing before the House this bill in the best possible form, and in all instances did they dedicate themselves to the welfare of the country. At no time did we attempt to take any advantage for one party or the other. I highly appreciate the efforts of the two members of the staff.

It would be quite impossible to attempt to cover all of the agencies in a statement made before the House today. This is the largest appropriation bill that will be passed by this Congress and perhaps it has required the most extended hearings and study of any one appropriation bill. It is obvious then that only a few points can be touched upon in a general over-all statement at this time.

We are confronted with one of the most difficult problems which a legislative body has to meet—the task of reducing appropriations in the face of demands for greater appropriations from nearly every agency. We have received little or no help from the heads of agencies in this all-important task of reducing appropriations. Yet, every man in this Congress realizes that this must be done and done at the earliest possible moment. Although the reductions in this bill below the original budget estimates sound somewhat large, I feel that the agencies which appeared before us were treated very judiciously by the subcommittee.

Large savings, as has been pointed out, have been effected by reductions in the original budget estimates as submitted by the President in his budget message in January. The cooperation of the agencies in revising their budget estimates has in some instances been very helpful. By and large the greater number came before us prepared to make a strong case for an ever-increasing amount of money.

I cannot fail at this time to pay special tribute to the Honorable Lindsay C. Warren, Comptroller General, and the representatives of his organization, the General Accounting Office. In presenting their case they recognize our problem perhaps better than any other agency. This is natural because their agency is known as a branch of the Congress of the United States. They fully understand the problems that are ours, that of representing the taxpayers of the Nation.

I have been impressed as I listened to these long days of hearings, which covered a period of more than 6 weeks, by the utter lack of uniformity of accounting in the various agencies. The Honorable Lindsay C. Warren and his staff pointed out to us the amazing fact that almost nowhere in the Government is there any semblance of cost accounting, and the billions of dollars that have been spent can never be properly accounted for. This is an alarming situation in a country so important in the world as ours. The Accounting Office showed the highest possible degree of willingness to cooperate in our drive for economy, and it began by proposing economy within its own organization. This was the rare exception to the rule.

In this bill we have added a provision which will authorize the Comptroller General to require proper accounting equipment and procedure in the agencies covered in this appropriation. We have stated often that the Government must be run like a private business. It is time that the house be put in order. I am confident that this provision is a necessary step in that direction.

One of the most difficult problems with which our Appropriations Subcommittee had to deal has been the tendency of the different agencies to become top-heavy with highly paid personnel. Especially is this true, because for 15 uninterrupted years the same persons have been with the same agencies, and it is natural that the heads of these agencies should assume that after this long span of time and ever-increasing appropriations there is no bottom to the barrel.

The Congress itself has been a contributor with promotions and pay increases. These highly paid Government experts have been so entrenched that their word sets the policy of the organization in which they are employed. Whenever an attempted economy is mentioned, these individuals see to it that economy is enforced somewhere outside their own little circle.

This has long been an administration known to the public as sympathetic to the common man. Yet it carried out this practice. It is the little fellow in the lower brackets, the more menial position in the field and zone office, who is fired. These highly paid experts remain. During all these years these of-

ficials have become truly experts in the field of propaganda and when economy threatens their lives they are not the least reticent in turning on the propaganda machine.

In this appropriation bill we have attempted to effect a down grading or reduction of personnel in the high-income group. If the intent of Congress is followed, these Government agencies will be able to perform more adequately the services for which they have been created. The committee feels that no great hardship will accrue to the various boards and commissions in the valuable work they are performing under the bill as reported to this House. Economy is our goal. There have been times this year when I felt that economy was sacrificed by reducing appropriations below the economy level, but I feel in this bill we are effecting true economy.

I direct your attention to the hearings and to the report of the committee accompanying this bill. I feel that the report is outstanding in its presentation and a most accurate expression of the committee's views.

You will observe that the Veterans' Administration represents approximately 85 percent of the total of this bill. I feel that it cannot be too strongly emphasized that no recommendation by the committee contemplates any reduction or change in any existing veterans' benefits. No recommendation of the committee suggests the reduction of even one penny in financial assistance to the disabled, the widowed, or orphaned, nor in medical care to those eligible. We have not denied money or medical personnel for hospitals, and personnel ceilings fixed by the Bureau of the Budget in this connection have not been reached. The recommendations of the committee concerned themselves with administrative expenditures and policies which have been under fire so often in the past by national veteran organizations, national publications, and other groups and individuals.

I know you have had an opportunity to read this in the committee report but the point I wish to make is that the committee is in no way breaking faith with the veterans and the commitments made by the Congress to the veterans. Cuts have been made but they are designed to effect economy without impairing any benefits of the ex-serviceman.

An admitted difficulty here is the rapid growth and size of the Veterans' Administration. No administrator or employee can be blamed for the rapid expansion of this agency. It is a direct aftermath of the war and was certainly foreseeable. It is only natural that an organization which so rapidly reached such gigantic proportions, having almost a quarter of a million employees, would have many financial wrinkles which need ironing out. It is the duty of Congress to assist in this as much as possible and I confidently feel that the recommendations made and the bill presented by the committee in this regard represent an honest effort to aid the Veterans' Administration with its tremendous problem.

While the committee has made some reductions in the Federal Trade Commission appropriations, I have been concerned as to whether or not we should not move with caution in this direction. This particular agency has a very important function to perform. Within their hands, to a very large degree, rests the fate of the small businessmen of America.

The Nation has been gradually drifting in one direction for the past 15 years. Wealth is being concentrated in fewer and fewer hands, despite all the arguments, political and otherwise, that have been made to the contrary. Little of anything has been done down through these years to stop the growth of monopolies. This agency is equipped to do the job. It is reasonable to ask that it put its house in order, reduce its administrative costs, but appropriations should not be denied to an extent to reduce its effectiveness in this all-important phase of our American life.

On the contrary, the Maritime Commission is a top-heavy agency. It is almost beyond understanding for a new Member to attempt to follow the justifications made by this agency. Every aspect of the situation is involved. Their construction fund, which has long existed, precludes to a large degree any specific and direct tieup with the Appropriations Committee. You will observe that specific effort has been made to correct this bad condition.

Many of the agencies, conspicuous among their the Archives, have asked for comparatively small sums of money, yet show an expense account for administration which would rival some of the largest industrial plants of the country. The records reveal that they have assistants to assistants to assistants. These top-heavy administrative forces do not justify themselves, especially in an appropriation amounting to only $1,600,000.

In conclusion I should like to deal briefly with the question of the liaison between Government agencies and the Advertising Council and the Motion Picture Council. I have looked into the question of the Advertising Council in considerable detail and I am convinced it is a splendid service this group of businessmen are rendering to the general public. It deserves adequate liaison with the executive branch and this liaison can best be operated out of the White House.

Because of the reluctance of Congress to continue the Office of Government Reports, which has not had too constructive a record over the years, it was a mistake for the Budget Bureau to establish this liaison service for the Advertising Council and the Motion Picture Council in the Office of Government Reports. The proper place for it is in the White House.

In eliminating the Office of Government Reports in its entirety I question the wisdom of the action of the committee. I believe it is desirable that the liaison work with the Advertising Council and Motion Picture Council should continue. My best judgment is that the work should be carried on by the staff in the White House with additional funds made available to the White House for salaries and expenses, recognizing the fact that as the country moves more and more into a peacetime economy, and as we hope less and less subject to continuing crises, there is no reason at all why these liaison activities costing perhaps thirty or forty thousand dollars a year cannot be absorbed in the White House operations. It would in all probability require the services of five or six persons to carry on this work.

We recognize the work is important and under the circumstances this is the best way to handle it. The Appropriations Committee of the Senate and the House should be currently informed of any and all work undertaken in this connection.

The Subcommittee on Independent Offices wisely provided for the earmarking of $25,000,000 of the sum total appropriated for atomic energy to be used for cancer research. This suggestion came to the subcommittee from a member of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable EVERETT M. DIRKSEN.

This is a timely recognition on the part of the Subcommittee of Appropriations of an all-important matter and makes available at once the necessary machinery to further this great campaign against the most deadly of human enemies, that of cancer.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I forgot to do one thing that I fully intended to do, to pay my respects to the staff of this committee, Mr. Duvall and his colleague and also our page. Mr. Duvall has been one of the hardest working clerks I have ever known. He just got through with the Interior Department Appropriation bill and sat in on this. We are all grateful to him for the work he has done.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I, too, would like to pay my respects to the members of our staff. They are fine gentlemen. They are very, very industrious and just as efficient as human beings can be. We are lucky to have Bill Duvall and his associates, and we appreciate their efforts and their assistance to the committee.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, that was a very dangerous concession of time because the subject matter for which I requested time is of such unlimited scope and of such enormous emotional appeal and intellectual appeal that I might go on indefinitely. I simply could not let this general debate conclude without raising my voice also in further testimony to the extraordinary fact that, after 3 months parked in the subterranean catacombs where members of the appropriation subcommittees are practically shackled during most of the session, this committee comes out all on speaking terms, all pleased with each other and full of mutual admiration. Let me say as a new member of the Committee on Appropriations that it has been an enlightening and delightful experience. I

have enjoyed working under our chairman. I have enjoyed sitting across the table batting these problems back and forth with these distinguished gentlemen from below the Mason and Dixon's line, not to speak of that charming Representative of the Gold Coast of California, as well as the gentleman from North Dakota.

Of course, no words of mine would be complete without admitting—or should not I admit for the RECORD—that all credit should go to those magnificent gentlemen like Bill Duvall, our clerk, who sat there with us patiently throughout this entire time and contributed no end of skill and industry toward producing this monumental work of art which is our report.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS] feels that he should not be the only one not to say anything. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman such time as he may desire.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I will not take any time to explain this bill inasmuch as such a fine explanation has been given by our chairman and our ranking minority member. But I do want to take this occasion to express the pleasure that I have had in working with this committee. I believe we were in session for 10 weeks sitting at least 5 days every week and several weeks for 6 days, from 10 o'clock in the morning until 5:30 or 6 o'clock in the afternoon. I think it was one of the few committees that ever worked on National Memorial Day. Our chairman was driving us mighty hard on that day and we sat in an unusually long session on the one day that most every other Government employee was celebrating. I want to say our chairman is one of the hardest working men I have ever served with.

I think this is a good bill. I am happy that we have all come out of that dungeon on speaking terms and friendly.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk read.

The Clerk read down to and including page 2, line 2.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SPRINGER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 3839, the independent offices appropriation bill, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the independent offices appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL (at the request of Mr. WIGGLESWORTH) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the legislative business of the day and any other special orders, I may address the House for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and under the rule referred as follows:

S. 28. An act to supersede the provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1946 by reestablishing the offices of registers of land offices, and providing for appointment of the Director and Associate Director of the Bureau of Land Management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

S. 30. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for certain lands to certain settlers in the Pyramid Lake Indian Reservation, Nev.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 263. An act to provide for the carrying of mail on star routes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 358. An act to provide for settling certain indebtedness connected with Pershing Hall, a memorial in Paris, France; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 394. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Raymond Wesley Doyle; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 395. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Richard Jay Doyle; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 396. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Thurlow Grey Doyle; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 397. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Lawrence Stanley Doyle; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 399. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Gladys May Doyle; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 403. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Gideon Peon; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 451. An act to authorize the Federal Works Administrator through the Commissioner of Public Buildings to provide space to accommodate the needs of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 483. An act to relocate the boundaries and reduce the area of the Gila Federal reclamation project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 484. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Joseph J. Pickett a patent in fee to certain land; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 686. An act to provide for the construction, extension, and improvement of public-school buildings in Owyhee, Nev.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 751. An act to continue a system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of school-age and under-school-age children in the District of Columbia through June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 753. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to defer the collection of certain irrigation construction charges against lands under the Flathead Indian project; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 816. An act to repeal the Post Roads Act of 1866, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 851. An act for the relief of Belmont Properties Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 924. An act to credit service in the military or naval forces of the United States in determining eligibility for and the amount of benefits from the policemen and firemen's relief fund, District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 966. An act to authorize the establishment of the District Educational Agency for Surplus Property in the municipal government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1056. An act to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, so as to permit adjustment of benefits authorized by section 1506 thereof and similar benefits extended by governments allied with the United States in World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

S. 1124. An act to amend the Boiler Inspection Act of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1185. An act to provide for the disposal of materials on the public lands of the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 1265. An act to amend sections 1301 and 1303 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia, relating to liability for causing death by wrongful act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1266. An act to amend section 1064 of the act entitled "An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, relating to admissibility of testimony by a party to a transaction when the other party is incapable of testifying; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 1306. An act relating to the construction and disposition of the San Jacinto-San Vicente aqueduct; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 1316. An act to establish a procedure for facilitating the payment of certain Government checks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

S. 1360. An act for the relief of Eric Seddon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1392. An act to prescribe certain dates for the purpose of determining eligibility of veterans for vocational rehabilitation, and for education, training, guaranty of loans, and readjustment allowances under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

S. J. Res. 113. Joint resolution authorizing the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to the Marine Corps dead of all wars; to the Committee on House Administration.

S. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate oil compact to conserve oil and gas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. J. Res. 124. Joint resolution to enable the President to utilize the appropriations for United States participation in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration for meeting administrative expenses of United States Government agencies in connection with United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration liquidation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. J. Res. 125. Joint resolution to strengthen the common defense and to meet industrial needs for tin by providing for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 310. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to permit the delivery of water from the District of Columbia and Arlington County water systems to the Falls Church or other water systems in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia in Virginia;

H. R. 360. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Francis Eugene Hardin, a minor;

H. R. 468. An act to amend section 115 of the Internal Revenue Code in respect of distributions by personal holding companies;

H. R. 620. An act for the relief of Blanche E. Broad;

H. R. 651. An act for the relief of the estate of Rubert W. Alexander;

H. R. 723. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Hunter A. Hoagland, a minor;

H. R. 765. An act for the relief of Elwood L. Keeler;

H. R. 888. An act for the relief of certain owners of land who suffered loss by fire in Lake Landing Township, Hyde County, North Carolina;

H. R. 925. An act for the relief of Therese R. Cohen;

H. R. 1065. An act for the relief of the estate of Thomas Gambacorto;

H. R. 1221. An act for the relief of Eva Bilobran;

H. R. 1237. An act to regulate the marketing of economic poisons and devices, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1344. An act to admit the American-owned ferry *Crosline* to American registry and to permit its use in coastwise trade;

H. R. 1412. An act to grant to the Arthur Alexander Post, No. 68, the American Legion, Belzoni, Miss., all of the reversionary interest reserved to the United States in lands conveyed to said post pursuant to act of Congress approved June 29, 1938.

H. R. 1482. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Gilda Cowan, a minor;

H. R. 1624. An act to authorize payment of allowances to three inspectors of the Metropolitan Police force for the use of their privately owned motor vehicles, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1874. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes.

H. R. 2207. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands within the Shiloh National Military Park, Tenn., and for other purposes;

H. R. 2237. An act to correct an error in section 342 (b) (8) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended;

H. R. 2257. An act for the relief of Southeastern Sand & Gravel Co.

H. R. 2353. An act to authorize the patenting of certain public lands to the State of Montana or to the Board of County Commissioners of Hill County, Mont., for public-park purposes;

H. R. 2368. An act to amend paragraph 8 of part VII, Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to authorize an appropriation of $3,000,000 as a revolving fund in lieu of $1,500,000 now authorized, and for other purposes.

H. R. 2852. An act to provide for the addition of certain surplus Government lands to the Otter Creek Recreational Demonstration Area, in the State of Kentucky.

H. R. 2872. An act to amend further section 4 of the Public Debt Act of 1941, as amended, and clarify its application, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3143. An act to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Paonia Federal reclamation project, Colorado;

H. R. 3151. An act to grant a certain water right and a certain parcel of land in Clark County, Nev., to the city of Las Vegas, Nev.;

H. R. 3197. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Mancos Water Conservancy District increasing the reimbursable construction cost obligation of the district to the United States for construction of the Mancos project and extending the repayment period;

H. R. 3348. An act to declare the policy of the United States with respect to the allocation of costs of construction of the Coachella Division of the All-American irrigation project, California;

H. R. 3604. An act to authorize the Methodist Home of the District of Columbia to make certain changes in its certificate of incorporation with respect to stated objects;

H. J. Res. 188. Joint resolution authorizing the erection on public grounds in the city of Washington, D. C., of a memorial to the dead of the First Infantry Division, United States Forces, World War II; and

H. J. Res. 210. Joint resolution to extend the time for the release, free of estate and gift tax, of certain powers, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 26. An act to make criminally liable persons who negligently allow prisoners in their custody to escape;

S. 125. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to extend the benefits of such act to the Official Reporters of Debates in the Senate and persons employed by them in connection with the performance of their duties as such reporters;

S. 321. An act to amend section 17 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, so as to increase the pay of cadets and midshipmen at the service academies, and for other purposes;

S. 597. An act to provide for the protection of forests against destructive insects and diseases, and for other purposes;

S. 614. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for a permanent Census Office," approved March 6, 1902, as amended (the collection and publication of statistical information by the Bureau of the Census).

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, June 18, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

796. A letter from the President, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to further amend the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; to clarify the meaning of references in the act of number of employees supervised and size of organization unit; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

797. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 5, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of channel in Honga River, to the plant of White & Nelson, Hoopersville, Md., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

798. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 9, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Essex River, Mass., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on February 28, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

799. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 5, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Macks Point, Searsport, Maine, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

800. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 4, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Greens Bayou, Tex., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on December 16, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

801. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 12, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on the Illinois River, Ill. (groundwater supply), requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on August 26, 1941; to the Committee on Public Works.

802. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act entitled "An act to make provisions for the care and treatment of members of the National Guard, Organized Reserves, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and citizens' military training camps who are injured or contract disease while engaged in military training, and for other purposes," approved June 15, 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3555. A bill to amend subsection (b) of section 303 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended; with an amendment (Rept. No. 595). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3736. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 730), as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 596). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCK:

H. R. 3870. A bill to authorize certain expenditures from the appropriation of St.

Elizabeths Hospital, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H. R. 3871. A bill to amend the act creating the Federal Trade Commission, to define its powers and duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEVENSON:

H. R. 3872. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 3873. A bill to redefine the powers and duties of the Board of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia, to establish a Department of Public Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MUNDT:

H. R. 3874. A bill to authorize the city of Pierre, S. Dak., to transfer Farm Island to the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 3875. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to control and reduction of pollution in the waters of the New England States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 3876. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to control and reduction of pollution in the waters of the New England States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 3877. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to control and reduction of pollution in the waters of the New England States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GRANT of Indiana:

H. R. 3878. A bill to amend section 3403 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 3879. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide unemployment benefits for individuals who have been employees of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MUHLENBERG:

H. J. Res. 218. Joint resolution providing for the representation of the Government and people of the United States in the observance of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Reading, Pa.; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States in relation to the Federal income tax as it affects community-property States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the act entitled "An act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii," approved April 30, 1900, as amended, known as the Hawaiian Organic Act, by amending section 73 thereof; and requesting the Congress to approve amendments herein set forth of chapter 78 of the Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945; and to approve the making, insuring, or guaranteeing of certain loans; to the Committee on Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 3880. A bill for the relief of Ludwig Pohoryles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

H. R. 3881. A bill to permit Haruko (Yamamoto) Iki to return to and remain in the United States as a permanent resident; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RABIN:

H. R. 3882. A bill for the relief of Lawrence J. Dempsey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

642. By Mr. SABATH: Petition of the City Council of the City of Chicago, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for inclusion in current budget of an appropriation for improvement of Calumet Sag Channel (part of Lakes-to-Gulf waterway north of Lockport, Ill.); to the Committee on Appropriations.

643. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Board of Supervisors of the County of San Luis Obispo, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of S. 866 and H. R. 2523; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 18, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Once again, our Father, we come to Thee in prayer, on the same old terms, because of our need of Thy help and our faith that Thou dost govern in the affairs of men and wilt hear our prayer in the name of Christ Thy Son.

Thou hast given us the inner voice of conscience, and Thy Holy Spirit enables us to distinguish good from evil. But where we are to choose between two courses when both are good and commendable, then we need the crystal clarity of Thy guidance, that we may see one to be better than the other. Help us, O God, at the point of our uncertainty, for there is no uncertainty with Thee. Thou hast a plan. We would clasp Thy hand. That shall be to us better than light and safer than a known way.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, June 17, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 50. An act for the relief of Joseph Ochrimowski;

S. 317. An act for the relief of Robert B. Jones;

S. 361. An act for the relief of Alva R. Moore;

S. 423. An act for the relief of John B. Barton;

S. 425. An act for the relief of Col. Frank R. Loyd;

S. 470. An act for the relief of John H. Gradwell;

S. 514. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Sylvia De Cicco;

S. 561. An act for the relief of Robert C. Birkes;

S. 620. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ida Elma Franklin;

S. 824. An act for the relief of Marion O. Cassady; and

S. 882. An act for the relief of A. A. Pelletier and P. C. Silk.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 254) for the relief of the legal guardian of Glenn J. Howrey, with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3203) relative to maximum rents on housing accommodations, to repeal certain provisions of Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 53) authorizing the Clerk of the House, in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 3203) relative to maximum rents on housing accommodations, to repeal certain provisions of Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress, and for other purposes, to make certain changes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 379. An act for the relief of Kuo Yu Cheng;

H. R. 431. An act for the relief of the Columbia Hospital of Richland County, S. C.;

H. R. 553. An act for the relief of Arsenio Acacio Lewis;

H. R. 645. An act for the relief of Ben. W. Colburn;

H. R. 649. An act for the relief of Antonio Belaustegui;

H. R. 710. An act for the relief of Fritz Hallquist;

H. R. 988. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of certain property owners adjacent to Fort Knox, Ky.;

H. R. 1162. An act for the relief of Persis M. Nichols;

H. R. 1486. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Alice Scott White a patent in fee to certain land;

H. R. 1493. An act for the relief of Anna Malama Mark;

H. R. 1508. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lula Wilson Nevers;

H. R. 1652. An act to provide for the naturalization of certain United States Army personnel—Yugoslav fliers;

H. R. 1737. An act for the relief of Owen R. Brewster;

H. R. 1800. An act for the relief of David Hickey Post, No. 235, of the American Legion;

H. R. 1845. An act to amend existing laws relating to military leave of certain employees of the United States or of the District of Columbia so as to equalize rights to leave of absence and reemployment for such employees who are members of the Enlisted or Officers' Reserve Corps, the National Guard, or the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2056. An act for the relief of J. C. Bateman;

H. R. 2151. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Erle E. Howe;

H. R. 2306. An act for the relief of Myrtle Ruth Osborne, Marion Walts, and Jessie A. Walts;

H. R. 2399. An act for the relief of Joseph W. Beyer;

H. R. 2434. An act for the relief of Ruth A. Hairston;

H. R. 2607. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of George Wesley Hobbs, a minor;

H. R. 3303. An act to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military Establishment of the United States;

H. R. 3484. An act to transfer the Remount Service from the War Department to the Department of Agriculture;

H. R. 3511. An act to extend the provisions of section 1 (e) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, until June 30, 1948; and

H. J. Res. 193. Joint resolution to grant authority for the erection of a permanent building for the American National Red Cross, District of Columbia Chapter, Washington, D. C.

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 310. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to permit the delivery of water from the District of Columbia and Arlington County water systems to the Falls Church or other water systems in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia in Virginia;

H. R. 360. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Francis Eugene Hardin, a minor;

H. R. 468. An act to amend section 115 of the Internal Revenue Code in respect of distributions by personal holding companies;

H. R. 620. An act for the relief of Blanche E. Broad;

H. R. 651. An act for the relief of the estate of Rubert W. Alexander;

H. R. 723. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Hunter A. Hoagland, a minor;

H. R. 765. An act for the relief of Elwood L. Keeler;

H. R. 888. An act for the relief of certain owners of land who suffered loss by fire in Lake Landing Township, Hyde County, N. C.;

H. R. 925. An act for the relief of Therese R. Cohen;

H. R. 1065. An act for the relief of the estate of Thomas Gambacorto;

H. R. 1221. An act for the relief of Eva Bilobran;

H. R. 1237. An act to regulate the marketing of economic poisons and devices, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1344. An act to admit the American-owned ferry *Crosline* to American registry and to permit its use in coastwise trade;

H. R. 1412. An act to grant to the Arthur Alexander Post, No. 68, the American Legion, Belzoni, Miss., all of the reversionary interest reserved to the United States in lands conveyed to said post pursuant to act of Congress approved June 29, 1938;

H. R. 1482. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Gilda Cowan, a minor;

H. R. 1624. An act to authorize payment of allowances to three inspectors of the Metropolitan Police force for the use of their privately owned motor vehicles, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1674. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2207. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands within the Shiloh National Military Park, Tenn., and for other purposes;

H. R. 2237. An act to correct an error in section 342 (b) (8) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended;

H. R. 2257. An act for the relief of Southeastern Sand & Gravel Co.;

H. R. 2353. An act to authorize the patenting of certain public lands to the State of Montana or to the Board of County Commissioners of Hill County, Mont., for public-park purposes;

H. R. 2368. An act to amend paragraph 8 of part VII, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to authorize an appropriation of $3,000,000 as a revolving fund in lieu of $1,500,000 now authorized, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2852. An act to provide for the addition of certain surplus Government lands to the Otter Creek Recreational Demonstration Area, in the State of Kentucky;

H. R. 2872. An act to amend further section 4 of the Public Debt Act of 1941, as amended, and clarify its application, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3143. An act to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Paonia Federal Reclamation project, Colorado;

H. R. 3151. An act to grant a certain water right and a certain parcel of land in Clark County, Nev., to the city of Las Vegas, Nev.;

H. R. 3197. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Mancos Water Conservancy District increasing the reimbursable construction cost obligation of the district to the United States for construction of the Mancos project and extending the repayment period;

H. R. 3348. An act to declare the policy of the United States with respect to the allocation of costs of construction of the Coachella Division of the All-American irrigation project, California;

H. R. 3604. An act to authorize the Methodist Home of the District of Columbia to make certain changes in its certificate of incorporation with respect to stated objects;

H. J. Res. 188. Joint resolution authorizing the erection on public grounds in the city of Washington, D. C., of a memorial to the dead of the First Infantry Division, United States Forces, World War II; and

H. J. Res. 210. Joint resolution to extend the time of the release, free of estate and gift tax, of certain powers, and for other purposes.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 139 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization Service under the authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CODE FOR HEALTH AND SAFETY IN BITUMINOUS-COAL AND LIGNITE MINES

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation establishing a code for health and safety in bituminous-coal and lignite mines of the United States the products of which regularly enter commerce or the operations of which substantially affect commerce (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Lands.

TRANSFER OF LANDS IN FORT WINGATE MILITARY RESERVE, N. MEX.

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the transfer of lands in the Fort Wingate Military Reserve, N. Mex., from the War Department to the Interior Department (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Florida, praying for the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan to provide old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

A letter in the nature of a petition, from Mrs. Edith Schubert, of Detroit, Mich., calling attention to the Constitution of the International Refugee Organization in its relation to relief for Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING—ILLINOIS LEGISLATURE JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference House Joint Resolution No. 34, passed by the house of representatives and concurred in by the Senate of the State of Illinois, relating to universal military training.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was received, ordered to lie on the table, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House Joint Resolution 34

Whereas this Nation now stands at the crossroads of what will surely be the most fateful period in its history; and

Whereas despite the magnitude of the victory in World War II, the time has not yet come when peace-loving nations may neglect their defenses or lay aside their arms; and

Whereas a plan of universal military training, embodied in Senate bill 651, and House bill 1988, has been introduced in Congress, at the suggestion of the American Legion, which plan provides for 1 year's training composed of 4 months of basic training and 8 months of advanced study in military schools, colleges, ROTC courses, or in the armed forces, the organized Reserve, or the

National Guard, with a choice of Army, Navy, or Air Force as a field of training; and

Whereas this year of training for every young man, coming sometime between his eighteenth and twentieth birthdays, would be valuable not only to the young men individually but of immeasurable benefit to the Nation in providing a continuing reserve of trained and capable manpower skilled in the technique of modern scientific warfare: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-fifth General Assembly of the State of Illinois (the senate concurring herein), That we endorse the plan embodied in the bills now before Congress as a vital step in the preservation of our strength and freedom; that a copy of this preamble and resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to each Illinois Member of Congress at Washington.

Adopted by the house May 21, 1947.

Concurred in by the senate June 4, 1947.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 1465. A bill for the better assurance of the protection of persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 1466. A bill for the relief of Michele Reverdito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1467. A bill to authorize the construction of a railroad siding in the vicinity of Franklin Street NE., District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 1468. A bill providing for payment of $50 to each enrolled member of the Mescalero Apache Indian Tribe from funds standing to their credit in the Treasury of the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 1469. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Gifford Monroe; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GURNEY (by request):

S. 1470. A bill to amend the act entitled "To make provision for the care and treatment of members of the National Guard, Organized Reserves, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and citizens' military training camps who are injured or contract disease while engaged in military training, and for other purposes," approved June 15, 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 1471. A bill for the relief of H. H. Parrot; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BROOKS:

S. 1472. A bill for the relief of Francesco Ambrosio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1473. A bill for the relief of Paul Knauer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 1474. A bill for the relief of Annie Blackmon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. J. Res. 130. Joint resolution establishing a code for health and safety in bituminous coal and lignite mines of the United States the products of which regularly enter commerce or the operations of which substantially affect commerce; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. J. Res. 131. Joint resolution providing for the representation of the Government and people of the United States in the observance of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Reading, Pa.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EMPLOYMENT OF TEMPORARY ASSISTANTS, ETC., BY COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. BRIDGES submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 129), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the Committee on Appropriations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

DISTRICT SCHOOL TEACHERS' SALARIES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. CAPPER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. SPARKMAN, and Mr. UMSTEAD) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 3611) to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 379. An act for the relief of Kuo Yu Cheng;

H. R. 431. An act for the relief of the Columbia Hospital of Richland County, S. C.;

H. R. 553. An act for the relief of Arsenio Acacio Lewis;

H. R. 645. An act for the relief of Ben W. Colburn;

H. R. 649. An act for the relief of Antonio Belaustegui;

H. R. 710. An act for the relief of Fritz Hallquist;

H. R. 988. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of certain property owners adjacent to Fort Knox, Ky.;

H. R. 1162. An act for the relief of Persis M. Nichols;

H. R. 1493. An act for the relief of Anna Malama Mark;

H. R. 1508. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lula Wilson Nevers;

H. R. 1652. An act to provide for the naturalization of certain United States Army personnel—Yugoslav fliers;

H. R. 1737. An act for the relief of Owen R. Brewster;

H. R. 1800. An act for the relief of David Hickey Post, No. 235, of the American Legion;

H. R. 2056. An act for the relief of J. C. Bateman;

H. R. 2306. An act for the relief of Myrtle Ruth Osborne, Marion Walts, and Jessie A. Walts;

H. R. 2399. An act for the relief of Joseph W. Beyer;

H. R. 2434. An act for the relief of Ruth A. Hairston; and

H. R. 2607. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of George Wesley Hobbs, a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1486. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Alice Scott White a patent in fee to certain land; and

H. R. 2151. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Erle E. Howe; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1845. An act to amend existing laws relating to military leave of certain employees of the United States or of the District of Columbia so as to equalize rights to leave of absence and reemployment for such employees who are members of the Enlisted or Officers' Reserve Corps, the National Guard, or the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3484. An act to transfer the Remount Service from the War Department to the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3511. An act to extend the provisions of section 1 (e) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, until June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Civil Service.

H. J. Res. 193. Joint resolution to grant authority for the erection of a permanent building for the American National Red Cross, District of Columbia Chapter, Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare considering the antidiscrimination bill may sit during the session of the Senate today.

I also ask consent that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry may sit at 2 o'clock today for the purpose of hearing witnesses who have to leave town, who were supposed to testify this morning.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made in each instance.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to hold a surplus-property hearing this afternoon while the Senate is in session.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

HENRY WALLACE AND THE SOUTHERN CONFERENCE FOR HUMAN WELFARE—EDITORIAL FROM NASHVILLE BANNER

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Henry and the SCHW," published in the Nashville Banner of June 13, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

TAX REDUCTION—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON NEWS

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial regarding tax reduction from the Washington News of June 18, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHEN A RIVER'S FLOODS ARE COUNTED UP—EDITORIAL FROM ARKANSAS GAZETTE

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "When a River's Floods Are Counted Up," published in the Arkansas Gazette of June 12, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXCHANGE STUDENTS—EDITORIAL FROM HARTFORD (CONN.) COURANT

[Mr FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Exchange Students," published in the Hartford (Conn.) Courant of June 13, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

NO TAX RELIEF—EDITORIAL FROM PITTSBURGH POST-GAZETTE

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "No Tax Relief," published in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of June 17, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

COURTS MARTIAL IN GERMANY

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD three letters from soldiers in Germany relative to court-martial proceedings there, which appear in the Appendix.]

REPORT OF JUDGE OF JUVENILE COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 7252.)

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN AGREEMENTS BETWEEN CARRIERS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 110) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senate bill 110, the unfinished business, is before the Senate, and under the unanimous consent agreement entered into heretofore a vote on that bill is to be taken at 4 o'clock this afternoon, the time from 2 o'clock onward to be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] offered several amendments to Senate bill 110, which is the unfinished business and will come before the Senate at 2 o'clock, or after the conference report on the so-called wool-support bill has been disposed of. I have discussed the amendments with the Senator from Wyoming, and on behalf of the committee which reported the bill, I will accept a part of them.

In order to simplify matters on the floor, I ask unanimous consent that I may have a print of a bill including the amendments which I am willing to accept. I ask unanimous consent that such a print be made, and lie upon the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAM FOR WOOL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WHERRY. I inquire if any arrangement has been made regarding the conference report on the so-called wool-support bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Conference reports are in order at any time.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. If the Senator from Vermont has recognition, at this time I wish to submit the conference report on Senate bill 814, which is the so-called wool-support bill.

I understand, however, that beginning at 2 o'clock, the time on the unfinished business, Senate bill 110, is to be equally divided until a vote is taken on that measure at 4 o'clock; so if the conference report on the wool support bill is still before the Senate at that time its consideration will have to be suspended until after action on the so-called Bulwinkle bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont is correct.

Does the Senator from Vermont submit the conference report?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; I submit the conference report, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report will be read.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 814) to provide support for wool, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 1, 2, and 3, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: On page 3 of the House engrossed amendments, beginning with the word "That" in line 16, strike out through and including the period in line 18, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That no proclamation under this section with respect to wool shall be enforced in contravention of any treaty or international agreement to which the United States is now a party."

And the House agree to the same.

GEORGE D. AIKEN,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
ELMER THOMAS,
HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
AUG. H. ANDRESEN,
ANTON J. JOHNSON,
WILLIAM S. HILL,
STEPHEN PACE,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, since the Senate is about to consider the conference report on the so-called wool-support bill, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Bridges	Cain
Baldwin	Brooks	Capehart
Ball	Buck	Capper
Barkley	Bushfield	Chavez
Brewster	Butler	Connally
Bricker	Byrd	Cooper
Donnell	Kilgore	Pepper
Downey	Knowland	Reed
Dworshak	Langer	Revercomb
Eastland	Lucas	Robertson, Va.
Ecton	McCarran	Robertson, Wyo.
Ellender	McCarthy	Russell
Ferguson	McClellan	Saltonstall
Flanders	McFarland	Smith
Fulbright	McGrath	Sparkman
George	McKellar	Stewart
Green	McMahon	Taft
Gurney	Magnuson	Taylor
Hatch	Malone	Thye
Hawkes	Martin	Tydings
Hayden	Maybank	Umstead
Hickenlooper	Millikin	Vandenberg
Hill	Moore	Watkins
Hoey	Morse	Wherry
Holland	Murray	White
Ives	Myers	Wiley
Jenner	O'Conor	Williams
Johnson, Colo.	O'Daniel	Wilson
Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney	Young
Kem	Overton	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report on Senate bill 814.

Mr. AIKEN obtained the floor.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. For what purpose?

Mr. TYDINGS. I wish to inquire of the Senator from Vermont whether he desires to hold the floor for any considerable length of time?

Mr. AIKEN. I intend to hold it only long enough to explain the conference report on the so-called wool-support bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. My reason for making the inquiry is that yesterday a few misstatements were made about the postmaster resolution as it affects Maryland. I should like an opportunity early in the session, if possible, to state the true facts.

Mr. AIKEN. I hope that the conference report on the wool-support bill may be disposed of before the consideration of the Bulwinkle bill is resumed. For that reason, I should rather not yield at this time. I am sure the Senator's remarks will be just as applicable at some other time as they are right now.

EMERGENCY FLOOD RELIEF

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I should like to ask unanimous consent at this time to lay aside temporarily the pending business and take up the emergency flood-relief bill. I do so because it is really an emergency measure. It was placed upon the calendar only yesterday. Many thousands of people are homeless. I might say, and more than a million acres have been inundated by recent floods. Money is needed immediately to cope with this emergency and to provide

for emergency flood-control work. I think the bill will not cause much debate, so I ask the Senator from Vermont to yield if he will for that purpose.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator intend to ask that the conference report on the wool-support bill be laid aside?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I was going to ask unanimous consent that the conference report be temporarily laid aside.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not think that would be advisable inasmuch as we hope to dispose of the report within a very short time. The wool bill itself deals with an emergency matter for a million or more wool growers of this country. I believe we should give all relief we can or should to the sufferers from the floods, but the conference report on the wool bill deals with a subject which has been before Congress so long that it seems to me if action is going to do any good at all, it must be taken immediately.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield for a brief observation.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I can say that in my section we are tremendously interested in the proposed emergency flood control appropriation. I know of no objection to it. Such action has been taken before in similar situations. The entire southeastern section of my State has been subject in the last 2 weeks to three unprecedented floods in three of our large rivers. A good many counties are being evacuated. Farm lands in Iowa which have never before been covered by flood waters are now completely ruined. There is no money, as I understand, in the hands of the Army engineers for the immediate repair of levees and of other installations which would stop further devastation.

I call the attention of the Senator from Vermont to the fact that yesterday there occurred over this territory another 4- to 5-inch rain, which will perhaps bring up a fourth crest of record height. I have been on the telephone almost constantly for the past 3 or 4 days in consultation with persons in these devastated areas. I know that in Illinois a similar situation prevails. I cannot too strongly impress upon the Senator from Vermont the vital need for having this emergency money placed in the hands of the Army engineers and the authorities in the flooded regions through the emergency legislation we propose to have acted upon now.

I will say, Mr. President, that if there is any objection to the bill, if it cannot be passed immediately, I would be in sympathy with the position taken by the Senator from Vermont. But I have the impression that there is no objection to the emergency appropriation, which is a matter of life and death literally, because by reason of the flood a number of lives have been lost in the State of Iowa, and countless millions of dollars in property and in top soil also have been lost. Prompt action on the measure will result in saving other property and top soil.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me for a short statement?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes, I yield; but I should like to say both to the Senator from West Virginia and to the Senator from Iowa that if it appears that the discussion on the conference report on the wool bill is going to be long drawn out, then I shall be glad to have it temporarily set aside, but the conference report also deals with an emergency matter, an emergency affecting wool. There is now no wool-support program in effect. I understand that thousands of farmers in order to meet obligations, are being forced to dispose of their wool at a price far below the market price. It seems to me we can dispose of the conference report in a very short time.

Mr. President, my own State has been hard hit by floods, but I do not think delay in acting on the flood-control bill until 4 o'clock today, or perhaps 1:30 o'clock, would result in any great loss. I hope we can dispose of the conference report in a relatively short time. Further, I understand the bill proposed to be taken up by the Senator from West Virginia calls for an appropriation.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is correct. I will say to the Senator that I do not believe there will be discussion of this emergency matter, once it is explained. I feel it can be disposed of within 10 minutes.

Mr. AIKEN. If I were sure that it would not take more than 10 minutes I would yield for that purpose, but so far as I know, I would have no control over the length of time that the discussion of the emergency flood-control measure might consume.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I might suggest to the Senator from Vermont that the conference report on the wool bill will involve some discussion. I doubt whether it would be concluded by the hour of 2 o'clock at which hour, I understand, time will begin to be divided on the so-called Bulwinkle bill.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I ask the Senator from West Virginia if it is proposed to take up House bill 3792, Calendar No. 294, just as it is, without amendment?

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is correct. There are no amendments to be made.

Mr. TAFT. Could we ascertain now whether any Senator is going to object to that bill? It is on the calendar. If not, it seems to me we might dispose of it in 5 minutes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes; I think it can be disposed of in less time than that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from West Virginia for the purpose he has stated?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from West Virginia to make the motion he desires to make.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from West Virginia does not propose to make a motion. He proposes to make a unanimous consent request for immediate consideration of the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from Nebraska for the correction, which makes the situation seem even better.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from West Virginia for the indicated purpose?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] asks unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside for the purpose of considering House bill 3792, which the clerk will state by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3792) to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3792) to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the sum of $15,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated as an emergency fund to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers for the repair, restoration, and strengthening of levees and other flood-control works which have been threatened or destroyed by recent floods, or which may be threatened or destroyed by later floods: *Provided*, That pending the appropriation of said sum, the Secretary of War may allot, from existing flood-control appropriations, such sums as may be necessary for the immediate prosecution of the work herein authorized, such appropriations to be reimbursed from the appropriation herein authorized when made: *Provided further*, That funds allotted under this authority shall not be diverted from the unobligated funds from the appropriation "Flood control, general," made available in War Department Civil Functions Appropriation Acts for specific purposes.

SEC. 2. The provisions of section 1 shall be deemed to be additional and supplemental to, and not in lieu of, existing general legislation authorizing allocation of flood-control funds for restoration of flood-control works threatened or destroyed by flood.

PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAM FOR WOOL—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 814) to provide support for wool, and for other purposes.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to review very briefly indeed the events which led up to the conference report on the wool bill which is now before the Senate. As every Senator probably knows, when the war began the sheep growers of the United States were hit very hard. They were hit so hard that the number of sheep began to be reduced materially, and the Commodity Credit Corporation, in order to assure an adequate supply of wool, undertook to sustain the support price for wool, and it did so, at one time maintaining a support price of 118 percent of parity.

With the ending of the war, however, and with the President's proclamation of last January 1, which would end the support price on June 30 of this year, the sheep growers were left without any support whatsoever for the price of the wool which they are producing.

In the meantime, from the years 1942 to 1947 the number of sheep in this country dropped from 49,000,000 to approximately 32,500,000, and wool production dropped from approximately 455,000,000 pounds in 1942 to an estimated total of 310,000,000 pounds in 1947.

Congress has provided, through the Steagall amendment, for support prices for many other farm commodities, to run until December 31, 1948, but the wool growers were left high and dry, and there is every indication that there is going to be a still further decline in the production of wool below its present low level, unless something is done to maintain a support price which will make it possible for our farmers to produce wool.

There is no question that for national security wool is a most strategic material. Therefore this spring several bills were introduced in the House and the Senate to provide for maintaining a support price for wool for this year's and next year's crop, or so long as the Steagall amendment provides a support price with a floor for other farm commodities.

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate held hearings the last week in March and the first day of April, and reported a bill, which was passed by the Senate.

Let me say, first, that the purposes of the several bills which have been introduced are two: First, to place a floor under the price of wool which will encourage American sheep growers to continue producing wool, so that we may not become wholly dependent on a source of supply thousands of miles away. The other purpose is to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to dispose of an accumulation of approximately 460,000,000 pounds of wool at a price which the market will pay. Much of this wool is of lower grade, and will not bring the full market price anyway. The Commodity Credit Corporation has been prohibited from disposing of this wool at any price less than parity, and as the market price for the wool was less than parity it has been unable to dispose of it as rapidly as seemed advisable. So the bill which was considered by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry last March carried these two provisions.

At the time hearings were held representatives of the Department of Agriculture appeared before the committee. They approved the bill. They said that it would be necessary to maintain a support price for wool if we were to continue to produce wool. They also wanted authority to dispose of the accumulation of 460,000,000 pounds of wool which they held at that time at the market price. However, they suggested that, if they started selling that wool at the market price, foreign competition might drop the price just below it, and soon there would be a price war, with a demoralized wool market for everyone. Therefore the Department of Agriculture suggested that some safeguard be placed in the bill authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture either to establish quotas or impose additional fees on wool which otherwise might be imported in such amount and at such prices as would completely demoralize the domestic market and prevent the Commodity Credit Corporation from disposing of the wool which it had on hand.

Members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry realized that we could not comply with the suggestion of the Department of Agriculture to provide for the imposition of higher fees on imported wool in the event that the domestic market appeared to be destroyed or that it was impossible to maintain a price support program, because the imposition of fees would naturally affect the revenues of the Government, and such legislation must originate in the House. Therefore when we reported the bill to the Senate we recommended that the House in its consideration of the bill adopt such an amendment as would permit the Government to impose fees or quotas if necessary.

I wish to say in all fairness that the State Department did not appear before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to testify on this bill. The State Department has since indicated its disapproval of the amendment which the House adopted, but at the time the Senate committee made the recommendation it was not aware of the opposition of the State Department.

The bill came back to the Senate, and conferees were appointed. The conferees of the House and Senate held several meetings. The House was adamant in insisting upon retaining the provision which the House had placed in the bill, which provided that the President could impose fees or quotas on imports of wool. We held a number of meetings, but got nowhere. As for myself, I would have been perfectly willing to have brought the bill back to the Senate without the House amendment, but the House conferees were anything but willing. In fact, they said they could not possibly get a bill through the House without that amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

So in order to get the bill before the Senate for as prompt action as possible so that we might determine just what we were going to do and whether we were to support the price of wool or not, the Senate conferees agreed to the House amendment, with an amendment qualifying it, and brought it back to the Senate, and it is now before us for action.

Before yielding to the Senator from Georgia, let me say that the House amendment originally provided for the imposition of fees only. The amendment which was adopted in conference provides that the President may impose either fees or quotas.

I now yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, is there anything in the bill which makes it mandatory on the President to impose either fees or quotas? Is there any standard fixed in the bill which requires him, in view of certain conditions, to impose fees or quotas? Or is it wholly discretionary with the President as to whether he shall or shall not impose them?

Mr. AIKEN. As I interpret the amendment, it is discretionary with the President. What the amendment does is to apply to wool the provisions of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. The Senator from Georgia probably knows that section 22 already covers 20 or more agricultural commodities. It has been made use of by President Roosevelt, and by President Truman in the case of cotton last winter. Wool was left out of the list of commodities covered by section 22. The purpose of the amendment which was placed in the bill by the House, and which has been agreed to by the Senate conferees, is to add wool to the list of such commodities.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Vermont has answered the question of the Senator from Georgia, if I correctly understood him to the effect that there is nothing compulsory upon the President to issue such an order. I interpret the section quite differently from the way the Senator from Vermont interprets it. The words are that if certain facts appear on the surface the President shall—

> cause an immediate investigation to be made by the United States Tariff Commission, which shall give precedence to investigations under this section to determine such facts.

Then—

> If on the basis of such investigation and report to him of findings and recommendations made in connection therewith, the President finds the existence of such facts, he shall by proclamation impose such fees—

And so forth. It seems to me that the language is certainly open to the interpretation that if the Tariff Commission determines as a result of an investigation that certain facts exist the President must impose fees or limitations.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand that different interpretations are being placed upon section 22 and the proposed amendment which has been agreed to by the conferees. However, it seems to me that it is optional with the President, because the Tariff Commission cannot take any action until instructed by the President. I might add that this provision has been taken advantage of twice, once in the case of wheat and once in the case of cotton. Nevertheless, recently there has been a surplus of potatoes in this country while potatoes were being imported from Canada, and the President has taken no action to prevent the importation of four or five million bushels of potatoes. If the President did not feel called upon to take action in the case of potatoes, I know of nothing which would compel him to take action in the case of wool unless he so desired.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. On page 4 of the bill as it comes from the conference, in line 15, it is provided that if the President finds the existence of certain facts—

he shall by proclamation impose such fees on or such limitations on the total quantities of, any article or articles which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption—

Then in lines 11 to 13 on page 5, there is the proviso—

That no limitation shall be imposed on the total quantities of wool or products thereof which may be entered or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption.

Are not these two provisions contradictory?

Mr. AIKEN. The second provision was stricken out in conference. The proviso which said that no limitation "shall be imposed on the total quantity of wool or products thereof," and so forth, has been stricken out. That is the one which would prevent the imposition of quotas.

First of all, any action must be initiated by the President. No one else can start any action to impose either fees or quotas. If the President finds that the domestic market is being demoralized, that it is impossible to maintain a support price program because of unusually heavy receipts into this country, he may direct the Tariff Commission to make an investigation. If the Tariff Commission should find that, in fact, our domestic market was being demoralized, then the President might, for such time as he saw fit, impose fees or quotas. He may impose fees up to the amount of 50 percent of the tariff, but he is not required to do that. He may impose a fee of 1 percent or 2 percent, or whatever he sees fit, up to 5 percent.

But what I want to make clear is that any action must start with the President.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. The Senator from Vermont brought out one point which I wish to emphasize; namely, the provision adopted by the House that import fees may be imposed in order to prevent dumping by foreign markets. Of course the State Department and the President could, if they wanted to, raise import fees sufficiently high so that there would be no costs. That is another thing that is disconcerting to the wool growers and to farmers in general—the cry against subsidies which are necessary to support farm prices. The President could, if he would, go to the extent of raising the import fees high enough so that no support price program would be necessary at all.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from North Dakota.

I want to say that there is no indication that the President would ever be called upon to impose either fees or quotas during the next 18 months. For that reason I felt that the amendment was unnecessary. But the House felt otherwise. I do not see how there can come the harm from this amendment which some of its critics claim will come from it. I realize that it has stirred up a furor around the world and that some countries, particularly wool-growing countries, have been given the idea that we are starting something which is eventually going to shut them out of our market. That would not be the case, because we are dependent on them already for 60 percent of the wool which we use in this country. We have got to have that much from them anyway.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. But with the market as it is today, which is a rising market, it occurs to me that if the Commodity Credit Corporation would dispose of the wool it has on hand there would be very little, if any, loss to the Government, and no harm whatsoever to the growers in foreign countries.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield first to the Senator from Massachusetts, and then to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont a question. When the bill passed the Senate it contained a provision in section 5 that disposition of any accumulated stocks should not be so made as to disrupt the domestic market. That provision was stricken out, and section 5 now reads as follows:

The Commodity Credit Corporation may, until December 31, 1948, dispose of wool owned by it without regard to any restriction imposed upon it by law.

My question is: May that not lead to disruption of the market? Was not the Senate provision a much better provision?

Mr. AIKEN. That is an amendment which was put in by the House and which was agreed to by the Senate conferees because we were sure that the Commodity Credit Corporation itself would not deliberately market the wool in such a way as to disrupt the market. Either the Senate or House provision is entirely acceptable to me. I think that either one assures adequate protection; but I think that without either provision the Commodity Credit Corporation still would not market the wool in such a manner as to disrupt the market. They wanted some language put in so that no one could say that they had been told to sell it all at once.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. May I ask a further question of the Senator?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; I yield further.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I wonder if the Senator from Vermont understood the previous question which I asked him, because I have a copy of Senate bill 814 as it was amended in conference, and lines 16 to 19 on page 4 would seem to indicate that the President could prevent withdrawal from warehouses; and then on page 5 of the bill, lines 11 to 13, there is a proviso which indicate that he cannot. I repeat my former question: Are not those two provisions conflicting?

Mr. AIKEN. They were conflicting. In fact, the one on page 4 permitted the President to impose quotas. Then in lines 11 to 13, page 5, he was in effect prohibited from imposing quotas. The sentence in lines 11 to 13, on page 5, was stricken out in conference. The original House amendment required him practically to impose fees, but as amended in conference he is authorized to exercise the use of either increased fees or quotas.

I now yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. I merely want to ask the Senator a question to clarify the situation somewhat. I think his explanation has been very clear, but I am not sure that it is understood, as, for instance, with reference to the life of this measure. When will it expire? I understand that the support price provision will end December 31, 1948.

Mr. AIKEN. The support price provision will end December 31, 1948. The Senate provided that the support price would be maintained for the 1947 and 1948 clip. The House amended that to provide that all payments must be made before December 31, 1948. Under the Senate version it might have been carried over a year or two and the Government would still be liable for support prices. I think the House provision is better.

Mr. HATCH. Is it the thought of the Senator from Vermont, who has given a great deal of study to this subject, that by this bill there is being established any permanent policy, or is it to meet the situation as presently existing?

Mr. AIKEN. I think the Senator has the correct idea, that it is regarded as an emergency measure to give the wool growers the same protection that the producers of many other agricultural commodities enjoy under the Steagall amendment until December 31, 1948. I feel, and I think the entire agricultural industry feels, that before that time comes we must work out a more permanent policy and program for agriculture in this country if we are to maintain a strong and stable agriculture. This is a temporary support price to cover this year's crop, which has just been sheared, and next year's crop which will be sheared next spring.

Mr. HATCH. Does the Senator from Vermont entertain the thought that this measure constitutes an arbitrary, mandatory rise in the wool tariff?

Mr. AIKEN. Absolutely not. In fact, I do not expect that the President will even consider raising the fees or imposing quotas, because the wool market is growing stronger month by month. I have hopes that the Commodity Credit Corporation can dispose of the 460,000,000 pounds they have without any loss whatsoever to the Government. But that is not very likely, because the accumulation has been picked over and the better grades have been used, so that most of the poorer grades still remain.

Mr. HATCH. I recognize the Senator's deep interest in international affairs as well as in domestic affairs. Does the Senator see anything in this bill which will complicate any of our international relations?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not see anything in it, as it is, that should complicate international relations. The only thing that might complicate international relations is that it could be interpreted, if people

were so minded, as indicating a trend toward economic isolationism on the part of the United States. But that is a state of mind.

I do not see anything in the conference report itself which would lead to international complications. When we send this report down to the President, as I think we shall, he can veto it if he so desires. I am not sure whether the State Department will recommend a veto. I am sure that the Department of Agriculture is not likely to recommend a veto.

If the President vetoes it, the chances are that there will be no support price for wool in the United States for the next 2 years. I understand that right now speculators are offering the small western growers 28 cents a pound for their wool, or 10 cents a pound below the world market price. As I understand the situation, they are trying to take advantage of the small producers who have notes due and must have some money in any event.

But if there is any doubt in the President's mind and in the minds of those in the State Department, I believe the President can sign this measure and at the same time issue a reassuring statement that should clarify the international atmosphere.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, from what the Senator has just said and also from his experience in the conference with the House conferees, is he completely convinced that the adoption of this conference report and its subsequent enactment into law constitute the only method by which the wool growers of the United States may have any kind of price support program in the future?

Mr. AIKEN. I am afraid the Senator is correct. I did think the House would be willing to pass a straight support price bill. I have serious doubts of that now. In fact, I am inclined to think that if this measure fails of enactment, that will be the end of the wool support price program. I am sorry to have to come to that conclusion, but I do.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. The Senator has just spoken of a reassuring statement that he could give the President and the State Department. I have just talked to Mr. Clayton about this measure. There is no statement that we could give him about these House amendments that would reassure him. He said that the nations with whom he is dealing at Geneva regard this proposed step as a high-tariff, isolationist move, and it is not in keeping with the quota provisions that we have previously applied to farm products of which we produce a surplus. He said that last year we produced 300,000,000 pounds of wool, and consumed a billion pounds, and that normally we import twice as much wool as we produce, and therefore on the basis of the quota provisions of the House amendments we would be going beyond any quota plan under the Agricultural Adjustment Act to support the wool price through the Commodity Credit Corporation, by limiting exports that come into competition with a product which is already in excess supply.

As to the other provision, Mr. Clayton said that while it may be discretionary with the President, nevertheless the nations with whom he is dealing at Geneva take the same attitude that the average newspaper and average person in the United States take, namely, that this is a move in the direction of a higher tariff on a principal commodity of a friendly nation on which in normal times the tariff is equivalent to 100-percent protection, and on which, on the basis of prices last year, which were abnormally high, the tariff was equivalent to a protection of 63 percent.

Mr. President, with all due deference to our distinguished conferees, it appears to me that we are inviting a veto of a measure that is very necessary on behalf of our wool producers, because, on account of the large supply of wool in the hands of the Government, the prospects are that the price of wool will go down in 1948 below 90 percent of parity.

I was happy to join with my distinguished colleague the Senator from Wyoming in a program to list wool as a basic farm crop and to give the wool growers the protection of 90 percent of parity. So far as I know, that is all that the wool growers have requested. That is all that the Virginia wool growers have requested. They would have been happy to get that. They still want it.

If we put this provision into effect, I am satisfied that the State Department will ask the President to veto the bill; and if he does, there will be no likelihood that the Congress will pass the bill over the President's veto, inasmuch as it was adopted by the House by only a very small majority, and certainly there will not be an overwhelming majority in favor of it in the Senate. That will mean that no measure on this subject will be enacted into law, and in that case we shall find that in reaching for a hypothetical advantage in the future, we shall have lost the loaf we want now for the protection of next year's prices.

So, Mr. President, why would not it be logical for us to insist on the bill as passed by the Senate, and reject the conference report, and let it go back to the House of Representatives? In that case, the first vote in the House would be on the question of having the House recede from its position and concur in the position of the Senate. If the House of Representatives should concur in the position of the Senate, the bill then would go to the President as the Senate passed it. If that was not done, the next step in the House of Representatives would be for the House to vote on the question of insisting on its amendments and requesting a further conference.

In any event, we would still have the bill before us, and there would be a chance to enact something on the subject into law.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I say to the Senator from Virginia that I did not mean to infer that this body should issue any reassuring statement. I meant that when the President signs the bill, he can issue a reassuring statement—to the whole world, if he wishes to do so—to the effect that he sees no possibility of having to apply it. I, myself, should have preferred to see the bill go to the President without the amendment; but I should prefer to see it go to him with the amendment rather than to have a million wool growers in the United States left at the mercy of the buyers, who will pay them far less than even the world market price which they are offering them today.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. But my colleague will understand that the traders of other nations know what English means, and they will know that the first move in connection with this bill was for a mandatory tariff increase.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Very well. Now we back off and provide for a permissive tariff increase. However, no explanation, in view of the origin of the movement, would satisfy them and reassure them that down in our hearts we do not intend, later on, to creep up on them and keep their wool out of our markets or else make them pay through the nose in order to sell their wool in our markets.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator said, in answer to a question, that the bill was temporary.

Mr. AIKEN. I said the support price was temporary.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I wish to point out that the temporary character applies only to the support price.

Mr. AIKEN. I did not say that it applies to anything else.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to make that point clear, because the provision we are arguing about will be permanent law.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The permanent law will be that this may be done so long as there is a support-price program. But that also expires, insofar as permanent law is concerned. It is a law now in effect, and it applies to every agricultural commodity except wool.

This matter is nothing new; this law has been on the statute books. It applies wherever there is an agricultural support-price program. The moment we establish a wool support-price program, it will apply to wool; and the moment the wool support-price program ends on December 31, 1948, it no longer will apply to wool.

So that provision also is dependent upon the time limit, and is effective only to the end of 1948, insofar as wool is concerned.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think the Senator's interpretation of the language, taken as it is from this conference report, is subject to controversy. I do not see anything in the language of this particular amendment, as it comes back to the Senate, which limits it to the period in which an agricultural support price is provided by the Congress.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator will find that in line 4, on page 4: "or the Wool Act of 1947."

The Wool Act of 1947 expires with the support-price program.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Wool Act of 1947 would be the bill we are now discussing, if it shall be enacted.

Mr. TAFT. But let me read the language:

> Whenever the President has reason to believe that any one or more articles are being, or are practically certain to be, imported into the United States under such conditions and in sufficient quantities as to render or tend to render ineffective or materially interfere with any program or operation undertaken, or to reduce substantially the amount of any product processed in the United States from any commodity subject to and with respect to which any program is in operation, under this title or the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, or section 32, Public Law No. 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 24, 1935, as amended, or the Wool Act of 1947.

So that it seems to be perfectly clear that the moment the support price on wool expires, the application of this section to wool will also expire. That certainly is the way I interpret the provision.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Ohio is correct about that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I desire merely to express my agreement with what has just been said by the Senator from Ohio. The effect of section 22 is bound absolutely by the terms in which the Wool Act of 1947 will be itself affected. That act will expire on the 31st of December 1948, and after that date section 22 will have no application whatsoever to wool, though after that date it will continue to have effect with respect to cotton, with respect to tobacco, with respect to a host of other agricultural products which are now under the section.

Moreover, I think it should be pointed out that before section 22 can become effective to make any change of any kind in the present tariff situation, it will be necessary, first, for the President to reach a decision that the support prices for wool are being undermined. Then it will be absolutely mandatory upon him to direct the Federal Tariff Commission to make an investigation. Then it will be necessary for the Tariff Commission to make the investigation and make its report. Then it will be necessary for the President to act, under the law. I submit that these four steps cannot possibly be taken before the wool law itself will have expired.

There is another factor, however, which has been completely overlooked in this matter. The OPA has ceased to exist. OPA ceiling prices have been removed from every single commodity. But the bill provides that wool shall be supported at the OPA ceiling price established during the war. So what we are saying in this measure is merely that the Government of the United States shall come to the aid of the domestic wool producers by guaranteeing to them the old OPA ceiling price, although OPA ceilings have been eliminated with respect to every other product.

With respect to the international phase of the matter, I should like to call attention to the fact that the wool which comes into the United States from abroad is sold here by a state monopoly, the British Joint Organization. All that is sought to be done now is to protect the domestic producers against any injurious effect upon domestic prices of a large dumping by the foreign state selling agency.

Mr. President, I cannot refrain from adding, with the permission of the Senator from Vermont, that in my opinion this section 22 amendment was introduced into the bill for the express purpose of trying to kill the bill, and to put the President upon a political spot. There is not the slightest doubt in my mind that this suggestion came from those who have opposed the wool-support program from the very outset.

Of course when it would seem that the State Department was fearful that it would interfere with the Geneva program, then it was perfectly obvious to the political opponents of the President that a golden opportunity was provided to put him on the spot, and although every effort has been made by the Senate conferees to get this paragraph out—because none of the wool growers have asked for it, no wool-growing organization in the country has asked for it—although the conferees made every effort to get it removed, it was not removed.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield with the permission of the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I yield that the Senator from Nebraska may ask a question of the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask how the Wool Growers' Association feels about the conference report as submitted.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, we would like to have it agreed to, because we know that if the bill is not approved, there will be no possibility of sustaining wool prices, and our domestic producers of wool will be laid open to the competition of the foreign state monopoly.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming whether it is his understanding that those who want to put the President in a political hole, or on the spot, are willing to jeopardize the entire wool-support program in order to do it?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I most certainly think they are.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is a great tribute to their good faith to put this provision in the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I think I can explain the situation.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Does the Senator from Wyoming concur in the position taken by the Senator from Virginia, that the logical thing for us to do now is to insist upon the Senate bill and let it go back to the House, with the hope that the House will recede and concur in the Senate bill?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator may feel that that would be the logical thing to do, but I know from what has already transpired that there is no possibility of the House receding. So I think it would be just wasted effort. The Senator from Vermont will be much better able to answer the Senator than I, because I did not participate in the conference.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. If the effort fails, the responsibility will be on the House for a situation under which the wool growers of the Nation would get no protection at all in prices next year.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. As one of the conferees on the bill, I should like to say that I think it was the feeling of most of the Senate conferees—it was my feeling personally—that we favored import fees and quotas, but that we were reluctant to accept these provisions only because they might invite a Presidential veto and thereby postpone enactment of necessary wool-support prices.

I favor import fees and quotas because the President might use them to prevent dumping, and if the cost to the Government in support prices is too great he could impose import fees to the extent of making support prices unnecessary.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming made the suggestion that there are those who would like to kill the wool-support program, and with that assertion I heartily agree; and that there are those who would like to put the President on the spot, and I can hardly disagree with that statement. It seems to me that possibly both objectives may be accomplished by the bill if we do not watch out. But my objective is to provide a support program for the wool producers of the United States, and I hope that will be done through the bill we are considering. I am not particularly interested in who is to blame for its failure, if it shall fail.

On the 27th of March, when the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was holding its hearings on the wool bill, Under Secretary of Agriculture Dodd was on the witness stand, and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] asked this question:

> Now, with respect to section 5, do you have any suggestions on that as to how that could be amended? That gives the power.

That means the power to dispose of the surplus wool which the Commodity Credit Corporation has on hand. The following interchange took place:

> Secretary DODD. That is on S. 103?
>
> Senator LUCAS. That is on the O'Mahoney and also on the Robertson (of Wyoming)

bills, S. 103 and S. 814. They are both the same.

Secretary DODD. In regard to the sale?

Senator LUCAS. Yes.

Secretary DODD. I think that could be worked out only to the extent that we were told to liquidate it in slow and orderly manner.

The only thing is I do not want to get caught, for somebody else to take the high-priced market, and for us to take the low.

I do not think it should be changed unless you have something, either an import fee or import quota, because otherwise it would not do any good to hold your wool off the market for 3 or 4 years unless you do something to the other part of it.

Senator LUCAS. I understand that, but do you think section 5 is all right as it is written, which says:

"The Commodity Credit Corporation may, without regard to restrictions imposed upon it by any law, dispose of wool at prices which will permit such wool to be sold in competition with imported wool."

Secretary DODD. I think it is all right unless you have either an import fee or import quota at which time I think there should be an amendment; they should be directed to take 3 or 4 years.

Senator LUCAS. That would give you or your successor the power to dump all of this overnight if you wanted to do it.

Secretary DODD. And personally I think it would be a terrible thing.

Senator LUCAS. That is the point, and there is a question in my mind whether there should not be some language which would restrict or limit such power

Secretary DODD. You would not want to restrict unless you had some control on imports.

Senator LUCAS. What I am talking about is selling it in an orderly fashion in line with what the world market will absorb without depressing the price. That is the point.

Secretary DODD. I am 100 percent for it but I think before we did that we should have either an import fee or import quota so that it could be exercised.

If the section 22 amendment went in so you could invoke that, then yes, I would like to see that.

And then, 2 days later, Under Secretary Dodd came back, and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] asked the following question:

Senator KEM. There is another thing about which I have been concerned.

As I recall, the first day you appeared before the committee and discussed the wool situation, you recommended that there be an import quota provision in the law. Are you still of that opinion?

Secretary DODD. I believe I made the statement, Senator, that I thought if you continued to have the support price, that something would have to be done about imports, either an import fee or some other method.

Senator KEM. Is that still your opinion?

Secretary DODD. Yes, it is.

So while there may be those in Congress who would like to kill a wool support-price program and embarrass the President, yet I am sure the Department of Agriculture, which originally suggested the amendment, had no desire either to kill the program or to embarrass the President. But it appears that there has developed a decided difference of opinion between Mr. Clayton, of the State Department, and the Department of Agriculture.

Finally, I received a letter, which I will place in the RECORD, signed by Mr. Dodd, of the Department of Agriculture, under date of June 10, stating how the Department would like to have it amended. But it was someone from the State Department who called me and said the letter was on the way, and it had been cleared with the Bureau of the Budget. So evidently the Budget Bureau and the State Department and the Department of Agriculture finally got together. But it looks as if, on paper, the Department of Agriculture lost.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter, dated June 10, 1947, from Under Secretary Dodd to myself, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 10, 1947.

Hon. GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Chairman of the Senate Conferees on S. 814.

DEAR MR. AIKEN: The purpose of this letter is to make clear the position of this Department with respect to the amendments to section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, as amended and reenacted (U. S. C. 1940 ed., title 7, 624), which would be made by section 4 of S. 814 as passed by the House of Representatives. Section 4 would authorize the imposition of import fees on wool or wool products for the purpose of preventing the impairment of the price-support program for wool.

This Department favors amending section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act to authorize the imposition of fees or quotas on imported wool or wool products when necessary to prevent the impairment of the price-support program for wool, provided that such authority is not exercised in contravention of the provisions of any treaty or international agreement to which the United States is or hereafter becomes a party. Accordingly, we recommend that the proviso prohibiting the imposition of quotas on wool or wool products—which section 4 of S. 814 would add to subsection (b) of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act—be deleted and the following proviso be substituted therefor:

"*Provided*, That no proclamation under this section shall be enforced in contravention of any treaty or international agreement to which the United States is or hereafter becomes a party."

A provision similar to the foregoing provision is contained in H. R. 1825, which would amend section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act to authorize the imposition of fees or quotas on any agricultural commodity or product thereof when necessary to prevent the impairment of any program undertaken with respect thereto and which was recommended for enactment by this Department.

An identical letter is being sent to Hon. CLIFFORD R. HOPE, chairman of the House conferees on S. 814.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it has no objection to the submission of this letter.

Sincerely yours,

N. E. DODD,
Under Secretary.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the Senator a question, and, if I may, I desire to make a very brief preliminary statement? First, I am not interested in embarrassing the President, but I do want to have a support price for the American wool growers. I am also very much interested in the consumers of wool and in the textile mills and in the people who work in them, in Massachusetts and New England.

I should like to ask this question: While the President, under the terms of the conference report, cannot by proclamation violate any present treaty, he is not prevented, is he, from putting any quota he may desire on wool which may in the future come into the country after the bill is passed?

Mr. AIKEN. He can only do it if he is so minded and can prove to the Tariff Commission that importations are interfering with the support-price program.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask a further question. The Senator from Ohio said that wool was by the pending bill placed within the terms of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. Is it not true that wool is the only commodity which will be within that act which we do not produce in sufficient quantity to meet our domestic needs?

Mr. AIKEN. No; I am not sure that is true. Section 22 covers at least 22 farm commodities, including noodle soup. I have often wondered on what kind of bush noodle soup grew; but it is in the list. But wool never has been included. However, when we maintain a support price for wool, and a foreign country persists in selling wool for a cent a pound under the market, so we are kept out of our own market, then we accumulate a surplus, and wool becomes a surplus on our Government's hands, just as does cotton or corn or oats.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. But under the terms of the bill as passed by the Senate, and also under the terms of the conference report omitting certain provisions, there is an opportunity for the Commodity Credit Corporation, if it so desires, to sell the wool at a price which will enable it to compete on the market.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct. With the rising market, I believe grease wool is about 10 cents a pound higher on the world market now than it was a year ago. With a rising market, I believe the Commodity Credit Corporation will be able to dispose of the 460,000,000 pounds they have on hand, and maintain the floor under the present clip, so that much of it will be sold directly to the users, without losing money. I would not have said that a year ago, but the wool market is strengthened, as the Senator knows.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So that there is no real need for the provision regarding quotas or increased fees, is there?

Mr. AIKEN. I should have preferred to see the bill enacted without that provision in it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. But with the provision regarding particular quotas, as well as increased fees, there will be a disruption of free contract, and it will not be possible for a purchaser of wool in a foreign country—and there are 20 such foreign wool-producing countries—to make a firm contract. Is not that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. Oh, I doubt that.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the President can impose a tariff, or a quota, at any

time in the future, in the case of countries which are far away, so that contracts run 2, 3, or 4 months ahead, what would keep a contract a firm contract?

Mr. AIKEN. It is a coincidence that the support price for wool is to continue just so long as the term of office of the present incumbent of the White House. It seems to me that foreign countries and buyers would have sufficient confidence in his doing what he ought to do, and not disrupting the market for the world, so that the market would not be disrupted. As a matter of fact, the Senator from Massachusetts knows our buyers cannot go into Australia and New Zealand and buy at any price. If an offer is made at a price that is too low, then the British Empire says, "We will take that wool. You can buy as much wool, within the empire floor, the JO floor, as you see fit, but you cannot go there and bid less than that floor."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Assuming that a textile mill is making a certain grade of cloth from a certain grade of wool, and that a quota is ordered, so that the contract being performed by the textile mill is affected, but with the need of further raw wool in order to finish the contract; what will happen to the remainder of the contract if the President puts into effect a quota?

Mr. AIKEN. The same thing that would happen if a quota were imposed under provisions of a trade-agreement act.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Assuming that to be true, and assuming that that will let the seller out of the contract, we will say, then the grade of cloth the mill can produce will deteriorate, will it not?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know about the textile business, but, before I conclude, I was going to read some other provisions of international agreements, which have already been agreed to by the nations. That constitutes just as serious a factor for the manufacturer as what is being proposed here, by including wool under section 22 of the AAA Act.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further question?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will it not be true that every textile mill in the country which makes woolen goods will be uncertain as to its future supply of wool of certain grades and qualities which it may wish to import from other countries, and also uncertain of the prices at which it can sell?

Mr. AIKEN. I understand there is a considerable degree of uncertainty in the textile business, but I do not think there will be such a great uncertainty on the part of our textile manufacturers under any provisions of the bill as there would be if we let our wool production in this country get down so low that we will be at the mercy of the British Empire for our wool supply. Maybe the uncertainty would be removed. Maybe the textile manufacturers would know that they would have to pay 60 cents a pound for wool then. But the stock pile we have, the accumulation of 460,000,000 pounds, undoubtedly has helped to keep down the price of foreign wool to our textile mills.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If a quota is established—and I want to reassert that there is no wish in my mind not to give some support price to the American wool growers—if a quota is established, licenses to import will have to be issued, will they not?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know how a quota would be handled. It would be very difficult.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Vermont says it would be very difficult to establish and apply quotas. If quotas were established and I received a license or were given the opportunity to import, and the Senator from Vermont did not, and he was a competitor of mine, would not that be grossly unfair to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know how quotas would be imposed. I do not know just how quotas are imposed at the present time. But at present we permit Canada to ship into the United States so much livestock, so much beef, so many thousand gallons of cream a year. We have quotas on imports from Mexico also, or anyhow we did have. I do not know how they are handled. But I assume that a quota on wool would have to be handled in a manner similar to the way quotas on other imports from other countries are handled.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Assume a quota was established, and I became a licensee, and the Senator from Vermont was not able to become a licensee for importation, then my license would become a thing of value in and of itself, would it not, in opposition to the competition of the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. AIKEN. I should think so. However, I do not anticipate it will be necessary to impose quotas this year or next year. I do not anticipate that it will be necessary to impose increased tariff protection this year or next year. For that reason I do not think the amendment was necessary in order to protect the wool grower. But I do think it is necessary now to pass the bill and send it to the President. If we do not, we will be taking a chance of there being no floor for wool at all.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If we do not establish quotas, as the Senator has just said, it may become necessary to establish increased fees or tariffs, and if we establish increased fees or tariffs then that will result in making the price uncertain. In other words, we either make uncertain the quantity that a manufacturer may have to use, or we make uncertain the price at which he can buy the increased quantity.

Mr. AIKEN. Neither fees nor tariffs can be imposed until the market has been demoralized in this country.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. As author of the wool bill, S. 814, I rise to support the conference report. I should like to draw the Senate's attention, and particularly the attention of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]—I am sorry the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] is not on the floor at the moment—to the proviso on page 5, lines 11 to 13, which the distinguished Senator from Vermont pointed out had been stricken in the conference report. The words beginning "that no limitation shall be imposed" and so forth, down to "consumption," were stricken out. I do not think the distinguished Senator has yet stated the proviso which has replaced those three lines which have been stricken out, and I should like to read that proviso now.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct. The Senator from Vermont had not concluded his remarks, but would be glad to have the Senator from Wyoming explain that proviso.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I read the proviso:

And provided further, That no proclamation under this section with respect to wool shall be enforced in contravention of any treaty or international agreement to which the United States is now a party.

That language, Mr. President, as I understand from the conferees, was placed in the report in order to remove any objections which the State Department might have to the bill.

In that connection, Mr. President, I was most interested in what the distinguished Senator from Virginia had to say with regard to his conversation with Mr. Clayton. As I took it down he stated that Mr. Clayton said, "Normally we import twice as much wool as we produce." I wonder if the Senator understood Mr. Clayton correctly, because if Mr. Clayton did say that, it is entirely erroneous. By "normally" I take it he meant in prewar years. In prewar years our domestic production of wool was from 400,000,000 to 450,000,000 pounds, and our consumption was from 600,000,000 to 650,000,000 pounds, which means that we would have had to import approximately 200,000,000 pounds. Since 1943 we have been importing anywhere from 700,000,000 to 800,000,000 pounds, up to 1,000,000,000 pounds. Last year our importations were around 800,000,000 pounds.

While on this point it might interest the Senate to know that during the years 1943, 1944, 1945, and 1946 the total duties collected by the United States on all dutiable imports amounted to $1,609,501,000. Of that amount, $505,200,000 represented the duties collected on imported wool. In other words, the wool duties amount to more than 31 percent of the total duties collected on all dutiable goods.

Mr. President, there is no intention to embarrass the President by this bill. The provision which I just read respecting trade treaties is ample evidence of that. The bill is absolutely necessary for the American wool grower. He must have a support price for his prod-

uct until world conditions, or, in any event, until the conditions so far as his industry are concerned, are more settled. This year the shearing of the sheep for the wool is almost complete. The wool has all been held in storage pending a bill of this nature. As the Senator from Vermont pointed out, the small producer has been forced to sell his wool at a price far below the normal market.

I hope the Senate will accept the conference report.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I do not believe it is necessary to go into any further explanation of the conference report. I simply reiterate that I believe that the effect of this amendment on the bill has been exaggerated, both by its proponents and its opponents. It has received a build-up out of proportion to its importance. I do not believe that it was necessary to tack it on to a price-support bill for wool. If there had been any way of getting out of it, I would not have accepted it.

Neither do I believe that it will disrupt world trade, because if it does disrupt world trade, it will be through the acts of the President of the United States; and I do not believe that he has any intention of disrupting world trade and preventing the making of further reciprocal trade agreements. I feel that the importance of the amendment has been exaggerated.

Mr. President, I believe that the approximately 1,000,000 wool growers of this country are entitled to the same degree of protection which is offered to producers of other agricultural commodities, for the next year and a half. I see no way of giving them such protection except through the passage of this bill, and I hope that the conference report will be approved by the Senate.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I do not want to take much time, or to delay a vote on the conference report. I assume that we are rapidly approaching that time.

I am in complete accord with what the Senator from Vermont has said, to the effect that the bill as it now stands, and will go to the President, vests only discretionary power in the President. The bill is not mandatory as to the raising of fees or the imposition of quotas. If it were, I would not support it, regardless of how important it may be to the wool growers of the West and of my State. Certainly I would not want to complicate international trade agreements. They are of importance superior even to the interests of our local growers. But I see nothing in the bill which would complicate the situation. I see nothing which would compel a mandatory increase in duties.

I feel, as the Senator from Vermont has so well pointed out, that we must either adopt the conference report or we shall have no program at all this year. I am utterly convinced that it would serve no useful purpose to send the measure back to conference. If the conference report is defeated we shall have no support program. The only chance we have for a support program—and it is a support program in which the wool growers are interested, and not a tariff provision—we have no choice except to adopt the conference report. For that reason I shall support the conference report.

In line with what I have said about the power being discretionary and not mandatory, I requested the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture to give me his written opinion on that question. I have his letter before me. He confirms everything I have said, and what the Senator from Vermont has said. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the letter from the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture in which he holds that the power vested is entirely discretionary with the President.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., June 13, 1947.

HON. CARL A. HATCH,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: Reference is made to your telephonic request for an expression of my views concerning the President's authority with respect to the imposition and enforcement of fees or quotas on wool under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (of 1933), as amended by section 4 of the conference report on S. 814. You are particularly concerned with the extent to which section 22, as so amended, would reserve to the President the right to decide whether fees and quotas should be imposed or enforced.

At the outset it should be observed that subsection (d) of section 22 provides that any decision of the President as to facts under such section shall be final.

Under subsection (a) of section 22 the President is required to cause an immediate investigation to be made by the Tariff Commission whenever he has reason to believe that any wool or wool products are being, or are practically certain to be, imported into the United States under such conditions and in sufficient quantities as to render or tend to render ineffective or materially interfere with the wool price-support program required to be carried out by the Wool Act of 1947 or to reduce substantially the amount of any product processed in the United States from wool. Accordingly, before an investigation can be made by the Tariff Commission the President must first decide whether facts exist which give him reason to believe that the imposition of fees or quotas would be warranted under section 22. The responsibility for this decision is vested solely in the President.

Subsection (b) of section 22 provides for the imposition by the President of fees or quotas on wool if, on the basis of such Tariff Commission investigation and report to him of findings and recommendations made in connection therewith, the President finds the existence of facts which warrant the imposition of fees or quotas under section 22. It is clear, therefore, that after an investigation has been made by the Tariff Commission, quotas or fees may be imposed only if the President finds that facts exist which authorize such imposition. Here again the responsibility for deciding whether such facts exist is vested in the President and, as we have already noted, the President's decision as to the facts is final.

As amended by the conference report, section 22 provides that no proclamation with respect to wool shall be enforced in contravention of any treaty or international agreement to which the United States is now a party. This is a mandatory provision the effect of which would be to nullify any proclamation of the President which contravenes an international agreement or treaty to which the United States is now a party. However, any view expressed by the President in this respect in issuing a proclamation would be accorded weight in the event the validity of the proclamation should be drawn into question.

The views expressed herein are, of course, not binding upon the President or any other agency of the Government.

Sincerely yours,

W. CARROLL HUNTER,
Solicitor.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I shall vote for the conference report with the assurances which have been given. Let me say further that if the President should find it necessary in his judgment to veto the bill, I shall be compelled to support the veto.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, a moment ago the question was raised as to whether wool growers were supporting the bill. Is my information correct that the American Wool Growers Association is supporting the bill?

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct. The farm organizations are behind the bill.

Mr. YOUNG. I should like to read a telegram from the American Farm Bureau Federation.

Mr. AIKEN. We have all received such telegrams.

Mr. YOUNG. I think it should be placed in the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that a telegram from the American Farm Bureau Federation be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 18, 1947.*

Senator MILTON R. YOUNG,
Washington, D. C.:

Board of directors, American Farm Bureau Federation in session today adopted following resolution:

"We respectfully urge approval by Congress and President of conference report on S. 814, providing price support program for wool until end of Steagall period. We also favor provision amending section 22 to include wool on same basis as other commodities. This provision is entirely discretionary and consistent with principle of escape clause now required by Presidential order in all trade agreements. In simple justice wool growers are entitled to comparable assistance already extended other commodities."

EDWARD A. O'NEAL,
President, American Farm Bureau Federation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I hope that a wool support bill will be passed, but not this one, or this one in its present form. I believe that we can pass a wool support bill without the uncertain provisions as to quotas and fees on imports and consequently the uncertainty of prices.

As a representative from New England, and particularly from Massachusetts, which has approximately 60 percent or more of the wool trade, and has a very substantial percentage of the textile mills of the country which use wool as a raw product, I believe that the bill in its present form, with quotas and possible changes in price levels, is a very unwise bill to pass.

We have heard a great deal about the wool grower. We all want American wool growers to continue to produce wool.

However, we have heard nothing about the consumer of wool products. We must remember that in establishing higher tariffs and imposing quotas, if either of those alternatives is put into effect the consumer of woolen goods, the man who wears a suit, as you and I do, Mr. President, will have to pay higher prices. Every person in this country who wears a woolen suit will inevitably have to pay higher prices for his clothes if the bill goes through in its present form, allowing restrictions on imports or higher fees on imports. We must remember that.

At the present time we produce approximately half of all the wool we use in an ordinary year. If my memory is correct, we produce between 300,000,000 and 400,000,000 pounds in an ordinary peacetime year. We use between six hundred and seven hundred million pounds. In the past few years we have been using almost 1,000,000,000 pounds of wool a year.

The bill in the form in which it passed this body, and also as reported to the House, contained a provision allowing the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell its inventory of raw wool on the market at a loss if necessary. That provision permits the Commodity Credit Corporation to compete with the foreign wool market. The reason there has been so much wool coming in from abroad is that the Commodity Credit Corporation inventory is held at a price above the level at which wool can come in from foreign countries. So while the Commodity Credit Corporation has been accumulating about 460,000,000 pounds of wool in warehouses, wool has been coming in from abroad underneath the price of the Commodity Credit Corporation wool, even with the tariff, and is being sold. The cloth which goes into our clothes has been coming in from abroad to a very considerable extent.

I should like to point out, as I tried to do in my questions addressed to the Senator from Vermont, that if we establish quotas we must devise some form of license. The licensee has a tremendous advantage over his competitor. If we do not establish quotas, we shall have uncertain prices. Wool comes from Africa and Australia. If an American is to make a contract for wool in Australia, he must make it 3 or 4 months in advance of the time when he wishes to use the wool. In the meantime, the President may perfectly properly, under the terms of the bill, impose a quota or impose a higher tariff fee. What happens? The man in this country who has bought the wool either cannot get the wool which he may have contracted to sell, or else he gets it at a higher price, and he must stand the loss. The wool broker, the man who buys wool and resells it, is an independent agent. He will not be able to do business.

It is said that we want to protect the producer. We do; but we also want to remember the consumer. We also must remember that we grow only about half the wool we use. If we grow only half the wool we use, we must import wool. If no one in this country can make a firm contract, he is not going to bring in wool from abroad, and we are not going to have the raw material with which to make our fabrics and textiles.

I hope that this bill will not pass in its present form. I believe that in the long run it is not for the best interests of all the consumers of woolen goods, and it is not for the best interests of the wool grower, because it establishes a very artificial market of which the grower is just as uncertain as is anyone else.

Because I know that not only I but many other Senators on both sides of the aisle feel very strongly about it, I should like to point out, Mr. President, that if this bill becomes law, for the next 2 years, as in the past 4 years, the Government will be the sole buyer of domestic wool. It is in the wool business, purely and simply, in competition with all the foreign wool which comes in through private hands. We want to get the Government out of business. We want to support a wool program for the grower, but we want to support it in such a way that the grower can live in competition with wool which comes in from abroad.

I hope, Mr. President, that this bill will be either recommitted to conference or be defeated so that we can start afresh.

As one representative of New England I want to say that I could and would support a reasonable bill in the interests of the domestic wool grower.

Mr. President, I should like now to make a parliamentary inquiry. Do I correctly understand that the conference report can be either accepted or rejected without amendment, or can be recommitted to conference? Those are the only three alternatives with reference to a conference report?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The conference report cannot be recommitted, because the House has accepted the report and the conferees have been discharged.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So that the only thing that can be done with the conference report is either to vote it up or vote it down?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report on Senate bill 814.

NOMINATIONS TO CERTAIN MARYLAND POST OFFICES

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I regret to take the time of the Senate when a vote is near. However, when the unanimous-consent request was made I wanted to make a statement that seemed to me to be in the nature of a question of personal privilege, but I deferred to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. I much regret that time will be consumed between now and 2 o'clock, but I feel under no obligations further to defer.

Yesterday the able Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] in closing his remarks on the postmaster investigation resolution saw fit to take four examples in Maryland to show how the ugly head of politics had entered into the appointment of postmasters in that State. I took the trouble this morning to read his remarks and to get the official record, and the Senator is wrong in all four cases. Never was a case argued to a jury on more erroneous statements than those presented by the Senator from North Dakota yesterday. Let me take them up in order.

First, he referred to the appointment of the postmaster of Ocean City, Md. An examination was held in Ocean City which resulted in only one eligible, and he was the acting postmaster. When I learned this I immediately got in touch with the Post Office Department and asked what had become of the veterans whom I knew had taken the examination. In reply to my request I received a letter from the Civil Service Commission, which is as follows:

> The veterans did not meet the minimum requirement for general experience, and general qualifications were insufficient to comply with minimum requirements of eligibility, and they were not assigned a grade.

The Senator from North Dakota lathered himself into paroxysms of sadness and agony as he assumed that the Maryland Senators had overlooked the nominations of veterans. The Senator from North Dakota was totally wrong. The Civil Service Commission failed to qualify them; the Senator from Maryland asked why they had not been qualified, and received the answer which I have just read. The acting postmaster being the only eligible, we therefore sent his name forward, and so his nomination comes before this body.

The second case which the Senator from North Dakota brought up was the Brandywine post office. I have nothing to do with that office, because as we all know, when a Democrat represents a district, all inquiries regarding post offices go to him. I asked the Representative from the district in question what happened. In that case there were 3 men who took the examination. The No. 1 man was a veteran. He had a very fine job in Washington, and could not make up his mind for a long time whether he wanted to accept the position or to decline it. Finally he declined it. The name of the No. 2 man was sent forward and is now before the committee. Yet the Senator from North Dakota assumed yesterday that some hocus-pocus had taken place and that the No. 2 man had been jumped over the No. 1 man. If he had asked me in advance what the facts were in the case I should have been glad to have gotten them for him. It is a shame that he saw fit to use erroneous facts in an attempt to bolster a very weak case.

The next case was that of Bishopville. There is where the real laugh comes in, because the man who is nominated for postmaster at Bishopville is a lifelong Republican. Let me give the Senate the facts in that case. I am quoting now from a letter:

> Mr. Ringler, now the United States postmaster at Bishopville, is affiliated as a Republican and has served as postmaster at Bishopville, Md., for almost 34 years under both Republican and Democratic administrations. He is popular and is the choice of over 90 percent of the patrons of the Bishopville post office, a majority of whom are active Democratic voters.

So what we have done in this case has been to pick a man who is a Republican, whom the Senator from North Dakota assumed was a Democrat, and to recommend his appointment as postmaster of Bishopville and his nomination is now pending before this body. I have asked the Senator from North Dakota to come on the floor so that he might hear these facts face to face, but evidently he has either not received the message or he has other business. The Senator stated yesterday that there was some hocus-pocus in connection with this matter.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to suggest to the able Senator that I, too, requested the Senator from North Dakota to be present and hear this presentation, and he sent word that he was conducting a committee meeting and would be glad to look at the RECORD and answer later.

Mr. TYDINGS. I hope that he will look at the RECORD, for if he does, he will find that what I have stated is so, and I hope that he will be, as I believe he is, big enough to get up on the floor and say that the statements which he made yesterday were erroneous.

I have here a letter from a patron of the Bishopville post office, who is a lady and a Democrat. I shall not disclose her name, but here is a statement from her letter:

> Mr. Ringler was born and bred a Republican, and, we, the people of this community, would be pleased to have Harry R. Ringler given the permanent appointment of postmaster at this office. After all, is it not the people's wish of his community that should be considered?

Both the Maryland Senators received a letter from the Democratic State Central Committee of that county saying they were nominating Mr. Ringler, a lifelong Republican, to this office as postmaster. I shall read from the letter, which is dated January 27, 1947:

> The Democratic State Central Committee of Worcester County unanimously recommended for appointment Mr. Harry R. Ringler for United States postmaster at Bishopville, Worcester County, Md., Mr. Ringler being eligible No. 1 for the office following a civil-service examination. Mr. Ringler, now acting United States postmaster at Bishopville, affiliated as a Republican, has served in the postmastership at Bishopville for almost 34 years.

The letter goes on to praise him. It is signed by the six Democratic members of the State central committee. Yet yesterday on this floor the Senator from North Dakota used this case as a means of securing authority to make an investigation into partisanship in the civil-service and the post-office appointments which have been recommended by the Maryland Senators.

In this instance we have a Democratic State Central Committee recommending the No. 1 man, who has been a life-long Republican, yet it was used as an argument to bolster the case—the weak case, the political case, the partisan case—which was back of the resolution which was under consideration yesterday.

Now I come to the last case the Senator from North Dakota mentioned, namely, the appointment of the postmaster at Oakland, Md. Mr. President, what happened in that case? An examination was held. The highest applicant was William Spoerlein, who had a rating of 80.33 percent. The second applicant was Paul A. Turney, who had 78.93 percent. He had that; but in order to obtain that percentage, which was lower than the rating of the No. 1 man, he used his veteran's preference. Even with his veteran's preference, he stood No. 2 on the list. So the Maryland Senators appointed the No. 1 man, as they should have done in that circumstance.

I have mentioned the four cases which were used yesterday. The Senator from North Dakota said the heart of the Senator from Maryland was bleeding at the way the ex-servicemen were treated. The Senators from Maryland were for all ex-servicemen; and when their names did not appear, the Senators from Maryland wrote to the Post Office Department and said, "What has become of the two ex-servicemen who took this examination?" The Civil Service Commission wrote us, in due time, that those two ex-servicemen had failed to make an eligible passing mark. It was only after we found that the ex-servicemen had not passed, that the Maryland Senators nominated the top man, who was not an ex-serviceman.

Finally, the Senator from North Dakota, to bolster his case, brought up the postmastership at Baltimore. Mr. President, I served in this body for a long time with one of the finest Americans who ever lived, Phillips Goldsborough, my colleague, who sat on the other side of the aisle. If we had both been Republicans or if both of us had been Democrats, no two men could have gotten along better than we did. We never had a dispute, and we cooperated just as fully as we would have if we had been members of the same party. During Mr. Goldsborough's tenure, the postmaster at Baltimore died. He was a Republican. In the course of time, an examination was held; and the first assistant, who was Mr. Green, passed first on the eligible list. Senator Goldsborough and I agreed that Mr. Green should have the job. It was said that Mr. Green was a Republican. Frankly, I do not know whether he was or not. Nevertheless, the people of Baltimore wanted him. He was a career man; and Senator Goldsborough and I, and later Senator Radcliffe and I, joined in having Mr. Green made the postmaster. After some 40 years of service in the Baltimore post office. When Mr. Green withdrew or retired, we again took the first assistant, who was a career man, and put him in.

I wish to say to the Senator from North Dakota that if the administration of the Post Office Department or any other department, State, local, or national, was as clean and as free from political interference and conniving as the postmasterships in Maryland, then they would have a record without one blot on it. I resent these imputations of political interference; and I have covered the records relative to the statements of the Senator from North Dakota. Patronage has never worried the Senators from Maryland, and it never will; and in connection with the filling of offices, where civil service examinations are necessary, we shall abide by the rules of the game, as the record here shows that we have.

Mr. LANGER subsequently said: Mr. President, during my unavoidable absence this afternoon, the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] proceeded to talk about certain post offices in Maryland. I wish to say that I have my reply ready, and I expected to reply this afternoon. However, I find that the Senator from Maryland is not upon the floor at this time. Therefore, at the earliest opportunity, as soon as the Senator from Maryland is upon the floor, I shall ask recognition, in order to reply to the Senator from Maryland.

PRICE SUPPORT PROGRAM FOR WOOL—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 814) to provide support for wool, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to discuss the conference report. However, it is now 5 minutes before 2, and at 2 o'clock we must take up the Bulwinkle bill, under the unanimous-consent agreement. Obviously, I shall not be able to complete my remarks on the conference report in the time between now and 2 o'clock. Therefore, Mr. President, I request that the conference report go over temporarily.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in view of the statement of the Senator from Kentucky, I suggest that we prepare to proceed with the unfinished business the consideration of which, under the unanimous-consent agreement, is to be resumed at 2 o'clock. Several Senators have matters which they would like to take up between now and 2 o'clock; and at 2 o'clock we can proceed to have a quorum call, preparatory to taking action on the Bulwinkle bill, if need for a quorum call then exists.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the time between 2 o'clock and 4 o'clock will be devoted to consideration of the Bulwinkle bill or other subjects, but that no vote will be taken on the conference report until after 4 o'clock?

Mr. WHERRY. I understand—and the minority leader can bear me out in this—that commencing at 2 o'clock, the time is to be equally divided between the proponents and opponents of the so-called Bulwinkle bill; and if any Senator wishes to speak during that time, he will have to arrange for time with either the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] or the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who are in charge of the time for the proponents and the opponents, respectively.

Mr. President, I believe—and I think I can speak with assurance—that there

will be no action on the conference report on the wool bill until after the Bulwinkle bill is voted on at 4 o'clock.

I yield now to my colleague from Nebraska.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I prefer to speak later.

Mr. WHERRY. Then, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Murray
Baldwin	Hawkes	Myers
Ball	Hayden	O'Conor
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Hoey	Overton
Bridges	Holland	Pepper
Brooks	Ives	Reed
Buck	Jenner	Revercomb
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Wyo.
Byrd	Kem	Russell
Cain	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Capehart	Knowland	Smith
Capper	Langer	Sparkman
Chavez	Lucas	Stewart
Connally	McCarran	Taft
Cooper	McCarthy	Taylor
Donnell	McClellan	Thye
Downey	McFarland	Tydings
Dworshak	McGrath	Umstead
Eastland	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ecton	McMahon	Watkins
Ellender	Magnuson	Wherry
Ferguson	Malone	White
Flanders	Martin	Wiley
Fulbright	Maybank	Williams
George	Millikin	Wilson
Green	Moore	Young
Gurney	Morse	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The time from this point on until 4 o'clock will be divided equally, under the control, respectively, of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. To whom does the Senator from Georgia yield?

STIMULATION OF VOLUNTEER ENLISTMENTS

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President——

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield a minute to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, on the call of the calendar on Monday, the Senate passed Senate bill 1218, a bill to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military Establishment of the United States. At the same time the House passed a similar bill, H. R. 3303. I now ask that the Senate consider the House bill, substitute the wording of the Senate bill as amended for the text of the House bill, insist on the Senate amendment, ask for a conference with the House, and that the President pro tempore appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 3303) to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military Establishment of the United States, which was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Dakota that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. R. 3303, a bill to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military Establishment of the United States, that the Senate strike out all after the enacting clause of the House bill and substitute therefor the text of Senate bill 1218, as amended, and that the House bill, as thus amended, be passed?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, is it necessary to do anything about the bill we have already passed, to reconsider the vote, or anything of the kind?

Mr. GURNEY. No; there is no change in language.

Mr. CONNALLY. I mean so far as the parliamentary procedure is concerned. We passed a certain bill. Are we to recall that bill from the House, or have anything to do with it at all, or merely forget it?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate bill will die in the House, the Chair is informed.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Dakota?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3303) to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military Establishment of the United States.

Mr. GURNEY. I now move that all after the enacting clause of the House bill be stricken out, and that there be substituted the language of Senate bill 1218 as it was amended.

The motion was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first paragraph of section 27 of the National Defense Act, as amended (10 U. S. C. 627, 628), is hereby further amended as follows:

"Effective July 1, 1947, the Secretary of War is authorized, notwithstanding the provisions of the last paragraph of section 127a of this act, to accept original enlistments in the Regular Army from among qualified male persons not less than 17 years of age for periods of 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6 years, and to accept reenlistments for periods of 3, 4, 5, or 6 years: *Provided*, That persons of the first three enlisted grades may be reenlisted for unspecified periods of time on a career basis under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe: *Provided further*, That anyone who serves three or more years of an enlistment for an unspecified period of time may submit to the Secretary of War his resignation and such resignation shall be accepted by the Secretary of War and such person shall be discharged from his enlistment within 3 months of the submission of such resignation. Except if such person, other than an enlisted member of a Regular Army Puerto Rican unit, submits his resignation while stationed overseas or after embarking for an overseas station, the Secretary of War shall not be required to accept such resignation until a total of 2 years of overseas service shall have been completed in the current overseas assignment, and in the case of anyone who has completed any course of instruction pursuant to paragraph 13 of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended (10 U. S. C. 535), or pursuant to section 2 of the act of April 3, 1939 (53 Stat. 556), as amended (10 U. S. C. 298a), the Secretary of War shall not be required to accept such resignation until 2 years subsequent to the completion of such course. The Secretary of War may refuse to accept any such resignation in time of war or national emergency declared by the President or Congress, or while the person concerned is absent without leave or serving a sentence of court martial. The Secretary of War may refuse to accept a resignation for a period not to exceed 6 months following the submission thereof if the enlisted person is under investigation or in default with respect to public property or public funds: *Provided further*, That no person under the age of 18 years shall be enlisted without the written consent of his parents or guardian, and the Secretary of War shall, upon the application of the parents or guardian of any such person enlisted without their written consent, discharge such person from the military service with pay and with the form of discharge certificate to which the service of such person, after enlistment, shall entitle him: *Provided further*, That nothing contained in this act shall be construed to deprive any person of any right to reenlistment in the Regular Army under any other provision of law. No person who is serving under an enlistment contracted on or after June 1, 1945, shall be entitled, before the expiration of the period of such enlistment, to enlist for an enlistment period which will expire before the expiration of the enlistment period for which he is so serving: *Provided further*, That any enlisted person discharged from the Regular Army who upon such discharge is recommended for reenlistment shall be permitted to reenlist with the rank held by him at the time of his discharge if he reenlists within a period to be specified by the Secretary of War but not to exceed 3 months from the date of such discharge: *And provided further*, That any enlisted person discharged from the Regular Army by reason of acceptance of his resignation shall not be entitled upon subsequent reenlistment to the rank, rating, or grade held at the time of discharge."

SEC. 2. Any person who enlists or reenlists in the Regular Military Establishment on or after June 1, 1945, in the seventh grade, upon the completion of recruit training, but not later than 4 months subsequent to the date of enlistment, shall, unless sooner promoted, be promoted to the sixth grade, provided he meets such qualifications as may be prescribed in regulations promulgated by the Secretary of War: *Provided*, That no back pay or allowance shall accrue to any person by reason of enactment of this section.

SEC. 3. Paragraph 4 of section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 is hereby amended by substituting a colon for the period at the end of such paragraph and by adding immediately after such colon the following: "*Provided further*, That in addition to such enlistment allowance, any person enlisting for an unspecified period of time shall be paid the sum of $50 upon the completion of each year of service for such reenlistment, and any person who resigns or is discharged from such enlistment for an unspecified period of time shall not thereafter be entitled to any additional enlistment or reenlistment allowance based on any period served in such enlistment for an unspecified period of time."

SEC. 4. Effective July 1, 1947, sections 653 and 653a of title 10, United States Code, are repealed and all other laws and parts of laws insofar as they are inconsistent with or in conflict with the provisions of this act are likewise repealed.

SEC. 5. Subsection 1 (b) of the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 (38 U. S. C., Supp. V, 691a) is amended by striking out the word "and" at the end of subsection (7) thereof, inserting a semicolon in lieu of the period after subsection (8) thereof, and adding the following: "and (9) any person entering upon active service, or enlisting, on or after the first day of the first month after the approval of the act adding this subsection."

SEC. 6. Sections 57 and 58 of the National Defense Act, as amended, are further amended by striking out the word "eighteen" therefrom and substituting therefor the word "seventeen" in each of the said sections.

Mr. GURNEY. I move that the Senate insist on its amendment, ask for a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. RUSSELL conferees on the part of the Senate.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN AGREEMENTS BETWEEN CARRIERS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 110) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I yield such time as he may desire to the minority leader of the Senate, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for such time as he may desire, within 1 hour.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I can guarantee to the Chair and to the Senate that I shall not consume the time which might be at my disposal under the order. As a matter of fact, I hope that my remarks will not occupy half the time available to those who are opposed to the proposal now before the Senate.

Mr. President, I find myself today, as I have heretofore, unalterably opposed, not only to the pending bill, but to similar legislation affecting any other great industry of the United States. Under the Constitution, Congress has power to regulate commerce among the States and with foreign nations. That authority grew out of controversies over the regulation of commerce which had arisen between the time of the signing of the treaty of peace following the American Revolution, and the convening of the Constitutional Convention by the Colonies.

Those who wrote the Constitution recognized that there must be some central authority with power to regulate commerce for the whole country. Although that power was conferred upon Congress in 1787, it was never exercised until 1887, a full century after it had been written into the Constitution of the country. Its exercise came about then because of abuses which had grown up among the railroads of the United States.

Congress was compelled to take note of those abuses because they carried with them the power to build up one community as against another, one industry as against another, by all sorts of preferences and favoritism conferred by the transportation systems of the country as they then existed. So Congress passed the act to regulate commerce in 1887, by which it provided, not the detailed regulations that have since been imposed, but by which it provided that rates should be fair and equitable as among shippers and communities, with certain power in the Interstate Commerce Commission to pass upon the fairness and equity of rates and practices.

Things dragged along until 1920, with various minor amendments to the law, following the return of the railroads to their owners after they had been taken over and operated by the Government during World War I. I happen to have been a member of the Committee on Interstate Commerce of the House of Representatives, which had jurisdiction of that legislation, and I was one of the conferees on the part of the House to adjust differences between the House bill, which was known as the Esch bill, and the Senate version, which was known as the Cummins bill. We were in conference for 6 weeks, as a result of which the Transportation Act of 1920 was enacted into law. That Transportation Act went further in the regulation of railroads and the power of the Interstate Commerce Commission. It went further in providing for joint routes and joint rates, and various other integrating provisions which had not theretofore been a part of the law. That law continued in force for some 20 years, and then in 1940 we enacted a new regulatory law applicable to railroads and other interstate carriers, which was called the Transportation Act of 1940.

Now, after 150 years in the exercise of the power to regulate commerce among the States, and after 60 years of regulation on the part of Congress not only of railroads but of other corporations, under the act to regulate commerce, we are proposing to lift railroads, steamships, motor carriers, busses, and trucks from under the provisions of the antitrust law and set them on an island of safety free from the intervention of the law-enforcing agency of our Government. And why, Mr. President? Because, in the Middle West, a lawsuit has been instituted charging certain carriers with a violation of the antitrust laws by combinations in derogation of the law, and because certain interested States in the South have instituted another lawsuit charging again a violation of the antitrust law.

Mr. President, I live on the south bank of the Ohio River. I am therefore not in official territory. I have stood on the south bank of the Ohio River all my life, and, looking across to the north bank of that river, I have observed the smoke of industry curling above factories and from smokestacks within a stone's throw of me, because they enjoyed a preference, a privilege, denied to those living south of the Ohio River. If we established an industry on the south bank of that river, we were required to pay a differential freight rate in order to get on the north side, to compete with factories which were on the north bank of the river; but the industries which were located on the north bank were not required to pay any differential in freight rates in order to get on our bank, to compete with us.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. There can be no possible difference between the conditions described by the able Senator and an internal tariff that the Congress might have levied, discriminating against the constituents of the Senator as compared to those who lived across the river from him.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is correct. The same result would have occurred if the State of Kentucky had had the power through its State legislature to levy a tariff of 25 percent on any manufactured articles that came across the river into Kentucky; but it could not do that, because the Constitution prohibited it. But, because of this favoritism, this special privilege, for which we had to pay in order to get on terms of equality with factories north of the river, and because of its absence on the part of industries north of the river, we have suffered for more than two generations as a result of that unequal situation.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. There was absolutely no difference in the cost to the respective railroads of transporting the goods or commodities, and there was absolutely no difference in the value of the goods or the commodities, which in any way afforded a basis for the discrimination in the matter of rates. Is not that a fact?

Mr. BARKLEY. There was not a particle of difference; the same commodities were produced in two plants within sight of each other; but, because God Almighty had built a river between them, one plant enjoyed a privilege, granted because of the power of government, and the other was denied it. That situation has prevailed for two generations.

Mr. HILL. I do not want to interfere with the logic of the Senator's speech, because I know he is making an able speech, as he always does, nor do I want to anticipate his thoughts; but the Senator speaks about living on the Ohio River. The Senator, of course, knows the effect of conditions which the pending bill would ratify and make lawful, so far as any benefit from waterways and waterway transportation is concerned. While operating under the monopoly as now constituted, which the pending bill would ratify, benefits are being denied in respect to waterways and waterway transportation. Is not that true?

Mr. BARKLEY. That is correct. I thank the Senator for the suggestion. I mentioned the comparative situation on the two banks of the Ohio River, because it is a tragic illustration of the injustice which is now sought to be perpetuated upon our people by the enactment of the pending legislation. But, of course, the same thing applies to all the territory south of the Ohio River, which is not within what is called official territory.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ECTON in the chair). Does the Senator from Kentucky yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The word "official" is in a way a misnomer. It should be called "favored" territory, should it not?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; it should be called favored territory. The word "official" is a misnomer, because everything the Interstate Commerce Commission does is official, and applies to our section of the country no less than to other sections; but through some quirk of intellectuality it is called official territory, when it ought to be called favored territory. It ought to be described in terms of a policy which Jefferson negated all his life, namely, the granting of a special privilege, not enjoyed by all the people, to a particular section and particular group. That is what it was. That was the effect of it. The practice of that privilege and favoritism has been brought in question in the courts of our country and, fearing that the Supreme Court might nullify that privilege and that favoritism, we are asked by the enactment of the pending legislation, to cut the ground out from under the Court in its ability to decide the question.

It has been suggested that we put a provision in the bill still leaving with the Supreme Court the power to decide this particular question. But that would be a moot question anyway, if the Court could decide it, were we to cut the ground out from under the law as it would be interpreted.

I have no way of knowing what the decision of the Supreme Court will be; I do not hesitate to say what I hope it will be; but the pending legislation has been brought forward and is now being urged because of the desire to take away from the courts of our country the power to pass on the question of the equality of administration of antitrust laws. This is a trend that is being accelerated in recent years.

We had the same proposition in the insurance field. When I came to Congress 34 years ago there was a very unjustifiable condition existing in my State with reference to insurance practices. I went to see the Attorney General, who happened to be Mr. McReynolds, at that time, in the beginning of Woodrow Wilson's administration, to see if something could not be done by the Department of Justice to correct this inequality and this monopolistic practice under which we were living. Mr. McReynolds promptly advised me that the Supreme Court had held that insurance was not commerce, and therefore there was nothing he could do.

I have always believed that a policy of insurance applied for in Kentucky and consummated in New York and sent through the mails across State lines to my State was just as much a piece of commerce as a share of stock in a corporation in which I have an equitable interest, issued in New York and mailed to me in Kentucky. But somebody brought a lawsuit to test the validity of the original opinion of the Supreme Court. It was in the Supreme Court for them to determine whether, after all, they would reverse their original decision holding insurance not to be commerce. Whereupon a bill was introduced in the Congress of the United States declaring that insurance was not interstate commerce, and undertaking to take away from the Supreme Court the jurisdiction to try the question of whether it was commerce, to take away jurisdiction to reexamine their original opinion on that subject.

As I have said heretofore, largely due to the legislative ability and the alertness and persistence of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], a fair and workable bill was finally passed. The Supreme Court subsequently reversed their original opinion and held that insurance is commerce among the States.

So when the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice goes after someone, not to secure a conviction, but in a procedure to determine whether there has been a violation of the law on a wholesale scale, it is customary now to introduce in Congress a bill lifting the conduct, or the commodity, or the agency out of the purview of the antitrust laws, so that no matter if a decision of the Supreme Court should be favorable, it would be nullified in advance by legislation enacted by the Congress.

Mr. President, I realize that it is necessary and convenient to have traffic bureaus in communities. I realize there must be liaison between one railroad and another in the shipment of freight across State lines, and in the provision for joint rates we have legalized such practice. We did it in 1920 by providing that there might be joint through rates on different railroads to be administered by the Interstate Commerce Commission. The Transportation Act of 1940 reiterates and strengthens and, to some extent, enlarges that power. No one contends that that is a violation of the antitrust laws. But the Supreme Court and the other Federal courts in the two or three series of litigations which are now pending, are called upon to determine whether the railroads have gone beyond the permission given by Congress to set up joint rates and to establish agencies by which joint rates may be effectuated. The Department of Justice, having had their attention called by preliminary investigation and by the complaint of public bodies in the United States and citizens who are entitled to be heard, that there may have been a violation of the provisions of the antitrust laws, we are now asked to make it impossible for the Supreme Court or for any other court to render an effective decision, even though they find there has been a gross violation of the antitrust laws. That tendency and trend, which was initiated in the insurance field, is now being applied in the railroad field.

We have now before the Congress a legislative proposal that there shall be designated only one air line to carry passengers and freight across the oceans—just one line. I hope that bill will not reach the Senate of the United States, but if it does I propose to exercise all the parliamentary rights I enjoy in order that it shall not become a law. We might as well make one steamship line a monopoly to carry all passengers and all freight across the oceans, as one air line. We might as well say that one railroad company shall have a monopoly in carrying freight to our seashores to be loaded onto steamships, or in carrying passengers to be embarked upon airplanes to go across the oceans of the world to places in which our people may be concerned.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am glad the Senator has pointed out the effort to have one air line take charge in the whole field of international transportation. It is merely a way station on the road to complete Government monopoly.

Mr. BARKLEY. Oh, yes; and in the meantime there would be private monopoly, until the Government would be forced to take it over. In view of the effort in the insurance field and in the transportation field by rail and water and bus and air, I feel that there is something insidious about the whole program. I do not indict any Member of Congress on that score, but there is an integration of interest among those who are seeking to use the Congress of the United States for the purpose of not protecting the people against monopoly, but of fastening monopoly upon them by enactment of law. I am not willing to be a party to any such program.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Wyoming made a very wise observation about the air-line bill, if it passes, setting up a way station toward Government ownership and Government operation. Does not the Senator from Kentucky agree that all such bills, if enacted into law, will constitute way stations toward the nationalization of the industries affected; in other words, toward socialism in America?

Mr. BARKLEY. I certainly do take that long-range view, because I think ultimately the American people will revolt against a program of monopoly. For 60 years they have been fighting monopoly, and, as they have had a perfect right to do, they have brought their viewpoint to the attention of the Congress of the United States in the original enactment of the antitrust law, and every amendment that has been made to it since it was first enacted. They have a right to know that the entire program which is now being attempted in the transportation field will not only lead ultimately, as I believe, to Government ownership and operation and to socialization of our transportation system; but if it does not lead to that, it will certainly lead to private monopoly before the Government is required to take over. I do not believe in private monopoly either in the transportation field or in the industrial field.

I see no justification for this proposed legislation. I have on my desk, as all Senators have, a list of organizations of various kinds which have endorsed the proposed legislation. The other day I received a letter from someone in Memphis, Tenn., whose name I do not now recall, who had some official connection with one of the organizations which have endorsed the proposed legislation. Probably we all received similar letters. The writer stated that someone had accused those organizations of being "high-

pressured" by the railroads to endorse the bill. He was indignantly resenting the idea that he or his organization could be "high-pressured" by a railroad or by anyone else into endorsing a piece of legislation unless they favored it.

I made no such claim as that. I do not know why he should have berated me, because I have never made any such statement or intimation, either in the Senate or anywhere else. I have never said that any of those organizations was "high-pressured" by the railroads into endorsing the proposed legislation. Personally I do not care whether they have been "high-pressured" or not. If every one of them did it on its own initiative, without ever having had the matter called to its attention by the railroads, I still would be against it.

If every organization in the United States—commercial, industrial, labor, farm, or any other type of organization—endorsed the bill, I would still be against it, because I think it is vicious legislation. I think it is an effort to impose a transportation monopoly upon the people of the United States. I say that notwithstanding the fact that the Interstate Commerce Commission still would have power to pass upon the fairness and justice of rates and practices among the railroads. However, the Interstate Commerce Commission was not established as a law-enforcement agency. It was never clothed with the authority to make preliminary investigations with respect to combinations in violation of the antitrust laws. The Interstate Commerce Commission is a rate-making body or a rate-approving body. Its jurisdiction has been enlarged until it has the right to approve certain practices or to deny such practices to the railroads. It is not a law-enforcement agency. It was never conceived as such. In my judgment it is not equipped, and cannot be equipped, in addition to its present duties, to investigate whether the antitrust laws are being violated by the railroads. I say the railroads. The bill applies not only to railroads, but to water carriers, busses, trucks, and even freight forwarders, who are organizers of the shipment of freight in their communities, but have no official connection with any railroad. So the bill applies to everyone who has any organized connection with the shipment of commodities from one part of the United States to another. It exempts them from the provisions of the antitrust laws. They will no longer be subject to the antitrust laws, no matter what they may do.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that Congress, in passing the Interstate Commerce Act and amending that act, as it has done several times, as the Senator knows, recognized that there was a broad, wide field which was left to competition and to the operation of the rules of competition, and to managerial discretion? That field was not supposed to be, and has not been, and is not now, under the Interstate Commerce Commission. The bill would destroy competition and ratify and make lawful the proposed monopoly, so we would have a private government of the transportation industries, operating beyond any control whatever so far as the Government of the United States is concerned.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is undoubtedly true. The day of railroad pioneering is over. No more new railroads are to be built, and therefore there is no possibility of further competition so far as the construction of new railroad lines is concerned. But there is competition in service. There is competition in equipment. There is competition in the method by which one railroad, as compared with another, hauls freight and accommodates those who desire to ship commodities over the railroads, or who desire to travel over the railroads. So the day of railroad competition has not disappeared, although the day of new railroad construction has disappeared.

What we are doing in this legislation is saying that we will no longer exercise punitive power over any combination of railroads, busses, trucks, or steamships engaged in interstate commerce, no matter what they may do, unless the Interstate Commerce Commission, by some pious resolution or moral persuasion, can dissuade them from some practice. The antitrust laws and the Department of Justice would no longer have any jurisdiction with respect to such conduct.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Of course, there was competition among the railroads in the matter of rate-fixing until the railroads established the private government which they now have, and which is being attacked in the Supreme Court.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. HILL. I have before me the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of *State of Georgia* v. *Pennsylvania Railroad, et al.* (324 U. S. 439, 458). The Supreme Court summed up the heart of the question which is before us today. The Supreme Court had this to say:

> The type of regulation which Congress chose—
>
> When it passed the Interstate Commerce Act and amendments thereto—
>
> did not eliminate the emphasis on competition and individual freedom in rate making. * * * The act was designed to preserve private initiative in rate making, as indicated by the duty of each common carrier to initiate its own rates. (*Arizona Grocery Company* v. *Atchison, T. & S. Ry. Co.* (284 U. S. 370).) If a combination of the character described in this bill of complaint—
>
> That is what we have today, and that is what the bill seeks to make lawful—
>
> is immune from suit, that freedom of action disappears.
>
> That is, the freedom of action of the individual carriers in competition.
>
> The coercive and collusive influences of group action take its place. A monopoly power is created under the aegis of private parties, without congressional sanction and without governmental supervision or control.
>
> The court summed up the issue before us. The issue is whether we are to have a private government of the railroads, without any competition as between the roads in rate making, equipment, service, or anything of that kind, but with the hierarchy of the private government dictating to all the roads, and with the destruction of competition.

Mr. BARKLEY. They exercise the power to determine whether a matter shall even come before the Interstate Commerce Commission. Before it ever gets there, they pass on that question. So there is really a hierarchy. It is a government within a government, but not controlled by government.

It has been urged that Congress has the power to decide the policy with respect to transportation. Congress has done so time after time. It did so in the orginal act to regulate commerce. It declared a policy in the Transportation Act of 1920; it declared a policy in the Transportation Act of 1940; but we are withdrawing a part of the policy which Congress, for two generations, has insisted upon with respect to the regulation of transportation in the United States.

I might say to the Senator from Alabama that the enactment of this bill will not only take away from the Supreme Court anything but a moot question in regard to the litigation now pending, but it will nullify the decision of the Supreme Court from which the Senator from Alabama has just read. So what we are doing now, as we have been urged to do in other matters, is to nullify by congressional action a decision of the Supreme Court upon a high-policy question in regard to the greatest industry in the United States—our transportation system. I believe it is unwise; I believe it is vicious; I believe that if carried on it will ultimately result in complete monopoly and cartelization not only of railroads but of those who use railroads in the shipment of their commodities.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator has said the very thing I wanted to hear him say when I rose to ask him to yield. I wondered if he was not going to make that very observation. Transportation is the greatest industry in America. Every other industry in America is dependent upon it. How can we have a monopoly cartelization in the transportation industry without its following through all other industries?

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course if we have a right to say that a railroad over which the United States Steel Corp. ships its products shall be exempt from the antitrust laws, why should we not go further and say that the United States Steel Corp., which manufactures products and ships them over the railroads, shall likewise be exempt from the antitrust laws, because they are both a part of our industrial establishment? Why not say the same about the International Harvester Co., or the American Aluminum Co., or the Standard Oil Co.? Why not say to them: "You support the railroads by your freight; you pay the bill; and if the railroads are to be exempt, as a part of our industrial system, why not exempt every great concern that ships commodities over the railroads?"

Mr. HILL. The bill is so drawn and so all-inclusive in its terms that I am not sure many of the things the Senator has suggested, for instance, the steel rails for the railroads, will not come under the provisions of the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not so certain that under this bill the United States Steel Corp. could not set up a little group and call it a freight forwarder and be exempt from the antitrust laws. Any other great company might do the same thing. The language is sufficiently broad to go much further than merely to lift the railroads and their practices out of the purview of the antitrust laws, when the implications of the language of the bill are finally interpreted by a court, which if the bill is enacted into law, I suppose will finally take place.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is little doubt that the implications of this bill, as recited by the Senator from Kentucky, are thoroughly familiar to the small business interests of the country, despite the imposing list of people who are supposed to have endorsed the bill, which list was submitted by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. We find that the small business organizations of the country are very much opposed to it. I hold in my hand a letter from the National Federation of Small Business, Inc., which is supposed to represent more than 200,000 small businesses in the Nation. They state that the bill was submitted to their membership on a Nation-wide poll. The letter says:

I am attaching for your information and record the result of this poll. The vote was as follows:

Eighteen percent for the bill.
Eighty percent against the bill.
Two percent not voting.

The letter goes on to say that instead of weakening the antitrust laws they think the laws should be strengthened.

If the Senator does not object, I should like to have that letter printed in the RECORD.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should be very glad to have it printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF SMALL BUSINESS, INC.,
Washington, D. C., June 11, 1947.

Hon. RICHARD RUSSELL,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR RUSSELL: It is reported in the New York Times of yesterday's date "Railway Pact Bill Opposed in Senate—Russell says Measure Would End Antitrust Control."

I believe you will be interested in knowing the results of a Nation-wide poll made by this association shortly after the introduction of the Reed-Bulwinkle bill. I am attaching for your information and record the result of this poll. The vote was as follows: 18 percent for the bill, 80 percent against the bill, 2 percent not voting.

Bear in mind Senator, that the question was put to this large membership of the Federation throughout the Nation in a simple, understandable way, and we here add to the membership vote by opposing any action that would weaken the antitrust laws.

The truth of the matter is, due to the testimony given recently before the Senate Civil Service Committee by the then Assistant Attorney General Wendell Berge (February 1947) it is our opinion, instead of any attempt to weaken the law that Congress should be more insistent that the law be rigidly enforced, that is, if free enterprise is really to remain in our Nation's economy.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE J. BURGER.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have a suspicion that if many of the organizations which have endorsed the bill had had the same kind of explanation given to them as to its implications and ramifications, many of them would not be on the list today.

Mr. President, I wish to conclude my remarks. I have already taken more time than I intended. There is no camouflage about this bill. In my judgment, the railroads, through their association, desire to have the transportation system lifted out from the jurisdiction of the antitrust laws. Judge Fletcher, who is the attorney for the Association of American Railroads, and who is a very able lawyer, an outstanding American, and for whom I have the utmost respect and admiration and personal affection, stated without any equivocation that he thought railroads and similar transportation systems which are regulated ought not to be under the antitrust laws. He is perfectly honest in that belief.

Mr. HILL. I think Mr. Fletcher included not only the transportation industry but industries which are under the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission and other similar Government agencies.

Mr. BARKLEY. His advocacy of the bill was, by its very terms, extended to all organizations of business that are regulated under certain laws. I cannot accept that philosophy. I, therefore, cannot support the bill. If it shall be passed by the Congress of the United States, I express here publicly the fervent hope that the President of the United States will veto it. I cannot imagine a more justifiable veto than one exercised with regard to this piece of proposed legislation.

Mr. BARKLEY subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks made earlier today on the pending legislation an editorial from the June 12 issue of the Louisville Courier-Journal entitled "Monopoly Is the Issue in the Senate Forum," and also an editorial entitled "Back to Monopoly," published in the June 15 issue of the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal of June 12, 1947]

MONOPOLY IS THE ISSUE IN THE SENATE FORUM

A debate has opened in the Senate on an issue of which the public should be more aware. It is presented by the so-called Bulwinkle bill. This seeks to exempt railroads and other common carriers from prosecution under antitrust laws for agreements among themselves on rates, charges, settlements, and similar general practices.

Opposing the bill, Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, and Senator TOBEY, of New Hampshire, charge flatly that the railroad lobby has put extraordinary pressure on Congress. The New Englander clashes with lobbyists personally in a Washington restaurant after he is informed that they are making distinctly unflattering personal remarks about him and his activities. Both Senators know, as the country should know, from the bare facts of the case, that passage of the bill can but mean a weakening of laws against monopoly. Both express a large body of opinion which views with misgivings a trend of special interests to work for exemptions when old privileges are ended by the courts or endangered by popular rebellion.

There have been of late several striking illustrations of the trend. Two years or so ago the Supreme Court held that an organization of southeastern fire insurance companies was liable to prosecution for having agreed on rates, removing this item from competition. Immediately one of the most powerful of lobbies moved into action, working for special antitrust exemption for the insurance industry. It almost succeeded, the fight winding up with a compromise by which exemption was granted for a limited period.

More recently, the strategy was employed by the News Publishers Association to amend the antitrust laws. The Supreme Court had ordered the Associated Press to amend its bylaws to eliminate the practice of granting exclusive franchises for its news service. The Mason bill was designed to circumvent this decision by granting exemption to news agencies. This legislation is pending, with Col. R. R. McCormick, publisher of The Chicago Tribune, spearheading the drive in its support. It is to be recalled that the court decision came as result of a suit by The Chicago Sun, newcomer competitor of Colonel McCormick's venerable Tribune, which had been denied an AP franchise under existing bylaws.

Now come the railroads into the lists. They took a beating recently from the Supreme Court, in a decision upholding an Interstate Commerce Commission order that tended to equalize North-South freight rates. But the railroads are known to fear most two antitrust actions against them now pending in Federal courts. Now soon to be heard by the Supreme Court is a suit started by Ellis Arnall when he was Governor of Georgia, asking damages from a group of railroads for rate discrimination against the South. In a Nebraska district court is a suit charging Western railroads with monopolistic practices. It is hard to convince opponents of the Bulwinkle bill that that proposed legislation is not an effort to beat the courts to the punch, and to win exemption before the blow falls.

True, the friends of the bill have a plausible case, though it is strikingly similar to the vain arguments by insurance companies. They say that rate agreements in a business so large and complicated as transportation are necessary to avoid utter confusion. Literal competition, they argue, would spell demoralization. They point out that the bill provides that the ICC must approve the agreed rates and practices, and that shippers as well as railroads are for them.

But the other side looks on these claims with justified suspicion. The ICC has rarely been in position to do more than approve the intricate schedules which railroads submit. A complete argument has never been presented to business organizations, farm groups or shippers that are held up as supporting the exemption. The bill passed in the House last year after less than an hour's debate. Only now is it getting an adequate airing in the Senate. We can only point out that the whole subject of monopolistic practices is one with which President Truman is familiar. His administration is committed to oppose them. We shouldn't be at all surprised if the bill is vetoed, assuming that it passes the Senate.

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette of June 15, 1947]

BACK TO MONOPOLY

Republicans in the United States Senate have shown where their interests lie. They are with the great combinations of capital and not with the average citizen. In this they have changed not one particle from the Republican principles of the old Mark Hanna-McKinley days.

The 50,000,000 American people who live in 14,000,000 dwellings are worried sick. They learn that a well organized, lavishly financed real estate lobby is about to force the Republican Congress to relinquish rent controls so that they will be left at the mercy of rent hogs all over the Nation.

While the people cry for protection it is denied them. Not so the railroads.

Senate majority leader TAFT places the Reed bill, to exempt the $26,000,000,000 railroad industry from the provisions of the antitrust laws, next on the Senate calendar—ahead of rent control.

If a new rent law is passed it will leave the way wide open for rapacious landlords to hike the rent of helpless tenants 15 percent; if no law at all is passed the present rent control law will expire June 30 and all restraints will be removed. We should not be surprised if the latter course is adopted in the hurry and turmoil of the close of the present session.

Republicans, ever willing to fetch and carry for big business, bow before lobby pressure for speed in their interests. The railroads need haste now because two important cases are pending against them under the antitrust laws.

First is the case in the Supreme Court against the Pennsylvania Railroad for alleged rate discrimination against the South.

Second is the case pending in the Federal district court in Lincoln, Nebr., charging monopolistic practices by the western railroads.

The railroads want protection from verdicts of guilty.

Long-range objective is to build a monopoly of all railroad transportation.

To consumers it means higher costs.

To businessmen it means higher costs.

Eastern private utility interests, already dictating budget cuts to congressional Republicans on western reclamation projects, would have their detrimental power further extended over the Nation.

Meanwhile TAFT and his allied monopolists have placed the Reed bill before the interests of 50,000,000 renters.

Democrats prevented passage of the Reed railroad bill in the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Republicans are protecting their backers in the Eightieth Congress.

All this even at the cost of the destruction of the American home through spiraling rent costs.

Now it looks as if the conspiracy is to railroad the Reed bill through Congress in the confusion of the last days of the present session.

It is a show-down fight between the liberal Democrats who have stood for a decade and a half for the interests of the poor and middle-class citizen against the reactionary Republicans who are bent upon taking the gains away.

The Republican leopard has not even tried to change his spots. The Republican organization is openly the creature of monopoly. It would return this country to the days of the $2 wage scale, to widespread unemployment, to poverty and dependence of millions of citizens who are now living better than they ever have before.

Have you had enough?

If you don't think you have, wait until the present session of Congress is over and you have time to appraise the net results.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, in supporting the passage of the Reed-Bulwinkle bill, Senate bill 110, I wish to state that I have listened to the arguments pro and con in connection with this bill to the limit that my other duties in the Senate would permit.

I realize that all of us become very earnest when we are supporting or opposing something in which we are deeply interested and it is difficult to put in their proper places our personal interest and the interest of our own States and communities to the end that we look at the picture as a whole, carefully weighing the facts in the interest of all the people of the Nation.

I have been much amazed at the criminations and recriminations which have been made in connection with this bill.

I wish to say that I know the executives and department heads of many of our transportation companies throughout the United States. Taking them all in all, they are as fine a group of men as I know in any branch or in any group of our American life. In a great many cases, probably more than in any other business, the top railroad executives of today are the workers of yesterday.

I still carry in my mind the case of Harahan, who became president of the Illinois Central Railroad and was killed at Terre Haute a great many years ago. He, a poor Irish boy, started as a track walker on the Illinois Central at $1 a day and rose to the presidency of that great company.

I think it is unfortunate for any of us to condemn all the leaders of any industry because such condemnation is not fair in the United States of America, nor does it help us to come to a decent and fair understanding of the problems confronting us.

The management and working people of the transportation companies in the United States have given to the United States the greatest transportation system in the world. They have performed a feat in war transportation which, if properly appraised, would be rated as one of the great accomplishments of the war. I say that advisedly, because I have heard General Eisenhower and other leaders of our forces say repeatedly that had it not been for the railroads and our magnificent transportation system, we never could have done what we did do in the war.

General Eisenhower himself told me that communications and transportation were the two most important elements in waging war, because without them, efficiently operated, neither Army nor supplies could move; and that would mean we could not carry on an offensive war.

The pending bill, to my mind, carries none of the serious implications which have been attributed to it by those who oppose it.

Some of my finest friends in the Senate are opposed to it because they feel their sections of the country have been discriminated against in rates over the past 50 years. Perhaps they have been. I am not here to speak on that subject. If they have been, such discrimination should be cured, and equity and justice should be evenly spread throughout the United States in the transportation system as well as in every other segment of our American life.

To me this bill simply says that certain joint-rate bureaus and conferences are vital to the establishment of rates of transportation, schedules, and the other things cited in section 2 of the bill.

The fact is that these procedures have been in effect for 50 years, and only in the past few years has the Department of Justice seen fit to question these acts as being in violation of the antitrust laws of the Nation.

I am as much opposed to monopoly and the inequities of coercion, threat, and intimidation, which deprive Americans of the right of free action as is any other Member of the Senate.

Nothing in this bill gives any railroad or any group of railroads the right to indulge in intimidation, coercion, reprisals, or conspiracy, so far as I can see, in connection with the conferences which are vital and necessary if the railroads are to arrive at rates, schedules, and the other things covered in the bill.

As I uderstand this bill, if any railroad or group of railroads or transportation companies indulge in practices not approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission, as defined in the bill, such railroads will not in any way be exempted from the antitrust laws of the United States. Even the Department of Justice or any transportation company or any citizen has a right to request review of any approval given by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

I cannot see how the decisions in the Georgia and Lincoln, Nebr., cases will be affected in any way by the passage of this bill. The objectives of this bill were conceived long before any suits were instituted by Georgia or by the Department of Justice at Lincoln, Nebr.

If this bill is passed and becomes law, it will say that the representatives of the people of the United States believe that the transportation companies should be permitted to continue their processes of arriving at rate schedules, and so forth, and that as long as they keep within the scope of the agreements made by them and approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission, they will not be subject to persecution or prosecution.

Right here I should like to say that every Member of the Congress has something to think about in connection with the difference between persecution by the Department of Justice and prosecution in the proper sense of the word. If we want to break down the American system which has grown up under the general direction of private individuals, I know of no better way to do it than to use the Department of Justice for persecution and harassment, rather than to use it properly in prosecuting for wrongdoing.

Mr. President, notwithstanding many statements to the effect that Senate bill 110 has as its purpose the welding together of monopoly in the railroad industry, the true facts reveal that this proposed legislation is needed for the purpose of establishing for the future a procedure necessary to carriers regulated by the Interstate Commerce Commission, because of the nature of the industry of which they are a part.

Individual corporate entities within the railroad industry are completely interdependent, exchanging equipment, rights-of-way, and contracts, to the end that this Nation is served by a continuous, standardized, efficient transportation system.

All this is necessary to make it possible for the producer of lettuce in California's Imperial Valley to place his product on the table of a Boston household, for the

producer of oranges in Florida to put his product in a northern market, and for fish caught in Alaskan waters to be put on the rails in the State of Washington and be handled by three or four railroads to the end that it promptly reaches grocers in Washington, D. C.

It was because of this interdependence of the individual railroads that the Interstate Commerce Commission, the first of the Federal regulatory agencies, was created in 1887. It was created to safeguard the public interest; and it has done a good job, as is attested to by all elements affected by that industry.

The enactment of this bill is necessary to clarify, through the expression of the Congress, the confusion which has arisen in recent years from the assertion of the Department of Justice and others that a conflict exists between the rate-making authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the antitrust laws of the United States.

I think we should take note of the fact that this bill has received the unqualified endorsement of 48 States and Federal governmental authorities; 20 carrier organizations; 85 shipper, traffic, and transportation organizations; 145 agricultural and livestock organizations; 108 business organizations; and 552 chambers of commerce, civic, and other organizations—a total of 958 responsible organizations, all of whom would be affected by its enactment.

To my amazement, I have heard it said on the Senate floor that the very fact that all our business institutions, traffic associations, and the various agencies of business throughout the United States are supporting this bill is a reason it should be defeated. I cannot go along with that kind of reasoning. I thought we in the Senate are here to represent the people of the United States, and not particularly the Justice Department. I thought that the Department of Justice was only an agency of the Government; I never dreamed that its purpose was to interfere with the proper conduct of business and the interest of the people as a whole.

The people who are supporting this bill, as it is now before us, represent millions upon millions of American citizens who are making the wheels go around to produce the revenue from which this Government, through taxation, derives its only power to exist.

If we are to stand and sneer at them or question this bill because they support it, then all I can say is that the future of this great country is in jeopardy.

Mr. President, I should like to say that today the history of the world shows conclusively that every nation and every people who have set about to destroy their leaders and thinkers and doers and kill the genius of the nation ended in the junk pile; and under such conditions the common man is far worse off than he is under any other conditions. So it is that our Nation will be far worse off if we in Congress stand off and sneer at the genius and the thinkers and the doers and leaders of our Nation.

Senate bill 110 will not relieve the railroad industry of responsibility under the antitrust laws in any respect, other than in the field of rate agreements; and in that case the bill provides what in my opinion are complete safeguards of the public interest, through the definition of the responsibilities of the Interstate Commerce Commission in the matter of rate establishment.

I quote from page 7 of Senate Report 44, which accompanies Senate bill 110, from the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee:

> The bill leaves the antitrust laws to apply with full force and effect to carriers, so far as they are now applicable, except as to such joint agreements or arrangements between them as may have been submitted to the Interstate Commerce Commission and approved by that body upon a finding that the object of the agreement is appropriate for the proper performance by the carriers of service to the public, that the agreement will not unduly restrain competition, and that it is consistent with the public interest as declared by Congress in the national transportation policy.

In connection with this alleged abridgment of the antitrust laws, which it has been suggested is provided by this bill, I should like to suggest that section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act permits the merger of two or more carriers, when approved and authorized by the Interstate Commerce Commission; and when that process has been completed, the antitrust laws do not apply, and the companies involved have complete immunity from the operations of the antitrust laws.

Senate bill 110 would authorize the establishment of rates, when regulated and approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission. This, it seems to me, is a clear analogy. I cannot see what there is about the fixing of rates under the method provided in this bill which differs from what is involved in the case of mergers permitted by section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act. If the public interest is protected in the one case by the Interstate Commerce Commission, it most certainly is in the other.

In the face of this Commission's splendid history, it is not now proper to imply that it is incompetent to administer in the field of rate fixing, or to suggest that such a limited authorization is a substitute for the antitrust laws in policing the intent of Congress.

If we do not give the Interstate Commerce Commission power to regulate the rate conferences and committees, how is this problem to be dealt with? No one seriously proposes that all rate conferences and committees be abolished. Even the Department of Justice admits that consultations and conferences among the railroads about rate changes are necessary.

The courts cannot and will not regulate the conduct of the rate conferences and committees. They will decide that certain specific practices are illegal under the law, and will enjoin the repetition of those practices; but the courts will not establish or attempt to administer any system of general regulation. They have no constitutional authority to do so. That is primarily a legislative function. The courts do not have the facilities to undertake administrative regulation. The courts themselves have frequently said that they will not enter decrees that have the effect of requiring the court to undertake the continuing administration and regulation of an industry or of its practices. History shows that it is impossible to settle the problem of rate conferences and committes by litigation.

After the decision of the Supreme Court in *United States* v. *Trans-Missouri Freight Association* (166 U. S. 290) and *United States* v. *Joint Traffic Association* (171 U. S. 505), the railroads modified and changed the organization and the rules of the rate conferences in an attempt to bring them into line with what the railroads believed the antitrust laws required.

For nearly 50 years, everyone supposed that the rate conferences and committees, as changed and modified, were not unlawful. In fact, in 1899, Attorney General Griggs handed down an opinion holding that it was not unlawful for the railroads to establish a classification committee which established common freight classifications to which the railroads agreed. Then, a few years ago, the Department of Justice attacked the rate conferences and committees as illegal combinations.

Let us assume that the Department of Justice wins the suit that it has brought against the railroads in the United States district court at Lincoln, Nebr. Then the railroads will change their form of organization, just as they did after the two earlier decisions, but it will still be possible for some later Attorney General to make a new attack upon the rate conferences and committees—an attack based either upon changed conditions or upon some new theory as to the meaning and application of the antitrust laws.

When that happens we shall be in the same position as we are today. The time has come to end the uncertainty and confusion about the legality and the operation of rate conferences and committees. How much harassment can the railroads and transportation companies stand and yet function efficiently? The railroads face many serious problems in the future.

It has also been suggested by opponents of this bill that because of the pending Georgia and Lincoln cases the bill represents an attempt to beat the courts to the punch with legislation.

I should like to point out that the original Bulwinkle bill, House bill 2720, was introduced on May 17, 1943. The Georgia suit was filed on June 19, 1944, 13 months later, and the Lincoln suit was filed on August 23, 1944, 15 months later. Clearly, the bill was drafted and introduced before action in the courts commenced.

Mr. President, the merits of this bill require consideration by the Congress, regardless of the pending antitrust litigation against the railroads.

This bill is prospective in its operation and does not have the effect of giving the railroads immunity for anything illegal that they may have done in the past.

Georgia's suit in the Supreme Court against the railroads is a suit that charges the railroads with having combined and conspired to fix rates, by coercion, that discriminate against Georgia.

This bill does not give any immunity to any coercive combination. Paragraph 6 leaves such a combination subject to the antitrust laws, just as it is today.

Nothing in the language of the bill purports to prevent the Department of Justice from carrying on its suit that now is pending in the United States District Court for the District of Nebraska. If the Department of Justice can prove the allegations it has made in that case, it might be entitled to injunctive relief, notwithstanding the passage of this bill.

I suppose that the court in the Nebraska case, in reading the Interstate Commerce Act and the antitrust laws together, could decide, if the facts so warrant, that the antitrust laws govern, notwithstanding the Interstate Commerce Act. The pending bill would, so far as rate cases are concerned, limit the area of operation of the antitrust laws.

There is no possible reason for awaiting the outcome of the litigation before enacting this legislation.

The problem raised by the rate conferences and committees is primarily a legislative problem. It is a problem of defining the general standards that shall govern the conduct of these organizations in the future, and the problem of authorizing an agency to administer and enforce those standards.

We cannot expect the courts to solve this problem. The courts do not legislate. They do not lay down general rules of conduct for the future. The courts decide specific controversies.

Let us assume, for the moment, that both the State of Georgia and the Department of Justice win their pending suits against the railroads. The decrees in those suits would not settle the general problem. The decrees would merely enjoin the railroads from continuing to perform certain specific acts that they have committed in the past.

As new questions arose on new facts, more litigation would arise; and the whole subject would be left in the confusion and uncertainty which envelop it today.

There might be dozens of lawsuits, and the problem of laying down a general rule of conduct for the rate conferences and committees in the future would still not be solved. That is the problem with which this bill deals.

I doubt very much whether in solving this problem Congress would get much assistance from the decisions of the Court in the Georgia and the Lincoln cases. In those decisions the Court would decide whether specific acts that the railroads had committed in the past were illegal, but I doubt whether it would throw much light on the question of how the rate conferences and committees should be regulated in the future. That is a legislative problem, and a problem that Congress should solve. It is just as much a legislative problem as is the problem of the merger and consolidation of railroads, which Congress has dealt with in section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act.

In short, Mr. President, the case for the bill may be put in this way:

The nature of the transportation industry makes it absolutely necessary that there be rate conferences and committees. Those conferences and committees should be regulated by the Interstate Commerce Commission. Congress itself should define the standards that the Commission should apply in regulating those bodies.

Since the conferences and committees are to be regulated by the Interstate Commerce Commission, any action that the railroads take in compliance with the approval and the directions of the Interstate Commerce Commission should not expose the railroads to suits or to prosecution under the antitrust laws.

I am strongly in favor of doing justice to all sections of the United States. If it is the will of the people that the railroads should be permitted to carry on as this bill will permit them to do, and if that is deemed injurious to the Georgia and Lincoln, Nebr., cases, then I should say that those cases should be confined to past actions, and not future cases or conduct of the railroads.

If when we get through with this bill there are opportunities for injustice and inequity to be done to certain sections of the country, we must find a way to cure that situation. To my mind, the protection and preservation of the right of independent action by any railroad or group of railroads as defined in this bill should take care of local or regional conditions. Coercion, conspiracy, threats, and intimidation are not removed by this bill from the application of the antitrust laws.

I am strongly in favor of the passage of Senate bill 110, simply for the reason that I believe it will provide an appropriate way, in accordance with established precedent, under which our great transportation system can function successfully and effectively. It is my earnest hope that all of us, after careful reflection, will cease to attack unjustly the directors of the great transportation system of the United States, and, instead, will properly hold them responsible for fair treatment to their clients and a just relationship among themselves to the same extent that we hold other segments of our American life responsible.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, all last week the Senate Chamber resounded with a continuous declaration that the bill under consideration would complete the monopoly of railroads over the traffic of the United States. It was repeated that the bill would remove all competition and enable railroad carriers to impose any sort of rates upon the commerce of the country that they desired.

Over the last 40 years the rate-bureau method of making rates has come to be standard. Since enactment of the Transportation Act of 1920 procedure of these bureaus has been uniform. Virtually all rail rates have been made by this method.

From 1921 to 1946 the rates charged by railroads actually decreased nearly 24 percent per ton-mile.

The average ton-mile earnings of the railroads on all traffic was 1.275 cents in 1921; in 1946 the figure was 0.978 cent. In other words, the railroad revenue per ton-mile decreased 23.3 percent. How many other services or commodities can any Senator name the prices of which in 1946 were 76.7 percent of the charge 25 years ago?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted, as part of my remarks, a table showing the average revenue per ton-mile by years, through all years from 1921 to 1946, inclusive, also the average revenue per passenger-mile through this same period, the average hourly pay of employees, and a comparison of the unit price of railroad materials and supplies by years, from 1921 through 1946, inclusive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Revenue per ton-mile and per passenger-mile versus wage rates and material prices—railways of class I in the United States, calendar years 1921 to 1946, inclusive

Year	Average revenue per ton-mile		Average revenue per passenger-mile		Average straight-time wage rate per hour		Index of average unit prices of railway materials and supplies (1921=100)
	Cents	1921=100	Cents	1921=100	Cents	1921=100	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
1921	1.275	100.0	3.086	100.0	60.8	100.0	100.0
1922	1.177	92.3	3.027	98.1	59.6	98.0	95.8
1923	1.116	87.5	3.018	97.8	59.5	97.0	103.8
1924	1.116	87.5	2.978	96.5	61.0	100.3	101.1
1925	1.097	86.0	2.938	95.2	61.8	101.6	98.4
1926	1.081	84.8	2.936	95.1	62.1	102.1	97.9
1927	1.080	84.7	2.896	93.8	63.5	104.4	95.8
1928	1.081	84.8	2.850	92.4	64.6	106.3	95.2
1929	1.076	84.4	2.808	91.0	65.8	108.2	96.3
1930	1.063	83.4	2.717	88.0	67.2	110.5	92.5
1931	1.051	82.4	2.513	81.4	68.4	112.5	86.7
1932	1.046	82.0	2.219	71.9	63.1	103.8	80.8
1933	.999	78.4	2.013	65.2	62.3	102.5	79.7
1934	.978	76.7	1.918	62.2	62.9	103.5	88.3
1935	.988	77.5	1.935	62.7	67.9	111.7	89.3
1936	.974	76.4	1.838	59.6	68.2	112.2	92.6
1937	.935	73.3	1.795	58.2	70.1	115.3	102.9
1938	.983	77.1	1.875	60.8	74.2	122.0	102.6
1939	.973	76.3	1.839	59.6	74.0	121.7	97.7
1940	.945	74.1	1.754	56.8	74.2	122.0	99.5
1941	.935	73.3	1.753	56.8	76.9	126.5	103.7
1942	.932	73.1	1.916	62.1	83.5	137.3	113.3
1943	.933	73.2	1.882	61.0	89.3	146.9	120.2
1944	.949	74.4	1.874	60.7	93.0	153.0	127.1
1945	.959	75.2	1.871	60.6	93.3	153.5	130.2
1946	.978	76.7	1.946	63.1	111.7	183.7	158.0

Source: Columns 1 and 3 from Statistics of Railways in the United States, published annually by the Interstate Commerce Commission. Column 5 computed from basic data shown in Wage Statistics of Class I Steam Railways in the United States, Statement No. M-300, published by the Interstate Commerce Commission. Columns 2, 4, and 6 computed from figures shown in columns 1, 3, and 5, respectively. Column 7 for years 1933-46, inclusive, compiled from semiannual reports of the railways to the Bureau of Railway Economics. Index for earlier years derived from price data compiled and published in Railway Age.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, it will be observed that while the revenue per ton-mile on freight has decreased from 1.275 cents to 0.978 cents, the passenger revenue per mile has decreased from 3.086 cents per mile, in 1921, to 1.946 cents, in 1946. The 1946 passenger-mile charge is only 63.1 percent of what it was in 1921. In the same period, the average straight-time pay per hour for all employees increased from 60.8 cents in 1921, to $1.117 in 1946. That is an increase of 83.7 percent. The cost to the railroads of materials and supplies increased 58 percent in the same period.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator have any figures of the receipts per ton-mile?

Mr. REED. These are the receipts per ton-mile.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. This is the average revenue per ton-mile.

Mr. REED. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator have any figures showing the over-all receipts?

Mr. REED. These are the over-all receipts.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No, this is the ratio, but not the over-all.

Mr. REED. This is not a ratio; this is the over-all revenue from all traffic in the United States, the number of tons multiplied by the number of miles divided into the revenue. This is an over-all figure.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But it is an average. I am wondering whether the Senator has a table showing the total receipts of railroads in 1921 as compared with the total receipts in 1946.

Mr. REED. I do not have.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to ask a pertinent question at that point.

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. To what extent did the traffic carried for the Government affect these rates? Government freight was carried much cheaper because of the arrangements with the land-grant railroads. Does the Senator know what part that played in these figures?

Mr. REED. I do not.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It played some part, did it not?

Mr. REED. It will play some part, yes. There was an 80 percent rate, I think, or some such rate.

Mr. President, I must request that I be not asked to yield. My time is limited.

Opponents of the bill have always proceeded, either wilfully or ignorantly, upon an erroneous basis. If, as they claim, the railroads have complete control of rates imposed upon the traffic of the country, the roads have certainly neglected to use any such power.

Every experienced traffic man knows that a majority of freight-rate changes, whether made by a bureau or in some other method or manner, are decreased. Competition between railroads, pressure from shippers from a given area, and commercial competition between large cities and great producing areas have this effect. Consistently rates decrease from any level established by the Interstate Commerce Commission. The table which I have offered is conclusive proof of this fact.

The Interstate Commerce Commission has made several Nation-wide increases in rates during the 25-year period I am discussing. Always, after a new level is established, attrition begins. Consistently rates go lower and lower until the next general increase is given.

Some months ago the Interstate Commerce Commission granted an increase in rates, to become effective January 1, 1947. The average revenue per ton-mile will be larger in 1947 than it was in 1946. The process of whittling at the rate level will then begin all over again, and, without any general increase or decrease through orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the average per ton-mile will be lower in 1950 than it will be in 1947. This has always been the case.

I also offer for the RECORD and ask to have included in my remarks at this point a table entitled "Comparative Freight Charges—Principal Countries."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MALONE in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparative freight charges—Principal countries

Country	Year ended	Average revenue per ton-mile (cents)
Great Britain [1]	Dec. 31, 1937	2.406
Germany [2]	Dec. 31, 1938	2.309
Denmark [3]	Mar. 31, 1939	2.231
Norway [4]	June 30, 1939	2.678
Australia [5]	June 30, 1938	2.128
France [6]	Dec. 31, 1937	1.953
Italy [7]	June 30, 1938	1.683
Union of South Africa [8]	Mar. 31, 1940	1.378
Sweden [9]	Dec. 31, 1939	1.425
British India [10]	Mar. 31, 1938	1.003
United States [11]	Dec. 31, 1939	.973
Canada [12]	do	.909
Japan [13]	Mar. 31, 1937	.679

[1] Annual Returns of the Capital, Traffic, Receipts and Working Expenditures, etc., of the Railway Companies of Great Britain, published by the Ministry of Transport.

[2] Geschaftsbericht der Deutsche Reichsbahn Gesellschaft.

[3] Beretning om Virksomheden, de Danske Statsbaner

[4] Norges Jernbaner, Norges Offisielle Statistikk.

[5] Summary of Australian Statistics of Transport and Communications.

[6] Statistique des Chemins de Fer, Ministere des Travaux Publics.

[7] Ministero delle Comunicazioni, Administrazione delle Ferrovie Dello Stato.

[8] Report of General Manager of Railways and Harbors.

[9] Allman Jarnvagsstatistik, Sveriges Officiella Statistik.

[10] Report by the Railway Board, Government of India.

[11] Statistics of Railways in the United States, Interstate Commerce Commission.

[12] Statistics of Steam Railways of Canada, Dominion Bureau of Statistics.

[13] Report of Department of Railways, Government of Japan.

The figure for average revenue per ton-mile in each country is obtained by dividing total freight revenue by total tons carried 1 mile.

In many instances no figures are available for war years, and the significance of such figures, if available, would be doubtful. The figures given, therefore, are for years just before the war. Insofar as the United States is concerned, present-day figures are only slightly higher than in the year shown (1939, 0.973 cent per ton-mile; 1946, 0.978).

Basic figures in each case were drawn from the official reports of railway operations in the several countries, as listed below for each of the countries shown.

Foreign currencies were converted to dollar equivalents on the basis of the average exchange rate for the period covered by the statistics in each instance, as reported by the Federal Reserve Board.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, this table shows a comparison of the average ton-mile revenue by rail carriers for one of the years 1937, 1938, or 1939. The United States and Canada have the lowest ton-mile freight rate in the world. Canada is a fraction of a mill lower than the United States.

The United States not only has the most efficient railroad transportation system in the world, but had in the test year, the lowest cost system with the exception of Canada. Japan is the only country having a lower ton-mile revenue than the United States or Canada.

In substance, all this bill does is bring rate bureaus, rate associations, and rate conferences under regulation of the Interstate Commerce Commission. Up to 1942, they proceeded without any regulation. The propriety and legality of their operations had been unchallenged for 40 years.

I repeat what I have said before. No common carrier may be legally paid for any service rendered, and no shipper may legally pay for such service unless there is a published tariff on file with the Interstate Commerce Commission, and/or the State commission, describing the service and setting out the charges.

Without tariffs, shippers could not obtain service from the carrier. Without tran portation service the commerce of the country would stop. Chaos would result.

Shipper opinion of the country was thrown into a panic in 1942, over the unexpected and wholly arbitrary action of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice. In short, shippers immediately realized the far-reaching implication of such action. That is why the shippers of the country have universally come to support this bill.

In all my contacts with transportation regulations, which have covered the last quarter of a century, I have seen nothing approaching the unanimous support which the shippers of the country have given to this legislation now under consideration.

Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] speaking a few moments ago, referred to a telegram, though I think he made the mistake of calling it a letter, which he had received from someone in Memphis. I have a copy of the telegram, which I think went to every Senator, signed by Alonzo Bennett, president of the National Industrial Traffic League. I ask permission to have the telegram included in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMPHIS, TENN., *June 16, 1947.*

Hon. CLYDE M. REED,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

I understand charges have been made during course of debate on Reed-Bulwinkle bill, S. 110, that shipper support reflects railroad

influence and domination rather than real sentiment of shippers. Such a charge has no semblance of truth and is a palpable absurdity. As president of the National Industrial Traffic League, representing 350,000 shippers, large and small, from all sections of the United States, who ship perhaps 80 percent of all tonnage moving in the United States, I know shippers of this country are virtually unanimous in favor of the bill. It is wholly unrealistic to imagine we would be influenced in such a matter by views of the railroads. In my memory there has never been a measure affecting transportation which has had such unanimity of support from all interests concerned with transportation. The hearings demonstrate this fact beyond dispute. In addition to shippers, Interstate Commerce Commission, Office of Defense Transportation, State railroad commissions, and other State governmental bodies, as well as truck, bus, inland waterway carriers, and intercoastal shipping interests appeared at hearings and testified vigorously in support of the measure. I hope none of the statements made during debate will mislead any Senator with respect to interests or position of the shippers of this country. They wish to see this bill promptly enacted into law.

ALONZO BENNETT,
President, the National Industrial Traffic League.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I will yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. The junior Senator from Georgia has submitted an amendment, with which, of course, the Senator is familiar, the effect of which, if enacted, will be that enactment of the pending bill will not affect a decision by the United States Supreme Court in the Georgia case. There are two questions I should like to ask the able Senator; first, would the pending bill, if enacted into law, affect the ruling of the Supreme Court in the Georgia case?

Mr. REED. The Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Connecticut are to discuss later that particular matter, I think. My own understanding is that passage of the pending bill would not affect the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court over the Georgia case. I have offered, to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], to accept paragraph (a), the first part of his amendment. If the Senator from Louisiana was not present when the unanimous consent agreement was entered into—and I do not think he was——

Mr. OVERTON. I was not.

Mr. REED. I am glad to advise him that 5 minutes are allowed to each side to discuss the amendments when that point is reached. We are now debating the bill itself, but there will be 5 minutes on each side to discuss the amendments which have been offered.

Mr. OVERTON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I inquire how much time remains to the opponents of the pending bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There remain 17 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I would yield 8 minutes to the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and I would yield the remaining 9 minutes to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, on the 14th day of June 1938, I made certain remarks in the Senate upon the question of a fair system of freight rates for the United States as a whole, and the removal of the discriminatory freight-rate barrier against the South. I had introduced previously Senate Resolution 296, and in my remarks on June 14, 1938, at page 9180, I stated the purpose of that resolution to be:

That the Interstate Commerce Commission, which has already been dealing with this general subject for a long time, be requested by the Senate to make a study of this problem of interterritorial freight-rate differences and inequalities, and report back to the Senate at the beginning of the next session with respect to any plan it may be able to conceive of which will eliminate these inequalities and these inequities, so that all the producers of the same commodity will compete for the same market upon the same transportation equality.

In those remarks, at page 9179, I said:

Mr. President, the Senate has just approved a conference report which for the first time commits the United States to the policy of a uniform minimum wage for the whole country, and for all phases of each industry, as soon as that minimum standard may be feasibly reached and accomplished.

The conference report and the national policy now, therefore, commit us to reaching that universal minimum as soon as it may be reached without doing injustice to any part of an industry or to any section of the country.

We can never reach equality in ability to meet one another in competition, for the market of a given product, so long as there are in this country inequalities in freight rates such as those which now exist, which penalize nearly four-fifths of the whole country.

Then I said:

I wonder if Senators are aware of the fact that Mr. Joseph B. Eastman, speaking in a report in 1934 (S. Doc. 110), said this about that subject:

"An objectionable phase of the railroad situation for many years has been the maintenance of regional differences and distinctions which are very imperfectly related to differences in cost and to territorial boundary lines, Chinese walls where rate systems and practices change."

Then I said:

Mr. President, this wage-and-hour bill has committed us to the policy of paying, wherever possible, the same minimum wage in Atlanta, Ga., in Dallas, Tex., or in New York City, for the same work; and we cannot be expected to meet that requirement if the producers of the South and the West and the far West, in order to get to the great markets of this country, have to overcome a Chinese wall in the form of a discriminatory freight-rate structure.

That appeared, Mr. President, in the RECORD of 1938, under date of June 14. Subsequent to that time, the Interstate Commerce Commission, under the principles laid down by the Congress in the Transportation Act of 1940, has promulgated decisions which have led to a measure of relief from the burden under which the South has previously labored, with respect to discriminatory freight rates. The Supreme Court of the United States in the Georgia case has laid down salutary principles of law, protecting unfavored regions of the country against the discriminations of the past.

Mr. President, I oppose the pending bill, not because I lack confidence in the Interstate Commerce Commission, for I have confidence in that body, in the integrity and the high purpose of its membership. But, Mr. President, because the pending bill, if enacted into law, would retard the progress of the program under which the South and the West at long last are becoming emancipated from the economic servitude of the past. I oppose this bill because, Mr. President, when monopoly is at an all-time peak in America, it is no time to strengthen or to risk strengthening monopoly. That is what the pending bill does, Mr. President. The bill would exempt the railroads from prosecution under the antitrust laws even if they violated the antitrust laws. What the bill does, Mr. President, is to give certain corporations a permit to commit economic crimes. I see no reason why the railroads or other carriers should be set aside in a class unto themselves. We deny the right of price-fixing to the lumber industry, to the steel industry, and to other service industries; therefore, Mr. President, it is not proper that that privilege should be awarded to the transportation industry. I am regardful of what the railroads have contributed to the strength, to the greatness, to the power of this country, I honor them, we want to see them continue to grow; but, Mr. President, they have grown to their present strength, America has reached its present power, under the law of the present; which the pending bill proposes to change.

I know of no circumstances, Mr. President, to justify the Congress in wrapping the cloak of immunity around the railroads of America and others engaged in the transportation business, so that by the process of rate fixing, which might be called price fixing, they may strangle the economy of America or any part of it.

Those who favor the bill say they believe in private enterprise. Let them practice private enterprise. If competition is the life of trade in our general commerce, it is the life of trade in the transportation industry. We all know that competition has made our transportation system the greatest transportation facility in the world. We know that there is no substitute for incentive; that there is no equivalent for the ambition to excel one's competitor. But, Mr. President, if the public carriers are permitted to form and combine against the public, if they are permitted to conspire together to remove transportation competition, there will be no incentive to improve or to provide a better service or a cheaper rate to the public; there will be no ambition to lead one's competitors.

Therefore, Mr. President, because the bill would hurt my South and my country; because it would strengthen the hands of monopoly; because it singles out a single class and gives that class an immunity from the laws to which other business enterprises are liable, I believe it to be discriminatory legislation contrary to the public interest, and I hope that it shall not have the sanction of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is recognized for 9 minutes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I listened with a good deal of interest to

the statement made by the Senator from Kansas, in charge of the bill, and I thought there was displayed in it the same mistake which it seems to me is made by practically all the sponsors of the bill. The Senator from Kansas said, if I understood him correctly, that the purpose of the bill is to enable the railroads to continue the work they have been doing for 40 years through rate bureaus, conferences, and committees. If that were the fact, this would be a very different question from what it is. The bill is not limited to that. The bill goes much further, because it grants the consent of Congress to the creation of organizations and associations of a kind which do not exist today.

We have, Mr. President, for example, the Association of American Railroads. That is a voluntary, unofficial organization, created by the railroads of the United States by their own will. It has adopted its own rules and regulations, so to speak, for the administration of the functions it performs. It has adopted its own charter. But the association has no official existence. It is not an agency of Government. It is not an agency clothed by the Congress with any power. But under the bill it would become possible for it to become an agency of the Government of the United States.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Moreover, there is the very vital fact that it is responsible only to its stockholders and not to the people of the United States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Georgia is quite right. But the language of the bill is so broad that it would be possible to form a new association which could be called the Association of American Railroads, of American Pipelines, of American Motor Carriers, and of American Water Carriers, and such an association, under the terms of the bill, would be authorized to set up a private government for the entire transportation industry of America, and any agreement it made would have to be approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission, unless the agreement fell within certain narrow prohibitions mentioned in the bill. My point, Mr. President, is that it is absolutely impossible for any human mind to comprehend the combinations and permutations that would be possible once we grant the authority. So when we grant the authority we must be very careful.

I have no objection to the establishment of the rate bureaus where conferences may be held among the carriers to determine what the rates may be; but I want the Members of the Senate to realize perfectly what would be legalized under the bill even beyond the matter of the creation of associations and organizations. Let me give an example. There is in my State a great railroad known as the Union Pacific Railroad, which has performed great service to the people of the West, and without which the great West could not have been opened. I have the greatest admiration for what has been done by the men who operated that railroad in the past. But under this bill it would be expressly possible for the Union Pacific Railroad to enter into an agreement by which it would be bound to maintain a rate between Cheyenne, the capital of my State, and Evanston, a town all the way across the State at the extreme western end, which would be the same or have a definite relationship with a rate on the same commodity maintained by the Pennsylvania Railroad between Philadelphia and Pittsburgh.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. REED. But both rates, to be effective, would have to have the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course. There is no doubt about that. But we are now proposing by this bill to grant to the railroads the power to form the organizations by which that sort of thing could be compelled. I have talked the matter over with representatives of the American Association of Railroads, and it was explained to me: "Why, of course, a thing of that kind has got to be done." Take the case of salt. Salt, I was told, is shipped from Louisiana to Chicago. Salt is shipped from Michigan to Chicago. It is shipped from other places to Chicago. Therefore, the argument went, it is essential that railroads operating in different areas should have the right to agree upon the rates to be enforced in these totally different territories, areas and regions, and it would be possible, therefore, for railroads in one section of the country to enforce a rate upon a railroad in another section of the country, and maintain the differential of which the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] spoke earlier today when he pointed out so eloquently and forcefully that all during his adult life he has been living upon the southern bank of the Ohio River, and has seen a differential effected by the railroads which has granted a preference to the industries which were established upon the north bank of the river.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Does not the record show that the Interstate Commerce Commission can and does consider not more than 2 percent of these rates?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, it cannot consider any large percentage. The great bulk of rates must be agreed to by the railroads themselves. But here we are granting to new organizations and new associations an authority which is mandatory upon the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator stated that only 2 percent of the rates would be examined by the Interstate Commerce Commission. How many does he think would be looked into by the Department of Justice?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have never indulged in speculation in that connection. I doubt whether it would be even one-tenth of one percent of what the Interstate Commerce Commission examines.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, has all time on the bill expired? Will the Senator from Kansas yield to me?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I think the time of the opponents has expired.

I yield myself 2 minutes in order to answer the Senator from Wyoming, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON].

The Senator from Wyoming mentioned salt rates as an example of how discrimination might occur. I participated in the biggest salt-rate case that was ever brought, the Salt Rate Case of 1923. Chicago is the great commercial salt market. Kansas shipped salt into Chicago, or would have shipped salt except for a high-freight rate. Louisiana ships salt; Ohio and New York ship salt; Michigan ships salt. So far as the railroads maintaining a discriminatory-rate structure are concerned, which barred Kansas from the Chicago market, the Interstate Commerce Commission fixed rates from Michigan to Chicago, from Ohio to Chicago, from Kansas City to Chicago, and from Louisiana to Chicago, with a fair relationship, all things considered, each to the other.

The Senator argues from an entirely false premise, or from no premise at all, when he uses such an illustration to attempt to show how discrimination might result.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for half a minute?

Mr. REED. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Wyoming to make reply.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is very kind.

I was leading up to a statement when time caught up with me. That statement was that I have submitted a number of amendments which I have discussed with the Senator from Kansas. I believe that some of them are acceptable to him. They will go far toward abolishing the possibility of discrimination, an abuse which I fear is inherent in the bill.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I repeat what I have said before. The Senator from Wyoming has made a most intelligent approach to this question. He has submitted a number of amendments. I went over them thoroughly yesterday. Last night I had printed a form of the bill showing some of the amendments submitted by the Senator from Wyoming, which I will accept. That print has been or will be distributed. I shall take time when we come to consider the amendments.

I now yield to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON].

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, the allegation has been made that it is only the railroads who are interested in the bill. I hold in my hand a telegram which arrived this morning, addressed to me. It is similar to dozens of others which I have received. It reads as follows:

NEW BRITAIN, CONN., *June 18, 1947.*
Senator BRIEN MCMAHON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I understand charges have been made during course of debate on Reed-Bulwinkle bill

(S. 110) that shippers support reflects railroad influence and combination rather than real sentiment of shippers. This is not true. We as shippers would like very much to see this bill enacted into law. Urge your support.

STANLEY WORKS,
J. M. STUART.

Mr. President, what I wish to say will not consume very much time. The Reed-Bulwinkle bill looks to the future. It applies to agreements which may in the future be submitted to the Interstate Commerce Commission for its approval. Agreements which are thus approved by the Commission may not thereafter be made the subject of prosecution by the Department of Justice. But before such agreements may acquire that status they must in the Commission's judgment measure up to certain standards which are prescribed in the bill.

What standards must be complied with before any agreement made by the railroads can be approved?

First, the agreement must not unduly restrain competition.

Second, the agreement must not curb the free and unrestricted right of every party to the agreement to act contrary to and independently of any decision of any group reached under the agreement.

Third, the object of the agreement must be appropriate for the proper performance of transportation service to the public.

Fourth, the agreement must promote the national transportation policy which has been established—by whom? By the railroads? By the Supreme Court? By the Department of Justice? By the Congress of the United States?

If the Commission finds that the agreements entered into comply with the tests which I have suggested, and if they are in conformity with those standards, then the agreements may not be attacked by the Department of Justice. Having had some experience with questions of this kind, I say that the reasonableness of rates cannot be settled before a jury in a criminal case, or on the hustings, or anywhere else except before the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Congress has created the Interstate Commerce Commission for one express purpose, and that is to regulate the transportation agencies which are the subject of the pending bill. All the bill does is to apply the regulatory power already entrusted to the Commission. The Commission is charged by Congress with the duty of enforcing the national transportation policy as Congress has declared it. To discharge that duty, the Commission has been given specific powers of regulation. In enacting this bill, Congress simply reinforces and strengthens those powers by extending them to agreements among the transportation agencies already subject to the Commission's regulation.

This is not an interference with the continued prosecution of the pending suit of the State of Georgia, and the case pending in the court at Lincoln, Nebr. The bill would not in any way prevent the courts in those suits from going ahead and making a final decision as to whether the past conduct charged in those suits was actually committed and, if committed, whether it was in violation of existing law. All the bill does is to do what Congress may properly do and should do—to declare the national policy for the future and to establish standards to guide the agency delegated by Congress to administer that policy.

The State of Georgia alleges discrimination and coercion. Discrimination will still be forbidden if the Reed-Bulwinkle bill becomes law. Coercion will likewise be forbidden. There seems to be running through the thread of this debate the idea that the bill would permit the railroads of the country to get together and, under cloak of law, coerce their competitors, their shippers, and their customers. Such a right is not granted by the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Connecticut a question in connection with the third provision which he mentioned. A point was raised which was of very much interest to me, and that is, if I correctly interpreted the remarks of the distinguished Senator, there would be no impairment of service through any arrangement or agreement which might be made, even by one railroad, unless it had the authority or the sanction of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. McMAHON. That is correct. Furthermore, I will say to the Senator that there was one railroad witness who appeared before the committee and who opposed this bill. I cross-examined him and went through every section of the bill one by one. If the Senator will turn to Mr. Purcell's testimony—he is vice president of the C. & O. Railway—the Senator will find the statement in his testimony that it is impossible to operate the railroads of the United States as a national transportation system without conferences between the railroads as to rates, schedules, safety measures, and other matters which must be considered if the railroads are to operate as a unified system.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. To me that is one of the salient points of the whole debate; that is, as to impairment of service. It is one thing to have a rate, but it is another thing for the railroads to furnish the service. As I read the testimony and the statements I gathered the same impression as that covered by the interpretation placed upon it by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut. I certainly would not want to be misinterpreting it, because I feel that even though the Interstate Commerce Commission has the final say, there should not be curtailment of service by any act of Congress. I think that point should be made very clear to the Members of the Senate. I understand it exactly as does the Senator from Connecticut. I say it is a salient point. We should have no impairment of service, even though the rates should be considered.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I yield 8 minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, for the past several days the argument has been made by those opposing Senate bill 110 that the bill is an effort to prevent an arm of the Government from enforcing the law and that it will promote and protect a monopoly in the operation of the railroads.

If the Department of Justice is to be an issue in this matter, I suggest that it should be remembered that since the original Court-packing proposal there has been carried on a most carefully planned program of the Justice Department to reduce the Federal judiciary to the control and domination of the Executive branch of Government. For 14 years the Federal district judges have been carefully selected with special emphasis upon their so-called liberal philosophy. As a result, there are few Federal judicial districts in which the Department of Justice may not find a sympathetic judge before whom it can try out its theories of a controlled economy.

Thus, in considering this legislation, we are faced with the simple issue of whether the Congress desires to abandon the railroads to the Department of Justice whose record during the past 14 years has been one of out-and-out business persecution, or, shall we delegate to the Interstate Commerce Commission the necessary authority to regulate and control this supremely important public utility service?

To leave the railroads at the mercy of the Department of Justice is to place this interstate activity in the hands of the Executive branch of Government and beyond the control of the Congress. On the other hand, if we delegate this regulatory function to the Interstate Commerce Commission, it will retain in Congress its exclusive constitutional prerogative to regulate interstate commerce.

The Interstate Commerce Commission is one of the oldest agencies of Government, having been established by congressional action more than 60 years ago. It is a bipartisan Commission. It has performed its duties in an acceptable and satisfactory manner. Its operations are circumscribed within those powers expressly delegated to it under the laws enacted by the Congress. This bill provides, in affirmative terms, that no order of the Commission shall be entered except after all interested parties, including the Attorney General of the United States, shall have been afforded an opportunity for a hearing. I insist there is not the slightest ground for the argument that the enforcement of the antitrust laws or any other law applicable to the operation of railroads will be impaired by this legislation. The Attorney General is free to complain to the Commission of any action taken under approved agreements, and, under other sections of the Interstate Commerce Act, to appeal from any ruling of the Commission or prosecute the violation of any order of the Commission that may result in monopolistic practices.

No one opposing the bill has attempted to explain how rates and schedules affecting rail shipments that move over the lines of interconnecting carriers can be established except by some sort of an agreement of the participating carriers. There is no other method by which it can be done. The shippers are cognizant of this fact. Representatives of literally

thousands of shippers have been before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committees of the House and Senate to explain this simple fact. Certainly, these agreements must be regulated and controlled and even supervised, but it is the constitutional function of the Congress to do so, and not some other branch of the Government. The Interstate Commerce Commission has been set up for such express purposes.

No one with the slightest conception of the complexities of railroad ratemaking can seriously argue that a speedy and adequate method of promulgating through freight rates by joint carriers is not absolutely necesary to the efficient operation of the railroads. The regulation and control of such public function by the Congress is a necessary attribute of the regulation of interstate commerce which is the exclusive constitutional prerogative of the Congress and not of the executive or the judiciary.

I want to emphasize again the certainty that if this legislation is not enacted, the Justice Department will, in fact, actually take over the physical operation of the railroads. Many important key industries are already being operated by the young theorists of the Justice Department under consent decrees which have been obtained by the most flagrant coercion and because the managers of business were afraid of the kind of justice that might be meted out by the judicial philosophy that presently obtains in most of our courts, if they dared defend against the Department's charges. The consent decrees under which all interstate transportation of crude oil is carried on is a good example of how this system works. Every detail of operations of this important industry is subject to control and direction of the Department. At intervals of twice each year the management of every interstate oil pipe line in the United States must appear before the Antitrust Division of the Department and lay before it every item of operation in the most minute detail, and, if not in complete accord with the ideas of the "economist-lawyers" of the Department, the pipe lines are required to revamp and adjust their operations in line with the departmental theories. These operations are carried on under continually expressed threats of contempt proceedings. As many Members of the Senate know, this same fate has befallen other large segments of our national industrial economy, such as the meat packing industry and many others. The action now pending at Lincoln, Nebr., against the western railroads, is for the sole purpose of eventually bringing those roads under a consent decree by which the Department of Justice may take from the Congress the constitutional authority to regulate their operations.

Mr. President, I urge upon the Senate the propriety of this amendment to the Interstate Commerce Act as a constitutional obligation of the Congress to regulate commerce. I trust we shall assume that obligation.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I want to speak briefly with relation to the proposed amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] to this bill. I want to speak specifically on subdivisions (b) and (c) of that amendment.

First. Subsection (a) would merely provide that the enactment of the bill into law would not deprive the Supreme Court of jurisdiction to hear and determine the case of Georgia against the Pennsylvania Railroad Company et al., Docket No. 11, original, October 10, 1945, or any proceeding for the enforcement of the provisions of any decree entered in that suit. As I read that provision, it would allow the Supreme Court to hear the case, enter a decree, and enforce its decree, and the bill, if enacted into law, would in no way affect the decision or the enforcement of any decree. However, I would be concerned with the next paragraph of the amendment. It would provide that the enactment of the section of the original bill upon which we are now working would not—

(b) change any principle of substantive or procedural law otherwise applicable in the determination of such suit or proceeding, or deprive any party thereto of any relief to which such party would be entitled but for the enactment of this section; or—

The next paragraph must be read in conjunction with paragraph (b). It is paragraph (c):

(c) render lawful the performance of any past or future act which shall have been found by the Supreme Court in such suit or proceeding to be unlawful or which shall have been prohibited by the terms of any decree entered therein or any supplement thereto or any modification thereof.

In other words, if we adopt the Russell amendment as a part of this measure, and if in the case now pending before the Supreme Court, the Court were to hold contrary to what it is proposed that we now make the law, all that we enact would be absolutely void, and would be no act at all.

Therefore, I think it is clear that if we adopt paragraphs (b) and (c) as part and parcel of this measure, in effect we would nullify the entire act insofar as it would conflict with anything the Supreme Court could, under the pleadings, decide in the case now pending before it.

So, as I see this matter, if it is the desire of the Congress in any way to change the present law, we could not do so by including this amendment as a part of the act.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I shall be compelled to vote against this amendment—not because of the first paragraph, paragraph (a), which states that the enactment of the section shall not deprive the Supreme Court of jurisdiction, but because of the inclusion of paragraphs (b) and (c). With paragraphs (b) and (c) included, I certainly would be compelled to vote against the amendment, because then it would nullify all that is intended to be done by the pending bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. In other words, the Senator from Michigan would be willing to have the Supreme Court determine what right the State of Georgia had, but he would have the Congress deny it any remedy whatever.

Mr. FERGUSON. No; I think that is provided for in the first paragraph which relates to enforcement.

Mr. RUSSELL. I cannot see that at all. That is tied in with the provision that it will not deprive the Supreme Court of jurisdiction. But under the terms of the bill, the State of Georgia would be denied any remedy whatever, even though the Court had jurisdiction. The second and third paragraphs of the amendment are necessary if we are to protect the rights of the States. Those paragraphs read as follows:

(11) The enactment of this section shall not—

(b) change any principle of substantive or procedural law otherwise applicable in the determination of such suit or proceeding, or deprive any party thereto of any relief to which such party would be entitled but for the enactment of this section; or

(c) render lawful the performance of any past or future act which shall have been found by the Supreme Court in such suit or proceeding to be unlawful or which shall have been prohibited by the terms of any decree entered therein or any supplement thereto or any modification thereof.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Georgia is referring only to the Georgia case——

Mr. RUSSELL. That is all it applies to.

Mr. FERGUSON. If it was part and parcel of the Georgia case, I would not say there was anything wrong with the amendment. But when we come to paragraph (c), we find that it makes all such matters lawful even though they have previously been found unlawful by the Supreme Court in connection with the Georgia suit; but that provision of the amendment would not apply to any other litigant.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is the way I read the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is not the intent of the amendment. Its intent is made crystal clear in paragraph (c), which states: "render lawful the performance of any past or future act which shall have been found by the Supreme Court"—please note the words—"in such suit or proceeding"—applying to the Georgia case in the Supreme Court——

Mr. FERGUSON. If the amendment is only for the purpose of applying to the Georgia litigation, that is one thing; but as I read the amendment, it would be applicable, not only to the Georgia litigants, but also to all litigants in the future, insofar as the particular law is concerned.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is not the intention of the amendment, and I do not think that would be its effect. The amendment is designed solely and exclusively to protect the rights of the sovereign State of Georgia in a case which now is pending in the Supreme Court of the United States. I think any construction of the amendment which would give it any other power or force is without validity.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then would the Senator from Georgia be willing to add these words:

Insofar as it relates to the plaintiff and the defendant in the Georgia case.

Mr. RUSSELL. On page 2, in line 2, after the word "party", I should be perfectly willing to add the words "to such suit" and to strike out the word "thereto", so as to make that provision read, "or deprive any party to such suit of any relief", and so forth. I should be glad to modify the amendment in that way.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would the Senator add the same words in paragraph (c)?

Mr. RUSSELL. In line 7, the amendment states "in such suit or proceeding." That does not apply to any litigation other than the Georgia case.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would the Senator from Georgia be willing to insert, after the word "proceeding," in line 7, the words "insofar as it relates to the parties to that suit"?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think that would be redundant. As thus modified, it would read:

In such suit or proceeding insofar as it relates to the parties to such suit.

But I have no objection to the addition of those words.

Mr. FERGUSON. Very well. If that addition is made, the meaning is clear to me.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no objection to the addition of that language.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kansas has 2 minutes at his disposal.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I wish to make it clear that this bill establishes no precedent. The Interstate Commerce Act has been in evolution ever since it was passed in 1887. In the beginning, the Interstate Commerce Commission had almost no power. From time to time the law has been amended, and it now includes the present section 5, of which the pending bill will be a part, as section 5a.

We have already done for the shipping industry, by means of the Shipping Act of 1916, what we propose to do in this case for the railroads. Ocean-vessel operators may make, between themselves, agreements relating to rates and services; and when they are approved by the Shipping Board, that renders those carriers immune from the operation of the antitrust laws insofar as those agreements are concerned.

Similar action was taken in 1938 for the airplane companies; they were permitted to make agreements not contrary to the public interest; and, when approved by the Civil Aeronautics Board, those agreements become lawful; and, as to them, that renders those companies free from interference by the antitrust laws.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Kansas has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment, which will be stated.

The first amendment of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was, on page 3, line 12, after the word "to" where it occurs the second time, to insert "freight classifications or to."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 6, after the word "the", to insert "initial"; and in the same line, after the word "determination", to insert "or report, or any subsequent determination or report."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 14, after the words "antitrust laws", to strike out the following proviso: *"Provided, however,* That this paragraph shall not apply to agreements, or parts thereof, dealing with matters over which the Commission has no jurisdiction", and in lieu thereof to insert the following: *"Provided,* That the approval by the Commission of any agreement concerning, or providing rules or regulations pertaining to or procedures for the consideration, initiation, or establishment of, time schedules, the interchange of facilities, the settlement of claims, the promotion of safety, or the promotion of adequacy, economy, or efficiency of operation or service shall not be deemed to be approval of any subsequent modification or amendment thereof or of any supplemental or other agreement made pursuant to any provision contained in the original approved agreement: *And provided further,* That the approval by the Commission of any agreement providing procedures for the consideration, initiation, or establishment of time schedules, the interchange of facilities, the settlement of claims, the promotion of safety, or the promotion of adequacy, economy, or efficiency of operation or service shall not be deemed to be approval of any joint or concerted action taken pursuant to any provision of such agreements."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I laid before the Senate several amendments 2 days ago, which were printed. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] and I have had several conferences with respect to the amendments. He has accepted some of the amendments. Others he has modified in a slight degree, and I think that those which have been thus agreed to between himself and the proponent of the amendments may be disposed of rather rapidly.

The Senator from Kansas has had a print of the bill, containing the amendments to which he has agreed and those which he has modified, distributed to all Members of the Senate. If it is agreeable, I shall present them verbatim.

Mr. President, I now offer the amendment which I had printed and which is lying on the desk, to be inserted on page 2, line 15.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, to make the record clear, what the Senator from Wyoming is speaking of is the last print of the bill?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No; I am referring to the print which is before the Senate, not the print the Senator from Kansas has had made. I will say to the Senator that the amendment which I offer appears on page 2, line 18, of his print. It is on line 15 of the bill which was reported by the committee.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I think we could simplify this somewhat if there were laid before the Senate the last print that was made entitled, in bold-faced type, "Amendments proposed by Mr. REED." They are a part of the O'Mahoney amendments, which, as the Senator in charge of the bill, I am willing to accept.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then I think I can expedite the whole matter if I discuss briefly, within 5 minutes, all the amendments which the Senator has agreed to accept, and those which he has modified, and then I shall seek to offer them as a whole.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Senator will offer the amendment, then the Chair will be able to administer the unanimous consent agreement. Otherwise, he cannot.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Very well. On page 2, line 15, of the bill as reported by the committee, which would be line 18 of the print offered by the Senator from Kansas, I offer an amendment, after the word "finds" to add the words "after public notice in the Federal Register and public hearing not less than 60 days thereafter."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I offer the amendment without discussion, provided the Senator from Kansas will accept it.

Mr. REED. I accept the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on page 2, line 18, of the bill as reported by the committee, I offer an amendment, to insert after the word "agreement" the words "is not unjustly discriminatory among shippers or geographical areas."

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. I wonder if the Senator would object to changing the amendment, instead of the word "among" to have it read "as between."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have no objection.

Mr. HILL. And after the word "geographical" insert the words "regions or."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Alabama has suggested a modification, so that the amendment which I offer will read as follows, after the word "agreement" to insert the words, "is not unjustly discriminatory as between shippers or geographical regions or areas, that it." I understand the Senator from Kansas agrees to that amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be modified as stated, and the question is on agreeing to the amendment as modified.

The amendment as modified was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on page 3, line 5, after the word "submit" I move to insert the words "to the Commission."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. On page 3, line 8, the Senator from Kansas has offered an amendment which varies from the one I have offered, but which I am very willing to accept in lieu thereof. Therefore I move that a new sentence be added after the word "representatives" to read as follows:

No bank or other financial institution shall be a member of any such conference, bureau, committee, or other organization.

Mr. REED. I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on page 3, lines 12 and 13, of the bill as reported by the committee, which will be page 3, lines 20 and 21, of the bill as printed at the request of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], I offer an amendment to strike out the words "matters relating to", the words "transportation under", and the word "over."

Mr. REED. And to insert.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The committee amendments have been agreed to.

Mr. REED. I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on page 4, line 17, of the bill as reported by the committee, after the word "by", I move that the words "any carrier by" be inserted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on page 6, line 6, of the bill as reported by the committee, page 6, lines 12 and 13 of the print offered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], after the name "United States" I move to insert the words "and interested State regulatory commissions or other authorities."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, there is one amendment which should be inserted on page 7 at the end of paragraph (9). The word "agreements" should be changed to "agreement."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the change is made.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I serve notice that that is the end of the agreement between the Senator from Wyoming and myself.

NO PRIVATE GOVERNMENT SHOULD BE PERMITTED

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I was about to say that myself. To my way of thinking, the most important of the amendments——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator offer his amendment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. On page 2, line 25, immediately following the word "paragraph," I move to insert the following new sentence:

No such agreement for the establishment of any association or organization composed of two or more carriers, or prescribing rules, regulations, or procedures for its consideration or any of the subjects hereinbefore specified, shall be approved by the Commission unless such agreement shall first have been submitted to and approved by the Congress by joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is the language shown on line 11, page 3, of the reprint. Is the Chair correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of my reprint, not of the reprint of the Senator from Kansas.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, with respect to this amendment I think the Senator from Kansas has been under the misapprehension that the effect of the amendment would be to transfer to Congress the responsibility of handling the great detail of rate making. It was not intended to do that, and I think under the language I have presented it would not do it.

The purpose, and the sole purpose, of the amendment is to provide that, if the carriers, acting under the authority of the proposed legislation, should form organizations to govern the transportation industry, those organizations could not be approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission, but should be approved by the Congress of the United States. This has nothing in the world to do with the fixing of the rates nor with the ordinary functioning of the rate increase. It is a recognition of the fact——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. I think certain of the Senators are somewhat confused about the unanimous-consent agreement. I should like very much to have the President pro tempore read at least paragraph 2 of the unanimous-consent agreement, which, as I understand, provides that the Senator offering an amendment shall have 5 minutes, and the Senator opposing it shall also have 5 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has stated the agreement correctly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Now, Mr. President, as I say, the purpose of the amendment is to provide that the Congress of the United States shall be advised, if the carriers undertake under this law to form organizations and associations, and to provide rules and regulations for the conduct of those associations and organizations. That is all the amendment does. It takes no power from the Interstate Commerce Commission; it takes no power from the freight bureaus, the conferences, and the committees which are proposed to be set up here. It merely recognizes the fact, Mr. President, that in the transportation system there has grown up a great tendency to create trade associations, which undertake to control and direct the activities of their members. Congress cannot run the risk of authorizing the establishment of a private government for the entire transportation system of the country.

My point is that if a trade association is to be formed among railroad carriers, or among pipe-line carriers, or among water carriers or motor carriers, or among them all, such an association, which would inevitably have the power of influencing the rates and every other aspect of the transportation system of the country, must come to Congress before it may secure any power.

The Senator from Kentucky pointed out very eloquently today that under the system which has grown up the railroads have enforced a differential in favor of States on the north bank of the Ohio, and against States on the south bank of the Ohio, the effect of which is that the railroads themselves have levied interstate tariffs, although the Constitution of the United States prohibits the States from doing so. So we have the anomalous situation, that corporations which are created by the States are doing things which the States by the Constitution are prohibited from doing. So I urge the adoption of this amendment, because, without it, we shall be delegating away the power of Congress over the transportation system of the United States. This I conceive to be the most important and necessary amendment I have offered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the proposition of the Senator from Wyoming is to require a joint resolution by Congress, before an association of two or more railroads may be set up and function. If Senators want to do that, they are advised not to pass the pending bill. If a joint resolution of Congress is to be required before the association can function, there is no use in passing the pending bill. Nobody who is sincerely in favor of the bill and the thing for which it stands—an attempt to bring rate bureaus and rate conferences under regulation—can for a moment accept the amendment. That is all I need say.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which has been printed heretofore, and which has subsequently been modified.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia offers an amendment, which the Clerk will state.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 7, immediately following line 17, it is proposed to insert the following new paragraph:

(11) The enactment of this section shall not—

(a) deprive the Supreme Court of jurisdiction to hear and determine the case of Georgia versus Pennsylvania Railroad Co., et al. Docket No. 11 (original), October term, 1945, or any proceeding for the enforcement of the provisions of any decree entered in such suit;

(b) change any principle of substantive or procedural law otherwise applicable in the determination of such suit or proceeding, or deprive any party to such suit of any relief

to which such party would be entitled but for the enactment of this section; or

(c) render lawful the performance of any past or future act which shall have been found by the Supreme Court in such suit or proceeding as it relates to the parties to such suit to be unlawful or which shall have been prohibited by the terms of any decree entered therein or any supplement thereto or any modification thereof.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I think that every Senator who has spoken in favor of the pending bill has stated that it in nowise impinges upon the rights of the State of Georgia, in the litigation which is pending in the Supreme Court at the present time. Senator after Senator has stated it was not his intention to in anywise affect the rights of the State, in the suit that is now pending. I assume there is no objection whatever to this amendment, particularly in view of the modifications made at the suggestion of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. I reserve the balance of my time thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, offered by the Senator from Georgia.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Idaho offers an amendment, which the clerk will read.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 6, line 17, immediately following "Provided,", it is proposed to insert the following: "That nothing contained in this section shall exempt any agreement, conference, or joint or concerted action from the operation of the antitrust laws so as to deny to any person or corporation who shall be injured in his or its business or property by any other person or corporation by reason of anything forbidden or declared to be unlawful by the antitrust laws of the right to sue for and recover damages as provided in the antitrust laws: *And provided.*"

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to reserve to private persons who are aggrieved or damaged by combinations and restraints of trade the right of action for triple damages which they now enjoy under the antitrust laws.

It is said by the proponents of Senate bill 110 that the bill is necessary to save railroads from the annoyance of bureaucratic interference by the Antitrust Division. They say that shippers and small railroads support the bill because they want railroads to be free from the annoying surveillance of the Justice Department.

If this is their purpose—if their purpose is merely to free the railroads from this bureaucratic interference and annoyance—if it is truly their desire not to impinge upon the rights of shippers and small railroads, then let them write into this bill a safeguard which will reserve to all private persons, to shippers, to small railroads all of the rights that they formerly had. Let the bill be purely a restriction upon Government activity, and let it retain the great private sanction of triple-damage suits.

I therefore propose that we amend the bill by reserving the private remedies for parties aggrieved by violations of the antitrust laws. My amendment merely provides that the right to sue for triple damages will continue to exist as heretofore. It will not interfere with the making of agreements. It will not interfere with the new power of the Interstate Commerce Commission to declare that agreements are in the public interest. But it will provide one small avenue to court review of agreements approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission under the Bulwinkle bill.

In my judgment, one of the great harms which this bill accomplishes is that it will practically destroy the power of the courts to review determinations of the ICC as to whether or not agreements are in restraint of trade. The Antitrust Division never had the power to make determinations; it could merely go to court to test its theory. But the ICC will make determinations which will often affect shippers adversely, and in some cases no one will be able to take them to court. We all know that the ICC has in recent years become the supine instrument of the railroad carriers.

Shippers need some protection, and while the protection afforded by my method is rather slight, it seems to me at least that much protection should be afforded. It will give shippers an opportunity to enforce the antitrust laws at their own expense. As history has shown us, the private-damage provision is a very poor substitute for enforcement by the staff of the Justice Department. It is a slender reed, but it is all that is left, and I beseech my colleagues not to take away from the shipper this last, small protection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the amendment is an impossible one. What we are trying to do by the bill is to permit the railroads in certain respects to operate without interference by the antitrust law. What the amendment seeks to do is to put the railroads back to the extent of—I do not really know what it seeks to do, but I know it should not be adopted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I offer another amendment. I shall not ask to have it read, as it is somewhat lengthy. I may say that it was originally prepared by former Senator Wheeler of Montana for the purpose of setting up an over-all Government bureau to negotiate rates for all Government bureaus with the railroads.

As I pointed out earlier in the debate on this bill, in a speech that was heard largely by empty seats, the railroads are in a very bad position to be coming around to ask for special favors from the Government.

During the war the Government paid out millions—indeed billions, by the estimate of the Justice Department—in overpayments to railroads. That represents the amount that the railroads have overcharged the Government on freight rates for wartime traffic. During the last war when the Army and the Navy transacted business with the railroads, many of its key negotiators were wearing Army or Navy uniforms but they were exemployees of the railroads. Since the war, they have returned to the railroads, at substantial promotions. In other words, they were negotiating freight rates with their former and future employers. It was all very clubby and congenial—what are a few dollars between friends—especially when Uncle Sam is footing the bill? Last August, I dug up a very thorough Budget Bureau report which said: "The Government has not only paid excessive charges in a stupendous amount before and since Pearl Harbor, but it is still paying such excess charges on presently moving traffic."

I made those charges public last August and I have hounded the Government departments to recover these railroad overcharges from that day to this, and I do not expect to stop until the Government recovers every cent wrongfully expended. It took a long time to stir up the brass hats in the War and Navy Departments, but they have finally agreed to let the Attorney General take action to recover these funds. The Justice Department estimates that the amount will run to $2,000,000,000. Let me give an illustration of the kind of overcharges that are involved.

One of the cases now pending involves crated automobiles. The railroads applied a rate of approximately 70 cents on boxed automobiles for export from Detroit to New Orleans. The Government, in order to conserve lumber and manpower decided to crate those vehicles, leaving out every other board on the box. The railroads immediately required a payment of approximately twice the rate for boxed automobiles. The Government came back and said there is nothing just or reasonable about that because there is no additional burden on the railroad, no additional expense for transporting crated automobiles rather than boxed automobiles. For a period of approximately 18 months that exorbitant double rate was applied to the crated automobiles. At the end of the 18 months the railroads acknowledged the justness of the Government's contention by publishing a new rate on crated vehicles identical to the rate on boxed vehicles. But they still have not paid back the amount they overcharged for 18 months.

There is another case where the Government was deprived of the land grant deductions to which it was entitled, from June 3, 1941, to October 1, 1946, on certain roads. This little oversight deprived the United States of America of approximately $1,000,000,000 a year in land grant benefits, the Justice Department says. I want the Government to recover these sums. I will not rest until it does recover them. But let me warn the Senate that is an uphill fight because the railroad lobby is one of the most powerful in Washington. Right now they are hard at work trying to get Congress to cut off

the suits by eliminating the appropriation for a legal staff to prosecute them. That is an ironic touch—tossing away a $2,000,000,000 claim on the pretext of economy. It reveals what some of these fellows mean by economy—everything for the big boys, nothing for the people.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Idaho has expired. If the Senator will send forward his amendment it will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The amendment offered by Mr. TAYLOR was as follows:

On page 1, between lines 2 and 3, to insert the following:

"TITLE I—INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT AMENDMENT"

On page 1, line 3, to strike out "That the," and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 1. The."

On page 7, immediately following line 17, to insert the following:

"TITLE II—ESTABLISHMENT OF FEDERAL TRAFFIC BUREAU

"SEC. 201. This title may be cited as the 'Federal Traffic Bureau Act.'

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 202. As used in this title unless the context otherwise requires—

"(1) the term 'United States' means the United States Government or any officer, department, or agency thereof (including a corporation all or substantially all of whose capital stock is owned or held by or for the United States);

"(2) the term 'carrier' means any transportation agency subject to regulation under any part of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; or under the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended; the Shipping Act of 1916, as amended; the Intercoastal Shipping Act of 1933, as amended;

"(3) the term 'Administrative tribunal' means the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Maritime Commission, and any other administrative agency now or hereafter constituted with power to regulate the rates, charges, practices, rules, or regulations of carriers;

"(4) the term 'Government traffic' or 'Government shipment' means one or more shipments of property by any mode of transportation to, from, by, or for the account of, the United States;

"(5) the term 'tariff' means any tariff, schedule, or classification, and any revision, or amendment thereof, or supplement thereto filed by any carrier, with any administrative tribunal, naming or affecting rates, ratings, charges, classifications, rules, regulations, or practices for the transportation of property;

"(6) the term 'Bureau' means the Federal Traffic Bureau established under section 203; and

"(7) the term 'Director' means the Director of the Federal Traffic Bureau.

"SEC. 203. There is hereby established an agency of the United States to be designated as the Federal Traffic Bureau to which Bureau there are hereby transferred all of the powers, duties, and responsibilities, of all departments and agencies of the Government (including corporations all or substantially all of whose capital stock is owned or held by or for the United States), with respect to the following matters, which are hereby vested exclusively in said Bureau—

"(1) the negotiation and making of all contracts for the transportation of Government traffic;

"(2) the routing, diversion, or reconsignment of Government shipments;

"(3) the representation of the United States in all proceedings before administrative tribunals relating to matters within the jurisdiction of the Bureau: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this paragraph shall be construed to deprive the Attorney General of any right, power, or duty conferred or imposed by title I of this act;

"(4) the checking, auditing, revision, and verification of bills for transportation charges for Government shipments; and

"(5) the filing and prosecution of claims, actions, suits, or proceedings for recovery of overcharges or unreasonable charges for transportation of Government shipments, or for loss of, damage to, or delay in Government shipments.

"SEC. 204. (a) The Bureau shall be administered by a Director to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall serve during good behavior and shall receive an annual salary of $12,000. The Director shall be a citizen of the United States and, during his term of office, shall have no pecuniary interest in or own any stock or bonds of any carrier or any person, firm, or corporation owning or controlling any carrier.

"(b) The Director shall, without regard to the civil-service laws, appoint and prescribe the duties of a general counsel, such assistant directors as may be necessary, a secretary for the Director, a secretary for such general counsel, and assistant Directors, and a secretary for each of such. Subject to the provisions of the civil-service laws, the Director shall appoint, and shall prescribe the duties of such other officers and employees as he shall deem necessary in exercising and performing his powers and duties. The compensation of all officers and employees appointed by the Director shall be fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

"(c) The Director may, from time to time, without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws, engage for temporary service such duly qualified experts, consulting engineers or agencies, or other qualified persons, as are necessary in the exercise or performance of the powers and duties vested in him, and shall fix their compensation without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

"(d) Within 60 days after the appointment and qualification of the Director, every officer, department, and agency of the Government (including a corporation all or substantially all of whose capital stock is owned or held by or for the United States), heretofore exercising or performing any of the powers, duties, and responsibilities transferred by this title to the Bureau, shall list upon forms to be prescribed by the Director, all officers and employees in such department, agency, or corporation, and all property, including office equipment and official records, employed in the exercise and performance of the aforesaid powers and duties, and thereafter there shall be transferred from such reporting department, agency, or corporation to the Bureau such of the officers, employees, property, including office equipment and official records, as shall be found by the President and specified by Executive order to be necessary for the efficient and prompt performance of the powers and duties of the Bureau as herein vested.

"SEC. 205. The Bureau is authorized and directed continuously to investigate and ascertain the facilities, equipment, instrumentalities, routes, and services of all carriers with respect to the availability for utilization thereof for the transportation of Government shipments, and by general or special instructions or routing guides, shall supervise and direct the selection of the carrier or carriers and the route or routes for the transportation of all Government shipments, by all consignors thereof, subject to the following considerations to control in the order named:

"(1) The quality of the transportation service required for the particular type or class of Government shipment involved.

"(2) The over-all cost of the transportation to the Government, including incidental and accessorial expenses as well as transportation charges paid the carrier.

"(3) The fair, impartial, and equitable distribution among all modes of transportation and all carriers in accordance with their respective carrier capacities.

"SEC. 206. It shall be the duty of the Bureau continuously to investigate the justness and reasonableness of all present and proposed tariffs insofar as they shall relate to or concern, directly or indirectly, any actual or potential Government traffic and to negotiate and contract with any such carrier: (1) For any change in any tariff; (2) for the establishment, for such period of time as may be agreed upon, of other just and reasonable tariffs for the transportation of Government traffic; and (3) as to the form, terms, and conditions of, and rules and regulations relating to, bills of lading and other billing papers or transportation documents covering or peraining to the transportation of Government traffic.

"SEC. 207. The Bureau, as the sole representative of the United States, shall be empowered to institute, or to intervene or participate in, any formal or informal proceeding relating to any matter within the jurisdiction of the Bureau, before any administrative tribunal, and to make such representations and introduce such evidence therein as the Bureau shall deem to be proper and necessary, and to file any petition or complaint with any such administrative tribunal as the Bureau shall deem proper or necessary in the interest of the United States.

"SEC. 208. The Bureau shall receive, audit, check, and verify all bills against the United States for the transportation of Government shipments and shall certify the correctness of such charges in writing upon the face thereof and such certification shall be final and binding upon all executive and administrative officers of the United States except as the same thereafter may be amended, corrected, or set aside by the Director, by any court, or by any competent administrative or other governmental tribunal.

"SEC. 209. The Director may, from time to time, in his discretion, establish regional, local, departmental, or agency branch offices, and may delegate and assign to such offices such powers, duties, and responsibilities as he shall determine; but in every such case, the officers and employees of such branch offices shall be subject to and report to the Director, insofar as their duties relate to the exercise of such powers, duties, and responsibilities.

"SEC. 210. (a) The Director is authorized and empowered to sue, for and in behalf of the United States, in any court or before any competent tribunal, for the recovery of any unlawful, unjust, or unreasonable charge theretofore paid by the United States for the transportation of Government ships, and for damages resulting from loss, injury, or delay thereto, or for the enforcement or for the breach of any contract relating to such charge or such transportation.

"(b) Any carrier is authorized to sue the Director, as the representative of the United States, in any district court of the United States in which district such carrier maintains a principal office or in which the Bureau maintains a principal or branch office for all unpaid charges for the transportation of Government shipments, or to enforce, or for the breach of, any contract made pursuant to this title with said Bureau.

"(c) It shall be the duty of any district attorney of the United States, under the direction of the Attorney General of the United States, upon application of the Director, to institute or defend any action, suit, or proceeding described in this section, except proceedings before an administrative tribunal.

"(d) All actions and suits against the Director under the provisions of subsection (b) shall be begun within 2 years from the

date the cause of action accrued, or within 2 years from the date of enactment of this act, whichever date is the later.

"SEC. 211. On or before the 3d day of January of each calendar year, the Director shall transmit to the Congress a report containing information with respect to all activities of the Bureau during the preceding calendar year and such information and data as may be considered of value in the determination of questions connected with the transportation of Government shipments together with such recommendations as to additional legislation relating thereto as the Director may deem necessary."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements among carriers, to establish a Federal Traffic Bureau, and for other purposes."

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I asked the Senator from Kansas to yield time to me simply to request unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram to me from M. B. Holifield, assistant attorney general of Kentucky, who has represented Kentucky in that capacity for many years, and who is interested in the freight-rates case in which Kentucky is interested. In the telegram he urges and prays for passage of the bill now pending.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FRANKFORT, KY., *June 16, 1947.*

Hon. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
Senate Office Building:

Rail carriers must enter into agreement with respect to rates, fares, charges, classification of commodities, allowance-time schedules, routes, and interchange of facilities. In these technical matters I have the same confidence in the Interstate Commerce Commission that I have in the Supreme Court. As a Member of the Senate I would vote for S. 110, calendar No. 40, Report No. 44. Time is essence of those agreements. Commerce should not be obstructed or delayed by unnecessary litigation.

M. B. HOLIFIELD,
Assistant Attorney General for Kentucky Railroad Commission.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I understood that the Senator from Idaho offered an amendment for consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Idaho offered an amendment, which he suggested he would orally describe, and which could be printed in the RECORD in view of being fully presented. It has been ordered to be printed in the RECORD and is the pending amendment.

Mr. REED. Of course, it is impossible even to consider an amendment of the kind proposed by the Senator from Idaho.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. REED. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BUCK. I have a pair with the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. If he were present and voting, I understand that he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote I would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. REED (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], who is absent by leave of the Senate, is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. The Senator from Oregon, if present and voting, would vote "yea" and the Senator from New York, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who is necessarily absent, is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. The Senator from Massachusetts, if present and voting, would vote "yea," and the Senator from Utah, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], who is necessarily absent, is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS]. The Senator from South Dakota, if present and voting, would vote "yea," and the Senator from Oklahoma, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], who is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference at Geneva, Switzerland, is paired on this vote with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "nay," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea."

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. The transfer of that pair to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] has been previously announced by the Senator from Kansas. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "nay" and the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea."

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], who is absent by leave of the Senate, is paired on this vote with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay" and the Senator from South Dakota would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 60, nays 27, as follows:

YEAS—60

Baldwin	Cain	Ellender
Ball	Capehart	Ferguson
Brewster	Capper	Flanders
Bricker	Chavez	Gurney
Bridges	Cooper	Hawkes
Brooks	Donnell	Hickenlooper
Butler	Dworshak	Hoey
Byrd	Ecton	Holland
Ives	Martin	Smith
Jenner	Millikin	Taft
Johnson, Colo.	Moore	Thye
Kem	Myers	Tydings
Knowland	O'Conor	Vandenberg
McCarran	O'Daniel	Watkins
McCarthy	Overton	Wherry
McGrath	Reed	White
McKellar	Revercomb	Wiley
McMahon	Robertson, Va.	Williams
Magnuson	Robertson, Wyo.	Wilson
Malone	Saltonstall	Young

NAYS—27

Aiken	Hayden	Morse
Barkley	Hill	Murray
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Downey	Kilgore	Pepper
Eastland	Langer	Russell
Fulbright	Lucas	Sparkman
George	McClellan	Stewart
Green	McFarland	Taylor
Hatch	Maybank	Umstead

NOT VOTING—8

Buck	Lodge	Tobey
Bushfield	Thomas, Okla.	Wagner
Cordon	Thomas, Utah	

So the bill (S. 110) was passed.

The bill as passed is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is amended by adding after section 5 thereof a new section as follows:

"SEC. 5a. (1) For purposes of this section—

"(A) The term 'carrier' means any common carrier subject to part I, II, or III, and shall include any freight forwarder subject to part IV, of this act; and

"(B) The term 'antitrust laws' has the meaning assigned to such term in section 1 of the act entitled 'An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes,' approved October 15, 1914.

"(2) Any carrier, party to an agreement between or among two or more carriers concerning, or providing rules or regulations pertaining to or procedures for the consideration, initiation, or establishment, of rates, fares, charges (including charges as between carriers), classifications, divisions, allowances, time schedules, routes, the interchange of facilities, the settlement of claims, the promotion of safety, or the promotion of adequacy, economy, or efficiency of operation or service, may, under such rules and regulations as the Commission may prescribe, apply to the Commission for approval of the agreement, and the Commission shall by order approve any such agreement (if approval thereof is not prohibited by paragraph (4), (5), or (6)) if it finds after public notice in the Federal Register and public hearing not less than 60 days thereafter that the object of the agreement is appropriate for the proper performance by the carriers of service to the public, that the agreement is not unjustly discriminatory as between shippers or geographical regions or areas, that it will not unduly restrain competition, and that it is consistent with the public interest as declared by Congress in the national transportation policy set forth in this act; otherwise the application shall be denied. The approval of the Commission shall be granted only upon such terms and conditions as the Commission may prescribe as necessary to insure compliance with the standards above set forth in this paragraph.

"(3) Each conference, bureau, committee, or other organization established or continued pursuant to any agreement approved by the Commission under the provisions of this section shall maintain such accounts, records, files, and memoranda and shall submit to the Commission such reports as may be prescribed by the Commission, and all such accounts, records, files, and memoranda shall be subject to inspection by the Commission or its duly authorized representatives. No bank or other financial institution shall be a member of any such

conference, bureau, committee, or other organization.

"(4) The Commission shall not approve under this section any agreement between or among carriers of different classes unless it finds that such agreement is limited to freight classifications or to joint rates or through routes; and for purposes of this paragraph carriers by railroad, express companies, and sleeping-car companies are carriers of one class; pipe-line companies are carriers of one class; carriers by motor vehicle are carriers of one class; carriers by water are carriers of one class; and freight forwarders are of another class.

"(5) The Commission shall not approve under this section any agreement which it finds is an agreement for a pooling, division, consolidation, merger, purchase, lease, acquisition, or other transaction, to which section 5 of this act is applicable.

"(6) The Commission shall not approve under this section any agreement which establishes a procedure for the determination of any matter through joint consideration unless it finds or by condition requires that under the agreement there is or shall be accorded to each party the free and unrestrained right to act contrary to and independently of the initial determination or report, or any subsequent determination or report, arrived at through such procedure, and unless it finds or by condition requires that all carriers of the same class (as defined in paragraph (4) of this section) within the territorial and organizational scope of such agreement shall be eligible to become and remain parties to the agreement upon application and payment of charges applicable to other parties of the same class. Nothing in this section and no approval of any agreement by the Commission under this section shall be so construed as in any manner to remove from the purview of the antitrust laws any restraint upon the right of independent action by any carrier by means of boycott, duress, or intimidation.

"(7) The Commission is authorized, upon complaint or upon its own initiative without complaint, to investigate and determine whether any agreement previously approved by it under this section, or terms and conditions upon which such approval was granted, is not or are not in conformity with the standards set forth in paragraph (2), or whether any such terms and conditions are not necessary for purposes of conformity with such standards, and, after such investigation, the Commission shall by order terminate or modify its approval of such agreement if it finds such action necessary to insure conformity with such standards, and shall modify the terms and conditions upon which such approval was granted and may impose additional terms and conditions to the extent it finds necessary to insure conformity with such standards or to the extent to which it finds such terms and conditions not necessary to insure such conformity. Any person, including the Attorney General of the United States, may make complaint to the Commission of any action taken under or pursuant to an agreement theretofore approved by the Commission, and the Commission, upon such complaint or upon its own initiative, shall after hearing determined whether any such action is in conformity with such agreement and with the terms of the approval thereof by the Commission and is consistent with the standards above set forth and whether its approval of the agreement should be modified or terminated or additional terms or conditions be prescribed with respect to the particular action complained of. The effective date of any order terminating or modifying approval, or modifying terms and conditions, or prescribing terms or conditions, shall be postponed for such period as the Commission determines to be reasonably necessary to avoid undue hardship.

"(8) No order shall be entered under this section except after interested parties (including in all cases the Attorney General of the United States and interested State regulatory commissions or other authorities) have been afforded reasonable oportunity for hearing.

"(9) No agreement approved by the Commission under this section, and no conference or joint or concerted action pursuant to and in conformity with such agreement as the same may be conditioned by the Commission, shall be deemed to be a contract, combination, conspiracy, or monopoly in restraint of trade or commerce within the meaning of the antitrust laws: *Provided*, That the approval by the Commission of any agreement concerning, or providing rules or regulations pertaining to or procedures for the consideration, initiation, or establishment of, time schedules, the interchange of facilities, the settlement of claims, the promotion of safety, or the promotion of adequacy, economy, or efficiency of operation or service shall not be deemed to be approval of any subsequent modification or amendment thereof or of any supplemental or other agreement made pursuant to any provision contained in the original approved agreement: *And provided further*, That the approval by the Commission of any agreement providing procedures for the consideration, initiation, or establishment of time schedules, the interchange of facilities, the settlement of claims, the promotion of safety, or the promotion of adequacy, economy, or efficiency of operation or service shall not be deemed to be approval of any joint or concerted action taken pursuant to any provision of such agreement.

"(10) Any action of the Commission under this section in approving an agreement, or in denying an application for such approval, or in terminating or modifying its approval of an agreement, or in prescribing the terms and conditions upon which its approval is to be granted, or in modifying such terms and conditions, shall be construed as having effect solely with reference to the applicability of the provisions of paragraph (9)."

"(11) The enactment of this section shall not—

"(a) deprive the Supreme Court of jurisdiction to hear and determine the case of Georgia versus Pennsylvania Railroad Co., et al. docket No. 11 (original), October term, 1945, or any proceeding for the enforcement of the provisions of any decree entered in such suit;

"(b) change any principle of substantive or procedural law otherwise applicable in the determination of such suit or proceeding, or deprive any party to such suit of any relief to which such party would be entitled but for the enactment of this section; or

"(c) render lawful the performance of any past or future act which shall have been found by the Supreme Court in such suit or proceeding as it relates to the parties to such suit to be unlawful or which shall have been prohibited by the terms of any decree entered therein or any supplement thereto or any modification thereof."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 50. An act for the relief of Joseph Ochrimowski;

S. 317. An act for the relief of Robert B. Jones;

S. 361. An act for the relief of Alva R. Moore;

S. 423. An act for the relief of John B. Barton;

S. 425. An act for the relief of Col. Frank R. Loyd;

S. 470. An act for the relief of John H. Gradwell;

S. 514. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Sylvia De Cicco;

S. 561. An act for the relief of Robert C. Birkes;

S. 620. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ida Elma Franklin;

S. 824. An act for the relief of Marion O. Cassady; and

S. 882. An act for the relief of A. A. Pelletier and P. C. Silk.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 18, 1947, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 50. An act for the relief of Joseph Ochrimowski;

S. 317. An act for the relief of Robert B. Jones;

S. 361. An act for the relief of Alva R. Moore;

S. 423. An act for the relief of John B. Barton;

S. 425. An act for the relief of Col. Frank R. Loyd;

S. 470. An act for the relief of John H. Gradwell;

S. 514. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Sylvia De Cicco;

S. 561. An act for the relief of Robert C. Birkes;

S. 620. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ida Elma Franklin;

S. 824. An act for the relief of Marion O. Cassady; and

S. 882. An act for the relief of A. A. Pelletier and P. C. Silk.

PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAM FOR WOOL—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 814) to provide support for wool, and for other purposes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to address the Senate briefly in opposition to the conference report. So far as I am concerned, consideration of the conference report may go over until tomorrow. However, if there is insistence on voting upon it tonight, I should like to make a few remarks regarding it. I desire to say to the Senator from Vermont that several Senators wish to discuss the conference report, and it seems to me obvious that we cannot conclude it this evening. I wonder if the Senate at this hour wants to resume consideration of it. I say in good faith to the Senator that we cannot conclude debate this afternoon without holding a very late session, because there are two or three Senators who desire to discuss it and who are not ready this afternoon to do so. There is no purpose to delay a vote. It is a bona fide discussion of the conference report. Personally, I should prefer to wait until tomorrow, but I am ready to go on now if necessary.

Mr. AIKEN. If the Senator will yield, I will say that I do not happen to know of anyone, other than the Senator from Kentucky, who wants to speak on the conference report, but I do not question that there may be others.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] wishes to dis-

cuss it, as does also the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], who has been called from the Chamber by important public business and is unable to be here any further today. There may be other Senators. I know of those two.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wonder if it would not be a good idea to go on as long as the leadership of the Senate thinks it advisable to proceed tonight, and we will save that much time tomorrow. I hope we can get a determination as soon as possible of whether there will be a wool support price. There has been no support price since the 15th of April, although legally there should be one until the 30th of June. However, the Department of Agriculture did not see fit—and I think it acted wisely—to start a new support-price program for this year until it could ascertain whether it could continue it. In the meantime, it is my understanding that buyers are taking advantage of the smaller wool growers of the country. The conference report will either be approved or disapproved by the Senate. The sooner we find it out, the better. If it is approved, the bill will be sent to the President; and if he signs it, the sooner we find it out, the better. If he sees fit to veto it, I will say there is a very remote possibility that some other legislation might be proposed to support the price of wool, although I think that its chance of enactment at this time is very remote. But if any legislation at all is to be enacted to take effect by the 1st of July, when the act completely expires, we shall have to get it through as soon as we can. Personally, I doubt if any further legislation would be enacted in the event of a veto, but I do think we should get a determination as soon as we can. It seems to me that if we proceed for a while longer tonight, we will save that much time tomorrow.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to submit a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. In the event the Senate votes down the conference report, will a motion then be in order that the Senate insist on its objections to the House amendments and ask for a further conference on its own bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In response to the Senator's inquiry, the Chair will say that if and when the present conference report is rejected, a motion will be in order requesting the House for a further conference and providing that the Chair shall appoint conferees. If that motion is agreed to by the Senate it is then in order to instruct the conferees.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. In a moment I will yield.

As I said a while ago, I have no desire and neither has any other Senator any desire, unduly, to delay a vote on this matter; but in view of the lateness of the hour and the fact that there are four Senators who want to address themselves to the conference report, it is obvious that we cannot finish it tonight. It is agreeable to me to vote at any time tomorrow that the Senate is willing to fix, provided a sufficient time is allowed for legitimate discussion. Assuming that the Senate shall meet at 12 o'clock I would suggest that a vote be taken at 3 o'clock tomorrow afternoon. I think that 3 hours would be sufficient time to discuss the conference report.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the Senator offering that as a suggestion?

Mr. BARKLEY. I am offering it as a suggestion, but I am willing to propound it as a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. WHERRY. Would it be agreeable to the distinguished Senator if we vote at 2 o'clock and divide the time——

Mr. BARKLEY. No; it would not.

Mr. WHERRY. If we convene at 11 o'clock?

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope we will not meet at 11. Tomorrow is Thursday, and there will be some committee meetings.

Mr. WHERRY. Would the Senator be willing to divide the time between 1 o'clock and 3 o'clock?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that was a suggestion?

Mr. BARKLEY. I was offering it as a suggestion, yes. I am willing to make it a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. WHERRY. If it is made as a request I suggest to the able Senator from Kentucky that the time between the hours of 1 and 3 o'clock be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of the measure.

Mr. BARKLEY. So that anyone getting the floor at 12 could occupy it until 1?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator state the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I presume to make the unanimous-consent request, inasmuch as I made the suggestion, that at the hour of 3 o'clock tomorrow the Senate proceed to vote without further debate upon the conference report now pending.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, would there be any objection to voting not later than 3 o'clock, in the event that we could vote upon the conference report before that?

Mr. BARKLEY. So far as I am concerned, there would not be. The difficulty is that Senators do not know whether the vote is to take place at 3 o'clock or at some hour before that when the debate may be exhausted. Therefore they would make their arrangements to be here at 3 o'clock.

Mr. TAFT. I may suggest to the Senator that we also have the conference report on the rent-control bill, which certainly ought to be dealt with tomorrow. It may involve some debate. I would hope that we might perhaps meet a little earlier. If we make the hour at 3 o'clock we will have a repetition of the same thing we have had today.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; that could not happen; because the agreement on the so-called Bulwinkle bill did not preclude debate on amendments that were to be offered. That is why that bill took much more time. I will agree to 2:30 o'clock. I will modify the request by making it 2:30 instead of 3.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I offer as a modification of the unanimous-consent request the suggestion that if we vote at 2:30 the time between 1 o'clock and 2:30 o'clock be equally divided. That would include all the time this side needs for discussion.

Mr. BARKLEY. That means that up until 1 o'clock any Senator can speak on anything. I think that if there is to be any control of the time it ought to begin when the Senate meets.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair can submit only one unanimous-consent request at a time.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will modify my own request, if the Senator will permit. It is that at 2:30 the Senate proceed to vote on the conference report and that the time from the assembling of the Senate tomorrow until that hour be equally divided between the proponents and opponents of the conference report, to be controlled respectively by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and I will control the other half of it, unless some other Senator wants to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator include in his unanimous-consent request not only the disposition of the conference report, but of any motions?

Mr. BARKLEY. Any motion or proceedings relative thereto.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous consent request? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as entered into and as reduced to writing, is as follows:

Ordered, That on the calendar day of Thursday, June 19, 1947, at the hour of 2:30 p. m., the Senate proceed to vote, without further debate, upon the question of agreeing to the conference report on the bill (S. 814) to provide support for wool, and for other purposes, or upon any motion relating thereto.

Ordered further, That the time intervening between the meeting of the Senate on said day and the hour of 2:30 o'clock p. m. be divided equally between the proponents and the opponents of the bill, to be controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I now propose that after the wool bill has been disposed of tomorrow at 2:30 o'clock the Senate proceed to the consideration of order No. 79, Senate bill 564, to provide for the performance of the duties of the office of President, in case of the removal, resignation, or inability both of the President and Vice President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska that when the conference report on the wool bill is completed tomorrow afternoon, the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 564?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I cannot consent to that request. Of course, the Senator from Nebraska can move to have the Presidential succession bill taken up, but I am not willing to agree by unanimous consent that that be done.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I appeal to the distinguished minority leader not to object. That bill could be made the order of business, and then could be laid aside while the Senate considered the other conference report which is ready. It seems to me that the Senator from Kentucky should not object to the request. The succession bill will have to be debated at some time.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not agree to that; it does not have to be debated at any time. However, any Senator can move that it be taken up.

Mr. WHERRY. I have asked unanimous consent that the Presidential succession bill be taken up at that time. I could have made a motion to have it taken up then, and I could have made such a motion before agreeing to the unanimous-consent agreement just propounded by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate that.

Mr. WHERRY. In this case, there would be little difference between moving and asking unanimous consent in regard to when the Presidential succession bill would be taken up tomorrow. I would definitely agree that, if made the unfinished business, it could then be laid aside for consideration of the conference report on the rent-control bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska can state, of course, that at the conclusion of action on the two conference reports, he will move to have the Senate take up the succession bill

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am aware of the privileges I have. I simply am asking the Senator from Kentucky not to oppose the unanimous-consent request; and then Senators can be advised when the measure will be taken up.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am sorry I cannot accommodate the Senator from Nebraska. But I take the liberty of suggesting to Senators that, following action on the conference reports tomorrow, the Senator from Nebraska will move to have the Senate take up the Presidential succession bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made.

Mr. BARKLEY subsequently said: Mr. President, one of the reasons why I objected to the unanimous-consent request which was made a while ago by the Senator from Nebraska was that probably it will take all day tomorrow for us to conclude action on the two conference reports which now are at the desk. That would mean that we would not reach consideration of the succession bill until Friday. I assume there will be no session on Saturday. I am very much interested in the discussion of the so-called succession bill. I am opposed to it. I am compelled to be away from the Senate on Monday and Tuesday of next week. It seemed to me that inasmuch as probably we would not conclude action on that bill on Friday, it might work an inconvenience on the Senate to have it made the unfinished business and then have it laid aside every day or two, for several days, so that other matters might be considered.

However, if the Senator from Nebraska wishes to do it and if he is willing to take the chances on that, with the understanding that the bill may be laid aside if the circumstances justify doing so, I shall relent and shall withdraw my objection.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished minority leader for his consideration.

I now renew the request on the basis of the statement of the minority leader.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the request is that the succession bill be made the unfinished business as soon as action is concluded on the conference report on the wool bill, and that then the succession bill will be laid aside in order to permit the Senate to take up the conference report on the rent-control bill?

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The present unanimous-consent request, as understood by the Chair, is that the succession bill, Senate bill 564, Calendar No. 79, be made the unfinished business at the conclusion of consideration of the conference report on the wool bill; and that thereupon the succession bill be laid aside, and the conference report on the rent-control bill be taken up.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN NOMINATIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider the nomination of Harold R. Medina, who has been nominated by the President to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As the Chair understands, the Senator from Wisconsin moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business for the purpose of considering the nomination he has just identified.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to call attention to the fact that the majority leader agreed last Friday to have the Senate take up the Army nominations, but inadvertently the confirmation of only the Regular Army nominations was requested, leaving the Senate in the position now of having confirmed the nominations in the Regular Army, but of having refused—as it did on Friday last—to confirm the nominations of officers in the Reserve Corps and in the National Guard.

Therefore, I wish that the Senator from Wisconsin would amend his request so as to include the Army nominations which appear on pages 6 and 7 of the Executive Calendar.

Mr. WILEY. I agree.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair suggests that the request be that the Executive Calendar be considered.

What is the request of the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. WILEY. The request is as originally made and as amended in accordance with the suggestion of the Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair did not hear the Senator's request. Will he state it again?

Mr. WILEY. My request is that the Senate proceed, as in executive session—and I ask unanimous consent for that purpose—to take up and consider the Executive Calendar, except for the nomination of Joe B. Dooley.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MAYBANK. I object.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, through inadvertence on last Friday, during the consideration of the Executive Calendar, the nominations in the Reserve Corps and in the National Guard were passed over. That was due to an inadvertence in connection with a statement made at that time by the majority leader, with the result that only the nominations of Regular Army officers were confirmed.

Therefore, I now ask unanimous consent that, as in executive session, the Senate consider the nominations of Reserve Corps officers and National Guard officers, as listed in the Executive Calendar.

Mr. MAYBANK. I object. I have no objection to having the Senate confirm the nomination for district judge in the southern district of New York; and I believe that by all means the nominations of the Reserve Corps and National Guard officers should be confirmed. But I object for the reason that the Senate is not in executive session, and I should like to make a few remarks before the Senate goes into executive session.

Mr. GURNEY. Then, Mr. President, I amend my unanimous-consent request by now asking that the Senate proceed to consider executive business; and, if that request is agreed to, immediately after the Senate proceeds to consider executive business, I shall move that the Army nominations be confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request?

TERMINAL-LEAVE PAYMENTS

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I object. I have only a few remarks to make. As I have said, I have no objection to having the Senate confirm the nomination for United States district judge for the southern district of New York, and I am certainly in hearty accord with the chairman of the Armed Forces Committee, the distinguished Senator from South Dakota, in stating that the nominations of the Reserve officers and National Guard officers should be confirmed. However, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that about a year ago, after the officers of the Army and the Navy had been paid their

terminal leave in cash, this body determined that the GI's, those who were lowest in rank in the armed forces, should be paid their terminal leave in bonds. So, Mr. President, the decision was that those men were to be paid their terminal leave in bonds, whereas the measure reported by the Military Affairs Committee and passed by the Senate provided that the officers be paid in cash. As justification for that action, it was stated that if the poor privates were paid in cash, the result would be to create inflation.

So, Mr. President, today I find, as a member of the Armed Forces Committee, after conferences with the Army, the Coast Guard, and the Marine Corps, that the present situation is that in the Coast Guard, 20,000 have not been paid their terminal leave, either in bonds or in anything else; in the Marine Corps, there are 136,994 who have not received their terminal-leave payment; in the Navy there are more than 700,000, a vast majority of whom are seamen, the others being officers. In the Army there are more than 2,000,000, of whom most are GI's, who have received no bonds which the Congress authorized, nor have they received any cash.

I am not condemning those who manage the armed forces. I realize that their appropriations have been cut to the bone. I realize that perhaps they cannot comply with the direction of Congress, but I merely suggest that there is a surplus, that there are certain moneys provided to retire certain bonds, that these bonds carry an interest rate of 2½ percent. I hope that before this session of Congress shall end the $2,800,000,000 in bonds, less what cash has been paid, will be redeemed for the benefit of the members of the armed forces who have terminal leave coming to them.

Mr. President, it cannot be inflationary; it cannot cost anything. We owe the money to the men; we passed the law; we printed the bonds bearing interest at 2½ percent. It causes detailed work beyond the imagination of man. It causes work on the part of hundreds of clerks to send the bonds to the GI's.

Many of these poor boys have no place in which to put the bonds, unless they rent lock boxes in the banks. So, considering the savings Congress will accomplish in the way of the 2½ percent interest payment, I appeal to Senators to make provision to redeem the bonds and pay the seamen and petty officers of the Navy and Coast Guard and the privates and noncommissioned officers of the Army in cash, as Congress said they should be paid, so that the Army, the Navy, the Coast Guard, and the Marines may not be required to keep volumes of books and records and the boys may not be compelled to hold bonds. Many of them have no place in which to keep the bonds. Some of the bonds might be lost, or destroyed in fires in homes in the country.

I hope the bill I have pending before the Armed Services Committee, to pay the members of the armed services their terminal leave in cash, will become law before Congress adjourns sine die.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business for action on nominations on the Executive Calendar to which there is no objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and withdrawing a nomination, which nominations were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles A. Robinson to be a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Public Health Service.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Anton J. Lukaszewicz to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Wisconsin.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harold R. Medina to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Col. Dwight F. Jones to be President of the California Debris Commission.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

UNITED STATES TAFIFF COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John Price Gregg to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Without objection, the President will be notified immediately of all confirmations of today.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if there is nothing further to come before the Senate at this time, I move that, as in legislative session, the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate, as in legislative session, took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, June 19, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 18 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Robert Franklin Jones, of Ohio, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of 7 years from July 1, 1947.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Nora M. Harris, of Connecticut, as collector of customs for customs collection district No. 6, with headquarters at Bridgeport, Conn., to fill an existing vacancy.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Otto Kerner, Jr., of Illinois, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Illinois, vice J. Albert Woll, resigning upon the appointment and qualification of a successor.

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE OFFICERS' RESERVE CORPS OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen Edward Courtney Bullock Danforth, Jr. (colonel, Infantry Reserve), Army of the United States.

Col. Ralph Gates Boyd, Judge Advocate General's Department Reserve, Army of the United States.

Col. Robert Wesley Colglazier, Jr., Staff and Administrative Reserve, Army of the United States.

Col. George Harris Cosby, Jr., Cavalry Reserve, Army of the United States.

Col. James Bell Cress, Corps of Engineers Reserve, Army of the United States.

Col. James Alexander Crothers, Transportation Corps Reserve, Army of the United States.

Col. Lloyd William Elliott, Army of the United States.

Col. John David Higgins, Infantry Reserve, Army of the United States.

Col. Russell Archibald Ramsey, Infantry Reserve, Army of the United States.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 18 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

TO BE A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 4, A CONSUL, AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Paul J. Sturm

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 6, VICE CONSULS OF CAREER, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

William J. Barnsdale	John M. Howison
Charles E. Bidwell	Randall T. Klein, Jr.
Archer K. Blood	Steven Kline
Robert C. Bone, Jr.	David Morris
William H. Bruns	Edward W. Mulcahy
Robert A. Christopher	Thomas H. Murfin
Ralph G. Clark	David L. Osborn
Nathaniel Davis	Sandy MacGregor Pringle
Robert B. Dreessen	Thomas M. Recknagel
Herman F. Eilts	Edward G. Seidensticker, Jr.
Thomas R. Favell	Nicholas G. Thacher
E. Bruce Ferguson	Francis T. Underhill, Jr.
John W. Fisher	William H. Witt
William R. Gennert	
James W. Gould	
Jerome K. Holloway, Jr.	

TO BE A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 1 AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Hugh S. Cumming, Jr.

TO BE A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 2 AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

A. Cyril Crilley

TO BE A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 3, A CONSUL, AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Carlile Bolton-Smith

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 4, CONSULS, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Clyde L. Clark
Charles K. Ludewig

TO BE A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 5, A VICE CONSUL OF CAREER, AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Charles Philip Clock

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 6, VICE CONSULS OF CAREER, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Robert G. Braden	Edward C. Ingraham, Jr.
William C. Canup	Richard G. Johnson
Harold E. Engle	David S. McMorris
Richard A. Ericson, Jr.	
Philip E. Haring	

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

John Price Gregg to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission for the term expiring June 16, 1953.

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

Col. Dwight F. Johns, Corps of Engineers, to be president of the California Debris Commission.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

Charles A. Robinson to be a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency for the unexpired term of 3 years from March 4, 1947.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Harold R. Medina to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Anton J. Lukaszewicz to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Wisconsin.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR CORPS

To be temporary senior surgeons (equivalent to Army rank of lieutenant colonel):

Hugh L. C. Wilkerson	William J. Brown
Daniel J. Daley	Luther L. Terry

To be temporary senior sanitary engineer (equivalent to Army rank of lieutenant colonel):

Maurice LeBosquet, Jr.

To be temporary senior scientists (equivalent to Army rank of lieutenant colonel):

Howard L. Andrews
G. Robert Coatney
Heinz Specht

To be temporary surgeons (equivalent to Army rank of major):

William L. Hewitt	George A. Shipman
Robert W. Rasor	Carruth J. Wagner

To be temporary sanitary engineers (equivalent to Army rank of major):

Frank Tetzlaff
Albert R. Stevenson

To be temporary senior surgeon (equivalent to Army rank of lieutenant colonel):

Kenneth W. Chapman

To be temporary senior sanitary engineer (equivalent to Army rank of lieutenant colonel):

Elmer J. Herringer

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR CORPS

To be assistant dental surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective date of oath of office:

Charles P. White
Richard P. French
Joseph W. Fridl

To be senior assistant dental surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of oath of office:

Thomas J. Riley, Jr.
Maurice Costello
Peter J. Coccaro

To be medical director (equivalent to the Army rank of colonel):

Henry A. Rasmussen

To be senior surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel):

Samuel J. Hall
Richard B. Holt
Edgar W. Norris

To be temporary senior surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel):

Marion B. Noyes

To be temporary surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of major):

LeRoy R. Allen

To be medical director (equivalent to the Army rank of colonel), effective date of oath of office:

Henry C. Schumacher

To be surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of oath of office:

Mabel L. Ross

To be nurse officer (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of oath of office:

Margaret K. Schafer

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR CORPS

To be senior assistant scientists (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of oath of office:

Herbert A. Sober	William C. Frohne
Isadore Zipkin	Richard P. Dow
Frederick L. Stone	Roy F. Fritz
Milton Silverman	Ralph C. Barnes
Libero Ajello	Joseph Greenberg
Alan W. Donaldson	John H. Hughes
Louis J. Olivier	Harold B. Robinson
Harry J. Bennett	Elmer G. Berry

To be dental surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of oath of office:

Robert M. Stephan

To be pharmacist (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of oath of office:

George F. Archambault

To be assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective date of oath of office:

Louis B. Thomas	C. Brooks Fry, Jr.
Donn G. Mosser	Robert D. Dooley
Alan D. Miller	Stuart M. Sessoms
Luther E. Smith	James J. Thorpe
A. McChesney Evans	Robert M. Farrier
Donald Harting	Charles C. Griffin, Jr.
Robert E. Westfall	Joseph E. Clark
William T. Meszaros	Francis P. Nicholson
Sheldon Dray	Raymond N. Brown
Cornelius J. O'Donovan	Frederic D. Regan
	Joseph Leighton

To be senior assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of oath of office:

Birdsall N. Carle	R. Carl Millican
Pasquale J. Pesare	Ross A. Snider
Clinton C. Powell	Carl R. Kunstling
Eliah M. Nadel	Marvin O. Lewis
J. Russell Mitchell	

To be junior assistant nurse officers (equivalent to the Army rank of second lieutenant), effective date of oath of office:

Dorothy A. Turner	Pauline M. Gronas
Joan M. Norkunas	Catherine J. Lyons
Augusta M. Christopher	Ardyth M. Buchanan
	Dolores T. Stang
Carlotta A. Ballantyne	Margaret M. Sweeney
Leona R. Cubinsky	Elaine Felt
Winifred Woods	Patricia H. Parnell
Anna B. Barnes	Josefina Sanchez
Alice I. Shedd	Ann M. Zidzik
Essie E. Lee	Ruth I. Webb
Joyce B. Rieling	Alice M. Driscoll
Virginia L. Roberts	Elsie M. Pinkham
Evelyn J. Guess	Barbara A. Emerson
Nelle F. McCarthy	

To be assistant nurse officers (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective date of oath of office:

Mary V. Ward	Maryrose Johnston
Ruth A. Johnson	Gertrude I. Miller
Winifred M. Mendez	M. Elizabeth McBride
Arne L. Bulkeley	Sally Wladis
Jeannette Bedwell	Marie F. Hanzel
M. Lois McMinn	Eleanor E. Wagner
Emijean Snedegar	Flora Jacobs
Sylvia Simon	Ina L. Ridlehoover
Stella M. Williams	Adele L. Henderson
Olive J. Faulkner	Marion C. Burns
Philomene E. Lenz	Helen E. Enright
Mable Pelikow	Henrietta Smellow
Jean C. Feely	Mathilde A. Haga
H. Jean McIver	Gertrude L. Anderson
Helen Gertz	Latis M. Campbell
Lucille E. Corcoran	Henrietta Rust
Dorothy G. Erickson	Myra I. Johnson
M. Estelle Hunt	Irma C. Thomsen
Mary E. McGovern	Irma M. Lamberti
Mildred T. Bogle	

To be senior assistant nurse officers (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of oath of office:

Elizabeth H. Boeker	Alice M. Fay
L. Margaret McLaughlin	Catherine L. Mahoney
	Margaret E. Willhoit
Edna A. Clark	Opal B. Stine
Miriam K. Christoph	Genevieve S. Jones
Ella Mae Hott	Daphine D. Doster
Alice E. Keefe	Frances S. Buck
Margaret Denham	Anna M. Matter
Eleanor J. Gochanour	Josephine I. O'Connor

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

TO BE COMMANDERS, WITH DATE OF RANK AS INDICATED AFTER NAMES

William M. Scaife, August 1, 1947.
Robert F. A. Studds, August 1, 1947.

TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS, WITH DATE OF RANK AS INDICATED AFTER NAMES

Gilbert R. Fish, August 1, 1947.
Franklin R. Gossett, August 1, 1947.

TO BE LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE), WITH DATE OF RANK AS INDICATED AFTER NAME

Allen L. Powell, August 16, 1947.

TO BE ENSIGNS, WITH DATE OF RANK AS INDICATED AFTER NAMES

John R. Plaggmier, July 28, 1947.
Leonard S. Baker, September 9, 1947.

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENT IN THE OFFICERS' RESERVE CORPS OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be brigadier generals

George Abbott Brownell
Clarence Lemar Burpee
Ken Reed Dyke
Robert Joshua Gill
Maurice Hirsch
Julius Cecil Holmes
Edwin Whiting Jones
Francis Rusher Kerr
James Fenton McMannmon
William Claire Menninger
Hugh Meglone Milton II
John Joseph O'Brien
Francis Willard Rollins
Conrad Edwin Snow

HONORARY RESERVE

To be brigadier generals

Thomas Donald Campbell
Oscar Nathaniel Solbert
William James Williamson

APPOINTMENT IN THE NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be major generals of the line

John Charles McLaughlin
James Clyde Styron

To be brigadier generals of the line

Walter LeRoy Anderson
Waldemar Fritz Breidster
Wallace Anthony Choquette
Albert Bartlett Crowther
Henry Cotheal Evans
George Washington Fisher
Ansel Blakely Godfrey
Paul Henry Jordan
James Albert Lake
Harold Gould Maison
Wallace Huntoon Nickel
Charles Gurdon Sage
Brenton Greene Wallace

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate June 18 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Ray C. Wakefield to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 18, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father of infinite love, who hast promised to those who with all their hearts truly seek Thee Thou wilt remove their transgressions from them, we pray for that true joy which Thy presence alone can give. As Thou dost require truth in the inward parts, cleanse Thou us from secret faults; forbid that we should be hasty in our judgments, lest in judging others we condemn ourselves. Grant that all hidden motives may be woven into a plea for unity and understanding among us. May we never miss life's great things, which neither strive nor fret, but move in gentleness and quiet as the purpose of Thy wondrous love is revealed.

In our Saviour's name and for His sake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

AMENDMENT TO FEDERAL INSURANCE CONTRIBUTIONS ACT

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3818) to amend the Federal Insurance Contributions Act with respect to rates of tax on employers and employees, and for other purposes, and asks for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That clauses (1), (2), and (3) of section 1400 of the Federal Insurance Contributions Act (Internal Revenue Code, sec. 1400), as amended, are hereby amended to read as follows:

"(1) With respect to wages received during the calendar years 1939 to 1949, both inclusive, the rate shall be 1 percent.

"(2) With respect to wages received during the calendar years 1950 to 1956, both inclusive, the rate shall be 1½ percent.

"(3) With respect to wages received after December 31, 1956, the rate shall be 2 percent."

SEC. 2. Clauses (1), (2), and (3) of section 1410 of the Federal Insurance Contributions Act (Internal Revenue Code, sec. 1410), as amended, are hereby amended to read as follows:

"(1) With respect to wages paid during the calendar years 1939 to 1949, both inclusive, the rate shall be 1 percent.

"(2) With respect to wages paid during the calendar years 1950 to 1956, both inclusive, the rate shall be 1½ percent.

"(3) With respect to wages paid after December 31, 1956, the rate shall be 2 percent."

SEC. 3. Section 504 of the Social Security Act amendments of 1946 (Public Law 719, 79th Cong.), fixing the termination date of amendments relating to grants to States for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to dependent children, is hereby amended by striking out "December 31, 1947" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1950."

SEC. 4. Section 603 of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of 1944 (terminating the provisions of such act on June 30, 1947) shall not be applicable in the case of the amendments made by title IV of such act to the Social Security Act.

SEC. 5. (a) Section 904 (h) of the Social Security Act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(h) There is hereby established in the unemployment trust fund a Federal unemployment account. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to such Federal unemployment account a sum equal to (1) the excess of taxes collected prior to July 1, 1946, under title IX of this act or under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, over the total unemployment administrative expenditures made prior to July 1, 1946, plus (2) the excess of taxes collected in each fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1946, under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, over the unemployment administrative expenditures made in such year. As used in this subsection, the term 'unemployment administrative expenditures' means expenditures for grants under title III of this act, expenditures for the administration of that title by the Board or the Administrator, and expenditures for the administration of title IX of this act, or of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act by the Department of the Treasury, the Board, or the Administrator. For the purposes of this subsection there shall be deducted from the total amount of taxes collected prior to July 1, 1943, under title IX of this act, the sum of $40,561,886.43 which was authorized to be appropriated by the act of August 24, 1937 (50 Stat. 754)."

(b) Section 1201 (a) of the Social Security Act is hereby amended by striking out "on June 30, 1945, or on the last day in any ensuing calendar quarter which ends prior to July 1, 1947", and inserting in lieu thereof "on June 30, 1947, or on the last day in any ensuing calendar quarter."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 4, after line 10, insert the following:

"SEC. 6. This act may be cited as the 'Social Security Act amendments of 1947.'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, these amendments to the Social Security Act were unanimously adopted by the Committee on Ways and Means. The salient facts are set forth in the following:

Federal Insurance Contributions Act—Federal old-age and survivors' insurance under original 1935 Social Security Act

Contributions under 1935 act:	Percent
1937 to 1939	1
1940 to 1942	1½
1943 to 1945	2
1946 to 1947	2½
1948	2½
1949	3
1950 to 1956	3
1957 and thereafter	3
Contribution rate under present law:	
1937 to 1939	1
1940 to 1942	1
1943 to 1945	1
1946 to 1947	1
1948	2½
1949	3
1950 to 1956	3
1957 and thereafter	3
Contribution rate under H. R. 3818:	
1948 and 1949	1
1950 through 1956	1½
1957 and thereafter	2

Unless H. R. 3818 is enacted, the contribution rate under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act will automatically increase to 2½ percent each on employer and employee in 1948, and to 3 percent each in 1949.

The enactment of H. R. 3818 at this time will, under present economic conditions, relieve employers and employees of additional contributions amounting to $1,000,000,000 each in 1948 and $1,400,000,000 each in 1949.

The rate has been frozen at 1 percent seven times, notwithstanding the accumulation of approximately $8,700,000,000 in the Federal old-age and survivors' insurance trust fund.

Income to fund this year, 1947—fiscal year—is estimated at $1,565,000,000. Disbursements are estimated at $464,000,000 for the same period.

Under H. R. 3818, the fund will have increased to about twice its present size in 1956.

At the end of 1946, there were 75,500,000 living persons who had wage credits under the insurance system.

On June 30, 1946, there were 1,500,000 persons receiving benefits. There were 888,000 persons fully insured who, if retired, could draw benefits.

There are 1,155,000 persons who are eligible for old-age benefits who are not drawing them at the present time.

Rates in H. R. 3818 will provide an actuarially sound system at least for the next 10 years.

AGED, BLIND, AND CHILDREN

Section 3 of the bill contains the increased Federal grants to the States for needy, aged, and the blind, and dependent children until June 30, 1950.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE FUND—WAR MOBILIZATION AND RECONVERSION ACT OF 1944

H. R. 3818, sections 4 and 5, provides for continuance on permanent basis certain temporary provisions of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Act of title IV of that act which expires June 30, 1947, unless made permanent.

Provisions established within the unemployment trust fund a separate account known as the Federal unemployment account. It authorized congressional appropriations to be made thereto in amounts equal to the excess of tax collections under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act over the unemployment administration expenditures, and such further sums as may be necessary.

The excess of Federal unemployment tax collections, as to State grants for administering unemployment insurance; and as to the resulting net profits which the Federal Government has so far made in tax collections. Excess at present amounts to some $800,000,000. This sum collected has been spent by Federal Government. Otherwise it could have been used for unemployment insurance purposes. This sum should be made permanently and irrevocably available for unemployment insurance purposes.

The reserves of 22 States exceed ten times the highest annual expenditures.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOEVEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article by David Lawrence.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a magazine article.

Mr. BLACKNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address which he gave over WJR, Detroit, Mich., on Saturday, May 31, 1947.

Mr. GOODWIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. ELSAESSER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BRADLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution by the Congregational Christian Churches of California and other Southwestern States regarding peacetime military training.

SHIPMENT OF STEEL PIPE FROM LONG BEACH, CALIF.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, the greatest shipment of material ever to be sent out of any one port to any one account, in the history of the world, is about to commence from the harbor of Long Beach, Calif. More than 1,000,000 tons of steel pipe, to be used by the Standard Oil Co. of California and the Texas Co. in the construction of an oil pipe line across Arabia, from the Persian Gulf to the Mediterranean, will be transported in a fleet of from 35 to 50 freighters, sailing at intervals of about every 5 days, until the shipment is completed. This vast quantity of pipe will be fabricated at the plant of the Consolidated Steel Co., at Maywood, Calif., from plates rolled at the United States Steel's mill in Geneva, Utah.

The port of Long Beach is pleased to receive this recognition of its high position in maritime circles—this recognition of the fact that it is now one of the best equipped, one of the most ably managed; in fact, one of the great ports of the world. It is a port which can accommodate ships of any size now afloat and which can handle expeditiously cargoes of practically any nature with a minimum of expense and with a maximum of expedition for both ship and cargo.

This shipment well illustrates the great industrial advance of our Western States.

THE ROCK THAT MR. TRUMAN THREW AT THE TAXPAYERS

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, the rock Mr. Truman threw at the taxpayers yesterday was shaped like a boomerang.

Let us be candid; everybody agrees that some of the surplus should be used for tax reduction.

We are fighting about what is to be done about the rest of it.

We Republicans believe that tax money which the Government does not need should be left with the taxpayer, who does need it to make both ends meet.

Truman Democrats say: Tote that barge, lift that bale, because we need your taxes to keep the boys on the pay roll; our slogan is: Truman in 1948—your taxes will help us.

Meanwhile, shall we vote billions for Europe, while a Democratic President denies tax relief to the American people?

THE HONORABLE EDWARD MARTIN

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, when the Thirteen Colonies of the United States had banded themselves together and were fighting for their very existence, which meant the liberty and the independence of the United States of America, General Washington caused to be created in the city of Philadelphia, Pa., the first American flag.

Last Saturday, on the anniversary of that important historical date in my State, the Governor of Pennsylvania, the Honorable James H. Duff, awarded the distinguished service medal of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania to Maj. Gen. EDWARD MARTIN, former Governor of our State, former auditor general, former treasurer, and former adjutant general, and a former commanding general of the Twenty-eighth Division. General MARTIN is now representing the Keystone State in the United States Senate.

I know I voice the sentiment of more than 10,000,000 Pennsylvanians in applauding the action of Governor Duff, as no Pennsylvanian in the long history of the Keystone State has built up such an impressive record of service to his State and his Nation as has General MARTIN. The Republican Party, which is already overwhelmed with a wealth of men of the capabilities and the talents that are required for the Presidency of the United States, would do very well to come back to the birthplace of the Nation and to examine the talents and abilities of this distinguished American.

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,
Harrisburg, June 14, 1947.

CITATION FOR DISTINGUISHED-SERVICE MEDAL

Maj. Gen. EDWARD MARTIN, an outstanding soldier, statesman, United States Senator, Governor, auditor general, treasurer, adjutant general, and commanding general, Twenty-eighth Division; his rare abilities, under-

standing of human nature, his counsel and guidance as a counselor at law, command the admiration and respect of all.

As an outstanding superior soldier and veteran of three wars, he was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross and the Purple Heart with the Oak Leaf Cluster. As commanding general, Twenty-eighth Division, his diligence to his duties, close attention to painstaking details, and his thoroughness of purpose, at times requiring the utmost tact and diplomacy, not only created a great combat division but won the hearts and admiration of his fellow soldiers. With many years as a public official, he labored incessantly for the benefit and welfare of his fellow man. Kind, courteous, and considerate always, the result of his efforts will stand as a monument to his memory.

In recognition of his unusual service to Pennsylvania, we do hereby award to him the distinguished-service medal of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

[SEAL] JAMES H. DUFF,
Governor of Pennsylvania.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer of June 14.

COOPERATION

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, where is the cooperation which you were supposed to get?

Millions of American taxpayers do not get any tax relief this year because we do not have enough Republican Congressmen to override a Democratic President's veto.

The Republicans are fighting as hard as they can to get some semblance of economy and efficiency in the Government departments. We Republicans are doing all we can to cut off appropriations to curb the departments from doing things that spell defeat in efficiency and economy. We get no cooperation from the Chief Executive.

Where is the cooperation that Congress was supposed to get? The American people must realize that since last November a new Congress was elected. If they want results in economy, less taxes, and better laws, we will need the help of a President who will cooperate with the Congress.

Next year elect a Republican President.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. In 1945 the President signed a tax bill that gave $6,000,000,000 relief to the corporations in the face of a $50,000,000,000 deficit. Now when there is a surplus in the Treasury he refuses to give the masses tax relief.

Mr. RICH. If he does not want to give tax relief, why does he not cut down Government expenses?

Let him give us a little cooperation. He promised it—but it is lacking.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KNUTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include editorials appearing in the New York Times, the New York Sun, and an article by David Lawrence.

Mr. OWENS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD concerning Danish-American Day.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. LYNCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Gen. L. C. Sheppard.

Mr. RAINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Thomas Russell.

Mr. MORRISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

FUTURE LEADERS OF AMERICA

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, those who are worried about the future of our Nation need only to meet the leaders of tomorrow to know that their fears are groundless. If we want to know the leaders, all we have to do is to meet the students from the various parts of the United States who are visiting our Capitol each day of the week. Today we have the pleasure of greeting a group of students of the high school of Barrington, Ill., which is located in the northern part of Illinois. Barrington is a fine farming community. The position of Barrington township is unique in that it is divided half between Cook County and half between Lake County, and represented by two districts, the Seventh and Tenth of Illinois. I have the honor to represent the Seventh. Yesterday, in the State of Illinois, we had the long-awaited congressional redistricting bill passed, and in the near future all the people of Barrington will be represented by the Honorable RALPH E. CHURCH, and I shall lose those fine constituents. My loss is his gain. I congratulate Mr. CHURCH.

THE TAX BILL

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, now that the House was unable or unwilling to override the President's veto of the tax bill and we are going to collect all this money from the people, it behooves this Congress to cut down on expenditures. We have to cut down these appropriations that have already been made; we ought to cut them a lot, and if this money must be taken from the taxpayers, it should be used in the public interest. It should be used to reduce the national debt. If the people cannot use it for their own benefit, as well as for the benefit of their communities, it ought to be applied to the national debt and not spent in the hope of electing and continuing the present reckless administration who seem to understand only deficit financing.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include as part of my remarks an editorial in today's the Philadelphia Inquirer entitled "So Millions of Little People Do Without Tax Cut."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. The editorial referred to reads as follows:

SO MILLIONS OF LITTLE PEOPLE DO WITHOUT TAX CUT

When the House yesterday lacked two votes needed to override President Truman's political veto of the $4,000,000,000 income tax-reduction bill, this worth-while measure died the death to which the Executive's indefensible action had condemned it.

So it is good night for the present to all tax-reduction hopes. As Speaker JOSEPH W. MARTIN commented, "This is the last say on taxes this year. Apparently the Democrats have little interest in cutting expenditures and reducing taxes. We may have to wait until we get a Republican President before we get tax reduction."

One thing Mr. Truman utterly failed to do in his labored message explaining his veto. He didn't make the explanation stick. His flimsy excuses carried clearer implication than ever that he and his associates are determined to twist tax reduction to partisan political purposes in a Presidential election year.

Why, otherwise, would he have made the ridiculous assertion that he is committed to tax reduction but only "the right kind of tax reduction, at the right time"? The right time for him, presumably, is not 1947 but 1948.

And why, otherwise, in purporting to set forth the injustices of the Republican tax-cut bill, would he have cited take-home pay increases based on dollar income rather than on the percentage of tax savings to the individual? The political odor of the President's illustration was strong.

But even if his point were justified—and it is, of course, obvious that the wealthy man would have more dollar (but not percentage) saving than the man in the lower brackets—it's a certainty that the millions of little people would have gotten a bigger kick, and probably more benefit, out of the tax reduction than would the man with an income of $100,000 or more.

However, the millions of little people as well as the handful of wealthy folk will have to go along without a welcome boost in their take-home pay, will have to go on fighting high prices with their war-taxed incomes—just because the time wasn't right for Mr. Truman to sign a tax-reduction bill, which both Houses of Congress had passed by impressive majorities. The whole business is disgusting, a travesty on democracy.

MEAT PRICES IN NEW YORK CITY

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the City Council of the City of New York has asked us to investigate the soaring meat prices, especially in New York City. New York Markets Commissioner Eugene G. Schulz reports on the basis of a city-wide sampling meat prices within an 18-day period have advanced upward of 29 percent.

These outrageous price rises are not limited to choice cuts but strike the hardest kind of blows against low-income families, who buy the cheaper meats, so that a hamburger has become a luxury in New York.

It is hoped that the House Agriculture Committee will immediately investigate these gouging advances, and especially the spread of price between cattle growers and retail butchers. I incline to the belief that the investigation will show illegal price fixing. Continuance of present conditions will result in the bulk of New York families being deprived of necessary nutrition that comes from meat.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Evening Star.

Mr. DEANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. SMATHERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the State Legislature of Florida.

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials.

Mr. RICHARDS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

INCOME-TAX REDUCTION

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, the remarks just made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] remind me of a sign I used to have in my law office some years ago which said "Quityourbellyaching." I sincerely trust that before this Eightieth Congress finally recesses we will have a real tax reduction bill which will be just and fair to the little man, not a bill such as the one the Republican majority tried to put over on the people of America; a tax reduction bill which will not be for the benefit of the $300,000-a-year income taxpayer contributor to the Republican National Committee, but a tax bill which will increase the exemptions of the little man and take the citizen making less than $2,500 a year off the tax rolls.

TERMINAL-LEAVE-PAY BONDS

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I bring to you today the voice of the Legislature of the State of Florida, which passed unanimously a Senate concurrent resolution requesting this Congress to pass legislation providing for cash payment to veterans holding terminal-leave bonds. I hope we will not delay longer passing this legislation. I further bring to you the voice of the American Legion, the State Department of Florida, which unanimously passed a resolution calling on this Congress to pass legislation making said bonds redeemable in cash. We have but a few days left now to pass such legislation and send it to the Senate for action. We waited the last session until the very last minute to give these boys their terminal-leave pay, and when the bill went to the other body it came back unsatisfactory to this House by making terminal leave pay in bonds instead of cash. Let us take action now to right that wrong and provide that these boys can get cash. Let us not go home and tell the boys, "We had to accept something because the other body did it." I appeal to you to do something today. Do not procrastinate. The day of salvation is at hand.

COOPERATION

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, as a boy I learned how effective and how important cooperation could be, when one day I batted bumble bees right and left in a clover field, and the next day I was foolish enough to stir up a nest of them in an old rotten log. On the one occasion I was victorious over hundreds. On the other occasion I was pretty badly bunged up and put to flight by a mere handful.

The point I want to stress is this: Cooperation is a very effective and a very desirable thing in the world today. In fact, it is the basis of civilization. Now, then, if one branch of the Government wants cooperation on its foreign policies, perhaps another branch of the Government should expect cooperation on domestic policies.

Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago President Truman signed the Revenue Act of 1945, which was a Democratic tax measure sponsored by the gentleman from North Carolina, Congressman ROBERT DOUGHTON, then chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. The Revenue Act of 1945 provided tax relief of over $6,000,000,000 per year, most of which went to corporations; and this in the face of a $20,000,000,000 budget deficit. Now, President Truman has vetoed a Republican tax reduction bill that proposed to give 49,000,000 individuals tax relief amounting to $4,000,000,000, most of which would have gone to taxpayers in the lower brackets. The bill was vetoed in spite of the fact that we expect a Treasury surplus of several billion dollars during the present fiscal year.

In taking this action President Truman brushed aside the advice of such Democratic leaders as Senator GEORGE and the gentleman from North Carolina, Congressman DOUGHTON, who told him the country needed tax relief now. These two men are outstanding tax authorities, each having been chairman of the respective tax committees of the Senate and the House. President Truman preferred to follow the advice of lesser men who do not understand that this Nation cannot long maintain full employment, full production, and a sound economy, and at the same time carry the present excessive wartime tax load. The President's veto message forces the internal revenue men to continue to extract 20 percent out of the pay envelopes of some 45,000,000 American workingmen.

It is interesting in this connection to note that in 1944, President Roosevelt vetoed a tax bill, the first tax bill ever to be vetoed by an American President. And at that time Senator Truman joined Senator BARKLEY in denouncing the veto message and helped by his vote to override that veto.

TAX, SPEND, ELECT

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, it is still tax and tax and tax, and spend and spend and spend, but it will not be elect and elect and elect.

EXCISE TAXES ON TRAILERS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, at the present time we have a 7-percent excise tax on housing in the form of trailers.

The levy constitutes an unjust and discriminatory tax on one particular type of housing. It is not levied against any other form of housing.

Last year the Government collected more than $5,000,000 in trailer excise taxes.

Most of that money was paid by veterans who needed housing.

So far this year more than 60 percent of the trailers sold have gone to veterans.

The Bureau of Internal Revenue maintains trailers should be taxed along with other automotive equipment.

The facts are that through direct purchase the Government has recognized trailers to be housing, not automotive equipment.

Milwaukee has purchased more than 1,000 trailers for housing so far this year. Hundreds of smaller cities have purchased them in lesser quantities.

In 1941 the Michigan State Supreme Court upheld a decision of Circuit Judge H. Russell Holland, in which Judge Holland stated clearly that trailers are housing units.

Last year Housing Expediter Wilson Wyatt recognized trailers as housing by including them in the Government emergency-housing program.

It is time for us to take the 7-percent excise tax off housing and I hope that Congress will do that in the very near future.

UNITED STATES REDEEMS RUSSIAN MONEY

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, for the past 24 hours word has been coming to us through the press and over the radio that the United States Government has had to redeem $380,000,000 worth of money spent in occupied Germany by Russian soldiers. The United States is called upon to redeem this money because it is in fact American occupation money made available to Russia by the United States. This money was printed by Russia on plates furnished them by the Treasury of the United States early in 1945. They are still printing it and still spending it, and we are still redeeming it. How much we will have to redeem we do not know.

Mr. Speaker, is it possible that the tax bill was vetoed in order to be sure to have enough of American taxpayers' dollars to redeem American occupation money spent by the Russian Army in the occupied zone in Germany?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain editorials and extraneous material.

VETO OF THE TAX BILL

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under the Constitution, the House of Representatives has the power to tax the people of this country and take their money to run the Government. Under that same Constitution, the President is empowered to direct foreign affairs.

The founding fathers that wrote the Constitution inserted a provision that the President could veto legislation passed by Congress. That veto was presumed to be used sparingly and only under unusual circumstances.

We now have the spectacle of the President using that veto power to, in effect, legislate on the taxing authority of the House. In other words, one man now says how much money shall be taken away from the individual wage earner. I feel that the President was wrong in using his veto power for this purpose. The House passed the tax bill by a big majority and if the President had lived up to the spirit of the Constitution he would have signed that bill because the taxing power is vested in the House and not in him.

Under the Constitution, the foreign relations is very properly directed by the President. I have always supported the President in his direction of foreign affairs. Many times there have been grave doubts in my mind when I voted. I have felt, however, that the President and the Secretary of State and his foreign department knew the facts probably better than I, so I have tried to support him in our relations with other countries. I feel that is following the provisions and spirit of the Constitution.

Now the President has taken upon himself the authority of telling the House of Representatives how they shall tax the people. He is taking this authority for what, to my mind, is a frivolous reason. He apparently wants to gain some questionable political advantage. If I, as a Member of the House, acted with the same motives and in the same spirit as the President, I should vote against every proposal that he makes. I will not do that. I still intend to vote for what I consider and believe are the best interests of the country under the spirit of the Constitution.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article written by one of his constituents.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3839) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3839, with Mr. SPRINGER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. General debate was completed on yesterday and the first paragraph of the bill had been read.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PANAMA CANAL CONSTRUCTION ANNUITY FUND

Panama Canal construction annuity fund: For payment of annuities authorized by the act of May 29, 1944 (Public Law 319), $1,910,000.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for eight additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I do not think the committee has any thought of limiting the time or objecting, but what was the nature of the gentleman's comment? Would it be possible to ask for the additional time when the gentleman has consumed the first 5 minutes?

Mr. GORE. If the gentleman so wishes that procedure, it is satisfactory to me. I withdraw that request, Mr. Chairman. I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I have seen in the press and heard over the radio a great many statements and many varying figures and amounts as to how much the budget has been cut to date. The truth is that the phony cuts—that is, the phony claims of reductions—now exceed the real cuts in the budget by nearly a billion dollars.

The purely phony budget-cut claims of the Republicans have now reached a total of $2,649,150,000.

Republican leaders now shy away from the word "reduction" and are undertaking to substitute the word "saving"—with a double meaning. For instance, they are now claiming as savings not only phony reductions, but additional revenue as well.

With consideration of the 1948 budget about completed by the House, the vaunted Republican economy drive is now revealed to have fizzled—hopelessly bogged down. The bona fide reductions in appropriations now total only $1,875,716,750—pitifully short of the $6,000,000,000 goal.

What is more, the reduction is larger now than it will be at any time between now and June 30, 1948. The process of reducing the reduction will soon get under way by two methods: One, the other body, will add many millions of increases as they consider appropriation bills, and, two, deficiency bills will have to be considered early next year.

I have kept the fiscal score so far, and I expect to keep the tally until all deficiencies are in and the fiscal year ends June 30, 1948. At that time I shall be surprised if the Republicans do very much better than to live within the President's budget.

BONA FIDE AND PHONY CUTS

I decided to post the scoreboard. To do so, I have made two charts or tables and place them side by side: First, total

bona fide reductions in appropriations made by the House of Representatives, and, second, the phony budget-cut claims in which there is not one dollar of real reduction of Government expenditure. Here they are:

Total bona fide reductions in appropriations made by the House of Representatives for fiscal year 1948 (including independent offices bill as reported)

Appropriation bills:	*Bona fide reductions*
Treasury, Post Office	$97,072,750
Labor, Federal Security	28,825,520
Government corporations	14,847,550
Agriculture Department	343,427,742
War Department	435,809,077
Navy Department	377,519,200
State, Commerce, Judiciary	159,645,031
Interior Department	134,006,907
Independent offices	[1] 175,240,732
Total	1,766,394,509

[1] Includes a $20,000,000 reduction in appropriation for Philippine War Claims Commission which may or may not prove to be a real reduction.

Phony budget cut claims (in which there is not one dollar of real reduction of Government expenditure)

Postponement of tax refunds	$800,000,000
Additional revenue from ship sales	505,075,000
Downward revision of budget by the President	291,075,000
Treasury cancellation of CCC notes	642,000,000
Abolishing Maritime Commission's revolving fund	108,000,000
Atomic Energy Commission part-year appropriation	75,000,000
Contract authorization instead of appropriation for veterans' hospitals	30,300,000
Substitution of contract authorization for money already appropriated	50,000,000
Deferral of appropriation for veterans' pensions	50,000,000
Contract authorization substituted for appropriation for Hill-Burton hospital program	50,000,000
UNRRA	47,700,000
Total	[1] 2,649,150,000

[1] Does not include alleged reduction in Maritime Commission budget of $73,200,000 which, together with elimination of budget limitation, will probably increase rather than decrease expenditures.

REAL REDUCTIONS LISTED

I should like to point out first the real reductions in the budget. These are taken from the bills that we have passed. They total $1,876,716,750. These are to be considered in conjunction with the phony cuts claims in which there is not one dollar of real reduction in expenditure to the taxpayers. I should like to take these in turn and give my own explanation of why they do not represent any real cut in Government expenditure.

Let us take the first one: Postponement of tax refunds. That has been debated here, and I will not detain the Committee at any length to discuss that, but will merely quote the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee which reported the bill. In debate on the bill the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] said on March 10 when the bill was under consideration:

> We do not intend to leave the impression that this $800,000,000 reduction will save a single dollar for the taxpayer. The Government will still have to pay out whatever taxes are paid unnecessarily.

That is better than I can say it, and it comes from the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee; yet in repeated statements to the press I have seen this claimed as a saving or a reduction in the President's budget.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I shall be delighted to yield.

Mr. COUDERT. Does the gentleman deny that that is a reduction from the budget estimate of the President? Yes or no, please.

Mr. GORE. I am saying, as the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee said——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I certainly know that neither the committee nor I personally will object because we are always glad to have anyone, even a member of the opposite party, demonstrate so clearly the savings that are being made to the taxpayers of the United States; and I do not believe the taxpayer will care particularly whether it is called a saving or a reduction, as the effect on the taxpayer's pocketbook is the same. If the gentleman from Tennessee will permit me, I thought perhaps he could save time if it might be understood that the minority party of which he is so distinguished a member is opposed to all reductions in spending or reductions in the budget. That would save some of his time. That is all I have in mind.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, you will note the sudden use of the word "saving." You will notice it more as we go along.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman answer the question I asked before his time ran out?

Mr. GORE. I will be delighted to yield, but I must warn the gentleman it may be necessary to request additional time if I yield because I have a number of items to discuss.

Mr. COUDERT. The gentleman's time will not be cut off prematurely, I am sure.

Mr. GORE. I thank the gentleman. I have served on the committee with the able gentleman from New York and whenever he asks anyone to yield I know he has in his mind a real contribution to the discussion; so I gladly yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COUDERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I too have enjoyed service with the gentleman from Tennessee. I would like the gentleman from Tennessee to tell me whether or not the first item in that, and the only one to which he has referred, does not in fact reflect a reduction in the budget estimates submitted by the President?

Mr. GORE. It represents a phony reduction. It is apparent but not real, as I have quoted the chairman of the subcommittee as saying.

Mr. COUDERT. I would like to ask the gentleman one further question. Does the gentleman admit that the point of departure, the point of comparison, in determining what is or what is not a budget reduction must be the original figure submitted in the original budget estimates from the Budget Bureau? I think that is a very simple question.

Mr. GORE. In reply, I would like to ask the gentleman a question: Does he think that this saves the American taxpayers one dollar?

Mr. COUDERT. Now, wait a minute.

Mr. GORE. Well, I am waiting for the gentleman's answer.

Mr. COUDERT. If our budget estimate is correct, it will save the American taxpayers no less than $800,000,000, or whatever the figure is.

Mr. GORE. I beg to disagree with the gentleman.

Mr. COUDERT. Of course, that would be a bagatelle to the gentleman's party because the Members on that side do not care anything about the people's money except to spend it.

Mr. GORE. The estimate, whether for $800,000,000 more or $800,000,000 less, would not save one dollar nor cost one dollar extra. Only those taxes which are overpaid will be repaid and none which are not overpaid will be repaid.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I want to ask him a question about the first item.

Mr. GORE. Will the gentleman secure me additional time?

Mr. TABER. I do not imagine the gentleman will have too much difficulty in that respect. This is the picture——

Mr. GORE. This is the picture absolutely.

Mr. TABER. If the money is not needed and the evidence indicated that it would not be needed, it is very proper for the Congress to operate and put in a figure that will represent what is needed instead of a phoney figure that might be in the budget.

Mr. GORE. The evidence of which the gentleman speaks is incorporated, I take it, in the report of the committee. The report says that taxes are going to be cut, therefore, the amount of tax refunds would be less. As a matter of fact, the very opposite would be the result. You and I are paying taxes and have been paying taxes at current rates, and any cut in taxes would entitle us to more refunds; not less. The evidence to which the gentleman refers is as spurious and bogus as the claim of budgetary reduction.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The claim of our Republican friends at the beginning of the session was that they would make a $6,000,000,000 reduction.

Mr. GORE. By reason of cuts in the budget.

Mr. McCORMACK. Now, if this $800,000,000 was appropriated and it was not needed, not a penny of it would be spent.

Mr. GORE. Not one.

Mr. McCORMACK. So there is no economy here, and the position that the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] places himself in takes on a peculiar light because when they put through the excise tax bill they tried to kid the public that it was not permanent legislation but that it was legislation without any time limit. They tried to make a lot of double talk in order to fool the people.

Mr. GORE. I thank the distinguished gentleman. I do not think there is any room for argument on this first item of the chart or table. The Chairman of the subcommittee states it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Now I would like to come to the second item, additional revenue from ship sales.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GORE. If the gentleman will just let me read the second item, I will be delighted to yield.

Mr. COUDERT. The gentleman from Tennessee did not answer the original question I asked him. I still want that answered and then I will let him proceed without interruption.

Mr. GORE. I thought I answered the question fully. I know the gentleman has such very acute powers of discernment, and I admit my limitations, I know he can understand anything that is stated logically, and I regret that I have not been able to so state it.

Mr. COUDERT. Will the gentleman please answer the question whether or not the point of departure for comparison as to reduction or nonreduction is the original budget submitted by the Budget Bureau on behalf of the President?

Mr. GORE. If the gentleman is asking me the question as to whether or not the yardstick of whether the Congress reduces or does not reduce the budget, is the estimate contained in the budget submitted by the President, then the answer is "Yes," if that answers the gentleman's question. But what I am trying to point out is that there are real ways to cut it, effective ways, and there are phony ways by which you are merely making a show of economy this year, only to make a deficiency appropriation next year.

Now I would like to go to the second item, additional revenues from ship sales, $505,670,500. You will find that claimed as a saving in the report of the committee on the bill now under consideration.

Now, what is that? The $505,000,000 is an estimate of the committee of additional income that may result from additional sales and charter of ships. That represents no reduction in the budget. It represents no curtailment of expenditure. That is just what it says it is, additional revenue to the Government. How they can claim that as a reduction of the budget, I just do not quite understand. All the committee has done about it is merely to hear a rumor that additional ships might be sold, and they have done nothing to bring it about.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, that came about as a result of a minute examination by the accountants of the committee and it developed that the money was coming in beyond question and that the President had not included it in his statement of receipts. We might just as well take the picture as it is right out in the open.

Mr. GORE. That is what I am trying to do.

Mr. TABER. There is no question about that.

Mr. GORE. I certainly respect and honor the distinguished chairman of the committee on which I have the privilege to serve, and I would like to ask him now just how this represents a reduction in the President's budget; how it cuts down on Government expenditures?

Mr. TABER. It does not cut down Government expenditure but it does reach into a place where a group of spenders might waste money and gather that money into the Treasury, where the people of the United States can have the benefit of it.

Mr. GORE. In the first place, you will not find one word in the bill requiring this to be paid in. The committee has merely found out that additional ships might be sold. They have done nothing to bring about an additional sale, they have done nothing to cause it to be paid into the Treasury, because that is where it would come anyway. The gentleman has just said it does not represent any reduction in expenditure. I thought that was what we were talking about when we started out talking about the President's budget. Now we have got around not to using the word "reduction" but the word "savings," now interpreted to be additional revenue.

Mr. COUDERT. If the gentleman will yield further, does he dare to pretend that when $500,000,000 of income that was concealed by the Budget Bureau is found by the committee and produced, they do not to that extent reduce the Government's obligation to spend? If you receive $10 you did not know you were going to get, are you not $10 better off?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes, and I hope he will yield to me.

Mr. GORE. I will as soon as I respond to the question of the distinguished gentleman from New York.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORE. In reply to the distinguished gentleman from New York, I will say that I am not a very daring man, but it does not require a great deal of courage or insight to realize that additional income to the Government represents no cut in the expenditures of the Government. The gentleman uses the word "produced." To that part of the gentleman's question I answer in the negative, because the committee and the Congress have not produced this additional revenue. It is merely additional sales which may occur without any action whatever on the part of the Congress.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I promised to yield next to my friend from Ohio.

Mr. COUDERT. Just one question? The gentleman yields to me.

Mr. GORE. I am sure that the design here is not to prevent the gentleman from Tennessee from discussing this long list of items on the phony cut chart, though some might gather that impression.

Mr. COUDERT. No, we want the gentleman from Tennessee to tell the whole story, because we are very proud of it.

Mr. GORE. I promised to yield next to my genial friend from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I rise for the purpose of being helpful to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. The gentleman, possessing as he does such admirable talents, is always very helpful.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I believe we can understand why there is such great confusion in the gentleman's mind and why there is a difference of opinion here on the floor. I believe the gentleman made the statement that he wanted to quote facts and figures. There are about half a dozen of us here who have been through grade school and who have just added up the gentleman's figures. They do not add. If he will add those figures for the House and get the correct sum total, perhaps then it will be a little more informative.

Mr. GORE. If the gentleman will lend me the adding machine he has in his pocket, I will be glad to undertake to ascertain any possible error in addition, small though it be.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I have the adding machine in my head, and I hope the gentleman has one there. If the gentleman will take the time to notice—and I was glad to get time for him.

Mr. GORE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If he will add up his figures, he will ascertain that his column of figures just simply does not add. He either has the wrong amount or the wrong figures. Of course, if the gentleman, who has made such a careful study for the benefit of the Democratic minority, cannot get down the right figures or cannot add them up, which ever way it may be, then I can understand why such great confusion exists not only in his own mind but throughout the country. I think perhaps we are just adding to the confusion as we discuss this today.

Mr. GORE. I certainly appreciate the contribution of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio. If there is a slight difference in his addition and mine, I think we could leave it to the distinguished young gentleman from North Carolina, if he would add the figures and tell which of us is correct.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FORAND. My only reason for taking the floor right now is to show that the opposition is really putting up a drive to prevent the gentleman from going through his entire recapitulation, or whatever he has. That fact has been denied on that side of the House. I am going to put them to the test, with the gentleman's permission.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Tennessee be extended 15 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object simply to remark to the gentleman from Rhode Island who has made the unanimous consent request that it was not my purpose to delay the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee in making his illuminating remarks, but instead I wanted to bring before the House accurate figures because I do not think we should discuss figures here which on their face are not accurate and correct.

I hope the gentleman will get his arithmetic book out and correct these figures.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, three of my distinguished colleagues have come to my rescue with reference to whatever errors there may be in addition here, and I will say that none of the three agree, so perhaps we had better get the adding machine.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. My colleague from Illinois [Mr. OWENS] and I have in the gallery a number of Barrington (Ill.) High School students, and I am sure that if they could see these figures before the gentleman from Tennessee, they would see an error by the millions.

Mr. GORE. The error, if any, is but small and inadvertent.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, the high-school children could compute the figures correctly.

Mr. GORE. Oh, I am sure of that, and with the help of the splendid class from the gentleman's district, the record will show the correct figures, I can assure the gentleman. Also I will put the adding machine to them instead of my mental arithmetic.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to proceed to the third phony claim of cutting the President's budget.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield before he leaves that item?

Mr. GORE. I wish the gentleman would permit me to proceed.

Mr. COUDERT. I should like the gentleman to yield before he leaves that item which is not complete so far as I am concerned.

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. COUDERT. I merely want to say that the gentleman apparently takes the view that income unexpectedly found and received by the Government is of no interest and makes no difference in budgetary figures.

Mr. GORE. Oh, no.

Mr. COUDERT. Does the gentleman mean by that that if this administration received unexpectedly $500,000,000 it will probably be wasted, misspent, and lost, like the $8,000,000,0000 that the Maritime Commission had and cannot in any way, shape, or form, account for now?

Mr. GORE. The administration, the executive branch of the Government, cannot spend one dollar which is not made available by Congress. This Congress, which has talked so much about economy, has already appropriated four times as much as was appropriated for all purposes in 1935 and about three times as much as was appropriated for all purposes in 1939; and if this money is spent it will be spent on the direction and authorization of this Congress which has been talking so much about economy, but which now refuses to deliver on the promises.

Mr. COUDERT. Would that $500,000,000 go into a general revolving fund?

Mr. GORE. I do not so understand, but maybe so.

Mr. COUDERT. Then the Maritime Commission could do what it likes with it and we have provided that it shall be covered into the Treasury so that nobody can touch it and waste it.

Mr. GORE. The gentleman is incorrectly informed there because the budget proposes a limitation of expenditure by the Maritime Commission.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that no Member would feel offended if the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] simply declined to yield until he has finished his statement, at which time he could yield for questions. I am sure the questioning could be done then just as well, and I, therefore, suggest to the gentleman from Tennessee that he decline to yield until he has completed his statement and then he can yield.

Mr. GORE. Does the gentleman from Florida include our distinguished colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE], who is on his feet now at the gentleman's side?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I include everyone.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. O'TOOLE. I congratulate the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] upon his ability to make the elephant jump.

Mr. GORE. I thank the gentleman for his compliment. And now, Mr. Chairman, I should like to go to the third claim, downward revision of the budget of the President.

On May 14, 1947, the President submitted to the Congress supplemental estimates of the budget or, in other words, a revision of certain items in the budget. I have his message here which is Public Document No. 252.

ONE POCKET TO ANOTHER

In this revision of budget items, the President made certain revisions upward and certain revisions downward in the Veterans' Administration. As a matter of fact, the revisions upward, to some extent exceed the revisions downward, but if you will notice in the report on the bill now before you, the committee charges to the budget all recommended increases but takes credit to itself for all reductions actually made by the President himself. Now, just what kind of rules of the game that is I do not know, but you will find it in the report. That represents no reduction by the Congress whatever. It represents reductions by the President in his revised estimates, and the President is given no credit for that, but he is charged with all the increases.

Now, I would like to go to the fourth one, Treasury cancellation of CCC notes. That is a sleight-of-hand attempt at bookkeeping. What happened? All the Members know that the Commodity Credit Corporation was authorized to borrow from the Treasury, and the Treasury was authorized to loan to the Commodity Credit Corporation funds to carry out the intent and legal purposes of the Commodity Credit Corporation. That money has been spent. It is already gone. It was spent in previous years, most of it even before this fiscal year. The President recommended in the budget that the Treasury be authorized to cancel the notes of the Commodity Credit Corporation. In order to try to show a saving, somebody had the bright idea that if it was just done in a deficiency bill it would somehow change the situation. It does not at all. It does not matter whether it is done in 1947, 1948, or 1949. It would not affect expenditures one dollar. The money has already been spent. To take that theory, the Republicans would be in the unusual position of trying to spend the money twice, and I know they would not want to do that. To claim that that is a reduction in the budget or even a saving, with either one of their two definitions, would be like my taking this dollar out of my right-hand pocket and putting it in my left-hand pocket and then charging my distinguished colleague from Kentucky, who sits so conveniently nearby, with the depletion of my right-hand pocket.

PAPER SAVING DESCRIBED

Now, one Government agency, the Treasury, holds the note of another agency of the same Government. It is listed in the budget with a double listing. It is listed as an asset of the Treasury and a liability of the Corporation. When we cancel the notes, we take the liability from the Commodity Credit Corporation and cancel the asset of the Treasury. It represents not one dollar in reduction of expenditures. The same thing could

be done, of course, and we have previously done it that way, by merely appropriating funds for the Commodity Credit Corporation with which to pay the Treasury, but, there again, we would be appropriating money out of the Treasury to another agency to make payment back to the Treasury. So that represents not one dollar of expenditure reduction.

Abolishing the Maritime Commission revolving fund: Now, there again they are dealing with funds which are assets and revenues of an agency of government. They merely transfer the receipts from the Maritime Commission into the Treasury. If we regarded the Maritime Commission or the Commodity Credit Corporation as agencies of some foreign government then we could count this as additional revenue or as additional expense, but since they are both agencies of the same Government, it represents no saving whatsoever.

Atomic Energy Commission, part-year appropriation. To show you that the committee did not even intend this to be a reduction I would just like to read from the report of the committee on the bill now before you. Here is what they say:

The committee have determined that funds should be provided for operation in connection with this important project on a part-year basis, additional funds to be provided during the early part of the next session.

In other words, we will make a showing for economy now and then early next session we will come in with a deficiency.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, make a reduction now but not an economy.

Mr. GORE. Make a show of reduction.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; a show of economy.

PUT APPROPRIATIONS OFF

Mr. GORE. Contract authorization. Instead of appropriations for veterans' hospitals you will find that the budget recommended $30,300,000 for construction of veterans hospital facilities, the committee cut out the appropriation and wrote into the bill contract authorizations, and here is what the committee says:

The committee has approved the proposal set forth in the budget estimate for the construction of 15 new veterans' hospitals.

Now, you notice, they have approved the plan, they have approved the program but they say:

In eliminating $30,300,000 requested in the estimate as an additional appropriation to carry forward the hospital program the committee is able to report definitely that the program has not been retarded or delayed in any respect. The committee has been assured by representatives of the Veterans' Administration that sufficient funds in cash is now in hand and available to meet all possible need until—

Again—

at least the latter part of the fiscal year 1948, at which time funds can be provided.

In other words, again let us make a show of economy by postponing the day of appropriation until next year and we will bring in a deficiency.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I want to accept the suggestion of my distinguished colleague from Florida; then I will yield.

Mr. OWENS. We get hungry once in a while.

Mr. GORE. The gentleman has my permission to go eat.

Then, there is substitution of contract authority for money already appropriated. Again the committee says—and I should like to read—you know the committee report really answers most of these questions in better language than I can. We have some clerks who are far more proficient in the use of the English language than I. I wish to read you about this item:

The committee has inserted in the bill a provision rescinding $50,000,000 with the understanding that funds will be made available if and when required in order that the following program may go forward without delay—

The committee has done what?—

has increased contract authorizations.

Obviously there is no reduction here, nor was any intended.

ANOTHER SUBSTITUTION

Mr. Chairman, the next to the last item is again a substitution of contract authorization for direct appropriations. To carry out the provisions of the Hill-Burton Hospital Act the President recommended an appropriation of $50,000,000. The committee struck that out and substituted contract authorization, not of just $50,000,000 but of $150,000,000; so instead of this being any reduction in expenditure, in all probability it will result in a considerable increase of Government expenditures during the year over and above the budget.

I would like to read again what the committee said. You know these committee clerks write very good reports.

The committee is firmly convinced that to insure against any impediment in the development of this program as rapidly as possible some firm provision should be made for Federal participation to whatever extent future developments may require during 1948.

The budget estimated that $77,700,000 would be needed in fiscal year 1948 to liquidate obligations of prior fiscal years. It now appears that only $30,000,000 will be necessary. The $47,700,000, or a sum thereabout, will not be spent, nor can it be obligated. This result has come about entirely without any effort on the part of the Congress.

LAUDS TALENTS FOR MISSING BOAT

The Congress has taken no action whatsoever to effect any reduction here. The Appropriations Committee merely "learned" that certain UNRRA funds set aside for reimbursement of the Maritime Commission for shipment of UNRRA supplies would probably not be fully used. Though the committee took no action to bring this situation about, nor in fact did anything about it, except to make inquiries, the report of the Independent Offices Subcommittee lists this as "saving." This is another indication of face-saving desperation.

DEFERRAL OF APPROPRIATION FOR VETERANS' PENSIONS

This is a "guesstimate." The committee report says, "No recommendation by the committee contemplates any reduction or change in any existing veterans' benefits." The budget estimated that compensation and pensions to veterans would amount to $2,221,915,000. The committee merely substituted its guess for the estimate of the budget and thereby claimed a reduction of expenditure to the tune of $50,000,000. Standards for veterans' pensions and compensation are fixed by law, and a guess that it will be either lower or higher will have no effect on the amount of actual expenditure. It is one thing to reduce appropriations for, say, a reclamation project, but quite another to guess-timate a fixed obligation.

ALLEGED REDUCTIONS IN SPECIFIC MARITIME COMMISSION BUDGET ITEMS

The budget recommended and contemplated a total expenditure of $280,200,000 by the Maritime Commission. The Independent Offices Committee Report claims to have reduced this amount by $73,200,000. It will be seen from the report, however, that a goodly part of this reduction is in ship reconversion which in actual practice results in approximately a net, or wash, operation, in that the sales price of the ships, which it is conceded are practically unsalable in present condition, amounts to approximately the cost of reconversion. Thus, we find here again a double listing, and properly so, in the budget—estimated cost of reconversion and estimated receipts from sale of ships, the two canceling each other out in the budget.

The committee action, however, would still have resulted in some reduction of expenditures had it not stricken from the bill the language recommended by the budget which would have limited ship construction by the Maritime Commission to ships for which the Maritime Commission had a commitment of sale. The basic law would require the purchaser to pay 50 percent of costs. The committee struck this restriction from the bill. The result will be that the Maritime Commission will build ships, bearing the entire costs, with or without commitment of sale. Without commitment of sale, the Maritime Commission will be left holding the bag—with ships in it. Only one recourse might be left to the Commission, and that would be charter—at a nominal rate, usually. It will be seen from the committee report, page 28, that $99,000,000 is authorized for new ship construction and betterment. The budget contemplates that one-half of the cost of ship construction would be borne by purchasers. So, the action of the committee with respect to the Maritime Commission may well result in an over-all increase of Government expenditure rather than a decrease. It is difficult to see how a reduction would result.

In order to complete the fiscal score, it is necessary to point out that the

House has thus far enacted contract authorizations exceeding budget authorization estimates by $328,425,000. The amounts contained in the two bills are as follows: The Federal Security Labor bill contained $150,000,000 in budget authorizations, and the Independent Offices Appropriation bill contained $178,425,000 making a total of $328,425,000.

I want to offer my congratulations to my astute Republican friends, the leaders of their party, on the admirable skill they have shown in keeping so far away from the goal they set for themselves. Not to have come near it once in so many trials shows the most splendid talents for missing the boat.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has again expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, it is apparent from the statement of my distinguished friend from Tennessee that the word "savings" is anathema to many on the minority side. The outstanding thing about the word "savings" is that we have not had from the minority side one single amendment offered on the floor to cut a single item that is presented here and not a single thing has been done by them for the purpose of saving money. The only thing we have had is a vigorous attempt on the part of the administration and of many of my friends on the minority side to keep up the appropriations to the level submitted in January by the President and the budget. My friend from Tennessee has criticized some of these items that we have referred to as possible savings. Let me say to you that the cut on refunds of taxes was made after hearings had developed, both in our committee and the Ways and Means Committee, that the amount in all probability would not be required. They had a great big setup in the Treasury Department for refund of excess profits taxes and they admitted before the Ways and Means Committee that that would not be required.

This item of $505,000,000 for ship sales is an item that our investigators demonstrated beyond question was going to be received by the Treasury of the United States from ship sales. It was not included in the President's estimate as a receipt. Therefore it is proper that we should take credit for pining it down and getting our figures on it so that it will appear in the Treasury of the United States and not be spent by the Maritime Commission in its revolving fund.

There is an item of $291,000,000, a downward revision of the President's budget figures, that my friend criticizes. Let me tell you just how that happened. That item resulted from an absolute demonstration by our investigators in the Veterans' Administration and the Maritime Commission that the funds were not going to be needed. It was based upon our efforts and our operations. There is no reason in the world why we should not take credit for it.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I would just like to say in that connection that I think the gentleman from Tennessee will find that the officials of the Bureau of the Budget actually expressed their thanks to the committee investigators for the help they have given them all along the line in this connection.

Mr. TABER. So that we will have the whole thing together, this item of $50,000,000 that was taken out of the item for veterans' pensions was taken out as a deliberate reduction because, according to the figures submitted to the committee by General Bradley and the Veterans' Administration, that amount would not be needed out of the revised estimate that was submitted, and therefore they were able to take an actual cut and not a phony cut.

So that the gentleman from Tennessee may have a picture of this Commodity Credit Corporation item, I just want to call his attention to this fact.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman started out to discuss this downward revision by the President and then jumped onto something else.

Mr. TABER. I finished with the downward revision on that particular item.

Mr. GORE. In the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. TABER. Yes; I finished with that. I just discussed the $50,000,000 cut at that time, because that all came out of the same pool.

Now, as to this Commodity Credit Corporation item, I think that we ought to have the full picture out in the front here. The President submitted a budget estimate of $830,000,000 for the Commodity Credit Corporation in January. That has been reduced as a result of investigation and the gathering together of information to $642,000,000. That is a reduction below the President's budget of $188,000,000. Now, that was submitted as an item that would be paid out of the Treasury in 1948, that $830,000,000 figure. The operations of putting it in the deficiency bill certainly resulted in whatever might be done about it being taken out of the 1947 budget, insofar as it was taken out.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Not until I complete this item.

Mr. GORE. I just want to give the gentleman a figure.

Mr. TABER. I want to give the gentleman the rest of the budget figure before I come to that, and then I will yield to him.

I will say to the gentleman that the budget carried an item of cash that the Commodity Credit Corporation had, which they expected to have available for turning into the Treasury, of $429,000,000 at the end of 1948, which they claimed somehow or other was an offset to that other figure.

Now I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GORE. For the sake of accuracy and in deference to my distinguished friend from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], I will say that the exact figure is $641,832,080.64.

Mr. TABER. I used the gentleman's figure of $642,000,000. I did not try to be accurate beyond his own table.

Mr. GORE. As is the custom in discussion, I used round figures.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Does the gentleman from New York contend that the Committee on Appropriations actually saved the expenditure of $600,000,000?

Mr. TABER. I do not claim that there was any saving on that thing as a result of anything the Committee on Appropriations did. I have made no statement heretofore on that subject anywhere, but I am making this statement now so that the whole picture may be out in front and everybody may understand just what it is. I was telling you just what the picture was, and I am not going to tell anything more about it because I do not think anyone can dispute a word I have said.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I just thought the people of the country would like to know whether there is a saving.

Mr. TABER. There is not going to be an expenditure in 1948. That has been the contention and that has been the only contention that ever has been made with reference to this particular item. The only saving is the $188,000,000 that resulted from a reduction from $830,000,000 to $642,000,000.

Mr. GORE. If the gentleman will yield further, may I say to my distinguished chairman that that, too, represents no change in final figures as to expenditures because it is a double listing.

Mr. TABER. It does make a change in figures.

Mr. GORE. It is a net transaction, a wash operation.

Mr. TABER. I do not know about that, but it makes a difference of $188,000,000 in the amount of expenditures that were estimated in the original budget. I do not say that the Congress made that reduction or that anything they did had anything to do with it, but that is the picture.

Mr. GORE. In the accounting procedure, when you reduce the one, where there is a double listing, you raise the other a corresponding amount.

Mr. TABER. Yes, but when you reduce the amount that is to be charged up net by $188,000,000 you have that much reduction. That is about all there is to that story.

The committee abolished the $108,000,000 revolving fund of the Martime Commission. That is an absolute saving, because it puts the Maritime Commission on a basis where they have to come to the Congress for whatever

money they get. The committee has provided plenty of money for them to go on for next year, but they do not have the revolving fund to play with any more, and the condition has been cleaned up.

On this atomic-bomb business we do not know whether or not that is a cut. It depends on what the Atomic Energy Commission can justify when they come back here, if they do come back here next January. If they do come back, I hope they come back with some figures that some committee or somebody in the Congress can understand and get in shape. They did not come with any kind of figures when they came to us this time.

On the veterans' hospital item $30,000,000 was taken off that and put into a contract authorization because the money was not going to be spent in 1948, according to the Veterans' Administration, and that was a proper thing to take out. There is no question about that. That is perfectly clear.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. In every case where a contract authorization is substituted for an actual appropriation, where if the appropriation were actually made the expenditure could not be accomplished in the fiscal year following, it represents an actual saving, does it not, as against the Budget estimate of expenditure in that fiscal year?

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. KEEFE. That is the reason the Committee on Appropriations translated that into a contract authorization, so as not to interfere with the continuity of the program. Is not that true?

Mr. TABER. That is right.

When conditions are such that you cannot build because you cannot get the labor and material, and money is going to be saved as a result of the postponement of those operations because of the economic conditions in our country, and we are not going to have to spend as much money as we would have had to spend the way the thing has been set up here in the January budget, we are entitled to take advantage of that situation and protect the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, my understanding of it is this: The budget is an estimate. I will agree with the gentleman from New York that the Committee on Appropriations has cut the estimated expenditures, but the gentleman from New York will not say that you have saved the Government any money because you have authorized the expenditure of this money by contracts to be made.

Mr. TABER. Oh, we have saved money. The gentleman does not understand the picture. That is the trouble. Let me tell the gentleman what the picture is. I told it once but I will repeat it so that the gentleman will understand the situation better.

Where money cannot be spent because of economic conditions in the country and the probability is that we will be able to get by with reduced costs when the economic conditions change, as we know they will, and we can cut down the amount that will be appropriated for next year as a result of that situation, and we cut it down, we save money for that particular year; and in the next year if we have to spend money in all probability we will save money on the whole thing because it will be less. Now, that is the picture, and we might just as well realize it.

The same thing that I have referred to applies to that Hill-Burton bill which was in the Federal Security Agency appropriations. The UNRRA item that we took off of about $47,000,000 was in the President's budget for 1948 as a proposed expenditure, and the recovery of that fund was an absolute and straight-out reduction in expenditures.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I also ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] be extended another 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, there have been in connection with the operations of the Committee on Appropriations so far actual reductions in appropriations and recoveries in one way or another as a result of our investigations and our operations, reductions in the President's budget estimate below the January figures which today total $3,702,326,029 to this date with the figures that are included in this bill.

In addition to that, there are large savings on rescissions which we have effected in connection with the bills and the appropriations for the Army, Navy, and Maritime Commission. I believe this will result in at least $500,000,000 reduction in the 1948 expenditures.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the gentleman include in his extension of remarks, item by item and line by line, the reductions or savings which he claims?

Mr. TABER. Oh, I have it all prepared and I intend to do so. I am going to put it in the RECORD so that you can shoot at it. You can shoot at it because you do not like to save money.

Mr. MONRONEY. I like genuine savings, not phony ones.

Mr. TABER. Now, the whole picture all the way through has represented a tremendous job on the part of our committee. We have been into this thing very carefully and we have held hearings hour after hour. We have had no cooperation at all from the departments and agencies that have come before us but we have had to pull it out of them just like pulling a tooth without novocain. They tried in every possible way to keep up all the appropriations and to keep every chairwarmer and every loafer on the Federal pay roll that they could. We have accomplished a great deal, in my opinion, in trying to put the Government of the United States on a business basis. We will not at this time, this year, save the amount of money I would like to save or that many others would like to save, but we are on the trail of information in the various departments and agencies of the Government that will permit us in the years to come to make very large savings and put the Government of the United States on a sound and respectable basis.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. I would like to ask my distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, since he just mentioned the words "business basis," what has happened to the legislative budget which was supposed to be completed, over 4 months ago, on the 15th of February? Just where is that legislative budget?

Mr. TABER. The legislative budget is just where it has been for a long time. The House passed it, representing its ideas. The Senate passed it, representing its ideas. We have not reached any agreement, and I do not believe we can; but we have gone ahead with the appropriation bills, and we have made cuts. I know that a very large percentage of the minority are opposed to making any cuts. There are exceptions over there among those patriotic men who believe that the salvation of the United States depends upon savings made in the Government.

Mr. ROONEY. Is it not the fact that for the fiscal year 1947, the minority party, which was then in the majority, cut every single appropriation bill that was sent down by the Bureau of the Budget? Is that not the fact?

Mr. TABER. Oh, they cut some of them but they never cut off enough to put the Government on a sound, honest, business basis. That is what I am trying to get at, and that is what we have got to do before we get through or we are going to be wiped out.

Mr. ROONEY. It would appear from the gentleman's remarks that no one ever made any cuts in the budget estimates until this year. The truth is that the cuts, instead of being new cuts, are, as demonstrated by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], phony cuts.

Mr. TABER. Well, the gentleman knows, if he had listened to what I have said, that we have claimed no phony cuts, but we have made cuts that have hurt, because they have thrown enormous numbers of leeches off of the Federal pay roll. I am sorry that the gentleman feels that throwing those leeches off of the pay roll is a phony cut.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is it not a fact that any cuts that were made in the budget estimates submitted to the Seventy-ninth Congress were made by efforts of the Republican members on

the subcommittees and on the committee itself?

Mr. TABER. They contributed very largely to those cuts.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. And is it not a fact, as the gentleman from South Dakota has just said, that those cuts were made by the Republicans in the Seventy-ninth Congress with a sufficient number of good, sound-thinking Democrats who helped us out and sustained our position?

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. And that additional cuts which the Republicans approved were resisted.

Mr. TABER. Oh, continuously resisted.

I just want to call attention to another figure before I finish. On the deficiency bills that have been presented to us the record of savings that we have made totals $282,590,767. The over-all saving that we have made runs to very large figures, not as large as I wish, but nevertheless a first-class start toward putting the Government of the United States on an honest and a businesslike basis.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and twenty-five Members are present, a quorum.

The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, it comes with mighty poor grace on the part of anybody on the minority side of this House to get up here and talk about economy. I listened to the speech given by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. I sought unsuccessfully for an opportunity to ask him this one question: Did he ever on this floor this year vote for a single dollar's reduction or for any amendment offered by any Member of the House from the majority side to reduce spending? His answer to that would have been "No" and had to be "No".

I ask also of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY]: Does he not recall the millions of dollars that he tried to add to the labor and Federal security bill? Does the gentleman recall those items?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Certainly.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman surprises me. I thought he rose to explain to the House what happened yesterday with regard to the tax reduction bill.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Certainly I will be glad to explain that. It is simply because the spenders on the Democratic side have resisted so well the efforts of the Republican Party to show a real saving that I personally could not conscientiously vote for a reduction in taxes at this time. I have no apology to offer for my voting to sustain the veto. Our Treasury needs the income if we are to cut our national debt.

You people ridicule the efforts of the Republican Party to try to effectuate real economy. We at least are trying to do the job of cutting down the expenses of government. You have not helped us in the least in our efforts to do so.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. No, I regret that I must proceed and cannot yield at this point, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yielded to the gentleman from New York because I mentioned his name, I might say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS].

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, it comes with mighty poor grace from any member of the minority side to stand up here and talk about economy. Where have we ever seen any efforts upon the part of the Democrats to economize? Had we the cooperation from the minority our Nation could justly expect and had we also cooperation, instead of ceaseless opposition, from the Federal departments and bureaus, we would today have effectuated the six billion cut below the President's budget. Instead of cooperation, we see the Democrats, as illustrated by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], fight at every turn our efforts toward making savings. Now this same gentleman attempts to belittle the nearly $3,000,000,000 reduction the Republican Party has accomplished. You know as well as I do that the entire Democratic side voted for the motion to recommit which would have added nearly $200,000,000 to the agricultural appropriation bill simply because you Democrats did not have the intestinal fortitude to say to your farmers that those farmers must contribute toward economy as well as every other segment of our population if we are going to achieve a real balanced economy in this Nation. I had that intestinal fortitude and have also gone against my party, the Republican Party, on H. R. 1, because I feel they are making a mistake in asking now for a tax reduction. However, you people do not seem to care whether the lid goes off or not. My farmers want to do their share, and so do yours. As long as we keep our triple A committees intact, farmers are willing, most of them, to give up the payments.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, it is due to the action on the Democratic side in trying to prevent the Republicans from making worth-while cuts in these budgets that I personally did not feel that I could conscientiously vote to do anything but to try to kill any tax-reduction bill that came before the Congress at this time. If we could have saved the six billions originally aimed at, our Treasury could then have stood the drain called for by H. R. 1.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I regret my inability to yield previously.

Mr. GROSS. Are the people of the gentleman's congressional district in favor of a reduction in taxes?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The people of my congressional district are honest, substantial, and common-sense people who do not want to see communism spread throughout the world. I feel those people know that above all——

Mr. GROSS. Answer yes or no.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am answering the gentleman. My people know that above all we must have a strong financial foundation under this Government of ours if we are to survive, and be able to resist any attacks upon our form of government. My people, most of them, I believe, are opposed to cutting taxes under circumstances presently prevailing.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. May I say to the gentleman from Minnesota that the people of his congressional district know that he is conscientious and that he is absolutely fearless in his decisions.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I thank the gentleman from New York. Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I want to repeat that it comes with mighty poor grace for anybody on the Democratic side to get up here and talk about economy in government.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words, and I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order and for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, we have discussed this bill with the majority leader, and we thought we could finish it early; therefore I hope there will be no further requests for additional time or to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I regret that due to the insistence of the minority side the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee has seen fit to precipitate an argument out of order and little related to the pending resolution in order that he might again, as he has done so frequently in the past, advise the people of America, as he smiles and claps his hands, how pleased he is to speak for the minority and proclaim that the Republican Party has not been able to effect savings to the extent that it thought it could. what a great position for a Member of Congress who has the welfare of the people of this country and his country at heart to take.

I ask the gentleman from Tennessee as he sits here, what is his purpose in getting up here time after time and telling the people that the Republican Party

has not been able to save as much money out of the Federal Treasury as it said it would? What is the purpose of this performance?

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yeld?

Mr. KEEFE. Yes. What is the gentleman's purpose?

Mr. GORE. My purpose is to give to the people that to which they are entitled, the truth; and, further, my purpose is to prevent the phony claims of economy, which in reality effect not one dollar in reduction of Government expenditures, from going unexposed and thereby serve to mislead the people. I am trying to keep the record straight, and I protest sleight-of-hand bookkeeping.

Mr. KEEFE. Does the gentleman believe in economy?

Mr. GORE. I certainly do, but not the wrong kind.

Mr. KEEFE. Has the gentleman ever voted for economy since he has been here?

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. KEEFE. Can he point to a single vote he has ever made in the interest of reducing appropriations?

Mr. GORE. Many, my friend.

Mr. KEEFE. Well, I would like to have the gentleman in his extension of remarks collect them and point them out, just as he asked the gentleman from New York to extend his remarks with particularity.

I came here in the same year that the gentleman from Tennessee did, and I have watched his work on this floor ever since he has been here. I do not have a recollection of a single time that the gentleman from Tennessee has not taken a militant position in favor of the New Deal. It has always been to either get the appropriations requested or get larger and bigger and better appropriations, and I think it comes with poor grace from the gentleman from Tennessee, above all people, to stand here repeatedly on the floor of this House and clap his hands and cheer because the Republicans have not been able to save the amount they expected to save when they adopted a provision in the House projecting a $6,000,000,000 cut below the President's budget. It seems to me that that is a perfectly absurd position to take, especially when in this Congress, in bill after bill, amendments have been offered, to increase appropriations. I have a recollection of two supply bills to which the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] offered one amendment after another to increase the amounts provided for in the bill by the Committee on Appropriations. I do not recall the gentleman from Tennessee ever voting any other way but to increase these appropriations. I also know that he also voted to recommit these bills in order that they might get more money to spend for these agencies of Government.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. Is it not true that the very amendments that I offered in the House during the course of consideration of the two supply bills to which the gentleman just referred were inserted in the Senate, and that that is the way the matter now stands, and that the gentleman, and whoever else is responsible, has failed to call a meeting of the conference on the Labor-Federal Security bill for over a month; is that not a fact?

Mr. KEEFE. That is not a fact, and the gentleman knows it is not a fact, and his present statement is about as inaccurate as most of the statements that he makes on this floor, except perhaps those that are prepared for him to read down here in the well of this House by the departments and sent up here. Now, the fact of the matter is, everybody on this floor knows that the gentleman from New York is a mere mouthpiece for the departments downtown, and that he is the one who distributes and passes out their speeches for the minority Members to get up here and parrot on the floor of the House. He has no idea of economy and never has had, and has resisted and fought every effort upon the part of the majority to try and economize and save any money in the expenses of the Government.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, my distinguished and able friend from Wisconsin who, as he says, took the oath of office the same day I did, has undertaken to reveal my record.

Mr. KEEFE. Well about the same time, I would say to the gentleman. I do not know whether it was the same day or not; I think it was.

Mr. GORE. Indeed it was. He and I have been very warm friends——

Mr. KEEFE. And I looked for different things from the gentleman at that time, I will say. I thought he had some great independence of spirit and great independence of thought, and I thought he had the courage to stand up here in the well of this House and fight for reductions of expenditures in government, the very thing which I knew in his heart he believed and which he believes in today; that he had the courage to stand up and tell the things which I know he believes in, because I have talked with him a good many times and I have great admiration for him.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. At that time, as we were freshmen, I, too, had high hopes for my distinguished colleague, and he has fulfilled, I am happy to say, the highest aspirations and anticipations I had for him in having a great, useful, and honorable career.

Mr. KEEFE. That is fine. I am glad to have the gentleman say that. I think the gentleman has a great and honorable career. It all depends, however, on the point of view. It depends on the point of view; is not that true?

Mr. GORE. I distinctly recall the occasion in 1939, as some of my friends here will recall, when I made my maiden speech in the Congress, which saved several hundred million dollars, and the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin, my friend, strode across the aisle in his manly way and clasped my hand and congratulated me on that move.

Mr. KEEFE. Yes; I remember that day well, as do a great many other Members of this Congress. I remember when the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee and the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] at that time got their heads together and had some independence, and I remember how the gentleman told me later that he was called down to the White House and the riot act was read to him by the President himself for making that speech. Ever since that time I have watched the metamorphosis take place, so that the gentleman has lost the independence that I strode across to congratulate him on having. I have watched the gentleman from Oklahoma, the distinguished friend of the gentleman from Tennessee, go right along hand in hand, until finally we see the picture here now, that these two fellows whom at that time I congratulated on their independence and because they had the courage to stand up and speak their convictions have all the time since followed the New Deal. I regret to see it. I regret to see my friend from Tennessee, who is a brilliant gentleman, and who does know better, stand up here day after day and belittle himself and belittle the party for which he speaks by applauding and laughing gleefully because as he contends we are not able to effect the savings that we thought we might be able to effect.

I say to the gentleman that he is going to have to watch some other things, too, that I see while sitting in the deficiency committee and noting the appropriation estimates that are coming up now for supplementals and deficiencies. Oh, what a magnificent future unfolds, what a great thing it is for these departments to be turned down by the Congress in their regular appropriations and then devise their ways and means through deficiency and supplemental estimates to wipe out all the savings the Congress has put into effect.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Wisconsin be extended for 3 minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. I do not want it from the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I would like to ask the gentleman another question.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the work of the Commission as authorized by law except for the work authorized by the act of June 28, 1933 (33 U. S. C. 701j), and sections 10 and 12 of the act of December 22, 1944 (Public Law 534) authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes, including the health service program as authorized by the act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 658);

payment of claims under part 2 of the Federal Tort Claims Act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 601); purchase of five and hire of passenger motor vehicles, $3,390,000; of which amount not to exceed $20,000,000 shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia exclusive of not to exceed $10,000 for special counsel and temporary services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 600), but at rates not exceeding $50 per diem for individuals.

Flood-control surveys: For expenses necessary for the work of the Commission as authorized by the act of June 28, 1938 (33 U. S. C. 701j), and sections 10 and 12 of the act of December 22, 1944 (Public Law 534), including contract stenographic reporting services; $266,500, of which amount not to exceed $114,900 shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to speak out of order and revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I will take advantage of this time to say that the tirade of my distinguished friend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] just a while ago, reminds me of an Old Mother Hubbard which covers everything and touches nothing.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I gladly yield.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman as usual is entirely wrong in his quotation. He should refer to it as a kimono and not an Old Mother Hubbard.

Mr. ROONEY. Well, the gentleman would know more about kimonos and Mother Hubbards. The gentleman would know better than I whether it is an Old Mother Hubbard or a kimono.

In any event, in his crusade to wreck the Labor Department and its functions the gentleman wrote up and brought to the floor of this House a bill—the Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill—which by its terms cut the funds for operation of the Labor Department by about 44 percent. Today he complains that at that time I offered a number of amendments which would restore such important functions in the Labor Department as the Division of Labor Standards which were being outlawed by the gentleman from Wisconsin. I say to the gentleman that, representing a district, as I do, in Brooklyn—and the gentleman has many times in the past called me the gentleman from Brooklyn, while to me he still is the gentleman from Oshkosh—I will not at any time sit idly by and not raise my voice in protest at the crusade of the gentleman from Wisconsin to wipe out important functions in the Labor Department.

The gentleman from Wisconsin did not ask me whether I had voted on occasions for economy measures. I do not know why he reserved that question for the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] but he knows full well that whenever there is contained in an appropriation bill an item which is wrong, which is improper spending, which is an item in which money can sensibly be saved by the Congress, that he and every member of the House Committee on Appropriations, whether in the majority or in the minority, can depend upon my vote in support of that proper economy, but never for senseless economies such as proposed by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The gentleman and his majority colleagues cut $370,500 in the Labor Department-Federal Security Agency appropriation bill from the amount asked for the staff and servicing functions of the Office of the Secretary of Labor. I offered an amendment in protest of this slash, requesting the amount contained in the President's budget. The other body restored $47,400 of these funds.

The gentleman from Wisconsin and his majority colleagues cut $718,700 from the same bill for continuing the Division of Labor Standards. They made no provision whatever for the continuance of the Division of Labor Standards. My distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], offered an amendment to restore to the bill the money for this purpose. The other body restored $400,000 of these funds.

The gentleman from Wisconsin and his colleagues on the majority side cut $598,400 for expenses necessary to enable the Secretary of Labor to exercise the authority vested in him to act as mediator and to appoint Commissioners of Conciliation in labor disputes, and virtually wiped out the entire supervisory and administrative staff of the Conciliation Service. They reduced the ability of the Labor Department to prevent strikes. I offered an amendment in the House opposing such action. The other body restored $120,000 of these funds and provided for the supervisory and administrative staff positions as I had advocated.

The gentleman and his majority colleagues cut $528,600 from the Labor Department-Federal Security Agency bill for the apprentice training program. I offered an amendment to restore funds. The other body restored $184,400 of these moneys. I also offered an amendment to increase the amount allowed by the gentleman from Wisconsin for the Wage and Hour Division and the other body subsequently restored $99,200 for that agency.

So you see, Mr. Chairman, even the other body disagrees with the gentleman from Wisconsin and he had the boldness a while ago to attack me for exercising my right to offer amendments which the other body subsequently found were justified.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I yield.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I wish to direct my remarks to the section which has just been read, namely, the appropriations for the Federal Power Commission.

I was pleased to learn from reading the report that the Committee on Appropriations had refused to give to this agency the sums recommended by the Budget Bureau. I thought of proposing an amendment to the Federal Power Section to reduce their appropriation by $1 not as a pro forma amendment, but rather as a token amendment to indicate to the Federal Power Commission that there were some members of the House who were dissatisfied with the way they are spending money and who propose to watch their expenditures closely in the years to come.

It is my contention that the Federal Power Commission has engaged in and is engaging in unlawful and uneconomical activities. In an attempt to correct that situation, I introduced last April two bills proposing amendments to parts 1 and 2 of the Federal Power Act. Hearings will open on those amendments before a subcommittee of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee next Monday.

Briefly, the bills have two objectives.

First, to deny to the Federal Power Commission control over manufacturing establishments producing electricity for their own consumption, and, second, to redefine navigable streams and interstate commerce in such a manner as to restrict the Commission's jurisdiction over utilities actually transmitting or selling power for transmission across State lines.

I previously told the House of the activities of the Federal Power Commission when they sought during this past year to force their jurisdiction upon five small Connecticut manufacturing plants which were generating electricity for their own use only. The Commission's activities, in my opinion, not only are unlawful in that they violate the letter and spirit of the Federal Power Act, but they are uneconomical in that the extension by the Commission of its jurisdiction can be effective only if it has increased personnel and increased facilities. They, in turn, will result in duplication of jurisdiction of State utility commissioners. It was the intent of Congress to set up a Federal Power Commission with limited authority to fill the gap that existed in the regulation and control over interstate transmission of electricity. State utility commissioners of this country are gravely concerned with respect to the encroachment of the Federal Power Commission in the field of local regulation and control.

It is interesting to observe that when this legislation was passed in 1935 the Congress completely rewrote every section of that bill to prevent such duplication. When the substitute language of the bill was finally passed by the House, Senator Wheeler in the other body made this rather interesting comment, speaking of the committee bill which had then passed.

He said:

The revision has also removed every encroachment upon the authority of the State. The revised bill imposes Federal regulation only over those matters which cannot be effectively controlled by the State. The limitation of the Federal Power Commission's

jurisdiction in this regard has been inserted in every section in the bill, to prevent expansion of Federal authority over State matters.

That is all I am asking in the amendments I have introduced, that we definitely restrict the Federal Power Commission to what was admittedly the intent of Congress.

I hope my colleagues will interest themselves in the hearings and in the subject matter that will be developed during these hearings and watch the operations of the Federal Power Commission in the year to come.

I appreciate what the Appropriations Committee has done to at least stop them from their rapid expansion and interfering with the function of the State utility commissioners.

To meet the situation adequately, I introduced the two bills to which I referred earlier in my remarks, namely, H. R. 2972 and H. R. 2973. These bills amend the Federal Power Act in certain particulars. These bills have been referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for consideration, and later I hope the bills will be favorably reported to the House for further consideration and action. In general terms, these bills restate what it is believed was the true intent of Congress as to the proper limits of the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission when the Federal Power Act was originally passed in 1920 and again amended in 1935.

The Federal Power Commission is a creation of the Congress of the United States. Its powers were delegated to it by the Congress, and such powers may be enlarged, restricted, or taken away as the Congress deems wise to do in the public interest.

The Federal Power Act was last amended in 1935. Twelve years have since passed, which is too long for most congressional acts to go unreviewed. I feel sure that during these years this act has at times been administered in a manner never intended and by methods not discernible from the annual reports of the Federal Power Commission to Congress.

At Windsor Locks, Conn., there are located five small manufacturing companies along the Connecticut River. Each purchases water from the Windsor Locks Canal Co. Two of these companies are manufacturers of paper; one is a manufacturer of sweaters, underwear, and yarns; one is a manufacturer of machine chucks; and one is a manufacturer of casters and handling equipment. All of these companies use the water which they lease or purchase from the canal company for manufacturing processes and purposes. In addition, these companies use a portion of the water purchased to generate a small amount of electric energy for lighting or power purposes in their plants. The amount of electricity is small and none of it is sold by any of these companies to anyone else. In fact, the total generating capacity of all of these companies from the water purchased is approximately 1,100 horsepower. Each of these companies is a small manufacturing concern of the family-ownership type, some of whom have been in business at their present location for more than 100 years. However, I was advised that in the summer of 1946 the Federal Power Commission notified these companies that they were operating unlawfully and insisted that they take out a license under the Federal Power Act. This, despite the fact that the provisions of a license under the Federal Power Act are not appropriate for one other than a public utility. After correspondence and conferences with the Commission's staff, I understand the Commission was willing, in March of 1947, to at least postpone its assertion of jurisdiction over these companies, although in a letter from the Chairman of the Commission, dated March 12, 1947, addressed to me, the Commission still asserts that it has not only the right but the obligation to require any company located in or along a navigable stream, that is using the water of the stream to generate electric energy for its own purposes, to take out a license under the Federal Power Act.

The Commission also claimed jurisdiction over the Windsor Locks Canal Co., which owns and operates the dam at Windsor Locks, Conn. The authority to erect this dam can be traced to May 1824, when the predecessor of the Windsor Locks Canal Co., the Connecticut River Co., received a charter from the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut which authorized it to lock the falls at Enfield, Conn., on the Connecticut River, and to construct a canal on either bank of the river near the falls, around 1830. In 1845, when a railroad line was constructed from Hartford to Springfield, Mass., the business of the Connecticut River Co. was seriously affected and about this time the company began to lease land and water to various industries which were then being established in Windsor Locks. The business of the company from that time to date has consisted principally of the sale of water to these industries. However, despite the fact that the Windsor Locks Canal Co. has been operating under valid State authority for more than a century, the Federal Power Commission has claimed that it is doing so unlawfully because it is not doing so pursuant to a license from the Commission. It is the position of the Commission that despite the existence of complete State authority, nevertheless, a Federal license is also required.

Hence it is appropriate at this time to examine such power and authority as were originally delegated to the Commission; the interpretation the Commission has placed upon its power and authority; the additional power and prerogatives the Commission has assumed so to determine if the Commission is performing properly the functions delegated to it.

The operations of the Federal Power Commission in recent years make it apparent that Congress must specifically define the area in which the Federal Power Commission may operate. These bills are designed to so define the limits of jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission and thereby let the Congress, the Commission, and the people know exactly where they stand. The Federal Power Commission will never, in my opinion, impose limitations on itself; rather it reaches out in an attempt to grab power for itself by asserting jurisdiction over companies and activities never intended by Congress. It interprets, or rather misinterprets, the laws of Congress in such a way as to give it the broadest possible field of jurisdiction without restraint. As a result, its activities are not only unlawful in that they violate the letter and spirit of the Federal Power Act, but they are uneconomical in that the extension by the Commission of its jurisdiction can be effected only if it has increased personnel and increased facilities and results in duplication of jurisdiction of State utility commissions. Therefore, I should say at the outset that these bills, when passed, will result in economies that will be of advantage to all taxpayers. These bills were prepared and introduced as a result of a conviction on my part that the Federal Power Act is being administered in an uneconomical and expensive manner, and in a way which Congress never intended. As I have stated, the Federal Power Commission has sought to engage in activities never intended to fall within its domain, which activities do not promote the public interest through the development and use of hydroelectric power, but serve only to waste the taxpayers' money.

The Federal Power Commission was created in 1920 at the time of the passage of the Federal Water Power Act. It has, therefore, been in existence for a period of 27 years. The Commission has grown from a small advisory organization to a large administrative bureaucratic commission which is constantly and energetically seeking to enlarge its personnel and its powers. The Commission in its budget requests this year asked for a 47 percent increase in its appropriation over the expenditures for the last year for salaries and administrative expenses.

While the name Federal Power Commission would indicate to those who are unfamiliar with its ramifications that it confines itself to the regulation and control of interstate power operations, a worthy and desirable objective so stated by the Congress, I assure you that this is not the case. The Commission has gone far afield of the interstate power business. While I feel certain that such was not the intent of Congress, I assert that if others do not share my belief, then we should express the right intent by these amendments.

My purpose is to point out that it was the intention of Congress to set up the Federal Power Commission with limited authority to fill a gap that existed in the regulation and control of interstate transmission of electricity and gas, and that they have gone far beyond that function. The State utility commissioners of the various States are gravely cornered with respect to the encroachments of the Federal Power Commission in the field of local regulation and control. Now, the most recent extension of the long and grasping arm of Federal Power Commission control is in the field of industrial manufacturing. It is hard to conceive that the Congress ever intended that the Federal Power

Commission would extend its control over small manufacturers located along the rivers and streams of the Nation simply because they use the water from such streams for manufacturing purposes. However, as I will more fully illustrate later, so insatiable is the appetite of the Commission that it now proposes to regulate such industries in part.

The Federal Power Act of 1920 is now part I of the Federal Power Act. Parts II and III of the act were added when it was amended August 26, 1935, by the Public Utility Holding Company Act, Senate bill 2796, title I of which provided for the control and limitation of public utility holding companies operating in interstate commerce, and title II of which provided for the regulation of transmission and sale of electric energy in interstate commerce, for the amendment of the Federal Power Act, and for other purposes.

It is obvious that when in 1935 Congress was considering Senate bill 2796 and its predecessor Senate bill 1725 it was considering a bill dealing with public utilities and public utilities engaged in the sale or transmission in interstate commerce of electric energy. It was not considering a bill dealing with manufacturing companies who might generate hydroelectric energy for their own use. Nor was it considering a bill that concerned those public utilities operating within a State which might generate hydroelectric energy for consumption within the State of generation.

However, the Federal Power Commission has taken a different view of its authority. In a letter dated March 12, 1947, addressed to me, the Chairman of the Commission in answer to my question concerning the policy of the Commission with respect to the licensing of industrial companies wrote as follows:

> You ask what the policy of the Commission will be in the future on companies similarly situated, insofar as obtaining a Federal license is concerned. The policy pursued by the Commission with respect to the Windsor Locks Industrial developments is exactly the same policy which it has pursued with respect to other industrial concerns similarly situated, considering each situation upon its merits. The Congress by section 4 (g) of the Federal Power Act has imposed the statutory obligation upon the Federal Power Commission to make investigations of the occupancy of public lands, reservations, or streams for the purpose of developing electric power. No distinction is made between manufacturing plants and public utilities in this connection. In compliance with this obligation, the Commission in 1937 began investigations taking first those concerns developing over 500 horsepower as a general and practical guide in proceeding in the investigations.

The field of Federal Power Commission jurisdiction has, as a result of a decision of the United States Supreme Court in 1940, holding nearly any stream to be navigable, been tremendously expanded. Remember that all that it now takes to subject some small manufacturer who is located along a stream to an expensive inquiry is the assertion by the Commission that the stream is or may be navigable. To back this assertion up, the Commission need show only that over 100 years ago several Indians went down the stream in a canoe or that logs were floated down. The investigation is started and the manufacturer either accepts the claim that the stream is navigable or he is involved in an expensive lawsuit. If he accedes, then the Commission insists that he take out a license.

Well, what does this mean? It means just this. It means that this person who has been operating his business lawfully for some years must file an elaborate application form with the Federal Power Commission, which incidentally is not adapted to a manufacturer, since to allocate accounting-wise for receipts from the use of the water power is an impossible task. Representatives of the Commission then will visit his plant, make an audit of his accounts, examine and analyze his books, cost records, engineering reports and other records pertaining to his application for a license. If a license is granted, it is granted subject only to conditions established by the Commission. For example, some of these conditions require that his accounts be regulated by the Commission, principally through a requirement that reserves be maintained, according to the rules of the Commission, for depreciation, repairs, and so forth, and for the amortization of the cost of his investment. An annual charge is levied, and finally, at the end of the license period, the Federal Government can appropriate his project, whether it is located in the State of Connecticut or any other State, not by paying the fair value thereof but by paying what the Commission chooses to call his net investment in the project, which is the original cost thereof less certain deductions. If this net investment is lower than the fair value of the project at the time of its acquisition by the Federal Government, this is just too bad for the licensee. Of course, all during the license period the licensee must battle with the usual reports and red tape which surround the administration of this particular Federal agency.

My proposed amendments to the Federal Power Act will not serve to oust the Federal Government from water power sites, which are properly a subject of Federal control or Federal ownership. I cannot state what the Federal Power Commission has done, or may do, in States other than Connecticut. What they have done, or may do, in Connecticut I can assure you will serve no general public interest. My proposed amendments further will not serve to prevent the development of any water power sites that should be developed under Federal domain.

This is no small problem in my State. Take, for example, the Thames River in Connecticut. The water-shed of this River covers part of the south central part of Massachusetts and most of the eastern part of Connecticut, draining into Long Island Sound. The river itself is located wholly within the State of Connecticut. Irrigation is not a factor. Navigation is possible approximately 20 miles up to Norwich, Conn., but has never been a factor above that city. There are no dams from Long Island Sound to Norwich. It being a tidal estuary, there is no water-power development upon the main stream. The tributaries of the Thames, however, have been highly developed for industrial water power. This is principally by small local manufacturing companies. There are a few hydroelectric plants owned by power companies but they are all relatively small, the largest being three thousand horsepower. Prior to the introduction of transmission of electricity, power developed by the various manufacturers along the tributaries was used mechanically in textile mills and other plants in the manufacture of a variety of commodities. Auxiliary steam power was installed in many of the mills. Now most of the mills, instead of generating mechanical power, generate for their own use electric energy, which, however, must be largely supplemented by public utility companies operating in the vicinity. Certainly Congress did not intend, when it adopted in 1920 the definition of navigable waters, that such definition should be so extended that the Federal Power Commission could use this definition as a springboard for its assertion of jurisdiction over numerous small manufacturing companies located on small streams which never had any commercial navigation value.

I would like to direct your attention to House bill 2973, a section-by-section analysis of which is as follows:

SECTION 1

Section 2 of title I of the Federal Power Act, approved June 10, 1920, and last amended August 26, 1935, contains the definitions of the act. The one definition which this bill seeks to amend is the definition of navigable waters contained in subsection (8) of section 3 of the act. The definition of navigable waters has been amended in the following particulars:

(a) The present definition includes in navigable waters, waters which either in their natural or improved condition and notwithstanding interruption in the navigable parts by falls, shallows, or rapids are used or are suitable for use for the transportation of persons or property in interstate commerce. The proposed amendment limits the present definition by: First, requiring that the navigability of a stream be determined at the time of the inquiry as to its navigability and not at any indefinite period in the future; second, requiring that the waters in question be generally and commonly used or have a reasonable probability of being so used rather than being waters which are used or could be made suitable for use; third, requiring that their use in interstate commerce be of a substantial character; fourth, requiring that the use be of waters in their natural condition or in an improved condition which improvement is then proposed rather than in some improved condition which in the future might possibly be proposed or made; fifth, requiring that any proposed improvements to make waters navigable cost an amount commensurate with the commercial benefits to be derived from the proposed improvements rather than having no economic yardstick for the cost of improvements; sixth, eliminating from navigable waters those parts of streams which someone has recommended to Congress should be improved but which

Congress has not in fact authorized for improvement; seventh, requiring that congressional authorization for improvement of a stream be an authorization to improve the stream for the purpose of furthering navigation in interstate commerce on the stream before such stream can be considered navigable, rather than an authorized improvement which has no relation to navigation.

In my opinion, this amendment provides a more reasonable definition of "navigable waters" than that contained in the present act and one which will be adequate to prevent private encroachment on the actual needs of commercial navigation on the waters subject to the jurisdiction of Congress and yet at the same time one which will prevent the extension of Federal regulation over persons developing electric power for any purpose along any stream when such regulation has no substantial relation to the regulation of navigation and interstate commerce. I believe that the regulation of the development of hydroelectric power is properly a matter subject to State jurisdiction, except in those cases where such development directly interferes with existing interstate commerce of a substantial character or probable interstate commerce which could be developed on the waters in question through a then-proposed expenditure of funds which would be commensurate with the commercial benefits to be derived therefrom.

SECTION 2

This section amends subsection (a) of section 23 of the act in three particulars. Subsection (a) at present deals with the protection of existing rights, provides for permissive application for licenses under the act, and deals with valuations of constructed objects. The proposed amendments to this subsection are concerned only with the provisions concerning the protection of existing rights.

The present subsection provides that the provisions of part I of the act shall not be construed as affecting any permit or valid existing right-of-way heretofore granted or as confirming or otherwise affecting any claim or authority heretofore given pursuant to law. The phrase heretofore granted is vague and is stricken out. Supposedly it means granted prior to June 10, 1920, the date of the approval of the Federal Water Power Act, and so this subsection is amended to state specifically that the provisions of part I shall not affect any permit, valid existing right-of-way, claim or authority granted prior to June 10, 1920. The present subsection protects any such rights given pursuant to law. Here again the term is not only vague but ambiguous and so the act is specifically amended to make it clear that any rights granted prior to June 10, 1920, pursuant to applicable State or Federal law will not be affected. Lastly, this subsection is amended to make it clear that if pursuant to any State or Federal law granted prior to June 10, 1920, a person has constructed any dam, water conduit, reservoir, powerhouse or other works incidental thereto, the provisions of part I of the act are not applicable thereto.

SECTION 3

This section amends subsection (b) of section 23 of the act in seven particulars. Subsection (b) of the act among other things makes it unlawful for the purpose of developing electric power to construct, operate, or maintain any dam, water conduit, reservoir, powerhouse, or other works incidental thereto—hereinafter called project—across, along, or in any navigable waters without a license from the Federal Power Commission or without a permit or valid existing right-of-way granted prior to June 10, 1920. This prohibition is being asserted by the Commission against any manufacturer or any person whether or not he sold any power so developed and whether or not he sold it in interstate commerce. The first proposed amendment is to insert in the third line after the words "for the purpose of developing electric power" the words "for the sale thereof at wholesale in interstate commerce." This amendment would eliminate the necessity of a manufacturer as contrasted to a public utility from becoming licensed by the Federal Power Commission. It would also eliminate the necessity of a public utility engaged only in the sale of power in intrastate commerce from becoming licensed by the Federal Power Commission.

However, this amendment would not allow either such manufacturer or intrastate public utility to construct any project in navigable waters wholly irrespective of Federal law. The last proviso of the proposed amendment requires such a person to conform to the lawful requirements of the Federal Power Commission with respect to navigation or the effect of the project on navigation.

Since section 1 of this bill defines "navigable waters," reference to this fact is made in this section 3 by striking out in the sixth line after the words "navigable waters" the words "of the United States" and inserting "as herein defined." This amendment is purely formal.

The present subsection does not prohibit the construction, operation, or maintenance of any project in accordance with the terms of a permit or valid existing right-of-way granted prior to June 10, 1920. Therefore after the date in the eleventh line there has been inserted the phrase "pursuant to applicable State or Federal laws," to make it clear that a State or Federal permit or right-of-way protects one from the necessity of becoming licensed under the Federal Power Act. This is in conformity with a similar amendment to subsection (a) of section 23 contained in section 2.

A proviso is inserted after the first sentence of the present subsection (b) to make it clear that if any person constructed prior to June 10, 1920, pursuant to Federal or State law any subject, such person can without license of the Federal Power Commission continue to repair, reconstruct, operate, or maintain such project.

The present subsection (b) also requires anyone intending to construct a project on a nonnavigable tributary of a navigable stream to file a declaration with the Commission. If the Commission finds that the interests of interstate commerce would be affected by the project it is made unlawful to proceed without having secured a license from the Commission. The proposed amendment changes this to require a declaration from only those who intend to construct a project for the purpose of developing electric power for sale at wholesale in interstate commerce. The manufacturer or intrastate utility would not have to file a declaration but, as pointed out above, would still have to comply with any rules of the Commission with respect to the effect of such project on navigation.

The proposed amendment to this subsection also requires that before the Commission may require a license of such a project on a nonnavigable tributary of a navigable stream it must find not that the interests of interstate or foreign commerce would be affected by such project, but that the navigable capacity of the navigable stream would be adversely affected by such project on the nonnavigable tributary.

Lastly, the proposed amendment to this subsection provides that no license is required for the repair, reconstruction, operation, or continued maintenance of a project on a nonnavigable tributary of a navigable stream if such project was constructed under a Federal or State permit, right-of-way, or authority granted prior to August 26, 1935, the date of the last amendment to the Federal Power Act. Prior to August 26, 1935, anyone intending to undertake a project on a nonnavigable tributary could in his discretion file with the Commission a declaration of such intention. The filing of the declaration of intention was made mandatory by the amendment of August 26, 1935. Hence, it seems proper that anyone who prior to that date lawfully constructed a project can continue to repair, reconstruct, operate, and maintain such project without license from the Commission.

I wish to now direct your attention to H. R. 2972, a bill to amend section 201 of the Federal Power Act. Section 201 is the first section of part II of the Federal Power Act, which is the part concerned with the regulation of electric utility companies engaged in interstate commerce. Parts II and III of the Federal Power Act were added by the Public Utility Act of 1935. Section 201 of part II of the Federal Power Act contains the declaration of policy, states the necessity for Federal regulation, defines the scope of regulation to be exercised by the Commission, and defines certain terms which are used in determining the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission.

The Federal Power Commission has been no less modest in asserting that the provisions of part II give it jurisdiction over public utilities than it has in its claims of jurisdiction based upon the provisions of part I hitherto discussed. In fact, although it is believed that administratively the Commission is so departmentalized that one group of bureaucrats administer part I and another group administer part II, there is little or no distinction in the capacity of either group; both are zealous to the point of being unlawful in their assertions of

jurisdiction. It should be remembered that parts II and III of the act were added because of the decision of the United States Supreme Court in 1927 in the Attleboro case—Two Hundred and Seventy-third United States Code, page 83—which held that sales of electric energy at wholesale in interstate commerce between public utilities were not subject to regulation by the States and in the absence of Federal regulation such sales went unregulated. Part II of the Federal Power Act was therefore passed so that Federal jurisdiction could be asserted over such interstate public utilities. The Federal Power Commission has used part II to assert its jurisdiction over intrastate public utilities. Hence, the need for the proposed bill. There are, for example, two public utilities in Connecticut, all of the properties of which are wholly located within the State and all their business in electric energy is done wholly within the State. These companies have no ownership in any interstate transmission lines, nor do they transmit electric energy across the State line of Connecticut. However, because one of these companies generated electric energy some of which it sold to another company which furnished some of this energy to companies in Massachusetts, and because the other of these companies purchased electric energy, a minute part of which at times came from without Connecticut, the Federal Power Commission has asserted jurisdiction over all the accounts of these companies. Yet both of these companies in all their activities were entirely regulated by the Public Utilities Commission of Connecticut.

If the Federal Power Commission has jurisdiction over the accounts of a company, it is no laughing matter. It means that the company is subject to two masters, the Federal Power Commission and the utilities commission of the State in which the company operates. This may mean two sets of books, two contrary orders on any subject. Such overlapping of regulation is unnecessarily expensive and serves no purpose. In fact, it leads only to hopeless confusion as it did in the Jersey Central Case (1943, 319 U. S. 61) where the New Jersey Public Service Commission said the Jersey Central Power & Light Co. could issue and sell certain securities and the Federal Power Commission ordered it not to sell.

Certainly such extravagant claims should be curbed. I propose to do this by means of H. R. 2972.

The fundamental purpose of the bill is to redefine the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission under the Federal Power Act as passed in 1935.

Notwithstanding that this was the intention on the part of Congress, as is clearly shown by the debates and committee reports, the language in the present act is such that the Federal Power Commission has construed the Federal Power Act so as to give the Commission a great deal of jurisdiction overlapping that of the State commission and to give jurisdiction over many companies operating wholly in one State and doing an essentially local business which is subject to complete State commission regulation.

After more than 10 years of operation under the Federal Power Act it has become clear that the Federal Power Commission intends to attempt to establish jurisdiction and control over companies that Congress never intended should be subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission. It is my position that this needless duplication results in waste of the taxpayers' money and increased cost of the service rendered to consumers.

It is the purpose of my proposed amendments contained in H. R. 2972 to confine Federal Power Commission jurisdiction to that originally intended by Congress, namely, that every substantial sale of electric energy shall be subject to regulation by some public body so that in any rate proceeding a public utility cannot assert a cost of electric energy which is not subject to being passed upon by some public authority.

In order to accomplish this purpose, it is thought necessary to take care of two general situations, namely, first the transmission and sale by a local company of energy it purchases from an interstate company subject to Federal Power Commission jurisdiction; and second, the sale by a purely local company to an interstate company which may result incidentally in some small part of the locally generated energy being transmitted outside the State.

Getting down to the particular amendments I offer to section 201 of the Federal Power Act, the purpose of my proposed amendments to subsection (b) of section 201 is to make it clear that a purely local electric company operating within a single State can purchase energy from an interstate company without its becoming subject to Federal Power Commission regulation under the Federal Power Act. The Federal Power Commission would, of course, continue to have jurisdiction over the selling company and over the sale by it to the local electric company, thus the principle of the Attleboro case is satisfied and nothing goes unregulated. My proposed amendment makes it clear that the Federal Power Commission would have no jurisdiction over such local distributing companies and as I have said, I believe this is in accordance with the original intention of Congress in passing the Federal Power Act. In adopting the amendment we would merely be making clear the original intention of Congress and thus remove the overlapping jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission. In addition we would make it possible for local electric companies to interconnect their facilities with interstate companies thus enabling them to render better service at cheaper rates to the ultimate consumers. Local companies are reluctant to make these interconnections under existing interpretations of the Federal Power Act because of the onerous burdens of duplication of regulation. There is nothing in my amendments which would in any way exempt interstate utilities from Federal regulation.

The purpose of my proposed amendment to subsection (c) of section 201 is to avoid a claim of jurisdiction by the Federal Power Commission over a company operating in one State which sells energy to another company operating in the same State even though a small amount of the energy so purchased may be transmitted by the second company across a State line. The second company, since its operations extend across State lines, would, of course, continue subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission. Let us assume the case where company A has a considerable amount of distribution in State X where it purchased energy from company B, which is a purely local company, and the purpose of the purchase is to supply such energy to customers of company A in State X. However, some small part of the energy so purchased may be transmitted across the State line into State Y. It is my position that company B, the selling company which is a purely local operating company, should not be subject to Federal regulation unless the principal purpose of the sale was to enable the purchasing company to transmit the energy so purchased across State lines. Company A is and remains subject to Federal regulation.

I propose a second amendment to subsection (c) of section 201 which would permit a local distributing company to make an interconnection for emergency service or for the exchange of energy where settlement for any variation in delivery would be made on the basis of cost of production or of purchase of such energy. This amendment also provides that a slop-over of electric energy between connecting lines or systems shall not be held to be transmission of electric energy in interstate commerce. My proposed amendment to section 201 (d) merely complements and further clarifies the provisions of section 201 (c).

I also propose amending section 201 (e) to provide that a company which ceases to be a public utility as defined in the act by reason either of cessation of ownership or operation of facilities subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission or by any amendment to the act shall not thereafter be subject to the Federal Power Act or any rule or regulation or order of the Commission by reason of its having formerly been a public utility subject to the act. I think it only fair and a matter of common sense that if a company ceases to own or operate facilities subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission it should not thereafter be subject to any rule, regulation or order of the Commission.

Section 201 (f) of the act now provides that no provision of the Federal Power Act shall apply to the United States, a State or any agency or authority thereof. In order to permit and encourage local electric companies operating in a single State to make interconnections and exchange energy with government-owned hydroelectric systems, I have proposed an amendment to section 202 (f). Under my proposed amendment any person engaged in the transmission or sale of electric energy through facilities located wholly within one State and not otherwise subject to the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission may make a temporary or permanent connection within the State in which its operations are conducted with facilities owned and operated by a governmental agency and such person shall not become subject to

the provision of the act by reason of such connection even though the electric energy received or delivered by such person through such connections is to be or has been delivered across a State line by such governmental agency. If such interconnections were made I am told that various governmental agencies throughout the country would be able to make interconnections with local electric companies which would permit them to sell to the electric companies excess power during periods of high water and to purchase from the privately owned utility sufficient energy to meet their requirements during emergency periods and periods of low water. The purpose of my amendment is to encourage such interconnections which would result in reducing the cost of service to the ultimate consumers. As I have already mentioned, there is a reluctance on the part of local companies at the present time to make these interconnections because of the onerous burdens of duplication of regulation.

In conclusion, let me say that in the introduction of these two bills I have sought to perpetuate a principle to which I have always adhered and one which I believe is the policy of Congress as indicated by its many pronouncements, which policy is that the interests and rights of the States in determining the developments of the watersheds and water resources within their borders and likewise the interests and rights of the States in water utilization and control shall be recognized and reaffirmed and that any attempts on the part of a Federal agency such as the Federal Power Commission in derogation of such interests and rights of States should be curbed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia; health service program as authorized by act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 658); payment of claims determined and settled pursuant to part 2 of the Federal Tort Claims Act (Act of August 2, 1946, Public Law 601); contract stenographic reporting services; newspapers not to exceed $500; not to exceed $8,000 for deposit in the general fund of the Treasury for cost of penalty mail as required by section 2 of the act of June 28, 1944; and purchase of the one passenger motor vehicle; $2,800,120, of which not less than $228,695 shall be available for the enforcement of the Wool Products Labeling Act: *Provided*, That no part of the funds appropriated herein for the Federal Trade Commission shall be expended upon any investigation hereafter provided by concurrent resolution of the Congress until funds are appropriated subsequently to the enactment of such resolution to finance the cost of such investigation.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FOLGER: On page 17, line 17, after the word "vehicle", strike "$2,800,120" and insert "$2,975,120."

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, since I have been here I have found myself devoted most particularly to agricultural concerns and needs, primarily because I felt that that is one of the great bulwarks of our American economy, and that care for it must engage the attention and thought of every Member of the House.

In connection with that and attached to it has been the appropriation for the Interior Department, which deals, in large measure, with a kindred subject of reclamation and drainage and forestry service throughout the United States. I have not meant, however, to be disregardful of the business interests of the Nation. The Federal Trade Commission is, in my opinion, one of the splendid agencies of Government which serves the legitimate and laudable interests of the manufacturers and commercial people of our country. In that is an activity which is substantially eliminated by the action of the committee in failing to appropriate for that purpose. The report of the committee on the subject is as follows:

The action of the committee results in the denial of all proposed increases including all funds for work in connection with the proposed financial reports program which was to have been carried on in cooperation with the Securities and Exchange Commission.

I am informed, Mr. Chairman, that this is one of the very important activities of the Federal Trade Commission; that in collaboration with the Securities and Exchange Commission they have been able to perform a very satisfactory service to all the manufacturers and commercial interests of the United States, and that this service is looked to, and the Federal Trade Commission is expected to have information, that this research would provide. It is with quite a bit of regret that I see this provision eliminated entirely from the bill.

I am informed that this elimination will result in the discontinuance of employment of between 45 and 67 people, that really $225,000 will do the work that I conceive to be absolutely in the best interests of all the manufacturers and commercial interests of the United States. I have, however, in offering my amendment, cut $50,000 from that amount, making it $175,000 added to the appropriation. I feel that it is a really important amendment and that the committee probably with further consideration might agree to it. It is of much importance, and I ask the special attention of the Committee on Appropriations, and of the membership of the House to the subject.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 3 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the committee considered the item in question very carefully and came to the conclusion that it was not an item of such importance that it was imperative to embark upon it at this time. It is an activity that was not carried on during the war years. It would seem that it could well wait a year or two more under existing conditions, if we are to embark upon it again.

The Commission received for the fiscal year 1946 about $2,100,000. For the current year it had about $2,800,000. The recommendation of your committee gives it exactly the same amount that it had for the current fiscal year.

I may point out in this connection that the record indicates that 50 trial attorneys in the Federal Trade Commission had only 2,008 hours of hearings, or about 40 hours apiece in a year. It indicates that 137 on the investigating staff filed 801 final reports, or about 6 apiece in a year; that 13 trial examiners had 1,637 hours of hearings, or about 136 hours apiece in a year; and that the Division of Stipulations with 27 secured some 96 stipulations, or about 3½ each in a year.

These figures would seem to suggest that the Federal Trade Commission instead of being provided with too little money could on the contrary get along very well with less money.

I hope the amendment suggested will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL ARCHIVES

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses of the Archivist and the National Archives; including personal services in the District of Columbia; scientific, technical, first-aid, protective, and other apparatus and materials for the arrangement, titling, scoring, repair, processing, editing, duplication, reproduction, and authentication of photographic and other records (including motion-picture and other films and sound recordings) in the custody of the Archivist; contract stenographic reporting services; not to exceed $100 for payment in advance when authorized by the Archivist for library membership in societies whose publications are available to members only or to members at a price lower than to the general public; not to exceed $650 for deposit in the general fund of the Treasury for cost of penalty mail as required by the act of June 28, 1944; and travel expenses, $1,236,335, of which $1,000 is for claims determined and settled pursuant to the Federal Tort Claims Act: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the salary of any employee of grade 4 or above in the professional service or of grade 11 or above in the clerical, administrative, and fiscal service who was originally appointed in the National Archives to a war-service appointment.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. PHILLIPS of California:

Page 37, line 5, strike out "4" and insert "5."

Page 37, line 9, strike out the period and insert a comma and the following words: "except a presently employed veteran of either World War or a member of the active or inactive reserves AUS."

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, the amendment comes with the consent and approval of the committee to make a correction in the wording on page 37 in order that veterans, if any, may be protected, the intent of the original amendment having been to provide and protect veterans' rights in the agency.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take the floor at this time to call attention to the apparent necessity of writing legislation in appropriations bills in order to deal with the question of employment in Federal Government. I have no objection to the amendment just offered, but I direct your attention to the fact that somehow, someway there should be a method for dealing with reductions in force and bringing about economy in Government, as well as dealing with the question of duplication of effort, other than solving the problem on the basis of the amount of funds expended.

On other occasions I have taken the floor in support of legislation that I introduced to provide for an agency representing the Congress and responsible to Congress that could work constructively at all times in an effort to deal with the problem as to what services the people of this country believe they want. What agencies are needed to perform that service, as well as the number of people that seem to be needed in order to carry on such service. This problem of employment is being conducted in a more or less backward manner. If you will read the hearings you will find that this committee over and over again directs attention to what their investigators have done in order to bring about economy in certain departments.

It seems rather odd that the great Appropriations Committee of the House, in order to bring about a certain amount of economy and efficiency, are required to do so by sending what they call investigators into the various departments of the Government in order to get it done. There should be a group who could give careful study to these problems at all times and should keep the Congress informed with regard to the needs and requirements of the various departments of our Government.

The whole thing should be handled in a constructive manner. If you will read the hearings you will find that in too many places there is a certain amount of resistance on the part of department heads when there should be full cooperation. There is no good reason why departments and agencies should not cooperate with the committee. They should tell them about their needs, of course, but they should also explain wherein economies can be made and efficiency brought about in the departments of government.

I want to commend the members of this committee for the splendid work they have done, but I say again, it is unfortunate that it is necessary for the committee to have to handle so much of the legislation under the circumstances which they appear required to do. Of course, there should be justification for the amount of government expenditures and there should also be cooperation on the part of department heads in dealing with the problems involved.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask a question of the chairman of the subcommittee in order that I may determine whether at a later point in the bill an amendment should be offered. The budget recommended that this language be included in the provisions of the bill relating to the Maritime Commission:

Provided further, That, except for payment of construction differential subsidies as provided in section 504 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, no moneys or contract authority shall be available during the period beginning with the date of enactment hereof and ending June 30, 1948, for the construction of any vessel begun after such date of enactment unless the Commission has entered into a contract for the sale of such vessel.

Before the gentleman answers, let me state my understanding of it, and maybe that will clarify the question somewhat.

My understanding of this language is that the President is recommending that the Maritime Commission be prohibited from starting the construction of any new vessels in the next fiscal year until and unless they have a contract of sale for them. As I understand it, if this is stricken out, it means, according to the committee report, that the Maritime Commission will begin construction and construct $99,000,000 of new ships for which they may or may not have a sale.

As it operates under the basic act, as I understand it, the shipping interests are required to pay 50 percent of the cost of a vessel under a contract of sale. If this is stricken out, it means the Government will pay 100 percent of the cost; and having no sale, the only recourse left to the Government may be a charter which in some cases, or in most cases rather, is a very nominal fee.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the able and hard-working chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. May I say to the gentleman that I think the effect of the action in striking out the proposed proviso is to leave the law exactly as it is today and as it always has been. Of course, the old program of construction is already under contract and the proviso would only affect the new program as it develops. I think the feeling of the committee was that they should not unnecessarily tie the hands of the Commission with respect to methods which they have heretofore used under the enabling legislation.

Mr. GORE. What does the gentleman mean by "unnecessarily"? All this does is to prevent them from beginning the construction of a ship until they have a contract to sell it. If they cannot sell it, they are holding the bag—with the ship in it—and they have nothing to do but to either let the ship lie idle or charter it; and, as I say, those charter fees are frequently very nominal; and it really means upping the budget since the budget recommended $84,000,000 for new ships, the shipping interests to pay half of it, or $47,000,000. But, as it is, the Maritime Commission will have to pay all of it.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. If the distinguished gentleman, the chairman of the subcommittee, is finished with his answer, I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield for the moment to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. May I say to the gentleman that the committee was unanimous in striking out the budget limitation for three reasons. In the first place, if you will read carefully the budget limitations it says "except as provided in section 504 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936." That is the section of the act which allows the construction differential subsidy up to 50 percent.

Mr. GORE. That is right. But that is what you are striking out.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. If the gentleman will wait just a moment—the amendment is very ambiguous. It says, "except that." And since the amendment is not clear, that was one ground on which they removed the limitation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. The next ground is that we merely want to put it back as it normally was. This budget calls for only nine new ships. Three of them are prototype passenger ships and the remainder are new type cargo ships. Their total cost is only $84,000,000. The figure you refer to, the remainder, the difference between 99 and 84 is for betterments. The bill only carries about $21,150,000 this year to get the program started.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to correct one mistake which I think the gentleman is laboring under. These ships will certainly, when constructed, be chartered out but not on a nominal fee because they will be so much better than what we have now. In truth and in fact, they will bring in a profit, and the Maritime Commission says that they are satisfied that within the next 6 or 8 months, even before they get these ships laid down, they will be sold.

Mr. GORE. Does the gentleman agree with me that the striking out of the proviso which would require the subsidy participation, the participation of the shipping interests in the cost of construction, means that the Government will pay the entire amount of $84,000,000 rather than a part?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I think the gentleman is wrong and I will tell him why. I think the gentleman is in error in his judgment that eventually the Maritime Commission will have to pay it all, for this reason.

At VJ-day the Maritime Commission embarked upon a new shipbuilding program of 43 ships. Today 36 of the 43 are completed and sold. It is the expectation that these 9 ships, long before they are constructed, will be sold.

Mr. GORE. Then what is the objection to having the proviso in the bill that construction be not started until there is a contract of sale?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. It will simply slow it down, for the simple reason they have not closed all the negotiations with the purchasers at this time. Frankly, the purchasers are having a little trouble with the Treasury Department on their differential.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, frankly I do not quite see the advisability of starting out on a 100-percent cost-of-construction program by the Maritime Commission when we now have more surplus ships than we can possibly sell, and this would really increase the expenditures of the Government rather than reduce them. This eliminates the participation of the shipping industry to the extent of 50 percent of the cost. It really means upping the expenditures of the 1948 merchant-marine expenditure.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I do not think there is anything in the picture which contemplates a 100-percent assumption of cost by the Government in this connection. The construction subsidy is either paid at the outset or it is collected from those to whom the ship is sold.

Mr. GORE. Well, you have no understanding that you can or will dispose of the ships.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The policy has always been the same heretofore. Striking the proviso leaves the situation as it always has been.

Mr. GORE. Now, if it is necessary, from the standpoint of national defense that the Maritime Commission may inaugurate a shipbuilding program, then I offer no objection. But I want the House to understand that it means this so-called saving of budget items of the Maritime Commission, referred to in the report, is partially washed out. That, too, becomes an apparent but not a real saving.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That does not follow at all.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. If the gentleman will refer to the hearings, he will find a letter from the Secretary of the Navy to the chairman of the Maritime Commission, urging them to go ahead with the cargo shipbuilding program, for national defense purposes. I can assure the gentleman from Tennessee that it is not the intention of the committee to up the budget estimate in this regard one penny, because we are confident that the ships will all be sold long before they are completed.

Mr. GORE. Regardless of intent, that may prove the result. However, in the light of its hearing upon national defense plus the unanimous confidence of the subcommittee that the provision should be stricken I shall not offer the amendment I had intended to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] has again expired.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Administration, medical, hospital, and domiciliary services: For necessary expenses of the Veterans' Administration, including maintenance and operation of medical, hospital, and domiciliary services, in carrying out the functions pursuant to all laws for which the Administration is charged with administering, including personal services in the District of Columbia; examination of estimates of appropriations in the field, including actual expenses of subsistence or per diem allowance in lieu thereof; furnishing and laundering of such wearing apparel as may be prescribed for employees in the performance of their official duties; health service program as authorized by act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 658); purchase of 323 passenger motor vehicles; utilization of Government-owned automotive equipment in transporting children of Veterans' Administration employees located at isolated stations to and from school under such limitations as the Administrator may by regulation prescribe; services as authorized by section 15 of Public Law 600, Seventy-ninth Congress; maintenance and operation of farms; recreational articles and facilities at institutions maintained by the Veterans' Administration; expenses incidental to securing employment for war veterans; funeral, burial, and other expenses incidental thereto for beneficiaries of the Veterans' Administration except burial awards authorized by Veterans' Administration Regulation No. 9 (a), as amended; the purchase of tobacco to be furnished, subject to regulations of the Administrator, to veterans receiving hospital treatment or domiciliary care in Veterans' Administration hospitals or homes; aid to State or Territorial homes in conformity with the act approved August 27, 1888, as amended (24 U. S. C. 134), for the support of veterans eligible for admission to Veterans' Administration facilities for hospital or domiciliary care; the purchase of printed reduced-fare requests for use by veterans when traveling at their own expense from or to Veterans' Administration facilities; not to exceed $3,500 for newspapers and periodicals; and not to exceed $120,200 for the preparation, shipment, installation, and display of exhibits, photographic displays, moving pictures, and other visual educational information and descriptive material, including the purchase or rental of equipment; $878,040,780, from which allotments and transfers may be made to the Federal Security Agency (Public Health Service), the War, Navy, and Interior Departments, for disbursement by them under the various headings of their applicable appropriations, of such amounts as are necessary for the care and treatment of beneficiaries of the Veterans' Administration, including minor repairs and improvements of existing facilities under their jurisdiction necessary to such care and treatment: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay in excess of 100 persons engaged in public relations work: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for the purchase of any site for or toward the construction of any new hospital or home, or for the purchase of any hospital or home; and not more than $7,807,000 of this appropriation may be used to repair, alter, improve, or provide facilities in the several hospitals and homes under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration either by contract or by the hire of temporary employees and the purchase of materials.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana: On page 48, line 18, strike out "$878,040,780" and insert in lieu thereof "$978,040,780."

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, the object of this amendment is to do exactly what General Hawley told the Veterans' Affairs Committee yesterday that he had to have in order to staff the hospital beds he will have after July 1.

I presented this question back on May 2 to the committee, as will be seen from page 4470 of the RECORD of that date, and I showed at that time that the Veterans' Administration had at that time 5,174 beds which it was not able to operate, and those beds were scattered all over the Nation, some in every hospital perhaps in the Nation, more or less, all the way from a few beds, 15 or 20, up to 400 or 500. I also showed at that time that on and after July 1 when we reached the new fiscal year we will have a total of about 9,700 beds that General Hawley will not be able to operate because he does not have the doctors, nurses, and attendants to operate them. He does not have those people because he does not have the money.

Yesterday, General Hawley appeared before our committee again. We asked him what he needed in the way of money to operate the beds. Here is what he said, and I beg the committee to look at this question very seriously. I am presenting an amendment for certain needs as revealed by the highest medical authority in the Veterans' Administration. The chairman of the Veterans' Committee is present, as well as other members, and they know this is so. Here are some of the questions that were asked General Hawley yesterday. Mr. KEARNEY, of New York, a splendid Republican member of the committee, asked General Hawley this question:

We want to know whether you are being denied necessary personnel or the funds properly to run your set-up?

Dr. HAWLEY. We do not have enough funds to run the present scope of our set-up.

Mr. KEARNEY. How much more do you need?

Dr. HAWLEY. $100,000,000 and 30,000 people.

Mr. KEARNEY. $100,000,000 and 30,000 more people?

Dr. HAWLEY. Yes, plus the additions that will come in during 1948.

Dr. Hawley further testified, and I want you to listen to this:

Dr. HAWLEY. We have on duty today in all hospitals 61,529 people and if you subtract the 2,933 that are earmarked for new hospitals, that give us only 56,703 people to operate the hospitals next year exclusive of those three new ones.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. According to the statement the gentleman has just made, the situation will be worse in the coming year than it is at present time?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I thank the gentleman. That is exactly what will happen. Here are the facts and no one on either side of the aisle can deny it. It is not a political matter, it is not a party matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Did General Hawley explain to your committee just why he did not reveal that fact to the Appropriations Committee when he was asking for appropriations? Does the gentleman know his reasons for having said to the Appropriations Committee that the committee was giving him everything he had asked for? If the gentleman will examine the record of the testimony taken by the Appropriations Committee he will find that the committee went to great pains to make certain and to make clear that it was giving General Hawley every cent he was asking for. General Hawley is a soldier, and I dare say in appearing before the Appropriations Committee he was performing as a soldier. The recommendation of the Budget is what General Hawley accepted as being binding upon him, but General Hawley knew that the personnel recommended by the Bureau of the Budget would not enable the Administration to serve the veterans as they should properly be served.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Georgia for that statement. He is correct in saying that General Hawley is a soldier, and General Hawley is operating under Budget directions. I do not have all the testimony before me that General Hawley gave yesterday, but General Hawley let us know that he was operating under Budget restrictions. I see the distinguished chairman of the committee on her feet, and I yield to her.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does it not seem to the gentleman that in matters as important as hospital benefits and other benefits that at least some member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs should sit in with the Committee on Appropriations? Apparently the committee has been told one thing and we have been told something else. Our responsibility is to legislate in the first instance for the veteran, and there is something very wrong, it seems to me, about the present procedure.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I thank the gentlewoman. I have no comment now as to whether a legislative committee should sit in with the Committee on Appropriations, but I do know this, that there seems to be a discrepancy, and I do know that General Hawley has given us the latest figures. Let me say this: Regardless of what the Budget Bureau says, it is still the responsibility of this Congress to see that the hospitals are operated properly, and General Hawley says emphatically that he does not have the money; that he lacks $100,000,000 of having enough money and he lacks 30,000 people of having adequate personnel, and it is the responsibility of Congress to see that he has it.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Texas, a member of the committee.

Mr. TEAGUE. General Hawley did make the statement to the committee that he had 20,996 veterans waiting to enter hospitals, but no member of the committee pursued that statement to ask him how he was going to take care of them. It seems to me there was some indication to the committee that he was not receiving enough money. He also stated to the committee that they would not reach their maximum hospital load until 1970, and after General Hawley made that statement there was no question asked him as to how he intended to take care of that 21,000 waiting list.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. As a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I wish the gentleman would clear this up for me. It is my understanding that under existing law the Veterans' Administration provides beds for men with non-service-connected disability where beds are available. Now, is it the gentleman's understanding that it is the responsibility of the Veterans' Administration to recommend a construction program to care for the needs of all veterans who require hospitalization, whether service connected or not?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I want to say to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut that that question is not before us at this time. The policy now in operation was established years before I came here. I am talking about operating hospital beds that we now have and will have next year.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. It is before us today.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. That is not the question presented in my amendment. As I said, a number of years ago Congress provided that non-service-connected cases could be entered in hospitals if there were available beds not being used by service-connected cases. What I am talking about is meeting the issue next year. I am talking about meeting the issue now and I ask that this House not evade this issue. I ask this House to provide enough funds in this bill right now to take care of the needs for next year. My amendment will do it. I ask your support.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there is not a member of the Committee on Appropriations of this House that has not the best interests of every veteran in America at heart.

We have made it very clear in our report that in the recommendations which we have made there is not contemplated one penny reduction in any benefit provided by the Congress for our veterans; nor one penny reduction in anything due to the widowed, the orphaned, or in medical care to any that are eligible.

We considered the over-all picture very carefully. General Hawley was before our committee for days, and it was only a few days ago. At the conclusion of our consideration, we allowed the full Budget estimate, in respect to the item the gentleman from Louisiana now seeks to increase, except as to $38,000,000; $27,000,000 of the $38,000,000 was in respect to personnel and the balance in respect to so-called other obligations. The committee made it crystal clear in its report that not one penny of the $27,000,000 of reduction in personnel was to be applicable to hospitals; in other words, that General Hawley was to have every person and every cent that he had requested.

The record also indicates, as I pointed out yesterday, that not only has the Congress made available every cent and every individual requested by General Hawley heretofore, but that General Hawley has not yet reached the personnel ceiling the Bureau of the Budget has allowed him——

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I reiterate what the chairman has just said, that it was the intention of the committee to give General Hawley every dime he asked for, and that we did. There may be one or two minor exceptions under some small items. Let me submit this proprosition to the chairman: Since it is the intention of the committee to take 100 percent care of these veterans in the way of hospitalization, if General Hawley will go over to the other body and ask for an increase, and justify it, to the amount suggested by my distinguished friend from Louisiana, am I not safe in saying that the gentleman's committee will go along with that justification? But certainly it was not made before this subcommittee.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. This committee has not had one bit of evidence in justification of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Louisiana. If anybody is to blame, General Hawley himself must take that blame upon his shoulders, because he never brought one syllable of evidence to our committee a few days ago. I subscribe 100 percent to the suggestion of the gentleman from Texas to the effect that if General Hawley can justify further appropriations either before the Senate Appropriations Committee in connection with this bill or before the House Appropriations Committee in connection with a deficiency bill, of course he will get every cent that he proves to be necessary. I do not see, however, how this committee can be expected to subscribe to an increase of $100,000,000 without one syllable of testimony before it to support the proposal.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. May I say that I have examined the record of the testimony

taken by the gentleman's committee and am confident that if General Hawley had made this disclosure to the committee and had made a request for this additional money the committee would have given it to him.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. The gentleman is bound to know that any representative of a department up here is supposed to live and to make his demands within budget recommendations. I am not talking about budget recommendations, I am talking about needs, I am talking about what General Hawley says now under solemn cross-examination that he needs. It is a question of whether we want to live up to what he needs.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. If the general will come before the Committee on Appropriations and justify those needs he will not find any difficulty in having them satisfied.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not rise in opposition to this amendment because I want in any way to take away any of the benefits the veteran is entitled to. I rise in opposition to the amendment because I, myself, am personally offended at the position General Hawley has taken. General Hawley knows full well that he could have told us at perfect liberty, off the record, if he wanted to protect himself, that he did not have enough funds to take care of these veterans who had made application to get into the hospitals, but he did not do so. We need not assume the position that any man in any department need feel he is bound by the recommendation of the budget, because he is not. On many occasions they have told our committee that the budget recommended a certain amount but that they needed so much, and in many instances we have increased the appropriations over the budget recommendations.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Did any member of your committee ask General Hawley if he needed anything above the budget recommendation?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I think throughout the hearings every member of our committee asked every man who appeared before us from the Veterans' Administration, "Are we properly caring for the veterans in providing for the benefits that are coming to them?"

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Did you ask him to make any further recommendations?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Is it not a fact, may I ask the gentleman from Florida, that we did just those things and that representatives of the Veterans' Administration, as well as representatives from other agencies, with great frankness told us just exactly what each situation was? It is, therefore, a matter of orderly budgeting, whether justifications shall be made before the Committee on Appropriations, as they were in this case, and the money given by the Committee on Appropriations, or whether, without any justification at all, a request shall come in for an additional $100,000,000. It seems to me that the suggestion from the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] is the solution, and that General Hawley should go before the Senate subcommittee having consideration of this bill and justify what he apparently said before a legislative committee, but not before the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I think the gentleman from California is correct. We stated here yesterday in general debate that no one had any intention of denying any veteran any benefit to which he is entitled, not by one cent. Every member of this committee knows full well, and so did General Hawley that if he needed more money all he would have had to say to us was that the budget recommended a certain sum but that he felt the budget was incorrect. Or he could have told us that he could use a certain amount of money in taking care of these veterans and he could have gotten it. Everyone knows that we have increased appropriations above budget estimates in certain instances. The whole point is simply that General Hawley came before one committee and said one thing and then went before another committee and said another thing.

The solution to this problem is this: My recommendation would be that General Hawley now go before the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and I am sure the Senate will agree to put the money in the bill if he says they need it and if he makes a case. I am sure the House conferees will accept that if he wants to do it. His next move, if he runs short of funds, is to ask for a deficiency appropriation. I am sure no committee, not the deficiency committee or the whole Committee on Appropriations or any Member of the House, would deny him funds. But I do not think it is correct for him to come before us and tell us one thing and then go before another committee and tell them something else. He had every reason to tell us what he needed. He was before us. He did not have to be the soldier and abide by the budget recommendations. He could have told us exactly what he needed because it is our job to determine whether or not the budget requests are right, and that is what we do.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. May I say to the gentleman from Florida in fairness to General Hawley that he did not volunteer any of this information. It came as a result of questioning before our Committee on Veterans' Affairs. He was making no complaints and he was not asking for anything.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Well, the point I make is this. He disclosed this information to your committee, so why did he not disclose it to the committee which was making the appropriation?

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield.

Mr. TEAGUE. The reason is that none of you asked him any questions.

Mr. HENDRICKS. We do not have to ask any of these men any questions.

Mr. TEAGUE. He told you that there were 20,000 patients on the waiting list.

Mr. HENDRICKS. That is begging the question. They know perfectly well what they need. We do not have to ask questions as to whether they need money. All they have to do is make a simple statement, and they will get it if they need it. It is our job to decide, as I said before, whether the budget is correct and whether we will give more or less. We are perfectly willing to listen. If General Hawley had said he needed the money or had indicated in any way what he needed, there is no member of this committee who would have denied him what he needed.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment close in 12 minutes, the last 2 minutes to be reserved for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I am extremely glad that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN] has brought up this matter. I think it is high time that representatives of the departments stop telling the Appropriations Committee one thing as regards their needs and then coming to the authorization committee—the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in this instance—and telling them they need more money. Under the circumstances I am willing to accept, for the time being, the verdict of the Committee on Appropriations. If General Hawley feels he does not have enough money to operate the hospitals and care for the veterans properly he can go before the Senate committee and ask for that amount of money. Apparently no one on the Appropriations Committee feels he asked for a cent more than they have appropriated. For that reason for the present I am willing to go along with the Appropriations Committee and accept their promise that they will appropriate more in one of the appropriations bills which will follow this.

I am very glad that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN] brought up the point. I could not be present yesterday during the entire hearings, because I had a very important committee meeting with the Speaker of the House regarding certain veterans' matters in another section of the Congress. No one in the House wants to deprive the veterans of any money for hospitalization or proper medical care. It is important that requests for appropriations be discussed in the House, because this sort of thing must be stopped. I have repeatedly asked that I and a few members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee might sit

in with the Appropriations Committee to find out what the Veterans' Administration has to say to them. If they come before us and say something different, it is very unfair to us and to the Appropriations Committee and to the veterans. In the first instance the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has the responsibilities for legislation for the veterans' welfare.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Should it not be perfectly clear in the RECORD that any administrative agent like General Hawley, representing the Veteran's Administration, who appears before the Appropriations Committee, is bound by instructions in writing from the President of the United States, which has gone out to every executive agency of Government, that they are not to justify any request for appropriation in excess of the budget estimate? But when he comes before your committee he is not bound by that instruction, and he can tell your committee what is on his mind. I have noticed it in handling requests for appropriations time and again, when I felt that an agency was not getting enough money from the Bureau of the Budget to properly handle their business and I have tried the best I could to pull out of those people, when they came there, justification for more money for a thing I knew they should have more money for. But they would close up like clams, and then, off the record, would tell me, "We are sorry, Congressman, we cannot violate the order." It would not make any difference if you sat in with the Appropriations Committee. Does not the gentlewoman see the point?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes, that is true in some cases, insofar as public requests are made to the Appropriation Committee but I am quite sure that requests are made to that committee off the record and I should assume the members of the Appropriations Committee would ask General Hawley off the record if he needs anything more.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. If that is intended as a criticism of the Appropriations Committee, with all due deference to the gentlewoman, I think it very unfair.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield no further to the gentleman from Georgia. I will say to the gentleman that I was rather defending the Appropriations Committee, I believe that no one on the Appropriations Committee would fail to ask that question of representatives of the Department, in this instance General Hawley.

Mr. COX. Will the gentlewoman yield further?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield no further to the gentleman from Georgia.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that General Hawley did not come before our committee and ask for additional money. He came before our committee and told us that there were 20,000 veterans waiting for hospitalization. We asked him how he was taking care of them. He stated that he could not because the hospital load was increasing all the time and actually his amount of money had increased none. Then we asked him how much money it would take to take care of these veterans and that was how this thing came out.

I wish to ask a question of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH]: On page 536 of the hearings General Bradley pointed out to the gentleman from Massachusetts that there would probably be a shortage of funds for rations and medical supplies during 1948 and asked what his procedure should be. Should he go ahead and use what was needed and ask for a deficiency or should he stop? The gentleman's answer to him was that the committee would think the matter over and get together. I would like to know what the final answer to General Hawley was.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE. I yield.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Under date of June 3, 1947, I wrote General Bradley as follows, as chairman of the subcommittee:

JUNE 3, 1947.

Gen. OMAR N. BRADLEY,
Administrator, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL BRADLEY: At the conclusion of the recent hearings in connection with the 1948 estimates for the Veterans' Administration you asked the subcommittee the following question:

"If we find we can take care of 39,000,000 patient-days with the personnel which is allowed us, but it would involve a bigger expense for rations and medical supplies, are we justified in coming back to you for that difference?"

I am authorized by the subcommittee to advise you that the answer is "Yes" to your question.

Sincerely yours,
RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations.

Mr. TEAGUE. I thank the gentleman, and yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I take these 3 minutes in order to straighten out an incomplete question I asked of the gentleman from Louisiana, for fear it may be misunderstood. I asked the gentleman a few minutes ago if I was right in believing that under existing law the Veterans' Administration was charged with admitting veterans to veterans' hospitals suffering from non-service-connected disabilities where beds were available. The gentleman answered "Yes," but he said that matter was not before us at this time and he would discuss it later.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I cannot yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. But I yielded to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I have got caught before yielding when my time was short. I want to get this matter completed if I can. I want to clarify this matter of admitting veterans with non-service-connected disabilities to hospitals where beds are available. I think it is pertinent to the question of appropriations.

In my district the general medical hospital of the Veterans' Administration is at the present time about 93 percent occupied by veterans with non-service-connected disabilities.

If Congress is going to provide for every World War I and World War II veteran to be treated at these veterans' hospitals for all types of non-service-connected cases, I am concerned about where we are going to put the service-connected men who apply for admission. If you are going to carry out the whole program, then the $96,000,000 that we are talking about now is only a drop in the bucket; and I think it is very important that the Congress through the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, of which the distinguished gentlewoman from Massachusetts is chairman, clarify that policy.

I am not criticizing the Veterans' Administration because if there is an empty bed and a non-service-connected case comes along they should admit him, but when all the beds are filled with non-service-connected cases and a service-connected case comes along they cannot admit the veteran suffering from a war disability.

I now yield to the gentleman from Louisiana. I did not mean to be abrupt to him when I declined to yield earlier.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I wanted to say to the gentleman that the question of admitting non-service-connected cases is permissive. As the gentleman knows there is nothing mandatory about it. It is a matter of administrative discretion on the part of the Veterans' Administration. If there are vacant beds the Veterans' Administration has the right to admit non-service-connected cases.

The gentleman is asking about a policy as to what can be done in the future. That is a matter for the Congress to determine. I do not know what the Congress is going to do and the gentleman does not know.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. But I think we should know what is going to be done. Suppose there is one empty bed and a non-service-connected case comes along with appendicitis and he has his appendix out, and 8 hours later a service-connected veteran applies for admission. Obviously you cannot turn out the non-service-connected case that had his appendix removed 8 hours earlier and turn the bed over to the service-connected case.

I think it is very important that the policy be determined and that adequate facilities be provided to meet the situation.

May I repeat. I have no objection, in fact I approve of providing hospital care for every veteran regardless of the cause of his or her disability whenever and wherever there is a vacant hospital bed, but if we are going to build hospitals enough to provide an empty bed for every

war veteran who may need it we have a huge building program ahead of us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, the point made by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER] shows the seriousness and the complications of the situation and is well taken. It calls attention to the fact that this is not a matter that can be settled without supporting facts, to the extent of $100,000,000, on the floor of the House. I rise to suggest again the propriety of the idea of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], that we should refuse this amendment, then ask General Hawley to present facts in justification before the Senate committee. If General Hawley was a soldier before the Appropriations Committee I think he was also a soldier before the legislative committee. I can assure the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN] that we do not refrain from asking questions and that the same informality, the same freedom of expression, obtains in the Committee on Appropriations as in legislative committees. I concur with the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] in her hope that there will be cooperation between legislative and appropriation committees.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the amendment be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOFF: On page 48, line 18, strike out "$878,040,780" and insert in lieu thereof "$868,040,708."

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Chairman, this amendment involves a cut of $10,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, what I now have to say must be taken in no sense as a criticism of our fine House subcommittee of both Republicans and Democrats which has worked long, faithfully, and capably on the present bill. I entertain only the highest regard for fellow Members of Congress who lean over backward to insure the ultimate in care for our disabled comrades in arms and the fullest opportunity for veterans' widows and orphans and for veterans themselves to enjoy every benefit accorded by law. In the face of insistent public demand for cuts in expenditures, any doubts have been resolved in favor of ample provision for veterans' welfare, rather than parsimonious snipping.

The Veterans' Administration is the giant of our independent Government agencies. It is a sprawling colossus, created after World War I, which mushroomed in size after the termination of hostilities in World War II, and is headed by one of our national heroes, a man whose integrity and high purpose are above all possible question.

Legislation has been passed by Congress to cover almost every possible need of veterans of the two World Wars, and the problems and cost of implementation of such legislation have grown almost beyond the bounds of congressional scrutiny.

But now we must attempt to do some weeding in the field of the Veterans' Administration. This Congress has tackled the personnel superstructure of other governmental agencies, and I see no just reason why this important bureau should be held inviolate when it comes to plowing under incompetent jobholders.

Unfortunately, after each war, the agency became a haven for a very large number of job hunters of limited ability, but recently discharged from war service, for whom no places at any way comparable salaries were open in ordinary civilian employment. Many were men of good intention but a paucity of qualifications to do the work. A lot of them were what we call professional veterans, often active in veterans' organizations, out looking for soft berths to land in. A lot of them, during hostilities, had managed to slip into safe Army jobs far from the hardships and the shooting, and had let someone else do the fighting. Some of them were commissioned officers of doubtful ability, whose talents are more suited to drive milk trucks than holding down administrative positions.

My amendment is not aimed at the many able and zealous public servants in the Veterans' Administration. Their jobs will be easier if we clear out the dawdlers. It is not aimed at hard-working personnel engaged in giving hospital or medical care to our veterans. But my amendment is directed at the hordes of inefficient administrative employees, particularly of our regional, subregional, and local offices, and, worse than these, the misfits, the selfish, and the lazy, who have crawled onto what to them is the gravy train. I speak of the important-looking brief-case boys, some of whom hardly conceal their contempt for veterans who work for a living. Then there are the office managers, who should be pushing wheelbarrows instead of pencils. A private physician writes me of a veteran he sent to an administration office who waited for more than an hour while the man he was to see was out for a cup of coffee. Serious-minded members of Legion committees tell me of attending conventions and conferences where some regional official was accompanied by as many as four other Veterans' Administration employees, who carried brief cases and contributed nothing, while relaxing on their expense accounts. I know of veterans who have been booted out of one ordinary civilian job after another, but who complain bitterly that they are not making more than $7,000 a year now with the Veterans' Administration. There is a subregional office where stenographers complain in disgust that they average typing one letter a day and spend the rest of the time reading magazines, or at whatever else will take up the slow hours. They know they are overpaid and overgraded. There is no need for four janitors where one grew before. This is not a situation peculiar to one part of the country. These shilly-shally business methods have existed since the First World War.

I invite your attention to the next to the last paragraph on page 20 of the report on the bill. This reads as follows:

The record discloses disturbing weaknesses in the present situation.

There appears to be no proper central control of personnel. This seems to have been lost back in December 1945 when the power of employment was delegated to heads of offices in the field, some 78,000 employees having been added to the rolls in a period of 6 months thereafter. The committee is advised that no current personnel records, covering positions and salaries of those in the field offices, are available in the central office in Washington, although available records do show a disproportionate assignment of personnel of branch and regional offices and of administrative and maintenance personnel at hospitals.

Again I say that the bulk of the Administration employees want to do a good job. I would be the first to agree that generalities are unfair to the earnest and efficient worker. But I do know a man whose ability I respect who voluntarily took other employment at a much lower salary because he was fed up on the inefficiency of the Veteran's Administration office in which he worked.

I believe there are Members of the House who have felt that something ought to be done to remedy the situation, but who have kept silent because they did not want to appear unfriendly to ex-service men and women.

This is something veterans ought to want to see cleaned up. We know that eventually a long-suffering public will revolt at such incompetence and the whole program will be discredited. Now is the time for Congress to act. We can force a shake-up by a cut in appropriations. We want to provide for our veterans all that is justly due from a grateful Nation, but if less goes to pay salaries of useless job holders, then there will be more for the veterans who need help.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I have a very high regard for the gentleman from Idaho who has just spoken, and who has served not only in one world war but in two. I know of his earnest desire to try to improve existing conditions within the Veterans' Administration. I think we all share in that desire.

However, Mr. Chairman, as far as further reduction in personnel is concerned, I feel as I indicated yesterday, that the committee has gone as far as it is desirable to go at this time.

I believe it is better to be on the conservative side, particularly in view of the fact that General Bradley has indicated his full realization of the importance of a proper over-all central control over personnel and in view of the fact that he now has studies under way with a view to improving present conditions.

I therefore think it would not be wise to adopt the proposed amendment at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For hospital and domiciliary facilities, in addition to the unobligated balances of other appropriations for this purpose, and to the unobligated balance of the contract authority of $441,250,000 in the Third Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1946 (which authority is hereby extended to July 1, 1949), the Administrator is authorized to incur obligations prior to July 1, 1949, in an amount not exceeding $338,250,000, which shall be available for use, with the approval of the President, for extending any of the facilities under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration or for any of the purposes set forth in sections 1 and 2 of the act approved March 4, 1931 (38 U. S. C. 438j-k) or in section 101 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944: *Provided*, That not to exceed 6.7 percent of the foregoing appropriation and contract authorizations shall be available for the employment in the District of Columbia and in the field of all necessary technical and clerical personnel for the preparation of plans and specifications for the projects as approved hereunder and in the supervision of the execution thereof, and for all travel expenses, field office equipment, and supplies in connection therewith, except that whenever the Veterans' Administration finds it necessary in the construction of any project to employ other Government agencies or persons outside the Federal service to perform such services not to exceed 10 percent of the cost of such projects may be expended for such services.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: On page 51, line 20, strike out the period and insert a semicolon and the following: "*Provided further*, That no part of the funds appropriated in this bill or any funds heretofore made available, including contract authorizations, shall be used for the purchase or condemnation of the site or for the erection of a hospital on the tract of land in Arlington County, Va., known as the A. M. Nevius tract, situated at the intersection of Lee Boulevard and Arlington Ridge Road, containing approximately 25.406 acres; or for the purchase or condemnation of the site or erection of a hospital in Tallahassee, Fla."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment to save the Government some money. I was encouraged to offer it by the discussion which occurred here during most of the morning, off the record, in which everybody was in favor of either saving money or cutting appropriations. I am in favor of both.

This Nevius tract concerning which I am going to talk has been a subject of discussion on Capitol Hill for, I believe, as long as I have been here. There have been efforts by numerous bureaus of the Government to purchase this land. Always it has been successfully blocked heretofore. When I learned that it was proposed to erect a veterans' hospital on the Nevius tract I immediately went to see General Bradley to enter my protest.

Many of you probably are not acquainted with that location. It is just off the Lee Boulevard a short distance from Memorial Bridge. It is adjacent to and overlooks the National Military Cemetery. I have never heard that it would be encouraging to the recovery of veterans that they should be placed in a hospital where they look out of their windows upon the graves of their departed fellows and where they are constantly attuned to the taps of the burial of their comrades and the firing of the final salutes. That is what is proposed here.

I oppose this site for several reasons. One of them is that very rapidly the Federal Government is absorbing Arlington County and withdrawing its property from taxation to the point where that county is going to find it very difficult to survive in the future. That is a subject which perhaps does not so much interest Members of Congress. So I am going to talk to you about what does interest you.

This Nevius tract is a property for which the Government proposes to pay the sum of $891,000, I believe it is. The owners are claiming that the property is more valuable than that, and the jury will finally have to decide how much more than $891,000 the Government is going to have to pay for that site. Within 3 miles of that site the Government can buy sites—hilly and wooded land on arterial highways for only a very small percentage of what it is proposed to pay for this site.

I took occasion this morning to inquire as to the value of property within 3 miles of that which the Government could purchase. I was told that within 3 miles of the site for which the Government proposes to pay $980,000 or $1,000,000—and it will probably have to pay something in the neighborhood of $2,000,000 for the property—there is property which is more appropriate, better, and more beautiful, and in quieter surroundings which can be purchased and which is only a 5-minute drive of that Nevius tract for $25,000. And that would purchase the same quantity of land.

We all want to do what is right for the veteran. I do not think it is going to help them any to set them up in a hospital overlooking the cemetery which is going to be their final resting place. I doubt if it is going to help their morale or their recovery. Furthermore, there just is not any sense in our not paying some attention to the common-sense proposition of getting our money's worth when the Government is the purchaser.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SIKES. The gentleman has presumed to include in his amendment language affecting my district. I wonder if he will direct his discussion to telling us why he included Tallahassee Park?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Very gladly.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Virginia will wait, I will take care of the gentleman from Florida on that score.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ELSTON. May I ask the gentleman if there is any medical center or anything near this tract which warrants the building of a hospital at that particular place?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. It was stated to me that that was the reason for putting it there; that it would be nearer the hospitals in Washington. The fact is that the Congress last year provided for a medical center in the District of Columbia. Nobody has yet determined where that site is going to be, whether it is going to be nearer this tract or a long distance from it.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. ELSTON. Some years ago there was a hearing before the Military Affairs Committee at which time an effort was being made to annex this particular tract of land, which is about 25 acres, to Arlington Cemetery. At that time there was testimony before our committee that the owners paid only about $22,000 for the tract. Of course, that was some years ago, but $22,000 was about all they paid for the same tract which they are now trying to sell to the Government for almost $900,000.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Property in that area is very high in price. I am not criticizing the owners of the property for trying to sell it for as much money as they can get for it. That is their privilege and their right. What I am criticizing is that a Federal agency seems to be utterly impervious to the value of a dollar.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. RICH. You say that within 5 minutes from the point where they now want to purchase a site for $900,000, they can buy one for $25,000?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is exactly what I said and I hope the gentleman will be for my amendment.

Mr. RICH. Why, Mr. Chairman, every man here should be for that amendment. If there is any man who would not be for that amendment, I would like to see him stand up.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

ARLINGTON COUNTY, VA.,
OFFICE OF COMMISSIONER OF REVENUE,
Courthouse, Arlington, Va., June 16, 1947.

Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE: In my opinion, the purchase of the Nevius tract by the Federal Government for a veterans' hospital would be extreme extravagance on the part of the Government. The Nevius tract is one of, if not the most, valuable tracts of ground in Arlington, consisting of approximately twenty-three-and-a-fraction acres, or about 1,000,000 square feet. My information from Judge Harry R. Thomas, who represents the Nevius people as well as from Mr. C. L. Kenier, the county planning engineer, is that temporary plans were presented to the building inspector of Arlington County for the erection of a $20,000,000 hotel

on this tract before the Veterans' Administration attempted to take the property over for a hospital.

I am further advised by the parties herein mentioned that a value of $5,000,000 was agreed to for the land, or about $5 a square foot.

There are numerous tracts of land in close proximity to Washington that, in my opinion, could be used to better advantage for a veterans' hospital, and could certainly be purchased at a far less cost than the Nevius tract. I am advised that the owners of the Nevius tract will not accept the price suggested by the Government in condemnation proceedings and I am sure that the owners of this tract can bring forth expert testimony that the tract is worth far more than the amount proposed by the Veterans' Administration.

A further objection to the Nevius tract for a veterans' hospital is the fact of its close proximity to Arlington Cemetery, with numerous burials daily, accompanied by squad firing and taps, which would seem to be very depressing to a veteran whose life was despaired of. If I remember correctly, some of the county officials, when they first learned of the proposal of the Government to take this tract over, suggested other cheaper and more desirable tracts in close proximity to Washington which could be obtained for a veterans' hospital.

From a tax angle, it means a further loss to Arlington at the present time of about $9,000 a year with a potential loss, should the proposed hotel be built, of at least $325,000 annually on the land and building alone, to say nothing of the personal property and license taxes which a hotel of such proportions would produce for the county.

I cannot too strongly emphasize the extravagance of the Federal Government in appropriating money to purchase property at a price far in excess of what more desirable property with far more acreage could be purchased for the same purpose.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY K. GREEN.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] has made out a very good case in this instance, but I think I ought to read, at the request of the Disabled American Veterans, a letter that has come to me, signed by Francis M. Sullivan, national director of legislation:

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
Washington, D. C., June 18, 1947.

The Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
Chairman, House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: The rule granted for consideration of the independent offices appropriation bill, 1948, provides that amendments may be offered to said bill which would prohibit the use of funds appropriated in such bill or any funds heretofore made available, including contract authorizations, for the purchase of any particular site or for the erection of any particular hospital.

This is a most unusual and discriminatory rule. It strikes at the very necessary hospital-construction program and conceivably results in the elimination from such program sorely needed hospitals. The program has been carefully considered by the Federal Board of Hospitalization, by the House Committee on Appropriations, and other interested agencies.

We of the Disabled American Veterans respectfully request that you recommend to the House of Representatives the rejection of any proposed amendment intended to affect the proposed hospital-construction program as contained in the independent offices appropriation bill.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS M. SULLIVAN,
National Director of Legislation.

I would like to point out to the House the danger of bringing in a rule of this kind. For instance, if any Member of Congress should happen to have a hospital that was under construction in his district, and anticipated funds were in this appropriation bill, if a Member rose under this rule and moved to strike out that the funds heretofore authorized should not be used for the construction of the hospital, they could not be used if the House so voted and the hospital might never be completed, because it is legislation on an appropriation bill. There is great danger in a rule of this kind. I think the Members are entitled to know that—those of you who have hospitals under construction; those who have plans under consideration. Sometimes $100,000 worth of plans have already been under way. Apparently, in the case of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] as he makes out the case, there will be a saving, and the present site is an undesirable one. But it is a very bad precedent if we are going to follow the law we have laid down regarding using the suggestion of the Board of Hospitalization for hospital sites.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I cannot yield just now.

I would like to ask regarding the funds for the Tallahassee Hospital. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] has asked the question. I do not know whether there is any construction under way there, or any plans. Is that correct?

Mr. SIKES. If the gentlewoman will yield, I will be glad to state that a site has been acquired and plans have been completed for the construction of a hospital. Construction itself has not begun.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Was that recommended by General Hawley and the Board of Hospitalization?

Mr. SIKES. Yes, it was.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It was recommended that that site be purchased? How much was paid for the site?

Mr. SIKES. I am unable to give that information just now. It was recommended that the construction of the hospital proceed and that it be completed as soon as possible.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mrs. BOLTON. Am I to understand that all the placing of hospitals is done very definitely under the National Hospitalization Board?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The Board of Hospitalization is supposed to do the selecting of the sites. I understand that sometimes the President overrules the Board.

Mrs. BOLTON. Is that selection accepted by the Veterans' Administration? Because unless we do have a unified and united plan for the hospitals of this country we are certainly going to have duplication and unnecessary expense not only for the veterans' organizations but also for civilian hospitals.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would say to the gentlewoman that the veterans have always preferred to be hospitalized except for in some instances specialized care in their own hospitals, and the veterans' organizations have endorsed hospitalization in Veterans' Administration hospitals. I want to point out again that under this rule they could shut off funds for hospitals under construction. If such a rule should be brought in relating to other Government hospitals, construction could be stopped.

Mrs. BOLTON. Possibly it would be better if some of those hospitals were stopped, they are put in such strange places.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I doubt if legislating hospitals in an appropriation bill on the floor would help the situation. General Hawley and the Board of Hospitalization make the selection of the sites unless we adopt a rule of this sort and we legislate the sites; or we legislate in the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to take the power away from the Board of Hospitalization and recommend hospital sites in a hospital construction bill.

Mrs. BOLTON. I have only common sense at my disposal, but it seems to me that some of the hospitals have been located in amazing places.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania for a question.

Mr. RICH. I wanted to ask the gentlewoman, she being chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, if some Member of Congress realizes that we can get a site for $25,000 that is just as good as one that has been selected but which will cost $900,000, the cheaper site being within 5 minutes of the other, does not the gentlewoman think under present conditions we ought to take the $25,000 site?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I should say that the gentleman ought to take it up with the Board of Hospitalization and fight it out there. However, I always advocate the saving of money when the same results can be attained and the veterans be given the same care and service.

Mr. RICH. No; we have got enough of these bureaucrats and enough of these people in the Government who are squandering the people's money. We want to stop this, and it is the gentlewoman's business to stop it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It has been indicated heretofore that the Hospitalization Board designates the location of hospitals.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is correct.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. When the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt was President he set aside the action of the Board and located hospitals to suit his own fancy.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understand there were three hospitals so located.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If the same process can still be followed, it would seem that the Chief Executive finally decides the location.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I may say to the membership that I do not know whether they want to legislate into an appropriation bill the stopping of the building of hospitals. That is up to them, but I think it is a dangerous precedent. It may be well in this case but it is a dangerous precedent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment and ask unanimous consent to speak for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I regret the necessity of having taken the responsibility for putting in the pending amendment the language relating to the Tallahassee, Fla., hospital. My situation is such that I felt amply justified in doing this and now feel justified in taking the floor and appealing to you to support the position I take.

If this hospital had been placed at Tallahassee upon any other than political grounds, I doubt if I would take the responsibility of offering this amendment, even though putting it there involves the waste of millions of dollars.

At the time when this Hospital Board in the Veterans' Administration was examining the question as to where the hospital should be placed within the area represented by my friend the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] to the south of me and myself, a certain political influence intervened and overthrew the judgment and recommendation of experts within the Veterans' Administration and brought about the determination that the hospital should go to Tallahassee in satisfaction of or in fulfillment of a political promise, and for no other reason whatsoever. You will find in the files of the Veterans' Administration a recommendation to the effect that the hospital at Thomasville, Ga., be retained and further developed. In the effort to justify the location of this hospital at Tallahassee, Fla., the Veterans' Administration is junking a magnificent institution located at Thomasville, Ga., 35 miles away. The Thomasville hospital represents an outlay of something in the neighborhood of $6,000,000.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. I dislike to disturb the continuity of the gentleman's statement, but he has made the statement that political considerations determined the location of the hospital.

Mr. COX. I make that statement advisedly. My information is reliable. The statement is true.

Mr. SIKES. Will the gentleman identify the person to whom he refers?

Mr. COX. The gentleman is not the person to whom I refer, of course. I do refer, however, to a Floridian who is prominent in Florida and in national political affairs.

I say that in order to justify the discontinuance of the Thomasville hospital they are now contending that Thomasville is not the kind of a place that will attract personnel and that there is not sufficient recreational facilities to make it a desirable place for the veteran to go. Let me say to you, Mr. Chairman, that Thomasville has been attracting people of large means who could visit anywhere in the world that they might desire, and others of lesser means for a hundred years. They go there because it is a pleasant place to live. It has a fine climate and is a beautiful city. It even attracts people from Tallahassee who go there for recreation and for medical care. Thomasville is very nearly as large and is just as attractive as is Tallahassee. It is more of a medical center, and has as much to offer veterans as any other place that I know about where a veterans' hospital is located.

There are within the fifth area, which comprises Tennessee, Florida, Alabama, and Georgia, about 2,500 veterans now on the waiting list, and yet in spite of this fact and in order to justify Tallahassee, the Veterans' Administration is closing the Thomasville hospital that is prepared to render service to these veterans.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HUBER. The mentioning of the plant at Thomasville as being an excellent building, I understand that that was of temporary construction, a wooden building, and is not fireproof; is that true?

Mr. COX. Thomasville is both wood and brick, both permanent and temporary, but nevertheless it represents a large expenditure; an expenditure, as I say, in the neighborhood of $6,000,000, and there are those within the Veterans' Administration that recommended that Thomasville be retained; that the temporary buildings be abandoned, and that needed new construction be provided. Still, because of this political interference the Board, or whoever made the decision, was compelled to accept Tallahassee.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON. How much will it cost if they abandon the hospital at Thomasville and build a new hospital at Tallahassee?

Mr. COX. You would not realize 2 percent on the Thomasville investment. The Tallahassee hospital, it is estimated, will cost $4,372,000. The pending bill makes an appropriation of $1,899,160. All that I am requesting of the House is that they adopt this amendment and delay the construction or the beginning of construction of the Tallahassee hospital in order that there may be a new examination, a new survey, a new determination of the whole question. This is a reasonable request and I submit that that it is what this House should do.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Let me ask the gentleman from Georgia this question: Is not the Thomasville hospital a 1,500-bed hospital?

Mr. COX. I believe it is a 1,700-bed hospital, yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. And there is this waiting list in the fifth area.

Mr. COX. We have a waiting list in the area of about 2,500. Now, let me say this to you. General Hawley said that they experienced difficulty in obtaining sufficient personnel to meet their needs. Well, there sits before me one of my colleagues who recently, in behalf of two nurses, made application for positions at Thomasville, and he was advised that they had a long waiting list and could not take care of these two graduate nurses.

That is the situation, my friends. With all these veterans on the waiting list wanting hospitalization, here you find the Veterans' Administration in an effort to justify a bad decision, abandoning existing facilities of which use should be made.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. What is the size of the hospital they are anticipating building in Tallahassee?

Mr. COX. A 200-bed hospital.

Mrs. BOLTON. And they are abandoning one having 1,700 beds?

Mr. COX. The Thomasville hospital is around 1,700.

Mrs. BOLTON. Almost 2,000, I believe by actual occupancy.

Mr. COX. Yes. The hospital is still active on a limited basis.

Mrs. BOLTON. And there are doctors in Thomasville who do give their service to these hospitalized veterans.

Mr. COX. That is very true.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. If we do not pass the gentleman's amendment, then they will construct a hospital at Tallahassee and they will do away with the one at Thomasville; is that the situation?

Mr. COX. That is true.

Mr. RICH. And then the place that they now have for hospital facilities at

Thomasville will be absolutely worthless.

Mr. COX. That is right.

Mr. RICH. That certainly is a foolish thing for anybody to do, is it not?

Mr. COX. I think so, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, at the proper time an amendment will be offered to separate the language affecting the Tallahassee Hospital from the language of the pending amendment, in which, of course, it has no proper place.

Mr. Chairman, I dislike very much to find myself in oposition to my distinguished and beloved friend from Georgia, who occupies a place of great influence in this House. However, I believe that if he were in full possession of all the facts he would have hesitated to take the position he did here even though his own district is affected.

Obviously, Mr. Chairman, we cannot select sites for veterans' hospitals on the floor of the House, however much some of us would like to. It would result in a hodge-podge based on political pressure; it would be pork-barrel politics of the worst sort, jeopardizing the lives and well-being of the boys whose welfare is one of our greatest responsibilities. We do not want to take chances on those things. It would result in the exact type of politics the gentleman is objecting to.

If there is a need for the hospital at Thomasville at the moment, I have no objection to its continuing to operate but we are thinking about a long-range program, and we must plan for a long-range program and build for a long-range program which will insure the proper hospitalization for the Nation's veterans. Thomasville General Hospital is a one-story, temporary, nonfireproof structure, of frame construction, with some asbestos siding and shingling and temporary wallboard siding. The type of construction makes the building extremely difficult to heat, and, therefore, it is hard to maintain a comfortable and a safe temperature. It is very costly to maintain that temporary type of structure. Recreational outlets at Thomasville are limited, train service is limited, and there is no air service. Proper staffing of the hospital, according to the Veterans' Administration's testimony is extremely difficult. Actually they say it is impossible. There is insufficient housing accommodations for the staff, and insufficient accommodations for visiting relatives. No transportation facilities are provided to and from the hospital from the city.

By contrast, Tallahassee, a considerably larger city, the capital of the State of Florida, and a cultural, educational, and industrial center for north Florida, offers advantages which this committee cannot afford to overlook and which the Veterans' Administration did not overlook. There are two State colleges of splendid standing which offer library and research facilities important to an institution of this sort. There is north-south and east-west air service. There is more adequate train service. There are housing and other facilities which were provided in connection with Dale Mabry Air Field, now inactivated.

The temporary hospital at Thomasville was inherited from the Army. It was not designed for permanent operation, and the cost of operation of this structure, according to the testimony that is in the record, would in a short time involve an expenditure almost equivalent to the construction of a new fireproof hospital which is considered to be adequate to the needs of that area in the years to come.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The gentleman says the record will show that the operation of the hospital at Thomasville is excessively high. If he will examine the record, he will find that prior to the Veterans' Administration starting this effort to make a bad record it ranked as second in economy to any the Army operated.

Mr. SIKES. I submit to the gentleman that all records show that the maintenance of temporary construction is infinitely higher than the maintenance of permanent construction. Maintenance alone at Thomasville will soon cost as much as a new, adequate hospital at Tallahassee.

At Tallahassee we have designed a new fireproof hospital. It is designed for efficiency, designed to give every comfort to the veterans. There is no comparison between the operating cost of a hospital such as the present one at Thomasville and one of the design approved by the Veterans' Administration for construction at Tallahassee.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I would just like to make a suggestion. I think many Members of the House are exceedingly interested in knowing about this situation and are intrigued by the statement of the gentleman from Georgia that some political considerations have caused this situation and the inference was that some distinguished gentleman from Florida, not the gentleman now addressing us, but someone else, has manipulated this situation. I would like to have the gentleman address himself to that matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I think I am as familiar with the circumstances involved in the selection of this hospital as anyone present could be. I followed the entire matter throughout the period of selection of site.

The Veterans' Administration was committed to the construction of a hospital in northwest Florida long before Tallahassee was selected as the site for the construction of the building. The area is so located that the veterans living there and in the sections of the States immediately adjoining northwest Florida found it difficult to receive hospital attention which they required. They had to travel long distances and go into other States to receive the services to which they are entitled and which we want them to have. The Veterans' Administration has long realized the need for a veterans' facility in that area and committed themselves to the construction of a hospital there long before Tallahassee was selected as the site for its construction.

Tallahassee was actually selected as the site by the Veterans' Administration after a number of communities had offered sites within the area.

For the information of those who are interested, Tallahassee was selected as a site after President Truman took office. This removes the authenticity of the story being whispered here today. I am convinced that no political consideration affecting anyone prominent in politics in Florida today entered into the decision by the board to use the Tallahassee area.

The land for the hospital at Tallahassee has been acquired, costly planning has been completed, and the work of construction is now ready to proceed on the building.

I think it important to point out that there is no assurance that Thomasville could be used or would continue to be used for more than a very limited period, because of the temporary type of construction there, even if the amendment before you were to prevail.

Let me say again we are building for a long-range program. There are many structures such as the one at Thomasville that have been offered to the Veterans' Administration throughout the Nation, but we cannot select sites for veterans' hospitals on the floor of the House. We must depend on somebody who will take into consideration the geographical location, the veterans' population, and the distances to hospitals, and we must follow their advice, we must follow the advice of responsible agencies of our Government if we are to have an orderly program which will adequately provide for the men whose lives and health are now in our keeping.

Mr. Chairman, I trust that the gentleman's amendment will not prevail.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the discussion in the House at the moment centers around veterans' hospitals, I should like to inform my colleagues of the struggle I have had and am still having, for that matter, in trying to get the Veterans' Administration to make use of a first-rate facility in my district. I refer to Schick General Hospital located at Clinton, Iowa.

This hospital was authorized by the War Department in early 1942. Construction was started in June, most of the buildings were completed by December, and the first patients were admitted in March of 1943. The selection of Clinton as the locale for this Army installation was by no means haphazard. For your information, Clinton is an enterprising, up-to-date city of about 35,000 population located on the Iowa banks of the Mississippi River. It is in the geographical center of an area bounded by Chicago, the Twin Cities, Omaha, and St. Louis. There are excellent transportation facilities—rail, air, and highway—in every direction.

The hospital occupies about 160 acres of land in the northwestern part of the city on the bluffs overlooking the Mississippi. The citizens of Clinton donated some $85,000 to purchase the site as a gift to the Federal Government. The buildings are two stories high, of cinder block construction with brick veneer, and so arranged that they can be utilized economically in whole or in part as circumstances may warrant.

In addition to medical facilities, the institution has all modern conveniences for the rehabilitation of patients, including a chapel, a Red Cross auditorium, a beautiful swimming pool, a large gymnasium, an outdoor athletic field, tennis courts, a theater, a post exchange, visitors' buildings, and mess halls.

The outstanding war record of this hospital continues to be a source of genuine pride not only to the residents of Clinton but to all the citizens of Iowa and Illinois as well. On several occasions during the war more than 3,000 patients were hospitalized in the wards of this well-equipped institution.

Even before VJ-day I called on the Veterans' Administration to make plans for utilizing these splendid facilities. In response, the Veterans' Administration has engaged in a campaign of evasive, phony excuses suggesting that Schick is not needed and not suitable—and, meanwhile, has gone ahead with plans for a building program calculated to cost many millions at a time when costs are very high because materials and labor are very scarce.

At present I have a bill pending before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs directing the Veterans' Administration to occupy and use this hospital. The text of my bill, House Concurrent Resolution 26, is as follows:

Whereas hospital facilities used by the Veterans' Administration in Iowa and Illinois at the present time are inadequate to meet the needs of veterans residing in the area of those two States; and

Whereas there are available for use existing facilities owned by the United States Government and known as Schick General Hospital, Clinton, Iowa; and

Whereas these hospital facilities are suitable for use as a modern hospital and are well located for hospitalizing veterans residing in Iowa and Illinois; and

Whereas the State Legislatures of Iowa and Illinois have during the current year adopted resolutions recommending that the Veterans' Administration utilize these hospital facilities: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the judgment of the Congress of the United States that Schick General Hospital, Clinton, Iowa, be occupied and used by the Veterans' Administration for the care of veterans.

Mr. Chairman, in order to gain firsthand knowledge of the merits of my bill, the Hospital Subcommittee of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee recently sent a delegation consisting of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CROW], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MITCHELL] to Clinton to make an on-the-spot inspection of Schick Hospital. The delegation arrived there to find the War Assets Administration, which has temporary control of the property, engaged in disposing of equipment in a ridiculous manner—heating tables valued at $35 each were being sold for $1 apiece, beds were being given away, and so forth. It is to the everlasting credit of this committee that prompt action was taken to stop further disposal of this valuable equipment until a decision on the disposition of Schick Hospital has been made by the Congress. Although the delegation's official report has not as yet been made public, I know that all the members were deeply impressed by the substantial construction and splendid facilities of this institution which is available for use by the Veterans' Administration merely for the asking.

Mr. Chairman, Schick Hospital cost the people of the United States something more than $10,000,000. Yet, it stands idle while hundreds of veterans in Iowa and Illinois, who need medical attention, are being denied hospitalization. In the meantime, despite the high cost of building materials of all kinds, and the acute shortage of some materials, the Veterans' Administration goes ahead with grandiose plans for new construction. This proposed program will not only interfere with the construction of homes for all veterans but will deny immediate hospitalization to disabled veterans who need medical attention now. Is this fair? Is this just? Is this economy? Mr. Chairman, House Concurrent Resolution 26 should be approved in the interest of the veteran who needs hospitalization immediately, in the interest of the taxpayer who needs relief from his tax burdens, and in the interest of ordinary, practical common sense.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HENDRICKS to the amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Strike out the following words in said amendment: "or for the purchase or condemnation of a site or erection of a hospital in Tallahassee, Fla."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for 10 minutes under the arrangement made as to the division of time.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, I hate to find myself in opposition to the position taken by my friend the gentleman from Georgia, [Mr. COX], or by my friend the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], but I find it necessary to bring out the facts before this House this afternoon.

First let me say this is a most unusual procedure, because when the Rules Committee reported the rule they had two things in mind, and this amendment includes those two things. So we are going to permit two members of the Rules Committee to decide about what they want to do about two hospital sites in their respective territories and the other Members of this House are compelled to abide by the decision of the Hospitalization Board. I would not even object to that if it were not for the fact that we are opening the gate for every Member of Congress to come in and say "This location is not proper; I want it in my district." Let me give you a little example. While the gentleman from Georgia was talking I heard a Member say: "Well, if he can do it, so can I. There is a hospital in my area that I do not think is properly located. I think it should be in my district." I heard another Member talking just a moment ago about the improper location of a hospital.

If you adopt this amendment you open the gates to every Member of Congress to come in here and try to change the location of sites already determined for these hospitals.

We went through that process last year. I was chairman of this subcommittee dealing directly with the Veterans' Administration, and I may tell you a personal story, that they intended to locate a neuropsychiatric hospital in the South and in the State of Florida. I had a very fine city that offered a location free of all cost and every other advantage they could think of to induce the Veterans' Administration to bring that hospital into my congressional district. They determined on a different location than we put up, and in spite of all my persuasion they took that hospital out of my district.

I do not think a member of the Rules Committee should be allowed to come in here and change the location of a hospital already decided upon and place it somewhere else where he wants it. That is a matter that should be left to the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman realize that under the pending amendment any other Member with a situation on his hands similar to that which is on mine can do the same as I am doing?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I recognize that only too well. That is exactly what I have just said, that we are opening the gate to everybody, and it should not be done.

We should defeat both these amendments. Now, I should like to go a little further. It may seem partisan because I am trying to strike out the last part of this amendment, but I am going to offer an amendment also to the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia to keep this in accordance with what we did last year.

Let me say this to you, Mr. Chairman: Something was said here about a political debt that was being paid. Of course, no names could be called, but everyone got the significance of it. Of course, you are indulging in prejudice; I know that.

I am not always in accord with the gentleman to whom the debt is supposed to have been paid, but I want to say that rumor is absolutely false. In the first place, persuasion could be brought easily by anybody on either side on the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman say that the statement I made that political considerations did intervene, that it was based upon that premise that the hospital was located at Tallahassee, is false?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I do not say that the gentleman himself is telling an untruth, but his source of information is false.

Mr. COX. The gentleman is ignorant of the facts in the case and if he will take the pains to make an honest investigation he will find that the statement I made is justified by the authority he now seeks to invoke.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I may be ignorant, but I am not so ignorant that I do not know the background of this whole situation and I am going to tell it to you right now.

Everyone knows Judge Tarver, who was a member of the Appropriations Committee. You had great admiration and respect for him. Before it was decided to construct this building at Tallahassee, Judge Tarver made every effort in the world to have the Veterans' Administration take over the hospital at Thomasville, Ga. Every member of the committee wanted to help Judge Tarver and we actually called the Veterans' Administration to go over the thing, review it again and see if it could be done, because we did not want to spend money for any hospital when there was one available that could be used to better purpose. The Veterans' Administration finally said, "We cannot use this, we have no intention of using it as a permanent hospital; we are going to build in Tallahassee, Fla." The committee sustained the Veterans' Administration in spite of their great admiration, love, and respect for Judge Tarver. If we did not do that for Judge Tarver, I do not see why we should do it for my esteemed friend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX]. Those are the facts in the case.

We had this same situation up last year, and many Members of the Congress, when we were talking about locations, came in and said: "The Army has abandoned this hospital. Why do you not have the Veterans' Administration use it?" I got letters from my district that the Army and Navy had built hospitals there and saying: "Why do you not have the Veterans' Administration use these instead of spending money for new construction hospitals?" The only answer, Mr. Chairman, if you are interested in the welfare of the veteran, is that the Veterans' Administration cannot afford to use these ramshackle, half-frame, half-fireproofed, unheated buildings for the care of the veterans.

In spite of the fact that my friend from Georgia says this hospital is of permanent construction and is fireproof, the Veterans' Administration reported to us last year, because we asked for a report on the condition of every hospital, that hospital is built of gypsum blocks and asbestos shingles. In the hearings this year the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] asked General Hawley about this. I did not ask one single question. I did not know this amendment was coming up. The gentleman from Texas asked about the difference in cost between the Thomasville hospital and the Tallahassee, Fla., hospital. General Hawley pointed out the defects in the Finney Hospital and said it could not be properly heated, that the cost of that hospital within 6 years would be more than the construction cost of the hospital in Tallahassee, Fla., and remember, Mr. Chairman, this is not a program of the moment. If this were an emergency I would say, "Use any hospital until we can do something better," but it is not a program of the moment. We will not reach the peak of our hospitalization until 1970. You will have something like 30 years yet and you have to use these buildings. In 30 years the Finney Hospital will cost five times what a new hospital under one roof, built for the purpose of taking care of these veterans in a proper manner, giving them proper heat and light, air conditioning and the things that they need, will cost. It will cost five or six times as much. The whole point is, as I say to you again, that the Committee on Appropriations went over this thing last year. We followed a certain procedure. We made it clear to the House, and I made it clear in my statement on this bill last year, that whenever any Member of Congress was dissatisfied with the location of a hospital, that they were to report it to the committee and we would take it up with the Veterans' Administration, hold hearings, and decide what was to be done. That is exactly what ought to be done with these two sites, including both Tallahassee and the one in Virginia. I am offering the amendment to strike out the one in Tallahassee for the simple reason that the Veterans' Administration has reported to us that they never intended to use Thomasville as a permanent hospital. It would be unsuitable. It is not fireproof. Those are the simple facts of the matter, my friends.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENDRICKS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. I would like to ask the gentleman if he thinks it is fair or proper for one gentleman, who makes a good case as to why a hospital should be placed in a certain place in his district, to go further and add to his amendment an objection to a site in somebody else's State 800 miles away and try to say in that amendment that a hospital should not be built in a location in that district outside of his own.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I do not think the two amendments should ever have been combined at all. I hope that this amendment I offer is adopted, after which I propose to offer another amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HENDRICKS) there were—ayes 45, noes 48.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. HENDRICKS and Mr. COX.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 48, noes 69.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HENDRICKS to the amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: At the end of said amendment insert "until the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives has investigated and given final approval."

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia may be read as modified by my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia as modified by the amendment offered by Mr. HENDRICKS: On page 51, line 20, strike out the period and insert a semicolon and the following: "*Provided further*, That no part of the funds appropriated in this bill or any funds heretofore made available, including contract authorizations, shall be used for the purchase or condemnation of the site or for the erection of a hospital on the tract of land in Arlington County, Va., known as the A. M. Nevius tract, situated at the intersection of Lee Boulevard and Arlington Ridge Road, containing approximately 25.406 acres; or for the purchase or condemnation of the site or erection of a hospital in Tallahassee, Fla., until the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives has investigated and given final approval."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I have no objection to the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SPRINGER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3839) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill, and all amendments thereto, to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JUVENILE COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 329)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered printed, with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress a communication from the judge of the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, together with a report covering the work of the juvenile court for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 18, 1947.*

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two articles and a speech by Mr. Joseph E. Casey.

Mr. GORE asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made earlier today, and to include certain tables.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech made by Mr. Henry A. Wallace last night. I have been advised by the Public Printer that the cost will be $189.34. Notwithstanding, I ask that the extension be made.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding, and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include excerpts.

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. PETERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 7 of the Florida Legislature.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole and include certain letters.

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include a newspaper article.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. PHILLIPS of California) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT BY WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight on Friday of this week within which to file a report on the bill H. R. 3861.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

WAR DEPARTMENT ENLISTMENT BILL

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday the House passed the bill H. R. 3303, the so-called War Department enlistment bill. The Senate passed Senate 1213, striking out all after the enacting clause in the House bill and substituting the Senate provisions. By motion of the Senate today, they request a conference. That is being messaged over to the House. I move that we agree to the conference and that the Speaker appoint conferees.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would inform the gentleman from New York that the papers have not yet arrived, and the request to agree to the conference and appoint conferees is not in order at this time.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in one to include an editorial from the Washington Post, and in the other to include an editorial from the Washington Post and some remarks by Vicente Villamin.

Mr. TABER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain tables which he had prepared.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a speech by the wife of the Ambassador from Brazil.

Mr. ROHRBOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. RIZLEY (at the request of Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 3

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House proceed to take up House Concurrent Resolution 51, which does not favor Reorganization Plan No. 3 of May 27, 1947, and, pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole and that general debate be limited to 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress does not favor the Reorganization Plan No. 3 of May 27, 1947, transmitted to Congress by the President on the 27th day of May 1947.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I understand there is no objection to this resolution.

I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MANASCO], ranking minority member of the committee, to explain the resolution and any opposition, if any there be.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, a similar plan was sent up during the Seventy-ninth Congress and rejected by the House.

This plan reorganizes the housing agencies of the Government. Our committee thinks these agencies should be reorganized but we do not think the lending and insuring agencies should be placed in the same organization with the construction agency.

I have no requests for time on this side. That is the only issue involved.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISPOSAL OF WAR HOUSING

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3492) to provide for the expeditious disposition of certain war housing and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3492, to provide for the expeditious disposition of certain war housing, with Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on Thursday, June 12, the Clerk had completed reading section 4 and

there was pending an amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS].

Without objection, the Clerk will again report the Rains amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RAINS:

On page 4, immediately following section 4, add the following new section:

"Transfer of war housing to the War or Navy Department.

"SEC. 5. Notwithstanding the provisions of this act or any other provision of law, the Administrator may in his discretion upon the request of the Secretaries of War or Navy transfer to the jurisdiction of the War or Navy Department any war housing that may be considered to be permanently useful to the Army or Navy."

Renumber sections 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10, as sections 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11, respectively.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAINS. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my asking the gentleman to yield to me now is that before the Committee rose the last time we considered this bill there was considerable confusion in the House. I rose and made a point of order with the intention first of all of calling attention to the fact I had an amendment to the body of the section which should be considered ahead of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama; however, there was so much confusion my point was made that the House was not in order and before I could obtain recognition the Chair recognized the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] and the Committee rose. As a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman, I want to know whether or not my amendment can be considered following the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS] or will I be deprived of the opportunity to offer my amendment if the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS] proceeds?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair holds that the gentleman's amendment will be in order following consideration of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama if it is in connection with the preceding paragraph.

Mr. FORAND. It is in the body of that section.

The CHAIRMAN. The Rains amendment will then be held in abeyance pending action on the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. FORAND. Therefore I get recognition and Mr. RAINS follows.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS] has the floor. The gentleman will succeed him in recognition.

Mr. FORAND. I will not be precluded from offering my amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. No; the gentleman will not be precluded.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, I have offered the amendment which you have heard read in the interest of preserving certain war housing for the Army and Navy. First of all may I say that, in my judgment, this bill in some respects is a good bill and in some respects it very much needs amending. I may say also that I do not rise with any idea of preserving war housing for the Army and Navy in my district, because I have none. If you will read this bill carefully you will find it does five specific things. Among the things not mentioned it does this: It would eliminate the provision now contained in the Lanham Act permitting the transfer of permanent projects to the War and Navy Departments.

I want to read to the Committee, if I may, a letter from the Secretary of War addressed to the Speaker:

The SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: It has been noted that H. R. 3492, a bill "to provide for the expeditious disposition of certain war housing and for other purposes," introduced on May 15, 1947, has been reported out of the committee by Report No. 414, dated May 21, 1947, and was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

The purpose of H. R. 3492 is to transfer the functions of the National Housing Administrator and the National Housing Agency to the Federal Works Agency, effective upon enactment of the bill. The Administrator is charged with selling for cash prior to December 31, 1948, all housing projects so transferred and to give preference to veterans for the purchase of this housing.

Housing is one of the major shortages of the Army and one which vitally affects morale. Under the types of housing to be transferred fall many projects which currently have been requested of the National Housing Administrator to be transferred to the War Department. Approximately 24 of these projects are in the hands of the National Housing Administrator for final action. In addition, eight other projects are under consideration by the War Department for ultimate transfer. If H. R. 3492 is enacted in its present form the War Department would be deprived of many projects sorely needed for family housing.

It is pertinent to note that upon transfer of these projects to the War Department under existing law, tenants who are currently occupying the units are permitted to remain and are not evicted except for legal cause. As the projects requested by the Department for transfer are situated at or near active military installations, it has been found that at least 50 percent of such projects are available for occupancy by military personnel.

Inasmuch as the War Department was not requested for comments on this measure while it was being considered by the committee, it is recommended that the attached amendment be considered by the House when this measure is under consideration. The amendment would merely permit the continuance of existing law which authorizes transfers to the War and Navy Departments of such projects as may be determined to be permanently useful to the Departments concerned.

I understand informally that the Secretary of the Navy is making a similar recommendation to you.

Due to the lack of sufficient time, this report is submitted without a determination by the Bureau of the Budget as to whether it conforms to the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

_____,
Secretary of War.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to call the attention of the committee also to the fact that neither the War nor Navy Department was given permission or did appear before our committee or had an opportunity to appear, not knowing what the provisions of the bill were to be.

I would also like to call the committee's attention to the following letter, addressed to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], chairman of the Armed Services Committee, by Mr. John Nicholas Brown, Acting Secretary of the Navy, in which he states that available funds are inadequate to meet the over-all problem for new construction and that many of these very buildings which we are now taking away from the Army and Navy were built by funds appropriated to the Navy:

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, May 26, 1947.

Hon. WALTER G. ANDREWS,
Chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Navy Department has noted the introduction of the bill (H. R. 3492) to provide for the expeditious disposition of certain war housing, and for other purposes. This measure was reported to the House of Representatives from the Committee on Banking and Currency on May 21, 1947 (Rept. No. 414) and was committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

The purpose of the measure is to provide for the disposition of permanent housing accommodations constructed under authority of the so-called Lanham Act (Public Law 849, 76th Cong.), as amended; Public Law 781, Seventy-sixth Congress; Public Laws 9, 73, and 353, Seventy-seventh Congress; and Public Law 140, Seventy-eighth Congress. The task of supplying these needed housing accommodations under the Lanham Act was delegated to the Federal Works Administrator when that act became law on October 14, 1940, and was subsequently transferred to the National Housing Agency pursuant to Executive Order 9070 of February 24, 1942, which agency exercises jurisdiction at the present time through the Federal Public Housing Authority.

Existing law governing disposal of war housing under the control of the Federal Public Housing Authority authorizes the Administrator of that agency to transfer to the jurisdiction of the War and Navy Departments such housing as may be considered to be permanently useful to the Army or Navy, when the respective Secretaries request such transfer. These transfers have been made without an exchange of funds, and although not specifically required by the Lanham Act, it has been the policy of the National Housing Agency to extend priority to the armed services over disposition to non-Federal interests.

The measure under consideration does not authorize transfers to the War and Navy Departments without exchange of funds on a priority basis. The acquisition of war housing for families of naval personnel, pursuant to the transfer provisions now contained in the Lanham Act, is of major importance in meeting the Navy Department's housing requirements for married enlisted personnel and junior officers during the postwar period. If authority to acquire such housing without exchange of funds is terminated, or not provided for as in the case of H. R. 3492, the Navy Department will lose the opportunity to obtain housing facilities considered permanently useful to its shore establishments.

Naval personnel are ashore for comparatively brief periods of time during their careers in the service. It is essential to their morale that they have an opportunity to be with their families during the time they are assigned to duties ashore. Available funds are inadequate to meet this over-all problem by new construction. Consequently, acquisition of federally owned housing which has

been terminated for war use must be undertaken to meet permanent requirements without the necessity of further appropriating public funds for this purpose.

The Navy Department has submitted a list of war-housing projects desired for transfer to the Administrator of the National Housing Agency. Many of these projects were constructed with funds originally appropriated to the Navy Department and are occupied by naval personnel. Enactment of H. R. 3492 would result in the disposal of these projects to non-Federal interests, whereas the facilities are still required for the purpose for which they were originally authorized and constructed.

In view of the foregoing, it is requested in order to protect the interests of the War and Navy Departments, and in the interests of economy, that the following amendment be presented from the floor in the event that the House of Representatives considers the bill H. R. 3492:

On page 4 immediately following section 4 add the following new section:

"TRANSFER OF WAR HOUSING TO THE WAR OR NAVY DEPARTMENTS

"SEC. 5. Notwithstanding the provisions of this act or any other provision of law, the Administrator may, in his discretion, upon the request of the Secretaries of War or Navy, transfer to the jurisdiction of the War or Navy Departments any war housing as may be considered to be permanently useful to the Army or Navy."

Renumber sections 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 as sections 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11, respectively.

It is understood that the Secretary of War is forwarding a similar proposal for your consideration.

The Navy Department has not been advised by the Bureau of the Budget as to the relation of this report to the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN NICHOLAS BROWN,
Acting Secretary of the Navy.

So I say to the Committee simply that I can see no rhyme or reason in taking away from the Army or Navy much needed buildings in nearby installations of the Army and the Navy. I can see no reason for taking from the Army and Navy Departments the buildings they need, and for that reason I submit that there should be an amendment as such adopted to this bill which would retain for the Army and Navy the benefits they now have under the Lanham Act. I have no other reason except to say it does not make sense to take away from the Army and the Navy those houses which we allowed them to get under the Lanham Act.

The CHAIRMAN. Further action on the Rains amendment will be withheld for the time being, and the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND] is recognized.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FORAND: Page 4, line 5, after the word "project" strike out the period and insert "except that municipalities in which such housing projects are located such municipality or a local housing authority thereof shall have 90 days from the day of the passage of the act in which to exercise priority of purchase of such housing project as a single unit: *Provided*, That the transferee shall agree for itself, its successors, transferees or assigns that until December 31, 1951, families of veterans and servicemen (as defined in the Lanham Act) shall be given a preference for all vacant dwelling units."

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, I believe, is very clear. It does but one thing. It gives priority either to the city or the Housing Authority to purchase as a unit a project within their own locality and it gives them priority of purchase of the whole project as a unit.

Now, there are several projects throughout the United States that come within this category. I have one in my own State. All the veterans' organizations, as well as the city administration, that is, the city council, have asked that the opportunity be given to the city or to the Housing Authority to purchase that project as a unit so that they would not be disturbing those people who live in them now, most of whom are veterans. They have gone so far as to ask the State legislature, and obtained permission from the legislature, to float bonds for the purchase of this project.

This project I have in mind is in the city of Newport, and those of you who were here in the last Congress know the many headaches we had in that city in the past as the result of the activities of some of our Government departments. There has been a constant state of uncertainty on the part of the people of Newport as a result of the closing down of the naval torpedo station. Many veterans, both veterans of World War I and World War II, were employed at the torpedo station and lived in this project known as Tonomy Hill. There is great fear that if there is to be a sale made piecemeal, that some group, some organization, using the veterans as a front, will find ways and means of obtaining possession of this project and the result will be that many of the veterans—and there are three-hundred-and seventy-some-odd units in the project—will find themselves out on the street with no place to go because housing is very, very short in that territory. For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will accept this amendment.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORAND. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. If the city acquires the property, the city can then turn around and deed it to the veterans.

Mr. FORAND. Not under the provisions of the agreement called for in my amendment, because there is a proviso that the transferee shall agree for itself, its successors, transferees, or assigns, that until December 31, 1951, families of veterans and servicemen, as defined in the Lanham Act, shall be given a preference for all vacant dwelling units.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. That is for rental purposes, but how about the sale? Cannot the veteran buy some of that from the city?

Mr. FORAND. Perhaps that could be worked out eventually, but at any rate they will be protected for the present.

Mr. Chairman, I hope my amendment will be adopted.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, the amendment should not be adopted for several reasons. In the first place, these municipalities, had they wanted to buy these properties for other than low-rent use, have had nearly 2 years in which to do so. It is improbable that a municipality which has not acted up to the present time would do so for any purpose than possibly to defeat the very purpose of this act.

I realize that in respect to most of these projects there are local conditions which presumably must be met, but we cannot legislate for all these projects to meet one particular condition; we cannot let the exception prove the rule. We have laid out a program which would apply best and most equitably to all the projects which have to be disposed of.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FORAND. The only reason the people of Newport did not act before now is that under our State law they could not obtain the funds. They have applied to the State legislature and now have permission to float bonds for the purchase of the project.

Mr. WOLCOTT. This may be an unfortunate case, but I do not see any reason why we should delay the disposal program for 3 years to accommodate any particular community. That is the point. This program primarily is to get housing, good housing, as cheaply as possible for as many veterans as possible. Although the gentleman's amendment would seemingly reserve these properties for veterans for 3 years, they would be reserved for that short period of time only for rental purposes. These properties are depreciating every day. The market is changing. This program has a termination date on it, for the very reason that we can foresee that the program we have set up at the present time for the present disposal of these properties may not apply 3 or 4 years from now.

The committee has given much time and consideration to this bill, and we have done the most equitable thing we could do in respect to all the communities. I hope the amendment is not agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FORAND) there were—ayes 30, noes 56.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Rhode Island a question. Did I understand you to say that the city of Newport was unable to take advantage of the opportunity of purchasing projects in Newport due to certain restrictions that existed from a legislative angle?

Mr. FORAND. Yes; because of their financial situation, it was necessary for them to obtain permission of the legislature to float the bonds necessary to raise the money to purchase the project.

Mr. McCORMACK. And if I understand the gentleman, legislative action in the State of Rhode Island was necessary before the city of Newport could take any action at all?

Mr. FORAND. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. Can the gentleman advise the House as to when that action was taken by the legislature of Rhode Island?

Mr. FORAND. In the latter part of May.

Mr. McCORMACK. The city of Newport is desirous of having a project or projects located in Newport which come within the purview of this bill?

Mr. FORAND. The Tomony Hill project comes within the purview of this bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman state that the city of Newport desires to purchase this project?

Mr. FORAND. Both the city and the housing authority of the city of Newport are anxious to get it. They do not care which one gets it but neither one could purchase it until the State legislature took action. That action was taken in the latter part of May.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, the city of Newport, desiring to purchase the project, was unable to do so because it did not have the authority in relation to the issuance of bonds; is that correct?

Mr. FORAND. That is correct.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

There is nothing in the bill to prevent the sale of this property to the city of Newport or to the municipality after the time in which the veterans may exercise their priorities terminates. In other words, after 180 days. If no veteran wants to buy this property, then the city can buy or anybody else can buy it.

I might say also if this bill is enacted there is nothing to prevent the city of Newport from buying it for low-rental purposes if they want to, and under existing law there is that provision.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to get some information on this. It seems to me that we should try to give municipalities an opportunity of purchasing these projects if the municipality desires to do so, and the purpose of my taking this time was to develop the facts.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. FORAND. As the gentleman says, there is nothing to prevent the city from purchasing the property after everyone else has exercised their option in the list of preferences, but by that time the city will not be able to purchase the project as a single unit and, therefore, make it possible for them to operate it economically as a single unit.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. It has been called to my attention that the city of Newport could not buy this property without the further action of the Congress under existing law anyway, it being reserved under an agreement with the FPHA for transfer to the city for low-rental purposes. When I say being reserved, I mean that sometime in the future you or the city of Newport would have to come to Congress to get specific authority to buy this property for low-rental purposes. There has been reserved more property than is being disposed of. That is the complaint that was made here the other day. Ordinarily, under existing law, you would have to come to Congress to get specific authority to buy this for such purposes. Under this act, you will not. If this bill is enacted, you can buy it subject, of course, to these priorities. I do not see that the town of Newport is in any different position than any other locality so far as that is concerned. There are something like seven-hundred-and-some-odd projects. I do not know the exact number, but there are hundreds of them anyway that are being reserved for this very purpose. There is no difference between the city of Newport and any of these other localities.

Mr. McCORMACK. If I understand my friend from Michigan correctly, with the passage of this bill the city of Newport will be able to have an opportunity of purchasing this project after 180 days have elapsed. Is that correct?

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is right, if no veteran wants to buy it.

Mr. McCORMACK. What groups would have the right to purchase within the 180 days?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Of course, I am not acquainted with the type and character of the property. If a unit can be split up into individual units, or if they are units for one, two, three, or four families, then the veteran occupant has first priority. The second priority is veteran nonoccupant; and then the nonveteran tenant has the third priority.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has again expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Then, next, organizations; corporate groups of veterans, who desire to buy the property for veteran occupancy, or who act as local agent for those who are buying property for occupancy by veterans.

The priority in each of these different classifications must be exercised as they have been graded, in 30, 60, 90, and 180 days. So that all priorities must have been exhausted at the end of 180 days, and the properties are open then, and the city of Newport, or anyone else who can negotiate a bid with the Federal Public Works organization can buy them, and can buy them without this restraint of having to come back to Congress to get specific authority.

Mr. McCORMACK. There are other groups outside of veterans who would have priority before the city?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No; just one. When the property has seen sold for single occupancy, then the third priority is the present tenant who may not be a veteran. But the highest priority is given to the veteran occupant. The second highest is given to the veteran nonoccupant, and the third is to the tenant.

Mr. McCORMACK. And then the city would come after that?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No. Then veteran organizations who wanted to buy the property for occupancy by veterans whom they represent.

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. FOLGER. The matter I had in mind has been answered by the chairman. These priorities are for veterans, in one category or another?

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is correct.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. FORAND. It boils down to this, does it not, Mr. Chairman, that the city of Newport, if I understood you properly, is not in a position to purchase today, because of existing law.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is right.

Mr. FORAND. But the city of Newport will have to wait until all other priorities have been exhausted before they will be eligible to purchase?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes, sir.

Mr. FORAND. And therefore everything will be gone by that time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has again expired.

We will now revert to the Rains amendment.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, many Members of Congress have been receiving letters and telegrams protesting the provision relating to low-rent housing in the Government corporations bill—H. R. 3756—for the fiscal year 1948. Also, I have examined with great care the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 11, 1947, with particular reference to the comments of the Administrator of the Federal Public Housing Authority concerning the effect of this bill. I am likewise cognizant of some press comment to the effect that the action of the House imperils low-rent housing.

I desire to clarify for the benefit of all concerned the effect of the House action, and I shall comment specifically on statements made by the Administrator of the Federal Public Housing Authority.

Concerning the matter of failure to clear slum areas, the FPHA states they know of no evidence to support a statement that slum clearance has been almost completely ignored, and the statement was made that as of June 30, 1946, 90.8 percent of the eliminations had been made.

I invite attention to the fact that they state they "know of no evidence" to support the statement of the committee's investigators that slum clearance has been ignored.

This is their saving clause and is typical of the deceitful half-truths and innuendo with which this agency has confronted our committee.

The Administrator of FPHA fails to elaborate and explain that of the eliminations he mentions—none of which, incidentally, have ever been inspected by his agency—only a small percentage have been accomplished on a slum site. He fails to point out that approximately 65,000 of these alleged eliminations have been accomplished by adding up houses

demolished in the community or improved by adding facilities not previously available.

In other words, these eliminations would have occurred in the natural course of events and were not influenced, encouraged, or dictated by the terms of the United States Housing Act. These facilities were personally inspected by the committee's investigative staff. A motion picture was made of representative ones proving conclusively that the eliminations were made in five residential communities, were isolated units, and do not constitute a slum in the usual definition of the word. For the edification of the Administrator, I would like to quote Webster's definition of slum, and I suggest the FPHA make the same required reading: "A thickly populated street or alley marked by squalor or wretched living conditions."

I suggest to the Administrator that he ask the owners of properties brought up to standard if they feel the above definition describes their homes. I warrant they would be righteously indignant if they knew that their names and addresses appeared in the files of the FPHA as examples of slums that had been cleared by low-rent subsidized housing.

FPHA goes on to attempt to explain their accounting deficiencies, and I refer to the following excerpt from page 6838 of the RECORD of June 11 for an example of the double talk that attempts to justify the most deplorable accounting presently in Government:

Inquiry: Some FPHA records were in such an "atrocious condition" that a reputable accounting firm declined to audit them.

Comment: On April 30, 1947, the Comptroller General submitted to the Congress a report of a survey of the accounting system of the Federal Public Housing Authority. This survey was made by Price, Waterhouse & Co., a New York firm of independent public accountants, who made the study under the direction of the Corporation Audits Division of the General Accounting Office.

The report of Price, Waterhouse & Co. said: "Our review of the bookkeeping records and financial reports of FPHA has disclosed serious deficiencies in the accounting procedures and in the performance of the bookkeeping work and a resultant lack of accounting control over the assets, liabilities, income, and expenses of the various programs."

The survey was made in the summer of 1946 and was concerned with the accounts for the years ended June 30, 1945, and June 30, 1946. Examination of these accounts necessarily directed major consideration to records and conditions of accounts as they existed in the years before 1946.

FPHA has been fully aware of these shortcomings and has instituted corrective action on its own initiative. Reports of its own Audits Division have pointed out deficiencies and remedial action was begun more than a year before the survey made by Price, Waterhouse.

There were two major reasons for the weaknesses reported in the survey:

1. When FPHA was created in 1942, several types of programs previously administered by other Government agencies were transferred to it. The varied records of these programs had to be brought together and integrated into one accounting system. This huge task is still being carried on.

2. In the period covered by the survey, FPHA used an accounting system suitable for activities carried on with appropriated funds but not suited to the commercial type of operations FPHA was assigned in its war housing programs.

The difficulties presented by this situation were reported by Price, Waterhouse as follows: "Accounts and records for the fiscal year 1945 and prior years were maintained under regulations promulgated by the Comptroller General a number of years ago. * * * This procedure provides for appropriation and fund accounting. * * * However, in the form prescribed, the procedure is not well suited to commercial operations such as those conducted by FPHA, nor does it lend itself to the preparation of statements showing financial position and the results of such operations."

The fact that FPHA had recognized the existence of deficiencies and had taken steps to correct them as early as 1945 is attested by the Price, Waterhouse report:

"The present management [of the Authority] recognized that the accounts and procedures in use in 1945 were inadequate and, at the beginning of the fiscal year 1946 (i. e., July 1, 1945), adopted a revised accounting manual and revised procedures intended to provide both for appropriation accounting as prescribed by the Comptroller General and for financial accounting in the ordinary commercial sense."

Price, Waterhouse stated the opinion that these revised procedures should enable the agency to reconstruct its accounts for the fiscal year 1946 to the extent necessary to prepare an adjusted financial statement suitable for examination. The accountants suggested, however, that this would take time and effort disproportionate to the probable benefits, a view shared by the General Accounting Office.

The deficiencies noted in the report do not involve loose handling of cash or disbursements. This fact is clearly stated by Mr. T. Coleman Andrews, director of the GAO Audits Division, in his letter of April 30, 1947, transmitting the Price, Waterhouse report to the Comptroller General. He wrote:

"The foregoing statement [of deficiencies] is not intended as an implication that there has been laxity in the handling of cash receipts and disbursements. A system of internal control of these is and has been in existence, which should minimize any irregularities in connection with the handling of cash items. The deficiency noted is one of inadequacy of general accounting policies and poor bookkeeping."

Although the substance of the report is concerned with accounts of 1945 and earlier years, Mr. Andrews made this comment concerning the present accounting work of the FPHA:

"The preliminary work now being carried on by this [GAO's Corporation Audits] Division has demonstrated that considerable progress has been made in clearing up old errors and discrepancies and that the recording of current transactions is being carried on in an intelligent, reasonably accurate, and satisfactory manner."

The Administrator likewise comments that the number of ineligible tenants has been greatly reduced and requires every local authority to remove 5 percent of its ineligible tenants each month. He fails to explain that this policy has only recently been developed and as a direct result of the inquiry directed by this committee. He further fails to explain that the ineligibles are being reduced by the simple expedient of raising income limits both for occupancy and continued occupancy to cover present earnings of tenants. The hearings before the subcommittee for Government corporations detail many families earning enough to pay economic rents which would permit them to live in privately owned housing. As an example of the paternalism of the agency, consider that average earnings of tenants in the Public Law 412 program is $2,129. Remember this is an average and is supposed to constitute the lowest income earners in America.

Concerning the success or failure of the veterans' housing program, I suggest the veteran be the judge of this and I speak as one of them who has lost faith in this agency of Government. Consider further that this agency had the effrontery to deny preference to the veteran in the sale of war housing necessitating action by Congress to place this important function in the hands of an agency which properly appreciates the debt we owe to the veteran.

Let me say at this point that there is some indication that the personnel of the Federal Public Housing Authority, either directly or indirectly, has precipitated the mass of protests which the members have been receiving. There is a striking similarity in the telegrams and letters that have been received, and this along with reports which have come to my attention leads me to believe that we may be confronted with a situation which is as disgraceful as the campaign recently conducted by certain of the employees of the Bureau of Customs. If my information proves to be accurate, I intend to do everything in my power to have persons violating the law, which prohibits using public funds to influence the course of legislation, properly dealt with by taking up the matter with the Department of Justice.

Low-rent housing provides dwelling space for persons in low-income categories on the basis of what such persons can afford to pay as rental, and not on the basis of the total cost of providing such space. Under this system, persons of limited income are provided with housing of a better type than they otherwise could obtain. Low-rent housing projects under the jurisdiction of the Federal Public Housing Authority may be divided, for purposes of this discussion, into two categories. The first is those housing projects which are owned by the Federal Government or its agencies. The second category embodies housing projects owned by public agencies other than those of the Federal Government. In both of these types of housing, the Federal Government makes a contribution toward providing dwelling accommodations for persons of low income. In the case of federally owned projects, the cost of erecting the buildings was met by Federal funds. Such funds are not required to be repaid and therefore no annual contribution is necessary to make up operating deficits which would otherwise be occasioned by charging low rentals to tenants. This type of housing however, is subsidized by the Federal Government just as much as though annual financial grants were provided.

In the act of September 1, 1937, which created the United States Housing Authority, it is provided that property owned by the Authority is to be exempt from all taxes; Federal, State, municipal, or otherwise. However, payments in lieu of taxes with respect to property owned by the Authority are authorized by the United States Housing Act, Public Law

412, Seventy-fifth Congress, up to the amount of taxes that would be paid to the State or its political subdivisions upon such property, if it were not exempt from taxation. Obviously, in making its recommendations to the House, the Committee on Appropriations did not raise objections to the payment of sums in lieu of taxes in instances where such payments are authorized by law.

Property owned by public agencies other than those of the Federal Government may be taxed by municipalities or States according to their legislative decision. The so-called locally owned low-rent housing projects fall into this latter category. These housing projects are constructed and operated by local authorities under the supervision of the Federal Public Housing Authority, and the finances are provided either by the sale of bonds which are fully guaranteed as to both principal and interest by the Federal Government or which are purchased and held by the Federal Government. In order that the tenants might occupy such housing, even though they are unable to pay the amount necessary to pay off the bonded indebtedness and provide funds for operating these projects, the Federal Government makes annual contributions in an amount equal to the difference between the operating expenses, including amortization of capital investment and operating income, plus contributions made by local authorities. Obviously an increase in operating expenses necessitates an increase in the Federal contributions. No question was raised as to the legal right of States or their political subdivisions to impose taxes upon locally owned low-rent housing projects. However, the committee was, and is, concerned with insuring that Federal funds, in the form of contributions to maintain the low-rent character of locally owned housing projects, is used only in accordance with the intent of the Congress as expressed in legislation.

The FPHA made an administrative determination without legislative authorization that locally owned low-rent housing projects could make voluntary payments in lieu of taxes in addition to the contractual amount and that such could be charged in computing the Federal subsidy. In some instances the original contracts between the Federal Public Housing Authority and the respective local projects permitted payments to be made in lieu of taxes. The committee, in effect, recommended that these original contracts should govern in determining whether payments in lieu of taxes might properly be considered in computing the subsidy in fiscal 1948.

Thus, the action of the House merely means that subsidy funds may not be used to make payments in lieu of taxes in excess of a contractual agreement unless earnings were available.

Low-rent housing was originally provided for by Congress as a local benefit, and in consideration of such housing the community was to waive taxes as their fair share in the venture. The committee has not asked that the original intent of the Housing Act be adhered to. It merely recommended the prohibition of voluntary contributions above this amount only where the Federal subsidy is involved. Contributions up to full taxes may still be paid if earnings are available. Nothing could be more reasonable at this time.

It is unfortunate that the budgets and revenues of municipalities have become adjusted in recent years to receiving such payments in lieu of taxes. As pointed out, these payments are not authorized by law, and in advising local housing projects that they are legal, the officials of the FPHA have taken the law unto themselves. These Federal officials must now answer for their own actions, and I suggest that municipal officials whose budgets are affected turn their complaints against the proper parties rather than against their elected congressional representatives.

I desire also to comment upon another aspect of low-rent housing which was affected by the Government corporations appropriations bill. Locally owned housing projects now hold reserves, principally in the form of Government bonds, aggregating approximately $40,000,000. Officials of the FPHA cry crocodile tears that these reserves are necessary in part to insure the favorable marketability of the bonds which were sold to provide the capital funds for low-rent housing projects. These bonds are fully guaranteed by the United States both as to principal and interest. I am not aware that the credit of the United States requires additional bolstering at this time, although I can well understand that it might if persons such as officials of the Federal Public Housing Authority continue to manage the affairs of this Government.

Part of these impounded reserves are also for alleged vacancy losses. This is farfetched indeed if the poor and underprivileged are always with us, and regrettable as it surely is, I am afraid they are with us.

Working capital reserves and other reserves are provided beyond justification or need.

The lack of necessity for all these reserves is amply demonstrated by the astounding fact that they are substantially invested in Government bonds on which the United States taxpayer pays interest. Thus we are faced with the ridiculous situation of paying subsidies to local groups, who, not needing the funds, invest them in United States bonds. We thus pay them interest while at the same time they themselves owe the Government substantial funds.

Owing to the large amount of reserves held, which amount is beyond all reasonable proportion to the purpose of maintaining the low-rent character of local projects, and in view of the other factors set out here, the committee determined that the budget estimate of $7,200,000 for subsidy payments should be reduced to $2,200,000. This amount is adequate to cover contributions to local projects under the provisions of the United States Housing Act in view of the large reserves now on hand.

I would like to emphasize that the committee's investigation and report does not indict all local housing groups. As a matter of fact, many splendid examples of good public housing were found, and it is our belief that the spirit of the United States Housing Act would be more properly and efficiently carried out if the yoke of the Federal Public Housing Authority were removed from their necks.

I believe that public housing is a local problem and does not need the supervision of a swollen Federal bureaucracy that is driving the taxpayer closer and closer to bankruptcy.

It is the belief of the committee that the Federal Public Housing Authority has exceeded its authority and needs to clean up its own operation. We feel the committee's action was necessary to correct certain practices not authorized by law. I am sure if the FPHA will clean its house, and stay within the law, the committee will deal fairly with the agency and carry out the commitments of the Federal Government to the local housing authorities provided the local housing authorities carry out the terms of their contracts within the law.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Does this propaganda which is going out emanate from Government agencies or Government employees?

Mr. JENSEN. It has all the earmarks of emanating from affected Government agencies.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I suggest to the gentleman, if he can submit any proof, I shall be glad to receive it and turn it over to my committee which is now investigating propaganda and publicity by Government agencies.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman from Indiana. I am quite sure the gentleman's committee will have a job to do in respect to this matter at an early date.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAYS to the amendment offered by Mr. RAINS: In line 5, after the words "war housing", strike out the remainder and insert "situated within the approximate vicinity of any permanent Army or Navy Establishment and which requests were on file May 15, 1947."

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I would have to join the chairman of our committee in opposition to the amendment offered by my good friend the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS], because I feel that we should not provide this sweeping exemption for even such worthy agencies of Government as the Army and Navy. I feel that it just could not be justified. But there are some situations that deserve attention and I should hope that my amendment might even meet the situation the gentleman from Alabama has in mind, and I trust that the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Michigan, will agree to my amendment.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield.

Mr. RAINS. The gentleman from Arkansas is very persuasive. I rather think his amendment makes mine better

and I gladly accept it. I hope the chairman of the committee will accept it also.

Mr. HAYS. I thank the gentleman. I believe it is clear why there is resistance to the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama in the form in which he submitted it. In that form all the Army or Navy would have to do would be to say in effect "We desire this property over here." It might be any number of miles from the military establishment. We are gaining some experience in the handling of surplus property. I had occasion recently to look into the disposition of 40,000 acres of land under the Surplus Property Act, land classified as agricultural.

I fear that in certain instances there has not been a rigid interpretation of the purpose of Congress in handling transfer of this property to Government agencies. We ought to profit by this experience and because of the results of the inquiry I made in connection with surplus real estate I have this conviction about the loose handling of housing property. So, if the gentleman from Michigan would care to comment on the amendment I have offered as an improvement in the Rains amendment and would express his feeling, I would appreciate it. I hope he will offer no objection to it in order to meet some specific situations where applications were filed for land that is adjacent to these military establishments.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I may say that I am afraid of the situation for the reason that the War and Navy Departments have had 2 years in which to acquire these properties. They have had a top priority. They have been right here dealing daily with the administrators of this program. They surely have known long before this whether the housing projects in the vicinity of camps and bases were to be needed by the War Department and Navy Department as a part of their installation. Why have they not asked for this before? They did not appear before our committee, they did not ask to come before our committee. The first I heard about this was when we were about to bring this up on the floor. Then the War Department and Navy Department seemed to get hysterical about the fact that we were disposing of properties they might want. Frankly, it is not altogether, in my opinion, a question of their falling asleep on the projects, because the FPHA had an obligation to go out and sell these properties and on ever one of these properties some one has come to the FPHA and asked about them. So there has been a little negotiation. If the FPHA had disposed of these properties previous to this time, if they had not been inclined to hold them for transfer to purposes that are not within the purview of this act, then the War Department and the Navy Department would have no rights whatsoever, no priorities and no opportunity to buy these properties. Now, all of a sudden they become very much interested in them. I think that the amendment the gentleman has offered, which restricts them to properties within the proximity of a camp and where application is made before a certain date, helps the situation, but I am not sure it would cure all the ills, because these properties might be transferred to the War or Navy Departments, then transferred to somebody else for the very purpose of getting out from under the jurisdiction of this act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. RAINS. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the statement that the Army and Navy Departments have been waiting around during 2 years and they have had that time in which to get this very much needed war housing. That is a bit in error, according to the letter I read from the Secretary of War a moment ago. They already have tentative requests in for 24 establishments and this bill will cut them off from those requests which were made prior to the time of any work being done on this particular legislation. Further, I should like to make clear to the gentleman from Arkansas another fact. I presume he favors this amendment which I understand was offered as an amendment to the amendment provided it is limited to war housing in the immediate proximity of permanent War and Navy Establishments.

Mr. HAYS. That is the language of the amendment I have offered in an effort to meet some specific situations, yet not open the door to the wholesale transfer of property.

Mr. RAINS. I share the gentleman's opinion, and I think that is a very good safeguard.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. Does not the gentleman think that the language in the amendment which provides that this applies only to applications which were pending before this bill was introduced would prevent the possible evasions mentioned by the chairman, particularly in view of the fact that it applies only to applications made by the Army and the Navy for immediately adjacent housing accommodations, and that approval was simply delayed because of some technical reason?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan to answer.

Mr. PACE. Under the amendment offered by the gentleman, this would apply only to those applications which were pending before the bill was introduced, and whose approval was delayed by reason of technical requirements of an investigation to be conducted before they were approved.

Mr. WOLCOTT. We have the list of the projects that the Army and the Navy have asked for as of April 15, 1947. That has been furnished to us by the Federal Public Housing Administration. I wish the gentleman would look it over and see if the date could not be changed until April 15 to meet his situation, and if we can change the date to April 15, then, by reference to the report, anyone could determine that we intend to restrict the program to these particular projects and that would take a little curse off of it, if I may put it that way.

Mr. HAYS. I appreciate the point made by the chairman. I realize that it is never satisfactory to attempt to work out on the floor a difficult local situation. We have had two things in mind here. One was to avoid the mistake of a wholesale loss of property, where it was not needed, and then to meet specific situations properly, so if the gentleman from Michigan would agree to the April 15 date, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be modified to read April 15 instead of May 15. I do not want to embarrass the chairman of the committee, but I am doing this in an effort to meet what I regard is a valid objection to the Rains amendment.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, if that amendment is offered, and if the modification is accepted, then it is understood that the projects which come within the purview of this amendment appear on page 13 of the hearings of the War Housing Disposal Act of 1947 of the House Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. HAYS. And I trust the Committee then will support us in this amendment because, as the gentleman from Michigan has pointed out, we can make this limitation very specific, and I am grateful to him for getting that into the RECORD so that it will be understood just what we are trying to do in this connection. I appreciate the hearing this Committee has given us.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be regarded as modified by the change in date to April 15 rather than May 15.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I wonder if this is only the Army list. Does that include the Navy Establishment as well?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes. There are 24 Army projects and 5 Navy projects. They are found on page 13 of the hearings.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the modified amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAYS to the Rains amendment: Amend the Rains amendment by striking out in line 5 after the words "war housing" the remainder and insert "situated within the proximate vicinity of any permanent Army or Navy establishment and which requests were on file April 15, 1947."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, on my own responsibility I am constrained to accept the amendment with the very definite understanding that it means that, if the amendment is adopted, the program of transfer to the Army and the Navy shall be for no other projects than those contained on page 13 of the hear-

ings of the House Committee on Banking and Currency on this act, and that it is not intended to include the transfer to the War Department or the Navy Department of any projects which are not included in that list. With that very definite understanding, for myself, I shall support the amendment.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. FOLGER. May I say to my chairman that under those conditions as the gentleman outlines them, with that definiteness affixed to it, I am willing to go along, but otherwise I am not.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HAYS. That certainly is my understanding. I am glad to have that in the record in that specific form.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment prior to this.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it an amendment to section 4 or any portion thereof?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Yes. It is on page 4.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Is the parliamentary situation such that we will dispose of the Rains amendment before we consider another amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. If the Rains amendment were adopted, it would preclude the offering by the gentleman from Florida of his amendment to section 4.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Rains amendment be passed on first and that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] be permitted to offer his amendment just as soon as we have disposed of the pending amendment. I think that will be in the interest of clarification.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS].

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Florida: Page 4, line 10, after the period insert the following sentence: "For purposes of this subsection terminal leave bonds (at face value plus interest at the time of sale) may be transferred to, and accepted by, the Administrator in lieu of cash, but shall be held by the Administrator until said bonds are payable as may be provided by law."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane, that it operates in effect as an amendment to the Terminal Leave Pay Act, which is not within the subject matter of the bill under discussion.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Florida desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, this bill sets out how these housing units shall be sold. It provides that they shall be sold for cash as expeditiously as possible and not later than December 31, 1948.

SEC. 4. (a) All war housing (except mortgages, liens, or other interests as security) transferred to the Administrator by section 3 shall, subject to the provisions of this act, be sold for cash as expeditiously as possible and not later than December 31, 1948. Wherever practicable each dwelling in a war housing project shall be offered for sale separately from other dwellings in such project. Any mortgage, lien, or other interest as security transferred to the Administrator by section 3 or acquired by him under this act pursuant to a contract entered into prior to February 26, 1947, may, subject to the provisions of this section, be sold for cash.

I provide in compliance with this particular section that a veteran who is in possession of the house and who has a priority under this bill may, in order to stay there and prevent being denied the right to purchase that house, if he has no money and has a bond plus a little money, to deposit this bond with the Administrator. The Administrator holds that bond until the law is passed providing that we shall cash them, whether it be 4 years, or if we pass a law which I think we are going to pass, and I do not think there is any question but what this Congress is going to pass a law making these bonds redeemable in cash or making them negotiable. Now, that is an absolute fact, and if that be so, then they can use these bonds as a part payment in cash. That is all I want to do.

Some of them may say, Mr. Chairman, "Well, we are going to pass an act." Suppose we do not pass that act? Here is a man in possession of the house who has a preference under the bill, and if he has no money, what can he do? It is, "Get out of here, Mr. Veteran, get out, and get out now." But he should be able to say, "I have a bond of the Government. The Government owes me $700, or the Government owes me $500." But, then, they will say, "That does not make any difference, and you have no right in this house; get out."

Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment is relevant; I think it is germane and pertinent to the provisions of this bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman from Florida is not addressing himself to the point of order, but is rather discussing the merits of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida will speak to the point of order.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is any question that this certainly deals with how these houses may be purchased. This provides that it may be applied to a cash payment. The bill says cash. I provide by this amendment that for the purposes of this section the cash payment may be reduced by the value of the bond. That is all. To my mind, Mr. Chairman, it is germane.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], if he desires to speak on the point of order.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, this bill relates to the sale of certain war housing. Certainly, it seems to me in connection with the sale of war housing that Congress can determine the method of payment, whether it is cash or on term payments. And if that is so, the Congress can determine that terminal-leave bonds outstanding, and I am now talking on the point of order and not on the merits of the question, may be used in connection with the sale of war housing. It certainly seems to me if the Congress in its wisdom in connection with the sale of surplus war housing tries to permit the use of these terminal-leave bonds in payment in whole or in part, it is certainly germane to this bill, the basic premise of which is the sale of certain war housing, and this is an incidental part thereof.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do, Mr. Chairman. I would like to be heard for this reason. Under the terminal-leave-payment bill, there is an express provision that the bonds are nonnegotiable and that the bonds are nontransferable. In order to provide that they be used as down payment or for any other purpose in connection with these projects, they must be negotiated; they must be transferred. For that reason, we amend a basic provision of the law which is not within the purview of the bill presently under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma). The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair holds the point of order is well taken, for the reason that the Terminal Leave Pay Act provided that the bonds were nonnegotiable for a definite period of time—5 years. That is not within the purview of the bill under consideration, this being a bill which does not seek to amend or change the provision of the Terminal Leave Pay Act, but merely for the disposal of surplus housing.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

WAR HOUSING MORTGAGE INSURANCE

SEC. 5. Title VI of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"SEC. 609. (a) The Administrator is authorized, upon application by the mortgagee, to insure under section 603 or 608 of this title any mortgage executed in connection with the sale by the Federal Works Administrator of any housing (including property determined by the Federal Works Administrator to be essential to the use of such housing) transferred to the Federal Works

Administrator by the War Housing Disposal Act of 1947 without regard to—

"(1) any limit as to the time when any mortgage may be insured under this title;

"(2) any limit as to the aggregate amount of principal obligations of all mortgages insured under this title, but the aggregate amount of principal obligations of all mortgages insured pursuant to this section shall not exceed $750,000,000;

"(3) any requirement that the obligation be approved for mortgage insurance prior to the beginning of construction or that the construction be new construction;

if such mortgage is otherwise eligible for insurance under such section and is eligible for insurance under subsection (b) of this section.

"(b) To be eligible for insurance pursuant to this section a mortgage shall—

"(1) have a maturity satisfactory to the Administrator but not to exceed 25 years from the date of the insurance of the mortgage.

"(2) involve a principal obligation (including such initial service charges, appraisal, inspection, and other fees as the Administrator shall approve) in an amount not to exceed 90 percent of the reasonable value of the mortgaged property as determined by appraisal made by an appraiser or appraisers designated by the Administrator."

PREFERENCES

SEC. 6. (a) Preference in the purchase of any dwelling designed for occupancy by less than five families shall be granted to veterans and their families and to occupants over other prospective purchasers of such dwelling in the following order:

(1) A veteran and his family who occupy a dwelling unit in the dwelling to be sold.

(2) A veteran and his family who do not occupy a dwelling unit in the dwelling to be sold but who intend to occupy a dwelling unit in the dwelling to be purchased; but if the dwelling is designed for occupancy by two, three, or four families, equal preference shall be granted to a private corporation, association, or cooperative society which is the legal agent of veterans and their families who intend to occupy the dwelling purchased by such corporation, association, or society.

(3) A nonveteran who occupies a dwelling unit in the dwelling to be sold.

(b) In the case of any war-housing project where it is not practicable to offer each dwelling for sale separately from other dwellings in the project and in the case of any dwelling designed for occupancy by more than four families, preference in the purchase thereof shall be granted to any private corporation, association, or cooperative society which is the legal agent of veterans who intend to occupy the war housing purchased by such corporation, association, or society.

(c) The Administrator shall give such notice in such manner as he deems reasonable to enable prospective purchasers who have a preference under this section in the purchase of war housing to exercise such preference. Any prospective purchaser having a preference under subsection (a) in the purchase of any dwelling may apply for the purchase of such dwelling (1) if the preference is under paragraph (1), within 30 days after the date of the notice of the offer for sale, (2) if the preference is under paragraph (2), within 60 days after the date of the notice of the offer for sale, and (3) if the preference is under paragraph (3), within 90 days after the date of the notice of the offer for sale. Any corporation, association, or society having a preference under subsection (b) in the purchase of any war housing may apply for the purchase of such housing within 180 days after the date of the notice of the offer for sale.

SALES WITHOUT PREFERENCE

SEC. 7. If any dwelling or war-housing project is not sold to a purchaser who is granted a preference under section 6 and who applied within the time prescribed in subsection (c) of such section, such dwelling or war-housing project shall be sold as provided in this act without regard to any preferences granted under section 6 and without regard to any restrictions contained in any other law as to whom war housing may be sold.

TITLE OF PURCHASER

SEC. 8. A deed or other instrument executed by or on behalf of the Administrator purporting to transfer title or any other interest in property under this act shall be conclusive evidence of compliance with the provisions of this act insofar as title or other interest of any bona fide purchasers for value is concerned.

VALIDITY OF CONTRACTS

SEC. 9. Nothing in this act shall be deemed to impair or modify any contract entered into prior to February 26, 1947, for the sale of property, or any term or provision of any such contract, without the consent of the purchaser or his assignee, if the contract or the term or provision thereof is otherwise valid.

DISPOSITION OF PROCEEDS

SEC. 10. Moneys derived by the Administrator from the disposition of war housing under this act shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. WOLCOTT (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with and the bill be considered as read for the purpose of offering amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUCHANAN: On page 7, in line 13, after the word "granted", insert the word "first", and in line 16 strike out the period and insert a comma and the following: "and second to any city, village, town, county or other political subdivision, or public agency or corporation (including a housing authority), in whose area of jurisdiction or operation any such dwelling is located."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. With the understanding that this provision for authority to purchase by a municipality succeeds the priorities set up for purchase by veterans and others in the language stating it, I see no reason why the gentleman's amendment should not be accepted.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to give the cities and towns in which permanent war housing projects are located an opportunity to purchase this housing ahead of speculators.

In offering this amendment I do so with full knowledge that this bill is unworkable, unsound, and should be rejected by the House. However, this amendment is an effort to make a bad bill a little less bad and to give cities some protection against a wholesale movement of this housing into the hands of speculators.

The majority report of the Banking and Currency Committee on this bill assumes that the great part of this permanent war housing is suitable for sale to individual veterans for their personal occupancy. This assumption is contrary to fact. Aside from the so-called demountable houses, the great bulk of the permanent Lanham Act housing is in multifamily projects. I am advised that out of the 540 projects affected by this bill, more than 300 are of a type which cannot feasibly be subdivided into individual units for sale to individual veterans.

It is precisely these projects which the speculators have an eye on. And it is precisely these projects which the speculators will get under the provisions of this bill.

The House should realize that the cities and towns in which these projects are located have a big stake and a vital concern in the future of this housing. The House should give careful consideration to the local interest in this housing and not ignore and override this local interest by passing hasty, ill-conceived, and irresponsible legislation.

Practically every city in the country has a serious housing shortage today. That alone gives every city where a Lanham Act project is located an immediate interest in how these projects are disposed of. But these cities also have a long-term interest in this housing. In many of them, these projects represent a substantial percentage of their total supply of rental housing. They want to see these projects disposed of in a manner that will serve the long-term housing needs of the community, that will tie in with the long-term growth and development of the community, and that will protect property values.

Above all, they do not want to see these properties dumped into the hands of speculators who will milk them as long as the housing shortage makes milking profitable and then let them deteriorate into slums. And that is precisely what is threatened by this bill in its present form.

The Lanham Act recognized the local interest in this housing. It specifically required that local officials be consulted in the development of this housing in order to conform it to local planning and tradition to the greatest extent practicable under wartime conditions. In the same manner, local governments have been consulted in the plans for disposition of these projects. Local disposition committees, appointed by the mayors or other heads of the local governments concerned, have worked closely with officials of the National Housing Agency and the Federal Public Housing Authority in developing local disposition plans. These local consultations have already been completed in the case of more than 300 permanent Lanham Act projects.

This entire framework of local consultation would be wiped out by this bill. This bill does not say a word about local consultation. It does not contain a whisper as to giving any attention or consideration to local recommendations on

disposition. It pulls away the responsibility for disposition from the agency which has been dealing with the local governments involved for more than 5 years and gives that responsibility to the Federal Works Administrator who necessarily has had no part in or knowledge of these local consultations. It simply orders him to sell these projects for cash and to sell all of them by December 31, 1948.

More than that, this bill does not even specificaly recognize the right of local governments to buy these projects, in cases where they want to and are able to. Local governments would simply be lumped in with speculators and any other buyers where buyers in the preferred classifications did not appear. This is entirely contrary to the policy established by the Congress for all other surplus property disposal. In fact, in all other cases of surplus property, the Congress has uniformly given State and local governments a preference second only to the preference accorded to Federal agencies.

This amendment will not correct all the weaknesses I have outlined. No single amendment could possibly correct all the weaknesses and inconsistencies in this bill. But the amendment would at least give local governments and other local public bodies the clear-cut right to come in and bid for these projects at their appraised price and ahead of speculators.

This amendment would not interfere with veterans' preference in the disposal of this housing. The bill as reported gives preference for the purchase of projects not suitable for subdivision into individual properties to "any private corporation, association, or cooperative society which is the legal agent of veterans who intend to occupy the war housing purchased by such corporation, association or society." This language is ambiguous. I doubt that many, if any, bona fide veterans' groups could qualify for purchase of these large projects under this provision. I also fear that this provision is open to abuse by dummy corporations and other fronts for speculators.

Nevertheless, this amendment would not disturb the preference to such corporations and associations. But it would give the second preference under this provision to local governments and other local public agencies to purchase projects located within their area of jurisdiction.

This is the least which the Congress should do to protect the interest of local communities in these housing projects. It would not eliminate the many unsound provisions which appear throughout this bill. It would not even preserve the right which local governments now have under the Lanham Act to come in and request the Congress to convey specific projects to them for use as low-rent housing where such use is desired by the community.

But it would at least give those local governments which are in a position to purchase these projects the right to do so and the opportunity to protect themselves and the future of their community against the consequences of exploitation of these projects by real-estate speculators.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin: On page 9, line 7, strike out the period and add a semicolon and insert "or (2) to prohibit the Administrator from completing under the provisions of the Lanham War Housing Act the sale of a war-housing project or portion thereof, upon terms other than cash to a mutual ownership or cooperative organization that has heretofore instituted negotiations with the Government toward the purchase of such housing for occupancy by members."

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to correct a situation which I outlined when this bill was last under consideration. Under the provisions of this bill, the present occupants of a housing development who have banded together in order to purchase those homes will have to terminate those negotiations. I outlined at that time the situation which exists in the city of Manitowoc, in my district. In this case the layout of the housing project offered by the Government would not comply with the city zoning regulations. Any purchaser, therefore, would have to purchase all of the units and then improve them, put in new sewers, new kinds of foundations, and make various other repairs in order to comply with municipal regulations.

These people who presently occupy the homes, loyal war workers working in the shipyards at Manitowoc, inquired over a year ago as to what could be done whereby they could purchase these homes individually. The only solution that could be found was for them to band together and form a mutual ownership corporation which would buy the unit as a whole, make the necessary adjustments, and then sell to the individual under the arrangement which is provided for in the agreement under those circumstances. These people did join together. They hired counsel. They went to a great deal of work all under representations made to them by the Government. Now we come along with this legislation after over a year's work and the expenditure of funds and are going to say to these people: "That is all out of the window now, boys. We are sorry, but we have changed our minds and, in spite of all the work you have done, you can forget about it."

To me that is not equitable and the only thing this amendment does is to provide that, where there is a bona fide organization that has been formed and has already entered into negotiations with the Government for the purchase of such property, that organization shall be allowed to continue its negotiations. This does not necessarily mean that the Government has to sell to them if they do not meet conditions which presently exist. To put it quite frankly, the Government has been as much responsible as anybody for the fact that this negotiation has not been concluded, because appraisals have not been made. When the committee advised the administration to cease in February, negotiations did not go through, they did not appraise the property; and that is just the point at which they are. All that is left is agreement on the sales price. It is a matter of time.

You may say they have had plenty of time, but they have not because the have had the legal technicality of complying with city zoning regulations, of getting a city ordinance passed in order to permit the purchase of this property, and the putting it in proper condition for use as peacetime housing. The city allowed the Federal Government to construct this project simply because there was an emergency, but looking to the future the city does not want this now turned into a slum district and they are insisting that their regulations be complied with. The units cannot be sold to an individual under those circumstances. It has to be through some organization which will buy the real estate, make these improvements, then resell it. You all know what that means. In that event it simply means that instead of the present tenants getting it under the arrangements that have been worked out, they will not. I might say also that under the arrangements worked out with this ownership organization it is provided that veterans have priority with the present occupants; so it is not going to deny housing units to any veteran.

I trust the committee will see fit to agree to this amendment and permit the continuation of the negotiations which have already been started.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin is adopted it would defeat the very purpose of this bill, which is to make these units available to as many veterans as possible. I do not know, but I could conjecture that there is not one of these units upon which there has been no negotiation whatsoever. I would assume that in the files of the Federal Public Housing Authority there is correspondence which might be considered the initiation of negotiations on all of these projects which we seek to dispose of under the terms of this provision. I may say in respect to the project which the gentleman has in mind that there are 94 single units which 94 veterans might purchase under very high priorities. There are 306 semidetached units which likewise 306 veterans can purchase, making a total of 400 units which can be made immediately available for purchase by veterans at very reasonable prices.

The danger of the gentleman's amendment is that if we delay the sale of these units because there have been some negotiations on them, then we would put these projects in a position where they could not be sold as individual units to individual veterans. We would have to sell the projects to whomever had been negotiating for the purchase of them. So it would destroy the very purpose

of the bill, therefore, I hope the gentleman's amendment will be defeated.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. FOLGER. One of the great objectives sought in this bill is to make it possible for the veterans to obtain houses at reasonable prices?

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is right.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. As I understand it, the date used in this bill is February 26th, is that right?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes; that is the date on which we submitted to the Commissioner a resolution asking him not to dispose of any of these projects except in such a manner as to return cash to the Treasury from the proceeds of the sale. The program which FPHA was carrying on in some instances amortized the payments over 45 years with 5 percent down and 3½ percent interest. We did this so the Congress could formulate a program for the disposal of these projects without embarrassment to either the Administration or the purchasers. February 26 is the date on which we started to consider this program which resulted in the reporting of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to put a statement in the RECORD so that it will appear during the discussion on this bill in the House. We have in the United States large groups of houses, particularly in the western agricultural regions. I know that applies to California and Texas; I am quite sure to Oregon and Washington, and possibly to Utah and some of the other States. Some of this housing has been built during the war years; and I am advised by a member of the committee handling the bill that it would be classified as temporary housing. On the other hand, much of this housing has been in existence, to my personal knowledge, for 12 years or more. It may have been added to during the war.

There is a bill pending before the Committee on Agriculture attempting to dispose of this in such a way that it will be preserved for agricultural labor rather than sold to some buyer for resale on the open market, as would otherwise be required. It has occurred to me this bill might be a vehicle for the disposition of that housing in such a way that it could be protected for agriculture and while I am offering no amendment today, I rise to put this in the RECORD so that our friends in the other body will not say, if it is brought up over there, that nothing was said about it in the House, and so my friends on this committee will, I hope, give it sympathetic consideration if the matter is brought up in that way.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BRYSON: Page 9, insert after line 11 the following new section:

"SEC. 11. The term 'war housing' as defined in section 2 (3) of this Act shall not include any housing with respect to which the Federal Public Housing Authority received prior to June 9, 1947, a request that such housing be conveyed to any public or private agency organized for slum clearance or to provide subsidized housing for persons of low income. The Federal Public Housing Commissioner shall, as expeditiously as possible, report all such requests to the Congress. The housing so requested shall not, unless specifically authorized by Congress, be conveyed to any public or private agency organized for slum clearance or to provide subsidized housing for persons of low income."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I propose would merely exclude from the provisions of this bill any housing now under the jurisdiction of the FPHA but which has already been requested by the local communities for low-rent use.

The projects thus effected are listed on page 82 of the report of the hearings on this bill.

These projects, which include 18,278 units, have been requested because the local communities in which they are situated are in great need of low-rent housing facilities.

The requests have been made in good faith under the provisions of the Lanham Act, but thus far the FPHA has not acted upon the requests. The law requires that all such requests be reported to the Congress for its approval. My amendment also requires that the FPHA report all these requests to the Congress as expeditiously as possible.

The need for low-rent housing facilities for families of low income is greater than ever before. Our working people cannot possibly finance the building of new homes at present inflated costs. They need adequate housing at rent they can afford to pay.

The bill, H. R. 3492, does lip service to veterans by giving them first preference in the purchase of these Government-built residences. However, it is reasonable to assume that very few veterans now occupying these units would be interested in purchasing them.

For instance, at Spartanburg, S. C., in my own district, the Camp Croft Courts, a 110-unit housing project built under the Lanham Act, is occupied by veterans exclusively. The city of Spartanburg last December filed a formal request with the FPHA for transfer of this project to low-rent use. According to information I have received from Spartanburg, none of the veterans now occupying these units desires to purchase the unit in which he is living. If the veterans do not wish to purchase these units, then why should the city of Spartanburg not take them over for low-rent use, since there is great need in that area for residences of that type at a rent rate the people can afford to pay? The same situation exists in the other communities where more than 70 applications already have been made for the transfer of these Lanham Act residences to low-rent use and for the purpose of slum clearance.

That was the original purpose of the Lanham Act, and these municipalities throughout the country have complied with the law in filing official requests for this property. I believe their requests should be honored.

If it is argued that these projects should not be used for the purpose of low rent and slum clearance at all, then I may point out that under the existing law the FPHA must submit the requests from the communities to the Congress before such transfers may be effected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3492) to provide for the expeditious disposition of certain war housing, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 223, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CLASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in Committee this afternoon and include certain pertinent material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Attorney General Tom Clark made this morning before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REREFERENCE OF THE BILL H. R. 2415

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture be discharged from the fur-

ther consideration of the bill H. R. 2415 and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 50. An act for the relief of Joseph Ochrimowski;

S. 317. An act for the relief of Robert B. Jones;

S. 361. An act for the relief of Alva R. Moore;

S. 423. An act for the relief of John B. Barton;

S. 425. An act for the relief of Col. Frank R. Loyd;

S. 470. An act for the relief of John H. Gradwell;

S. 514. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Sylvia De Cicco;

S. 561. An act for the relief of Robert C. Birkes;

S. 620. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ida Elma Franklin;

S. 824. An act for the relief of Marion O. Cassady; and

S. 882. An act for the relief of A. A. Pelletier and P. C. Silk.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 45 minutes, p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, June 19, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

803. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Public Health Service Act in regard to certain matters of personnel and administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

804. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the transfer of lands in the Fort Wingate Military Reserve, N. Mex., from the War Department to the Interior Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

805. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

806. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 139 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

807. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed joint resolution establishing a code for health and safety in bituminous-coal and lignite mines of the United States, the products of which regularly enter commerce or the operations of which substantially affect commerce; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

808. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TWYMAN: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 3638. A bill to amend section 10 of the act establishing a National Archives of the United States Government; without amendment (Rept. No. 597). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JONES of Washington: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 2588. A bill requiring all mails consigned to an airport from a post office or branch, or from an airport to a post office or branch, within a radius of 35 miles of a city in which there has been established a Government-owned vehicle service to be delivered by Government-owned motor vehicles; with an amendment (Rept. No. 598). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LOVE: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 3513. A bill to transfer the Panama Railroad pension fund to the civil-service retirement and disability fund; without amendment (Rept. No. 599). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HESS: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 3315. A bill to authorize conversions of certain naval vessels; with an amendment (Rept. No. 607). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 608. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 116. An act for the relief of Mrs. Mildred Wells Martin; with an amendment (Rept. No. 600). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 405. A bill for the relief of Thomas M. Farley, Mrs. Susie Farley, Mrs. Helen Moss, the legal guardian of Donna Louise Farley, and the legal guardian of Melvin Moss; without amendment (Rept. No. 601). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPRINGER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 406. A bill for the relief of Walter R. and Kathryn Marshall; with an amendment (Rept. No. 602). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 990. A bill for the relief of the estate of Patricia Ann Moore, deceased; with an amendment (Rept. No. 603). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1492. A bill for the relief of P. L. (Spud) Murphey, coowner and manager of Spud's Tailors, Laundry & Dry Cleaning Works; with an amendment (Rept. No. 604). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPRINGER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1736. A bill for the relief of O. Dean Settles and Mrs. Ruth E. Settles, husband and wife; Mrs. Ruth E. Settles, individually; the estate of Ora H. Hatfield; and Mrs. Kittie B. Hatfield; with an amendment (Rept. No. 605). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2268. A bill for the relief of Charles E. Crook; with an amendment (Rept. No. 606). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, the Committee on Agriculture was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2415) to amend the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended, and the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, so that after June 30, 1947, employment by production credit associations and national farm loan associations will be covered by the old-age and survivors insurance benefit provisions of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes, and the same was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 3883. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of War to transfer to the Territory of Alaska the title to the Army vessel *Hygiene;* to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CARSON:

H. R. 3884. A bill to provide for including dairy cattle owned by a taxpayer conducting a dairy farm as "property used in the trade or business" within the meaning of section 117 (j) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 3885. A bill to provide that the Commissioner of Internal Revenue may by regulation eliminate the requirement that certain tax and information returns shall be made under oath; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 3886. A bill to raise the minimum wage standards of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H. R. 3887. A bill to amend section 102 of the Revised Statutes with reference to the penalty applicable in the case of contumacy of persons summoned by authority of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEADE of Kentucky:

H. R. 3888. A bill to provide increased subsistence allowance to veterans pursuing certain courses under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 3889. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), parts I and II, as amended, to establish a presumption of service connection for chronic and tropical diseases; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 3890. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend unemployment compensation to veterans becoming ill or disabled while employed; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 3891. A bill to authorize any agency of the United States Government to furnish or to procure and furnish materials, supplies, and equipment to public international organizations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VURSELL:

H. R. 3892. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to permit settlement

and compensation for terminal leave under such act to be made in cash, to provide that bonds issued under such act shall be redeemable at any time, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3893. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish appropriate zones for the State of Montana when prescribing open season for the taking of migratory waterfowl, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. R. 3894. A bill to reduce the interest rate on tax overpayments and delinquencies from 6 percent to 4 percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HESS:

H. R. 3895. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the Director of the Census to collect and publish statistics of cottonseed and cottonseed products, and for other purposes," approved August 7, 1916; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 3896. A bill to provide for the payment of 30 days' basic compensation to certain persons separated from service in the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. R. 3897. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to accept a conveyance to certain real estate as a site for a general hospital, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 3898. A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and to extend the succession and certain lending powers and functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. R. 3899. A bill to amend section 12 of the Immigration Act of 1917; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. J. Res. 219. Joint resolution to abolish the office of Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to perpetuate the existence and identity of the United States Marine Corps by specifying its functions in legislation unifying the armed services of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 3900. A bill for the relief of Dr. Pradish Cheosakul; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 3901. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to Martin E. Fossen; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 3902. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Gifford Monroe; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 3903. A bill for the relief of Lena E. Sikes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOODRUFF:

H. R. 3904. A bill for the relief of Kathleen Rose Ranes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

644. By Mr. ARNOLD: Petition of the faculty of the College of Agriculture and the staff of the Missouri Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo., not only "to restore the publication of the Experiment Station Record but to enlarge its scope and usefulness. This seems to be necessary in order to utilize our time most economically and to make our duties and activities of the greatest value to the farming people and industry"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

645. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mrs. Pearl Arnold, Lake Worth, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

646. Also, petition of Henry Clay Curtis, West Palm Beach, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to protesting further operation of rent control; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

647. Also, petition of A. M. Keller, Tampa, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

648. Also, petition of Mrs. M. G. Rowe, Daytona Beach, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

649. Also, petition of Henry Clay Curtis, West Palm Beach, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

650. Also, petition of the Municipal Council of St. Croix, V. I., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing full confidence in and pledging loyal support to Gov. William H. Hastie; to the Committee on Public Lands.

651. Also, petition of Daniel N. Norton, St. Petersburg, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

652. Also, petition of the president, file department, City of New York Retired Men's Association, Inc., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to favoring a limited Federal tax exemption on pensions and annuity incomes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 19, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, while we pride ourselves that we learn something every day, we seem to make little progress in spiritual things.

Nowhere is our ignorance more tragic. So long have we been riding on the balloon tires of conceit, for our own good we may have to be deflated, that on the rims of humility we may discover the spiritual laws that govern our growth in grace. If our pride has to be punctured, Lord, make it soon before we gain too much speed.

For the salvation of our souls and the good of our country. In Jesus' name. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3492. An act to provide for the expeditious disposition of certain war housing, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3818. An act to amend the Federal Insurance Contributions Act with respect to rates of tax on employers and employees, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3839. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 51) against adoption of Reorganization Plan No. 3 of May 27, 1947, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 3792) to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAM FOR WOOL—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 814) to provide support for wool, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into yesterday, a vote is to be taken at 2:30 o'clock this afternoon on the conference report on Senate bill 814, and the time intervening between the convening of the Senate until the hour of 2:30 o'clock is under the control of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. Under the circumstances, the Chair can recognize no one except by permission of the Senator from Kentucky or the Senator from Vermont.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield to me to ask for the approval of the Journal?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of yesterday, June 18, 1947, be dispensed with, and that the Journal stand approved.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

MEETING OF COMMITTEE DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President——

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to continue to sit during the session of the Senate today while holding hearings on the antidiscrimination bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

LETTERS FROM FORMER PRESIDENT HOOVER ON ECONOMIC SITUATION IN EUROPE

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief statement concerning an insertion in the RECORD I wish to have made.

Mr. President, the news from Europe becomes increasingly alarming. The economic situation appears to be rapidly deteriorating, and prompt action will be necessary if we are to save the world from further chaos.

From the standpoint of America, we are being called on for more and more aid, and the time has definitely come to take account of stock, both as to what our foreign policy should be and what limits must be placed on the aid that we can give in this crisis. Without America sound economically, we will soon find ourselves in serious difficulty.

While perhaps it is the first responsibility of the Committee on Foreign Relations to keep abreast of these matters and prepare to act promptly if necessary, it is my feeling that every Member of the Senate should be informed of conditions. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two important communications from former President Hoover dealing with the economic situation abroad. The first is a letter to the Honorable JOHN TABER, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, dated May 26, 1947, entitled "We Must Speed Peace." The second is a letter to the Honorable STYLES BRIDGES, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the United States Senate, dated June 15, 1947, entitled "The Limits of American Aid to Foreign Countries."

A study of these letters in connection with Secretary Marshall's recent statement of policy and the statement on June 14 on United States rehabilitation of foreign countries by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, will furnish a background for an understanding of some of the serious problems which are facing us and will indicate the direction in which our participation in foreign affairs should move.

I ask unanimous consent that the letters referred to from former President Hoover be printed in full in connection with my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

The letters from Mr. Hoover are as follows:

WE MUST SPEED PEACE

NEW YORK, N. Y., *May 26, 1947.*

Hon. JOHN TABER,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TABER: I have your request for a memorandum on my views upon the recommendation of the War Department of $725,000,000 for food and collateral relief requirements for Germany, Japan, and Korea for the next fiscal year.

You have also requested that I should furnish you a memorandum upon the causes of these continuing demands upon us, measures which might ameliorate these demands upon our taxpayers and generally upon our foreign relief and reconstruction policies. I shall, as you requested, attend the committee hearing on Tuesday to give any further information they desire.

For clarity, I have throughout this text numbered my specific recommendations.

1. As matters stand this appropriation of $725,000,000 should be made. In addition to this proposed American appropriation the British are also to contribute their share of bizonal relief in Germany. These enormous sums are inescapable for the next year unless millions of people under our flags are to die of starvation. They are about the same as during the present fiscal year and this year's experience demonstrates how near starvation is in these countries.

Surely we must take steps to bring these burdens upon our taxpayers to an end.

We are now providing relief for the third year after the war.

The delay by Russia in making peace with Germany and Japan together with the Allied policies of reparations and industrial demilitarization have paralyzed the industrial productivity of these countries. They are unable to make substantial exports and are not contributing, as they otherwise could, to their own support.

General Marshall, in Moscow, ably urged the immediate necessity for Russia and France to comply with the Potsdam agreement, which provided for economic unification of the four zones; for the revision of the plant transfers for reparations; and the revision of so-called levels of industry. Meanwhile, Russia and France are taking industrial exports from their zones which, under the Potsdam agreement, would contribute to paying the food bill in the American and British zones. Thus we are paying reparations. We are shipping fertilizers for relief which could be supplied from the French zone. We are supplying France with Ruhr coal which could be used for the manufacturing of exports in Germany with which to pay for food.

2. In view of the Russian refusal to General Marshall's able presentation at Moscow, and the continued violation of the Potsdam agreement to unify German economy in both Russia and France, we are surely no longer bound by that agreement as to reparations and industrial policies.

In the bizonal area of Germany, after 2 years since VE-day, the agricultural production is about 75 percent of prewar and the industrial production is only at 33 percent of 1936, and exports are only 3 percent. In Japan there has been about 80-percent recovery in agricultural production, but industrial production is only 30 percent of prewar, with exports about 4 percent.

To understand the situation in the German area, we might visualize what would happen if the present policies were imposed on the United States. Suppose America were divided into four zones with little interchange of economic life or food surpluses, with an obligation to tear down and ship abroad 25 percent of our peace-production plants, and with a restricted level of industry which would destroy 60 percent of our possible export trade. Then add to this the failure even to designate the plants that are to be removed, so that all initiative to operate the remaining plants is destroyed by uncertainty as to whom the victims will be. Suppose also we were not allowed to produce oil, and were limited in fertilizer production. Without relief from some humanitarian country, millions of our people would die.

Unless there are revolutionary changes in our policies as to Germany and Japan, the burdens upon our taxpayers are not likely to lessen, and are more likely to increase. There are three alternatives before us in our occupied territories: To wash our hands of the whole business and then let the conquered countries drag the whole world to final chaos; or, for humanitarian reasons, merely to carry these people on a food-subsistence level, hoping for improvement in the attitudes of other nations; or to act at once to free ourselves from their hindrances as far as possible.

3. The time has come when we should issue a last call to Russia and France to comply with the Potsdam agreement. If they do not at once respond, we and the British should immediately take the steps to set up the economy of the bizonal areas so as to restore their industrial production and exports.

4. An effort should be made to consolidate the French zone (except the Saar) into the bizonal area. In this we have a right to expect French cooperation, in view of the great sacrifices the American people are now making on behalf of France.

5. In any event, we should immediately carry out the present project of a temporary centralized German government over the American and British zones subject to our military direction. We might even contemplate a separate peace with this government if the next Conference of Foreign Ministers does not succeed in more constructive policies.

6. If we are to secure adequate exports with which they can pay for food, it is urgent that we at once revise the reparations and industrial demilitarization policies imposed upon these zones by various Allied agreements. These latter policies are identical in Japan, where they must likewise be revised.

7. We should, in our German zones and in Japan, suspend the whole concept of levels of industry, placing restrictions upon only a few specified industries, such as shipping and aviation.

8. We should at once abolish for good the destruction or removal of all industrial plants which can make peacetime goods or services. The heavy burden now borne by our taxpayers is ample proof of the folly of these policies. It is an illusion that there are any consequential reparations to be had by removal of peacetime industrial plants. The buildings, foundations, water, electrical, and other connections in such plants have no value for removal. All that is removable for any use are machines, all secondhand and many obsolete. The cost of tearing them out, shipping them to some area where there is neither skilled labor nor skilled management, and of building new foundations, buildings, and connections, leave even these values comparatively trivial. We should allow the removal of equipment from such munitions factories which cannot be converted into peacetime production. We should assess by independent engineers the actual value to any proposed recipient of

peacetime plants, deducting the cost of dismantling, and then call upon Germany or Japan to pay such a sum over the years and retain the plants. With such action, the uncertainties which now paralyze German and Japanese initiative would quickly revive many industries and gradually provide exports to pay for their food. The drain upon our taxpayers would gradually disappear. Unless this is done, Germany and Japan will not be self-supporting in our time.

Such policies have no practical relation to the demilitarization of either Germany or Japan. I assume we are not going to make the major mistake of Versailles of leaving these countries the nuclei of militarism by granting them any armies or navies. It seems generally agreed that we will absolutely disarm these peoples so that they shall not again be able to engage in aggressions; that this disarmament will embrace destruction of all military arms, fortifications, and arms factories; that they will have no army, no navy, and no air force; that they will retain only a constabulary in which no previous officer may be employed; that no militarist officials can hold public office; that this disarmament must be continued for a generation or two, until they have lost the know-how of war, and the descent of militarism through birth. We have already offered to join in guaranties which will make these prohibitions effective.

9. With such a policy of demilitarization, the chains on production and export of peace purpose goods should be removed and a simple check maintained to assure that industry does no evil.

The situation in Japan is not complicated by zonal occupation of other armies, and we are more free to act. Also, the United States is paying the entire food bill. The world has had the service of a great administrator in General MacArthur under whose guidance the Japanese have adopted a constitution approved by us; they have freely elected a government and are determined upon democratic processes.

10. We should at once summon the peace conference with Japan and make a peace with her by as many nations as wish to adhere.

Such policies as I have outlined are of a vast importance to the nations outside of Germany and Japan. The whole world is suffering from delay in restoration of productivity. The whole world is an interlocked economy, and paralysis in two great centers of production is a world disaster. There is greater opportunity to speed recovery in the world by such action as I outline than by any amount of gifts and loans from the United States.

There has been announced an American policy of defending the frontiers of western civilization. The most vital of these frontiers are Germany and Japan. If they are lost, all Europe and the Far East are lost.

The reasons for continuous obstruction by Russia to every effort which would restore production have at least some expression in the Russian press as a method by which the United States can be bled white by relief measures. We should wait no longer. Russia will not make war about it.

COORDINATION OF AMERICAN POLICIES

11. The problems of relief I have been discussing are involved in a much wider action. That is the coordination of all aid which we are extending for relief and reconstruction abroad. The resources of the United States are not unlimited and we are carrying over 90 percent of these burdens. In the 2 years since the war the United States has spent upward of fourteen billions in free relief, Government loans or loans from agencies dependent upon the United States for their survival. Already we are practically committed to five billion during the next fiscal year. These activities are divided among five or six such agencies directed from Washington that are extending aid to a score of nations. Their policies are not coordinated so as to secure cooperation among nations which would save large sums to the American taxpayers and would produce more rapid restoration of recovery abroad. The purpose of these activities is to save life and restore productivity. The restoration of production in the world is of mutual interest to all nations. I have in this memorandum cited instances of a lack of cooperation among nations. To state it bluntly, we cannot get such cooperation unless there is coordination of our own organization at home so as to make American aid to other nations conditional upon their cooperation to the common end. I am talking about the American taxpayer, about mutual economic action and not about dollar diplomacy.

Yours faithfully,

HERBERT HOOVER.

THE LIMITS OF AMERICAN AID TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 15, 1947.*

The Honorable STYLES BRIDGES,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have your letter asking me to give you and your associates my views upon the following points:

1. What are the limits of relief and loans that we can reasonably give to foreign nations annually without seriously impairing our resources in a free economy?

2. Are there methods by which we could increase our gifts and loans above those now available from our present production?

3. What policies should be adopted to make our resources more effective in world rehabilitation?

THE PROBLEM

As a background to this appraisal I wish at the outset to state:

Upward of a billion people in the war-torn areas of western Europe and Asia are asking for help. In these nations some have not recovered one-third of tneir prewar industrial production; most of them have not recovered over 75 percent of their prewar food production.

There is greater danger of political and economic chaos in the world today than at any time since the war ended. There is more hunger and want today than there was during the war.

In the face of this threatening situation the American people must continue to do the utmost to prevent starvation in the world. We must do our utmost to aid nations in the recovery of their own productivity. That underlies peace and progress on earth.

But the greatest danger to all civilization is for us to impair our economy by drains which cripple our own productivity. Unless this one remaining Gibraltar of economic strength is maintained, chaos will be inevitable over the whole world.

To discover the common-sense course requires clear objectives and organization on our part. The burden is beyond our resources unless there is immediate unity and cooperation among other nations to lessen our unnecessary burdens and thus enable the application of our resources to the most effective use.

THE ECONOMICS OF THE PROBLEM

Too often gifts and loans to foreign peoples are visualized as just money transactions. The only way money of important volume can be transferred from one nation to another is by goods (including gold) and services. Therefore, when we make a gift, credit, or loan, it is not money that we transfer; it is goods and services. There is thus a direct relationship of exports to the volume of loans and gifts.

While exports to pay for our imports cause us no difficulty, it must be recognized that we cannot safely, through gifts and loans, export more goods than our surplus. And the surplus applies to specific commodities, for we do not produce a surplus in all kinds of goods. If we ship more than our surplus we are taking it from the standard of living of the American people. Further, the immediate result of exporting more than a surplus in our free economy is to raise prices. From that we get a dangerous spiral of increased costs of living and wages.

OUR PRESENT ECONOMIC SITUATION

To appraise our present national situation, it is necessary to examine our experience in the 2 years since the war. In so doing, many debit and credit items must be estimated. We must estimate the exports, including Army supplies to foreign civilians, and we must estimate imports of the last months of the present fiscal year. Until full data are available many months hence, the sums given must be considered as illustrative of the situation.

Our exports of goods and services in dollars were about as follows:

	1945–46	1946–47
Exports	$13,500,000,000	$15,500,000,000
Imports	7,200,000,000	7,700,000,000
Excess of exports over imports	6,300,000,000	7,800,000,000

We have provided for the excess of exports over imports by loans or gifts.

An examination of the sources and amounts of these loans and gifts for the combined 2 years since the war were about as follows:

We have provided about $4,500,000,000 in gifts from our Government through relief. We have provided about $1,500,000,000 in gifts by our citizens for relief and by way of remittances to relatives abroad.

We have provided about $5,500,000,000 in credits by Government agencies including the Export-Import Bank loans, subscription to the World Bank and the Stabilization Fund. Loans by these institutions are, in the final analysis, largely drafts on American dollars and are dependent upon us for resources to maintain their operations. We have provided about $1,500,000,000 in private credits and loans.

Thus we have provided in the last 2 years about $6,000,000,000 in relief and gifts together with about $7,000,000,000 in loans or credits, or a total of $13,000,000,000. The differences between these amounts and the trade deficits given above are no doubt accounted for by drawing upon previous foreign dollar balances in the United States.

OUR COMMITMENTS FOR THE NEXT 12 MONTHS

The estimated unexpended balances of appropriations and various credit commitments to foreign nations on July 1, 1947, are not included in the above. They already amount to over $5,000,000,000. We should add further probable loans and expected private gifts of $1,000,000,000. And we must add unknown further calls from the World Bank and Stabilization Funds.

There is also a further liability of the United States in the shape of the foreign deposits in American banks, including earmarked gold and foreign ownership of American securities. These aggregate at least $14,000,000,000. We must at all times be prepared to meet their withdrawal. Some withdrawals are likely to be used to pay for exports during next year, thus increasing the total volume of exports required from us. And to all these commitments and liabilities we must add the exports necessary to pay for our imports amounting to probably $7,500,000,000.

Any study of our international balance sheet, taking into account, on one hand, our commitments in loans, foreign deposits, and investments in the United States, etc., and

on the other hand probable returns from previous loans and lend-lease, including our citizens' greatly impaired foreign investments, will likely discover that the United States is today a debtor rather than a creditor nation.

There is another angle of our national situation that we cannot ignore. These gifts and loans to foreign nations are spent in current purchase of goods. These gifts are an immediate burden on the taxpayer. The goods furnished under loans also must be paid for immediately while the repayment is deferred for years. This has a bearing upon our tax burdens. Including local government expenditures, they now amount to about 35 percent of our national income. No free nation can continue at that rate for long without impairing its productivity.

To pay for our imports and to satisfy the probable gift and loan commitments already made for the next fiscal year, and assuming present prices, we would need export at about the the same ratio as during the past 2 years $14,000,000,000 to $16,000,000,000 annually of goods and services.

A TEST OF THE LIMITS OF LOANS AND RELIEF

The most definite test of the extent of our ability to aid foreign nations is whether we have been overexporting our resources during the past 2 years, and thus unduly straining our economy. For example, we have exported gigantic amounts of agricultural products. During the past 12 months the index of our cost of living has advanced more than 20 percent. Increases in the cost of agricultural products were responsible for about 70 percent of this increase. This has contributed greatly to set in motion the inflation spiral of increasing wages with more increases in prices. A good deal of economic disorder and waste was created by interruptions in production in making these adjustments.

Other examples could be cited. Some of our exports have been taken from our own possible railway, factory, and housing reconstruction. Some part of the rise in prices of these materials is due to exports. So much have prices risen in the construction industries with the accompanying wage spiral and costs, that we now have considerable unemployment in these trades while at the same time, the country is crying for homes and buildings.

I would not contend that the whole rise in living costs, with its inflation spiral has been due to our large exports. But it cannot be denied that with fewer exports that increase would not have been so great.

The conclusion seems to me irrefutable that as the result of our rate of giving and lending we are overexporting goods and cannot continue at such a rate with our present production and consumption without further evil consequences to our stability.

We cannot estimate how much the curtailment in exports, and hence in giving and lending to finance the trade deficit, might be for the next year until we are able to estimate our next year's surplus in agriculture and other major commodities.

While the world situation requires that we do our best, my own view is that, unless we can undertake to increase our productivity or decrease our consumption of goods, we must seriously reduce the volume of exports below the rate of the last 2 years with a corresponding reduction in the gifts and loans for which we supply goods.

Various proposals have been made for expansion of loans by fifty or more billion dollars. The impracticability of these ideas with our present rate of production must be obvious.

STRAIN ON OUR NATURAL RESOURCES

There is a further question of the impairment of our natural resources involved in the export of such materials as iron, oil, metals, lumber, and some other items. As our resources in this sort of commodities are not renewable, their shipment abroad is a depletion of our resources and a charge against our future economy. While such exports may be necessary to restore the world, we cannot ignore the consequences.

POSSIBILITIES OF INCREASING OUR AIDS AND MAKING THEM MORE EFFECTIVE

There are certain measures which have been suggested as enabling us to better bear the load or to increase our exports and to make more effective our aid to foreign countries.

EXPORTING GOLD

1. It has been suggested that we can export gold from our seeming large stocks and thus enable other nations to buy elsewhere than in the United States. With our present requirements for currency and bank reserves, and to cover the very large foreign-demand deposits in our banks, it is necessary that we hold a large stock in reserve. The amount of gold that we have free of such necessities is not material in this situation.

INCREASING IMPORTS BY STOCK PILING

2. One proposal is that we at once import more goods and thus diminish the amount of gifts and loans necessary to furnish. This is a very minor help in the immediate world situation. It would be no help to the world to import materials into the United States which are needed elsewhere. Nor would it help to import goods which we ourselves produce economically. That would create unemployment in the United States and weaken our productivity.

There is, however, a method of increasing our imports which should have serious consideration. We could import and stock pile for national defense many commodities, both those we do not produce and those in which our natural resources are being depleted. We do not have enough of such resources to assure our national defense. Commodities of this kind are tin, manganese, iron ore, mercury, copper, lead, zinc, tungsten, chromite, nickel, and rubber. There are few immediate surpluses of these commodities abroad, but such surpluses will be available within a reasonable time. It happens that few of such commodities are produced by our direct debtors, but our purchase of them would, through multilateral trade, strengthen the whole international financial structure and we would be receiving commodities instead of obligations.

REESTABLISHMENT OF WARTIME CONTROL MEASURES

3. Another proposal is that we reestablish wartime control measures to increase our productivity or reduce our consumption and thus increase our ability to export more goods. The seeming warranty of this idea arises out of the fact that we exported in goods and services over $15,000,000,000 in some war years in addition to many billions in supplies to our armies. But we must remember that war-purpose production was greatly expanded and consumption restricted through war-inspired patriotic impulses.

The restoration of these controls would require again the abolition of the production of important commodities; the restoration of longer work hours in labor; the return of women to industry and agriculture, rationing of most commodities, and total Government control of all economic activities. That is a form of totalitarian economy which the American people are not likely to accept in peace for it would do violence to our whole concept of freedom. Moreover, without emotional background of fighting for national defense, such measures would more likely decrease than increase our productivity.

A METHOD OF INCREASING FOOD EXPORTS

4. Should the next world harvest indicate dangerous shortages, it is possible to increase our food exports for limited periods by voluntarily reducing our own food consumption and altering certain food manufacturing practices. We have here a great spiritual impulse to save starving people. And we may be called upon to do it again unless there is a world increase in food production.

COOPERATION OF OTHER NATIONS VITAL TO SALVATION

5. A most productive field of action by which the limited American economic resources can be made more effective for world reconstruction lies in cooperation of foreign nations in the political field.

The obstruction of the Soviet Government to peace has, during the past 2 years, imposed billions in expenditures upon us through support of occupation armies and relief to starvation which would not otherwise have been required. However, we can apparently expect little cooperation from that quarter.

But if there were full mutual cooperation from the other nations, it would lessen our burdens and divert much of our dead loss expenditures to more constructive channels abroad.

For instance, cooperation in the three western zones in Germany and in Japan to abolish the inhibitions on their productivity due to wrong concepts of reparations, and levels of industry, would increase their productivity and exports, and thus would greatly reduce the drains upon us for food and other supplies. Restoration of their productivity would aid all other nations. Cooperative action to speed peace, such as I recently outlined in a letter to Congressman TABER would greatly reduce demands upon us.

Such cooperation would allow our resources to flow into channels more beneficial to all the world.

POLICIES TO BE ADOPTED

In my view we need to develop or expand the following policies, some of which are already partially in action.

1. We must have in our own foreign economic relations single, coordinated action in all direct and indirect agencies of government—the relief funds, the Export-Import Bank, the World Bank, the Stabilization Fund, the Federal Reserve System, and all those agencies which administer our exports. We must consolidate our front if we are to succeed in our policies.

2. We must prevent excessive exports and by so doing reduce excessive prices. In the matter of food we should begin about August 1 with the new harvest.

3. If necessary to prevent starvation we should increase our available export surplus volume by voluntary reduction of consumption by the public and alteration of some trade practices.

4. We should periodically estimate the goods and services which we can safely export and limit purchases of our commodities by limiting gifts and loans.

5. We should prepare to stock pile for national defense certain commodities from abroad when they are available in surplus.

6. We should bluntly insist that in return for our sacrifices, which are inherent in all loans and gifts, that all nations recipient of our economic aid cooperate with us in measures to reduce the burdens upon us, to promote productivity and bring peace for the world at large.

7. We should insist upon certain principles in operation of gifts and loans, whether directly from our Government or through Government-supported agencies. These principles involve important questions of security, inspection of use, and application to the utmost in increase of productivity.

8. We should concentrate our limited resources in the areas in which western civilization can be preserved.

This problem can be solved if there is prompt unity and mutual aid between other

nations, resolution on their part to build back their productivity, and if we act, on our side, with sense and devotion in this great crisis of mankind.

Yours faithfully,

HERBERT HOOVER.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time taken by the Senator from New Jersey will be charged equally to both sides.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for yielding.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Murray
Baldwin	Hawkes	Myers
Ball	Hayden	O'Conor
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Holland	Overton
Bridges	Ives	Pepper
Brooks	Jenner	Reed
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Kem	Robertson, Wyo.
Byrd	Kilgore	Russell
Cain	Knowland	Saltonstall
Capehart	Langer	Smith
Capper	Lodge	Sparkman
Chavez	Lucas	Taft
Connally	McCarran	Taylor
Cooper	McCarthy	Thye
Cordon	McClellan	Tydings
Donnell	McFarland	Umstead
Downey	McGrath	Vandenberg
Dworshak	McKellar	Watkins
Eastland	McMahon	Wherry
Ecton	Magnuson	White
Ellender	Malone	Wiley
Ferguson	Martin	Williams
Fulbright	Maybank	Wilson
George	Millikin	Young
Green	Moore	
Gurney	Morse	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Two hours and ten minutes remain available for debate. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] controls 1 hour and 5 minutes, and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] controls 1 hour and 5 minutes.

Mr. AIKEN. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 10 minutes.

INVESTIGATION OF HIGH PRICES OF CONSUMER GOODS

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, for nearly 6 months, the Eightieth Congress has been in session dealing with a number of important concerns of the American people. However, in those 6 months, I have heard little discussion of—and no solution suggested with respect to—the gravest domestic problem facing our country today, which is the problem of high prices.

If we can say that the American people were more concerned about one subject than any other at the time of the elections last fall, I think that concern was about prices. Yet, we have, so far in the present Congress, made only a few references to the question and have provided no positive specific action, nor has the administration done so. There is little point in political recriminations about the matter at this time. I do not believe our people are nearly so much interested in placing the blame as they are in lowering the prices. After having seen the failure of price-control measures and recognizing the necessity for the operation of a free economy, we on this side of the aisle, in all good faith, assured the people of the country that the decontrol of prices would bring the relief they so sorely needed. Now, it seems to me, it is up to us to demonstrate that we can, and will, do something to provide lower prices, particularly on the necessities our people now find it most difficult to buy.

Experience in the past has shown that we cannot adequately legislate against high prices. Prices are so deeply entangled in economic cause and effect and reaction that they cannot be easily or completely affected through some single legislative action or by controls.

However, the fact is perfectly clear that something can and must be done to change the growing trend toward higher prices. When one finds new cars being sold in second-hand lots at prices from $400 to $600 above the manufacturers' stated prices; when one sees $2 shirts selling for $4 and $5; when one sees steaks nearing $1 a pound, and the price of the less expensive cuts also increasing proportionately, he realizes that there is something fundamentally wrong with our pricing system. It is very difficult to compare certain prices. For example, it is difficult to compare 58-cent-price-controlled butter that could not be obtained, with $1-black-market butter, or with 69-cent-uncontrolled butter. It is true in some fields that shortages are still causing high prices. This is particularly true in the case of certain manufactured articles the demand for which is still far ahead of supply. However, in the case of certain other items, such as basic food necessities, there is every reason to believe that supplies are adequate. Yet prices are still high. This trend upward has been accelerated since the war, until now we find by comparing prices on comparable items, they are probably the highest in our history. Under such conditions, we cannot, as a Nation, continue or improve the high standard of living that has made us the envy of the world and that has made possible our position as the leading Nation today.

According to Bureau of Labor statistics, food prices as of April 1947 are 93 percent higher than in January 1941 and 33 percent higher than in April 1946. Clothing prices are now 82 percent higher than in 1941 and 20 percent higher than a year ago. Food prices, particularly, have seriously affected all our people. Bread prices, for example, have jumped from 8.6 cents in 1941, to 10.6 cents in 1946, to 12 cents in March 1947. Milk—in the same period—has gone from 14 cents to 16 cents, to 19 cents. Potatoes have gone from 39 cents to 75 cents, and now 68 cents a peck. Taking the price index from 1935 to 1939 as 100, children's shoes have jumped from an index of 115 in 1941, to 147 in 1946, to 194 in 1947. Men's shirts have moved from an index of 110 to 183, to 246. These few illustrations should serve to demonstrate the violent increases in price our people have suffered. As we well know, the incomes of many of our people—perhaps most of them—have by no means been increased comparably. While it is most difficult accurately to picture this price condition statistically, any housewife can tell us in irrefutable terms what these costs mean to her family.

The Congress is representative of all the people in all the States. In every sense, it must be the eyes to see what is going wrong in our country and—seeing it—take measures to correct it. It must likewise be the ears for all the people to listen for what is going wrong and—hearing it—take measures to correct what needs correction. Since the administration has shown no disposition to date to cope effectively with this very important problem, there is every reason why Congress should ascertain at the earliest date why prices are high, what corrective measures can be taken, and then to formulate and to put into operation such measures.

It seems to me, therefore, that it is high time that on both sides of the aisle we regard this question as fundamental and nonpolitical. The Senator from Connecticut does not believe anyone of us here has so little faith in our free-enterprise system that he would involuntarily return to the confusion, shortages, and black markets that typified our wartime control of prices. Now it is up to all of us, regardless of party, to do our part to make that American system work. It is high time that we quit talking about high prices and start doing something about them. If exorbitant profits are being made, let us find that out. It is possible that artificial shortages are being created. If that is so, let us find that out. It is possible that increased wages and lower production are the answer—though statistics indicate wages alone cannot account for the increase. I do not pretend to know at this time the detailed causes. However, it seems to me, it is time we do something about it. All of our people are deeply worried about the high cost of plain living—the cost of food, the cost of housing. For that reason, Mr. President, the junior Senator from Connecticut is submitting a concurrent resolution requiring that a joint congres-

sional committee be appointed to begin an immediate, comprehensive investigation and report to the Congress not later than March of next year as to what, in their opinion, the causes are, and what, in their opinion, can be done to give our people just and needed relief. The hour is already late. Let us hope the Members of the Senate will need no urging to join in this common effort to solve what all of us know is the most pressing daily problem our people face.

At this time, Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution authorizing the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House to appoint such a committee.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 19) was received and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is hereby established a joint committee to be composed of five Members of the Senate (not more than three of whom shall be members of the same political party) to be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, and five Members of the House of Representatives (not more than three of whom shall be members of the same political party) to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Vacancies in the membership of the committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the joint committee (1) to make a full and complete study and investigation of the present high prices of consumer goods and (2) to report to the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than March 1, 1948, the results of its study and investigation together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem desirable.

SEC. 3. (a) The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

(b) The joint committee is empowered to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for comparable duties.

(c) The expenses of the joint committee, which shall not exceed $100,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of disbursements so made.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator will probably be interested to know that the Joint Committee on the Economic Report will begin hearings on Tuesday next, which will continue during the next 30 days, and to which have been invited most of the leading industrialists of the country and representatives of all the agencies which have statistical organizations dealing with the general question of wages, prices, maintenance of employment, and prosperity in general. The Senator is invited to attend those hearings. So far as I can see, the committee is doing exactly what the Senator thinks such a committee should do.

Mr. BALDWIN. If that is so, I can only join with the rest of the people of the United States in rejoicing over it, and in hoping that there may be speedy action.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Connecticut has expired.

PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAM FOR WOOL—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 814) to provide support for wool, and for other purposes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS].

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I may say by way of introduction that much of what the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] has just said makes sense, and good, common sense. If the Senator from Ohio had not done so, I would have reminded the Senator from Connecticut that at long last the Joint Committee on the Economic Report has gotten around to consider the very subject which is worrying the Senator from Connecticut so much. Unfortunately, we have waited all too long, I believe, to look into this subject, which is so serious. I think the Congress should have given time and attention to it long ago.

But in the Congress of the United States we have been endeavoring to lower taxes for the rich and raise rents for the poor. We have been inviting a return to the days of dog-eat-dog economics. We have placed the housewife at the mercy of the profiteer. We have attempted to emasculate the wage-hour law, and we have attempted to break unions up into tiny little segments so that they can be taken one by one, just as Hitler took the nations of Europe one by one until he had gobbled up the entire continent. I think it all ties in together. I think the bill under discussion, the wool bill, ties into this situation.

In this morning's issue of the Philadelphia Inquirer I came across a rather disturbing editorial. I may say that the Philadelphia Inquirer espouses a political philospohy to which I do not subscribe, but it is one of the finest and most influential newspapers in the United States. It has constantly supported Republican candidates for office and has constantly and regularly supported the Republican ticket.

This editorial is directed to the present session of the Pennsylvania Legislature, which completed its deliberations on Tuesday evening of this week after five and a half months of sessions.

Mr. President, the Governor of Pennsylvania is a Republican, and a fine man, a real gentleman, a patriotic American. The Legislature of Pennsylvania, in both houses, is overwhelmingly Republican. This Republican newspaper, in its issue of this morning, has this to say in the opening paragraph of an editorial entitled "'Tobacco Road' Session Ends in Failure":

Perhaps the major accomplishment of the session of the Pennsylvania Assembly just ended was its final adjournment at 10:20 o'clock Tuesday night.

In the last few paragraphs of the editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer I find the following:

Home rule, racketeers' extortions, the threat of skyrocketing rents, the whiplash of prejudice held over workers by certain employers: all these meant nothing to the Tobacco Roaders.

They clung to their selfish, narrowly political, amazingly behind-the-times views, and they swung their votes that way.

The wonder of it is that the recent session achieved anything worth while at all.

But its accomplishments are marred forever by its failures, its malingering, its incompetence. It will go down in history as the Tobacco Road legislature.

What worries me is this: If we here in the Congress continue to malinger, if we continue to avoid the very things which the Senator from Connecticut brought to our attention today, if we continue to close our eyes to the grave dangers on the home front, if we continue to snipe at the foreign policy of our Government, as this bill does, then this session of the Eightieth Congress may become known as the Tobacco Road session.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of June 19, 1947]

TOBACCO ROAD SESSION ENDS IN FAILURE

Perhaps the major accomplishment of the session of the Pennsylvania Assembly just ended was its final adjournment at 10:20 o'clock Tuesday night.

For up to that time, all through the wearisome weeks since January, its record was mainly one of dismal failure.

Few sessions in the history of the State had the opportunity to enact more urgently needed laws, only to waste that opportunity with Tobacco Road legislating of the worst kind; legislating that smacks of the backwoods and a refusal to keep in step with modern times.

It is typical of the Tobacco Road state of mind to keep the session dawdling on for weeks without important accomplishment, and then as adjournment neared to tie the business of the assembly into hopeless knots of confusion.

On the credit side is passage of legislation opening the way for insurance companies to develop large housing projects in Philadelphia; permitting Pennsylvania to have community-property laws such as a number of other States enjoy, with resultant reductions in income taxes for married couples; and regulating automobile financing practices so as

to put an end to the extortionate overcharges that have been prevalent.

Measures to reduce the rates of unemployment compensation charges levied upon employers under the merit rating system and to provide $89,000,000 for new construction at State mental hospitals, including Byberry, may also be put down as substantial accomplishments.

Certain approved labor regulations are desirable, such as the ban on strikes by State and city employees, including school teachers and essential public-utility workers, and the denial of unemployment compensation to strikers. But a number of other proposed regulations were lost in the shuffle.

Higher pay for teachers is made possible by the legislature, and local tax bases broadened to help out in this connection. But the manner in which this was performed for Philadelphia—by the imposition of a mercantile license and an additional personal-property tax—cannot be accepted as perfect because the amount of money collected may fall far short of the need.

It is in the session's outright sins of omission, however, that the members have proved mainly delinquent.

They refused to pass a fair-employment-practice bill that would have made it unlawful for anyone to deny employment because of race, religion, or color.

They refused to wipe out the disgraceful racket in new-car sales.

They refused to give communities the home-rule right of deciding for themselves whether they wish to add hockey to the list of sports permitted on Sundays.

They refused to protect rent payers with a rent-control law that would have been in effect after Federal controls are lifted.

They refused to reapportion the State's legislative districts to give the people fair representation at Harrisburg for the first time in 25 years.

They refused to outlaw the Ku Klux Klan.

They refused—the Tobacco Road Republicans holding the balance of power—to legislate for the people. They insisted on blockading measure after measure that would have benefited our State.

They have no excuse. They cannot say they did not have ample time—the session stretched on for 5 months. They cannot say they did not understand the various issues—the Inquirer kept pounding away for weeks stressing the desirability of various bills and urging their passage.

Home rule, racketeers' extortions, the threat of skyrocketing rents, the whiplash of prejudice held over workers by certain employers—all these meant nothing to the Tobacco Roaders.

They clung to their selfish, narrowly political, amazingly behind-the-times views, and they swung their votes that way.

The wonder of it is that the recent session achieved anything worth while at all.

But its accomplishments are marred forever by its failures, its malingering, its incompetence. It will go down in history as the Tobacco Road legislature.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I am deeply worried and concerned about the dark shadows cast by the pending wool bill. We have advanced hundreds of millions of dollars to countries all over the world. For what purpose? We have advanced that money to shelter the homeless and to feed the hungry and clothe the naked. I think we have advanced these moneys too in our own intelligent self-interest, as the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] has so often said. I was and I am thoroughly in accord with this policy, and I congratulate him for the bipartisan leadership which he has given to our present foreign policy. However, I fear that if this bill passes we shall give notice to the other countries of the world that we are abandoning the course which we have followed for some years past.

We cannot carry the world on our back. This we all realize. We can lend money to other countries to enable them to rehabilitate themselves, to assist them along the road to economic recovery.

But of course this is but a temporary and immediately necessary aid. Eventually they must help themselves and the only way they can do so is by engaging in trade with us and with all the world. But this bill gives notice to the nations assembled at the Geneva Conference, and to all the world, that our brave words of reciprocal trade and the lowering of trade barriers are just words—only words. It is notice to the world that we are returning to a policy of isolationism. If we follow that course if we adopt this conference report, our entire foreign policy may be in jeopardy. So I sincerely hope that the Senate will vote down the conference report, because of the world-wide repercussions which may follow. If the Senate approves the conference report, I hope the President will veto the bill. If he does, I hope that his veto will be sustained.

Mr. President, we have offered our assistance and our aid to those countries which subscribe to the kind of democracy in which we believe. I hope we will continue to help those countries which respect the will of the majority of their peoples. If we do there is a chance that we may ultimately achieve that world of decency and of human freedom which we all hoped for during the days of World War II.

But if we retreat now—and this bill is one of the first steps in a retreat—the nations of the world may well be driven into the all-embracing arms of communistic totalitarianism. They may conclude at this crucial hour that America is only whispering honeyed words, and that although we have loaned them some money and have said to them, "We hope you can finally rehabilitate yourselves with this help," we have in reality turned our backs on them, and said, "We will take none of your trade. We will take none of your business. Where then Mr. President will they turn in their desperate search for a road back to economic recovery. Will they turn to trade blocs, sterling blocs, or a sphere of influence in which we may not have any part—a sphere of influence in which we have no influence?

So, Mr. President, while America takes firm and courageous stands on international issues presenting what appears to be a united bipartisan front in behalf of freedom and decency for all peoples everywhere, little men, arrogant little men wield their hatchets on the appropriations necessary to carry out our commitments, and scream in dismay at every dollar spent here or abroad for the purpose of strengthening democracy. They beat their breasts to emphasize the platitudes they speak about as the American way, but they do their mightiest to return America to the ways of isolationism internationally and jungle economics domestically. Disaster follows either course.

If we back out of Europe now, tail first, talking "international cooperation"—and this wool bill, Mr. President, is the start of backing out of Europe tail first—at the same time we retreat from the responsibilities which go with it—world trade is one of those responsibilities, Mr. President; reciprocal trade is one of those responsibilities, and this measure jeopardizes the reciprocal trade program, then, I say, God help those throughout the world who look to us for freedom, for certainly there will be no one else to help them.

And if they go down into the sea of despair which invites expanding totalitarianism, then, I say, God help America, for alone we cannot stand off a world which envied us the wealth we squander so recklessly on nonessentials while denying a fraction of our bounty to save the lives of millions of hungry, cold, and hopeless men, women, and children.

Mr. President, every newspaper editorial I have read, every letter I have received, is concerned over the threat to our reciprocal trade program by this wool bill. I ask unanimous consent, that at the close of my remarks there be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD certain editorials and news articles from various newspapers in Pennsylvania.

I know of no one in my State who is in favor of the pending legislation. So, Mr. President, not only because of its domestic effects, not only because of the complications which will be occasioned on the home front, but particularly and more importantly because of the series of dire consequences to our whole international policy, I hope and trust, that the conference report will be rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania to have inserted in the RECORD certain editorials is granted.

The editorials referred to are as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor]

WOOLEN TORPEDO

It may not sound very dangerous—a torpedo of wool—but it is. Let's get the story from the beginning:

Before the war ended, statesmen in many nations began to plan for economic peace in the world as one base for political and military peace. A prime factor in economic peace, they decided, was a freer movement of goods between countries. To that end, they sought ways to lower tariffs and other artificial barriers by reciprocal agreements.

A key move in this program was the enactment last year of a new Trade Agreements Act by Congress. This gave the President authority to negotiate pacts reducing the American tariff on specific imports by as much as 50 percent in exchange for similar reductions by other countries. With this authority, the United States arranged a conference at Geneva to work out such reciprocal plans for giving world trade more freedom.

Meanwhile, a new Congress was elected. It was controlled largely by men who believed in high tariffs. There were reports that they would repeal the Trade Agreements Act of 1946, but apparently they decided not to try. Instead, they began to undermine its operations. Some of them served open notice that other nations could

not depend on trade agreements with America to last after expiration of the act next year.

Also, they found a weapon. It is a proposal to raise the already high tariff on wool by an extra import fee sufficient to make it difficult for other countries to ship wool to the United States. The House of Representatives off-handedly passed this bill, which tends to increase the cost of every yard of woolen goods used in America.

If the Senate should also pass it, Mr. Truman would almost surely veto it. But much of the damage would have been done. Other countries would have had notice from Congress that groups of producers with special interests are still powerful enough in the United States to block a general program for reducing trade barriers—even at the expense of the general interest of the consumers. And, as Secretary Marshall warns, "Wool is a symbol of our intentions in foreign trade."

There is your "wool torpedo." And if the American people do not want it to blow up the Geneva conference and the most hopeful steps for economic peace, they should let Congress know—soon and emphatically.

[From the Pittsburgh Press of June 16, 1947]

THE WOOL GRAB

Of course, President Truman will have to veto the wool-tariff bill.

No more greedy, senseless, and untimely measure has even been considered by this Congress.

Here our Government is lending and giving away billions of dollars to other countries because they haven't the exchange to buy goods which we produce and they need.

Wool is one commodity which some other countries have that they could trade for our goods—if we would only buy more wool from them. Yet, our Government has accumulated 430,000,000 pounds of domestic wool, which it can't sell at less than the price-support level of 42 cents a pound, a price higher than our own people can pay. And we already have a tariff of 34 cents a pound against wool imports.

Now along comes Congress with a bill proposing a 50-percent addition to the tariff. And at a time when, under the initiative of our own Government, an international trade conference is being held at Geneva to reduce barriers to commerce.

Fortunately, the Republicans will not have enough votes in Congress to override the veto. And between now and the next election there should be enough time to educate the GOP on some of the economic facts of our present world, which is in the shape it is largely because of the Fordneys and McCumbers and Smoots and Hawleys of days gone by.

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette]

WOOL AND WAR

The wool-grab bill, by which this country would revive its suicidal high-tariff policies of the twenties, is almost certain to be passed by Congress. This bill would not only retain the present duties on wool but would require the President either to raise them or to impose quotas whenever imports were found to be reducing the amount of domestic fiber produced.

The immediate effect of the bill will be to sabotage the efforts of our State Department officials who are now negotiating reciprocal agreements with representatives of 18 nations at Geneva. It is questionable whether these nations can now place much credence in our pious words about freeing world trade when our legislative actions prove us hell-bent for economic isolationism.

The wool tariff hits most of all the British Empire, that family of nations which should provide our closest allies. For example, almost 90 percent of Australia's exports to this country—and a large part of New Zealand's—are accounted for by wool. If we are to close our markets to these Dominions, we shall not only invite a resumption of the Empire preferential system but will set an example in those discriminatory trade practices which are the sure harbingers of war.

Unless all our postwar foreign policy is to go by the board, President Truman must veto—and Congress must sustain his veto of—the wool-tariff bill.

[From the Pittsburgh Press]

GOP ATTACKS TRADE POLICY IN WOOL DEBATE—CALLS FOR RETURN OF HIGH TARIFFS

(By Charles T. Lucey)

WASHINGTON, May 23.—House consideration of a bill authorizing a higher import duty on wool today brought a Republican frontal attack on the whole reciprocal trade program. It had GOP Members calling for a return of the good old days of the Smoot-Hawley tariff.

Heated floor debate turned the congressional clock back 20 years as Republicans called for a traditional party tariff stand and Democrats warned of retaliation from abroad such as followed passage of past high-tariff laws.

Administration officials fear that signs of revival of the old protectionist spirit apparent in the fight on wool will mean trouble when the reciprocal-trade law comes up for extension next year.

CONFERENCE JEOPARDIZED

Already, according to State Department people, the proposed higher tariff on wool has jeopardized the success of the current Geneva Conference studying world reduction of trade barriers.

Under Secretary of State William L. Clayton told the House, in a letter read by Democratic Whip JOHN MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, that "if * * * when we are negotiating at Geneva, we raise new barriers as this bill proposes, we stand convicted of insincerity."

From Republican Representative HAROLD KNUTSON, of Minnesota, Ways and Means Committee chairman, came a sharp answer by way of appointment of a special subcommittee to study the whole subject of what the United States representatives are proposing at the 21-nation Geneva meeting.

UNITED STATES POSITION WEAKENED

Mr. Clayton flew home from Switzerland a few days ago after word of the proposed higher wool tariff, reaching there, had weakened the position of the United States delegation.

Mr. KNUTSON also said it seemed the entire American wool industry was doomed as the price of shipping a few autos to Australia, and he warned that Geneva conferees should be on notice that Congress is in no mood to destroy one domestic industry so that another might ship surpluses abroad.

The wool bill started as a measure simply to continue the Government's wool-support-price program, which already has cost the taxpayers $38,000,000 and piled Government warehouses high with a 40,000,000-pound wool surplus. The program increases woolen goods' costs to consumers.

[The House today rejected a proposal to reduce the Government's support price for wool from 42.1 cents a pound to 38 cents. The vote was 110 to 56.]

But the House Agriculture Committee added a section authorizing also a new import fee on wool, up to 50 percent of value, beyond the 34-cents-a-pound tariff now levied on cleaned wool.

The GOP high-tariff position was reiterated by Representative ROBERT RICH, Clinton County, Pa., Republican, who proposed direct action by adding a tariff of 8 or 10 cents a pound in addition to the existing tariff.

FOR THE GOOD OLD DAYS

"I'm of the old school," he shouted to the House. "The Republican Party always stood for a tariff and I'm for it today. Let's get back to the good old days."

Representative MCCORMACK asked "if he meant the good old Smoot-Hawley days."

"No, no—I mean yes," replied Mr. RICH.

HOUSE ACTION ON WOOL BILL JARS OUR WORLD TRADE PLANS

(By Marquis Childs)

WASHINGTON, June 3.—Under Secretary of State Will Clayton is a tall, soft-spoken Texan who believes deeply in free enterprise and free trade. As a free trader, starting from scratch, Will Clayton has built one of the impressive private fortunes of his generation.

Now he is serving the Government as conscientiously as he once served his own private interest. His job is not an easy one. He is trying to persuade the other countries of the world that it is possible to revive the free-trade pattern.

The State Department has a plan for an international trade organization. But before the other nations will accept that plan they want us to show our good faith by reducing tariffs and indicating in other ways that we intend to accept imports from abroad.

In April, Clayton went to Geneva, Switzerland, to promote the world trade idea at an international conference. In the middle of that conference, Congress threatened to pull the rug out from under the American proposals at Geneva. Clayton flew back to Washington to argue his case, not with skeptical foreigners, but with doubting and resentful Members of Congress.

This is how the House put the world trade plan in jeopardy. The House passed a bill which would make it possible under certain circumstances to raise by 90 percent the tariff on wool coming into the United States. We were telling anybody who cared to listen that, instead of lowering tariffs, we proposed to raise them.

The House bill represented the pressure of wool growers in this country to get a guaranteed market. They produce only a small fraction of the wool we use, and they produce it at a high cost and at a small margin of profit to themselves, if any. Yet they are distributed in States with comparatively scant population and so they can make their political weight felt.

The wool story is a long and complicated one. During the war, our Government bought wool at a support price, and the Government now holds 500,000,000 pounds which cannot be sold under present law. The price has dropped to about half that of the wartime support price.

The Senate adopted a wool bill that did not contain the provision for a 50 percent boost in tariff. There is a good chance that the Senate point of view will prevail and that the 50 percent provision in the House bill will be knocked out. Even Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, who comes from one of the wool States, has said he is for compromise since he is convinced the President would veto the House bill and he wants help for wool growers in the form of a domestic subsidy.

When Clayton first returned from Geneva, he went down under an attack of flu. Now, after administration of large doses of penicillin, he is well enough to go up to Capitol Hill to battle for his goal.

Much harm has already been done by the action of the House. It was an indication to the delegates at Geneva of an attitude exactly the opposite of that which Clayton was urging. Perhaps if the final outcome is favorable, the damage can be repaired.

But one must say frankly that this is a forlorn hope. The pressures that developed to protect the wool farmers will certainly be exerted again when farmers in other fields

begin to find the going rough. Unless there is powerful and continuing resistance, the shadow of the wool bill may prove to be the shadow of the shape of things to come.

There is another pattern. It is the pattern of subsidies, of dumping on the world market, of imperialism.

If the plans for a world trade organization fail, that is the way it will go. The producer will be given a domestic subsidy. Under the subsidy the Government is likely to acquire surplus stocks. Then comes the pressure to unload those stocks. They cannot be disposed of at home without upsetting the support price. So they are dumped onto the world market.

This means a kind of competition that is in actuality economic warfare. We shall be competing on this level with Argentina and the Soviet Union, which have put their trade under complete state control. The pressure to do the same thing in this country, in order to hold our own in that warfare, will be very great. So the hope of free enterprise goes glimmering.

The proposed hike in the wool tariff must be blocked. Similar pressures must be resisted. Clayton has fought a gallant fight and he deserves better of Congress.

[From the Washington Post of June 19, 1947]

SHEEP'S CLOTHING

House and Senate conferees have agreed on a mongrel measure for looking after our puny wool industry which would gouge the American consumer and promote corruption in the customs administration. Evidently the conferees were impressed by the objection that an import fee added to the present tariff would violate the letter of our existing trade agreements with a group of nations. Accordingly they adopted an alternative course of keeping out foreign wool, namely, the imposition of import quotas. Strange as it may seem, there is no specific ban on import quotas in any of our commercial pacts with foreign nations, though they would clearly violate their spirit. Doubtless nobody ever thought that the time would come when such a method of fighting the foreigner would be taken seriously. That this device has come out of the Eightieth Congress is no compliment to its sense of morality.

Let us think what might be expected to follow this novel method of propping up our wool growers at the consumers' expense. Congress would authorize the Administration to exclude 50 percent of an import trade that is now four times our domestic clip. What yardstick would the administrators pick? The easiest and doubtless the only practicable way would be to shut the ports to foreign wool as soon as the quota had been attained. That would start a race on the part of foreign suppliers to get their stuff into America. Clearly the factor of distance alone would promote discrimination and ill will. But it is the opening for graft on a grand scale that is the most dismaying thing about an import quota system. Wool is such an important item in the economy of Australia, New Zealand, Argentina, and Uruguay that they would do everything they could to obtain import permits. It is irresponsible of Congress to subject the customs administration to this temptation.

One import quota, of course, would deserve another. If this new method of fleecing the consumer succeeds, then we would have a line of sick and uneconomic industries buttonholing Congress for similar protection. The prospective hold-up should arouse the consumer. Already he is paying through the nose for his woolen goods. This new bill would subject him to another steal of monstrous proportions. It might seem surprising that the industry which finds such favor in the eyes of Congress is wool. Its product is worth only $120,000,000, or much less than one-thousandth of the national income. But wool, like silver, is well distributed, and 23 States (or, better put, 46 Senators) have a vested interest in it. And other States might not be averse to going along with the wool States in the hope that with the introduction of this new type of windfall from the public trough they might get theirs. One good turn always has earned another in tariff politics.

We have not discussed the international implications of this opening gun in the congressional declaration of economic war. The Geneva Conference on trade agreements might as well close up shop if the wool bill should be enacted. What our representatives are trying to do there is to establish economic peace. But the wool bill means economic war. It is a new technique in import restrictions which would persuade other nations to copy our example, with disastrous results on world and American trade. Our representatives also are trying to find ways and means of helping foreigners earn the dollars wherewith to buy our goods. The problem of the dollar shortage has now become a crisis of the first magnitude engaging the full-time attention of Secretary Marshall. But the wool bill would close an avenue for earning dollars and at the same time for aiding the American consumer. It thus flies in the face of our national interest. Cannot the national well-being make any dent at all upon men obsessed with selfish interests? The wool bill is the year's prize example of lunatic exploitation of the American consumer and the foreign supplier.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] yields 20 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH].

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, under the unanimous-consent agreement providing for limitation of time, it will be impossible for me to discuss at length and in detail all the matters affecting the wool producers of this country. There are many things that should be said. Some of the charges which have been made throughout the press, largely, I think, due to misunderstanding, ought to be answered. The stigma which has been heaped upon the producers of wool in this country ought to be removed. I would that I had the time today to answer the charges of selfishness and greed and unconcern about world affairs and international relations which have been made, ill-advisedly, against those who are engaged in the actual production of a basic American commodity. Some of the charges and some of the things which the Senator from Pensylvania [Mr. MYERS] has just said have given me grave concern.

When it is remembered that since the first reciprocal trade agreement was proposed in the Congress of the United States I have supported every measure, the original act and every extension of it, and not only that, but I have opposed every crippling provision which has been offered throughout the years, including even the one with reference to Argentine beef, it cannot be said that I am not concerned with world trade or international affairs. Considering that record, of which I am not ashamed, it may well be understood that when the House of Representatives added this particular amendment, I was deeply and gravely concerned lest it constitute the erection of a tariff barrier, the placing of an embargo, which would destroy trade which is vitally necessary, as the Senator has so well pointed out. But, Mr. President, if that were the case, if this bill were to have that effect, I would stand here with every man who opposes such a measure and use my voice and my vote to defeat it, no matter what might be the consequence to my own State; for I believe, Mr. President, that international trade is important; I believe that world trade flows across borders, as has been so often said, where armies do not march. I think it is important to the peace of the world that proper trade relations be maintained with all nations. So devoted am I to this principle, Mr. President, that when the amendment first came to my attention I not only gave it such consideration and study as I could give it myself, but I enlisted the advice and counsel of others, men of legal training and efficiency, men who had time to go into it carefully, or more time than I had. As a result of such study as I have given to the subject and of the advice which I have obtained, I am utterly convinced that the measure, even with the amendment proposed by the House, does not have the effect which has been so often attributed to it.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. MYERS. I take it that the Senator is in total disagreement with the Secretary of State and the Under Secretary of State as to the implications of this measure?

Mr. HATCH. When the Senator says "implications" I do not know just what is meant. Implications are of many kinds. I do know that if the Secretary of State or the Under Secretary of State says that this measure would produce limitations or undue restrictions upon the importation of wool, I believe they are wrong.

Mr. MYERS. Is the Senator in disagreement with the Under Secretary and the Secretary when they say that this amendment, if agreed to, will torpedo and wreck the Geneva Conference?

Mr. HATCH. I have no information as to that. I have not been to Geneva. I know what the respective gentlemen have said, and in their judgment and opinion I have the utmost confidence; but I say to the Senator that, if such is the case, it is an entirely unjustified contention, as I shall presently point out. It is based upon an element with which the Senator from Pennsylvania began his remarks. He said, "I fear." That is the way the Senator began his remarks. He does fear. Perhaps other nations fear. Against such fear I know of no successful defense except truth, and in order to dissipate some of the fears in the Senator's mind and perhaps in the minds of others, I shall truthfully point out what this measure does. But if we are to be ruled and regulated by fear, nothing but chaos will develop at home and abroad.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HATCH. I must remind the Senator that I am under a limitation as to time. I will yield this once.

Mr. MYERS. They are now engaged in negotiating new agreements and they fear the effect this measure may have upon such new agreements.

Mr. HATCH. I shall not discuss that question with the Senator.

Mr. MYERS. There is nothing certain or absolute, but there is a grave danger involved.

Mr. HATCH. I shall reach that point in a few moments if the Senator will permit me to proceed.

Mr. President, I have said that, if this measure had the effect which has just been ascribed to it, if it did arbitrarily raise the tariff duties, if it did impose what amounts to an embargo, I would vote against it, regardless of the consequences to my State. I go further than that, and say that I believe so much in the patriotism of the wool growers of New Mexico that if the effects which have just been ascribed to this measure were shown actually to exist, and if the results would be so chaotic as has been predicted, they would join me in casting that vote.

Mr. President, I have been diverted from the line of my remarks. I wonder whether the Chair can advise me how much time I have consumed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. HATCH. Very well.

It is true, Mr. President, that the wool growers want protection for their industry to the extent that they can have some measure of the profit and prosperity which prevails throughout other industries of the land. It may be true, Mr. President, that the products of their toil and occupation represent but a small part of the national income. This has been said so frequently I wonder if the thought is gaining strength and momentum that because an industry does not represent a great part of the national income, it may be well to wipe it out of existence and bankrupt and destroy those who are engaged in it. I doubt, Mr. President, the justice and wisdom of any such line of thought. I doubt whether it will appeal to any fair-minded citizen who will look at the facts as they actually exist and not as they are sometimes represented—or, rather, I am inclined to say, misrepresented—to be.

I, for one, Mr. President, notwithstanding my lifelong convictions as to reciprocity being the true basis of world trade, am not willing to single out one lone industry and say that it shall be destroyed and bankrupted, while others prosper and flourish under exactly the same conditions which would preserve and keep it alive. I am not willing to make goats out of sheep.

While the pending measure, Mr. President, has been one represented to be something in the nature of a wolf in sheep's clothing, I am not unmindful of the fact that there may also be contained within the bill itself and within some of those who prompted and caused the tariff provision to be written, something in the nature of a wolf disguised as a sheep. I am utterly convinced, Mr. President, that there are those—and I am not speaking of Members of Congress now—who wanted that provision in the bill, in the belief and in the hope that including it in the measure would cause its defeat either in the Congress or by a veto by the President which could not be overridden, and that as a consequence the whole support program for wool would collapse and that those interests which are concerned chiefly with obtaining cheap wool would thereby unduly profit and gain at the expense, loss, and perhaps bankruptcy, of the wool growers of America.

I shall not elaborate upon this subject today; but having served as a member of the Special Committee To Investigate Wool Trade and Practices, I learned many things about how the wool growers of this country in the past were deceived and even defrauded—which are mild terms compared with actual practices which our committee found to exist in many, many instances.

Now, Mr. President, to the bill itself: The measure does provide a continuation of a support program for the next 18 months. It is but a temporary measure, as was developed on yesterday, and it establishes no fixed or determined policy. Insofar as prices are supported, the Congress does not seem to be in much disagreement as to the terms of the measure. It appears to be almost the unanimous opinion that so long as present unsettled and disturbed conditions exist, it is necessary to have some kind of a support program for wool. Even the most vigorous opponents of the pending bill concede that. So it will not be necessary today to discuss that feature of the measure, and I shall not do so.

The opposition is directed against the provision which relates to the imposition of duties and the fixing of quotas. That is an important matter. This is the provision which gives me so much concern. It is one which I did not want in the bill. I did not think, and I do not believe, that it was at all necessary. Its inclusion was a mistake—such a mistake, Mr. President, as to cause me to question why that provision was inserted, for it may have the effect of eventually killing the entire measure. As I have said, if it did require the raising of import duties, if it did require the fixing of quotas amounting to an embargo, I would vote against it.

As I have previously stated, I studied that provision. I sought the advice and counsel of others. After having done that, I arrived at an interpretation of the bill which was exactly the same as the one which was given yesterday by the distinguished and able Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Incidentally, I might add that the reputation and the record of the Senator from Vermont are such that I know that nothing could persuade him to agree to a conference report or to a provision in any bill which he believed to be contrary and detrimental to the interests of the country as a whole. This is no idle compliment I pay to the Senator from Vermont. His entire record in this body warrants, justifies, and demands this tribute to his character and to his statesmanship. He has not been narrow, selfish or greedy in any of his attitudes with regard to matters of public interest. He has said—and I agree with him—that the provisions in the bill relating to the increase in import duties and the quotas are entirely discretionary with the President.

The measure as it is now presented in the conference report only gives to the President the discretion to protect any program conducted under the Wool Act of 1947 in the same manner and by the same methods as he is now authorized to use to protect programs conducted under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as reenacted and amended, the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, and section 32 of Public Law 320, Seventy-fourth Congress, as amended.

The provisions of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act empower the President, "whenever he has reason to believe"—note the words, "whenever he has reason to believe," for they are the words of the act—"and finds, after an investigation conducted by the Tariff Commission," that one or more of the articles included in that section are being imported under such conditions and in sufficient quantities as to interfere materially—not merely incidentally—with any program conducted under the provisions of the laws enumerated, to impose such fees on, or such limitations on the total quantities of, any article as he finds to be necessary, within, of course, the limitations that are fixed, in order that the importation of such article will not materially interfere with programs conducted under the laws mentioned.

The words I have just used are taken, in large part, from the statement of the House managers, but they correctly quote the act and they correctly state its implications.

Mr. President, the words I have quoted, appearing, as they do, in the statement of the House managers, are words which would be interpreted by any court constructing the provision. They should also be understood and interpreted by the other countries who may deal with this provision. They convey the clear and definite meaning that the exercise of the power vested rests entirely within the discretion of the President of the United States.

Although he may sometimes entertain fear, will any Senator on this side of the aisle stand here and say that he fears and distrusts the wisdom and discretion of the President of the United States? Does he fear and distrust that the President of the United States will unreasonably, unduly, and harshly raise tariff duties or impose quotas? If there is such a fear on the part of any Member of the Senate, he entertains a fear which I do not share, and he has a feeling toward the President of the United States which I do not have.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield for 1 minute.

Mr. MYERS. I am sure the President does not even want this power, since his Secretary of State has opposed the granting of the power. Furthermore, I am of the opinion that what is proposed will be permanent legislation. Although I have no fear of the present President, I do not know who may be President in the

future, and I say this is to be permanent legislation, which will extend beyond 1948.

Mr. HATCH. Again, Mr. President, the Senator expresses fear, and I say that when he expresses a fear that it is permanent legislation, he expresses a fear which is entirely ungrounded and unfounded, for it is not to be permanent legislation, as was fully explained on the floor yesterday. It will automatically expire on the 31st day of December next, when President Truman will still be in office.

Mr. MYERS. I am in accord with that statement, but with the Senator's interpretation I am not in accord.

Mr. HATCH. What I have said about the present occupant of the White House, when I stated that I do not mistrust and will not mistrust his motives, I would say regarding any occupant of the White House, for, regardless of how elections may go, I am convinced, as an American, that the man the American people choose for their Chief Magistrate will be a reasonable, a just, a fair, and a patriotic American. No matter to what party he might belong, I would say, Mr. President, that I would have complete confidence that no President of the United States would unduly and unreasonably exercise the power proposed to be vested by the bill to destroy international relations, to destroy world trade, and bring chaos and ruin to all the world. I have too much regard for all Presidents and all parties to entertain any such fear as that. So what I have said about the present occupant of the White House applies to all.

Of course, Mr. President, world trade is of such vast importance that it requires the efforts of all of us to maintain it and keep it on a sound, fair, and just basis, especially with nations like Australia and New Zealand, whose chief exports are wool, which they send to us, buying from us in return. I would do those countries no injury, and my President will do them no injury. If those at Geneva are entertaining grave fears because of the passage of the pending measure, let them read the amendment itself, and let them realize that the power is only discretionary and that, as I say, it will not be used by the President except in the most extreme case, when it might be absolutely necessary to use it in order to prevent the ruin of an important industry here at home. I do not believe even the Australians or New Zealanders would have any reasonable objection to that.

Mr. President, I have taken already more time than I should have taken; but I feel deeply about every question involved in the bill. I did not want the provision we have been discussing; I do not want it now. I think it is unnecessary. But I believe it will be completely harmless and ineffective, and if the measure shall not be enacted, if the program shall be killed and destroyed, I am quite sure many citizens of America engaged in the production of wool will face bankruptcy and perhaps ruin.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired. To whom does the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield 7 minutes to the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. I believe the Senator from Kentucky will want to speak on the other side at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Wyoming.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized for 7 minutes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the very well-reasoned statement which has just been made by the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], who pointed out that section 22, which seems to be drawing the principal fire of those who are fearful of the results of the proposed legislation, makes itself operative by the phrase "whenever, in the discretion of the President of the United States." The provision cannot become effective unless the President in his judgment finds that it is essential.

I wish to point out that it is my understanding that every reciprocal trade agreement which is now proposed to be entered into will contain an escape clause, which will be an expression of the same, exact power of the President of the United States with respect to any agreement.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator is familiar with the provision of existing law giving the President of the United States power not only to raise but to lower tariffs.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If a reciprocal trade agreement is made, it is a binding obligation of our Government, of course, until it is modified, but when the reciprocal trade agreement contains an escape clause, then those who enter into the agreement—and this must include all those assembled at Geneva—are on notice that the President of the United States may bring the agreement to an end. The situation, therefore, logically and factually is no different with respect to the pending bill than with respect to any reciprocal trade agreement which may be entered into. Therefore all the charges which are being made that the bill undertakes to establish a new policy of economic isolation fall absolutely to the ground.

Mr. President, I wanted to call attention to another phase of the matter.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. If what the Senator says is true, why is the State Department so violently opposed to the proposal?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Because the State Department has been impressed by the emotional reaction of those who are seeking to prevent the enactment of this support bill, the emotional reaction of those who seek to capture the largest possible amount of the American market for wool.

I point out to the Senator from Illinois that the primary basis for the wool legislation is that the chief producers of wool in the world, outside the United States, are Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa, as the Senator well knows. The Government of Great Britain has entered into an agreement with those three Dominions under which the Government of Great Britain has set up a joint organization to sell wool in the United States. Great Britain has, in other words, a state monopoly for the disposal of that wool in this market.

It goes further than that, however. The Government of Great Britain lends its money to France to promote manufacturing of the British-owned wool in France, to be reexported to Great Britain, and exported to the United States as the output of Great Britain. The same policy has been followed with respect to Italy. In other words, the Government of Great Britain has organized the wool-producing and the wool-manufacturing trade for the purpose of capturing the largest possible share of the American market, and all that we, who are supporting the pending measure, are trying to do is to prevent that program from destroying our own basic industry.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. How absurd it is to say that we will endanger either the foreign exporters of wool or the domestic consumers becomes evident when I point out to the Senate that the pending bill provides only for the purchase of domestic wool at the OPA ceiling price. There is no other commodity of the farm or the factory which is being held to the OPA ceiling price.

I now yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wanted to inquire if the Senator did not know that the joint organization of which he speaks is really, in fact, a sort of prototype of our Commodity Credit Corporation?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, I do not agree with that suggestion.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is it not operating with respect to wool produced in the British Dominions, in order that there may be an orderly marketing of that product in the nations of the world who are in a position to receive it?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But the Commodity Credit Corporation buys only what it sells within the United States.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. What I am pointing out to the Senator from Kentucky is that the Government of Great Britain has launched itself upon a program of state commercialism. Not a single pound of American cotton can be bought in Great Britain by any individual citizen of Great Britain. Every pound of cotton to be purchased there must be purchased by the state, not by the individual. If we are to preserve a system of free economy, we must preserve a system in which the individual is free.

Mr. LUCAS and Mr. BARKLEY addressed the Chair.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am under limited time, and I wanted to refer to another point.

The whole basis, Mr. President, of our saving the world from the results of the war is the productive capacity of the United States, the productive capacity of America. We cannot afford to destroy that productive capacity, whether it be the producers of wool upon the ranges, the producers of automobiles in American industry, or the industrial producers of New England. So we cannot

afford to follow a policy that may jeopardize the productive capacity of the wool growers, in order to find foreign markets for our industrial output. There must be a balance.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, when the pending bill was initially before the Senate for consideration, I voted against its passage. I intend to vote against the adoption of the conference report today, not because of what was added to the bill in conference, but because I think it an unsound piece of legislation. When we pass the pending bill we are establishing a precedent of supporting an agricultural commodity at a price far in excess of parity. This is the first bill relating to farmers that has come before the Eightieth Congress. In it there has been selected one section or group of American farmers. And we are proposing for the next 18 months to guarantee to that group the highest price they have received for their product during the past 14 years. In other words, we are picking out one favorite group and guaranteeing to it wartime prices in a peacetime economy.

A statement was made a few minutes ago that there are no other agricultural products selling at OPA ceilings. I would dispute that statement because today there are many agricultural products which the eastern farmers are selling considerably below the former OPA ceiling, and which they have been selling below that ceiling for some time. It is nothing unusual to establish price ceilings in wartime, but the farmers do not expect and Congress has no right to establish wartime prices in a peacetime economy. We have heard a great deal of discussion recently both by the President of the United States and by Members of this body regarding the high cost of living, and yet, at the same time, we find that while the Government, through one agency, is buying potatoes and dumping them on this side of the border, through another agency potatoes are being imported from our neighbor on the north. The same thing is being done, or is now proposed to be done, with respect to wool.

The 1946 report on agricultural statistics shows that this country is normally an importer of wool since we actually produce less wool than we consume. The whole price structure can be worked out on an equitable basis through the tariffs. It is ridiculous that we should today establish the price of any commodity at wartime levels and then complain about the high cost of living, yet that is exactly what we are doing. Many mills in our country are operating entirely on imported wool because the foreign countries are selling their wool in the American market at just a shade under the price which we are endeavoring to maintain. I think we should be rendering maximum service to the farmers, the laboring man, and to the man who has retired from active employment if, instead of calling upon them to pay still higher prices, we should endeavor to check the inflationary rise in the cost of living. Mr. President, I shall continue to vote against such a program as that here proposed.

I ask to have included in the RECORD a table which shows the production of wool in the United States, since 1936. It also shows the consumption of wool within the United States during the same period, the amount of wool imported, and the price. I call attention to the fact that the price ranged from 19 cents to 42 cents. We are today proposing to stabilize the price at the highest price on record, which is near 42 cents.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Wool

Year	Consumption	Total production	Exports	Imports for consumption	Price
		Million	*Million*	*Million*	
1936	406	419	16	110	26.9
1937	380	423	68	150	32.0
1938	284	425	1,343	30	19.1
1939	396	428	179	98	22.3
1940	407	436	456	222	28.3
1941	647	456	38	613	35.5
1942	615	459	111	1,004	40.1
1943	624	449	27,878	918	41.6
1944	622	418	7,396	584	42.4
1945	645	387	32,392	709	41.9

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. To whom does the Senator from Kentucky now yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I promised to yield to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], but he is not on the floor at the moment. Would the Senator from Vermont care to yield time to someone?

Mr. AIKEN. No, Mr. President. We have used 37½ minutes out of our 65 minutes, I believe.

Mr. BARKLEY. How much?

Mr. AIKEN. We have already used more than half our time. I suggest the Senator from Kentucky yield to someone on the other side.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I inquire how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that 49 minutes remain to the side of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am exceedingly interested in world recovery; I am extremely interested in certain of the elementary principles of world trade. It seems to me the pending bill is at cross purposes with what is desired by the American people, namely, world recovery, in our economic and political relations with other nations. A moment ago the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], replying to a query, said the State Department was opposed to the pending measure, by reason of the emotional situation which arises with other nations of the world who are now in conference at Geneva, attempting to secure economic uniformity throughout the world, whereby the raw materials of this and other nations may be furnished without tariff barriers, which are contemplated by the pending bill. Knowing George Marshall as I do, knowing Will Clayton, the Under Secretary of State, as I do, I am certain they are not being misled by the emotional side of the economic picture which faces them at the present time. Once a beginning is made with legislation of this kind the door is being opened to ultimate repeal of the reciprocal trade-agreement program which was inaugurated years ago by Cordell Hull. I am told that Cordell Hull is unalterably opposed to the conference report which is now before the Senate. If there is any man in America who understands reciprocal-trade relations between this and other nations, it is the distinguished former Secretary of State, Mr. Hull.

Mr. President, I am sure that the citizens of New Zealand and Australia and other sheep-producing countries of the world are disillusioned as the result of what is proposed to be done by the pending bill. In other words, we are talking out of both sides of our mouth at the same time, as we proceed to pass legislation of this kind. Sooner or later the Congress is going to be compelled to look at this kind of problem from the standpoint of the Nation as a whole, as its economic power is related to that of the rest of the world. That is not now being done. The same old, sectional, selfish interest is involved in the wool bill as is involved in a good many other measures which come to the floor of the Senate and by means of which United States Senators seek to protect some particular industries at the expense of the economic life of the rest of the Nation.

Mr. President, I am opposed to the conference report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maine is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I have been interested in this matter from the standpoint of the woolen mills of the East, which, it has been suggested, might be prejudiced by the proposed action. In my study of the situation I have been interested to find that exactly the same power which is placed in the President by this bill to protect the domestic wool industry and dispose of the great reserves of wool we have accumulated, extends also to the manufactured product, so that if any prejudice should extend to the manufacturers of wool products by reason of the provisions of the bill, the President has exactly the same power to extend protection to the woolen manufacturers of the East or of any other section of the country that he has to the wool growers of the West. I say that because there has been concern expressed as to whether or not the eastern manufacturers would be prejudiced by the provisions of the pending measure. That would be by means of imposing quotas on the importations not only of wool but of wool products, a power which was bestowed upon the President in the Tariff Act of 1930 under section 1336. So I think there will be no question regarding the powers of the President to act, as he has said,

for the protection of any industry in the United States which is threatened with disaster by these means.

Nor does the measure interfere with any of our existing trade agreements. While in the United Kingdom agreements it is provided that no fees shall be imposed, and so that method of protection would not be available under the terms of the pending bill, it does not prohibit the imposition of quotas. We hear a great deal about quotas being inconsistent with our existing international trade policy. My only answer to that is that the greatest single item concerned is now handled by quotas not under the tariff.

While Mr. Clayton, our very eminent Under Secretary of State, dealing with economic matters, and, I think, without employing any criticism, one of those most familiar with the cotton industry, so that he must be fully informed regarding the situation, inveighs against protection for products of the North and the West, while he challenges the proposed action regarding wool, and cries to high heaven that quotas are utterly incompatible with the great trade philosophy which he is seeking to sell to the nations of the earth, yet today he has his great cotton industry safely sheltered behind a quota system which is the most restrictive of any of the provisions we have in our laws or in our regulations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point, the annual import quotas on cotton.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Annual import quotas on cotton

	Pounds
Under 1⅛ inch, other than rough or harsh cotton under ¾ inch	14,516,882
1⅛ inch or more, but less than 1⅛ inch	45,656,420
This item was increased by Presidential action last week to add this amount of 1⅜ to 1⅛ inch fiber	23,094,000
Less than ¾ inch harsh rough fiber	70,000,000
Total quotas of all lengths	153,267,302

Cotton 1⅛ inches longer comes in quota free but pays a duty of 3½ cents a pound.

These quotas represent a total of somewhat under 300,000 bales. The amount of fiber longer than 1⅛ entering the country is negligible. The total United States production of all lengths of cotton is approximately 10,000,000 bales.

Mr. BREWSTER. These figures show that while we produced 10,000,000 bales of cotton under the import quotas established by Mr. Clayton, who inveighs against import quotas, not more than 300,000 bales of cotton of any character, outside certain items which are very little used in this country, can be imported. I suggest that what is sauce for cotton is sauce for wool, if I may use a somewhat mixed metaphor, and that if it is all right to protect the American cotton industry by import quotas on cotton, I am quite sure that the trade program of the world will not collapse if the poor little sheep of the West or the poor little woolen industry of New England is accorded a similar assistance. What is good for one is certainly good for the other, and with that I wish to leave the discussion.

Mr. BREWSTER subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks made earlier in the day, a brief statement relating to the position of the wool-textile industry under Senate bill 814.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POSITION OF WOOL-TEXTILE INDUSTRY UNDER S. 814

If the Wool Act of 1947 becomes law and import restrictions (either fees or quotas) are imposed on raw wool, what will be the position of the wool manufacturers who are buying raw wool? The following comments are addressed to section 22 as it would be amended by the wool bill now before the Senate.

Section 22 (a) provides that when any one or more articles are being imported so as to interfere with the Wool Act, the President shall direct the Tariff Commission to make an immediate investigation to determine whether additional import restrictions are necessary to protect the domestic program. Wool textiles are certainly within the scope of section 22 (a) as well as raw wool.

Section 22 (b) authorizes the imposition of fees or quotas on any article or articles which the President finds to be necessary to prevent the entry of such article or articles from interfering with the program.

Both raw wool and wool manufactures are clearly covered by section 22, provided, of course, that the facts show the necessity for action in order to prevent imports from interfering with the domestic program.

The principal question concerning compensatory protection to the textile industry arises from the last proviso of section 22 (b): "That no proclamation under this section with respect to wool shall be enforced in contravention of any treaty or international agreement to which the United States is now a party." That provision would not affect raw wools finer than 44s—the types produced in the United States—because such wools are not included in existing trade agreements. The proviso would, however, preclude the imposition of fees, but not of quotas, on wool textiles. Practically all forms of imported wool textiles are included in existing trade agreements, the most important of which in this connection is the agreement with the United Kingdom. Under the proviso, in the wool bill no article on which an outstanding trade-agreement concession is in effect could be subjected to an import fee under section 22 because the agreement prescribes the maximum duties that can be imposed on the articles covered thereby, and the fee under section 22 is a duty within the terms of the agreement and would therefore be in contravention thereof.

However, quotas may be imposed on trade-agreement articles under certain conditions, one of which permits the use of quotas "in conjunction with governmental measures or measures under governmental authority operating to regulate or control the production, market supply, quality, or price of the like article of domestic growth, production, or manufacture."[1]

The Wool Act of 1947 in effect establishes a floor under the price of raw wool produced in the United States and therefore is a measure to regulate or control the price of such wool within the meaning of the trade agreement. It would also seem reasonable to conclude that by controlling the price of raw wool the wool act would operate to control the price of textiles—at least to the extent that the cost of the raw wool is reflected in the cost of the textiles. From all this it is concluded that the proviso of section 22 (b) would preclude the use of import fees on wool textiles but that import quotas could be imposed.

[1] This language is quoted from art. XV of the trade agreement with the United Kingdom. Other trade agreements contain identical or similar language.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Maine has expired.

The situation is that the Senator from Vermont has 20 minutes remaining, and the Senator from Kentucky has 43 minutes remaining. The Chair understands the Senator from Kentucky yields 15 minutes to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS].

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, when the Nation is about to begin to take a certain course of action it is highly desirable that we survey the circumstances that exist in order to test whether or not the proposed course of action is desirable and in the over-all national interest. Today we live in a world that is very sick indeed. Most of the economy of Europe has been destroyed. The nations over there are having a very difficult time to make ends meet. The situation in Asia is far from wholesome and far from promising. As a matter of fact, the United States is the one great citadel of economic sufficiency, on the one hand, and stabilized democratic government, upon the other, that seems to exist among the great powers of the earth.

After the last World War the earth was not so greatly devastated. When that war was over our allies owed us $11,000,000,000 in war debts which we refused to cancel. In the next 11 years private banking interests in America loaned $15,000,000,000 to foreign governments and subdivisions thereof and to foreign corporations. So that by 1929, in war debts and in private loans made after the war to foreign governments and subdivisions thereof and to foreign corporations, there were $26,000,000,000 owing to the United States of America as a government or as a people.

At the same time we prevented those who had borrowed the money and who owed us the money from paying the debt in the only medium of exchange that existed, and that was in goods or services. To my way of thinking, this helped materially to bring on a world crisis, which in time overtook our own Nation and put us through one of the most serious depressions of all time.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I cannot yield.

Today the situation is far worse. Today the earth is much more devastated and impoverished than it was after World War I. Today countries are not able to float loans on a security basis. What has been done in this body so far has been largely in the nature of gifts which we call aid. I do not know how far this process will continue, but it is estimated by high authority that if we were to adopt it in its full scope it would require $24,000,000,000 or $25,000,000,000 to place a bottom under the economy of the world so that a sound world economy could thereafter evolve. Probably the Congress would not welcome embrac-

ing—certainly not at one time—an aid program of this magnitude. Nevertheless, we have already started along that roadway. In this session of Congress we have appropriated $350,000,000 for general foreign relief and $400,000,000 for Greek and Turkish assistance, a total of almost $1,000,000,000, besides other appropriations which directly and indirectly go to aid a stricken world.

We must not lose sight of the fact that in this country we have only about 6 percent of the earth's population; but we have a much larger percentage of the world's income. It has been estimated that the United States has approximately 30 percent of the total world income. So here we are, a people numbering 6 or 7 percent of the population of the earth, with 30 percent, or nearly a third, of the total income of the entire earth. We are rich, happy, and prosperous almost beyond human imagination, in comparison with many other countries.

One must actually see at first hand the conditions which prevail in the world faintly to appreciate them. Last year I had the good fortune to go around the world and visit many of the countries of the earth and see at first-hand the dire conditions which exist.

We can talk in generalities all we please about how we must rehabilitate and safeguard civilization, how we must place a substantial floor under it so that we can build upon that floor, how we must have a world at peace and must have security at home. We can talk about disarmament abroad and at home so that the United Nations may perform the task for which it was created. But all of that is only so much Fourth of July oratory unless we couple with it another premise of procedure. There must be some division of the world's work if world prosperity and a sound economy are to come to the peoples of stricken lands. We can own all the ships on earth which carry commerce on the seven seas; we can own all the airplanes in the world which fly commerce in the air; we can perform all the banking business; we can perform all the insurance business of the world; we can raise more food than any other country on the globe—but after all is said and done, unless the other fellow can do something also, he cannot buy what we have to offer; and if he cannot buy what we have to offer, our own prosperity is adversely affected.

We must find some way, without adopting the repugnant tenets of communism in international affairs, to allow production to be grouped into natural places. A country which can best produce beans ought to be given an opportunity to produce beans for the good of mankind all over the world, particularly if it can produce little else. By selling those beans outside the country which produces them, that country can obtain credits—dollars—with which to purchase the things which it cannot produce, and which we desire to sell. We cannot do it all. If we do it all, all we shall do is to look at suffering humanity all over the globe and from time to time funnel out from the Treasury of the United States sums sufficient merely to keep life in existence all over the globe.

Many countries are faced with a situation in which they cannot compete with us. They have not our industrial know-how. They have not our inventions, or our machinery. They have not our transportation facilities. In a prosperous, busy world, in a world dedicated to peace, and a world which is in a position to keep the peace, there must be some sort of division of the world's work. No one wants to make the sacrifice. The man who is in the airplane business wants to fly all the planes from this country to all points of the compass. The man who is in the shipping business wants to have his ships go to all the ports of the earth, without competition from any foreign source. The man who produces cotton, wool, cattle, potatoes, automobiles, furniture, clothing, shoes, or what not, wants to have customers all over the globe.

That is a commendable outlook so far as it goes, but we cannot have customers all over the globe unless we have customers who can sell something in order to obtain the money with which to buy the things which we desire to sell. If we do not have a broader horizon than mere little segments of this, that, or the other business enterprise, we shall be in the position of prolonging the misery of the world and unwittingly sowing the seeds of rebellion, and perhaps of another war as a consequence.

I do not mean to say that part of this bill has not a great deal of merit. During the war and for several years preceding it, this Government has been dedicated to what is known as a support program. The bill as it passed the Senate under the able leadership of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] carried a provision with respect to wool which is similar to that enjoyed by other commodities. But when it came back from the House of Representatives it was an entirely new bill. There was an effort to jam the mailed fist of power into the economy of nations so as to stop the normal ebb and flow of trade.

What will the people of New Zealand, Australia, and South Africa, who now produce wool, produce instead of wool, so that they may get the money with which to buy our automobiles, our wheat, our corn, our cattle, our cotton, and our manufactured goods, if we stop the importation of wool into this country? They certainly must produce something. They cannot buy with thin air. They cannot buy unless they can sell.

So, Mr. President, I shall vote against the conference report with the hope that if we are able to vote the conference report down, the Senate bill, which has gone to the House of Representatives, will then be in order for reconsideration in the House. If the House should be so wise as to pass that bill, we could keep the commendable features in our present economy in it without walking a road which is fraught with serious dangers.

Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. TYDINGS. I was intrigued with the language in the bill. It says that the President of the United States is empowered to levy fees—mark the word, 'fees"; f-e-e-s—against imports of wool if certain conditions arise which make it desirable, under the philosophy of the bill. The word should be "tariffs." That is all it is. The word "fees" is nothing more than a pleasing substitute, a euphemism, if you please, to soften the harsh character of the connotation of the word "tariff."

I am therefore hopeful, Mr. President, that others may see this situation as I see it, that they may see that we are starting with one bill after another to walk the same roadway we walked after World War I. At that time we loaned money to our customers so that they could buy the goods which they desired from us. We did not let them sell us anything that we could keep out; but we made loans to the extent of $15,000,000,000 after World War I, and our customers paid the money which they had borrowed from us with which to buy the goods we were selling to them. But when the loans stopped in 1928 and 1929 that trade stopped, and the whole world skidded into a gigantic depression. Now we are beginning again to make gifts instead of loans to the foreign states that are in a depleted condition. At the same time we erect barriers so that we will have to make these gifts, for the sake of humanity, over a longer period of time than otherwise would be necessary.

There must be some division of the world's work if there is to be a prosperous world, if there is to be a peaceful world, and it should be an orderly and natural division of the world's work, not one which is artificial, grabbed or acquired or protected by the artifices of governmental legislation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Maryland has expired. To whom does the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield 5 minutes to the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The junior Senator from Wyoming is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, several statements were made by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] to which I should like to reply, particularly his statement questioning the advisability of this measure on the ground that it would have the effect of reducing the foreign imports of wool, thereby further reducing the ability of a foreign nation to buy goods from us, or, in other words, to receive American dollars. I fully realize the necessity of foreign nations obtaining American dollars, but the passage of the pending bill affecting the wool industry would not interfere with their ability to obtain American dollars.

Prior to the war, as I made clear yesterday, we imported approximately 200,000,000 pounds of wool, mostly from Australia. During the war, when the cost of production of wool in this country rose approximately from 200 to 300 percent, it was impossible to maintain our production, and it dropped from 450,000,000 pounds to 300,000,000 pounds, which is the production today.

By reason of the peculiar nature of the sheep business it is impossible to increase production in 6 months, a year, or 2, or even 3 years. It is a very gradual process; and if we ever do get back to raising 400,000,000 to 450,000,000 pounds of wool in this country it will probably take us at least 10 years to do so. During that time, and certainly for the next 2 or 3 years, the foreign imports coming into this country, instead of being approximately 200,000,000 pounds, which was the amount in prewar days, will be approximately 800,000,000 pounds, as it is now.

Our consumption of wool has increased from approximately 600,000,000 pounds to approximately 1,000,000,000 pounds, and there is no possibility, Mr. President, of that amount of imported wool being reduced. Our consumption is, as I say, approximately a billion pounds, and experts claim that it will continue at that rate for many years to come. I myself am inclined to think that that may be a slight exaggeration, but I believe that the floor will be somewhere around 800,000,000 pounds, which will still leave an importation of at least 500,000,000 pounds of wool.

Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, and the Argentine are importing into this country two or three times as much wool as they have ever before imported in any prewar period.

So far as my having any sympathy with attempts to boost imports from those foreign countries is concerned, I cannot go along with the Senator from Maryland.

Regarding the statement of the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Clayton, that our attitude at Geneva would appear inconsistent, I cannot agree that we would be inconsistent in any way if this bill should be passed. Our imports would continue at the high rate at which they are today; and there is nothing inconsistent in approaching any trade treaty or any understanding with a foreign nation when they continue to export to this country the vast quantity which they exported during the war years because of the great demand for wool to be used in the manufacture of uniforms and blankets for our Army and Navy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Subsequently,

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, I merely wish to ask that a correction be made relative to a news release appearing in today's Washington Post. The title is "Senate Ready To Vote Today on Wool Bill." After referring to the remarks of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the last paragraph states that—

> Senator ROBERTSON (Republican, of Wyoming) also said other nations would regard passage of the bill in its present form as a high-tariff, isolation move by the United States.

The article continues to show that I would vote against this measure.

Mr. President, obviously that position should have been ascribed to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], a Democrat. It was he who made that remark. Let me add that I am advised that over the radio networks this morning the statement was made that Senator ROBERTSON of Wyoming was opposed to this bill—a bill which he himself introduced.

So I hope the press and the radio will make the necessary correction, in line with this correction which I am inserting in the RECORD.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I feel compelled to correct the Senator from Wyoming in this respect: He referred to this measure as being a bill he introduced. This is not the bill he introduced. All of us can support and did support the bill he introduced.

Mr. President, I now yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I shall vote against this conference report. I shall do so, because, as I stated yesterday, it will make it very difficult for the people who are consumers of wool to use wool as a raw product. I shall not repeat the argument which I made yesterday, but I should like to make two points in answer to the distinguished junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] with relation to the use of wool in woolen mills. He stated that there were quotas on cotton. I do not doubt that that is true. The difference between cotton and wool is a very simple one. We produce all the cotton we can use, whereas, as the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] said a moment ago, we produce approximately only half of the wool we consume. If quotas are placed on wool or its cost is increased, the amount of wool or the price at which it goes into the woolen mills for use in the making of garments is directly affected.

It is true, as the junior Senator from Maine has stated, that, under the reciprocal trade agreements, tariffs can be raised by the President on the other wool products that go into the making of cloth. In other words, if quotas or increased prices are put on raw wool, then the President has the power under present laws to increase the tariffs on yarn and other material.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have only 5 minutes.

Mr. AIKEN. If it takes only 30 seconds of my time?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Imposing an additional tariff on wool is not a condition for imposing a tariff on the finished product. The President can impose a tariff on the finished product regardless of the tariff on raw wool.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Vermont is entirely correct, and if I made a statement to the contrary it was inadvertent. What I intended to say was that if an additional tariff or a quota is put on raw wool, presumably, in order to keep the balance equal, a higher tariff would have to be placed on yarn. I shall not argue the question of international relations; but I do submit that what we are doing is to impose upon the consumer a higher price for suits made of woolen goods which he must buy.

I believe we can help the grower of raw wool, the sheep raiser, by providing a floor under raw wool prices, without having the Government go completely into the business and without adopting a quota or a fee system which would make it almost impossible for the buyer of wool to make contracts in other countries, and which would make wool producers in other countries unable to do business with us in the United States without the fear that either their contracts would have to be canceled or higher prices would have to be put on them.

I believe the conference report creates a great deal of unnecessary uncertainty. I hope it will be rejected, and that the Senate bill will be returned to the House and a further conference requested.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky has 23 minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I feel compelled not only to vote against this conference report myself but to join other Senators who have urged its defeat. When this conference report was before the House of Representatives a few days ago, a motion to recommit it was defeated by a little more than 20 votes, which leads me to believe that if this conference report is defeated in the Senate, and if a further conference is requested by the Senate, and if the bill is returned to the House of Representatives and a further conference is held, with or without instructions from either body, we would very likely have returned to us the bill which the Senate passed, without this amendment which has caused all this controversy in regard to the wool situation.

Mr. President, the wool situation is one which has bedeviled Congress ever since I can remember. It is one upon which the Taft administration was wrecked back in 1909. Schedule K, which was the wool schedule of the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill, was the beginning of the hard luck which Mr. Taft encountered in the 4 years of his Presidency.

At the present time, the tariff on wool is 34 cents a pound. We in the United States have never produced as much wool as we consume; and as our population has increased and as our people have from time to time worn more clothes, the proportion of wool produced in the United States in relation to the total amount of wool consumed in the United States has declined, until at the present time, out of a billion pounds of raw wool consumed by the people of the United States, we produce less than 300,000,000 pounds—less than 30 percent. So, in order to meet our needs, we are required to import more than 70 percent, or, to state it in round figures, let us say approximately 70 percent of all the wool we consume.

From the figures of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, and other agencies which deal

with the cost of living, we are advised that at the present time the cost of clothing in the United States receives a figure of 200 percent, as compared to 100 percent for its cost in 1939—in other words, that in the 8 years from 1939 to 1947 the cost of clothing to the American people has increased 100 percent.

The situation with respect to wool at the present time is that the Commodity Credit Corporation, which has purchased wool in order to maintain a price for the American wool producers, now has 460,000,000 pounds of wool in its possession. Under the law, it cannot sell that wool, because Congress has provided that it shall not sell it. One of the objects of this measure, as originally passed by the Senate and as now incorporated in the conference report, is to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell at the market price the wool it now has, together with the wool which it will take over from the 1947 and 1948 clip. No one thinks that the Commodity Credit Corporation is stupid enough to dump all that wool on the market. It will feed it to the market, of course, as the market will absorb it. There is no provision in this proposed law that compels the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell it; it is merely authorized to sell it. That is a wise provision, because if that Corporation were compelled to keep the 460,000,000 pounds it now has, plus approximately 600,000,000 pounds for the 1947 and 1948 clip, the Commodity Credit Corporation would find itself the owner of a billion pounds of American-produced wool. Inasmuch as we are compelled to buy more than two-thirds of the wool we consume in the manufacture of clothing, blankets, and other woolen manufactured goods in this country, it seems to me that we already have on the books a tariff sufficient to protect the wool growers of the United States, many of whom live within my State.

I dare say that in some 20 or 25 States of the Union there are sheep ranches on which wool is produced. Wool is a byproduct of the sheep industry. One can drive from one end of Kentucky to the other and see beautiful flocks of sheep grazing upon the meadows. It has always been an ambition of mine to own one of those meadows and have some sheep grazing upon it.

I have not received a single letter from a wool producer in my State asking for inclusion in the bill of the provision we are discussing. The wool producers did not ask for it in the House. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] yesterday made the statement that this amendment was inserted in the bill in order to put the President of the United States on the spot, or in a hole. I do not know in what fertile brain that stupid idea was germinated. Nobody denied that accusation here yesterday, and I take it for granted there must be some substance to it. But I know that the wool growers did not ask for the provision. They did ask that we provide for the same type of price support for wool that we provided for price support in the case of other commodities, most of which are in surplus, such as tobacco, wheat, and cotton. We produce more of those commodities than we consume, and therefore we have a surplus to sell to other markets of the world. In view of the world conditions in those markets, and the domestic condition, too, at the time the support was provided, we provided for support prices for those commodities, payable out of the Treasury of the United States.

There is a condition in the wool market that is entirely different. We not only have no surplus, but we have a two-thirds deficiency in our own production compared to our own consumption, so that we must obtain wool from foreign fields, and we must obtain that wool from the countries which produce it in surplus—Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, and the Argentine.

Mr. President, the provision of the bill we are discussing may well become effective, because while the bill does not compel the President to initiate the investigation which he would refer to the Tariff Commission, there will be no doubt a moral obligation, and there will certainly be great pressure brought to bear upon the President by those who are interested, with the presentation of such facts and figures as they may collate, in order to induce him to submit to the Tariff Commission a direction for an investigation such as that which is provided in the bill.

The President could arbitrarily say, "Notwithstanding all this, I will not do it," and there is no force that could compel him to do it, I grant. But if the facts which are submitted to him, if the bill shall become law, by those who are interested in the enforcement of the provision, are such as to make out a prima facie case in favor of an investigation and an increase, the President cannot arbitrarily decline to order it, without subjecting himself to the charge of deliberately ignoring his obligation under the law.

After he has ordered the investigation, from there on it is mandatory. When the Tariff Commission has made the investigation and has made its report to the President, showing that the facts submitted to him in the first instance are true, or substantially true, then the President shall do certain things, under the terms of the bill. It does not say he may do them; he shall do them. Then he shall institute these quotas, and, assuming that the Tariff Commission report were accurate and could be relied upon by the President, it is no longer a voluntary act on his part, he is commanded to do certain things.

Mr. President, I have here a letter written by the Secretary of State. Certainly he is a man of responsibility. He is not actuated by any partisan, political considerations, or by local considerations with respect to the production or sale or the price of wool. Secretary Marshall has written a letter to the Senator from Vermont, which I shall not have the time to read, but to which I call the attention of the Senate, in which he emphatically states that the adoption of this provision, added on to the bill by the House of Representatives, and brought here in a merely modified form, but substantially the same as that which went to the conference committee—and in some respects I believe it is even worse—will materially interfere with the economic phases of our foreign policy, and, Mr. President, we cannot avoid the economic phases of our foreign policy.

The distinguished President of the Senate, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, has time and time again, in language of sincerity and eloquence, announced the doctrine that we cannot long prosper in the United States if the rest of the world is prostrate. We have made loans to various nations in order to try to stabilize their economy, and not only to stabilize their economy, but, by stabilizing their economy, to stabilize their political institutions, because politics depends very largely upon economic conditions in every country for its own stability, and we know that the alien nostrums and doctrines and ideologies move into any territory where there is economic chaos and uncertainty, unemployment and want. So that in order to help stabilize these economies in the interest of a peaceful world we have made loans to various nations.

We know that the making of these loans cannot continue forever. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations a few days ago made a suggestion with reference to the creation of a commission to investigate our ability and our resources, and also the need for our assistance in foreign countries. That was a very constructive suggestion, and I endorse it, with this reservation, that I hope that by whatever method the set-up may be created, the question of investigating our resources and our ability to respond to the needs of foreign nations may be in some way related to our Department of Commerce, which I think is best equipped to investigate that subject, and that in so far as the investigation of the needs in other countries may be concerned, it may be related to our State Department, which I think is best equipped to make such an investigation, but that the two investigations should be correlated and dovetailed into each other, so that we may not overreach ourselves either in the matter of the needs of other countries, or our ability to respond to those needs.

Mr. President, we cannot in any event, regardless of this investigation or its results, if it is held, continue indefinitely to feed money to Europe, which will exhaust itself in its very expenditure, and that expenditure will be futile unless out of it can come economic reconstruction, so that Europe can get on to her feet, manufacture products, and sell them to the markets of the world.

In order to do that, European nations must buy machinery. Where can they buy it except in the United States? Nowhere, in sufficient quantities. How can they pay for machinery bought in the United States except with dollars? They cannot pay for it in pounds, or in marks, or in francs, or in drachmas. They must pay for it in dollars. Dollars are the only commodity the American manufacturer will accept in return for his goods.

There are only two ways by which these foreign purchasers can obtain dollars. One is either by borrowing the money from us or accepting a gift from

us; or by selling something to us in exchange for dollars.

Which do we prefer? Shall we continue to lend or give them money, or shall we allow them to sell something to us in exchange for dollars, which they then exchange for other products? With those dollars they buy our surpluses, they buy our food, they buy our wheat, they buy our tobacco, they buy our meats, and they have to pay for them in dollars. By allowing them to sell us a surplus which they produce, such as a surplus of wool, they can exchange their wool for our meats, our tobacco, our corn, our wheat. Dollars do not travel. Money does not travel. It does not meet itself going forth or coming back in the middle of the Atlantic Ocean. Goods are exchanged, but money is used as a medium of the exchange.

So, Mr. President, we are required either to continue to feed money into Europe by loans or gifts in order that they may have dollars with which to buy things from us, or we must allow them to sell things to us in order to get dollars; and wool is one of the things which is the most convenient means by which certain nations producing a surplus of that commodity may obtain dollars to exchange for American products. Australia's wool constitutes 90 percent of her exports to the United States. That is an important part of the world economy, and I do not think we can afford to lose sight of our recent history. I do not believe we can afford again to stick our heads in the sand economically or politically and imagine that our entire anatomy is concealed, when the truth is that most of it is in plain view. We have fought two expensive and bloody world wars in order to learn that lesson. Are we going to forget it now?

I am not able at first hand to say to what extent the passage of the pending bill will interfere with the Geneva Conference now in progress, but when, out of a clear sky, without any hearings, the House of Representatives made an addition to the pending bill, Mr. Clayton, the head of our delegation in Geneva, was so concerned about it that he was compelled to leave the Geneva Conference and come here in an effort to avoid this thing that might bring catastrophe to the Geneva Conference, which not only involves trade agreements but the charter of the International Trade Organization which has been set up under the United Nations.

I have here a copy of the letter which former Secretary Hull wrote to the Secretary of State. Cordell Hull, in his room at the hospital in Bethesda, was so concerned about it that he wrote a letter to the Secretary of State, urging elimination of the provision. I ask that the Secretary of State's letter to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and Mr. Hull's letter to Secretary Marshall, and also a telegram to Secretary Marshall from former Secretary Henry L. Stimson, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks. I have also received a telegram from the League of Women Voters of the United States, which I ask to have printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters and telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 4, 1947.

The Honorable GEORGE D. AIKEN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR AIKEN: I wish to express appreciation to the Senate and House conferees in hearing the Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs with respect to pending legislation on wool. I am sure Mr. Clayton made clear the serious issues involved from the point of view of our foreign policy. However, I wish to summarize the position of the Department of State in this matter.

The Senate bill directs the Commodity Credit Corporation to continue until December 31, 1948, to support a price to domestic producers of wool at the same price at which it purchased domestic wool in 1946. It authorizes the Commodity Credit Corporation to dispose of wool owned by it at market prices.

The House added to this bill a provision intended to result in an increase in the high tariff on wool, and thus enable the Government to give this support to domestic wool producers without financial loss to this Government. The cost of such support would thus be passed on to the consumers of woolen goods.

The critical importance of this action, as it bears on our foreign relations, arises from the fact that there is in progress at this very time in Geneva, an International Conference on Trade and Employment called by the United Nations on the initiative of this country. The United States delegation, of which Mr. Clayton is chairman, is taking a leading part in this Conference.

The object of the Conference is to negotiate reciprocal trade agreements for the reduction of barriers and the elimination of discriminations in international trade. A further object is to agree upon a draft of a charter for an international trade organization to be set up under the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

Some 50 or 60 negotiations are actually taking place between the different countries represented at this Conference, and it is expected that eventually some 70 or 80 agreements will be entered into. The participation of the United States in this aspect of the proceedings derives from the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, last extended by Congress in 1945.

While wool constitutes a relatively small part of our domestic economy, being only one-half of 1 percent of agricultural income, it is a highly important commodity in other countries. For example, it forms 90 percent of the value of all of the exports of Australia to the United States.

The question here is whether the best interests of the United States will be served by the passage of the Senate wool bill, which affords protection to the domestic wool producers at a relatively small cost to the United States Treasury, or by the adoption of the House version of the bill which would provide this protection by further raising barriers to international trade. The Department of State is strongly of the opinion that the Senate bill provides the only acceptable course of action open to us not wholly inconsistent with our current efforts to remove the cause of serious conflicts in the world economic field.

I am taking the liberty of passing on to you herewith the views on this subject of our most distinguished elder statesmen—Mr. Stimson and Mr. Hull.

Faithfully yours,

G. C. MARSHALL.

(Enclosures: Letter to Secretary Marshall from Hon. Cordell Hull, dated June 4, 1947. Copy of telegram to Secretary Marshall from Hon. H. L. Stimson, dated June 4, 1947.)

NAVAL HOSPITAL,
Bethesda, Md., June 4, 1947.

The Honorable GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
Secretary of State.

MY DEAR SECRETARY MARSHALL: I have been very disturbed to learn of Mr. Clayton's return from Geneva in connection with the possibility of action by the Congress intended to increase the tariff on wool. I believe that such action would seriously endanger the success of the negotiations now going on in Geneva for the reduction of trade barriers under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, and for the establishment of an international trade organization, embodying the basic principles of mutually beneficial international economic relations for which we have striven so long.

After more than a decade of successful operation under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, and at a time when the principal trading nations of the world are prepared to follow our lead in carrying out a program of economic disarmament, it would be tragic indeed if any action of ours should endanger that program.

I do not wish to pass judgment on whether or not the growers of wool in this country are entitled to additional assistance. That is for the Congress to decide. I do feel very strongly, however, that such assistance, if given, should not be in a form which would preclude or nullify the comprehensive negotiations in which we are now engaged with other countries for the reciprocal reduction of tariffs and other trade barriers. The success of these negotiations is indispensable to our own economic stability and prosperity, and for the creation of a climate favorable to the preservation of world peace.

The form in which domestic wool producers receive price support must not jeopardize our international relations. As the President said in his address at Waco, Tex., on March 6: "The negotiations at Geneva must not fail."

Faithfully yours,

CORDELL HULL.

JUNE 4, 1947.

The Honorable GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am deeply concerned regarding the pending wool legislation in Congress. In the form proposed by the House of Representatives, this legislation would increase the tariff on wool.

It is my considered opinion that to enact the House measure at any time would be most unwise. It would amount to a repudiation of the whole structure of American economic policy developed in the Congress and the State Department during the 15 years since Cordell Hull began his great work for trade agreements. And such repudiation now, when American leadership has been so largely responsible for the Conference on World Trade at present proceeding in Geneva, could not fail to have serious and immediate international effect, both economic and political. To other nations now watching for proof of American sincerity and unity it would be a shocking indication that the policy of the United States can at any time be shackled by the sort of economic shortsightedness for which all the world has paid so dearly in recent years.

After World War I, the American people and others executed an economic and political retreat from world affairs. These policies were in large part responsible for the great economic break-down which followed both here and in Europe. Now we are engaged in an effort to reconstruct a world shattered by the war which grew out of that economic break-down. In this effort of reconstruction greater freedom of world trade is indispensable. No such freedom can be achieved if this country retreats behind tariff walls higher than ever.

To enact any provision raising the wool tariff would be a clear first step toward the disastrous repetition of our former error. If the Congress should determine that the price of wool must be supported, a question on which I do not here offer any judgment, it can accomplish this purpose at relatively small cost by employing the method of subsidies contained in the Senate bill. But to support these prices by raising the tariff on wool would be to give financial assistance to a few at the cost of a large share of this Nation's hope for world prosperity and peace.

Very sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 18, 1947.*

The Honorable ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Tariff amendment added by House to S. 814, the wool bill, constitutes, in our opinion, first concrete attack on reciprocal-trade program. We consider expanded world trade essential to well-being of the American economy and to reconstruction of the world. We urge you to oppose approval of conference report on this bill.

ANNA LORD STRAUSS,
President, League of Women Voters of United States.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, surely Cordell Hull cannot be actuated by partisan politics; surely, Cordell Hull, who has done a great work that will live forever in the annals of our history, is not actuated by any petty desire either to injure or to promote any industries in the United States. Surely, that great Republican, Henry L. Stimson, who was Secretary of War in the administration of William Howard Taft, Secretary of State in the administration of Herbert Hoover, and Secretary of War, again, under the Roosevelt administration—surely, he is not actuated by partisan politics, or by any desire to put the President of the United States in a hole or on a spot.

Mr. President, I have been advised that I have only 2 minutes remaining.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask the Chair to notify me when I shall have consumed one more minute because I want to yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

Mr. President, I hope that the conference report will be defeated, and, upon its defeat, I hope that a further conference may be requested by the Senate. In view of the closeness of the vote in the House a few days ago, I have no doubt that it will be agreed to, and that we can get a bill which will do all the wool growers request, and all they have a right to expect, in order to put them on the same basis as the producers of wheat, tobacco, cotton, and other commodities—in order to support their price in the postwar period—without adding this other thing that materially interferes with the economy and welfare of the world, and also indicts our own sincerity in the provisions we have made upon that subject.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. AIKEN subsequently said: I yield 1 minute to the senior Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The senior Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in that 1 minute I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the end of my remarks an editorial entitled "Break in the Dike," published in the Washington Post of June 17, 1947; an editorial entitled "Bad Timing," published in the New York Times of June 17, 1947; an editorial entitled "Extreme Short-Sightedness," discussing the same subject, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of June 13, 1946, with an accompanying article entitled "Vital Role of American Dollar," by Warwick O. Fairfax; and an editorial entitled "Sheep's Clothing," which appeared in the Washington Post of June 19, 1947.

There being no objection, the editorials and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of June 17, 1947]

BREAK IN THE DIKE

Some persons will see in the congressional enactment of the new wool bill a return to economic isolationism. Such an assessment misses the mark. The superprotection provided for American wool stems, in our opinion, from a combination of purely domestic circumstances. It has been fostered by representatives of the western wool-producing States in part as retaliation against Republican cuts in reclamation projects. Their colleagues then passed the buck to the President as a way out of a predicament which is always felt on the favor-bartering Hill. The trouble is that this action is buck-passing with economic peace and treaty observance.

The dilemma in the wool industry could have been resolved for at least the present by acceptance of the Senate bill providing for domestic subsidies. Instead, the conferees left the President with the ugly alternative of raising the import fees or lowering the import quotas to support the price of domestic wool. It is bad enough that such ill-conceived action makes a mockery of all our high-sounding talk on new trade agreements at Geneva. What is worse is that the amended program, if upheld, will provide a flagrant violation of reciprocal trade agreements we have already signed with the wool-exporting nations.

As Mr. Stimson phrased it, it will "amount to a repudiation of the whole structure of American economic policy developed * * * during the 15 years since Cordell Hull began his great work for trade agreements" and would be "a shocking indication that the policy of the United States can at any time be shackled by the sort of economic short-sightedness for which all the world has paid so dearly in recent years." If this blow is sustained in contravention of our pledged word, what Nation can then afford to trust us? An emphatic veto should be forthcoming.

[From the New York Times of June 17, 1947]

BAD TIMING

Only an adverse vote in the Senate can now prevent Congress from sending Mr. Truman the final draft of a measure which is about as untimely as any measure of which the imagination could well conceive at this moment. This is the wool bill, directing the President to increase the tariff or to impose quotas on that commodity, in order to carry out a price-support program. The House of Representatives approved the measure yesterday.

The bill reaches a peak of untimeliness because it promises to do damage on two fronts. At home one of the chief problems of the moment is rising costs of living; this bill would hold up or increase the price of woolen clothing for all American consumers. Abroad, there is no problem more pressing than that of how to get as much as possible of Europe and Asia started on the road to economic recovery through a revival of trade and enterprise; this bill would increase barriers to trade and torpedo the work on which the international conference at Geneva is now engaged.

Surely there ought to be enough votes in the Senate to halt so bungling a measure.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of June 13, 1946]

EXTREME SHORT-SIGHTEDNESS

One would have to look far to find a more perfect example of short-sightedness than the action of the Senate-House conferees who agreed to permit higher import restrictions on foreign wool. In its final form, the wool bill provides for exclusion of imports through higher tariffs or quota restrictions. Senator AIKEN, of Vermont, who was reluctant to agree to these provisions, predicted a Presidential veto if the bill is passed by Congress. It deserves no better fate.

On another part of this page we print an article by Warwick O. Fairfax, a leading Australian, who explains in sober, restrained language how American trade policy can affect foreign nations. The outside world desperately needs dollars, he writes. It needs them first to buy food. For "if it cannot live, it cannot earn its living." It also needs dollars to buy the machinery of reconstruction, to replace war-exhausted productive capacity. It can get dollars only if the United States lends them or gives them, or if Americans will buy what foreigners can produce.

Although Mr. Fairfax does not say so, it will at best be years before the world can produce enough to buy the dollars it needs. Thus, higher imports do not provide the whole answer. But they are one thing that is needed. We say, therefore, that for the United States to reduce the ability of foreigners to sell to this country, at the very time when the United States has taken the initiative in promoting an international conference to increase world trade, is unbelievably short-sighted. Before American representatives went to Geneva, the State Department put wool on the list of articles to be considered for a tariff reduction up to 50 percent. These representatives are now seeing their efforts torpedoed by a bill to raise instead of lower the tariff.

The wool-growing industry in the United States is small. It has needed price supports as well as high tariffs to survive. The wool growers themselves treat wool as a kind of by-product. In 1946 the income from wool for all United States sheep growers was only $126,000,000, less even than the duties levied on foreign wool in the same year and a mere nothing in relation to the national economy. How, then, other than on the basis of the narrowest form of catering to special interests, can a bill be justified which imperils relations with one of America's best neighbors, Australia; which jeopardizes the success of American foreign policy, and which is an economic monstrosity, raising the price of wool to American consumers and depriving foreigners of the dollars with which they could but the products of American industry? It cannot be justified. The Congress should defeat it and save the President the necessity of vetoing it.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of June 13, 1946]

VITAL ROLE OF AMERICAN DOLLAR—AUSTRALIAN EDITOR APPEALS TO UNITED STATES ECONOMIC VISION IN WORLD REORGANIZATION

(By Warwick O. Fairfax, managing director, the Sydney, Australia, Morning Herald)

America dominates world economy today. With the rest of us she is only now beginning the struggle at Geneva to find a sound

basis for world trade, yet she has provided and is providing for Britain and many other countries dollar funds vitally necessary to their political and economic stability. Will the funds be exhausted before the machinery of world trade starts moving?

The recipients of these loans do not want charity—they want the right to work. The British Commonwealth in particular dislikes having to take such help because it is forced into the position either of accepting an intolerable interest burden or of becoming a defaulter. A great part of the world, including even ex-enemy countries, is accepting American help in one way or another, which does credit to the humanity and the idealism of America.

Why is this necessary? Emphatically not because the countries concerned were incapable of standing on their own feet, or because they could not provide themselves with a sound and stable government or an adequate economic system. The reasons were two—one greater and the other lesser.

The greater reason is, of course, that nearly all Europe and the British Commonwealth had their economy torn to pieces by 10 years of warfare out of the 40 years that began with the Kaiser's ultimatum to Belgium. The second reason was that the 20 years of peace were marked by a number of factors which made any satisfactory basis of world trade utterly impossible.

First of these factors was the unbalanced internal control of most nations. They pursued unduly deflationary policies in bad times, thus accentuating the boom of the late twenties and the slump of the early thirties. The second factor was the tendency, steadily increasing throughout this period, to economic nationalism and isolationism.

It is not the business of the Geneva Conference to say which nation is responsible and how much so for any of the shortsightedness, the blunders, the crimes that have brought us to this pass. No one can escape responsibility for what has happened during the last 30 years, and the greater the nation the greater the responsibility.

But the plain question before the Geneva Conference and all such conferences is what is to be done and who is best able to do it?

It is scarcely an exaggeration to say that the world cannot live without American dollars. More accurately, the least fortunate nations will be half starved and bankrupt if they cannot get dollars; with others, such as Britain, dollars can make the difference between a grim and precarious livelihood which will not for long improve beyond the privations of wartime conditions, and a decent livelihood. With more happily placed countries like Australia it makes the difference between living a rather isolated and pinch-penny existence and coming well into the world picture as an extensive buyer and trader.

Why does the world want dollars?

First, to supply itself with the commonest type of consumer goods without which it literally cannot live—that is, food, clothing, and shelter. If it cannot live, it cannot earn its living.

Second, to accumulate, buy, and construct capital goods without which it cannot earn its living. It needs factories, machinery, tools, and capital.

The German householder, the English mill-hand, the Australian farmer, the Greek peasant, the Chinese and Indian coolies are all alike, desperately dependent upon what happens in the United States. They are dependent obviously upon its external political and trading policy. They are dependent upon its internal policy because since American prices have risen while the dollar exchange has remained stable, it makes it yet harder for them to buy and more expensive for the Americans to lend or give. Great as is the political power of America today, her economic power is even more staggering, since for purposes of world trade Russia, in proportion to her size, is a negligible quantity.

What, then, will America do? Broadly speaking, she has three possible courses of action:

1. She may try to earn her living within her own borders and trade outside where trading is possible. In that case the world will remain in a state of economic chaos for a very long time, long enough to accumulate slowly the means of earning a living which has been destroyed. There would be suffering and starvation on a colossal scale as well as incalculable political consequences.

2. The United States may help, as she has been doing, by lending or otherwise making available funds to selected countries which are considered worthy of support or which are suffering so much as to require charity. But unless the rest of the world is eventually able to earn its own living the effect of such help will be purely temporary and the dollars can never be repaid. They can probably not be repaid in any case.

3. Instead of giving away dollars for nothing, America can buy something with them.

It is not enough to say that unless she does this she will be undermining her own export market and preventing world recovery, bringing about a first-class world depression which may for a number of reasons be even more violent in America than elsewhere in its swing from great prosperity, just as in 1930.

The boom of the last 2 years has been based on a number of temporarily operating factors and has no firm foundation. In all countries, but most particularly in America, there has been a sudden release of great spending power.

That period obviously cannot last. In fact, the tide is already turning. The height of the price structure in America is being widely recognized as the principal obstacle to the continuance of a prosperity which is already admitted to be threatened.

It is, therefore, inevitable that when the wave of postwar buying subsides, when the most urgent demands that have to be met at any cost have been satisfied, when the popular feeling of relief at being able to buy again has had its fill, there can be no steady world demand at present world prices. For the world is actually impoverished, despite the fact that it can absorb all the automobiles that can be turned out at much higher than the prewar price.

If the world were all equally impoverished the problem would in a way be simpler. But the greatest economic power—the United States—has its means of production untouched by enemy attack, its manpower resources not decimated by war, its financial structure sound and its taxes relatively low. In other words, it can meet the market in a superlatively good position—both to export heavily and to import heavily.

Let us take as a concrete example Australia, a fairly prosperous country which suffered less than others during the war and which before the war was a heavy buyer of automobiles, films, newsprint, petroleum products, clothing, and many other things from the United States.

Australia today has an overseas sterling balance of more than £200,000,000 (more than $800,000,000)—the highest in her history. The primary products which she exports are at a very high price level. Yet America's expectation of selling to Australia is low today and is growing steadily less. Why? The first reason is rising prices, the second, and dominating reason, is absence of dollars.

Selling all her wool to England, France, or Belgium makes Australia prosperous but it does not enable her to buy 1 cent's worth of American goods. That can only be done with dollars and the possession of all the francs or sterling in the world will not give Australia dollars. All the dollars spent by the British Commonwealth come from a pool which is filled from two sources only: One is the proceeds of the American loan to Great Britain, which is rapidly being exhausted; the other comes from whatever Great Britain or Australia or other British countries contrive to sell to America.

For every car that the Ford Motor Co. wants to sell abroad it is up to Ford to see that some American buys the equivalent amount in foreign goods. That is, of course, unless Ford prefers America to go on lending dollars without being paid back. It is understandable that no matter what it is proposed that America import, whether it is wool or wine, someone will get up and say that there is an industry in America that needs protection.

It is for other nations simply to point out that if she does not import, certain results will follow. The rest of the world will suffer but it will not be ruined. To the extent that Australian women cannot get locally made or European-made stockings they will go without—as most of them did during the war. To the extent that Fords or Chevrolets cannot be got, we shall either manufacture ourselves (which we are already preparing to do), or get along with less suitable models and make old ones last longer.

The first result of American refusal to import will be an enormous stimulation of competitive industries throughout the world. It will not be necessary for anyone consciously to organize a sterling bloc. The bloc will just be there through force of circumstances. The articles to be manufactured may or may not be as good and as cheap as American ones, but if the purchaser has no dollars he either takes them or goes without.

The present Australian labor administration has gone further than any other in our history to work closely and to form a close friendship with the United States. It is not good to hear the Australian Prime Minister express himself as being confounded and astonished to find that America—the country which had originated the Geneva trade negotiations—had taken action of an almost internationally provocative nature in proposing to increase the wool tariff; but it is hard to disagree with him.

We must have the support of the American people. Communism is unlikely to thrive in any country that is prosperous and fully employed.

[From the Washington Post of June 19, 1947]

SHEEP'S CLOTHING

House and Senate conferees have agreed on a mongrel measure for looking after our puny wool industry which would gouge the American consumer and promote corruption in the customs administration. Evidently the conferees were impressed by the objection that an import fee added to the present tariff would violate the letter of our existing trade agreements with a group of nations. Accordingly they adopted an alternative course of keeping out foreign wool, namely, the imposition of import quotas. Strange as it may seem, there is no specific ban on import quotas in any of our commercial pacts with foreign nations, though they would clearly violate their spirit. Doubtless nobody ever thought that the time would come when such a method of fighting the foreigner would be taken seriously. That this device has come out of the Eightieth Congress is no compliment to its sense of morality.

Let us think what might be expected to follow this novel method of propping up our wool growers at the consumers' expense. Congress would authorize the administration to exclude 50 percent of an import trade that is now four times our domestic clip. What yardstick would the administrators pick? The easiest and doubtless the only practicable way would be to shut the ports to foreign wool as soon as the quota had been attained. That would start a race on the part of foreign suppliers to get their stuff into America. Clearly the factor of distance alone would promote discrimination and ill will. But it is the opening for graft

on a grand scale that is the most dismaying thing about an import quota system. Wool is such an important item in the economy of Australia, New Zealand, Argentina, and Uruguay that they would do everything they could to obtain import permits. It is irresponsible of Congress to subject the customs administration to this temptation.

One import quota, of course, would deserve another. If this new method of fleecing the consumer succeeds, then we would have a line of sick and uneconomic industries buttonholing Congress for similar protection. The prospective hold-up should arouse the consumer. Already he is paying through the nose for his woolen goods. This new bill would subject him to another steal of monstrous proportions. It might seem surprising that the industry which finds such favor in the eyes of Congress is wool. Its product is worth only $120,000,000, or much less than one-thousandth of the national income. But wool, like silver, is well distributed, and 23 States (or, better put, 46 Senators) have a vested interest in it. And other States might not be averse to going along with the wool States in the hope that with the introduction of this new type of windfall from the public trough they might get theirs. One good turn always has earned another in tariff politics.

We have not discussed the international implications of this opening gun in the congressional declaration of economic war. The Geneva conference on trade agreements might as well close up shop if the wool bill should be enacted. What our representatives are trying to do there is to establish economic peace. But the wool bill means economic war. It is a new technique in import restrictions which would persuade other nations to copy our example, with disastrous results on world and American trade. Our representatives also are trying to find ways and means of helping foreigners earn the dollars wherewith to buy our goods. The problem of the dollar shortage has now become a crisis of the first magnitude engaging the full-time attention of Secretary Marshall. But the wool bill would close an avenue for earning dollars and at the same time for aiding the American consumer. It thus flies in the face of our national interest. Cannot the national well-being make any dent at all upon men obsessed with selfish interests? The wool bill is the year's prize example of lunatic exploitation of the American consumer and the foreign supplier.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Kentucky has expired, except for 2 minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. LODGE. Admitting, as I do, that a wool-support price program is desirable, I nevertheless feel that the method or the philosophy which is set forth in the conference report is not a prudent or a wise way to do it, particularly at the present time. It comes at a moment when our foreign relations are in a tense condition, and at a time when we are doing our best to revive the economies of foreign countries and to place trade on a healthful footing, not so much because of our interest in foreign countries, as because we believe the development of such a trade is good for us. Certainly the setting up of the system which is contemplated in this piece of legislation, runs counter to those hopes.

Then, Mr. President, we confront the fact that large numbers of our citizens who may not actually be groaning under the high cost of living, yet are certainly feeling it very keenly, and that if the provisions of the pending bill are invoked, it will certainly tend to increase the cost of living for a great many people in this country. Those are the reasons why I intend to vote against the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. AIKEN. I now yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the problem we face here is not a new one, and it is one we are going to face with increasing force and strength for the next 2 years, particularly when we finish the agricultural-support program in 1947 and have to decide a new agricultural policy. There are three methods of protecting American industry, and I think nearly everyone who has spoken has expressed his desire to protect the wool industry. One method is by subsidy; another method is by tariff; and a third method is by quotas. We have adopted all methods as to different commodities. We have placed quotas on sugar, to protect sugar; we have, in effect, subsidies to protect silver; and we have a general tariff policy, which is the traditional policy of the country, as a method of protecting American industry.

All the pending bill does is to say that, in addition to using the subsidy method, which is what the Senate approved, the President may also use the method of increasing the tariff, or he may use the method of developing a quota system. Personally, I like a tariff system better than I do either of the other two. I went along with the subsidy plan, because, after all, we have an agricultural-price guaranty, to which we are pledged for 1947 and 1948, that necessarily implies in many cases a subsidy; and it seemed to me the wool growers were entitled to the same protection as any other industry; so that I was satisfied to go along with the subsidy. But I do not think that those who provided the other two methods, which are traditional in the United States, were inspired by political motives. In fact, the Senator from Vermont has shown that the scheme was suggested by the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, not by the Republicans in the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, the proposed action does not represent a tremendous departure from the policy now prevailing, in fact, it is no departure at all. I think it might have been better had the House not placed the amendment in the bill, but under the existing law, as the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] has shown, the President already can raise the tariff 50 percent under the provisions of section 1336 relating to the equalization of the cost of production. In that case the Tariff Commission acts if it finds that the cost of production at home is in excess of the cost of production abroad plus the fixed tariff.

Moreover, in case of discrimination by other nations the President is given the arbitrary power to raise the tariff by 50 percent. Today, under present world conditions, there is not a nation in the world that is not discriminating to some extent against American commerce. So I believe that under existing law the President can raise the figure 50 percent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I called up a member of the Tariff Commission yesterday on that subject and, as I understood from him the only raw wool that is not now subject to reciprocal-trade agreements is raw wool below 44 percent in quality. Where there is a reciprocal trade treaty involved, section 1336 of the code does not apply.

Mr. TAFT. However, the other section, section 338 of the code, relating to discrimination, does apply. Under that provision I think we can find that discrimination exists today in nearly every nation. They have been forced to discriminate against American imports in many respects because they cannot afford to take American imports. Of course, the section already applies to every other agricultural commodity. Why on earth should it not apply to wool?

Action is entirely discretionary with the President. As a matter of permanent law I would be opposed to giving the President the wide discretion given in the bill, but he can apply one of three methods, the tariff, the subsidy, or the quota method. When we come to decide the question ourselves I think we will have to decide what method shall be used. But during the next year and one-half during the maintenance of the agricultural support program I am willing to waive the right of Congress to act, and give discretion to the President as to which of these three methods should be adopted.

Mr. President, I can see no reason why the Australians or any others should think we are changing our policy or doing anything except carrying out the traditional policy which every Senator favors, of placing in the hands of the President some method of protecting American industry. Wool is no petty industry. For a long time American producers provided more than one-half the total consumption of wool in the United States. Today, because of the tremendous increase in consumption, American production is down to about one-third of the total American consumption. But in a number of States it is one of the leading industries, and I see no reason why it should not have exactly the same protection that every other industry has and every other agricultural product has, and that is all the bill does.

I voted for the Senate bill, and I should have been glad if it had come back to the Senate in the form in which we passed it. It seems to me, however, that the objections to this particular amendment are utterly unfounded, that there is absolutely no reason why any foreign nation or any American should be concerned about this proposal involving a great change in policy, or in any way abridging the reciprocal trade program or doing anything else which will interfere at all with our foreign trade.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator mentioned the increase of consumption of wool in the United States. Is he not also aware that there is a dangerous decrease in production?

Mr. TAFT. Yes, the production has decreased, too, I think, 300,000,000 pounds. Wool is a strategic material. Apart from tariff questions, I think it is very important from a national standpoint that we should be prepared to produce at least as much wool as we are now producing, and of course if there is not some protection the production will decrease much further, and it will become a mere byproduct of another industry.

Mr. President, I hope very much that the conference report will be agreed to. I do not think there is any politics in it. I think the gentleman who is protesting in Geneva is sincere, but I think he is completely mistaken. I believe he and his colleagues should be able to show the people with whom they are meeting that this proposal does not represent any change in the policy of the United States.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, in that 1 minute I should like to discuss the attitude of the conferees on the bill. There was no sentiment in the conference committee to put the President on the spot. I cannot understand why Mr. Clayton, or New Zealand, or Australia, should be concerned about import fees and quotas which are explained by the President unless they want to increase their imports into this country far and above what they are importing now or unless they were looking toward reduced tariffs.

At the present time our imports are about 80 percent of the wool that is used in the United States. It would seem to me that the President should welcome this provision, and that also foreign countries should welcome it, because it would provide a means of controlling the market. Otherwise there might be a wide-scale dumping and a depressing of prices. So in my opinion, if the foreign countries are interested only in the program now in effect there should be no objection to the amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield myself a couple of minutes.

When we vote on the conference report let us not lose track of the main objective which is to put a floor under the price of wool in this country for the next 18 months, so as to give the sheep farmers a comparable position to that enjoyed by the producers of the other farm commodities.

I regret very much that the House saw fit to put any amendment on the bill after it left the Senate. I do not think the amendment was necessary. It does not give the wool grower any protection which was not afforded him by the Tariff Act of 1930, and it does not give him any additional protection. Moreover, it does not give the President or anyone else a new or additional power in dealing with international commerce unless the President is minded to use it. Any President so minded could use the provisions of this amendment or the provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930 in the international commerce of the world if he saw fit. This amendment does not give the President any power which he does not already possess. But I do not believe the President of the United States has any intention whatsoever of misusing the amendment, and I say again, I think the provision is absolutely unnecessary.

What we have got to consider now is that the bill is undoubtedly the only chance we have during the present Congress to put a floor under the price of wool for the next 18 months. It has been charged that the amendment was placed in the bill by the House so as to put the President on the spot. I do not attempt to interpret or analyze the purposes of the House leadership. But when it comes to a question of letting the President get on the spot or destroying the income of a million farmers of the United States, and that means the economy of 11 of the Western States then I am satisfied that it is better to take the chance with the President, because I do not think he is on any spot anyway, and can certainly find a way off should he be on one.

I want to point out one thing more. It has been said that this is the first step toward a high-protection policy of the United States. Let me say that there is no surer way to international trade barriers or a high-tariff wall than to destroy the economy of 1,000,000 farmers in 11 of the 48 States of the Union, because in 11 States the economy is dependent largely on the price of wool.

So, Mr. President, I say again, I regret the House put the amendment on the bill, but the only thing for us to do now, if we want to protect the 11 States and the 1,000,000 farmers in the United States who produce wool is to accept the conference report; and that is all we can do.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. All time for debate on the pending report has expired.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Did I correctly understand the ruling of the Chair yesterday in answer to a parliamentary inquiry by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] that if the conference report is defeated a motion will be in order to send Senate bill 814 back to conference, with instructions to the Senate conferees?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Buck	Chavez
Baldwin	Bushfield	Connally
Ball	Butler	Cooper
Barkley	Byrd	Cordon
Brewster	Cain	Donnell
Bricker	Capehart	Downey
Brooks	Capper	Dworshak
Eastland	Lodge	Reed
Ecton	Lucas	Revercomb
Ellender	McCarran	Robertson, Va.
Ferguson	McCarthy	Robertson, Wyo.
Fulbright	McClellan	Russell
George	McFarland	Saltonstall
Green	McGrath	Smith
Gurney	McKellar	Sparkman
Hatch	Magnuson	Taft
Hawkes	Malone	Taylor
Hayden	Martin	Thye
Hickenlooper	Maybank	Tydings
Hoey	Millikin	Umstead
Holland	Moore	Vandenberg
Ives	Morse	Watkins
Jenner	Murray	Wherry
Johnson, Colo.	Myers	White
Johnston, S. C.	O'Conor	Wiley
Kem	O'Daniel	Williams
Kilgore	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Knowland	Overton	Young
Langer	Pepper	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. AIKEN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] who is absent on public business, and who would vote as I am about to vote. I vote "yea." I am advised that if present the Senator from New York would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent because of illness. If present and voting he would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family. If present and voting he would note "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is unavoidably detained on committee business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], who are absent on public business, would vote "nay," if present.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is necessarily absent has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. The transfer of that pair to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], who is absent on public business, has been previously announced by the Senator from Kansas. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "nay," and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 38, as follows:

YEAS—48

Aiken	Capehart	Ecton
Brewster	Capper	Ellender
Bricker	Chavez	Gurney
Brooks	Connally	Hatch
Buck	Cordon	Hawkes
Bushfield	Donnell	Hickenlooper
Butler	Downey	Jenner
Cain	Dworshak	Johnson, Colo.

Kem	Martin	Robertson, Wyo.
Knowland	Millikin	Taft
Langer	Morse	Thye
McCarran	Murray	Watkins
McCarthy	O'Daniel	Wherry
McFarland	O'Mahoney	White
Magnuson	Reed	Wiley
Malone	Revercomb	Young

NAYS—38

Baldwin	Ives	Pepper
Ball	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Va.
Barkley	Kilgore	Russell
Byrd	Lodge	Saltonstall
Cooper	Lucas	Smith
Eastland	McClellan	Sparkman
Ferguson	McGrath	Taylor
Fulbright	McKellar	Tydings
George	Maybank	Umstead
Green	Moore	Vandenberg
Hayden	Myers	Williams
Hoey	O'Conor	Wilson
Holland	Overton	

NOT VOTING—9

Bridges	McMahon	Thomas, Utah
Flanders	Stewart	Tobey
Hill	Thomas, Okla.	Wagner

So the report was agreed to.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

TRANSFER BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF MOTORBOATS TO JUNIOR MIDSHIPMEN OF AMERICA, INC.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the Junior Midshipmen of America, Inc., New London, Conn., had requested the Navy Department to transfer three motorboats for use of that organization in training boys in seamanship, navigation, and related subjects; to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the 30-day period ended May 29, 1947 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

ADMINISTRATION OF GUAM, SAMOA, AND THE PACIFIC ISLANDS (H. DOC. NO. 333)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 19, 1947.

Hon. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
President of the Senate pro tempore,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is enclosed a copy of a report from the Secretary of State indicating a course of action which the Secretaries of State, War, Navy, and Interior have agreed should be followed with respect to the administration of Guam, Samoa, and the Pacific islands to be placed under United States trusteeship.

On October 20, 1945, I appointed a committee consisting of the Secretaries of these four departments to make recommendations concerning this matter. After preliminary consideration it seemed inadvisable to formulate a final recommendation until a determination had been made of the status of certain islands formerly under Japanese control. In the meantime, the departments represented on the committee continued to give study to the problems involved.

After the United Nations Security Council approved a trusteeship agreement designating the United States as the administering authority for the former Japanese mandated islands, I requested that the members of the committee again give joint consideration to problems relating to the administration of the Pacific islands. The enclosed report has been submitted pursuant to that request.

I am sure that the agreement reached by the four Secretaries will be of interest to the Congress in connection with its consideration of legislation to provide civilian government for these islands, and that the information obtained by the departments in studying this question will also be helpful in the consideration of such legislation.

It has long been my view that the inhabitants of Guam and Samoa should enjoy those fundamental human rights and that democratic form of government which are the rich heritage of the people of the United States. We have already extended those rights and that form of government to other possessions of the United States, such as Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, and with respect to the inhabitants of the trust territory have given solemn assurance to the United Nations of our intention to grant these inhabitants a full measure of individual rights and liberties.

I hope that the Congress will approve legislation for the purposes indicated in the enclosed report and that such legislation will provide for the full enjoyment of civil rights and for the greatest practicable measure of self-government.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D. C., June 18, 1947.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Pursuant to your request, the Secretaries of State, War, Navy, and Interior have held several meetings and have agreed upon the following course of action:

1. Separate organic legislation for Guam to provide civil government and to grant citizenship, a bill of rights, and legislative powers to Guamanians should be enacted this session. In recent hearings on such organic legislation the Departments have recommended the transfer of administration from the Navy Department to a civilian agency designated by the President at the earliest practicable date, the exact date to be determined by the President.

2. Organic legislation for American Samoa, providing civil government and granting citizenship, a bill of rights, and legislative powers should be prepared by the Navy and Interior Departments and presented to the next session of Congress.

3. Suggestions for organic legislation for those Pacific islands placed under United States trusteeship are in preparation by the Department of State for presentation to Congress, provided favorable congressional action is taken on the trusteeship agreement to be shortly presented for approval.

4. The Navy Department should continue to have administrative responsibility for Guam and American Samoa on an interim basis pending the transfer to a civilian agency of the Government at the earliest practicable date, such date to be determined by the President. With respect to the trust territory, a similar transfer should be effected by the President at the earliest practicable date.

5. Provided Congress acts favorably on the trusteeship agreement, an Executive order should be issued when the agreement enters into force terminating military government in the trust territory and delegating civil administration to the Navy Department on an interim basis, subject to the conditions set forth in paragraph 4.

Faithfully yours,

G. C. MARSHALL.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BRICKER (for Mr. TOBEY), from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 829. A bill to provide for control and regulation of bank holding companies, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 300).

By Mr. CAPEHART, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 1070. A bill to provide for the cancellation of the capital stock of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the refund of moneys received for such stock, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 301).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 305. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hilda Margaret McGrew; without amendment (Rept. No. 292);

S. 706. A bill for the relief of William D. McCormick; without amendment (Rept. No. 293);

H. R. 381. A bill for the relief of Allen T. Feamster, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 296);

H. R. 407. A bill for the relief of Claude R. Hall and Florence V. Hall; without amendment (Rept. No. 298);

H. R. 617. A bill for the relief of James Harry Martin; without amendment (Rept. No. 294);

H. R. 1067. A bill for the relief of S. C. Spradling and R. T. Morris; without amendment (Rept. No. 312);

H. R. 1144. A bill for the relief of Samuel W. Davis, Jr.; Mrs. Samuel W. Davis, Jr., and Betty Jane Davis; without amendment (Rept. No. 313);

H. R. 1318. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Fuku Kurokawa Thurn; without amendment (Rept. No. 299);

H. R. 2915. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Frederick Faber Wesche (formerly Ann Maureen Bell); without amendment (Rept. No. 297); and

H. R. 3769. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to qualifications of part-time referees in bankruptcy; with amendments (Rept. No. 295).

By Mr. WILSON, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 2389. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the designation of Army mail clerks and assistant Army mail clerks,"

approved August 21, 1941 (55 Stat. 656), and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 302).

By Mr. BALDWIN, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 1807. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the county of Pittsburg, Okla., a perpetual easement for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a public highway over a portion of the United States naval ammunition depot, McAlester, Okla.; without amendment (Rept. No. 303).

By Mr. MAYBANK, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 1371. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to appoint, for supply duty only, officers of the line of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 304); and

H. J. Res. 92. Joint resolution authorizing the presentation of the Distinguished Flying Cross to Rear Adm. Charles E. Rosendahl, United States Navy; without amendment (Rept. No. 305).

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 1362. A bill to permit certain naval personnel to count all active service rendered under temporary appointment as warrant or commissioned officers in the United States Navy and the United States Naval Reserve, or in the United States Marine Corps and the United States Marine Corps Reserve, for purposes of promotion to commissioned warrant officer in the United States Navy or the United States Marine Corps, respectively; without amendment (Rept. No. 306).

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 1376. A bill to amend the acts of October 14, 1942 (56 Stat. 786), as amended, and November 28, 1943 (57 Stat. 593), as amended, so as to authorize transportation of dependents and household effects of personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard to overseas bases; without amendment (Rept. No. 307).

By Mr. GURNEY, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. J. Res. 167. Joint resolution to recognize uncompensated services rendered the Nation under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 308).

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 229. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to construct a postgraduate school at Monterey, Calif.; with amendments (Rept. No. 309);

H. R. 1379. A bill to establish the United States Naval Postgraduate School, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 310); and

H. J. Res. 96. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue posthumously to the late Roy Stanley Geiger, lieutenant general, United States Marine Corps, a commission as general, United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 311).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Jed Johnson, of Oklahoma, to be judge of the United States Customs Court, vice William J. Keefe, resigned;

Otto Schoen, of Missouri, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Missouri, vice William B. Fahy, term expired;

Frank B. Potter, of Texas, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Texas, vice Clyde O. Eastus, term expired; and

Henry W. Moursund, of Texas, to be United States attorney for the western district of Texas, vice William R. Smith, Jr., resigned.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 1475. A bill for the relief of Emma L. Jackson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1476. A bill to require the designation by the senior circuit judge of another judge to sit in the place of any judge against whom an affidavit of personal bias and prejudice has been filed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENNER:

S. J. Res. 132. Joint resolution providing for the proper observance of the one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of the signing of the Constitution of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. VANDENBERG introduced Senate Joint Resolution 133, to provide for return of Italian property in the United States, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and appears under a separate heading.)

RETURN TO ITALY OF CERTAIN PROPERTY

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, at the time the Italian treaty was on the floor of the Senate for consideration, I suggested, as emphatically as I could, that the democratic government of new Italy would constantly find evidences of American friendship and interest as the days went on. I particularly referred to the purpose of the State Department to facilitate the return of Italian property in the United States to prewar ownership.

At the request of the State Department I now ask unanimous consent to introduce a joint resolution to provide for the return of Italian property in the United States, and requiring that Italy shall not be treated as a nation with which the United States has at any time since December 7, 1941, been at war. I think it will prove to be a matter of great interest and helpfulness to Italy.

I request that the joint resolution be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 133), to provide for return of Italian property in the United States and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. VANDENBERG, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EXPENDITURE OF ADDITIONAL FUNDS BY COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. BRIDGES submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 130), which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eightieth Congress, $10,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes, specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946.

INVESTIGATION OF EFFICIENCY, ECONOMY, AND PRACTICES OF CERTAIN CORPORATIONS

Mr. LANGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 131), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Whereas a recent report of the Federal Trade Commission on mergers showed that—

(a) Since 1940, 1,800 industrial concerns have been absorbed by other concerns;

(b) More than one-third of all mergers since 1940 have been in three industries, in which small concerns have predominated: food, nonelectrical machinery, and textiles;

(c) Big companies are most active in mergers of business units since 1940, almost a third of the absorbed companies being taken over by the largest corporations, with assets of $50,000,000 or more;

(d) At the end of 1945 the 62 largest manufacturing corporations held $8,400,000,000 in net working capital;

(e) About three-fifths of mergers in the past 6 years have been horizontal, of firms producing similar products; and

Whereas the Congress has for several years considered legislation prohibiting the acquisition by corporations engaged in commerce of the stock or other share capital, or assets of another corporation; and

Whereas the continued concentration of corporate wealth in private monopolies constitutes a serious threat to the economic stability of the Nation, and to the prosperity and living standards of all American consumers, but the potential benefits of large-scale production and distribution should be obtained for consumers: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make an investigation into the efficiency, economy, and practices of giant corporations in the United States. The committee shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable the results of its investigation, and shall make a preliminary report during the second session of the Eightieth Congress.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings; to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions and recesses of the Senate in the Eightieth Congress; to employ and to call upon the executive departments for clerical and other assistance; to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents; to administer such oaths; to take such testimony; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

SECOND URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL—AMENDMENT

Mr. HOLLAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3791) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 7, after line 11, insert the following:

"DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

"NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

"National parks: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1948, for 'National parks,' $89,000.

"FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses

"Maintenance of mammal and bird reservations: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1948, for 'Maintenance of mammal and bird reservations,' $50,000."

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 3492. An act to provide for the expeditious disposition of certain war housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 3818. An act to amend the Federal Insurance Contributions Act with respect to rates of tax on employers and employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 3839. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 51) against adoption of Reorganization Plan No. 3 of May 27, 1947, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

RENT LEGISLATION—STATEMENT BY SENATOR TAYLOR

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a press release prepared by him on rent legislation, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PROPOSED MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY—EDITORIAL FROM THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial regarding the proposed Missouri Valley Authority, from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, which appears in the Appendix.]

PREPARATIONS FOR NATIONAL SECURITY—ADDRESS BY CORD MEYER, JR.

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Cord Meyer, Jr. at a luncheon forum sponsored by United World Federalists and American Federation of Scientists, at Washington, D. C., June 19, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

ANALYSIS OF KEY POINTS OF THE LABOR BILL—ARTICLE BY LOUIS STARK

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "An Analysis of Key Points of the Labor Bill," by Louis Stark, from the New York Times of June 15, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS—ARTICLE BY REV. BENJAMIN L. MASSE

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "NAM's Free Enterprise—Not American, Not Christian, Not Too Free," by Rev. Benjamin L. Masse, from the magazine America for May 31, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE TAFT-HARTLEY BILL

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement regarding the so-called Taft-Hartley bill by 13 practitioners and professors of administrative law, which appears in the Appendix.]

DISPUTE OVER AIR SAFETY EQUIPMENT

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "CAA, Air Lines, Armed Forces Squabble Over Air Safety Equipment," by Albert Douglas, published in the June 19, 1947, issue of the Wall Street Journal, which appears in the Appendix.]

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 3—STATEMENT BY VERNON P. SPENCER

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "In Opposition to Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1947," made by Vernon P. Spencer before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, June 19, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHAT IT MEANS TO BE AN AMERICAN—ESSAYS BY SCHOOL CHILDREN OF HAZLETON, PA.

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD three prize winning essays by school children of Hazleton, Pa., on the subject What It Means To Be an American, which appear in the Appendix.]

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the National Resources Economic Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands may be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF MEETING OF SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE WILDLIFE RESOURCES

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I announce that the Committee To Investigate Wildlife Resources, being a subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, will hold a hearing on June 24 and 25 in relation to hunting regulations on migratory birds. The hearings will be held at room 357 in the Senate Office Building, and all those who desire to testify should get in touch with the clerk. The hearings will open at 10 o'clock in the morning on each of those 2 days.

REORGANIZATION OF EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, it is a matter of deep gratification to me that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has today voted to report favorably Senate bill 164, a bill which I introduced in the Senate, and the counterpart of which was introduced in the House by Representative BROWN of Ohio. This bill proposes to create a commission to study and submit recommendations by January 1, 1949, for the complete overhauling and reorganization of the executive branch of the Government. This is a far-reaching and important matter, and I think the committee is to be congratulated for the action it has taken and also for the fact that it acted unanimously. I should like to express my appreciation to the committee, through its distinguished chairman, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and the chairman of the subcommittee, the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], for the work they did. In the serious times through which our country is now passing, it is more important than ever that our Government be both efficient and economical.

It is my hope and intention that at the next call of the consent calendar, this bill will be favorably acted upon, inasmuch as it has already been explained at great length on the floor of the Senate and in the committee. Of course, if any Senator desires to have a more extensive presentation made, I shall be happy to make what contribution I can to that end.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3303) to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military Establishment of the United States; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ANDREWS of New York, Mr. SHORT, Mr. ARENDS, Mr. VINSON, and Mr. DREWRY, were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent order of yesterday, when the conference report on the wool bill was disposed of, the Presidential succession bill, Senate bill 564, was to be laid before the Senate as the unfinished business and then temporarily laid aside to permit consideration of the conference report on the rent control bill, House bill 3203, relative to maximum rent on housing accommodations; to repeal certain provisions of Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress, and for other purposes. The Chair lays Senate bill 564 before the Senate.

The Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill (S. 564), to provide for the performance of the duties of the office of President in case removal, resignation, or inability both of the President and Vice President.

EXTENSION OF RENT CONTROL—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the unfinished business will be temporarily laid aside for the consideration of the conference report on House bill 3203.

Mr. BUCK submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3203) relative to maximum rents on housing accommodations; to repeal certain provisions of Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2 and 4.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Strike out the word "and" following the comma at the beginning of said amendment.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"(5) the Housing Expediter shall prescribe by regulations: (i) the manner in which such housing accommodations shall be publicly offered in good faith for sale or rental to veterans of World War II or their families in accordance with the provisions of this section, and (ii) exceptions to this section for hardship cases, including appropriate exceptions from the operation of paragraphs (3) and (4): *Provided*, That nothing contained in this Act shall affect or remove any veterans' preference requirements heretofore established under Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress, and outstanding with respect to housing accommodations completed prior to the date of the enactment of this title."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"(c) For purposes of this section (1) the Housing Expediter shall prescribe by regulations the time as of which construction of housing accommodations shall be deemed to be completed, and (2) the term "person" shall have the meaning assigned to such term in section 1 (b) (3) of this Act."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SEC. 201. (a) The Congress hereby reaffirms the declaration in the Price Control Extension Act of 1946 that unnecessary or unduly prolonged controls over rents would be inconsistent with the return to a peacetime economy and would tend to prevent the attainment of the goals therein declared.

"(b) The Congress therefore declares that it is its purpose to terminate at the earliest practicable date all Federal restrictions on rents on housing accommodations. At the same time the Congress recognizes that an emergency exists and that, for the prevention of inflation and for the achievement of a reasonable stability in the general level of rents during the transition period, as well as the attainment of other salutary objectives of the above-named Act, it is necessary for a limited time to impose certain restrictions upon rents charged for rental housing accommodations in defense-rental areas. Such restrictions should be administered with a view to prompt adjustments where owners of rental housing accommodations are suffering hardships because of the inadequacies of the maximum rents applicable to their housing accommodations, and under procedures designed to minimize delay in the granting of necessary adjustments, which, so far as practicable, shall be made by local boards with a minimum of control by any central agency.

"(c) To the end that these policies may be effectively carried out with the least possible impact on the economy pending complete decontrol, the provisions of this title are enacted.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 202. As used in this title—

"(a) The term 'person' includes an individual, corporation, partnership, association, or any other organized group of persons, or a legal successor or representative of any of the foregoing.

"(b) The term 'housing accommodations' means any building, structure, or part thereof, or land appurtenant thereto, or any other real or personal property rented or offered for rent for living or dwelling purposes (including houses, apartments, rooming- or boarding-house accommodations, and other properties used for living or dwelling purposes) together with all privileges, services, furnishings, furniture, and facilities connected with the use or occupancy of such property.

"(c) The term 'controlled housing accommodations' means housing accommodations in any defense-rental area, except that it does not include—

"(1) those housing accommodations, in any establishment which is commonly known as a hotel in the community in which it is located, which are occupied by persons who are provided customary hotel services such as maid service, furnishing and laundering of linen, telephone and secretarial or desk service, use and upkeep of furniture and fixtures, and bellboy service; or

"(2) any motor court, or any part thereof; or any tourist home serving transient guests exclusively, or any part thereof; or

"(3) any housing accommodations (A) the construction of which was completed on or after February 1, 1947, or which are additional housing accommodations created by conversion on or after February 1, 1947 except that contracts for the rental of housing accommodations to veterans of World War II and their immediate families, the construction of which was assisted by allocations or priorities under Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved May 22, 1946, shall remain in full force and effect, or (B) which at no time during the period February 1, 1945, to January 31, 1947, both dates inclusive, were rented (other than to members of the immediate family of the occupant) as housing accommodations.

"(d) The term 'defense-rental area' means any part of any area designated under the provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, prior to March 1, 1947, as an area where defense activities have resulted or threaten to result in an increase in the rents for housing accommodations inconsistent with the purpcses of such Act, in which maximum rents were being regulated under such Act on March 1, 1947.

"(e) The term 'rent' means the consideration demanded or received in connection with the use or occupancy or the transfer of a lease of any housing accommodations.

"TERMINATION OF RENT CONTROL UNDER EMERGENCY PRICE CONTROL ACT OF 1942

"SEC. 203. (a) After the effective date of this title, no maximum rents shall be established or maintained under the authority of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, with respect to any housing accommodations.

"(b) On the termination of rent control under this title all records and other data used or held in connection with the establishment and maintenance of maximum rents by the Housing Expediter, and all predecessor agencies, shall, on request, be delivered without reimbursement to the proper officials of any State or local subdivision of government that may be charged with the duty of administering a rent control program in any State or local subdivision of government to which such records and data may be applicable: *Provided, however*, That any such records or data shall be so made available subject to recall for use in carrying out the purposes of this title.

"RENT CONTROL UNDER THIS TITLE

"SEC. 204. (a) The Housing Expediter shall administer the powers, functions, and duties under this title; and for the purpose of exercising such powers, functions, and duties, and the powers, functions, and duties granted to or imposed upon the Housing Expediter by title I of this Act, the Office of Housing Expediter is hereby extended until February 29, 1948.

"(b) During the period beginning on the effective date of this title and ending on the date this title ceases to be in effect, no person shall demand, accept, or receive any rent for the use or occupancy of any controlled housing accommodations greater than the maximum rent established under the authority of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and in effect with respect thereto on June 30, 1947: *Provided, however*, That the Housing Expediter shall, by regulation or order, make such adjustments in such maximum rents as may be necessary to correct inequities or further to carry out the purposes and provisions of this title: *And provided further*, That in any case in which a landlord and tenant, on or before December 31, 1947, voluntarily enter into a valid written lease in good faith with respect to any housing accommodations for which a maximum rent is in effect under this section and such lease takes effect after the effective date of this title and expires on or after December 31, 1948, and if a true and duly executed copy of such lease is filed, within fifteen days after the date of execution of such lease, with the Housing Expediter, the maximum rent for such housing accommodations shall be, as of the date such lease takes effect, that which is mutually agreed between the landlord and tenant in such lease if it does not represent an increase of more than 15 per centum over the maximum rent which would otherwise apply under this section. In any case in which a maximum rent for any housing accommodations is established pursuant to the provisions of the last proviso above, such maximum rent shall not thereafter be subject to modification by any regulation or order issued under the provisions of this title. No housing accommodations for which a maximum rent is established pursuant to the provisions of the last proviso above shall be subject, after December 31, 1947, to any maximum rent established or maintained under the provisions of this title.

"(c) The Housing Expediter is hereby authorized and directed to remove any or all maximum rents before this title ceases to be in effect, in any defense-rental area, if in his judgment the need for continuing maximum rents in such area no longer exists due to sufficient construction of new housing accommodations or when the demand for rental housing accommodations has been otherwise reasonably met.

"(d) The Housing Expediter is authorized to issue such regulations and orders, consistent with the provisions of this title, as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this section and section 202 (c).

"(e) (1) The Housing Expediter is authorized and directed to create in each defense-rental area, or such portion thereof as he may designate, a local advisory board, each such board to consist of not less than five members who are representative citizens of the area, to be appointed by the Housing Expediter, from recommendations made by the respective Governors. Each such board shall have sufficient members to enable it promptly to consider individual adjustment cases coming before it on which the board shall make recommendations to the officials administering this title within its area. The local boards may make such recommendations to the Housing Expediter as they deem advisable with respect to the following matters:

"(A) Decontrol of the defense-rental area or any portion thereof;

"(B) The adequacy of the general rent level in the area; and

"(C) Operations generally of the local rent office, with particular reference to hardship cases.

"(2) The Housing Expediter shall furnish the local boards suitable office space and stenographic assistance and shall make available to such boards any records and other information in the possession of the Housing Expediter with respect to the establishment and maintenance of maximum rents and housing accommodations in the respective defense-rental areas which may be requested by such boards.

"(3) Within thirty days after receipt of any recommendation of a local board such recommendation shall be approved or disapproved or the local board shall be notified in writing of the reasons why final action cannot be taken in thirty days. Any recommendation of a local board appropriately substantiated and in accordance with applicable law and regulations shall be approved and appropriate action shall promptly be taken to carry such recommendation into effect.

"(4) Immediately upon the enactment of this Act the Housing Expediter shall communicate with the governors of the several States advising them of the provisions of this subsection and of the number and location of defense-rental areas in their respective States, and requesting their cooperation in carrying out such provisions.

"(f) The provisions of this title shall cease to be in effect on February 29, 1948.

"RECOVERY OF DAMAGES BY TENANTS

"SEC. 205. Any person who demands, accepts, or receives any payment of rent in excess of the maximum rent prescribed under section 204 shall be liable to the person from whom he demands, accepts, or receives such payment, for reasonable attorney's fees and costs as determined by the court, plus liquidated damages in the amount of (1) $50, or (2) three times the amount by which the payment or payments demanded, accepted, or received exceed the maximum rent which could lawfully be demanded, accepted, or received, whichever in either case may be the greater amount: *Provided*, That the amount of such liquidated damages shall be the amount of the overcharge or overcharges if the defendant proves that the violation was neither willful nor the result of failure to take practicable precautions against the occurrence of the violation. Suit to recover such amount may be brought in any Federal, State, or Territorial court of competent jurisdiction within one year after the date of such violation. For the purpose of determining the amount of liquidated damages to be awarded to the plaintiff in an action brought under this section, all violations alleged in such action which were committed by the defendant with respect to the plaintiff prior to the bringing of action shall be deemed to constitute one violation, and the amount demanded, accepted, or received in connection with such one violation shall be deemed to be the aggregate amount demanded, accepted, or received in connection with all violations. A judgment in an action under this section shall be a bar to a recovery under this section in any other action against the same defendant on account of any violation with respect to the same plaintiff prior to the institution of the action in which such judgment was rendered.

"PROHIBITION AND ENFORCEMENT

"SEC. 206. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person to offer, solicit, demand, accept, or receive any rent for the use or occupancy of any controlled housing accommodations in excess of the maximum rent prescribed under section 204.

"(b) Whenever in the judgment of the Housing Expediter any person has engaged or is about to engage in any act or practice which constitutes or will constitute a violation of subsection (a) of this section, he may make application to any Federal, State or Territorial court of competent jurisdiction, for an order enjoining such act or practice, or for an order enforcing compliance with such subsection, and upon a showing by the Housing Expediter that such person has engaged or is about to engage in any such act or practice a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, or other order shall be granted without bond.

"MAINTENANCE OF ACTIONS FOR CERTAIN ALLEGED PAST VIOLATIONS

"SEC. 207. No action or proceeding, involving any alleged violation of Maximum Price Regulation Numbered 188, issued under the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, shall be maintained in any court, or judgment thereon executed or otherwise proceeded on, if a court of competent jurisdiction has found, or by opinion has declared, that the person alleged to have committed such violation acted in good faith and that application to such person of the 'actual delivery' provisions of such regulation would result or has resulted in extreme hardship.

"PROPERTY, PERSONNEL, AND APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 208. (a) The records, property, personnel, and funds relating primarily to rent control, transferred to the Housing Expediter by or pursuant to Executive Order Numbered 9841, dated April 23, 1947, may be used for the purpose of carrying out the powers, functions, and duties of the Housing Expediter under this title; except that any personnel so transferred who are found to be in excess of the needs of the Housing Expediter for the exercise of such powers, functions, and duties shall be separated from the service.

"(b) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Housing Expediter such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

"EVICTION OF TENANTS

"SEC. 209. (a) No action or proceeding to recover possession of any controlled housing accommodations with respect to which a maximum rent is in effect under this title shall be maintainable by any landlord against any tenant in any court, notwithstanding the fact that the tenant has no lease or that his lease has expired, so long as the tenant continues to pay the rent to which the landlord is entitled unless—

"(1) under the law of the State in which the action or proceeding is brought the tenant is (A) violating the obligation of his tenancy (other than an obligation to pay rent higher than rent permitted under this Act or an obligation to surrender possession of such housing accommodations) or (B) is committing a nuisance in such housing accommodations or using such housing accommodations for an immoral or illegal purpose or for other than living or dwelling purposes;

"(2) the landlord seeks in good faith to recover possession of such housing accommodations for his immediate and personal use and occupancy as housing accommodations;

"(3) the landlord has in good faith contracted in writing to sell the housing accommodations to a purchaser for the immediate and personal use and occupancy as housing accommodations by such purchaser;

"(4) the landlord seeks in good faith to recover possession of such housing accommodations for the immediate purpose of substantially altering, remodeling, or demolishing them and replacing them with new construction, and the altering or remodeling is reasonably necessary to protect and conserve the housing accommodations and cannot practically be done with the tenant in occupancy, and the landlord has obtained such approval as may be required by Federal, State, or local law for the alterations, remodeling, or any construction planned; or

"(5) the housing accommodations are nonhousekeeping, furnished housing accommodations located within a single dwelling unit not used as a rooming or boarding house and the remaining portion of which is occupied by the landlord or his immediate family.

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the United States or any State or local public agency may maintain an action or proceeding to recover possession of any housing accommodations operated by it where such action or proceeding is authorized by the statute or regulations under which such accommodations are administered: *Provided*, That nothing in this subsection shall be deemed to authorize the maintenance of any such action or proceeding upon the ground that the income of the occupants of the housing accommodations exceeds the allowable maximum unless such income, less any amounts paid to such occupants by the Veterans' Administration on account of service-connected disability or disabilities, exceeds the allowable maximum.

"ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT INAPPLICABLE

"SEC. 210. Section 2 (a) of the Administrative Procedure Act, as amended, is amended by inserting after 'Selective Training and Service Act of 1940;' the following: 'Housing and Rent Act of 1947;'.

"APPLICATION

"SEC. 211. The provisions of this title shall be applicable to the several States and to the Territories and possessions of the United States but shall not be applicable to the District of Columbia.

"EFFECTIVE DATE OF TITLE

"SEC. 212. This title shall become effective on the first day of the first calendar month following the month in which this Act is enacted:

"SHORT TITLE

"SEC. 213. This Act may be cited as the 'Housing and Rent Act of 1947'."

And the Senate agree to the same.

C. D. BUCK,
JOE MCCARTHY,
HARRY P. CAIN,
JOHN SPARKMAN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
JOHN C. KUNKEL,
HENRY O. TALLE,
PAUL BROWN,
MIKE MONRONEY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Under the unanimous consent agreement, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a number of Senators have asked relative to the session tomorrow and a possible session on Saturday. I should like to say that if it is agreeable to Members of the Senate it is proposed to consider tomorrow afternoon at approximately 1:30 the labor bill, if it be vetoed. I understand that there will probably be no extended debate and that we can probably conclude it within a few minutes on Friday afternoon. If there be no extended debate, we shall proceed with the Presidential-succession bill, or with some other bill, if the Senate decides that such bill is

urgent. If we dispose of the labor bill, in the event that it is vetoed, there will be no session on Saturday.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. May I inquire of the Senator from Nebraska whether, if we have a session tomorrow afternoon, it is the intention of the majority to continue on Saturday, or will the Senate adjourn until Monday? I make that inquiry because I am scheduled to go to Tennessee tomorrow night to make a speech before a group of lawyers and I do not want to leave if there is to be a session on Saturday.

Mr. WHERRY. I can assure the Senator that the intention is, if it is agreeable to the Senate, that we proceed with the consideration of the labor bill tomorrow afternoon, if it be vetoed. If consideration is concluded tomorrow afternoon, it is not contemplated to have a session on Saturday, but I think it is the sense of the majority that if it takes a longer time than Friday afternoon we will continue with the labor bill until we conclude it tomorrow evening, if that will expedite matters.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. So far as I am personally concerned, I am not anticipating what may happen. All this discussion is based on something that may or may not happen.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. But if there is a veto message, I am ready to vote on it at any time. If the debate on it should not be concluded tomorrow—and there is no way to tell at this juncture—and should not be concluded Saturday, if we hold a session on Saturday, it would go over until Monday of next week. On next Monday, Tuesday, and possibly Wednesday a number of Senators will be absent from the Senate, because I understand that the President is scheduled to go to Warm Springs, Ga., to dedicate a memorial for the foundation there, and several Senators have been invited to go along. They do not have to go, but some of them would like to go. If consideration of a possible veto of the labor bill is not concluded on Friday or Saturday, I wonder whether it could go over until the middle of next week, there not being any particular emergency.

Mr. WHERRY. My answer to that question is that we must wait and see how we get along on Friday and Friday night. I think I can announce that if it is agreeable to the Senate, we shall proceed Friday afternoon and Friday night. By that time the Senate can decide how it wants to proceed from that time forward. That is, assuming that the President vetoes the labor bill.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I have noted with interest, if not with curiosity, the optimism expressed by the Senator from Nebraska. It is rather an extraordinary optimism, in view of what the House did in connection with the tax bill. It is said that history sometimes repeats itself.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida for his observation. No one has more optimism in connection with the work of the Senate than I have.

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF GLENN J. HOWREY

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOPER in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 254) for the relief of the legal guardian of Glenn J. Howrey, which was, on page 1, line 6, to strike out "$500" and insert "$1,500."

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MOORE, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. MCGRATH conferees on the part of the Senate.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1230) to amend sections 2 (a) and 603 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, which were, on page 1, lines 4 and 5, to strike out "the following: 'and prior to July 1, 1947'" and insert "'1947'" and inserting "'1947'"; and on page 1, to strike out lines 6 to 9, inclusive; and to amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend section 2 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended."

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF RENT CONTROL—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the conference report on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3203) relative to maximum rents on housing accommodations; to repeal certain provisions of Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress, and for other purposes.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, I shall undertake to point out as briefly but as completely as I can, the provisions which were agreed to and the changes which were made by the conferees in the rent-control bill as it left the Senate.

In the first place, by the action on Senate amendment No. 14, the conference report extends the Office of Housing Expediter, for purposes of this legislation, until February 29, 1948.

In that connection, let me say there was considerable discussion at the conference in regard to the effect which the bill might have upon the Expediter's premium payment program for merchant pig iron. It was the feeling of the conferees that that program could be completed in 1947. I invite attention to the following section of the statement of the managers on the part of the House:

> Under the language of section 1 (a), the Housing Expediter will have the authority to administer and liquidate the existing obligations of the Government with respect to market guaranty agreements and premium payment regulations, including a premium payment regulation for merchant pig iron issued prior to the enactment of this act and extending through the calendar year 1947. Any such premium payment plan shall be within the $65,000,000 estimated by the Housing Expediter as the total amount required of the $400,000,000 authorization under section 11 of Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress.

Mr. President, the so-called Cordon amendment, providing $10,000,000 additional for access roads, to be provided in the same manner as the $15,000,000 made available for these purposes under the Veterans Emergency Housing Act—that is, by advances from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation—was not retained in the conference report. The House conferees, while not objecting to the principle of this provision if need therefor should be demonstrated, took the position that since the Veterans Emergency Housing Act was, in effect, being liquidated, there was no justification for continuing the provision for access roads involving the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Housing Expediter, when that matter should properly be taken care of through the agencies of the Government normally dealing with access roads. In fact the House conferees, in their formal statement, note specifically that omitting this amendment is without prejudice to its consideration in other legislation.

The amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], which added to the buildings or facilities for which a permit could have been required, those to be used for commercial other than housing purposes, was not agreed to. The House conferees refused to yield on their position that permits should be required only for construction of amusement and recreational buildings and facilities. I may say, Mr. President, that this was one of two provisions which the House conferees insisted be stricken from the bill. They said that if controls on building materials were put back in the bill, it would be very questionable whether the conference report would be approved by the House of Representatives. In fact, they believed it would be impossible to have it approved by the House in that case.

Furthermore, we were not clear in regard to exactly what the term "commercial" meant, whether it included construction for industry, or merely what might be termed "commercial buildings."

Mr. President, the Senate amendment which rewrote paragraph (5) of subsection (a) of section 5 of the House bill, dealing with preference or priority to veterans of World War II or their families in connection with the sale or rental of certain housing accommodations, was agreed to with certain modifications. It may be recalled that that amendment

was submitted by the distinguished junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN].

Let me point out here a very important change which was made in the Senate bill: The pattern of discontinuing controls under the Price Control Act and of providing new basic authority was adopted in the conference report. That means that all the rules and regulations that were carried under the OPA law have been done away with, and the Expediter will have to promulgate his own rules and regulations. The authority for that is contained in the conference report in the following words:

(d) The Housing Expediter is authorized to issue such regulations and orders, consistent with the provisions of this title, as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this section and section 202 (c).

Mr. President, the conferees on the part of the House agreed to the Senate provision terminating controls on February 29, 1948.

The Housing Expediter was retained as the official to administer the law, and the provision for utilization of local boards vested with broad administrative authority was also retained in the conference report.

The House provision authorizing decontrol by local governing bodies was eliminated.

The Senate provision relating to the transfer of rent controls to the States was stricken out. It was thought by the conferees that since there was a Federal law to control rents, it should not be made permissive for the States to take over control.

The following changes were made in the Senate provision for decontrol of housing accommodations:

The House language dividing residential hotels and motor courts was adopted. I should like to refer to that further. It is found under title I of section 202, and reads as follows:

Those housing accommodations, in any establishment which is commonly known as a hotel in the community in which it is located, which are occupied by persons who are provided customary hotel services such as maid service, furnishing and laundering of linen, telephone, and secretarial or desk service, use and upkeep of furniture and fixtures, and bellboy service.

From that type of buildings, controls are removed.

The Senate provision for decontrolling accommodations renting for $225 or more a month was stricken out. It was generally felt that this was class legislation, and should not be incorporated in the bill.

Now we come to the so-called Hawkes amendment. That amendment, as adopted by the Senate, was amended in two respects. The 15-percent increase was allowed on maximum rents in effect at the time the act becomes effective. That differs from the Hawkes amendment in that the increase would have applied to rents in effect September 1, 1946, under the Hawkes amendment.

There was a further amendment to the section which provides that a copy of the release is required to be filed with the Housing Expediter within 15 days after the date of execution. That was contained in the language of the House bill, and it seemed desirable to incorporate it in the conference report.

There is only one other matter to which I wish to refer, that is, that the Senate bill contained a provision which terminated rent controls in the District of Columbia on the same date rent controls generally would be terminated, and that provision was stricken out. We were informed, at the time, by the House conferees, that there was now being considered in the House a bill which would refer to the District of Columbia, in which the final date of expiration for control of rents in the District would be provided for.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOPER in the chair). Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. BUCK. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I do not wish to interrupt the orderly discussion of the provisions of the report, but I am very much interested in section 209 (a), which is found on page 6 of the report, under the title "Eviction of Tenants." The bill which was passed by the Senate, which went to conference, and is now before us in the conference report, provided in section 209:

No action or proceeding to recover possession of any controlled housing accommodations with respect to which a maximum rent is in effect under this title shall be maintainable by any landlord against any tenant in any court, notwithstanding the fact that the tenant has no lease or that his lease has expired, so long as the tenant continues to pay the rent to which the landlord is entitled, unless—

Then there are set forth five exceptions. Under the present law, as I understand, there is a similar provision, which under certain conditions prevents the recovery of the premises by the landlord. Does the able Senator have in mind how many exceptions to the rule exist under the present law which is about to expire?

Mr. BUCK. No; I do not know.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Under the present law, as I understand, there is either a ruling, or it is a part of the statute, that after notice, or after recovery has been effected in a court, the tenant may continue to hold the premises for some 6 months.

Mr. BUCK. It is either 3 or 6 months.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Is that an administrative ruling, or is it done pursuant to express provision of the statute?

Mr. BUCK. It is a regulation of the OPA.

Mr. REVERCOMB. It is an administrative ruling?

Mr. BUCK. Yes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Under section 209 (a), can the Administrator, or the Expediter, in this case, still fix a time within which a tenant may continue to hold the premises before he is compelled to vacate?

Mr. BUCK. I am advised that he cannot.

Mr. REVERCOMB. In other words, the exceptions expressly stated in the bill as we have it before us are such exceptions that the landlord is entitled to recover and have immediate possession, according to the judgment of the court, of course. Is that correct?

Mr. BUCK. Apparently that is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, I should like to sum up in a few words the main features of the conference report bill.

The bill provides for rent controls to be administered by the Expediter, who at present is Mr. Creedon.

There are certain types of properties which will be excluded from controls after the enactment of the bill.

The rent areas will set up local advisory boards, which will have as complete power as it is possible to give them under the act.

Controls will terminate, if the bill shall be approved, on February 29, 1948.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the conference report.

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN POSTMASTER APPOINTMENTS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, yesterday afternoon I gave notice that as soon as I could get the floor I would reply to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] relative to certain post offices and the appointment of postmasters. This being the first opportunity I have had to take the matter up, I wish to go into it in some detail.

First of all, I wish to invite the Senator from Maryland to go pheasant hunting next fall in the State of North Dakota.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall be delighted to go pheasant hunting with the Senator from North Dakota next fall in North Dakota, or any other place. We will load our guns and I hope neither of us will shoot any political postmasters. [Laughter.]

Mr. LANGER. I am delighted the Senator has accepted, and I am sure that if he will come with me he will have a most delightful time in North Dakota, and meet some wonderful people. The people in North Dakota are of all nationalities, all religions, all creeds. The people in our State have a habit of helping each other.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I gladly yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator would guarantee that I could kill as many pheasants as he is trying to kill postmasters, I would accept an invitation from him myself. [Laughter.]

Mr. LANGER. I am sure the Senator from Maryland and I would like to have the Senator from Kentucky come along and carry the birds after we shoot them.

Mr. BARKLEY. I can do that.

Mr. TYDINGS. There is nothing I enjoy more than hunting, and I would

like very much to go hunting with the Senator from North Dakota. I wish to say to him that in spite of our disagreement over certain matters, there is nothing personal in my attitude, as I am sure he appreciates, and this controversy perhaps will go on. My only interest is in presenting the facts as I think they exist. I hope the Senator will understand that.

Mr. LANGER. Certainly; I can readily understand.

As I was about to say, in North Dakota people help each other. It is a common occurrence there, when one farmer becomes ill, for his neighbors to come in and put in his crop for him. It is common there, no matter how bitterly the publishers of two newspapers may be fighting, if a fire occurs in one of the newspaper plants, the publisher of the opposite political faith will come forward and help in getting out the paper of the one who has had the disaster.

Mr. President, coming more specifically to the matter of post offices, I can readily understand that the distinguished Senator from Maryland has been so busy during recent years that he simply has not had the time that I have taken, as chairman of the Committee on Civil Service, to delve into the facts. I have the highest regard for the integrity of my distinguished friend, and I know that this man, upon whom has been bestowed the highest medal that the United States can bestow upon any person for bravery and valor, would never rise on the floor of the Senate and say willingly a thing which was not true. I want to suggest to him that he is mistaken, as I think for example he will concede, in connection with the postmastership at Baltimore. On page 5266 of the RECORD, concerning a Republican appointee by the name of Benjamin Woelper, who was postmaster at Baltimore, Md., the distinguished Senator from Maryland said he was retained in office by himself and former Senator Radcliffe, because he was a good man. It is interesting to note the following facts:

Mr. Woelper was nominated on January 7, 1930, and confirmed by the Senate on January 16, 1930, which gave him a 4-year appointment. This continued him in office until January 16, 1934. The Democrats having taken over in 1933, it would have been impossible for the Democrats to have removed him from office until the end of his term, the following year.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the Senator is not well informed about that. Mr. Woelper came to my office with Mr. Green, his first assistant. Mr. Woelper was getting along in years, and did not live very long after that. He told me that he desired to retire from the post office, and he recommended most strongly for my consideration and that of my colleague, his able first assistant, Mr. Green. It is my opinion that if Mr. Woelper had not made that statement, he could have stayed in the position as long as he wanted, because, ever since Mr. Woelper retired, the career men in the Post Office Department in Baltimore, regardless of political affiliation, have succeeded to the postmastership each time. There have been no political recommendations of any kind, shape, or form, to support any candidate for the post office of Baltimore City. If Mr. Woelper had not come to my office and told me that his health was such that he wanted to withdraw, he would have stayed there much longer, after his term had expired.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I merely want to say to the distinguished Senator from Maryland, he suffers from what perhaps happens to all of us at times, a lapse of memory; the Senator has so many things to do. For example, yesterday, on one occasion, the Senator said:

We let him—

That is, Mr. Woelper—

hold that office until he resigned, many years thereafter.

Mr. TYDINGS. I did not remember the number of years, but the point is substantially true, that Mr. Woelper was not disturbed, no one ever thought of getting a successor to him, until Mr. Woelper came to my office and said, "Senator Tydings, my health is such that I want to get out; here is my assistant, who has spent 30 or 40 years in the office, and I recommend him." I called on my memory for the length of time. The fact is substantially as I related.

Mr. LANGER. Those, no doubt, are the facts as the Senator remembered them.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes. I do not want to interrupt the Senator, but I hope he will understand, certainly the facts are transparent, that whenever there has been a vacancy in the office of postmaster of Baltimore City, there has never been a political recommendation made to me, or by me, to the Post Office Department; but, on each occasion, the next ranking career man has been promoted to the office. The Baltimore Sun, one of our great newspapers, has carried on a campaign, and a proper campaign, to give these offices to career men in the Post Office Department. I subscribed to that campaign and went along with it, as the proper way to conduct the postal service. At no time has any party politician of any consequence, an active worker in the party, ever received, directly or indirectly, any support of mine for the office of postmaster of Baltimore City.

Mr. LANGER. I merely wish to call to the attention of the distinguished Senator the fact, nevertheless, that Mr. Woelper's term expired on the 16th day of January 1934, and that he did not remain in office a great many years after that, as the Senator said, I am sure inadvertently, the other day, because the nomination of his successor, Mr. Green, was submitted to the Senate on February 22, 5 weeks after Mr. Woelper's term expired, and it was confirmed a week later, on the 28th day of February.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator has refreshed my memory. Here is exactly what happened: I think this is a very accurate recollection. Mr. Woelper did not come to my office, until almost the end of his term. I had nominated nobody to succeed him when his term would expire. He came, and he said, in substance, this: "Senator, my health is such that I do not feel that I can go on with the office, whether or not you gentlemen are for me." My recollection is that Senator Goldsborough, who was my colleague then, was present at the meeting, and that, when Mr. Woelper told me that, I asked him when he intended to retire. He told me whatever the date was, it was proximate, very close; and, immediately upon his retiring, I sent in the name of his first assistant, on his own recommendation. Mr. Woelper wrote a letter in commendation of the nomination. It took about 5 weeks to process the nomination before it reached the Senate.

But what I want to make sure that the Senator understands is, that I never sent in any recommendation to supplant Mr. Woelper, until Mr. Woelper came at the end of his term and told me he did not desire to be postmaster any longer. I then took the man from the post office whom Mr. Woelper recommended. To this day, on my word of honor, I do not know whether Mr. Green was a Democrat or a Republican. I have heard that he was a Republican. He certainly took no part in politics, as he should not have taken, being the postmaster and a civil service and a career man. I was happy to be for him, because he had a long and distinguished service, which should have been crowned by his appointment to the postmastership as it was.

Mr. LANGER. I merely wanted to make the RECORD plain that after his term expired, Mr. Woelper held office only 5 or 6 weeks and not many years.

Mr. TYDINGS. Allow me to say at that point that the Senator stated he held office only 5 or 6 weeks after his term expired. That proves my point, because had I wanted to get rid of him I would have had his successor ready the moment his commission expired, but I did not know anything about it until Mr. Woelper came to me and said he did not want the office any longer.

Mr. LANGER. But the Senator said inadvertently that Mr. Woelper held his office for many years after his term expired. As a matter of fact, he held it for only 5 or 6 weeks after his term expired.

Mr. TYDINGS. I may have been in error on that point.

Mr. LANGER. In connection with the Ocean City, Md., postmastership which the distinguished Senator discussed yesterday, I took the trouble to obtain the official records, and I have them here. The Senator from Maryland said he had seen them.

Before I refer to that point, I want to say that I resent very much the attempt which was made to charge the Senate Civil Service Committee with holding up the appointments of veterans. That was a matter which was stressed time and time again on the floor. I want to make it very plain that not one minority member of the Senate Civil Service Committee ever made a motion to report a single Democratic postmaster nomination. That is the record. I want to make it plain also that neither the distinguished Senator from Maryland nor the distinguished Senator from Illinois ever came to me and talked to me about the postmasters. I want to make it very plain that when our committee organized we

provided that the Democratic members should be given an official who would receive $10,000 a year salary, and we said, "We want this man to have charge of the post offices and the postmasterships, and report back to the committee." Neither the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] nor the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] could agree on a man. Both Senators are members of the committee. It was not our fault that they have not agreed on anyone.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator said that I have never conferred with him or apparently with any other majority member of the committee. I have talked with Democratic members of the committee several times about the postmasterships.

Let me state what happens. The distinguished Senator from North Dakota, when his committee receives a nomination sent up by the President, follows the precedent established in the past by sending a white slip with the name of the nominee to the Senators from the particular State asking whether they approve or disapprove the nominee. I have been receiving such white slips right along, and I presumed that when the Senators asked for my approval my notation on the slip would be sufficient, without having a conversation with him, because he told us on the floor the other day how very busy he is, and I know that to be true. I presumed when he received my approval of a nomination that would be sufficient. Notwithstanding what the Senator says, no nomination has been reported by the committee.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I may say that we follow the custom which was initiated, or at least followed, by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] and later by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. We send out the white slips the Senator referred to. If some Senator objects to a nomination, obviously we would not bring up that nomination in committee. Both Democratic members and Republican members of the committee are interested in seeing that veterans are protected. They want to protect the veterans. That is why I want to come to the post office in the State of my distinguished friend from Maryland, Ocean City.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, before the Senator goes to that city, will he yield to me?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator said no Democrat spoke to him about any of these appointees. I should like to remind the Senator from North Dakota that in February or March I approached the Senator, as chairman of the Committee on Civil Service, with respect to some appointments in my State, including a veteran who had been appointed postmaster at Louisville, a former mayor, who was the top man on the list, and who was appointed by reason of his priority. There were some others in the Kentucky list. The Senator told me that he would let me know within a couple of weeks from that time what the policy of the committee would be with respect to these appointments. I waited during that period, and then went to the Senator again, and yet up to now I have not found what the policy of the committee is. I even went to see the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] to ascertain, if I could, what the policy of the majority was to be with regard to these appointments, and I was told that it was not the policy of the committee to defeat or hold up the appointments, but that the committee had gotten into a wrangle over the Senator's desire to have some money with which to investigate the appointments, and that the whole matter was held up for that reason.

Mr. LANGER. That is exactly right.

Mr. BARKLEY. Notwithstanding all that, however, the appointments, now nearly 1,000 in number, and nearly half of whom are veterans, are still pigeonholed in the committee. It has been announced that we are to adjourn on the 26th of July, and I am wondering whether this matter is to drag along until the end of the session, and no appointments be confirmed. Congress will meet in January, and with a Presidential election approaching, there may be the possible hope that the Republicans might indulge the vanity of believing that the people will elect them next year, and having that hope they might hold off still longer in order that they may garner in those offices if the election should result favorably to the Republicans. I wonder if anything like that is in the back of the head of my genial friend the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. The conversations the Senator from Kentucky has mentioned took place, in exactly the manner the Senator has stated.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. I call his attention to the fact, however, that we could not determine the policy, and if Senators will permit me to take up the Ocean City situation I will show why it could not be determined.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course I am interested in a general way in Ocean City.

Mr. LANGER. I think the Senator will be particularly interested in Ocean City after I shall have described the situation existing there.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am more particularly interested in Louisville and other cities in Kentucky.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Not only is the Senator from North Dakota very anxious to do what is right and fair, but he wants his investigation to go forward. I believe that on next Tuesday, if I can make a motion to report favorably all the nominations of postmasters that are in the committee, against whom no complaints are lodged, the Senator from North Dakota will probably vote with me to report them favorably. So on Tuesday I shall make the motion, as I want to have it made known who is for such action and who is against such action in the committee at that time. The Senator himself knows that we have not made such a motion because we love him so much that we did not want to embarrass him. The Senator has succeeded in having adopted his resolution providing for an investigation, but I am sure the Senator does not wish to investigate nominees against whom there are no complaints lodged. So I am confident he will vote with us to report all nominations against which no complaints have been filed. I shall make that motion next Tuesday.

Mr. LANGER. I suggest to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina that he is 2 days late with his suggestion. The moment the resolution was adopted we promptly called a meeting of the subcommittee consisting of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and we promptly retained counsel, who is here today, and we said we thought we could report two or three hundred nominations by next Tuesday.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Next Tuesday?

Mr. LANGER. Yes; at our next regular meeting. It has been our position right along that we would take action as soon as we could secure someone who could make an investigation of the nominations. If Senators will permit me to take up the Ocean City, Md., situation they will understand the necessity for such action, and they will find how veterans are being discriminated against.

In Ocean City—and I have the official record here—a man by the name of E. Raymond Bounds is acting postmaster.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I will yield when I finish with Ocean City.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Let me ask the Senator from North Dakota——

Mr. LANGER. I will yield after I have finished with Ocean City. Until I do I will yield to no one.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The committee has received no letters from South Carolina protesting against any of the nominees for postmaster in South Carolina, has it?

Mr. LANGER. We will take up South Carolina when we get into the committee meeting. I want to take up Ocean City. In Ocean City, Md., one of the towns with respect to which the Senator from Maryland has submitted a resolution, Mr. Bounds is acting postmaster. He took the examination the first time on April 9, 1945. On the written test he received 53.75 percent, and on education 82 percent. I want Senators to remember those figures. His average was 67.88 percent, which was not sufficient. So he took the examination over again in January 1946, and received a mark of 62.50 in the written test, and an educational mark of 84.40, which gave him an over-all mark of 73.

At the same time two veterans applied. I am sure that the distinguished Senator from Maryland has never investigated this case. One veteran was named Winfield S. Wallace, Jr. When he was 21 years old he enlisted in the Marine Corps. He served 4 years in that branch of the service. He saw foreign service. He was a college graduate, with an A. B. degree. I think he also had some pre-law schooling. He came home and

took the examination. What happened? I want to show the distinguished Senator what happened. He received a mark of 67.50. Below that is the word "ineligible." He did not receive a single point for business experience.

Now let us take the case of the other veteran. His name is Harold Jackson Rayne, Jr. He is also a college graduate. This man had charge of 240 men in business while he was in the Army for 4 years. He came back after 4 years of foreign service and took the examination. Both these college men received higher marks than did the acting postmaster. This particular veteran received a mark of 78.75. Below that mark is written the word "ineligible."

Mr. TYDINGS. He also had no business experience.

Mr. LANGER. The word "ineligible" was written in because it was said that he had no business experience.

Mr. President, I ask each Senator to place himself, in imagination, on the Senate Civil Service Committee. We find in Illinois a man who is a bartender. He is advanced. He has business experience. We find another man operating a pool hall. The report in the office of the Postmaster General says that it was so dirty that they had to go in with a shovel and shovel out the dirt. That man was said to have had business experience.

Here we have two soldiers who served their country in the armed forces. They were described ably and eloquently the other day by the Senator from Maryland. I could not begin to do as good a job as he did. All of us agree that the soldier boys, if they have the ability to be postmasters, are entitled to be appointed. I agree with what the Senator from Maryland has said in that connection. The two men to whom I refer have a college education. One of them has prelegal training. One of them had charge of 240 men. Yet the Post Office Department would not give either one of them a single point for experience. The Department held them to be ineligible. I submit that if the Post Office Department can say to a boy who went into the Army when he was 21 that even though he is now 25, he cannot be a postmaster, it can bar every veteran in America who went into the Army at 21 years of age and stayed there and fought for his country.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator has recited the very thing which occurred to me. The Senator will recall that prior to the last election the Eastern Shore of Maryland, or the First Congressional District, had a Democratic Representative, and that after the last election that Representative was succeeded by a Republican. Under the rules in existence I had no knowledge of the Ocean City case while there was a Democratic Representative from that district, because the policy is to refer such nominations to Senators only when there is no Representative of the administration party in the district in which there is a vacancy in the post office. That has been the custom under both Democrats and Republicans. So my connection with this case started, as I recall, some time during this year.

When I found that there was a vacancy in Ocean City I wrote to the Post Office Department and asked if there was an eligible list. As I recall, one or both of these veterans had written to me, or someone had written in their behalf, calling my attention to the fact that certain veterans had taken the examination.

When the list was received, it had only one man's name on it. The other men had not been given a passing grade. Therefore there was only one eligible. But I did not appoint that eligible, although he was the only one. I went to the telephone and called up the Post Office Department. I asked, "What has become of the veterans who took this examination?" I was told that the Department would look up the case; and in due time I received a letter from the Civil Service Commission. As I understand, this examination was not given by the Post Office Department. It was given by the Civil Service Commission. I thought surely that if it was given by the Civil Service Commission under the rules and the law, it was given fairly. I mention this only to show the Senator that I was just as anxious as he is to have the veterans rewarded, assuming that they had passed the examination. I was astounded when I received the following letter:

They—

That is, the two veterans—

did not meet the minimum requirements for business experience and general qualifications, and were insufficient to comply with minimum requirements of eligibility, and were not assigned a grade.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. If I may be permitted to do so, I should like to finish this statement.

Naturally, when I saw this letter from the Civil Service Commission I assumed that the veterans had not been given an opportunity to take the examination. Having taken it, and not having reached a passing mark, and there being only one man on the eligible list, I then said, "Fill the office from the No. 1 place on the list." Having explored the fact that the veterans had not qualified, there was nothing else I could do under the circumstances, because the Civil Service Commission said that under the rules for holding examinations for postmasters all over the United States, as applied to these two veterans, they were found to be ineligible.

I may say to the Senator that the veterans in that section of the country are very dear to me, because probably the fathers of those boys were in the same outfit in which I served in World War I. I certainly have an exceedingly wide acquaintance among veterans in that district. The veterans' post had written to me, and that occasioned my writing to the Post Office Department.

The point of this recital is that I want the Senator to know that if there was any slip anywhere along the line, it was not in the office of the Senator from Maryland, who was anxious to give the veterans every consideration which the result of the examination warranted. When it was shown that neither of the veterans had an eligible rating, the Senator from Maryland could do nothing more than take the name at the top of the list and appoint that man to the position.

Furthermore, the Senator from Maryland had nothing to do with this particular post office until January 1, 1947, when the new Congress came into being.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President——

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, before I yield to my distinguished friend from Connecticut, let me say that the Senator from Maryland was not present on the day when I took up this resolution. I want the distinguished Senator to know that, at the request of the entire committee, a part of the investigation will involve the Civil Service Commission. We want to determine why the Commission says that two veterans who had served 4 years, and who had had previous experience, one of them having handled 240 men, should be held to be ineligible. We think that that is absolutely wrong.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator allow me to make a comment?

Mr. LANGER. Yes, indeed.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator knows, as I am sure all of us know, that when veterans come back from war they frequently take civil-service examinations for all manner of positions, both in and out of the Post Office Department. Of course they get preference because of their service and double preference in case of disability. However, it sometimes happens—I do not know what the facts were in the instant case—that a veteran taking an examination—quite often he is a man with a good education—though given the benefit of his preference of 5 points, or 10 points if he be disabled, does not make as high a grade as someone who has not been in the service, who may have kept fresh his mathematics, or whatever the subject of the examination might be. As the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] will concede, both of us having had similar experiences, there is nothing that makes one forget what he has learned so rapidly as does service in the Army or the Navy. It tends to crowd out and make dull one's knowledge of law or some other profession, because the absorption is so heavy and so intense while in the service. It looks, on the face of things, as if these men who went to two universities ought to have gone far enough in their studies to pass the examination.

All I want to say is that the Post Office Department did not conduct the examination; it was conducted by the Civil Service Commission. It seems to me that if the Senator from North Dakota—he might not have had the idea when all this was more or less new, and this is now hindsight—had asked the Civil Service Commission to submit the examination or to submit the law or the rules, he would have gotten to the root of the evil.

I want the Senator to know that, so far as I am concerned, I have supported the No. 1 person on the list in all these places, right straight down the line, and

as I stated yesterday, one of those mentioned was a life-long Republican who is registered to this day as a Republican and who stood No. 1 on the list. Notwithstanding the fact that he is a Republican he received the appointment in the little town of Bishopville in the same county in which Ocean City is located.

Mr. LANGER. I may say to the distinguished Senator that the Senator from North Dakota could not go to Maryland, to West Virginia, and to all the other States. There was no way in which the committee could possibly do that. All we were asking for was sufficient money to enable us to find out how many cases like this there were and to prevent a repetition of the situation. I think the Senator will agree that the Civil Service Commission ought never to have declared these veterans ineligible.

Mr. TYDINGS. While a prima facie case is made out, I should like completely to know the facts. Three committee meetings are going on at this time, and I am anxious to go to at least one of them, but I wanted to be here while the Senator was discussing the Maryland situation.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. I think the distinguished Senator from North Dakota may have already covered what I am about to mention. I am certain that the Senator from Maryland knew nothing about this situation, and I am certain he is in the same situation with reference to those appointees as is practically every other Member of the Senate.

Mr. TYDINGS. That statement is not quite accurate.

Mr. BALDWIN. The Senator went through the ordinary procedure that we would all go through to find out what happened. He accepted, as I would accept, the word of the Civil Service Commission. He did just what I have done. I have said to my people, "Here is the report from the Civil Service Commission. There is not anything more that I can do about it."

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. BALDWIN. At the same time, from the cases which have been presented here and others which have come before the committee, we knew that we must go behind the report of the Civil Service Commission and find out from their own records what they had done and why they had done it, and if there is a sufficient number of typical cases to warrant the Senate's going into a thorough study of the matter to find out whether or not there has been discrimination in those cases.

That, Mr. President, is why I believed the Senate should adopt the resolution. There ought to be times when we can check up on various Federal agencies, and now is the time, it seems to me, when the Civil Service Commission should be called in to question.

Mr. TYDINGS. The resolution has already been adopted and the Senator has the tools with which to carry on the work. The only thing which brought on this colloquy was an implication, which perhaps the Senator from North Dakota never intended. The facts are, so far as all recommendations made by the Senator from Maryland are concerned, that in each and every case appointees were taken from the top of the list; that in each and every case the veteran's rights were explored and looked after with the Civil Service Commission; and that in each and every place, notwithstanding the fact that perhaps he was a Republican, the top man had gotten the appointment. In Baltimore City—the largest post office in the whole State of Maryland—there had been absolutely not a single tinge of politics. Every man involved, from the beginning to the end, has had 30 or 40 years' service. I am advised that the first one recommended was a Republican, but that did not make any difference.

Mr. BALDWIN. The Senator has had the same experience I have had. I have been trying to get a man appointed—I do not know what his politics may be—who has been in the postal service 25 years, and everyone says that while he was in the Post Office Department he did the postmaster's work, and we would like to get for him the job of postmaster.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have always found with Republicans, as the Senator has probably found with Democrats, that if I appoint a Republican to office he is likely to be at least as grateful as one of my own party.

Mr. BALDWIN. I had experience in public life in another position before I came here. I had the experience of having a Democratic Senate turn down names of Democrats whom I reappointed and who had been previously appointed by a Democratic governor. I say to my distinguished friend from Maryland that some of these things are thoroughly incomprehensible to me.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I am going to leave the floor——

Mr. LANGER. I do not want the Senator to leave.

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall stay, then.

Mr. BARKLEY. Has the Senator finished with Ocean City?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to say to the Senator that my main concern is that on next Tuesday the Senator is going to report these nominations so that they may be considered on the floor——

Mr. LANGER. Two or three hundred of them.

Mr. TYDINGS. And I am sure we will want to consider them as rapidly as possible.

Mr. LANGER. I will take up, next, the Brandywine case. First of all, I want to call the attention of the Senate to what was said by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]——

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Are we going to have an investigation?

Mr. LANGER. The man retained by the subcommittee will make a report to the full committee on Tuesday. I understand that there are several hundred nominations to be reported favorably to the full committee.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is the Senator now making a report to the Senate of what has taken place all over the United States?

Mr. LANGER. No. All I said was that the man retained by the subcommittee has informed me that he thinks between 200 and 300 nominations can be reported to the full Senate Civil Service Committee for action, and then it is up to the Civil Service Committee to do what it wants to. I have no authority to speak for the full committee but I think it will report the nominations. I think there will be a unanimous vote to report them. I cannot see any objection to reporting them.

I come back to the Brandywine post office. I call the attention of the Senate to the remarks of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] at the time the Civil Service Act was passed. He said:

> This measure has three positive virtues: First, it substitutes the merit system for the spoils system in the selection of postmasters. In other words, it does away with favoritism and establishes principles of open competition.

I maintain that that has not been done.

> Second, it authorizes the selection of postmasters by promotion within the service. In other words, it extends to all the vast army of postal employees, clerks, and carriers, village carriers and rural mail carriers, the opportunity to rise to the highest position in the postal service.

That has not been done, as witness Oakmont, Ill., the case I brought up the other day, involving a man who served 17 years in that office, commencing in 1931. A man named Murphy moved there in 1942. He did not have a single recommendation that amounted to anything, except one from an alderman in Chicago. Although every commercial club and civic group and the leading businessmen and doctors and lawyers—over 100 of them—sent in letters of recommendation for the first man, who had been in the office for 17 years, nevertheless the man second on the list was appointed.

The third point, according to the Senator from Wyoming, is that the law prevents the evasion of the spirit of the merit system and the rule of Senate confirmation by requiring that acting postmasters shall not serve for more than 6 months without the permission of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. President, on the floor of the Senate the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] raised the point, which also was raised yesterday, that if these places were not filled within 6 months, there would be a vacancy.

Now I come to the case at Brandywine, Md. In that case, the examination for postmaster of that third-class post office was held on May 26, 1945. There were three eligibles: Paul L. Peacock, 81.50; Milton P. Holt, 79; and Mrs. Carrie E. Outen, 72.75. I refer to this post office for the reason that Mrs. Carrie E. Outen has been acting postmaster at Brandywine, Md., since July 1943. That information is given to the Senate to refute the argument made on the floor of the Senate a few days ago that haste has

been necessary in the confirmation of present acting postmasters because they could serve for only 6 months. The argument was made that such nominations must be confirmed at once; and that inasmuch as they have not been confirmed immediately, the committee should be discharged from their further consideration. But here we find the case of a lady who has been serving since 1943, even though she serves as acting postmaster. The certification of that list was made on October 8, 1945, but we find that on January 8, 1947, 15 months after the certification was made, the acting postmaster tendered her resignation, but it has not yet been acted upon. On January 14, 1947, 1 year and 3 months after certification had been made, the veteran applicant resigned from the eligible list, to accept other employment. Now we find out how that veteran was kept out of the position. He took the examination and, as a result, he was at the top of the list. Although the law said that the acting postmaster could serve not more than 6 months, nevertheless 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 months went by; and, finally, the veteran gave up.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course, this particular post office is in a district that is represented by a Member of the House of Representatives who is in the Democratic fold. So I know nothing about the facts in that case, except what I adduced from him after the Senator from North Dakota made his remarks the other day on the floor of the Senate. However, the Representative from the district tells me that the man who stood first on the list had a job in Washington that was paying more than the postmastership, for which he had taken the examination, would have paid; and he wanted some time to consider whether he would give up his Washington job and take the post-office job or whether he would not, and it took him quite a long time to make up his mind.

Of course, the Senator from North Dakota knows that had that veteran wanted the job, all he would have had to do would have been to tell the Representative, "I want that job," and then his name would have been sent in. But he did not do that. Instead, he said, "I don't know whether to give up the job I have or not. It is a good job; it pays me more than the post-office job will pay. It is true that I am No. 1 on the list for the postmaster job, but I should like to have some time to think it over."

So, after thinking it over for a long time, he finally decided that he did not want the post-office job, but wanted to withdraw his name from consideration for that job. The next person on the list, No. 2 on the list, was appointed, in his place.

Mr. LANGER. No; the third person was appointed.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mrs. Outen was third on the list. She did not want the place; she wanted to get out a long time before that, but the eligible who was No. 1 on the list would not take the position, although he took a long time to make up his mind what he would do. So the Senator from North Dakota should not say that the No. 1 man wanted the position, when, as a matter of fact—although, of course, the Senator from North Dakota did not know this—the Representative was in touch with the No. 1 man, but that man could not make up his mind whether he wanted the post-office position or whether he did not want it.

Mr. LANGER. I assume that he wanted it or else he would not have taken the examination.

Mr. TYDINGS. No; he took the examination just as a chance thing; and after he got the chance to have the job, he took some time to decide whether he wanted it. Finally, realizing that he was making more money in Washington, he decided to continue with the Washington job, which he already had; and so he declined the post-office job. That is all there is to that matter.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, it is quite important if a temporary appointee, who, under the law, could serve for not more than 6 months, was kept in the job for 17 months, and if, as a result, some veteran who wished to be appointed to that position and who was first or second on the list could not get it.

Mr. TYDINGS. But in that case the veteran did not want the place.

Mr. LANGER. I do not know about that.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is what the Representative tells me. He said the veteran could have had it; but the veteran said, "Look here, do you think I would be better off by taking this post-office job or not? I have a job in Washington which pays me more." The Representative said, "Well, think it over, and decide what you want to do."

But the veteran could not make up his mind for a long time. Finally he did make up his mind, and withdrew; and the No. 2 man, who then became the No. 1 man, was appointed.

Mr. LANGER. I think the Senator from Maryland will agree that when a temporary appointee holds over for more than 6 months, contrary to the law, that is an important matter which should be investigated.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; I agree that it looks bad. But actually there was nothing wrong with it. All that time was taken simply in order to let the veteran decide whether he wanted the job or did not want it.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to call attention now to the Bishopville, Md., case. I mention it for the same reason. In that case, a temporary appointee continued to serve, after the 6-month period was over, for 7, 8, 9, 10 months. As the Senator from Wyoming has said, the law provides that temporary appointees shall serve not more than 6 months. Certainly it should not be possible to keep veterans out of such positions simply by continuing acting postmasters in office for many months after the 6-month period has terminated. That is why I have mentioned these cases.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I am informed that a conference committee of which I am a member is meeting and is unable to get a quorum, and I have been called twice to go to that meeting. But let me say before I leave, for I know the Senator from North Dakota wishes to be fair about this matter, that Mr. Ringler, who at the present time is the postmaster at Bishopville, is, as the Senator has been informed, I think, a lifelong and affiliated Republican. He was so popular that the patrons of that post office asked the Democratic State Central Committee to recommend him, a Republican, to continue to hold that post-office position. Yesterday I held in my hand—and I have it here now—a letter signed by six members of the Democratic State Central Committee for Worcester County, recommending Mr. Ringler, a lifelong and affiliated Republican, for appointment as postmaster at Bishopville. Let me read one part of the letter:

> Mr. Ringler, now the acting postmaster at Bishopville, affiliated as a Republican, has served as postmaster at Bishopville, Md., for 34 years—

So, Mr. President, we find that he was appointed away back under President Taft, I believe—

> under both Democratic and Republican administrations. He is popular, and is the choice of over 90 percent of the patrons of the Bishopville post office, a majority of whom are active Democratic voters.

Nothwithstanding that he is a Republican, the Democratic State Central Committee recommended him. Certainly the Senator from North Dakota does not think anything evil was done in that case.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator missed the point entirely.

Mr. TYDINGS. What the Senator is saying is that it should have been done more quickly?

Mr. LANGER. Yes. The law says within 6 months.

Mr. TYDINGS. But the Senator does not hold the Senator from Maryland responsible for the situation?

Mr. LANGER. No, but the resolution goes to the whole civil service. This is the case of a veteran who wants the job, and the authorities let the incumbent remain in office 7 months, 8 months, 9 months, 10 months, after the 6 months began to run. That is what I objected to. Veterans cannot be kept out in that way. Now, there is only one more case.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have been sent for by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] two or three times, who begs me to attend the meeting of the conference committee. They are stymied for lack of a quorum. I should like to stay and debate this matter with the Senator, but I think I am doing an injustice to the conference committee.

Mr. LANGER. The case involving Oakland, Md., is the last one.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have held the conference committee up an hour already.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator used a very unfortunate word yesterday. In the comparison between a veteran and a civilian, the Senator said that the veteran took advantage of his five-point preference. I am satisfied the Senator did not mean that. He knows every veteran has a right

to have that five-point preference. The veteran is not taking any advantage. On the list, the Senator will remember, the first man had a rating of 80.33, and the second a rating of 78.93. It is brought to the Senator's attention again that the committee is interested in the veterans. We do not want the veterans held out because someone is holding over 6 months.

Mr. TYDINGS. I concede that to the Senator.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator from North Dakota, and I am delighted to know that a great bulk of these appointments are coming out of the committee, because some of the veterans really need the jobs, and I know the Senator will be serving the cause of patriotism and merit at the same time.

I am glad to assure the Senator that I shall go pheasant hunting with him.

Mr. LANGER. We will go pheasant hunting together. [Laughter.]

EXTENSION OF RENT CONTROL—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3203) relative to maximum rents on housing accommodations; to repeal certain provisions of Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress, and for other purposes.

Mr. BUCK. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Morse
Baldwin	Hatch	Murray
Ball	Hawkes	Myers
Barkley	Hayden	O'Conor
Brewster	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Bricker	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Holland	Overton
Brooks	Ives	Pepper
Buck	Jenner	Reed
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Va.
Byrd	Kem	Robertson, Wyo.
Cain	Kilgore	Russell
Capehart	Knowland	Saltonstall
Capper	Langer	Smith
Chavez	Lodge	Sparkman
Connally	Lucas	Taft
Cooper	McCarran	Taylor
Cordon	McCarthy	Thye
Donnell	McClellan	Tydings
Downey	McFarland	Umstead
Dworshak	McGrath	Vandenberg
Eastland	McKellar	Watkins
Ecton	Magnuson	Wherry
Ellender	Malone	White
Ferguson	Martin	Wiley
Fulbright	Maybank	Williams
George	Millikin	Wilson
Green	Moore	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. BUCK. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I served as a member of the conference committee appointed to resolve the differences between the House and the Senate on the measure to extend rent control. I signed the conference report, not because I agreed with the bill, or because I felt that it was a good measure. As a matter of fact, I feel that it is not a good measure. However, I have tried to be realistic. In my opinion, it is the only measure that we can hope to obtain as a result of the conference. It is only eleven more days until rent control expires. I believe that we were given sufficient notice during the conference that it was a matter either of obtaining this bill or none at all. So far as that is concerned, the bill we brought back from conference is no worse than the bill that we carried into conference from the Senate. In fact, I am of the opinion that we perhaps strengthened it somewhat in the conference, by taking a few of the provisions from the House bill, that made it better than it was when it left the Senate.

When the bill was being considered on the floor of the Senate, I made a few remarks, in which I criticized our action in including title I, as passed by the House of Representatives. I still think that we made a mistake in including title I as a part of the rent-control measure. It is not rent control. Title I is a measure that decontrols housing. Nevertheless, title I was agreed to by the Senate and by the House, with few changes. Therefore, it was not within the power of the conference to omit title I, or to make any great change in it.

Title I was improved on the floor of the Senate by certain amendments which were adopted. One amendment in particular was that offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and adopted by the Senate. Unfortunately, however, the House conferees were insistent upon excluding that amendment, and the conferees dropped it from the bill.

Mr. Creedon, the Housing Expediter, on June 2, 1947, issued a press release, in which he stated, in part, as follows:

> Right now there is a backlog of more than $2,000,000,000 in deferrable nonresidential projects being held up because of material shortages. If this pent-up demand were suddenly turned loose on the building materials market, the resulting scramble for materials would leave the little fellow trying to build a home out in the cold both literally and figuratively. It would be the lifting of L–41 all over again—only worse, because without price control, the sky would be the limit on the scarce building items.

In leaving out the Knowland amendment, that is exactly what we have done. We have acted contrary to the advice and against the warning Mr. Creedon has given us in his statement. Mr. Creedon stated to our committee very frankly that he did not believe it necessary to retain building controls for a very long time. He said that, in any event, it was his intention to remove all controls not later than October 31, and perhaps by October 1; and that all he needed was a few months to surmount the present building surge. However, when the bill becomes law, assuming that it does, those restrictions will be removed, and all nonhousing structures will be eligible to proceed without the necessity of permits, except for the one class of recreational buildings. Under the bill, that type of building will still require a permit.

Most of the shortages in the building materials, according to Mr. Creedon, have disappeared. There remains only one that is really critical, and that is pig iron and soil pipe. Under a provision in the bill and under the agreement of the conferees, Mr. Creedon is given the right to continue to make commitments on premium payments within the $65,000,000 that remains in his hands for premium payment purposes, to encourage the production of pig iron and pig-iron products.

Furthermore it was agreed among the conferees that the meaning of the language in the bill not only would give him the right to make the commitments for incentive payments which will be made even up until the end of the year—that is such commitments as are made prior to the signing of the bill into law—but coupled with those commitments there may be certain conditions requiring the allocation of the pig iron and soil pipe to housing purposes. I believe it is important that we have that thorough understanding in order that we might not later criticize Mr. Creedon for acting in the space of a few days and making long-time commitments which will run over the period of the next 6 months.

Mr. President, with the exception of removing the requirement of permits from noncommercial buildings, as was done when the Knowland amendment was stricken out, and with the understanding we have as to the meaning of the language on premium payments and allocation of pig iron and soil pipe, title I is not in such bad condition. I believe that under it Mr. Creedon can proceed with a fair building program, though not what he could have done had we not tinkered with the law by inclusion of title I.

When it comes to the rent-control provision I want to say that I am of the same opinion now regarding the so-called Hawkes' amendment that I was when it was offered on the floor of the Senate. While by its language and according to the intent of its sponsor it relates only to agreements that are entered into voluntarily, there is no doubt in my mind that it can be used in such a way as to intimidate tenants to agree to a 15-percent rent increase. We were against a general rent increase. Our committee voted it down. Yet on the floor of the Senate we in effect wrote into the bill virtually a 15-percent increase in rent. However, that matter was not in conference, because both the House and the Senate had agreed to it, and there was nothing we could do about that.

In our bill in the Senate committee we included local advisory committees to help in reaching decisions as to when areas might be recontrolled and when agencies were needed, and what those agencies should be. That gave flexibility to the measure.

We did something that we all felt ought to be done, that is to provide for a gradual thawing out of the rent freeze that we have on a Nation-wide basis. The Hawkes' amendment flies directly in the face of that philosophy. However, it

is a part of the bill, and there was nothing that the conferees could do about it.

I am of the opinion that this measure is better than no law at all, and if we do not agree to it, that when June 30 comes there will be no rent control whatsoever.

Mr. President, on June 13, 1947, an editorial appeared in the Christian Science Monitor somewhat critical of this legislation, and yet rather thought-provoking. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be placed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECONTROL BY SUBTERFUGE

Congressional conferees have reported out a bill which would continue a thin shadow of rent control until March 1, 1948.

There is some defense for lifting controls on transient accommodations—they are already decontrolled, in fact—and on new housing built at today's costs. As to the remainder of the bill, Congress seems intent on taking the country with it into trouble, without established justification, and by a slippery route.

Its approach is neither honest nor courageous. Rent controls in general are extended; yes. But if tenants "agree," landlords may boost rents, in return for a lease, by 15 percent. And the landlord is granted sufficient leverages—changed legal grounds for eviction, for instance—that most tenants will find no other alternative.

The House recoiled from voting a forthright 10-percent increase last April. But now both Houses push forward what would be in effect a still higher boost behind a screen of tenant "consent."

Congress is maneuvering, furthermore, to put the President, not itself, on the spot: to present Mr. Truman with the alternatives of this legislative sham or no rent control at all—the same choice he faced with OPA.

True, many landlords—often the most considerate—got squeezed under the ceilings. But a great number of the real hardship cases have been granted relief. And as a rule landlords have maintained full occupancy at the cost of some repairs and no improvements. Which leaves the bill resting largely on the plea that since other businesses have been released, landlords should also be free to exploit a sellers' market.

That sounds reasonable and fair from the landlords' view. But here is where the real d[illegible]er lies: At what cost to the whole Nat[illegible] would they profit?

Higher rents are as inflationary as higher wages. They are more psychologically explosive even than costly food. For a family can, when pinched, eat oatmeal and cabbage instead of pork chops and cauliflower, and less of everything, to get by for a time. But the choice, pay more rent or get out, when there is little likelihood of anywhere else to get to, might prove a desperate one for several million Americans.

The prospect is not cheering.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, although the Senator from Alabama may not agree with the reasons for the bill, I want to thank him for the great contribution which he made in its preparation. I refer particularly to his suggestion that the rent areas be controlled through the local boards. The Senator from Alabama is the one who made that proposal, and the committee adopted it, and I think it is the keystone of the whole bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Senator from Delaware for those words.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I rise to speak in opposition to the enactment of the bill, because I believe it is deceiving the American people into believing that they have something which they will not in fact have. I feel that there will be no rent control, for all practical purposes, if the bill is enacted into law, and that it would be much more honest to defeat it and let the people know that there is no rent control. That would relieve a great many landlords from engaging in nefarious practices to get their rents raised, which they can engage in under the bill.

In the first place, of course, we all know that at one time the subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency agreed to a bill containing a flat 10-percent increase across the board. That bill met with the disapproval of the full committee, however, and was referred back to the subcommittee, because we did not want a 10-percent increase. However, when the bill reached the floor of the Senate we adopted the Hawkes amendment, which is not only a 10-percent-across-the-board increase, but a 15-percent-across-the-board increase.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I know the Senator from Idaho does not want to leave a false impression when he says that the amendment offered by me provides for a 15-percent, across-the-board increase. It simply gives permission to a landlord and a tenant to agree voluntarily and in good faith on any increase up to 15 percent. It might be 5 percent. It might be nothing. If the tenant says, "No, I am willing to take my chances on what is going to happen to rents and housing," then it is nothing. So I am sure the Senator does not want to leave an erroneous impression about the amendment. It simply says to the American people, "We will not free the renting and housing industry completely at this time, but we propose to inject a little bit of Americanism into the program and give a tenant a chance, if he wants to embrace it, to make sure that for the entire year 1948 he will not have to pay more than 15 percent, or 10 percent, in excess of the rent he pays today, remembering that rent controls will cease under the Federal law on February 29, 1948."

I am certain the Senator does not want to leave the impression that every landlord in the Nation is going to blackjack every tenant in the Nation and say, "Unless you do this you are going to be evicted." That is not good business. That is not good Americanism, and I have sufficient confidence in the American people to believe it will not happen.

Mr. TAYLOR. I thank the Senator from New Jersey for his contribution. I had intended to elaborate on the statement I made. When the Senator says that the provision enabling the landlord voluntarily to agree with his tenant to raise rents 15 percent is just a little touch of Americanism, well, that is the Senator's definition of it. I think the people are becoming awfully tired of Americanism in the form of dollar-a-pound steaks and one thing and another. I think we can hardly call this provision "Americanism." It simply permits the tenant and the landlord voluntarily to agree to raise rents 15 percent if the tenant gets a lease extending through 1948. If a tenant expected to stay in his accommodations for any considerable length of time beyond the expiration of the rent ceiling in the bill—even if he expected to stay 2 months beyond that time—he would indeed be simple-minded if he did not sign a lease guaranteeing an immediate 15-percent increase, because if he did not sign it, then when the rent control measure died he would be subject to any amount of increase. There would be no ceiling. His rent could be increased 100 percent, 200 percent, or even 500 percent, if the landlord felt like charging that much. Those figures may sound fantastic. It may sound as though I am talking merely to hear my teeth rattle; but that is what happened in Idaho when the rent controls were taken off. In a number of instances rents were raised—sometimes on veterans—as much as 250 percent. In fact, their rents went up to such an extent that their rent bill alone was more than they were making.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. In view of the situation which the Senator has described, which resulted from the lifting of rent controls, does not the Senator believe that it is much sounder to pass this bill and protect against any greater increase than 15 percent during the time the provisions of the bill are in operation?

Mr. TAYLOR. All we are doing is setting a bomb with a time-fuse on it under the tenant. Personally I think it would be better to get it over with and not make the tenants suffer in this way. Perhaps we should start letting the magic law of supply and demand, about which we have heard so much, get busy.

There is another reason why it might be sounder not to pass the bill, and to get the suffering over with as soon as possible. The bill would kill housing controls and throw the market open to the construction of commercial buildings, of which I understand there is a $2,000,000,000 backlog. Mr. Creedon, the Housing Expediter, has said that if the bill is passed it will cheat us out of 200,000 homes this year. Two hundred thousand homes would help relieve the situation a little, and head us toward that happy day when the law of supply and demand will again work. So the bill would delay us, and would make available for commercial purposes materials that might otherwise go into the building of homes.

What we would gain by the bill would be a modicum of rent control and a 15-percent increase, which would practically amount to an across-the-board increase, so far as I can see. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] may disagree with me. I grant that there may be some landlords who would not increase rents the full amount, but the number of such landlords would be negligible. I believe that between 97 and 99 percent of them would take advantage of the situation and increase rents to the maximum.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HAWKES. I am sure the Senator has not forgotten that the Director of the Office of Temporary Controls, General Fleming, stated before the Committee on Banking and Currency that in his opinion there was only one way to solve these inequities at the present time—this was 2 months ago—and that was by a 10-percent-across-the-board increase. I am not referring to the 10-percent-across-the-board increase over which the dispute arose. I am talking about his testimony before the Committee on Banking and Currency 3 weeks after the release at the White House, which was withdrawn. I am talking about his mature, considered judgment.

He also stated to me that the advisory committee of the OPA unanimously recommended to him a 10-percent-across-the-board increase.

That came from the Administration. It did not come from the Senate; it did not come from me; it did not come from the House. It came from the Administration.

I should like to ask the Senator one further question, and then I shall not annoy him further.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Senator is not annoying me. I am happy to have him ask any questions he wishes to ask.

Mr. HAWKES. I appreciate very much the Senator's courtesy in yielding. The Senator has stated that he believes that my amendment is the equivalent of a 15-percent-across-the-board increase. Does he believe that the Senate would have voted for a straight 15-percent-across-the-board increase?

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not believe it would. That is all the more reason why I dislike the amendment, which sneaked up on the blind side of the Senate, so to speak.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield for one further observation, then I shall take my seat.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HAWKES. If I thought that my amendment gave anyone a bludgeoning power over the tenant, or if I thought it was not in the interest of the tenant to carry him through to the end of 1948 at not more than a 15-percent increase—and I say that advisedly—over the rent he was paying when he made the lease; if I thought it would not protect him after the bill becomes law—if it does—and say something to him that he would like to have said to him, I would not have sponsored the amendment.

I have talked with hundreds of tenants and have received hundreds of letters on the subject. I think it is a very desirable thing for them to have the privilege of knowing that they can remain where they are at not to exceed 15 percent more than they are paying, when they know that rents were frozen 6 years ago, and that the cost of everything that enters into housing, including plumbing, janitor service, and every other necessary service, has almost doubled. They think it is a fair thing and they are delighted to have this privilege. I want the Senator to know that that has been my experience with the tenants with whom I have talked.

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not doubt that. It is characteristic of service in the Senate that Members of the Senate become known for differing views on various subjects; and people approach us with different points of view. I may say that no one has come to me who has been enthusiastic over the fact that he is faced with a 15-percent rent increase. A number of persons have protested the provision to me. It seems to me that it has been pretty well established that the OPA by virtue of increases in hardship cases has kept rents up to a fair level for landlords. I do not believe that an additional 15-percent rent increase is justified. It may be justified when compared with the profits being made by the great corporations of the country, if we want to bring the landlords up to that level. But if we compare the profits of landlords with the profits which they made in any previous period, I believe that landlords nowadays are faring pretty well. I grant that there may be exceptions.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THYE in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield to my friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MYERS. It seems rather strange to me—and I surmise that it seems strange to the Senator from Idaho—that the advocates of this amendment indicate that it will give protection to the tenant through 1948. If that is so, it is a back-door protection. Why not give him such protection by means of a frontal attack, and extend the law through 1948, rather than indicate that this amendment would afford such protection? If that is the philosophy of the advocates of the amendment, I think they must therefore conclude that the tenant needs protection through 1948. If they do, I should much prefer to write such protection into the law, and extend rent control through 1948.

Mr. TAYLOR. When the Senator from Pennsylvania mentions a frontal attack, he doubtless means an open and aboveboard approach to the question. Has he known of such an approach being taken lately by the majority party in the Senate? Was there an open approach to the problem of the continuation of OPA? Does the Senator from Pennsylvania believe that the action of the Senate in that connection was open and aboveboard when it approved a mandatory provision for price increases and called it a price-control measure? Does the Senator believe that that was open and aboveboard?

Mr. MYERS. Of course not. I think this bill means an end of rent control, just as the OPA bill passed last year meant the end of price control. By the middle of March or the first of April we will see just as much legalized black-marketing in the landlord-and-tenant field as we now find in every other field in America.

Mr. TAYLOR. When the Senator from Pennsylvania says that he wishes the situation had been approached with a frontal attack in the open, does he believe that the recent tax bill which passed the Senate and was ballyhooed as a big help for the poor man and a little help for the rich man, was a frontal attack? Does he not feel that that was misrepresenting the facts? Does he not think that the rich would get far more help than would the poor?

Mr. MYERS. I think that tax bill was one of the greatest pieces of hokum that ever came out of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. TAYLOR. It was chicanery, pure and simple. When the Senator says he would like to have the subject attacked in an open and forthright manner, does he think that the wool bill was open and above-board and forthright?

Mr. MYERS. I had something to say about that on the floor today, and I definitely believe that the wool measure will have a serious effect upon our entire foreign policy and may disrupt and interfere with the entire international situation.

Mr. TAYLOR. If we are looking for a forthright approach to any of these problems, we should repeal the law right out and tell the people it is repealed and gone. But in that respect those of us on this side of the aisle will be sadly disappointed. That is not the way it is being done nowadays. They just withhold appropriations, or pass a law and call it a rent-control law or a price-control law, when in reality it is a decontrol law. Frankly, Mr. President, the measure which we are considering could very appropriately be called the rent-decontrol and dehousing bill of 1947, inasmuch as it is going to cheat us out of 200,000 homes, according to the Expediter. I might point out that Mr. Creedon himself has urged that this bill be not enacted into law.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. BUCK. I think the Senator is mistaken about that. That statement by Mr. Creedon was not made in my presence.

Mr. TAYLOR. I mean what he had to say in the newspapers.

Mr. BUCK. It was not said in committee when he was present before us.

Mr. TAYLOR. He said he would like to have these controls continued, and he suggested the control over pig iron as the absolute minimum that would prevent chaos in this program. That was not written into the bill. We told him, off the record, to go ahead and we would not look to see what he was doing. That is the way legislation is handled around here nowadays.

In support of my contention that this is a rent-decontrol bill, let me point to the provision that "any housing accommodations the construction of which was completed on or after February 1, 1947, or which are additional housing accommodations created by conversion on or after February 1, 1947," are exempt from rent control. If we create additional accommodations by conversion—it does not say how much conversion; just by conversion—then we are out from under

rent control. In other words, Mr. President, if we had a five-room house we could nail up a door between two rooms and the other three rooms and put a hot plate in and call it additional accommodations. It would then have been converted and the owner would be out from under rent control and probably receive twice as much for one apartment as he received for the whole house previously.

So, as I say, it will lead to landlords taking devious methods to get out from under rent control.

The eviction provisions have been changed so that a tenant can be gotten rid of for any number of reasons, five or six of them. For example, if he is a nuisance; if he is using the place for immoral purposes; or if the owner decides he wants to move into the house, he can kick out the tenant. But there is nothing in the bill which provides that the owner must move in; all he has to do is to want to move in. If he does not move in, there is no penalty attached to it. He can get the tenant out, convert the house by nailing up a door, and be no longer under rent control.

Mr. President, this bill will end rent control for all practical purposes. It will end controls over housing materials. It will lose us a great number of additional housing accommodations which might act to bring down the price of rents.

So, Mr. President, I shall vote against the conference report and be honest with the people and tell them that we have left them to their own devices, and not have the word go forth that we are still protecting them and then having them wake up one of these days to find the landlord nailing up a door and converting the place or accusing them of being a nuisance, or any one of a number of other things, and putting them out on the street.

Another thing to remember is that February, in many parts of the United States, is the middle of winter. People will be put out on the streets or have their rent raised to exorbitant heights. I think it would be better to end it now and let them be put out in the summer so they can sleep in the parks while they are looking for a place to live, rather than to find themselves in the middle of a snowbank next winter.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BUCK. The Senator knows as well as I do that that month was selected because it would be 2 months after Congress convened, and there would be time then to consider the situation——

Mr. TAYLOR. Inasmuch as there is no election between now and next winter I have no reason to think that Congress would be any more soft-hearted at that time than it is now. Whether the law expires at that time or not it seems to me to be of little consequence. We might give the landlords another 10-percent increase at that time and let them sign another contract for a number of years and fix it up so they can subdivide the subdivisions they have converted and make more housing accommodations. I do not think that would help much.

Mr. President, I shall vote against the conference report, and I urge my colleagues, if they want to be open and above board and not "pass the buck" to the President as has been done on so many occasions, to vote against it and let it die.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report on House bill 3203.

Mr. TAYLOR and other Senators called for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The report was agreed to.

CORRECTION IN ENROLLMENT OF ACT EXTENDING RENT CONTROL

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 53 which the House passed immediately following the adoption of the conference report on House bill 3203.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the resolution for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 53) as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Clerk of the House of Representatives, in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 3203) relative to maximum rents on housing accommodations; to repeal certain provisions of Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress, and for other purposes, is authorized and directed, in section 4 (a) to strike out "March 31, 1948" wherever such date occurs and insert in lieu thereof "March 1, 1948."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. What is the pending business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the unfinished business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senate bill 564, to provide for the performance of the duties of the office of President in case of the removal, resignation, or inability both of the President and Vice President.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington was recognized, and he has the floor.

SALARIES OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3611, fixing and regulating the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Reserving the right to object, let me say that I understand that the Senator from Washington is requesting that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside in order that the Senate may consider a bill which he says is not controversial and can be disposed of without undue delay. With that understanding, it is perfectly agreeable to me to have the unanimous-consent request agreed to.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, let me say that I would be deeply hopeful that there would be no unnecessary or undue delay in regard to the bill, although it may take some little time to dispose of it. It really is an important matter.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, reserving the right to object to the request to have the bill taken up at this particular time, let me say that there are certain amendments to which a majority of the members of the committee have agreed. It will take quite some time to dispose of them. I think it is now a little too late in the day to take up the bill, unless Senators wish to have the Senate remain in session until a late hour.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I am sure that all other Senators are as fully aware as I am that the remaining days of this month are rapidly running out. Unless this bill is promptly disposed of, the result will be to place in jeopardy the rights of the school teachers of the District of Columbia. For that reason, I ask that Senators remain on the floor of the Senate until this bill is disposed of.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I suggest that the unfinished business is not an urgent matter that has to be disposed of today or tomorrow. We could very well spend some time tomorrow in considering the teachers' bill, in my judgment.

It is not a matter of life or death whether the Presidential succession bill be passed tomorrow or Monday or Christmas, as compared with the teachers' bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senator from Kentucky will strike out the word "Christmas", I shall appreciate his doing so.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I always try to accommodate the Senator from Nebraska. If he wants me to take his Christmas away from him, I shall agree to do so. [Laughter.]

But, Mr. President, seriously speaking, I mean that we need not stay in session tonight in order to consider this bill. We can continue its consideration tomorrow, if necessary.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, there is no objection on the part of the Senator from Nebraska. I have already agreed to the request. Of course, the Senator from South Carolina has reserved the right to object. But I have agreed to the request, and I agree with the suggestion of the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I agree that I wish to have the bill taken up and disposed of as soon

as possible. The only matter in disagreement, so far as I know, is the question of the treatment of approximately 196 teachers in the District of Columbia who, I believe, have entered into binding agreements with the Board of Education of the District of Columbia whereby they are considered by the Board of Education as having the equivalent of a master's degree. I wish to point out that seven members of the committee, out of the 12 members eligible at the present time, have endorsed these amendments.

If the Senator from Washington will agree to my amendments, I shall agree to his request to have the bill taken up at this time. But I want those teachers properly cared for. So if the Senator from Washington will agree to my amendments—amendments which a majority of the committee have endorsed—I shall be glad to have the bill taken up and disposed of at once.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, let me say that consideration of the amendments is obviously the purpose of the debate. But I take it that the Senator from South Carolina is not now asking me to agree to the amendments.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from South Carolina that it is going a little far to ask, without knowing what the amendments are, that Senators agree to them as a condition upon which the Senator will agree to the request to have the bill taken up. I think the temper of the Senate would be to consider the amendments on their merits when they are offered.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true.

Mr. BARKLEY. In order to do that, I think it fair to say that this bill should not be considered tonight, but should be considered tomorrow. If it is made the unfinished business, with the understanding that we shall not precipitate a lengthy session tonight on account of it, or undertake to dispose of the amendments tonight, I am sure the Senator from South Carolina will have no objection.

Mr. CAIN. My only anxiety is to have the matter fully and completely handled and disposed of; and I shall certainly concur in any suggestion the Senator makes in reference to how that can best be done.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I object to having the bill taken up at the present time. I shall be ready to have it taken up tomorrow or at any time thereafter; and that is the position of the other members of the committee who share my views. We wish to have some information on this matter presented to the Senate; and I believe that the Senate will agree with the majority of the committee after the amendments are discussed.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest that we follow the suggestion of the minority leader and make this bill the temporary unfinished business, with the understanding that it will not result in having the succession bill laid aside, for I assert with all the force that is in me that the succession bill is a matter of life and death.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is mainly a matter of death. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHERRY. So I suggest that a recess be taken at this time, and that this proposed legislation be taken up tomorrow, and that the amendments be presented and discussed at that time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the able Senator from South Carolina whether the amendment he has referred to has been printed. If not, I would suggest that it be presented, and lie on the table, and be printed.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The amendment is now printed and is on the desks of all Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from South Carolina whether I correctly understand that he is not prepared to present today his side of the controversy concerning the teachers' pay bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. So far as I am concerned, the bill can be taken up at this time; but I do not want the discussion on it closed this evening. I shall be prepared to take up the amendments tomorrow.

However, Mr. President, in order to clarify the situation, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from South Carolina if he would withhold his objection for a moment, until I can make a comment. It would be perfectly agreeable to me, and I trust to other Members of the Senate, to defer consideration, providing we can begin the discussion at the earliest possible moment tomorrow. It is perfectly agreeable to me, if it is acceptable to those who are interested in the amendments.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I am as anxious as is the Senator from Washington that this measure be disposed of. The only difference is over the 196 teachers, I think.

Mr. CAIN. Do I therefore understand the situation to be that House bill 3611 will be considered during the course of tomorrow's session?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so understands.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, to clarify the situation, I shall not object when the request is made to consider the bill tomorrow.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BUSHFIELD

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I was deeply impressed by an address delivered by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] before the Senate Committee on Appropriations. The address had reference to his observations and feelings in relation to the agricultural appropriation bill, which is now under consideration by the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

When I picked up the address and started to read through its pages I was impressed particularly by the fourth paragraph:

> Conservation of our productive farm land is, in my opinion, one of the most essential of these services that must be performed. My own State—

He was speaking, of course, of South Dakota—

> My own State is a great farm State, and I know how erosion can damage the land. I have seen it. It isn't pretty. Erosion damage to farm land is not temporary. It leaves its mark on the land for years and generations. It means reduced production. It means nothing good. Everything about erosion is bad. People cannot live and prosper on eroded land. Eroded land provides little food for anyone—either on the farm or in the city.

Mr. President, this is one of the choicest argument, I have seen regarding erosion of land and conservation of the soil. I think it is so important that I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks the address be printed, for the information of Senators, especially those now considering the agricultural appropriation bill.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR HARLAN J. BUSHFIELD ON AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL

As passed by the House of Representatives, the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture would reduce the budget request by about 29 percent, or from $1,188,571,318 to $847,601,976 for the fiscal year.

I know that a great majority of our people want greater economy in Government. I agree with them wholeheartedly and consistently advocated cutting Government expenditures. Economy is absolutely essential to the future welfare and economic stability of our Nation. That is why I am interested in cutting down the cost of Government in every way that is possible without hurting or stopping any of the essential services that must be performed.

I have no doubt that many services offered by the Department of Agriculture are no longer necessary, and I believe that there may be considerable duplication and overlapping in administration of these services. I feel it is the duty of Congress to insist on efficient service, and we should demand sound businesslike methods in this Department.

But I am not in favor of curtailing useful services to the American farmer and rancher. I am not in favor of economy which, in the long run, will cost us more money. I feel strongly that some of the reductions effected by the House should not be sustained by the Senate, and I shall urge that appropriations for certain items be restored to the full amount needed for essential operations.

Conservation of our productive farm lands is, in my opinion, one of the most essential of these services that mut be performed. My own State is a great farm State, and I know how erosion can damage the land. I have seen it. It isn't pretty. Erosion damage to farm land is not temporary. It leaves its mark on the land for years and generations. It means reduced production. It means nothing good. Everything about erosion is bad. People cannot live and prosper on eroded land. Eroded land provides little food for anyone—either on the farm or in the city.

Twelve years ago Congress called soil erosion a national menace, and nothing has happened since then to alter that fact. Erosion today is still a national menace, perhaps more so now than then, because now our lands are suffering from the hard use we

made of them during the war. Yes; it was hard use. We put more land under cultivation and kept it under cultivation to produce the food and fiber we needed to help win the war. We had to do it.

The record-breaking production from our farm and range land was not obtained without a price. The price was further exploitation—further damage—to our irreplaceable soil resources. We couldn't keep up such production very long under our present system of farming and maintain our land at the same time.

Half of all the productive farm land of the United States has already been damaged by erosion. The war has served to speed up the rate of that damage. In such a situation, it is only good business sense—good common sense—to take whatever steps are necessary now to slow down the damage and reverse the process. We need to speed up the rate of soil conservation—the kind of conservation work that will be permanent and pay dividends year after year in high production per acre, at low cost, while protecting the land at the same time. We need our farm land; we must have it to continue as a great nation. In the kind of world we live in nowadays, we must have it—and have enough of it, in good, productive condition—to keep the United States strong and prepared for any emergency.

There is only one way to do this job and do it right. That is by scientific analysis of the land and scientific application of the right combination of conservation measures. We've seen this demonstrated in South Dakota, just as it has been demonstrated in every other State in the country. Halfway measures simply don't work. We've seen that demonstrated, too. Only farm-by-farm and acre-by-acre treatment of the land is ever going to get his big and vital job done.

The appropriation which was cut most severely by the economy ax of the House of Representatives was the one for the agricultural conservation program. Under the bill, payments to farmers for 1947 would be reduced by about half. No appropriation is indicated for next year.

Now, right here is where I think Congress should do some soul searching. This Nation has embarked upon a program under which we are sending millions of dollars abroad in loans to bring some measure of relief to foreign nations. In this connection, I insist that our first responsibility is to look after the needs of our own people.

Why take money away from American farmers and at the same time give lavishly to others? To my mind, we can best serve world interests by first looking after our own national interests.

Yes; we are sending millions of American dollars abroad, and there is serious doubt whether we will ever get our money back. So I submit to you that it is far more important to look to the conservation of our own national resources.

All during the war, and since the war, farmers have broken one production record after another. Part of the reason why farmers could do this was the conservation practices encouraged by the Government, which in some measure helped hold the line against what could have amounted to absolute soil destruction. The enormous crop production turned out by our farmers, however, could not fail to levy its cost in loss of soil fertility. So it is imperative that action be taken to protect our national economy adequately by bolstering—not weakening—programs which contribute markedly to the welfare and strength of the whole Nation.

Farmers were convinced of the need for soil and water conservation, and so they planned to increase the program practices carried out on their farms this year. Many farmers have gone ahead in carrying out their plans. They did this in good faith, for written large in the Agricultural Appropriation Act of last year was the congressional authorization for the development of a 1947 program amounting to $300,000,000. The Department of Agriculture based its plans on this amount, and farmers were told that they could count on funds this year for conservation assistance from the Government.

Farmers feel—and rightly, I believe—that they have been working under a definite commitment. Many of the program practices are well under way, some of them completed under contracts with earth-moving concerns. In some parts of the country farmers have in effect received full payment for carrying out practices, through grants of lime and fertilizer materials and services.

If the appropriation for these payments were reduced in half, there would be a very serious problem in planning any sort of equitable distribution of the funds. It might mean attempting to recapture some of the payments already extended to farmers for 1947 practices, which in many instances would simply amount to putting them on the Federal Debt Register. Or else farmers who have not yet received program payments would get much less than 50 cents on the dollar for the practices they have planned to carry out. More than 56 percent of the farmland in my own State is operated by renters and tenants, and these people must farm for a living. Without help they cannot always afford to farm the conservation way in the long-time interests of the Nation.

Nor would farmers be the only ones affected by this cut in appropriations. I understand that in South Dakota alone there are 600 contractors who have planned their year's operations on the assumption that the Government conservation program would be carried out as announced. Many of these contractors are veterans, who have assumed debts and taken out GI loans to buy earth-moving equipment, in the assurance that the program would provide business. What of these?

I feel that Congress should restore the full amount to the appropriation for the agricultural conservation program. I urge you to allow the full $301,720,000 for this phase of work in the Department of Agriculture.

Now I'd like to talk about the Soil Conservation Service, the agency which is charged with providing technical services for this work. As a word of explanation, the entire farm program ties in one with another. The Agricultural Conservation Program provides payments for service. The Extension Service is doing good work for education of the farmers, but the Soil Conservation Service, which also suffered a drastic cut in appropriation—some $6,000,000—by the House of Representatives, is the agency which provides the technical men and the know-how to carry on the conservation practices.

The Soil Conservation Service is the agency that goes out on the land with the farmer, into the fields and pastures, and helps the farmer work out the best kind of land use and actually apply the right conservation measures on the land to get the job done.

This is not pampering the farmer. It is not providing a kind of luxury service he doesn't need. The farmer can rarely do this job alone, and in saying that I am not detracting in any way from the ability of our farmers. They are the best on earth. But effective soil conservation is a complex business. To do the job right, the farmer needs expert assistance, right on the ground. Every man in every business needs such expert assistance of one kind or another from time to time. That is what the Soil Conservation Service is providing—scientific assistance in soil conservation, farm by farm and acre by acre.

Once the job is done on a farm, it is done. It does not have to be done over and over again, year after year. If we had had this kind of service 50 or 100 years ago, we wouldn't be faced with a conservation problem today. So, if we are going to protect our farm lands against erosion, we do have to get the technicians out there working with the farmers on the land. The sooner we get this job over with, the less it is going to cost—in dollars and in ruined farm land.

The time to do this conservation job is now. We gain nothing by delay, because it must be done sooner or later. The House reduction in funds for the Soil Conservation Service slows down the soil-conservation program. It doesn't kill it; it doesn't change its character, or the nature of the work done. It just slows it down. That doesn't seem to make any sense. Why slow down the only conservation program that is giving us permanent results in protecting our farm lands against erosion?

We have only to glance at the news of the day to realize that more of such conservation practices such as terracing and building dams for erosion and flood control are most urgently needed. The farms of the Nation are the first line of defense in erecting barriers to control the flood waters now on a rampage throughout the Nation. Surely it is short-sighted economy not to take every step possible to prevent such destruction.

These programs have a solid record of accomplishment to their credit. And, as the conservation movement has gathered force, the amounts of practices completed have also increased. For instance, in my own State, nearly 10,000,000 cubic yards of earth were moved in constructing dams and reservoirs during 1945, whereas 8,500,000 cubic yards were moved back in 1941; 66,000 linear feet of earth were moved in constructing wells during 1945; and 55,000 feet in 1941; 193,000 acres were seeded on the contour under the 1945 program, compared with 37,000 acres in 1941; 103,000 acres went into contouring intertilled crops in 1945, compared with almost nothing in 1941; 714,000 pounds of seed were used in reseeding pastures, and 84,000 pounds back in 1941.

All of these practices, dams, grass seeding, proper range management, and other types of conservation, do much to prevent excessive run-off of water. With enough of the right kinds of conservation practices, people who have made a study of this thing tell me that these destructive floods can be stopped.

The farmers are ready to go ahead. They have organized more than 1,800 soil-conservation districts throughout all the States of the country. In my own State they have organized 39 districts, covering nearly 18,000,000 acres. They are asking for this technical service. They like it. It does the job. They have learned that they can't make much conservation progress without it.

Only the Soil Conservation Service is in a position to provide the farmer with the expert help he needs. Only the Congress can put the Soil Conservation Service in a position to meet this demand and do the job all of us really want done.

The House wants to cut the appropriation of the Service by more than $6,000,000. The net effect of such a cut would be to reduce the service to soil-conservation districts to an average 22 percent below what they are getting this year. And it would cut soil-conservation research in half. This is particularly serious as conservation research is relatively new, and there is still much to learn about conserving our soil and water resources.

For example, we are going to need a lot of information on soil and water conservation as it relates to irrigation in my own and the other Plains States. Most of the good irrigation projects in the Mountain States have been built, and the expansion of irrigated lands must come in the Plains States where very little irrigation research has been done. The Soil Conservation Service's Division of Irrigation and Water Conservation Research needs to develop and adapt irrigation-conservation practices and measures to Plains soil, climatic and cropping conditions. We need to know much more about

the control of wind erosion. Drainage problems will come with the new irrigated lands. Research needs in my own State are great—the State is assisting and will continue to assist in getting conservation research done. So far as I know, not a single experiment station director in this country has ever claimed that Soil Conservation Service research duplicated or overlapped that done by his station. On the contrary, experiment station directors have consistently supported Soil Conservation Service research with lands, equipment, facilities, office help, and the like, and have publicly stated that Soil Conservation Service research, as cooperatively carried on with their stations, supplements and complements State station research.

I said that the average soil conservation district would have 22 percent less assistance in 1948 than the average district had in 1947. This needs some explanation since the cut in soil conservation "operations" item is only 12½ percent. The difference is accounted for by the increased number of soil conservation districts. In other words, there is less money to serve more districts. The soil conservation district governing bodies tell me that they need more assistance rather than less assistance. This is particularly true in my home State of South Dakota where the policy has been to organize relatively small districts and to add to the districts as nearby farmers and ranchers become convinced of their need for soil conservation assistance and apply for inclusion of their lands within the district boundaries. In the 9-month period, June 15, 1946, to March 15, 1947, South Dakota farmers have added 2,300,000 acres to the district total in nine districts. Since the beginning of the district program, 36 of the South Dakota districts have added nearly 10,000,000 acres to the district acreage as a result of 70 different additions or a little more than half of the total acres in soil conservation districts in South Dakota. In addition to explaining why district supervisors say that they need more rather than less funds, I believe that the action of these South Dakota farmers rather effectively answers one of the points made by the House Subcommittee in its report on this particular appropriations item. The report states, in discussing this item, "The committee believes that many of the soil conservation districts which have been in existence a number of years will be able to get along with materially reduced technical assistance and advice. The advice and assistance given in the initial years of these districts ought not to require repetition year after year, certainly not to the degree such advice was needed in the beginning."

The conservation job cannot be done on the basis of "advice." It requires careful farm by farm, field by field, acre by acre analysis of the conservation problems and technical assistance on the land in laying out and applying the needed combination of conservation practices and measures to meet the various problems revealed by the analysis. It was to get this specific kind of direct technical assistance that these South Dakota farmers and ranchers asked that their lands be added to existing soil conservation districts. They had not been sure as the original districts were organized. They had not wanted their lands included in many cases, but after watching the progress within the boundaries of soil conservation districts and observing the kind of results obtained from a careful field by field job being done, they decided they wanted to be included and, therefore, asked to be made a part of the soil conservation districts in their neighborhood. They were not seeking "advice" but direct, on the land, assistance in meeting their problems after being on the outside looking in and deciding that they liked what they saw.

The House cut implies that there is nothing to be gained by speed in doing the conservation job right. In my opinion, the House is wrong in this matter. I believe there is need for speed—not only to protect our farm lands before a great deal more damage is done, but to avoid paying an even higher price for the conservation work in 5, 10, or 20 years from now.

I believe the full amount of the budget estimate for the Soil Conservation Service should be allowed—$43,437,000 for soil conservation operations, and $1,423,000 for soil conservation research. This is little enough to spend in a year for the protection of our greatest natural resource and the foundation of our agriculture, considering that we are spending many, many more millions for purposes that promise much less return.

As I have demonstrated many times here in Congress, I am vitally interested in the Rural Electrification program, and I would like to take a few moments to ask that REA appropriations be returned to a sufficient amount to sustain this program.

House action resulted in a 10 percent reduction in REA loan funds from $250,000,000 to $225,000,000 and a 28.5 percent reduction in the administrative expense item from $5,600,000 to $4,000,000.

The need for rural electrification in the Nation is very great. As of June 30 last year, only 14.8 percent of the farms in my State had central electrical service. Only one State, North Dakota, has a smaller percentage of its farms electrified. The farm people in my State are most anxious for electricity. I am most anxious that this service be made available to them.

But I have not forgotten the farmers of other States, and I feel that the continuation of REA is essential to the welfare and well-being of our entire agricultural population.

At the present time REA is striving to place its resources at the disposal of farmers in all sections of the country. With the reduction in the REA staff resulting from the House cut, it will become necessary to make essential departures from the present pattern of loan operations. The reduction in force will tend to divert the bulk of the loan fund to areas where feasibility can be more readily established with a minimum of REA staff assistance. As you know, the extension of rural electrical service in the Dakotas has lagged far behind the rest of the Nation. Lack of rural population density and high construction costs due to natural factors have hindered progress.

The enactment of the 1944 amendments to the Rural Electrification Act liberalizing REA loan terms made possible the tremendous advance in the last 2 years. But these gains were achieved only by concentrated effort in the field and here in Washington in assisting farmers to develop their projects. I have witnessed this development in South Dakota.

If the $250,000,000 in loan funds as requested by the President were made available, $9,000,000 would probably be made available for electrification in South Dakota in the 1948 fiscal year. This amount would fall short by $2,000,000 of meeting requests on hand and in process in the field. The 28.5 percent cut in administrative funds as specified in the House appropriation bill would make it especially difficult to make loans in the State of South Dakota. Construction progress all over the Nation would be slowed down by about 25 percent if the Senate sustains the House reduction.

It is difficult for me to see at this time how proper assistance can be made available with the few people that would be left for work on power generation and transmission problems. This is a field of great importance in South Dakota and all over the Nation, and the need for assistance will increase as rural lines are extended and the demand for power grows.

There can be no doubt of the merit of the REA program. Since REA began, the percentage of electrified farms has increased from less than 11 percent to about 57 percent, but 2,500,000 farms still lack electric service. Most of those still without electric service are in more sparsely settled and inaccessible areas making the problem ahead bigger and far more difficult than it has been. Applications for loans have far exceeded the available funds. This reflects the strong demand for electric power by millions of our rural population.

I regard the request for $250,000,000 as the minimum amount necessary to enable borrowers to enter into the contractual obligations and continue their progress in extending this essential service to rural people in the most orderly and economical manner.

Most REA borrowers are independent, taxpaying, locally owned cooperatives organized by farmers for the purpose of bringing electric service to themselves. The sound financial condition of these cooperatives is testimony that their operations are managed on a businesslike basis in every sense of the word.

But the REA program is more than a money lending operation. It brings into the hands of the rural people the power to improve through their own efforts their own welfare as they make their homes more livable and their farms more prosperous.

Can we, as Members of Congress, vote to hinder individual effort on the part of the farmer to provide for his own welfare? Can we, through shortsighted planning, stand in the way of the farmer who is trying to get for himself some of the comforts which we are so proud to speak of as being typical of America?

The farmer's life is not easy. We have continually made demands on him, and he has assumed these obligations with head high and conviction in his heart. He produced more food during the war, with less help than ever before dreamed possible. Did he complain? Did he strike? No, you bet he didn't.

Is it too much now to ask for a small amount of federal assistance to improve the lot of this sturdy fellow and his family?

The worth-while REA program demands the support of Congress. I beseech you, gentlemen, to restore sufficient funds to this appropriation so that this program can go forward and so that our farmers can take advantage of the great industrial progress which has been made available to the city dweller through his having electric power at his fingertips.

If we can contribute billions to the people of foreign nations, we certainly cannot forget the farmer and turn down this request for this relatively small increase in appropriation.

Another item in the appropiration bill about which I feel strongly is the one for crop insurance. As passed by the House, $1,000,000 is recommended for liquidating this program.

Now, this sum is entirely inadequate. About 450,000 crop-insurance contracts are now in force, and potential liabilities run into hundreds of millions of dollars. I ask you, how can an operation of this size be supervised with a one-million-dollar fund, and at the same time protect the interests of the Government in any way? This amount would not provide enough even for liquidation, much less for building a sound foundation for any future crop-insurance program Congress may authorize. Experts say that about four times that much would be needed to do any kind of a satisfactory job.

In my opinion, crop insurance can be a vital means of cushioning the blows of bad weather and other blights which farmers cannot avoid. That any such program must be operated according to businesslike, efficient methods goes without saying. But you don't cure a headache by cutting off the patient's head; you find out what's wrong and try to correct it. Let's find out what's wrong with crop insurance and correct it. Given a sound foundation, I think crop insurance will work.

And this is no pious hope. In South Dakota the program has worked just the way

it was intended to by Congress. Ever since 1940 the wheat-insurance program in my State has operated in the black, with premiums exceeding losses. And these good years have served to offset the very bad crop years of 1939 and 1940, the first 2 years of the Federal crop-insurance program. After 8 years under the program South Dakota is, for all practical purposes, even with the board.

But each year some counties, some individual farmers, have lost heavily as a result of drought, excessive moisture, hail, or other unavoidable hazards. No one can say when disastrous years like 1939 and 1940 will happen again. Farmers have thought they were building up protection against such catastrophes. Surely the Federal Government would not deny to farmers a measure of protection which is available to all business undertakings. But so much for crop insurance.

Another program in which I am interested is the Farmers' Home Administration. The House took a sizable chunk from the funds requested for the appropriation of this agency. As the bill now stands, direct loans for farm purchases for which 41,000 veterans have applications on file with the Farmers' Home Administration would be eliminated. There is also a cut of a third in the funds for farm-operating loans.

Nation-wide demand for farm-purchase loans has developed among veterans who became eligible to participate in the program under section 505–b of Public Law 346, the GI bill of rights. Farms purchased under this program must be bought on the basis of their long-time earning capacity.

Veterans across the Nation also have heavily increased the demand for farm-operating loans made to farmers who cannot get credit from private sources. During the first 10 months of the present fiscal year, more than 144,000 applications for new loans were received by Farmers' Home Administration, 48,000 of them from veterans. With loan funds exhausted in most States, 11,600 of the veteran applications were still on file, although preference was given to them wherever possible. Not more than 6,500 new operating loans can be made under the reduction in operating loan funds prescribed by House action.

To meet the cut, the Farmers' Home Administration is preparing to close 575 county offices and has given dismissal notices to more than 3,400 employees. In South Dakota, 18 county offices will be closed. Nationally, the reduced staff will service more than 1,200,000 borrowers whose obligations to the Government total $700,000,000. Part of the Government's security for these loans has come from the assistance in farm and home planning and in on-the-farm guidance toward improved farm practices given borrowers by Farmers' Home Administration personnel.

In South Dakota, the Farmers' Home Administration made 2,137 loans, totaling $3,081,152, during the first 10 months of the present fiscal year. Seventy-two percent of the funds went to veterans. As of April 30, 1,162 applications for loans were on file, 484 of them from veterans.

Direct loans totaling $4,336,538 for the purchase of 539 farms have been made in South Dakota under the program which has been eliminated by House action. Applications on file from veterans alone total 260.

Operating loans totaling $78,489,951 have been made in South Dakota, and 473 applications are on file. The bill passed by the House reduces funds for this type of loan to the point that an average of only two new loans per county can be made during the next fiscal year. Almost all of the proposed funds will be needed to meet the credit requirements of present borrowers.

From the figures I have given, it is obvious that farm tenants and the veteran are taking advantage of the funds made available to them. I should like to look to the day when every farm would be home-owned; that is, owned and operated by the same farmer. This would make for a more stable farm economy for very apparent reasons. The Farmers Home Administration is certainly a way to promote this condition.

As I have shown, the veteran, whom we were all worried about getting back on the farm, is using these funds to establish or reestablish himself in agriculture. I think it is the obligation of the Federal Government to continue this program so that our veterans will be given every opportunity to take their places on the farms and ranches of this Nation.

The Farmers Home Administration should be continued, and I ask your support in adding sufficient funds to sustain an adequate program in this activity.

Now last but not least, tucked away in the House committee report, is an item headed "Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering." There is a reduction of $100,000—a relatively small sum when we are used to dealing with millions and billions here in Congress—for soil improvement, management, and irrigation projects.

I have talked with officials in the Department of Agriculture, and they tell me that six dry-land experiment stations will be closed unless this appropriation is allowed. One of them is located in my own State of South Dakota. I'm speaking of the Belle Fourche irrigation and dry-land field station at Newell.

As a citizen of South Dakota, I have watched the work of this station. It was established in 1906 in an effort to study crop rotation, soil moisture, conduct maximum production tests, meteorological investigations, and also provide facilities for lamb-feeding experiments.

This has been a worth-while project and one which has been entirely beneficial to the rancher of western South Dakota. New techniques have been developed. These have been made available to the rancher and dry-land farmer, and they have continually worked to his satisfaction.

I am sure that this is true at the other stations which are to be closed if this appropriation is not allowed.

The sudden closing of the Newell station would result in the loss of much valuable research material, and it would disrupt cooperative arrangements with the State experiment station.

I hardly see how we can justify closing this important project, and I ask that you restore the $100,000 appropriation for soil improvement, management, and irrigation projects.

I have consistently argued for economy, and I have not changed my views. That is the reason I have spoken today. I feel that it would be false economy to abandon the worth-while farm practices which I have mentioned. Our most valuable natural resource is our soil. Soil fertility is essential to the prosperity of our Nation. It is especially important now that the American farmer has been called upon to feed the nations of the world. If we are going to meet these commitments, we must maintain our farm land at its highest level of production.

We must contribute to the welfare of the farmer. Agriculture is our basic industry and upon it depends the prosperity of the Nation.

It is the obligation of us Members of Congress who are charged with the responsibility of determining the course of events for our Nation to look to this important industry. We must do everything in our power to assure the prosperity of the farmer, for when he prospers, so does the Nation.

We cannot break faith with the farmer by discontinuing the programs upon which he has come to depend.

As was reflected in the election last fall, the farmer placed his faith in this Congress. We cannot betray him. I urge your support in restoring funds for the activities of the Department of Agriculture which I have mentioned today.

THE IMPORTANCE OF GROUND WATER WORK OF THE GEOLOGICAL SURVEY TO PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, it is a source of great satisfaction to me, as I said last Friday when the Interior Department appropriation bill was reported out of the Senate Appropriations Committee, that the Senate bill provided a minimum of $740,000 for cooperative and noncooperative ground water activities of the Geological Survey. The bill as passed by the House provided no funds for this activity. Unfortunately, in reversing the House on this item, the Senate committee did so not by increasing funds materially for the gaging streams appropriation of the Interior Department, of which Ground Water is a part, but merely by providing that on the limited appropriation set up by the House for gaging streams, the Geological Survey is to do not only its regular surface water work, but is to spend at least $740,000 for ground water work.

I am informed that this resultant cut in the surface water activities and for quality of water studies will be most serious. Since the House provided substantial sums for this surface water work and none for ground water, I am hopeful the conferees will see fit to allow the full amount of the House item for surface-water activities plus the full amount of the Senate item for ground-water activities, thus saving both programs, because they are equally important. Of course, this means allowing practically the entire budget amount for gaging streams. I realize the desire of the majority in Congress to cut the budget, but it is evident that a House cut on ground water is unacceptable to the Senate, and it seems to me that the Senate cut on surface water should be unacceptable to the House which had previously voted a much higher amount.

When I testified before the Senate appropriations subcommittee on the Interior Department bill urging the restoration of the ground-water work, I was asked whether, in the absence of Federal funds, the State of Pennsylvania could carry on this work by itself. Not having been informed one way or another by the State administration at that time, I was unable to give a categorical reply, but it was my impression the State would not be able to do the work by itself except at a tremendously disproportionate cost. I decided to find out definitely, and wrote to the Governor of the Commonwealth, the Honorable James H. Duff, for this information.

Last night, I received a reply which bears out my original impression. I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD, following my remarks, a copy of my letter to Governor Duff and of his reply received yesterday, and of the statement he enclosed. This statement, prepared, as the Governor said in his letter, by the geological bureau of the

department of internal affairs of Pennsylvania, starts off with a very definite statement:

Elimination or curtailment of cooperation by the United States Geological Survey in Pennsylvania's ground-water studies would be disastrous to the continuity of our ground-water investigation and to the timeliness of results which are vitally important.

It goes on to tell about the very modest cost to both the State and Federal Governments of this very vital work, describing it in some detail, and concludes with this paragraph, which I think is a sufficiently categorical reply to the question asked me by the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], whether the State could handle this work by itself. This is the State's reply:

The geologic field program now in effect demands the supplementary service of highly specialized personnel. It is a service that is available only through cooperation with the United States Geological Survey. If the existing staff of specialists now in the employ of the Federal Survey is disbanded, the service they afford could be reclaimed by the individual States only at greatly increased cost and, no doubt, only after a considerable lapse of time. Our ground-water program like that of many other States is geared to and is dependent upon the scientific facilities that have long been made available by the United States Geological Survey. That the Federal Government would permanently abandon this service is very improbable; from the standpoint of economy, that the service should be interrupted and the highly specialized personnel scattered is unthinkable.

I ask that the entire correspondence be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 26, 1947.

Hon. JAMES H. DUFF,
Governor, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Harrisburg, Pa.

DEAR GOVERNOR: On last Friday I appeared before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee considering the Interior Department Appropriation Bill for the 1948 fiscal year to oppose on behalf of the people of Pennsylvania certain cuts in the Interior Department budget made by the House which I considered detrimental to industry, particularly, and to the people of Pennsylvania. I am enclosing a copy of that statement, and I respectfully call your attention to the last page of it which discusses the Ground Water work of the Geological Survey in Pennsylvania.

It is my understanding that if this Federal function is eliminated, the States, generally speaking, will be unable to duplicate the work inside their own borders except at a cost far exceeding the modest expense entailed by the Federal Government under a nation-wide program. I was asked by members of the subcommittee whether Pennsylvania would be able to continue this work by itself and was not able to give a categorical reply.

I should appreciate receiving some expression from you or from your aides engaged in cooperative work with the Federal Government on the Ground Water Survey as to the effect on the State's program if the Geological Survey's work in Pennsylvania on ground water is eliminated.

In several previous instances involving appropriation bills, I would have found it helpful if I had known the States position on some of the reductions as they affect Pennsylvania, particularly in regard to the reductions in the Labor Departments funds for the United States Employment Service. As you may know, the House bill allowed the States the full amount the Labor Department had asked for them in operating their individual employment services, but cut the USES by a very substantial amount so that it would no longer be able to supervise the various State programs. The Senate bill restored some of the funds for the USES but proceeded to make a substantial cut in the funds available to the individual States. That bill is now in conference and I don't know what the final result will be.

In other Federal-State programs there will be, I am sure, instances where it would be helpful to me to know how the State Administration feels about budget cuts substantially affecting long-established Federal-State programs.

Sincerely and respectfully yours,

FRANCIS J. MYERS.

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,
Harrisburg, June 16, 1947.

Hon. FRANCIS J. MYERS,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MYERS: I apologize very profusely to you for not sooner answering your letter of May 26, but it was mislaid in the business of the closing days of the general assembly.

You asked to have an expression of opinion on the attitude of the State with respect to the Ground Water Survey, if the Federal Government's geological survey in Pennsylvania is eliminated.

The Geological Bureau of the Department of Internal Affairs has complied with my request to them for information on this subject and the same is herewith enclosed.

With best regards,

Sincerely yours,

JAMES H. DUFF.

WHAT ELIMINATION OF THE GROUND-WATER DIVISION OF THE UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY MEANS TO PENNSYLVANIA

Elimination or curtailment of cooperation by the United States Geological Survey in Pennsylvania's ground-water studies would be disastrous to the continuity of our ground-water investigation and to the timeliness of results which are vitally important.

Water is one mineral resource in which every citizen has a personal interest. Demands upon our ground-water supply are increasing. Because of modernization of our way of living and modernization of our industrial practice, the rate of increase in demand is disproportionately larger than the rate of increase in population and industrial growth. Due to this accelerated demand, we definitely need to know more about the physical character and capacity of our ground-water aquifers so that the ground-water supply can be fully utilized yet adequately protected.

As a conservation measure, investigation and protection of our ground-water resources is, when compared with some other conservation measures, such as forestry, surface water, etc., relatively complex, because we are here dealing with the unseen. It is a study involving both geology and hydraulic engineering. To cope with this specialized type of investigation, the United States Geological Survey has developed methods and has trained personnel that are not duplicated elsewhere.

This Commonwealth is in the midst of a cooperative program with the United States Geological Survey that was begun in 1931. Thus far the program has cost each entity a modest amount which has ranged between $400 to $10,000 a year, and has averaged about $1,500 a year. Wartime emergencies demonstrated that our studies in this field should be intensified. Consequently, for the biennium just beginning, it has been recommended that $15,000 per year be allotted by each entity for this purpose with the expectation that during several succeeding bienniums the work will be further expanded. During the period 1931–41, the work consisted of a comprehensive reconnaissance of the ground-water situation throughout the entire State, the results of which have been published in seven volumes. Since 1943, the work has been more localized and much more intensive. Our present program calls for a detailed inventory of ground-water conditions. Work has begun in the Philadelphia and Pittsburgh districts and should be expanded to cover all other populous and highly industrialized areas in the State. Concurrently, there has been carried on a well-observation program that contributes basic data relative to fluctuation of ground-water reservoirs and the significance of said fluctuation. These observations should be continued.

The geologic field program now in effect demands the supplementary service of highly specialized personnel. It is a service that is available only through cooperation with the United States Geological Survey. If the existing staff of specialists now in the employ of the Federal survey is disbanded, the service they afford could be reclaimed by the individual States only at greatly increased cost and, no doubt, only after a considerable lapse of time. Our ground-water program, like that of many other States, is geared to and is dependent upon the scientific facilities that have long been made available by the United States Geological Survey. That the Federal Government would permanently abandon this service is very improbable; from the standpoint of economy, that the service should be interrupted and the highly specialized personnel scattered, is unthinkable.

RECESS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, June 20, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 19 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Charles E. Saltzman, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

AMERICAN MISSION FOR AID TO TURKEY

Edwin C. Wilson, of Florida, to be Chief of the American Mission for Aid to Turkey.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

James Earl Wells, Jr., of South Dakota, to be Cooperative Bank Commissioner of the Farm Credit Administration.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY IN THE ARMY NURSE CORPS

To be lieutenant colonels

Florence A. Blanchfield, N700065.
Jessie M. Braden, N701002.
Ida W. Danielson, N700407.
Mary F. Galli, N700648.
Alida J. Garrison, N700329.
Ida L. Langenheder, N700206.
Elizabeth V. Messner, N700017.
Joanna Peters, N700301.
Agnes A. Resch, N700472.
Elsie E. Schneider, N700682.

Burdette B. Sherer, N700669.
Lillian G. Thompson, N701135.
Maidie E. Tilley, N700303.
Edna D. Umbach, N700342.
Rozene Wentz, N700215.

To be majors

Lucile B. Bacchieri, N701701.
Bernice W. Chambers, N700403.
Rosalie D. Colhoun, N702183.
Helen A. Dugan, N700305.
Pearl T. Ellis, N700355.
Elizabeth Fitch, N702129.
Anna M. Grassmyer, N700594.
Abigail B. Graves, N700255.
Frances C. Henchey, N700443.
Helen V. Johnson, N701800.
Pauline Kirby, N701952.
Dorothy M. Kurtz, N701884.
Mary Miller, N700260.
Mary J. Miller, N701895.
Dora A. Noble, N700773.
Amy R. Pendergraft, N702158.
Mary C. Scherer, N700530.
Sara M. Schoenberger, N700722.
Augusta L. Short, N701837.
Alice C. Wickward, N701883.

To be captains

Helen Adams, N702002.
Vivian L. Allmendinger, N702210.
Eleanor R. Asleson, N702583.
Mary S. Barry, N702357.
Estella Baylor, N702187.
Jaynie E. Belcher, N702279.
Monta R. Boswell, N702447.
Althea V. Buckins, N702574.
Burnett C. Drumm, N702479.
Blanche H. Eager, N700173.
Martha Fulwood, N702185.
Mabel E. Hause, N702159.
Myrtle C. Huhner, N701321.
Cecelia F. Kehoe, N701448.
Virginia K. Kilroy, N701155.
Ethel A. Lamansky, N701948.
Blenda M. Laverick, N702644.
Margaret M. Moss, N702488.
Julia I. Mullen, N700906.
Clemmie L. Reynolds, N702106.
Alvine L. Schmidt, N700782.
Catherine M. Underdown, N700292.
Lena Vanderwood, N702465.

To be first lieutenants

Irene C. Blochberger, N702966.
Aller M. Crowell, N703093.
Thelma Crowell, N703092.
Anna M. Hackett, N703076.
Emilie K. Jensen, N703013.
Marguerite M. Klein, N703004.
Blanche M. McAndrews, N703063.
Avis O. Meeks, N703034.
Mollie A. Petersen, N703086.
Helen A. Stack, N703024.
Mary M. Steppan, N703082.
Ruth M. Stoltz, N702916.
Frances P. Thorp, N703047.
Madeline M. Ullom, N703031.
Marguerite A. Yerger, N703035.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 19, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, whose life is within us and whose mercy is about us, help us, with self-possession, without haste or confusion, to mark the path that we should follow. For our mistakes, for our insincerities and our tendencies, we ask Thy forgiveness. From the deep silences out of which voices are born, recalling regrets, grant that a divine emotion may be created by which are engendered joy and peace. Dear Lord, in the things which are divinely strong, we are humanly weak. Grant us, we pray, a newborn gladness in finding something new in old tasks, and thus welcome each day as a new beginning.

"Speak to Him thou, for He hears, and Spirit with Spirit can meet;
Closer is He than breathing, and nearer than hands and feet."

In our Lord's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3792. An act to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 110. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3303. An act to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military Establishment of the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. RUSSELL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JACKSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial and a letter.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, some of those who were shouting oil shortage a few days ago are now trying to retrace their steps to a safer position. I hope that no lasting damage has been done by the assertions of some who are high in the administration.

The fact is that there is not a shortage of oil. There has always been somebody around to predict one—usually someone with no chips in the game at all—ever since Colonel Drake's day. I do not recall that the gloom ever before became as deep as it has been recently when the oil shortage became the concern of just about every Washington bureau. It sounded like the return of gasoline rationing and A coupons all over again.

There is, right now, some trouble over distribution of supplies of petroleum products. Some "spot" or local deficiencies have occurred. There are a few strikes still going on that have curtailed refinery operation, and the explosion and fire at Texas City several weeks ago affected seriously the refineries in that locality. There is also a deficiency in transportation. Steel is needed for building tank cars and pipe lines which would go into fields where there is now a developed production of crude in excess of transportation facilities.

I am told by those who are in close daily touch with the situation that the supply could be increased in areas where it is most greatly needed—the supply of crude oil for use in refineries of those areas—with more drilling. Here again it is a question of steel. Producers and drilling contractors from California to Pennsylvania tell the same story. They cannot get casing and tubing, and the pipe-line people—both in oil and natural gas—cannot get their requirements. Many hundreds of wells will not be drilled this year because of lack of tubular goods.

The trouble is not wholly a shortage of steel. The vast quantity that is going to foreign countries would enable producers here at home to drill many thousand wells and to put in secondary recovery projects in the old fields, further safeguarding our national supply of oil.

It has been a deliberate policy of the executive branch of the Government to stimulate the export of oil country tubular goods, and they have been highly successful. At the rate exports of these goods were moving in the first quarter of this year, it was indicated that the 1946 shipments might be nearly doubled.

When I said that there is no shortage of oil, I meant that the reserves now developed and those which can be found and developed in the United States will take care of us for a long time to come. But we should not forget that a shortage could be created. If the oil producers cannot get materials and equipment with which to drill and produce, the supply will naturally decline. There is some suspicion that certain bureaucrats would like to see that happen. It would add to the prospects for Government control of the oil industry if it could be made to appear that the industry was not doing a proper job, and it would satisfy the one-world crew in Washington who have already talked about internationalizing the world's oil under the United Nations control, giving Siam the same voice in policies over our oil as the United States would have.

I think the principal danger to our future supply is the continued presence in Washington of a group of oil experts who would not know a working barrel from a fractionating column. Some of them are left-overs from the OPA. They have jobs and few duties and lots of time to dream up controls.

The best I can find out from the oilmen themselves is that we will have enough petroleum products this year for ordinary needs, perhaps a little pinch in a few localities where transportation most seriously affects supply. Basically, as to raw material—crude oil—we are in good shape and with more attention to home affairs and less to the needs of Russia and some other parts of the world, the oil industry can take care of the job as it has always done.

THE STEEL SHORTAGE

[From the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick, of June 18, 1947]

United States Senator EDWARD MARTIN, of Pennsylvania, chairman of the subcommittee which is investigating the steel shortage, says his organization will go ahead until it finds out what is wrong and how to correct it.

The subcommittee proposes to take the testimony of an impressive number of small businessmen who have purchased large quantities of gray-market steel at exorbitant prices and who could keep their businesses operating in no other way. Old customers, according to the testimony, are unable to obtain steel even with a historical quota. Some newcomers are without sources of supply, while other newcomers are receiving consideration from supplying sources. Further testimony is needed to determine the extent and effect of integrated purchases and operations in the steel industry.

Evidence has been given the Martin subcommittee that certain steel products in export are causing unfavorable results to the domestic economy, especially in sheet steel and in steel pipe, casings, and tubings. The subcommittee needs further statistics on the export of steel products and further testimony by responsible Government officials on quota determinations, licensing controls and special Government projects requiring steel.

Senator MARTIN is taking a strong personal interest in the recovery of steel scrap. Figures at the end of last February showed that the scrap supply was less than half the prewar levels. He says the Government has it in its power to cure much of this shortage. The Government has the scrap, but it is not making it available. There are damaged Liberty ships fit for nothing but junking. There are surplus machine tools made for war production and now having no current use. There is an immense amount of war material left to rust on foreign beaches. He points out that not only is this steel being wasted but we are paying people to watch it.

"I understand," says Senator MARTIN, "that some time ago an order went out that our ships returning in ballast from foreign voyages should carry surplus war goods as ballast instead. I understand this was done for some time and some machinery brought back. Then the whole thing was dropped. Perhaps somebody wouldn't be bothered."

American consumers are clamoring for steel. This is especially true of the automotive industry. Yet American steel is going abroad. Its scarcity is creating fancy prices paid by American manufacturers. Scrap is not being gathered by the Government. Here we have a situation which should be corrected but nothing was being done about it until the Senate undertook the present investigation.

It is strange that a Government which has upward of 2,500,000 people on its pay roll cannot look after matters which mean so much to the people of the country.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

ARMY ENLISTMENT BILL

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H. R. 3303, to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military Establishment of the United States, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ANDREWS of New York; SHORT, of Missouri; ARENDS, of Illinois; VINSON, of Georgia; and DREWRY, of Virginia.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. POTTS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. ELLIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, in each to include a newspaper article.

Mr. JARMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address to the Greek Parliament by Deputy Bacopoulos thereof.

PRIVILEGE OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks, and include therein a letter by Hon. Lloyd Binford, head of the moving-picture censorship of Memphis, Tenn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege of the House and offer a resolution (H. Res. 250), which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas there is being shown at the Palace Theater, in the District of Columbia, a moving picture entitled "Duel in the Sun," that is filthy, debasing, and insulting to the moral instincts of decent humanity; and

Whereas the District of Columbia is under the protection of the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas we are charged with the responsibility of protecting the youth of the District of Columbia from such filth: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives call upon the police of the District of Columbia to either close the Palace Theater or prevent the further showing of this vicious film in the Palace Theater or in any other theater in the District of Columbia.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the District of Columbia is under the jurisdiction of the Congress of the United States. It is our duty to protect the decent people of the District from the impositions to which they are subjected.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, is it not the practice of the House, under the rules of the House, that a bill can come before the House only after being first reported from a committee?

The SPEAKER. The House can consider any resolution or bill properly brought before it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am going to read you a letter from Lloyd T. Binford, head of the moving-picture censorship in Memphis, Tenn. I read this to one of the best Members of Congress this morning. He said, "I took my daughter to see that picture last night. It was horrible, and even my little child was shocked."

Mr. Binford wrote to David O. Selznick, producer of this picture, in Los Angeles, Calif., as follows:

Mr. DAVID O. SELZNICK,
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR SIR: It is with a feeling of regret that I must inform you that your production, Duel in the Sun, violates the city ordinance of Memphis pertaining to the showing of "obscene or salacious" public performances, either upon the stage or the screen. I say "with regret," because it is, indeed, regrettable that there are producers of stage and screen plays so disinterested in the welfare of the physical and spiritual health of the American people—especially of their boys and girls of impressionable age—that they make boards of censorship necessary.

In its Estimate of Current Pictures, the official organ of the Motion Picture Association of America says: "Duel in the Sun is a reflection upon the good taste of the motion-picture industry; the film is detrimental to the moral and cultural standards of the American screen." Archbishop Cantwell said: "Catholics may not, with a free conscience, attend the motion picture, Duel in the Sun; it is morally offensive and spiritually depressing." Dr. Fosdick, a great Protestant minister, said: "There is bound to be a reaction against this flaunting of promiscuous sensuality, this glorifying of adultery, this flippant deriding of love, which contributes to the demoralization of the social life."

The Memphis Board of Censors, after previewing Duel in the Sun, finds that it would not be in the public interest or welfare to approve the picture. It is a sexy, salacious story of illicit love, cold-blooded murder, adultery, and outlawry, the witnessing of which would have the effect of degradation, even upon the mind of a calloused adult.

This production contains all the impurities of the foulest human dross. It is sadism at its deepest level. It is the fleshpots of Pharaoh, modernized and filled to overflowing. It is a barbaric symphony of passion and hatred, spilling from a blood-tinted screen. It is mental and physical putrefaction.

Duel in the Sun begins with a double murder which takes place in a bedroom of a saloon and dive theater, and which is spawned and instigated by infidelity. The picture ends with a double murder brought to pass by a series of seductions and the destruction of a young woman's virtue. It is a tale of two lust-driven delinquents who rush through reams of sadistic love-making toward a final catastrophe of minds filled with murderous mania to the exclusion of even the tiniest spark of human decency. It is a story of jungle savagery which might have amused the people of Sodom and Gomorrah in the final moments of the destruction of those ancient, evil cities.

The scenes of rape of the half-breed Indian girl should not even be shown to the inmates of a "red-light district," much less

to decent adults. To permit innocent, unsuspecting children to see this lecherous depiction of sexual abnormality and brutality would be contributing to the delinquency of minors. For, in the finale of the picture, the two victims of the lowest form of depraved animal passion slaughter each other, and, with blood streaming from their wounds and sweat pouring from their bodies, press their mouths together in a last spasm of sadism and die in each other's arms.

To add flavor to this film of filth, an unordained minister of the gospel, known as the Sin Killer, offers prayers to God that are worse than blasphemous, irreverent, impious and profane. Christians unfortunate enough to enter a theater where Duel in the Sun might be shown, will cringe and shudder as they witness the scenes in which Walter Huston appears, and hear his sacrilegious outbursts.

Hollywood commentators and critics refer to Duel in the Sun as stark realism—it is stark murder! It is stark horror! It is stark depravity! It is stark filth! If Duel in the Sun is a sample of the manner in which a prominent and influential director is going to help preserve American ideals of honor and fidelity and decency—God help America!

LLOYD T. BINFORD,
Chairman.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I asked the gentleman to yield to inquire of him whether or not he would consent to his motion's being referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. RANKIN. I was going to ask for its immediate consideration if I could get unanimous consent for that purpose.

Mr. HALLECK. I am sure the gentleman cannot get unanimous consent at this time. It strikes me the proper way to proceed would be to refer it to the Committee on the District of Columbia and let them investigate.

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman from Indiana that these appeals have come to me from all over the country protesting against this film. Mr. Binford, of Memphis, sent me this copy of this letter which he wrote the producer of this picture, a letter which cannot be answered.

As I said, a Member of the House told me this morning that he took his little girl to see this picture and he said it was shocking and revolting.

Congress is the governing body of the District of Columbia. The people here look to the Congress to protect them.

I do not want this thing to die in the committee and let this salacious film continue to be spread before the eyes of children in this District.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman, of course, did not say anything to me about his proposal. I have not seen the picture, I know nothing about it. Certainly the gentleman would not want the House of Representatives to act upon his resolution with nothing more before it than the gentleman's statement. In other words, in the interest of orderly procedure it would seem to me that the gentleman would be in sympathy with a suggestion that the matter be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia for investigation by them.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. O'TOOLE. In my city, New York City, the picture, Duel in the Sun, is losing hundreds of thousands of dollars because of the fact that the decent, church-going element have quietly boycotted the picture. I think, however, that the gentleman from Mississippi is giving the picture a hundred thousands dollars' worth of free advertising this morning that will cause a terrific interest in it and will cause the producer to owe him a debt that he can never repay.

Mr. RANKIN. Do Members of the American Congress propose to sit here and let this kind of filth and debasement be shown before the eyes of children who have to look to us for protection?

Mr. O'TOOLE. We are handling it rather well in our own way in New York City. They can do it in the District of Columbia. They did it in Memphis, too.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may say to the gentleman from Mississippi that I have not seen the picture nor have any formal complaints come to me with reference to it. But I assure the gentleman that if his resolution were referred to the District of Columbia Committee it would receive immediate attention.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, since the Committee on the District of Columbia is going to investigate this proposition, I want to read to you from another letter by Mr. Binford relative to the moving picture called Monsieur Verdoux in which Charlie Chaplin plays an unenviable part. I hope while the Committee on the District of Columbia is investigating this loathsome picture called Duel in the Sun they will also investigate this monstrosity known as Monsieur Verdoux and join me in calling upon the Attorney General to institute proceedings to deport Charlie Chaplin at once.

Mr. Binford's letter, to which I refer, reads in part as follows:

UNITED ARTISTS CORP.,
St. Louis, Mo.

GENTLEMEN: * * * Monsieur Verdoux made a business of using and disposing of women, characteristic of the author, in a different way, who is not an American citizen and whose reputation, personal conduct, and communistic leanings deserve the contempt of all decent people.

Charlie Chaplin is a traitor to the Christian American way of life, an enemy of decency, virtue, holy matrimony and godliness in all of its forms; and his reputation as a perverter of home life and of childhood, if true, should have justified his deportation for moral turpitude long ago.

America has been kind to this former London guttersnipe, in permitting him to reside here for more than a generation without becoming a citizen, although he has been raised from the status of a steerage refugee to wealth; and what has he done with his millions of American dollars? Used it for un-American propaganda purposes? To pay off young girls and women whose virtue he has destroyed, and whose lives he has disgraced and wrecked? Is it true that he was engaged in the infamous act of mercilessly persecuting a girl, less than half his age, who claimed that he had betrayed her, and whose illegitimate child he fathered?

Westbrook Pegler, in referring to Chaplin's trial said: "It was a trial which revealed him as a vicious old man still as nasty at 56 as he had been throughout his earlier years."

Is it true that Chaplin assisted Joe Stalin's friend, Lion Feuchtwanger, to gain admission into the United States? In Feuchtwanger's book, Moscow 1937, he eulogized Stalin and the Bolshevik regime. He said on pages 149-50, when referring to the United States: "The air which one breathes in the West is stale and foul—one breathes again when one comes from the oppressive atmosphere of a counterfeit democracy and hypocritical humanism, into the invigorating atmosphere of the Soviet Union." Chaplin's conclusive moral thesis and savage note of bitterness is distinctive communism.

Now comes this insolent reprobate asking the people of America to drop more millions of their dollars into the box office of theaters, which might insult its patrons with Monsieur Verdoux, in order that he may use such dollars to disgrace other trusting girls, and destroy the land whose atmosphere is stale and foul? If there is any staleness or foulness about the atmosphere of America, it is because too many men of the Chaplin stripe are permitted to live and to prosper in it.

The Independent Theater Owners of Ohio, comprising over 300 exhibitors, has adopted a resolution calling on theater owners throughout the United States to give serious thought on the matter of withholding time from Monsieur Verdoux saying: "Screen time should not be dissipated upon a screen personality such as Chaplin." The ITO advocates a Nation-wide theater owners' boycott of Chaplin films.

LLOYD T. BINFORD,
Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, again I say that it is the duty of the Congress to protect the children, as well as the adults, of the District of Columbia from these filthy, salacious, and immoral films.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request and ask unanimous consent that the resolution be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to withdraw his request and asks that the resolution be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PICKETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. COURTNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a short newspaper article.

PHONY BUDGET CUTS

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain correspondence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] very ably

clarified for the Members of Congress and the American public the phony nature of the Republican claims of reductions in the President's budget. Members of the Committee on Ways and Means are given the responsibility of supplying the revenues to run the Government. The Appropriations Committee is primarily responsible for determining the amount of money spent. Nevertheless, when the justification for tax reduction is an extravagant claim of a budgetary surplus members of the Committee on Ways and Means must take into account the appropriations picture.

In the debate on the conference report on H. R. 1, I pointed out that the majority had already abandoned their promise of a cut of four and one-half to six billion dollars in the President's budget, and that at least half of the reduction of two and eight-tenths billions then claimed were phony. The two items which appeared illusory paper transactions to me were the first and fourth items on Mr. GORE's list of false budget-cut claims; namely, postponement of tax refunds totaling $800,000,000 and Treasury cancellation of CCC notes amounting to six hundred and forty-two millions. In the case of tax refunds, Mr. Speaker, there can be no question. On the second item I was not so certain, since it presented an involved matter of Government budgeting and accounting. As I indicated in the House on June 2, I wrote to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget requesting written verification of my impression that the shift of the $642,000,000 CCC item from 1948 to 1947 failed to decrease appropriations for 1948 or to increase appropriations for 1947. On June 12, Mr. F. J. Lawton, Acting Director of the Bureau of the Budget, replied that—

Your impression that total estimated receipts and expenditures in the budget for 1948 is not affected by cancellation of the notes is correct; nor are the estimated budget receipts and expenditures for the fiscal year 1947 affected by the inclusion of the authority for the cancellation of such notes in one of the deficiency appropriation bills for 1947.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point my correspondence with the Bureau of the Budget:

JUNE 4, 1947.

Mr. JAMES E. WEBB,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
State Department Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WEBB: I understand that an item in the President's 1940 budget for cancellation of notes of the Commodity Credit Corporation has been included in one of the deficiency appropriation bills for the fiscal year 1947.

It has been suggested to me, inasmuch as this item appeared as both a debit and credit item in the President's estimates of expenditures for 1948, that no reduction in the budget totals for 1948 results from the transfer of this appropriation item to fiscal year 1947 appropriations.

Will you please advise me whether my impression about this matter is correct?

Sincerely yours,

HERMAN P. EBERHARTER,
Member of Congress.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., June 12, 1947.

Hon. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. EBERHARTER: I have your letter of June 4 addressed to Mr. Webb, concerning the effect which the cancellation of notes of the Commodity Credit Corporation has upon the estimated budget expenditures.

Your impression that total estimated receipts and expenditures in the budget for 1948 is not affected by cancellation of the notes is correct. Nor are the estimated budget receipts and expenditures for the fiscal year 1947 affected by the inclusion of the authority for the cancellation of such notes in one of the deficiency appropriation bills for 1947. The original estimate of the notes of Commodity Credit Corporation to be canceled by the Secretary of the Treasury, $830,380,311, will be found in the budget document in table 10, page A107, included as an expenditure of general and special accounts. The same amount, $830,380,311, is also included as a credit to the expenditures in the checking account of the Commodity Credit Corporation in arriving at the credit figure of $500,000,000 in table 14, page A112, of the budget document. The totals of the estimates in tables 10 and 14 make up the "total budget expenditures" as summarized in table 3, page A6, of the budget document.

When the estimated amount to be canceled was reduced by $188,548,730 to $641,832,081 in House Document No. 186, the budget estimate totals were not affected. The reduction in the estimated expenditures in the general and special accounts of $188,548,730 was offset by a reduction of an identical amount in the credits in the corporation checking accounts with the Treasurer of the United States; thereby making the estimated expenditures in the checking accounts that much higher. Likewise the change in the effective date from fiscal year 1948 to fiscal year 1947 did not change the budget totals for either year.

The reason for this is that the funds, making up the total of the notes to be canceled, were expended in years prior to the fiscal year 1947 and in Treasury reports they were included in the expenditures of such prior years in the checking account of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The write-off of the notes by the Secretary of the Treasury is actually accomplished by a bookkeeping transaction showing the amount of the notes canceled as an expenditure in the general and special accounts of the Treasury and as a credit to (i. e., a deduction from) the expenditures in the Commodity Credit Corporation's checking account with the Treasurer of the United States, in the same amount and in the fiscal year in which the authority is granted to cancel such notes.

The effects of the cancellation of notes are (1) to eliminate the liability of the Commodity Credit Corporation to the United States Treasury in the amount canceled, (2) to charge off the assets of the Treasury represented by the notes canceled, (3) to relieve the Corporation from further interest charges on the amount canceled, and (4) to restore the borrowing authority of the Corporation by the amount canceled.

Sincerely yours,

F. J. LAWTON,
Acting Director.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement by the National Clergymen's Committee on the Taft-Hartley bill.

Mr. HUBER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. DURHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a couple of editorials.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two subjects.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address.

PRESIDENT'S VETO OF THE TAX BILL

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, because of an engagement of long standing to address a forum at Tulane and Loyola Universities in New Orleans, I was unable to be present Tuesday when the vote came on the President's message in reference to the tax bill. I take this opportunity to state that had I been here I would have voted most emphatically to sustain the President's veto, which I consider an act of statesmanship and an act putting national solvency and sound national credit above political expediency. I have been amused at the cries about spending and spending when the Nation knows that every nickel spent by this administration must be appropriated by this Congress, which is dominated by the Republican Party.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Louisana has expired.

REVISION OF COURT-MARTIAL PROCEDURE

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, someone to the right or left, or in between Shakespeare and Alexander Woollcott, said that when they felt the urge to exercise coming on they would lie down until the feeling passed. I have tried the practice in this House. When I have felt like saying some things, I have sometimes walked out of the Chamber or to the cloakroom to eat a banana. But the time has come now in the matter of a revision of court-martial procedure for the Army and Navy that I feel I must speak out. I do not know whether it is going to do any good or not. But the sands are running out and I see no evidence that this question is going to receive consideration during this session of the Congress.

The majority party has not indicated that it expects to put this needed legislation on the must list. I say to you that all atrocities perhaps were not committed by our enemies in the last war. There is a crying need for revision of our procedure in military law that will give

the boy in service who may be charged with an offense the same right to defend himself properly as is accorded the common criminal in most of the jurisdictions of State courts of this country.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

THE PICTURE, DUEL IN THE SUN

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, we have witnessed the rather unusual spectacle this morning of the gentleman from Mississippi under the guise of the privileges of the House seeking to ask immediate consideration of a bill that would call upon the police to stop the showing of a picture in the District of Columbia. Ordinarily a bill must go to a committee. It is threshed out in that committee, where witnesses are heard. The gentleman from Mississippi would overrule all the procedure of the House and have us consider a bill in the fashion he sought this morning.

I have not seen that picture and I do not think the gentleman from Mississippi has seen the picture. He speaks from knowledge that he obtained from other sources rather than from an actual view of the picture itself. The picture, as a matter of fact, is no longer being shown in Washington. The passage of the gentleman's resolution would be abortive. He would be the keeper of the Nation's morals.

Mr. Speaker, I presume the gentleman from Mississippi is going to act as censor over Shakespeare, Congreve, and Pryor who are probably no worse or no better, as to bawdy or immoral connotations, than Duel in the Sun.

Without commenting upon the merits or demerits of the picture, we deplore the gentleman's self-constituted role of censor.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlemen from New York has expired.

MOTION PICTURES

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I take no part in this controversy about these motion pictures, because I have seen neither one of them, but every Texan who has seen Duel in the Sun thinks it is a slander on the fair name of the State of Texas.

COMMUNITY-PROPERTY STATUS FOR ALL MARRIED TAXPAYERS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under the present application of income-tax laws, marriage is considered to be a full partnership in 10 States, but not so in the remaining 38.

This inconsistency means that the married taxpayers of 38 States are paying heavier taxes, couple for couple, than those living in the 10 States which have community-property laws on their statute books.

In the 10 preferred States the United States Department of Internal Revenue allows married couples to divide the annual income for taxation purposes even though the husband may have earned all of the income. This results in a saving of one-quarter to one-third for couples living in the 10 community-property States.

To bring the point home, let us compare the income-tax liabilities of two taxpayers, both of whom are married, have no dependents, and whose official salaries constitute their only family income. Let us assume that taxpayer A lives in a community-property State, and taxpayer B in a non-community-property State, and that the salary of each is $15,000.

Taxpayer A will pay a tax of $2,869.

Taxpayer B will pay a tax of $3,842.

In other words, taxpayer B pays $973 more than his colleague, even though the family status and income of both are identical.

This is a form of economic discrimination which really hurts.

Breaking the comparison down into details we get these contrasting tables:

Taxpayer A

Self:	
Income	$7,500
Standard deduction	−500
Personal exemption	−500
Net taxable income	6,500
Wife:	
Income	7,500
Standard deduction	−500
Personal exemption	−500
Net taxable income	6,500

Total tax for self and wife, $2,869.

Taxpayer B

Self:	
Income	$15,000
Standard deduction	−500
Personal exemptions	−1,000
Net taxable income	13,500

Total tax, $3,842.

Such a disparity leads us to inquire into the meaning of community property.

This legal concept was introduced into the United States by Spanish and French settlers. Community property is that marital property which is not the separate property of either husband or wife. Prior to their marriage, the husband and wife, as individuals, may have accumulated property; and insofar as each is willing, by contract, to perpetuate his or her individual ownership of such accumulations after marriage, the said accumulations of wealth constitute the separate property of the husband or wife. Subject to the exception that a husband or wife may retain as his or her separate possession the property which the husband or wife acquires after marriage from a third party by gift or will, all other property that accrues after marriage is presumed by the community-property States to be the product of the joint endeavors of the husband and wife, even though the wife's contribution in reality may amount to no more than that of a housekeeper; and in the property thus accruing the husband and wife are each said to possess a vested and undivided one-half interest. The latter form of ownership, which attaches only to property acquired during the existence of the marital relationship, terminates upon the death of one of the spouses, or the dissolution of marriage by divorce.

The advantage enjoyed by married taxpayers living in community-property States is derived from the assumption underlying the community-property concept that income accruing after marriage is the product of the joint endeavors of the wife with her husband. By this theory, the salary of the husband, who may be the sole producer of income, becomes the common property of the wife and her husband, each having a vested one-half interest therein. Accordingly, in meeting Federal income-tax requirements, the husband need report only one-half of his total income, which for the purposes of this illustration, represents salary only, and his wife may file a return reporting the other half. Each is entitled to all the privileges granted to income taxpayers; that is, each, as to his or her income reported, is entitled to the same deductions, to the same accounting methods for computing gains and losses, and to the rates applicable to the net income disclosed in the return. The only limitations are the requirements that deductions for dependent children may not be split, but must be taken in full by one of the taxpayers and, secondly, that the community income must be divided evenly between the husband and wife. The latter requirement must be observed even when the husband and wife are wage-earners. Furthermore, sums withheld from salary by employers in current payment of Federal income taxes must be totaled and divided evenly.

If the Federal income tax involved the imposition of a single rate upon net income, of whatever size, the economies enjoyed by married couples in community-property States would be small. It is the levy of progressively higher rates on large incomes which makes the community-property system attractive to the taxpayer; for, by division of income, it is possible to utilize rates applicable to the smaller and equal halves of a large income which will be lower than the rates imposed upon the entire income. It is believed that net income must exceed $3,000 before any savings are affected by splitting the income of the husband into two parts and having one-half credited to the wife.

In Massachusetts, as in other non-community-property States, there is a movement to correct this inequality in taxation. The strategy of seeking relief from this discrimination through the State legislatures, appears to be the wrong approach. A community property bill would necessitate the complete overhauling of property laws and bring chaos to the fields of probate, real estate, domestic relations, and other branches of the law. The greatest losses would

be sustained by third parties, chiefly creditors. They may discover, in transactions with the husband, that the latter was not legally competent to pledge as assets securing his debts the property which appeared to be his own. All evidence of wealth that are employed in business transactions, such as real estate, bank deposits, securities, and insurance, would have to be evaluated by the creditor in terms of the wife's interest therein if the assets appropriated in the event of a default are not to prove inadequate.

How to remove the income tax discrimination without upsetting the whole body of property laws is the question.

A community-property bill, passed by the individual State, is not the answer.

The logical method of equalizing the tax is that suggested by Professor Griswold, of Harvard Law School. He advocates a congressional enactment which would establish the income for all married couples as twice the tax on half the income. A married man, making $10,000 a year, would make a return on $5,000, and his wife would make a similar return. The total would be substantially less than a tax on the $10,000 as a whole.

The President has called for a thoroughgoing revision of the tax system. The community-property concept applied to the income-tax laws is one reform that merits our immediate approval.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JONES of Alabama asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the Alabama legislature.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one editorials appearing in the Rochester Times-Union and the Washington Evening Star, and in the other an editorial appearing in the New York Times.

INVASION MONEY REDEMPTION

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, a great many of the Members probably have heard radio commentator Fulton Lewis, Jr., last night describe one of the worst acts of the New Deal when former Secretary of the Treasury, Henry Morgenthau, by and with the consent of the former President of the United States, the President who appointed him as Secretary of the Treasury. This Secretary of the Treasury gave to Russia American printing presses in order that they might print American invasion dollars to be redeemed by this country with gold at $36 an ounce. All that Russia has to do today is to take a little paper and print the money, and then we pay in gold. We have paid to the extent of some three or four hundred million dollars already. How much more we have to redeem no one knows. No one in the history of the Nation ever heard of anything so ridiculous and asinine as that, and to think that Russia is in the position, if they print more of that paper money, that we have got to pay good American coin to redeem it. It seems to me that the President of the United States and Secretary of the Treasury Snyder should recall those printing presses at once and stop such ridiculous procedure as that. To think that Russia prints our invasion money, at very little cost, if any, to Russia—and that we as a nation must redeem that paper currency at the rate of $36 an ounce for gold for each dollar of worthless paper money, which we redeem, and we are obligated to redeem it all. Stop it—stop it at once, notify Russia at once, Mr. President, to return our printing equipment and put it in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing where it belongs. You can see what happens to our American taxpayers when you elect incompetents to office. Take notice and act accordingly in 1948 when you elect a President and a Congress. Enough said—vote Republican.

REDEMPTION OF OCCUPATION CURRENCY IN EUROPE

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I cannot allow to pass unchallenged the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], who has spread upon the RECORD extracts from one of the exceptionally misinformed broadcasts of a highly commercialized radio commentator named Fulton Lewis, Jr.

This radio "news" caster who is notorious for the wide gulf between the content of his broadcasts and his unctuous and often-repeated statement, "These are the facts, ladies and gentlemen," rather outdid himself in his loose charges that the Government will lose millions upon millions of dollars through the redemption of occupation currency in Europe.

Listening to Mr. Lewis is not, Mr. Speaker, one of my favorite forms of relaxation. My opinion of the National Association of Manufacturers is a matter of widespread public knowledge, and Mr. Lewis' propagandizing for the NAM and its accomplices, both as a paid employee and as a volunteer laborer in the vineyards of big money, has not endeared him to me.

If, however, his comments were completely factual, and his opinions were labeled as such and not handed out as substantiated fact, I would merely discount him as one of the crosses we must bear in the name of free speech.

FREQUENTLY MAKES RECKLESS CHARGES

The fact is, however, that this is not the first time that Mr. Lewis, in his burning zeal for sensation, has made reckless charges which he was subsequently unable to prove. He has the advantage of 15 minutes of coast-to-coast radio hook-up, plus a repeat broadcast, and the denials and disproofs seldom catch up with the velocity of the original misstatements.

In the present instance, he has made grave and serious charges and has repeated them while the most responsible officers of our Government have been quoted in all newspapers and by all fair and reputable commentators in denial of the charges and in explanation of the true facts.

I feel that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], who daily calls our attention to the country's financial state and to our national debt, should have taken Mr. Lewis' no doubt sensational but as yet unproven reports on the transactions in occupation money with several grains of the proverbial salt, except that the gentleman himself is somewhat prone to the same weaknesses as Mr. Lewis.

CHARGES DENIED BY SECRETARY PATTERSON

As it happens, I have here in my hand a story from the Chicago Daily News of Thursday, June 12—just a week ago—which I cut out only this morning myself because this headline caught my eye: "We won't lose dime on marks—Patterson."

Now, I am willing to take the word of the Secretary of War, who is himself, as you may recall, a Republican and a former jurist of the highest probity, and respected by everyone, regardless of party, in preference to any wild statements by Fulton Lewis, Jr.

I do not think that charges like these should be so recklessly bandied about from time to time. America has come of age, and it is time that the bad boys of the press and radio should show the same kind of mature responsibility that the majority of journalists have displayed for many years past. I have long championed free speech, and I do not for a moment suggest that any relevant fact should be kept from the American people. I suggest only that charges be proved before they are made public under such sensational circumstances.

In this case Mr. Lewis continued his charges days after the full facts had been made public by the War Department and other agencies concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend as a part of my remarks this article and other articles from outstanding men who have the interest of the country at heart and who believe in the truth.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the statements that were made by Mr. Lewis, in reference to the article which the gentleman is printing, were to the effect that this money is being redeemed now and that they redeemed over $600,000,000, and you are going to redeem more, and nothing was ever so ridiculous in the history of America as a thing like that.

Mr. SABATH. Sure, it is being redeemed, but not at the expense of the American people; and it will not cost the Government a penny. The gentleman, before quoting so frail an authority as Fulton Lewis, Jr., should inform himself fully on the subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

PAPERS CARRIED STATEMENT

Mr. SABATH. All the wire services carried the original sensational stories and then covered also the War and Treasury Department statements and explanations. I insert at this point the story to which I have already referred, taken from the Chicago Daily News of Thursday, June 14, 1947, just 1 week ago:

WE WON'T LOSE DIME ON MARKS: PATTERSON

WASHINGTON.—The War Department said today the American taxpayer won't lose "one thin dime" by the occupation currency transactions in Germany.

Senator KNOWLAND (Republican of California) and several other GOP Senators fear American taxpayers will be stuck with a bill for from four hundred to nine hundred million dollars through redemption of Russian-printed occupation notes flowing into the United States zone.

Secretary of War Patterson replied that Army expenditures for German labor and goods will liquidate all the occupation currency "in about 1 year," and hence cost taxpayers nothing.

He said he would welcome the investigation planned by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Senator BRIDGES (Republican of New Hampshire), chairman of the Appropriations Committee, said the hearings would get under way next week with testimony from "top echelon" officials of the State, War, and Treasury Departments.

BRIDGES said he wanted more details on the transaction whereby the Russians received American engraving plates to run off more than 1,600,000 occupation notes on Soviet printing presses.

The Army said it has no knowledge of the Russians "milking" United States dollars out of the American zone. It explained that when the United States, Britain, France, and Russia completed the conquest of Germany they agreed to a joint issue of currency and use of the same printing plates.

"THESE ARE THE FACTS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN"

Now, Mr. Speaker, to paraphrase Mr. Fulton Lewis, Jr., but with more factuality, "These are the facts."

The United States Government has not undertaken to redeem occupational German marks or Japanese yen, but instead has exchanged foreign currencies for its United States Armed Forces and American or allied civilian personnel attached to its Armed Forces in the occupied areas. Personnel of our Army and Navy in Japan and Germany were paid in Japanese yen and German marks prior to July and September 1946, respectively. They accordingly were allowed the privilege of exchanging the unneeded portion of their yen or marks, received as pay and allowances, into United States dollars. Facilities were provided whereby funds could be transmitted to any person, bank, or agency in the United States on a moment's notice. Numerous family crises were averted or solved by this administrative provision. Having been paid in these foreign currencies, it became an obligation of the United States Government to convert these foreign currencies, in reasonable amounts, back into dollars.

Part of the marks on hand were received from the legitimate sale by agencies of the United States Government of goods or services to agencies or personnel who had only marks with which to pay for them.

The Army and Navy have not paid their troops in yen or marks, nor have they converted any yen or marks into dollars, since July and September 1946, respectively.

Russia served notice in the Allied Control Council for Germany in Berlin that she had discontinued issuing marks on July 1, 1946.

WILL AMERICAN TAXPAYERS PAY ITALIAN REPARATIONS?

The armed forces do not hold any Italian occupational lire which must be redeemed or converted into United States dollars. All Allied military lire have been redeemed by the Italian Government and have been withdrawn from circulation.

With regard to reparations for Italy, these reparations will not start until 2 years after the ratification of the peace treaty, unless by special agreement by the Italian Government. Reparations are to be scheduled in such a way as to avoid imposition of any additional liabilities on other Allied or Associated Powers.

ONE HUNDRED AND FORTY MILLION DOLLARS SAVED TO TAXPAYERS

In the course of the handling of billions of dollars worth of some 75 different foreign currencies, the armed forces effected considerable savings to the United States Government by obtaining protection against devaluation for these holdings of currency. Although not a profit, the savings thus effected totaled in excess of $140,000,000.

The inference is drawn rather assiduously that all these marks resulted from black market operations, or dealings with the Russians. Such is not the case. Many of the marks were acquired in the normal operation of our military activities overseas, wherein we perforce acted in the same capacity as a bank dealing in exchange. If profits were made in these dealings, they were made by the American soldier. Had they been made by Mr. RICH's business establishment in international trade, that would have been quite all right; but for a soldier, it is all wrong.

ARMY HOLDS ONLY $160,000,000 DEBIT

Furthermore, instead of the vast deficits alleged by Mr. Lewis, we find the War Department has a debit balance of only $160,000,000 in German marks and Japanese yen at this time. It has plans for liquidation of these holdings by the end of 1948. The War Department does not propose to ask Congress for an appropriation to effect this reduction.

I note also that in Mr. Fulton Lewis' statement read to the House by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] that Mr. Lewis still persists in saying War Department officials gave the plates to the Russians. The authenticity of this statement is about on a par with many others made by Mr. Lewis by which he misleads that portion of the American public which places any credence in him. Had Mr. Lewis merely stated that the plates were turned over to the Russians by the United States Government, he would have been correct; but in his animosity toward the War Department, he attributes the turning over of the plates to War Department officials.

I have no doubt but that a representative of Fulton Lewis was present at the hearings before the Senate committee investigating foreign currency. There under oath, it was testified that on orders of an official of the Treasury Department the plates were turned over to the Russians at the Washington Airport by the Bureau of Printing and Engraving. It was also testified under oath, that the decision to turn them over was a matter which the State and Treasury Departments made after conferring with their British opposites. I find no fault with the decision; but I do find fault with Mr. Lewis who, to suit his own animosities, presents other than the facts.

FACTS ARE AVAILABLE TO ALL

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the true facts are available to all newspapermen and writers. This very week the Committee on Foreign Currency Transactions, a special joint committee composed of subcommittees of Committees of the other House on Armed Services, Banking and Currency and Appropriations, has held hearings on this very question. The Honorable Howard C. Peterson, the Assistant Secretary of War, whom many of us know personally, and in whom we have great faith, spoke Tuesday of this very week, just 2 days ago, on behalf of the Secretary of War. While this will be available in the printed hearing, together with other testimony, I feel that the inclusion of this statement by the Under Secretary is justified at this point by the importance of the subject and the widespread publicity given to misinformation and reckless and unprovable charges.

STATEMENT OF HOWARD C. PETERSEN, THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF WAR, BEFORE THE SENATE INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN CURRENCY TRANSACTIONS, TUESDAY, JUNE 17, 1947

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I will discuss in broad outline the foreign currency problems resulting from our military operations in World War II. My statement will serve, I trust, to introduce the subject to this committee and serve as a background for the testimony of witnesses who will follow me. I will confine myself principally to matters within the purview of the War Department. Both the State and Treasury Departments had a policy-making role in this field. The War Department, however, like the Navy Department, and its field forces had the operating responsibility in foreign exchange matters. Representatives of the State and Treasury Departments are here today.

The War Department is prepared to present in as much detail as the committee deems necessary a full accounting of the discharge of its responsibilities in dealings in foreign currencies. Much of this testimony will be somewhat technical. It will be presented by expert witnesses who will follow me. I did not know anything about this subject, nor did I have any responsibility with respect to it, prior to December 1945 when I took my present office.

THE PROGRAM

The Armed Forces, through the operations of their finance offices overseas, necessarily became engaged in large-scale foreign-exchange operations which involved the handling of over $11,000,000,000. In making these transactions there accumulated substantial holdings of foreign currencies in excess of dollars appropriated by Congress which could properly be used for the conversion into dollars of these holdings. All foreign currency

used by the Armed Forces for pay of troops or for local procurement, except in occupied areas, or other purposes authorized by Congress was dollar backed. However, because currency controls which were feasible under combat and redeployment conditions proved inadequate and because of other factors which I shall relate, foreign currencies in a total amount of $380,000,000 were redeemed for dollars by armed forces finance offices in excess of the dollars appropriated by Congress. Through methods of liquidation which have been decided upon and are now in operation, this $380,000,000 of excess holdings of foreign currency is being reduced to $160,000,000. Plans for the liquidation of this remaining amount have been approved by the executive departments concerned and it is expected that this liquidation will be consummated over the next 18 months. The War Department does not propose to ask Congress for an appropriation to effect this reduction.

When the conversion of foreign currencies was stopped, the Armed Forces held $380,000,000 worth. Of this, $250,000,000 were in marks, $75,000,000 were in yen, and the remainder in various other currencies. Of the $160,000,000 remaining to be liquidated $100,000,000 are in marks and $60,000,000 are in yen.

The conversion of local currency into dollars ceased when the military-payment-certificate plan went into effect in Japan and Korea in July of 1946 and in Europe in September of 1946. Since those dates there have been no further receipts of foreign currencies.

CURRENCY PROBLEMS ARISING FROM THE WAR

Currency problems arising during and after World War II were numerous and exceedingly difficult of solution. The first, and overriding, rule in their solution was, of course, that they must take second place to considerations having a direct bearing on the vigorous prosecution of military operations. At the same time the State, Treasury, Navy, and War Departments were at all times aware of the importance of foreign-currency transactions involving the staggering sum of $11,000,000,000.

The first decision which had to be made was whether the United States would use dollars or foreign currencies in its military operations abroad. Having decided to use foreign currencies, it was necessary to develop methods for their acquisition. Then it was necessary to insure that the American soldier would suffer no loss because of receiving his pay in foreign currencies. And in all cases there were complex preparations to be made with regard to currencies before our invasions. These preparations had to be made with much secrecy and in such a way as to further the prospect of success of military operations.

DECISION TO USE FOREIGN CURRENCIES

The decision to use local currencies in overseas areas was arrived at early in the war after an intensive study of the problem by all United States departments concerned, fullest exploration of the problems with our allies, and after a thorough review of all of the implications resulting in a decision to use either American dollars or the local currencies. That decision was reported to the Congress in a report on House Resolution 150 (79th Cong., 1st Sess.), submitted to the chairman of the House Committee on Military Affairs dated April 28, 1945. That report covered the method of payment of troops in foreign currencies and the provision made for the reconversion into dollars.

POSSIBLE EFFECT OF USE OF DOLLARS ON MILITARY OPERATIONS

The use of dollar currency would have made it more difficult to maintain order behind our lines. The use of dollar currency, causing lack of confidence in the local currency, might well have caused a break-down in the economic life and the general political stability of areas through which supplies for our armies had to pass. The maintenance of a uniform rate of exchange would obviously become difficult. Worst of all, it might well have led to a situation in which in the local economy suppliers would refuse to deliver goods against local currency, thus bringing about a complete break-down in the supply of food and other essentials to the populations of these areas. We did not wish to bankrupt or destroy the currency of friendly countries through which we operated by flooding the areas with dollars.

These considerations made undesirable the use of dollar currency for procurement or for the pay of our troops in liberated or occupied areas.

RECOGNITION OF SOVEREIGNTY

Allied governments consistently insisted upon recognition of their sovereign right to determine not only rates of exchange but what was to be legal tender within their boundaries. For example, before the invasion of France, certain sovereign rights of the provisional French Government in exile were recognized. The United States Government recognized the right of the local government of the liberated area to establish the rate of exchange; and the French Provisional Government did exercise that right. Concurrently with setting the rate of exchange the French decided what was legal tender. In France it was determined that the legal tender should be the metropolitan franc and also the supplemental franc which the Allied forces brought in on D-day. The French Government assumed responsibility even for the supplemental francs brought in on D-day.

KEEPING DOLLARS FROM THE ENEMY

Another major factor in the determination to use foreign currencies rather than dollars was to keep dollars from the enemy. In a military operation as large as the invasion of Europe there was always the risk that large numbers of men and amounts of money might fall into the hands of the enemy. The Allied governments naturally did not welcome any action which would have assisted traitors to the Allied cause. As it filtered through unauthorized channels in liberated areas, dollar currency spent by the American armed forces might well have become a means by which traitors and fifth columnists could finance their operations or by which collaborationists could hide their assets and thus nullify the efforts of the Allies to recapture their illegal profits.

CONSIDERATIONS STEMMING FROM DESIRE TO PROTECT MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

The pay and allowances of the personnel of the armed forces of the United States are fixed by acts of Congress. The basic policies underlying all War and Navy Department actions relating to the financial problems of the troops overseas are simply and clearly defined.

First, every soldier, wherever stationed, must receive the full amount to which he is entitled by existing statutes.

Second, no soldier shall suffer financially because of assignment to duty in one overseas area as against another.

While serving abroad, the current and future financial interests of the American soldier were well safeguarded. All calculations affecting the total pay and allowances to which the soldier was entitled were made in United States dollars. The soldier was entirely free to determine for himself those portions of his earnings which he wished to allot, save, or spend. Whenever he desired, the soldier could, at any Army installation, convert such portion of his pay drawn in a foreign currency, which proved excess to his needs, back into dollars at the same rate at which the pay was drawn. This contributed in large measure to his peace of mind and effectiveness as a combat soldier. By far the most important benefit, however, from the soldier's point of view, derived from the War Department policy of foreign currency reconversion to dollars at a protected rate, was the facility of transmitting funds to any person, bank, or agency in the United States on a moment's notice. Numerous family crises were averted or solved by this administration provision.

In war the paramount factor is the morale of troops. An important element in that morale is assuring troops equitable purchasing power for their money. This was recognized by the Congress itself (in consideration of Public Law 554, approved December 23, 1944). The Senate Committee on Banking and Currency stated: "The aim of all agencies considered [it] of paramount importance to provide means whereby the morale of personnel serving abroad will not be disturbed because of fluctuations in foreign exchange," and added that "protection is afforded only when personnel receiving such foreign currencies as pay can exchange them without loss for United States currency or the currency of yet another country to which they may be proceeding under military orders."

PLANNING FOR INVASION OF EUROPE

Our decision to invade Europe was one of the most momentous in the history of our Nation. Every phase of the operation, both military and administrative, presented problems of enormous import and complexity. The currency problems were no exception. For security reasons alone, the problem of obtaining suitable legal tender well ahead of the attack for disbursing and procuring officers and for the individual troops participating in operations shrouded in military secrecy, was tremendous. Even if otherwise possible, it was considered unsafe to approach most "governments in exile," as demands for specific quantities and specified delivery dates would have provided invaluable data to unfriendly persons.

In order to be prepared for any eventuality in Germany, including a situation in which inadequate supplies for reichsmark currency would be available to the combined military forces, due, for example, to a scorched-earth policy on the part of the retreating enemy, a supply of supplemental legal tender currency similar to that known to the local population was imperative.

POLICIES WITH RESPECT TO GERMANY

With respect to Germany, the United States and British Governments desired the Soviet Government to use the same Allied Military German currency as that used by the combined US-UK military authorities, as part of the plan to treat Germany as an economic whole. To agree to the Russians using a different currency would have constituted an agreement in advance to what actually happened, the division of Germany into four airtight compartments. As you know, this result was never intended and its consequences which have so gravely hurt our occupation in Germany were a result assiduously to be avoided.

NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE SOVIETS

My information on this point is as follows: A combined US-UK decision was taken early in 1944 that a German mark currency would be used by the combined military forces for expenditures in Germany. As was done in preparation for invasions of other areas where scarcity of currencies might exist, such as in the case of the military lira used by the combined military forces in Italy, Allied Military marks were printed for use in Germany. Because we had the facilities, the printing was done in the United States.

Negotiations were undertaken with the Soviet authorities in Washington for the purpose of assuring that the Soviet forces would use the same mark currency. The

Soviet authorities agreed to use a German mark currency of the same design as that which would be used by the United States and British forces in Germany. However, the Soviets refused the offer of the US-UK authorities to furnish the Soviets with adequate supplies of Allied Military mark currency, and demanded that facilities be made available to them from which they could prepare their own supplies of Allied Military marks. Negotiations extended over several months. On April 8, 1944, the Russian Government sent a note to the United States stating that if the plates were not delivered to the Russians, the Soviet Government would be compelled to prepare independently military marks for Germany of its own pattern.

The British Government advised this Government that the use of a Russian-produced mark currency distinct from that used by the United States and the British would be prejudicial, and agreed that the Russians should be given the plates from which the currency was printed. After due consideration, the United States Government agreed to make the plates available to the Russians, and this was done. On April 18, 1944, the Soviet Ambassador was furnished with glass negatives and positives of plates for the use of the Soviet Government in the printing of Allied military marks, together with technical information on inks, paper, and other elements of the printing procedure.

The only agreement or understanding reached between the United States Government, the British Government, and the government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was the general understanding that all three powers would use Allied military marks and no other currency as a supplement to the indgenous German mark currency. The Allied military marks were made legal tender in the national economy without distinction from the reichsmark and were interchangeable at the rate of one Allied military mark for one reichsmark. This rule, however, was applicable only to the German economy, and the armed forces did not convert reichsmarks into dollars.

The policy adopted by the United States Armed Forces for converting Allied military marks into dollars for authorized personnel was a policy adopted unilaterally by the United States Government. It was no different from the policy prevailing in all overseas countries where local curency was used.

There was and is no obligation on the part of the United States or other occupying powers to redeem Allied military marks. The first quadripartite agreement with reference to this matter was entered into on September 20, 1945, and provided assurance that the German Government would redeem this currency. Moreover, provision can be made in the Treaty of Peace to provide for the redemption of any of this currency still held by us.

THE BLACK MARKET

United States troops, in the main, were stationed in overseas areas where the local economy was severely damaged by the war. This damage resulted in placing vast quantities of local cash currency in the hands of the local population with virtually no goods and commodities available at wholesale or retail levels. Consequently, the temptation to sell post-exchange articles and items of individual equipment was great; money meant nothing to the native population; cigarettes, candy, soap, and ordinary personal items of comfort claimed high prices. The American soldier stationed abroad quickly found that his personal equipment, many post-exchange items and goods sent to him from the United States were more useful as a medium of exchange than the local currencies themselves. Moreover, many members of the Military Establishment found that this extra-legal trading of goods with local citizens or members of other armed forces and the subsequent conversion of local currencies back into dollars at Army post offices and finance offices provided handsome profits.

I will give two common illustrations of the manner in which these accumulations accrued. An American soldier sold an article from the PX or an item of personal or governmental equipment to members of other Allied Forces for Allied military marks at a considerable profit and converted the marks excess to his personal needs into dollars for purchase of war bonds or deposit in savings account or remittance home. Another typical transaction would be one in which a civilian employee who might be a native of a liberated country and who was authorized to make purchases in the PX or quartermaster commissary, made such purchases within the ration limits imposed, and the PX or the quartermaster converted the foreign currency so received into dollars through the Army finance offices.

ADMINISTRATION OF CONTROLS

The difficulties of imposing effective, individual administrative controls strictly limiting the reconversion of local currency to the amount acquired by each man through authorized channels were very great. There were approximately three and one-half million men in the European and Mediterranean theaters, spread over more than 15 countries and utilizing as many different currencies. There were almost 1,000,000 men in Japan and the Far East. During this period there were over 40 different currencies which were eligible for conversion at armed forces finance offices at specified rates.

At an early date the accumulation of foreign currencies in Army accounts was a problem which received serious attention. The foreign currency controls in effect at the beginning of the war worked very satisfactorily for a period of almost 2 years. Throughout the North African campaign and the subsequent Sicilian and Italian campaigns excess remittances were practically nonexistent. This was no doubt due in part to the fact that there was a greater quantity of goods which could be purchased by the soldier for his use and the prices for such goods were reasonable. The soldier accordingly spent his money and did not engage in extensive barter transactions. With the invasion of northwest Europe a quite different situation was presented. There was a great scarcity of consumer goods, a great abundance of local currency in the hands of the civilian population and a great demand for goods which the soldiers could obtain from Army sources. Even so, it was not until troops had obtained a more or less static position following VE-day that the accumulations of excess holdings of foreign currencies took on serious proportions. When it started, however, it snowballed. Troops with large accumulations of pay earned during periods of heavy fighting for the first time had a real opportunity to spend their money. Then they found in the occupied areas particularly that they were unable to obtain desirable goods for their money. Thus in many cases resort was had to barter transactions with the soldiers obtaining foreign currencies instead of goods which currencies were converted to dollars and remitted home or put in the form of savings or war bonds.

As long as foreign currency was converted into dollars the only truly effective control had to be based on control over the individual's transactions in foreign currencies. With the large numbers of personnel engaged in these operations (over 3,500,000 in European and the Mediterranean theaters) it was not administratively feasible to effect precise administrative controls over individuals. Accordingly, at the outset the controls were of a quantitative nature and they became successfully more refined and more stringent in respect of the individual as rapidly as the military situation and the personnel available to administer such controls permitted.

The controls exercised through the early redeployment period were of this nature: each remittance made by, or conversion made for, military personnel was scrutinized by unit commanders or unit personnel officers. Unusually large amounts were investigated prior to allowing them to be converted into United States dollar instruments. Many such conversions were denied, and in certain cases the individuals were prosecuted where there was evidence that the currency had been obtained in black-market transactions or illegally.

REDEPLOYMENT AND DEMOBILIZATION

During fiscal year 1946 in the European and Mediterranean theaters, and from August 15, 1945, to June 30, 1946, the Pacific theater, the Army and Navy passed through the redeployment and demobilization phase of World War II. At the termination of hostilities in Europe, troop redeployment began from the European and Mediterranean theaters to the Pacific. Some was direct and some was by staging through the United States. Later, troops were returned to the United States from all over the world. Currency wise, this involved redemption of foreign currencies held by our soldiers in one area for dollars or dollar instruments or exchange into foreign currencies of another country or area. Millions of dollars' worth of foreign currencies were so converted, with the result that large quantities of foreign currencies were accumulated by the Army from its personnel as well as other authorized civilians and attached Allied military personnel, and from other sources. There were as many as 300,000 authorized personnel disbursements to whom were not reflected in Army accounts nor under Army control but for whom the Army acted as the banker in the field and for whom the Army provided PX, Quartermaster commissary sales, and other similar services. This factor alone accounted for a very substantial accumulation of foreign currencies.

"Authorized" personnel leaving the theaters presented for reconversion all of the foreign currency held by them at that time. The amounts presented for exchange represented in many instances, accumulations of many months' pay and allowances. On a quantitative basis, large amounts were to be expected, due to the fact that soldiers leaving the theaters were turning in their holdings prior to their return to the United States. No means existed of distinguishing currency properly acquired from that illegally acquired.

When the unusually large accumulations were noted, the European theater commander effected a more stringent control than he had previously placed in effect. The new revised controls applied to all Army and Navy personnel and to all civilian personnel in and under the military establishment. These controls prohibited any individual from transmitting funds to any point outside the theater in a single calendar month in any amount equal to or amounts aggregating a sum in excess of the sender's unencumbered pay plus 10 percent.

Such controls added to the already overburdened administration of units overseas, and were effected only after full deliberation and consideration by the authorities. However, the rapid and full-scale redeployment gave ample opportunity for clerical mistakes, negligence and willful fraud. Inexperienced fiscal replacements from the United States were not equipped readily to search for and detect loopholes in the existing currency exchange controls.

THE CURRENCY EXCHANGE CONTROL BOOK

The European theater commanders continued strenuous study on the problem and in November 1945 placed Currency Exchange Control Books into effect in the European theater. A similar procedure was effected in February 1946 in the Mediterranean areas. The pay and allowances drawn by individuals overseas were recorded in this book.

As foreign currency was used, deductions were made in the book. The principle applied in this type of control limited the amount of foreign currency any one person could convert into dollars to the amount he had originally received as pay and allowances from the Army. Although not perfect, this method served to reduce the accumulation of currencies.

THE MILITARY PAYMENT CERTIFICATE

As a final control measure, the military payment certificate was introduced in Japan in July 1946. It was instituted in September of 1946 in Europe, the delay there being occasioned by the time it took to print the necessary currency. The military payment certificate is a medium, denominated in dollars, for use within the military establishment only. Its introduction was preceded by intensive study on the part of all four departments, since the concept was entirely new. With such adoption, the armed services no longer permit the conversion of foreign currencies by their disbursing officers and no further acquisitions of foreign currencies are made.

OUR POSITION MADE

As a result of these financial operations in some 75 different foreign currencies throughout the world, the Army and Navy found themselves, following the combat and redeployment phases of World War II, with the long positions in foreign currencies which I have mentioned. Through financial settlements already completed, or presently in the process of completion with certain of the liberated countries involved, the United States armed forces have been reimbursed for the full dollar equivalent of their foreign currencies held in our official accounts. In the case of Germany and Japan, where there is no government which can reimburse us for the currencies we hold, we are disposing of the currencies through normal legal expenditures by official and quasi-official American agencies, and through the normal expenditures of American individuals presently in these countries. The present calculation by the War and Navy Departments, although at this stage an estimate, is that we will have disposed of our holdings of German marks and Japanese yen, which show a total debit balance of approximately $160,000,000 by the end of 1948.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in revising and extending my remarks I may include another letter written by Mr. Binford on the same subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

AMENDING VETERANS' PREFERENCE ACT OF 1944

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 231 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1389) to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] and yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this is a general rule, merely providing consideration of, and 1 hour of general debate on H. R. 1389, a bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944. Section 2 of that act provides preference in Government employment for persons who served on active duty in any branch of the armed forces of the United States—for which a campaign badge has been authorized. This wording leaves some question as to whether the Coast Guard reservists are eligible for preference under the law.

There are some 70,000 of these temporary Coast Guard reservists who performed wonderful service to our country during the recent war. As was pointed out by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee when reporting this bill, the country owes a debt of gratitude to these men, but they are not to be classed as ex-servicemen, who were actually uprooted from their civilian occupations and subjected to the rigors of full-time military training and combat. It is to the latter group that Congress intended to provide employment preference in the Government service.

This bill defines the term "active duty" as "meaning active full-time paid duty."

Temporary Coast Guard Reservists were volunteers who served several hours 1 or 2 nights a week. Therefore, they would not be eligible for veterans' preference under the definition of "active duty" in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am for this rule. I do not believe there is any question at all that it is in order to give the men who actively served in the armed forces of the United States this preference to which they are so justly entitled.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I feel that this rule makes in order a bill amending the Veterans' Preference Act which is fair and just. It is approved and recommended by the Judge Advocate General of the Navy and the Civil Service Commission. Consequently, I have no opposition to it, nor do I wish to take up any time against the rule. I think the rule should be adopted and the bill passed.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1389) to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1389, with Mr. KEEFE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, this bill, H. R. 1389, provides for an amendment to section 2 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 by adding a proviso at the end thereof which the committee believes clarifies congressional intent regarding those ex-servicemen who are entitled to veterans' preference. The objective of the bill is to define the words "active duty in any branch of the armed forces of the United States" by providing that active duty shall mean active full-time duty with military pay and allowances in any branch of the armed forces during any way or in any campaign or in any expedition for which a campaign badge has been authorized.

The bill is recommended by unanimous agreement of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and supported by the Civil Service Commission and by the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled American Veterans, American Veterans of World War II, and American Veterans Committee. It also has the support of a number of other organizations.

The Navy Department and War Department representatives submitted reports favoring the enactment of this bill. Opposition to the bill was expressed by the Coast Guard League, an organization composed largely of former members of the Temporary Coast Guard Reserve. This group pointed out that the bill would exclude temporary Coast Guard reservists from the benefits of veterans' preference.

The committee is fully aware of the courageous and patriotic services rendered by the members of the Temporary Coast Guard Reserve, which worked in addition to the regular civilian duties of such Reservists. The committee did not feel, however, that it was the intention of Congress to include Temporary Coast Guard Reservists under the provisions of the Veterans' Preference Act, because they did not serve in the armed forces on a full-time active-duty basis with military pay and allowances. These men were employed by the Government and did render certain services of importance during their employment in Government service. There is no question about their having performed a very worthwhile service. There are about 70,000 in the group. Some rendered more service than others, but it should be understood that they are all very fine, patriotic men. However, the question is whether or not Congress in the Veterans' Preference Act intended that this preference should go to any other group except those included in the definition above described. I am informed there are a comparatively few of these men who did wear uniforms.

Under a decision rendered by a Federal court, which, I am informed, was not unanimous, the court decided in favor of a group of these men who appealed from a decision of the Civil Service Commission. The court having determined that under the language of the act it was believed that the particular Temporary Reservists who appealed were entitled to such consideration.

As I stated a moment ago, the services rendered by these men is appreciated. If, however, they are to be included, then

additional groups should likewise be entitled to similar consideration. There are many others who did render valiant service during the war, such as ambulance drivers, Red Cross workers, and a good many others, who are really entitled to a lot of credit and consideration.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield.

Mr. HAND. I believe none of us have any objection to this bill. I do not think the majority of the Coast Guard Reservists have any objection, but I want the gentleman's assurance, if I may have it, that this bill would not prevent a proper recognition by the Congress of the fact that these men have served in the armed forces of the United States, which is a recognition they earnestly desire. A bill for that purpose is now pending before our Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. REES. I am sure of that. The only thing that we are dealing with here is veterans' preference.

Mr. HAND. That is veterans' preference under the act of 1944.

Mr. REES. That is correct. I agree with the gentleman that they did render valiant service and are entitled to much consideration for so doing.

Mr. HAND. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] has expired.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself two additional minutes.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Did the committee consider the position of the Filipino soldiers who served in the United States Army, who gave valiant service in the Philippine Islands, which have since been declared an independent nation? In what position would that leave them? Would they be denied consideration under the adoption of this legislation?

Mr. REES. This legislation does not affect that group at all.

Mr. Chairman, if there are no further questions, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back 1 minute.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, it is apparent to me that there is considerable confusion and misunderstanding concerning the military status of former temporary members of the Coast Guard Reserve who served on active military duty, protecting our harbors and shores from submarine attack and preventing sabotage of our docks and shore installations. I want to give a brief history of this component of the armed forces, so that the issue on veterans' preference which is before the House today may be voted upon with full knowledge of the facts. In 1941, the Congress enacted the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act which authorized the Temporary Coast Guard Reserve as a military component of the armed forces. This act also provided for the Coast Guard Auxiliary, a civilian organization in contrast to the Temporary Reserve which is a military component. Admiral Waesche, Commandant of the Coast Guard, testified before the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee on January 28, 1941, that "the members who are brought in as temporary Reservists, who are also military in every respect, will be brought into the military service for duty in a particular locality." This act provided that temporary members of the Reserve could be enrolled for full-time or part-time intermittent duty, with or without pay.

Operating as a part of the Navy during the war, the Temporary Reserve in the Coast Guard was activated by the Commandant of the Coast Guard with the approval of the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Treasury. These Reservists volunteered to serve a minimum of 12 hours per week, and were subject to full-time active duty at the discretion of the Commandant. Some served 2 and 3 years full time active duty. All volunteered for the duration. They agreed to serve without pay, and consequently were not subject to transfer without their consent. These men were given physical examinations by the United States Public Health Service. They were trained and had to pass qualifying examinations before they were taken into the service.

As authorized by Congress, the Temporary Reserve of the Coast Guard was recognized as a component of the armed forces. On April 4, 1944, in Circular Letter 4145, the Civil Service Commission held such honorably separated Reservists as eligible for veterans' preference. On April 11, 1944, the Judge Advocate General of the Navy, in an opinion approved by Secretary Knox, stated that these Reservists were undoubtedly members of the armed forces. On July 15, 1944, the Secretary of the Navy held that members of the Coast Guard Reserve—temporary—are members of the armed forces of the United States within the meaning of the servicemen's voting law. Under date of February 7, 1944, the Acting Secretary of the Navy ruled that members of this Reserve component are considered to be members of a naval or military organization eligible for expeditious naturalization under the Nationality Act of 1940. What greater gift has this country to offer? In June 1944 the United States District Court of the Eastern District of Pennsylvania in the case of *Brown* v. *Cain* (56 F. Supp. 56) held that a temporary member of the Coast Guard Reserve was amenable only to a naval court martial for an alleged homicide which took place during a tour of duty, on the ground that he was a member of the armed forces of the United States. These Reservists were held to have served on active duty in the armed forces of the United States in the present war and entitled to the World War II Victory Medal authorized by act of Congress July 6, 1945.

Officers in this Reserve component took the identical oath administered to regular members of the Coast Guard. The oath of the enlisted men was likewise a regular military oath. It read as follows:

> I do solemnly swear that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and that I will serve them honestly against all their enemies whomsoever; and that I will obey the orders of the President of the United States and the orders of officers appointed over me according to the laws and regulations for the government of the United States Coast Guard.

This oath bound them to serve for the duration of the war.

Those men taking this oath were required to perform the same duty as any other member of the Coast Guard, subject to the full penalties of court martial. They could be, and were, ordered to duty to shoot and be shot at. They performed the same duty, underwent the same hazards and were subject to the same military command as other members of the Coast Guard with whom they served. It is not conceivable that an officer of this Reserve component would not be on military duty when his entire crew under him, as was often the case, was composed of regular members of the Coast Guard who were on active military duty. Many of these men were injured in the course of their military duties, and more than 100 of them lost their lives. These Reservists are distinguishable from civilian groups who performed hazardous duty during the war. They took a full military oath and were subject to full military discipline and could be ordered by military command to undertake any assignment regardless of hazard.

There can be no question that they served in the armed forces on active duty in World War II. Under existing law, any serviceman who served on active duty in the armed forces during any war, and was honorably separated is entitled to veterans' preference. Preference is granted even though that service may have been for so short a time as 1 day. The bill before the House proposes a new definition for the term "active duty." Temporary members of the Coast Guard Reserve served far beyond the minimum time required under the present law. This amendment will take away from one group of servicemen benefits which are granted to other servicemen who may have actually given less service to their country. In addition, the proposed amendment can be interpreted to deny preference rights to numerous other groups of veterans. At the very least, temporary members of the Coast Guard Reserve were limited-service veterans. Where other veterans were in limited service category by reason of physical limitations, temporary members of this Reserve component were limited as to the place of their duty in conformity with act of Congress and prescription of the Commandant of the Coast Guard.

I do not believe that we should adopt language of the nature proposed in this amendment which carries the threat to many thousands of ex-servicemen merely to reach about 2,000 former Coast Guard Reservists out of the 70,000 men and women who were temporary members in the Coast Guard Reserve. Two

thousand is probably the maximum number that will ever be interested in Government employment because a large percentage of the remainder are World War I veterans already entitled to preference, and business and professional men who are established in their own private enterprises.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, this bill is probably without precedent in the history of veterans' legislation. It proposes to take away from one group of veterans of the armed forces of World War II a benefit they are now entitled to under the law, a benefit promised to them prior to their voluntary service in the armed forces, and a benefit which vested in them by reason of their active-duty military service during World War II. It proposes to deprive the widows of those men who died in line of duty of their veterans' preference rights. It discards the equity of a long-established rule for veterans' preference and proposes to substitute for it a new rule or standard which is subject to numerous interpretations which may spell grief to hundreds of thousands of veterans who now feel secure in their veterans' preferance rights.

This bill, H. R. 1389, is directed at those who served as temporary members of the United States Coast Guard Reserve, who guarded our harbors and docks, did antisubmarine patrol off our shores, and protected important military and industrial installations along the shores of our rivers and bays.

In 1941, Congress enacted the Coast Guard Reserve and Auxiliary Act. This act specifically authorized this Reserve component as a part of our armed forces. The members of this Reserve bore arms, were subject to all the laws, regulations, and military discipline of the Coast Guard. They volunteered for duty for the duration of the war, served part-time or full-time duty at the discretion of military command. They performed the same duties, and took the same oath as the other members of the regular Coast Guard with whom they served. Having faithfully performed the active military duty required of them, they were, only after VJ-day, honorably separated from the service the same as any other member of the armed forces of the United States.

The Civil Service Commission issued orders granting veterans' preference to honorably separated members of the Reserve component before the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 was passed. The Commission issued similar orders after the act was passed. But wholly in error and without foundation in law, the Commission later denied preference to these veterans. The United States District Court and the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia have both so held in decisions handed down.

The Civil Service Commission is now coming to Congress and requesting legislation to perpetuate their error by the enactment of this amendment. This is their bill, H. R. 1389. They plead that it was not the intent of Congress that the members of this Reserve component of the Coast Guard be entitled to preference. The present law states that anyone who served on active duty in any branch of the armed forces in any war or in any campaign and has been honorably separated therefrom is entitled to veterans' preference. Hon. Joe Starnes, author of the bill enacted as the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, in testifying before the Senate Civil Service Committee stated the purpose and intent of the act clearly. Concerning preference he said:

> It is a reward to a man for patriotic duties well performed; it encourages our young men and women to serve their country in an hour of need; and it makes them feel, when they have given their all or offered to give their all in defense of this country and its institutions, that a grateful country will recognize their sacrifice and service when peace comes by giving them preference for service in various capacities with their Government.

It was the intent of Congress that everyone who took the oath placing himself under military command, regardless of where he served, or what kind of duty performed, be entitled to preference on being honorably separated from the service. This act gives preference to the widows of men who lost their lives directly or indirectly in the performance of their military duties.

It is difficult to see how the Civil Service Commission can question the plain meaning of the law or raise the question of intent of Congress. The law was designed to cover every man in the armed forces. Is the Commission in doubt that Congress meant that all widows should be treated alike? Certainly Congress did not intend to provide veterans' preference to the widows of some men killed on active duty and not provide preference for the widows of other men who gave their lives on active duty. What difference whether the widow be one whose husband served as a temporary member of the Coast Guard Reserve or in any other branch of the armed forces? The husband is just as dead in each case. Each lost his life in carrying out orders of a military command. The widow is faced with the same problems in each case. Where is there any basis for distinction? Does it matter whether the husband lost his life on his first day of active duty or at the end of the fifth year? Does it matter whether he served without pay, received a private's pay, or a colonel's pay? The loss is the same and every widow stands equally in her loss. Yet this amendment proposes that one widow may still have preference but another widow may not. Is the Civil Service Commission trying to suggest to Congress that it intended to enact such an unreasonable and unfair law? That is what this amendment they have brought up here for your approval will do. This is a question of American justice and moral conscience. If you believe that Congress intended that the widows of all veterans are to be treated the same because of their loss and hardship, then there should not be a single vote in this House for this amendment.

That is not all that this amendment will do. It will bring the preference rights of hundreds of thousands of other servicemen into jeopardy. In view of the erroneous interpretation placed by the Commission on the present law, it is difficult to imagine what may happen to veterans' preference rights under the proposed amendment. This new definition requires the performance of active full-time duty with military pay and allowances. Consider for a moment how this can be interpreted. Were those men who were released from service to return to our factories and farms as essential workers on full-time active duty? What of those men who were honorably separated on their own request for hardship reasons? What about those men who were in limited-duty status? They were not physically able to perform full general military duty. Do they qualify under the definition? Then there are those men who were a. w. o. l. for a few hours or days. Were they on full-time duty? They were hardly on full-time active duty when they were in violation of orders. Many servicemen were under disciplinary action and held in the brig or guardhouse but later honorably discharged. It is difficult to see how the Commission could fail to rule these veterans out of their preference rights. When a serviceman is in prison he can hardly be on full-time active duty. And this same man may fail to meet the test in another respect—that of military pay. He may have had his pay denied to him while being disciplined. The Commission can disqualify him on that ground if it chooses. Thus a soldier who may have been in the guardhouse for a minor infraction and later served 5 years, with decorations and citations awarded, could be denied preference while another soldier who served but a single day would be eligible for preference. Does this represent fairness and equity to two honorably separated veterans? Yet that is what the Civil Service Commission is asking Congress to approve.

Look at the amendment again. It requires military pay. Most of the members of this Coast Guard component excluded by this amendment served without military pay. Are we to use the language of this amendment and say to all patriotic Americans, "You must be paid before you can serve your country in time of war"? A majority of these temporary members of the Coast Guard Reserve were businessmen, lawyers, doctors, and professional men prominent in their communities. Many were servicemen of other wars. This amendment says in effect that their service is less honorable and not worthy of the recognition given the man who was paid. These men were all volunteers. They were honorable citizens. Communist veterans who received military pay will still be eligible for preference, but under this amendment, loyal Americans and Reservists would not be eligible. What strange devices and reasoning will we have to resort to under this amendment to determine eligibility? This bill can undermine the whole structure of veterans' preference. The amendment is a quibbling subterfuge for justice. It is not conceived in good conscience. This

amendment is a Pandora's box of confusion which will plague the Congress, the Civil Service Commission and the veteran. I do not believe that it represents any concept of fairness and justice of this Congress or the intent of any previous Congress.

The present law is clear, simple, and equitable. It stands on a basic principle which is tested by time. It is a principle that veterans organizations have supported vigorously for years. This amendment solves no problem but will multiply them. It should be dedefeated.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE].

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, I need not take 5 minutes unless there is some controversy or some questions to be asked.

The committee felt it was absolutely necessary to bring in this bill. It is no reflection upon the valuable service of these gentlemen who served in temporary capacities. However, they were never separated from their civilian jobs and consequently were not, in our judgment, entitled to veterans' preference, as the Congress originally intended. We felt it was necessary to bring this bill before you, and it is here for your consideration.

Unless there are some questions, I yield back the remainder of my time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back 4 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, approved June 27, 1944, is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end of such section and inserting a colon and the following language: "*Provided*, That 'active duty in any branch of the armed forces of the United States' shall mean active full time paid duty in any branch of the armed forces during any war or in any campaign or expedition (for which a campaign badge has been authorized) and have been separated therefrom under honorable conditions."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That section 2 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, approved June 27, 1944, is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end of such section and inserting a colon and the following language: '*Provided*, That when used in this section the term "active duty in any branch of the armed forces of the United States" shall mean active full-time duty with military pay and allowances in any branch of the armed forces during any war or in any campaign or expedition (for which a campaign badge has been authorized).'"

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KEEFE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1389) to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, pursuant to House Resolution 231, he reported the same back to the House with an amendment adopted in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include two editorials from the Brooklyn Eagle and in the other an analysis of the Taft-Hartley bill by the minority leader of the New York State Assembly.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Commercial Appeal of Memphis, Tenn., on the so-called Southern Conference on Human Welfare.

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include two newspaper articles.

Mr. NORBLAD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

RULE MAKING IN ORDER CONSIDERATION OF H. R. 966

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 243, providing for the consideration of the bill H. R. 966, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 966) to amend section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of June 27, 1944 (58 Stat. 387). That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this rule merely provides for the immediate consideration of H. R. 966, to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of June 27, 1944. In passing this Act, it was the intent of Congress to guarantee certain employment and retention preference for veterans on the Federal pay roll. It has recently been brought to the attention of Congress, however, that certain executive departments have interpreted the law to suit their convenience, and have thereby deprived veterans of some of the employment safeguards provided in the act.

The preference law provides that a veteran who is discharged, furloughed, or reduced in grade or salary, may appeal the action to the Civil Service Commission. After investigation and consideration of the evidence, the Civil Service Commission is required to submit its findings and recommendations to the proper administrative officer in the agency employing the veteran. Now it was the intent of Congress in establishing this procedure, that the agency would abide by the recommendations of the Civil Service Commission. Certain of the executive agencies have, in some cases, chosen to ignore the recommendations of the Civil Service Commission, however. This bill protects veterans from arbitrary administrative decisions by making the recommendations of the Civil Service Commission binding on the executive departments and agencies.

Mr. Speaker, this is an open rule. I do not believe there is any question but that honorably discharged veterans should have this preference in the matter of governmental employment.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, again I favor the adoption of a rule. I am in favor of legislation that will aid veterans.

This bill has been approved by the committee and it was recommended by the President, by veterans' organizations, and by the Civil Service Commission.

This is the second bill in aid of veterans. This morning we had before the Committee on Rules two veterans' bills which will cost the Government $50,000,000 to $60,000,000. Action has been temporarily postponed because we felt that some provisions in both these bills should be corrected before the bills come before the House, though I am in favor of giving every aid possible to our deserving veterans.

I am informed that there are pending veterans' bills which would cost a total of fifty to sixty billion dollars. Perhaps some of the bills have merit notwithstanding the tremendous burden upon the Government due to the First and Second World Wars. However, instead of trying to bring about an adjustment of differences to preclude another war, we hear nearly every day reckless statements on the floor and by commentators who are trying to create more trouble and who would force us into another war. The aim of the Members of this House and the aim of the people of the country should be to eliminate all reckless and provocative charges and accusations that might tend to force us into war. We should attempt to bring about a lasting peace that the world needs and the people of this country demand. Consequently, I hope that instead of making these charges here, many of which, of course, are unjustified

and unwarranted and not based on fact, we will desist and try to devote ourselves to bringing about harmony and an adjustment of all differences, so that we may have that just and permanent peace for which the whole world is seeking and praying and looking, to which the people are entitled, and which I hope and have every reason to believe can be brought about by following the wise counsel of Secretary Marshall and General Eisenhower and other national leaders who realize that all differences can be adjusted.

Mr. Speaker, having no opposition to this rule, and in fact favoring its adoption, I shall use no more time.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

AMENDMENT TO SECTION 14 OF THE VETERANS' PREFERENCE ACT OF JUNE 27, 1944 (58 STAT. 387)

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 966) to amend section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of June 27, 1944—Fifty-eighth Statutes, page 387.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 966, with Mr. BARRETT in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is another measure to amend section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 and it has the unanimous approval of the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service, the approval of the Civil Service Commission, and the approval of the veterans' organizations, the VFW, the American Legion, and the Disabled War Veterans. The bill was on the Consent Calendar but because of some little objection on the part of someone it was necessary to get a rule to bring it to the floor of the House for consideration and vote.

The bill provides, in substance, that where a veteran employed in Civil Service has been downgraded, dismissed, or otherwise in his judgment has not been treated fairly under the Veterans' Preference Act, and has appealed to the Civil Service Commission, which he has the right to do, and if the Civil Service Commission sustains the employee in his contention and believes he should be returned to his position wherever he was working in the Government, that the employing agency is required to take him back into the service in the position that he held before he was discharged, downgraded, or otherwise unfairly dealt with as provided under the Veterans' Preference Act, and sustained by the Civil Service Commission.

Under this bill it shall be mandatory for administrative officers in executive agencies of the Government to take such corrective action as the Commission finally recommends after an appeal is taken by a preference eligible from a decision of a department or agency, to discharge, suspend for more than 30 days, furlough without pay, or reduce in rank or compensation any such preference eligible.

Mr. BUCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. BUCK. I am entirely in favor of this bill. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if the committee has any plans for giving similar rights to nonveterans in the civil service who may be subjected to unjustifiable dismissals or downgrading?

Mr. REES. I will say to the gentleman that the committee presently has under consideration legislation dealing with that particular group. It has the problem under consideration, and it is a serious and an important one. But, it is one that is not dealt with in this particular legislation. This bill has to do with veterans only. I am in sympathy with what the gentleman has to say, and I think that in too many cases there has been, on the part of some agencies, a failure to follow the law and the rules and regulations thereunder with respect to downgrading of those employees in civil service. In far too many cases career employees are not receiving the consideration to which they are entitled. I hope to have something to say on that subject in the near future.

Mr. BUCK. I understand then that the committee has that problem under consideration.

Mr. REES. Yes. And let me say I appreciate the deep interest the gentleman from New York has taken on this problem.

This measure deals only with veterans and amends the Veterans' Preference Act. Let me assure the gentleman from New York the committee is mindful of the problem to which he directs our attention.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE], a member of our committee, such time as she may desire.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, this legislation is merely a clarification and a correction. It is doing justice to our ex-servicemen, which is something that we all want to do. It is going to make the task of the administrative officers in the executive departments easier because it clearly sets forth and enacts into law the President's thought in his letter of August 23, 1945, to the heads of the executive departments when he said: "It is my desire that the heads of all departments and agencies arrange to put into effect as promptly as possible the recommendations which the Civil Service Commission makes under section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944." This legislation will strengthen the hands of the department heads so that they can make the Veterans' Preference Act work according to the original intention of the act. And it also gives the veteran a chance to appeal and submit evidence to the Civil Service Commission. In other words, it helps to make the Veterans' Preference Act a living and strong reality and not merely some high-sounding words without authority. It will greatly help the agencies and departments, who we know will welcome this amendment to the act of 1944.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to know that another sound piece of veterans' legislation is going to pass this House unanimously today.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE].

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, apparently there is no objection to this bill. It gives the power to the Civil Service Commission to enforce its rulings regarding veterans. I feel that it is very necessary legislation, and I am sure the committee will favor it by its adoption.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FORAND. This, in other words, is a bill that would make it compulsory for the departments to reinstate an employee if the Civil Service Commission says that his rights have been violated.

Mr. LYLE. That is correct. The House originally gave the Civil Service Commission jurisdiction to review these matters but it failed to give them the power to enforce their rules and regulations. This gives them power.

Mr FORAND. And the result is that many who feel they have been treated unjustifiably, although the Civil Service Commission has said they were entitled to reinstatement, have never been reinstated.

Mr. LYLE. That is correct, in a few cases.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TWYMAN].

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Chairman, there can be no opposition to this bill. It is perfectly clear that when the Veterans' Preference Act was written there was an imperfection which this bill intends to correct. There is no reflection whatsoever upon any Government agency in proposing this measure. The committee learned of many instances where, through lack of information about the purpose of the act, arbitrary decisions were made which worked to the disadvantage of veterans. This simply provides another step for the veteran to take in order to clarify his right under the Veterans' Preference Act. We expect, of course, that there will be no opposition on the part of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first proviso of section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 387) is hereby amended to read as follows: "*Provided*, That such preference eligibles shall have the right to make a personal appearance, or an appearance through a designated representative, in accordance with such reasonable rules and regulations as may be issued by the Civil Service Commission; after investigation and consideration of the evidence submitted, the Civil Service Commission shall submit its findings and recommendations to the proper

administrative officer and send copies of the same to the appellant or to his designated representative, and it shall be mandatory for such administrative officer to take such corrective action as the Commission finally recommends."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after "preference", strike out "eligibles" and insert "eligible."

Page 2, line 2, after "and", insert "shall."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BARRETT, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 966) to amend section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of June 27, 1944 (58 Stat. 387), pursuant to House Resolution 243, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MODIFICATION OF RAILROAD FINANCIAL STRUCTURES

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 246 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2298) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question it shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], and now yield myself such time as I may use. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 243 makes in order House Resolution 2298 from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The rule under this resolution as granted by the committee does waive points of order but it permits, of course any amendments to be considered under the 5-minute rule.

The bill concerns itself with railroad financial reorganizations and it permits or sets up a new procedure whereby railroads not in bankruptcy or receivership may under certain conditions with the approval—and I want to explain that—with the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission, alter or modify their obligations, such as bonds, mortgages, indentures, and similar instruments, with the assent of the holders of 75 percent of such obligations.

However, before such permission can be granted, the Interstate Commerce Commission must make a finding which approves any such alteration or modification; and in that finding, ascertain and decide that the plan of reducing these obligations by it, is within the scope of the new section 20 (b); will be in the public interest; will be to the best interests of the carrier, of each class of its stockholders, and of the holders of each class of its obligations affected by such modification or alteration, and will not be adverse to the interests of any creditor of the carrier not affected by such modification or alteration.

What it does, in simple language, is to permit a railroad which is in financial difficulty to escape the necessity and the heavy expense of going through bankruptcy or receivership proceedings, and, instead, if 75 percent of the security holders affected first vote or agree, the railroad may then go to the Interstate Commerce Commission where a hearing shall be held, where evidence shall be submitted to substantiate the need for this reorganization or this reduction in obligation or whatever you want to call it and then the Interstate Commerce Commission must find that this is for the benefit of that particular class of stockholders, bondholders, or security holders, or indenture holders, or whatever they may be called. The finding must be that it is for the benefit of the whole 100 percent. In addition thereto, will also in no way endanger the rights of other holders of other classes of indentures or stocks or bonds of that railroad.

If I have made myself clear, this legislation is merely to simplify the reorganization of the financial structure of railroads which find themselves in difficulties. The reorganization must be found by the Interstate Commerce Commission to be for the benefit of and for the welfare of the indenture holders who own the particular type of stock or bonds or mortgages of the railroad. Of course, they cannot even come before the Interstate Commerce Commission unless 75 percent of those holding the indentures ask that it be taken before the Commission.

As I understand this legislation, and I am sure a careful study of it will convince you of the same idea, no indenture holder, no bondholder, or no stockholder that may be affected by this legislation will lose anything as a result of following this procedure. Instead, his interests will be protected, because, instead of spending most of the money that may be derived from the reorganization plan, wasting it in bankruptcy proceedings, and in long involved legal action in receiverships, the money will go to the stock and bondholders. This simple way can be followed with the consent of the Interstate Commerce Commission to equally adjust values so as to give a market value to their stock above that which it would have if they were in bankruptcy and receivership.

I believe the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has done splendid work in bringing this bill before the Congress. They understand it in detail, I am sure, much better than I, but I am hoping that this rule will be adopted promptly and the committee may have an opportunity to give you more complete information on the measure.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I understand from the gentleman that this bill does not apply to any railroad now in receivership or now undergoing reorganization?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is correct. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] is recognized.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, another rule is brought forth that permits legislation which is not in order, and consequently this rule waives points of order on many provisions that would otherwise be subject to a point of order.

If I could believe the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] is correct, that it is for the interest of the stockholders and bondholders, who in good faith and upon the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission have invested their savings, and it would be to their advantage and benefit, I naturally would support and ask that this rule be adopted.

I presume the rule will be adopted but I hope that when the Members are familiar with the provisions of this unfair bill they will at least adopt amendments to safeguard the rights and interests of the minority stock and bondholders. No one would object to eliminating the necessity of railroads going into bankruptcy or receivership. I will be the first to advocate legislation that will stop the outrageous proceedings and practices that have gone on for many, many years in this country on the part of the railroad manipulators. Later I will give you figures as to what some of these manipulators have done in fleecing bond and stockholders. This bill, if adopted, will permit 75 percent of the bond and stockholders, by petition, to ask the elimination of the interest of the other 25 percent of the stock and bondholders notwithstanding the provision in the mortgages which assures and guarantees the investors that the indentures and mortgages would not be changed in any way. This proposal gives these selfish interests the right to go before the Interstate Commerce Commission on the petition of 75 percent of the stock and bondholders and ask that the provision safeguarding the interests of the purchasers and investors be wiped out and that these manipulators have a free hand, and the right and the privilege to say to the 25 percent of the bondholders remaining: "You are out."

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman, I believe, should also point out that even though the 75 percent of these bond and mortgage holders pursue this formal proceeding there still must be a hearing before the Interstate Commerce Commission, and that Commission must find that the rights of the 25 percent will in no way be injured but will be protected and enhanced by the action proposed. I am sure the gentleman from Illinois does not believe that the Interstate Commerce Commission will go around trying to gyp any stockholder or mortgage holder.

Mr. SABATH. I wish I could feel that way, but when I think of what the Interstate Commerce Commission did in the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul, & Pacific and the Chicago & Northwestern Railroad cases, where they wiped out thousands of stockholders and even some bondholders, I am doubtful.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Is the gentleman sure that that was not the action of the courts rather than the action of the Commission?

Mr. SABATH. No; the Interstate Commerce Commission rules on it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The courts also entered into it.

Mr. SABATH. And they wiped out most of the stock and bondholders in the interest of the insiders, notwithstanding the fact that the railroads just about that time started to make tremendous profits, had great surpluses, and were not justified in forcing that legislation.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. In the cases that the gentleman has mentioned, while the Interstate Commerce Commission may have had some connection with those cases in their inception, is it not a fact that the decisions in these cases to which the gentleman has referred were made by the United States courts?

Mr. SABATH. The only jurisdiction the courts had was to approve or disapprove the findings, that is all.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Then the Federal courts did find that the Interstate Commerce Commission acted promptly and I presume by that the gentleman is criticizing both the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Federal courts.

Mr. SABATH. Yes; I do, because I find that our judges in many instances have been unfair to many of the bondholders, stockholders and holders of securities not only of the railroad companies but of other corporations as well, running into the millions of dollars, yes, billions of dollars.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. When the gentleman referred to the surpluses that these railroads now have, I am sure he overlooked the fact that the interest on the bonds has been in default in all of these reorganizations for as long as 11 years and that if the defaulted interest was paid there would be no surplus.

Mr. SABATH. There was no reason why most of these railroads should not have paid their interest, because they had the money in the Treasury, as you yourself stated. I admit there might be some of the smaller railroads that did not make so much money, that did not take advantage of the Government, that did not take advantage of the public that are not in this position; however, most of the roads could have and should have been in the position to pay back the interest. They had the money and they were not justified, to my way of thinking, in depriving these thousands upon thousands of stockholders and shareholders who originally were assured by the Interstate Commerce Commission that these bonds and stocks were all right, "We approve them; you go ahead and buy them, part with your money; of course they are all right;" while a few years later it said: "There is too much watered stock, we shall have to eliminate the stock and securities that are held by many American investors."

Mr. Speaker, to my mind this is manifestly unfair and unjustifiable legislation giving an advantage to 75 percent of holders, who are the insiders. Most of the railroad stocks and bonds are controlled by the 75 percent of the holders, by the insiders, the 25 percent being held by outsiders, the general public, the widows, orphans, the estates, the people who in good faith put their money in railroad bonds and railroad securities. They will be told now: "Oh, well, now, the railroads are not making so much money, so you must be wiped out so that we can take care of those boys who are managing and controlling the railroads, who have effected the bankruptcy of many of the railroads heretofore."

Mr. Speaker, I wish the Members had time to study the history of our railroads and the manipulations from the time of Gould, Hill, Huntington, Vanderbilt, Mellen, and Harriman on down, and see how many millions and millions of dollars the people were shamefully relieved of, the people who in good faith invested their money, in many cases their all, in these railroad securities.

From 1879 to 1906, inclusive, James J. Hill and his associates personally profited to the amount of $407,325,000 in manipulation of Great Northern, while that company's treasury received only $181,875,000.

Again, the manipulations of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad by Charles S. Mellen, one of the great destroyers of property, and his cohorts is still fresh in the minds of many here today. Mellen not only monopolized all transport facilities in New England, but stepped out into the newspaper field to get a voice to further his nefarious schemes of plunder. His destruction of that once great railroad and his unconscionable impoverishment of many deserving investors, including widows and orphans, entitles this man to a high place in the Hall of Shame.

The history of nearly all railroad reorganizations has been the taking away of the investments of stockholders and bondholders chiefly by chicanery, bribery and fraud perpetrated by the head officials of the roads with the connivance of investment bankers.

The overissue of railroad securities is still a common practice and a study of the financial set-up of the railroads today will show that they are loaded to the guards with the common stock, preferred stock, debentures, first, second, and consolidated mortgages, notes, and refunding certificates and, when the time is ripe, there is a reorganization.

I wish time would permit me to touch on the reorganizations and activities of those who 50, 60, and 70 years ago manipulated the stocks of the Southern Pacific, the New Haven, and other roads. Before the Pacific Railroad Commission in 1887 it was disclosed that the Southern Pacific expended over a period of years the sum of over $5,000,000 at Washington for imparting information to Congress, to the departments, or for some purpose of that character.

Congress certainly seems to be getting a lot of information on railroads today. I hope it is of the kind that will help to safeguard the investments of those who have invested their all and the little stockholders.

Now, I feel that the bill should be amended and I hope that it will be amended so that the endangered minority may be properly safeguarded. If the minority should be safeguarded, I would be perfectly happy. I am wholeheartedly in favor of any program or policy that will preclude the placing of these railroads in bankruptcy or receivership, because I know that these great judges in whom the gentleman from Ohio has so much confidence have held these bankruptcies and receiverships within their grasps, appointing a lot of their stooges and friends as receivers, with long-term tenures, and they have been mulcting those railroads and public utility companies. I know some jurisdictions wherein some of these cases have been pending for 10 or 12 years without any justification. So, naturally, I would be in favor if we would eliminate the bankruptcy proceedings, and that is the reason I favor the bill that my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED] advocated in the last session and which I hope he will bring up again, that will protect the minority stockholders and bondholders, and not only a few.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield for a question.

Mr. MACKINNON. Does the bill make the order of the Interstate Commerce Commission final or is an appeal allowed to the courts?

Mr. RABIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RABIN. There is no appeal allowed to the court at all except for technical defects, patent defects. The bill provides in one of the last sections that the power of the Interstate Commerce Commission is plenary and exclusive.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman from New York is right. No real appeal to the courts is permissible and the action of the Interstate Commerce Commission

is final. Even if an appeal to the courts would be permitted, what chance has a stockholder or a bondholder or a few stockholders or bondholders owning from 5 to 100 shares, should they engage a lawyer in trying to cope with railroad lawyers or the attorneys of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. WOLVERTON. In answer to the question as to whether the order made by the Interstate Commerce Commission is final in character without any opportunity of court review, I would say this: The order that is made by the Interstate Commerce Commission is subject to the same review in court as every other order that is made by the Interstate Commerce Commission; in other words, this bill being an amendment to the Interstate Commerce Act carries with it all of the review procedures that are provided in that act for all orders and actions by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. MACKINNON. I wonder if the gentleman would elaborate on what review is allowed on existing orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission?

Mr. RABIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RABIN. In direct answer to that question I will read the testimony of one of the Commissioners of the Interstate Commerce Commission, Mr. Mahaffie. He said:

> I should think that the litigation, unless we did something arbitrary, or unless the application were filed in a way that the corporation was not legally authorized to file it, or some defect that is patent—

And so forth. Then he goes on to say:

> It would be subject to litigation under the Urgent Deficiencies Act for a defect in the legal steps we have taken.

That is in the event that the Commission's decision is arbitrary.

But it does not call for court approval as to the fairness of the plan at all.

Mr. SABATH. I agree with the gentleman. He explained it fully.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. I think it should be emphasized that this bill does not apply to railroad stock but only to the bonds. The stockholders can only be benefited, and certainly cannot be harmed, because it applies only to bonds.

Mr. SABATH. It applies to any indebtedness.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. No. That should be made clear. This is not the Reed bill. This does not apply to stock.

Mr. SABATH. I will read the bill, and I leave it to the Chairman whether that does not apply also to stock. It applies not only to bonds, but all certificates of indebtedness.

Mr. WOLVERTON. The bill as drawn does not apply to stocks.

Mr. SABATH. I am glad to hear that it does not apply to stocks.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. May I ask the chairman of the committee what the language on page 3, line 9, means, "evidences of indebtedness"? Is not that broad enough to include common stock?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I do not think common stock has ever been considered as evidence of indebtedness, not even preferred stock, for the reason that it is dependent upon the granting of dividends, so that a stock is never considered as an evidence of indebtedness.

Mr. SABATH. I am under the impression that when the final ruling is issued it will apply also to some issues of stock.

I do not want to detain the House much longer. All I wish to say is this: Notwithstanding the opinion of some lawyers of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Commission and some of the highly paid railroad lawyers, I am of the opinion that this bill is unconstitutional, and I want to bring that home to you again and again. Please remember what I said, namely, that this bill is bound to be held unconstitutional if some few of the unfortunate minority bondholders are able to get together and hire a good lawyer who will be able to cope with the railroad lawyers and the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Commission lawyers and present their cause in a proper way.

I quote, in part, from section 20b (1) of the bill. It says:

> It shall be lawful notwithstanding any mortgage, indenture, and deed of trust * * * for the carrier to alter or modify any provision of any class of bonds, notes, debentures, or other evidences of indebtedness.

In other words, regardless of the provisions of the original mortgage or trust, the Interstate Commerce Commission is authorized to act.

But listen to this proviso in the bill. I quote from it in part:

> The provisions of this section shall not apply to any equipment-trust certificates, which naturally were issued for the purpose of obtaining their rolling stock.

Yes; the interests of these equipment suppliers, who generally cooperate with the railroads, are safeguarded, but no such safeguard is provided for the well-meaning people who invest their earnings in these securities.

In view of this partly quoting of provisions of the bill, I feel that the court will be obliged to hold this act unconstitutional, because in the bill you state that regardless of what agreement I have with the railroad in buying its stock, that agreement does not count; it is eliminated; that guaranty to which I gave full credit is abrogated, and the railroad can and will be able to do as it pleases, with the sanction and approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission, that has done such a regrettable job on the four or five hundred thousand stockholders of the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific and the Chicago & North Western, most of whom are in my section of the country.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. WOLVERTON. May I make this remark with reference to the statement made as to the constitutionality of the act? If I understood the gentleman correctly, he stated that he is of the opinion that railroad counsel and other lawyers have rendered opinions attacking the constitutionality of this proposal.

Mr. SABATH. No; I said that notwithstanding the opinion of the Interstate Commerce Commission attorneys and the railroad attorneys, who believe that it is constitutional, I am of the opinion, and other attorneys who are not directly interested are of the opinion, that it is not constitutional.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I have a great deal of respect for the gentleman's judgment on any matter to which he has given particular study, but in this particular matter may I say to the gentleman that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce had full hearings, and at no time either on this bill or on bills similar in character that have been introduced in the Senate on previous occasions has anyone doubted the constitutionality of this act. If the gentleman has an open mind upon it I shall be only too glad to supply him with cases that are so directly in point that, regardless of what his present opinion is, I am certain he will come to the same conclusion that other eminent counsel have, that there is no question about the constitutionality of this act.

Mr. SABATH. I feel that the able gentleman is sincere in believing that these lawyers are right, but I do know from past experience that, naturally, we always get from those that represent us an opinion which is favorable. That is the reason the lawyers give the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce the opinion that they believe this will be held constitutional.

Mr. RABIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. RABIN. The chairman is correct when he says in the 1 day of hearing, because there was only 1 day of hearing, that no witness expressed doubt as to the constitutionality of the act, but in the discussion and before the report I expressed serious doubts as to its constitutionality, particularly in view of the fact that the railroads are solvent, that there is no court proceeding, that the bill does not provide for court approval, and that there is no pay-off or appraisal of minority dissenters' holdings.

Mr. SABATH. This would make it lawful that any express provision contained in any mortgage, indenture, deed of trust, or other instrument, notwithstanding the approval of the court, be invalidated and they could rule that these stockholders and bondholders shall be wiped out, notwithstanding the very definite provision in the instrument of mortgage.

I wonder whether the gentleman would go out and buy a mortgage from anyone and pay for it and later on have the mortgagor say, "Well, now, you know that is in there, but it should be eliminated. The guaranty and the assurance that were given to you when you bought this mortgage should not apply." I think it is manifestly unfair, unjustified, and unwarranted.

I have a right to my opinion, but, admittedly, I am not a constitutional lawyer, if you please, anyway, I hope I have a little horse sense, and I know what is right and what is just. If the judges would rule according to what is right and equity, and not be misled by these railroad lawyers who are invariably men of great ability drawing from twenty-five to fifty thousand dollars a year as against the lawyer who is engaged by some of these deserving bondholders who perhaps receives a salary or makes three or four thousand dollars a year and cannot always cope with these great lawyers for these great corporations, that would be well. That is the reason I am always fearful that the rank and file of these cases, 25 percent of the people who have invested millions of dollars of their money in these companies, will be ruthlessly wiped out and deprived of their investments.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the courtesy that the gentleman has extended in yielding to me as frequently as he has. I have requested the gentleman to yield at this time in order that I might answer the statement made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. RABIN] with respect to the right of an individual to have an appraisal of the value of his stock, and that, in the absence of that, the act would be unconstitutional. I am surprised that he is not familiar with the fact that this bill is similar in every respect to the McLaughlin Act which was chapter 15 in the Chandler Act. That act, with a provision in it similar to this, was declared constitutional, and there was no provision in it for an appraisal of stock of dissenters.

Mr. RABIN. Was not that a court procedure? This is not.

Mr. SABATH. I have my own opinion as to judge-made law. I have more confidence in the laws that we make in Congress, even if they are not at all times in exactly the right direction, and even if they are not always exactly fair and just, than in a lot of the laws that are made by judges' rulings and followed in some of the cases to which you have referred.

When I came to Congress in 1907 it was generally recognized that the railroads controlled the State legislatures, helped to elect governors and, yes, even helped to elect Senators and Members of Congress. Of course, in the last 40 years the oil, steel, power, and manufacturing interests have followed the pattern set by these railroad magnates and manipulators. In the last few years the railroads' lobbyists have again come forward, not wishing to be outdone by other lobbyists, and have the strongest lobby they could muster to further legislation favoring their interests or defeat legislation inimical to their interests. Two years ago they succeeded in forcing through the House the bill repealing the Land Grant Act which was enacted years ago in consideration of our Government giving the railroads millions of acres of the public domain upon which to build their rights-of-way. That act gave the Government reduced rates on its freight but now the Government pays the same rates as other shippers, but the railroads have got the land. Under the pending Bulwinkle bill they want exemption from operation of antitrust laws; and now they come in with this outrageous bill. Of course, some of my friends here think that the Interstate Commerce Commission will protect the 25-percent minority of stockholders, but in view of its past record in connection with the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific and the Chicago & North Western where, as I have stated, they ruthlessly wiped out thousands upon thousands of stock and security holders, it is impossible for me to retain my former confidence in the Commission.

I feel members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will have ample opportunity to explain the provisions of this bill later during the 2 hours that have been granted for general debate and then under the 5-minute rule. Consequently, I shall conclude my remarks with the request that I have the privilege of revising and extending my remarks and insert some of the profits that the insiders have made on the railroad in the last 50 years, who they were and how they robbed the American investors.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

MODIFICATION OF RAILROAD FINANCIAL STRUCTURES

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, holding, as I do, a very high regard for the gentleman from Illinois, the dean of the House [Mr. SABATH], I am hopeful that he will carefully review his remarks of today before they are printed in the RECORD, because I seemed to sense he was questioning the integrity of the membership of the Interstate Commerce Commission and of some of our Federal court judges.

Of course, I am not unmindful of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that most if not all of those Commission members have been appointed by the President within the last few years, and that most, if not all, of the judges have also been appointed within the last few years. These appointments were confirmed by the Senate of the United States, after full investigation of the standing and qualifications of the appointees had been made. I am sure these appointments were made in good faith. I am certain the Senate would not have confirmed men who they did not believe were of proper integrity and honor. I am sure the members of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Federal judges will not be willing participants in any fraud upon the security holders affected by this legislation. So I am hopeful, just as a good friend of the gentleman, that he will carefully review the remarks he has made here today.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes; I yield.

Mr. SABATH. I appreciate the advice of my friend—

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It is not advice. It is an expression of hope. I know I cannot give the gentleman any advice.

Mr. SABATH. But I want to say to him, and he ought to know, it does not make any difference to me if a man is not performing his duty toward the people, in the position to which he has been appointed or elected, I do not defend him, whether he is a Democrat or a Republican or who he may be.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No allegation has been made that the gentleman would defend anyone whom he knew was guilty of fraud; but I am hoping that he will read very carefully the remarks he has made, and unless he does have some evidence to support his thinly veiled charges of failure to perform their duties as they should, which he has made against both the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Federal courts, that he will correct those statements. I will be perfectly willing to strike the remarks I have just made from the RECORD if the gentleman wishes to correct his remarks.

Mr. SABATH. Whenever I hear the gentleman giving advice, I am suspicious.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have requested these few minutes in an effort to clear up any misunderstanding that may exist in the minds of any of the Members concerning a possible conflict between two pieces of pending legislation, the bill to which the rule now before us relates and H. R. 3237.

As most of you know, I introduced a bill in the Seventy-ninth Congress—H. R. 5924—which related to similar subject matter. That bill was designed primarily to grant needed relief to railroads already in bankruptcy. It was amended in committee and by committee amendments from the floor, and as so amended it was passed by the House. A bill with a similar purpose (S. 1253) was passed by the Senate.

The House substituted the provisions of the House bill for S. 1253 and then passed the latter bill as so amended. The Senate called for a conference. The conference report was passed by the House by a majority of about 2½ to 1. Subsequently the bill was vetoed by the President, but on grounds that did not challenge the fundamental principles upon which the measure was based.

Section 1 of the bill that passed the House last year by a majority of something like 2½ to 1 (S. 1253) was very similar to the Wolverton bill (H. R. 2298), which this rule would make it in order to consider this afternoon.

Section 1 of the bill I have introduced this year, H. R. 3237, which is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary, is also similar to the bill now before us. There are other sections in H. R. 3237, but I would not deem it proper at this time, under consideration of the rule on the Wolverton bill, to discuss H. R. 3237. I will merely point out, however, that there are two principal sections of H. R. 3237, one of which deals with railroads in bankruptcy and the other of which deals with railroads not in bankruptcy. There are some differences between section 1 of that bill and the bill to be considered under the rule now before us, but I do not deem it relevant to discuss those differences in speaking to the pending rule.

What I do wish to impress upon the minds of the membership is that there ought to be relief not only for those railroads in bankruptcy, to enable them promptly and soundly to emerge from bankruptcy, but also for those roads not in bankruptcy, to enable them to avoid bankruptcy.

As has been already stated, Congress passed the Chandler Act in 1939, which was succeeded by the McLaughlin Act in 1942—chapter 15 of the Bankruptcy Act. Those acts provided for voluntary reorganizations, and under them the Baltimore & Ohio and other railroads were reorganized. The McLaughlin Act expired by its terms in 1945. The bill made in order by this rule is patterned after, and is designed to take the place of, the McLaughlin Act.

It is my earnest hope and desire that this rule be granted and that this bill be passed by the House. In my judgment, it will not in any way conflict with the consideration by the House of the bill H. R. 3237, now before the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman stated that the bill he has reference to, the bill introduced by himself, is now pending before the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. REED of Illinois. That is correct.

Mr. SABATH. What assurance has the gentleman that his bill will be approved by the House and passed by the Senate?

Mr. REED of Illinois. I have confidence in the members of the Judiciary Committee and feel that they are in favor of the bill. I have assurance from the size of the vote last year—2½ to 1—that the House will favor the bill.

Mr. SABATH. That is a good bill. I agree with the gentleman, but my concern is whether the committee will report it out and whether, if reported out, the House will pass it and the Senate will pass it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield one additional minute to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. REED of Illinois. I certainly think nothing can be lost so far as getting the relief that is intended if the House passes this bill, H. R. 2298, and sends it to the Senate. If next week or the week following we pass the other bill, H. R. 3237, and send it to the Senate, then action on the latter bill would obviate further action on this bill, H. R. 2298.

While I feel that the railroads in bankruptcy need relief the most and require immediate legislation to prevent unjust and unnecessary forfeitures of their securities, nevertheless, the enactment of H. R. 2298 alone, even if no action were taken on the bill from the Judiciary Committee, would at least help railroads to avoid bankruptcy in the future.

I therefore hope that the rule will be adopted and that the bill, H. R. 2298, will be passed.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, if I understand this bill correctly it will have the effect, if enacted into law, of extending the provisions of section 15 of the bankruptcy law which expired last year. For that reason I hope that this rule is adopted and the bill under consideration is acted on favorably.

I have to take exception to the statement made by my distinguished friend from Illinois that this bill resembles very much the measure that was passed at the last Congress and subsequently vetoed by President Truman. True it is that one section of the Reed-Hobbs bill and the measure under consideration are similar, but the iniquitous part of the bill that was vetoed by President Truman was that which permitted the assets of railroads in reorganization to be turned over to stockholders and to that class of investors who were not investing for the purpose of receiving proper return on their investment but for speculative purposes only. So this measure does not remotely resemble the bill that was passed at the last session of Congress.

This legislation is essential, particularly in view of the statements that we have seen in the press recently concerning the earnings of the railroads. Why, the Pennsylvania Railroad paid a dividend in the last quarter out of surplus and has been operating in the red. There is not a railroad in the United States that is going to be able to make money and I make this prediction on the basis of earnings statements I have recently seen: I am firmly convinced that after another year unless legislation of this sort is enacted we are going to see a great many railroads in bankruptcy.

This is a very carefully drawn measure. I am wondering whether or not the distinguished chairman of the committee reporting this bill would not be willing, even though it is surplusage, to provide adequate court review for a decision of the Commission? I do not think that this Commission or any other commission ought to have absolute power. The mere fact that there is some other body which can review the decision of an administrative agency of itself makes that agency more careful in its deliberations and makes that agency act strictly in accordance with the law.

Mr. Speaker, I trust this rule will be adopted.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two statements.

Mr. McGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article and a speech of former Governor Moore, of New Jersey.

AMENDING THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT, AS AMENDED

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2298) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2298, with Mr. MILLER of Nebraska in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 35 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the bill, H. R. 2298, which is now before us for consideration is, in my opinion, one of the most important pieces of legislation that can come before the House at this time for action. It may not be spectacular and it may not attract the attention that some other subjects of legislation do, but having in mind the situation that confronts us today with respect to the railroad industry, with its diminishing revenues and continuing high cost of operation, I think you will agree with me that there is nothing more necessary, in time of peace as well as war, than to preserve the strength, the stability, and the efficiency of our transportation system. Although the railroad industry is privately owned, yet the fact remains that it is charged with a public interest and there is no other industry wherein the public interest requires, to so great a degree, stability of financial structure and efficiency of operation.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of H. R. 2298 is to add a new section, to be numbered section 20b, to the Interstate Commerce Act, which will enable railroad companies to adjust their financial affairs quickly, economically, and on a business basis. Such legislation is neces-

sary, and the bill should be enacted as quickly as possible.

The so-called McLaughlin Act, which extended chapter XV of the Bankruptcy Act, provided a procedure for the voluntary readjustment by railroads of their financial affairs without resort to proceedings in bankruptcy or in equity receivership; but that act expired by its own terms in 1945. Since that act came to an end, there has been no similar statute under the terms of which railroads may voluntarily readjust their financial affairs without resort to bankruptcy or equity receivership proceedings.

Inability of a railroad to meet an obligation may be only of a temporary nature, not requiring a drastic receivership or bankruptcy proceeding. The difficulty may be due to omissions or antiquated provisions in an old mortgage or indenture which, because of the burdens resulting therefrom, should be altered or modified and brought in line with more modern provisions.

But, at present, if a railroad should find itself in financial difficulty, even of a temporary duration, it might unnecessarily and unfortunately be forced into a bankruptcy proceeding under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act, involving proceedings before the Interstate Commerce Commission and in the courts, lasting over a period of many years and imposing a burden of costs and expenses which may run into millions of dollars. In some instances section 77 proceedings which began over 12 years ago are still pending. The range of expenses in a single section 77 bankruptcy proceeding has been from $817,799, in the case of a relatively small road, to $2,891,121, for a large road.

During the first 2 months of 1947, as many as 39 class I railroads, or railroads having a gross revenue of at least $1,000,000 in a year, had a deficit in net income. The number having a deficit in net income in 1946 was 35, and in 1945 the number was 26. After a period of expanded revenues and earnings, occasioned by the war traffic which they handled efficiently and expeditiously, the railroads are now confronted with substantially increased costs and declining revenues. It must not be understood that all these railroads will be required to readjust their financial obligation; but, nevertheless, there is a possibility that some, if not several, may be required to do so, and the time may soon arrive when prompt action will have to be taken.

No one will seriously contend that every opportunity should not be given to a railroad and its creditors voluntarily to work out their own financial problems and to avoid the delays, expense, and uncertainties of bankruptcy proceedings, provided, of course, there is an appropriate regulatory procedure that must be followed before the Interstate Commerce Commission. Such voluntary action is not only desirable from the standpoint of the railroad and its creditors, but it is required for the protection of railroad credit. With the knowledge that the procedure provided for by this bill is available to railroads and their creditors for the readjustment of financial problems which would impose burdens and threaten bankruptcy if not readjusted, investors will have a feeling of greater security in purchasing railroad obligations, and the result will be enhancement and improvement of railroad credit. Such voluntary financial readjustments by railroads and creditors also are necessary in the interest of adequate and efficient transportation service at the lowest consistent cost to shippers and the traveling public. Perhaps no other industry is affected with a greater degree of public interest. In capital invested and revenues, the railroad industry is among the largest in the Nation; and, in importance to the Nation in peace and in war, the railroad industry is the first. The American public has invested heavily in railroad securities, including bonds, notes, debentures and other forms of obligations, and stocks. The public interest, and the interest of all these creditors and stockholders, can be protected only by a continuity in sound financial structure for the railroads. Deterioration of service and interruption of employment, which the threat of financial difficulties inevitably brings, should be prevented.

The purpose of this bill is to provide the most appropriate and efficient remedy for the conditions which have been described.

The method employed by the bill—paragraph (1)—is to permit a railroad, other than a railroad in equity receivership or in process of reorganization under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act, with the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and with the consent of at least 75 percent of affected security holders, to alter or modify any provision in any class or classes of its bonds, notes, debentures, or other evidences of indebtedness, issued under any mortgage, indenture, or deed of trust, or other instrument of like nature, and also to alter or modify any provision of any mortgage, indenture, deed of trust, or other instrument pursuant to which any class of its obligations shall have been issued. Equipment trust certificates, and conditional sales agreements with respect to equipment, because of their standing and status in the financial markets, are excluded from the provisions of the bill.

Under paragraph (2), whenever an alteration or modification, within the scope of the bill, is proposed, the railroad seeking such alteration or modification must present an application to the Commission. The Commission must hold a public hearing, with respect to which adequate notice must be given, but as a prerequisite to such hearing the Commission may require the railroad to secure assurances of assent by holders of a percentage (to be determined by the Commission) of the aggregate principal amount outstanding of the obligations affected. If the Commission, after such hearing, shall find: (a) That the proposed alteration or modification is within the scope of the new section 20b; and (b) will be in the public interest; and (c) will be in the best interests of the railroad, of each class of its stockholders, and of the holders of each class of its obligations affected by such modification or alteration; and (d) will not be adverse to the interests of any creditor of the railroad not affected by such alteration or modification, then the Commission shall cause the railroad to submit the proposed alteration or modification, with such terms, conditions, and amendments, if any, as the Commission may prescribe, to the holders of each class of its obligations affected thereby for acceptance or rejection. The Commission must pass on the correctness and sufficiency of all material facts stated in letters, circulars, advertisements, and financial and statistical statements used in soliciting assents to the proposed alteration or modification. If the Commission shall find that, as a result of such admission, the proposed alteration or modification has been assented to by the holders of at least 75 percent of the aggregate principal amount outstanding of each class of obligations affected thereby—or by such larger percentage as the Commission may fix as just and reasonable in any case where 75 percent of such principal amount is held by fewer than 25 holders—the Commission shall enter an order approving and authorizing the proposed alteration or modification upon the terms and conditions, and with amendments, if any, determined by the Commission to be just and reasonable.

Any alteration or modification which shall, under paragraph (2), become and be binding pursuant to approval and authority of the Commission shall be binding upon each holder of any obligation of the railroad of each class affected by such alteration or modification, and upon any trustee of or other party to any instrument under which any such class of obligations shall have been issued.

Under paragraph (5), the authority conferred by the new section 20b is exclusive and plenary, and any railroad, in respect of any alteration or modification authorized and approved by the Commission, shall have full power to make such alteration or modification without securing approval under any other section of the Interstate Commerce Act, and without securing the approval of any State authority.

Any person adversely affected by an order of the Commission under the new section 20b will have the same full and adequate opportunity to obtain the judicial review of such order which is available under present law in the case of other orders issued by the Commission under the Interstate Commerce Act. It is therefore unnecessary to include specific judicial review provisions in the new section.

The support of the bill is overwhelming. It has the full endorsement and approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission. In a letter of May 9, 1947, the Legislative Committee of the Interstate Commerce Commission describes the purpose of the bill as "to amend the Interstate Commerce Act by adding a new section to be designated as 20b

which would provide a procedure for railroads not in bankruptcy or receivership which are experiencing temporary difficulty in meeting maturing obligations to pay either principal of or interest on outstanding debt, to alter or modify such obligations with the assent of the holders of 75 percent of such obligations with the approval of the Commission without recourse to proceedings in the courts," and calls attention to "the deterioration of service, and decrease of employment, and to the unfavorable effect upon railroad credit and the market value of railroad securities, which accompany even the temporary financial difficulty of a carrier."

In a letter of October 26, 1945, to former Senator Wheeler, the legislative committee of the Interstate Commerce Commission endorsed a bill which was then pending as S. 1253, containing provisions substantially similar to those in the present H. R. 2298, and said that legislation of this character would be in the public interest and of real aid in the restoration of railroad credit, and that instances arise where drastic reorganization, such as results from an equity receivership or a section 77 bankruptcy proceeding, is neither necessary nor desirable. In these respects, the Commission said:

> After further and intensive consideration, we have concluded that it would be to the public interest and of real aid in the restoration and preservance of railroad credit that legislation of this character be enacted.
>
> The Congress is cognizant of the deterioration of service and decrease of employment which usually occur whenever a carrier begins to experience substantial loss of traffic and revenues. This, in no small measure, is caused by the necessity for the carrier to meet its fixed charges or else to face the prospects of receivership or a judicial reorganization under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act. The financial structures of many carriers were, and in some instances still are, such as to require a thorough rearrangement of their financial and corporate structures. On the other hand, instances arise where drastic reorganization is neither necessary nor desirable. Although the financial difficulty of a carrier may be temporary, when such a condition becomes known, it produces a very unfavorable effect on its credit and the marketability of its securities. This arises from the uncertainty of fear that certain classes of securities may be totally eliminated and others drastically modified in the event of judicial reorganization.

The bill, known as S. 1253, was passed by both the Senate and House of Representatives, but was vetoed because of an amendment adopted after the Commission's letter of October 26, 1945, relating to matters other than those which were contained in the bill as endorsed by the Commission. If it had not been for such amendment, S. 1253 unquestionably would have become a law, and legislation such as that proposed in the pending H. R. 2298 would now be on the statute books.

In his testimony before the House committee on the pending bill, Commissioner Mahaffie called attention to the burdens of old mortgages, with rigid provisions, and to the desirability of providing an effective means for modification in order to bring them in line with flexibility in mortgage provisions of modern times. He said:

> All railroads, as you know, have been built pretty largely on borrowed capital. I think the first bond issue was almost coincident with the construction of the first railroad. Bonds have been always a heavy element in capital structures. The early mortgages were pretty rigid. Some of them contained provisions that made it, for instance, impossible to deviate from the original line of the railroad without affecting the provisions of the mortgage. Some of those mortgages are still extant.
>
> In modern times there has been a great deal more flexibility in mortgage provisions, provisions by which modifications may properly be made. Still there are many of the old indentures outstanding under which the railroads have to live and it is to the advantage of both the carrier and the holder of its securities that desirable modification be made.
>
> Yet it is frequently impossible to modify indentures unless the mortgage is paid off or all the bondholders consent. That is one feature that makes for the desirability of such legislation as this—a means by which oppressive or out-of-date or expensive provisions which are no longer of benefit to anyone can be modified without having to pay off the few people who insist on being paid off in full if you attempt to modify the terms of the obligation. But that is the least important feature of this proposal.

Commissioner Mahaffie then pointed out the more important situation, where most or a great majority of creditors are quite anxious to revise the financial structure so that the railroad can decently survive. He said:

> I had discussed the difficulties that arise from inflexible indentures and mortgages, which, as I stated, are becoming less burdensome in later indentures. That, I stated, was the lesser of the two important things which to my mind make it desirable to facilitate voluntary reorganizations. A more important one is the thing we have just been discussing (that was financial difficulties). Frequently a carrier can see considerably in advance that it is going to have difficulty in meeting a maturity or its interest charges are getting too heavy. Frequently, most or a great majority of its creditors are perfectly aware of those facts and are quite anxious to revise the financial structure so that the railroad can decently survive.
>
> Many voluntary reorganizations have been attempted or have been discussed, but only a few in past times have been carried out, for the reason that there was no instrumentality or no way in which the gentlemen who were unwilling to cooperate and who insisted on being paid out in full, if adjustment were made, could be denied a privileged position as against persons who did go along. There was no way in which it could be done. The alternative to the railroad, if it found it too difficult to proceed under its set-up, used to be receivership. Now it is section 77 proceedings. * * *
>
> All of those, in varying degrees * * * have a detrimental effect on service, or employment, and on the general credit situation that we have been talking about. It has seemed to me important to work out some kind of a scheme by which those effects can be avoided.

In its fifty-seventh annual report—for the year 1943—the Commission pointed out the desirability of legislation such as that now proposed by H. R. 2298.

In its fifty-ninth annual report—1945—the Commission recommended legislation as now proposed by H. R. 2298, and said that such legislation would materially aid in promoting the public interest, increase the stability of values of railroad securities, with resulting greater confidence therein by investors, and promote a more sound financial condition by avoiding prospective financial difficulties.

In its sixtieth annual report—1946—the Commission went into considerable detail in recommending, again, legislation of this character. The Commission said:

> That deterioration of service and decrease in employment usually occur when a carrier begins to experience substantial loss of traffic and revenues is well known. Deterioration of service and decrease in employment are caused, in no small measure, by the necessity for the carrier to meet its fixed charges and maturities or else face the prospects of a receivership or a judicial reorganization under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act. The financial structures of many carriers were, and in some instances may still be, such as ultimately to require a thorough rearrangement of their financial and corporate structures. On the other hand, instances arise where drastic reorganization is neither necessary nor desirable. Although the financial difficulties of a carrier may be only temporary, such condition, when it becomes known, produces a very unfavorable effect on the carrier's credit and on the marketability of its securities. This arises from uncertainty as to the carrier's ability to extricate itself from its difficulties without judicial reorganization, and the fear that certain classes of its securities may be drastically modified, if not wholly eliminated, in the event of such reorganization.
>
> To avoid such consequences, most creditors would gladly cooperate with the carrier in effecting a voluntary reorganization. However, because of the fact that the obligations of carriers ordinarily are widely held, and for other reasons, it usually is not feasible to effect a voluntary financial reorganization which requires the consent of all the holders of a carrier's obligations or even of all of the holders of an individual issue. * * *
>
> A large part of the capital structures of carriers by railroad has always consisted of bonds. A considerable portion of these bonds is secured by old mortgages which lack many of the provisions which give the flexibility characteristic of mortgages of more recent date, e. g., those permitting or requiring a reduction of the mortgage debt through the operation of sinking funds, those enabling the carrier to call the bonds prior to maturity, and those under which the carrier, with the cooperation of its bondholders, may alter or modify the provisions of the mortgage. As a rule, bonds issued under the old mortgages must remain outstanding until they mature, and maturities may all fall within a comparatively short period. Frequently a carrier can see considerably in advance that it may have difficulty in meeting a maturity, or that its interest charges may become unduly burdensome. There is merely a threat which can be recognized readily by both the carrier and its creditors. Most, or a great majority, of the creditors are well aware of the potentialities of such a threat and are usually willing, sometimes anxious, to cooperate with the carrier in modifying or altering its obligations so that the anticipated difficulty may be avoided. * * *
>
> Since the provisions of chapter XV have expired, there is no method whereby a carrier which is not in need of drastic reorganization, but which anticipates difficulty in refunding its outstanding obligations or

meeting its fixed charges, may work out an alteration or modification of its obligations without the cooperation of all holders of the obligations affected, or without paying off those of the holders who insist on being paid the full amount of their claims. We are convinced there should be provided a simple and inexpensive method whereby carriers in cooperation with a substantial majority of their creditors can effect an alteration or modification of their obligations without bankruptcy proceedings under either section 77 or such a procedure as was formerly provided by section XV.

The passage of the bill is urged by the Association of American Railroads, and by institutional investors, such as insurance companies and banks, and by investment houses and others.

It is clear that this legislation is needed, for the protection of the railroads and their stockholders and creditors, and the public, and it is urged that the bill should pass.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. The measure under consideration is an amendment to the Interstate Commerce Act and provides a new section 20b. So, it is a new section, in no wise affecting any of the other provisions, including that for judicial review of the Interstate Commerce Act.

Mr. WOLVERTON. That is true. It does not repeal, amend, or change the judicial review provided by the Interstate Commerce Act. It leaves all of the provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act intact and the same as they now are and have been for many years.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. Further, in connection with what the chairman has just said, and the assurance that he has given the House that there is adequate court-review revision, I will just read from an answer that Commissioner Mahaffie made to me during the hearing, when he said:

Now when our final order came out, however, it would be subject to litigation under the Urgent Deficiencies Act for a defect in the legal steps we have taken that our action was arbitrary, or not in accordance with the law, just as a rate order or any other order we issued may be, and a great many of them are, attacked and reviewed in the courts.

Mr. WOLVERTON. That is true. The constitutionality of a similar provision in the Chandler Bankruptcy Act has been approved, and there is no such provision as some might want to suggest.

Mr. MACKINNON. In view of the gentleman's statement with respect to the power of appeal, I wonder what was meant by the language on page 10, lines 10 and 11, where it says, "The authority conferred by this section shall be exclusive and plenary."

Mr. WOLVERTON. What does the gentleman think it means?

Mr. MACKINNON. Well, I think one meaning of "plenary" is "absolute." I think that construction would throw some doubt as to the existence of a right of appeal.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Does not the gentleman realize that acts of Congress are plenary in character in the matter of regulating interstate commerce when Congress has acted?

Mr. MACKINNON. Yes, but it is the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the courts that the bill is talking about.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Certainly. I am speaking now of the jurisdiction of Congress over interstate commerce. The fact that the result of its action is plenary in character does not preclude the congressional act from having a court review, and the action of the Interstate Commerce Commission taken under and by virtue of the provisions of such an act of Congress is likewise subject to review. I would like to hear from the gentleman why he thinks the action of the Commission under this bill would not be subject to the review procedure provided for in the Interstate Commerce Act.

Mr. MACKINNON. Well, the logic that would support that conclusion is the statement in this bill that the authority conferred upon the Interstate Commerce Commission by this section is "exclusive and plenary." If that is generally true the courts could not interfere as one of the meanings of the word "plenary" is "absolute." In other words, the quoted language may give some support to the construction that the power of the Interstate Commerce Commission is absolute. I agree with the gentleman that the right of appeal should exist and the only question I raise is whether that is effectively provided for in view of the language that I have referred to in the bill.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Of course it is, for the reason that the power that is given to the Interstate Commerce Commission by this bill is an amendment to the Interstate Commerce Act, and that act provides for a review. One follows the other.

Mr. MACKINNON. Yes; but this section here says that the authority conferred by this section is absolute.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Of course, it is as to any action taken but that does not change the fact that its act can be reviewed. The same language, namely, "exclusive and plenary" appears in section 20a of the act. It has been in the statute for many years but it does not destroy the right of review.

Mr. MACKINNON. Which would mitigate against the review, the general review, that would be provided elsewhere.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Of course, the Commission has the absolute right to act, no State or local statute or ordinance to the contrary, but nevertheless when the Commission has acted its order or action is subject to the review provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act.

Any order of ICC may be reviewed in a court proceeding instituted under the provisions of the act of October 22, 1913, 38 Statutes, pages 208, 220. Under that act an injunction proceeding may be brought to enjoin or set aside any order of the Commission in a proceeding in a Federal district court composed of three judges, one of whom must be a circuit judge. Decisions of such court are reviewable by direct appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States. Any dissatisfied bondholder may intervene before the ICC and become a party and institute any such proceeding for the purpose of reviewing in court the order of the Commission.

Mr. MACKINNON. I am very glad to have the gentleman's explanation. I feel that the ambiguity in the bill has been cleared up by the gentleman's statement that such exclusive and plenary power only refers to original proceedings and not as to appeals to the courts.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. There is, of course, no question that it is the intention of the Congress and of the gentleman and his committee that the right of review by the courts of any order of the Interstate Commerce Commission is intended, and it is not intended to be taken away by this act.

Mr. WOLVERTON. That is true.

Mr. O'HARA. I mean, we do not want to say that there should not be any appeal, and that was our intention when we reported this bill out that there should be the right of appeal.

Mr. WOLVERTON. In conclusion, I wish to express a few further thoughts with respect to the constitutionality of this proposed legislation.

The constitutionality of this bill has been carefully studied.

From these studies we are convinced that the bill is an appropriate exercise of the powers of Congress to regulate interstate commerce.

The bill is declared to be "in aid of the national transportation policy of the Congress, as set forth in the preamble of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, in order to promote the public interest in avoiding the deterioration of service and the interruption of employment which inevitably attend the threat of financial difficulties and in order to promote the public interest in increased stability of values of railroad securities with resulting greater confidence therein of investors, to insure, insofar as possible, continuity of sound financial condition of common carriers subject to part I of said act, and to enable said common carriers, insofar as possible, to avoid prospective financial difficulties, inability to meet debts as they mature, and insolvency."

The primary concern of the bill, therefore, is the public interest. The purpose is to protect and insure an adequate transportation service to the public by railroads in a healthy financial condition. In a case involving priority of operating expenses incurred prior to receivership as against bondholders, the Supreme Court has said:

The public retains rights of vast consequence in the road and its appendages, with which neither the company nor any creditor or mortgagee can interfere. They take their rights subject to the rights of the public, and must be content to enjoy them in subordination thereto. (*Barton* v. *Barbour* (104 U. S. 126, 135).)

Since the bill is an exercise of the power of Congress to regulate interstate commerce, it must be borne in mind that the power of Congress to regulate such commerce is exclusive and plenary—*N. L. R. B.* v. *Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp.* (301 U. S. 1). Congress can subject railroads to restraints not shown to be unreasonable and calculated to serve the public interest—*Johnson* v. *Southern Pacific Co.* (196 U. S. 1); *Wilson* v. *New* (243 U. S. 332); *Second Employers' Liability Cases* (223 U. S. 1); *Baltimore & Ohio R. R. Co.* v. *I. C. C.* (221 U. S. 612); *I. C. C.* v. *Goodrich Transit Co.* (224 U. S. 194); *Virginian R. Co.* v. *System Federation* (300 U. S. 515). The power of Congress to regulate the issuance of securities, under section 20a of the Interstate Commerce Act has been upheld, in one case the court having said that—

> The whole matter of the issue of capital stock, investment, and incurring of bonded indebtedness * * * becomes so directly interrelated with the problem of maintaining a just relation between the public and the carrier, that they fall clearly within the constitutional authority of Congress to regulate interstate commerce. (*Pittsburgh & W. Va. Ry. Co.* v. *I. C. C.* (293 Fed. 1001, appeal dismissed, 266 U. S. 640).)

Since the power exists with respect to new issues of securities, the same standards of validity unquestionably should support the power with respect to existing securities.

The prohibition against impairing the obligation of contracts runs in terms against the States and not against the Federal Government—*Hepburn* v. *Griswold* (8 Wall. 603); *Union Pacific R. Co.* v. *U. S.* (99 U. S. 700). While the fifth amendment bars arbitrary action by Congress having the effect of impairing the obligation of contracts, Federal legislation having the collateral or incidental effect of impairing existing contracts has frequently been sustained—*Legal Tender Cases* (12 Wall. 457); *Louisville & Nashville R. R. Co.* v. *Mottley* (219 U. S. 467); *New York* v. *United States* (257 U. S. 591); *Continental Bank* v. *Rock Island Ry.* (294 U. S. 648). In the Gold Clause cases the Supreme Court seems to have gone even further, since in those cases it was decided that legislation is valid when within the constitutional grant, although it directly operates upon and nullifies existing contracts—*Norman* v. *Baltimore & Ohio R. R. Co.* (294 U. S. 240).

In a leading case the Supreme Court said—*Louisville & Nashville R. Co.* v. *Mottley* (219 U. S. 467):

> The agreement between the railroad company and the Mottleys must necessarily be regarded as having been made subject to the possibility that, at some future time, Congress might so exert its whole constitutional power in regulating interstate commerce as to render that agreement unenforceable or to impair its value. That the exercise of such power may be hampered or restricted to any extent by contracts previously made between individuals or corporations, is inconceivable. The framers of the Constitution never intended any such state of things to exist.

In view of the purposes which H. R. 2298 seeks to serve, and the appropriateness of the means chosen for those purposes, the provisions of the bill should without question prevail over any challenge under the due process clause.

Contracts which operate directly to burden or obstruct interstate commerce do not have the protection of the fifth amendment—*Addyston Pipe & Steel Co.* v. *United States* (175 U. S. 211).

I would not justify a bill that did not give an individual the right of review after the Interstate Commerce Commission had acted.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation deals with a very practical problem that now confronts our country, one of great importance. A few years ago, before the war began, 30 percent of the mileage of the railroads of the United States was in the possession of the courts in one form or another on account of their financial difficulties. Frequently unwarranted financial obligations contributed very substantially to the weakened conditions of these carriers. They were hopelessly bound by contract obligations that were no longer compatible with the carriers affected or the public interest. There was no practical relief.

In the last few months we have had a demonstration of the lack of earning power of a large part of our carriers that suggests the possibility, unfortunately, that we may again face a similar situation. In fact, some of the railroads are now rapidly following the course toward the courts that placed them there before. It is of great importance that the most practical plan that is just can be adopted to avoid these railroads being forced into the courts.

The principal features in this bill are that a carrier is permitted to apply to the Commission for the modification or alteration of its obligations. The Interstate Commerce Commission can, if it chooses to do so, demand in the initial stage an assurance that a certain percentage of the holders of those obligations are agreeable to the plan. In the absence of such an action by the Commission the law here proposed requires that holders of at least 75 percent of the obligations must consent to a plan of modification or alteration before the Commission has power to approve it. If there are less than 25 stockholders as a whole, it will be the duty of the Commission to determine whether or not a higher percentage of the security holders should be required.

Then after that stage of the proceedings is reached the matter goes to a hearing, in which, of course, the interested parties are entitled to appear. If after that hearing the Commission finds certain specified facts, the Commission may make an order approving or rejecting or suggesting alterations in the plan before it gives its approval. Only after the complete approval of the plan does it become effective.

This is fundamentally a permissive plan. It is true that as much as 25 percent of the holders of obligations may be compelled to comply with the order that is made by the Commission without their consent. The practical question presented here, as I see it, is whether or not the minority holders of these obligations are sufficiently protected by the provisions of this bill. There are two fundamental provisions intended for their protection. The first is that 75 percent of each class of holders of obligations affected must consent before the Commission has power to make an order. The second method of protecting the holder is by the hearing and approval required by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

It is suggested that there should be an approval also by the court. I think the provisions embodied in this bill more strictly conform to the general policy of the bill and afford justice to the holders of obligations. In my judgment a procedure that requires a duplication of hearings and findings by each of two separate agencies of the Government is not conducive to good administration.

In other words, if we require court approval and the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission, that means a double proceeding with the delay and expense which is frequently involved in court procedures.

In supporting this bill I do so on the theory that the hearings and findings of the Interstate Commerce Commission and this requirement that 75 percent of the holders must agree, is ample protection for the holders of those obligations.

Just for a moment I would like to repeat the statement of the bill as to the findings required to be made by the Commission as presented by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON]. The findings required to be made by the Commission indicate the care and scope of the investigation by the Commission before it determines the issues. The Commission must find that the proposed alteration and modification is within the scope of this act; that it will be in the public interest; that it will be in the best interests of the carrier and of each class of holders of obligations and of the holders of each class of its obligations affected by such modification or alteration and will not be adverse to the interest of any creditor of the carrier.

This legislation does not come under the bankruptcy clause of the Constitution, but rather under the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution under which the Interstate Commerce Commission acts. It gives a hearing by a fair body and certainly by a competent body. I think no one could deny that there is no greater familiarity and ability in dealing with transportation problems in the government than in the Interstate Commerce Commission. I would as soon or rather expect a just judgment from the Commission than from a court. I think there is no practical reason why such adjustment as here proposed should be heard by both the Commission and a court before approval could be given. Such a procedure would require a determination of issues of fact by two governmental agencies.

That is the substance of the situation. I believe the stockholders are sufficiently protected. It is of great importance that this measure become a law so as to avoid bankruptcies and expenses and delays of court procedure so far as possible.

There are a good many cases in which carrier companies have been in the con-

trol of the courts until the patience of everybody concerned has been worn thin. In the meantime some of those unfortunate companies have had their treasuries greatly depleted by the expenses incidental to such proceedings.

This is not a substitute for bankruptcy, but it is a method which we hope will substantially lessen the necessity of bankruptcy proceedings.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I feel that this bill has been rather fully explained by the statements of my able, distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from New Jersey and the gentleman from California, who have preceded me in speaking on this bill.

It is true that this bill is presented to the Congress under the theory of the Constitution granting to the Congress the right to regulate interstate commerce. I do believe that everyone will agree with the general appeal of the legislation, which is mainly an attempt to avoid the expenses of bankruptcy proceedings to the stockholders and bondholders of the railroads and in lieu thereof to vest jurisdiction of reorganization in the Interstate Commerce Commission if not less than 75 percent of the bondholders agree to such proceedings. I hope this is not used, if it becomes law, for any other purpose than to escape the expense of bankruptcy proceedings; and that it will not seriously affect the rights of other minority stockholders or minority claimants, whichever they be, either bondholders or stockholders. I think a great deal depends upon how carefully and assiduously the Interstate Commerce Commission applies itself to the administration of the act. Frankly, I would say that a great deal depends upon the type of administration and the attention given this act by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

In response to a question asked by my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACKINNON], of our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON], it is my understanding that the language contained on page 10 of the bill, where the language refers to subsection (5) in line 10, "Authority conferred by this section shall be exclusive and plenary," refers only to the original jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and does not in any way affect the right of appeal by anyone from any order made by the Interstate Commerce Commission, either jurisdictional or in the course of these proceedings. There is nothing that would or should prevent any individual, person, or corporation from the right of appeal. I think, as the chairman has said, no one on the committee would bring out a bill which did not give the person affected the right of appeal, which exists under the law at the present time, from any order of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

There is one other matter which I do not raise because of any confusion, but which has been a matter of some concern. It was the testimony of a very able witness before our committee, Mr. Fletcher, who represented, as counsel, the Boston & Maine Railroad, as to the practical situation which arises with reference to the management of a railroad which, after being authorized by 75 percent of the bondholders, would go into this organization, with reference to the difficulty of that organization proceeding for some time, where the stockholders did not have any voice in the management. The only difficulty which I see and which may cause some concern is the practical question of management. It has been a difficult subject with which to deal in this bill, and it may properly come up later on during the consideration of a bill which I understand will be offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED], who has recently spoken on the matter. I think, however, it is a matter to which we will have to give further consideration, depending upon what may develop in the number of cases which may arise under this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] has expired.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RABIN].

Mr. RABIN. Mr. Chairman, I have listened very carefully to the statement made by the distinguished chairman of our committee. I have a great deal of respect for the chairman of our committee. I agree with that statement in substance. I do not agree with it entirely. This bill is a step in the right direction in connection with railroad reorganization; in fact, it is a step in the right direction in connection with the reorganization of any corporate enterprise where the holdings are diverse and where the holders are numerous.

This bill seeks to prevent financial difficulty rather than to cure it after the difficulty has arisen. It seeks to give prophylactic treatment to the financial troubles of the railroads. I am one who believes that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure holds good in dealing with financial difficulties as well as with medical troubles. I go along with those objectives. I think however certain safeguards are lacking and I want to recommend the adoption of those safeguards. I shall offer what I consider proper safeguards at the time this bill is read for amendment. I want to recommend safeguards which will make the bill in my opinion more just and more equitable to the parties affected. I want to recommend safeguards which will strengthen the constitutionality of the bill.

I do not say this bill is unconstitutional. I do not know how anybody can say whether it is or it is not in the light of the 5-to-4 decisions that have been handed down lately. I do not know how, even though you be an acknowledged authority on constitutional law, you can make a flat statement about the constitutionality of the bill. I have, however, some serious doubts as to the constitutionality of the bill as it now stands. I will discuss that later. But even though the bill be constitutional I think the amendments I wish to offer should be in it because they will make the bill more equitable and fair. I will discuss them in great detail later but just mention them now in passing. One amendment provides for real court approval of any plan adopted by the ICC. I say "real" court approval—adequate court approval. I say we need more than a court review that simply considers patent defects in procedure or arbitrary decisions of the ICC; and that is all the review you now have under this act.

Secondly, I will offer an amendment which will provide that in the case of a minority dissenter his rights should be protected, but without giving him an opportunity to prevent the reorganization and without giving him an opportunity to embarrass the reorganization and without giving him an opportunity to strike against the reorganization unless he gets an unfair payment. With these two amendments I think it will be a better bill constitutionally, it will be a better bill equitably.

When a debtor is in trouble what does he do? He calls in the creditor and they sit around the table and try to reach an agreement that will solve the difficulties of the debtor. It cannot be done in railroad reorganizations because there are thousands of creditors. You cannot get them around a table, and even if you could get them into a large hall you would never get 100-percent consent. Under the new, modern, streamlined trust indentures we have provisions for modifying them without 100-percent consent. The old indentures require 100-percent consent. We therefore need a bill of this kind, we need a bill of this nature; and this bill is written to cure that obstacle in dealings between creditors and debtors. Under this the companies will bargain with the bondholders. The ICC's position is to call the parties in, sit around the table, supervise the negotiations, and in effect be an umpire.

What can the ICC do under this bill? Let us assume I have a $1,000 bond and I do not go along with the plan, even though 75 percent of the bondholders do want to go along with the plan. What can they do with my bond? They can say to me, "Instead of a thousand-dollar bond you will take $500." They can say to me, "Instead of your bond becoming due in 2 years it will become due in 20 years." They can say to me, "Instead of taking 5-percent interest you take 2-percent interest." True, they must find that such decisions are in the best interests of all the bondholders, of all the stockholders, and of all those who are affected.

Now, I have a great deal of respect for the members of the ICC. When they came before our committee I was agreeably surprised at the high type and high caliber of men they are, distinguished jurists most of them.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABIN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I believe the gentleman said that the stockholders were affected.

Mr. RABIN. I mean the bondholders.

Mr. Chairman, the men of the Interstate Commerce Commission are men of exceptionally high type, and I may say if you would compare them with men in other agencies they would not only compare favorably but would excel in many instances. As I say, I have respect for them, but so have I respect for the courts, and we allow an appeal on the merits from decisions of courts. They are human. They may make a mistake.

Suppose I am a minority stockholder and I think they made a mistake in this case—that they reached the wrong conclusion, that they are taking my property unfairly and unjustly. What can I do about it? I say my investment is impaired; it is a breach of my contract. What can I do? The Interstate Commerce Commission will answer: "We are bound by certain judicial decisions. We cannot do anything arbitrarily." Yes; they are bound by certain judicial decisions; but as has been pointed out in this bill, their power is plenary, absolute. They say, "Well, you can go to court and get a review." But can you? Can you go to court and can you have a review? The review that you get in court under this bill, under the ICC Act, under any administrative act, for that matter, is not a review that determines the merits of the claim. It is a review, and I will quote the words of a member of the ICC, Mr. Mahaffie, who appeared before us. He says unless they did something arbitrary or unless the application is filed in a way that the corporation was not legally authorized to file it, or there is some defect that is patent.

You can only review arbitrary decisions. You cannot review their judgment. That is what I think the minority stockholder should have a right to do. I think he should have a right to review their judgment. I do not think that would cause any great delay, either.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEA. I take it that under the method the gentleman proposes you would have to have two hearings on all questions involved, one before the Commission and one before the court?

Mr. RABIN. I am getting to that now. They say that their objection to that type of review is that these bankruptcy proceedings have been in court for many years. True, they have been in court for a long time, but the inception of those proceedings is in court, and most of the time it takes in court is for the parties to get together on an agreement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman seven additional minutes.

Mr. RABIN. Mr. Chairman, before you get to court this plan has been worked out. Time must be taken to reach an agreement of at least 75 percent. That time must be taken in any event. All it requires is a motion in court. The court does not have to work it out. I have had some experience in this type of work. I had the privilege of helping write a reorganization bill in New York State with respect to real estate, where we had as many as 7,500 bondholders in one single issue. I reorganized 15,000 issues affecting the rights of 250,000 bondholders. I reorganized a billion dollars' worth of mortgages with 15,000 separate issues, and we had a court review in each. We did the whole job in 4 years, and I wrote to the Governor, asking to abolish my office. We finished the job.

Now, it can be done and it should be done.

The next amendment is this: Where a bondholder is in a minority and they cut down his interest to 50 percent, or in any other way, I say he should have a right to say "appraise the value of my bonds and give it to me either in cash or provide security therefor." I do not say to let the bondholder strike and let him get 100 percent of his dollar, or else let him hold up the proceeding. I do not say he should do that, but give him the value of his bonds. I do not say give him cash, because it may embarrass the reorganized company to give him cash. The railroad may not have it. I say provide for some security. He has a contract.

True, the Constitution does not prohibit the United States from violating a contract, but is there any reason for us to do it? That is no reason for us to do it. But, the due process clause may prevent us from doing just that. At the hearing cases were cited which we were told held the violation of a contract to be constitutional. What cases did they cite? They cited the Gold Clause case. I am not going to consider whether that was a good decision or a bad decision. That was the decision and that is the law. I venture the opinion that most of the Members to my left did not think at the time the decision was handed down that it was good law, but that decision was written in a period of emergency. That decision was written at a time when not to do it would cause great national harm. In some instances a decision like that is justified even though it does appear to violate the terms of the Constitution. If I be wrong on that then I am too generous to those who have views on the constitutionality of these provisions. But to provide for the protection of the right of contract, as I ask provision be made, is not to do anything that is unknown to American jurisprudence. We strive to protect the right of contract, and again I say, merely because we have the right to abrogate the terms of a contract is no just reason for doing that, and we can avoid it without endangering the plan, without hampering reorganization and without depriving any holder of a bond of his rights as given to him under the mortgage.

I am for this bill. I think we ought to accept these safeguards which do not impair its efficacy.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABIN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WOLVERTON. The gentleman made reference to the Gold Clause case, and very properly so, because I think the decision in that case resolves most of the doubts that he otherwise would have had in his mind. Does the gentleman want to make any reference to the decision and the principles upon which they were founded in the Holding Company Act cases?

Mr. RABIN. I will say this, we are not going to resolve the question of constitutionality on this floor. Whether I believe it to be constitutional is immaterial, but I do say—that even if this bill be constitutional, and I will pass the question of constitutionality, while I seriously doubt it—even if it be constitutional, there is no good and valid reason why a bondholder should not have the right to have court approval on the merits of a plan; why there should not be an adequate review and also why the bondholder should not have his contract protected, if we can do that by the provisions of the bill.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Does not the gentleman fear that his amendment to provide for the fixing of the value of the dissenting holder's securities would lead to innumerable hold-ups or a very polite form of legal blackmail, and is not that the very illustration cited by Mr. Mahaffie in the hearing regarding the New England railroad referred to?

Mr. RABIN. My answer is no, first, and I will tell the gentleman the difference. In that case the bondholder insisted on 100 cents on the dollar plus accrued interest. Here all I provide for is that the value of the bond be fixed at the time of the reorganization proceedings. Second, here I do not provide that he be paid cash. I provide that some security be given him for it. Third, I assume in these reorganizations that the value of the bonds will go up, otherwise it is of no benefit to the bondholder to reorganize, and the bondholder who dissents gets his value fixed as of the time of the reorganization, which would be less.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RABIN. If we are going to pay the man the value of his security as of the time the reorganization was started, then it would be less, and there would be no inducement for him to dissent.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. It does appear to me as if this is opening the door to a lawyers' holiday. There are an infinite number of possible interventions by people who would like to get some advantage from it.

Mr. RABIN. I can only give the gentleman my experience, where I reorganized a billion dollars worth of mortgages, with 15,000 separate issues, and we did it all in 4 years, and there were no strikes, no hold-ups, and everybody came through all right. That is my experience over 4 years.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KLEIN. I want to carry further the point that the gentleman from Pennsylvania made, which is the question of delay by an objection by a dissenting

bondholder. Will there be any delay? Will it have to go through the courts and thus hold up the entire reorganization proceedings?

Mr. RABIN. Under my amendment, the entire reorganization is finished before there is any chance to go to court. The plan is approved, they have the 75 percent, and the decision of the ICC is made. It is on motion, and the court can pass on it summarily.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABIN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Would it not necessitate a hearing by the court before its determination could be made as to whether or not the court would approve the plan? Then it would go before the Commission, as I understand.

Mr. RABIN. No; the Commission can do it. It does not become effective until after the court approves it.

Mr. HARRIS. It must have the approval of the district court?

Mr. RABIN. That is right.

Mr. HARRIS. Then it would necessitate a hearing before the court before the court could give its approval.

Mr. RABIN. It is in the court's discretion.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABIN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. I know the gentleman from New York has made a very careful study of this bill. Will he tell us very briefly under what circumstances a carrier can invoke the provisions of this law? What is the legislative intent?

Mr. RABIN. The carrier can come in and petition the ICC for a reorganization of its bonded indebtedness, or of any particular class of bonded indebtedness, if it believes that such reorganization will offset financial dangers, and the Commission can grant it if it finds it is in the interest of the corporation, the bondholders, the public, and the stockholders, and if it has 75 percent consent.

Mr. CARROLL. I wanted to have the record show that the Commission itself has to make a finding as a condition precedent that such a condition did exist.

Mr. RABIN. That is right; the Commission will have to find those things. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. CARROLL. The next question I have to ask concerns the gentleman's amendment on the minority bondholder. Could he have been in agreement originally with the 75 percent, and then protest later?

Mr. RABIN. No, that is only for a minority bondholder, one who dissents.

Mr. CARROLL. Then he would go into court and have his day in court, is that the gentleman's idea?

Mr. RABIN. Yes. Then, if it is decided against him, he can have his bond appraised and step away from it. I fear that 75 percent of the bondholders can force out the 25 percent minority. It would be difficult but it can be done. I do not want to leave any loopholes in a bill of this kind where 75 percent can push 25 percent around.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

(Mr. HALE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I do not suppose I can add anything very material to what has been said by the very able speakers who have already discussed this bill.

I want, however, to attest my interest in the passage of the measure because I think it is a desirable and constructive piece of legislation.

Its purpose is certainly a laudable one. Its purpose is to enable a railroad which is in financial difficulties or is on the verge of getting into financial difficulties to alter or modify its obligations without the expense and long delays incident to procedure under receivership or under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act.

Of course, there would not be any need of legislation of this sort if we could be perfectly sure that the railroads would never again be in financial difficulties, but, unfortunately, it is almost certain that they will be in financial difficulties. In fact, our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is now engaged in hearings on bills in which the financial difficulties of the railroads are revealed.

We have a bill before us now in which it is sought to give the railroads in effect a subsidy to buy boxcars on the theory that the boxcars will not be obtained in any other way. I do not say that this is a sound piece of legislation. I do not say it is going to pass, but I do say that it indicates the very grave concern which not only the railroads have but the shippers have, for the roads' financial soundness. The railroads, of course, had unprecedented gross incomes during the war, but the peak of their net income came in 1942 before the expenses of operation increased as they did subsequently. Last year, in 1946, the railroad net, I think, was at the rate of 3½ percent on their capital investment, and the Interstate Commerce Commission granted them a belated rate increase effective the first day of January 1947. But it is doubtful if the railway net income this year, even with the increased rates, will be as good as it was in 1946.

Of course, if you have railroad strikes and if you have a depression, which dries up the gross revenues of the railroads, then the roads' position is going to be even worse.

The war showed us, if we needed to be shown, how completely we were dependent upon the American railroads. Had they come to a standstill, the war itself would have come to a standstill.

The bill provides a new section to part I of the Interstate Commerce Act to be known as section 20b. I call attention to the fact that this legislation is an amendment to the Interstate Commerce Act. It does not repeal any provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act with reference to appeals and so on.

Under this bill, as has been explained, the embarrassed road may modify any provision or any clause of its bonds, notes, or debentures, or other evidences of indebtedness except their equipment trust certificates, when the Interstate Commerce Commission after hearing shall make four findings.

I particularly call attention to the fact that we have provided for due process in connection with hearings before the Interstate Commerce Commission. The committee amendments which appear on lines 17 and 18, page 4, provide for reasonable notice of any hearing, by mail, advertisement, or otherwise, as the Commission may find practicable and may direct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. HALE. The Interstate Commerce Commission must find that the modifications are within the scope of paragraph 1; that they are in the public interest; that they are in the best interests of the railroad and each class of the stockholders; and that they are not adverse to the interests of any of the creditors that are affected. If the Commission makes these findings, the modifications must be referred to the bondholders for their assent. Seventy-five percent must assent.

I have listened with very great interest to the remarks of my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. RABIN]. I appreciate his concern for the constitutionality of this legislation, but I believe that one can affirm its constitutionality as safely as one can affirm the constitutionality of any legislation. See pages 25 and 26 of the hearings and page 4 of the report. It seems to me that the amendments which he proposes with respect to dissenting bondholders would gravely impair, if they did not completely nullify, the value of this legislation, because they simply would offer a bondholder an incentive to dissent and not to go along.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALE. I yield.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. The gentleman from New York [Mr. RABIN] stated that his amendment was designed to see that 75 percent of the bondholders did not push 25 percent around. Is it not more likely that his amendment would enable some part of the dissenting 25 percent, through this proceeding, to push the 75 percent around to the disadvantage of the general public as well as a majority of the bondholders?

Mr. HALE. I think what the gentleman says is precisely right. I think that is exactly what would happen. Of course, the reason we want this legislation at all is that it is now too easy for a small minority to push a large majority around.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine has again expired.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Forty-five Members are present; not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 84]

Allen, Ill.	Flannagan	Macy
Anderson, Calif.	Fuller	Mansfield, Tex.
Bell	Gallagher	Monroney
Bennett, Mich.	Gifford	Norton
Bland	Granger	Patman
Blatnik	Hart	Pfeifer
Bloom	Hartley	Ploeser
Bonner	Havenner	Powell
Boykin	Hébert	Rains
Buckley	Hill	Richlman
Celler	Hope	Rivers
Clark	Jones, N. C.	Sarbacher
Clements	Jones, Wash.	Sheppard
Coffin	Kearns	Sikes
Combs	Kefauver	Smith, Ohio
Coudert	Kelley	Towe
Cravens	Kennedy	Van Zandt
Dawson, Ill.	Keogh	West
Dolliver	Larcade	Wigglesworth
Engle, Calif.	Lucas	Winstead
Fernandez	Lusk	Wood
Fisher	McMillan, S. C.	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLER of Nebraska, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having under consideration the bill (H. R. 2298), and finding itself without a quorum, he directed the roll to be called, when 361 Members responded to their names, a quorum; and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CARSON].

Mr. CARSON. Mr. Chairman, I feel it is necessary now to go over a little more what we have already gone over because so many of the Members were not present at that time.

We are now considering H. R. 2298, which is a reorganization bill for modification of railroad financial structures. This bill was introduced by the chairman of our committee in the form suggested, and upon the recommendation of the Interstate Commerce Commission. I know of no other commission that is more familiar with railroads than the Interstate Commerce Commission. If you will look over their annual reports for the past few years, you will find that in their fifty-seventh annual report, also in the fifty-ninth and in the sixtieth annual report, they included recommendations for the enactment of such legislation as you have before you now.

There is undoubtedly need for this legislation, and we need it at this particular time. Even though the railroads, as we know, are privately owned, no other industry is affected with a greater degree of public interest. In capital invested and revenues earned it is among the largest in the Nation. There is no other industry that I know of in this United States that is of more importance to the Nation, both in peace and in war. The American people collectively have a tremendous personal and financial interest in the railroads. They have even greater interest in the continuity of efficient and adequate service on the railroads. I say there is need for this for the simple reason that we had before this a law as you will remember in 1939, the law which was passed at that time which lasted for only approximately 1 year. In 1942 the McLaughlin bill came in and that expired November 1, 1945. There is need at this particular time because there is no other legislation on the statute books that meets the situation exactly as it is now.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARSON. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I think it might be well at this point to explain to the membership of the House that the quorum call recently made was not on behalf of the committee nor in connection with this bill.

There appears to be no particular argument concerning the bill, but there may be some amendments offered at the conclusion of the debate.

Mr. CARSON. That is a correct statement and I thank the gentleman for calling attention to it.

Mr. Chairman, we had before our committee some very fine men. I wish just briefly to call attention to some of the testimony they gave and the position they take with reference to the bill.

Mr. Charles D. Mahaffie, Commissioner of the Interstate Commerce Commission, in a letter to the committee made the following statement:

It has seemed to the Commission that we have arrived at a time when we could well ask the Congress, as we have, to consider facilitating voluntary reorganizations where it can be shown to be in the public interest and where a sufficient number of creditors affected consent. It is on this basis that we recommend this bill.

It is on that basis that the bill is recommended to us.

I want to bring the attention of the membership particularly to part of the testimony of Mr. Mahaffie in which a question was asked by Mr. HOWELL, and you will find it on page 12 of the hearings:

Mr. MAHAFFIE. The desirability of such legislation and such a procedure being available is, I think, illustrated by the present earnings' history of the railroads. For the first 2 months of this year, out of 126 class I railroads, whose reports are analyzed in statement M-125 issued by our Bureau of Transport Economics and Statistics which I have before me, 39 of those railroads had a deficit in net income. I do not mean to infer that those 39 railroads will necessarily have to readjust their obligations, but it at least points at the possibility that exists in that regard.

For the year 1946, of a similar number of class I railroads, 35 showed a deficit in net income.

For the year 1945, 26 showed a deficit in net income. I cite those, as I say, merely as showing the possibility that among the railroads there will be some who will find it desirable and whose creditors will find it desirable that their obligations be revised.

He also brings out very forcibly to us the only law that we have on the statute books at the present time which will meet this situation, which is the section 77 procedure but that is still a very elaborate, very expensive, and very time-consuming proceeding.

I just want to bring to your attention in passing a few of those proceedings in this 77 bankruptcy bill. I think it will be of interest to you.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield three additional minutes to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CARSON. Under section 77 proceedings the extent of the expense involved, ranging all the way from $1,811.95, for a relatively small road, to $2,135,778 and $2,891,121 in the case of two large carriers.

Even under section 15 procedure, which has now expired, as I recall, the B. & O. Railroad in a reorganization was nearly 2 years getting the reorganization started and it cost $1,500,000. That is the situation we are faced with now, and I bring these to your attention to show the need of this legislation.

I want to pass hurriedly on in my limited time and come to some of the people who appeared before our committee who are definitely in favor of this legislation. We had a letter from Halsey Stuart & Co. of New York, in which they make the following statement:

All that was then said in our behalf in support of the Mahaffie bill is, we believe, now equally applicable in support of H. R. 2298 (which is identical, except for a few minor language changes and the beneficial addition of paragraph (11) which clarifies the exemption from the Securities Act of 1933 of securities issued in proceedings under H. R. 2298).

As well as reaffirming our views previously expressed, we would point out that the expiration (since November 1945) of another year and a half in the pendency of railroad reorganization proceedings which have now been pending for 12 or 14 years, has served to illustrate even more forcefully the desirability of some more workable and prompt method of adjusting the financial embarrassments of railroads. In our opinion, the enactment of H. R. 2298 would provide a much-needed alternative to reorganizations under section 77 and would be of great and lasting benefit to railroad credit. We believe that passage of your bill is desirable from the standpoint of both the public interest and of the interest of railroad creditors and other security holders.

I want to go a little into the testimony of Mr. Carter Fort, vice president and general counsel of the Association of American Railroads. This is what he had to say:

We are very strongly in favor of H. R. 2298.

He further states:

Experience has demonstrated that a great deal of time, perhaps several years, is consumed by section 77 proceedings and that very large expenses are incurred in such a proceeding. This is only to be expected in view of the complexity of a section 77 case and of the many issues and interests involved.

We will now go over to the testimony of Fred N. Oliver, who was speaking on behalf of two organizations. One was the Railroad Security Owners' Association, in which there are 354 members with bonds amounting to approximately $2,500,000,000, or something in excess of 20 percent of the total bonded indebtedness of the railroads of the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. CARSON. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Oliver also stated that he appeared on behalf of the railroad committee of the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks located in 17 States, that they have about 16,000,000 depositors and that most of these banks are also members of the Railroad Security Owners' Association.

He stated definitely in our hearings:

I have been instructed by the executive committee of the Railroad Security Owners' Association, and the Railroad Committee of the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks to appear before this committee in support of H. R. 2298. We believe that this measure, if enacted, will be beneficial to the railroads, to the security holders and to the public. We believe it will do much to re-establish confidence in railroad securities, railroad investments, for reasons which I shall outline.

Those are a few of the people who appeared before us in our hearings.

In summing up this matter, it seems to me we should look at the entire situation. We are definitely doing something in the interest of the public because when a railroad operates under threatened bankruptcy it will skip on maintenance and thus reduce the number of its employees. A poorly maintained railroad is not good for the traveling public, it is not good for the employees, it is not good for the investors, it is not good for the stockholders or the Nation. This is an effort to do something before the damage is actually done.

As we read the bill you will find every single step that is taken is under the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission. It is a voluntary act on the part of the railroads. They appear before the Commission. They file their application if they so desire and the Commission even controls the manner in which they will file it. Nothing possible can be done in the matter until at least 75 percent of the security holders have consented and they are within the Interstate Commerce Commission control.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN].

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I am not a member of the committee reporting this bill, but I am a member of the Committee on Corporate Reorganization of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York. This committee has had this question under consideration, and although I cannot find the report which was filed, I do know that the committee considered this question and reported favorably on it. There does not appear to be any objection to the bill, but my colleague from New York [Mr. RABIN], a member of the committee, will introduce two amendments later on which I feel will make this a better bill. One will provide for court review of decisions of the ICC and the other will add additional protection for the dissenting minority bondholders, the 25 percent or less group.

I want to clear up some misunderstanding about the effect of the amendments to be offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. RABIN]. He will go into it in detail when he speaks on those amendments. It would not delay the reorganization proceedings under this act at all. If the 75 percent of the bondholders agree to the plan, the plan will go through. The only additional protection that we would like to give the dissenting bondholders is that they can come in and say, "We do not want to go along with this plan. There will be no hold-up or strike suit, such as exists at the present time. All we want is this: We do not want to go along with the plan. We want to get paid either in cash or securities as of this date.

"We want an appraisal made as to the value of our bonds as of now, and say that later on—we do not care when that may be, at some future time—we want to get the value of our security as of this time." It would not hold up the proceedings. The reorganization would go through according to plan if 75 percent agreed, and the other fundamentals under this bill were present. But it would give that additional advantage to the minority, to the dissenting bondholders who do not want to go along with the plan. All he wants is to get back the value of his securities; not what he paid for them or what they would be worth at maturity, but simply what they are worth at the present time. I do not see how anybody can object to that, and I hope, gentlemen, when the amendment is offered, it will be adopted by the Committee.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOWELL].

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Chairman, this bill came to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with the unanimous recommendation of the Interstate Commerce Commission in a letter of transmittal by Mr. Walter M. W. Splawn, chairman of the legislative committee, Interstate Commerce Commission. Mr. Charles D. Mahaffie of the Commission appeared before the committee in support of the measure. There was no opposition offered to it by anyone at any time.

As has been previously pointed out by my colleagues on the committee, it provides a simple and inexpensive manner by which railroads may reorganize without being forced into our regular bankruptcy courts under the ordinary proceedings of section 77 (b) of the Bankruptcy Act. It is expedient and it is vital, and the bill comes to the floor without opposition. If the Members will read just the first opening paragraph of the report which accompanies the bill, I know you will agree that the measure does deserve support and should be enacted not only in the interest of the investing public, the railroad users, the shippers, but everyone interested in the future of our railroad industry as it contributes to the economic welfare of our system of private enterprise.

So, therefore, I join with my colleagues in urging the Members of the House of Representatives to support the measure which comes to the floor with the unanimous support of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which held hearings on the bill as advocated by the members of the Interstate Commerce Commission, at which time no amendments were suggested by anyone, and therefore in its simple uncontroversial form it should be passed today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ELLSWORTH].

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I take this time not so much to argue for or to extol the virtues of this bill, which I think have been thoroughly explained. I think every one knows by now that this bill is not controversial in nature. But I thought it might be interesting, Mr. Chairman, to the membership of the House to give a word of explanation regarding the procedure of our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and describe the development and origin of a bill of this kind, and of this bill.

Under the rules of the House in force this year the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was not materially changed in its form from what it had been in previous years, but a new policy was adopted, a policy which has not been adopted or used by any other committee, and that policy was that all of the agencies, boards, commissions, and so forth, whose legislation our committee handles, have come before our committee in informal sessions for a discussion of the work of their organization, their legislation presently in existence, and in every case where it was possible we discussed with these boards, agencies, and commissions such legislation as might be pertinent to the activities of their organizations.

In the talks we have had with the several agencies I have been particularly and especially impressed with the fact that of all the agencies the Interstate Commerce Commission, the oldest, in fact, of all the independent agencies, is the one organization that came before our committee and said in so many words, "We operate only and strictly within the statute given us by Congress. We do not try to stretch it or do our own legislating. We simply stay within the law that Congress lays down."

Then it came before the committee recommending certain pieces of legislation which it thought would be beneficial to the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, I yield two additional minutes to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. We found in our discussions with some of the other agencies that we had to discuss with them rather frankly the fact that they have overstepped the bounds of existing statutes, and we had to ask them, "Why have you not suggested additional law if you feel that you should operate with that type of authority?" But not so with the Interstate Commerce Commission. They stay within the bounds.

They suggested this piece of legislation. They gave us adequate reasons why it should be enacted. They presented complete and satisfactory proof of its merits. The result is that a bill was drawn, complete hearings were held, and the bill was reported by our committee unanimously.

The bill will have the beneficial result, as has been described here many times this afternoon, of saving railroad companies from taking one of two disastrous choices, to go either into bankruptcy under the 77–B statute or into receivership, neither of which procedures is satisfactory in any respect.

This bill when enacted will allow the Interstate Commerce Commission to bring about an orderly reorganization without disrupting either the financial structure or the organizational structure of any railroad corporation. I strongly urge the passage of this bill. I feel certain there will be no objection to it on the floor here today.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I realize there is little I can add to the explanation of the bill made by the members of the committee who have preceded me, but I do want to take just a minute or two to commend the ranking members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the members on both sides of the aisle, for the consideration and assistance they have given to the 10 new members of that committee. They sat patiently through hearings listening to testimony that was very beneficial to the new members of the committee but with which they were very familiar. It has been a pleasure to work with that committee under the leadership we have had.

I should like to take just a brief minute to discuss the question of the amendments that have been suggested today by the gentleman from New York [Mr. RABIN]. The first thing that occurred to members of the Commerce Committee was that we wanted to be sure to protect minority interests among the bondholders of our railroads. That was discussed very fully in the committee. Mr. Mahaffie, of the ICC, was quite frank both on and off the record, in informal discussions, as to the wisdom of such a course.

I would remind you that many of the rulings that are now issued by the ICC are much more far reaching in their effect on the bondholders of our railroads than any agreement they might approve under this legislation, still this legislation provides for exactly the same review for any order issued under its authority by the ICC that is now provided in many other statutes relating to the ICC.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I hope this Committee today will not in the limited time that is available to us try to amend this bill. The question raised by the Rabin amendment has been gone into thoroughly by the committee. As I believe has been stated, it had the unanimous support of the committee and there were no minority views filed. No one knows just what the delays might be if in our desire to aid minority interests we should further amend the bill.

There certainly is this danger, as has been shown in the testimony concerning voluntary reorganizations of this kind, as was effected in the case of the Maine Central and the Boston & Maine Railroads that with the desire to properly protect minority interests we sometimes accomplish simply this—that the so-called smart boys who insist on their pound of flesh get theirs to the detriment and to the disadvantage of the other bondholders.

I believe that with the court provisions which now apply to ICC rulings every bondholder is protected.

The CHAIRMAN. General debate has been concluded. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That it is hereby declared to be in aid of the national transportation policy of the Congress, as set forth in the preamble of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, in order to promote the public interest in avoiding the deterioration of service and the interruption of employment which inevitably attend the threat of financial difficulties and which follow upon financial collapse and in order to promote the public interest in increased stability of values of railroad securities with resulting greater confidence therein of investors, to assure, insofar as possible, continuity of sound financial condition of common carriers subject to part I of said act, and to enable said common carriers, insofar as possible, to avoid prospective financial difficulties, inability to meet debts as they mature, and insolvency. To assist in accomplishing these ends and because certain classes of the obligations of such carriers are in the usual case held by a very large number of holders, and, further, to enable modification and reformation of provisions of the aforesaid classes of obligations and of provisions of the instruments pursuant to which they are issued or by which they are secured in cases where such modification and reformation shall have become necessary or desirable in the public interest in order to avoid obstruction to or interference with the economical, efficient, and orderly conduct by such carriers of their affairs, it is deemed necessary to provide means, in the manner and with the safeguards herein provided, for the alteration and modification, without the assent of every holder thereof, of the provisions of such classes of obligations and of the instruments pursuant to which they are outstanding or by which they are secured.

Part I of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, is amended by adding after section 20a the following new section:

"20b (1). It shall be lawful (any express provision contained in any mortgage, indenture, deed of trust, or other instrument to the contrary notwithstanding), with the approval and authorization of the Commission, as provided in paragraph (2) hereof, for a carrier as defined in section 20a (1) of this part (other than a carrier in equity receivership or in process of reorganization under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act) to alter or modify (a) any provision of any class or classes of its bonds, notes, debentures, or other evidences of indebtedness (whether secured, unsecured, matured, or unmatured) issued under any mortgage, indenture, deed of trust, or other instrument of like nature, such bonds, notes, debentures, or other evidences of indebtedness being hereinafter in this section sometimes called 'obligation'; (b) any provision of any mortgage, indenture, deed of trust, or other instrument pursuant to which any class of its obligations shall have been issued or by which any class of its obligations is secured: *Provided*, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to any equipment-trust certificates in respect of which a carrier is obligated, or to any evidences of indebtedness of a carrier the payment of which is secured in any manner solely by equipment, or to any instrument, whether an agreement, lease, conditional-sale agreement, or otherwise pursuant to which such equipment-trust certificates or such evidences of indebtedness shall have been issued or by which they are secured.

"(2) Whenever an alteration or modification is proposed under paragraph (1) hereof, the carrier seeking authority therefor shall, pursuant to such rules and regulations as the Commission shall prescribe, present an application to the Commission. Upon presentation of any such application, the Commission may, in its discretion, but need not, as a condition precedent to further consideration, require the applicant to secure assurances of assent to such alteration or modification by holders of such percentage of the aggregate principal amount outstanding of the obligations affected by such alteration or modification as the Commission shall in its discretion determine. If the Commission shall not require the applicant to secure any such assurance, or when such assurances as the Commission may require shall have been secured, the Commission shall set such application for public hearing and the carrier shall give such notice of such hearing in such manner, by advertisement, or otherwise, as the Commission may find practicable and may direct, to holders of such of its classes of securities and to such other persons in interest as the Commission shall determine to be appropriate and shall direct. If the Commission, after hearing, in addition to making (in any case where such alteration or modification involves an issuance of securities) the findings required by paragraph (2) of section 20a, shall find that, subject to such terms and conditions and with such amendments as it shall determine to be just and reasonable, the proposed alteration or modification—

"(a) is within the scope of paragraph (1);

"(b) will be in the public interest;

"(c) will be in the best interests of the carrier, of each class of its stockholders, and of the holders of each class of its obligations affected by such modification or alteration; and

"(d) will not be adverse to the interests of any creditor of the carrier not affected by such modification or alteration,

then (unless the applicant carrier shall withdraw its application) the Commission shall cause the carrier, in such manner as it shall direct, to submit the proposed alteration or modification (with such terms, conditions, and amendments, if any) to the holders of each class of its obligations affected thereby, for acceptance or rejection. All letters, circulars, advertisements, and other communications, and all financial and statistical statements, or summaries thereof, to be used in soliciting the assents or the opposition of such holders shall, before being so used, be submitted to the Commission for its approval as to correctness and sufficiency of the material facts stated therein. If the Commission shall find that as a result of such submission the proposed alteration or modification has been assented to by the holders of at least 75 percent of the aggregate principal amount outstanding of each class of obligations affected thereby (or in any case where 75 percent thereof is held by fewer than 25 holders, such larger percentage, if any, as the Commission may determine to be just and reasonable and in the public interest), the Commission shall enter an order approving and authorizing the proposed alteration or modification upon the terms and conditions and with the amendments, if any, so determined to be just and reasonable. Such order shall make provision as to the time when such alteration or modification shall become and be binding, which may be upon publication of a declaration to that effect by the carrier, or otherwise, as the Commission may determine. Any alteration or modification which shall become and be binding pusuant to the approval and authority of the Commission hereunder shall be binding upon

each holder of any obligation of the carrier of each class affected by such alteration or modification, and upon any trustee or other party to any instrument under which any such class of obligations shall have been issued or by which it is secured, and when any alteration or modification shall become and be binding the rights of each such holder and of any such trustee or other party shall be correspondingly altered or modified.

"(3) For the purposes of this section a class of obligations shall be deemed to be affected by any modification or alteration proposed only (a) if a modification or alteration is proposed as to any provision of such class of obligations, or (b) if any modification or alteration is proposed as to any provision of any instrument pursuant to which such class of obligations shall have been issued or shall be secured: *Provided*, That in any case where more than one class of obligations shall have been issued and be outstanding or shall be secured pursuant to any instrument, any alteration or modification proposed as to any provision of such instrument which does not relate to all of the classes of obligations issued thereunder, shall be deemed to affect only the class or classes of obligations to which such alteration or modification is related. For the purpose of the finding of the Commission referred to in paragraph (2) of this section as to whether the required percentage of the aggregate principal amount outstanding of each class of obligations affected by any proposed alteration or modification has assented to the making of such alteration or modification, any obligation which secures any evidence or evidences of indebtedness of the carrier or of any company controlling or controlled by the carrier shall be deemed to be outstanding unless the Commission in its discretion determines that the proposed alteration or modification does not materially affect the interests of the holder or holders of the evidence or evidences of indebtedness secured by such obligation. Whenever any such pledged obligation is, for said purposes, to be deemed outstanding, assent in respect of such obligations, as to any proposed alteration or modification, may be given only (any express or implied provision in any mortgage, indenture, deed of trust, note, or other instrument to the contrary notwithstanding) as follows: (a) Where such obligation is pledged as security under a mortgage, indenture, deed of trust, or other instrument, pursuant to which any evidences of indebtedness are issued and outstanding, by the holders of a majority in principal amount of such evidences of indebtedness, or (b) where such obligation secures an evidence or evidences of indebtedness not issued pursuant to such a mortgage, indenture, deed of trust, or other instrument, by the holder or holders of such evidence or evidences of indebtedness; and in any such case the Commission, in addition to the submission referred to in paragraph (2) of this section, shall cause the carrier in such manner as it shall direct to submit the proposed alteration or modification (with such terms, conditions, and amendments, if any, as the Commission shall have determined to be just and reasonable) for acceptance or rejection, to the holders of the evidences of indebtedness issued and outstanding pursuant to such mortgage, indenture, deed of trust, or other instrument, or to the holder or holders of such evidence or evidences of indebtedness not so issued, and such proposed alteration or modification need not be submitted to the trustee of any such mortgage, indenture, deed of trust, or other instrument, but assent in respect of any such obligation shall be determined as hereinbefore in this section provided. For the purposes of this section an obligation or an evidence of indebtedness shall not be deemed to be outstanding if in the determination of the Commission the assent of the holder thereof to any proposed alteration or modification is within the control of the carrier or of any person or persons controlling the carrier.

"(4) (a) Any authorization and approval hereunder of any alteration or modification of a provision of any class of obligations of a carrier or of a provision of any instrument pursuant to which a class of obligations has been issued, or by which it is secured, shall be deemed to constitute authorization and approval of a corresponding alteration or modification of the obligation of any other carrier which has assumed liability in respect of such class of obligations as guarantor, endorser, surety, or otherwise: *Provided*, That such other carrier consents in writing to such alteration or modification of such class of obligations in respect of which it has assumed liability or of the instrument pursuant to which such class of obligations has been issued or by which it is secured and, such consent having been given, any such corresponding alteration or modification shall become effective, without other action, when the alteration or modification of such class of obligations or of such instrument shall become and be binding.

"(b) Any person who is liable or obligated contingently or otherwise on any class or classes of obligations issued by a carrier shall, with respect to such class or classes of obligations, for the purposes of this section, be deemed a carrier.

"(5) The authority conferred by this section shall be exclusive and plenary and any carrier, in respect of any alteration or modification authorized and approved by the Commission hereunder, shall have full power to make any such alterations or modification and to take any actions incidental or appropriate thereto, and may make any such alteration or modification and take any such actions, and any such alteration or modification may be made without securing the approval of the Commission under any other section of this act or other paragraph of this section, and without securing approval of any State authority, and any carrier and its officers and employees and any other persons, participating in the making of an alteration or modification approved and authorized under the provisions of this section or the taking of any such actions, shall be, and they hereby are, relieved from the operation of all restraints, limitations, and prohibitions of law, Federal, State, or municipal, insofar as may be necessary to enable them to make and carry into effect the alteration or modification so approved and authorized in accordance with the conditions and with the amendments, if any, imposed by the Commission. Any power granted by this section to any carrier shall be deemed to be in addition to and in modification of its powers under its corporate charter or under the laws of any State. The provisions of this section shall not affect in any way the negotiability of any obligation of any carrier or of the obligation of any carrier which has assumed liability in respect thereto.

"(6) The Commission shall require periodical or special reports from each carrier which shall hereafter secure from the Commission approval and authorization of any alteration or modification under this section, which shall show, in such detail as the Commission may require, the action taken by the carrier in the making of such alteration or modification.

"(7) The provisions of this section are permissive and not mandatory and shall not require any carrier to obtain authorization and approval of the Commission hereunder for the making of any alteration or modification of any provision or any of its obligations or of any class thereof or of any provision of any mortgage, indenture, deed of trust, or other instrument, which it may be able lawfully to make in any other manner, whether by reason of provisions for the making of such alteration or modification in any such mortgage, indenture, deed of trust, or other instrument, or otherwise: *Provided*, That the provisions of paragraph (2) of section 20a, if applicable to such alteration or modification made otherwise than pursuant to the provisions of this section, shall continue to be so applicable.

"(8) The provisions of paragraph (6) of section 20a, except the provisions thereof in respect of hearings, shall apply to applications made under this section. In connection with any order entered by the Commission pursuant to paragraph (2) hereof, the Commission may from time to time, for good cause shown, make such supplemental orders in the premises as it may deem necessary or appropriate, and may by any such supplemental order modify the provisions of any such order, subject always to the requirements of said paragraph (2).

"(9) The provisions of subdivision (a) of section 14 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 shall not apply to any solicitation in connection with a proposed alteration or modification pursuant to this section.

"(10) The Commission shall have the power to make such rules and regulations appropriate to its administration of the provisions of this section as it shall deem necessary or desirable.

"(11) Any issuance of securities under this section which shall be found by the Commission to comply with the requirements of paragraph (2) of section 20a shall be deemed to be an issuance which is subject to the provisions of section 20a within the meaning of section 3 (a) (6) of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended. Section 5 of said Securities Act shall not apply to the issuance, sale, or exchange of certificates of deposit representing securities of, or claims against, any carrier which are issued by committees in proceedings under this section, and said certificates of deposit and transactions therein shall, for the purposes of said Securities Act, be deemed to be added to those exempted by sections 3 and 4, respectively, of said Securities Act."

Mr. WOLVERTON (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with, that the bill be considered as read, be printed in the RECORD at this point, and be open for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 2, line 25, strike out "20b (1)" and insert "SEC. 20b (1)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 4, line 17, strike out the word "such" and insert the word "reasonable."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 4, line 18, after the word "by" insert "mail."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RABIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RABIN: On page 6, line 7, after the word "Commission" insert a comma and the words "after having obtained the approval of a district court of the United States upon notice given in the same manner as provided in this paragraph for hearings before the Commission."

Mr. RABIN. Mr. Chairman, during the general debate I discussed this proposed amendment at some length. I do not wish to burden this committee with a repetition of my remarks. However, in view of the fact that so many Members are present now who were not present at the time I discussed the matter, I wish to say at the outset that this is a good bill. It is a step forward in the direction of railroad reorganization. But I do think we should add two safeguards to protect the rights of minority bondholders. The one safeguard that I shall discuss at this time, because that is the subject of this amendment, is the giving to the minority bondholder the right to have a decision of the Interstate Commerce Commission reviewed by the court, or rather to give him the right to have a plan accepted by the Interstate Commerce Commission reviewed by the court before it becomes effective.

As I said, I have a high regard for the Interstate Commerce Commission. I have a high regard for the courts, too. But the courts have procedures where the decision of the court may be reviewed.

You will be told that under the Interstate Commerce Act a review is possible at the present time. I say that the type of review that is granted under the interstate commerce law is not the type of review I have in mind, or the type of review contemplated by this amendment. This bill calls for the reorganization of bonds or securities of a railroad that is still solvent; not in bankruptcy; not in receivership; but a railroad that merely contemplates financial difficulties. The Interstate Commerce Commission will have the right to cut down, if it so chooses, with the consent of 75 percent, the principal of the bond owned by a bondholder; to extend the date of maturity; to reduce the amount of interest. That is giving it wide discretion. It is giving it important powers. It is giving it the right to breach a contract. It is giving it the right to modify a contract. I say, let the dissenting minority bondholder have the right to go to court, and permit the court to review not only for patent defects or arbitrary decisions, which is the only review that is now allowed under the law, but review that decision on the merits. Let the court determine whether the Commission exercised its powers reasonably and equitably.

We are told also that it would take too much time for such review. There is no excuse for the denial of justice because the administration of justice requires time or effort. And it would not take too much time. It only requires a motion. The time taken in reorganization is the agreement on the plan. Before this is taken to court, the plan will already have been agreed to. A decision will have been made by the Interstate Commerce Commission. Give the minority bondholders a few months at least—I do not think it would take that long—to have that decision reviewed on the merits. That is the least you can do for one who is having his contract modified, who is having some of his rights taken away from him. I do not think it is asking too much. It will safeguard the bill. It will make for progress. It will strengthen the possibility that this bill may be held constitutional.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABIN. I yield.

Mr. KLEIN. I ask the gentleman, as chairman of the Mortgage Commission of the State of New York, did he not have a similar proposition which went to the court, and as a matter of fact, the Supreme Court of the United States upheld the constitutionality?

Mr. RABIN. That is right. I stated that in my general remarks. I did not want to bring it out particularly. In fact I reorganized 15,000 such mortgages within a period of 4 years where 250,000 bondholders were involved and a billion dollars of securities were reorganized with this provision, and we completed the job within 4 years, and my commission stepped out at its own request, having completed its job. Court approval did not delay that job.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I refrained from taking any part in the debate because we seemed to have unanimity of opinion here as to the desirability of this legislation.

The gentleman from New York said he intended to offer two amendments. This is the first one. As I understand his position he is for the bill but thinks it is necessary that the two amendments he proposes be adopted by the Committee and the House.

Mr. Chairman, I have the greatest admiration and respect for the gentleman from New York. We know he has had many years of experience in dealing with matters of this kind because of his association and as a member of an outstanding law firm in New York City. I do, however, take issue with him on his proposed amendments.

In the first place, I do not believe the gentleman's proposal is practical. Even so, it is certainly a most unusual procedure in court. Here we propose to give the Interstate Commerce Commission certain authority with reference to the reorganization of the financial structure of railroads, and the gentleman from New York proposes in his amendment that even though the Commission may find after due procedure established in this proposed legislation that such a plan of modification or alteration is necessary before they can issue an order perfecting that plan it must be presented to a district court for approval. I say to you that would be an unusual procedure in court. It is not the right of appeal at all. It is in effect saying to the Interstate Commerce Commission that before it can issue an order affecting the alteration of modification of the financial structure of a railroad it must be submitted to a court of the United States and the approval of that court obtained; and then the Commission must say—now, listen to this—the Commission must say that the court is right so we will approve the order of the court. That is exactly what you have here as I see it.

I am very strongly for the protection of the minority interests, but I do not think we should permit a windfall for 15 or 20 percent of the holders of obligations of any corporation. That is what this amendment would do.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. What would the situation be in the event that the Commission after careful deliberation concluded that the plan submitted was entirely proper and the only plan that was workable under the circumstances, and the court in substituting its judgment for that of the Commission should reach an entirely different conclusion?

Mr. HARRIS. As I see it, and in contravention of what the gentleman from New York said a while ago, if the matter were submitted to the district court and the district court heard it and gave its approval or its disapproval either of the parties to the litigation could appeal. That would necessarily bring about a long delay. If there is a real interest manifested, and a bona fide interest, I agree with him that a delay would certainly be justified.

I cannot see, however, the justification for saying that a matter must be heard by the Commission and determined on the basis of the facts presented, then submitted to the court, and the court rehear the whole matter again. Certainly you must presume that a court before it can give its approval or disapproval on any matter must have a hearing or at least it must be satisfied that it has information that will justify a decision.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment should be defeated. For the information of the Congress, I am including with my statement the questions asked Commissioner Mahaffie and his answers as contained in the hearings. This will, I believe, explain this matter briefly with the inclusion of a table as to the profits and deficits of class I railroads for the years of 1945 and 1946.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Commissioner, do I understand that this bill would apply to those cases that are not involved in bankruptcy, and is designed to permit them to reorganize to the extent that would likely prevent them from going into that?

Mr. MAHAFFIE. That is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. And the so-called Reed bill applied not only to those cases, but also to the cases presently in bankruptcy?

Mr. MAHAFFIE. That is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. Do I understand that the carrier must first make the application?

Mr. MAHAFFIE. That is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. For modifying, altering, or readjusting of notes, debentures, bonds, and so forth?

Mr. MAHAFFIE. That is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. And the Commission then will take up the application and hold hearings?

Mr. MAHAFFIE. Yes, sir; that is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. And then determine whether or not, from the Commission's point of view, the applications should be permitted to go ahead for consideration?

Mr. MAHAFFIE. That is correct, with this modification: The Commission may, on consideration of the plan proposed in the appli-

cation, modify it, and it would be that modified plan that then, if the carrier does not withdraw it, would go to the security holders for approval or rejection.

Mr. HARRIS. That is to the stockholders?

Mr. MAHAFFIE. The stockholders are not covered by this plan as far as the modification of their rights are concerned, in compulsory modification. This relates only to obligations.

Mr. HARRIS. To the bondholders?

Mr. MAHAFFIE. That is right. I may say that there might be such a modification as to bondholders as to affect some classes of stock, and therefore in this draft, unlike the first draft, which was 1,253, it is provided that the Commission must make a finding that the adjustment is not adverse to the interests of any class of stockholders, rather than as to the stockholders as a whole.

That is necessitated by the fact that there are sometimes preferred stockholders who have interests that are not the same as the common stockholders.

Mr. HARRIS. Are the bondholders under this procedure given any advantage, or is there any likelihood that they would be given any advantage over the stockholders?

Mr. MAHAFFIE. I can see no possible advantage to bondholders over the stockholders resulting from this legislation.

Mr. HARRIS. I believe the language of the bill reads that such proposal has been assented to by the holders of at least 75 percent of the aggregate principal amount outstanding of each class of obligations. Does that mean that 75 percent of each of the different classes of obligations must give their approval of it, and not 75 percent of all classes?

Mr. MAHAFFIE. Very definitely; 75 percent of each class affected.

Mr. HARRIS. I wanted to clarify that to be sure. That is the way I read the language of the bill.

Now, suppose that some of the 25 percent of the minority holders were to object. Then where would we be?

Mr. MAHAFFIE. They should present their reasons as to why it is unfair at the hearing before the Commission, and that is the thing that the Commission would have to consider, whether they made out a case that the modification should not be approved. If, after hearing them, the Commission made the findings prescribed, and then the 75 percent of the class affected voted favorably, that 25 percent, unless they found some defect in the procedure on which they could set aside our order in court, would be through, and it is precisely for the purpose of terminating the opposition of a minority, small minority, usually, of holders of a security, when you try to readjust it, that some such legislation as this is necessary.

Mr. HARRIS. It would be at that point that the Commission would be required to determine whether or not there was a constitutional question involved in any given proposal?

Mr. MAHAFFIE. The Commission would determine it before the vote. It would determine it before making its findings.

Mr. HARRIS. I share the views of the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA], that it seems to me like it could be a very serious question of constitutionality of the act. But I assume the Commission has given most careful thought to that particular question.

Mr. MAHAFFIE. We would have brought this forward many years ago, I think I may say, had we been convinced that it was a constitutional measure. I personally hesitated to suggest it as to the mortgages that we were approving until after the gold-clause decision by the Supreme Court. Then we began inserting it, or requiring it, in some of the mortgages.

Mr. HARRIS. When was that decision?

Mr. MAHAFFIE. I should say about 1935, but I am guessing.

Mr. HARRIS. And have you requested, or indicated, your desire for such legislation since that time?

Mr. MAHAFFIE. We began inserting a similar provision in mortgages that we approved in the reorganization of railroads, putting in a provision that the obligation might be adjusted with the consent of 75 percent of the security holders affected.

That raised the question initially and we worked on it a good deal, as to whether it was constitutional if Congress prescribed that as to existing mortgages, and as I say, we reached the conclusion that it was an appropriate measure for us to recommend to the Congress.

Mr. HARRIS. Question has been raised here with reference to the need for immediate action. I assume that the same need and desire exists as existed when you first recommended the legislation from the viewpoint of the Commission.

Mr. MAHAFFIE. Yes, sir; that is correct. It is not any sudden thought with us.

Mr. HARRIS. I assume the answer to the question on taking the other over-all measure in preference to this would be that inasmuch as there has been some difficulty arisen over that proposal, it would be better to get this proposal which a great many people say is desirable, if you cannot get all that some want in the other proposal, realizing, of course, the Commission has reported adversely on section 2 of that act.

Mr. MAHAFFIE. Yes, sir; that is correct. As to the first part of your question, I think that is particularly a question of congressional policy on which perhaps my opinion would not be especially helpful. We think this is desirable no matter what happens as to the roads now in reorganization.

Mr. HARRIS. Would you say it would be even more desirable now because of the probability of future difficulties in the railroad industry, in that they are having more difficulty than they did during the war when business was at a top?

Mr MAHAFFIE. Very much more urgent now than it was when we began urging it; yes, sir.

Mr. HARRIS. You mentioned a little while ago that there were 36 railroads operating on a deficit in 1946.

Mr. MAHAFFIE. Thirty-five.

Mr. HARRIS. In 1945 there were how many?

Mr. MAHAFFIE. Twenty-six. That is class I railroads. Of course, there are lots of smaller railroads that are not included in these figures.

Mr. HARRIS. I realize that.

For the benefit of the committee, and so that the record will be completed, is there any objection to including those railroads and what the deficit was in your statement?

Mr. MAHAFFIE. Not a particle, sir. Those matters are all public. The thing I hesitated to answer was as to railroads that might shortly need the benefit of this legislation. But as to those deficit figures, they are public, and they can be furnished to your committee. I have copies here, but not enough for your committee.

Mr. HARRIS. Those are likely to be the railroads that would need this legislation.

Mr. MAHAFFIE. Those are the most likely to need it, yes, sir; although you cannot always get it down to those limits because a railroad may need it on account of a maturing obligation even if it is making adequate earnings.

To go on with that a moment, there are about $3,000,000,000 fixed-interest obligations on the class I railroads. Those mature over the early period at the rate of approximately a quarter billion dollars a year. Whether or not maturities can be refunded, or refinanced, frequently depends not entirely on the earnings of the individual railroad, but on the general market condition. It is possible that such securities may be those of a railroad that is showing good earnings, but which might need the benefit of some provision such as this; in other words, to extend a maturity which it could not meet by payment in cash or by the sale of securities.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the information be included in the record. I believe it would be helpful to the committee, if there is no objection to it.

Mr. HOWELL. Commissioner Mahaffie has pointed out that the information with reference to deficit-operating railroads is already available, so I would see no objection to having that come into these committee hearings. But I think he properly pointed out that it might not be wise to include the names of the other roads who might be in need of this relief at some future time.

Mr. HARRIS. I did not ask that he include that specific information, but merely to see what railroads have been operating at a deficit in the last 2 years.

Mr. HOWELL. I see no reason why they should not be included.

Mr. MAHAFFIE. Mr. Chairman, I have that information here for the years 1946 and 1945, in a rather elaborate table. I do not know whether that is the form in which you could use it in your record. If it is, I could hand it to the reporter now.

Mr. HARRIS. Whichever you think is best. It would certainly be all right with us.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Harris, the committee will receive it, and determine the proper form in which to include it in this record.

Mr. HARRIS. Very well, Mr. Chairman.

(The information is as follows:)

Net income, by regions and districts, class I steam railways

FOR THE 2 MONTHS ENDED FEBRUARY 1947 AND 1946

Region and railway	Net income	
	1947	1946
United States, total	$43,633,019	$51,546,940
Eastern district, total	[1] 6,490,879	[1] 10,127,715
New England region, total	[1] 2,169,551	623,779
Bangor & Aroostook	309,340	292,319
Boston & Maine	95	259,792
Canadian National Lines in New England	[1] 165,588	[1] 212,957
Canadian Pacific Lines in Maine		
Canadian Pacific Lines in Vermont		
Central Vermont	[1] 263,267	[1] 346,716
Maine Connecting	149,995	178,958
New York Central	[1] 95,723	109,294
New York, New Haven & Hartford [2]	[1] 1,808,664	512,772
Rutland [2]	[1] 295,739	[1] 169,683
Great Lakes region, total	3,304,650	[1] 2,434,117
Ann Arbor	76,816	32,950
Cambria & Indiana	[1] 76,654	168,934
Delaware & Hudson	406,113	393,576
Delaware, Lackawanna & Western	55,606	233,383
Detroit & Mackinac	51,859	12,352
Detroit & Toledo Shore Line	201,974	88,921
Erie	226,596	[1] 1,762,630
Grand Trunk Western	[1] 375,603	[1] 1,079,617
Lehigh & Hudson River	71,948	50,936
Lehigh & New England	79,397	139,672
Lehigh Valley	213,056	291,621
Monongahela	227,371	185,082
Montour	128,155	92,861
New York Central [2]	[1] 1,574,911	[1] 2,639,238
New York, Chicago & St. Louis	1,368,014	546,993
New York, Ontario & Western [2]	[1] 384,170	[1] 437,722
New York, Susquehanna & Western [2]	[1] 79,399	[1] 71,714
Pere Marquette	372,217	211,903
Pittsburgh & Lake Erie	737,254	239,243
Pittsburg & Shawmut	44,114	12,614
Pittsburgh & West Virginia	89,551	[1] 55,457
Pittsburg, Shawmut & Northern [2]	[1] 26,543	[1] 40,683
Wabash	1,471,889	951,903

Footnotes at end of table.

Net income, by regions and districts, class I steam railways—Continued

FOR THE 2 MONTHS ENDED FEBRUARY 1947 AND 1946—continued

Region and railway	Net income	
	1947	1946
Central eastern region, total	$7,625,978	$8,317,377
Akron, Canton & Youngstown	112,637	28,394
Baltimore & Ohio	1,098,644	[1] 1,853,103
Bessemer & Lake Erie	265,192	[1] 203,667
Central R. R. of New Jersey [2]	[1] 926,500	[1] 1,243,576
Central R. R. of Pennsylvania	260,720	84,953
Chicago & Eastern Illinois	[1] 43,108	[1] 166,892
Chicago & Illinois Midland	192,216	103,410
Chicago, Indianapolis & Louisville	[1] 287,256	[1] 199,209
Detroit, Toledo & Ironton	579,284	269,993
Elgin, Joliet & Eastern	743,672	[1] 422,007
Illinois Terminal	156,353	91,765
Long Island	[1] 1,882,785	[1] 964,066
Missouri-Illinois	123,700	91,460
Pennsylvania	[1] 9,789,701	[1] 4,780,365
Pennsylvania-Reading Seashore Lines	932,016	[1] 874,685
Reading	[1] 1,239,340	830,746
Staten Island Rapid Transit	[1] 206,450	[1] 180,066
Western Maryland	711,544	600,266
Wheeling & Lake Erie	958,536	469,272
Southern District, total	25,093,385	27,344,412
Pocahontas region, total	13,761,051	14,400,938
Chesapeake & Ohio	6,509,873	6,359,310
Norfolk & Western	5,345,677	6,102,867
Richmond, Fredericksburg & Potomac	513,376	930,359
Virginian	1,392,125	1,008,402
Southern region, total	11,332,334	12,943,474
Alabama Great Southern	191,648	168,293
Atlanta & St. Andrews Bay	44,414	5,724
Atlanta & West Point	[1] 5,887	23,224
Atlantic Coast Line	2,476,069	2,212,572
Central of Georgia [2]	[1] 1,002,607	[1] 449,398
Charleston & Western Carolina	52,440	[1] 65,464
Cincinnati, New Orleans & Texas Pacific	571,066	401,718
Clinchfield	16,607	12,479
Columbus & Greenville	347,396	542,384
Florida East Coast [2]		
Georgia R. R., lessee organization		
Georgia & Florida [4]	[1] 140,824	[1] 142,140
Georgia Southern & Florida	26,077	78,344
Gulf, Mobile & Ohio	383,588	274,072
Illinois Central	2,336,418	2,329,220
Louisville & Nashville	2,535,228	3,825,031
Mississippi Central	6,801	[1] 13,692
Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis	103,380	263,800
New Orleans & Northeastern	209,276	161,212
Norfolk Southern	12,176	22,069
Seaboard Air Line	1,361,484	12,084
Southern	1,842,171	3,315,193
Tennessee Central	[1] 63,828	[1] 78,119
Western Ry. of Alabama	29,241	44,868
Western district, total	25,030,513	34,330,243
Northwestern region, total	[1] 3,546,095	[1] 1,095,444
Chicago & North Western	[1] 1,566,081	528,908
Chicago Great Western	33,112	[1] 346,855
Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific	884,328	1,321,195
Chicago, St. Paul, Minneapolis & Omaha	[1] 426,322	[1] 582,780
Duluth, Missabe & Iron Range	[1] 2,003,717	[1] 1,786,502
Duluth, South Shore & Atlantic [2]	[1] 151,248	[1] 121,952
Duluth, Winnipeg & Pacific	[1] 49,308	[1] 39,857
Great Northern	[1] 494,931	311,861
Green Bay & Western	61,854	52,675
Lake Superior & Ishpeming	[1] 148,312	[1] 163,527
Minneapolis & St. Louis	283,054	115,040

Footnotes at end of table.

Net income, by regions and districts, class I steam railways—Continued

FOR THE 2 MONTHS ENDED FEBRUARY 1947 AND 1946—continued

Region and railway	Net income	
	1947	1946
Northwestern region—Con.		
Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie	[1] $315,065	[1] $383,408
Northern Pacific	780,186	567,159
Spokane International	3,272	1,513
Spokane, Portland & Seattle	[1] 349,751	[1] 510,223
Wisconsin Central [2] [5]	[1] 87,166	[1] 58,691
Central western region, total	21,481,083	27,720,619
Alton [2]	180,383	14,498
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe [5]	6,907,397	10,537,322
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy	5,703,091	7,791,764
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific [2]	1,009,173	1,741,460
Colorado & Southern	40,888	11,404
Colorado & Wyoming	46,257	[1] 24,097
Denver & Rio Grande Western [2]	[1] 340,580	419,920
Denver & Salt Lake	199,768	67,185
Fort Worth & Denver City	44,683	35,110
Northwestern Pacific	[1] 137,749	[1] 539,722
Southern Pacific	1,091,425	43,817
Southern Pacific Transportation System [2]	5,703,318	4,412,651
Toledo, Peoria & Western [5]		
Union Pacific	6,731,631	6,666,669
Utah Railway	38,666	21,444
Western Pacific	[1] 33,958	933,845
Southwestern region, total	7,095,525	7,705,068
Beaumont, Sour Lake & Western [2]	295,372	439,821
Burlington-Rock Island	[1] 173,727	[1] 36,534
International-Great Northern [2]	[1] 426,064	14,044
Kansas City Southern	718,778	506,389
Kansas, Oklahoma & Gulf	177,560	118,934
Louisiana & Arkansas	354,338	200,670
Midland Valley	39,604	16,688
Missouri and Arkansas	[1] 30,403	[1] 47,039
Missouri-Kansas-Texas	214,808	893,021
Missouri Pacific [2]	1,670,881	1,752,653
New Orleans, Texas & Mexico [2]	77,352	205,755
Oklahoma City-Ada-Atoka	18,584	23,681
St. Louis, Brownsville & Mexico [2]	350,344	435,343
St. Louis-San Francisco	431,819	[1] 446,810
St. Louis, San Francisco & Texas	38,005	46,236
St. Louis Southwestern [2]	1,149,696	518,148
San Antonio, Uvalde & Gulf [2]	[1] 249,214	[1] 92,798
Texas & New Orleans	1,641,623	1,888,731
Texas & Pacific	729,980	1,226,156
Texas Mexican	66,189	41,979

FOR THE 12 MONTHS ENDED DECEMBER 1946 AND 1945

Region and railway	Net income	
	1946	1945
United States, total	$288,534,467	$446,761,553
Eastern district, total	824,234	117,658,240
New England region, total	[1] 6,604,411	3,681,342
Bangor & Aroostook	453,811	747,104
Boston & Maine	713,246	[1] 569,482
Canadian National Lines in New England	[1] 4,588	23,113
Canadian Pacific Lines in Maine		
Canadian Pacific Lines in Vermont		
Central Vermont	[1] 1,573,187	[1] 1,084,525
Maine Central	497,409	428,710
New York Connecting	280,395	1,178,806
New York, New Haven & Hartford [2]	[1] 6,365,788	3,596,689
Rutland [2]	[1] 605,709	[1] 639,073

Footnotes at end of table.

Net income, by regions and districts, class I steam railways—Continued

FOR THE 12 MONTHS ENDED DECEMBER 1946 AND 1945—continued

Region and railway	Net income	
	1946	1945
Great Lakes region, total	$1,823,235	$39,960,551
Ann Arbor	[1] 117,365	331,123
Cambria & Indiana	645,481	570,381
Delaware & Hudson	2,131,148	418,853
Delaware, Lackawanna & Western	36,216	[1] 3,292,145
Detroit & Mackinac	97,967	[1] 2,371
Detroit & Toledo Shore Line	466,317	457,501
Erie	2,994,724	5,797,185
Grand Trunk Western	[1] 6,123,690	82,497
Lehigh & Hudson River	260,404	175,218
Lehigh & New England	1,118,538	209,404
Lehigh Valley	108,103	[1] 7,562,105
Monongahela	473,590	607,177
Montour	472,291	664,017
New York Central [3]	[1] 10,449,268	24,412,525
New York, Chicago & St. Louis	5,567,790	8,083,229
New York, Susquehanna & Western [2]	[1] 3,018,515	[1] 2,630,327
Pere Marquette	[1] 642,559	38,014
Pittsburgh & Lake Erie	645,286	2,139,121
Pittsburg & Shawmut	3,661,346	3,572,242
Pittsburg & West Virginia	151,293	113,146
Pittsburgh, Shawmut & Northern [2]	[1] 45,523	584,613
Wabash	[1] 284,627	[1] 313,181
	3,674,288	5,504,434
Central eastern region, total	5,605,410	74,016,347
Akron, Canton & Youngstown	188,558	215,896
Baltimore & Ohio	2,648,709	8,660,319
Bessemer & Lake Erie	3,603,793	398,641
Central R. R. of New Jersey [2]	[1] 1,978,526	[1] 3,684,837
Central R. R. of Pennsylvania	948,924	[1] 2,752,600
Chicago & Eastern Illinois	[1] 517,902	1,052,452
Chicago & Illinois Midland	437,908	558,992
Chicago, Indianapolis & Louisville	[1] 1,101,222	367,057
Detroit, Toledo & Ironton	1,465,686	803,308
Elgin, Joliet & Eastern	1,475,231	657,631
Illinois Terminal	487,163	1,630,713
Long Island	[1] 1,188,076	857,579
Missouri-Illinois	680,380	446,533
Pennsylvania	[1] 8,530,317	49,008,238
Pennsylvania-Reading Seashore Lines	[1] 2,605,484	[1] 1,615,723
Reading	4,594,491	10,622,756
Staten Island Rapid Transit	[1] 823,250	[1] 230,357
Western Maryland	2,029,196	4,239,834
Wheeling & Lake Erie	3,790,148	2,749,915
Southern district, total	93,909,399	95,736,561
Pocahontas region, total	58,006,334	46,507,447
Chesapeake & Ohio	27,726,780	16,379,847
Norfolk & Western	23,727,676	23,533,680
Richmond, Fredericksburg & Potomac	3,376,923	2,346,426
Virginian	3,174,955	4,247,494
Southern region, total	35,903,065	49,229,114
Alabama Great Southern	1,563,290	2,206,770
Atlanta & West Point	109,106	353,305
Atlantic Coast Line	5,474,694	5,579,686
Central of Georgia [2]	[1] 3,563,626	[1] 777,544
Charleston & Western Carolina	[1] 272,009	283,335
Cincinnati, New Orleans, & Texas Pacific	2,256,644	2,320,929
Clinchfield	22,470	56,673
Columbus & Greenville	109,494	[1] 76,325
Florida East Coast [2]		
Georgia R. R.—lessee organization		
Georgia & Florida [4]	[1] 930,195	[1] 771,178
Georgia Southern & Florida	238,118	445,087
Gulf, Mobile & Ohio	1,473,947	1,384,112
Illinois Central	7,462,575	11,697,482
Louisville and Nashville	11,579,590	17,536,341
Mississippi Central	5,954	108,833
Nashville, Chattanooga & St. Louis	270,428	1,838,971

Footnotes at end of table.

Net income, by regions and districts, class I steam railways—Continued

FOR THE 12 MONTHS ENDED DECEMBER 1946 AND 1945—continued

Region and railway	Net income	
	1946	1945
Southern region—Con.		
New Orleans & Northeastern	$721,036	$797,645
Norfolk Southern	[1] 55,183	11,663
Seaboard Air Line	459,384	[1] 10,472,058
Southern	9,252,270	16,298,721
Tennessee Central	[1] 506,473	59,110
Western Ry. of Alabama	231,551	347,556
Western district, total	193,800,834	233,366,752
Northwestern region, total	49,824,460	78,259,158
Chicago & North Western	7,179,832	14,116,780
Chicago Great Western	173,488	799,609
Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific	3,176,068	14,077,911
Chicago, St. Paul, Minn. & Omaha	[1] 1,363,100	889,986
Duluth, Missabe & Iron Range	8,358,602	14,397,338
Duluth, South Shore & Atlantic [2]	[1] 892,119	[1] 519,927
Duluth, Winnipeg & Pacific	[1] 523	401
Great Northern	23,457,001	24,157,590
Green Bay & Western	137,700	90,608
Lake Superior & Ishpeming	298,779	884,568
Minneapolis & St. Louis	439,288	574,040
Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie	154,188	1,754,433
Northern Pacific	8,881,146	11,559,860
Spokane International	101,620	138,083
Spokane, Portland and Seattle	[1] 1,160,478	[1] 2,959,433
Wisconsin Central [3] [2]	882,968	[1] 1,702,689
Central western region, total	105,417,406	110,063,902
Alton [2]	367,999	573,29[illegible]
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe	39,015,17[illegible]	29,414,500
Chicago, Burlington & Quincy	23,102,77[illegible]	27,405,399
Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific [2]	3,679,068	7,023,987
Colorado & Southern	7,901	1,803,802
Colorado & Wyoming	183,167	158,964
Denver & Rio Grande Western [2]	[1] 4,079,889	[1] 7,139,492
Denver & Salt Lake	498	51,490
Fort Worth & Denver City	[1] 245,608	[1] 20,254
Northwestern Pacific	[1] 2,160,813	[1] 1,105,107
Southern Pacific	11,551,165	14,854,235
Southern Pacific Transportation System [5]	25,281,106	33,105,440
Toledo, Peoria & Western [6]		
Union Pacific	30,431,603	33,031,580
Utah	14,112	105,932
Western Pacific	3,550,251	3,905,567
Southwestern region, total	38,558,968	45,043,69[illegible]
Beaumont, Sour Lake & Western [2]	1,595,113	792,244
Burlington-Rock Island	[1] 795,716	[1] 105,746
International-Great Northern [2]	[1] 2,200,494	545,807
Kansas City Southern	3,680,194	5,616,864
Kansas, Oklahoma & Gulf	616,077	712,147
Louisiana & Arkansas	1,635,721	1,693,031
Midland Valley	41,757	78,563
Missouri & Arkansas	[1] 192,580	[1] 319,196
Missouri-Kansas-Texas	1,715,447	5,867,599
Missouri Pacific [2]	6,309,123	7,327,909
New Orleans, Texas & Mexico [7]	2,689,455	[1] 471,716
Oklahoma City-Ada-Atoka	24,797	147,131
St. Louis, Brownsville & Mexico [2]	692,406	896,338
St. Louis-San Francisco [2]	2,252,249	1,136,031
St. Louis, San Francisco & Texas	[1] 4,768	211,809
St. Louis Southwestern [2]	4,665,669	3,993,006
San Antonio, Uvalde & Gulf [2]	[1] 833,443	[1] 878,670
Texas & New Orleans	11,060,295	10,431,090
Texas & Pacific	5,435,135	7,243,162
Texas Mexican	172,531	126,289

[1] Deficit or other reverse item.
[2] Report of trustee or trustees.
[3] Includes Boston & Albany, lessor to New York Central R. R.
[4] Report of receiver or receivers.
[5] Formerly included in report of Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie.
[6] Includes Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Ry., Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe Ry., and Panhandle & Santa Fe Ry.
[7] Data not included in totals. Includes Southern Pacific Co., Texas & New Orleans R. R. Co., and leased lines.
[8] Federal manager's operations terminated 12:01 a. m., October 1, 1945. Filed no report.

Analysis of net income—all class I railways [1]

Period	Railways reporting a net income		Railways reporting a net deficit	
	Number of reports	Amount	Number of reports	Amount
February 1947	86	$32,095,271	40	$17,713,725
February 1946	78	37,824,223	48	15,887,911
2 months 1947	87	71,043,838	39	27,410,819
2 months 1946	86	75,180,601	40	23,633,661
December 1946	85	99,777,558	40	11,002,435
December 1945	53	38,789,546	72	117,354,337
12 months 1946	90	353,767,080	35	65,232,613
12 months 1945	99	498,457,614	26	51,696,061

[1] Excludes reports of 4 roads whose net income (or deficit) was absorbed by the controlling company.

Mr. MAHAFFIE. I have a similar statement, identified as statement M–125, through February 1947 showing the earnings of the class I railroads and the same figures for those 2 months, compared with the similar 2 months in the year 1946, which can be furnished to the committee very readily, if you would like that.

Mr. HARRIS. Just one other question.

Is it your belief that this policy statement in any way materially affects the transportation policy of 1940 as set out in the first section of that act?

Mr. MAHAFFIE. No, sir. I think it in no way affects it, because the 1940 policy statement does not relate particularly to the solvency situation that we are discussing here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, without in any way questioning the good intentions of the gentleman from New York who has offered the pending amendment and for whom I have the highest regard, I must say in all sincerity that if the amendment is adopted it will destroy the very purpose of the bill. As has been so ably pointed out by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] the effect of the amendment would only prolong the proceedings. It would create delay, time upon time, expense upon expense.

If those of you who are not familiar with the bill will read its pages, you will see that every protection has been given to all interested parties that any reasonable person could expect.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. Does the gentleman make the point that under this proposed legislation there is no right of appeal?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I do not. I contend for the opposite viewpoint, namely, that there is adequate right of appeal.

Mr. CARROLL. There is the right of appeal?

Mr. WOLVERTON. Yes.

Mr. CARROLL. How does that differ from the right of appeal that the gentleman from New York has suggested?

Mr. WOLVERTON. If the gentleman heard the argument made by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] he would have realized that the proposed amendment would result, practically speaking, in two hearings. I want to point out further to the gentleman in answer to his inquiry that there is nothing in this bill which destroys or limits in any way the right of appeal that any aggrieved person or allegedly aggrieved party might have to any order that has been made by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Mr. CARROLL. It occurs to me that what we have done here is transfer under 77B of the Bankruptcy Act from the court the matter and place it in an administrative agency; then the right of appeal is limited to arbitrary and capricious rulings. As I understand the gentleman from New York, he is asking for an appeal upon the merits. I read to the gentleman from the report:

> The railroads have been through a period of expanded revenues and earnings occasioned by the war traffic.

We see in the legislation a particular type or class of obligation. Now I ask the question whether or not those class obligations are new issues or old issues? I was not in this country. I do not know. I was overseas. Were the new issues resulting during the war to aid the financing of the railroads or are we talking about old obligations?

Mr. WOLVERTON. We are talking about all existing obligations, old or new.

Mr. CARROLL. Necessarily under this act you would not have to affect all obligations; you would affect only the obligations of a particular class; is that not so?

Mr. WOLVERTON. Well, that would depend on the particular case.

Mr. CARROLL. I am just wondering. As I say, I have no conviction on this bill, and I ask the question whether or not it would seriously injure this legislation if minority bondholders could go to the courts on the merits.

Mr. WOLVERTON. The purpose of this legislation is to meet those situations where, looking into the immediate future, there is every indication that the railroad company will be unable to meet its obligations either resulting from maturity of the obligation or from lack of sufficient revenue to pay the interest charges. That is an immediate situation confronting that company. The purpose of this bill in situations such as that is to provide a means by which the interested parties may meet the situation by adjustment of maturity date, rate of interest, or otherwise, and thus bring a quick settlement of the emergency in a manner that will tide them over the serious situation that they are facing.

Mr. CARROLL. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. The premise on which the gentleman based his question would indicate that he had in mind that this was a proceeding in a bankruptcy matter.

Mr. CARROLL. No. I had in mind that this was one that precedes a proceeding in bankruptcy. As I understand this legislation, the railroad does not have to be insolvent; it only has to manifest a danger of insolvency or expression of insolvency.

Mr. WOLVERTON. That is right. In fact, if it was insolvent, it would have to come under 77B of the Bankruptcy Act or institute receivership proceedings.

Mr. CARROLL. It seems to me there might be certain dangers in a class of obligations whereby they could express their danger and say, "We want to reorganize." It is true that there are safeguards under the ICC, but nevertheless it does not give a minority stockholder a right of a rehearing on the merits in a court of law. He is bound by an administrative ruling which necessarily limits his right to a judicial review.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Of course, if it is the idea of the gentleman that the ICC or the SEC or the FPC or the FTC or any other agency of Government that has been set up for the purpose of passing on matters within its particular jurisdiction cannot be trusted, and that therefore there must be a court proceeding preliminary to their entering an order and wherein the court will have a hearing of its own and must first approve the proposal and then tell the Commission that its order is approved, you might as well abolish either court or the Commission. There is no sense, in my judgment, in having such duplication. The proceedings in this case, in the first instance, provide every precaution that I think any one could reasonably expect. In the first place, when an application is made, under the provisions of this bill, the Commission can require a percentage of the bondholders, or the other interested parties, to give their assent; before it will entertain the application. The Commission does not have to do so in the original instance, but it can. The discretion is given if it wishes to exercise it. When the application has been presented to the Commission and shown to come within the provisions of this act, then the Comission is directed to hold a hearing. It must then determine from that hearing that the proposal is in the public interest. It must also find, that it will be in the public interest, and for the best interest of the carrier, of each class of its stockholders, and of the holders of each class of its obligations affected by such modification or alteration.

In the final analysis, they must find that it will not be adverse to the interest of any creditor of the carrier not affected by such modification or alteration. Thus, you can see that this bill provides that the Interstate Commerce Commission must take into consideration all of the interests, numerous and various though they may be, even conflicting. It is only then, when they have found all of these basic elements to exist, that it can give its approval and authorize the submission of the proposal to the interested parties. It must be shown that 75 percent approve before the order becomes effective. In soliciting the assents, the communications that are sent out by the applicant company must also first be submitted to the ICC and have its approval. When all of that has been done, and when there has been an acceptance or approval of the proposal by at least 75 percent, even then, if an individual who did not assent feels aggrieved and feels that the judgment of the ICC and of the 75 percent is all wrong and that his interest is paramount to the interest of the public and all the classes of obligations and stockholders who have approved, he still, under the act, can ask for a review by the court.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Let us consider something that is far more important than the mere question of values in dollars: material value. Let us take the case of a trial where the defendant is answering a charge of murder. Who determines the facts? A jury of 12 individuals. When those 12 individuals have spoken and found a verdict of guilty, if the defendant feels he is aggrieved, what are his rights? He has a right to appeal, but he does not have a right to a retrial of the case by the appellate court. I know of no such procedure anywhere. The appellate court passes upon the record as made in the trial court. The appellate court decides whether the rights of the defendant have been properly regarded and respected. If the court of review finds any mistake in the record of the case, it can order a retrial. In the proceedings under this proposed bill the principle is no different. The party has his right of appeal to the court, and the court looks over the record made below by the ICC and passes upon whether it is right or wrong. That procedure has been followed in all matters of orders made by the ICC ever since it has been in existence. That has been the procedure in all these years.

Furthermore, this amendment would require court approval before the plan can become effective.

Such prior court approval is not necessary under a statute where Congress exercises its paramount authority to regulate interstate commerce. The bill recognizes paramount public interest in an adequate transportation service by railroad systems which are strong financially. The provisions in the Constitution against impairment of obligation of contracts apply only to legislation by the States and not legislation enacted by Congress pursuant to its authority to regulate interstate commerce.

Any requirement for prior court approval would be detrimental to the public interest and to the interest of carriers and their creditors because exceedingly long delays would be involved and such procedure would impose upon carriers and creditors a heavy burden of expense. One of the prime purposes of the bill is to avoid such burdens and such delays.

Any creditor would have due notice of hearings before the Commission and will be permitted to intervene before the Commission. He has such right to intervene under the law. In the event he should not be satisfied with the plan as approved by the Commission he may appeal to the courts. The courts, of course, will protect all his legal rights in any such proceeding.

Such right of appeal to the courts is the same right which any other person objecting to an order of the Commission may pursue. It fully satisfies all the legal requirements.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not profess to know a great deal about this legislation, but I have listened with a great deal of interest to the debate. In attempting to answer the gentleman's explanation of the difference in the right of review, may I say that that review from the ruling of an administrative agency, is very much limited in law from the right of a judicial review.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. The rule as laid down in the Administrative Procedure Act follows the rule as stated by the Supreme Court in the Consolidated Edison case. There, the Court held that the finding must be based on substantial evidence, and that a mere scintilla was not sufficient in order to sustain the finding of the agency.

Mr. CARROLL. That is right. Of course, we can say that the Commission has had the facts before it and the Commission, has made a finding upon those facts. This is the old rule of administrative law that unless there has been some arbitrary and capricious action on the part of the board the court will not reverse the finding. I say to any lawyer here that there is a great difference between that and a full judicial review.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. Let me say I do not think we should go into the question of capriciousness in this appeal.

Mr. CARROLL. Let us confine it to arbitrariness.

Mr. O'HARA. May I say this to the gentleman—that obviously under the bill which we are considering, the first thing that would have to be determined is whether or not 75 percent or more of the bondholders agree. That is a simple question of fact which, if the Interstate Commerce Commission were in error, would be reversible. That is, for example, if they did not find that it would be in the public interest; or it would be in the best interests of the carrier of each class of its stockholders and of the holders of each class of its obligations affected by such modification or alteration; or that it would not be adverse to any creditor of the carrier not affected by such modification or alteration.

Those are the provisions of the bill. If the Commission is in error on any one of those things, I believe it would be reversed by the court on appeal.

Mr. CARROLL. Yes, but I make this point, however. You see, we are dealing with a situation here which I think is pretty strange in law. There is no emergency here. This is a contemplated emergency, something which may arise. We are not dealing now with a situation that is similar to that in the bankruptcy act under section 77-B. Under this legislation they are now saying we apprehend that we will be running into economic difficulty; therefore, we ask the right to reorganize voluntarily.

Now, that raises the question here of what we mean by public interest. This is an economic condition—the economic facts are presented to the Commission and to the 75 percent of the bondholders. When that Commission makes a finding on the economic report and the economic conditions, unless it is arbitrary, and that is, of course, a word that the courts have strained to get away from, then the minority bondholders are bound by that. That would not be so found in a hearing on the merits as a matter of law.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. May I say that I share the same concern as my distinguished friend, the gentleman from New York, and the gentleman now speaking.

Mr. CARROLL. I might say to the gentleman that I am not a bond lawyer.

Mr. O'HARA. I am not either, but I have interested myself in this thing and I am a little concerned about it, as my friend, the gentleman from New York, knows.

I have come to the conclusion that those things are the only things that we can test on an appeal in these proceedings. I am informed, and I know a little about it, that in the McLaughlin Act these tests have been sustained by the courts.

I might say to the gentleman, I share the general concern for the minority groups, but I do not see how we can further protect them in the matter of an appeal.

Mr. CARROLL. Of course, I would certainly be willing to go along with you. I do not think we ought to in any way befriend those groups that want to interfere with legitimate reorganizations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, the people of Denver are quite familiar with the uphill fight that a certain railroad in that territory has been waging to reorganize in order to operate at its maximum efficiency. This reorganization has been going on for a period of years, at great trouble and expense to those interested in reorganization. I shall not attempt to comment upon the position taken by the various groups interested in that controversy, except to say that that type of litigation ought to end sometime and should not continue on and on for years. It has been stated on the floor of the House today that the legislation before us will expedite voluntary reorganization programs. With that principle I am in full accord. It occurs to me, however, that, in the interest of expedition, we must not overlook another very important fundamental principle, that of protecting the full legal rights of minority bondholders. Clearly every investor has a right to his day in court.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. RABIN], who has had considerable experience with this sort of thing, indicates that his amendment will materially strengthen this bill in that respect. He has stated that in the event of a voluntary reorganization agreed to by 75 percent of the bondholders, that the remaining 25 percent, if they so desire, are entitled to a judicial review from the findings of the Interstate Commerce Commission, and that such review should not result in prolonged, expensive litigation. The amendment seems to be entirely reasonable, and is certainly consistent with well-established rules of law. We must keep in mind that this is novel legislation. This is a departure from 77B of the Bankruptcy Act in that voluntary reorganization may take place, not because of bankruptcy but in anticipation of insolvency.

I have presented here only the issues involved in this debate. However, no real consideration has been given to the constitutionality of this legislation. I seriously doubt whether this bill meets the constitutional requirements of due process.

Mr. O'HARA. I appreciate what the gentleman has said. On the other hand, if we follow the purpose of this act, for a speedy reorganization, and keep away from bankruptcy, I am frank to say to the gentleman that I cannot prophesy what might happen. If we follow the spirit of this act, I think the concern which the gentleman has will be dissipated. If he is right, then I am as much concerned as he is. But let us see how this works out. That is my hope on this thing. If it does not work out fairly in the interest of all, then I say to the gentleman we should certainly change it.

Mr. CARROLL. There may be something in your position.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] has expired.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I simply want to point out to the committee the fact that we can base our decision on whether to vote for this amendment or not, on what has actually happened; not what we think might happen. We have a law in New York State which is very similar to this. Our law on real estate reorganizations has a similar clause in it, similar to what the gentleman from New York [Mr. RABIN] would accomplish by his amendment. That simply provides that the court must approve the reorganization before it becomes effective. Our experience has been that in such proceedings it takes very little time to obtain the Court's approval. You simply make a motion in the equity part of Supreme Court. The judge does not hear the case all over again. He simply takes the papers, reads the record before the Commission and the lawyers for all parties concerned argue before the court. We have had cases that the court has decided in 20 minutes, on issues which may have been as involved as are those which are contemplated by this law. I cannot see what objection anybody can have to placing in the law this additional safeguard. Mention has been made of the fact that we would have to have two hearings. Technically, you have to have two hearings in any appeal. But actually, in proceedings such as these, it would simply mean that the court would read the record of the proceedings before the Commission. Whatever objections are made can be brought to the attention of the court, and a decision rendered immediately.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Under the suggested legislation it may not be submitted to the court.

Mr. KLEIN. That is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. But under the amendment it would be required to be submitted.

Mr. KLEIN. But it is still better to have that additional safeguard. The court might not take any time at all, if it is a good plan, and it probably would be. It would seem to me that we would be engendering in the minds of investors in such securities a feeling of security by letting them know that their interests will be amply protected, not only by the Interstate Commerce Commission, but that they have an additional safeguard in the right of appeal to the court for its approval.

Mr. RABIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield.

Mr. RABIN. Even though it may be required, if there is no objection to the plan there will be no appeal.

Mr. KLEIN. That is it. The court automatically will affirm it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] has expired.

The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. RABIN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RABIN) there were—ayes 25, noes 75.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RABIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RABIN: On page 6, line 24, after the word "modified", strike out the period and insert ", except that if such alteration or modification shall become effective, it shall be without prejudice to the right of any particular holder, who has duly dissented to the proposed alteration or modification, to have the Commission, [subject to approval of a district court of the United States,] determine the cash value of such

securities as he may have owned on or before the date of the submission of the application by the carrier to the Commission pursuant to this paragraph, and to provide for the payment or securing of such amount."

Mr. RABIN. Mr. Chairman, in view of the last vote by the committee I would be willing to leave out of this proposal the phrase "subject to the approval of the District Court of the United States." We can take that out of this amendment.

Now, here we have an amendment that is not going to delay the reorganization at all, not the slightest, because this does not apply until after the plan has become effective; until after the reorganization has gone through.

I ask that this amendment be adopted in the interest of the minority bondholders; bondholders who cannot see their way clear to go along with the plan. As I pointed out, a bondholder has a contract to get his money paid at the date of maturity 100 cents on the dollar with a certain rate of interest. A plan under this bill may modify and alter that contract. It may cut him down to 50 cents on the dollar, may cut him down to 2 percent interest instead of 4 percent, and the date of maturity may be extended to 4 years instead of 1, or 20 years instead of 1.

I have no objection to those provisions because that is the spirit of the bill, but I do say that, if a minority bondholder does not want to go along with it, if he does not want his contract impaired, he should have a right to protection provided that that protection will not prevent the plan from going through, and that he cannot use the protection we give him to strike against the plan, and that he cannot use that protecion we give him to embarrass reorganization, and that he cannot insist on a hundred cents on the dollar, and he cannot insist on having every pound of flesh and every drop of blood.

This amendment will do that because it provides that he be given not a hundred cents on the dollar but merely that his security be appraised at the present market value.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABIN. I yield.

Mr. LESINSKI. I wish to ask the gentleman this question: The gentleman talks about minority bondholders. Suppose a person went out on the market and picked up a bond at 5 cents on the dollar. Would he not be entitled to 100 cents on the dollar under this plan?

Mr. RABIN. No; assuredly not. I am not asking that he get a hundred cents on the dollar.

Mr. LESINSKI. But I understood the gentleman to say that the minority bondholder should be entitled to a hundred cents on the dollar.

Mr. RABIN. The gentleman misunderstood me. I did not say he was entitled to ask for a hundred cents on the dollar.

Mr. LESINSKI. The gentleman realizes that a lot of bonds sold on the market may not be worth a nickel.

Mr. RABIN. If he were to be entitled to a hundred cents on the dollar under my purpose then I would ask you to vote against this amendment. I do not ask that. I ask simply that the value of his bonds be appraised. I have not asked that it be paid in cash because I realize that it might embarrass the reorganization to ask cash payment for some railroads may not have the cash to pay. I simply ask that the value of his bonds be fixed as of the date of the reorganization provided he owns the bonds on or before the reorganization commenced; and I ask that he be given some security, that the ICC give him some security to make sure that he gets the value that is fixed, and the amount is to be fixed by the ICC. I am not asking too much. It is not asking too much for a man whose contract has been impaired. It is asking the minimum.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABIN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Would not the 25 percent, or the minority bondholders, have the same status as the 75 percent, or whatever larger percent might request modification or alteration?

Mr. RABIN. Would they have the same status?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes.

Mr. RABIN. I am talking about the bondholders who do not want that status.

Mr. HARRIS. They have the right to be protected just as the other 75 percent who are requesting the modification or alteration.

Mr. RABIN. The 75-percent consent; they get what they want; they voted for it. The minority are in a different class. They do not get what they want because they are voting against it. They do not get protection after the House passes this bill.

Mr. HARRIS. Do they not get the same thing under the Commission's order?

Mr. RABIN. They get what they do not want.

Mr. HARRIS. I disagree with the gentleman.

Mr. RABIN. They get the same thing, but they do not want it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. RABIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABIN. Mr. Chairman, why take my $1,000 bond and against my will give me 50 cents on the dollar and say, "You have got to take it whether you like it or not." I do not ask for the thousand. I say, "I do not want that 50 percent. Give me the value as of today," and do not pay it today, either. Pay it when the ICC says it should be paid. Let me say if you put this through it will save this bill in court.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is with some reluctance that I rise to oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York. All of us on the committee have a great deal of respect for his legal ability, and personally I have referred to him many times as my legal counsel on the committee. I believe, however, that the amendment he now offers in effect would be an amendment which, if adopted, would result in discriminatory legislation greatly favoring dissenting minority bondholders.

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] in asking the question a moment ago put his finger on the logic in this situation when he asked if all security holders did not have the same rights under the provisions contained in the bill.

I do not care to prolong the debate on this matter, but I wish to call attention to page 26 of the hearings very briefly, in which there is a specific instance related by Commissioner Mahaffie that I think is applicable to the proposal of the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. Mahaffie said in response to a question asked by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE], a member of the committee:

> Some years ago the Maine Central had a maturity, as I recall, of about $10,000,000. It could not meet it by any refinancing, but its earnings were sufficient to make it reasonably sure that it could continue to pay the interest on that obligation. The Maine Central went to its security holder, and, as I recall, got somewhere between 80 and 90 percent to consent to an extension of that maturity on the basis of continuing the interest payment at the coupon rate. It had to pay off the 10 or 15 percent who would not consent, and the fact that it had to pay them off made those who were inclined to go along somewhat recluctant to do it, though ultimately enough of them went along so that the railroad was able to put up the money to pay off the dissenters.
>
> The majority, as I say, hesitated to do it because they did not like to see some of their coholders preferred over them by getting their money in full.

Then Commissioner Mahaffie related that the Boston & Maine had a similar difficulty in 1940.

Mr. Chairman, I submit to my distinguished friend from New York that the adoption of his amendment in any case under this proposed reorganization plan would produce similar situations and would greatly favor and place in a preferred class the minority dissenters.

Mr. RABIN. The object of my amendment is to prevent just such things as the gentleman refers to, because in the first place the plan can go through without his consent. Secondly, he does not get 100 percent on the dollar. He gets what the ICC wants to pay him. Third, he does not get it in cash. He gets that which the ICC wants to give him. Fourth, he does not get it as a condition precedent to the plan going through. He gets it when the ICC wants to give it to him.

Mr. PRIEST. I believe my good friend will agree with me, however, that it does place him in a preferred status and that therefore it is discriminatory legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the passage of an amendment of this char-

acter is creating a nuisance value. I cannot see it in any other way. This amendment is offered from the standpoint of protecting the individual. While I have no doubt as to the good faith of those who offer the amendment in a sincere desire to protect what they believe to be the interest of a minority party, yet the fact remains under a similar law, the McLaughlin Act, which was chapter 15 of Chandler Bankruptcy Act, and in force for several years, there was no such provision in that act as now offered by the gentleman from New York. That act similar to this proposed law was in effect for many years. No question such as has been raised here as to a possible loss by some individual ever was raised in the administration of that act.

But, there is a further and a very controlling objection. It would seem to me, and that arises from the fact that the emphasis that is placed upon the right of an individual overlooks entirely the fact that the public has an interest. Every proposal is submitted and approval given on the basis that the public interest is to be served. The Commission must find that it is to the benefit of the public as well as all the other classes of security holders. In this connection, I call to your attention the language of the Court in the case of *Burton* v. *Barbour* (104 U. S.). The Court said:

> The public retains rights of vast consequence in the road and its appendages in which neither the company or any creditor or mortgagee can interfere. They take their rights subject to the rights of the public and must be content to enjoy them in subordination thereto.

In other words, the controlling consideration is the public interest. The public interest requires a continuing transportation system, and whether it continues or not depends upon the strength of its financial structure. As soon as you permit individuals to interfere with that public interest, such as has been argued here, then you are working against the public interest and doing that which is detrimental to the public interest.

The amendment would require a cash payment to any dissenting creditor which would be determined by the cash value of his interest.

Congress, acting pursuant to its paramount authority to regulate interstate commerce, is not bound by the constitutional provision with reference to impairment of the obligation of contracts. Such constitutional provision applies only to the States.

Under the bill the rights of all creditors affected would be determined by the vote of 75 percent of such creditors, and in addition the plan after a full hearing before the Commission would have to be approved by the Commission. It would entirely defeat the purposes of the bill if any dissenter should be given the right to demand cash payments as this amendment would propose.

Where a plan is proposed under the bill the question to be determined is whether or not the public interest and the interests of all the creditors as a whole would be better served by the carrying out of the plan or by a bankruptcy proceeding or a receivership proceeding if the plan should not be carried out. In the event of a bankruptcy proceeding or a receivership proceeding, the creditors very likely would lose a great deal more in interest than they would otherwise give up in the event a voluntary plan was approved by 75 percent of the creditors and also by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Since Congress, acting in the public interest, may enact legislation which will have the effect of impairing the obligation of contracts there could be no reasonable doubt as to the constitutionality of the provisions of this bill. The Supreme Court has on numerous occasions upheld the power of Congress to enact legislation of this character and the latest important decision is perhaps in the gold clause case—*Norman* v. *Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Company*, (294 U. S. 240), a decision with which everyone undoubtedly is familiar. In that case the Supreme Court held that Congress could enact legislation which would deprive the holders of bonds of railroad companies from their right to be paid in gold coin of a standard of weight and fineness which was fixed by the contractual obligation.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am neither a railroad lawyer, and never was, nor am I a railroad stockholder or bondholder, and never was. Consequently, I cannot claim the professional interest and personal knowledge about this problem that some of those who have spoken profess to have. But I do have some convictions. One of the gentlemen said that he had no conviction about this bill. I realize he said this to show his impartiality, and I admire his good faith. Possibly I am not so impartial. Frankly, I do have some convictions about this matter. I have a conviction that is old-fashioned; it is reactionary; it is in direct conflict with the views just expressed by the previous speaker, who stated that the public interest should outweigh the interest of the individual. After all, I believe in private property. I believe that when an individual buys an obligation, whether it be my personal note or a bond of the New York Central Railroad, that individual gets the right to collect as long as the maker has the ability to pay. He has a right to share in the property of the individual or the corporation that executed that obligation. I do not think there is any public interest that can intervene and wipe out the right of that individual to collect his obligation. Certainly if the public has such an overwhelming interest in a railway reorganization as to require the wiping out of certain obligations, it is the duty of the public to pay those obligations. Certainly the public has an interest and a right that is greater than that of any individual. Our constitutional law long ago recognized that, and I recognize it, but just as the Constitution recognizes the obligation of the public, so do I recognize that the public has no right to take my private property, no matter what the exigencies of the public interest are, without paying me for it.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I am sorry. I have only 5 minutes. I want to talk about these fundamentals. I do not want to talk about what the railroad lawyers are interested in. I do not want to talk about what these new-spun theorists are interested in. I am interested in maintaining the right of every individual in America to receive payment on the obligations due to him, and I am interested in the duty of every individual to pay his debt when he has the means. I am interested in seeing that railroad corporations as well as individuals are charged with the payment of their debts as long as they have the funds with which to pay them. I think that when a man signs a note he signs an obligation to pay it, and I think that when a railroad company signs a bond it signs an obligation to pay it, and I, for one, doubt that it is in the public interest to exempt railroad corporations from the obligation of contract.

This bill does not do anything in the world except to relieve certain obligors from their obligations for the benefit of a certain class in a certain group. They tell us that it is for the public. If it is for the benefit of the public, let the public pay the bill, but do not let one group of obligors be relieved of their obligation for the benefit of some bondholders and some stockholders, and above all do not try to take the bondholder's property from him without compensation and at the same time deny him recourse to the court. If you are going to take private property from railroad purposes, let us at least do it in the courthouse under the forms of law.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. RABIN].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments? If not, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLER of Nebraska, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2298) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 246, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS BILL

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, as I am quite sure all the Members know, tomorrow is the final day for action one way or the other on the labor-management relations bill. If there should be a veto and it comes in at noon tomorrow, it is our plan to proceed immediately with the vote to override the veto. I make this announcement in order that the Members may make their plans accordingly.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight tonight to file a report on H. R. 3444.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech recently made by a former Member of the House, Hon. James P. McGranery.

TAFT-HARTLEY BILL

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago this House closed its eyes, blocked its ears, and voted "yea" on the Taft-Hartley bill now before the President for consideration. Few Members of this House knew what was in this bill. Indeed, few of them could know. None outside of the managers on behalf of the House had a chance to see it until the very day of passage. The distinguished gentleman from Texas, the former Speaker, rose, I remember, in forceful protest against this kind of action. I believe he remarked that he had not received the statement of the managers on the part of the House until 20 minutes before noon of that day.

Now, this is an extremely complicated, extremely intricate bill. It covered more than 70 pages. The conference report covered 69 pages. No one can be blamed for not knowing the content and effects of this bill after a few hours, much less a few minutes. It does not look like the original House bill, and it does not talk like the original House bill. But, Mr. Speaker, I can assure the House—and I am prepared to show by the most unimpeachable evidence—that this conference bill was nothing but the old House bill masquerading in new legalistic clothing.

Now, few Members of this House may agree with that statement at the present time. And I believe it is the highest possible compliment to the strategy of the majority party that this may be the fact. For, by reason of the length and intricacy of this bill and aided by their insistence upon speedy action, they succeeded in convincing not only the press and a large body of the American people but even many of the distinguished Members of Congress that the bill presented for a vote more than 2 weeks ago was in fact the Senate bill.

I believe the campaign for passage of this antilabor measure was the slickest piece of operating I have seen around here in a long time. When the bill went to conference, it was termed by the press, by many of my distinguished colleagues, and by many Members of the Senate as a harsh and stringent measure. At the same time we were told that the Senate bill was a sound, reasonable, and necessary redefinition of the rights and privileges of employers and employees under Federal law.

The distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, who was chairman of the managers on the part of the House in conference committee deliberations, gave repeated public assurances that the severe provisions of the House bill were being abandoned in favor of the more conservative stand which we were to suppose had been taken by the Senate. The measure presented to us by the conference committee thereafter gained the reputation for being substantially the Senate bill, with all of the harmful provisions of our original proposal entirely eliminated. And, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that many of us, voting both for and against the conference bill, did so under the distinct misapprehension that the Taft-Hartley bill fundamentally followed the approach used by the Senate.

I have, for instance, nothing but the deepest sympathy and understanding for the plight of my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, who sat with me in conference over this bill as one of the managers on behalf of the House. He said the writing of the final bill shifted so rapidly that even he was unable to keep track of it. Even he could not get a copy of the conference report to see whether the bill was tough enough for him to support it.

Personally, I regarded the conference labor bill as thoroughly destructive of labor's rights and as thoroughly productive of industrial strife as the original House bill and upon these well considered grounds I voted against both. Nothing, however, could be further from the truth than the propaganda that there is a substantial difference in objectives and approach between the two bills.

Mr. Speaker, if any one were to look for it, there is the most ironclad, rock solid proof of the proposition I'm making here today. I am going to prove my point by taking every word from the statements of the gentleman from New Jersey, chairman of the committee reporting the House bill and chairman of the managers on the part of the House. If you will bear with me for a few minutes, I am going to make a brief comparison between the report on the House bill and the report on the conference bill. This is exactly the thing which every Member of this House should have had an opportunity to do prior to the passage of the conference bill, but which was unfortunately and deliberately denied by steam roller methods.

Upon page 5 and a part of page 6 of the original majority report on H. R. 3020, I found a list of 20 accomplishments claimed for the Hartley bill. It seemed to me these 20 points, claimed by the majority to represent the major features of the measure, would provide the soundest basis for comparison with the conference bill. And if the conferees on the part of the House have reported the accomplishment of the same objectives there would appear to be substantial identity bewteen the two.

The result, Mr. Speaker, is astonishing. I actually found that all except one of these listed accomplishments were repeated in the Taft-Hartley bill. In other words, the more things were changed, the more they remained exactly the same.

Let me go over each one of these points to show you what I mean. Now, mind you, these are not my words. They are the words of the two reports. I am quoting from the statements of the gentleman from New Jersey himself. I am not even going to comment for the present as to whether their effects, in my opinion, are good or bad.

Point 1 reads as follows:

(1) It abolishes the existing discredited National Labor Relations Board and creates in lieu thereof a new board of fair-minded members to exercise quasi judicial functions only.

Turning to pages 37 and 38 of the conference report, in which was discussed the creation of two new members of the Board and a new independent general counsel, charged with all prosecuting and administrative functions, I found these words:

The combination of the provisions dealing with the authority of the general counsel, the provision abolishing the Board's review division, and the provisions relating to the trial examiners and their reports effectively limits the Board to the performance of quasi-judicial functions.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the creation of two new Board members sufficiently changes its character and the general counsel is for all purposes the exact equivalent of the independent administrator which would have been created by the Hartley bill.

This identity is stressed by the second point of the report on the Hartley bill, which states:

(2) It establishes a new official to exercise the various prosecuting and investigative functions under the National Labor Relations Act, to be entirely independent of the Board.

In relation to this comment I find on page 37 of the conference report the following:

The general counsel is to have general supervision and direction of all attorneys employed by the Board (excluding the trial examiners and the legal assistants to the individual members of the Board), and of all the officers and employees in the Board's regional offices, and is to have final authority to act in the name of, but independently of any direction, control, or review by the Board in respect of the investigation of charges and the issuance of complaints of unfair labor practices, and in respect of the prosecution of such complaints before the Board. * * * By this provision responsibility for what takes place in the Board's regional offices is centralized in one individual who is ultimately responsible to the President and Congress.

At the outset, therefore, we are told that the present enrolled bill establishes exactly the same system as the Hartley bill for administration of the Wagner Act. The Hartley bill report then turns to the question of evidence which can be considered by the Board in hearings and the effect of Board decisions upon court review. Point 3 of the list states:

(3) It requires the Board to act only upon the weight of credible legal evidence, and it gives the courts of the United States a real, rather than a fictitious, power to review the decisions of the Board.

On examining the conference report, I find, first of all, on page 53, that the provisions of the House bill, accomplishing the above objective, so far as the legal evidence at hearings is concerned, was followed verbatim by the conference bill. Here is the pertinent language:

The House bill provided, in section 10 (b), that the proceedings before the Board should be conducted, so far as practicable, in accordance with the rules of evidence applicable in the district courts of the United States under the rules of civil procedure. * * * The conference agreement in section 10 (c) contains this provision of the House bill.

At the bottom of page 53 and on page 54 of the conference report I find that, in regard to the weight to be accorded evidence in the findings and decision of the Board, the provision of the conference bill is the counterpart of the provision of the Hartley bill. Again, I read from the conference report:

In section 10 (c) the House bill provided that the Board should base its decisions upon the weight of the evidence * * * the conference agreement provides that the Board shall act only on the "preponderance" of the testimony—that is to say, on the weight of the credible evidence.

And not only is the Board required to act upon the weight of credible, legal evidence, but also, the courts of the United States are in effect accorded the same powers on review under both bills. This is made clear on page 56 of the conference report. Here again, I quote:

The provisions of section 10 (b) of the conference agreement insure the Board's receiving only legal evidence, and section 10 (c) insures its deciding in accordance with the preponderance of the evidence. These two statutory requirements in and of themselves give rise to questions of law which the courts will hereafter be called upon to determine—whether the requirements have been met. This, in conjunction with the language of the Senate amendment with respect to the Board's findings of fact—language which the conference agreement adopts—will very materially broaden the scope of the courts' reviewing power.

Therefore, even though the conference bill adopts the language of the Senate bill in regard to court review, it nonetheless accomplishes by related provisions the purpose of giving the courts what is termed by the Hartley report "a real rather than a fictitious power to review decisions of the Board."

Point No. 4 of the Hartley bill relates to the closed shop and industry-wide bargaining. It states that both are outlawed. And both are either completely outlawed or seriously impeded by the conference bill.

First I quote from page 41 of the conference statement:

Both the House bill and the Senate amendment, in rewriting the present provisions of section 8 (3) of this act, abolished the closed shop. * * * The conference agreement adopts the language of the Senate amendment in section 8 (a) (3) of the Labor Act with one clarifying omission.

Again I quote from page 60 of the conference report:

Under the House bill there was included a new section * * * to assure that nothing in the act was construed as authorizing any * * * form of compulsory unionized agreement in any State where the execution of such agreement would be contrary to State law. * * * The conference agreement * * * contains a provision having the same effect.

When it comes to industry-wide bargaining, however, the conference report is anything but frank. It states that provisions of the House bill, restricting industry-wide bargaining, were omitted from the conference bill. Nonetheless, there is embodied in the conference bill a provision stating that in any strike imperiling the national health or safety in all or a substantial part of an industry, where an injunction has been issued, there must be a company by company vote of the employees on the final settlement offer of each employer before the injunction is discharged. There is not any doubt in my mind that this provision would effectively block industry-wide bargaining in practically every case where the employers do not desire to bargain on such a basis. The conference report on page 63 states that the House bill contained this provision. And on page 65 of the report are the words:

It is provided in the conference agreement that the employees vote on the employer's offer as stated by him.

The next accomplishment is the exemption of supervisors from the Wagner Act. By turning to page 35 of the conference report you may discover that these employees are also exempted under the conference bill after slight redefinition of the term.

Point No. 6 deals with the duty of both parties to bargain and refers to a supplementary provision for a secret ballot on the employer's last offer of settlement. The provision of the present law requiring employers to bargain collectively has been retained. The conference bill also imposes a duty on unions to bargain collectively. In this regard I want to quote from pages 42 and 44 of the statement of managers. On page 42:

Under the House bill the following unfair labor practices were set forth: * * *. To refuse to bargain collectively with the employer.

On page 43:

Under the new section 8 (b) of the Senate amendment, the following unfair labor practices on the part of labor organizations and their agents were defined: * * *. To refuse to bargain collectively with an employer.

And again on page 44, relating to the prior comments:

From the above description of the House bill and the Senate amendment dealing with unfair labor practices on the part of labor organizations and their agents, it is apparent that the Senate amendment was broader in its scope than the corresponding provisions of the House bill. The conference agreement adopts the provisions of the Senate amendment.

Now, I have already gone over some of the provisions of the conference bill covering the requirements of secret ballots in emergency disputes. But I want to call your attention to pages 62 and 63 of the conference report regarding the duties of the Director of Mediation and Conciliation. I quote:

One important duty of the Director which was not included in the Senate amendment is included in the conference agreement and is derived from the provisions of the House bill providing for a secret ballot by employees upon their employer's last offer of settlement before resorting to a strike.

It is perfectly clear to me, therefore, that point 6 of the listed accomplishments of the Hartley bill has been effectively carried over into the conference bill.

Point 7 professes protection for independent labor organizations on the same basis as affiliated labor organizations. This point is covered on page 48 of the conference report. I want to quote it in full:

It was further provided—

That is, in the House bill—

that employees were not to be denied the right to designate or select a representative of their own choosing by reason of an order of the Board with respect to such representative or its predecessor that would not have been issued in similar circumstances with respect to a labor organization, national or international in scope or affiliated with such an organization. The Senate amendment in section 9 (c) (3), contained a provision having the same purpose. Both the House provision and the Senate provision were directed to the practice of the Board in denying employees the right to vote for independent labor organizations in respect of which orders had been issued by the Board under section 8 (1) or 8 (2) finding employer domination where, under similar circumstances, it did not apply the same rule to unions affiliated with one of the national labor organizations. * * * The conference agreement, in section 9 (c) (2) contains a provision having the same purpose and effect.

What, may I ask, could give greater protection than insuring a place on the ballot for company unions on an equal footing with bona fide labor organizations.

The next point 8: No labor organization may be certified if it has Communist or subversive officers. Page 49 of the conference report explains that the same provision is in the conference bill with its effect limited to present membership in the Communist Party. The reason for this is readily explained. I quote from page 49:

The "ever has been" test that was included in the House bill is omitted from the conference agreement as unnecessary, since the Supreme Court has held that if an individual has been proved to be a member of the Communist Party at some time in the past, the presumption is that he is still a member in the absence of proof to the contrary.

Rights which union members can claim of labor organizations are claimed

to be protected by point 9 of the accomplishments of the Hartley bill. In this regard, I call your attention to pages 38, 39, 40, 42, and 43 of the conference report. I want to quote first from page 38:

Both the House bill and the Senate amendment in amending the National Labor Relations Act preserved the right under section 7 of that act of employees to self-organization, to form, join or assist any labor organization, and to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing and to engage in other concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection. The House bill, however, made two changes in that section of the act. First, it was stated specifically that the rights set forth were not to be considered as including the right to commit or participate in unfair labor practices, unlawful concerted activities, or violations of collective-bargaining contracts. Second, it was specifically set forth that employees were also to have the right to refrain from self-organization, etc., if they chose to do so.

On page 39:

It was believed that the provisions, excepting unfair labor practices, unlawful concerted activities and violations of collective-bargaining agreements were unnecessary.

Next from page 40:

The second change made by the House bill in section 7 of the act (which is carried into the conference agreement) also has an important bearing on the kinds of concerted activities which are protected by section 7.

Then on page 42:

Under the new section 8 (b) of the Senate amendment, the following unfair labor practices on the part of labor organizations and their agents were defined:

(1) To restrain or coerce employees in the exercise of rights guaranteed in section 7, or to restrain or coerce an employer in the selection of his representatives for collective bargaining or the adjustment of grievances.

Again on page 43:

(2) To discriminate against an employee to whom membership in a labor organization has been denied or terminated on some ground other than nonpayment of dues or initiation fees. The purpose of this provision of the Senate amendment was obvious.

I turn to page 44:

The conference agreement adopts the provisions of the Senate amendment.

Now, it seems to me that no measure could demonstrate a more solicitous attempt to protect union members from their union even though the real purpose and effect is to protect the employer from the union and to weaken or destroy any democratic union control of its members by the cherished principles of majority rule.

Next comes point 10, outlawing sympathy strikes, jurisdictional strikes, illegal boycotts, collusive strikes by employees of competing employers, and sit-down strikes. These features of the House bill are treated on page 59 of the conference report, and I quote:

Many of the matters covered in section 12 of the House bill are also covered in the conference agreement in different form, as has been pointed out above in the discussion of section 7 and section 8 (b) (1) of the conference agreement. Under existing principles of law developed by the courts and recently applied by the Board, employees who engage in violence, mass picketing, unfair labor practices, contract violations, or other improper conduct, or who force the employer to violate the law, do not have any immunity under the act and are subject to discharge without right of reinstatement. The right of the employer to discharge an employee for any such reason is protected in specific terms in section 10 (c). Furthermore, under section 10 (j) of the conference agreement, the Board is given authority to apply to the district courts for temporary injunctions restraining alleged unfair labor practices temporarily pending the decision of the Board on the merits.

In other words, section 8 (b) (1) makes mass picketing and sit-down strikes unfair labor practices and section 8 (b) (4) of the conference bill similarly outlaws sympathy strikes, jurisdictional strikes, illegal boycotts, and collusive strikes by employees of competing employers. Any employees participating in these activities may certainly be discharged for cause and are not entitled to reinstatement. And when I read sections 10 (j) and 10 (l) of the conference bill, I find that the National Labor Relations Board can seek court injunctions against mass picketing, jurisdictional strikes, and sit-down strikes, and must apply for injunctions against all of the other mentioned practices. On top of all this, employers are given a cause of action to recover any damages caused by the activities made unfair by section 8 (b) (4). The managers on the part of the House therefore cannot contend that they gave any real concessions on this phase of the House bill.

Point 11 is that the House bill outlaws strikes to remedy practices for which an administrative remedy is available, or to compel an employer to break the law. I believe this is taken care of by Section 8 (b) (4) (C) of the conference bill outlawing strikes to force recognition of unions other than those certified by the Board and I again place particular emphasis upon the admission of the conferees on page 44 of the report to the effect it is apparent that the Senate amendment is broader in its scope in regard to this provision than the corresponding provision of the House bill.

Point 12 I have already covered in substance. This point relates to mass picketing and forms of violence designed to prevent persons from entering or leaving places of employment. Sections 7 and 8 (b) (1) of the conference bill combine to make these activities unfair because they are coercion by unions and are subject to injunctions and to damage suits as explained on pages 42 and 43 of the conference report:

This provision of the Senate amendment in its general terms covered all of the activities which were prescribed in section 12 (a) (1) of the House bill as unlawful concerted activities and some of the activities which were proscribed in the other paragraphs of section 12 (a). While these restraining and coercive activities did not have the same treatment under the Senate amendment as under the corresponding provisions of the House bill, participation in them, as explained in the discussion of section 7, is not a protected activity under the act. Under the House bill, these activities could be enjoined upon suit by a private employer, specific provision was made for suits for damages on the part of any person injured thereby, and employees participating therein were subject to deprivation of their rights under the act. The conference agreement, while adopting section 8 (b) (1) of the Senate amendment, does not by specific terms contain any of these sanctions, but an employee who is discharged for participating in them will not, as explained in the discussion of section 7, be entitled to reinstatement. Furthermore, since in section 302 (b), unions are made suable, unions that engage in these practices to the injury of another may subject themselves to liability under ordinary principles of law. Then, too, under the provisions of section 10 (j) of the conference agreement the Board can seek a temporary injunction enjoining these practices pending its decision on the merits.

Point 13, which governs stranger picketing, has also been covered by Sections 7 and 8 (b) (1), since picketing a plant in which no labor dispute has occurred would constitute the coercion. This is covered by my above quotation from page 42 of the conference report.

Point 14, which lists the creation of a cause of action in damages for unlawful concerted activities, relates right back to point 10. Sections 301 and 303 of the conference bill provide the very remedy of which the House committee report boasts. The matter is treated at length on page 67 of the conference report:

Section 303 of the Senate amendment contained a provision the effect of which was to give persons injured by boycotts and jurisdictional disputes described in the new section 8 (b) (4) of the National Labor Relations Act a right to sue the labor organization responsible therefor in any district court of the United States (subject to the limitations and provisions of the section dealing with suits by and against labor organizations) to recover damages sustained by him together with the costs of the suit. A comparable provision was contained in the House bill in the new section 12 of the National Labor Relations Act dealing with unlawful concerted activities. The conference agreement adopts the provisions of the Senate amendment with clarifying changes.

As for the next point, it is stated that the House bill prescribes unfair labor practices by employees as well as employers. I think I have covered this sufficiently by my previous remarks. Certainly no one can question that there are a host of these new unfair labor practices in the conference bill. The pages of the report are filled with intricate discussion of their effects. I refer particularly to pages 42 to 46 of the report, from many of which I have already quoted. The fact that the final bill makes these unfair when performed by labor organizations and their agents is a minor distinction between the two measures.

Going further down the line of achievements claimed for the Hartley bill, I read next under point 16 that it creates a new and independent conciliation agency. And, as explained on page 62 of the conference report, this is the effect of title II of the conference bill. The United States Conciliation Service is abolished and a new independent Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service is created under the leadership of a Director appointed by the President.

Three of the remaining four points of the Hartley report are clearly covered by the conference bill and the conference report. Suits for contract violations in the Federal courts mentioned by point 18 are available under the final bill and are

treated in detail on pages 65 and 66 of the report:

Section 302 (a) of the House bill provided that any action for or proceeding involving a violation of a contract between an employer and a labor organization might be brought by either party in any district court of the United States having jurisdiction of the parties, without regard to the amount in controversy, if such contract affected commerce, or the court otherwise had jurisdiction. Under the Senate amendment the jurisdictional test was whether the employer was in an industry affecting commerce or whether the labor organization represented employees in such an industry. This test contained in the Senate amendment is also contained in the conference agreement, rather than the test in the House bill which required that the "contract affect commerce."

The immediately preceding pages also explain an elaborate method for stopping strikes which imperil or threaten to imperil the public health, safety, or interest. This is the practical counterpart of point 19 of the Hartley report. And the last point, namely, that the Hartley bill guarantees freedom of speech to employers, employees, and their representatives is outlined on page 45 of the conference report, where it is stated that the conference agreement adopts the provisions of the House bill in this respect.

Now the only point which does not seem to me to have been completely covered by the conference report is No. 17, stating that the Hartley bill removes the exemption of labor unions from the antitrust laws. This would be a fortunate thing if it were actually true. The conference bill, however, subjects unions to mandatory injunctions sought by the Board, to damage suits and to unfair labor practice proceedings, for practically every type of conduct in the use of economic force which formerly rendered these unions liable to damages and injunctions under the antitrust laws. The Norris-LaGuardia Act would be thrown out the window in these proceedings. The more recent decisions of the Supreme Court finally recognizing an effective exemption from the antitrust laws would be reversed by the Congress. The rule of the Danbury Hatters and Duplex cases of years ago would be revived again to plague unions in the legitimate use of the strike and the boycott to protect their very existence. This, therefore, Mr. Speaker, represents only a modest departure from the extreme position of the Hartley bill. I cannot recognize it as providing an important change from the policies and purposes of that measure. Nor does the conference report itself recognize this as a change. This is shown by the comment on page 65 of the conference report:

Since the matters dealt with in this section have to a large measure been effectuated through the use of boycotts, and since the conference agreement contains effective provisions directly dealing with boycotts themselves, this provision is omitted from the conference agreement.

There is the story, Mr. Speaker. It is in black and white. The gentleman from New Jersey has provided us with the complete picture provided we only look far enough. This irrefutable evidence exposes all the duplicity, all the misconceptions, and all the confusing double talk which have surrounded this measure. I am determined to have this story made clear once and for all. I am determined to make this point for the record and make it stick. That is my plain duty to the American people who must no longer be deceived.

GENERAL LEAVE TO REVISE AND EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the bill H. R. 2292 may revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole on the bill, H. R. 2298, and include herewith questions which he propounded and replies thereto by Mr. Mahaffie before the committee during the hearings.

Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extracts from certain publications.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a portion of the State Department Appropriation Act under which the so-called Voice of America operates.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a speech recently made by Hon. MARY T. NORTON at the International Council of Nurses at Atlantic City.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BENNETT of Michigan (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. DOLLIVER (at the request of Mr. HOEVEN), for 3 days, on account of official business.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3792. An act to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 310. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to permit the delivery of water from the District of Columbia and Arlington County water systems to the Falls Church or other water systems in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia in Virginia;

H. R. 360. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Francis Eugene Hardin, a minor;

H. R. 468. An act to amend section 115 of the Internal Revenue Code in respect of distributions by personal holding companies;

H. R. 620. An act for the relief of Blanche E. Broad;

H. R. 651. An act for the relief of the estate of Rubert W. Alexander;

H. R. 723. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Hunter A. Hoagland, a minor;

H. R. 765. An act for the relief of Elwood L. Keeler;

H. R. 888. An act for the relief of certain owners of land who suffered loss by fire in Lake Landing Township, Hyde County, N. C.;

H. R. 925. An act for the relief of Therese R. Cohen;

H. R. 1065. An act for the relief of the estate of Thomas Gambacorto;

H. R. 1221. An act for the relief of Eva Bilobran;

H. R. 1237. An act to regulate the marketing of economic poisons and devices, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1344. An act to admit the American-owned ferry *Crosline* to American registry and to permit its use in coastwise trade;

H. R. 1412. An act to grant to the Arthur Alexander Post, No. 68, the American Legion, of Belzoni, Miss., all of the reversionary interest reserved to the United States in lands conveyed to said post pursuant to act of Congress approved June 29, 1938;

H. R. 1482. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Gilda Cowan, a minor;

H. R. 1624. An act to authorize payment of allowances to three inspectors of the Metropolitan Police force for the use of their privately owned motor vehicles, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1874. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2207. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands within the Shiloh National Military Park, Tenn., and for other purposes;

H. R. 2237. An act to correct an error in section 342 (b) (8) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended;

H. R. 2257. An act for the relief of the Southeastern Sand & Gravel Co.;

H. R. 2353. An act to authorize the patenting of certain public lands to the State of Montana or to the Board of County Commissioners of Hill County, Mont., for public-park purposes;

H. R. 2363. An act to amend paragraph 8 of part VII, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to authorize an appropriation of $3,000,000 as a revolving fund in lieu of $1,500,000 now authorized, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2852. An act to provide for the addition of certain surplus Government lands to the Otter Creek recreational demonstration area, in the State of Kentucky;

H. R. 2872. An act to amend further section 4 of the Public Debt Act of 1941, as amended, and clarify its application, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3143. An act to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Paonia Federal reclamation project, Colorado;

H. R. 3151. An act to grant a certain water right and a certain parcel of land in Clark County, Nev., to the city of Las Vegas, Nev.;

H. R. 3197. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Mancos Water Conservancy District increasing the reimbursable construction cost obligation of the district to the United States for construction of the Mancos project and extending the repayment period;

H. R. 3348. An act to declare the policy of the United States with respect to the allocation of costs of construction of the Coachella division of the All-American Canal irrigation project, California;

H. R. 3604. An act to authorize the Methodist Home of the District of Columbia to make certain changes in its certificate of incorporation with respect to stated objects;

H. J. Res. 188. Joint resolution authorizing the erection on public grounds in the city of Washington, D. C., of a memorial to the dead of the First Infantry Division, United States Forces, World War II; and

H. J. Res. 210. Joint resolution to extend the time for the release, free of estate and gift tax, of certain powers, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 20, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

809. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of $1,743,000 for the Department of Labor (H. Doc. No. 331); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

810. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of $35,000 for the legislative branch, Library of Congress, in the form of an amendment to the budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 332); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

811. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed joint resolution to amend the joint resolution providing for the membership of the United States in the American International Institute for the Protection of Childhood; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

812. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of a proposed transfer of naval equipment to the Junior Midshipmen of America, Inc., of Connecticut; to the Committee on Armed Services.

813. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 9, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Winterport Harbor, Maine, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

814. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 9, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on the intracoastal waterway from Choctawhatchee Bay to Pensacola Bay, Fla., and a preliminary examination and survey of waterway from the intracoastal waterway south across Santa Rosa Island, Fla., to a point at or near Deer Point Light, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on October 5, 1940, and also authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

815. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report on the cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease; to the Committee on Agriculture.

816. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a copy of a report from the Secretary of State indicating a course of action which the Secretaries of State, War, Navy, and Interior have agreed should be followed with respect to the administration of Guam, Samoa, and the Pacific islands to be placed under United States trusteeship (H. Doc. No. 333); to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BURKE: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 107. A bill for the acquisition and maintenance of wildlife management and control areas in the State of California, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 609). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TOLLEFSON: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 859. A bill to provide for the exploration, investigation, development, and maintenance of the fishing resources and development of the high seas fishing industry of the Territories and island possessions of the United States in the tropical and subtropical Pacific Ocean and intervening seas, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 610). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BRADLEY: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 3569. A bill to authorize the construction of a chapel and a library at the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N. Y., and to authorize the acceptance of private contributions to assist in defraying the cost of construction thereof; with an amendment (Rept. No. 611). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. House Joint Resolution 211. Joint resolution consenting to an interstate oil compact to conserve oil and gas; without amendment (Rept. No. 612). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPRINGER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1639. A bill to amend the Employers' Liability Act so as to limit venue in actions brought in United States district courts or in State courts under such act; with an amendment (Rept. No. 613). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. S. 1316. An act to establish a procedure for facilitating the payment of certain Government checks, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 614). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SADLAK: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 1995. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide for the return of the amount of deductions from the compensation of any employee who is separated from the service or transferred to a position not within the purview of such act before completing 10 years of service; with amendments (Rept. No. 615). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REES: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 3813. A bill to provide for removal from, and the prevention of appointment to, offices or positions in the executive branch of the Government of persons who are found to be disloyal to the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 616). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REED of New York. Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 3444. A bill to amend section 251 of the Internal Revenue Code; without amendment (Rept. No. 617). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 3905. A bill to authorize the transfer of lands in the Fort Wingate Military Reserve, N. Mex., from the War Department to the Interior Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3906. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to make provision for the care and treatment of members of the National Guard, Organized Reserves, Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and citizens' military training camps who are injured or contract disease while engaged in military training, and for other purposes," approved June 15, 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 3907. A bill to authorize construction of buildings for the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 3908. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 so as to require payments under section 6 of such act to be made to persons entitled thereto without requiring them to make applications for such payments; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SCOBLICK:

H. R. 3909. A bill to provide for the advancement in grade upon appointment to regular positions of certain substitute employees in the postal service who are veterans of World War II; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TOWE:

H. R. 3910. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 so as to extend the benefits thereof to certain officers discharged prior to its enactment; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WEICHEL (by request):

H. R. 3911. A bill to continue temporary authority of the Maritime Commission until March 1, 1948; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WOODRUFF:

H. R. 3912. A bill to amend section 2000 (a) (2) and 2000 (c) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code relating to taxes on tobacco and tobacco products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 3915. A bill to increase the size of the Arkansas-Mississippi Bridge Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. J. Res. 220. Joint resolution establishing a code for health and safety in bituminous coal and lignite mines of the United States the products of which regularly enter commerce or the operations of which substantially affect commerce; to the Committtee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. Res. 250. Resolution banning salacious moving pictures; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COURTNEY:

H. R. 3913. A bill for the relief of Willie Ruth Chapman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 3914. A bill for the relief of James Leon Keaton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

653. By Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Resolution adopted by the Buffalo Council for a Permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission, Buffalo, N. Y., urging favorable action on H. R. 2824 and S. 984, providing for a Fair Employment Practice Commission, in this session of Congress; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

654. By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of Publishers Printing Co. chapel, New York City, urging that Congress take immediate steps to amend the social-security law by reducing the retirement age from 65 to 60 and increasing monthly payments by 100 percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

655. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretary and president of the Triumvirate Friends Club, Mexico, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to expressing appreciation of the citizens of Cuautla for the honors paid to the Mexican people in the person of their ruler, Lic. Miguel Alemán Valdés; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JUNE 20, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. John E. Garvin, of the diocese of Bismarck, N. Dak., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and Eternal God, we adore Thee, and we promise obedience to Thy Holy Law.

We pray Thee, O God of might, of wisdom, and of justice, through whom authority is rightly administered, laws are enacted, and judgments decreed, assist, with Thy Holy Spirit of counsel and fortitude, the Members of the Senate of these United States, that their ministrations may be conducted in righteousness and be eminently useful to Thy people, whom they represent. Let the light of Thy divine wisdom direct their deliberations and shine forth in all the proceedings and laws framed for our rule and government, so that they may tend to the preservation of peace, the promotion of national happiness, the increase of industry, sobriety, and useful knowledge, and may perpetuate to us the blessings of equal liberty.

Grant to them this day the grace to work with gratitude and joy, considering it an honor to employ and develop the talents they have received from God; to work with order, peace, moderation, and patience, ever recoiling before weariness or difficulties; to work, above all, with purity of intention and with detachment from self, having always before their eyes the public good and the welfare of our country. Inspire them with Thy wisdom and strengthen them with Thy power, so that the results of their words and actions may be characterized by justice and prudence and the government of our great country may conform always to Thy holy will.

Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 19, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 966. An act to amend section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of June 27, 1944 (58 Stat. 387);

H. R. 1389. An act to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944; and

H. R. 2298. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR THE PROTECTION OF CHILDHOOD

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the joint resolution providing for the membership of the United States in the American International Institute for the Protection of Childhood (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

DONATIONS BY NAVY DEPARTMENT TO NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, a list of institutions and organizations, all nonprofit and eligible, which have requested donations from the Navy Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Resolution 23

"Joint resolution memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States in relation to the Federal income tax as it affects community-property States

"Whereas there appears to be a movement on the part of non-community-property States to secure the passage of Federal legislation which would deny to residents of California the right to file separate income-tax returns on community income or which would arbitrarily permit in every State the division of all income of one spouse with the other, without regard to the law of that State; and

"Whereas California, Arizona, Idaho, Louisiana, Nevada, New Mexico, Texas, and Washington are community-property States under the laws of which husband and wife are each the owner of one-half of the community property; and

"Whereas by reason of such community ownership husband and wife own all community property and all community income equally, for all purposes, including the responsibility of paying taxes thereon; and

"Whereas Federal income taxes are, and ought to be, levied against the owner of income as determined by law; and

"Whereas such proposed legislation would fictitiously permit persons who are the legal owners of income to avoid payment of Federal income tax thereon; or which in community-property States would force payment of a tax on income which is not legally owned by the husband, completely disregarding the bona fide and historic property laws of California and the several States relating to property and income acquired after marriage; and

"Whereas the community-property law was in effect in the western region of the United States prior to the admission of California into the Union, and the property rights then in effect were guaranteed to the residents of California by the treaty with Mexico under which California became a part of the United States; and

"Whereas such proposed legislation would thus, by indirection, destroy the property rights of citizens of California as guaranteed by said treaty; and

"Whereas these community-property rights are in jeopardy because of pending Federal legislation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the President and the Congress of the United States are hereby respectfully memorialized and requested to take such steps as may be necessary to defeat such proposed legislation as, in part, are represented by H. R. 1759, by Mr. REEVES; amendment to H. R. 1 (Knutson bill), by Mr. BUTLER; S. 626, by Mr. CORDON; S. 649, by Mr. TYDINGS; S. 550, by Mr. LANGER; H. R. 2219, by Mr. ANGELL; H. R. 2002, by Mr. ROBERTSON.

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate prepare and transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President pro tempore of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from California."

A letter in the nature of a petition from L. Graham Lehman, Washington, D. C., praying for the passage, over the President's veto, of the so-called Taft-Hartley labor bill (with

an accompanying paper); ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution adopted by the members of the fourth division of the American Legion, Department of Texas, in convention assembled at Temple, Tex., June 8, 1947, favoring the prompt enactment of Senate bill 866, the so-called Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Joint Resolution 8

"Whereas the huge reduction in the 1947 agricultural conservation program funds from $301,720,000 to $165,614,290, and the reduction in other agricultural appropriations, recommended by the House Appropriations Committee in Washington, has halted practically all Production and Marketing Administration (AAA) activities in Alabama. Preliminary estimates recently made by PMA show that funds already obligated will equal or exceed the $165,614,290 allowable by the Appropriations Committee recommendation; and

"Whereas much progress has been made in conservation during the past 9 years with the aid of AAA; practically one-half of Alabama farmers are now planting winter cover crops; terracing and other soil-conservation work is being carried on with great benefit to Alabama and the Nation; and

"Whereas there are now about 65,000 farmers in Alabama cooperating with and being directly benefited by this program; and indirect benefits are being derived by all the people of Alabama; and

"Whereas the conservation needs of Alabama are far in excess of what are now being met; we believe it is the responsibility of society to see that our soil resources are maintained and improved for future generations; and

"Whereas the proposed reduction in agricultural appropriations threatens to wreck the school-lunch program in Alabama unless the State greatly increases its funds of matching Federal money; and funds will be denied for farm-tenant loans to thousands of Alabama veterans, and small farmers under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Purchase Act; and

"Whereas we believe the farmers will be forced to exploit and drain the soil fertility if the agricultural conservation program is curtailed; much heretofore accomplished will be lost: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the State Senate of Alabama (the House of Representatives concurring):

"1. That the Congress of the United States be most respectfully urged to continue and not to reduce the appropriations for the United States Department of Agriculture to carry on the agricultural conservation program and other programs being put on by the Agriculture Department.

"2. That the United States Senators, Hon. LISTER HILL and Hon. JOHN SPARKMAN, and our Representatives in Congress, be asked to support the agricultural conservation program and to vote for and to lend their support for the continuance of the annual appropriation of $301,720,000, and other agricultural appropriations vital to the people of Alabama.

"3. That the secretary of state of Alabama be directed to transmit duly certified copies of this memorial to the President of the United States, chairmen of the United States Senate and House Committees on Agriculture, the United States Senate and House Committees on Appropriations, the Secretary of Agriculture in Washington, and to each Member of our congressional delegation.

"Approved June 13, 1947."

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alabama, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.)

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 18. A bill to establish uniform qualifications of jurors in the Federal courts, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 314);

S. 175. A bill to provide for the furnishing of quarters at Brunswick, Ga., for the United States District Court for the Southern District of Georgia; without amendment (Rept. No. 315);

S. 179. A bill for the relief of Maj. Ralph M. Rowley and First Lt. Irving E. Sheffel; without amendment (Rept. No. 331);

S. 258. A bill for the relief of Troy Charles Davis, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 322);

S. 292. A bill for the relief of Samuel Augenblick; without amendment (Rept. No. 316);

S. 490. A bill to provide for the extension and application of the provisions of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to certain officers and employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service in the Department of Justice; without amendment (Rept. No. 317);

S. 880. A bill for the relief of Rev. John C. Young; without amendment (Rept. No. 332);

S. 957. A bill for the relief of Col. William J. Kennard; without amendment (Rept. No. 333);

S. 1100. A bill for the relief of Frankie Stalnaker; with an amendment (Rept. No. 323); and

H. R. 1742. A bill for the relief of Mary Lomas; with an amendment (Rept. No. 318).

By Mr. BRIDGES, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 3791. A bill making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 319);

S. Res. 129. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Appropriations, in making investigations under the Legislative Reorganization Act, to employ temporary assistants and make certain expenditures; with an amendment; and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration; and

S. Res. 130. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Appropriations to make additional expenditures under section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946; without amendment; and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 2276. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to pay certain expenses incident to training, attendance, and participation of personnel of the Army of the United States in the Seventh Winter Sports Olympic Games and the Fourteenth Olympic Games and for future Olympic games; with amendments (Rept. No. 328).

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 1358. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the management and operation of naval plantations, outside the continental United States," approved June 28, 1944; with amendments (Rept. No. 326).

By Mr. BALDWIN, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 1375. A bill to further amend section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, so as to provide for the clothing allowance of enlisted men of the Marine Corps and Marine Corps Reserve; with amendments (Rept. No. 324); and

H. R. 2248. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to grant an easement and to convey to the Louisiana Power & Light Co. a tract of land comprising a portion of Camp Livingston in the State of Louisiana; without amendment (Rept. No. 325).

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 1845. A bill to amend existing laws relating to military leave of certain employees of the United States or of the District of Columbia so as to equalize rights to leave of absence and reemployment for such employees who are members of the Enlisted or Officers' Reserve Corps, the National Guard, or the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 327).

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 3629. A bill to authorize the transfer to the Panama Canal of property which is surplus to the needs of the War Department or Navy Department; without amendment (Rept. No. 329).

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 3124. A bill to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the Eighty-first National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held in Cleveland, Ohio, August 10 to 14, 1947; without amendment (Rept. No. 330).

By Mr. ECTON, from the Committee on Public Lands:

S. 402. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to James Black Dog a patent in fee to certain land; with an amendment (Rept. No. 334); and

S. 608. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Growing Four Times; with an amendment (Rept. No. 335).

By Mr. McCARTHY, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 1361. A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 so as to permit capital grants for low-rent-housing and slum-clearance projects where construction costs exceed present cost limitations upon condition that local housing agencies pay the difference between cost limitations and the actual construction costs; with amendments (Rept. No. 336).

EXTENSION OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I ask unanimous consent to report an original joint resolution to extend temporarily the succession and powers of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and I submit a report (No. 321) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received, and the joint resolution will be placed on the calendar.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 135) to extend the succession, lending powers, and the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, was read twice by its title and placed on the calendar.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I ask unanimous consent to report adversely the concurrent resolution (H. Con. 49) against adoption of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of May 1, 1947, and I submit a report (No. 320) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received, and the concurrent resolution will be placed on the calendar.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. LANGER, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon pursuant to law.

INVESTIGATION OF OPERATIONS OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION AND SUBSIDIARIES

Mr. BUCK, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 132); which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete inquiry into the operations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date but not later than March 1, 1948.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable, and is authorized, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joints resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GURNEY (by request):

S. 1477. A bill to designate the Air University Library, Army Air Forces, as a public depository for Government publications; and

S. 1478. A bill to authorize the transfer of lands in the Fort Wingate Military Reserve, N. Mex., from the War Department to the Interior Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CAPEHART (by request) (for himself, Mr. MARTIN, and Mr. KILGORE):

S. 1479. A bill to provide for an appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States from the decision of the Court of Claims in a suit instituted by George A. Carden and Anderson T. Herd; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCK:

S. 1480. A bill authorizing the conveyance to the State of Delaware of a portion of Pea Patch Island; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McGRATH:

S. 1481. A bill to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight saving time in the District; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 1482. A bill for the relief of F. DuWayne Blankley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 1483. A bill for the relief of Guy Cheng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE (by request):

S. 1484. A bill to continue temporary authority of the Maritime Commission until March 1, 1948; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 1485. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to dispose of certain lands heretofore acquired for the Albuquerque Indian School, New Mexico; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. THYE (for himself and Mr. O'CONOR):

S. 1486. A bill to provide for payment of salaries covering periods of separation from the Government service in the case of persons improperly removed from such service; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. HILL):

S. 1487. A bill to remove restrictions upon loans by Federal agencies to finance the construction of certain public works; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. J. Res. 134. Joint resolution providing for the proper observance of the one hundred and sixtieth anniversary of the signing of the Constitution of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. BUCK, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, reported an original joint resolution (S. J. Res. 135) to extend the succession, lending powers, and the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which was ordered to be placed on the calendar, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. VANDENBERG (by request):

S. J. Res. 136. Joint resolution authorizing the President to accept on behalf of the Government of the United States the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION—AMENDMENT

Mr. McMAHON submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 564) to provide for the performance of the duties of the office of President, in case of the removal, resignation, or inability both of the President and Vice President, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL INSURANCE CONTRIBUTIONS ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. BALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3818) to amend the Federal Insurance Contributions Act with respect to rates of tax on employers and employees, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred as indicated:

H. R. 966. An act to amend section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of June 27, 1944 (58 Stat. 387); and

H. R. 1389. An act to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944; to the Committee on Civil Service.

H. R. 2298. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

DAVID I. WALSH—EDITORIAL EULOGIES

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two editorials eulogistic of the late Senator David I. Walsh, the first from the Boston Herald of June 12, 1947, and the second from the Boston Globe of the same date, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE CLARK HILL PROJECT IN SOUTH CAROLINA—STATEMENTS BY HON. J. STROM THURMOND AND HON. BUTLER B. HARE

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD addresses by Hon. J. Strom Thurmond, Governor of South Carolina, and Hon. Butler B. Hare, former Representative from South Carolina, before the Civil Functions Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, which appear in the Appendix.]

SOIL EROSION BY FLOODS—EDITORIAL FROM PHILADELPHIA EVENING BULLETIN

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Your Country's Soil Is Being Stolen," published in the June 15, 1947, issue of the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] I ask consent of the Senate that the subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare holding a hearing on the so-called Fair Employment Practice Act, now being considered by the committee, may hold a meeting while the Senate is in session today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

AID IN INDUSTRIALIZATION OF UNDERDEVELOPED AREAS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, in connection with Senate bill 1452, to provide for aid in industrialization of underdeveloped areas, and for other purposes, introduced in the Senate on June 16, 1947, by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], several other Senators, and myself, I should like to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Mr. W. W. Mims, editor of the Edgefield Advertiser, a newspaper which has been in operation for 111 years, longer than any other newspaper in my State. The editor of this paper has lived close to the soil, he has served his State well as a legislator and an editor. I believe he here grasps the significance of a situation which is the root problem in the South's relatively poor economy. I commend to the attention of the Senate his letter and two editorials from his newspaper, and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the lettter and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EDGEFIELD ADVERTISER,
Edgefield, S. C., June 17, 1947.

Senator OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSTON: I am pleased to see that you, together with other Senators,

are seeking congressional aid in bringing industries to the South and West.

This problem which you are facing squarely is in reality a national problem. When the rural areas of the Nation with their proportionately large population lose their buying power it is impossible for the country as a whole to prosper.

If Congress could know the widespread poverty in rural areas even in normal times, a poverty not the result of thriftlessness, but poverty in spite of thrift and 10 to 18 hours a day of toil in all weather, it would consider the human side as well as the economic which itself is important enough.

We realize in the South that mechanization is on its way. We realize that when this postwar restrictive period is ended and machinery is available in any quantity the farm lands which are adapted to the use of machinery will be almost completely mechanized.

The result will be not only the displacement of farm labor, but this type of farming will offer such competition to the small farmer, whose lands are not so well adapted to machine operation and who for other reasons cannot make the best use of modern methods, that he will be thrown almost completely out of the economic picture.

It is important, I think, to keep in mind the fact that the South is the most purely American area of our whole Nation, and it is true that these small farmers are typical themselves of what America means. They have carried on through generations, frequently on the same lands, planting the same fields and taking great pride in the continuity of ownership and in their independence.

You know, Senator, that the southern farmer was taught by his father to work. You, as well as any southerner, can resurrect the picture of a typical small farmer laboring in his fields long hours, often with members of his family, including children, and in the fall these same children would not, from the harvest, have the money to buy adequate school clothes. And unfortunately college training seldom reaches into these families.

Through many generations our farms have been cultivated and exploited with small reward. Cotton at 5 cents to 12 cents cannot rebuild a depleted soil, or maintain it. The cash value of farm products in normal times is not such as to repair outhouses or build terraces.

Automobiles which now sell for $1,400 will not sell for $200 when and if cotton drops to 5 cents, as it has done in the past. Refrigerators, which are now accepted as standard household equipment, will not sell for $30 when and if corn and hogs drop back to their lowest level.

Whether farm prices will ever be normal again, or hit bottom in a period of slump, no one knows, but prices are likely to fall most in the class of products grown on the farm. Industrial sections can control the prices of their products: They shut down their plants and lay off their workers if necessary, but the farmer plants his crops with only faith and hope, and these have not been enough. The harvest floods the markets and the labors of the farm family have been in vain.

To avoid a relapse into an economic condition which led the late President to say "The South is the Nation's No. 1 economic problem," small farmers of the South must have means of employment to earn the necessary cash for a fair standard of living. Experience is showing now that they will remain on their farms and produce in their spare time home needs. They are more apt to leave the farm if they do not have other means to supplement their cash incomes.

The late Henry Ford's phrase "one foot in factory and one in the soil" patterned a hopeful way of life for the small farmers of rural America, farmers who will not be able to keep pace with modern farm methods.

Each town should be aided in the development of small industries. They need technical help just now more than financial aid. They cannot lift themselves by their boot straps. For example, Edgefield people have been interested in a pottery plant (Edgefield had successful potteries in years past). Even though they might raise the money, what steps would they take to establish a pottery not knowing the engineering requirements or what clays would be suitable? Edgefield people last year organized the Edgefield Industrial Development Corporation capitalized at about $20,000 inviting outside investments and offering to build a building, with especial interest in garment manufacturing. This has not yet succeeded, although many investors from other States have been here to discuss proposals.

Fact is that trained men who know how to set up plants for the manufacture of such things as pottery, clothing, canned goods and other food products and products from wood of which this section has a plentiful supply, are simply not available, and even though local persons organize and raise money, they actually have no point at which to make a start. They do not have what is commonly called the "know-how."

In a section which has been agricultural from the earliest times, industrialization with its skills and techniques will take a longer time than though technical experts could be furnished to communities to help in these problems.

Edgefield County has a large variety of minerals and clays which could be utilized. It has a plentiful supply of labor—people who don't mind working for fair pay. Citizens here are eager to provide industrial employment and are ready to invest their money in enterprises which are well advised and can be established on a reasonably sound basis.

American technicians have promoted industrial development in almost every country of the world. But here in large sections of our Nation there is almost a complete ignorance of industrial techniques and possibilities.

I think your work in connection with industrialization of rural sections will be a great boon to the South and to the whole Nation as well.

Nonindustrialization perpetuates nonindustrialization. Young students of engineering leave home to go where there is a progressive outlook and opportunity for lifetime success. If the South can make headway during this period when local citizenry has some capital of its own—when farm prices are at a very good level—the South stands a chance of establishing economic independence. If it loses the opportunity now, there will be another impending period of economic stagnation.

I want to thank you for your support of equalization of rail rates, and for your other efforts in behalf of the progress of this section.

Sincerely,

W. W. MIMS.

[From the Edgefield (S. C.) Advertiser of February 26, 1947]

ONE FOOT IN THE SOIL

The best defense developing against another serious depression is the coming of local industries to this section to provide pay rolls, or in simple phrase—spending money which is the life-blood of business.

While incoming industries are no certain guarantee against economic slump, which at its worst becomes a world-wide depression, they will help to brighten the business picture in dark days, as well as serving surely to make business better in normal times.

It is well to keep in mind that local industries drawing workers from surrounding areas, keeping "one foot in the soil" (the words are Henry Ford's), is an ideal situation. In case of temporary work suspension in times of economic stress, dependency is not shifted to government, as in case of the city worker whose environment leaves him so susceptible to communistic propaganda. With home and farm still intact, the family is still a functioning unit of democracy.

A friend, and a very solid citizen in our opinion who believes in his church and in his home and in his farm, told the writer one day this week that he had applied for a job at the new Johnston mill where he will make a substantial hourly wage. "I can make more cash there than on my farm," he said. "But I have no intention of giving up my farming operations entirely. The new mill has a revolving shift for all workers, which will enable me to get a lot done at home to boot, and I'll continue to raise grains and to provide home needs."

A better example of why the South is the Nation's most hopeful section we do not know.

[From the Edgefield (S. C.) Advertiser of May 14, 1947]

INDUSTRIAL PRODUCTION IN LOW-INCOME AREAS ALTERNATIVE TO GOVERNMENT CONTROL

A slump and perhaps another major depression will be the result if the Nation reverts to a condition in which the industrial sections sell their products at industry-regulated prices while agricultural commodities go on the markets at whatever the market will pay.

In 1947, even more than in the nineteen thirties, a large portion of consumer spending goes for industrial products. This money spent for what other sections produce is siphoned off with a large degree of permanence; for there is nothing comparable in agriculture to the selling value of machine-made, industrial goods.

The alternative to Government extending control over production, marketing, prices and almost every other phase of business enterprise, at some future time, is industrial development in areas where the income of the people is lowest.

The most grievious fact of American economy for the past several generations is that large areas of the Nation have had an average per capita income of barely one-half that of industrial areas where wealth has been produced almost exclusively by machine mass production. This unbalanced condition in which southern States have lived on a mere subsistence basis, depleting much of their soils, timber, and other resources, drew the comment of the late President Roosevelt that "the South is the Nation's No. 1 economic problem."

Conditions in agricultural sections are better today, but it will take a long time to catch up.

The South now is definitely on the advance industrially. The war converted industry to armament-making, and in the postwar reconversion the chance to establish industrial plants in new locations has been the result. One major moving factor has been the opportunity of agricultural sections to build up cash resources and capital.

Congratulations to all who had a part in the fight for equalization of freight rates. This will be of incalculable benefit in the South's industrial advance.

SALARIES OF SCHOOL TEACHERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill (S. 564) to provide for the performance of the duties of the Office of President in case of the removal, resignation,

or inability both of the President and Vice President, is the unfinished business.

Mr. CAIN obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum, or does he prefer to proceed?

Mr. CAIN. I think it might be well to have a quorum.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Morse
Baldwin	Hatch	Murray
Ball	Hawkes	Myers
Barkley	Hayden	O'Conor
Brewster	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Bricker	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Holland	Overton
Brooks	Ives	Pepper
Buck	Jenner	Reed
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Va.
Byrd	Kem	Robertson, Wyo.
Cain	Kilgore	Russell
Capehart	Knowland	Saltonstall
Capper	Langer	Smith
Chavez	Lodge	Sparkman
Connally	McCarran	Taft
Cooper	McCarthy	Taylor
Cordon	McClellan	Thye
Donnell	McFarland	Tydings
Downey	McGrath	Umstead
Dworshak	McKellar	Vandenberg
Eastland	McMahon	Watkins
Ecton	Magnuson	Wherry
Ellender	Malone	White
Ferguson	Martin	Wiley
Fulbright	Maybank	Williams
George	Millikin	Wilson
Green	Moore	Young

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family.

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3611, the bill affecting school teachers in the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the House bill, H. R. 3611?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3611) to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I send to the desk two committee perfecting amendments and ask for their consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington offers an amendment, which the Clerk will state.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 30, line 4, after "SEC. 21", it is proposed to insert "(a)", and on page 30, between lines 10 and 11, it is proposed to insert the following subsection:

(b) After the effective date of this act, the act entitled "An act for the retirement of the public school teachers in the District of Columia," approved August 7, 1946, shall apply to employees of the Board of Education whose salaries are fixed by this act, and all references in said act to the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1945, as amended, shall be interpreted to apply to this act. Nothing in this subsection shall require the recomputation of the annuity of any person retired under the act of August 7, 1946, prior to the effective date of this act, or of any person retired prior to the effective date of the act of August 7, 1946, whose annuity is computed in accordance with the provisions of that act.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will not the Senator explain what the amendment would accomplish?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, some of the persons to be covered by the provisions of House bill 3611 appeared during the course of the committee's deliberations and expressed a feeling that some of their annuity and retirement and tenure rights might be held in jeopardy because of the provisions of the bill. The amendment is merely a clarifying amendment, which goes back to the basic law of 1906.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Washington on behalf of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I send another amendment to the desk and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 29, line 6, it is proposed to strike out the word "sick," after the word "cumulative", and on page 29, line 7, after the word "pay", to insert "because of personal illness, the presence of contagious disease, death in the home, or pressing emergency."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Washington on behalf of the committee.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington explain the amendment?

Mr. CAIN. Indeed, sir. For a number of years, sick-leave benefits have been provided to employees in the attendance officers' section. The employee could avail himself of sick leave only if he was actually sick. As a result of full discussion, not only with the employees affected, but with the school administration and the school board, it was thought wise and proper to liberalize the restrictions presently found in the sick-leave provision so as to permit a teacher to be absent, at home, because of death in the family, serious illness of children, or other pressing emergency; a determination of the emergency to be made by the school administration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington on behalf of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, House bill 3611 does more than provide needed salary increases for the teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia. Its provisions, if adopted, will result in an improved school system. The bill recognizes and includes the progressive improvements developed within recent years by the foremost school systems of America.

H. R. 3611 is not the result of the thinking and work of any single individual. It was designed through the joint efforts and collective study by the District of Columbia fiscal subcommittees of the Senate and House of Representatives, the Washington, D. C., School Superintendent and his staff, the Board of Education, representatives of teachers' organizations, and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. It is worthy of note that H. R. 3611 was not submitted for approval to the District of Columbia committees of the Senate and House of Representatives until its substance and details had been approved by the previously mentioned groups of codesigners. In their opinion, H. R. 3611 is an instrument which will advance the cause of modern education in the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3611 is possessed of both a philosophy and a tangible purpose. Underlying its five titles is an acknowledgement that the sole aim of the school system of the District of Columbia must be, and is, to provide the best possible education for children of the community. Every plan and every action of the Board of Education must be construed and thought of in the light of the resulting benefit to pupils and students.

The primary purpose of H. R. 3611 is to attract and hold teachers who are qualified and who want to instruct the youth of today, who are to become the citizens of tomorrow. If children are to be well educated, it is obviously essential that high morale and a reasonable sense of security prevail among educational officers and teachers. The pay bill before us provides teaching incomes which, without being extravagant, are high enough to make the District of Columbia teaching profession attracting and attractive.

H. R. 3611 accomplishes five major objectives:

First. The bill puts into effect the principle of the single salary schedule, which is that equal salary recognition will be given at all teaching levels for equal preparation. Every progressive school system in America recognizes this principle today. H. R. 3611 provides salary

recognition for the master's degree at the elementary school level as previous congressional legislation has provided such salary recognition for the same degree at the junior and high school levels.

Second. The bill provides for making permanent the $450 temporary salary increase which was granted by the Congress for 1946–47 only, and for an additional annual salary increase of $150. This will grant an increase in salary to all teachers in the system except for a group of slightly less than 1 percent of the total of teachers who number approximately 3,600. Teachers in this small group are already above the maximums of the classes to which they would be assigned under the bill. The recommended 1947–48 salary increase of $150 will cost $770,000.

Third. The bill establishes a salary range of $2,500 to $4,000 for teachers without masters' degrees and of $3,000 to $4,500 for teachers who possess masters' degrees. The present minimum teaching salary is $2,350; the maximum is currently $4,150. It is thought that the recommended salary ranges will induce capable young teachers to enter the teaching profession and to encourage those already in to remain. These salary ranges are properly in line with the upward trend throughout the Nation, though they are substantially below the highest comparable salaries being paid in some other large American cities. In addition, the bill establishes comparable increases in salary ranges for administrative personnel who worked on a 12-month basis.

Fourth. The bill provides for a program of in-service training to be established under regulations to be formulated by the Board of Education for teachers, school officers, and other employees in order to insure professional growth among these persons. The program will serve also as a means and standard for determining eligibility for additional salary increments at 5-year periods. This provision will make as certain as can be made certain that the teachers and employees within the system will keep pace with progress.

Fifth. The bill recognizes that the practices of the Board of Education to accomplish promotions to what has been known as the superior rating group are eliminated by the intended in-service training program. This change which will be readily endorsed and approved by most of the teachers, as it is by the Board of Education, will also materially simplify the whole salary schedule structure.

Mr. President, the many authors of H. R. 3611 feel little pride of authorship. They simply feel privileged in having had an opportunity to work toward improvements for their school system, out of which will come young graduates who are trained and ready and anxious to take their places in higher institutions of learning or in the outside world. A year ago the Congress directed the Board of Education to study its needs and problems. This examination was undertaken by conscientious and unselfish people. To my mind they did a competent job. Not all of their suggestions were accepted by the proper committees of the Congress and the District Commissioners but the excellence and imperative requirements of their recommended program are covered by the provisions of H. R. 3611. To pass the bill is to help in creating a school system to which any Member of the Senate could well afford to send his son or daughter. That is a very high compliment indeed. The junior Senator from Washington hopes that the bill will pass without material changes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD], I offer an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 10, line 21, after the numerals "1946" and the period, it is proposed to insert the following:

> Any teacher, school officer, or other employee who, on June 30, 1947, under the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1945, as amended, was in group C or D of class 2, group A or B of class 3, group A or B of class 4, group C or D of class 5, group C or D of class 6, group A or B of class 7, group A or B of class 8, or in any one of classes 9 to 30, inclusive, irrespective of whether such teacher, school officer, or other employee possesses a master's degree, may receive the annual increases provided for in this act until the maximum salary of his class is reached.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina, for himself and other Senators.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, there are in the District of Columbia school system 196 school teachers who have been employed since 1933, whom the Board of Education has recognized as having the equivalent of a master's degree, although in fact they do not have a master's degree. The Board of Education has considered them to be in the same category with teachers possessing a master's degree. The Board of Education at the present time feels that it would not be treating those teachers fairly if at this time we were to say to them, after the Board had, during all this period, considered them as having the equivalent of a master's degree, some of the teachers having been with the system as long as 14 years, "You shall no longer be considered as having the equivalent of a master's degree."

This amendment will cost only a few thousand dollars, but it will probably amount to a great deal to the teachers as they retire in the future. It will not give them all of the increase at one time, but will allow them to take advantage of the increase gradually until they reach the maximum of $4,500. If we want to say to those teachers, "Yes; we employed you, and have employed you year after year, and have considered you as possessing the equivalent of a master's degree, but now we are going to block you out," that is what the bill would do. The majority of the committee, having sponsored this amendment, feel that it would do nothing but justice to those teachers to give them what the Board of Education has accorded them in the past. The amendment would have no effect on teachers to be employed in the future. It would have no effect on the standardization of the school system. As these particular teachers retire and new teachers are employed, there will be in the law the requirement of a master's degree. However, we feel that these particular teachers should enjoy the same privilege which they have enjoyed in the past.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from South Carolina several questions.

First, is the Senator satisfied in his own mind that he and other Senators who joined with him in sponsoring this amendment have not merely read the amendment, but have studied it and know precisely, beyond question of doubt, what the amendment would do if translated into law?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I think we all understand what it would do. The object is to take care of 196 teachers. Is not that what the Senator understands?

Mr. CAIN. I was directing the question to the Senator as to what the amendment would do if it were to become law. The Senator says it would take care of 196 teachers.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Only 196. That is the information which I have received from the Superintendent of Education. The amendment was prepared at his direction and suggestion, and I joined in sponsoring it.

Mr. CAIN. The second question is: Do I correctly understand the Senator to say that the Board of Education approves his approach to this problem through the amendment?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Board of Education submitted the suggested amendment.

Mr. CAIN. If I may offer a suggestion, the Board of Education submitted it at the request of the Senator from South Carolina, did they not?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator may recall that when the Superintendent was before the committee he stated that the amendment would be nothing but right and just.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, this is not an easy problem. If I may have the permission of the Senator from South Carolina, I should like to define as best I can the difference between a single-salary schedule, which we are endeavoring to devise for the teachers of this community, and the procedures which the school system has followed in the past.

Today there is a requirement for a master's degree if a teacher is to be engaged to teach in the senior-high schools. There is no such provision with relation to the junior-high schools, or the elementary schools. The single-salary schedule

merely provides that teachers shall receive equal pay for equal preparation, regardless of where the teaching is done, whether in the elementary schools, the junior-high schools, or the senior-high schools.

When the hearings on the teachers' pay bill were begun several months ago it was early determined that the school system wanted, above all else, a single-salary schedule to cover all its teachers. Members of the committees of both the Senate and House agreed, without argument, and almost without discussion, because we know what the progressive teaching and school trends are. We said, "We shall endeavor to give you what you request, a single-salary schedule. How are we going to do it?" The simplicity of the schedule was made clear to us. It was proposed to provide a minimum level and a maximum level for those who were possessed of master's degrees, regardless of the divisions in which the teachers might be teaching. We have laid down a dollar minimum and maximum for holders of masters' degrees, of $3,000 to begin with, going to a maximum of $4,500. That is the upper side of the single-salary schedule.

We have likewise agreed upon minimum and maximum salary levels for those within the system, in the senior high schools, junior high schools, or elementary schools, who are not possessed of master's degrees. We attempt to begin with a minimum of $2,500 and a maximum of $4,000. The difference, therefore, at all levels is $500. This is what the school system desires more than any other single feature to face its immediate and long-range future.

When we undertook to go from the system under which we had been working to a single-salary schedule we found certain obstacles. We found that in 1908 there had been established within the school system of the District of Columbia what was known as a superior-group classification. The school superintendent and his staff had authority under the Enabling Act of 1908—if I do not state it correctly the Senator from South Carolina can check me—to place within the superior group classification as many as 10 percent of the total number of teachers upon any level within the system.

That classification was designed, in a sense, to provide the very incentive which we hope to provide more properly in the years which lie ahead. Within the superior-group classification we find certain of the teachers to whom the Senator from South Carolina has referred. We do not find within that group 196 teachers, which was the number mentioned by the Senator from South Carolina. At one of our hearings Dr. Corning, of the school system, had given us the figure of 196 within the superior-group classification. I have since had that figure checked. I have a memorandum from Dr. Corning's office which states that the figure of 196 given by Dr. Corning at the hearing on May 28 included officers and instructors in teachers' colleges who do not enter the picture. At the present time there are 118 in the superior-classification group who have not reached their maximum and 27 who have reached their maximum, or a total of 145 in all, who do not possess master's degrees, but find themselves within the superior-classification group.

Mr. President, examinations are given each year to permit persons without master's degrees to go into this superior classification. If they pass the examinations and are accepted, then, with five annual increments of $100 each, in 5 years there has existed a differential of $500 between the superior-group classification salary rating and those who are not within that group. In the past, Mr. President, up until this moment, there has been a salary level, maximum-wise, of $4,150. Within the superior-group classification there are 27 teachers, who do not possess masters' degrees, who have already reached what has been the maximum for the highest paid teachers in this community. They have gone to $4,150. They are in the superior-group classification. They do not possess a master's degree. It is our intention and has been our recommendation that because we are providing what ought to be provided, namely, a single-salary schedule, there is, from the point of view of many who worked on this problem, no justifiable reason for making an exception in the case of those 27 teachers who have already reached the maximum. It has been our contention that they have within themselves the ability, the willingness, and the energy, in the interest of improving the school system, to secure a master's degree, as it can be secured by any excellent teacher any time, anywhere. It is our intention that they retain a dollar preferential of $150, as the Senator from South Carolina knows, over what we have laid down as the maximum level beyond which a nonmaster's degree holder should not go.

On the other side of the same picture referred to by the Senator from South Carolina, there are 118 now master's degree teachers presently within the superior-group classification, whose present annual incomes are below the maximum of $4,000 recommended for a nonmaster's degree holder. These are admittedly fine teachers. It is our intention and has been our very serious recommendation that those 118 teachers should be permitted, obviously, to go to the top of a new classification which is being established as the result, so to speak, of a "surgical operation." They are not being restrained from getting the $150 raise which is recommended in the bill. They are not precluded from getting their increments, so long as their increments and their raises do not at this time exceed $4,000.

From our point of view we should be doing an injustice to the system if, having granted what can be secured only through a major operation, we should make concessions in addition to the enlargements and the improvements which we have provided. I personally have a measure of sympathy for the proposition maintained by the Senator from South Carolina, but because the persons within the superior-group classification, if they have been alert—and I take it we all agree they have—have known beyond question that if the school system was to be improved a single salary schedule sooner or later had to come. They have had at least the opportunity, the time, the right, and certainly the brains, to have equipped themselves for this development, not from what has been an archaic system, for it has been in keeping with the times, but of a better system for which they could have prepared themselves.

One hundred and forty-five school teachers are involved in the only single controversy between the Senator from South Carolina and the junior Senator from Washington. Of the 145 we maintain that those who have already reached the maximum should not be granted an increase through increments totaling $500 to bring them to the level attained by those holding master's degrees.

I wonder if the Senator from South Carolina will respond to my approach to this problem.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Washington that the bill is an excellent piece of work. The only objection I have to it is in reference to one item——

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I have to leave the Senate floor, but I want to say in connection with what the Senator from Washington has said and what the Senator from South Carolina has said that I think it is a matter of good faith that we should accord these teachers the same treatment that we are giving others who actually hold a master's degree. In saying that I certainly do not want to be understood as being at all critical of the Senator from Washington and the excellent work that he and his subcommittee did in preparing this bill and bringing it before the Senate. But the situation, as I understand it, is this: Back through the years these teachers have been hired. If I understand correctly, the Board of Education started the policy about 1932 of employing teachers, with the understanding that if they remained in a certain job for so many years—10 years, I think it was—they would be given a rating which would be the equivalent to that of teachers holding a master's degree. Those teachers were employed under that condition. I believe it would be a breach of faith now to say, "Even though you were hired under this condition we are now going to change it. We are giving to those who actually hold masters' degrees the opportunity of working up to the level of $4,500 a year, as maximum pay, but we are depriving you of that privilege, even though we have said that by your 10 years of work in a particular position you would be regarded as having the equivalent of a master's degree." I certainly believe that the Senate does not want to breach the condition which was made to them when they were employed. For that reason, Mr. President, I am heartily in favor of the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the amendment does not weaken the system at all. It has nothing to do with future employment of

those who may have a master's degree; it has to do only with those who have been hired with a certain condition in their contract.

Mr. CAIN. If the Senator will yield, we are not taking any rights away from this very limited number of teachers. We are changing an act which has previously been on the books and for which a good case could be made. If the Senator will understand that our position is that we are, in a very concrete way, changing the very foundations of the system which has previously prevailed within this community, I think he can only draw the conclusion that the teachers who have been without master's degrees in the past have been very well taken care of. They remain in a preferred position, if you please, because of the preference granted in the past and because of their mental attainments. Some of them may wish a master's degree, which can be obtained without very much trouble. It has been said that a good many teachers are in opposition to our insistence in endeavoring to put this bill through as it reads; but I do not think that is true. I have talked to as many school teachers as cared to see me during the past 3 or 4 weeks. I have been able, I think, to convince some of them that what we were doing for their ultimate and the complete good certainly justified their willingness to go along with the program, and a good many of them have done so.

I wish to say in all seriousness that I have constantly conferred and reconferred with the Board of Education and with the Superintendent of Schools and his staff, and I am of the very sincere opinion that they would prefer, for a reason which I have yet to mention, among other reasons, that this bill be passed by the Senate as recommended by those of us who have sponsored it.

I have a basic question to direct to the Senator from South Carolina. I know he feels that his amendment will do exactly what he wishes to have done, namely, provide an additional salary increase to only those nonmaster degree persons, regardless of their number, who previously have been benefiting from salary ranges paid to holders of a master's degree.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is the only purpose I have.

Mr. CAIN. Much as I oppose the principle of the Senator's amendment, which is completely apart from this contention, I wish to say that, for two reasons, the Senator's amendment cannot possibly accomplish his intention.

If the Senator from South Carolina and the junior Senator from Washington could get closer together in the Chamber, it would serve our joint purpose.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I wonder whether the Senator would agree to have a vote taken on this matter at 2:30. Several Senators have to leave the Chamber to go to a conference meeting, and thereafter they will return; but they wish to be in the Chamber when the vote is taken. So I suggest that the vote be taken at 2:30, so that those Senators may be present when the vote is taken. I also suggest that we decide upon that now, so that the Senators to whom I have referred will know when to return to the Chamber. That is my only reason for making the request.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me suggest that such an arrangement would rather complicate the procedure. By unanimous consent, the measure now under consideration has been taken up, temporarily supplanting the succession bill. If the Senate wishes to proceed with the teacher's bill at this time, that will be perfectly agreeable; but if for any reason the Members of the Senate feel that they should wait until 2:30 before voting on the teacher's bill, such a procedure would involve having the Senate return to the consideration of the other legislation, and that would involve unanimous-consent agreements.

So I suggest to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina and the distinguished Senator from Washington that if they come to an agreement that the debate should continue, then let it proceed; but the Senate should conclude action on this proposed legislation, if possible, before returning to the measure which temporarily has been laid aside.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I was making the request only for the convenience of the Senators who have to leave the Chamber at this time.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I do not make the request for my convenience, for I shall remain in the Chamber.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I think that in the next few minutes it will be possible to satisfy, in a sense, both the Senator from South Carolina and other Senators. I regard as very important the Senator's belief that his amendment will result in providing continued additional compensation for the 145 teachers who previously have been in a superior group classification. I call the Senator's attention to what appears to be an undeniable fact, on advice of the very best counsel we can obtain, namely, that as a result of the Senator's rearrangements of the classifications, the result has been—although obviously it is completely unintentional—that instead of covering the 145 teachers who the Senator thinks should be covered, and who I think should not be covered, the Senator's amendment would, in fact, as a study discloses to be the case, cover 311, many of whom have never been within the purview and consideration of our committee.

In the second place, the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina would do something crippling to the purpose which he has in mind. It is difficult to explain this matter, but I shall try. within the superior group classification there presently are 118 teachers without master's degrees who are receiving less than the recommended $4,000 for nonmaster's degree teachers. It is possible that some of those teachers teach in the senior high schools, although that is not likely, because for the most part in the high schools the teachers have the equivalent of a master's degree. It is more likely that those teachers teach in the junior high schools and in the elementary schools. The Senator's amendment, if adopted, would destroy something which all of us want destroyed; namely, the superior-group classification. That would mean that after that group had been dissolved the teachers would go back to their own A, B, C classifications, whatever they might be, and 81 of them would go back to divisions within the school system which do not presently require—nor is it contemplated that they will require—a master's degree as a requirement at entrance. Therefore, the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina would accomplish only a part of his purpose, and were the Senator's original intention to prevail, through this amendment, he would be causing a loss of preference to 81 of the 118 teachers whom the Senator from South Carolina seeks to assist.

Therefore, from my point of view, if I am correct—and I can only say to the Senator from South Carolina in good faith that I am completely satisfied that I am correct—the Senator from South Carolina would not want his amendment to be adopted.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, in reply to the Senator from Washington, let me say that the attorney for the Committee on the District of Columbia and also the members of the committee who drew up the amendment understood that it would cover only 196 teachers—the original number. Of course, that number has been changed since that time. But that would be the coverage of the amendment, so far as we understand.

Mr. CAIN. I am afraid they are mistaken because in my interest in determining exactly where we were going, and why, and in what fashion, I have found that those attorneys, among others, have ascertained that it is legally necessary to subscribe to the position which I have just advanced in the discussion with the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to repeat that this amendment was drawn at the suggestion of the Superintendent of Schools, Dr. Corning, and I point out that he marked on the bill what should be amended, stating that such amendments would care for the situation. He himself went through the bill and suggested these amendments.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, as a result of this debate, I have two points to maintain. The first is that the Senator's amendment is not justifiable, in my opinion, in view of the fact that we are moving into a single-salary schedule. I think I have in support of my contention the Board of Education, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and the Superintendent of Schools and his staff in considering the greatest good for the greatest number.

It should likewise be realized that the bill has already been passed by the House, which took affirmative action on it as it is now before the Senate, with the exception of two perfecting amendments which have been agreed to. As a result, if the amendments proposed by the Senator from South Carolina were now added to the bill, it would be necessary to have a

conference with the House, and in the conference the bill as thus amended would encounter considerable difficulty. Both the Senator from South Carolina and I realize that the end of June is fast approaching; and, of course, if considerable difficult were encountered in conference, the result might be that no legislation at all on this subject would be enacted. So I would resist the amendment for that reason, if for no other.

Moreover, in my opinion the amendment is not technically correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, we do not disagree with the bill as a whole, but we feel this amendment should be agreed to for the good of the teachers involved.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from South Carolina for himself and other Senators. [Putting the question.] The "noes" appear to have it.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from South Carolina wish to present his other amendment?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, it is not necessary to present the other amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is still open to amendment. If there be no further amendment to be presented, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 3611) was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 1346 will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and ask for a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. CAIN, Mr. FLANDERS, and Mr. MCGRATH conferees on the part of the Senate.

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 564) to provide for the performance of the duties of the office of President, in case of the removal, resignation, or inability both of the President and Vice President.

Mr. WHERRY obtained the floor.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Bricker	Butler
Baldwin	Bridges	Byrd
Ball	Brooks	Cain
Barkley	Buck	Capehart
Brewster	Bushfield	Capper
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Connally	Kem	Overton
Cooper	Kilgore	Pepper
Cordon	Knowland	Reed
Donnell	Langer	Revercomb
Downey	Lodge	Robertson, Va.
Dworshak	McCarran	Robertson, Wyo.
Eastland	McCarthy	Russell
Ecton	McClellan	Saltonstall
Ellender	McFarland	Smith
Ferguson	McGrath	Sparkman
Fulbright	McKellar	Taft
George	McMahon	Taylor
Green	Magnuson	Thye
Gurney	Malone	Tydings
Hatch	Martin	Umstead
Hawkes	Maybank	Vandenberg
Hayden	Millikin	Watkins
Hickenlooper	Moore	Wherry
Hoey	Morse	White
Holland	Murray	Wiley
Ives	Myers	Williams
Jenner	O'Conor	Wilson
Johnson, Colo.	O'Daniel	Young

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House having proceeded to reconsider the bill (H. R. 3020) to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes effecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes, returned by the President of the United States with his objections, to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, it was—

Resolved, That the said bill pass, two-thirds of the House of Representatives agreeing to pass the same.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1230) to amend section 2 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

REVENUE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid aside temporarily, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3737, which is the revenue bill for the District of Columbia for the year 1948.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to a consideration of House bill 3737?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I may say that, as I understand the parliamentary situation, the so-called succession bill is the unfinished business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. If consent is granted the junior Senator from Washington, it is, as I understand, only for the purpose of considering the revenue bill for the District of Columbia for 1948, and with the understanding that when the House bill 3737 is disposed of, the Senate will revert to the unfinished business, namely, the succession bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Not only that, but the Senator may call for the regular order at any time he pleases. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3737), to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will proceed to state the committee amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on the District of Columbia was, on page 11, line 9, to strike out:

(s) The word "resident" means every individual domiciled within the District on the last day of the taxable year, and every other individual who maintains a place of abode within the District for more than 7 months of the taxable year, whether domiciled in the District or not. The word "resident" shall not include any elective officer of the Government of the United States or employees of the United States Government, nor shall it include any officer of the executive branch of such Government whose appointment to the office held by him was by the President of the United States and subject to confirmation by the Senate of the United States and whose tenure of office is at the pleasure of the President of the United States. For the purposes of this act the domicile of such officer or employee shall be in the State in which he expressly declares to be the State of his domicile: *Provided*, That he shall have acquired a domicile in such State under the laws of such State prior to the beginning of the annual period for which the tax is claimed. Such declaration must be made in writing, under oath, to the Assessor and the time for filing such declaration shall not expire until 60 days after written demand shall have been received by such officer or employee.

And insert:

(s) The word "resident" means every individual domiciled within the District on the last day of the taxable year, and every other individual who maintains a place of abode within the District for more than 7 months of the taxable year, whether domiciled in the District or not. The word "resident" shall not include any elective officer of the Government of the United States or any officer of the executive branch of such Government whose appointment to the office held by him was by the President of the United States and subject to confirmation by the Senate of the United States and whose tenure of office is at the pleasure of the President of the United States, unless such officers are domiciled within the District on the last day of the taxable year.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 21, after the word "including", to strike out "$2,000" and insert "$3,000."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I am satisfied that many Senators are interested in this measure. I think a larger number of Senators should be present to hear the debate. I therefore suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina suggests

the absence of a quorum. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Morse
Baldwin	Hatch	Murray
Ball	Hawkes	Myers
Barkley	Hayden	O'Conor
Brewster	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Bricker	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Holland	Overton
Brooks	Ives	Pepper
Buck	Jenner	Reed
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Va.
Byrd	Kem	Robertson, Wyo.
Cain	Kilgore	Russell
Capehart	Knowland	Saltonstall
Capper	Langer	Smith
Chavez	Lodge	Sparkman
Connally	McCarran	Taft
Cooper	McCarthy	Taylor
Cordon	McClellan	Thye
Donnell	McFarland	Tydings
Downey	McGrath	Umstead
Dworshak	McKellar	Vandenberg
Eastland	McMahon	Watkins
Ecton	Magnuson	Wherry
Ellender	Malone	White
Ferguson	Martin	Wiley
Fulbright	Maybank	Williams
George	Millikin	Wilson
Green	Moore	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). Eighty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the second committee amendment, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 20, line 21, after the word "including", it is proposed to strike out "$2,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I think the bill should be thoroughly explained. This is a tax measure for the District of Columbia. I think we should know what is in the bill before we pass it. I should like to have it explained in detail.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina desire the floor?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I think the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] has the floor.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I inquire if the junior Senator from Washington has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the junior Senator from Washington has the floor.

Mr. CAIN. I may say to the Senator from South Carolina that it is our intention at this time thoroughly to explore these figures.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is the reason I raised the question. Before we go forward with any amendments, I think we should have an explanation of the bill, and an understanding of how the amendments affect the bill.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I wonder if Senators who are present could see fit to accommodate their thirst for knowledge to my willingness to provide as much as I can by taking seats immediately in front of the charts which have been prepared and placed on easels on the Senate floor. The charts attempt to prove the need for additional revenue, and to show what members of a joint committee which designed the program think are reasonable figures.

About 4 months ago a joint subcommittee of both Senate and House was presented with the President's budget, a part of which covered the needs of the District of Columbia for the year 1947–48. That budget indicates a deficit of approximately $17,000,000.

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia proposed to the joint committee a tax-revenue program which consisted in large part of the figures which appear on the first chart, covering sources of revenue which had not previously been tapped within the District of Columbia. I have placed the figures on this chart mainly to indicate that the committees which were charged with the responsibility of balancing the District of Columbia budget were not interested in merely recommending taxes for the sake of new taxes. As I present the recommended program, it will be noted that it does not include a majority of the taxes recommended by the Commissioners.

It was suggested by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia that we could best accommodate their need for additional revenue in 1948 by so increasing the income-tax coverage within the District that $2,250,000 additional would be raised.

It was proposed that the Congress impose upon the citizens of the District of Columbia a sales tax at the rate of 2 percent, which, in the opinion of the Commissioners, would raise as much as $9,000,000.

It was further suggested that unincorporated businesses, which have previously been exempt from taxation, be subjected to taxation, to raise an additional $900,000.

It was further suggested that the prevailing taxes on alcoholic beverages now being sold and dispensed within the District of Columbia be so increased as to benefit the District treasury to the extent of $2,800,000 additional.

It was further suggested that it might be advisable to place a tax on public-utility bills, the bills which the average housewife receives at least once a month, which tax would produce additional revenue approximating $1,000,000.

It was further suggested that a tax be imposed upon every package of cigarettes to be sold, dispensed, or given away within the District of Columbia, which would produce an aggregate tax revenue of $800,000.

An amusement tax was suggested which would be approximately twice the present tax. It was the expectation of the Commissioners that such a tax would produce an additional $1,000,000 of revenue.

The total amount of revenue to be produced would be approximately $17,000,000, to balance what was considered to be the deficit.

There was an obligation on the two subcommittees of the District of Columbia Committees of the Senate and House not to readily, carelessly, or thoughtlessly accept any suggestions which would further add to the tax liabilities of residents of the District of Columbia. We held rather exhaustive hearings. Certainly they were long drawn out.

In that connection I should like to pay my personal respects to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], who are jointly responsible with me for the introduction of this measure. I congratulate them because of their willingness to work upon an interesting but troublesome and rather difficult problem.

At the same time I should like to pay my respects to the gentleman from Massachusetts, Representative GEORGE J. BATES, chairman of the House subcommittee, and his several confereres, who worked very hard on behalf of a community in which they themselves had no particular interest, because their domiciles are in various other parts of the country.

As a result of our hearings, at which appeared every individual or representative of a group who was desirous of being heard, we arrived at a program which has already in part been accepted by the House, a program in which we did not think it necessary at this time to adopt some of the tax measures recommended by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

As most people know, there are three different categories of expenses and revenues in the average city. Washington, D. C., is a reasonably good example of a typical American city, so far as its tax and revenue requirements are concerned. Those three general classifications are, first, the general fund; secondly, the highway fund; and thirdly, the water fund. We have placed on different charts a break-down of the figures involved in each of those classifications for the years 1947, 1948, and 1949. I think it proper to advance our suggestions as to the water fund at the outset.

The figures for the various years in question, 1947, 1948, and 1949, speak for themselves. Our unobligated balances are the balances remaining in the water fund which are unobligated, and are considered available for obligation during succeeding years.

We brought over from the year 1946 $659,303 which sum has been used in large part or in its entirety during this year.

The next item on the chart is entitled "Lapsed Balances." It represents the balances of prior year appropriations which are unexpended and which may be available for reappropriation during succeeding years.

It will be noticed that in the year 1947 the water fund of the District sold of its own investment account $1,079,722 worth of securities. From these receipts in the year 1947 approximately $3,500,000 is anticipated. For the year 1947 it is anticipated that there will be a revenue availability of $5,300,000 with an estimated expenditure total of the same figure, leaving within the water fund of the District for the year 1947 a balanced operation, for the reason that the Commissioners and the Water Fund Superintendent, in the interest of economy, were willing to cut their own budget requirements by the amount of $708,000 which provides them with a carry-over

sum of the same figure for the year 1948, which we immediately approach.

I think it is unnecessary, unless some of the Senators want to ask me some question with reference to the revenue availability of 1948, to discuss it in detail.

I should like to suggest to the Senate what has already, as I understand, been adopted by the House, which is the recommendation that we authorize within the District an increase in the water rents of 25 percent and an increase in the assessment rates of 25 percent which, insofar as the year 1948 is concerned, would increase the water rents by $800,000 and the assessment rates by $31,250. I should like to say, with reference to our recommendation that the water rents be increased 25 percent, that they are and have been exceedingly low when compared with other comparable cities throughout the Nation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRICKER in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator have for the RECORD a comparative table showing the rates of other cities which he thinks are more favorable than the Washington rates?

Mr. CAIN. I do not have such a table with me. The figures are included in the hearings held before the committee, and I shall certainly make them a part of the RECORD.

The Senate will notice an item of new revenue to be made available to the District, in the sum of $1,000,000 as a Federal contribution. We are urging that the Federal Government increase its Federal contribution to the District of Columbia by a lump sum of $4,000,000 for the years 1947 and 1948. As nearly everyone knows, the Federal Government for several years in the past has given to the District a lump sum of $8,000,000. We are asking for $12,000,000 and we think we can justify it. If $4,000,000 is available we are asking that $1,000,000 of it be earmarked for the water fund as an offset or charge-off for an approximately equal sum from which the Federal Government is benefiting today through the water which it uses and for which it does not pay. It is hoped that in the matter of financing the needs of the water fund in the future, if we are permitted to increase the water rents and the assessment rates and to earmark a million dollars on a yearly basis, we shall enable the water fund of the District of Columbia to meet its minimum requirements, so far as we can see for the next several years ahead, without having to borrow any money from the Federal Government.

We are not certain that we can accomplish our objectives in this modest approach to a big construction problem and program, but the water superintendent and the District Commissioners and those who joined themselves in building this program think it deserving of an adequate and fair trial.

That is all I care to say at this time regarding our recommendations with reference to the water fund. I wonder if there are any Senators who have a further interest which I could attempt to satisfy.

The next topic is the financial condition of the highway fund during the fiscal years 1947, 1948, and 1949, based on both the present tax structure and the proposed gasoline tax and inspection fee increases. It will be noted that an unobligated balance of approximately $1,500,000 was carried forward from 1946 to the fiscal year 1947. This balance, plus cash receipts for the fiscal year 1947, amounts to a total revenue availability of $8,242,000 plus. The estimated expenditures for this year amount to approximately $7,800,000, which leaves an unobligated balance of $401,000 plus to be carried over to the fiscal year 1948.

Some Senators have asked me the question whether it was a fact that the highway fund within the District, the authorities having been unable because of the war and postwar conditions to spend moneys appropriated to them in years gone by, had a very large sum of what might be called free cash. I should like to say in that connection that, so far as I know, that is not true. The $401,000 represents the free cash which they moved forward to 1948 for expenditure reasons. This unobligated sum of $401,000, as we now approach the year we are trying to balance, as far as the budget is concerned, and the receipts during the year based upon the present tax structure, results in a total revenue availability of $7,482,000. Estimates for the fiscal year 1948 now before the Congress, amounting to $9,210,000, would result in an estimated deficit, as of June 30, 1948, of $1,727,000. The imposition, however, of the additional gasoline tax and inspection fee recommended, in connection with an estimated reduction in the 1948 budget of $100,000 will yield an additional $1,770,000 in revenue. This would eliminate a deficit of $1,700,000 and leave an unobligated balance of $42,000 plus to carry over to the fiscal year 1949. This unobligated balance of $42,000 plus from the fiscal year 1948, plus receipts during the year 1948–49 based upon the present tax structure, results in a total revenue availability of $7,222,000.

Expenditure estimates for the fiscal year 1949, amounting to $8,275,000, would result again in an estimated deficit, as of June 30, 1949, of $1,652,000-plus. The imposition of the additional gasoline tax and inspection fee will yield an additional $1,670,000. We are assuming that if the gasoline tax is placed in operation we will have the same new revenue availability that we anticipate getting in 1948. The imposition of the additional gasoline tax and inspection fee will yield an additional $1,600,000 in revenue. This would eliminate the deficit and would represent an unobligated balance of $17,192.35 to carry over into the fiscal years of 1950 and 1951.

As a result of the passage of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944, the District of Columbia has received allocations of $2,974,000 and $2,889,000, respectively, for the fiscal years 1946, 1947, and 1948. The existing law does not make provision for Federal-aid allocation subsequent to 1948. These allocations would not be considered as revenue, in that the District must have revenue to finance Federal-aid work in its entirety before reimbursement of the Federal share can be requested. The net result is that Federal-aid allocations permit of more work being performed and not in adding to the revenue availability.

With reference to the gasoline tax, I should like to say that presently, as we know, the gasoline tax in the District of Columbia is 3 cents a gallon. As I recall, the gasoline tax in Maryland is 6 cents a gallon, and in Virginia is 5 cents a gallon. We are recommending an increase from 3 cents to 4 cents a gallon, which presumably will provide $1,600,000 of additional revenue. There is considerable opposition to an increase in the gasoline tax, as there necessarily is opposition to the imposition of any tax. However, insofar as the members of the joint committee are concerned, it is simply a matter of whether it is desired to maintain the streets and highways in this community and whether it is desired to take advantage of certain Federal-matching funds, in order that bridges and viaducts can be designed, constructed, and maintained, or whether we do not wish to do so. The committee is firmly of the opinion that the recommendation which it makes for an increase in the gasoline tax from 3 cents to 4 cents a gallon is most reasonable, and that it will encourage and permit this community, which is confronted with a tremendous maintenance and construction problem, to keep pace, in a relative sense, at least, with that problem.

The inspection fee for vehicles almost speaks for itself. A few years ago an automobile-inspection law was passed, and it requires that every District of Columbia vehicle be inspected annually, at a charge of 50 cents. We have found that that charge no longer pays for the cost of the inspection. Therefore, the recommendation is that the fee, in accordance with the basic law, be increased from 50 cents to $1. We think that increase will enable the inspection system and program to pay for itself as it proceeds.

Mr. President, let me say that I should like very much to answer any detailed questions in regard to how these revenue or expenditure moneys are to be spent. I shall be glad to answer such questions either now or later, if any of my colleagues have a particular interest in this branch of the problem.

We come now to the general fund, which for the fiscal year 1947–48, which begins on the first day of July 1947, is, on paper at least and in fact so far as we know, overdrawn, so that we are confronted with a deficit of approximately $10,494,000. It is safe to say that your joint committee could have approached this deficit problem from any one of a dozen different fiscal and financial points of view. Again, the committee has no particular pride of authorship in the plan it now suggests for consideration by the Senate in regard to ballancing the budget for the District of Columbia. We think the plan we now present is sound and reasonable, and that with any good fortune insofar as

price structures are concerned, it will provide, maintain, and continue the essential services which are so badly needed and which are justified by the citizens of this very great community. So, to offset the deficit of $10,494,000-plus, we suggest that revenues within the District of Columbia, beginning next year, be increased in the following way: First, that the real-estate tax rate, which presently is $1.75, be increased to $2. Many people will not like that, and we can understand their point of view. But as best we could, we went back and analyzed the needs and requirements, fiscalwise, of this community over the past decade, and we went one step further and analyzed comparable situations in comparable cities throughout America. We now feel with reference to the real-estate tax that because the rate which we suggest will be based on a 70 percent assessment of a reasonable valuation, we shall not be imposing any undue or too heavy burden upon the citizens of the District of Columbia. It is our expectation that if this recommendation is followed, $4,000,000 will accrue toward balancing the budget of the District of Columbia. Those figures are shown just above the point which I have indicated on the chart which now is before us.

Our next suggestion is that we broaden the coverage of the Income Tax Act as it relates to the District of Columbia. At the present time, and for quite a long time past, the only persons in this community of more than 900,000 persons who have paid income taxes have been those domiciled in this community on the last day of the tax year. We are recommending—and this, in fact, is almost the basis of our approach to this community problem—that we provide within the law a provision that those who are to pay income taxes are those who are either domiciled in the District of Columbia on the last day of the fiscal year or those who live as a resident within this community for a period of 7 months within the year. It is my considered opinion, for whatever it is worth, that the income-tax law governing in this community in years gone by has been inequitable and unfair; that if the Senate and the House of Representatives cannot agree to the provision we are suggesting, it would be only proper and fit and, in fact, just honest, to encourage the Congress to get rid of the income-tax structure in its entirety in this community.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. KNOWLAND. What provision would be made to prevent double taxation?

Mr. CAIN. Any person otherwise affected by this tax who pays an income tax in the State of his domicile will not pay an income tax of any kind within the District of Columbia, unless it so happens—and so far as I know, there is only one exception to this rule—that the tax rates charged in the State of his domicile are less than those in the District of Columbia. There is a possibility that in the State of Delaware—and perhaps the Senator from Delaware will confirm this—the rates are actually lower than those within the District of Columbia.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. Certainly.

Mr. BUCK. In the event that this amendment is not agreed to, what is the next step that would have to be taken to increase the revenues of the District of Columbia?

Mr. CAIN. If the suggestion is not adopted, the District of Columbia budgets for both 1948 and 1949 will be in deficit. Then I should think the realistic approach to the problem would be, first, in the interest of fairness to get rid of the income tax entirely, and to avail ourselves of any of the other revenue possibilities which the District of Columbia Commissioners recommended to us when this problem first arose.

It is quite obvious to anyone that we could have taken an easier approach to this problem. For instance, we could have provided for the imposition of a sales tax, and at this time the imposition of such a tax would have very largely cured our problems on a temporary basis; but in the opinion of those responsible for presenting this program, it is felt that basic taxes, such as real-estate taxes and income taxes, should bear their proportionate share of the obligations of a community before recourse is had to what might be called extra taxes.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, did the Senator from Washington study the matter of having the Federal Government pay more to the District of Columbia?

Mr. CAIN. Yes. As a matter of fact, we shall come to that point in a moment. We have a recommendation covering it.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Does the Senator think that $3,000,000 additional will be sufficient to pay the District of Columbia for the use or benefit the Federal Government receives from the District of Columbia?

Mr. CAIN. I can answer that question in two ways: I can say that if we obtain an additional $4,000,000 at this time from the Federal Government, on the basis of this tax program, it will be possible to balance the budget of the District of Columbia and to maintain minimum services; but in my opinion further thought and study are needed to determine whether the Federal Government is presently carrying and has in the past carried its share of this community problem, for the Senator is as aware as I am that years ago the Federal Government paid on the basis of 50 cents out of every dollar. Now it is paying on the basis of 8 and a fraction cents on the dollar. We would not have asked the Federal Government in this instance for any additional money, if we had not first turned to the field of real estate, to indicate to the Federal Government that this community, in the case of real property, was willing to stand on its own feet so far as possible.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In my opinion, the Federal Government should assume the responsibility of all the tax increase. It should take care of every cent of it.

Mr. CAIN. I am the last to say that the Senator has not a very good case, but it is a case which we endeavored to cover in a formula. We had about six different formulas presented to the committee, and after studying them as carefully as we could, we were by no means satisfied that any of the formulas actually gave the justice they intended to render.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. I wonder if the Senator from South Carolina knows that between the years 1922 and 1937 there was on the statute books a law which provided that the Federal Government should pay 40 percent and the District 60 percent of the expenses of the District.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I understand that to be the case.

Mr. BUCK. That was the law for 15 years, and that ratio was observed for 3 years. During the other 12 years the Government made a lump sum payment. If it had paid according to the act, which it did not, it would owe over a hundred million dollars more than it actually paid.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. My reason for raising the question a few moments ago was the report by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], which brings the amount much closer to twelve million, possibly eight or nine million.

Mr. CAIN. The formula of the Senator from Wyoming would have resulted in exactly the same figures we present, because this is new revenue we are asking the Federal Government to pay, $4,000,000, which, when added to what it previously has been giving, namely, $8,000,000, makes the $12,000,000 which the formula of the Senator from Wyoming would have given.

Being very frank about this discussion, and particularly with reference to the remarks of the Senator from South Carolina, we should not too hastily adopt a formula which restricts the contribution to a figure with which we are by no means satisfied. Perhaps it should be $20,000,000, or $25,000,000. Certainly if it were proper to make the contribution years ago in the proportion which has been stated, there is some reason to believe there should be a recalculation of the whole contribution.

To recapitulate we have asked for an increase in the real-estate tax of 25 cents. We also ask for an increase in coverage in the case of the income tax, which would impose a tax on all persons resident here for 7 months, and all domiciled here at the end of a taxable year. It would not require any individual who pays a higher rated tax in any other State to pay an income tax here. That individual would pay absolutely nothing in this District.

There are 32 States in the Union which have income-tax laws, and the chances are 10 to 1 that very few, if any, of those

domiciled in those States, presently living as residents in the District of Columbia, would pay any local tax at all. There are 16 States of the Union which have no income-tax laws, but some of those States have intangible tax laws, which would be an offset against any tax which the individuals paid here. But a resident of a State like my own, the State of Washington, which has no intangible tax law and has no income-tax law, living in Washington, D. C., for a period in excess of 7 months, would pay, as I am absolutely and sincerely convinced he or she should pay, a reasonable tax, toward the maintenance of the services which make their living, on the average, so happy and contented in a community which is so far away from home.

If those two suggestions are adhered to, we are recommending, as I have previously said, an additional Federal contribution of $4,000,000, $3,000,000 of which would be used in our general-fund operations, and a million would be earmarked for the water fund. These three items, however, amount to only $10,100,000. That means we are still a considerable figure short of balancing our budget.

So far as the general fund construction operations of the community are concerned, there has been a willingness evidenced by the authorities in charge to reduce their budget in the sum of $2,500,000, which means a slowing up of some of the improvements which they really want, but which, after a full consideration, we are inclined to think we can get along without for a reasonable length of time, hoping that prices will come down and that obstacles will be removed, and that by adopting an agreed-upon reduction of $2,500,000, we shall balance the budget in 1948, carrying over a very small sum of money, which will provide, at the end of the next 2-year period, a cash balance, however small it may be.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAIN. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. Can the Senator say what the rate of tax on real estate is in the District of Columbia, under the proposal he is presenting?

Mr. CAIN. Yes; $2 a hundred. It is presently $1.75 a hundred.

Mr. BALDWIN. That is much lower than it is in any other city in the United States. Is not that a fact?

Mr. CAIN. It is much lower than in most of the comparable cities we examined.

Everyone will agree with me that if it had been his responsibility, rather than the responsibility of the joint congressional committee, the approach to this problem might have been different. Perhaps we should have started out with a sales tax as our base, and gone on from there. We just did not think that was the proper way to proceed.

We have been extraordinarily conservative in forming this budget for the next 2-year period. It does not permit of any serious mishaps or unexpected events transpiring in this community. We are only anticipating an over-all cash balance of $17,000-plus at the end of fiscal 1949, and every Senator is as conscious as I am how easy it may be to turn that balance into a deficit.

I would not be embarrassed, or feel any need to apologize for myself and my colleagues, if we have fallen short of what we started out to do in achieving a sound balancing of the budget. I should merely re-present the problem to Senators on the basis of need, knowing before I did so that they would give me the hearing to which the subject is entitled.

Mr. President, I ask the approval of the Senate for this program, so that in the general fund our real-estate tax rate may go up 25 cents, and our income-tax base be broadened, though the rates will not go up. I likewise ask your approval for an additional Federal payment to the general fund of $3,000,000.

With reference to the water fund, we are asking for the authority to increase the assessments by 25 percent, to increase water rates by 25 percent, which rates are much lower here than throughout the country, and we are asking that of the $4,000,000 we are asking from the Treasury of the United States $1,000,000 be earmarked to the water fund.

Our third request covers the highway fund. We are asking for an increase in the vehicle-inspection fee of from 50 cents to a dollar, in order that the service may pay for itself. We are asking the Senate's approval of an increase in the gasoline tax of from 3 cents to 4 cents a gallon.

I think this budget deserves the consideration of the Senate, and I hope it will have Senators' approval.

Mr. President, I send to the desk a proposed amendment in behalf of the committee, and ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 20, line 20, it is proposed to strike out subsection (9), down to and including line 25, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(9) Payments made under laws relating to veterans: Payments of benefits made to or on account of a beneficiary under any laws relating to veterans.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 3737) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. CAIN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. CAIN, Mr. FLANDERS, and Mr. MCGRATH conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 814. An act to provide support for wool, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3203. An act relative to maximum rents on housing accommodations; to repeal certain provisions of Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress, and for other purposes.

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 564) to provide for the performance of the duties of the office of President, in case of the removal, resignation, or inability both of the President and Vice President.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Murray
Baldwin	Hawkes	Myers
Ball	Hayden	O'Conor
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Holland	Overton
Bridges	Ives	Pepper
Brooks	Jenner	Reed
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Kem	Robertson, Wyo.
Byrd	Kilgore	Russell
Cain	Knowland	Saltonstall
Capehart	Langer	Smith
Capper	Lodge	Sparkman
Chavez	McCarran	Taft
Connally	McCarthy	Taylor
Cooper	McClellan	Thye
Cordon	McFarland	Tydings
Downey	McGrath	Umstead
Dworshak	McKellar	Vandenberg
Eastland	McMahon	Watkins
Ecton	Magnuson	Wherry
Ellender	Malone	White
Ferguson	Martin	Wiley
Fulbright	Maybank	Williams
George	Millikin	Wilson
Green	Moore	Young
Gurney	Morse	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

MANAGEMENT AND LABOR RELATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.
June 20, 1947.

The House of Representatives having proceeded to reconsider the bill (H. R. 3020) entitled "An act to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes," returned by the President of the United States with his objections, to the House of Representatives, in which it originated, it was

Resolved, That the said bill pass, two-thirds of the House of Representatives agreeing to pass the same.

MANAGEMENT AND LABOR RELATIONS—VETO MESSAGE (H. DOC. NO. 334)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read.

(For President's veto message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 7485.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The message of the President of the United States will be spread on the Journal as required by the Constitution.

The Senate proceeded to reconsider the bill (H. R. 3020) entitled "An act to amend the National Labor Relations Act, to provide additional facilities for the mediation of labor disputes affecting commerce, to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

The yeas and nays are ordered, under the requirement of the Constitution.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Morse
Baldwin	Hatch	Murray
Ball	Hawkes	Myers
Barkley	Hayden	O'Conor
Brewster	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Bricker	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Holland	Overton
Brooks	Ives	Pepper
Buck	Jenner	Reed
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Va.
Byrd	Kem	Robertson, Wyo.
Cain	Kilgore	Russell
Capehart	Knowland	Saltonstall
Capper	Langer	Smith
Chavez	Lodge	Sparkman
Connally	McCarran	Taft
Cooper	McCarthy	Taylor
Cordon	McClellan	Thye
Donnell	McFarland	Tydings
Downey	McGrath	Umstead
Dworshak	McKellar	Vandenberg
Eastland	McMahon	Watkins
Ecton	Magnuson	Wherry
Ellender	Malone	White
Ferguson	Martin	Wiley
Fulbright	Maybank	Williams
George	Millikin	Wilson
Green	Moore	Young

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am sure Congress and the country have been impressed by the message of the President. I have heard it said upon the floor that Senators have never seen a veto message more comprehensive and more thoroughly penetrating than the veto message of the President which has just been read. Every aspect of this matter has been carefully analyzed and thoroughly surveyed in the veto message. The President has made it clear, as would be expected of the Chief Magistrate, that he is not speaking for a class, but for the country; for the President is trying to preserve the economic strength of America, at a time when even the strength of this giant is under momentous and serious challenge. The President has made it clear that he is defending our cherished system of private enterprise, at a time when private enterprise is under the most bitter assault of all times in the world. The President has rededicated himself to the instincts of democracy and to her preserving institutions, at a time when democracy is under its most dangerous attack. The President has made it clear that he is trying to preserve in America the kind of free give-and-take, the kind of bargaining together, which is characteristic of the traditional relations between labor and capital in our long past; that he does not propose to throw the settlement of labor disputes either into the halls of Congress or into the forum of the Nation's courts. The President realizes, as he has so clearly pointed out in his message, that this is a measure to promote and not to diminish industrial strife. Moreover, he has emphasized that this bill is an attack upon the masses of the people, upon the workingman, in his job and in his union, and that, by impairing the strength of the working people, it endangers the power of America.

The President has made it clear that this is a step backward and not a step forward in our industrial relations. He does not propose to become a party to an effort to wipe out the gains of decades of experience in finding ways to resolve and reconcile differences between management and labor, nor does he propose to strip from labor the gains which it has secured in our own time, under administrations chosen by the people of the United States and given their overwhelming approval.

The President recognizes that this is a very serious issue for the Congress and to the country. He knows, of course, the brunt of criticism and the spleen of bitterness and venom which will be heaped upon his head by this courageous step. He has not been afraid in the past to speak his sentiments; he has not been afraid or reluctant this time, Mr. President, to give his views to the Congress and to the country.

Considering the reports on the bill they had generally from the press, I believe the people who read the message will find that this is a kind of labor bill of which they never dreamed. The people never see this kind of criticism; they never had a chance to read this sort of message. The people have had a one-sided report upon this legislation. They have been of the impression and the opinion that this legislation was honestly and properly designed to bring about industrial peace in America, to strike down the exercise of tyrannical power, and to protect America in emergencies. Naturally, believing that it was legislation of that character, they have generally given it their approval. But, Mr. President, this analysis reveals that it is not that kind of bill. This analysis reveals that, instead of the bargaining power of labor and management being equal, we have weighted the scales on the side of management. The public discovers from this message that instead of labor and management being put in an equal position, in other respects, the scales have been weighted on the side of management, and the employee has been penalized.

Mr. President, the people will discover from this message, from the President himself, that the bill as passed is not effective as a measure which would protect the public interest in case of emergency; for he has pointed out in his message that it would require a great deal of exertion on the part of the Government, but prove inevitably ineffective and fruitless. Therefore, Mr. President, the President does not wish to see America rely upon efficacy of a remedy which does not exist. He quite naturally felt it his duty to call to the attention of the country those deficiencies of the measure.

Mr. President, now that the President has laid before the Congress and the country this comprehensive and clear treatment of the measure—which I believe cannot be questioned or denied—I hope there will be a different feeling about this proposal in the Senate. I shared the general desire of Senators that there might be some legislation in this field. As a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with some of my colleagues, I joined in a minority report, in which we set forth aspects of the bill which we thought were in the public interest, and we emphasized that we were willing to go even further than the President went in his recommendations to the Congress, in order to assure legislation in this field. But we refused to support this extreme measure. We knew that there were abuses. Even among the chosen Twelve, Mr. President, there was a traitor. In our churches, there are sinners. There are some who err unintentionally, and some, intentionally. Of course, if in the field of labor relations there were some way by which those who erred could be restrained and circumscribed in their power, we were all disposed to apply those restraints and that curb to them. To put it another way, we were willing to prune the tree, but not to cut it down. But the bill did not satisfy itself by pruning the tree of the labor movement and removing the branches that should be pruned. It cut at the very root of the tree; it undertook to strike it down. Those who observed and appreciated its far-reaching import could come to no other conclusion than that it would have the effect, if it were not designed to accomplish that end, of strangling and destroying the organized labor movement of America.

Mr. President, I read a statement in a newspaper to the effect that a part of our program to give democracy to Greece, to whose assistance we have gone, was to require that Greece permit the organization of labor unions. I dare say we would make that a condition in any country in the world where we were laying down the criteria of democratic conduct. We say to Greece: "If you are going to prove your democracy, let the working people organize themselves into their own associations, so that they may bargain collectively with their employers." But here in the Congress, which was the fountainhead of the grant of power under which such conditions could be imposed, we adopt a measure which, I say, if not designed to destroy, would have the effect of destroying the labor movement in America. All that the President has set forth in his message. He has shown how the employer could break a union. He has shown how the employer could discharge an employee arbitrarily, but the employee in certain cases would have to work a minimum of

80 days for the employer. He has pointed out how, for all practical purposes, the right of collective bargaining would hereafter become impossible to the working people. He has emphasized in his message the case of the closed shop as it has existed in America.

During the course of our management and labor experience in our own American way of working out our problems by trial and error, we have found it to be in the public interest to give a free hand to management and to labor and to make their own contracts one with another where nothing contrary to the law or the public interest was involved. Under that American practice, in the exercise of that prerogative of economic and political democracy, millions of American working men and women—a number in excess, I believe of three-quarters of all the organized workers in America—have entered into collective bargaining agreements which provide for the closed shop or union security. Experience has shown that principle to be in the public interest and not contrary to it. It has shown that the exercise of that right has given job-security to men and women which they otherwise could not have had. Through the medium of the labor organization the employer has been provided with skilled and competent personnel which probably he could not otherwise so well or so immediately acquire. Experience, I say, Mr. President, has proved that it is not only in the interest of the working people but it is in the interest of a greater America that we have recognized the right of employer and employee to bargain together and by bargaining agreements to provide for the principle of the closed shop and union security.

But the bill intervenes. Here at the bargaining table is an uninvited guest, Mr. President, who lays down the prohibition, "Thou shalt not," to employers and employees who desire to bargain in respect to a closed-shop agreement. The President knows that to void the contracts under which millions of working people have been working satisfactorily for their employers would not only be a disservice to the employees, but to their employers as well.

Only a few weeks ago we read in the newspapers of Washington a statement by Mr. Cyrus Eaton, a distinguished businessman of America, denouncing legislation that would outlaw and prohibit the closed shop and interfere with free collective bargaining between employer and employee. I believe that, if the truth were known, it would be revealed that the majority of the far-sighted business leaders of America appreciate the wisdom—yes, the necessity—of freedom to contract with the employees, and feel that the experience of the past should not be discarded by this legislation.

Mr. President, the message of the President is a critical, carefully analytical, thoroughly comprehensive consideration of the so-called Taft-Hartley labor bill, and the conclusion of the President is that the measure, if enacted into law, would be contrary to the public interest.

The President has not, however, taken the time to go into the background against which this bill was passed. He might have said that it comes at a time when monopoly in America is at an all-time peak. He might have said that the employers who urge the legislation are seeking to cheapen labor at a time when their profits are swollen to an all-time high. He might have said that those who looked upon the bill as the panacea for all ills in industry, who believed it would prevent strikes, were only harboring a delusion, because last year 82 percent of all the man-days lost by strikes, 75 percent of all the men and women out on strike, were the result of disputes over wages and hours, and the bill does nothing to make the employer more disposed to agree to give justice to his employees in respect to wages and hours.

The President might have added that any industrial peace the bill would achieve would be reached and gained at the expense of the living level of the working men and women of America. Mr. President, I feel the President might have added that that is too high a price for industrial peace in our country.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. My purpose in asking the Senator to yield was to suggest to the Senate that there is some reason to believe that we might secure a unanimous-consent agreement with respect to the time at which to vote upon the pending question. In view of the fact that it is necessary to have a quorum call in order to propose such unanimous-consent agreement——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair might state to the Senator from Nebraska that it is not necessary under existing circumstances, according to the Parliamentarian.

Mr. WHERRY. Regardless of that fact, I believe that in fairness to the Members of the Senate we should have a quorum call, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. PEPPER. I yield for that purpose, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Morse
Baldwin	Hatch	Murray
Ball	Hawkes	Myers
Barkley	Hayden	O'Conor
Brewster	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Bricker	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Holland	Overton
Brooks	Ives	Pepper
Buck	Jenner	Reed
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Va.
Byrd	Kem	Robertson, Wyo.
Cain	Kilgore	Russell
Capehart	Knowland	Saltonstall
Capper	Langer	Smith
Chavez	Lodge	Sparkman
Connally	McCarran	Taft
Cooper	McCarthy	Taylor
Cordon	McClellan	Thye
Donnell	McFarland	Tydings
Downey	McGrath	Umstead
Dworshak	McKellar	Vandenberg
Eastland	McMahon	Watkins
Ecton	Magnuson	Wherry
Ellender	Malone	White
Ferguson	Martin	Wiley
Fulbright	Maybank	Williams
George	Millikin	Wilson
Green	Moore	Young

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it seems to be unnecessary to go into detail in proposing a unanimous-consent request to vote upon the pending question, so I shall bring it to the attention of the Senate as quickly as possible. We have been in communication with Senators who are vitally interested.

I now propose, for the consideration of the Senate, a unanimous-consent request that the Senate vote upon the pending question at 5 o'clock this evening.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I think it is perfectly obvious that we cannot vote at 5 o'clock or any other hour today. A number of Senators on both sides are absent from the city, and are on their way back in order to cast their votes. So I am compelled to object to the request of the Senator from Nebraska that we vote at 5 o'clock or any other hour today.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the distinguished minority leader, if it is impossible to accede to the unanimous-consent request for a vote at 5 o'clock today, if he would be agreeable to a vote on the pending question at 3 o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not want to be in the attitude of objecting to every request, or seeming to be unreasonable.

Mr. WHERRY. The minority leader is always fair.

Mr. BARKLEY. There are Members who will not return to the city until after lunch tomorrow. We cannot tell whether there may be some delay in their arrival which would prevent them from arriving here before 3 o'clock. I am compelled to say to the Senator that I would object to fixing the hour of 3 o'clock tomorrow for a final vote; but I would be inclined to agree to 5 o'clock, if that is agreeable to the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am quite satisfied that the hour of 5 o'clock will be agreeable if we cannot have a vote at 3.

Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky that I have been advised by several Senators that if it were at all possible they would like to vote on this question today; and if we could arrange an hour not later than 3 o'clock on Saturday, that would be acceptable, in the event we could not vote today.

I know how important this question is, and I know that the minority leader and the majority leader want the strength of the Senate to be present to vote.

Mr. BARKLEY. I may say to the Senator that no more important veto message has been before the Senate in a long time; and in my judgment no more clear-cut or logical veto. I feel that Members of the Senate ought to have an opportunity to study the veto message and analyze it paragraph by paragraph and point by point. Obviously, they have not had an opportunity to do so today. Those who are on their way back here will have to depend upon the newspapers for copies of it in order that they may study it. I do not think it would be practicable to vote at 3 o'clock tomorrow, or at any other hour earlier than 5 o'clock tomorrow afternoon. I do not know whether that hour will suit the Senate, but it is agreeable to me.

I have consulted with most Senators who have been active on the committee, and I think that hour would be reasonably agreeable, although there are those who feel that the veto message ought not to be voted upon even tomorrow. They are perfectly sincere in their position. The message is so comprehensive and goes into such detail with respect to this legislation that it is felt by some that further study should be given to it.

My own judgment is that between now and 5 o'clock tomorrow afternoon Senators will have ample time to study the message and will be in a position to determine how they will vote. I think that is not an unreasonable length of time to request, in view of the importance of the question and the critical effect upon the country which a decision one way or the other may have.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to make a few brief remarks upon the request.

In my opinion, the President of the United States has handed down a sound and unanswerable veto message on this bill. In fact, I believe it to be one of the most powerful veto messages ever handed down by a President of the United States in all our history. I think that on point after point the President has made very clear in his veto message the type of legal legislative monstrosity upon which the Senate of the United States is now asked to pass final judgment. Tonight the President is going to take to the air in a Nation-wide radio broadcast. He considers this question to be of such vital importance to the economic welfare of the Nation that apparently he believes it advisable and necessary to apprise the American people of the economic dangers inherent in this piece of legislation.

As a firm believer in representative government, Mr. President, I think sufficient time should elapse between this veto message and the final vote in the Senate to enable the people of the country to make their wishes known in regard to this legislation. I think the President has done a much better job than have any of us who have been opposing this legislation. I am pleased that the veto message covers the major points I made in my speech of June 5, in opposition to this bill. However, in addition the President has made many other salient points. I think he has very clearly stated in his veto message the reasons why we should not pass this legislation. I, for one, believe that an adequate period of time should be afforded to enable the people of the United States to be heard from in regard to the last step in the passage or nonpassage of this piece of legislation. I know there are arguments against it. I appreciate the fact that to object at this time might bring down upon me criticism that our best opportunity to sustain the veto might be tomorrow afternoon. Of course, Mr. President, that goes to the individual responsibility of each Member of the Senate to be here next week, and he will have to assume that responsibility for himself. I think that balanced against the argument that more men may be here tomorrow is the importance not only of Members of the Senate taking time to study the veto message—and let me say that it cannot be done in a very short period of time if what we are trying to do is a conscientious job of weighing the inherent merits of the objections which the President has raised—but I think it is likewise of great importance that American employers study it.

I am inclined to believe, Mr. President, that the industrial statesmen among American employers, once they come to comprehend what is involved in this message and what will be visited upon them if this measure becomes law, will be heard from early next week. I think it will be found that a great many employers will take the same position which a group of very impartial and distinguished experts in the field of labor relations has taken in a telegram which I wish to have incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. The telegram, which was sent to the leaders of the Congress yesterday or the day before, I believe, is as follows:

> We speak as economists, lawyers, and educators representing no organization or partisan interest. We are unanimous in the conviction that the Taft-Hartley bill should not become law. This omnibus bill includes many provisions which are extremely unwise, unfair, and unworkable. It goes far beyond the legitimate purposes of curbing union abuses or providing equality of bargaining rights and duties. It would seriously weaken protections of Norris-Laguardia Act and National Labor Relations Act. It provides no constructive solution to problem of national strikes. It would increase industrial unrest and strife.

Who are these men, Mr. President, who have seen fit to call our attention at this zero hour, so far as the legislative history of this legislation is concerned, to the weaknesses of this bill? Let us take a few names:

E. Wight Bakke, director of labor-management center, Yale University; Paul Dodd, director of Institute of Industrial Relations and dean, University of California in Los Angeles; Thomas Emerson, professor of law, Yale University; Nathan Feinsinger, professor of law, University of Wisconsin, formerly public member, National War Labor Board.

Senators need only to read some of the outstanding decisions of this distinguished labor-relations scholar to recognize that when he takes this position they are hearing from an expert in the field of labor relations.

Phillips L. Garman, associate professor of labor and industrial relations, Institute of Industrial Relations, University of Illinois; Lloyd K. Garrison, attorney, formerly Chairman, National War Labor Board and dean of law school, University of Wisconsin; Walter Gellhorn, professor of law, Columbia University; Charles O. Gregory, professor of law, University of Chicago; James K. Hall, professor of economics, University of Washington; William S. Hopkins, Director of Institute of Labor Relations, University of Washington; Mark De Wolfe Howe, dean of law school, University of Buffalo; Vernon Jennsen, professor, New York School of Industrial Relations, Cornell University; Clark Kerr, professor and labor arbitrator, formerly Chairman, National War Labor Board Meatpacking Commission; Harry A. Millis, professor of economics (emeritus), University of Chicago), formerly Chairman, National Labor Relations Board; Lloyd G. Reynolds, associate director of labor-management center, Yale University; William G. Rice, professor of law, University of Wisconsin; Harry Shulman, professor of law, Yale University, impartial umpire for Ford Motor Co. and United Automobile Workers, CIO; Edwin E. Witte, professor of economics, University of Wisconsin, recognized as one of the six outstanding scholars in the field of labor economics in the entire country.

There is a long list of additional signers, as follows:

Prof. Jacob H. Benscher, University of Wisconsin; Prof. Ralph S. Brown, Jr., Yale University; Prof. Henry T. Buechel, University of Washington; Prof. John Dunlop, Harvard University; Prof. J. B. Gillingham, University of Washington; Prof. Horace M. Gray, University of Illinois; Prof. David Haber, Yale University; Prof. Paul Hays, Columbia University; Prof. John P. Herring, University of Washington; Prof. Willard Hurst, University of Wisconsin; Prof. Abbott Kaplan, University of California at Los Angeles; Prof. Delmar Karlen, University of Wisconsin; Prof. Leonard Mathy, University of Washington; Prof. Addison A. Mueller, Yale University; Prof. Vernon A. Mund, University of Washington; Prof. Frank C. Pierson, Swarthmore College; Prof. Effey Riley, Cornell University; Prof. George J. Ritter, Yale University; Prof. Arthur Ross, Berkeley, Calif.; Prof. Ralph J. Thayer, University of Washington; Prof. Samuel E. Thorne, Yale University; Prof. Marlin Volz, University of Wisconsin; Prof. Colston E. Warne, Amherst College; Prof. Donald H. Wollett, University of Washington.

What I want to point out, Mr. President, is that already we are beginning to hear from the country; already sufficient time has elapsed for some of our scholars to analyze the meanings and the effects of the Taft-Hartley bill, and they are coming forward with remarkable unanimity in opposition to this type of legislation. That is why I say that I think we ought to stop, look, and listen before we hastily vote on the veto message. Precious as time is, I know of no better way the Senate of the United States could spend its time for the next few days than to study the veto message and this legislation and take stock of what the sober thinking of the country tells us in regard to what its effects are bound to be.

This afternoon, in the House of Representatives, after the veto message was read, in a very short time the matter was swept through the House by an overwhelming vote to override the veto. There was no debate on the message. I want to say about the House action that it is a commentary on representative government. I do not want to see the branch of the Congress of which I am a Member engaged in such hasty action.

Some of the proponents of this legislation, Mr. President, already are deeply concerned about some of its weaknesses and are hastily preparing amendments to offer immediately after the final vote on the veto. I would suggest that statesmanship calls upon us to perfect our legislation before we pass it. Oh, yes,

some great newspapers, like the Washington Post of this city, in editorials are trying to lead the readers into believing that it is this legislation or no legislation. That does not follow, Mr. President. The leadership of the Congress rests with my party, and whether or not we get good legislation or bad legislation is the responsibility of the Republican majority in the Congress. The leadership of the majority knows that if we sustain this veto, if they have the will to pass good legislation they can pass it within 10 days after the veto is sustained. We do not need to pass legislation on any promise that once it is passed we will proceed at once to correct some of the weaknesses in it. What we should do, in the name of wise statesmanship, Mr. President, is to sustain the veto and then go to work immediately and endeavor to put through Congress legislation which will function properly, which will be workable, and which will promote industrial harmony and stability.

I wish to say that if the President's veto is sustained, within the hour after it is sustained, I myself will introduce some legislation on the subject, I shall introduce legislation which, on the basis of the experience gained from the work we did in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, will meet the objections raised in the veto message and will give us legislation which will be fair, reasonable, and workable. It will give us legislation which will equalize the Wagner Act and check those labor abuses which employers legitimately protest against.

But I shall not sit here and vote for an early overriding, if it may be that, of the President's veto message, until the country has an opportunity to be heard from in regard to the veto message. As a matter of courtesy and consideration to the President himself, who will speak over the radio tonight, I think we owe it to him not to vote on this question until the early part of next week.

Therefore, Mr. President, I object to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I did not know that the Senator from Oregon was going to object so abruptly. I wished to ask him to yield to me. However, inasmuch as he has objected, I shall not ask him to yield now.

I wish to make an observation—if the Senator from Nebraska will yield to me, if he has the floor; or, if he has not, if I have it——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I think I have the floor; but I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I have listened with the greatest of interest to the statement which has been made by the Senator from Oregon. I agree with him absolutely with respect to the basis of his intense feeling about this legislation. The President's message has not only confirmed all the objections which I raised to this bill when it was originally under consideration in the Senate and when it later came before the Senate in connection with the conference report, it has confirmed not only all the objections which were raised by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and other Senators who discussed the proposed legislation at length before it was finally passed by both Houses of Congress, but the President's message has gone beyond some of the objections which we thought of, and which we raised at the time when the bill was previously under consideration.

Mr. President, we are confronted with a practical legislative situation. After we make a further study of this measure, carefully and without prejudice, in an earnest effort to understand not only the legislation which the President has vetoed but the sincerity with which he has done it and the meticulous care he has exercised in undertaking to understand the effect of the legislation, my own judgment is that if after doing so, by late in the afternoon tomorrow Senators who voted for the bill are not by that time willing to change their minds and are not then willing to vote to sustain the veto, then I doubt very honestly whether a postponement of the vote until next week would change a single vote by reason of outside pressure brought to bear upon the Senate because of a further study of the mesage on the part of the public.

I have a feeling that tomorrow there will be a more representative attendance in the Senate than there will be on any day next week. That may sound like an indictment of the interest of Senators in their attendance here, but it is not so intended. It is always impossible to have all Senators on the floor at one time. Exigencies arise which make inescapable that some Senators will be absent when any vote is taken. I believe that tomorrow afternoon, at the hour suggested, there will be a larger attendance of the Members of the Senate than there will be on any day next week; and I believe that our best chance to sustain this veto is by having the fullest possible attendance of Senators when the hour to vote arrives.

I do not believe that a delay from 5 o'clock tomorrow afternoon until Monday, Tuesday, or even Thursday of next week will result in the changing of any votes. On the contrary, it is entirely possible, taking into consideration the human elements which enter into these considerations, that a prolonged effort to bring pressure on either side upon Senators who have been under long pressure, for months, upon the subject, might do more harm than good.

Therefore, although sincerely believing in the position taken by the Senator from Oregon and recognizing his great service in this body and in other capacities in behalf of labor and his services in connection with the interpretation of the law as it now exists and his efforts to interpret the proposed laws on the subject—agreeing entirely with him about that—nevertheless, I have the hope that the Senate will agree to vote on this matter at some hour tomorrow. I say that in view of the situation, the unlikelihood that any greater change would take place next week than would take place tomorrow—if any changes are made in the final vote—by the time tomorrow at which it has been proposed that the Senate vote, to which proposal the Senator from Oregon has objected. We all know that seven Senators must change their votes if the veto is to be sustained. I have not undertaken to insert my eyes into the breast of any Senator to see what is going on in his bosom. I do not know whether any Senator is prepared today, or will be prepared tomorrow or next week, to change his vote, or whether a sufficient number of Senators are willing to do so, so as to sustain the veto. I fervently hope so. I fervently hope that all Senators will read the President's message with open mind and sincerity and without guile, to try to see whether under the conditions which he portrays, it would, in their judgment, be in the interest of the country for them to change their votes—and I refer particularly to the Senators who must change their votes if the veto is to be sustained. I sincerely and earnestly hope that that may take place.

But, Mr. President, I also sincerely and earnestly believe that if that cannot take place by tomorrow, at 5 o'clock or some other hour, it will not take place by Monday or Tuesday or any other day next week.

Therefore, with the greatest deference and with the greatest admiration for the position of the Senator from Oregon and his sincerity in regard to the matter, I earnestly hope that we may reach an agreement to vote at some hour tomorrow afternoon, because I believe there will be a larger vote tomorrow afternoon—knowing what I do about the situation confronting many Senators—than there will be on any day next week.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not intend to press unanimous-consent requests any further at this time. However, I am very optimistic that we shall be able to work out this problem later. I was attenmpting to give the opinions of, I believe, most of those who feel that an early vote on the veto message is what they would like to have; and with that end in mind, I have put in some untiring efforts, I suggest to the distinguished minority leader, in trying to obtain an agreement as to an hour which I thought would be acceptable to everyone concerned.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to the Senator from Nebraska and to other Senators, including the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], and other responsible spokesmen on the other side of the aisle, for collaborating with those of us on this side of the aisle in an effort to determine whether some agreeable hour might be arrived at, and also to see whether Senators might be accommodated. I appreciate that effort.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to suggest to the distinguished minority leader, and I ask him if it is not a fact, that we gave every consideration so that all Senators might be in attendance, regardless of how they would vote. It was our feeling that the hour which has already been suggested would be the most satisfactory hour.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is true; and I say, further, that we have made a special effort to have Senators now absent be in attendance here tomorrow afternoon.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; and we have done so regardless of their position on this question.

Mr. BARKLEY. We have done so in the case of Senators who now are on their way here, and will be here at the hour tomorrow afternoon for which the vote is suggested, unless some difficulty which we do not contemplate and cannot foresee arises.

Mr. President, I appreciate all these efforts; but I also appreciate that every Senator has a right to his own opinion, and we cannot avoid the exercise of such rights by Senators who entertain their opinions strongly.

However, I still hope that, notwithstanding the objection which has been registered to this request, it may subsequently be possible for us to work out an agreement.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I associate myself completely with the optimism expressed by the minority leader, who has in many years gone by worked out unanimous-consent requests, and I shall certainly try again.

However, in view of the fact that objection has been made, and there are those who would like to know what the Senate expects to do, I should like to say that, with the consent of the Senate, we expect to continue on the remainder of the afternoon and into a night session debating the subject matter at hand. In the meantime, we will see what can be done toward arriving at an agreement on an hour for a vote.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the Senator from Oregon on the splendid statement he has just made. Generally, in an overwhelming majority of instances, I have agreed with the Senator from Oregon in his actions and statements. A time or two I have disagreed with what he has done, as in the last election, when he supported different candidates than those I supported, and spoke for them in the vain hope that he was liberalizing the Republican Party. I can forgive him, knowing his zeal for liberalism and for his party.

I wish to say, however, Mr. President, that I feel that the President's veto message is the first opportunity the opponents of the labor legislation have had to get their point of view across to the country, and, as the Senator from Oregon pointed out, it will take several days for that point of view, a very clear explanation of the bill, to be broadcast throughout the Nation. The President is taking to the radio this evening. I feel that the decision we are to make should be postponed in order that the country may have time to digest the very splendid analysis of the bill which the President has presented to us.

I might say for myself—of course, I cannot presume to speak for the Senator from Oregon or for any other Senator—that it would be agreeable to me if a day for a vote on the bill could be set some time next week. Next week there will be a dedication ceremony at Warm Springs, Ga., and many Senators are leaving the Capital for that ceremony, so that it seems to me that the only practical day for a vote on the bill, when we would have a full attendance, would be Thursday of next week, when Senators have returned from the trip to Warm Springs.

I have no desire to make an extensive speech on the subject. We have said about everything that can be said on it in the Senate, and what we have to say would not get Nation-wide attention and change any opinion out yonder. But the President's message will.

However, Mr. President, if it is the plan of the majority party to keep us in session until the bill shall be voted on, I do not propose to have it voted on immediately. As I have said, my object is not to talk. I deplore a filibuster. Of course, a filibuster is for the object of killing legislation or preventing a vote upon a matter. I have no objection to the veto message and the bill being laid aside and any other legislation being considered, and to our having an agreement for the vote on a day certain, which I would suggest be Thursday of next week. In that case I should be perfectly satisfied not to talk on the subject any further.

However, if it is the intent to throw down the gauntlet and say, "We are going to vote at the earliest possible moment, and those of you who feel that the country should have an opportunity to react will just have to hold the floor," I will say that I hope the time will never come when I shall be forced to see how long I can talk on the floor of the Senate. I do not relish the prospect at all, and, as I have said, my remarks would not be in the nature of a filibuster to prevent action; they would be in the nature of delaying the vote until the people have had time to think over the matter, and let their Senators know their views.

I am perfectly willing to have the vote taken at the time I have suggested, without anything at all being said by me. But if the only way by which we can delay the vote until the full import of the measure gets across to the country, by way of the President's thorough, calm, coolly reasoned message—if the only way we can delay the vote so that that may happen is by talking, then I say, Mr. President, I shall talk, I shall talk at length, and I think that I can talk at considerable length if I am compelled to do so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. It is my understanding that the vote on the bill which has been vetoed takes precedence over any other business of the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. And that if any other business is to be transacted, it must be done by unanimous consent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It can be done by motion.

Mr. WHERRY. On motion or by unanimous consent?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Objection to any other business is in order, and the vote on the labor bill on its reconsideration is the pending question and has the right of way?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a few minutes ago a unanimous-consent request was presented to the Senate. Reserving the right to object, the Senator from Oregon gave his reasons as to why he thought he should file his objections. Is the junior Senator from Oregon correct in his understanding that when he made that response to the question of the Chair as to whether there was objection to the unanimous-consent request, he did not sacrifice any of his rights under the rule to speak twice on the same legislative day on the pending business?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would rule that the Senator was speaking on the unanimous-consent request only.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, apropos of the question as to the time for a vote, I believe that it probably would be an injustice to some of the Members of the Senate if a vote were to be had tomorrow afternoon, although I would have been perfectly willing to agree to such a time for a vote if there could have been general accord.

It is known, however, that Senators are en route back to Washington, some from other countries. Some of those Senators have been vitally interested in the legislation which is the subject of the veto message, and other legislation of a similar character. I think that within reasonable limits every Member of this body is entitled to vote on vital matters of legislation, and especially when the matter is of such far-reaching significance as is the matter before us, and where the issue is whether a veto of the President of the United States shall be overridden or sustained.

So far as I have heard from the Senators who made objection, or indicated a desire for delay, they have not specified any time next week, and it seems to me it might be possible that a vote could be taken the early part of the week. I suggest to the leadership the consideration of that possibility, if no agreement for an earlier vote can be achieved.

I agree thoroughly with what has been said about the importance of the labor bill, and the right of the American people, in a democracy, to know what the President has said and what the measure involves. Do Senators realize that this is just one sentence in the President's message:

> I find that this bill is completely contrary to that national policy of economic freedom.

In instance after instance the President has said that the measure goes to the essential democracy of America. Surely, when we are to make a decision of such great import, it does not have to be done on a week end, with Senators scattered all over the country, and some in foreign countries, on official missions.

Surely, Mr. President, a matter of that importance can be determined in one of the early days of next week. The Chair has advised that this measure can be laid aside on motion or by unanimous

consent. I know of nobody disposed to object to a motion or to a request for unanimous consent to lay this bill aside, so that a vote may be had at an agreed time. That will not therefore delay the progress of Senate business, for we can begin immediately, if we could make such an agreement, to consider anything else the leadership of the majority desires to bring before the Senate.

I realize that we are not going to persuade one another with what we say here upon this measure. I never saw the message or had a chance to examine it, until it was being read from the rostrum here. I do not know whether any other Senator had a preview of the message; but I dare say many did not, if any at all. Yet we are asked to vote upon a measure of that vital importance, without a chance reflectively even to read the President's message; certainly, without the people of the country having a chance to see it and to manifest their opinion to the Congress.

Mr. President, the people of the country under our Constitution have a right to petition Congress; they have a right to assemble, and to address their public officers. If we decide this matter before they have a chance to exercise that right, we, for all practical purposes, thwart a provision of the people's Constitution. I think the people of the country are vitally interested in this legislation. I think that every man, woman, boy, and girl in America has a stake in how this issue is decided. I think, Mr. President, that this bill is contributing to the momentum that the country is already acquiring down the road to another depression. Surely, that will strike at the heart of every business enterprise, every financial institution, the integrity of every home, the job of every working man and woman in America.

Mr. President, the President of the United States says the issue of democracy and economic freedom is involved in this legislation. Surely, the American people, upon legislation of such vast importance, have a right to be heard, have a right to manifest their opinion.

The President has emphasized in his message what the bill does to our political rights in our cherished democracy. He says, in the latter part of the message, that the bill would make it unlawful for a labor-union newspaper to write an editorial opposing or favoring candidates for public office. He emphasizes, Mr. President, that it would be unlawful, as the Senator from Ohio said here upon this floor it would be, for a labor leader, if his time were paid for by his union, to speak to the people on the radio about a public issue, about a party, or about a candidate for public office.

Mr. President, the President points out that the corporations of America own the newspapers and own the radio stations. They have access to the public ear all the time. Yet, to deny the working people a right to speak through the leadership of their unions, which they may pay for with their hard-earned wages, to deny a union newspaper a right to express its opinion, to deny a labor union the right to issue pamphlets for those they think favorable to the cause of labor and the public interest, is to strike at the very heart of political democracy as well as economics in America. Yet that is what the President of the United States says the bill does. That is a serious matter, Mr. President. It is not an irresponsible columnist; it is not a radio commentator; it is not a partisan; it is the Chief Magistrate of the United States who, in a solemn veto message, has proclaimed those sentiments and convictions to the Congress and to the country.

Yes, Mr. President, the President has said that the bill goes far beyond the question of labor disputes in America; it transcends partisanship; it goes beyond the effort of one class to gain the ascendancy over another; he says it goes to Americanism, Mr. President, to the very fundamentals of our political and economic structure.

These are just the last few paragraphs in summary of the message:

> The most fundamental test which I have applied to this bill is whether it would strengthen or weaken American democracy in the present critical hour. This bill is perhaps the most serious economic and social legislation of the past decade. Its effects—for good or ill—would be felt for decades to come.
>
> I have concluded—

Continued the President—

> that the bill is a clear threat to the successful working of our democratic society.
>
> One of the major lessons of recent world history—

Says the President—

> is that free and vital trade-unions are a strong bulwark against the growth of totalitarian movements.

Let me interpolate there, Mr. President. As Senators will recall, it was brought out at Nuremberg that in his effort to accomplish totalitarianism, the three objectives of Hitler were to destroy the church, destroy the labor unions, and to persecute the Jew. I am quoting further from the President's message:

> We must, therefore, be everlastingly alert that in striking at union abuses we do not destroy the contribution which unions make to our democratic strength.

The President says further:

> This bill would go far toward weakening our trade-union movement. And it would go far toward destroying our national unity. By raising barriers between labor and management and by injecting political considerations into normal economic decisions, it would invite them to gain their ends through direct political action. I think it would be exceedingly dangerous to our country to develop a class basis for political action.

The President says further:

> I cannot emphasize too strongly the transcendent importance of the United States in the world today as a force for freedom and peace. We cannot be strong internationally if our national unity and our productive strength are hindered at home. Anything which weakens our economy or weakens the unity of our people—as I am thoroughly convinced this bill would do—I cannot approve.
>
> In my message on the state of the Union which I submitted to the Congress in January 1947, I recommended a step-by-step approach to the subject of labor legislation. I specifically indicated the problems which we should treat immediately. I recommended that, before going on to other problems, a careful, thorough, and nonpartisan investigation should be made, covering the entire field of labor-management relations.
>
> The bill now before me reverses this procedure. It would make drastic changes in our national labor policy first, and would provide for investigation afterward.
>
> There is still a genuine opportunity for the enactment of appropriate labor legislation this session. I still feel that the recommendations which I expressed in the state of the Union message constitute an adequate basis for legislation which is moderate in spirit and which relates to known abuses.
>
> For the compelling reasons I have set forth, I return H. R. 3020 without my approval.

Mr. President, this veto message is a document that will go down in history as thoroughly American in its every word and line.

I have regretted to see on the other side of the aisle such a degree of unanimity in expressing a determination to pass this legislation. It may be that the majority party will say that it has a mandate from the people. It is strange to me, Mr. President, that the people should have given a mandate for the destruction of their fundamental economic and political interests. But if the majority party feels that it has a mandate, and it wishes to make a political issue of economic democracy in America, then I think the challenge can well be accepted.

I believe that this measure presents an issue as clear as the noonday sun. In voting on this measure I think Senators disclose where their sympathies lie and on which side they desire to be aligned in the industrial struggle between the masses of the people and the privileged corporate few in America. I am not in any sense of the word disparaging the opinions or impugning the motives of any other Senator. I am only expressing my own views as to the issues, as I see them disclosed in the legislation.

As a Democrat, I am proud that a Democratic President had the courage to say "No" to this effort to hamstring the working people of America, and to hurl the Nation into another economic abyss and pull down with us the rest of the world. At a time when General Marshall is talking about our strength being measured at home, when former President Hoover is saying, "Let us see how much we can afford to give to Europe and the rest of the world," here before us is a measure action upon which will help determine how much we can afford to give to the people of the devastated countries and to others in need. At a time when everything possible should be done to strengthen our economy, we find before us a proposal which if enacted would result in weakening rather than strengthening our economy, and instead of our production being increased, would result in its dwindling into a trickle.

That is the reason why the President says that what we now do is of vital concern not only to America but to democracy in the world. As a Democratic Senator I am proud that a majority of those on this side of the aisle—and I make this as a prediction—will be found sustaining a Democratic President in the magnificent veto message which we have just heard read from the rostrum.

Mr. President, I do not think there is anything extraordinary about the way the two parties by their majorities have alined themselves. I think it simply represents the customary division in point of view between the parties. I think the majority party is still expressing the philosophy of its recognized founder, Alexander Hamilton. It still believes that the best kind of a tax bill is the bill that gives the principle benefit to the privileged few. We on this side of the aisle do not have such a belief. That is the reason Senators on this side of the aisle generally opposed the recent tax bill. We believe that if we are to give tax relief we should give it first to those who need it most. Even before that, perhaps we should pay our debts when we have the money with which to pay.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. And when the public were able to understand the meaning of the tax bill they, too, rejected it, according to polls which were taken throughout the country.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is absolutely correct. We were assailed by a great clamor and a great tumult, and had we been persuaded by it we would almost unanimously have adopted the tax proposal which was submitted to us. But when the people had a chance to analyze it, when they had a chance to see whose nests it feathered, that the nests it feathered were the already downy nests of the privileged, they said, "Well, that is a different kind of a tax bill from what we thought it was. We thought it was proposed to give all of us tax relief; that the burdens upon all our backs were to be lightened by Congress." But when they saw the bill they found out that the backs that were to have the burdens lifted from them were the backs that were almost erect, and the backs that were bent over by burdens were hardly given any relief at all.

The House passed the tax bill, and the Senate passed it, but the President, as in the present case, had the wisdom and the courage to veto it, to stand against the clamor of those who did not understand the kind of a bill Congress had enacted. But when the President vetoed it and in a message which plainly showed what the bill would do, the House of Representatives sustained his veto.

As the Senator from Montana has intimated, there was a Gallup poll taken, and what did it show? It showed that the majority of the American people agreed we were right in opposing the tax bill. I cannot escape the force of the analogy here. The people thought this was a labor bill which ought to be enacted; that there were abuses by labor leaders and by irresponsible labor members which should be corrected; that the country should be protected against any excesses, or against grievous emergencies, or against flagrant violation of the public interest. Of course, people thought we should have legislation with those objectives. Everybody thinks so, or should think so. And, naturally, having confidence in their Congress, which all the newspapers told them was doing the just and necessary thing, they believed Congress was enacting wise and necessary legislation. Remember, the newspapers generally are corporate employers, and are not for the workers of America. From what the newspapers told the people they thought that this was that kind of a labor bill.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. I should like to call to the Senator's mind what happened in this Chamber last year. The circumstances were reversed, however. We had a message from the President advocating drastic action in the matter of labor relations, and the House did the very same thing that has happened there today. They rushed that legislation through in a few minutes, if Senators will remember, and then when it came to the Senate the predictions were that the same thing would happen here. But we kept it from coming to a head for a little while, and on second, sober thought we reversed the matter here.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is the Senator from Idaho referring to the bill that was proposed by the President of the United States last year to draft labor into the Army of the United States?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The bill which came over from the House and was advocated by the majority party, and which was blocked on the floor of the Senate by the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]? Is that the bill to which the Senator refers?

Mr. TAYLOR. I refer to the bill which was blocked by a number of Senators. I would not give the credit to the Senator from Ohio. I remember at the time that it happened I was reading the bill at my desk, and as I went through it I found it to be very distressing, and I finally came to the last paragraph which provided that, in addition to other things that would happen, all profit from industries while they were in the hands of the Government would go to the Government, and I leaned over to the Senator next to me—I have forgotten who he was, as we have moved around a little bit since then—and I said, "The Republicans will never agree to the bill when they read the last paragraph." At that time I looked over and saw that the Senator from Ohio was just finishing reading the bill, and when he read the last paragraph he hit the ceiling, and his fist hit the desk, and he was bitterly opposed to that labor legislation which would take the profits away from the big industrialists. So, yes; I am happy to say the Senator from Ohio opposed the legislation.

I want to call that situation to mind, in order to remind Senators that it is not good to act in too great haste. Perhaps if we argue the matter long enough we will find that the legislation before us might take some profits from somebody, and that would indeed win converts to our side. I frankly feel that it would take profits from every industrialist, from every little businessman, from every farmer, because it would create uncounted labor disputes, and when business stagnates naturally everyone loses profits. I feel that as soon as the farmers and small businessmen of America realize what this is going to mean they will add their voices in protest to the voices of those who labor with their hands for a living. I am confident that that will have a considerable effect on the final outcome.

As I have said, I have no desire to indulge in a filibuster. All I want is time for the President's message to get to the people. If they talk it over and let their Representatives in Congress know how they feel, I believe that those Representatives can in all good conscience change their votes and help to sustain the veto. I am confident that many Senators have voted on this question thinking that they were reflecting the will of the people back home when, in truth, the people back home were not informed. I believe that the Representatives in Congress of the people should be given full credit for wanting to represent the will of the people.

I thank the Senator from Florida for yielding.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able Senator from Idaho.

I was saying that I had observed with some pride—pardonable, I hope—the stand of the Democratic membership of this body. I speak, of course, of the majority of the Democratic membership. We do not always have unanimity in either party. I am willing that my party should be judged, as I suppose the majority party is willing to be judged, by the action of the majority of its members.

I am proud to recall what the action of the two parties was with respect to price control. Some Democrats voted to eliminate price control; but if we consult the RECORD we find, I believe with one exception, that in all the many votes the majority of the people's party stood on the side of the people in the matter of protecting their standard of living against inflationary prices and profits.

So in this case it seems to me perfectly natural that the party which follows the philosophy of Alexander Hamilton should believe that the rich, the well-born, and the privileged occupy a little higher place in the hierarchy of democracy than do the ordinary run-of-the-mill people. Naturally that kind of a philosophy would lead an exponent of that faith to see first the employer rather than the employee; the large corporation, the colossus astride a nation's economy, with its tentacles extending around the world, instead of the humble men and women who answer the whistle and who eat their lunches in the plant at noon out of their little buckets. Naturally one who adheres to that belief will read the newspaper editorials published by corporate publishers to see what their opinions are, and will heed them more than they do the murmurings and the inarticulate mutterings of the humble people of America.

So it is not surprising that we divide in the Senate as we are divided on this issue. The party which follows the doctrine of Thomas Jefferson, which be-

lieves in the dignity of the people, has no place to go except to the defense of the people, as their President has gone to their defense, and as a majority of their party in the Senate is going to their defense in the final vote upon this veto message.

Why do I say that this involves the masses of the people? Because if the bill had its right name it would be called a bill to cheapen labor in America. If wages rise, that cuts down profits. There are some employers who are so greedy that they are not willing to pay the worker a fair wage, because that would cut down their profits a little.

Mr. President, is this a depression? Are profits so dwarfed and dwindled that they are a mere trickle, so that the stream must be enlarged? No, Mr. President; the river of corporate profits in America today is at an all-time flood, and corporate profits are going up. In 1946 corporate profits in America increased $3,000,000,000, but what happened to salaries and wages? In the same period, while corporate profits went up $3,000,000,000, salaries and wages went down $5,000,000,000. Yet it is sought to impose a labor bill on the workers of America which would make it impossible for their unions to maintain the wages which they are receiving today. Is that in the public interest? Does not that mean that the living level of the people is involved?

Mr. President, this bill relates to calories. It relates to the very food on the family table, for the children who come there in the innocent belief that they will be provided for, in the richest country in the world.

Mr. President, the bill involves the health and lives of men, women, and children in America. During the debate on the bill I gave, from certain reports, reliable figures which showed that people with inadequate wages received less medical care, that more were ill, and that a greater number died than was true of the class in which income was adequate.

There may be some who would not be moved by that kind of an appeal, although it is difficult for me to conceive it if they really understood what was involved. This measure affects the prosperity of the Nation in every aspect of our economy.

Let us take a case which is close to my heart, the citrus industry of my State of Florida. I speak not only for Florida but for the citrus industry of the whole Nation. During this week, representatives of the citrus industry in Texas, Arizona, California, and Florida have been meeting to try to find some way to protect the price level of our product, which is so meaningful to the economies of our States, and to find some market abroad for the volume of citrus fruit which we are producing.

What is beginning to hurt us, Mr. President, is the dwindling purchasing power of the American worker. If the American worker and the people generally are able to buy, of course they will enjoy the grapefruit, the oranges, the tangerines, and the canned fruit juices which we produce in our several States.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. We all know that citrus fruits are a necessity. During the depression I saw piles of oranges in California 10 feet high and half a mile long, laid out to rot. If anyone had taken one he would have been arrested for stealing; and yet at that very moment millions of children were growing up with rickets, as was attested by the statistics obtained from our selective-service files. Many men suffered from physical defects caused by a lack of the necessary vitamins during youth.

Of course, some persons consider citrus fruits were an absolute luxury. If we had to choose between meat, let us say, and citrus fruits, we might give up citrus fruits first. When I was a boy citrus fruits were an absolute luxury. If I saw one orange a month I was very lucky. I could probably remember the times when I had an orange to eat when I was a child.

But does the Senator know that not only citrus fruit, but milk, is involved? Milk is the most basic necessity for the welfare and health of our children, to say nothing of adults. The consumption of milk, at least in Pittsburgh or Philadelphia, I read the other day, has fallen off 7 percent. There can be no other reason for that than that the workers are not receiving sufficient money to buy this most urgent necessity. If that is happening to them in the case of milk, God help the citrus growers. While citrus fruit is a wonderful food and should be a necessity, it does not rank so high on the list as does milk; and if people cannot even afford to buy milk for their children, there will be a lot of sufferers among producers because of lack of return on their crops, and it will be a very costly thing to our Government to maintain support prices.

All this is directly traceable to the fact that the worker's actual take-home pay has been dwindling while profits have been increasing. We know that the people who make the profits have all the citrus fruit they want and all the milk they want. They have had all the milk and citrus fruit that they wanted all the time, and they are not going to buy any more. It is a very serious thing which strikes at the foundations of our economy, because this bill would cripple and possibly ruin labor unions and make it impossible for them to recoup the losses they have sustained in the way of purchasing power.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wanted to say to the able Senator from Florida that I shall not at this time, as a matter of courtesy to him, make a point of order relative to his having spoken twice on the same subject on the same legislative day; but since the able Senator from Idaho has at least given the implication that he is willing to conduct a filibuster to prevent the Senate from coming to a vote on this question, I must in the future advise the able Senator from Florida that unless he yields only for a question I shall have to make that point of order.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Let the Chair make a brief statement. The Chair feels that if the rules are to be strictly enforced there should be notice that they are to be strictly enforced. We have been proceeding under our natural process this afternoon, and up to this point the Chair would not consider it necessary to enforce the strict rule in respect to speeches and yielding to questions. If we are to proceed on the other basis, the Chair needs notification also. Therefore the Chair suggests to the Senator from Florida that he yield no further except for questions.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, while the matter is under discussion I should like a ruling of the Chair, and I hope it may be an indulgent one characteristic of his usual courtesy and generosity. This is, in fact, only the first speech of the Senator from Florida on this matter, because the Chair will recall that the Senator from Florida was addressing the Senate when the acting majority leader asked him to yield in order to present a unanimous-consent request. Then the Senator from Oregon, taking advantage of that request, addressed himself to the subject temporarily. The Senator from Florida had not intended to relinquish the floor, but the Senator from Idaho rose to say something on the same point; and the fact that he, as did the Senator from Oregon, digressed technically a little bit from the rule——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. So able a parliamentarian as the Senator from Florida does not need to be reminded that there are other ways of obtaining recognition. The Chair may say that if a filibuster is undertaken or an effort to indulge in one is undertaken, the Chair is quite ready to enforce the rules. But that is not the usual custom.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator from Florida has participated in only one filibuster since he has been a Member of the Senate, and that has been for nearly 11 years. He does not expect to participate in another. It is not a filibuster to have 2 or 3 days of debate. So far as I am concerned, I was willing to vote on Saturday, and I am willing to vote on Monday; but on a matter of such importance as is the veto message of the President of the United States, which directly affects the whole economy and the political life of the Nation, surely 2 or 3 days could not be considered an extraordinary time for the discussion of it on both sides of the aisle. So I can assure the Chair that the Senator from Florida is in no sense of the word going to be a party to any filibuster.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I will yield if the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] will not raise a point of order. I do not want to be called out of order.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator realize that twice we have debated every point that is contained in the President's veto message? I have been over it, and there is not a new thing in it. Does not the Senator realize that sooner or later we must stop debating measures which come before the Senate? This measure was debated in full when it was originally before the Senate and it was again debated in full when the conference report was considered.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am sure that the Senator from Ohio, able constitutional lawyer that he is, would not deprecate the importance and ignore the difference in the issues presented to the Congress when we have a Presidential veto and when we are debating legislation for passage by the body itself. Surely the Constitution of the United States vested in the Chief Magistrate of this land the veto power with the expectation that it would be solemnly regarded and observed by the American Congress and by the country. That was an extraordinary authority to give the Chief Magistrate of the land. But the Constitution gave it to him. So I think, Mr. President, if there were nothing involved except whether or not the veto of the President of the United States, elected by the whole people, should be overridden, that alone would be a worthy and proper subject of discussion by the Senate of the United States, which still likes to cherish its world-wide reputation of being the greatest deliberative body in the world.

Moreover, the President has been able to bring to bear upon this measure a degree of scrutiny and a thoroughness of examination which has not in the past been available to the Senate. I will wager, Mr. President, that there has been no report submitted to the Senate by the committee of which the able Senator from Ohio is the chairman, that compares in thoroughness of analysis of this measure with the veto message of the President of the United States.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I will yield for a question.

Mr. TAFT. The veto message goes over, point by point, the points raised in a memorandum put into the RECORD by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], to each item of which the Senator will find an answer which I put into the RECORD. Does not the Senator think that the veto message substantially and in detail follows the Pressman memorandum which the Senator from Montana put into the RECORD?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I cannot attribute any reason for the question asked by the Senator from Ohio except the innuendo that Lee Pressman afforded the basis for this Presidential veto, which I deny with all the indignation of which I am capable. It is an unworthy insinuation. Unless the Senator from Ohio has the fact he should make no such charge; if he has such information I should like him to tell his colleagues of the Senate the basis of his information.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I made no such charge. What I suggested was that if the Senator would read in the RECORD the Pressman memorandum, which was put into the RECORD by the distinguished Senator from Montana, and also put into the RECORD by one of the House Members, the Senator will find that the veto message follows it almost point by point. I am not suggesting that other things were not also considered; but I think the Senator will find that they are very similar.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield for a question. That is all I am permitted to do, under the rule.

Mr. MURRAY. I will ask the Senator if it is not a fact that I introduced not an analysis made by Lee Pressman, but a very thorough and impartial analysis which was prepared for me, at my request, by the National Labor Relations Board and which was inserted in the RECORD in connection with my remarks at the time I discussed the bill during the debate?

Mr. PEPPER. I was going to say to the Senator from Ohio that I had never seen any memorandum put into the RECORD by the Senator from Montana as coming from Mr. Lee Pressman, general counsel of the CIO. I will answer the question of the Senator from Montana. My understanding is that the memorandum about which the Senator from Ohio was speaking was prepared by the National Labor Relations Board and not by Mr. Lee Pressman. I have seen no Lee Pressman memorandum presented here on the Senate floor, and I have not seen one privately or publicly.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAYLOR. Would it be parliamentary for the Senator from Florida to yield to me in order that I might ask a question of the Senator from California?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair does not think so.

Mr. TAYLOR. I cannot do that?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Not under this new regime.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for permission to ask a question of the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator can submit his question.

Mr. TAYLOR. I simply wish to ask the Senator from Florida whether he thinks that it ill behooves the Senator to interrupt the discussion on the floor and to insist upon strict observance of the rules when we are discussing the necessity of citrus fruit in the diet of the people of this country, inasmuch as the Senator comes from a great citrus-raising State, the State of California.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator from Idaho for reminding the Senator from California of his own great interest in the citrus industry. I am sure he would not consciously do anything to its detriment.

Mr. President, I say that the President of the United States has access to sources of information which we ourselves do not have available. I am informed that only today the President has stated that he had from three to five independent agencies make an independent search and analysis of this bill and make an independent response to him, and that then he took all those responses and reexamined and reanalyzed this measure and molded that opinion with his own into the veto message.

So, Mr. President, I am glad to have the Senator from Ohio state that he did not intend to imply or insinuate that Mr. Lee Pressman or any other labor leader or labor-interested person had any part in the preparation of the President's veto message. All of us have been reading in the newspapers statements to the effect that the President has refused to talk to representatives of either one side or the other in regard to this question. The newspapers carry the information that the President did the same thing with respect to Democratic Party officials who yesterday in his office sought to discuss the subject with him; he cut them rather curtly short. I read in the newspapers and I heard from those who were there that he said he had not discussed this matter with either labor or management, and that he would not discuss it with any public officials; and I do not know of any Democratic officials with whom he has discussed it.

But, Mr. President, I was saying that this matter is vital to the country, and I was speaking of the vital importance of this measure to the citrus industry of my State, and I was pointing out that the problem we have today is due, essentially, to the diminished purchasing power of the people of the United States. Between January 1945 and December 1946 the actual wages of the workers of this country—taking into account inflation and the increased cost of what they had to buy—diminished 22 percent, or more than one-fifth. Let me digress here to say that yesterday in the Senate we hurried through, with only a few minutes of debate, a bill which will have the practical effect of immediately raising rents 15 percent for a large segment of the people of the United States, and in the course of a few months will eliminate all semblance of rent control in the United States; we did that just yesterday, here in the Senate; so it is not surprising that the following day an attempt should be made to strike an even greater blow to the homes in America and the standard of living of the American people.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I should like to ask the Senator whether it is not a fact that it was the diminished purchasing power of the American workers, following the last war, that brought on the great depression which put 16,000,000 men on the sidewalks in the United States, looking for jobs.

Mr. PEPPER. It was; and I thank the Senator from Montana for his inquiry, because he has stated exactly what former Gov. Harold Stassen, of Minnesota, said to the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, namely, that it was the diminished purchasing power of the workers of America, due to hostile

labor policies on the part of the Government, that contributed very materially to the depression of the late twenties.

Now we are asked to adopt similar policies, and I affirm that they will have similar results, as Governor Stassen stated when he gave his testimony to the Senate committee.

So, Mr. President, if we wish to increase the intensity of the recession, which already is under way, all we have to do is to cut down the ability of the American people to buy goods, and that will be the result.

I do not know why more people are not sufficiently wise to understand the correctness of what Mr. Cyrus Eaton, a leading businessman, pointed out in recent interviews to which I have referred. I do not know why the greed and the avarice of a few people in the United States will let them act contrary to their own economic interest. I know there is not an employer of labor in the United States who will not be worse off, if this bill becomes law, than he is today. Not only that, Mr. President, but there is not a market in the United States that would be as secure and as adequate for goods and services as it is now, before this bill has become law.

So I am disturbed about what is happening to our economy. Today, if we go to practically any part of our country, and ask the people what is happening, they will give us evidence of a returning recession. They will show us rising unemployment; they will show us diminished markets for agricultural products; they will show us more and more working people with reduced wages and earnings; they will show us one sign after another indicating that the structure of the present prosperity is gradually being undermined and that the foundations are being eaten away by the kind of termites that are in accord with the policy embodied in this bill, which some persons wish to hurry through the Senate by passing it over the President's veto.

Mr. President, let us remember, as I have said many times before, that the American people are still a poor people. Of course, some persons say that the labor unions have been getting too much money for the workers and are cutting profits too much, and are interfering more than they should with management. Yet, Mr. President, the statistics of the Treasury Department reveal that approximately half the families of America make less than $40 a week. What kind of a house can a family making $40 a week live in, and what kind of diet can they have, and how much medicine can they buy, and how much doctor's care can they receive, and how many of the clothes which they require are they able to purchase? What can they lay aside for a rainy economic day?

Mr. President, it is said that certainly they must have a lot of money now. However, we remember what the Federal Reserve Board discovered only a short time ago, namely, that two out of five Americans then had—and that was last year—total liquid savings of less than $40. It is upon such American workingmen that this iniquitous antilabor legislation is proposed to be saddled.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Is it not true that installment buying is on the increase because the people have not the current income sufficient to enable them to pay cash for the things they need?

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is absolutely correct. He will recall that I put in the RECORD a little while ago a statement from the Wall Street Journal giving a long summary of all the many signs that were present in our economy of the recession I described a moment ago. One was the increase in installment buying. Do not Senators recall the increase in installment buying in the 1920's, what it led to, and what it preceded?

Another sign is the sale of savings bonds, the sale of E bonds which the people bought during the war. They have been sold in great volume. Diminished savings on the part of the people in dollars are another sign.

Certainly there are some Senators on this floor who especially should be interested. I am reminded, for instance the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], who makes the wonderful Capehart radio machine. Surely he wants every family to have a Capehart, big or little. They cannot even have a little Capehart in the family if the family income is not adequate so that they are able to purchase something of such excellent quality as a Capehart.

Mr. President, we should stop, look, and listen today in our economy. We are talking about saving Europe. More and more Senators are becoming concerned about what is going to happen to the economy of the United States of America.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I should like to ask the Senator whether he is opposed to installment selling.

Mr. PEPPER. I am not opposed to installment selling, but if it grows beyond a normal volume, it may have a significance because, after all, it is buying on credit. There are two kinds of people who buy on credit, in my humble opinion: One is the person who uses credit wisely; the other is the one who uses credit as a way of getting something he cannot otherwise afford. If it is carried too far, it becomes a danger signal rather than something healthy for our economy.

Mr. CAPEHART. Will the Senator agree with me that through installment selling in America millions and millions of our people have been able to enjoy refrigerators, modern equipment, automobiles, pianos, and the like?

Mr. PEPPER. I do agree. Nearly every automobile I have owned I have bought on the installment plan.

Mr. CAPEHART. What is the objection, then, to the fact that installment sales are rising? That means that someone is able to purchase an item for his own use which, in turn, gives employment to somebody else who makes it.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; but we found out, during the days preceding the last depression, that when it goes too far it is a danger signal instead of a sign of health in our economy.

There will always be a certain number of people who will buy on the installment plan, and who can afford to, but if it goes beyond the normal number who should participate in that kind of credit, as I have said, it indicates diminished savings and diminished buying power, and becomes a danger signal to the health of the whole economy.

Mr. CAPEHART. How does the Senator propose to control it?

Mr. PEPPER. I propose to control it by making it possible for more people to pay more nearly in cash, or liquid value, for what they get. They achieve that position by getting better wages, and by having more savings, so that they can pay either a larger share of the total cost of what they buy when they get it, or fewer of them will be forced to the necessity of installment buying. I am sure the Senator does not mean to indicate that everything in America should be sold on the installment plan.

Mr. President, President Hoover and other leaders have said we had bettter examine the ability of America to help others. The bill we are considering would diminish rather than strengthen the power of America to help the destitute nations and peoples of the world.

We hear it asked, how can labor unions have anything to do with the level of wages for the workers? In the recent debate I read an opinion written by former Chief Justice Taft, of the Supreme Court, who referred, better than I can, to what it meant to the workers to have the power of organization, or of bargaining collectively with the employer, of using their united strength. The whole principle of our Federal Union is, that in union there is strength, and that principle applies to labor unions, as well as to the American Union of States.

Yes, we have strength we would not otherwise possess. What would America be if we had been permanently divided by the War Between the States, if other nations could deal with us as parts, not as a great and mighty whole? What were we when we were merely an aggregation of colonies which might become the prey of an enemy? We became strong when we got together in union and in unity. The same applies to the workers of this country. Let the employer be able to discharge any worker, and everyone is weak. But give unity to all the workers, find the mechanism by which they can make a common cause, let the employer know that if he discharges one without just cause they will all withhold their work, and that one man has a strength and power comparable to that of the whole number of men who work in the enterprise.

Mr. President, what the bill we are considering is designed for is to restore the arbitrary power of the employers and to restore the weakness of the employees. That is what it comes down to. The President has gone through the bill item by item, and set forth the details by which that is to be accomplished.

Mr. President, it is not only contrary to the interest of the working people of

the country, it is contrary to the interest of all the people of America.

I have two letters here which I should like to read. The first is from Mr. William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor. No one ever accused Mr. Green of being a violent radical. No one ever suggested that he was a Communist, or that he was trying to do other than help the men and women of America to get a more decent wage, and have more decent working conditions under which to labor.

Mr. Green is speaking for millions of the working men and women of America, and this is what he says to me this day:

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am taking the liberty of transmitting herewith to you, and I hope through you to your fellow Senators, a sincere expression of the hope that the President's veto of the highly objectionable Taft-Hartley bill will be sustained by the United States Senate.

The working men and women of the United States whose economic life and activities would be subjected to force and governmental domination, are the same working men and women who served in the army of production during the war period, who responded in full measure to the call of the Government for increased production, who made a no-strike pledge for the duration of the war and carried it out, and who outdistanced the workers of any other nation in the world in the production of planes, ships, guns, ammunition, and war material.

It is inconceivable that these free working men and women who made such a magnificent record during the war period should now be penalized through the enactment of restrictive and compulsory antilabor measures such as are provided for in the Taft-Hartley bill.

The Taft-Hartley bill provides for compulsion, force, and governmental domination in the relationship between labor and management. It should be classified as an industrial war-provoking measure. It will substitute hatred, bitterness, and class warfare for cooperation, good will, and understanding between management and labor.

An analysis of the National Labor Relations Board section of the bill makes clear that if the Taft-Hartley bill was passed, said Board would be converted into a union-breaking tool of employers. This section of the bill would cause confusion and chaos. It would open up a field of litigation which would extend over a long period of time.

The changes in the National Labor Relations Board procedure are so revolutionary as to create widespread misunderstanding, suspicion, and distrust.

The obvious purpose of the authors of this legislation is to strengthen employers and weaken unions. For instance, self-organization of workers into unions has served to secure for them better wages, shorter hours, employment security, and many other benefits. But under section 8 (b) and (c) of the Taft-Hartley bill, a union which asks a worker to join and in doing so tells the worker that his union membership holds promise of benefits, can have such statement held against it as evidence of an unfair labor practice.

Elections under the Taft-Hartley amended Labor Relations Act would be endless. The bitterness and strife which arise out of hotly contested elections would be never ending. The public interest would be seriously affected because of reduced production and increased industrial and management inefficiency.

Labor throughout the Nation will deeply resent the revival of government by injunction and the restriction of the exercise of the right to strike. This would strike a vital blow at our free-enterprise system.

That part of the bill which provides for the institution of suits for damages can only be interpreted as an additional effort to destroy bona fide labor unions. Labor unions accept the principle of the sacredness of contracts entered into and are committed to the maintenance of contracts entered into inviolate. But to subject labor unions to suits for damages as provided in the Taft-Hartley bill means that designing employers can, through the employment of stooges, promote violations of contracts and through such action establish suits for damages against labor unions. The financial resources of labor unions can be wiped out through the institution of such suits for damages inspired by management through the activities of these stooges employed directly by them.

Section 304 of the Taft-Hartley bill stands out as a direct assault upon free press and a violation of the constitutional guaranty of free speech. Under this section the funds of a labor union could not be used for the purpose of acquainting working men and women with the voting record of Members of Congress upon legislation in which labor may be deeply interested.

I will interpolate here to say that when this matter was being considered in the Senate I said that that should be called the "Republican political insurance section" of the bill, it looks as if they might have desired very strongly to curb the voice of labor in the next election.

Under this section, the funds of a labor union—

As I read—

could not be used for the purpose of acquainting working men and women with the voting record of Members of Congress upon legislation in which labor may be deeply interested.

This provision does not apply to unincorporated employers or trade associations. According to the Department of Commerce, there are some 2,400 trade associations, each comprising a combination of employers, and each made immune from these restrictions on political contributions. Farm organizations, cooperatives, and all unincorporated enterprises are free of the political ban imposed by the bill upon labor unions.

Let me interpolate at this point, Mr. President, that an organization of farmers can spend its money in a political campaign; it can put out literature; it can have radio speeches made. Would Senators who are the advocates of the pending measure say that the Farmers Union, the National Grange, or the Farm Bureau Federation should not have the right to use their money to tell the American people that a political party or a political candidate is unfair to agriculture in America? Would Senators wish to vote for that kind of bill? Yet, Mr. President, while we do not deny that right to organizations of employers and to farmers' organizations or to other organizations, this bill singles out labor and says, "You cannot give your opinion in your editorial columns about a political party or a political candidate. You cannot make a radio speech and pay for it with union dues, saying a certain party or a certain candidate is unfair to labor. You cannot distribute literature. You cannot disseminate information, even among your membership, of what are the issues as you see them in a political campaign." All this the President points out in his message.

Mr. President, do Senators realize what that does to the fundamental rights of an American citizen? I want to state here and now, I believe that that section of this bill is in violation of the Constitution of the United States, that it will be stricken down in the courts; but it will cost labor a great deal of money trying to protect itself in the courts against the assaults that will be made upon its exercise of free speech and freedom of the press, under the section to which I have adverted in this bill. And so Mr. Green properly points out:

Farm organizations, cooperatives, and all unincorporated enterprises are free of the political ban imposed by the bill upon labor unions.

Now, Mr. President, I will state frankly what is behind this section. There are certain people in the politics of the United States who do not want the working people to be too articulate or too effective. In the past, it was the rich who put up the money in political campaigns. The reports of the United States Congress show, in campaigns of the past, how much the Pews, how much the Rockefellers, how much the Sloans, and how much the du Ponts and other of the rich families of America have poured into political campaigns. But there is something new that has happened in the last few years. The CIO came along with its Political Action Committee. They said that they had a right to take part in politics. They raised from their membership some money, with which they printed literature, they made radio speeches, they disseminated information to the American public, supporting the Democratic Party and men like Franklin D. Roosevelt in the great fight they were making to better the condition of the working people of America.

Now, they are not a corporation, mind you, Mr. President. What a corporation can do can be determined by the law of the State that grants the charter; but the State has no right to tell me, a citizen, what I can do, except not to violate the law. There is a difference between a corporation, which is a person, and a citizen, who is a citizen. A corporation is not a citizen, yet advocates of the measure talk after this fashion: "We want to put the working employees and management upon the same basis." They propose to reduce the working men and women of America to the inanimate status of a body corporate. They want to strip them of the dignity of a citizen and the right of a citizen under our Constitution, and drag them down to the level of the corporation. Mr. President, a corporation is formed because men and women, the stockholders, do not want to be personally liable for the debts of the joint enterprise. It is a device to limit liability; that is what a corporation is. It is a means of working together, and a device to limit liability. Will it be said that justice is being done when working people are put in that class? Yet there are probably those who say, "We are going to put the corporation that owns the business in the same category with the workers, who are citizens of the country," hence in this bill they

are picking out a class of our citizens, denying them the rights of citizens to better themselves; just as, in a certain part of the bill, they outlaw what they call the secondary boycott.

That means that if a workingman goes to another workingman's home and sits in his parlor in the evening and says, "Listen, you folks over there are working on a commodity which we produce in our plant, and you are helping our employer to become rich, and yet he treats us like dogs. Suppose we strike, quit working for him until he gives us recognition and a decent wage. Why do not you fellows help us by saying you will not work on what he turns out since he treats us as unfairly as he does?" The man who made such a suggestion would violate this law. A man could not even talk to his neighbor about what is best for the community and for the two families without violating the law, according to the provisions of the bill. The President of the United States has pointed that out in his veto message. That is the kind of bill with which we are dealing. That is the reason why I believe we are within our rights when we say that the American people who will be affected by that kind of legislation have the right to know what it is and what it does to them.

I read further from Mr. Green's letter:

> This section of the Taft-Hartley bill is accepted by the officers and members of organized labor as an additional direct attack upon them and as an attempt to weaken and destroy the political strength and influence of organized labor.
>
> The facts are that the problems of management and labor can be solved through voluntary action on their part. This principle of voluntarism of collective bargaining between management and labor squares with our free-enterprise system. The attack made upon labor unions in the Taft-Hartley bill is also an attack upon our American free-enterprise system.

That is what the President of the United States also says. It is not simply the statement of a labor leader. It is also what the President of the United States says. Mr Green continues in his letter:

> It is impossible to establish perfection in a world made up of imperfect human beings. We can approach a high standard of perfection through honest, sincere cooperation, and understanding. We can never do it through the enactment of compulsory legislation such as the Taft-Hartley bill.
>
> Very sincerely yours,
>
> W. M. GREEN,
> *President, American Federation of Labor.*

Mr. President, I also have a letter from Mr. A. E. Lyon, executive secretary-treasurer of the Railway Labor Executives' Association. That is an organization composed, I believe, of 19 of the railway labor brotherhoods of America. Its members are responsible Americans. They are good citizens. Their sons fought and their sons died for America. There is not a finer group of workingmen in the Nation than the railway employees of the country, and a large number of the railway employees are in the organizations for which Mr. A. E. Lyon, as executive secretary-treasurer, speaks in the letter.

I should like to read the names of the organizations affiliated with the Railway Labor Executives' Association. They are: Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen; Order of Railway Conductors of America; Switchmen's Union of North America; Order of Railway Telegraphers; American Train Dispatchers' Association; Railway Employees' Department, A. F. of L.; International Association of Machinists; International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Shipbuilders & Helpers of America; International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths, Drop-forgers & Helpers; Sheet Metal Workers' International Association; International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America; International Brotherhood of Firemen & Oilers; Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees; Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees; Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America; National Organization Masters, Mates & Pilots of America; National Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association; International Longshoremen's Association; Hotel and Restaurant Employees' International Alliance and Bartenders International League of America.

The letter, dated today, Mr. President, addressed to me by Mr. Lyons, is as follows:

> DEAR SENATOR PEPPER: I enclose a statement under six separate headings, which gives in brief form the result of our analysis of a few of the features of the pending labor bill.
>
> The bill as finally changed in conference and sent to the President is, in our considered opinion, vastly more detrimental to the public interest and much more destructive of the fundamental rights of a great body of American citizens than was the original bill passed by the Senate.
>
> We are convinced that should the bill become law it would bring about a most unfortunate and tragic era of industrial discord and internal dissension in our country. That is something that our country, and indeed the entire world, can ill afford happen at this critical time.
>
> Respectfully yours,
>
> A. E. LYON,
> *Executive Secretary.*

Attached to the letter is a statement. Without reading the statement, I wish to read the headings in it. The first heading is: "The bill places unfair restrictions on the political activity of unions."

The second heading is: "The bill makes industry-wide bargaining impossible."

The third heading is: "The bill impairs, if not destroys, the efficiency of the National Labor Relations Board."

The fourth heading is: "Judicial review of the decisions of the National Labor Relations Board."

The statement under that heading emphasizes the changes made by the bill in the administrative procedure for the handling of labor-management cases under the Board.

The fifth heading is: "The union shop is a practical impossibility under this bill."

The statement does not speak of the closed shop, Mr. President, but the union shop. It says the union shop is a practical impossibility under this bill.

The sixth heading is: "The bill jeopardizes vacations with pay, compensation for sick leave, etc."

Under that heading is emphasized the detrimental effect of the bill upon the welfare funds and provisions of the contracts which have been entered into in the past between management and labor, and which, if it were not for the bill, would be entered into between them in the future. As the President himself has pointed out in respect to the welfare funds, the bill simply makes the creation of the welfare funds more difficult; it lays down conditions for their regulation which makes them a more onerous burden and a more difficult task than has been true in the past. Mr. President, when we see how many of our people do not have provision for their security in their old age or in their illness, when we see the human wreckage in our industrial machine in America today and the meager care which is given those human wrecks, it would seem to me that the Congress, instead of striking down and discouraging welfare funds and humanitarian provisions in contracts, should on the contrary be adopting resolutions asking management to be conciliatory with labor in making more generous provisions of this character in the future. We provide that the public must pay for the wreckage of machinery through the increased cost of the product, but we are callous enough to let the human beings be crucified on the industrial cross of America. We seem to exhibit little concern for passing on to the public, in the cost of the commodities the American workman makes, the cost of his own bodily impairment and his mental deficiency.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the statement sent to me by Mr. Lyon printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, those are expressions of a view of the labor organization. I am sure they are simply typical of the opinion of all the labor organizations of America. Those letters came from two great leaders, Mr. William Green, speaking for millions of American workingmen, and Mr. A. E. Lyon, also speaking for more than 1,000,000 American working men and women who work upon the railroads of the country.

There are some who say that only the labor leaders feel that way about this legislation. I heard Mr. William Green—and he is an honorable man, one whom I am proud to quote—say that in all his years of association with labor he has never seen the rank and file of American workingmen so deeply stirred, so moved—and I might add, Mr. President, so indignant about an attack upon their welfare as they are today because of the assault which this bill makes upon them.

I have heard Mr. Phil Murray say the same thing. I heard Mr. Lyon say the same thing about railway employees.

And both of these honorable and able men are responsible beyond question.

The other day in passing through one of the cities of my State I got off the train to walk up and down the platform for a few minutes in the sunshine. The workingmen on that railroad showed up from all over the yard, to ask me about the Taft-Hartley bill. Was the Congress going to pass it? Was the President going to veto it? Could we sustain a Presidential veto?

They did not receive their orders from the top. They were talking with me, their Senator, and pouring out their hearts in petition. They were expressing resentment that they were being treated as they were by this legislation.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ECTON in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I ask the Senator if it is not a fact that laboring men are coming to Washington from all over the country to consult their representatives in Congress and advise them of their attitude toward this legislation. They are expressing the very deepest resentment against it, because of the fact that it is punitive legislation, clearly designed to hamstring and destroy labor unionism in the United States.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator very much for mentioning that point. The other evening I attended a meeting at which the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] was present. We saw a church literally jammed to the rafters with men and women who had come from all over America, many of them from the Pacific coast, to protest to Senators against the enactment of this legislation, and to beg the President to veto it, imploring Senators to sustain a veto if one should be forthcoming.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Is it not a fact that the only result of this situation will be that we shall witness a long period of chaos and conflict between labor and management because of the fact that labor believes that the legislation was designed by the National Association of Manufacturers for the very purpose of crushing labor? It will create in their minds the deepest resentment, and will interfere with cooperation and production for years to come.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is absolutely correct. Neither he nor I make that statement in the form of a threat, because, of course, we do not speak for labor organizations. But I express it—as the Senator from Montana implies in his question—as my deep-seated conviction, as the President has said in his message, that the result of the bill will be an increase in strikes. In the paragraph No. 1 on page 3 of the President's message the caption is:

> The bill would substantially increase strikes.

The President says:

> It would discourage the growing willingness of unions to include "no strike" provisions in bargaining agreements. * * *
>
> It would encourage strikes by imposing highly complex and burdensome reporting requirements on labor organizations which wish to avail themselves of their rights under the National Labor Relations Act. * * *
>
> It would bring on strikes by depriving significant groups of workers of the right they now enjoy to organize and to bargain under the protection of law. * * *
>
> The bill would force unions to strike or to boycott if they wish to have a jurisdictional dispute settled by the National Labor Relations Board.

And so forth. Mr. President, there is no question in my mind that the bill would produce the largest volume and the greatest extent of industrial strife in America that we have ever seen. At no time during the war, or even in early 1946, in the early days of reconversion, did we have anything comparable to the industrial strife which we shall have under the provisions of this bill. I say that, Mr. President, because Americans will fight for their liberties. In innumerable cases fathers and husbands have had to go home at mealtime to see nearly an empty cupboard and an empty table. They have had to listen to their children crying in the night because of lack of food; and yet they have remained on strike because they felt that they were fighting for a principle.

Mr. President, there is something deep-seated in the American character which makes an American love and cherish his freedom and independence; and he will fight for it. If anyone believes that the American workingman can by any kind of tyranny be cowed into economic and political servitude, he will learn that such efforts now will be no more successful than those of George III. If in fighting this vicious legislation workers are accused of treason, there will be some of them who, like Patrick Henry, will say, "If this be treason, make the most of it." They will fight to defend their homes, their firesides, their jobs, and their standard of living.

Until the inflation which was initiated by the same interests which support this legislation came along, until an actual wage decline occurred, the American workingman was living better than he had ever lived. He is still living very poorly, but he was living better than he had ever lived. He had more security than he had ever had.

Since Franklin D. Roosevelt came to the White House his employer could not fire him because he wanted to join a union, or because the employer did not like the color of his hair, or because he was a Jew or something else that the employer did not like. Under the protection of the National Labor Relations Act, the American workingman had risen to the dignity of an American citizen, even on his job. He had more security because he had the assurance that other employees with whom he worked were one with him. They would stand by him and he would stand by them. They had the protection of the National Labor Relations Board, which they never had before. He had a welfare fund. If a rock fell on his back and broke it, and he could do nothing but merely move his limbs, he might reflect in his agony that at least he would receive some protection from the welfare provisions, or some other benefits which he had been able to secure by contract, with respect to which he was free to negotiate with his employer. We had begun to achieve something like industrial democracy in America.

Mr. President, I am as proud of my America as is any citizen in it. I think I love it as much. But those who study economic and political systems throughout the world have often said that we are further ahead in our political democracy than we are in our economic democracy. I suspect there is some truth in that statement. It took the administration of Franklin Roosevelt to begin to give economic rights to the men and women of America who work and who earn their living by the sweat of their brows. Up until that time they could not organize. If they tried to organize they could be discharged. Every man stood on his own, not with his fellows. He had no job contract; he had no assurance that he could work a certain length of time. He could go to work one morning and work, and at the end of the day might receive a little slip along with his time check saying, "We do not need you tomorrow." All he could do was to stagger home and tell his wife and children that he had received his notice and that he did not have a job. Moreover, Mr. President, in time past there was a little notice put into a man's pay envelope telling him, "If you vote for William Jennings Bryan tomorrow you lose your job. Do not come back." That happened in the Bryan-McKinley campaign. That happened not so very long ago, Mr. President, or something very much like it happened.

A workingman in respect to his job did not enjoy the rights of an American citizen or rights in the enjoyment of which an American citizen should be protected. But we tried to change all that; we tried to give the workers a security they had never before had, a protection they had never before had, safeguards, strength, bargaining power. "Yes," we said, "you can have an election in your plant. Choose your own bargaining agent. The employer has nothing to do with it; he cannot say anything about it; he cannot call you in and tell you that if you select a certain bargaining agent he will discharge you or demote you. If he does, that is an unfair labor practice. You can take him before the National Labor Relations Board and it can restrain him from doing it or penalize him if he does it."

For the first time in America the American workingman began to stand up and walk like a man. Mr. President, instead of trying to increase those rights, to enlarge those safeguards, to add to his bargaining power, this bill strangles, throttles, and chokes the organized-labor movement in America. Have we not been getting along all right under the

present system? I do not think that anyone in America would seriously suggest that we turn back the clock. Have we ever had greater prosperity? Have we ever had greater purchasing power? Have the corporations ever made more profit? Has monopoly ever been more powerful? Has the output of American factories ever been greater? No, Mr. President. At a time when America is at its peak in power, in profit, and in production, they would fasten upon the back of labor this octopus, the crushing weight of this destructive legislation.

Mr. President, we hear a great deal about the example that we set before the world. We urge other people to practice democracy. We tell them how they should conduct their elections, how they should protect their minority groups; we admonish them, Mr. President, how they should practice democracy. Is there not something of an obligation upon us to make our democracy effective, to make it speak so eloquently that people will wish to follow it and to lead the world to democracy without trying to force it down their throats? Is this legislation going to be an asset to us in showing the world how we practice democracy in America? People will read what the President has said about it. This is the President who speaks to them for us. If they cannot believe him with regard to a labor bill, how can they believe him about other subjects about which he speaks for us?

He says that the American Congress is strangling the labor movement in America. Suppose Congress ignores the statement of the President. Will it not give ammunition to the people over there who say that there is no real democracy in America? They will say, "Look how they are trying to strangle the working people in the United States. The Congress of that country is not friendly to the masses of the people. No wonder they are against this, that, and the other thing. They are not friendly to the masses of the people. Their own President says that they are unfair."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I just wondered if the able Senator from Florida, at the time he was making the statement about the President speaking for his party——

Mr. PEPPER. I said, speaking for the people.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wondered if the Senator recognized that in the House today, among the Democratic Members of the House of Representatives, there were 106 who voted to override the veto and there were only 71 who voted to sustain the veto. Certainly the Members of the House of Representatives who are of the Senator's party also feel that they speak for the Democratic Party of the Nation.

Mr. PEPPER. My remarks, the Senator will recall, were directed to the action of the Senate. Since we are not, under the rules, permitted to speak disparagingly of our sister body, I do not suppose there is very much we can say about the behavior of that body. But I am willing to go to the country next year upon what a majority of the two parties of the Senate will do regarding the President's veto message. I predict that a majority of the Democratic Party in the Senate will be found supporting the leadership of the President of the United States on this veto message.

Mr. President, as I said, and as the President said in his message, democracy is on trial today; it is on trial everywhere in the world.

I do not think it can too often be said that the only way to win the battle for democracy is to make democracy work. We must show that democracy is the best way to advance the progress of the human family; that nothing else compares with it.

Mr. President, I deeply regret to see the trend that there is today in our country away from that principle. The principle of my party and, I believe, the principle of Americanism, is the greatest good for the greatest number of people. This bill cannot possibly give the greatest good to the greatest number of people. Is there anything about this bill to give better wages to the working people of this country? Is there anything that will assure them of receiving a larger share of the profits of industry in America? Is there anything in this bill that will give them shorter working hours, better working conditions, more leisure, and recreation?

Is there anything in this bill that will house American families in better homes or will put more children in school or will give the families of the United States a better diet? How can this bill be the vehicle for the greatest good for the greatest number of our people? This bill is aimed at benefiting the privileged few in America, the large employers who want to get cheaper labor so that they can make more profits; at least, that is what its effect will be. Does any abuse that may have been committed by any labor leader justify that kind of legislation? Are we to act like a bull in a china shop? Are we so blind that we have to strike down everyone who works, in order to wreak retribution upon one who wrongs us? Is the Congress of the United States so incompetent that it cannot separate the good from the evil in the American labor movement, and preserve the good? If I correctly recall, I think there is a maxim in the law—utile per inutile non vitiatur—in the Latin, meaning that the useful is not rendered valueless by the useless.

Mr. President, the existence of some abuses in the American labor movement does not justify the destruction of that movement. Are not there some abuses in the capitalistic system of America? Would Senators deny that in American industry there are tycoons and tyrants who violate the principles of Americanism and justice? The La Follette committee of the Senate told a story—one of the most sordid stories ever related—about how certain employers, in order to break the organized labor movement in America, had men killed. In 1944, I was in the coal-mining section of West Virginia, and people there told about how detectives, who were sent there by the mine owners, threw the furniture of the miners out into the roads, on the ground, and drove the families out of the company-owned houses.

Yet, Mr. President, because some capitalists do wrong, we are not trying to abolish the capitalistic system. We put in jail those who are found guilty of criminal offenses; we enjoin in the courts those who are engaged in the commission of remedial wrongs; we sue at law those who are liable to suit at our choice; but we are proud of our capitalistic system, and we are not trying to destroy it. Yet, because a few labor leaders have done something they should not have done, because some irresponsible workmen may have violated a contract here and there—although the record during the war years stands like a glowing light as to the fidelity with which the American workingmen stood by their contracts, as Mr. Green has said—and because there are a few annoyances and provocations of that sort, there are persons who wish to destroy, as this bill would do, the dignity of the workingman in America, and imperil his job and his pay, and break his labor unions, diminish his bargaining power, and leave him stripped of the gains made in the last few years, and thus place him in the pitiable state he was in years ago.

Mr. MURRAY. M . President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Is it not true that as a result of the wrongs and ills that had developed in our capitalistic system, it was brought to the verge of ruin in 1929, and there was precipitated a long period of unemployment and distress in this country? That situation was due to the fact that no effort to correct those evils were made by the very persons who today are trying to inflict this punitive legislation upon labor unions. And is it not true that they allowed all those conditions to prevail because they were profiting from them; and so allowed the country to come to a point where we were in danger of losing our capitalistic system?

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator from Montana is absolutely correct. In my opinion the President in his veto message is trying to preserve in all its great and mighty strength the free-enterprise, capitalistic system of American democracy; and I venture to say that it is the opposition—not by design, I am sure, but by the effect this bill will have—who will prove to be the enemies of the present vigorous strength of our industrial system.

Mr. President, I am not permanently discouraged. In the first place, I do not believe the Senate will override the veto. I believe that Senators who voted for this legislation are impressed by the analysis of the bill which is embodied in the President's veto message. I believe that Senators will see this matter differently after they read the moving message of the President. Everyone knows the record of the President. He has spoken out against labor abuses. He has recommended to the Congress legislation

stronger than I thought should be enacted; he did that at the last session of the Congress. He is not the partisan of organized labor in America. He is occupying a position where he is trying to do what is right. In this matter he is trying to do what is good for all America, not merely for a class. But he knows that what is good for this class is good for all America.

Therefore, Mr. President, I think that when Senators have read the President's veto message and have meditated and reflected upon it, a sufficient number of them will see the matter differently to cause the President's veto message to be sustained. But, regardless of whatever happens tomorrow or next week about this matter, there is one thing that I know and believe with a faith that is as firm as that which makes me believe that beyond the sky there is a living God, and that is that this measure will not stay law. I would wager my right arm upon that, Mr. President: It will not stay law, if it becomes law. If it goes on the statute books, it will not remain there. In the first place, it will be impossible of enforcement. It will be impossible to keep it on the statute books. It is not possible to strangle American working men and women in a noose of restrictive legislation; so long as the right of the ballot and the right of assembly and of speech and of press exist in the United States, it is not possible permanently to place excessive burdens on the backs of the hard-pressed working people of the United States.

We remember what happened in Great Britain. In the early twenties—in 1926, as I recall—there was a general strike there. It was a regrettable experience for the British nation. The most stringent labor legislation was passed. But the worm turned, Mr. President. The liberal party was destroyed, and there emerged the Labor Party, a party which today is the Government of Great Britain. One of the first things that Government did was to repeal that law, which had rankled in labor's breast since the day it was passed.

I declare, Mr. President, that is going to be true with this bill if it shall be passed. I say that out of as deep a conviction as I have had about anything in my life. I believe this bill to be morally, economically and politically wrong, and I believe we will repent of our action if we ever make it law. If we do not repent, I believe the people of the country will change it anyway; and I think they should.

If this was an isolated blow which in these days of reaction was being struck at the lives of the people of this country, it would not perhaps be so bad; but it is one of a shower of arrows which today are being shot into the well-being of the masses of the people of America.

I had hoped we could continue what we had achieved in recent years. History will say that one of the fine days of America was not only when we fought our war and gloriously won it, but when we dreamed anew of what America might be, in the stirring days of Franklin D. Roosevelt's early tenure in the White House. We were moved and lifted up by great emotion and great aspiration to go ahead. We were having cultural projects all over the country, giving the boys and girls with talent a chance to play and sing and draw, and we were not ashamed of giving men and women a chance to work. We were thinking about the America we were building again out of the wreckage of a depression. We were lifting our national income up notch by notch, putting more and more people to work, opening more and more schools, giving health care to more and more people.

Even the migrant workers, in the many States of the Union where seasonal crops are harvested necessarily by migrant workers, were not forgotten. Camps were built for them, with running water. They had the assurance of sanitation and supervision. The children got a chance to go to school. There were nurses who looked after them. They were even provided with hospitals and given the medical care they needed free. There was one of those hospitals in my State, at Belle Glade.

Now what has happened? At a meeting of the Committee on Agriculture 2 or 3 days ago testimony was being heard upon the proposal to sell the migrant labor camps. Where are those workers to live? The proposal is not only to sell the migrant labor camps but the hospitals will close down June 30 if no funds are added to the appropriation; and there is no hope of getting any.

The dream that was in our breasts that people were entitled to live somehow has been dissipated. Gentlemen say they have a mandate to destroy America's dream and to shatter her hopes and her aspirations.

Mr. President, I am proud to be a New Dealer. I care not how high the flood of reaction rises, so long as I can raise my humble voice I will say I am as proud of my political faith as I am of my faith in God. I believe they both relate to the dignity of human beings. And if my desire to lift people up to better living makes me a New Dealer, I am proud to wear the badge.

And be sure, Mr. President, that that is the way of the future. Reactionary movements come and go.

This temporary fanaticism, this psychological fear of the rights of the people of this country, will pass like a thunderstorm in the summer, and after awhile we will begin to see a new light, and it will be leading us toward the east again, when we will talk, not about how we can strike down the working people, but how we can lift them up.

Mr. President, so long as I am a Member of the United State Senate, when I get a chance to vote for a decent minimum wage, I shall be for it. When I get a chance to help every American man and woman have a job, a decent job, with decent pay and reasonable hours, I shall be for it. When I get a chance to vote to put every American boy and girl in a good school, I shall be for it, I do not care what it costs. It cannot cost as much as it will cost us not to have it. Whenever I get a chance to vote to give every man and woman, boy and girl, a chance to get the medical care they need, I shall be for it, I care not what it costs. I think they can, and should, and will pay for it by an insurance plan such as the able Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and others have proposed. I want to help to build a greater and stronger America—to assist all our people.

Mr. President, what I regret to see is that the people who are against one of these objectives are usually against all of them. They think there is some good reason why we should not do any of them. I think this is part of the same struggle that is going on in America today between those trying to better the condition of the masses of the people, those who are trying to help them, and those who are trying to preserve the well-being of those already well off and are trying to help them. That is the way I feel.

So, Mr. President, I am proud of the President of the United States, who would send to Congress, against terrific political pressure, against vituperation and bitter denunciation, a message which will again remind the American Congress of the American dream of economic and political democracy for our people. I hope that he will have, as he so rightly deserves, the hearty support of the membership of the Senate.

EXHIBIT A

THE BILL PLACES UNFAIR RESTRICTIONS ON THE POLITICAL ACTIVITY OF UNIONS

Section 313 of the bill is admittedly outside of the scope of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, and stated to so be on page 69 of the conference report. This device of injecting such a provision into legislation which purportedly is designed to improve labor-management relationships should certainly be condemned if this legislation is the result of a mandate such as that claimed by its sponsors. The provision relating to political activities clearly does not come within that alleged mandate. It is entirely unrelated to the other provisions of the act and is a matter which in fairness to all concerned should at least be subject to separate debate and consideration.

This section of the bill makes it unlawful for any labor organization to make a contribution or expenditure in connection with any election at which Presidential and Vice Presidential electors, or a Representative or Senator, or Delegate, or a Resident Commissioner to Congress will be voted for, including any primary election, political convention or caucus.

One of the important functions of a labor union is to educate its members in a variety of ways. To accomplish this purpose it is the practice of such organizations to issue magazines, newspapers, and periodicals which contain items of interest to the members of the organizations. Such articles include news items of importance to working people, instructions and lessons in the trade or craft or work in which such members may be engaged, reports of the activities being carried on by the various unions and officers and representatives, etc. These magazines and newspapers are not published for political purposes and deal with political subjects only incidentally. During the periods immediately prior to primary elections and general elections the members of the union are obviously interested in the records which have been made by candidates for public office and the effect which the activity of these candidates may have had upon the rights and welfare of the working people. It has been the practice for labor organizations to furnish their members with tabulations of the voting records of representatives to Congress in connection with legislation which has to do with the welfare of employees. It

has been the practice in these magazines to carry biographical sketches of certain candidates for public office and in addition thereto to publish what might be termed "editorial comment" with respect to the political and economic views of candidates. Unions conceive this activity to be a worth-while program and a contribution to the improved citizenship of their members. Candidates for office or incumbents should have no objection to having the record which they have made in their high office furnished to the citizens whom they represent.

This bill would prevent labor unions from using their magazines for any political activity, from issuing circulars or bulletins or any other type of information which requires any expenditure of money, if such expenditure may be attributed to political activity.

On the other hand the provisions of this bill not only make possible but encourage the indirect method of accumulating huge sums of money for political activity which is not restricted to the furnishing of information to the members of a given organization. It is perfectly proper under this bill for individual members of labor unions to make contributions to a political committee obviously designed to promote the interests of labor in any election. There is no limit upon the amount which can be contributed to such a political committee and it may use these funds not for the education of the working people but for any other purpose it may desire. We submit that it is this kind of activity which may in the hands of the wrong individuals result in some corrupt practices. It is not the activity of unions in connection with their own members which could become corrupt.

Indeed this legislation merely emphasizes the common criticism of the restriction on expenditures by corporations in political campaigns. It is commonly known that corporations utilize the device of individual contribution by very wealthy persons to political committees and thus successfully and effectively and by the use of tremendous sums of money influence the voting public either for or against a certain candidate.

Both because this bill does not accomplish the end sought to be accomplished in the prevention of any corrupt political activities and because it is so obviously unrelated to the avowed objectives of the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947, it should not receive the support of the Congress.

This effort upon the part of Congress to inject into this bill a provision designed to protect its Members from the consequences of their own votes in connection with it cannot be justified. It does not represent the forthright and honest approach to legislation which American citizens are entitled to expect from their representatives.

THE BILL MAKES INDUSTRY-WIDE BARGAINING IMPOSSIBLE

Language contained in the conference committee report indicates that it was not the intention to make industry-wide bargaining illegal, in that it is stated on page 32 that—

"The treatment in the Senate amendment of the term 'employer' for the purposes of Section 9 (b) is omitted from the conference agreement, since it merely restates the existing practice of the Board in the fixing of bargaining units containing employees of more than one employer, and it is not thought that the Board will or ought to change its practice in this respect."

It is significant, however, that industry-wide bargaining can be just as effectively restricted by obstacles placed in the way of its being carried on as by an actual statutory ban.

The conference bill makes provision for the partition of the various collective-bargaining units into distinguishable groups which would make industry-wide collective bargaining an impossibility.

Section 9 (b) of the bill provides, in part, that—

"The Board shall decide in each case whether, in order to assure employees the fullest freedom in exercising the rights guaranteed by this act, the unit appropriate for the purposes of collective bargaining shall be the employer unit, craft unit, plant unit, or subdivision thereof: * * * (2) decide that any craft unit is inappropriate for such purpose on the ground that a different unit has been established by a prior board determination unless a majority of the employees in the proposed craft unit vote against separate representation."

If individuals or small minority groups are to be given the right to bargain collectively in employer units, craft units, plant units, or subdivisions thereof, and the Board is under the positive duty to recognize such units, there could be no industry-wide bargaining in any industry where the employees in a single plant or of a single employer, or even in a subdivision of these units, desired the right of separate representation.

Thus the suggestion of the conference committee that it has not made industry-wide bargaining illegal is no defense against the charge that as a practical matter the bill has made industry-wide bargaining impossible.

THE BILL IMPAIRS, IF NOT DESTROYS, THE EFFICIENCY OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

One of the most serious defects in the present bill is the effect which it will have upon the administration of its provisions by the National Labor Relations Board. Statutes which contemplate administration by an administrative agency and especially those which are remedial in nature can be no more effective than the procedure which is prescribed for their administration.

Under the present law, and with the benefit of a number of procedural practices designed to expedite the board's proceedings, there now exists a backlog of 5,000 cases and the figures show that during the year 1946 more than 12,000 cases were docketed. There has been an increase of 40 percent in the number of cases in a single year.

The present board has followed a practice of having the many thousands of pages of testimony, taken in various hearings, reviewed by certain attorneys employed by the board for that purpose. Obviously this has relieved the board itself from the long and tedious task of studying such transcripts. Under this bill such a practice would be prohibited.

This bill places in jeopardy every collective-bargaining unit now in existence by requiring the Board to recognize as appropriate units such groups as employer units, craft units, plant units, and subdivisions thereof. As a matter of fact, section 9 (b) (2) of the act provides that the Board shall not "decide that any craft unit is inappropriate for such purpose on the ground that a different unit has been established by a prior Board determination unless a majority of the employees in the proposed craft unit vote against separate representation."

This invitation to every small group to separate itself from presently existing collective-bargaining units will multiply the representation cases to a degree which is beyond comprehension.

There are any number of other provisions in this bill which will complicate the procedure of the Board and add tremendously to the volume of work. For example, prehearing elections are abolished; the Board is charged with the duty of interfering with the internal affairs of unions to the extent that it must decide in certain cases what constitute reasonable dues and initiation fees charged by unions; the increase in the number of unfair labor practices provided for in this bill cannot help but greatly increase the number of cases before the Board; the Board is required to conduct elections in connection with the establishment of union shops in addition to its obligation to conduct elections in representation cases; and the obligations on the part of the Board to initiate injunction actions in certain types of cases will require its participation in unlimited litigation.

One of the provisions of the bill which will probably do more to discredit the board and to bring it into disrepute in the eyes of the parties who are to utilize its functions is the duty imposed upon it to inject itself into jurisdictional strikes to the extent that it must determine the proper work-task allocations as among unions. This involves the board in the most intricate and complicated problems of job content which it cannot possibly be equipped to handle and will inevitably result in decisions which will destroy confidence in its judgment and integrity.

While the above duties are not all which have been added to the board's already heavy burden, it must be clear that its functions will necessarily break down when it is considered that under the present law it now requires 9 months to process an election case and 20 months to process an unfair labor practice procedure.

JUDICIAL REVIEW OF THE DECISIONS OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

The National Labor Relations Board is an administrative agency of the Government and as such should be treated, insofar as procedure and review are concerned, the same as any other administrative agency. It is further significant that this board is dealing with problems involving human relations and the parties who appear before it are for the most part laymen. Collective bargaining agreements are not customarily prepared by attorneys nor is there need, in the vast majority of cases which are processed by the board, that the parties be represented by counsel.

This bill provides that proceedings before the Board or any member or agent thereof shall, so far as practicable, be conducted in accordance with the rules of evidence applicable in the district courts of the United States. This provision prescribes a different rule, with respect to the introduction of evidence, from that prescribed for all other administrative agencies of which we have knowledge. This requirement is not contained in the Administrative Procedure Act which has for its purpose the creation of some uniformity and procedural justice in proceedings before all administrative agencies.

The above-mentioned section of the bill is destructive of the principal purposes sought to be accomplished by administrative agencies. It prevents the informality and speed which are essential prerequisites to a successful administrative procedure. It will, particularly in labor cases, prevent a direct approach to the essential problems involved in such cases. It will require, for the proper presentation of any cases, the services of a lawyer or a representative trained in the rules of evidence as they are applied to court procedure. It will require the board to weigh each item of evidence on the basis of court rule.

Even more important, this bill will change the scope of the reviewing power of courts which are called upon to consider decisions of the Board. The conference committee itself stated on page 56 of its report that the requirements of this bill will give rise to questions of law which the courts will hereafter be called upon to determine and, further, that it will very materially broaden the scope of the courts' reviewing power.

This bill, by virtue of these provisions, discriminates against the working people of this country in requiring them and their

representatives to submit to more rigid standards in the presentation of questions involving their rights than those established for any other citizens in any other field of endeavor. These provisions remove from the field of labor law the worthy purposes of administrative procedure and will prevent an adequate, fair, and just disposition of labor-relations problems.

THE UNION SHOP IS A PRACTICAL IMPOSSIBILITY UNDER THIS BILL

The conference bill outlaws the closed shop even in those industries where it is mutually acceptable if not actually desired by both employees and employers. In attempted mitigation of this deprivation of long-established rights the committee bill offers what it terms the union shop.

An examination of the bill discloses, however, that the obstacles to the acquisition and maintenance of a union-shop agreement are almost insurmountable.

This bill removes certain supervisors from the coverage of the law, requires that professional members may not be included in the same unit with nonprofessional employees unless they vote for such inclusion, prevents guards or plant protection employees from being represented by labor organizations representing other than guards, and requires that craft unions must be recognized unless a majority of the craft votes against it. The bill further provides that the board must conduct an election in which a majority of the eligible voters in the unit must vote in favor of the union shop before such union shop is legal. More important still is a provision in the bill which prevents such election being held if a question of representation exists.

There are thousands of collective bargaining units now enjoying the privileges of the union shop which include within their scope certain supervisory employees, professional employees, guards, and employees of more than one craft. In some of these units a separation must necessarily be made to comply with the law. Until all of these representation cases are settled the representative of the employees in the existing units will be foreclosed from petitioning the board for an election on the union-shop question. As a matter of fact, with the added inducement in the bill for individuals and minor groups to further subdivide existing collective bargaining units, it is doubtful whether a vote on the question of a union shop could ever be taken where there exists any distinguishable group of discontented employees. Furthermore this act gives the employer the right to initiate a representation dispute merely on the ground that one or more individuals have presented claims to be recognized as representatives of a unit of employees.

Should any union have the good fortune to obtain a union-shop agreement under the foregoing conditions it will still be confronted with an impossible problem in maintaining it.

This bill makes it an unfair labor practice for an employer to discharge an employee for nonmembership in a labor organization if he has reasonable grounds for believing that membership was denied or terminated on grounds other than the failure to tender periodic dues and initiation fee, and makes it an unfair labor practice for a union to cause or attempt to cause an employer to discharge an employee for nonmembership on any ground other than his failure to tender the periodic dues and initiation fee.

Thus, regardless of the conduct of the union member, or his character or activities, neither the union nor the employer can, without risk of being charged with an unfair labor practice, bring about the termination of his employment on any ground of nonmembership in the union other than a failure to pay dues or initiation fees.

For example, this bill requires that no union shall be certified as the collective bargaining representative if one of its officers is a Communist. The union may undoubtedly remove such member from office or even from membership in the union in order to obtain the right of representation or to maintain order and discipline in the union. The employer, however, even under a union shop agreement, could not discharge such Communist from his employment without being guilty of an unfair labor practice. One of the vital purposes of the union shop is to permit the union to handle its own affairs in such manner as to make it possible to assume and carry out the responsibilities expected of it. If, as is so commonly stated, the unions should assume more responsibility for the powers vested in them, it certainly should follow that they should be vested with sufficient power to carry out that responsibility.

It is apparent from the foregoing that this bill does not, as is declared by its sponsors, grant to employees and labor organizations a procedure under which a union shop may be established and maintained.

THE BILL JEOPARDIZES VACATIONS WITH PAY, COMPENSATION FOR SICK LEAVE, ETC.

A term which has been almost universally misunderstood in labor-management relations is "feather bedding." Section 8 (b) (6) of the conference bill purports to ban "feather bedding." It is generally recognized by those familiar with labor laws that there are a number of benefits accorded employees which contemplate the payment of money or some other thing of value for time not worked.

The present bill makes it an unfair labor practice for a labor organization or its agents "to cause or attempt to cause an employer to pay or deliver or agree to pay or deliver any money or other thing of value, in the nature of an exaction, for services which are not performed or not to be performed."

It is not clear what the bill means by referring to the payment of money "in the nature of an exaction." The word "exaction" contemplates any use of compulsion and does not necessarily refer only to extortion or to conduct of unjust severity. Thus a strike or a threat to strike might well constitute a type of force which would be well within the meaning of the term "exaction."

Some of the objectives of employees which contemplate payment for services not rendered are vacations with pay, payment to employees while on sick leave, and, even more generally, a rule which requires that employees who are called for service and not used on that particular day are entitled to compensation for a fixed number of hours.

These objectives, as well as others which could be mentioned, have never been considered to be unreasonable or unjust, and yet it is clear that they involve payment for services which are not performed and which are not to be performed. It would seem, therefore, that they would come within the meaning of the provisions of section 8 (b) (6).

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 20, 1947, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 814. An act to provide support for wool, and for other purposes; and

S. 1230. An act to amend section 2 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS—VETO MESSAGE

The Senate resumed the reconsideration of the bill (H. R. 3020) to prescribe fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management in their relations with one another which affect commerce, to protect the rights of individual workers in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce, to recognize the paramount public interest in labor disputes affecting commerce that endanger the public health, safety, or welfare, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. MURRAY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Murray
Baldwin	Hawkes	Myers
Ball	Hayden	O'Conor
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Hoey	Overton
Bridges	Holland	Pepper
Brooks	Ives	Reed
Buck	Jenner	Revercomb
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Wyo.
Byrd	Kem	Russell
Cain	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Capehart	Knowland	Smith
Capper	Langer	Sparkman
Chavez	Lodge	Taft
Connally	McCarran	Taylor
Cooper	McCarthy	Thye
Cordon	McClellan	Tydings
Donnell	McFarland	Umstead
Downey	McGrath	Vandenberg
Dworshak	McKellar	Watkins
Eastland	McMahon	Wherry
Ecton	Magnuson	White
Ellender	Malone	Wiley
Ferguson	Martin	Williams
Fulbright	Maybank	Wilson
George	Millikin	Young
Green	Moore	
Gurney	Morse	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

MISSISSIPPI RIVER FLOODS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief United Press dispatch published in the Washington Post of June 18, describing the major Mississippi River flood now hitting the 150-mile stretch of the central Mississippi Valley. It is pointed out that the Iowa State Department of Agriculture predicts that most of the bottom land in the southern half of the State will produce no corn this year, with an estimated loss of millions of dollars. This new flood now cresting along the Mississippi River is prevented only by already weakened levees from sweeping across 400,000 acres of the Nation's richest farm land.

These startling facts prompt me also to ask to have printed in the RECORD two ably written editorials describing this continuing problem of damaging floods, and pointing out the necessity of once and for all preventing such devastation through the enactment of a unified river basin resources development plan such as is suggested in the Missouri Valley Authority bill, Senate bill 1156. One editorial, entitled "At Expense of the Many," was published in the York, Pa., Gazette and Daily for June 16. The other, entitled "MVA, Lesson of the

Floods," was published in the St. Louis Post Dispatch of June 11. I commend these thoughtfully written editorials to Members of the Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. TAFT. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS—VETO MESSAGE

The Senate resumed the reconsideration of the bill (H. R. 3020) to prescribe fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management in their relations with one another which affect commerce, to protect the rights of individual workers in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce, to recognize the paramount public interest in labor disputes affecting commerce that endanger the public health, safety, or welfare, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, may we have the motion stated again?

Mr. McGRATH. The motion is that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The Clerk will call the roll.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, there seems to be some desire to vote. I withdraw my suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest that a second quorum call at this time is not in order, because no business has been transacted by the Senate since the last quorum call.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, business certainly was transacted. I asked unanimous consent to have certain matters printed in the RECORD, and objection was made. That is the transaction of business.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will have to rule that that was not business.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, what is the ruling of the Chair on the point of order raised by the Senator from California?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The ruling of the Chair is that the refusal of the Senate to permit the matters presented by the Senator from Montana to be printed in the RECORD was not the transaction of business.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a Senator certainly has a right to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question before the Senate is the appeal from the decision of the Chair. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Is the question subject to debate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The appeal from the decision of the Chair is debatable.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. If a Member of the body debates the appeal from the decision of the Chair, and thereafter seeks to make a speech on the veto message, will his speech on the appeal from the decision of the Chair count as one speech against the veto message?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will not.

The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I should like to discuss that question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I asked permission to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD certain editorials and a newspaper article concerning the Mississippi flood which is now raging in the Mississippi Valley. It seems to me that this is a matter of such vital concern to the Nation that this material should appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I cannot understand how any Senator could oppose such a reasonable request on my part, because it seems to me that the Senate ought to be willing to be advised with reference to the dangerous flood situation which prevails at this time, and which is of great concern to the American people.

There is now pending before one of the Senate committees a resolution calling for an immediate study of this problem. It seems to me that if Members of this body understood what I am seeking to accomplish they would not desire to block my action. I cannot believe that the Senate desires to remain in ignorance of this problem. I therefore suggest that the Senate should vote in favor of reversing the ruling of the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question before the Senate is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. MURRAY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a point of order——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, supported by the Parliamentarian, no business having been transacted, a quorum call is not in order.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Does not the appeal from the decision of the Chair itself constitute a sufficient transaction of business so that a Member of this body can suggest the absence of a quorum so as to obtain the attendance of Senators who are absent, and who do not know what has transpired?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is not the transaction of business until it is voted upon.

The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate? [Putting the question.]

The decision of the Chair was sustained.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH] that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the demand sufficiently seconded?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon will be recognized in a moment.

Is the demand for the yeas and nays sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll, unless the Senators from Oregon wishes to be recognized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's request for a quorum call is justified, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Cooper	Hill
Baldwin	Cordon	Hoey
Ball	Donnell	Holland
Brewster	Dworshak	Ives
Bricker	Eastland	Jenner
Brooks	Ecton	Johnston, S. C.
Buck	Ferguson	Kilgore
Butler	Fulbright	Knowland
Cain	George	Langer
Capehart	Hatch	Lodge
Capper	Hawkes	McCarran
Chavez	Hickenlooper	McCarthy

McClellan	O'Daniel	Taylor
McFarland	Overton	Thye
McGrath	Pepper	Umstead
Malone	Reed	Vandenberg
Martin	Revercomb	Watkins
Maybank	Robertson, Va.	Wherry
Millikin	Robertson, Wyo.	White
Moore	Russell	Wiley
Morse	Saltonstall	Williams
Murray	Sparkman	Young
Myers	Taft	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH] that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The motion is not debatable; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. On this vote I transfer that pair to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], who is absent because of illness, is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER].

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent on committee business.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], the Senators from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS and Mr. O'CONOR], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. The transfer of that pair to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] has previously been announced by the Senator from Kansas.

The result was announced—yeas, 16, nays 52, as follows:

YEAS—16

Aiken	McCarran	Pepper
Chavez	McFarland	Russell
Hill	McGrath	Sparkman
Johnston, S. C.	Morse	Taylor
Kilgore	Murray	
Langer	Myers	

NAYS—52

Baldwin	George	Overton
Ball	Hatch	Reed
Brewster	Hawkes	Revercomb
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Robertson, Va.
Brooks	Hoey	Robertson, Wyo.
Buck	Holland	Saltonstall
Butler	Ives	Taft
Cain	Jenner	Thye
Capehart	Knowland	Umstead
Capper	Lodge	Vandenberg
Cooper	McCarthy	Watkins
Cordon	McClellan	Wherry
Donnell	Malone	White
Dworshak	Martin	Wiley
Eastland	Maybank	Williams
Ecton	Millikin	Young
Ferguson	Moore	
Fulbright	O'Daniel	

NOT VOTING—27

Barkley	Gurney	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Hayden	Smith
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Byrd	Kem	Thomas, Okla.
Connally	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Downey	McKellar	Tobey
Ellender	McMahon	Tydings
Flanders	Magnuson	Wagner
Green	O'Conor	Wilson

So the Senate refused to take a recess.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I think it is deplorable that the majority will not agree to let this mattter go over until Monday or some other day next week in order that the American people may have time to read the President's veto message and listen to the President on the radio and form their own conclusions about this matter, and then have sufficient time to inform the Members of the Senate how they feel regarding this most important and vital subject. I deplore the fact that the majority have thrown the gauntlet to us, instead of agreeing to let this matter go over until next week, and that they have said they will hold us here and make us talk, if we want to give the American people time to consider this matter.

Mr. President, I have heard the word "filibuster" used here on this floor. In my opinion, a filibuster exists when a group of Senators, large or small, begins to talk with the object in mind of preventing action on a piece of legislation. Certainly my object is not to prevent the taking of action on this legislation. I realize that that could not be done, in the first place, for it is a long time until the final adjournment of this session of Congress. I have no desire to prevent action upon this bill. My sole aim and hope is that action will be postponed sufficiently long to enable the American people to have the opportunity for the first time, I believe, to obtain a true picture of this piece of legislation, in order that they may decide what they think of it; because, after all, we are only the servants of the American people, and if they have had no opportunity to get a clear understanding of the full meaning of the provisions of this bill and what it will mean to them, they have not had sufficient time to study it; and naturally, therefore, they have not been sufficiently informed to be able to let us know what they really think of it.

Only now is organized labor becoming acquainted with the full implications of this bill. They are the people most vitally and most directly interested, the people whose livelihood will be directly threatened because their means of sustaining their wage scales and of securing decent working conditions and the things that affect them most fundamentally will be seriously impaired, in many cases destroyed, if this bill becomes law.

But I say that only now, at this late date, have the members of organized labor become fully cognizant of the full implications of this measure, and only now are they really making their voices heard. Only now are they writing to their Senators and their Representatives in Congress. Indeed, so desperate is their plight that they are coming to Washington, to try to prevail upon the people they sent here to represent them, to get them, in turn, to fulfill that obligation and truly represent them by repudiating this legislation.

Mr. President, I believe the President of the United States has given us an opportunity to save this Nation from one of the most vicious pieces of class legislation which has ever come out of the Congress.

I fervently hope that the President's wise action in vetoing the Taft-Hartley labor bill will be sustained by this great body.

To me, Mr. President, the bill is completely in the pattern of most of the legislation which has been sponsored at this session by Senators on the other side of the aisle. It attempts to do by subterfuge what they dare not do by direct and open legislation. Through its voluminous pages it presents us with many pious words, ostensibly designed to safeguard the rights of labor, and to arrive at a general recipe for labor-industrial peace in our great Nation. In presenting those acres of pious words, the bill too closely follows the pattern of such legislation as the Reed-Bulwinkle bill, passed day before yesterday, to exempt the railroads from the antitrust laws. It too strongly resembles the fine words contained in the so-called rent-control bill, which preserves the form but not the fact of rent control.

The rent-control bill, Mr. President, is another measure very similar to the labor bill. It is another measure which is going to affect the working people most severely. Everyone will feel its effects, but the man who works for wages—the white-collar worker on a fixed income—they will be the ones least able to bear the dire consequences of the so-called rent-control bill, which was passed by the Senate yesterday.

At that time, Mr. President, I meant to go into the question of the so-called advisory boards provided for in the rent-control measure. As Senators know, the

rent-control bill provided that the governors of the various States should appoint boards in their various rent-control areas. I am sure the proposal was offered in good faith by the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], for whom I have the highest respect, and I am sure that he thought it would be a good idea, or he would not have presented it for consideration.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield to my friend the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am sure the Senator from Idaho knows——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will advise the Senator from Idaho that he can yield only for a question.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am asking the Senator a question. I am sure the Senator from Idaho knows, does he not, that the Senator from Alabama, when he offered the proposal that there be local advisory boards, did not propose that those boards should be named by the respective governors, but that they should be named by the person, whoever he might be, whom we would designate as the rent control director?

Mr. TAYLOR. I had not remembered that. I am glad the Senator called it to my attention. That absolves him from any responsibility in the criticism which I am about to level at this so-called rent-control measure.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Senator will yield further, I should like to ask him another question.

Mr. TAYLOR. May I yield for the question, Mr. President?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator may yield for a question.

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield for a question.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Would the Senator from Idaho have been in favor of local boards had they been set up as the Senator from Alabama intended them to be when he suggested that they be named by the Director, in order to have people who were down on the local level assist the Director, and advise him as to the three or four things which were specified, first, whether or not a particular area or portion thereof should be wholly decontrolled; second, whether or not there should be a general increase of rent in that particular area or portion of an area; third, whether or not there should be some relief for that particular area or section of it in some other form; and fourth, whether or not individual cases in that particular area or section might be entitled to some specific relief? Would the Senator have supported that type of local advisory board, which was the type suggested by the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I may say to the able Senator from Alabama that I doubt if I could have supported the plan even had it been in that form, which was far superior to the way it is now. I never did feel that it would work. I appreciated the Senator's intention. It was a good idea to get this matter to the local level, but I have several reasons for thinking it would not work.

One reason is that we are presuming that there still exists the spirit of self-sacrifice which was apparent during the war, when people were willing to serve on the draft boards. Patriotism was the impelling motive then, Mr. President, because certainly those people took a great deal of abuse, and received no remuneration. That was one of the finest jobs that was done during the war, one of the most unselfish, because, while the men who actually went away to war received glory and praise, the draft boards generally received little but condemnation, from people who thought they should receive special favors. The service of the draft boards was a great monument to our American way of life, to the high quality of the citizenship of our people. In an overwhelming majority of the cases our draft program was handled on a fair, impartial, patriotic basis.

It is now proposed that people be appointed to serve on rent boards, and the abuse will be heaped upon them for raising people's rent or not raising it. They are bound to get abuse in every instance, because if they raise the rent the tenant will abuse them and if they do not raise the rent the landlord is going to be their enemy for life. So, anyone who would volunteer to serve on one of these rent boards might just as well go around and kiss half his friends goodbye, landlord or tenant, for they are bound to be one or the other. The members of the board are going to lose one out of every two friends they have in the community. I do not believe we would be able to get people to serve on the boards unless they had a special reason for serving.

If there had been a provision that the boards were to be apportioned among various segments of our population, for example, with a representative of labor, a representative of real-estate interests, a representative of the renters, and a representative of the public, that might be all right. If we could get a fair representation in that way, the idea might have worked, except for the fact that the members are to be appointed by the Governors of the State.

The rent boards are to have the privilege of raising the rent on one house, a block of houses, a whole city, a whole district. They can raise the ceiling or they can abolish the rent on one house, or two houses, or a block of houses, or for a city, or for a whole district.

When the Governor appoints these people, if he wants to be political about it, and an election is not very far away, he can and will probably appoint members of his own party, be they Democrats or Republicans. I am not casting aspersions on any one party; I am merely mentioning politics. The members of one party could raise the rent for landlords who were their Democratic friends. They could lower the rents of their Democratic friends who were tenants. They could discriminate in either way. They would not take the responsibility. They could lay the blame on the Federal employees who were in the office and had to meet the public face to face. They would say, "Look what those bureaucrats are doing to you." So it will not work out satisfactory, in any way, shape, or form.

Mr. President, I meant to discuss that subject yesterday, but it slipped my mind; not that it would have made any difference, because Senators probably had made up their minds as to how they intended to vote.

I want to say, Mr. President, I am happy to see the seats here all filled. I do not know what has impelled Senators to stay in such force to listen to me. I am highly gratified by this display of friendly affection and interest in my remarks.

Mr. President, the labor bill too strongly resembles the fine words contained in the so-called rent-control bill, which preserves the form but not the fact of rent control in our country. Its form, more than coincidentally, appears to be the same as that of the legislation which has been introduced to emasculate our reclamation projects in the West, by cutting out the public power features, which are so necessary to their financing. I may say, in speaking of public power and private power, that in the last election in Idaho, the Democrats campaigned on an issue of the CVA. Those initials, Mr. President, stand for Columbia Valley Authority. We wanted to develop our great Northwest. Senator Hugh Mitchell, who served here during the last Congress, was greatly interested in CVA. He was one of my closest friends; I respected him highly; in fact, I thought as much of Hugh Mitchell as of any man I ever met. We sat next to each other, and our friendship was so close that, several times, each of us had an opportunity because of seniority to move our seats nearer the front, but we refused, in order that we might stay close to each other. I know he was a man of integrity and honesty and high principle. He told me he hoped to put through the Columbia Valley Authority, to develop the resources of the Northwest, and especially his State of Washington. He told me of the great plans he had for aiding his people in the State of Washington. We campaigned in Idaho, in the last election, on the issue of a Columbia Valley Authority, right down the line. We had strong opposition. The contractors opposed it. Under the present system of handling reclamation, we let a contract for one dam every 5 or 10 years. The contract is let to a private contractor or group of contractors. They round up the machinery, rent it, lease it, or buy it, and haul it back into the hills. They get a gang of green-horn laborers, and transport them back into the mountains. They have to go to the expense of recruiting them each time. Then they complete the work on one dam, or perhaps they just do part of it, and Congress refuses to appropriate funds with which to carry on the work, so they all move out for a year or so; the machinery is dispersed again about the West. Then we get a little more money from Congress, and the contractors round up all the boys and the machinery and go back to work for a little while longer; the appropriation runs out; they take all the machinery out, and the workers return to their homes in the various States. We get another little appropriation, and they work a little while longer.

That is very fine for the contractors. They do not like the idea of a valley authority, because, if the work were done

the way it was done in Tennessee, the Government would set up a construction outfit which would move from one dam to another, become proficient and efficient, and would do the work much cheaper. The Government, under CVA, would save the people millions upon millions of dollars.

The contractors do not like that, so they fight a valley authority. I think, really, Mr. President, that they are very short-sighted, because if they were to get behind it and let us get a valley authority, the development that would take place would create enough additional activity on the part of private interests to more than compensate the contractors for the loss of the one dam they get every 5 or 10 years, but they cannot see it that way.

"A dam in the hand is worth two in a valley authority" is their motto. The power companies oppose the Columbia Valley Authority, because, Mr. President, if we develop a small amount of cheap power in the Northwest, and municipalities and REA cooperatives are permitted to buy it and distribute it to their customers, they will do it more cheaply; they will cut out or lessen power-company dividends. The power companies would not lose anything, actually. They would be paid, if the municipality voted to take over their facilities; but the stockholders would miss those dividend checks.

However, I might say this: There are a large number of patriotic citizens in Idaho who own large blocks of stock in the Idaho Power Co. who favor the Columbia Valley Authority, because they know it means cheaper power for their farms and other undertakings. They know they would be just as well off without the dividend checks from the power company. They would get their returns in other ways, through opportunities of investing money in other places. However, the power companies opposed CVA bitterly. They had a very clever scheme. They simply told the people that if there were a Columbia Valley Authority they would lose their water rights. Now, of course, Secretary Krug came to Idaho to tell them that their water rights would be protected under a CVA even better than they are now; we all told them that. The question is important, Mr. President—water is all we have in Idaho. The land is of little value without water. It can be seen readily that water is what creates the value. The farmers could not be blamed. I did not blame them for being apprehensive about a Columbia Valley Authority in view of what they had been told. It is as if someone came to me and told me that if a certain bill passed he would take my oldest son out and shoot him. I might not believe it, but I love that boy and I would not take a chance. That is the way the farmers in Idaho felt about their water rights.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield for a question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield to the Senator for a question.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. First, I desire to say that I agree thoroughly with what the Senator has said about power and about the power interests. I have enjoyed what he has had to say about rent control. I wanted to know if the Senator from Idaho would favor the payment of terminal leave bonds in cash, in the event the bill having that purpose in view were reported favorably by the committee?

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I certainly would be in favor of paying our terminal-leave bonds in cash. As I have pointed out here, and as others have pointed out, the actual take-home pay of our workers is dwindling. It is I believe about $5,000,000,000 below the peak, in spite of the fact that all the soldiers have come home adding to the total force of wage earners. If all those who were working during the war, while the soldiers were away, and if now all, including the soldiers, get $5,000,000,000 less now than the war workers received, what are the soldiers living on? I suppose many of the veterans have nothing. It would be a very good time to pay the terminal-leave bonds in cash. Most of the soldiers now, of course, are married, I suppose, and many probably have infants. As I pointed out earlier this evening, in the city of Philadelphia the consumption of fresh milk has fallen off 7 percent, recently. That can be attributed to nothing in the world other than the fact that the people simply do not have enough money to buy this absolute necessity. Inasmuch as the veterans are probably in the majority as parents of small children at the present moment, it would seem that they could use the money due from their bonds to buy milk for their babies. Yes, I certainly would vote for a measure to pay the veterans in cash for their terminal-leave bonds.

To get back to my point about a Valley Authority, Mr. President, those opposed to such an Authority told the people of Idaho that if a Columbia Valley Authority were established, the people would lose their water rights. It scared the people to death, and our candidates were defeated.

Oddly enough, the power company furnished much of the money for this attack. They had front organizations to speak for them and spend the money. One was the National Reclamation Association, which has degenerated into a front organization for contractors, power companies, private fertilizer interests, coal companies, and barge companies. Another such front organization is called the Southwestern Idaho Water Conservation League, Inc. It was set up in Idaho, originally, by irrigation farmers to promote irrigation, but the power companies, the contractors, and the special-interest groups found they could use these organizations. So they bored from within. We hear talk about the Communists boring from within. They are not the only borers from within in this country. I will say that the power companies and special-interest groups in Idaho are some of the most expert borers from within that I have ever seen. They took over these organizations, and for a while they could obtain genuine dirt farmers to serve as officials of these groups, until the farmers found out how they were being used. Then the farmers refused to serve. So during the last campaign these front groups had to have officials of the Idaho Power Co., bank officials, and officials of the contracting companies serve as the board of directors of these alleged water-conservation groups which were supposed ostensibly represented the interests of the people who owned irrigated land.

I should like to say, Mr. President, that I could end this feud with the Idaho Power Co. any time I saw fit to do so. I could get them to support the Columbia Valley Authority, and they would certainly be glad to support it. In fact, I was told recently by a substantial stockholder of the Idaho Power Co. that if I would agree, and if I could get the Interior Department to agree, to give the Idaho Power Co. a 20-year lease on the power from all the dams in Idaho, with an option to renew for 20 years more, they would cease and desist in their efforts to block the Columbia Valley Authority, and we could all get together and live happily ever after. We would get our valley authority, we could irrigate our land, if we would just let them have the power. Of course, that would not be so good, because the power would not be available at cheap rates. It would not be attractive to industry. We would only get one-third of the benefits we should get out of such a project. All we would get would be supplemental water for the land now under irrigation, and water for new land. We would get that. It would result in homes for veterans. It would help develop our State. But we would not get the new industry which would come if we could furnish abundant cheap power. We would lose the benefit which would come from new industries, and we would also lose the benefits of cheaper power for home consumption. Thus these interests work.

It is a question which must be decided, whether we want to compromise and give the private power companies the electricity and let them make a profit on it in exchange for the cooperation in getting the Valley Authority. In 40 years we might have a chance to enjoy the full benefit. The alternative is to continue to fight straight down the line. Personally, that is what I would do. I like to do that. But, the people of Idaho are deeply concerned over this matter, and I will confer with them and see what they think. I will try to find whether they believe it would be better to compromise for immediate gains, or just stick to our guns. I think we can beat them in the next election. If we cannot, then I believe we can in the next election, and if not in that election, then in the next one. And there ought to be others after that.

I may say, Mr. President, that we did not fare too badly in the election in Idaho on the issue of a Columbia Valley Authority. In the States of Washington, Idaho, Utah, and Nevada there were senatorial elections in 1944 and again in 1946. I may say that in the State of Washington my good friend, to whom I previously referred, Hugh Mitchell, was the candidate for the Senate. He was an incumbent Senator. In the State of Utah, Abe Murdock, a very fine and able Senator, was the candidate and an incumbent. In Nevada, the candidate was

Mr. Berkeley Bunker. He was in the House and had served in the Senate. But here was the difference. In the State of Washington, Hugh Mitchell, who had introduced the bill, thought he saw the conservative trend, so he did not stress too heavily the issue of a Columbia Valley Authority. In Nevada, Mr. Bunker, who had been quite liberal the last year or so, drifted quite a ways over to the right to get in line. In Utah, Senator Murdock had no good, liberal issue, although he had been known as a New Dealer. In Idaho, our candidate, Mr. George Donart, was not an incumbent. He was a State senator. In spite of that fact, in Idaho from 1944 to 1946 we Democrats lost 9 percent, in Washington the Democrats lost 10 percent, in Utah they lost 11 percent, and in Nevada they lost 14 percent. The Democrats lost almost in direct proportion to the liberal tone set in the campaigns they conducted. So, we will probably be back campaigning again on this issue of a Columbia Valley Authority.

Mr. President, the appropriaion bills we have passed here in the name of national economy have throttled individual functions in reclamation, public power, agriculture, labor relations, and in a score of other activities. These appropriation bills involve selective cutting, cuts which would take the heart out of the programs which have been legislated by law. I wish to disassociate myself from these cuts which have been going on in Congress. I do not approve of this type of legislation. Most of the cuts the West has received are not in out-of-pocket expense; they are simply refusals to make investments in developments for which the Government will be paid back fully in cash. In addition, when a reclamation development is built not only is the money paid back in full but industries are started, farms and factories established, and in all this development increased production results, with the further benefit that millions of dollars of additional taxes will be paid into the Federal Treasury. It is a handsome investment; and yet we have cut it down.

Mr. President, I feel that, if the Senate believes that we should have a bill which would take away the rights of workingmen to form a union and bargain collectively on working conditions and hours, it should pass a straightforward repeal of the Wagner Act and the Norris-LaGuardia Act.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BALDWIN in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAYLOR. Would it be proper for the speaker to ask a question of the acting majority leader?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair holds that, under the rules, such procedure is not in order.

Mr. TAYLOR. Very well.

Mr. President, we should present the people of the Nation with a clear-cut decision in which they could concur or not concur at the polls.

I had intended to ask the acting majority leader if he had any idea how long he intended to keep us here tonight, so that I would know how to pace myself. If we are going to stay a long time, I do not want to take it too fast or become excited. On the other hand, if it is a reasonable length of time, I shall try to give the occupants of the gallery a run for their money. But inasmuch as there is no way of knowing, we shall have to assume that we shall be here until morning, when the sun comes up.

That is nothing new to me. I spent my life in show business, and we never got started until this time of the evening. We would finish about 1 o'clock, and then, for a good many years—7 or 8 years before I came to the Senate—after that time I would read about economics, what the Congress was not doing, and things like that. Many times I would sit up until the sun came up, trying to prepare myself for the day when I should be in Washington. So it will not put me out a great deal if we stay here until sunup.

Mr. President, we should not entangle our laws with thousands of words of window dressing which pretend to preserve the spirit of our beneficial labor laws but which will, in fact, dismember them when the lawyers and the courts have finally succeeded in ferreting out the meaning of the Congress.

I have reluctantly come to the conclusion that the majority in this Congress has but one aim. That aim, it must appear upon the basis of the legislation which we have passed, is to send the Nation into another great depression as quickly as we possibly can.

Mr. President, the "bust" of 1929 to 1932 was hatched by the policies pursued by the Republican administration of Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover. The depression, as it was called in those days, resulted from the scarcity of purchasing power on the lower levels and a muscle-bound concentration of power and wealth above.

I wish to make it plain that I am not in any way conducting a filibuster. I am only talking to give the American people time to think this question over, to read the President's message, and decide whether or not they think this is good legislation. I am acting in the best interests of the American people. I am not trying to prevent action on anything; but I think we should delay action long enough to let the people find out what this is all about. They have not yet had an opportunity to do so.

I have previously spoken against this measure, but the press did not see fit to print my remarks.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield only for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Is it the position of the Senator from Idaho that the President of the United States is entitled to the courtesy of the lapse of time over the week-end, which would enable the American people to study his veto message?

Mr. TAYLOR. I think the President is entitled to that simple courtesy, and the American people are entitled to that opportunity.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Is it the position of the Senator from Idaho that the United States Senate should take a recess at this time so that there can be further consideration and reflection upon the question, and reconvene tomorrow at noon for further consideration?

Mr. TAYLOR. Certainly that would be the fair thing to do. As I have previously pointed out, I am willing to agree to a unanimous-consent arrangement to postpone consideration of this question until some time next week. I would be willing to agree upon Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday. The President and a number of Senators are leaving the city on Tuesday to go to Warm Springs, Ga., for dedication ceremonies. They will not be back until Thursday morning. Therefore it seems to me that Thursday would be the logical day. If we could reach such an agreement, we could proceed with other legislation, and nothing would be delayed 1 minute.

So Senators on the other side ought not to accuse me of delaying consideration of the question. They are delaying it by being bull-headed and saying, "We must vote now," without giving the American people an opportunity to study the question. It was even suggested that we vote tonight, before the President could speak on the radio.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Is it the position of the Senator from Idaho that the United States Senate should give the employers of America an opportunity to study the President's message and this legislation, so that they can make known their reactions to Members of the Senate before we finally vote on the legislation?

Mr. TAYLOR. I think that is very important. I believe that if the majority leadership are sincere in their desire to protect the best interests of the American people, they will be happy and anxious to agree to some such arrangement, to give the people an opportunity to study the question.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further for a question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Is it the opinion of the Senator from Idaho that after the country has had an opportunity to react to the veto message and make known to Members of the Senate its views on the message, it will be our duty as individual Senators, after we weigh those views, to exercise honest, independent judgment on the question as to whether we should vote to sustain or override the President's veto?

Mr. TAYLOR. Of course, we should always exercise our best judgment. I point out to the Senator that on yesterday we had the wool bill before us. We have a lot of sheep out in Idaho, and someone owns them. I felt that the wool bill was detrimental to our best interests as a Nation, to our reciprocal-trade program, and I voted against it.

I have no idea what the political repercussions will be in Idaho. I hope the President will veto it so that it will come back here and we can cut out the objectionable parts and pass the support-price part of the bill so that our sheepmen will be taken care of. That is my hope. But if I had known that would not happen, I should still have been forced to vote against it in the best interests of my country.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Idaho agree with the junior Senator from Oregon that it is the duty of the individual Members of the Senate to weigh very carefully the points of view of their constituents on an issue such as the veto message and to satisfy themselves that they have a full understanding as to what their constituents want done in regard to a message such as this?

Mr. TAYLOR. Certainly. Each Senator should always try to get the views of his constituents. He should be happy to receive them, at least, on any subject, and let them enter into the over-all consideration of the problem. I do not say that they should always be the governing factor, but we should consider them seriously.

With reference to the Bulwinkle bill, frankly I received a number of resolutions from Idaho urging me to support the bill. But I am convinced that those people did not have an opportunity thoroughly to understand what the Bulwinkle bill would mean to them. So I had to exercise my best judgment. I had sought the most expert advice I could find on the subject and I voted against the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Idaho agree with the junior Senator from Oregon that after receiving the views of his constituents on a given issue such as this—and such views could certainly be received before the first part of next week—it then becomes the duty of each Senator to determine for himself, under our representative form of government, whether the public welfare and interest will be best served by the proposed piece of legislation?

Mr. TAYLOR. Certainly, a Senator should study this veto message carefully, because it is the clearest, most concise, and forthright analysis that has come to my attention. It should be weighed in that light and in the light of the feelings of his constituents. Then he should act according to his conscience and vote for what he feels would be best for all the people of America—not just the laboring man, but all the people.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator agree that if, after we have reached our final decision, after giving due weight to the views of our constituents on a given issue, we are of the opinion that our final view does not coincide with the view of a temporary majority as of that time, we have the political responsibility of standing upon our vote and taking to the people our reasons for our vote?

Mr. TAYLOR. Absolutely. I may say that I did that in connection with the Columbia Valley Authority. There was no demand from the people of Idaho for a Columbia Valley Authority. They never heard of it. I had to go out and tell them about it and try, against great odds, to sell them on the idea. I shall continue to do so, because I think it is for the best interests of my people and for the United States.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes; I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator agree that if we should agree to vote on the President's veto message tomorrow we simply would not have sufficient time to make an accurate check as to what public opinion on the respective sides of the issue really is?

Mr. TAYLOR. Of course, we would not have time. The President is going on the air this evening. By tomorrow our constituents will not have time to digest the matter and write us and let us know what their idea is as to how it is going to affect their business. That is very important. We have not gotten down to cases here and heard from the average businessman. He has not had a clear exposition of this bill and has not seen what it might do to him. It is important that we hear from those people.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes; I am happy to yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator agree with me that if we should proceed to vote on this measure tomorrow there would be those within the ranks of the public who would be inclined to believe—rightly or wrongly, it is not for me to say—that we wanted to get the vote over with before we could hear from our constituents?

Mr. TAYLOR. Oh, yes. As I said a while ago, I think that was the object. They wanted to get it over with before the President could open his mouth and have anything to say about it and before the newspapers could print it, for that matter. No one could have gotten home from work and read about it in the evening paper if we had voted this afternoon. A man would have gotten home and looked at the paper and that would be the first time he would have seen anything about the labor bill. Then he would turn on the radio and find out about the vote which had already been taken just about the time he made up his mind that the bill was not a good thing after all.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator agree with me that under our constitutional form of government the power of veto vested by the Constitution in the President of the United States is one of the very important checks in our check-and-balance system?

Mr. TAYLOR. Most certainly; and it is not something to be regarded lightly. When the President sends a veto message to the Congress we should, in the language of the West, take another look at our "hole card" and kind of look the proposition over again before we vote.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes; I am happy to yield to my good friend from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. By his last statement does the Senator mean to make clear that he feels that because the veto power is one of the important checks vested in the President under our Constitution to protect the people from hasty action by a majority in Congress, we owe it to the people, to the President, and to our form of government to give very careful and thorough study to any veto message, particularly when it pertains to a subject which is vital to the Nation's economic welfare, as is this particular message?

Mr. TAYLOR. Most certainly. This is, I believe, one of the most important messages in years on domestic problems, at least. No one can say that I am for this veto because I am a Democrat, because I do not hesitate to oppose my own party whenever I feel that the party is wrong. I opposed President Roosevelt on his proposition to draft workers in defense plants. I had just come from a defense plant, and I opposed it. It was the first important matter which came before us when I came to the Senate, and I had just told the people that I would probably agree with the President 95 percent of the time, which was true; but the 5 percent hit me in the face the first thing, and I had to disagree.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Indiana for a question.

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes; I shall try to put it in the form of a question.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I cannot yield unless the Senator wishes to ask a bona fide question. I do not want any slip-up to occur.

Mr. CAPEHART. I shall do my best to put it in the form of a question. If I do not, the Senator need not answer.

The Senator from Idaho was a Member of the Senate, was he not, when President Truman sent to this body a message asking us to enact legislation drafting workers into the Army?

Mr. TAYLOR. We discussed that earlier this evening.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am asking the Senator whether he was a Member of the Senate when that happened.

Mr. TAYLOR. I was.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator from Idaho voted against that measure; did he not?

Mr. TAYLOR. Most emphatically, I did.

Mr. CAPEHART. If the President was wrong on that issue, why might he not be wrong in his veto of the pending labor legislation?

Mr. TAYLOR. He may be; it can well be that he is wrong, Mr. President. All we ask is that the American people be given time to consider whether he is right or wrong.

Mr. CAPEHART. I should like to ask another question: Has anything new been added to the labor legislation which we have not been discussing for weeks and weeks?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is anything new added to the legislation, anything that all of us do not know about and have not known about for weeks?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes; something new has been added.

Mr. CAPEHART. What is the newness?

Mr. TAYLOR. Veto. [Laughter].

Mr. President, today we are following the same disastrous policies that were engineered by the heirs and successors of the bunglers of the decade of 1929 and 1932. We are now moving toward another 1929.

The Congress already has voted, for all practical purposes, to abolish rent controls and further lower the living standards of our workers. The majority is preparing to leave the building cycle free to soar and smash. It has done nothing to provide housing for the middle- and low-income family.

It recently voted to reduce income taxes in the higher brackets, but it has done little to increase the purchasing power of consumers in the low-income groups. No better illustration of the effect of this kind of policy can be found than the fact that in one city the consumption of milk, one of the most basic necessities, has fallen off 7 percent.

On the contrary, in the House Ways and Means Committee, the majority party members are beginning to talk about sales taxes as a way to pay off the national debt. Sales taxes destroy the buying power of the little man. They cut into the income of the consumer. Mr. President, the chairman of one House subcommittee has even proposed that a tuition be charged in the public schools as a means of raising revenue for the District of Columbia.

We have given great tax bonuses to big business through the enactment of the carry-back provisions and the repeal of the excess-profits tax, and now the Congress has voted to destroy the Wagner Act which enabled labor to organize and to maintain wage scales through collective bargaining. Now the majority is asking us to override the veto of the President of the United States, and to pass this bill, after he has given us a chance to save the country from the debacle which this and measures like it will create.

Congress, likewise, has demonstrated its interest in lowering wages through the enactment of a bill which, under the guise of eliminating portal-to-portal-pay suits, is actually destroying the effectiveness of the minimum wage law.

We are heading pell-mell for another depression. We are destroying the purchasing power of the great mass of the American people.

Now, Mr. President, comes the ultimate and the acme of all the acts and deeds guaranteed to undermine the morale of our people and the stability of our economy. The crowning touch has just been added. I read from the Evening Star of Monday, June 16:

> Chairman TAFT told a reporter the Senate-House Economic Committee certainly will want to hear from Mr. Hoover when it begins its scheduled investigation next week of how to prevent depressions at home and still give the world some help along the road to recovery.

Mr. President, the Republican steering committee, which thus far has steered an unerring course toward depression, is not satisfied with the progress being made, so it has called in a greater expert—in fact, the greatest expert of them all, the man who knows more about creating depressions and less about how to get out of a depression than any other man in the United States—yes, in the world—that great engineer of two-car garages in which to store pots of two-chicken capacity because there were no cars for the garages and no chickens for the pots, that great defender of a veteran's inalienable right to sell shiny red apples on street corners, that great architect and builder of housing whose lack of accomplishments in that field are only exceeded by his present-day contemporaries who have failed even to equal his famous pioneer housing development known as Anacostia Flats.

Mr. President, the Republicans are not satisfied with their efforts to bring us to chaos, and so they have called for the advice of the man whose very name is synonymous with depression, Herbert Hoover. In view of all this, I am sure I echo the sentiments of millions of Americans when I say God help us.

Mr. President, we should present the people of the Nation with a clear-cut decision in which they could concur or refuse to concur when they vote at the polls. That is what we should do when we vote on such matters as labor legislation and other legislative proposals. It seems that the majority party is no longer interested in preserving the private-enterprise system in which business can function competitively within certain laws which keep it from becoming monopolistic. It seems, if we are to judge by the legislation which has been introduced and passed, that it is the desire of the majority party to reduce labor to the basis of individual bargaining, which was the rule when capitalism came into being in the eighteenth century. Great corporations—hundreds of thousands of times larger than the small companies of the 1800's—are to be given a completely free hand to exploit their workers if they so desire—and I regret to say that apparently most of them do so desire. Perhaps we should have been forewarned that there are people in this Nation of ours who desire the disastrous cycle of boom and bust.

I have before me a copy of a few paragraphs from an article printed in the fall of 1945. It was written by Mr. Ralph Blodgett, an advertising executive, and it appeared in an employer's magazine, the Automotive and Aviation Industries. These unbelievable phrases appear in that article:

> It is to be hoped that depressions are never abolished, for they have many desirable features.

Mr. President, I suggest that the majority steering committee employ this man as one of their staff. He should fit into the picture very nicely.

I read further from his article:

> Those who learn to ride the business cycle can find as many advantages in depressions as booms.

That is sage advice, Mr. President. Frankly, I never learned how to ride a business cycle. I can ride a motorcycle, I can ride a bicycle, and I can ride a bucking horse, but I do not know how to ride a business cycle so a depression seems a nice thing to me.

Think of it, Mr. President, in the year 1945 appeared a statement in a responsible trade publication extolling the benefits of depressions; extolling the great suffering and human misery which result from mass unemployment; extolling the great loss of productivity in this Nation, whose productivity we are so wont to glorify, as proof positive that our system of economics is the greatest in the world today.

But let us read on. Mr. Blodgett is not through. Why does this spokesman for a great American industry feel that depressions are such happy events—almost a blessed event, I might say? I quote again:

> That very name "depression" is inappropriate. It horribly maligns those great periods so full of splendid opportunities and human benefits. Let us keep those periods but abolish only the name.

That is a quotation, not my sentiments, Mr. President. I was in a depression once, and I do not like them.

It seems that that part of the admonishment in this trade magazine has been carried out very well. Senators will recall that most of our business publications now do not use the term depression. When they talk about the possibility of a decline in the business cycle nowadays, of even a crack-up, we have more euphemistic terms thrown at us. Recession has come into wide use. I think it originated in 1937. When we were making progress but had not yet gotten out of the depression and started backward again, they did not want a depression within a depression, so they called it a recession.

However, in late months even so mild a term as "recession"—to describe the almost complete break-up of our free-enterprise capitalistic society—has come into disrepute.

It, too, in the words of this writer in the automotive- and aviation-industries magazine, "horribly maligns those great periods so full of splendid opportunities and human benefits," and so now we have the latest coined word to describe this situation.

The daily newspapers and trade publications in the last few months have adopted the term "shake-out." That is very pleasant. It reminds one of a hula-hula dancer, probably, or something of the sort.

It seems that a shake-out is even more desirable and probably several times as desirable as a depression. They all mean the same thing, of course. They all mean bread lines, hungry children,

broken homes, unemployment, and a scale of living far beneath the dignity of the African Hottentot, whom the New Dealers were so roundly criticized for once having said they would like to aid.

But the very nicest description has just been coined by Mr. Aldrich, president of the Chase National. He said in a recent speech that the United States is headed toward a corrective recession.

Incidentally, milk consumption has fallen off 7 percent, as I mentioned a while ago. Perhaps we could make an arrangement with the Hottentots to take up the slack with that bottle of milk now.

As I have said, this gentleman, Mr. Blodgett, writing in the magazine, said, "Let us keep those periods, but abolish the name," meaning depression.

Apparently we have abolished the name, and this Congress seems hell-bent on keeping those periods. Fortunately, the President of the United States, in vetoing the Taft-Hartley bill, the latest in a long series of measures designed to "keep those periods," has given us an opportunity to thwart at least one attempt at insuring depression.

But I must read to the Senate one more paragraph from the omniscient writings of Mr. Ralph Blodgett away back in the fall of 1945. He said this:

> Unemployment brings needed rest to millions, whether they are ready for it or not.

I agree with that.

> There is a job to be done, of showing all America that the miscalled "depressions" offer as wide a range of rich opportunities and human benefits as a prosperity season or any other part of the business cycle.

Mr. President, I am sorry I cannot agree with my friend when he looks back with nostalgia upon these depressions and says we should have them right along, that they are fine things, and that all we ought to do is merely to change the name and they will be pleasant experiences. I cannot agree with him, because I was in the other depression. I was in bad shape, in fact. I was in a business, a luxury business. Ironically enough, I was in the show business, one of the first to suffer. When people do not have money they do not have to go to a show. They do have to buy a few groceries and a few clothes once in a while, they do have to pay their rent; but they do not have to buy any jewelry, they do not have to buy any fur coats, and they do not have to go to a show. So one can be down and out pretty quickly in that business, as I discovered. But I will say this, that I never went on relief. I might have done so if I could have, but being in the show business, I had no home, and having no home, no one was responsible for me. So I had to fight it out.

I ate jack rabbits, although in the West we do not consider jack rabbits fit to eat. We will not eat them in normal times.

There is nothing pleasant about the memory of not knowing from one day to the next where one's next meal is coming from. There is nothing pleasant about the recollection of having a sick wife and a sick baby and not knowing how in the world you are going to get medical attention for them. In fact, Mr. President, in my case I did not get medical attention for them. I just prayed to God that everything would be all right, and that they would pull through. They did. No, there is nothing pleasant at all about those recollections, and I disagree with this gentleman who has that philosophy.

I disagree with the things the Republican Party is doing nowadays—the very same things that were done in the 1920 to 1929 era that brought on the depression—and which will bring on another depression. I hope I can escape the suffering I went through in that depression. I probably will, if I am fortunate enough to stay in the Senate, with a fixed income, which is very nice. But there will be many other people out where I was who will not be able to escape the depression. I shall be glad to try to help them as much as I can, so long as my finances hold out, but that will not be for long.

I think the exponents of free enterprise, who like to call me a Communist, a Bolshevik, and a Socialist, are the worst enemies of our capitalistic system. They are selfish, unthinking of the consequences of their actions, looking only for greater profits, trying to saddle the burdens of taxation upon the little man all the time, trying to fix it so that his wages can be cut, trying to get the big man out from under the antitrust laws so that he can corner everything. They are the enemies of democracy.

Mr. President, I would not be United States Senator this minute if it had not been for this dog-eat-dog attitude of our conservative friends who care nothing about the little man. I was contented to go my humble way and make a very humble living, with nothing fancy about it. I was content not to have a great abundance of this world's goods. I was not overly ambitious. I liked a condition in which I could go fishing once in a while and enjoy myself and be with my family. All I wanted was to have just enough to eat, and to be sure I could pay the doctor bills. I was not even insistent that I should have a home, and I did not have one. I was traveling in the show business. I did want to have enough money to pay my hotel bill. But no, Mr. President, they would not even let me have that. They so engineered things that finally I had to eat jack rabbits. I could not get a doctor for my family. I could not afford to stay in a hotel, so we lived in a truck. We did not have even a mattress, hard times overtook us so quickly. We slept on a pad about 3 inches thick—one of these camp mattresses that we happened to have. We spent a winter in Wyoming, in weather 20° below zero, sleeping on that pad. When we got ready to go to bed, instead of taking off our clothes and putting on a nightgown or pajamas, we just left everything on. We had to put a muffler around our head and put on our overcoat, and so to bed.

Mr. President, it got me roiled up a little bit, and I started looking into economics, to see what caused it. I found out. I found out, Mr. President, that it was not an accident, it was not all just by guess and by God; there were reasons for everything that happened. I found out what the reasons were. It was because there were too many Republicans back in the United States Congress, enacting bills of this kind, during that period. So I determined that there would be one less, back there, of that kind, and I kept that promise.

Mr. President, I want to say that the course that is being followed at the present moment will result in the same result again. There are many people out yonder who are perfectly satisfied with the lot that has been given to them; they have a decent place to live; probably, for the first time in their lives, they are making a decent wage, although it will not buy very much nowadays. They would like to see prices come down a little, but they are fairly well satisfied. They can buy clothes, they can get a doctor, they can go to the movies once in a while. But, Mr. President, if we continue passing measures to help monopoly, to destroy labor, to push down the little man, and fortify the big man in his castle, there will be a lot of Glen Taylors springing up out yonder, and there will be a lot of hard-bellied United States Senators who will be going back looking for another job.

I was a small free-enterpriser back in those days, Mr. President. I was very happy with it. I had my own troupe of actors touring the country when the depression hit. Frankly, I do not know which came first, the depression or the talkies; they came together. It is like the chicken and the egg. They placed loud-speakers on the stages, and we could not get any bookings. That did not make any difference, because if we got bookings, the depression had started, and nobody came, anyhow.

I enjoyed to the fullest those "rich opportunities and human benefits" of the great depression of two decades ago; and Mr. President, I can tell you, for one, that I want no more of them, and, speaking both as a "free enterpriser" in the best American small-business tradition, and as an individual, I do not want anybody else to have to put up with them. That is why, because of my background, my sympathies are with the people who work, including, of course, the farmer.

I was raised on a farm, if it may be dignified by calling it that. I worked with my hands. The last job I had before I came to the United States Senate was working with my hands as a sheet-metal worker, as a member of one of the unions we now have down on the floor, whose throat we are trying to cut. I was a small businessman; I understand their problems; I sympathize with them. I sympathize with the problems of big business. There are many problems, divers and diverse. There are many good, big businessmen, but some of them seem to want the world with a fence around it, and they seem to send a lot of folks down here to Congress to represent them. It is not going to turn out very happily either for them or for the little folks, either. That is the reason I entered politics, because I thought I might be able to help in some small way to avoid the horrible manifestations of mass suffering which have been progressively and euphemistically described as "depression," "recession," and now "shake-ups." I want no more of them; that is why I

want no part of the Taft-Hartley labor bill. That is why I urge the Members of this body to vote to sustain the courageous veto message of our President.

Mr. President, the thesis that the Taft-Hartley labor bill is a part of the over-all program of the majority party to insure another depression would seem to be upheld by none other than one of the eminent sponsors of the measure, the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

If he was correctly quoted in the newspapers—and I do not believe he has denied the statement—the senior Senator from Ohio said only a week or so ago that the effect of the President's veto of the Case bill in the Seventy-ninth Congress was to bring higher wages. That statement, it seems to me, carries with it the corollary that had the Case bill been made law wages would have at least not risen and perhaps would have declined.

If that was the objective of the senior Senator from Ohio a year ago in urging passage of the Case bill, it would seem fair to assume that it is still his objective, and that it has been one of the major goals in connection with the writing and passage of what is now the Taft-Hartley bill, which is before us.

There we have the conflict. On the one side we find the supporters of this measure, those who would override the President's veto, saying that this is not a repressive bill for labor.

Mr. President, I hope that everybody listening to my voice, or who may hear me talk, will tell his friends that I am talking here for one purpose only—to give the people time to read carefully the President's veto message and decide for themselves whether or not they want this legislation passed. I am not trying to keep anybody from voting upon the bill at an appropriate time. Such a time which will be when everyone has had an opportunity to read the President's message, to hear what he has to say on the radio, one or both, and to think over the matter. And then I should like sufficient time for the people to communicate with their Senators and let them know what they think of the bill. If the people want it passed, then that is all right; I certainly am not one to protest a decision of a majority at any time, if I think the decision is arrived at fairly and openly and after full discussion and debate.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. TAYLOR. I can yield for a question only, I am sorry.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question. May I ask if the Senator's philosophy goes this far; if the Senator became convinced tomorrow, or in the immediate future, that the majority of the people wanted the veto overridden, would the Senator vote to override the veto?

Mr. TAYLOR. No; I would not vote to override the veto; certainly not.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Then, Mr. President, what is the object? I take it that the Senator is advocating the use of his own judgment as to whether or not the bill is good or bad.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. And that, even if he were convinced that the majority of the people of the country desired that the veto be overridden, as I understand, the Senator says he would still not vote to override the veto.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am convinced in my own heart, after applying to the subject the best judgment I can, that it is a bad measure. I feel, however, that all of us, in our deliberations, consider the wishes of our constituents as much as we can. If a matter comes before us on which I do not have profound convictions, though I think generally it is bad, but I am not sure of it, and I find that my constituents want it, then I will let my own weak convictions go by the board and try to do what the people want done. But if I have profound convictions that are deep-seated I will stick with them.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield for a question.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Then, Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator this question: What then is the logic of his argument in saying "Let us delay until the people express themselves to their Senators," when the Senator himself says that he would not take the will of the people if he were convinced that the will of the people actually was to override the veto? I fail to follow the Senator's logic in his desire for a delay for that purpose.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Senator from Iowa is absolutely correct in what he says, that I would not change my mind simply because the people told me they thought I ought to vote to override the veto. However, if they presented arguments, I would be willing to listen to them, and if they convinced me that I was wrong, then I would change. I feel that there are a number of Senators who do not have strong convictions about the measure, and if they find out that the people really want the veto sustained, and that the people think it is a bad piece of legislation, those Senators may change their votes. Not many votes will have to be changed to sustain the veto. Not many Senators' votes will have to be changed; only four or five or six to decide the issue. So I think my position is perfectly logical and defensible.

Mr. President, the situation becomes all the more interesting when we look at the statistical information available on total wages and total profits.

The Federal Reserve Board—hardly to be criticized as a source of prolabor statistics—reports a continuing upward trend in total profits of corporations in this country.

The National City Bank of New York has compiled a table showing that leading industrial corporation profits in 1946 were about 29 percent more than they were in 1945.

The Office of Business Economics of the Department of Commerce has estimated that profits of all corporations in the United States after taxes, in 1945, were eight billion nine hundred thirty-nine million, as compared with total profits for corporations after taxes in 1946 of twelve billion five hundred and thirty-nine million.

That the trend is continuing is borne out by the Federal Reserve Board in its report for the first quarter of 1947. The Board's compilation of profits after taxes for 629 corporations shows that during the first quarter of 1946 the total was $323,000,000, and in the first quarter of 1947, the total profits, after taxes, had risen to $875,000,000—more than double. Yet there are those who contend that labor is out of hand and must be curbed, when the actual take-home pay of labor, of those who work in this country, has declined by $5,000,000,000, and the profits of the corporations, the poor little corporations which we are going to protect from these big bad wolf workingmen—their profits have more than doubled. It seems to me, Mr. President, we are getting the regulation at the wrong end.

Let us look at the total wages and salaries. Figures compiled by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce show an actual decline in total wages and salaries in the years 1944 to 1946.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FERGUSON in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAYLOR. In the opinion of the Chair is the Senator from Idaho making his first speech or his second speech on the bill?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I desire to have the parliamentary situation explained first.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the opinion of the Chair that it is the Senator's second speech.

Mr. TAYLOR. Is it fair or is it permissible to ask why the Chair so rules?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. After the message dealing with the bill was laid down, the Senator from Idaho took the floor and spoke. That was the first time the Senator spoke. The present speech is the second speech.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I want to say that I was trying desperately to be recognized by the Chair at the time the matter of unanimous consent was being discussed. I tried a number of times to obtain recognition. The Chair would not recognize me, and finally laid down the message, and then recognized me, and I had to say what I had to say on the subject of unanimous consent. That is what I was talking about.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I can yield for a question only.

Mr. KILGORE. Has the Senator checked the question of present prices of automobiles?

Mr. TAYLOR. I bought one a while ago.

Mr. KILGORE. The figures will show that the present price of the average automobile is approximately 102 percent more than the price was in 1941.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Senator will have to propound a question. I cannot yield for a statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator refuses to yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. Except for a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will yield only for a question.

Mr. KILGORE. I was asking a question. Has the Senator checked to ascertain whether or not the present price of automobiles on the market is approximately 102 percent above the price in 1941, whereas the increase in wage, plus the increase in cost of material have been approximately 33 percent. Has the Senator checked that?

Mr. TAYLOR. No, I have not checked it. I wonder where the extra money is going.

Mr. KILGORE. I may say to the Senator that in an investigation of the Bilbo case——

Mr. TAYLOR. I cannot yield except for a question. I am sorry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator refuses to yield.

Mr. KILGORE. May I ask one question then?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield for a question, but I cannot yield for any other purpose.

Mr. KILGORE. Will the Senator kindly explain to the Senator from West Virginia why it is there is such a terrific urge on the part of the majority party to act upon the legislation at the present time? At the same time, despite the terrific housing shortage existing in the United States, there appears to be no urge whatsoever to pass the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill which would provide housing for veterans who have returned from the wars, who have wives and families and no place to live.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am sorry that I cannot enlighten the Senator as to why there is so little display of interest on the part of the Republican majority in this Congress in the housing extremities of our veterans. Not only are they doing nothing about housing, but they are doing their best to tear down what little remained that could done under regulations. In the rent bill which we have just passed, they struck down all remaining housing controls, that is, controls over materials. Such materials will now all go into commercial buildings; and a veteran or anyone else will indeed be fortunate if he can find enough materials with which to build himself a lean-to.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield for a question.

Mr. KILGORE. Yesterday, I believe, it was announced in the press that in certain unions an agreement had been made for an 11½ percent increase in wages; yet we have recently passed in the Senate, under terrific pressure, a bill permitting a 15 percent increase in the price of housing for the same type of workers who received the 11½ percent increase in wages.

Mr. TAYLOR. If the Senator has been listening, of course he has heard the Senator from Idaho contending all evening that the course of the majority party, if it were planned by the highest paid experts for that purpose could not be better calculated to lead us into a depression. It is hard to believe that they actually want a depression. But, Mr. President, the actions which have taken place would certainly seem to indicate it.

Figures compiled by the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce show an actual decline in total wages and salaries in the years 1944 to 1946. According to this agency in the Department of Commerce, in 1944 salaries and wages totaled $112,800,000,000. In 1946 they had declined to $106,600,000,000. Mr. President, I think those figures are shocking. They show that while total profits are rising, total wages and salaries are declining.

As the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] has pointed out, the automobile companies have raised the prices of their cars 102 percent, while their wages and materials cost them 33 percent more. It is a pretty good racket that they are working on us. Every time the worker asks for a dollar increase in wages, they raise the profits $3 or $4. That is the way they have been doing during the war and ever since the war. The Congress is doing its level best to help them by crippling the unions so that they cannot ask for wage increases, so as to make it possible for the big fellows to increase their profits whether the workers receive any increase in wages or not. They do not like the ratio of a $3 increase in profits for a $1 increase in wages. They want to raise profits without raising wages. Perhaps they will succeed pretty soon.

Mr. President, I can think of no better recipe for a depression than to augment the trend of higher profits, higher prices, and lower wages. It is an unbeatable formula. Of course, there are a very few in this country who profit from a depression. It is hard to believe that they exercise enough influence to send a Congress here to work their will upon the other 99 percent or more of the people. But this very small percentage of the people has so much of the country's assets that they can withstand a depression; and then, when everyone else has gone bankrupt and assets are for sale at 10 cents on the dollar, they can step in and buy them. Those people benefit by a depression. It is difficult to believe that they have taken control of our Congress; but it is hard to find any other explanation. Perhaps that is what our friend Blodgett, from whom I was quoting awhile ago, meant by "riding the cycle of depression," as he termed it. That is why a depression can be so good.

Mr. President, the decline in wages and salaries means only one thing—a drop in purchasing power. Likewise a drop in purchasing power means only one thing—a curb on buying power, a curb on consumption, which means the shutting down of factories.

As the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] pointed out earlier in the day, citrus fruit in Florida—and I presume also in Texas, Arizona, and California—is going to waste. It cannot be sold. The people have not the money to buy it. Idaho potatoes are in the same situation. The people simply have not the money to buy them.

Some persons have the idea that the great demand for our farm products during the war was brought about because of the fact that we shipped so much food abroad. Actually, what we shipped abroad in the way of foodstuffs was almost negligible. We sent considerable food abroad to feed our soldiers, but they would have eaten if they had been at home. But they are now at home, and they should be eating just as much as they did when they were soldiers, but they are not. The average person cannot feed himself as well as soldiers in the Army are fed, with wages going down as they are. We were able to sell all the farm products of our great State of Idaho and other agricultural areas simply because, for the first time in the history of the United States, or for the first time in the history of any country in the world, for that matter, the people had enough money to buy practically all they wanted to eat, and they consumed all the products of our farms. But the surpluses are showing up again, because the people have not the money with which to buy.

Mr. President, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], in an aside, asked me to yield to him for the purpose of making an announcement. I should like to yield to the Senator for that purpose, but the Republicans are becoming pretty tough, and will not allow me to yield for that purpose. I would even yield to a Republican if they would permit me to do so, but I cannot do it, so I shall have to continue.

Let us look for a moment at the background of some of those who, I understand, have been boasting in the hotel lounges and cocktail bars of the city of Washington that they had a hand in writing the labor legislation which we have before us today. One such person is a Mr. Theodore Iserman, who, I understand from his own words, describes himself as one of the most active consultants in the writing of the Taft-Hartley bill. Mr. Iserman is an attorney representing the Chrysler Corp. Certainly such connections would seem to make him most eminently qualified to write a fine, human document fully nondiscriminatory against the rights of employees, which would lead this country along the primrose path of industrial peace.

Let us look at the labor record of the great Chrysler Corp., which pays Mr. Iserman his hire. The report of the Committee on Education and Labor in the Seventy-sixth Congress, on its investigation of violations of free speech and the rights of labor, gives us this interesting information on the activities of the Chrysler Corp., Mr. Iserman's employer.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I will yield for a question.

Mr. KILGORE. Has the Senator from Idaho ascertained whether Mr. Iserman equipped the bill which he drafted with fluid drive, with which all other Chrysler vehicles are equipped?

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Iserman has a fluent drive which urges him on to write these bills for the Congress, it seems.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield for a question.

Mr. OVERTON. Is he as fluent in his oratory as the Senator is?

Mr. TAYLOR. I appreciate the compliment of the Senator. I have

never been called fluent. I have just been accused of being persistent.

Mr. President, the Chrysler Corp. was listed in the report among the largest purchasers of gas and equipment. That is not gasoline and equipment; that is tear gas. In the appendix to the report, part 6, No. 3, in a table listing the purchasers of over $1,000 worth of tear- and sickening-gas equipment, the Chrysler Corp. is shown to have purchased on December 4, 1935, approximately $7,000 worth of this type of gas and equipment. Of course, Mr. President, the Chrysler Corp. was looking forward to a day when Hitler's troops would invade this country, no doubt, and the corporation wanted to do its part in repelling the invader, I suppose. No doubt that great corporation, employing thousands of men, had no thought of using this tear-gas and sickening-gas and equipment on its own employees. Time after time these great corporations have told us that they never resort to violence in an attempt to settle a labor disturbance. Somehow, Mr. President, it is always the strikers, armed with fists, who attempt to beat the living daylights out of machine guns and tear-gas equipment in the hands of the employer's representatives.

But the report of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, of the Seventy-sixth Congress, has this to say:

> The committee found that the large purchasers of gas munitions during the period of this study, 1933 to 1937, were employers involved in strikes or threatened strikes, and law enforcement agencies in localities affected by the strikes.

Then the report had this to say:

> The Chrysler Corp. advanced the funds in May or June 1936 for the purchase of one submachine gun by the police of the city of Hamtramck, Mich., where most of the Chrysler plants are located.

That was nice. That was a public-spirited gesture on the part of Mr. Chrysler's corporation to buy machine guns for the policemen in the towns where the company's plants are located. How much better it would have been, than to advance funds for purchasing submachine guns for the police department of the town, to have advanced funds for hiring additional school teachers or for establishing playgrounds for the children of the workers, or for beautifying the parks, or doing any of a hundred other nonessential things. It might have been a good idea to set up a labor-relations school where people could study to make better labor relations in representing unions and employers.

The report of the Senate committee went on to detail further activities of the Chrysler Corp. in the field of labor spying, but I will not burden the Senate with the details. It is enough to show the eminent qualifications of the Chrysler Corp.'s representative, Mr. Theodore Iserman, to write, or help to write, a bill in the public interest to control labor relations in our Nation.

Mr. President, there is still another coauthor of this bill whose name, strangely enough, does not appear in the formal sponsorship of the measure. He is Mr. William Ingles, a representative of the Allis-Chalmers Co.

Mr. Ingles, too, has been, shall we say, devoid of false modesty about taking credit, in the better clubs and lounges, for the provisions of this great welfare document which is now before us for action.

Let us see whose interest Mr. William Ingles is protecting.

This company has since 1906 provided us with one of the worst examples of labor relations in our Nation.

It has consistently sought to break strikes—break unions—grind down the conditions under which its employees worked, and has consistently refused to bargain with representatives of its employees.

I quote from the magazine Survey of April 1941:

> Accounts of the Allis-Chalmers strike in Milwaukee headlined "The man-days lost, the outbreak of violence, the charge of Communist influence." But it was only in an inconspicuous paragraph—if at all—that the dailies carried the fact that on March 3, a month before the strike was settled, the union accepted the OPM proposal for settlement, and the company refused even to consider the proposal. This made the controversy not a strike, but a lock-out.

The accuracy of this statement is further attested by Mr. Thomas Burns, of the Office of Production Management. Mr. Burns said:

> The company's rejection of the OPM recommendations now places responsibility for continuation of the deplorable situation squarely upon their shoulders.

Further substantiation of this view came from Mr. William Davis, who was Vice Chairman of the National Mediation Board and who took an active part in the settlement of the 1941 strike. He declared:

> The strike was caused because the employer did not accept the principle of collective bargaining in good faith.

This, then, is the background of Mr. William Ingles, another self-described author of the Taft-Hartley bill.

I hope that every Member of the Senate will take time or has taken time to read the pointed remarks of Congressman JOHN LESINSKI, of Michigan, a member of one of the conferences which considered this measure.

Mr. LESINSKI in his speech before the House yesterday made very clear the fact that the Taft-Hartley conference bill differs only in language—not in spirit—from the Hartley bill originally passed by the House, although it was presented to the Nation as substantially a "mild" bill along the lines of the original Taft bill.

By the way, I do not grant the validity of the statement that the original Taft bill was a mild bill. Even though the conference bill was thus advertised, the bill, in fact, retains every one of the 20 major points which Representative HARTLEY described as distinguishing his bill in the House of Representatives.

I shall not attempt to go into the undesirability of all of those major points, because I think they have been or will be well covered in the debate. However, there is one portion of the bill which is so patently undemocratic that I cannot refrain from calling attention to it in particular.

I refer to the provisions revising the laws by which voting on union security and other contractual relations are conducted. For example, in order for a union to receive authorization to make with an employer an agreement containing a union security clause, the union must obtain a favorable vote from a majority of all of the employees in the entire unit, regardless of whether they vote. In other words, an employee who, because of illness, disinterest, or any other reason fails to cast his vote in such an election is automatically recorded as voting "no" for all practical purposes. That is, indeed, a strange conception of democracy as it is practiced in this country. That is not the way we vote when we elect Governors, Members of the House of Representatives, and even Senators and Presidents. It is an entirely foreign idea injected into a bill which claims to bring about a greater degree of democracy in the conduct of union affairs.

The bill's restrictions on free speech on the part of unions and union spokesmen have been well covered in the debate on this floor, as well as in the veto message. I feel that such restrictions utterly contravene the constitutional guaranty of the right of free speech.

A corporation may hire whom it pleases—radio commentators, newsmen, or publicity experts—to influence elections or legislation as it pleases; but by the terms of this bill a union is even prohibited from publishing a voting record of a Member of Congress. If union members have thus to be expected to vote for or against a Member of Congress on the basis of something other than his voting record, I say our democracy has gone a long way from the principles of the founding fathers.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I can yield for a question to the distinguished and elcquent Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. The President of the United States has stated in his veto message that under this bill a labor-union newspaper——

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I can yield only for a question.

Mr. PEPPER. I am going to ask a question. I say that the President has stated in his veto message that this bill, if enacted, would forbid a union publication from editorially supporting or opposing a political party or a candidate in a political contest. Does the Senator from Idaho think that is in accord with the free press provision of our Federal Constitution?

Mr. TAYLOR. No; certainly I do not, Mr. President. I deplore those provisions in this bill.

Frankly, I am inclined to agree with the President that this thing may backfire, and all the radio commentators may find that they will be off the air, regardless of whether they work for a labor union or for some corporation. Indeed, I can see no good reason why a newspaper should be permitted to publish comments

about an election, if this bill becomes law, because the bill provides that no corporation can take part in an election, and certainly the average newspaper is owned by a corporation. The bill does not say anything about exempting a newspaper corporation.

Mr. President, inasmuch as the labor unions are, by this bill, forbidden to take any part in elections or political matters, either directly, indirectly, or in any other way, presumably the voters should vote for or against a Senator or a Member of the House of Representatives because of the way he combs his hair, the way he smiles, or perhaps even the efficacy of his technique in kissing babies; but certainly they would seem to be prohibited from voting in the truly American way on the basis of whether they favor or disapprove of the things for which the Members of Congress voted.

The steamroller tactics by which this bill was pushed through the House of Representatives have a parallel in the methods used to bludgeon public opposition to it.

I was encouraged and pleased to see the fine position taken by the National Catholic Welfare Conference with regard to this repressive labor bill.

The statement of the National Catholic Welfare Conference is, in part:

> The Taft-Hartley bill does little or nothing to encourage labor-management cooperation. On the contrary, it approaches the complicated problem from a narrow and excessively legalistic point of view.

I think that is a true and factual statement. I think it is a forthright and Christian statement coming from an organization of religious people.

I think the National Catholic Welfare Conference had not only the right but the duty to strike out at legislation which it deemed designed to grind down the living standards and well-being not only of laboring people but of everyone in this Nation.

When living standards are lowered, Mr. President, it leads to immorality in many cases. We know there is more lawlessness, more robberies, more crime, where there is poverty. And this Taft-Hartley bill is a bill to subject the laboring people to a regime of poverty.

So I think it is salutary for this Catholic organization, the welfare conference, to take cognizance of the great harm that can be accomplished by this bill, and to do something about it.

But, Mr. President, we hear a self-righteous criticism of the National Catholic Welfare Conference from a strange quarter. I have quoted Mr. David Lawrence previously on this floor. I often quote him when I want an authority of the utmost reliability on what is fashionable in reactionary circles. Mr. David Lawrence, who has won a position of eminence as a spokesman for big business in the United States, took occasion to chastise the conference severely for its temerity in rashly speaking its mind on a vital national issue, in an article published on Monday, June 16, 1947, in the Washington Evening Star.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I can yield for a question.

Mr. PEPPER. I am going to ask the Senator a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. TAYLOR. For a question.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator has quoted from the resolution of the Catholic Welfare Society opposing the proposed legislation. Does the Senator know of any single agency which is dedicated to humanitarianism in the United States which is trying to better the lot of the masses of the people of our country, which is agitating for the passage of this legislation?

Mr. TAYLOR. No, none. Of course, there are a number of organizations which claim to have the interest of everybody at heart. The National Association of Manufacturers spends millions upon millions of dollars trying to convince the American people that the National Association of Manufacturers is our Uncle Moneybags, just doing everything it can to help us.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield for a question.

Mr. PEPPER. My inquiry related to a humanitarian organization. That excluded the National Association of Manufacturers.

[Laughter in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There must be no manifestations of any kind on the part of the occupants of the galleries.

Mr. TAYLOR. No genuine humanitarian organization is trying to have the bill passed.

I may say that I am gratified to realize why the Presiding Officer is pounding his desk at various times. It is because of the trickles of laughter emanating from the galleries. A moment ago I thought I might be out of order when I offered the Senator from Louisiana a cough drop, and the Chair rapped on his desk. I thought that I was not in order, but I see it was because of the fact that there was a little laughter occasioned at that time. I assure the Chair that offering the Senator from Louisiana the cough drop was not meant to cause levity in any way. The Senator was coughing, and I thought he needed one, so I offered him one.

Mr. President, Mr. David Lawrence gratuitously attacked the statement made by the Catholic Welfare Conference, saying this:

> It is a partisan attack on the labor-relations bill now before President Truman for approval or disapproval.

Now that is indeed a strange criticism. It seems to me the sponsors of this bill were boasting that they had bipartisan support for the bill; that there was no partisanship in its backing. Yet when a private organization of Catholic laymen, admittedly not affiliated with either party, deigns to criticize the measure, they are accused of partisanship. The conference did not criticize the Republicans; it did not criticize the Democrats, it criticized the legislation. So there was nothing partisan about it. Its interest was simply in the welfare of the people of America, especially those who work.

Mr. President, I think there could well be added to the old saying that "man does not live by bread alone," the further statement that he certainly cannot live without some bread.

Mr. Lawrence's criticism does not stop with an allegation of partisanship. He continues:

> To mix the church with politics in America has long been looked upon with disfavor by laymen of all denominations.

Now that is an interesting assumption. Because a group of leading Catholic laymen criticize proposed legislation they are mixing in politics. It seems to me they are merely expressing concern for the welfare of their members, and all people. If the Catholic Church or any other church sought to take an active part in the Government of this Nation by collecting or receiving taxes or by having its officials perform governmental functions, I agree that such action would be mixing church and politics, and would be thoroughly undesirable. I would oppose it, no matter what denomination resorted to it.

I see no such threat here. And it is passing strange that no such anguished cries of mixing church and state were heard from Mr. Lawrence, or any other reactionary columnist or commentator supporting the pending legislation, when clergymen take a reactionary position.

But do not let them speak up for the working man, or they are butting into other peoples' business!

Mr. President, I am happy that our Catholic brethren in the United States have seen fit to take a fine, progressive view on this critical issue. It is the duty of the church to assist its members in developing physical, as well as spiritual, well-being, because the two are inextricably tied in together. As Benjamin Franklin said, an empty sack cannot stand erect.

Could it be that Mr. Lawrence abhors what he calls mixing church and politics when it goes against the grain of the National Association of Manufacturers, and yet silently applauds when such action redounds to the benefit of the forces which work against democracy?

Mr. President, I can think of no more concise and yet no more complete statement of the effect if the Taft-Hartley bill should become law than the words of the President in his message to the Congress, in which he said:

> The bill taken as a whole would reverse the basic direction of our national labor policy, inject the Government into private economic affairs on an unprecedented scale, and conflict with important principles of our democratic society. Its provisions would cause more strikes, not fewer. It would contribute neither to industrial peace nor to economic stability and progress. It would be a dangerous stride in the direction of a totally managed economy. It contains seeds of discord which would plague this Nation for years to come.

Those are the words of Harry Truman, President of the United States. The President's analysis of the bill shows that not only would it discriminate against laboring men and their unions and thus have an adverse effect upon the entire economy but by its very terms would so limit and complicate the action

of employers as to make more difficult rather than less difficult the settlement of disputes with labor organizations.

And in turning to the effect which this bill will have on our domestic economy and its correlative effect on international relations, the President is no less logical when he says:

I cannot emphasize too strongly the transcendent importance of the United States in the world today as a force for freedom and peace. We cannot be strong internationally if our national unity and our productive strength are hindered at home. Anything which weakens our economy or weakens the unity of our people—

That is what the President has to say. He continues—

as I am thoroughly convinced this bill would do—I cannot approve.

Those are the words of the President.

And then the President recalls that in disapproving this abomination of a bill he is not closing the door to just and necessary reforms in our labor laws. The President says:

In my message on the State of the Union which I submitted to the Congress in January 1947, I recommended a step-by-step approach to the subject of labor legislation. I specifically indicated the problems which we should treat immediately. I recommended that, before going on to other problems, a careful, thorough and nonpartisan investigation should be made, covering the entire field of labor-management relations.

The bill now before the Senate reverses this procedure.

It would make drastic changes in our national labor policy first and would provide for investigation afterward.

I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that a bill carrying out the President's recommendations in his message on the State of the Union last January was introduced in the form of an amendment to the Taft bill by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Pennsylania [Mr. MYERS], the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and myself.

I believe that the provisions of that bill which would curb jurisdictional disputes, smooth machinery for mediating labor disputes, and otherwise perfect our labor laws, should be approved by the Congress in order to provide a forward step in our entire labor-management relations.

Let us take this positive action rather than the negative, repressive, and depression-breeding action, representing an absolutely erroneous approach to the labor problem, of allowing the Taft-Hartley bill to become the law of the land. Let us embrace the last chance we have to repudiate it.

Mr. President, in connection with the matter of labor relations—and it is a matter that affects our whole economy, the functioning of our whole economy, the question of whether or not workers will have sufficient purchasing power with which to buy the goods produced, whether or not we shall have prosperity or depression—evidently we have got to reverse the trends which have been indicated here tonight—profits going up; purchasing power going down; prices going up. That situation must not continue, for it can only lead to ruin.

Another facet is the question of credit. As was pointed out, installment buying is increasing by leaps and bounds. Installment buying is a good thing for people who stay within their means, but some do not do that. Some people will buy when they cannot really expect to pay for a thing. It is not sound. That is what happened in the depression of 1929. Thousands of people bought things they could not pay for, and finally, when the national economy started downhill, they had to return what they had bought. The fellow who had sold the goods had no use for them; he went broke because he could not get his money for them.

But there is a larger field of credit, Mr. President, to which I wish to call attention. I should like to call the attention of the Senate to a very disturbing fear which is beginning to overtake our people.

It is the fear of another financial depression.

It is the small businessman's fear of bankruptcy.

It is the worker's fear of unemployment.

It is the farmer's fear of declining farm prices.

I share these fears, and I cannot take them lightly.

I cannot share the unruffled optimism of such members of the banking community as Mr. Winthrop A. Aldrich, retiring president of the International Chamber of Commerce and president of the Chase National Bank, who, in a speech made last week in Switzerland, referred to the prospects of what he blithely called a corrective recession in the United States.

This, indeed, exhibits an attitude of spartan courage. The banker does not fear the slight decline.

He faces the ravages of economic decline with head high.

Perhaps he will draw the velvet curtain of his club window a little closer, to shut out the sight of the poverty on the streets.

Or perhaps he is even too brave to do that, but merely closes the curtain so that the cold and the hungry will not see within the clubroom, and will build up unhealthy resentments.

Corrective recession, indeed.

Mr. President, let the banker try his optimism out on the unemployed, on the GI emerging from college and looking for a job, on the old man laid off because industry no longer requires marginal employables.

Let him stop the jalopies on the highway, and tell our migrant laborers that this is merely a corrective recession.

Let him tell that to the small businessman, who is forced into bankruptcy, and who watches in anguish while his life savings and his business prestige dissolve in despair.

Corrective, indeed. A ruler on the knuckles for the little fellow, who has been eating too much meat, whose children have been drinking too much milk. Let him cease and desist from union activity; he is making too much money anyway.

Mr. President, I hold no brief for or against Mr. Aldrich. But by a revealing word formulation he has made himself a symbol, a symbol well worth our attention.

We must decide now whether Congress will adjourn without taking action to prevent another depression.

Depressions are caused by a lack of purchasing power in the hands of the little people.

Inventories begin to pile up and the wheels grind down to a standstill and panic fills the land.

There is one sure way to prevent depression. That is to keep purchasing power widely spread. Are we doing that?

First, has our Joint Committee on the Economic Report made its reply to the President's suggestions—a reply due by law on February 15? No; it has failed to do so. It has missed its deadline.

If the head of any executive agency stood almost 4 months in default on a report due both Houses of Congress, he would have been excoriated, condemned, and chastised. But when a committee of Congress sees fit to fail to render a report when due, not a ripple perturbs the surface.

The majority party has decided that there are more important issues before the Congress. Canute has told the waves to be still.

Have we faced the threat of coming depression in our tax bill? No. We have passed a bill which gives millions to millionaires and pennies to the poor. It gives a great deal to the top brackets, but does nothing to increase purchasing power where it is required if a depression is to be prevented.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. TAYLOR. I may yield for a question.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator has spoken of what in effect the bill accomplishes. I wonder if it might be the opinion of the Senator that the labor bill is just the converse of the tax bill which the President recently vetoed, which action the House of Representatives sustained? Whereas the tax bill gave the benefit to the rich and little aid to the poor, the labor bill imposes a burden upon the working people and no obligations upon the employers.

Mr. TAYLOR. And now as the Senator from Florida points out, we come to a labor bill. By this bill are we strengthening labor unions in their efforts to increase wages—that is, increase purchasing power—of the average American?

No, we are crippling unions; we are doing our utmost to destroy them; we are racing backwards to the place where wages were fixed by the employer, and the worker took his pay or left it—he had no choice in the matter.

Mr. President, if a depression or recession, corrective or otherwise, or a

shake-out, or whatever one may want to call it, comes upon us, we can look back to this day, we can look back to this bill, and say: "That was the greatest step toward national financial ruin since the days of Herbert Hoover."

While purchasing power diminishes, wealth accumulates at the top. Are we doing anything to prevent a depression by retarding that accumulation at the top?

Are we doing anything to root out the gigantic weeds which choke and destroy the plants of small business?

We are failing to do that.

Let us see what we are doing to thwart the growth of monopoly.

What does the majority want us to do about the railroad monopoly problem?

It wants us to exempt the railroads from the antitrust laws.

Imagine! Mr. President, if a corrective recession is what is wanted, we certainly are on our way.

Cripple labor, tax small business, and exempt big business from the antitrust laws.

Mr. President, this proposal to trustify railroads and to lessen labor's bargaining power presents a very neat juxtaposition. It is one to shock the conscience of the American citizen.

I have often heard members of the majority assert that last November they were given a mandate to destroy the gains made for the common man by the Roosevelt administration. Mr. President, it is hard for me to reconcile that with the campaign promises, but I have grown used to the assertion.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield for a question.

Mr. McGRATH. I should like the distinguished Senator from Idaho to enlighten the Senate further by giving his views as to why the American people elected so many Republican Senators and Representatives in the last election. The Senator has given a partial answer.

Mr. TAYLOR. I can expound further on the subject. It was because, as I said, the housewife could not obtain canning sugar, and because she was obliged to present coupons for her sugar, and such things.

The people had forgotten about Hoover. Many of them were too young to remember Hoover, and the older ones had forgotten. So they did not vote for labor legislation, or anything else in particular. They simply vote against inconveniences.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield for a question.

Mr. McGRATH. I should like to ask the Senator to expand upon the theory as to whether, in the last election, the people voted for more meat or for the enslavement of labor.

Mr. TAYLOR. They voted against small irritations. They were told that if they would only get rid of the Democrats and the OPA there would be plenty of meat at reasonable prices. I can remember when that statement came from the other side almost every day. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] used to make a daily practice of telling us how meat was doing. The price had not gone up very much. Everything was simply lovely. Before the controls went off he assured us that everything would be fine. For some reason the Republicans have not bragged much lately. I do not know what the reason is.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield for a question.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to ask the Senator a question. First, I wish to give him a résumé——

Mr. TAYLOR. I will yield for a question; and if the Senator is out of order, I will depend upon the Chair to correct him.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In October of last year, just before the election, I went to Ohio——

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BALDWIN in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The point of order is that the Senator from South Carolina——

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am asking the Senator a question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The point of order is that it must be phrased as a question, and not as a statement.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. From the foregoing facts——

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PEPPER. Can the Presiding Officer tell whether a statement is a question or a declaration until it is finished?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. From the foregoing facts, I should like to ask the Senator from Idaho, when the people were voting last November, whether they were voting at that time on whether or not we should pass the labor legislation which we now have under consideration; or were the people at that time stirred up about the OPA, the want of meat, and things of that kind? To illustrate that point and throw a little light on the situation, just before the election I went to Ohio. I appeared on the radio at that time. A Republican was to have been there with me to answer questions. If I remember correctly, every question that came in to be answered on that day was along this line: "We want meat. When are we going to get it?" Nothing was said about labor. The only thing I could say was, "Well do I remember that in 1933"——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from South Carolina is making a speech and not asking a question.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am giving information as to what was taking place just before the election. I want to know whether at that time the people were asking for this labor legislation or were asking for something else.

Mr. TAYLOR. I can give the Senator an answer to that question, if I may illustrate with a little story.

In Fremont County, which is largely agricultural, our county chairman is a rather prosperous farmer. He has now retired and lives in town. The day after election he went out in the country to look at one of his farms, and stopped at a small crossroads store. He stopped there because he knew that the proprietor of the store was a Democrat, and he thought he would go in and commiserate with him a little. He said, "Bill, they beat hell out of us yesterday; didn't they?" Bill, the storekeeper, looked at him for a minute, and then said, "Joe, I voted Republican yesterday." Joe said, "No; you didn't." He replied, "Yes; I did." The farmer then asked him, "Why did you do that?" The reply was, "Well, I don't know. With all these coupons and regulations and everything, I just voted Republican. I know that they will get us into a mess. I think I will sell my store." [Laughter.]

So he voted Republican, and the day after election he was ready to sell his store and get out from under, to escape the "bust." Many will not have the foresight of that gentleman.

Mr. President, I am startled to learn that the bill goes much further than I expected. It now appears what the Republicans meant when they said that they had a mandate to upset the advances made in the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Woodrow Wilson said that the business of government was to organize the common interest against the special interests; but the Eightieth Congress has done just the opposite. I submit that in the Taft-Hartley labor bill it has sought to weaken the organization of the common interest. In the Reed-Bulwinkle bill the Senate strengthened the organization of the special interests by granting them special exemption from the antitrust laws.

INVESTMENT BANKING TRUST

Let me tell the Senate about the top monopoly in our great pyramid of monopolies. I refer to the money monopoly, the Wall Street top directorate. I think it will be highly relevant to this discussion to consider what is happening on the employer's side of the bargaining table, while we are pulling the chairs out from under the employees.

When we speak of Wall Street, the average person sees a porky individual with a fat cigar and a high hat, seated upon bulging money bags. This is the stereotype which has been created by caricaturists for the American people. I do not know whether Wall Streeters are fat or thin, or whether they smoke cigars or pipes; but I am very sure of what four exhaustive investigations by the Congress in the past 35 years have proved, and that is that Wall Street is still sitting on the money bags, and still has the power of life and death over American business, transportation, and industrial development.

What I mean by Wall Street is the Wall Street investment banker, the firms and individuals who purvey financial advice to large American corporations, who originate and purchase the stocks and bonds of corporations, and in turn sell such securities to the public.

For example, take the group centering around the so-called House of Morgan in Wall Street. According to the National Resources Committee, this includes the investment banking house of Morgan, Stanley & Co., Inc.; the Commercial Bank of J. P. Morgan & Co.; the First National Bank of New York; and 41 other large financial and industrial corporations closely grouped together by interlocking directorships and other associations. In 1939 the Morgan group included 13 industrial corporations headed by the United States Steel Corp., 12 utility corporations headed by the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 37 electric generating companies, 11 of the Nation's major railroads, and several important financial institutions. The total assets of the banks and trust companies alone in which the members of the Morgan firm held trusteeships, according to the records of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, amounted to $3,811,400,000.

Mr. President, the railroads in which the Morgan members held directorships had assets totaling $3,430,000,000. The public utility and holding companies had assets of $6,222,000,000. The insurance companies had assets of $337,000,000. The industrial corporations had assets of more than $6,000,000,000. In grand total the Morgan members held 126 directorships in 89 corporations with total assets of more than $20,000,000,000. This was called "incomparably the greatest reach of power in private hands in our entire history."

There are similar groups of lesser magnitude centered around other important investment banking houses as well.

Perhaps, Mr. President, we now see why the cartoonists draw pictures of the big man on the money bags. Why does the investment banker sit at the top of the pile of money? Why is he such a powerful figure in our national life? The investment banker is a person of great wealth only in rare instances. Since the Banking Act of June 16, 1933, he has had to cease making deposits, doing a commercial banking business, and has had to confine himself to the business of selling securities and financial advice. In fact, the firm of Morgan, Stanley & Co. admits to capital assets of less than $5,000,000.

As a group the leading investment bankers parcel out business, decide which enterprise may or may not have access to large-scale credit, and set the prices, terms, and conditions of sale at which companies may secure their capital and at which their securities are sold to the public. The leading investment houses form a tight little group organized by custom and mutual understanding. They may quarrel among themselves, but they form a united front against any outsider, and whoever poaches on their preserves does so at his own grave risk. No one investment banking house has a complete monopoly, but a group of a dozen leading firms effectively dominate all business of investment banking. Corporations needing money, Mr. President, and investors needing securities to buy have to meet the banker's terms or go without.

The great investment banking houses have access to confidential information unavailable to others.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President——

Mr. TAYLOR. So, if they care to adjourn at any time they will not lose any advantage——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield for a question.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. If the Senate will agree to it, would not the Senator like to listen to the President at 10 o'clock out of courtesy to him?

Mr. TAYLOR. Oh, of course, I would like to listen to the President, but I do not think it is possible to get the Senate to agree to let me listen to the President of the United States. He is a Democrat.

Mr. President, as I have said, the great investment banking houses have access to confidential financial information.

I will say to the Senator from South Carolina that the Senate did not even want the people to listen to the President of the United States until after they had rendered moot the subject of his speech and done away with any reason for delivering it.

The great banking houses have access to confidential information unavailable to others. They receive secret monthly and quarterly reports from corporations which the ordinary stockholders never see. They interlock on the boards of numerous corporations and financial institutions. The relative strength and influence of investment bankers within their own tight little group can very easily be measured. In 1938 the Investment Bankers' Association reported a total membership of 723 dealers in securities having 1,410 offices located in 210 cities in 40 States. Thirty-eight leading investment bankers dominated the entire field, having sold in a 5-year period in the 1930's 91 percent of all stock issues registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission and offered to the public. In other words, 5 percent of the investment houses dominated 91 percent of the business. Six leading firms——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I will yield for a question only.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I was out of the Senate Chamber and have been informed that the Senator from Idaho has served notice that he will talk until noon tomorrow.

Mr. TAYLOR. I said I was going to talk until we recessed. I would be willing to agree on a vote next week but I insist that we accord the President the courtesy of letting the country read his veto message before we vote.

Mr. WHERRY. I would like to say to the Senator that in view of that statement he may be interested to know that we had already determined, if it be the pleasure of the Senate, to stay in session as long as it takes to get a vote on this bill, if it takes all night, tomorrow, tomorrow night, the next day and the next night, until we finally get a vote on the pending measure.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to hear the Senator say that. That will indeed call attention to the tactics being employed by the majority party in trying to railroad this measure through before the American people have an opportunity to read the President's message, hear what he has to say, make up their minds, and get some word to their Senators as to how they feel about this measure.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAYLOR. No. I refuse to yield. I am just getting going now. [Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent——

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the point of order.

Mr. TAYLOR. I will yield for a question.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Senator has yielded. He had declined to yield before, which he had the right to do. He has now yielded, so that the point of order is not in order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, we have to have some decision; we have to have someone say what is the pleasure of the Senate and what the procedure will be; and I ask this question of the Senator, in view of the statement he made: If the Senator wants to have the information, and an announcement is made to the Senate that we expect to stay in session tonight, and tomorrow, and tomorrow night, or as long as it will take to get a vote on this measure, does it not seem to the Senator that that gives ample opportunity for everyone to debate the question? It is my humble opinion that this is such an important measure that there ought to be continuous debate until a vote is had upon it.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, that is a very interesting statement. I am sure that the American people appreciate the devotion to the cause of labor displayed by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I am sure the American people appreciate it; yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question from me?

Mr. TAYLOR. For a question, I shall be happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator from Idaho understand that the Senator from Nebraska announced that we would violate the Sabbath here, if necessary, in order to vote on this measure?

Mr. TAYLOR. That would not be the first blow at religion delivered by the Republican majority of this Congress. We changed our Chaplain the first thing in the session. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. A moment ago the Senator from Idaho called attention to the fact—and I am prefacing my question with a remark—that he wanted some Christianity in this bill. It is within the rules of the Senate for the Senate to meet on Sunday, if there is an emergency. I agree with the Senator from

Idaho that the principles of Christianity are involved herein.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. And as a Christian and as an active member of a church, I think it is within the province of the Senate to be in session on Sunday to settle such an important issue as the one which now confronts the people of the United States, and I think the people will deeply appreciate it.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho will state it.

Mr. TAYLOR. I move to strike out the remarks of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator yield to any Senator who is on the opposite side of this problem, to permit him to point out anything in this bill that has any Christianity in it?

Mr. TAYLOR. I will yield to any Senator for that purpose, if the Chair will permit me to yield. I will even be discriminatory in my yielding; if a ruling is made that I cannot yield to Democratic Senators except for questions, but that I can yield to Republicans, such as the majority whip, for speeches, I shall abide by that ruling, if Senators wish to have that done.

No, Mr. President; I agree with the Senator from Nebraska that this is a great Christian issue; we must vote on it right away, for we have the laboring man down, with our foot on his face, and we must not let him up, for if people hear what is going on, they might insist that we let go our half-Nelson hold, and then we might have to desist in this crusade to "uplift" the workingman down to a dollar a day. Perhaps Senators on the other side of the aisle have never heard of the Biblical admonition that the laborer is worthy of his hire. I may say that when they talk about staying in session, there is a group of us on this side of the aisle who are prepared to stay in session indefinitely for the sake of the American workingman and the American working public in general.

[Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The occupants of the galleries will be in order. If there is any further demonstration, which is against the rules of the Senate, it will be necessary to have the galleries be cleared.

The Senator from Idaho will proceed.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I should like to say, on behalf of the occupants of the galleries, and in connection with the statement that the galleries are out of order, that I have heard more applause in the galleries on issues less important to the American people than this, without the galleries having been admonished by the Chair.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, let me return to a discussion of the investment bankers.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate very much the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, but I submit to the Chair that the galleries are out of order in making any demonstration in the Senate Chamber. In fact, after——

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am stating a point of order. In view of the traditions of the Senate of the United States, the greatest legislative body in the world, I think we should preserve inviolate the Senate's traditions; and I suggest to the distinguished present occupant of the Chair that he has ruled in keeping with the Senate rule, and that it is out of order for the occupants of the galleries to make any demonstration of any kind. That rule has been adhered to as long as I have been a Member of the Senate, and I think that rule should be explicitly applied, not only now, but always.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, if I may answer the remarks which the Senator from Nebraska has made——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair asks the Senator from Michigan to withhold his inquiry until the Senator from Rhode Island states his question.

Mr. McGRATH. I think the remarks of the distinguished majority whip are entirely out of order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho has the floor. Does he yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President——

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I cannot refuse to yield to a point of order, can I?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Michigan for the purpose of having him state his point of order or parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. FERGUSON. I make the point of order that the Senator from Idaho has lost the floor by permitting the Senator from Rhode Island to make a speech intervening in the speech of the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I make the point of order——

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that the Senator from Rhode Island was discussing the recent point of order.

At this point, the Chair will read the rule, so that Senators who may not be altogether familiar with it and the occupants of the galleries may understand what the rule is:

> Whenever confusion arises in the Chamber or the galleries, or demonstrations of approval or disapproval are indulged in by the occupants of the galleries, it shall be the duty of the Chair to enforce order on his own initiative and without any point of order being made by a Senator.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McGRATH. What Senator has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho has the floor.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield for a question.

Mr. McGRATH. Lest I do the case of labor justice some harm, I shall not take advantage of my opportunity to answer the remarks of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I have not yielded——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. I rise to question whether the Senator from Idaho yielded for a comment.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I had not yielded for a comment.

Let me say that six leading banking firms—Morgan Stanley & Co., Inc., the First Boston Corp., Dillon Read & Co., Kuhn, Loeb & Co., Smith Barney & Co., and Blyth & Co.—constituting less than 1 percent of all the investment bankers in the United States, managed 57 percent of all the business. Morgan Stanley managed more than 23 percent of all the business.

In case anyone should get the idea that I am doing this because I am subservient to any labor group, I should like to repeat, once more, that there are only about 15,000 organized laborers in Idaho, and I am doing this because I feel it is best for the people of America, the small businessmen, and particularly the farmers, who make up the great bulk of the people in my State of Idaho.

In opposing the passage of this bill and in my efforts to hold up this decision for a reasonable length of time, until the people have had a chance to look into this bill and find out how thoroughly vicious, how un-American, and how disastrous to the future of the country it can be, I believe I am doing the correct thing. I believe I am thoroughly justified in taking this stand. I may say that if the representatives of the majority party in the Senate wish to get tough and stick out their chins and tell us that they are going to stay here all night, that is just fine. However, in that case I shall ask the indulgence of the occupants of the galleries, for it will be a little difficult for me to keep my voice raised sufficiently to be heard throughout the Chamber, in which the acoustics are not very good. I would rather take it a little easier, if I have to talk for such a long period of time.

Mr. President, this select group of New York firms kept all the best business for itself.

During the period referred to in the 1930's, no investment banking firm located outside of New York managed any first grade registered bond issue. The lower the grade of securities the larger the relative importance of the firms out-

side of New York City. The gravy was kept for the elect and the crumbs were dusted off to what they call the "hinterlands."

Mr. President, our people are concerned about the fact that the wealth of the West is owned and controlled from offices in New York, rather than from offices in Boise, Salt Lake City, Spokane, Portland and Seattle.

Our power companies, our railroads, our air lines, our telephone companies, our chain stores, and many of our industries are controlled, not by the people who live among them, work among them and use them, but by a relatively small group of Wall Street financiers.

This is how the investment bankers sit on top of the money pile. The figures I have just mentioned are proof positive that the channels for the control of credit in this country—the money that makes the wheels of enterprise turn—is wholly in the hands of a small but powerful group of investment bankers. Out of approximately nine billions of registered industrial securities issued and sold to the public from 1935 to 1939, the top group of investment bankers—the present-day money trust—handled eight and one-half billions.

A dozen firms in Wall Street can thus control the flow of this essential of our economy.

The investment banker occupies a key position. A director of an industrial corporation who is also an important investment banker is in a position to decide as an industry man that the company should issue securities and sell them to himself as a banker. As an investment banker he is in a position to fix the price at which they are to be taken and the price they are to be sold to the public.

He is on both sides of the table at one and the same time, and he is bargaining with himself. What he says goes, whether the corporation likes it or not. It cannot be otherwise.

Being a banker-industrialist, he buys the securities from his own corporation at a price and on terms which he has a share in fixing. Then he sells these securities as a banker to insurance companies and financial institutions in which he or his associates are able to exercise some control as directors.

Often the issue of the securities may be undertaken not because the corporation particularly needs the money, but because the market for securities has been favorable. For example, the tremendous number of new railroad issues that were floated during the hectic 1920's had little relation to efficiency or improvement of railroad property or service. In consequence, many railroads found themselves overextended with valueless or uneconomical operating properties and burdened with tremendous amounts of capital indebtedness.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the Senator for a question.

Mr. KILGORE. I wonder if the Senator from Idaho is aware that the investment bankers connected with these corporations probably draw far more of their income in the way of salaries from the profits of the corporations by means of fixing prices than they do from their investments as investment bankers. I wonder if the Senator from Idaho is aware of that fact.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am aware that they have many angles. I have been studying the situation, and it is really a revelation, I will say to the Senator from West Virginia. They have them going and coming and turning around all the time.

I do not need to recount the history of railroad financing in the United States. These unbalanced financial structures caused a wave of bankruptcies among railroads. After the railroads went bankrupt and the stockholders took their losses, the investment bankers, who had sold the stock in the first place, and insurance companies maneuvered themselves into controlling positions on the reorganization committees of the very same railroads. The stockholders were out in the cold.

Frequently, Mr. President, the bankers called upon the Government's Reconstruction Finance Corporation to bail them out. I regret to say that the recent investigation by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] of the RFC's dealings with the B. & O. reveal that these arrangements were not always conducted on a high plane, to say the least. But the man on the money bags sees to it that none of his activities as a corporation director harms his interests as a banker.

His first loyalty is not to the corporation on whose board he sits and to which his loyalty and fealty legally belong but to the investment banker he secretly represents. He is, in short, a Trojan Horse on the corporation's board of directors.

Mr. President, this sort of protective activity cripples efficiency of our industries. Inventions remain undeveloped, and advances in operating techniques and production are delayed. For example, the president of the Chesapeake & Ohio Railroad has publicly charged that the introduction of air conditioning into railroad coaches was discouraged because it would have forced the Morgan-controlled Pullman Co. into what was stupidly regarded as unnecessary expense.

In short, the bankers are taking the word "enterprise" out of their phrase "private enterprise."

Now, some may ask, Why cannot corporations shop around and get credit facilities and financing elsewhere in Wall Street? Why cannot new enterprises and corporations needing credit secure funds from the controlling coterie of investment bankers?

In the first place, that question partially answers itself, and the answer is in another question:

Does anyone believe, Mr. President, that a responsible group of industrialists could have secured capital funds from the Wall Street investment bankers to bid on the great United States owned Geneva steel plant in Utah?

Of course not.

Does anyone believe that the Morgan group would have provided the means for creating competition affecting the interests of the United States Steel Co., the largest industrial unit in the Morgan group—or would they permit anyone else in Wall Street to provide such financial backing? To ask that question is to answer it.

Mr. President, does anyone believe that the Morgan group would provide capital to the railroads they dominate to replace antiquated ice cars with automatic refrigeration when the same group has a financial stake in retaining the old-fashioned equipment? In other words, they own it and rent it to the railroads, so why should they get rid of it?

Does anyone believe, Mr. President, that Henry Kaiser could have secured from the Wall Street investment bankers the financial resources to build a new plant to manufacture a competitive automobile, with a different labor policy, in competition with General Motors?

The investment bankers who handled automobile financing for many years turned Kaiser down flat. Henry Ford, too, knew better than to go near the Wall Street investment bankers. When he needed additional credit he was forced to go to his dealers and to draw on his own financial resources. He wanted to keep control of the great enterprise he had built up from a bicycle shop.

But the real reason why corporations needing money cannot shop around in Wall Street is that the investment bankers do not compete. The people who sit on the money bags do not consider competition ethical.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I can yield for a question, and I will be happy to do that.

Mr. McGRATH. I was very much interested in what the Senator was saying.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to make inquiry as to whether the Senator from Idaho is yielding to the Senator from Rhode Island merely for the purpose of his asking a question?

Mr. TAYLOR. That is the only purpose for which I have yielded. I expect the Chair to protect my interests in this matter.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to ask if the Chair really understands that the Senator from Idaho has yielded for the purpose of a question being asked?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so understands. Will the Senator from Rhode Island state his question?

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I would like to say that I would not ask the Senator to yield for the purpose of taking the floor away from him. I was very much interested in his bringing into this discussion the name of Mr. Henry Kaiser, and I wanted to ask the Senator if he realized that Mr. Henry Kaiser is probably the first American in this generation who has had the courage to go ahead and promote new enterprises against the monopolistic influences of

which the Senator is speaking to a greater extent than any other industrialist?

I also wanted to include in my question, since I must put my remarks in the form of a question, whether the Senator knew that committees of the United States Senate, as of today, are trying to put in the way of Mr. Kaiser and his enterprises every embarrassment that they possibly can, as against the entrenched interests against whom he is trying to compete. Is the Senator aware of that?

Mr. TAYLOR. May I say to the Senator from Rhode Island, I was not aware of the fact that committees were hounding Mr. Kaiser, or were after him. Of course, Henry Ford had the temerity also to not let himself become enslaved to the money bags. Another one who is having a scrap with them, more or less successfully, is Robert Young, who seems to be getting along fairly well in his fight with Wall Street. But individuals seldom get away with it, Mr. President.

Of course, they never say that they do not compete, or that they do not believe in competition. They give free enterprise and competition a lot of lip service and rationalize their behavior in a dozen different ways. But the fact remains that the precious rule of the investment banking fraternity is one of phony ethics by which it is declared unprofessional to come to the financial relief of any corporation which is already the customer or client of another investment banker.

I do not want to talk irreverently of the business hierarchy so close to its shrine, but I am prompted to ask, How different is this from the days of the beer barons, when the mob in the Bronx did not "muscle in" on the territory of the Manhattan mob and vice versa?

And the people who sit on the money bags force these ethics down the throats of their subordinate firms and associates. For example, when several investment banking firms and their affiliated or associated security dealers are organized to market securities for a particular corporation the group is called a syndicate, and its members, underwriters.

Thus the good will of the combination of investment bankers must be solicited and their favor courted by dealers and smaller firms if they are to continue in business. In the hierarchy of investment banking, J. P. Morgan & Co., is known as the Corner. When matters are in dispute or differences of opinion arise, it is the Corner which issues the orders and gives the final word.

With the investment bankers calling their shots it is no surprise to find that they have profited handsomely from their transactions. And the people who pay the freight are the securities buyers—the public, you, me, and Aunt Jane, who has a few dollars to invest.

The investment bankers, it must be remembered, purchase the securities from the corporation at one price and resell them to the public at a higher price.

The difference in prices—the spread—is the banker's profits. In the days before the Securities and Exchange Commission, this spread was often 5 to 8 points. That is, five to eight dollars on every hundred dollars worth of securities sold went into the pockets of the bankers. This was a toll levied on the corporations and on the public.

In a $100,000,000 issue, for example, the bankers got from $5,000,000 to $8,000,000 as their take. Their out-of-pocket expenses were only an infinitesimal fraction of this sum. Within recent years the "spread" has been reduced.

Mr. President, I have been thinking the matter over and to me it is indeed strange that this piece of legislation, the labor bill, is the only piece of legislation in the consideration of which the majority party has seen fit to force night sessions so as to hurry it along. Is there a dead line with respect to it? I do not know of any. I believe there is no appropriation connected with the bill. There is a great hurry, however, a great urgency exhibited with respect to it. I think I have discovered the reason for the haste, Mr. President. The whole proposition stinks to high heaven, and the Republicans do not want it around so long that the people can smell it.

Mr. President, we do not seem to have time nor the inclination to take up housing legislation. The people need homes. Housing legislation is one matter respecting which we should stay up nights working on. It is only proper that we should do so, because there are many people sitting up tonight, or sleeping in chairs. Only the Lord knows where they are sleeping, because they do not have decent, proper housing accommodations. But we should worry! We are Senators! We all have houses. I was renting a house, but I bought one. Of course, if I had not been a Senator I could not have done so. I had to borrow some money and make a down payment on the house. If I had not been a Senator I could not have borrowed the money. But I have a place to live. All God's children have places to live if they are United States Senators. But there are many people who do not have places in which to live.

Of course Congress passed one rent-control bill applying to the country generally, and there is another for the District of Columbia. We turned the people of the country over to the tender mercies of the 15-percent landlord. The bill which deals with the District of Columbia is of an altogether different color, however. I think the same old bill has been renewed so Senators and Representatives will not get stuck with the 15-percent increase. Members of Congress are going to fix things up nicely for themselves. They do not, however, have time to pass housing legislation. They have time to pass the Bulwinkle bill exempting the railroads from the antitrust laws. They have time to pass the rent-control bill raising the ceiling 15 percent, and making provision that a landlord can nail up a door between two parts of his house, thus dividing it up into two sections, where before there was only one section, and thus come out from under rent control. By so doing he can charge more for each section which he has divided by nailing a door between them, than he could charge before for the whole place.

Mr. President, the 15-percent increase across the board is mere chicken feed. That is nothing to what landlords are going to receive as a result of the passage of the so-called rent-control bill. That bill is as big a farce as was the bill which a year ago purported to extend the OPA. We were told that under it we had price control, but all the bill did was to make price increases mandatory. And now, see the fix we are in. Prices have gone completely through the roof; they have gone sky high; and there is no hope of bringing them back again.

I was astounded the other day when the able Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], the present occupant of the chair, suggested on the floor of the Senate that an investigation be had into high prices. Does the Senator not know that it was the Republicans in Congress who scuttled OPA? Of course he does not know that. He was not here at the time, and I can excuse him for his genuine concern for the common people. He was not here when the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the capable Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] almost got into a fist fight one day over who should have the most credit for killing the OPA. For a long time they boasted about it. I wish they would get up and boast about it on the floor of the Senate tonight. It would be very helpful under the circumstances. After boasting about how they killed the OPA, they said, "Look, you can get meat. The price is up to about a dollar, but it will come down in a few days to 50 cents." But the price did not come down. I grant that we did succeed in getting meat at a high price. But the price did not come down so the low-income family still does not get meat.

Finally the bragging appeared to peter out for some reason. They have learned better than to brag. But they will keep us here 4 or 5 days in an endeavor to have the pending legislation passed, and get labor all tied up in a knot, and the whole country tied up in a knot, and we will probably have more strikes than the country has ever seen.

Mr. President, if I were a laboring man—and I was one not very long ago—and if I were working in a plant I would not pick up another tool until they had changed the legislation. I would let my tools lie idle; and I am afraid that is what the workers of America are going to do. They are going to show that they just cannot be kicked around.

Mr. President, I feel that if we can forestall action on this measure for a few days we might be able to defeat the bill. As I pointed out, the only reason I am taking the time of the Senate now is to try to hold up action on the measure until next week. Tuesday would be an agreeable time to me on which to vote on it. That would give Senators and others the opportunity to go down to Georgia to the dedication ceremonies at the place where President Roosevelt spent so many happy hours—as happy hours as a man in his physical condition could have. I am sure, however, he was a very happy man because of the many good things he did for people. After all, the greatest happiness that can come to anyone in this world accrues from serving his fellow men.

I sometimes feel sorry for Republicans. How unhappy they must be, because they are always trying to do somebody instead of doing something for somebody. Of course, they are doing something for the fellows who do not need anything done for them. That does not result in any real satisfaction. My conscience would hurt me terribly if I did such things. But then I guess it takes all kinds of people to make a world. So we have Bulwinkle bills, and labor bills, and rent-decontrol bills, and we have tax bills that help the rich and do not help the poor.

Since the introduction of competitive bidding by the SEC in 1941 for the securities of registered public-utility holding companies, and by the ICC in 1944, with respect to railroad bonds, the average banker "spreads"—that is, the profits—have been reduced by half. This means more money for the railroads and public utilities and better bargains for the investing public which wants these securities. The investment bankers, with two exceptions, bitterly fought the adoption of competitive bidding and still seek to discredit it.

Perhaps there will be a law to exempt the bankers from the antitrust laws one of these days. If there is not, it will be because they never thought of having one of their lawyers draw it up and hand it to some Member on the majority side.

Moreover, competitive bidding does not extend to include the vast field of industrial securities.

The most recent Roper poll in Fortune magazine demonstrated that the banking and stock-exchange reform legislation of the past 15 years has been the most appreciated legislation that the Congress has ever enacted. But the banking fraternity is still awaiting the day when Republican majorities in Congress will be large enough to make it possible quietly to repeal this protective legislation. They will slip it by in the dead of night, after people have gone to bed, as they are trying to do in this case. But the people are not going to bed. Look at them in the galleries. They are going to stay around and watch to see what happens.

It is a comforting thought to know that the President of the United States has also been talking to the people for the past few minutes on this subject, trying to forestall this catastrophe.

We owe more money than does any other country in the world, but we have not yet found out that we are broke, and the other countries have.

The situation is illustrated by the old story of the soldier who was fighting the Germans in the First World War. It is an old joke. One day he went over the top. He threw away his gun and took out his razor, a weapon with which he was more familiar. He passed a German soldier and took a swipe at him. The German said, "Ha, you never touched me." The boy said, "The heck I didn't. Just wait until you try to move your head." [Laughter.] We are likely to move our head one of these days and find out that we are bankrupt, that our throat has been cut. We had better be careful not to get into situations of that kind, where we have to move our head and find it out. It is all right if we never turn our head. If the German had never turned his head, and had kept going, he might have lived to a ripe old age. If we get into a big economic upheaval, the people will become frightened. That is all that is necessary. Of course the Republicans will have to assume the responsibility for it, but that will not help a Democrat to get something to eat.

Coming back to the banks again, the fundamental structure of the investment banking business, the traditional relationships between the Wall Street investment banking firms and their domination and control over the corporations whose securities they sell, have been unaltered. The great financial and economic power of those investment bankers has only recently been challenged by the Government in an attack launched against their monopolistic and restrictive practices.

Mr. President, I suppose that the President of the United States has now finished speaking. The people have heard what he has to say. Now they can start thinking about the subject, and after that they can inform their Senators how they feel about it. As the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] said, I am particularly interested in our industrialists, our businessmen. They have been for this measure but some of their ablest leaders have in recent weeks sensed its dangers. I am particularly concerned that they should have a full, complete, and understandable description of the bill from someone who could not possibly afford to misrepresent it. That would be the President of the United States. I believe that when the small businessmen, the big businessmen, the farmers, and the rest of our citizens get this report and have an opportunity to study it, there will be a decided change in the thinking of Americans.

I feel that possibly even some of the excited editorial writers may wake up and change their tune.

As I have stated, it is not a hopeless undertaking, and one which I would not attempt, unreasonably to delay the vote on the veto message. I know that there are a number of Senators who are not strongly committed on this question. They have felt that we needed some legislation. They are doubtful as to the wisdom or efficacy of this particular measure. They are on the fence, so to speak. If they felt that the folks back home were supporting them a little more, they would be only too happy to change their votes and sustain the President's veto.

I do not expect to change the attitude of any legislators who are violently opposed to labor—men like the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who sponsored the bill, and any number of other Senators on the other side of the aisle who would like to hamstring labor completely. I would not try to change the attitude of the junior Senator from New York, who participated so actively in its preparation.

No; I do not expect to change them. There are some Senators on the other side of the aisle and some on this side who do not feel strongly about this matter and who would be glad if they thought their constituents felt that way. It would be well, Mr. President, for them to change their views and spare us this catastrophe.

After an epochal investigation lasting some thirty months the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice has at last come to grips with the combination of Wall Street investment bankers that bestride American industry and finance. At long last it is to be hoped that the Antitrust Division can break the power of the investment banker.

We can soon look forward to action to make it possible for businessmen to have freer access to the capital which the general public wants to invest. We can look forward to the day when they will be able to get that capital on competitive terms. Both the borrower—the businessman who wants to finance his plant operations—and the lender—the members of the general public with money to invest—will profit by this action of the Antitrust Division. The only loser will be the middle man—the investment banker.

And, above all, this will reduce the control—the stifling, unimaginative, selfish, and unenterprising stranglehold—which investment bankers now maintain over business. It will pave the way for self-management of American business and industry.

No longer should the influence of Wall Street be paramount in merging and combining competing companies, and in the creation of great combinations of economic power.

In our economy it is essential that industry and business, both small-scale and large, should have free and unhampered access to the capital markets.

To hope for any less is to turn back to Wall Street a large share of the direction of the future of our country.

And that, Mr. President, is the surest way to financial crisis, panic, depression—or, as Wall Street itself now calls it, "corrective recession."

Mr. President, a few moments ago the Senator from Nebraska, the majority whip, was talking about its being a very Christian thing to put this bill through as fast as is possible. Indeed! I wish he were here and that I could yield to him for the privilege of having him point out what is Christian about this bill.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I can yield for a question only, I will have to admonish my friend.

Mr. McGRATH. I was about to suggest that probably a quorum call would bring to the floor the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. TAYLOR. I cannot yield for a quorum call. I would probably lose the floor; so there will be no quorum call for many hours.

Mr. President, what is Christian about the proposition of denying the workingman the right to associate himself with his fellow workers for the purpose of seeking to maintain his standard of living and his wages? Especially what is Christian about it in face of the fact that the profits of corporations have risen to fantastic heights, while the take-home pay of all workers has

decreased approximately $5,000,000,000? I have seen that kind of Christians, Mr. President; I have seen plenty of them; they go to church every day of the week, if they can find a church open every day of the week; and when they are not in church they are busy skinning someone out of his eye teeth. That is the kind of Christianity embodied in this bill, Mr. President. What semblance of Christianity is there in telling the working people that they cannot associate themselves, exercise their collective influence in any way, shape, or form, to see that they do not get the kind of Senators who occupy so many seats and are able to pass this sort of legislation to enslave the workingman? Some Senators want to enslave the workingmen and make it impossible for them ever to take any action to free themselves. That is all very clever, very Christian, Mr. President—very Christian, I must say!

While we are on the subject of who is a Christian and who is not, I should like to read a statement signed by 642 prominent religious leaders representing all parts of the country. What are they urging, Mr. President? Are they urging the passage of the Taft-Hartley bill because it is the Christian measure described by my good friend the Senator from Nebraska? Are these religious leaders urging that it be passed? No, Mr. President, they are urging a veto of the Taft-Hartley labor bill.

Representing the National Clergymen's Committee on the Taft-Hartley bill, a four-man delegation bearing the petition was to visit the White House. The delegation was to include the Reverend John Duffy of New York City; Rabbi Ira Sud of Arlington, Va.; Father Charles Owen Rice, and the Reverend Sheldon Rahn, secretary of the committee.

May I warn these gentlemen, Mr. President, that they had better watch out or David Lawrence will find out about it. If he does he will write them up in his column and say they are interfering and mixing church and state and that they should not be urging a veto of this bill. They ought to let the Republicans get the workers down and keep their heads under water until they suffocate.

Among those supporting the delegation are: Bishop William Scarlett, of Missouri; Father William Kelly, of Brooklyn; Dr. David De Sola Pool, of New York City; Dr. Sidney E. Goldstein, of New York City; Dr. Liston Pope, of New Haven, Conn.; Father Wilfrid Parsons, of Washington; Rabbi Bernard Segal, of New York City; Rev. Donald Harrington, of New York City; Rabbi Julius Mark, of Nashville; Bishop Charles K. Gilbert, of New York City; Rev. Ernest Fremont Tittle, of Chicago; Bishop Edward L. Parsons, of California; Bishop Francis J. McConnell, of New Haven; Rev. William Lloyd Imes, of Dundee, N. Y.

This is a roll of honor, a group of clergymen who have issued a statement urging that the Taft-Hartley bill be vetoed. I would not doubt that every really true Christian in America, if he were familiar with this bill, would urge its defeat.

I resume giving the names of these clergymen:

Father Richard B. Lavelle, of Brooklyn; Dr. Howard Thurman, of California; Father Joseph F. Buckley, of Brooklyn; Rabbi Manuel Laderman, of Denver; Father M. Sidney Rushfort, of Brooklyn; Father Philip Dobson, of Jersey City; Dean Walter Muelder, of Boston; Father Joseph Hammond, of Brooklyn; Rev. Edwin McNeill Poteat, of Rochester, N. Y.; and Bishop Walter Mitchell, of California.

I like the way these names are all mixed up here—fathers, rabbis, and reverends.

Father Philip Dobson, of Jersey City, N. J.; Dean Walter Muelder, of Boston, Mass.; Father Joseph Hammond, of Brooklyn. Mr. President, a great many good people come from Brooklyn, it seems. All of them seem to have a soft spot in their hearts for the workingman. They are against this bill.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield for a question to my good friend, the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. McGRATH. Does the Senator subscribe to the belief that a clergyman in these United States cannot express his views on an economic question without being accused of making an attempt to mix the church and the state?

Mr. TAYLOR. I did not understand the full implication of the Senator's question. I should be glad to have him repeat it.

Mr. McGRATH. The Senator from Idaho spoke of an article by David Lawrence in which he stated that he resented the fact that certain people who have some responsibility for the morals and social welfare of our people have dared to express their views, in accordance with their rights as free Americans. Does the Senator from Idaho subscribe to the view of Mr. Lawrence that because a man happens to be of the cloth, he thereby is precluded from expressing his views on economic and social and political questions.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I say to the Senator that I disagree with that view of Mr. David Lawrence's, and I may add that I do not recollect ever reading anything which he wrote that I did agree with.

Mr. McGRATH. Does the Senator from Idaho agree that an expression of that kind by a columnist is worthy of the severest condemnation in the Senate of the United States—a comment of that sort from a man who proposes to silence the voice of morality in this country, as against his own, self-proclaimed right of expressing his views on politics and economics and unmoral issues?

Mr. TAYLOR. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island that I have been condemning Mr. David Lawrence for that statement as vigorously as I possibly could, here on the floor of the Senate. I think he is absolutely wrong. I think it is one of the first duties—possibly not the first duty; I suppose the first duty of a clergyman is to look after our souls; but after our soul has departed this body for lack of sustenance, he will have a hard time looking after it. So I think the second duty of a clergyman is to see that the physical man is taken care of, that the worker has a chance to earn a decent living, and certainly that little children have a decent break in this world and decent food, and are able to consume the oranges and other citrus fruits that are going to waste in Florida. Of course, we note that the consumption of milk has fallen off 7 percent. There is only one answer to that: The children are going without the milk they need.

Certainly any clergyman can speak out against this unspeakable piece of legislation, and can assert that the workers have a right to get their wages up to a point where they are able to buy the milk that is being produced but is not being sold. Surely that is Christian.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator whether he agrees that the promotion of social justice in our country is the primary work of the church.

Mr. TAYLOR. Certainly social justice is one of the most important things that can possibly be done by any church, because if a man has security, a decent place to live, where he can raise a family, and if he is assured a steady income, be will have time to think; and when a man has time to think, his thoughts turn to the immortal and the meaning of life and, indeed, when a man begins to think those thoughts, there can be only one conclusion, namely, that there is an Almighty, an Omnipotent Being; and, naturally, his thoughts will turn to religion.

But, Mr. President, if a man is in dire economic circumstances, worried every moment about how he is going to take care of his family, it is very likely that he will have little time for such thoughts. In fact, just the physical fact that a man and, or his family, have no decent clothes to wear, will keep them from going to church. In fact, that has kept more people from going to church than any other reason. As a matter of fact, it kept me from going to church more times when I was a little boy than any other reason—the fact that I did not have decent clothes to wear, when I was a boy. I was afraid to go to church and have other children see that I did not have decent clothes.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, if I may make this observation without prejudice to the Senator's right to continue——

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I must remind the Senator from Rhode Island that I cannot yield for an observation. I must ask the Chair to protect me if I get caught off guard.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may make a comment——

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I was going to comment on the morals of the duty——

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Idaho may yield for a question, but for no other purpose.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have not yielded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The point of order is sustained.

The Senator from Idaho may proceed.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, let me ask a question of the Chair: If some Senator rises and begins to talk, even though I have not yielded, am I supposed to talk louder than he does?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will assist the Senator in the protection of his rights, but the Senator will have to take primary responsibility for what happens.

Mr. TAYLOR. In other words, I shall have to watch out; and if a Senator to whom I have yielded for a question departs from his question and begins to make a statement, I shall have to take cognizance of that, and shall have to call the attention of the Chair to it; is that correct?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will cooperate with the Senator in that respect.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, a point of order: I do not want the RECORD to show that I intended to take the Senator from Idaho off the floor, for I am in entire sympathy——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is compelled to say to the Senator from Rhode Island that the Senator from Idaho cannot be interrupted, under a strict application of the rule, which can be required, except for a question.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island will state it.

Mr. McGRATH. May I state the point of my inquiry to the Chair?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island can address his inquiry to the Senator from Idaho, if he has a question to submit to him.

Mr. McGRATH. I cannot propound a parliamentary inquiry?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes; the Senator can submit a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, my parliamentary inquiry is whether during the course of the remarks of the Senator who has the floor, another Senator can explain the purpose for which he rises to obtain the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A Senator cannot now interrupt the Senator from Idaho except by his consent, and, then, only for the purpose of asking a question.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, during the debate tonight we have heard much about Christianity and the fine Christian act we would do by staying here indefinitely, probably into Sunday, to pass this great emancipation document that we are working upon. I wish to ask the majority whether they think it is Christian to keep these poor little page boys here all night. They should be home, in bed, Mr. President. I have suggested my willingness to have us adjourn, and convene again tomorrow. Nothing will be gained—not even 1 minute—by keeping these page boys here tonight. I suppose it will not hurt the Republicans to stay up all night, and probably it will not hurt the Democrats. But these page boys certainly should go home and go to bed, when there is nothing of any more urgency than this labor bill before us. It is not going to die or expire, as I pointed out before; it can well wait. Yet Senators insist upon having us continue on and on and on, while our page boys sit in the front of the Chamber and their morals are corrupted by seeing adults stay up all night.

Mr. President, I was reading the names of these clergymen and others who have issued this statement.

Father Joseph Hammond, of Brooklyn.

Rev. Edmund McNeill Poteat, of Rochester, N. Y.

Bishop Walter Mitchell, of California.

Catholic members of the committee pointed out today that strong opposition to the Taft-Hartley bill has been voiced by such leaders as Archbishop Robert E. Lucey, of San Antonio, and Bishop Bernard J. Sheil, of Chicago, and many priests in local communities throughout the country.

Mr. President, Bishop Sheil is a splendid gentleman. He has appeared before the Committee on Banking and Currency a number of times, and he is a true Christian. He loves the common people. He is out battling for them all the time. He is not one of these Christians who wants to pass a bad labor bill so that he can starve somebody to death.

The National Catholic Welfare Conference, representing America's Catholic bishops, in opposing the bill, has said it "will almost inevitably lead to industrial strife and unrest."

The formal statement of Protestant and Jewish leaders follows:

"We appeal to you to veto the Taft-Hartley labor bill because it would violate human freedoms essential to the ethic of both democracy and religion."

Mr. President, I am sorry that my good Christian friend the Senator from Nebraska is not present to hear what other Christians think about this proposition.

I continue to quote from these other Christians:

Basically it substitutes government regimentation for sound collective bargaining and wise attention to the fundamental economic and psychological causes of industrial strife. It is a measure calculated to destroy the real strength of a free-labor movement by undermining basic principles of collective bargaining, making the Government of the United States a ready instrument of employer resistance to legitimate needs of workers, and subjecting unions to a process of decimation and frustration under government control.

Where are our friends on the other side of the aisle, Mr. President? Where, may I ask, are those friends of ours over there who have always fought so nobly and so valiantly against Government control? Where are they? Suddenly they want the Government to run labor relations, that is, run them for the employers. I guess they have seen what good luck the Government had in running the mines. There has not been any trouble at all. Of course, that is quite a deal. The employers have not been doing a thing but vacationing in Florida, while the Navy ran the mines for them and sent them the profits. Nobody could strike. It gives a lot of people a chance to see the flag. It is up over each one of the mines. We put up a flag to show we took them over, and we send the profits to the boys who own the mines.

My friends on the other side of the aisle seem to have forgotten their great antagonism to Government control now, as the President pointed out. They want the Government to jump in with both feet. Do they not realize that if the Government takes over labor relations, pretty soon it will start moving in a little further, and the first thing we know there will be a demand from the people that if the Government is going to make labor work, that the employer should be not a private employer, but a publicly owned institution?

That is what our friends are preparing. It will be a great joke, an ironic joke, when that day comes to pass, and they find out they have scuttled our private enterprise system by passing legislation of this kind.

Mr. President, these churchmen proceed to say:

The closed shop and the union shop developed historically as a defensive union measure against determined employer resistance to independent unions. Many industries such as clothing have combined closed shops with some of the best and most constructive industrial relations in America. But in addition, just as every town resident must share the costs of community services by paying taxes, so every worker in the industrial community bears an obligation to share the costs of collective bargaining through the agency designated by a majority of the employees. Just as some towns have occasionally enforced tax collections under tyrannical administrations, so a few industries have had closed shops under tyrannical and dishonest union controls. But the remedy lies, not in abolition of compulsory union dues or town taxes, but rather in the enlightened concern of free community and union members. This legislation would destroy constructive industrial relations already achieved.

We look to you for a vigorous veto message.

Mr. President, I think that men of God who have the courage to send a message like that to the President of the United States deserve to have their names put in the RECORD of the United States Senate, and I intend to read them into the RECORD in order that everyone may see who these men are who are not afraid to get up and say to the Senator from Nebraska, and all the Senators who have voted for this bill, including the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], that they are wrong in voting for the bill, and that it should not pass.

So, Mr. President, I should like to read the list of the names of the signers of the veto appeal. I am sure it will be most interesting to Senators, and so I shall proceed with the reading of this honor roll.

I may say for the benefit of the Senator from Florida that this is a list of clergymen, Catholic fathers, and rabbis, who have sent a very forceful message to the President of the United States urging that he veto the Taft-Hartley bill, pointing out the reasons for it. I have stated that I feel that these men deserve to have their names inscribed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for posterity to see; those who had the courage to stand

up here and fight for the rights of the common man and to do the Christian thing, when special privilege is attempting to strike down the unions of the country and undermine the living standards of our workers, their families, and children. First on the list is a minister from Alabama, Mr. President. I call this to the attention of the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who is on the floor. I think that he voted for the bill, but he announced he would uphold the President's veto. I am very glad of that. As I pointed out, he was one of those who did not have strong convictions on the matter. I am sure there are many others who, if we can just hold this off a little while and give them time to consult their constituents will change their minds. I believe there will be a number of others, a sufficient number at least, who will change their minds, so that the President's great and courageous veto will be upheld.

I may say that the prayers of the clergymen were not unanswered. The President of the United States came forth with a veto message, a splendid message. I believe it is one of the finest, most logical, calm, cool, collected arguments and presentations to come from the White House since Mr. Truman has occupied it. I want to congratulate him on it. I think the outcome of the elections in 1948 may very well be decided upon the veto message that is before us. The people of America did not vote for legislation of this kind; they do not want it; and as soon as they have a chance to get to the polls again, many of those who are behind this sort of thing are going to find out that the people do not want it. No, the farmers in my State do not want it. They want the workers to have good wages, good jobs, so that they can sell their products. The farmer is just as intelligent as the men who occupy the seats on this floor.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. PEPPER. What I rose to ask the Senator, in regard to his comment about the agriculutral attitude, was this—if it is not an established and provable fact that there is a very direct relationship between industrial wages and agricultural prices in our national economy, and if that does not establish the fact that there is an identity of interest between the well-being of the workingman and the prosperity of the farmer? Is it not, therefore, to the interest of the farmer that he support the workingman in getting a fair wage for his work so that he, the farmer, can get a fair price and an adequate market for the product of his farm, and if it is not a fact, therefore, that the farmers of the country, when they understand the issue involved in this legislation, will realize that their own interest is being attacked, their own prosperity destroyed, and the present high level of agricultural life in America impaired, if this legislation shall become the law of the land?

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I want to thank the distinguished and able Senator from Florida for that penetrating question.

Mr. President, would the reporter please read the question so I can ponder it again?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would suggest that the Senator from Idaho not press good nature too far.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am sorry; I could not hear sufficiently well what the Chair said.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair suggests that the Senator from Florida repeat his question. I think we can get at it a little easier that way.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Chair is asking the Senator from Florida to repeat his question? That is all right; the Chair has said so. If the Senator will repeat the sense of it, I may say he does not need to be so eloquent as he was before.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, what I was asking the Senator from Idaho was, since he comes from one of the great agricultural regions of the country——

Mr. TAYLOR. I thank the Senator for that compliment to the great State of Idaho.

Mr. PEPPER. Whether or not it is a provable statistical fact that the indices of industrial wages and agricultural prices in our country are very directly related; in other words, to boil it down to a point, whether it is not a fact that if we impair by this legislation the wages of the working people of the country, if we do not to that degree impair the market and the prices that will be enjoyed by the agricultural producers of the country; and therefore, is it not true that whatever is contrary to the interest of the industrial workers of the country is contrary to the interest of the agricultural element of our Nation?

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I thank the senior Senator from Florida. I agree with his statement, absolutely We all know what happened in the 1920's.

When the farmers' income fizzled out; it got lower and lower. Naturally, they could not buy the products of the factories; and, while the farmers do not buy all the products of the factories, their ability to consume is considerable—it is enough to start this thing in reverse. It does not take much, Mr. President, to start this economy of ours in reverse.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield for a question only.

Mr. KILGORE. I realize that the Senator from Idaho is younger than the Senator from West Virginia. I wonder if the Senator from Idaho or the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] can recall when the only time a workingman's children ever saw oranges or tangerines was at Christmas, because at no other time of the year could the workingmen afford to buy such fruits for the tables of their homes?

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] does not believe that. He comes from a State where tangerines and many other kinds of fruit grow. I pointed out earlier in the evening that I could almost remember every orange I had up until the time I was 12 years old.

Mr. President, I am going to read the names of a group of men who, I feel, are Christians, real Christians as was my father, who was a sincere and devoted minister of the gospel. They are sincere and honest in what they believe, or they would not issue a statement of this kind. By issuing a statement of this kind, Mr. President, these men are not going to secure better jobs in high-tone churches to which the Four Hundred go, where the NAM boys hang out. They are not going to secure jobs in such churches for signing their name to a statement such as this. These men are sincere, they are honest in their Christianity, and I think they deserve to have their names read into the RECORD.

There is Rev. A. R. Carlton, of Geneva, Ala. There is Rev. C. C. Garner, of Stockton; Dr. Howard I. Kerr, Huntsville; Rev. William H. Marmion, of Birmingham; Rev. John Bransford Nichols, of Prattville, Ala. Then there is Rev. Andrew S. Turnipond, of Montgomery; Rev. Cullen B. Wilson, Fairhope, Ala.

Rabbi Nathan Barach, of Phoenix; Rev. Francis T. Brown, of Phoenix.

From Arkansas we have the following names: Rev. S. F. Freeman, Jr., of Little Rock; Rev. John P. McConnell, of Fayetteville; Rev. Glenn F. Sanford, of Conway.

I hope the Senators will listen to the reading of these names if it is their idea that their constituents back home are all excited in favor of the labor bill, and therefore they voted for it. I hope they will listen to the reading of these names because generally we would find most ministers quite closely in touch with the rank and file of the people and know how they feel. It is hard to believe that one would find such a long list of clergymen who would stand up completely against what was the sentiment of their people. I am glad there were this many clergymen who were so brave as to sign the statement. It is reasonable to assume their sentiments are in accord with those of their parishioners.

From California I read the following signers of this statement urging the President to veto this abysmal bill. Rev. Gross W. Alexander, of Redlands.

Rabbi Elliot M. Burnstein, of San Francisco. San Francisco is where I worked in a defense plant just before I came to the United States Senate. I was a member of a union there, Mr. President.

Rabbi S. A. Dalgin, Los Angeles.

Mr. President, we hear talk about crooks being in unions and running them into the ground and stealing the workers' money. If that happens it is the fault of the workers pure and simple. I was a member of the sheet-metal workers union in the plant where I worked in San Francisco, and still am a member of that union, but the union used to offer turkeys and different kind of prizes in an effort to get the workers to come to their own union meetings. I may say that years ago, shortly after I went into the show business, I joined the Actors' Equity Association. I was out West. We never saw a representative of the union. I never got anything out of it, but even at that early stage of my life I was sympathetic with the cause of the workingman. So I joined the Actors' Equity Association. My card had a

number lower than 1,000. Later, when I became a manager, I allowed my card in the Actors' Equity Association to lapse; but recently I addressed a group in New York City. The meeting was held in the Forty-second Street Theater, I believe. It was a meeting of all the actors' groups of America—the four A's, as they are called—representing the musicians, the radio artists, the vaudeville artists, the dramatic actors, and so forth. They held a big meeting in a theater to protest the bill which we are considering at this moment.

I addressed the meeting. I told them about having been a member of their organization at one time. So they said they would bring my card up to date; not only that, they would make it a life membership.

I was reading the names of certain California clergymen, rabbis, and Catholic fathers who signed this statement to the President.

The next name on the list is that of Rabbi S. A. Dalgin, of Los Angeles; Rev. Alfred G. Fisk, San Francisco; Rev. Owen M. Geer, of Los Angeles.

Mr. President, I should like to ask the majority if they do not realize that they are granting those of us who advocate letting the pending question go over for a few days a great favor by their tactics. The only reason I mention it is that I dislike to keep Senators on the floor of the Senate when they might just as well go home and go to bed and come back tomorrow to resume consideration of the question. No time will be gained by this procedure. The majority are in reality helping us, because I know from my years of experience in the show business that their actions make the situation much more dramatic. The effect will be much better if we are forced to talk straight through the night. The night will pass away, and the first announcement on the radio in the morning will be, "They are holding the bridge. They are talking, and saving the labor movement."

The majority are playing right into our hands. Perhaps I should not tip them off. However, as I say, I sincerely dislike to keep Senators here. I am hopeful that by virtue of the delay so gained the people back home will have an opportunity to familiarize themselves with the vicious provisions of the bill and will let their Senators know how they feel. It will not be necessary to change many votes. If four or five Senators change their minds, the veto will be sustained, and it will go down in the history of America as one of the gladdest days in all the long and glad history of this glorious Republic.

On this list is the name of Rev. Alfred G. Fisk, of San Francisco. Mr. Fisk does not like this bill. He thinks it is rotten. He does not say so. That is, he does not use that word; but from what he has to say one can get the idea.

The next name on the list is that of the Reverend Owen M. Geer, of Los Angeles. He is against the bill. He implored the President to veto it. I am sure that, if he were present, he could show the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], who goes to church every Sunday, that this is not a Christian bill.

The next name is that of Rev. John M. Hestenes, of Fresno, Calif. That is in the heart of the Associated Farmers' country. If a labor organizer goes down there, they tar and feather him, shoot him, or do away with him. But this pastor has sufficient intestinal fortitude to sign his name to this statement. He is in the midst of a hotbed of antilabor agitation in Fresno, Calif.

Rabbi Harry Hyman, Huntington, Calif.; Rabbi Louis Kaufman, Sacramento; Rabbi Jacob Levine, Los Angeles; Bishop Walter Mitchell, Rancho Santa Fe; Rev. Hu C. Noble, Los Angeles.

Rev. Edward Ohrenstein, of Berkeley.

That is where Henry Wallace had to speak from the street, Mr. President. They would not grant him permission to speak on the campus of the university. So he stood across the street with loud speakers, and approximately 15,000 students stood over on the campus. In that way they got around the technicalities.

Rev. Kirby Page, La Habra; Bishop Edward L. Parsons, San Francisco.

San Francisco is a lovely city, Mr. President. Of course the President pro tempore would know that; he has been to San Francisco to attend the United Nations Conference. He was there and has seen what a beautiful city it is. It looks like the City of Tomorrow which is shown in magazines such as Popular Mechanics and in one of the architectural magazines. The great bridges, the Golden Gate Bridge and the Bay Bridge, and many other things about San Francisco, when one sees it in a panoramic view from up on top of the Twin Peaks, make it look like the City of Tomorrow. It is a historic city; and certainly more so since the United Nations Conference, at which our able President pro tempore had such an important part, for which we are all very grateful, as we are grateful for the work which was done there.

Rev. Edwin P. Ryland, of Los Angeles.

He is against this bill.

Rev. Alfred S. Schroeder, of Oakland; Rev. Howard Thurman, San Francisco; Rev. George Warmer, San Diego; Rev. Hugh Vernon White, Berkeley; Rabbi Bert A. Woythaler, of Los Angeles.

Mr. President, it is probably becoming a little tiresome for my good friends and colleagues for me to read these names, so I will leave them for a while. However, I intend to come back and finish this worthy undertaking some time between now and tomorrow noon.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I will yield for a question only.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Does the Senator have the names of those from South Carolina?

Mr. TAYLOR. If the Senator will bear with me a while I will hunt for South Carolina. Here is North Carolina. I am getting close.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes; the Senator is getting close.

Mr. TAYLOR. North Dakota, Oklahoma—well, I do not know. Surely if there are some from North Carolina there must be some from South Carolina. Yes; here is South Carolina. Here the name of the Rev. Pierce E. Cook, of Dillon. Does the Senator know the Reverend Cook? Of course he does. I will bet he knows every preacher in South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I know most of them, I believe. I have conducted 11 State-wide campaigns.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Senator means, in the same State?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR. May I ask the Senator if he knows——

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The able Senator from Idaho responded to a question, but as I interpret the rule of the Senate he is not privileged to address a question to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. TAYLOR. I cannot ask anyone any questions? I am thankful.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The point of order is technically correct.

Mr. TAYLOR. We will obey all the technicalities, even those suggested by the Senator from California. We will try to obey the rules completely, because I do not want this to wind up.

Here is the name of the Reverend F. Clyde Helmo, of Columbia, S. C. I cannot ask the Senator from South Carolina if he knows the Reverend F. Clyde Helmo, but I will wager that he does, Mr. President.

[Manifestations of laughter and applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Senator will suspend for a moment, the Chair would like to state to the occupants of the galleries that manifestations of any kind are against the rules of the Senate.

Mr. TAYLOR. Herc is the name of Rabbi S. W. Rubenstein, of Charleston, S. C.

I will leave that, Mr. President. I have something else which I should like to call to the attention of the Senate. Here is the speech delivered over the radio this evening by the President of the United States. Many of the Members of the Senate, I know, have been here all evening. They are anxious to know what the President had to say. One of the reasons that I have held forth here is in order to give the people of America an opportunity to hear what the President had to say and an opportunity to act upon it. Obviously there is no object in the President's delivering a veto message to the Congress, and certainly there is no object in his delivering a radio address, unless he delivered it for the purpose of telling the American people why he vetoed this bill and to give them an opportunity to digest the proposition, and, if they care to, to inform their Senators what they think about it. That is simply one-two-three logic, Mr. President.

The President had this to say:

My fellow countrymen, at noon today I sent the Congress a message vetoing the Taft-Hartley labor bill. I vetoed this bill because I am convinced it is a bad bill. It is bad for labor, bad for management, bad for the country.

Mr. President, may I say that if the bill is bad for labor, bad for management, and bad for the country, whom is it good for? The Senator from Nebraska, I guess.

Mr. Truman went on to say:

I had hoped that the Congress would send me a labor bill I could sign.

He does not say that he is against labor legislation. He does not say that legislation is not needed, Mr. President. He says he had hoped that the Congress would send him a bill that he could sign. He goes on as follows:

I have said before, and I say now, that we need legislation to correct abuses in the field of labor relations. Last January I made specific recommendations to the Congress as to the kind of labor legislation we should have immediately. I also urged that the Congress provide for a commission to be made up of representatives of the Congress, the public, and labor and management, to study the entire field of labor-management relations and to suggest what additional laws we should have. I believe that my proposals were accepted by the great majority of our people as fair and just.

Mr. President, Harry Truman is absolutely correct. That was a fair proposal—to set up a commission or board to study the problem, and to do so intelligently, not haphazardly, not in anger, not in a spirit of punitive retaliation or revenge. That was sound. I believe the people would agree that that would be a good thing.

Mr. President, the President of the United States further said in his radio address:

If the Congress had accepted these recommendations, we would have today the basis for improved labor-management relations. I would have gladly signed a labor bill if it had taken us in the right direction of stable, peaceful labor relations, even though it might not have been drawn up exactly as I wished.

Mr. President, the President of the United States is very conciliatory. He would have liked to have a bill he could sign. But he cannot take this thing, and nobody with a level head is going to blame him.

I read further from his speech:

I would have signed the bill with some doubtful features if, taken as a whole, it had been a good bill. But the Taft-Hartley bill is a shocking piece of legislation—

I read further from the President's address—

a shocking piece of legislation. It is unfair to the working people of this country. It clearly abuses the right, which millions of our citizens now enjoy, to join together to bargain with their employers for fair wages and fair working conditions. Under no circumstances could I have signed this bill.

Mr. President, the word "this" is underlined. Harry Truman is doing a good job on this matter.

I read further:

The restrictions that this bill places on our workers go far beyond what our people have been led to believe.

That is correct, Mr. President. The American people have been utterly deceived in regard to this Hartley-Taft bill. There has been a great deal of propaganda about the terribly harsh House bill and about the nice, soft Taft-Ives bill. From all that has been said about the nice, soft Taft-Ives bill, one would think it was only 16 years old. The propagandists certainly have done a good job. We find one commentator after another and one newspaper editor after another talking about this dishwater bill. O Mr. President, they find fault with it, of course. They say it is too mild—that it is a terribly mild bill. Of course, they knew what was in it, but they were simply trying to deceive people.

Mr. President, I wonder whether the press will print any extensive résumé of the President's message. The New York Times is about the only newspaper that I know of that will print it in its entirety.

In talking in this way, Mr. President, I do not want people to feel that I am condemning all the press. Obviously, I am not. But I am speaking of a good, big share of the press. Certainly we have not seen much in the Washington newspapers against the Taft-Hartley bill; almost all the comments in the Washington newspapers have been on the other side of the question. Mr. President, I am not in favor of that. It is not fair. The newspapers have an obligation as well as a privilege; they have an obligation to tell people both sides of every case.

Mr. President, in urging the press to clean house, let me point out that today we see what labor has brought on itself by not correcting little abuses. Just see what labor has brought on itself—the Taft-Hartley bill. The press can do the same thing, of course.

I wish to say that I read the Washington News; I subscribe to it, and I read it every day. But in the last several days I have seen several things in the Washington News that make me feel afraid that I shall not subscribe to it much longer if such things continue. When Henry Wallace spoke, down at the Water Gate, that occasion was described in an article in the Washington News, the next day. The heading of the article contained the word "Peace," and then the word "(cheers)," and the word "(cheers)" was in very large letters. Then it said, "Mother Russia (cheers)"—and the word "(cheers)" was in very small letters, in an attempt to give the impression that Wallace had mentioned peace and had received a great cheer—which he did; that is true—and then had mentioned "Mother Russia," and did not get such big cheers. I simply wish to say that Henry Wallace never mentioned "Mother Russia." He spoke of Russia at different times, in an entirely objective and critical manner, but he certainly never used the term "Mother Russia," or any other term of endearment or unquestioning approval, as was implied in the article in the Washington News. I resent the appearance of such misleading headlines in the newspapers.

Mr. President, that is bad. It is bad for the American people that they cannot get the truth, just the unvarnished truth. It is all right to have a little sensationalism once in a while, but let us not distort in serious matters. It may be all right if a fellow gets run over by a car to blow it up a little bit and give the folks a thrill, or to sensationalize a murder a little, but in the news that affects the country and the people and the world, let us be factual.

Some of these papers will go out of their way to build up a Red scare. The Lord knows the Red situation is bad enough, it is serious enough, without being blown up all out of proportion.

I do not think we are in any great danger from communism as such in this country, unless the Republicans stay in power another term or two, and I do not think the people are going to let that happen.

Mr. President, this business of accusing people of being Communists merely because, for instance, they may associate with CLAUDE PEPPER or GLEN TAYLOR is a serious matter. Mr. President, would you believe it would lay you open to the charge of being a Communist if you associated with the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]? I will tell why that comes about.

Where I worked in the defense plant out in San Francisco I was a sheet-metal worker. I had a welder working with me. I had to lay out a job and cut it out and get it in place, and the welder welded it together. He was a pretty nice fellow. I will not tell his name here, because the Rankin committee or the Dies committee would get it, and I do not want them to do that, because he was a nice, quiet fellow. He had a little home up in the country and went home on week ends.

The only thing about this man—and I did not know it to begin with—was that he was a little "reddish." But he was a nice fellow. We argued. He cussed Roosevelt, and I would say, "Now, listen. Roosevelt came in there and took over the Presidency of this country when we were in dire, desperate shape. We were ready to collapse, and Roosevelt came in and saved us."

"Oh, Roosevelt never did a good thing in all his life. He is one of the worst, if not the worst, President we ever had. I hate his guts."

He would say that word. We would talk very plain in the defense plant, use a lot of words I cannot use here. That is the way this man talked, and I talked back to him. I would point out, "Roosevelt fed the hungry. What's eating you, Denny?"

He would argue with me, "Oh, he never fed them. He gave them a little relief and one thing and another." I argued back, and it went on for 6 weeks, I guess.

Finally, one day we were arguing, and he stopped—he always chewed tobacco—he stopped and spit out some of his tobacco and looked at me and kind of grinned and said, "You know, I admire you for your humanitarian impulses, for sticking up for Roosevelt. You sincerely think he did a good job, the best thing for this country, that he saved the capitalistic system, that he presumably saved democracy. Very possibly he did. If he had not come in, we might have had a revolution." He said, "You feel that is the best thing for this country." He said, "To tell you the truth, I am a Communist."

He used to argue with me. He would say, "I don't want Roosevelt to be

elected." I forgot that part of my story. He would say, "I don't want Roosevelt to be elected." That was in 1944. He would say, "I want BRICKER to be elected. I want BRICKER to be nominated. BRICKER is the man I am for," and he would go around talking to everybody, saying that he was for BRICKER. [Laughter.] If he could not have BRICKER, his second choice was TAFT. [Laughter.] He would take TAFT, but he would rather have BRICKER.

Finally, when he broke down and confessed to me that he was a Communist, he said, "GLEN, do you know why I have been arguing for BRICKER? If Roosevelt had not come in we would have had a revolution and had this thing over with long before now, but Roosevelt headed off the revolution, and that is why I don't like him. And I am for BRICKER because if we can elect BRICKER we will have a revolution in short order." [Laughter.]

So, Mr. President, it can be argued that anyone who supports the Senator from Ohio is a suspect. He can very well be a Communist, a Communist of the most violent type. He might want to see us go to revolution.

There are some Communists who support Democrats because they want to move generally in the direction of the better deal for the workingman. They are the milder ones. But the real revolutionary Communist will be found supporting TAFT and BRICKER, RANKIN and THOMAS.

Let us have an end of this Red baiting business. It is going to be difficult enough to keep peace in the world if everybody watches everything he says and tries to keep the ship on a level keel.

Mr. President, if, when history is written, providing anybody survives the atomic bombs, the disease germs, and other new secret weapons, I am afraid it will say that the press of the United States was the biggest, blackest villain the world ever saw, that it kept up until finally it brought the crisis to a head. I wish they would, for the welfare of the country and for their own welfare, Mr. President, and the welfare of the world. I enjoy the newspapers. I am in a way like Will Rogers, in that about all I know is what I read in the newspapers. I like to read newspapers. Some people criticise me for reading newspapers so much; they say I ought not to read the newspapers carefully, but should merely glance at the headlines to see whether Red murdered the Black Dahlia, or not, and let it go at that, and then sit down and read a good book. But I like newspapers. They do not have to reform greatly, but I wish they would just get over their sensationalism when it comes to serious matters affecting the welfare of the world. We all enjoy sensationalism, for that matter, when it is about frivolous matters, something that is not going to affect the future course of the world, or something like that.

Mr. President, I want to continue reading the President's message. Mr. Truman had this to say:

> The restrictions that this bill places on our workers go far beyond what our people have been led to believe. This is no innocent bill.

That is right, Mr. President. It is a diabolical bill, diabolical in the extreme. There is nothing innocent about this bill, and the people that got it up and pushed it through are not innocent, either. I pointed out the Communists are supporting some of them.

It is interesting to note that on June 4 Congressman HARTLEY, on the floor of the House of Representatives, made the following statement:

> You are going to find there is more in this bill than may meet the eye.

That was a clever statement, all right. I read that into the RECORD before, Mr. President. The text here goes on to say:

> That is a revealing description of this bill by one of its authors.

Yes, Mr. President, the truth will come out about this thing if we can just hold out long enough. I hope certain other Senators who really believe in democracy and believe in the people having an opportunity to know what is going on before a deal is consummated—I want some of them to get the material together and ready to speak after a while—tomorrow, sometime.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the very able Senator from West Virginia for a question.

Mr. KILGORE. Does the Senator know that the Prentiss-Hall organization, which publishes very valuable analyses of industrial relations practices for a group of readers largely composed of corporations' personnel directors, has had this to say very recently in one of its publications:

> If it—
>
> Meaning this bill—
>
> becomes law, labor-management relations aren't going to be any simpler. If anything, they will become more complex.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is very interesting. It is very interesting to find out that this organization which services employers has that to say about this very bad bill.

Mr. KILGORE. And does the Senator also know that the executives' labor letter printed for businessmen readers, warns that the Taft-Hartley bill promises a greater industrial strife, a tremendous increase in time-consuming lawsuits, and the rapid growth of Government control over relations between management and labor?

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, that is very revealing. That is the reason I am doing what I am doing here on the floor, because management-labor relations organizations are just beginning to find out that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has rubbed Aladdin's lamp here, and the genii is loose, and just what he can do to them—and when they do become fully aware of it, they are going to call off their dogs. I am confident that the bill will be repudiated, that the President's veto will be sustained, and that America will go on to a new and greater day. Doubtless we shall have labor disputes, but doubtless they will be settled and doubtless we shall go on to greater and greater prosperity, if we can just elect the Democrats in 1948.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. TAYLOR. A question? I am happy to yield for a question.

Mr. KILGORE. Is the Senator aware that under the Taft-Hartley bill the Labor Relations Board is denied the right to select its chief counsel or its attorney, which will lead to endless strife between the Board and its counsel, and to endless disputes; not conducive, may I say, to peaceful labor settlements?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, I was aware of that provision of the bill. It is ridiculous. As the President pointed out in his message to the Congress today, it is absolutely silly to separate them that way; but, in fact, this whole bill is not only vicious, it is stupid; it just is the acme of bad bills, from every point of view; whether it is intelligent draftsmanship, whether it is the ability to accomplish the purposes it sets out to accomplish, or whether it is in the fact it divides up agencies, and here, when we are talking about economy, centralizing, getting everything under one head, this bill just starts chopping everything all to pieces.

As the Senator pointed out, it would have the Government in labor relations far deeper than it is now, and it would cost the people millions upon millions of dollars for holding useless representation elections and one thing and another. All we shall ever get out of it is more and more strife. In fact, I should not be surprised if that welder with whom I worked in San Francisco were not in favor of this bill, for the same reason that he supported the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] because it is the quickest way to bring about communism. Yes, he is probably supporting it right now; I should not be surprised.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield for a question.

Mr. KILGORE. I wonder if the Senator has ever looked at the Rube Goldberg cartoons, which bring out certain very miraculous results, in connection with things that will not work out physically, but which always have inherent in them a certain amount of naturally human aspects, which human aspects alone make them workable? I sometimes think of the bill as a Rube Goldberg cartoon. I wonder if the Senator from Idaho thinks of the same thing.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is certainly a very apt comparison. Now that the Senator has mentioned it, I have not seen a Rube Goldberg cartoon for a long time. I always did enjoy them. Perhaps Rube Goldberg received a patent on a contrivance based on one of his own cartoons and quit drawing cartoons. I do not know. I have not seen one for a long time.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield to the able and distinguished Senator and question-asker from Florida.

Mr. PEPPPER. Mr. President, I was impressed by the emphasis the Senator from Idaho gave to the President's message as a body of new information to the American people. First, I wanted to ask the Senator if he did not feel that the President's message to the Congress today and his radio address to the country

tonight has given the people of the country an entirely new understanding of the real nature and purpose and effect of the so-called labor legislation that has been pending before the Congress?

Mr. TAYLOR. Most certainly. I can say that the veto message which the President sent to the Congress was most enlightening because of its clarity, and the simple, direct way in which it explained the proposal. Frankly, I myself understood the bill better after reading the President's message than I ever had understood it before. I gave considerable study to the bill. It is not everyone who can explain a matter so simply that it can readily be understood.

As for the radio message delivered by the President tonight, of course, we have not finished that yet.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further for a question?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes; I yield for a question.

Mr. PEPPER. Does not the Senator think that the people of the country will be even more impressed by the President's veto message when they read that the President said in his radio address that the measure is unfair to labor and contrary to the public interest, and when the people recall that the President himself has made recommendations respecting labor legislation to the Congress, and therefore has exhibited by his own record that he is not a partisan of labor trying to protect labor from just legislation? Will not the country, in view of the President's record, be all the more impressed when the President says that this legislation is unfair to labor and contrary to the public interest?

Mr. TAYLOR. I should like to say to the Senator from Florida that President Truman's greatest asset, I might say, is the fact that he does impress people as being sincere, honest, and forthright. This is going to carry great weight with the people of America, because they feel they can have confidence in something the President tells them. After we talk here until Monday or Tuesday or Wednesday, it will take effect, I believe.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. PEPPER. Is it not some corroboration of the President's statement that this legislation, if enacted, would cause more litigation and more strife, when we hear the President give his version of the bill, when we hear the Senator from Ohio, the chairman of the committee, deny positively that what the President says is true about the bill, and when we hear Chairman Hartley, of the House committee, the father of the bill in the House, say there was more in the bill than meets the eye?

Mr. TAYLOR. That, Mr. President, was a very truthful statement. We will have to give Mr. Hartley credit for saying that there is more in the bill than meets the eye. But I think the American people are going to be greatly impressed when Harry Truman tells them what is in the bill, and they are not going to like what is in the bill. They are not only going to be opposed to it, they are going to be angry to think that certain Senators and Representatives and the press have ganged up on them deliberately to deceive them. They are going to demand that some people take action to see that the threatened catastrophe is not brought upon America for no good reason other than to satisfy the hate of a small minority in this country, the Association of Manufacturers and their cohorts and camp followers. No, the people are not going to like it at all.

Mr. President, we will now go back to the President's message. The President goes back to the phrase "there is more to it than meets the eye." He says:

> There is so much more in it than the people have been led to believe that I am sure that very few understand what the Taft-Hartley bill would do if it should become law.

Mr. President, there is a ringing indictment by the President of the United States of the spawners of this filthy and vile piece of legislation. Harry Truman goes on to say:

> That is why I am speaking to you tonight. I want you to know the real meaning of this bill.

Mr. President, I digress to say, what a mockery it would have been had we acceded to the wishes of the Republican majority this afternoon and permitted the bill to have been voted upon at 5 o'clock, when the President did not go on the radio until 10 o'clock. This would have been some speech, would it not, Mr. President, delivered at 10 o'clock, had we voted on the bill at 5 o'clock, and the matter had been all settled? Of course, the President had no idea that we would attempt to be so nefarious respecting the bill as to run the thing through in that way. He expected us to take a reasonable length of time, to give him time to talk to the people, and give the people time to digest what he had to tell them, and to communicate back to their Senators. So help me, Mr. President, that is what is going to happen. People are going to have time to go over the message and find out what it says, and find out the jokers that are in the bill, and they are going to have time to communicate back to their Senators before the bill comes to a vote, in spite of everything the Senator from Nebraska, the majority whip can do. He can sit in his seat from now until doomsday, and he will not succeed in having this matter come to a vote before we think the people have had an opportunity to make up their minds upon it. That will take just a few days. I cannot understand why he begrudges it.

The President goes on to say:

> We have all been told by its proponents that this is a moderate bill. We have been told that the bill was harsh and drastic when it was first passed by the House of Representatives, but that the Senate had persuaded the House to drop out all harsh provisions, and that the final bill, the bill sent to me, was mild and moderate.

Who misled the people in this matter, Mr. President? It was a job of conniving, of course. Certain people made the statement, and it was given prominent display in the press. The truth was never told to the people that this was a bad, vicious, harsh bill. The newspapers had people working for them who had enough sense to figure out what the bill meant. The newspapers did not have them do it. They just played up statements made by certain interested persons that this was a mild, jellyfish bill.

The President says:

> But I found no truth in the claims that the bill sent to me was mild or moderate. I found that the basic purpose and much of the language of the original House of Representatives bill were still in the final bill. In fact, the final bill follows the provisions of the original House bill in at least 35 separate places.

I continue to quote from President Truman:

> We have all been told that the Taft-Hartley bill is favorable to the wage earners of this country. It has been claimed that workers need to be saved from their own folly, and that this bill would provide the means of salvation. Some people have called this bill the workers' bill of rights.

Mr. President, what a mockery. I cannot help but remember sitting here the other day and listening to the junior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] expound at length about what a good friend of labor he was. There were some bad things in the bill, to be sure, he told us, but there were also some good things in it, too, so he was going to vote for it.

Mr. President, labor had better watch out and be sure who its friends are, and not merely take the word of someone on the floor of the Senate. The other day I noticed a group of working people in the gallery. Their Senator was speaking. He was dead against them. He was voting for the bill. He was telling them that there were some bad things in it, but they had been changed, and he was going to vote for it. About every third line he would say, "I am for labor." Then he would look up into the gallery and see these working people. They would nod and smile at each other, and say, "Yes, he is for labor." He would say, "I am going to vote for the bill," and then he would again look up at the gallery and assure the occupants of the gallery that he was for labor. They would look at each other and smile very happily and say, "Yes, he is for labor. He says so."

The working people had better look at the voting record of Senators. Under the terms of the bill it would be against the law to publish the voting record of Senators if the bill should become law; but the working people can find out in some way. They can learn by word of mouth, or bootleg the information. Instead of looking at what a Senator says, they had better look at what he did.

The President continues:

> Let us see what this bill really would do to our workingmen.

This should be interesting. Harry Truman tells the facts as he sees them. He does not exaggerate. He does not try to "kid" anyone. It will be interesting to see what Harry has to say about this "workers' bill of rights." This is what he says:

> The bill is deliberately designed to weaken labor unions.

That is pretty strong language. Whoever drafted the bill knew what he was doing, and its sponsors have been trying to "kid" the people ever since.

When the sponsors of the bill claim that by weakening unions they are giving rights back to individual workingmen, they ignore the basic reason why men can bargain with their employers on a basis of equality. Because of unions, the living standards of our working people have increased steadily until they are today the highest in the world.

I said the very same thing on the floor of the Senate the other day, Mr. President. I do not claim any credit for it. There is nothing original about it. It has been preached for years, and it is very sound doctrine. Unions are probably more responsible than any other segment of our population for our high standard of living in this country, because unions have continually agitated for better working conditions and higher wages. When they do that—and labor is no longer cheap—someone must invent better machines so that less labor is required. That produces more goods with less labor, so that labor can produce more goods on other machines. And when it wants more wages, another machine is invented. The process continues to spread, and redounds to the benefit of everyone. So there are more goods for everyone, and higher wages for the workers. The farmers can sell more products, and everyone is prosperous. Everything hinges on the workingman, and his welfare hinges on the labor unions. Here we have the Republican majority trying to strike down labor unions, the very foundation and backbone of our free-enterprise economy and our democratic way of life.

The President of the United States continues:

Unions exist so that laboring men can bargain with their employers on a basis of equality. Because of unions the living standards of our working people have increased steadily until they are today the highest in the world. A bill which would weaken unions would undermine our national policy of collective bargaining. The Taft-Hartley bill would do just that. It would take us back in the direction of the old evils of individual bargaining. It would take bargaining power away from workers and give more power to management.

There it is, Mr. President. It would take bargaining power away from workers and give more power to management. Those who will presumably benefit from the bill will not really benefit, because it will result in chaos, and everyone will suffer. But the profits of the big fellows whom it is sought to help are swollen out of all reason, at the expense of the people. Actual take-home pay is off $5,000,000,000.

The President continues:

This bill would weaken unions, would undermine our national policy of collective bargaining. This bill would even take away from our workingmen some bargaining rights which they enjoyed before the Wagner Act was passed 12 years ago.

We are going back more than 12 years, back to Herbert Hoover. As I showed earlier in the evening, Republicans are going to call in Herbert Hoover to tell them how not to have a depression. God help us!

Harry Truman continues:

If we weaken our system of collective bargaining we weaken the position of every workingman in the country.

That is true, of course.

This bill would again expose workers to the abuses of labor injunctions.

It would make unions liable for damage suits for actions which have long been considered lawful. This bill would treat all unions alike. Unions which have fine records, with long years of peaceful relations with management, would be hurt by this bill just as much as the few troublemakers.

The country needs legislation which will get rid of abuses. We do not need and we do not want legislation which will take fundamental rights away from our working people. We have been told that the Taft-Hartley bill is a means by which the country can be protected from Nation-wide strikes in vital industries. The terms of the bill do not support this claim.

In other words, Mr. President, they told us this bill would protect us from strikes, and it will not even do that.

The President goes on to say:

Many people are under the impression that this bill would prevent or settle a strike in the coal industry.

This bill would not settle anything. All it would do would be to "cook the goose" of America.

I sincerely trust that the coal operators and the miners will soon come to an agreement on the terms of a contract and that there will be no interruption of coal mining. But if the miners and the operators do not reach an agreement, and if this bill, under the complicated procedures of the bill would be the postponement of a strike from July until October 1.

Under this bill a work stoppage in the coal mines might be prevented for 80 days, and then if agreement had not been reached the miners would be free to strike, and it would be mandatory for the President to refer the whole matter to the Congress.

Postponing a strike in the coal industry until the approach of winter, when our need for coal is acute, is certainly not the way to protect the Nation against the dangers of a shortage of coal.

That is what I said the other day about the rent control bill—that it was not any bill at all. It will just postpone the inevitable, and even a lot of that would overtake us before the middle of next winter, leaving the landlords free to kick the tenants out into the street. I said the best thing to do would be to just be honest and get rid of them and let them stay out this summer. That is the way the President feels about the coal business. There is no use to postpone it until fall and then fight it out when everyone is freezing to death.

Mr. Truman says further:

We have been told by the supporters of the Taft-Hartley bill that it would reduce industrial strife. On the contrary I am convinced that it would increase industrial strife. The bill would soon upset security clauses in thousands of existing agreements between labor and management. These agreements were mutually arrived at and furnish a satisfactory basis for relations between worker and employer. They provide stability in industry. With the present type of agreements outlawed by this bill the parties would have to find a new basis for agreement. The restrictions in this bill would make the process of reaching new agreements a long and bitter one.

I wonder, Mr. President, if that is what the proponents of this bill want. I wonder if they want to provoke violence in the United States. I wonder if they have assurances of support from the military so that they can just take over and end it all in a Fascist dictatorship, like the Communist friend of mine about whom I was talking a while ago. He wanted to end it by electing the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and having a depression and revolution and getting it over and having communism right away.

I wonder if there are not those on the extreme right, who have designs upon our fundamental liberties and privileges here in America.

That is what happened in Germany. Hitler kept hollering, "Look out for the Communists" and all of a sudden the people woke up one day and the Nazis had taken them over. Maybe we had better watch out in America.

The President goes on to say:

The bill would increase industrial strife because a number of its provisions deprive workers of legal protection of fundamental rights. They would then have no means of protecting these rights except by striking. The bill would open up opportunities for endless law suits by employers against unions, and by unions against employers. For example, it would make employers vulnerable to an immense number of law suits, since grievances, however minor, could be taken into court by dissatisfied workers. Insofar as employers are concerned, I predict that if this bill should become law, they would regret the day that it was conceived. It is loaded with provisions that would plague and hamper management. It is filled with hidden legal traps that would take labor relations out of the plant where they belong and place them in the courts.

He says the bill is full of hidden legal traps, Mr. President. It reminds me that the other day I said of the rent-control bill it was a booby trap, which it is. It will blow up on you just when you think you have your rent stabilized. The landlord will come and nail up the door between the rooms and then subdivide it and raise the rent, and the tenant is out from under rent control.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from the great State of Florida, that great citrus-raising State——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DONNELL in the chair). Does the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes; I am yielding. It takes a little time.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, is it not the opinion of the able Senator from Idaho that what the President has said about this bill opening the employer to multitudinous lawsuits lies in the fact that if a labor union sued the employer for a technical breach of a contract the employer would be kept in the courts all the time because of the many little violations which normally occur in the course of the operations of an enterprise, and if the same principle would not subject the labor unions to constant litigation

and harassment if the employer wished to take advantage of this provision, because of the fact that there will be someone in the employee group who from time to time could be charged with some technical violation of the agreement? In other words, as a practical matter is it not an inducement to take the settlement of industrial disputes out of the hands of arbitrators and away from the machinery provided for in the collective-bargaining agreement, and to encourage the settlement of all these day-by-day industrial disputes by the tedious and expensive machinery of the Federal courts of the country?

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I thank the able and distinguished and eloquent Senator from Florida for his question and the many parts of it.

When he says this bill will provide the lawyers with a field day, he is eminently correct. Most certainly if this bill becomes law, it will mean a great deal of employment for lawyers. Perhaps they will be able to take up the slack of the unemployment that will be caused by the strife the bill will engender. Perhaps we shall get enough lawyers to work thrashing out these things to make up for the unemployment that will occur among other groups of our people. In fact, I would say to the Senator from Florida that it seems that the principal business of this Republican-controlled Congress is to make business for lawyers. Certainly the rent-control bill which was passed the other day will make a great deal of business for lawyers. Many people will be kicked out of their houses, and they will hire lawyers to try to keep a roof over their heads. Of course, it will not do them any good to hire lawyers in that case, but they will hire them just the same.

The same may be said in regard to the Bulwinkle bill, which was passed by Congress the other day. Of course, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] wants his name attached to it; he wants part of the credit for it. But I think the day will come when the Senator from Kansas will be no more proud of that bill than the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is of the fact that he helped kill the OPA. He never mentions that any more.

A number of decisions will have to be made on the Bulwinkle bill, too. They will be top-flight decisions. They will not result in bleeding the little people, as the rent-control bill will do; and they will not result in bleeding the unions, as the labor bill will do. But obviously the result will be to help employ lawyers. As a matter of fact, I think I shall have to do something to take care of the actors, in view of all we are doing to take care of the lawyers.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield for a question only.

Mr. PEPPER. Is it not a fact, in the opinion of the Senator from Idaho, that the situation in which the labor unions find themselves is different from that of the corporations by which the members of the labor unions are generally employed—that is to say, that the corporations can bring many lawsuits against the unions and can tie up the unions' funds and can tie up their books and can keep their officials constantly in court and can keep them harassed with various legal technicalities in such a way that the corporations can not only impair the functioning of the labor unions as the defenders of the interests of the laboring people, but can in substance prevent the labor unions from striking, because the corporations will be able to destroy the unions' reserve funds, so that if the workers do strike, the unions will not have any funds with which to carry on the strike and tide over the workers until the conclusion of the strike; in other words, is it not a fact that the power that is conferred by this bill upon the big employers of the country to keep the labor unions constantly harassed and subject to litigation, for all practical purposes will prevent the unions from effectively representing the workers and will prevent the workers from withholding their labor from an employer, because the unions will not be able to aid the workers to keep their families alive while they are trying to carry on a strike?

Mr. TAYLOR. Certainly; I wish to say to the great Senator from Florida that if this bill becomes law, labor unions will be bankrupt as a result of being kept in court. it will be as simple as falling off a log; it will be possible to take the unions into court on any pretext, and just string out the process; and the corporations will be able to stand it, in view of the profits they are making. They will be able to stand the expense, and will be able to keep that process going long enough to break the unions. Then it will not be long until they have the unions back where they want them.

Mr. President, we will continue with the President's speech. He said:

> Insofar as employers are concerned, I predict that if this bill should become law they would regret the day that it was conceived. It is loaded with provisions that would plague and hamper management. It is filled with hidden legal traps that would take labor relations out of the plant, where they belong, and place them in the courts.

Mr. President, after the last election I thought, when I got back to Washington, "Well, it is not so bad that we Democrats lost. Look at all the young fellows the Republicans have sent here. Any young fellow like that cannot help having a little liberalism about him. This is going to be pretty good." But I am sorry to say that it has not turned out that way. It seems to me that age has nothing to do with a man's liberalism or his reaction, because certainly never in the history of this country, to my memory at least, have the Congress and the country been plagued by legislation of such a reactionary character, as is being conjured up by those now in control of the Congress. It seems that liberalism and reaction know no age limit. So I will not be fooled any more, when I see a young fellow, into thinking he has a soft place in his heart for the common people. Mr. President, President Truman proceeded to say:

> Another defect is that in trying to correct labor abuses the Taft-Hartley bill goes so far that it would threaten fundamental democratic freedoms. One provision undertakes to prevent political contributions and expenditures by labor organizations and corporations. This provision would forbid a union newspaper from commenting on candidates in national elections.

I might say, Mr. President, that is exactly what they want. They do not want them to comment, because there are going to be some pretty uncomplimentary things said about the sponsors of this terrible legislation if they can get an opportunity to say it.

> It might well prevent an incorporated radio network from spending any money in connection with the national convention of a political party. It might even prevent the League of Women Voters—which is incorporated—using its funds to inform its members about the record of a political candidate.

Mr. President, the more we study this matter, the deeper we go into it, the more fantastic it seems, that grown men could possibly have hatched up this thing and foisted it upon the American people. Of course, they have not done it yet. There are a few of us standing between this point and the consummation of this ill-conceived match. The President continued:

> I regard this provision of the Taft-Hartley bill as a dangerous challenge to free speech and our free press.
>
> One of the basic errors of this bill is that it ignores the fact that over the years we have been making real progress in labor-management relations. We have been achieving slow but steady improvement in cooperation between employers and workers.
>
> We must always remember that under our free economic system management and labor are associates.

I guess the framers of this bill, the architects of this great industrial-relations endeavor, never thought that management and labor were associates, that they did not run to a judge every time they had a dispute.

I am not a lawyer, but suppose we wrote a law aimed at preventing a man and wife from sitting down and talking over their differences, their disagreements, and having to go to court every time they got into a scrap. We would have more divorces; marriages would not last long enough to say "Jack Robinson." That is similar to what has been done here. It has been made practically impossible for an employer and his employees to get together on any kind of friendly terms. The provisions are specific, that they have to fight, that they have to fight before they can do anything to have anybody try to iron out their differences. If they do not get into a knock-down, drag-out fight it is not considered a bona fide dispute, so they do not do anything about it. Then after that they do not do anything about it except turn it over to a lot of people, and finally it winds up in Congress, which has to decide the dispute between labor and management.

Mr. President, I may say that the Senator from Oregon informs me that he is

with me, and that he will take over whenever I leave off. I might tell the Senator from Oregon that he can go take a nap if he wants to. I am in no distress whatever. My voice is good and strong, and he can sleep soundly.

Mr. President, President Truman continued:

> They work together for their own benefit and for the benefit of the public.
>
> The Taft-Hartley bill fails to recognize these fundamental facts. Many provisions of the bill would have the result of changing employers and workers from members of the same team to opponents on contending teams.
>
> I feel deep concern about what this would do to the steady progress we have made through the years.
>
> I fear that this type of legislation would cause the people of our country to divide into opposing groups.
>
> If conflict is created, as this bill would create it, if seeds of discord are sown, as this bill would sow them, our unity will suffer and our strength will be impaired.

Mr. President, I commend that paragraph to the attention of all within the sound of my voice. Those words might have been written by Abraham Lincoln and, indeed, they may go down in history along with Mr. Lincoln's words. Let us go over them again:

> I fear that this type of legislation would cause the people of our country to divide into opposing groups. If conflict is created, as this bill would create it, if seeds of discord are sown, as this bill would sow them, our unity will suffer and our strength will be impaired.
>
> This bill does not resemble the labor legislation which I have recommended to the Congress. The whole purpose of the bill is contrary to the sound growth of our national labor policy. There is still time to enact progressive, constructive legislation during the present session. We need such legislation to correct abuses and to further advance our labor-management relations. We seek in this country today a formula which will treat all men fairly and justly, and which will give our people security in the necessities of life. As our generous American spirit prompts us to aid the world to rebuild—

It is generous of Mr. Truman to say that, in view of the fact that he just got through reading this bill.

> As our generous American spirit prompts us to aid the world to rebuild, we must at the same time construct a better America in which all men share equitably in the blessings of democracy. The Taft-Hartley bill threatens the attainment of this goal. For the sake of the future of this Nation I hope that this bill will not become law.

Mr. President, if by postponing action on this bill until some time next week, when the people of America will have had a chance to read the President's forthright message which was sent to the Congress this afternoon, when they will have had the opportunity to listen to this very fine radio address—I think it is very splendid indeed—when they will have had time to listen to that, to make up their minds then on the basis of the first information they have had on this proposition; many of them, I am sure of it; then, Mr. President, I have every confidence that Harry Truman will not be disappointed, that his hope will be realized, that this bill will be killed, and that his veto will be sustained.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Florida for a question.

Mr. PEPPER. As I understood the remarks this evening, over the radio, of the able Senator from Ohio, he implied, if he did not say, that the message of the President was largely a repetition of the sentiment and interest of the labor leaders, and a re-presentation of the argument of the labor leaders. I want to ask the Senator, in view of his knowledge of the President's message, if he does not find on the contrary that those words which he has read in the conclusion of the message are the words of a President thinking about the strength and the welfare of the whole country, and trying to forward and progress the interests of the whole people, rather than a narrow partisan, speaking a class sentiment in the message that he wrote to the Congress?

Mr. TAYLOR. I would say to my good friend from Florida that I think the message to the people of America that the President delivered this evening over the radio is one of the finest messages I have ever heard any President deliver over the radio. For its simplicity, its directness, and sincerity it was a masterpiece.

Mr. President, now that we have reached this final stage in our consideration of H. R. 3020—that is, the last few days—I believe that it is absolutely essential in the interest of future industrial tranquillity, to point out again why this bill should not become law.

I think it is possible, Mr. President, now that we are somewhat removed in time from the arduous task of formulating a bill, provision by provision, for us to consider it dispassionately and in its proper perspective. We can and should examine it with the thought of determining whether those who hold it as I do, to be repressive and punitive legislation, are suffering from some form of mental astigmatism, or whether in fact they are not essentially correct in their conclusions. Separately and cumulatively, the provisions of this bill make for an implacable strait-jacket around the working people of our Nation, Mr. President. They reverse a hitherto healthful workable national policy of encouraging collective bargaining, into a malignant sore-ridden policy of discouraging collective bargaining. They create the basis for unending confusion and chaos in our economic life. They do all this, Mr. President, because they set up restrictions which are stifling of the basic rights of our working people. They do it also, because they create an administrative machinery which is so ponderous and so unmanageable that it must actually serve to paralyze rather than to implement the smooth functioning of the procedures set up under it.

Consider first of all the interminable and enervating litigation to which unions are so cynically subjected by the bill. Compared with only five different employer activities which were prescribed as unfair labor practices under the National Labor Relations Act there are now under section 8(b) of this bill, nine different types of activities which are made unlawful for unions to engage in; where under the National Labor Relations Act the only recourse which existed against an employer who violated its provisions was the issuance merely of a cease and desist order by the Board, the devices created to control unions under this bill are cease and desist orders, injunctions, civil suits for damages and even outright loss, by employees of their status as employees; where up to now labor unions had a protected right to attain some measure of security through the closed shop, that type of union security is now not only forbidden but in its place is substituted a form which is hemmed by impossible restrictions; where previously labor organizations were encouraged to operate free from stifling regulations and circumscriptions, they are, under this bill, overburdened with costly and impossible regulations; where the national policy under the National Labor Relations Act was to encourage collective bargaining it is now plainly one of discouraging such bargaining.

How is this appalling, this backward-looking result reached by the bill?

I have said that the bill would serve to litigate unions out of existence. Let me attempt to show why this is so.

Take, for example, the seemingly innocuous definition for the term "agent" in section 2 (13). This provides that in determining whether a person was acting as an agent of another person so as to make such other person responsible for his acts, the question of whether such acts were actually authorized or subsequently ratified should not be controlling. This section is a complete reversal of, and makes wholly inapplicable, the very healthy restraint set by the Norris-LaGuardia Act upon abuses previously practiced by many unscrupulous employers upon labor unions. Section 6 of the Norris-LaGuardia Act provides that labor unions and their officers are not to be liable for the unlawful acts of individual officers, members, or agents, except upon clear proof of actual participation, authorization, or ratification of such acts after actual knowledge.

The effect of nullifying section 6 will be to make any union subject to litigation, even if it consistently refrains from engaging in unlawful activities within the meaning of the bill. The unauthorized actions of any disgruntled union official, even those of a mere shop steward, and I might add, Mr. President, even of a stooge put there by the employer to make trouble, can, under section 2 (13), be legally ascribed to the union as a whole and make it responsible. Unscrupulous employers will not be slow to take advantage of such a situation. Even if it should be abundantly clear that the individual and perhaps deliberately provocative actions of a so-called minor "agent" were engaged in against the desires of the union, the legal basis for litigation to harass the union will have been afforded to the employer.

Before I turn to other sections of the bill, I should like to point out how a quite

different and much more favorable situation is created, under it as to the liability of an employer. Section 2 (2) redefines the term "employer" so as to exclude from its coverage any person acting in the interest of an employer directly or indirectly.

The employer is out from under, Mr. President. I should think that the Presiding Officer [Mr. DONNELL], with his fine legal education, would be one of the severest critics of the bill. I am surprised that he is not.

The section substitutes in the place of this language the words "any person acting as an agent of an employer directly or indirectly." Apparently, the intention of this redefinition is to change the rule, affirmed by the Supreme Court, that an employer is responsible for the actions of his supervisory employees even though under strict common-law rules of agency he might not be liable for their acts. I think that no one can validly deny that in modern large industry this rule is a good one, since to rank-and-file employees who do not usually come into contact with the top officials of the company but only with their foremen, it is the foremen whom they look upon as management. With this change in the definition of the term "employer," however, an employer cannot be held accountable for the actions of his supervisors unless it is proved that they acted under specific authorization from their employer. The employer, it seems, can be held responsible for the acts of his foremen only if it can be proved that he gave them specific instructions to engage in the offending acts. The union, on the other hand, can be held responsible for the acts of any union official even when it is quite clear that the acts of this official were engaged in against the wishes of the union. Quite an amazing difference, one might say, in the treatment of employers and of labor unions.

Is there anything fair about that, Mr. President? How can the great legal mind possessed by the present occupant of the Chair reconcile such things as this with the ethics of the bar? It is discrimination, making one code for an employer and an absolutely different one for the employee.

Having found that the bill makes a union legally responsible for the actions of any subordinate official it becomes necessary to see how offensive these acts must be before a labor organization can be effectively and legally hamstrung by a watchful and hostile employer. In the first place, section 7 of the bill which sets forth the rights of employees which are protected under the act, includes among them the right "to refrain from joining a union or from engaging in concerted activities for collective bargaining." This right "to refrain" is, of course, a basic one.

In fact, it was just as basic when the National Labor Relations Act was passed. Yet since the stated purpose of the act was to encourage collective bargaining, it was obviously unnecessary to specify the protection of a right which was not being threatened. This basic right of employees of refraining from joining unions is not any the more threatened today. Its inclusion can have the result only of encouraging countless charges by employers against unions, especially in the initial stages of the organizing, by labor unions, of their employees, that the unions are violating their employees' rights "to refrain" from joining.

Another provision of the bill, section 8 (b) (1), serves as pernicious a source for multitudinous lawsuits against labor organizations as does section 7. In fact, both of these should be read together, if some idea is to be obtained as to how the efforts of unions at organizing can be made wholly innocuous by employer litigation, at the very first stages of their organizing campaigns. Section 8 (b) (1) provides that it shall be an unfair labor practice for a labor organization or its agents to restrain or coerce employees in the exercise of the rights guaranteed in section 7.

If we bear in mind that one of the rights under section 7 is to refrain from joining; and that in the minds of some persons the meaning of the terms "coercion" and "restraint" can range from that of enthusiastic verbal solicitation by an employee of membership in his union to that of outright violence, we can get some idea of how labor unions will be subjected to litigation under these sections. Acts which constitute real restraint and coercion cannot, of course, be condoned no matter by whom they are practiced, but it seems to me that our State and local machinery for law enforcement has not so far broken down that the Federal Government must intrude into the sphere of what is purely a function of policing. Not only would the Board be burdened down with investigating charges of infractions of the peace in almost every case which comes before it but the remedy which would be open to it would be wholly ineffectual. Violence should be met by quick arrest, trial and, where guilt is indicated, by conviction and appropriate punishment; not, as would be the case under the bill, of the investigating of a charge, a hearing after the charge has been investigated, and a cease-and-desist order issued perhaps many months after the violence took place. The only purpose that this procedure seems to serve is not in itself to effectively halt the practice by unions of restraint or coercion but to create another method by which unions through useless litigation can be harassed and balked in their efforts at organizing workers.

The employer's opportunity of forcing labor organizations into costly litigation is by no means exhausted with the provisions I have already discussed. In fact, their seriousness, so far as the continued existence of such labor organizations is concerned, is less than that even of certain other provisions in the bill.

Section 8 (b) (4) opens up for employers a brilliant new field for even more destructive litigation. Under this section a union is not only guilty of an unfair labor practice but is also made subject to civil suit for damages if it engages in certain strikes or boycotts whose objective is any one of those enumerated and made unlawful by that section. By this language, the test of the union's liability both as an unfair labor practice or as civil liability for damages, turns on whether even one of its "objectives" was one of those enumerated in section 8 (b) (4). This test, of the "objective" revives in our history a dark period when the courts freely handed down injunctions restricting the employees' right to strike because one of, perhaps many lawful objectives, was a prohibited one. This test is now again made possible in proceedings before the Board and in civil suits. Is there any reason to believe that employers will hesitate from multiplying the number of lawsuits brought against unions wherever such employers can hope to prove that, even in the most minor respect, one of the objectives of the union was a prohibited one?

No matter how little validity such suits may prove to possess, it is certain that they will serve at least the purpose of defeating the organizing efforts of the union, of depleting its treasury, and of sapping its energies.

If any union should be fortunate enough to escape litigation under any of the provisions which I have already discussed, it stands still the further danger of being litigated into abject helplessness by another section of the bill.

Really, this bill sets one gauntlet after another for unions to run. They can be sued and sued and sued, until they finally lie down and turn up their toes. They might as well do so in the first instance.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Is not that one of the principal vices of this bill, that we have to consider the cumulative effects of its restrictive provisions? Probably one alone might not be so disastrous, but when we take all of them together and consider what the total effect of these many restrictive provisions will be, the net effect of it is, as no doubt many designed it to be, to hamstring and strangle the effectiveness of the labor unions of the country as representatives of the working people.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want to say to the distinguished, able, and militant Senator from Florida that there would be no other result. The treasuries of the labor unions will be depleted. They will pass into the limbo of forgotten things; and I guess some people will be happy when we are back to that time. Some of the older gentlemen of the Senate could tell about when they used to work for a dollar a week, by gum, and they want everyone else to do the same. We will be back to those good old days, I guess, and some people will be happy.

Mr. President, the test is now again made possible in proceedings before the Board and in civil suits. Is there any reason to believe that employers will hesitate about multiplying the number of lawsuits brought against unions wherever such employers can hope to prove that even in the most minor respects one of the objectives of the union was a prohibited one? No matter, Mr. President, how little validity such suits may prove to possess, it is certain that they will serve at least the purpose of defeating the organizing efforts of the union, depleting its treasury, and sapping its energies.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Florida for a question.

Mr. PEPPER. I would like to ask the able Senator from Idaho if there is not another important difference between the lawyer for the corporation and the lawyer for the labor union. The expense incurred by the corporate employee, for example, in paying its lawyers is a deductible expense, is it not?

Mr. TAYLOR. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. It is taken partially away from the United States Government in diminished income taxes which the corporation pays, whereas the lawyer of the labor union is paid out of the fees contributed by the workers, who are people, and therefore it is not deductible from income taxes. Is not the burden, therefore, far greater upon the working people to try to defend themselves with high-priced lawyers than upon the corporate employers who attack them with vexatious and litigious lawsuits by lawyers who are paid out of funds which may constitute a business expense and be deductible from income taxes?

Mr. TAYLOR. The Senator from Florida has stated the case precisely and exactly, as he always does. That is exactly what would happen to those labor unions. They do not get exemptions for getting into court all the time. So it would work a far greater hardship upon the union than it would upon the corporation. That is why they can break the union.

If any union should be fortunate enough to escape litigation under any of the provisions which I have already discussed, there is still the further danger of being litigated into abject helplessness by another section of the bill.

A union, under section 9 (f), must, before it can set into motion the machinery of the Board, by the filing of any type of petition or charge, first file a detailed statement with the Secretary of Labor. Seventeen different items of information must be furnished by it in this statement. I cannot conceive of that unique situation where an employer will not be able to find, by diligent search, some minor deficiency in the statement filed by the union and thus be in a position to successfully challenge the union's right to employ the processes of the Board.

This is the most fantastic piece of legislation that has ever passed the Senate, Mr. President. I am no lawyer, but I can tell black from white and I can tell right from wrong when there is no doubt about it. We passed a bill to deal with Mr. Petrillo. It was a sensible bill, a short one of one paragraph. It went over to the House, and they put everything into it but the kitchen sink and sent it back to the Senate. When it came back I read the bill. Although I am not a lawyer I knew it was unconstitutional, because we cannot do things like that to Americans. I just felt it in my heart. So, Mr. President, I got up and fought that bill one whole day all by myself. Having been in the entertainment profession I felt it was incumbent on me to defend the musicians who were going to be discriminated against. I defended them for one whole day, with all the lawyers saying the bill was fine and would work out well. But, Mr. President, the courts upheld my position. They declared it unconstitutional.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Florida again for one of his very good questions.

Mr. PEPPER. May it not be that the lawyers whom the Senator has mentioned, who gave their solemn opinion that the bill the Senator has been speaking about was constitutional, were motivated by the same point of view as that class of expensive corporation lawyers who gave the very impressive and solemn legal opinion a few years ago that the Wagner Act was unconstitutional?

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, I do not know anything about law as such. I never read the books. But it does seem to me that there are some things that we cannot do to people in a civilized society. They should have some rights. I found out that they did. At least, so far the courts have ruled that way. I do not know about this bill. It seems to me that certainly some provisions of it would be unconstitutional.

It certainly is unsportsmanlike to place two antagonists against each other who have been getting along pretty well. They scrap once in a while, but now they are put into an arena and we say, "Boys, you have really got to fight. We are going to take away a lot of the protection you have had before and we are going to give you more power over here, and before you can appeal for aid to anybody you have got to show us that you have a fight going." We start them fighting and give one fellow all the advantage. It looks like we are putting blinders on the labor boys and giving the other fellows brass knucks and telling them to fight it out. It just does not seem right. Maybe it is constitutional, I do not know; but I cannot see how it can be.

If the bill were objectionable for no other reason than that it provided so many, many opportunities for unions to be harassed into nonexistence by constant litigation, that in itself would be sufficient basis for characterizing it as pure antilabor legislation. But, as I have stated at the outset, there are objectionable features to be found in other provisions of the bill which, in themselves, could very validly make such a label stick. I am referring now to the provisions which deal with the administration of the bill which, to my mind, are so unworkable as to lead to a complete break-down in the machinery set up by it.

Take, for example, section 3 (d) which provides for the appointment of a general counsel by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The duties of the general counsel are to exercise supervision over all attorneys, other than trial examiners and legal assistants to the Board members, and over the officers and employees in the regional offices. He is, also, to have final authority, on behalf of the Board, in the investigation and prosecution of all unfair-labor-practice cases. Regardless of whatever arguments may be made in favor of a so-called separation of functions, nothing can be said, in my opinion, in favor of concentrating into the hands of one single individual so much power.

Under this provision the general counsel, and he alone, can determine what complaint cases are to be prosecuted before the Board. He may refuse arbitrarily to issue a complaint, and no individual may have any recourse against him for such refusal. With this power he can potentially follow a policy wholly inconsistent with that of the Board, as evinced by its decisions. Nowhere in our governmental structure can there be found so complete an absence of checks and balances. Potentially, such a situation can create utter confusion. Neither employers nor labor organizations can, under such circumstances, find any sure guide as to the principles established under the act by which to conduct themselves. It is inconceivable that such a situation should be permitted to exist in the field of labor relations. Labor relations will simply be adrift, with no rudder and no anchor.

Also, from the point of view of proper administration, it is difficult to find any wisdom in that provision in section 4 (a), which prohibits the Board from appointing individuals for the purpose of making economic analyses. There are few fields, indeed, in which analytical studies of currents and trends are as essential as that which deals with labor relations. Many of the duties with which the Board is charged make the use of such trained personnel absolutely essential. For example, under section 8 (b) (5), the Board must determine in certain instances whether union fees are excessive or discriminatory. In making its determination it must consider, "among other relevant factors, the practices and customs of labor organization in the particular industry." It is beyond understanding how the Board is to attain familiarity with such factors without the aid of economic analysts. Then, too, the Board, under section 8 (b) (6), must determine whether a labor organization has committed an unfair labor practice by exacting payment for "services which are not performed or not to be performed."

It is to be expected that unions will endeavor to eliminate sweatshop conditions or speed-up systems. In doing so, they will necessarily demand that work loads be reduced and more workers employed. Whether such demands are legitimate, as will undoubtedly be contended by the unions, or whether they constitute feather bedding, as will no doubt be claimed by employers, are matters which, for the Board, without the aid of economic analysts, will be impossible of determination. The argument may be made, of course, that the information which the Board might seek through the use of economic analysts might better be submitted to it in the form of evidence at a hearing. This argument folds, however, on close examination.

The evidence which must be submitted on questions such as are covered by sections 8 (b) (5) and (6) falls, in large

part, into the category of expert testimony. Every lawyer knows that experts in the same field will often differ with each other, depending upon which side they appear to testify for. An expert representing an employer will differ with an expert representing a union. Only the impartial analyses made by employees of the Government can in such instances serve as a basis for a fair decision. There is no reason why the Board should not be permitted to employ such analysts.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRICKER in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield for a question; yes.

Mr. PEPPER. I wish to ask the Senator, before he passes too far beyond the point about the National Labor Relations Board's having authority to determine what fees shall be paid by members of labor unions to labor unions, whether he thinks it is outrageous discrimination against the labor unions to provide that this governmental board by law shall determine the fees which members of labor unions shall pay to the labor unions, when no law requires or permits any governmental agency to determine the fees which members of farm organizations shall pay to their organizations, or permits any such Government agency to determine the dues which members of fraternal organizations shall pay their organizations, or allows any governmental agency to determine the dues which members of an employers' association shall be required to pay to that association?

Mr. TAYLOR. No; certainly, Mr. President, as I have said, it is discrimination of the worst type. It is hard for me to believe that it is legal and that it will not be declared unconstitutional.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield for a question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Is not the same discrimination against a labor union instanced in the President's message when he points out that labor unions are required to file the most elaborate reports and are entitled to no protection under the National Labor Relations Act until they file such comprehensive reports, while the corporate employers, the partnerships or associations, which might be employers, are not required to file any such reports?

Mr. TAYLOR. It is, indeed. This is a bill to "get" labor.

For no valid reason that I can see, the bill proposes to eliminate from the Board's procedures two existing and valuable devices for expediting its functions. Their elimination is especially amazing because they are in the first instance employed in an area which is not at all controversial and, furthermore, have proved themselves to be extremely effective in reducing the number of cases constantly pending before the Board. These procedures have to do with the determination of a bargaining agent in representation cases by the use of the so-called prehearing elections and by the cross check of union application cards to determine majority. Section 9 (c) (4) of the bill has the unfortunate effect of eliminating these procedures. If it is remembered that the first of these procedures—the prehearing election—has been utilized by the Board only in cases where there have been no really controversial issues involved in the proceedings, and the second—the cross check of cards—only where both the employer and the union have agreed to the use of this method, then it becomes difficult to understand why a hitherto successful means of quickly disposing of 20 percent of the Board's adjusted representation cases should thus be eliminated. The need for the Board to hold formal hearings in such cases, under the bill, will not alone be extremely costly but must eventually make unnecessary inroads in the handling of more important functions.

Another provision which I believe to be objectionable from the point of view of good administration is section 10 (c), which provides that the findings and recommended orders of trial examiners shall become final if no exceptions are filed within 20 days after they are issued. In effect, this provision provides an excellent opportunity for a party to skirt the agency and take its case directly to the courts. If a party does not file any exceptions, the agency is powerless to modify the findings of the trial examiner, no matter how ill-founded they may be. Yet, it would be required to uphold in the courts a decision which it has not itself made and which it might willingly have corrected upon review if it were permitted to do so.

There are many other more or less seriously objectionable features in the bill. Time will not permit an exhaustive treatment of all of these. I shall make only brief comments as to some of them.

If any provision of the Board opens up the possibility of tying up the Board continuously and bogging it down to the exclusion of all other matters, it is section 10 (k). This section requires that the Board itself—and not an arbitrator—decide the issues arising out of jurisdictional disputes. The determination of such issues obviously requires specialized knowledge and techniques. How it is to be expected for the Board to involve itself directly in cases so involved and complicated, and yet to perform its other functions, is beyond understanding.

To add to the Board's administrative difficulties, there is section 8 (c). This provides that expression of views, argument, or opinion shall not constitute or be evidence of an unfair labor practice if they contain no threat of reprisal or force or promise of benefit. Nowhere in the field of law will such an amazing principle be found. No one would argue that an expression of opinion should in itself constitute an unfair labor practice when it does not include a threat. Such a rule would be a clear violation of an individual's constitutional right of free speech. But, on the other hand, there is absolutely no reason why the Board should not, like any other tribunal, judicial or quasi judicial, be permitted to accept in evidence such arguments or expressions of opinions if they furnish proof of motive in the commission of some other unfair labor practice. Any laymen will readily understand that proof of an individual's intention will in most instances lie in the expressions he has uttered or the arguments he has made. Yet the Board is forbidden by this section even to receive such expressions or arguments in evidence. The idea, in our jurisprudence, is preposterous. The rule serves to nullify almost every section of the bill which establishes specified activities to be unfair labor practices.

Another almost equally ridiculous provision in the bill which goes far toward nullifying the National Labor Relations Act is the amendment in section 10 (c), which provides that the Board may not order reinstatement or back pay to any individual discharged for cause. By these terms, the Board could not reinstate an employe and grant him back pay where his employer clearly discharged him because of his union activities simply because in addition to this reason for discharging him there also existed grounds for which the employer might also have discharged him. It should not be at all difficult for an employer to furnish such additional reasons for an employee's discharge in almost every case. I can see no reason why, if it is proved that an employee actually has been discharged for his union activities, the employer should be permitted to escape liability by pleading conduct which he was perfectly willing to tolerate until the employee became active in the union.

By no means the least objectionable feature of the bill is the one that has to do with the definition of collective bargaining. Section 8 (d) specifically provides that the duty shall not be imposed upon any party to discuss or agree to any modifications of the terms contained in a contract for a fixed period, if the modifications are to take effect before the end of the term of the contract. It is certainly not conducive to good relations between the parties to a labor contract if, when conditions make it necessary, one of the parties should wish to reopen discussion as to some term of a contract and the other party should be permitted to refuse even to discuss this matter. Discussion does not mean necessarily the making of any concession. In good reason, there is no sense in establishing a rule which will support intransigence whether on the part of an employer or a labor organization. This can only lead to strikes and to lock-outs. The existing rule, which requires the parties to sit down and in good faith discuss demands for a change in a contract is far more beneficial to industrial tranquillity.

I should also like to say something about another amendment which appears in section 8 (d) dealing with collective bargaining. In my mind, this amendment is extremely objectionable because it treats so disparately between employers and employees. This provision prohibits either employers or employees to violate the "cooling off" period of 60 days which is required before they can engage in strikes or lock-outs. The

objectionable feature in this section lies in the fact that if the employer violates this section his liability extends only to being subjected to a possible cease and desist order issued by the Board. On the other hand, employees who violate this section can be subjected summarily and at the will of the employer to the most drastic punishment to which any person who makes his livelihood by his labor can be subjected—that of the loss of his status as an employee. Not only is this distinction in treatment for the same type of offense extremely unfair but it makes for the very real possibility that an employer may deliberately provoke a strike to rid himself of certain of his employees. Such inequality of treatment has no place in our laws.

I have by no means covered every objectionable provision of the bill; yet I feel that those I have discussed are, if the bill contained no others, proof that the bill is unfair, biased, and unmanageable. The field of labor relations is not one in which this country can afford to make even minor mistakes. The enactment of this bill over the President's veto would be one of the major disasters of our era. Its passage would not only have widespread repercussions throughout the Nation, including strikes, stoppages, and lock-outs, but it would also indirectly affect the welfare of millions of people outside our borders. To the extent that production of basic commodities is interfered with to that extent must our people as well as the peoples of other nations suffer. Passing this bill is a mistake we cannot afford to make.

Mr. President, I should like to finish what I undertook to do earlier this evening, by inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the names of the brave churchmen who had the courage of their convictions, whose convictions were born of their Christian beliefs, that the bill is unworthy, that it should not be passed. Earlier in the evening I read the statement, and I read certain of their names. I should like to include the remainder of the names in the RECORD. I believe, Mr. President, I had concluded giving the names of those from California. Colorado is the next State on the list.

Rabbi Manuel Lederman, of Denver; Rev. Samuel W. Marble, of Denver.

Going to the State of Connecticut, there are a considerable number of signers. All these people are opposed to the Taft-Hartley bill, on account of the things that it will do to the American people, who are their parishioners. The names are as follows:

Rev. A. N. Avrutick, Hartford; Dr. James Good Broun, Ansonia; Rev. J. George Butler, Hartford; Rev. Merrill F. Clarke, New Canaan; Rabbi Hyman Cohen, Meriden; Prof. John W. Darr, Middletown; Rev. Lewis H. Davis, Torrington; Rabbi Maurice J. Elefard, Hartford; Rev. Meredith F. Ellor, Hartford; Rev. Richard A. G. Foster, New Haven; Rev. George B. Gilbert, Middletown; Rev. Donald Hamblin, Hartford; Rev. Emerson G. Hangen, Meridan; Rev. Earl C. Heck, Hartford; Rev. Charles X. Hutchinson, Hartford; Rev. Edgar N. Jackson, Bridgeport; Rev. Fleming James, Sr., North Haven; Rabbi M. Aaron Kra, Ansonia; Rev. Roderick MacLeod, Winsted; Rev. Sidney Lovett, New Haven; Rev. Harry L. MacKenzie, Greens Farms; Rabbi Moses S. Malinowitz, New London; Rev. Edward L. Peet, Hartford; Dr. Liston Pope, New Haven; Rabbi Stanley Rabinowitz, New Haven; Rev. Richard H. Ritter, Southington; Rev. W. Glenn Roberts, Hartford; Rev. Alfred Schmalz, Darien; Rabbi Aaron Shuchatowitz, New Haven. Rabbi Morris Silverman, of Hartford. I believe I met Rabbi Silverman at a meeting one evening when I was in that section of the country. Rev. Elsie F. Stowe, Seymour; Rev. Willard Uphaus, New Haven; Rev. Wallace T. Viets, Hartford; Rabbi Max R. Wasser, Torrington; Rev. C. Lawson Willard, Jr., New Haven; Rev. Loyd F. Morley, Stamford; Rabbi Harry Zwelling, New Britain.

That ends the State of Connecticut.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I may yield for a question.

Mr. KILGORE. I am asking this as a question. Under the Constitution and laws of the United States, is it not necessary, before a State may be admitted to the Union, that it guarantee to the people within the State a republican form of government?

Mr. TAYLOR. That is as I understand it.

Mr. KILGORE. A republican form of government is known as a representative form of government, in which representatives elected, proportionally to the population of the respective States or subdivisions thereof, shall be recognized as voting in their respective districts, is that not correct?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes.

Mr. KILGORE. Is it not rather peculiar that with respect to a measure of this importance there should be so terrific an effort made as is made at the present time to eliminate the votes of certain Members of the Senate of the United States, to prevent them from voting because, inadvertently, they happen to be absent from the Senate of the United States at the time the vote is proposed to be taken?

Mr. TAYLOR. Certainly.

Mr. KILGORE. Senators are representing the United States in Geneva, Switzerland, and in other places. Is it in line with the guarantees made by the Constitution, or the proper processes of a republican form of government, that Members of the Senate should endeavor to preclude other Senators from the right to represent their constituents in voting in the United States Senate on so important a question as the pending one?

Mr. TAYLOR. I may say to the distinguished and able senior Senator from West Virginia that it is a well-known fact that the whole procedure is aimed at railroading the measure through before the people realize what really has overtaken them. They have been kidded into believing that this was a mild bill, that it was not that old, mean, Hartley bill. The first spokesman to speak out to the people whose words will have to be heard—the newspapers will have to print what he had to say—is President Truman. He has told the truth about the matter. Many people have heard the truth now for the first time. Some newspapers have covered the matter in a fairly concise manner, but generally all the propaganda has been on the other side, that the bill was a nice little tame one, just like a little pussycat, that would not hurt anyone. It has been said the bill is sorely needed, and its advocates want to get it through while that impression still prevails.

I have never known before of Senators not agreeing to postpone a vote on an important measure for a day or so. The Senate the other day postponed a vote on the rent-control bill. The postponement was made from Friday until Tuesday of the next week. No one was excited about that delay. There was an expiration dead line with respect to that bill; but there is no dead line with respect to the matter now before us. Certain persons want to "get" labor. These frantic people, who see slipping from their grasp opportunity to strangle labor, to throttle labor, to do away with labor unions, to set up a Fascist state, are not going to miss this opportunity if they can help it. They will keep us here all day and all night, and all the next day and all the next night, and then all day Sunday.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes; I yield for a question.

Mr. KILGORE. In the mind of the Senator from Idaho, does not the attitude taken by some Senators show an effort to force through a bill regardless of whether certain States may be represented in the vote taken, regardless of the guaranty of a republican form of government by the Constitution, regardless of the form of representation guaranteed to the States? Is that not the general impression obtained by the Senator?

Mr. TAYLOR. If the Senator means that they are being inconsiderate of the Senators who are absent, certainly that is true. There are Senators like the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], who is away on official business. He would certainly like to be present to vote on this measure. The people of Utah are entitled to have his vote recorded, and we are entitled to have the benefit of his advice and consultation. The measure is so important that due consideration should be given to it before we vote.

We could postpone the vote on the measure for a week, and proceed with other legislation in the meantime. I am sure such legislation, however, would not be housing legislation. There is nothing pressing about that. People can live out of doors at this time of the year, so there is no hurry about housing legislation. I am sure no legislation would be passed to raise the minimum wage. Workers are receiving a minimum of 40 cents an hour, which amounts to $16 a week. That, some seem to think, is enough. So there is no hurry about raising the minimum wage. I am sure the legislation considered would not be such as would help the little man. We might consider some other monopoly bill which could be rushed in here to save the day, while we were waiting for Senators to return and vote on this great labor legislation, this bill which some contend is going to save the Union. Yes, Mr. President; it is

going to save the Union by wrecking the unions.

Mr. President, the procedure now being taken is very strange indeed. It is unprecedented, unheard of. Since I have been in the Senate I have seen nothing like it. We have indicated that it is not our desire to talk the measure to death, or anything of that kind. We are willing to say nothing more about it; just let the people think about it. We want to have absent Senators have an opportunity to return so they may vote. But no, some Senators will not agree to that. They are going to make us vote at the earliest possible moment. We are going to have to stand on our feet day and night until a vote is taken, Sunday included. I accept the challenge. I have talked about 9 hours today, and will be good for another 9 hours, and then after 8 hours' sleep I will be good for another 18 hours.

Mr. President, I should like to proceed with the list of names attached to the statement to which I referred previously.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. KILGORE. I do not know whether the Senator remembers or not, but I ask him if he does remember that, during the war, when the Democrats were in control of the Congress of the United States, no questions were asked as to who should be General Marshall's assistant, and who should be his chief adviser with respect to the war in Europe or the war in Asia. Is that not a fact?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes; that is a fact, as far as I remember.

Mr. KILGORE. Now may I say to the Senator from Idaho——

Mr. TAYLOR. No; the Senator cannot say anything to me. The Senator must ask me a question.

Mr. KILGORE. I ask the Senator's pardon. In the bill under discussion provision is made for a chief counsel, who is completely uncontrolled by the National Labor Relations Board, who is not answerable to the Board, but to himself alone. How would General Marshall have been able to conduct military affairs, settle questions which came before him, had Congress done the same thing with respect to him that is now proposed to be done with respect to the labor relations situation?

Mr. TAYLOR. If I were permitted to ask the Senator a question I would ask him if he really thought that anyone wants the bill to work successfully, that anyone wants peaceful labor relations to result from it. No; those who are anxious for its passage want to wreck the country, to get it into a great turmoil and take things over. That is about the size of it. That is the way it has been done before, by Hitler and Mussolini. They got things into a big uproar and then took over. The Communists do the same thing. We must watch from both angles. We must watch the Communists on one side and the Fascists on the other. This is a Fascist measure. There is no doubt about it. It is cleverly conceived. In its many ramifications it is like a futuristic painting.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRICKER in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. Before I ask the question, let me say that I sometimes wonder whether it would not be a good idea to paint the picture with a whitewash brush. With my background of farming and mining experience, of course, I would not ask that.

I ask the Senator if it is not more than merely a question of getting a vote—for example, a vote from the State of Utah, in the form of the vote of the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. Is it not a question of getting a man who has had years of experience in labor and industrial relations, in the question of economics, and other things with which the Senator from Utah has had experience during his entire lifetime, particularly his experience in the United States, in Japan, in Germany, and various other countries?

Mr. TAYLOR. Certainly, if any man in the United States is qualified to pass upon this question, it is the senior Senator from the State of Utah, a man who served with distinction as chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Education, and as United States delegate to many international labor conferences. It is not only a question of obtaining the physical presence here of Senators to vote and to consult and discuss. It is also a question of giving the people of America an opportunity to know about the bill. Before it has left us irrevocably, they should have time to think this question over for themselves and decide whether or not they want this legislation.

As I say, I have no hope of changing the minds of a good many Senators who are definitely decided on this proposal, but I believe that there are a large number of Senators whose minds are more or less open. If they should find, Mr. President, that their people back home definitely do not want the bill, I think it would change enough votes to kill this terrible legislation. A change of only three or four votes would be sufficient to kill this legislation, which will cost America uncounted wealth in dollars, as well as in the happiness of her people. It will involve destruction, disruption, lack of production, inflation, general strife, and turmoil.

It is a sad day indeed when our enthusiastic Republican friends suddenly, out of a clear sky, refuse to grant a reasonable accommodation with respect to the schedule for this legislation. In connection with other legislation, when it is said, "Let us vote next Thursday," they say, "Certainly." They are fine sociable fellows. But in connection with this bill, when the suggestion is made that we vote next week, so that the people can think it over, they say, "Not on your life. We are going to get this through right now, before anyone can think anything about it."

Yet this is a bill which the President felt was so crucial that he went on the air to speak to the people of the Nation. That is something which he has not done for some time in connection with legislation before the Congress. That is the difference. This is important. It means much to America. The Republican majority, which has been enacting one piece of legislation after another which will only lead us to ruin down the road to depression, are determined to get this bill through before the people have an opportunity to think it over. They realize that they can never get it through otherwise. So here they sit, like a bunch of buzzards out in Arizona, waiting for the corpse to drop to the floor. They will sit a long time, Mr. President, because I have outwitted those buzzards out there on the prairie.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield for a question.

Mr. PEPPER. I ask the able Senator from Idaho if it is not a fact that whatever demand there was generally in the country of a legitimate character for labor legislation was not directed primarily at a great wave of strikes? Was not that wave of strikes, which occurred in early 1946, attributable to the difficulties and maladjustments of the reconversion period? With the passing of the reconversion period, has not the real demand for that kind of legislation, and the necessity for it, passed? Therefore is not the President correct in saying that this bill comes substantially at a time of industrial peace, and that the effect of it would be simply to promote strife instead of peace? Is it not therefore correct to say that the legislation should not be enacted at this time?

Mr. TAYLOR. This bill should not be enacted at any time. If the country were tied up with strikes in every plant in the Nation, the bill would still be no good. As the President pointed out, it would not stop John L. Lewis or anyone else from doing anything he wanted to do. All it would do would be to get the Government mixed up, and cross its feet so as to make it fall over itself and become ridiculous. We would have a great many strikes, and much strife that we would not have otherwise.

Frankly, I do not hold out to the American people any great panacea that will give us completely unruffled labor relations, whether we pass this bill or not. If we pass it, the situation will be a great deal worse. If we do not pass it, there will still be occasional strikes and lockouts. We might as well tell the people the truth. There always have been conflicts involved in employer-employee relations, and there always will be. So long as we have our free economy, that is one of the penalties which we must pay for freedom. We must suffer a modicum of bargaining conflict and disagreement. I am willing to accept it.

When we see the profits of the big industrialists going sky high while the laboring man's actual take-home pay is dwindling and prices are rising, how in the name of heaven do we expect to escape industrial strife and unrest?

No; we shall never have industrial peace so long as the Republicans are running things. There is no doubt about

that. The situation will become worse and worse.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes.

Mr. KILGORE. During the war it was my privilege to do investigation work with the War Investigating Committee in connection with war production. Has it not been the Senator's observation that during the war labor—and I speak of labor as a whole, the workers——

Mr. TAYLOR. The Senator speaks of people?

Mr. KILGORE. Yes; the people of the United States. Is it not a fact that they did a magnificent job of production in getting out the necessary tools, machinery, equipment, and other things necessary to win the war?

Mr. TAYLOR. Certainly they did a magnificent job of production. I worked in a defense plant, as I have said before. The last job I had before I came to the Senate was in a defense plant. I have in my pocket a sheet-metal worker's card. Yes; they did a good job of production. There was a great deal of loafing in the plant where I was, but it was not the fault of the workers. I loafed, and it was not my fault. The materials were not there to work with, and the boss sent down word that the stuff had to last us for 2 weeks or 10 days, or whatever it was, and we looked it over and paced ourselves accordingly. We did not want to do it, but we had to. There is nothing more degrading than to be on a job where you cannot give it everything you have, and if you can think up better ways to do the work, see that they are put into effect. But the management wanted no suggestions. They said, "Keep your mouth shut. Never mind. We do not care whether you can do it more quickly or not."

The inspectors from the Navy would come through the plant and the manager would send someone to tell us that the inspector was coming, so that we could appear busy. It was not the fault of the workers. They did a good job, a magnificent job. I have seen a number of them quit the plant where I was working during the war. A man would say, "My God, my boy is over in Japan. I cannot stay here and loaf as we have to. I am going to some other place where I can work." And they would go. Pretty soon they would come back and say, "It was worse over at the place I went, so I am back here again."

The workers did a good job. They have been blamed for the fact that there was loafing in the defense plants. Sometimes inspectors would see them loafing, when the manager was not right on the job and did not send the warning agent through. The managers had more people than they needed in most places. It was cost-plus—the more it cost the more the plus.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a couple of additional questions?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes; I am happy to yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. Is it not a fact that most of the delays were caused by maldistribution of supplies? That is what I found in my investigations, as did various others. But during that time there was not any hostility between management and labor. Is not that a fact? In other words, management cooperated with labor to the fullest extent possible, based upon the supplies they had?

Mr. TAYLOR. There was no fighting. We were sorry we did not have the materials, but we cooperated with management. We did not try to put management in a hole.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes; I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. From that experience the Senator knows, I believe, that when there is a market for material produced there is cooperation between management and labor? Is not that a fact? They will cooperate so long as there is a market within the price range for which the material can be produced.

Mr. TAYLOR. I certainly feel that there is no necessity for hostility. It is not inevitable at all that management and labor should fight. I know of many managers who get along wonderfully well with labor because they treat workers like human beings. Of course, many of these equitable, amicable labor relations that are in effect will be ended if this bill goes into effect. It says to them, "You cannot do that. You cannot be friends any more. You have got to fight. Let us have some sport. Get busy; fight a little."

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes; I am happy to have the Senator ask me a question.

Mr. KILGORE. Therefore, it is not necessary for the Government to step in and say that they cannot enter into certain agreements between labor and management in order to protect the public, provided there is a market? Is not that correct?

Mr. TAYLOR. Certainly the Senator is correct in that.

Mr. President, I have gotten to the District of Columbia now in inscribing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the names of the churchmen who oppose this bill. I am referring to the group of churchmen, of various churches, priests, rabbis, and reverends, who issued this appeal to President Truman to veto the labor bill.

In the District of Columbia there are Rabbi Samuel H. Berkowitz and Rabbi David Pruzansky.

In Delaware there is Rabbi Joseph I. Singer, of Wilmington.

In Florida, Rev. Floyd M. Irvin, of Eustis.

In Florida there are Rabbi M. Mischeloff, of Miami Beach; Rabbi Sanders M. Tofield, of Jacksonville; Rev. Edward W. Ullrich of Miami; Rev. G. W. Washington, of Jacksonville.

In Georgia we have Rabbi Hyman R. Friedman, of Atlanta; Rev. David N. Howell, of Atlanta; Rabbi Charles M. Rubel, of Macon; and Rabbi Abraham I. Rosenberg, of Savannah.

There is quite a list from the State of Illinois. Evidently the clergy out there are really up and about and fighting for the welfare of the common man.

In Illinois there are Dr. James Luther Adams, Chicago; Rev. J. Frank Anderson, Tinley Park; Rev. Karl Baehr, Chicago; Rev. Frederic E. Bell, Seneca; Rev. Ray E. Bond, Chicago; Rev. H. N. Brockway, Oak Park; Rev. Hugh Elmer Brown, Evanston; Rev. Albert W. Buck, Chicago; Rev. Edwin T. Buehrer, Chicago; Rabbi E. Louis Cardou, Springfield; Rev. William Clark, Chicago; Rev. Harold E. Craw, La Grange; Rev. Paul B. Deferson, Chicago; Rev. Herbert J. Doran, Urbana; Rev. Clifford Earle, Chicago; Rev. Fred Eastman, Chicago; Rev. Robert Worth Frank, Chicago; Rev. Herbert George, Chicago; Rabbi David Graubart, Chicago; Rabbi Philip Graubart, Chicago; Rev. Armand Guerrero, Chicago; Rev. George Halsted, Chicago.

It is quite evident from the names that no particular nationality or faith has any monopoly insofar as a proper attitude toward organized labor is concerned. The names which I am reading certainly reflect America and its many races and nationalities and religions.

I read more of the names: Rev. Louis U. Huber, Jerseyville; Dr. Homer Jack, Chicago; Rabbi Monroe Levens, Oak Park; Rev. C. Sumpter Logan, Lawrenceville; Rev. William N. Lovell, Chicago; Rev. Harold L. Lunger, Oak Park; Rev. Hugh S. Mackenzie, Chicago; Rev. Douglas V. Machan, Chicago.

I read more of the names: Rev. Frank B. McCulloch, Chicago; Rev. William G. McGill, Chicago; Rev. J. B. McKendry, Oak Park; Rev. John Magill, Monmouth; Rev. Paul L. Meacham, Cermi; Rev. Carl T. Michel, Chicago; Rabbi Jacob J. Nathan, Chicago; Rev. Clyde K. Newhouse, Cobden.

All these men are opposed to this bill. All of them are from Illinois. I should like to call that fact to the attention of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], namely, that the names I am reading are those of ministers and rabbis and fathers from the State of Illinois who oppose this bill.

I continue to read the names: Rev. Duane Nichol, Chicago; Dr. Victor Obenhaus, Chicago; Rev. Douglas Patterson, Chicago; Rev. Leslie T. Pennington, Chicago; Rabbi Shlomo Rapoport, Chicago; Rev. Conrad Reiner, Chicago; Rev. Frederick W. Ringe, Franklin Park; Rev. Orville Sampson, Chicago.

Mr. President, I shall finish reading this list of names after a while.

I hear some of the proponents of this bill protesting violently that this is a filibuster. No; this is not a filibuster; this is a time-consuming operation just for the purpose of giving the people of America time to realize what is in this bill and time to think it over and then let the Congress know how they feel about it. I have pointed that out several times, and I think it will bear repeating, because if the press has anything at all to say about what I have said here this evening, I hope the press will tell the people of the country that I am not trying to prevent a vote on this bill. I expressed willingness to have a unanimous consent agreement after the elapse of the customary few days. If it is the will of the people that it pass, that is fine and dandy, and I shall have no argument after I think the people have had an opportunity to think about it. But I do not think they have had

that opportunity thus far. The only reason I am talking is to give the people an opportunity thoroughly to understand the bill and then let their Senators know what they think about it.

Mr. President, I may point out again that this performance is absolutely unnecessary; it is not called for at all; there is no sense in having it. If Senators of the majority party would simply agree to a day certain to vote, a few days hence, and give the people time to think this matter over, we could proceed with other legislation, and they could go home and go to bed tonight, if they wanted to.

They would not ordinarily come back tomorrow; tomorrow is Saturday; indeed, it is Saturday morning now.

Mr. President, if this was not such a great undertaking—stealing labor's rights—they would not think of coming back on Sunday. But this is a great crusade, so they think—a crusade to steal everything labor possesses—so we shall be here on Sunday.

So we shall be here. I simply hope the people find out the real reason why we are here. This is no filibuster; it is an endeavor to give the people an opportunity to know what is going on and what is in this bill.

Mr. President, the Taft-Hartley bill now before us proposes to take the Conciliation Service out from under the Department of Labor, where it rightfully belongs, and to substitute therefor a new kind of conciliation service that will conciliate nothing, that, on the contrary, will produce new and ever-increasing sources of disputes. I can think of no better description of the dangers in this situation and of the value of retaining a really practical, workable conciliation service, such as the one we have today, than that contained in a radio broadcast by the Honorable Lewis B. Schwellenbach, the Secretary of Labor. I quote from his broadcast:

During the 18 months since VJ-day the American people carried out the most tremendous job of military and industrial demobilization in our history. There were setbacks and disappointments, including many serious and costly labor disputes. Despite that fact, however, American production in 1946 exceeded all previous peacetime levels.

I cannot predict what will happen during this next year in the field of industrial relations. But I do know that both labor and management now have a much more constructive attitude today than during the first troubled months that followed VJ-day.

The Congress of the United States now has before it a number of bills designed to prevent a recurrence of last year's industrial strife. There is one particular proposal that I would like to discuss rather fully. This proposal takes two forms: One would set up a mediation board outside the Department of Labor; the other would set up a mediation board within the Department, but would make the board practically independent and transfer to it the work of conciliation and mediation now being carried on by the Labor Department. From past experience I feel sure that such a board would be in the Department for housekeeping purposes only.

Some advocates of this procedure contend that the Labor Department and its Secretary cannot act impartially because we have a mandate from Congress to "foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States. * * *"

The best answer to this argument would be a full review of the record and policies of the United States Conciliation Service. I cannot undertake that in the time at my disposal. But I would like to quote four character witnesses, if I may call them that. Four groups who have a vital stake in collective bargaining and the American way of life. They are: The National Association of Manufacturers, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the American Federation of Labor, and the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Necessarily, these groups have had a great deal of experience with the Conciliation Service. They are in a position to judge the work of the Conciliation Service because they take part in it. Day in and day out they watch negotiations being carried on with the friendly, impartial help of our Commissioners of Conciliation. Let me remind you that during the last year the Commissioners, under the capable direction of Edgar L. Warren, aided in the peaceful settlement of 13,000 industrial disputes. Moreover, in 90 percent of the disputes where Commissioners were called in before work had halted no stoppage occurred.

Last year we also aided in settling 3,400 strikes. Of these, nearly two-thirds had begun before either of the parties called for the services of a conciliator.

Equally important, all of these settlements were reached by voluntary methods of conciliation and mediation.

Knowing that record, the NAM, the AFL, the Chamber of Commerce, and the CIO are unanimously opposed to the creation of a mediation board. Let me quote the chamber's board of directors:

"The establishment of a Federal mediation board, or any similar body by another name, would interfere with and disrupt voluntary collective bargaining. There would be a tendency to refer important issues to such a board, which would undermine voluntary agreement."

My own experience as Secretary of Labor fully supports that view. During the war we could see this perfectly natural tendency at work. Time and time again the parties to a dispute were so eager to have their case settled by the National War Labor Board that the preliminary negotiations were little more than shadow boxing—a warm-up for the big show in Washington. Consequently, the Board found itself heavily burdened with a huge backlog of cases.

But after VJ-day, when numerous wartime controls were lifted, the War Labor Board quite properly began to turn its case load back to the parties for settlement. As a result, about 3,000 cases were left to collective bargaining and the overwhelming majority were settled peacefully—even during the troubled months of reconversion when labor and management faced a host of unfamiliar problems.

Without attempting to gloss over the fact that labor disputes did retard the rate of reconversion, I want to remind you that we now have more than 14,000,000 workers who are covered by some 50,000 union contracts. Yet even during the worst period of labor unrest in our history 45,000 of these contracts were renewed or renegotiated peacefully, not to mention the successful handling of countless grievances that are bound to arise wherever men work together.

To me, and to many others who are close to the labor scene, this indicates a much greater area of basic agreement than most people realize. Can we afford to move in on this large area with Government mandates or a super mediation board? The answer is: Not unless we are prepared to follow up with further controls and increasing Government participation in collective bargaining.

Here again our wartime experience is revealing. In the fiscal year 1943 the Conciliation Service handled more than 14,000 disputes, but 31 percent of these were referred either to the National War Labor Board or the National Labor Relations Board for final action. In 1944 the Service closed nearly 22,000 disputes, and of these, 32 percent were referred to one of the two Boards. In 1945 an all-time high was reached when the Conciliation Service handled over 23,000 disputes and referrals reached 33 percent.

Today the story is very different. Labor and management are again learning to use the collective-bargaining process. As we entered the new year 1947, work stoppages were the lowest since VJ-day. Not only were there fewer strikes but the number of workers involved and idleness were also well below those early months of 1946. As of January 1, 1947 our conciliators were attempting to mediate 111 stoppages involving only 35,000 employees. A year ago they were handling 145 strikes involving 10 times as many employees.

Quite apart from its effect on the Conciliation Service, there is another reason why I am convinced that a mediation board would impede industrial peace. My own experience has convinced me that the job is not one to be done by a board because the solution of labor disputes requires great flexibility. Solutions cannot be reached in an ivory tower. Every case is different; the issues are different; the personalities are different. It requires different types of individuals to handle different cases.

During the last year and a half we in the Department have acquired an intimate knowledge of the current problems of each industry and the various companies within the industry. We know the background and the mental attitude of the negotiators on both sides. No super-duper board can handle such a many-sided and complicated task, regardless of the character, ability, and experience of the men who might be appointed to such a board. With the best will in the world, a board would find itself delayed by technical problems which might prove a fatal handicap to successful collective bargaining.

The general public may not be aware of these facts, but labor and management know them well enough. They know, too, what steps have been taken to develop and strengthen the Conciliation Service. I am particularly proud that what has been done was an outgrowth of a unanimous recommendation by the President's Labor-Management Conference in November 1945. Everyone in the Conference agreed to the report which recommended that the Conciliation Service remain within the Department of Labor and that it operate with the advice of an advisory board consisting of representatives of both management and labor. This advisory board takes its work seriously and the results have been very gratifying to all concerned.

Again, time does not permit me to review these changes in detail. But I can tell you that the Conciliation Service today is better equipped than ever before to aid both unions and employers at the bargaining table. For example, all of the arbitrators now on the roster of the Service were passed upon by the regional labor-management advisory committees, thus insuring competent and impartial arbitrators who have been approved by leading labor and management representatives in their respective areas.

The same can be said of Conciliation's Technical Division which assists the parties in disputes where highly technical problems arise, such as incentive plans, job evaluations, merit-rating systems, workload studies, and related questions.

Beyond these regular methods which the Conciliation Service offers, we have developed several other means of promoting industrial peace. Fact finding is one of them. During the last year I appointed nine fact-finding or special-inquiry boards. In each instance their investigations led to a satisfactory settlement of the controversy. The

public has not heard much of this success, but I believe it can be repeated in the future, provided that certain basic principles are followed.

These principles include the full and voluntary cooperation of both parties, the selection of board members who are thoroughly familiar with the industry concerned, and, of course, a clear understanding that board's recommendations will not be forced upon the parties. Rather, I send each side a copy of the report and tell them in my opinion it should be used and considered in further negotiation. In other words, I do not convert the board from a mere fact-finding function into an arbitration function.

I have tried to outline for you some of the things the Labor Department is doing in the field of industrial relations. Equally important are the fundamental objectives behind this work. Unless I am very much mistaken, our goal is the same as yours. We in America want full, sustained production, and fair distribution. The kind of distribution that will reward incentive and preserve the freedoms we hold dear.

Free collective bargaining does impose serious responsibilities on both labor and management. Recent developments in steel and autos and in the vast construction industry show how different the industrial climate is today from 1 year ago. Unless I misjudge the caliber and democratic purpose of labor and management they will meet their joint responsibility without coercion or compulsion from our Government.

Mr. President, that was the text of the radio address on the subject of labor-management relations. It is a very fine testimonial to the good work being done. It really makes one sad to contemplate what is going to happen to this splendid organization when we get this phony bill.

Mr. President, as I stated earlier in the evening, I was prepared to go on for a considerable time. I could talk for a good many hours yet; but several of my colleagues, insistently pressing for an opportunity to speak, they are urging that I should not hog this thing, but should give them an opportunity to say a few words. So I shall desist temporarily and let some of my colleagues, friends of labor, and friends of the American people, have an opportunity to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. PEPPER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Downey	Johnston, S. C.
Baldwin	Dworshak	Kem
Ball	Eastland	Kilgore
Barkley	Ecton	Knowland
Brewster	Ellender	Langer
Bricker	Ferguson	Lodge
Bridges	Fulbright	McCarran
Brooks	George	McCarthy
Buck	Green	McClellan
Bushfield	Gurney	McFarland
Butler	Hatch	McGrath
Byrd	Hawkes	McKellar
Cain	Hayden	McMahon
Capehart	Hickenlooper	Malone
Capper	Hill	Martin
Chavez	Hoey	Maybank
Connally	Holland	Millikin
Cooper	Ives	Moore
Cordon	Jenner	Morse
Donnell	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Myers	Russell	Watkins
O'Daniel	Saltonstall	Wherry
O'Mahoney	Smith	White
Overton	Sparkman	Wiley
Pepper	Taft	Williams
Reed	Taylor	Wilson
Revercomb	Thye	Young
Robertson, Va.	Umstead	
Robertson, Wyo.	Vandenberg	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote! Vote! Vote!

Mr. KILGORE Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. KILGORE Mr. President, while I realize that Senators would like to vote and get this over with, that is one of the points which I should like to make.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask for order and for decent courtesy on the part of the Members of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from West Virginia has the floor. He may proceed.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the first point I should like to make is that under the Constitution of the United States we require the States of the Union to guarantee to their citizens a republican form of government, which is a representative form of government in which representatives of citizens by a proportionate ratio vote on the necessary measures for the Government of their citizens.

Mr. President, by the very evidence of the yelling of "vote" which does not speak so well for the dignity of the Senate of the United States, we have an indication on the part of certain Members of the Senate that they are willing to depart from that guaranty of the Constitution of the United States, insofar as the Congress is concerned, and to deny the representative vote to the various subordinate groups which make up the United States of America. I think it bespeaks ill of the Senate to have Senators take such an attitude.

Mr. President, the attitude all the way through this evening has been to try to deny votes to certain States which are entitled to representation. I do not particularly care how this bill turns out or how the vote turns out; but I say that I have heard so much about communism, as stated in remarks on the floor of the Senate, and so much about totalitarianism that I feel that I, as a humble citizen of the United States and as a Member of the Senate of the United States, should do my utmost to stop movements on the part of——

(At this point Mr. KILGORE made certain statements which subsequently were withdrawn by him.)

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I call the Senator from West Virginia to order, under section 4 of rule XIX of the Senate, for imputing to other Senators motives unworthy of a Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the rule, the Senator from West Virginia will have to take his seat.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I should like to proceed with my remarks on the bill, then.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia will take his seat.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senator from West Virginia be permitted to proceed in order.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, on that question I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. BARKLEY. First, Mr. President, let me say with great respect to the Chair and to the Senator from Ohio that I did not interpret and I do not interpret the remarks of the Senator from West Virginia as imputing improper or unworthy motives to any Senator. The mere fact that a Senator makes a point under the rule makes it necessary for the Senator concerned to take his seat. But I listened to the Senator from West Virginia and I did not observe that he imputed any such motives to any other Senator. I do not think he did, and I do not think he so intended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky that the Senator from West Virginia be allowed to proceed in order. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HATCH. I was about to make an inquiry which I think the Chair has already answered—namely, whether the Chair means that a motion that the Senator proceed in order is not debatable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to proceed in order is not debatable.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Will it be possible for those of us who do not recall what the Senator from West Virginia is supposed to have said——

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is making a parliamentary inquiry, and the Chair requests that he be allowed to state it.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to repeat it, Mr. President. Would it be possible, for the benefit of those of us who did not hear what the Senator from West Virginia said, which is supposed to be out of order, to have the Official Reporter read the statement the Senator made, so that we pass judgment as to how to vote on this question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The inquiry of the Senator from Oregon relative to whether it will be in order to have the Official Reporter read the remarks of the Senator from West Virginia would be a perfectly proper request and would be in order.

Mr. MORSE. I make that request, Mr. President.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Ohio did not advise the Senate to what remarks he objected. I assume that those are the words that will be read. Will the Senator from Ohio state what they are?

Mr. TAFT. I prefer to have the exact words read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the reading of the remarks by the Official Reporter will, in the opinion of the Chair, answer the question raised by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Official Reporter read all the remarks the Senator from West Virginia has made?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, let me say that if I made any reflection——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is not at this time entitled to recognition.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I think I am for the purpose of the statement I am about to make. May I state my proposition first, before the Chair rules?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia will please refrain for a moment.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, if it shall be interpreted that I cast any reflection upon any Member of this body——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is not in order at this time.

The Chair is trying to work out this problem in a parliamentary fashion.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from West Virginia be permitted to make the statement he wishes to make. I think that will clear up the matter so that there will be no necessity to have any action taken here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky that the Senator from West Virginia be allowed to make his remarks in explanation at this time? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, let me say that, if there is anything in what I have just said that would reflect upon any Member of the Senate, I desire to withdraw those remarks. The remarks were largely impelled by a little shouting of "Vote! Vote! Vote!" which possibly antagonized the Senator from West Virgina. I desire to withdraw anything that might reflect upon a Member of this body.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia would have a right, under the rule, to withdraw his remarks.

Mr. KILGORE. I thank the Chair.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I withdraw any objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Very well.

The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, with reference to the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, as passed by the Congress and as vetoed by the President of the United States, at which time the President made what this speaker regards as appropriate remarks and gave appropriate reasons, I should like to say a few things.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senate is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is well taken. The Senate is not in order.

Senators will take their seats. Those who desire to converse will please retire to the anterooms.

The Senator from West Virginia may proceed.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, after reading carefully the bill as passed by both Houses of Congress and as sent to the President for his signature, I am reminded of one of those old Rube Goldberg cartoons which used to delight the country, and still do when they appear. I refer to those which appeared 15 or 20 years ago. They pictured very intricate systems of handling some natural phenomena. For instance, I remember one in which a trained elephant upset a bucket of water, which in turn disturbed a bunch of bedbugs, and they in turn disturbed a human being who was asleep in bed, and that person, upon arising, put out a fire in the next house. However, all those cartoons ignored certain laws of physics and certain laws of human conduct.

This bill also reminds me of a famous story told by Riley Wilson, a well-known character of my State who used to tell a story about old man Tom Adkins. Tom lived back in the country, in the early days, when there was plenty of timber, and he cut a "passel" of logs and floated them down Twelve Pole Creek and brought them to the market. His boy went along the bank of the river, riding one mule and leading another one. They sold the logs for more money than old man Tom had ever seen in his life. So old man Tom caroused around a little bit and drank a lot of sodapop and smoked some cigars. He started out on his mule, with his boy beside him, returning home. When they got to the edge of town, the boy said, "Pap, we forgot something." Old man Tom said, "What did we forget, son?" He said, "We didn't get nothing for Ma." The old man said, "That's right, son. I'll light and tie, and you go back to Emmons-Hawkins Hardware Co., and get her a new ax." That is what the pending measure does. It lights and ties, and sends labor back to get a new axe, with which to try to get their rights.

In giving expression to the Taft-Hartley bill, Congress has invited the Rube Goldberg type of act—the type of things that forgets the rules of physics, but particularly forgets the rules of human behavior. When the Congress gets time, if they do get it—and I pray to God we shall have time, before we finish—to take another good look at the bill, particularly comparing it with the alleged—I use the word "alleged" correctly—portal-to-portal bill, which was passed 2 or 3 weeks ago, I think we shall notice the flaw. I think we shall ponder the effect, and I think we shall consign the bill to that oblivion it so justly deserves. The bill looks superficially attractive, when studied without reference to other bills upon the statute books and appears as an easy blueprint for avoiding disputes between individuals and groups, through the Government's forbidding them to have any dispute. Senators know how that works. If it worked, we should not have criminal courts. Actually it is a congressional guide to further confusion in our country's industrial relations. I say that most advisedly.

Mr. President, I come from a State that probably has as high a percentage of organized labor as any State in the Union. I began in the oil fields of that State, dealing with unorganized labor. I spent 25 years in the coal fields of that State, part of the time dealing with unorganized labor, part of the time dealing with organized labor. I know the many problems that beset management-labor relations. Only 2 weeks ago, I sat down with one of the leading coal operators in the State. We were discussing this particular bill. He said, "This bill is evidence that Congress did not have sufficient knowledge of industry-labor relations to pass a security bill." He said he had hoped for one, but he was disappointed. He stated the pending measure would not work. Said he, "Take the closed-shop theory; I do not want a mine, part union and part nonunion; I want my mine either all union or no union." He said, "From years of experience, I prefer to have it all union, provided the union has sensible leadership." That was the statement of a hard-boiled, hard-bitten industrialist of my State.

The fact that the bill if it becomes a law will cause further confusion has been noted by many persons other than myself. I refer to employers' groups, in addition to labor leaders, the churches, the civil spokesmen, the public members of our War Labor Board. I am not speaking of those appointed from the ranks of labor; I am talking about the public members, who in the main were recruited from industry. That board functioned through VJ-day, doing really excellent work. They have all warned that serious harm to the Nation will be done by advocating that labor-management relations be guided by provisions of the so-called Taft-Hartley bill.

The Prentiss-Hall Organization, which publishes very valuable analyses of industrial relation practices and policies for a group of readers who are largely composed of corporation personnel directors, had this to say very recently:

> If it becomes law, labor-management relations aren't going to be any simpler. If anything, they will become more complex.

That, coming from Prentiss-Hall, Mr. President, is rather significant to me, because I have always considered that publication as extremely conservative, on the employer side.

The executive labor letter, which is also printed exclusively for business readers, warns:

> The bill promises greater industrial strife, a tremendous increase in time-consuming lawsuits, and a rapid growth in Government control over relations between management and labor.

Mr. President, in our numerous efforts to preserve free enterprise, why should we introduce the question of management and labor in an endeavor to control all management, or shall I say all industry? That is certainly a very strange fruit from a bill sponsored by Republicans who, during all these years, have cried out in solemn tones against "government interference," against "bureaucracy," against "centralization of affairs in Washington"? Is not that a statement of fact? Is that not something that has gone on for the past 5 years—those very cries from the opposition to the administration? Yet it seems that, at the first opportunity, the same people who cried those things have rushed headlong into a dangerous experiment in—I hate to say it, but it amounts to industrial dictatorship, because when an employer is told what he can and cannot do by contract with his employees that is industrial dictatorship. The cries I have mentioned were heard against Franklin D. Roosevelt throughout his administration, in spite of the war crisis. Charges were being made that he was trying to dictate to industry, that he was trying to dictate to capital, that he was trying to dictate to labor. The first thing that is done after the death of our late lamented President is the passing of a bill by the Congress which of itself amounts to an industrial dictatorship—the very thing we have condemned in the past, the very thing we have inveighed against in the past, the very thing against which we have preached ever since, shall I say, 1936.

Let us also look for a moment at the proposals of the bill for changing the structure and functions of the National Labor Relations Board.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Rhode Island for a question?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, the Senator has spoken to us about industrial dictatorship and made allusions to the Roosevelt administration. The Senator comes from a highly industrialized State, a coal-mining State. I am wondering if at this time it would not be appropriate for him to tell us a little bit of the history of workers in the coal mines under the industrial dictatorships as he knew them in his younger days. I think it might be appropriate if the Senator would tell us a little about what went on in the coal-mining industry of his State before labor was given the right to organize, and what might be the Senator's prediction as to the consequences of the passage of the pending measure, in driving labor back to what I think was its condition in those days.

Mr. KILGORE. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island. May I say, Mr. President, that I well remember those days. I remember them entirely too well. I remember the days when coal miners and their wives were marched to the polls by the foreman, in columns of two, and were told exactly how to vote the ticket. If they did not vote, they found their furniture in the middle of the road.

I remember in other industries that the same thing was done. I remember that since we have gotten to the point where a man may not be discharged except for an industrial "misdemeanor," if I may call it that, such conditions have ceased to exist. I might cite a county other than my own, the county of McDowell, which used to go 6,000 on one side of the column. At the present time, with the voters free from fear of being discharged, it goes 6,000 on the other side of the column; but the men now have the right to vote as they please, and they cannot be discharged for voting the wrong way, either in the primary or in the general election. That is the result of the removal of industrial dictatorship.

I also remember when one was required to obtain permission from the sheriff, in some counties, before being allowed to alight from a train. I also remember that a lawyer found it necessary to obtain permission from the self same sheriff, before he could practice law in the courts of the county, no matter whether he was a member of the bar or not. I remember when one used to be a target for gunfire if he was unknown, and if he had no one to vouch for him.

Those days are gone I hope forever. My State is now a law-abiding State. We live according to the dictates of the laws of the State of West Virginia. We conduct our elections in the same way, despite what certain people may say. Our people are free of dictatorship, due largely to the fact of one clause only in a contract, namely, that a man may not be discharged except for cause—and voting the wrong way is not considered cause for removal.

I hope that is a sufficient explanation for the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. McGRATH. I had hoped the Senator might review certain working conditions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Rhode Island for a question?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield for another question, yes.

Mr. McGRATH. I had hoped the Senator might review for us certain of the working conditions in the days of unorganized mine workers. I was not thinking so much in terms of their political enslavement as I was of their industrial enslavement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, in the interest of protecting the rights of the Senator from West Virginia, must call the attention of the able Senator from Rhode Island to the fact that he is privileged to inquire, in the form of a question, from the Senator from West Virginia; otherwise a point of order might be raised, that the Senator had already spoken once. The Chair merely reminds the Senator from Rhode Island that the interruption must be in the nature of a question.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I would ask that the Official Reporter place a question mark after my last remarks, and I think they will appear to be a proper question.

Mr. KILGORE. I think that I can explain the questions raised by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, because I am rather familiar with them. In mine safety conditions, the safety of the worker has risen in the State, under a contractual system which has been a free contractual system, protected only by the Wagner Act. With the exception of one, every company in the State operates under a contract authorized by that act. I find no particular opposition from operators in my State to going ahead with a similar contract, so long as a similar situation prevails in the rest of the country. Additional safety precautions have been provided, additional protection for the home, additional health and welfare services have been provided for the mining community.

It is necessary to be around a mining community in order to understand what those things mean. I can remember when there were shanties, like box stalls at a cheap, two-bit race track, housing a family. In place of the shanties there are now decent frame houses. There is less pneumonia and fever, and miner's asthma is not so prevalent. Many similar conditions that formerly prevailed have been eradicated, and it has all been the result of free contractual service. I think any Senator can realize how keen my feelings are on the question of collective bargaining, because it has done so much for my State, and because it has meant so much to us. In 1920, for instance, a representative of the United States Department of Education stopped in Logan County and, lest I be accused of playing politics, may I say that, at that particular time, the sheriff of Logan County and also the county administration happened to be Democratic. The man referred to had to get back on the train and leave town; he was not allowed to check in. At that time it was not a question of what party one belonged to; it was a question of what gang he belonged to. Sometimes I belonged to the right gang, sometimes the other fellow belonged to the right gang. That was a bad situation for the State, and it was bad for the people. I want to see collective bargaining continued.

Let us look for a moment at the proposals of the pending bill, which Senators are considering passing over the Presidential veto; proposals for changes in structure and the functions of the National Labor Relations Board, the Government agency which must administer the legislation which we are considering. It is well known to Senators that a law is no better than its administration. I do not know whether it was Boies Penrose, or who it was that said, "You pass the laws, and let me name the administrators, and I will be satisfied." The success of any law depends upon the administrative agency set up to execute it.

The alterations in the National Labor Relations Board guarantee in advance that this bill will be sending both employers and union leaders, not to mention the Government executives themselves, on frequent trips to the aspirin bottle, or someone may want something a little bit stronger. Under the set-up provided in the bill I defy anyone to figure a way to prevent the bill producing a multitude of headaches for either side, and, I may say particularly for the Government.

First of all, the bill enlarges the Board from 3 to 5 members. Clearly the framers of the proposed law have very little faith in any man the President—and I may suggest for the benefit of aspirants who may be in the Chamber, any of his successors—might nominate, or that the Senate, this deliberative body, might confirm, to seats on this agency, for the bill immediately thereafter provides that the general counsel of the Labor Board shall be responsible, not to the 5 members of the Board for whom he is general counsel, but to the White House and to Congress. In other words, there is a general counsel who is a law unto himself, and there are 5 members who cannot tell him what to do, and yet he is their counsel.

The Board is denied the power to select its own chief counsel, the man who will determine what the Board's legal policy shall be. That is set forth in the bill. The chief attorney, who is appointed by the president and confirmed by the Senate becomes a power in his own right, without reference to anybody else. In other words, why have the Board, if we are going to have a chief counsel with complete power?

If he is at odds with the five members of the Board, the Board cannot remove him from office. If he fails to observe the policies determined by the Board, they have no recourse except admonition, chiding him gently.

This is a new and entirely monstrous departure in the administration of government, something that never has happened before, the attorney being divorced from his client so completely that he handles a case without either advice or direction from the client.

We are fortunate that there was no Republican majority in Congress to forbid General Marshall choosing the man whom he wanted to head his intelligence section, for instance, or to prevent General Eisenhower from removing incompetent officers in his command during our invasion of Europe. I think we would have been in horrible shape if the Chief of Staff under Eisenhower could have gone on operating despite the decisions of the Supreme Commander.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BALDWIN in the chair). Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield for a question.

Mr. BREWSTER. I ask the Senator whether or not the distinguished Senator from West Virginia did not do his best to remove the Chief of the Army Supply Service during the war.

Mr. KILGORE. I joined with the distinguished Senator from Maine in trying to curb the activities of the Chief of the Service of Supply during the war, when he sought to become Chief of Staff. I think the Senator from Maine will admit that I am correct in the statement that it was the joint action of the Senator from West Virginia and the Senator from Maine. It was not intended to curb his legitimate activities, but to keep him from engaging in some activities of which we did not approve.

Mr. President, this bill goes even a step further than the terrible divergence of control about which I have spoken. One would think that in creating a Government agency the heads of the organization would be given the power to meet their responsibilities. Is not that normal in government? When an agency is created, do we not give the head of the agency the power to meet responsibilities, or do we simply create it and say, "God be with you. I hope the people play ball and give you what you want."

No; we give them the power to perform the duties of their office, the power to meet the situations which arise as time goes on, and if Congress fails to give them the necessary power, we make of their administration a failure, as does the legislature of a State or the council of a city when they create an agency and fail to give it power. But this bill denies such right to the members of the National Labor Relations Board. All the lawyers, all the regional officers, are responsible, not to the Board which must determine policy, and which must enforce the act, and which must be responsible for its satisfactory performance.

We never charge a lawyer for losing a case. The man who gets charged is the one who is hung. If a lawyer defends a man for murder and he loses his case, we do not hang the lawyer, we hang the man—for which I, as a lawyer, am duly thankful.

The Board members in reality are responsible to the counsel, who is a power unto himself, and who is removed from criticism, the Board taking the rap, the counsel taking the salary and controlling the situation. Mr. President, that is bad legislatively, it is bad administratively, it is bad governmental policy, a bad setup.

That is not all. The members of the Board are forbidden to maintain a reviewing staff to review cases. Under the bill there are no concessions made to efficiency. It demands that each member of the Board or his secretary or legal assistant must personally read every one of the hundreds of thousands of pages of legal documents on which the Board must make its final decision.

Mr. President, as an illustration, let me suggest that a few days ago in discussing the Reed bill the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] lifted up the printed record on the Reed bill, just one of seven or eight thousand bills which come before the Senate, and after looking at it suggested that it probably would take 10 days' time to read it. I tried it out. He was overoptimistic. I think it would take 12 days. Can anyone imagine a member of this Board, with the assistance of a stenographer and one attorney, going over the record in every case that came before the Board for final disposition?

Some of the sponsors of the bill have complained about bureaucracy, but this bill seems to come straight from Alice in Wonderland.

> "The time has come," the walrus said,
> "To talk of many things:
> Of shoes—and ships—and sealing wax—
> Of cabbages—and kings."

Sometimes I think this bill gets into the cabbages and kings idea of the administration when it removes a lawyer from his client, removes the staff from the client, and yet blames the client for what happens.

Future members of the National Labor Relations Board, if they take their mandate seriously, will have no time to think of long-range policy or of the human relations in industry. The bill demands that they become bookworms, that they spend their days and their nights, and such time as comes in between, working on a mass-production basis, going over these records.

We would do better to appoint five photoelectric cells to the Labor Board, since these rules require, not men, but rapid-fire machines to scan the work arising out of hotly contested cases in every industry and in every section of the country. It often makes me think of a Chinese gentleman named Wang, in a town where I went to college. We used to ask Wang how long he worked, and he said 25 hours a day, and when we asked him what he did the rest of the time, he said the rest of the time he slept. It looks to me as if these fellows will have to work 25 hours a day and then sleep in between time. If they do any administrative work they will have to do it between times in the 25 hours a day, under the bill.

Mr. President, that is not the whole story. The bill specifically forbids the National Labor Relations Board to hire economic experts. We are not going to get five economists on this Board. If we did, they would not be worth anything as lawyers and as judges, yet they will not be able to hire economic experts to pass on whether or not a wage scale is fair and whether it will work. Nevertheless such experts are necessary to study industrial relations, to study company statistical records, to help compute back-pay obligations of companies, to provide the necessary advice for the Board to determine what is and what is not fair in the way of wages. But they are forbidden to hire such men.

Whom are they going to get? Will the Board proceed along the line of intelligent guesses we hear so much about? How a Government agency concerned week in and week out with problems arising out of economic conditions can function without the help of economists is a question I cannot answer. I would as soon operate a mine without a mining engineer as to try to establish a wage scale without an economic staff who can study the economics of the situation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield for a question?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Am I to understand that the Senator from West Virginia feels that if the National Labor Relations Board is to work effectively in the settlement of industrial disputes by the use of peaceful procedures, it needs a staff of trained economists to collect for the Board and to make available to the Board data bearing upon cases under consideration?

Mr. KILGORE. There can be no question about that. It is utterly impossible to reach a fair-wage scale and to reach a fair meeting of the minds between employers and employees unless there are economists who can study both sides of the case and give an impartial opinion, a long-range opinion.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator agree that the type of case that is submitted to the National Labor Relations Board for decision is quite different in its nature from the ordinary type of case that is submitted to a common-law court for decision?

Mr. KILGORE. Unquestionably. It is a case in which it is necessary to analyze costs, sales, man-hour work. It requires a very detailed analysis to determine what is a fair answer.

Frequently in common-law courts the Senator, as a lawyer, well knows that economists as experts are called in. But in the labor relations field they are far more essential, because, as in medicine there is diagnosis and prognosis, not merely diagnosis but prognosis as well. One is prophesying what is going to happen, and it is a field in which economics is of the utmost value.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator agree that in the ordinary issues before a common-law court in a civil case, the court is able to rely upon the briefs and the arguments of counsel for determination of the issue in accordance with the law which the court has before it to administer, whereas in a case before the National Labor Relations Board, the Board is dealing primarily, in most instances, not with legal issues, but with determinations of economic factors which have given rise to a dispute between an employer and an employee?

Mr. KILGORE. That is correct. The situation of the National Labor Relations Board is more nearly parallel with that of a court in chancery, in which we try to work out an equity based on estimates, as compared with a suit in law in which we are dealing with facts in esse, which we can multiply and divide and get at the result. I think the difference is best expressed that way, from a lawyer's viewpoint. But I think it goes even further than that, because there is a bit of prophecy, like the bit of prophecy that is necessary, shall we say, in a mandamus proceeding in a court of chancery, in which one has to see into the future, and there has to be a certain amount of prognosis.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not true that in the field of administrative law, there rests upon the administrative tribunal a responsibility to get for itself, if necessary, provided counsel for the two sides are not providing data, the necessary data upon which a fair judgment can be rendered on the issues?

Mr. KILGORE. That is one of the differences between an administrative handling of a matter and a judicial handling. In the judicial handling, the court can leave it up to what is proved, but there is a duty upon an administrative court to go further than that, to try of its own volition to find what is the correct solution, which does not rest upon a court of law.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from West Virginia agree with me that in the drafting of the particular bill before us for consideration an error has been made so far as the final workability of the law is concerned, in that there has been too much of a commingling of common-law court procedures with administrative law procedures, as illustrated by the particular point the Senator from West Virginia is raising now, in that the bill eliminates from the Board the services of economists?

Mr. KILGORE. I may say to the Senator from Oregon that in my opinion the bill creates a court and gives it an administrative problem to deal with, with only the judicial power of a common law court, or even less, I may say. I think that is the best description that can be made of it. We create an administrative court, but we give it only the power of a common law court in its administration.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the last question?

Mr. KILGORE. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. I am to understand, then, am I, that the criticism of the bill the Senator from West Virginia is trying to get across at this point is that the bill purports to give to the tribunal created under it administrative law functions, but gives it as its tool of procedure primarily common law procedure?

Mr. KILGORE. I may express it perhaps a little better than that. It gives it administrative court duties with common law powers.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BALDWIN in the chair). Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. KILGORE. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Am I to understand from the last colloquy that it is the opinion of the Senator from West Virginia that this administrative board can go outside the record, build up its own record unbeknown to the union or the company, and make a decision based on what it may find from the opinion of its own economists outside the record? Is that what we are to understand?

Mr. KILGORE. No.

Mr. FERGUSON. So that we may keep the record straight with respect to the duties, will the Senator explain?

Mr. KILGORE. I may say to the Senator from Michigan that the court has duties thrust upon it which it has no power to carry out, and the people of the United States have a right to believe that having duties thrust upon it, it has powers, and when those powers are removed the court is limited in its functions.

Mr. President, getting back to the main topic. Unfortunately, workers and employers will have no need to wait until their case goes to Washington before they discover themselves wrapped firmly in the embraces of the Taft-Hartley bill's red tape. Senators have all heard speeches designed to convince the general public that the bill is merely a mild—I love that word "mild"—cure for abuses—I have heard carbolic acid 50-percent diluted called mild compared with the straight solution—and that in no fundamental way does the bill act to curb or restrict collective bargaining. To anyone who has taken the trouble to read the bill, that type of assertion is pure propaganda. It has no connection with fact whatsoever, and no connection with the wording of the bill. Actually, in section after section, the impact of the bill will be to disturb, if not destroy, the harmonious process of reaching agreement between labor and management by forbidding certain kinds of contracts. It provides rewards and bonuses to those sinister forces in our industrial community which seek to escape the responsibility for reaching accord with the workingmen and the workingwomen. It loads the dice, for instance, against fair and open collective bargaining. It loads the dice in a subtle and in a vicious way which the lay public, unacquainted with the technical details of industrial relations, can little appreciate. But the public will find out all too soon if the bill becomes law that the Taft-Hartley proposals are a mighty obstacle rather than a guide to industrial peace and full production.

Mr. President, I may say that were it not for my hope for national security in the ensuing months I should like to see the bill experimented with just to convince the public how many strikes, how much industrial disharmony, how much disturbance it will promote. For example, workers in a particular plant may have had one union to represent them for a long period of years. There may have been an uninterrupted period of good relations with the employers. In my own State I know of hundreds of such plants, some of them union and some nonunion. There may be the highest degree of cooperation and good will between the union, or the employees in the case of a nonunion plant, and the company. But in the event any small group in the plant or the mine wants to split that bargaining unit and destroy the pattern of harmony, the bill allows the National Labor Relations Board no choice but to order a separate election for a small handful of workers. And, incidentally, when the employer decides to call an election he can call one.

Let us take two plants, A plant and B plant Both of them have had good industrial relations. Neither is a union plant. The employees do not belong to any union. They have gotten along with the employers. A new man comes in and buys B plant, the competitor of A plant. He asks for an election. He receives it, and the plant elects no union. Under the provisions of the portal-to-portal pay bill—and we cannot read one section of the law without reading others—he has 12 months in which he can increase hours and cut wages and do anything he wants to, and he cannot be sued. Mr. President, he either crucifies his competitor or he starts a strike the like of which has not been seen in that industry. However, the Board cannot take into account the good or the bad of the situation. It must mechanically order the election, with the possible destruction of the pattern of harmony that has prevailed, and once the election is held another election cannot be held for 12 months. I am in favor of the limitation of 12 months. But I do not believe the employer should call for an election. It is just like the owner of a lodge hall asking for a charter for a lodge in order to put a lodge in the hall.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask the Senator if he does not believe that one of the troubles with the bill is that the rights of both labor and industry are not clearly stated; that the bill is so written that almost all its provisions will require lawsuits to determine what the respective rights are?

Mr. KILGORE. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Arizona that I think it would be a very advantageous proposition if every lawyer and United States Senator resigned and went home to his own State and secured employment in settling the various lawsuits which are going to grow out of the bill. The bill is going to be a godsend to lawyers, because there are so many things left open in it to court interpretation, and interpretation may be made in various ways in various States, because in the bill we have even left various questions to be decided under various State laws. There is no uniformity. One cannot go into the Federal courts and secure decisions on certain points. I thank the Senator from Arizona for his question. What he brought out is one of the great weaknesses of the bill, that is, that there is no definiteness about it. There is too much left for interpretation. There is too much left for court action. The court action which will be taken in the future will result in litigation for the next 5 years.

Mr. McFARLAND. Of course, when the law is finally interpreted by the courts, it will be a better law. But does the Senator not think that, in the meantime, that will cause strife in the industries and probably strikes?

Mr. KILGORE. It is bound to, because everything that calls for court interpretation is going to result in strife. Strikes are going to be begun, and then court interpretations secured. Strikes will be brought about, and court interpretations made. There is going to be continual strife in the industry until every feature of the bill can be interpreted. It was drawn by a law firm, I think, with that in view.

Mr. President, while any group may automatically seek to disrupt an established functioning mechanism for reaching an agreement, the bill applies an all-or-nothing yardstick, when unions organize a previously unorganized plant. The bill overturns the time-tested doctrine, for instance, of the National Labor Relations Board. That, Mr. President, is a dangerous thing to do. The Board operated through one of the greatest crises in the history of the United States, through which collective-bargaining units were established on the broadest possible base, and to meet the greatest possible production. In some industries, unions have been able only to organize sections or departments of a particular factory. The Board has recognized in the past this process by setting up bargaining units on a department of section basis, pending final organization at some possible future date. In West Virginia we have a plant which has a CIO union in one section and an AFL union in another section. Yet it gets along with its workers. They do not have any trouble. Each union has its own bargaining policy. its own bargaining group. Mr. President, the Board recognized that process a long time ago. Such a policy of gradualism and common sense would be outlawed by the Taft-Hartley bill. Only if a union has organized every section and every department may it become the bargaining agent of the workers involved. All, or nothing at all, says the bill.

Mr. President, I diverge at this point. I grew up in a little unorganized industry, the oil fields. When I was a boy no one heard of a union because everyone treated oil workers fairly. We were the highest paid employees in the United States. It required a high degree of skill and a high degree of knowledge, and we were well paid for it and we responded accordingly. It has only been in recent years that that business has gone union. It only went union when the companies operating became so large that someone had to deal with them collectively. In my day and time, Mr. President, a contractor who employed 48 men was a big man. The oil companies did not try to drill. They employed contractors. So we did not have unions. We became highly concentrated, and when the companies started doing their own drilling and when various other things came in, then for the first time we secured collective bargaining. We never had it until that time. We would not have had it even now but for the fact, Mr. President, that someone in Pittsburgh, someone in New York, someone in Oil City, or someone in Boston undertook to tell the field superintendent how much to pay Joe Doakes, and Joe realized that he was not being paid enough. So Joe joined the union. And someone in New York, wanting more profit for the oil, without considering the livelihood of Joe Doakes and his wife and children, lowered the pay, at the same time upping the living cost.

Mr. President, the Board has recognized the process of setting up bargaining units in departments, pending some possible organization at some future date, as absolutely essential to the economic organization of a plant. Such a policy of gradualism, as I stated, and common sense, would be outlawed by the bill. Only if a union has organized every section, as I said before, every division, every department of the plant, can the bargaining of the workers prevail. In other words, the bill is an all or nothing bill. A union has to control all the plant or it cannot control any of it.

This double standard runs throughout the entire bill. A union is liable to damage suit for the action of every single member, even if he be a company-paid union agent assgned to cause trouble and violence.

Mr. President, let us suppose that a commission sales agent of the Aetna Insurance Co. could cause his company to be sued in case he ran over someone. That is what the bill would do with respect to unions. If we applied the same rule to corporations, there is not a corporation in the United States of America that would dare to employ anyone. They could not have a single employee, even on a commission basis. Yet, that is the rule we try to apply to the unions, even with respect to the committee at the mine in the mine field—their agents. All that is necessary to be done is to hire some fellow and put him on the committee. If any Senator does not believe that, I suggest that he read the report of the La Follette Committee on Industrial Practices, based on the hearings held by a Senate committee some 7 years ago, practices which still persist in the industries of the United States respecting what are commonly called company stooges, who can be shoved into jobs in the union in order to cause trouble. It is a common occurrence to have such stooges. Every coal company has them. They are men who belong to the union, who work at the plant, but who are on the company pay roll. I have often seen union presidents, secretaries, members of the board, and others who quietly drew a cash payment from the company. That was all shown up, as I said, in the La Follette report. Suppose the company wanted to wreck the international headquarters; all the company had to do was to get some of those fellows to do something detrimental.

Let us say someone wished to sue a coal company for damages caused by its agents. He would not need the provisions of the Taft-Hartley bill to do that. There is a decision of the United States Supreme Court on that point in the case of Willis Branch Coal Company against the United Mine Workers of America, which was tried in 1921 from the State of West Virginia, in which the Willis Branch Coal Co. recovered from the United Mine Workers of America approximately $485,000—and they got the money—for an explosion that wrecked a tipple. But they had to prove that the explosion occurred under the order of the executive committee of the United Mine Workers.

In my State at one time we had what was known as the Logan march. That was one of the situations I was talking about a while ago, in which it was necessary to get a special license from the sheriff to practice law in certain counties. Some were Democrats and some were Republicans, so I cannot blame that on either party. It was purely an industrial situation. In those counties the sheriff got 5 cents a ton. When I think of the howl that is raised over the 5-cents-a-ton welfare fund, I think of the 5 cents a ton that they used to pay the sheriff for protection. In Logan County a sheriff got rich at the rate of 5 cents a ton, just as the sheriffs did in McDowell and Mingo and other counties. When they undertook to discuss the question of organization with the miners of Mingo County, the sheriff there would not let them off the trains. So they undertook to go through Logan County; and the sheriff there, working with the sheriff of Mingo County, refused to let them do so. So they went back and got some shotguns and rifles, and then returned, and there was a first-class civil war, purely because of an endeavor to tell those people about organization.

Mr. President, similar situations might arise under the Taft-Hartley bill. I want to avoid such situations.

Under this bill the union is liable to damage suits for the actions of any

member of the union, even if he is a paid company stooge or if he is an agent assigned to cause trouble and violence. That is a practice that the Senate Civil Liberties Committee discovered to be widespread, in its investigations a few years ago; and it was not confined to the coal industry by any means. It also existed in the steel industry and in the automobile industry and other industries. But the same bill provides that a company need not be responsible for the illegal activities of even its own supervisors. This is a doubtful, lop-sided piece of legislation which we as Members of the Senate passed, to my regret, and are now asked to pass over the President's veto. Unless a supervisory employee has specifically been designated as a company agent, the company will not be held responsible for the illegal activities of that person.

I am reminded of Lawrence Dwyer, who worked for the Raleigh Coal & Coke Co. many years ago, about 1901. One day he went into the mine, and discovered that the top of the room in which he was working was coming down. He called that to the attention of the mine foreman. At that time there was about three-quarters of a carload of coal backed up against the face. He asked the mine foreman for more props to prop up that top. The mine foreman told him to get in there and get that coal out.

Dwyer was a young man with a wife and two children, and he said, "Oh, that is dangerous."

The foreman said, "Get in there and get that coal out, or else vacate your house tonight."

So Lawrence Dwyer went in and got part of the coal out; he got about half of it out, and then the top came down, just as he expected it would. He managed to jump over to the rib, which is the side wall of the room, and he only lost part of his leg—about 6 inches below the hip.

He went to the hospital. Of course, he lost his job; he could not hold it.

When he sued the company for the negligence of the mine foreman in sending him into a dangerous room, the company contended that the foreman, under the old pilot rule, was not representing the company; and Dwyer lost his suit. That man became known as Peggy Dwyer, and he, together with Mother Jones, started the 1903 strike against the Raleigh Coal & Coke Co. and organized West Virginia and stirred up probably more disturbance over a piece of legal injustice that was perpetrated on him by the courts of my State than was ever stirred up before. I think he was justified in what he did, although he broke the company he worked for and broke a number of other companies in doing so.

I say that if we persist with legislation of this type, we shall make Peggy Dwyers—he was Lawrence Dwyer, if you please; I knew him, and he was an Irishman and a gentleman, despite his feelings—we shall make Peggy Dwyers out of a great many workers in this country. Mr. President, that is something we must guard against.

The Logan march, as I said, was used to wreck the unions. It was stirred up and fomented to wreck the unions in my State; and as a result of that, we went into a situation of political peonage in which the legal voters had to vote as they were told.

Later the depression came. When the boss could not hire anybody, he could not kick the worker out of a company-owned house just because he wanted to get a little rent out of him but was unable to get it. As a result, the men who had been forced out of the union by reason of the complete denuding of the union treasuries came back; and West Virginia became approximately 99-percent organized as far as the miners were concerned. It always had been organized as far as the railroad workers and most of the other workers were concerned, with the exception of the steel workers, who were organized later.

Mr. President, one provision of this bill relates to the necessity of designating supervisory employees as agents of the company, before the company can be held liable for the acts of such employees. I cannot see that any company would be so stupid as to do that in any case. For instance, let us consider the superintendent of a plant. It would be necessary to put on him a badge stating that he is an agent, before it would be possible to charge the company with any misconduct by him. Otherwise, no matter what that man might do or say, the plant would be free from all liability on that account. On the other hand, if a member of the grievance committee does something in the plant, the international organization is chargeable for it. That shows the lack of fairness of the bill.

Such provisions cannot help but build the fires of resentment in the hearts of workers who find themselves confronted with a bill which clearly establishes obstacles in the path of organization and the maintenance of a union of strength and integrity. Everything is set up to break it down, and nothing is set up to help it hold its own.

The Taft-Hartley bill goes further than to weaken labor's hand at the collective-bargaining table. It does much to destroy the collective-bargaining process itself. Under this bill, no employer need ever discuss with the union of his workers any question of modifying an agreement during the life of the agreement itself. This provision flies squarely in the face of a Supreme Court decision in 1939 that employers are obligated, under the Wagner Act, to talk over proposed changes in an existing contract and to discuss interpretations of the agreement with the union. A proposal such as this could come only from persons who do not understand collective bargaining, or who do not want to see it work—persons who never have met a pay roll and who probably never hired any workers, and probably could not pay them if they did hire them. A union agreement is not a mechanical device; it is a set of working rules governing human relationships between employees and employers; and it should be flexible. It should be possible to change it so as to meet changing conditions. It should be possible to have discussions held between both parties at frequent intervals, when questions arise, so that the new contract will be ready for drafting when the time for it arrives. That is the democratic way. The United States Steel Corp., employing nearly a quarter of a million workers, understands that fact, even if the sponsors of the Taft-Hartley bill do not. The Big Steel contract specifically provides for quarterly discussions between the union and the company, at which the rules can be studied and difficulties worked out. This is the democratic way, the common-sense approach to a difficult problem. But the Taft-Hartley bill implies that it is wrong and unproductive.

I well remember the case of a man who was discharged for cause, and I wish to refresh the minds of other Senators on the same subject. He was putting up brattices in a mine in my State. He had a little pride of workmanship in putting them up, and he had a habit of scratching his initials on them. So he did so. They are made of concrete, and it is common for miners to scratch their names or initials on the brattices in the room they are working in. So when he finished the job, he put up a concrete brattice, and then he took a nail and scratched his initials on the brattice. Nevertheless, that was used as an excuse to discharge him for defacing property belonging to the company—simply because he had scratched his initials on it, something that had been occurring in that mine and every other mine for many years.

Mr. President, I have seen all sorts of excuses given. I have heard it said, "We will cut out this section," just so they could discharge a man "for cause." I have seen them suddenly have a mine-motor break down, and I have seen a machine pulled out of operation, just to provide a so-called "cause" for discharging the men who had been using that machinery. I have seen all sorts of things done, with the purpose of discharging a man "for cause." I remember that one man was discharged "for cause" from the Weirton steel mill. They did not even have to discharge him for cause, but they thought it would be better. The stated cause for which he was discharged was that he voted for Franklin D. Roosevelt, although Ernest Weir told him not to. The real reason for discharging him was that he happened to be a shop foreman. That shows us what happens "for cause."

Mr. President, such provisions cannot help but build resentment in the hearts of workers who find themselves in such situations.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Is it not a fact that, taking the provisions of this bill relative to discharge for cause in connection with the provisions about not allowing any statement to be admitted in evidence unless it contains the whole threat—and no doubt the Senator has been discussing them—for all practical purposes they give the employer arbitrary power to discharge a worker any time he commits a minor infraction of the rules? Cannot that be construed as "cause"?

Mr. KILGORE. Certainly. That is unquestionable. There does not have to

be any major cause. Any minor infraction can be regarded as sufficient, and will suffice, because the worker is able to have so few defenses. For instance, a worker can be insulted; and if he happens to "blow up" and say something to the boss, he can be dismissed "for cause," despite what the boss may have said to him, for, as I have stated, the company is not liable for what the boss does. I do not know whether a company would be liable for what the president of the company did or, perhaps, for what the chairman of the board did. Perhaps if he were caught napping, he might be "hooked," but I doubt whether even he would be held responsible.

But if the poor worker makes any mistake, he can be fired "for cause."

Mr. PEPPER. And if cause existed, no matter what the real reason for the discharge was—Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. As I was saying, if cause existed for discharge for an infraction of the rules, no matter what was the real basis of the discharge—perhaps it might be his labor activities—is it the opinion of the Senator that he could not be reinstated?

Mr. KILGORE. That is correct. If any violation or infraction of the rules could be alleged, even though the reason for discharging him might be his union activities, he could be discharged. Of course, he could not be discharged because of his union activities, if that were the only cause of complaint that could be stated. But perhaps it might be proved that he drew a chalk mark on the entryway or hung his hat on the wrong hook, or something of that sort. Such things could be used as "cause." Or perhaps the worker might resent something said to him by a foreman or superintendent who might have threatened him. There are many ways of egging a worker into giving a "cause," and the bill contains nothing to protect the workers in any way against such attacks, because we must realize that no one will be held to be an agent of the company unless he wears a badge marked "Agent of the XYZ Company."

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question? Is it a fact, also, that this bill has placed a very difficult obstacle in the way of proving that the employer did discharge the worker for his union activities, by denying admissibility to any statement of attitude that the employer may make, if the statement does not contain an explicit threat?

Mr. KILGORE. That is correct. In fact, the bill has thrown an insurmountable obstacle, in my opinion, in the way of making it possible for a worker to protect himself against being fired for union activities.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. KILGORE. I am glad to yield for a further question.

Mr. PEPPER. Is not the rule of evidence in respect to that matter, as laid down in this bill, contrary to the present law or at least the present rulings of the National Labor Relations Board? So, does not that show that the intention was to have the bill make it more difficult for an employee to be able to prove that he was discharged for his union activity?

Mr. KILGORE. I say to the Senator from Florida that it is not only contrary to the present rules of the National Labor Relations Board, but it is also contrary to the Anglo-Saxon principles of justice. A man is presumed to be innocent until he is proved guilty, under Anglo-Saxon principles of justice; but under this bill a man is considered to be guilty unless he proves himself innocent. Such a rule is contrary to the Anglo-Saxon principle of justice and contrary to the American concept of justice. It is contrary to the rulings and decisions of our courts, and it goes back to the days of Napoleon and the Napoleonic code.

However, that is the kind of law that Senators talk about enacting for the purpose of settling labor disputes. Mr. President, if Senators think the enactment of this law will settle labor disputes, at least it is clear that such a law has not settled them in other places in the world, and I doubt that it will settle them in the United States.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Does not that simply reveal that at that very point of contact with the labor-management question, some greater burden is added upon labor and some added advantage is given to the employer by the provisions of this bill?

Mr. KILGORE. Yes. Unfortunately at almost every point of this bill we find that added burdens are placed upon the workers and the organizations of workers, just as was the case under the portal-to-portal bill. That is an unfortunate thing, because those are factors which have caused most of the labor unrest in Europe and will cause further labor unrest in the United States.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the Senator agree that, vicious as are the separate provisions, the whole put together, each adding to the cumulative effect, makes the bill simply a distinctly antilabor bill, the effect of which will be effectively to strangle labor unions of the country?

Mr. KILGORE. It reminds me very much of a problem in physics I heard of recently. The distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] may remember this old formula, that while no horse of his own power can produce one-horse power, yet 25 horses can pull more than a 25-horsepower engine.

We have the same situation in this bill. We have 10 or 15 or 20 different horses pulling in different directions, who will do more damage than one concentrated engine or motive force of the same combined power mechanically could do. The separate action will be found more damaging than the concerted action in just one direction, but it goes in every direction. It is a disturbing factor, a deterrent to peaceful relations between employer and employee, which will constantly grow and pile up until it becomes like a snowball going down hill, and eventually somebody gets rolled under.

That same inhuman, mechanical approach runs throughout this vindictive piece of legislation. It says, for instance, that there can be no complaint by a union if a worker is fired for cause. Yet the whole history of our industrial relations has shown that even in the most outrageous cases of anti-union discrimination, the boss provides a cause to cloak the dismissal of an active union member with a seemingly legitimate alibi. A principal activity of the Labor Board has been to weigh the facts and determine whether a dismissal was actually for cause or for union activity. In the future, under this bill, it will be barred from even investigating such cases.

The red tape is particularly in evidence when a union seeks to secure a clause in the collective-bargaining agreement to give it security against possible efforts at undermining its status—efforts which this bill would encourage in every possible way.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield for a question.

Mr. PEPPER. Does not the way that single provision is written disclose that the design of the authors was not to assure freedom of speech to the employer, which would be a sensible reason for the provision, but to go further than that and to make it, as the Senator has already said, almost an insurmountable difficulty to prove any offense on the part of the employer in the discharge of the employee?

Mr. KILGORE. We are making it so easy for the employer to hide behind any threatening statement he may want to make. He may have said yesterday, "I am going to fire you," and tomorrow he may say, "I am going to fire anybody I don't like," and there will be trouble, under the bill, connecting the two statements together and getting a real threat.

A closed shop is now illegal—despite 125 years of such contracts. Consider, also, the steps a union must take to win even a union-shop or maintenance-of-membership agreement, which at present covers an estimated 10,000,000 workers in industry. The union must first be certified to be the collective-bargaining agent of a majority of the employees, as at present; it must then seek another special election on the security issue alone, and must achieve a majority vote among every single worker affected—including those not sufficiently interested to cast a ballot. In other words, first one has to be elected bargaining agent, then there must be another election, then after that is all done, there might be a maintenance-of-membership contract.

The union must show that it has not only made available but actually furnished to every one of its members, on both a local and national basis, a complete financial statement of the union's condition; and before securing a vote on

the union security question it must have supplied affidavits from each of its local and national officers that they are neither members nor affiliated with the Communist Party.

Mr. President, I want to ask a few questions. Suppose we should ask the Bell Telephone Co. to do the same thing every time it hired a man, to do the same thing every time it sold a share of stock, to do the same thing every time it sold a bond. They would raise cain before the Securities and Exchange Commission.

These are provisions calculated to invite employer opposition, to invite delay and litigation, to remove the collective-bargaining action from the sphere of simple human relations into a complicated realm of technical forms and legal action.

Truly, under these circumstances, the Taft-Hartley bill should be described as a severance of labor-management relations bill. Advertised as a measure to promote harmony, it will invite stress, discord, and never-ending litigation. Hailed as a bill to limit strikes, it will prove to be the greatest incentive to industrial unrest and increased friction that the Congress could possibly have adopted.

Supporters of the bill describe it as moderate and limited only to the correction of abuses. Theirs indeed is a masterpiece of understatement.

Mr. President, we should have accepted the advice that the President of the United States offered to us in his first message to the Congress, to convene a commission of industry and labor, and Members of both Houses, to study this situation, and properly prepare corrective measures for the labor bill, and not have started out, with the able assistance of a few Wall Street lawyers, to try to draft a bill dealing with the very human relations between employer and employee, a relation which a few of us have had a little bit of experience with and have a little bit of feeling for. The bill not only removes protections for our industrial workers which were enacted during the administration of the late President Roosevelt; it sets up curbs and restrictions never before considered.

It establishes complicated administrative machinery. It places a premium on procrastination in settling industrial problems. It bids fair to remove collective bargaining from the hands of those best equipped to conduct it—the representatives of management and employees—by turning the human relations of industry into a lawyer's paradise of court actions, injunctions, damage suits, and affidavits.

Clearly, the Taft-Hartley bill offers no substitute for mutual trust and developing cooperation between capital and labor. In fact, it will poison those relations and make more difficult the goal of industrial peace which its sponsors claim to seek. Such a bill is a menace to a democratic America, to democratic recovery, to industrial peace, to what we seek, which is maximum production.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). The absence of a quorum is suggested, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Baldwin	George	Morse
Ball	Green	Myers
Barkley	Gurney	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hatch	Pepper
Bricker	Hawkes	Reed
Briggs	Hickenlooper	Revercomb
Brooks	Hoey	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Holland	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Jenner	Russell
Cain	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Capehart	Kem	Sparkman
Chavez	Kilgore	Taft
Cooper	Knowland	Thye
Cordon	Lodge	Umstead
Donnell	McCarran	Vandenberg
Downey	McClellan	Watkins
Dworshak	McFarland	Wherry
Eastland	McGrath	White
Ecton	Malone	Wiley
Ellender	Maybank	Williams
Ferguson	Millikin	
Fulbright	Moore	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I desire to take a few minutes to discuss the parliamentary situation. Frankly, I doubt the wisdom of the course the Senate is pursuing at the moment, and I feel impelled to make a short statement with reference to it.

It is now half past 5 o'clock in the morning. We have gone through the night in continuous session. I recognize the reasons that have compelled us to that action. I recall the efforts which were made by the leaders on both sides to reach agreement for an early vote, and I was in accord with those efforts, and had hoped to see that result. A Member of this body, my colleague from Oregon, made objection to the request for unanimous consent. That was in accordance with the rule of the Senate. In an attempt to advance the earliest possible consideration of this matter the Senate continued in session, and I am not critical, Mr. President, of any Member of the Senate in what I am saying. That effort has continued to this moment.

Mr. President, I feel that the Senate should not continue in session longer. I feel there is other business the Senate must attend to—I was going to say tomorrow, but let me say today, Saturday, and the fore part of next week—business which is also important.

Mr. President, I recognize the importance of the question we are now considering. I think my views on the pending measures are well known. I have made my decision with reference to this matter, and what action is taken here in the interim I am confident will not bring forth any new information or evidence that would change it. I think that is generally true.

Mr. President, my colleague the junior Senator from Oregon and I do not see eye to eye on portions of the legislation with which we are faced. I am not in agreement with my colleague as to whether we should go over the week end before a vote is taken. I lean to the view that the earliest possible vote would be better for all concerned.

But, Mr. President, I have in mind this fact: The Senate has long been jealous of its tradition of always extending to its membership an opportunity of free and open debate. In this instance I am impelled to the belief that in our desire for immediate action we have forgotten that ancient tradition of the Senate. We have gone through the night, the first night, Mr. President, after this matter came before the Senate. We will go through the day, perhaps through another night—I know not how much longer. My colleagues are heavy-lidded at this moment. Other urgent matters, with which we must speedily go forward, will suffer as the result of our action now. We know that. The strain of too long a vigil might be felt otherwise, as well.

I express the hope, Mr. President, that my colleagues on this side of the aisle will give careful thought to the situation that faces us. I recognize that, having the floor at this minute, I might move for a recess. I shall not do so. I feel that those whom we have placed in leadership should continue in that position, and I shall certainly not attempt to place my will ahead of theirs.

I do not believe, Mr. President, that this action, carried through to a conclusion, will even achieve the result that is intended. I believe it will only end in a worn-out group of men and the slowing down of the work to which we are giving our attention, and to which we have given undivided and constant attention for weeks and months past. I believe that we shall not gain any time with reference to the final vote on this measure, and I fear that we shall lose considerable time in the consideration of other business before the Senate.

I know that the clashing of wills which we have witnessed here yesterday and today cannot make for even the degree of cooperation which we have had in the past; and, Mr. President, we need that cooperation. We have a heavy backlog of legislation yet facing us. We need all the cooperative action that it is possible to get.

I voice the hope that the leadership in my party will give consideration to the thought that it is better for our good, for the good of the Senate, and for the good of the people as a whole, that we give heed to what we are doing, and that we take a recess and get a little of the rest which we have lost, and prepare ourselves as best we can to go forward with all the manifold duties which face us.

I understand that my colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] expects to follow with a discussion of this question. I wish to say to my colleagues that the junior Senator from Oregon did not know before I rose that I was about to make these observations. They have come from me because I have been impelled to the conclusion that our action is not in our own best interest.

I wish to be objective about this question. I hope that I may always go about the business of the United States Senate from that viewpoint, and that alone. Certainly I have no criticism of any Senator, but I do believe that the good

of the people and of the Senate, and certainly of my colleagues, will be advanced if at this time we can find a way to a recess, and to the taking up of our business later today.

I understand that there is some thought of continuing in session through Sunday. So far as I am concerned, if that be done, I shall leave my telephone number with the Sergeant at Arms, but I shall not report on Sunday. I believe that we are all entitled to a rest. I believe that we must have it if we are to continue to do our work.

Before I take my seat, I should like to add that if the time comes in this body when there is clearly a deliberate attempt by filibuster to avoid voting upon any measure, and it reaches the point where, in my judgment, it is simply a stratagem for delay and delay only, I shall be glad to work day and night without end until that matter can reach a determination. I feel that that situation does not face us here. I cannot but believe that those with whom I disagree as to this measure, and as to whether we should take further time for consideration, have the right to be heard in the ancient tradition of the Senate.

Again I express the hope to my colleagues that they may find agreement with me in the thought that it is better for us all to take a recess.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in line with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Oregon, and also in harmony with what has been expressed by the minority leader [Mr. BARKLEY] in a prior statement in connection with a unanimous-consent request relative to the time which should be devoted to a debate on this question, I should like to say that I, for one, would like to be cooperative with all the other Members of the Senate.

I have previously stated that if I felt that the time had again arrived when we might propose a unanimous-consent request to vote upon this measure, I would do so, if possible. I expressed the optimistic hope that we might do so. Therefore, at this time I renew the request previously made, that we vote upon the pending question at 5 o'clock today. I ask unanimous consent now, in the light of what has been said, and urge every Member of the Senate to agree to the request in order that we may vote upon the pending question at that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation for the very sensible remarks made by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] and the tone and temper of those remarks. In view of the objection which has just been made to a vote at 5 o'clock today, I make bold to make a further request, namely, that at 5 o'clock p. m. on Monday next the Senate proceed to vote upon the veto message without further debate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to add my voice to the words which have been spoken by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON]. We have been here all night long. I do not think anyone can say that anything has been accomplished by this night session. It is true that the method of keeping the Senate in continuous session may force a vote contrary to the wishes of not only one Senator, but a minority of this body. There are more Senators than one who desire that the time for voting be postponed past Saturday, and perhaps until next week.

Mr. President, I realize full well that a majority can always force its way if it cares to use force; but I doubt very much whether anything worth while is ever accomplished by the use of force in a body such as this.

This is Saturday morning. It is not at all unusual for the Senate to adjourn over Saturday and Sunday, no matter what the busines may be. If members of even a small minority of the Senate sincerely desired—as I am sure they did—that the President of the United States should have the privilege of addressing the Nation before a vote was taken, and that the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] should have the privilege of presenting to the people of America views contrary to those of the President of the United States, which respective objects have been accomplished by both those honored gentlemen; and if even a small minority of this body desired that the people of America express themselves by telegrams or other communications to us in response to the pleas of those two able men, I see no reason why we should rush through with the consideration of the bill by continuous sessions, all night and all day, and all night tonight and all day Sunday.

Probably that could be done; but I am quite convinced that if the minority has sufficient determination it may use force on its side just the same. That is all that is being done. When we come to Monday or Tuesday and then vote, all we have done is to wear ourselves out and make more or less of a spectacle of the Senate of the United States.

Mr. President, I am voting with the majority on this bill. There is no question about how I shall vote. While I would have the utmost respect for any messages which I might receive, I know of nothing that might be said which would cause me to change my position, unless I am in such a hurry to cast my vote that I am unwilling to give the people of the Nation an opportunity to express to me anything they want to express.

Mr. President, I hope that this body will furnish some means by which we shall not have to remain in session all day Saturday, Saturday night, and Sunday, and vote on Monday or Tuesday. Surely there is enough wisdom in this body, enough of the spirit of cooperation, to dispense with the rule of force against force, and in some measure of intelligence find a solution of the problem with which we are confronted.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not wish to superimpose my judgment upon those who are responsible for the conduct of the business of the Senate. I think we all recognize the fact it is entirely possible, if we are compelled to remain in continuous session through the rest of today and tonight, tomorrow and tomorrow night, that a vote could be delayed until Monday. Having in mind that possibility and that probability, as I see the situation, I proposed the request a while ago that we vote on Monday, to which the Senator from California objected, which he had a right to do. It seems to me the practical effect of that would have been the same as that which may come about, with less exasperation on the part of the Senate than may be likely if we are compelled to continue in session until a vote is had.

I did my best yesterday to bring about an agreement to vote at 5 o'clock in the afternoon. That was objected to. The Senator who objected had a perfect right to do so. I have no complaint about that. I have made another request which has been objected to; and in the hope that we may arrive at some agreement about it at some time and govern ourselves accordingly, and recognizing that probably as minority leader I have no right even to offer a suggestion to the Senate as to what it should do, nevertheless, I now make the unanimous-consent request that at 3 o'clock on Tuesday next the Senate proceed to vote on the President's veto message without further debate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California objects.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 3 o'clock on Wednesday the Senate proceed to vote on this veto message.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California objects.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that at 2 o'clock on next Thursday the Senate proceed to vote upon this veto message.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the same objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California objects.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to suggest that the Senate vote on this measure at 6 p. m. today. I suggest that with the hope that arriving at that hour will meet the objection of all in the Chamber. I appreciate the very fine words of the Senator from Kentucky, the minority leader. I think he will agree that we did everything we could to bring about an agreement. It seems to me that there is little difference between 6 o'clock and a more or less early hour, or even the hour of 4 or 5 o'clock on Monday. Certainly we can debate this matter from now until 6

o'clock tonight, and there is not enough difference for anyone to assert his will if we really and truly agree with the sentiments and words expressed by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON]. I, for one, would like to have him and the other Members of the Senate know that we all want to cooperate to that end.

I ask once again that we compromise upon this matter and that we continue to debate the pending measure until 6 o'clock tonight, at which time I urge all Members to agree that we shall then vote upon the pending measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Oregon objects.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I share the feeling of the Senator from Oregon in regard to this situation. I also feel that it is the most serious question that has come before the Senate since I have been a Member. This is the first time I have seen the Senate in a state of mind which demands that an issue be voted on within 24 hours. We have to have a unanimous consent agreement to vote in a little over 24 hours or we have to work day and night. That kind of procedure is not good government and it will not lead to good government. If there had been any reasonable amount of debate upon this subject it would be a different proposition, but when Senators must work day and night or agree to vote within 24 or even 48 hours, it is not good government, and it will not lead to any good for this Nation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I dislike to continue to rise and inject my views into the situation, but I wish to emphasize and to elaborate for a moment on the views expressed by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON].

I do not think any of us, regardless of our views of the situation, can doubt the sincerity and the good faith of the Senator from Oregon. I am sure he shares the viewpoint which I share and which I feel every other Senator shares, that the preservation of the dignity, the reputation, and the high standing of the United States Senate is more important than any hour at which we may vote upon a pending matter. If by the course that we are pursuing we lower the high opinion in which we hope and believe that the Senate of the United States is held by the American people, we have lost infinitely more in the sense of government and legislative responsibility than anyone can possibly gain by any point, however important or however petty it may be, in connection with the present procedure. I sincerely hope that all Senators, regardless of what position they take on this veto matter, may have in mind the Senate of the United States, which is made up of 96 men representing 140,000,000 people, the faith of the American people in the Senate of the United States, and their belief that it will not resort as a legislature body, in this critical juncture of our history, to any petty, stubborn assertion of individual rights, merely in order that a point may be gained either by a single Senator, or by any group of Senators, or certainly by any political party.

If the Senator from Nebraska has something else to offer, I shall be glad to yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the dintinguished minority leader suggested Monday as a day on which to have the vote taken, I myself was about to make a bold venture, as he suggested his was, and I was about to restate what I have already stated, namely, that there is very little difference, from my way of thinking, between whether we vote at 6 o'clock on Saturday or at an early hour on Monday. Of course, there is a week end between.

So I should like to suggest another hour. If what the Senator wishes is time over the week end, I should like to suggest the hour of 1 o'clock on Monday as the time at which the Senate shall vote on the pending measure. That certainly would comply with all the arguments that have been advanced, and it seems to me it would be in keeping with the spirit of what has been said.

So, Mr. President, once again I urge that the Members on this side of the aisle agree to a unanimous-consent request for a vote on Monday at 1 o'clock.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to say that in view of the remarks of the able Senator from Oregon and the able Senator from New Mexico, and in the interest of trying to work out something so that the public business may be expedited, I shall not object to the request to have the vote taken at the hour of 1 o'clock on Monday.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I object to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. GEORGE. I ask for the regular order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I regret that all the oil that has been poured out for the past 30 or 40 minutes has failed to still the storms of emotion that are responsible for the Senate remaining in continuous session. For my part, I am ready to vote now, and will be ready to vote at 5 o'clock this afternoon or at 1 o'clock on Monday.

I regret to observe Senators in the state of mind which obtains in the Senate at the present time.

I appreciate the efforts which were made by the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] to placate the clashing wills and minds of Senators who have been unable to agree on a time to vote.

I listened with great interest and admiration to the very temperate statement of the senior Senator from Oregon, but there is one statement which he made with which I cannot agree, namely, that there has been no filibuster in progress in the Senate on this measure.

Mr. President, I wonder just what constitutes a filibuster, if a filibuster is not in progress at the present time.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon does not intend to usurp the prerogatives of Noah Webster, but the Senator from Oregon would like to say that his conception of a filibuster would be the carrying on of a discussion going almost entirely into irrelevant matters, after every possible avenue had been explored and every opportunity given to present all the views and arguments which might be pertinent to the issue.

It seems to the senior Senator from Oregon that somewhere between the opening of debate and infinity there might come a time when it might be said that the subject was exhausted.

Of course, I recognize that it will be a matter of judgment as to when we reach that point, and I say to the Senator from Georgia that the senior Senator from Oregon in exercising his judgment will be most lenient and will give all the odds to those who desire to present further debate.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am one of those who believe unalterably in freedom of debate in the Senate; but I have been the target for the charge, in times past, that I was guilty of the practice of filibustering, even though the matter I was opposing had not been on the floor of the Senate for more than 4 or 5 hours, and no discussion had been had save on the merits of the question.

I simply wish to observe that if a filibuster has not been in progress on this bill, it is because any debate which occurs and which does not have what can be called a southern Democrat participating in it, cannot, under any circumstances, be regarded as a filibuster. No matter how long or repetitious or irrelevant the speeches may be, a southern Democrat must participate in the debate before it will be defined as constituting a filibuster. I have always complained of this unjust method of definition.

Mr. President, I thought the Senator was merely showing regard for the sensibilities of his colleagues when he stated this was no filibuster. My colleague from Oregon is one of the most delightful of all Senators who have served in the Senate of the United States, and it is within his right to maintain the view which he has stated. However, I remember that when another measure was pending, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] all on occasion arose to denounce any speeches of any length in opposition to the measure which they were espousing; they denounced such speeches as being a negation of the democratic process. They asserted again and again that any speeches or paliamentary tactics which delayed the effort of the majority of the Senate to take action upon the bill which then was pending made a mockery of democracy, was an affront to the Senate and an injury to the country.

What I say here is not critical of any speech which may have been made or

which may be delivered hereafter, because I believe in freedom of debate for all other Senators as for myself. I may say, however, in all kindness, that if there has not been a night-long filibuster by three Senators who have condemned filibusters and who have introduced resolutions to change the rules of the Senate so as to make lengthy discussion impossible, then certainly we have seen a great deal of threshing of old straw which has been heretofore thoroughly threshed on the floor of the Senate for several weeks. The question of deciding what is a filibuster goes back to the old fable of whose ox is gored.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I invoke the regular order, and I propound the inquiry whether the Senator from Florida has spoken twice on the same subject on the same legislative day.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PEPPER. I wish to inquire whether all Senators on the floor are governed by the same rules and whether the principle of fairness requires that all Senators be governed by the same rules.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would first rule on the point made by the Senator from Georgia relative to whether the Senator from Florida has spoken twice on the same subject on the same day.

In the opinion of the Chair, the Senator from Florida——

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry: Can the Chair rule as to what the Senator from Florida was going to say, before the Senator from Florida announced what he was going to say? The Senator from Florida had only addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say to the Senator from Florida that the Chair will first rule on the parliamentary inquiry propounded by the Senator from Georgia; namely, whether the Senator from Florida has spoken twice on the same day on the same subject.

The Chair rules that the Senator from Florida has spoken twice.

Mr. PEPPER. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the fact that the Senator from Florida has spoken twice on the same subject prevent the Senator from Florida from making a motion if he is properly recognized, as he was by the Chair?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida can be recognized for the purpose of making a motion.

Mr. PEPPER. Then, Mr. President, I move that the further consideration of the pending bill be deferred until 2 o'clock on Monday next.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REED (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. On this vote I transfer that pair to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], who is absent because of illness, is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER].

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are unavoidably detained.

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senators from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS and Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are unavoidably detained.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. The transfer of that pair to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] has previously been announced by the Senator from Kansas.

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 14, as follows:

YEAS—50

Baldwin	Ferguson	O'Daniel
Ball	George	Reed
Brewster	Gurney	Revercomb
Bricker	Hatch	Robertson, Va.
Bridges	Hawkes	Robertson, Wyo.
Brooks	Hickenlooper	Russell
Buck	Hoey	Saltonstall
Butler	Holland	Taft
Cain	Jenner	Thye
Capehart	Kem	Umstead
Cooper	Knowland	Vandenberg
Cordon	Lodge	Watkins
Donnell	McClellan	Wherry
Dworshak	Malone	White
Eastland	Maybank	Wiley
Ecton	Millikin	Williams
Ellender	Moore	

NAYS—14

Barkley	Johnston, S. C.	Morse
Chavez	Kilgore	Myers
Downey	McCarran	Pepper
Fulbright	McFarland	Sparkman
Green	McGrath	

NOT VOTING—31

Aiken	Lucas	Stewart
Bushfield	McCarthy	Taylor
Byrd	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McMahon	Thomas, Utah
Connally	Magnuson	Tobey
Flanders	Martin	Tydings
Hayden	Murray	Wagner
Hill	O'Conor	Wilson
Ives	O'Mahoney	Young
Johnson, Colo.	Overton	
Langer	Smith	

So the motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if the Senate will be patient with me, I should like to make one more unanimous-consent request. I do so in the hope that we can get unanimous consent at this time. I think the Senate should at least have the proposition put to them, because we have taken considerable time now out of the regular order. Without further remarks, I should like to say that I hope Senators will accept it. I now make the unanimous-consent request that the Senate vote upon the pending question at 3 o'clock p. m. Monday next.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Reserving the right to object——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I only wish to say that I am in charge of the bill. If anybody wants an early vote more than I, I do not know who he is, and I hope very much the Senate will agree to the proposal made by the Senator from Nebraska. It seems to me it presents the best solution to the problem. I do not like the idea of running through Sunday any more than does the Senator from Oregon. I think we should permit full debate today, and I would hope that we may recess until, say 11 o'clock this morning, and continue the debate this afternoon; and, if we can agree to the unanimous-consent request, that we then vote on Monday at the time requested by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, I should like to ask, what is the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to state it again for the benefit of the Senator from Arkansas. I made a final request for unanimous consent to vote upon the pending measure at 3 o'clock Monday afternoon next. I do that with this hope: It seems to me there is little difference between voting at 5, 6, or 7 o'clock Saturday, and voting at an early hour on Monday; and, once again, as I have already stated, in keeping with the sentiments expressed by the senior Senator from Oregon, it seems to me that if we can comply with those sentiments and that request, we should do so. Personally, I am as anxious to continue in session as anyone here.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, did I understand the Senator correctly?

Mr. WHERRY. I am just as anxious—well—[laughter]. Watch out—I will make a speech here this morning. I am beginning to feel fine. I certainly would not want to impose a speech upon Senators. I am going to say I would like very much to have the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, now that we seem to have almost complete unanimity—I cannot even pronounce the word [laughter]——

Mr. BARKLEY. The word is unanimity.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator will pronounce it for me. I ask that we unanimously agree to vote at 3 o'clock Monday. I hope that this last unanimous-consent request I have proposed will be accepted, because I feel that if it is not, the only thing that can be done is to proceed with the regular order and continue to debate the subject.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield that I may make a request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, do I have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas has the floor. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have not been asked to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio made such a request.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I only wished to ask the Senator from Nebraska if he would add to his request a division of the time on Monday, between 12 o'clock and 3 o'clock.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly, Mr. President; I had that in mind. Excuse me—will the Senator from Arkansas yield, to enable me to answer the distinguished Senator from Ohio?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it is perfectly agreeable to me to amend the unanimous-consent request. I thought that should have been made prior to this time, but, in all the discussions we have had, some felt that the best thing to do was to merely fix an hour certain. For that reason we did not divide the time. But now I should like to suggest a modification, namely, that from the time the Senate convenes at 12 o'clock on Monday, the time between 12 o'clock and 3 o'clock be divided equally, and that it be controlled for those opposing the veto by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and for those supporting the veto by the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], or anyone that side of the question might select.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I regret that this request could not have been made and agreed to at a proper time and at a reasonable time. We have been kept here all night long, listening to a lot of harangue, that has accomplished nothing and to accommodate whom? Many Senators have been greatly inconvenienced by this procedure and this useless all night session. I had an obligation, a speaking engagement in my home State this afternoon. I was perfectly willing, after the President's veto message came, to accommodate everyone and anyone with reference to the time of voting. But I have not been accommodated; the whole Senate has not been accommodated. We have been imposed upon, and no good has been accomplished. Now, after staying up all night in continuous session, we are asked to accommodate those who provoked this situation and insisted upon this procedure. I do not like it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I appreciate what the Senator from Arkansas says, but that is—

Mr. McCLELLAN. May I say, Mr. President, it is the truth.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not disputing that.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Here we are, right after a quorum call and a vote. I challenge any Senator to deny it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not getting into a dispute with the Senator about that, but what I was about to observe is, that that is water over the dam. It is impossible to fix any time that accommodates every Senator. For 6 weeks I have had a speaking engagement in my State to address the State convention of the Rural Electrification Cooperative Association, some five or six hundred men and women, who will be at Louisville at noon on Monday. I am hoping we may enter into this agreement to vote at 3 o'clock on Monday, notwithstanding that means I must cancel the engagement and cannot fill it. Other Senators have to be disaccommodated by reason of any unanimous consent that is granted. I appreciate and sympathize with the Senator because of the fact that he has had to cancel his appointment in his home town. I have one in my home town, too, that I shall have to cancel. I hope that we may not, because we have been disappointed already, or will be disappointed on Monday, as I will be, refuse to grant the consent. I hope the Senator from Arkansas is not going to object to the request. I earnestly hope he will not. I do not know of anybody that will find Monday so inconvenient a time to vote as myself.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President——

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, if the Senate will agree to adjourn until Monday and vote at 4 o'clock I will enter into such an agreement. I will not enter into any other agreement. After having stayed here all night, after having prepared myself to make a speech last 10 or 12 hours, I shall not agree to a unanimous-consent request that the Senate recess until 11 o'clock today. I shall object to such a request, and the Senate can stay in session all day today, if necessary, and all night, too.

I will agree to a unanimous-consent request that the Senate adjourn until Monday, and vote at 4 o'clock Monday. But, after having stayed here all night, and having prepared to speak on the subject, I shall not agree to a recess until 11 o'clock today.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I simply reserved the right to object in order to bring to the attention of the Nation the ridiculousness of the procedure which has been pursued here during the past 12 hours. There was no reason on earth why a sensible agreement could not have been worked out by unanimous consent. But, in order to accommodate some whim of someone—and that is all it was—we have been kept here all night. Then at 6 or 7 o'clock in the morning, it is desired that the Senate enter into a unanimous-consent agreement, an agreement which could have been entered into and which should have been entered into, if one was going to be entered into, before the Senate began its night session.

Out of deference to the wishes of the very large majority of my colleagues who were not to blame, and who are not responsible for the disgraceful procedure that has gone on here all night long, I am not going to object, but I want the RECORD to show that I have been inconvenienced, and I want those responsible for this all night session to know that the Senate of the United States has been made to look ridiculous in its deliberation on this, one of the most vital measures that has been before this body.

Mr. President, why has such procedure been indulged? Where does the responsibility lie? Let the blame rest on the shoulders of those who are responsible, and let the country know who they are. I do not propose to take the blame. I have been willing, every minute, to vote on the question, or to agree with respect to any proper request that might have been made. I have not had the opportunity to have my way. Whoever has had his way in what has happened tonight, let him take the blame and the responsibility.

Mr. President, I am not objecting to any reasonable proceedings or requests, but I am not going to remain silent and inactive with respect to this sort of procedure in the United States Senate. Whenever I filibuster I am ready to acknowledge it and say I am filibustering and fight for whatever position I may take. But to go through a procedure such as the Senate has gone through this night, and then have a request made at 7 o'clock in the morning to postpone everything by unanimous consent until next week, in my opinion, does not comport with either statesmanship, patriotism, integrity, or sincerity of purpose. What has happened has been a mockery here tonight, and a lot of cheap demagogery. That is my appraisal of it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Does the Senator think whether we stay here 1 minute, 1 hour, 1 day, 1 month, or 1 year will change any Senator's mind?

Mr. McCLELLAN. My answer to the Senator is emphatically no.

Mr. MAYBANK. Certainly not.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Those responsible for this all-night session know that what has happened will not change any Senator's mind. It has been a lot of horse play and cheap acting, and the country ought to know it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator spoke of the procedure which has taken place now during 1 or 2 days. The issue in question has been debated in the Senate since January 1.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes. Mr. President, I am not going to object because the majority of my colleagues are not responsible for this; they have not had their way about it. We have had to suffer at the hands of a minority, and a very small minority, who have put on this show for some purpose, but not for the glory or to the credit of the Senate of the United States. Under the circumstances, Mr. President, I prefer now to continue until we can have a vote, but out of deference to the great majority of the Members of this body who are not to blame for this situation I shall not object to the request of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho has objected to the unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from Nebraska.

The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

DEATH OF FORMER GOV. HOWARD M. GORE, OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I have quite an important announcement to make. I tried to make it yesterday during the course of the proceedings, but under the rules was not permitted to do so. I feel that I should make it now.

It is with genuine distress that I announce to the Senate the death of former Gov. Howard M. Gore, of West Virginia, at his home in Clarksburg.

The work of a truly great man has ended. He served both his Nation and his State with ability and distinction. He was Secretary of Agriculture in the Cabinet of President Coolidge, and was Governor of West Virginia. During the last few years he has been head of the public service commission of his State.

His first interest was in agriculture and those who farmed the land, but he had a keen understanding of the problems of men in all walks of life.

As chief executive of our State he was progressive and independent, and active in his leadership. The roads built under his plans and direction will long stand as a monument to his contributions to the well-being of our citizens.

He was the soul of honor and dependability. He was lofty in thought and in his action. He was sympathetic to the call of distress. He was demanding of all, particularly of himself, in the fulfillment of obligations.

Genial of disposition, pleasant and entertaining in conversation, he was a delightful companion. His friends were drawn to him and held steadfastly to him through their genuine admiration for him, for his ideals and accomplishments.

Now, on the eighty-fourth birthday of statehood, West Virginia deeply feels and mourns the loss of one of her most distinguished sons.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS—VETO MESSAGE

The Senate resumed the reconsideration of the bill (H. R. 3020) to prescribe fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management in their relations with one another which affect commerce, to protect the rights of individual workers in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce, to recognize the paramount public interest in labor disputes affecting commerce that endanger the public health, safety, or welfare, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, by way of preface to my discussion, I wish to join in the commendation of the speech made by the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON]. For a great many years the senior Senator from Oregon and the junior Senator from Oregon have been very close friends. In my opinion, there is no more beautiful friendship in the United States than that which exists between the senior Senator from Oregon and the junior Senator from Oregon. We may differ from time to time on certain great national issues. Although we may differ on such issues, as we have differed on the merits of the Taft-Hartley bill, the two Senators from Oregon do pursue a common course when it comes to problems affecting the State of Oregon, when it comes to problems of Oregon politics, and also, I think the record will show, when it comes to agreement on matters of procedure such as were discussed by the senior Senator from Oregon tonight in his very able speech.

My colleague is quite correct when he says that I did not know that he was about to make the speech which he made before he made it; but it came as no surprise to me, even though I did not know of it in advance, because the senior Senator from Oregon is a man who believes in fair dealing. He is a man who believes that at all times minorities, too, should be protected, at a time when strong differences develop between majorities and minorities, and when fatigue, emotion, and hard feelings sometimes color the judgment of men.

I want the senior Senator from Oregon to know that I personally appreciate the great act of courtesy which he sought to perform for me in the remarks which he addressed to the Senate. That is not the first act of courtesy which the senior Senator from Oregon has extended to me. I am sure that on the witness stand he would testify also that such acts of courtesy have been reciprocated many times on the part of the junior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. President, I wish to discuss for a few minutes my views as to the procedural problem which faces us, because, as so often happens, once differences begin to develop, as they have developed since the unanimous-consent request was made yesterday afternoon, men form very early opinions as to what the facts are in those differences, and sometimes it requires the passage of time for them to come to realize possibly the facts are not what they thought they were.

When my good friend the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] submitted a unanimous-consent request yesterday afternoon to vote this afternoon at 5 o'clock on the question as to whether or not the Presidential veto should be sustained or overridden, I objected. As has been pointed out, it was my right to object under the rule, and at the time I objected I gave my major reasons for the objection, which I shall now expound for several hours.

I pointed out at the time that in my opinion the President of the United States had handed down a veto message on the labor bill which in my opinion was sound and unanswerable. I think the record will show that I also stated that in my opinion it was one of the most powerful veto messages that any President had handed down in the history of our country. I repeat that opinion now.

I continued, in my remarks yesterday afternoon, to say that I felt that under our form of representative government the people of the United States should have an opportunity to react to that veto message, and should have an opportunity to make their reaction known to the United States Senate. I still believe so.

Mr. President, I have on my desk certain telegrams which have already started to come in. They are a little indication—and I think it will be multiplied—that the country is beginning to react to the President's veto message. It happens to be an honest opinion of mine that when employers come to analyze the veto message many of them will change their minds on the question whether or not the veto should be overridden. I shall come to that question later in greater detail. I mention it now only because it bears upon the question of why I felt compelled to object to the unanimous-consent agreement which was requested.

There were other reasons, too. As I stated at the time, the White House had announced that the President was going on the air at 10 o'clock last night to discuss his views on the bill and give his reasons to the people of the United States for vetoing the bill. I stated that I thought that it was a matter of courtesy and decency and respect to the President of the United States that we delay action on the veto message over the week end so that it could become a matter of public discussion prior to a final vote.

I think that was a very proper suggestion, Mr. President. We may have our

party differences; we may become involved in the bitterest of partisan disputes, but there is one thing I think we must always make clear to the world, and that is that we all believe in the American system of government which includes, it seems to me, the great duty to show the highest of respect to each one of the three great coordinate branches. Oh, I know there are times in the bitterness of debate when each one of us forgets to the full extent his responsibility to show the highest of respect for the three branches of the Government. Sometimes we as lawyers become somewhat irked at a decision of some court. It might even be the Supreme Court on occasions. I am afraid that in those periods of emotion we are sometimes publicly unduly critical of our judiciary system. That does not help to strengthen that system. We commit error, it seems to me, when we do that. Sometimes in the heat of controversy, even on the floor of the Senate, we do not show the respect for the President of the United States that we should show him. I have been guilty of that on one occasion. I acknowledged it. I made clear on the floor of the Senate my regret for not having shown on that occasion the respect for the President to which I think he is always entitled, I care not who he is. His is a great office; it is a great symbol in the world today.

I do not think we help the standing of America when, either as individuals or as a body, we fail to recognize at all times to the maximum degree that that office is entitled to every possible consideration on the part of us as individuals and as Senators; that we should not act hastily in our judgment toward the man who occupies that position, and that in the Senate we should not, even though we might think it would be to political advantage to do so, act with unnecessary haste on a Presidential recommendation.

So I felt yesterday afternoon, Mr. President—and all I can say is that no one could be more sincere about it than I was then or than I am now—that the bare amenities of the situation, if nothing else, called upon us as one of the three branches of our great governmental system to delay for a time, for a week end, final action on the veto message. I think my objection to the unanimous-consent request on that ground, and on that ground alone, would have been justified. I should be perfectly willing, and I am perfectly willing, to stand before the American people today and say that on that ground alone I am perfectly willing to take their judgment.

But there are other reasons which I think make my objection a sound one. We did not have all the Members of the Senate present yesterday afternoon. I understand that all of them are not yet back in town; and I do not like, Mr. President, to enter into unanimous-consent agreements to limit debate under such circumstances, when the issue involved is of such great importance to the Nation, until I feel that full and ample protection has been given to all my colleagues in the assertion of their rights. So I objected, Mr. President, because I felt that there was no need for the great haste exhibited. Certainly by the beginning of the week we could find out one way or another, either by their presence or through telegrams or by telephone, what the wishes of the absentee Senators might be in regard to this matter.

I think, Mr. President, we owe each other courtesy also. I think decent comity should flow from each one of us to each other. It was my opinion that it would not be fair to hasten through a vote on this measure this afternoon at 5 o'clock, when, so far as I know, and no proof could be given to me to the contrary—at least, I could not find any assurance of it—that some of the absentees did not, when they left town, have any understanding that an attempt would be made to pass upon this message on Saturday afternoon at 5 o'clock.

I recognize, Mr. President, that on a great many issues the making of a unanimous-consent request does not call for checking with absentees. I know the rules do not make it necessary. I know that on a great many issues it really does not make any difference. But here we are dealing with one of the most vital issues to face the Eightieth Congress. It is so recognized by all of us and by the country. So I felt, Mr. President, that it was only fair that an opportunity be given for sufficient delay in the final vote on this message so that the absentees would have opportunity to return here, try to arrange pairs, or make their wishes known as to whether they felt we should proceed to vote on Saturday afternoon in their absence. On major issues such as this, if an absent Senator, for example, made known that he did not want the vote to be taken in his absence, I would never hesitate to object in his behalf, even though he then were absent.

But I also wish to say that in my opinion there is a responsibility upon each one of us, even though we may disagree on the merits of issues, to lean over backward in trying to be fair and highly courteous and respectful of the rights not only of those who agree with us but also of those who disagree with us.

So I objected to the proposed procedure on that ground.

I objected on another ground, and I wish to be very frank about it. I think my colleagues who have worked with me on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare this year will testify without exception that from the beginning of the hearings to the final meeting of the committee, at which time the committee voted to report the Senate committee bill, not a single time did I fail to extend to my committee colleagues the utmost consideration and cooperation in the honest endeavor that each and every one of us was making to come forward with a labor bill which we felt would check the abuses of labor, which abuses most certainly need to be checked and should be checked, and to the extent that they can be checked by legislation they should be checked by the Eightieth Congress.

That was the spirit in which I worked on this labor legislation. The record will have to speak for itself as to whether I made any worth-while contributions to that end; but if Senators will check the legislation I have introduced during this session of Congress and will check the work of the committee and will take note of the specific suggestions, motions, and proposals I made, they cannot escape the conclusion that a good many of my suggestions were woven into the fabric of the Senate committee bill.

Mr. President, as the RECORD shows, when the bill came to the floor of the Senate and certain amendments were made, and when the bill went to conference and certain additions were made, I could not see my way clear to vote for the measure, because in my judgment it would not work; because in my judgment it had become legislation which was administratively unsound, and because in my judgment it would result in a serious impairment of the rights of both labor and industry. I shall discuss that part of my speech later at greater length.

I am simply seeking now to lay the outline as to why I have seen fit to object to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement. I could not agree to the legislation, but I make these points because I know that in a controversy such as this there are those who momentarily will overlook the true position of the junior Senator from Oregon in regard to labor legislation.

I feel that this legislation is so bad, and I feel that the President's veto message in regard to it is so sound, that I thought at least a week end should be devoted to public discussion of the legislation and the veto message. I think great good will come of such discussion, because had we voted yesterday afternoon and had the die been cast, so to speak, at that time, all of us know that there would not have been nearly as much public discussion as there will be as a result of the objection I filed and, through it, the focusing of public attention on the message and the bill, because if and when this bill is enacted into law and becomes operative, it is very important that as many of our people as possible understand what it entails and what some of us think are its weaknesses, and prepare themselves—if those of us who object to it are proved to be correct, and I think time will prove us to be correct—to make the adjustments in the economic field which will have to be made in order to meet the various emergencies and dislocations which in all probability will develop in our economic order as a result of the application of the legislation to specific instances.

Let me make myself perfectly clear at this point in the RECORD in regard to another position of mine concerning legislation of which I may not approve, and that is that once such legislation is actually placed on the statute books and has the standing and the sanctity of law, there is no man in this body who will be more insistent than I upon its enforcement and who will refuse to condone in any respect or to any degree whatsoever any refusal on the part of anyone to comply fully with its terms.

We cannot have Government by law in this country maintained on any other basis. Of course, my deep feeling about that, that once it takes on the sanctity

of law it must be carried out, is not going to change human nature. Thus, as I have said before, if a law becomes unpopular with a large minority of our people who believe that it is inherently unjust to their legitimate rights, it is going to be very difficult to administer such a law, but so long as it is on the books I think every effort should be made to enforce it, or as I have said in some decisions, whatever forces of Government are available and necessary to be used in an attempt to enforce the law should be used.

I have applied in many arbitration decisions and many War Labor Board decisions what I thought were mistaken laws, laws which I would not have voted for had I been in Congress at the time, laws which I felt did not strengthen Government by law, and I have said to a good many unions, in many decisions, words to this effect, "I did not write the law, but it is the law, and this union is going to comply with the law under its contract as long as this arbitrator is arbitrator under the contract."

Mr. President, I make this point because I want the RECORD to show that no one need worry about my countenancing any violation of the law. I can hold my beliefs as to what I think some of the administrative and enforcement problems of the law are going to be without in any way countenancing any practices which seek to defeat the administration of the law.

I cannot throw away years of very practical experience in the field of labor relations. Sometimes I am a little amused at one typical criticism which one of my background gets now and then, namely, "Did you ever meet a pay roll?" "Did you ever run a business?" "Do you really know anything about the practical affairs of business?"

I cannot understand that attitude. Of course, I did not come up with a silver spoon in my mouth. For a good many years the two most important dates in my home were the interest date and the tax date. I learned something about the value of money in that training. So the practical businessmen who are inclined to criticize me for a lack of practical experience know very little about my background, apparently.

For many years on our farm we sought to meet the economic wolf at the door, so to speak, when farm prices were depressed, but for everything we had to buy the prices were very high. So, from the standpoint of practical life and understanding in the field of agriculture, I have had experience.

Mr. President, that is not all. I know what it is to drive a mail wagon, because in high school and college night after night I met trains until 4 o'clock in the morning, and went to school the next day. I think it gave me a little practical understanding of the problems of labor.

Then there were the harvest fields in the Dakotas, and the cement mixers, and many other menial jobs, which I think gave me a little practical understanding of the worker's point of view.

There were years of college administration. I am surprised at the number of businessmen who seem to think, apparently, that administrative work in the field of education is no practical problem. Running a law school for 13 years during a period of depression, when budget problems were severe, was quite a business, and I think involved the requirement of some business acumen.

In my own private affairs, my own financial interests, small as they are, have not left me in any vacuum as far as the practical problems of business and our economic system are concerned.

There have been years, and hard years, of very practical work in the field of labor relations, when in case after case, amounting to several hundred, I had a baptism in the practical problems of American business. I became as familiar as anyone possibly could with the financial problems, the financial books, the profit-and-loss problems, and the economic problems confronting both employers and labor in those cases. I think out of that experience, to a very large degree, I demonstrated a practical knowledge of the problems of the business, that proved in many instances of great help to the businessman involved in the cases. I am willing to say that one will look in vain to find any businessmen who have tried cases before me, who would share the view of the critics, that I lack a practical background or understanding of American business and its problems, or of American labor and its problems.

It is not particularly agreeable to me personally to say these things, but I say them because the suggestion is made in some quarters that I am a perfectionist in regard to labor legislation, that I am making the approach to it of a theorist and ex-college professor; although, let me say, in defense of my former profession, that, contrary to a general opinion, members of university faculties are very practical people. In fact, I have found in my work that some of the most impractical are to be found in the field of business and not on our college faculties at all. But be that as it may, I call attention to these things only because I want to have the record as clear as I can make it that I have not sought to make any theoretical approach to the labor legislation. I have sought to work for legislation that would work. I have sought to promote through the Senate legislation that would meet the practical problems of employer-employee relations; and I do not think this bill will do that. I think that as American industry comes to study it we are going to find that more and more of its members will come to share my view.

But, as I said, I thought it very important that American industry and the people generally be given an opportunity to consider the legislation over the week end, and therefore I am willing to run all the risks of unpopularity among certain colleagues in the interest of focusing attention on the legislation and the veto message by my objection. I am perfectly willing to assume the full and single responsibility for it. The fact is I was not alone. The fact is I do not stand alone in the fight which I am making this week end. There are other Senators in this body who share my view, and who, to the extent of our physical endurance, are going to see this fight through to a conclusion, if we are able to hold out that long; and I think we can.

I digress from that point for a moment to say that I agree with the senior Senator from Oregon that it is not good practice for the Senate to hold sessions on Sunday, unless some really great national emergency compels it; and the session on this coming Sunday, which apparently seems to be in the offing, is not necessary; it would not have been necessary, if an attempt had not been made to force a majority view upon a minority, which was asking only for what I think was a reasonable postponement of final vote on the question. To the extent that I can, tomorrow, during the second speech which I shall make on this subject, which undoubtedly will fall on the morrow, I shall endeavor to move to the extent possible upon a spiritual level. But I think it is a great mistake for the majority in effect to force a Sunday meeting upon us, simply because we will not bow down and accept the unanimous consent agreement to vote on this day, Saturday, at 5 o'clock.

I think the senior Senator from Oregon was entirely correct on another point that needs to be reemphasized, and that is, this type of struggle and controversy in the Senate really is unnecessary. It is bound to produce strains. Oh, yes, I know in the cloakrooms we can laugh it off, but it does not produce, as the senior Senator from Oregon implied in his very excellent statement, that cooperation among us and that brotherly feeling which I think ought to exist even though differences of opinion exist. There is a little difference here, though, Mr. President. Some one very aptly put it, I think, when he said that this situation was really based upon the law of force, the force of the majority imposing its will upon the minority. At least I do not think it is the most kindlly approach that could be made to the solution of the problem; and I regret it. I think it is too bad. I think we ought to move above it. In fact, I think what the Senate of the United States needs now, Mr. President, more than anything else, is a period of relaxation. We need a good fellow get-together. We need to wash the slate clean of this controversy. I think we need to recognize that it should not have arisen in this way. I think there is a pretty good case in support of my view on that subject. Let us look at the RECORD.

I wonder if the Chair knows of any time—I cannot recall one—during the present session when we thought a situation was of such an emergent character that immediately upon its being laid before the Senate, as was the President's message yesterday afternoon—when I say "immediately," I mean within certainly a very short time, a matter of minutes, but I cannot recall now how many minutes—the request was made to vote upon it as of today at 5 o'clock, and when that request was objected to, lo and behold, it was made clear to those of us in the minority that we were going to stay in session until such time as a vote could be had.

I was shocked at that. I think it was very unfortunate, because I cannot for-

get my experiences in the Senate of the United States in connection with unanimous-consent agreements and filibusters. I know my own record on that subject, too, Mr. President. No one in the Senate, not even my good friend the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is more aware of my position on filibusters than I am myself. I shall vote any time for a rule of the Senate that will make filibusters impossible. I shall vote also at any time for a rule which will prevent the abuse of the unanimous-consent agreement, because, as I have said before, I think it is very important that we keep this body a forum in which there shall be untrammeled, unlimited debate on the merits of an issue.

Ours is the last great citadel in the world, among all the parliamentary bodies in the world, in which that precious right is still guaranteed. But it is going to become an empty right, Mr. President, if a dominant majority by way of a unanimous-consent agreement procedure, places a minority in a position of feeling that if it acts to protect the right of unlimited debate it is guilty of some great wrong against the Senate. I think in the present session of Congress the unanimous-consent agreement procedure has been overused to such a degree that its use is in fact, not in theory, threatening the principle of unlimited debate on the merits of issues in the Senate.

The Chair knows my conviction concerning unanimous-consent agreements procedure. The Chair will recall that in the Seventy-ninth Congress, when I was leading a fight, in cooperation with my senior colleague from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] in behalf of protecting the interests of the lamb producers of Oregon from what we knew to be the very arbitrary and unreasonable action of OPA, after failing in all negotiations with the OPA I decided, upon my own motion, to keep the Senate informed daily of the developments of the OPA relations to the lamb industry in my State. I received a considerable amount of criticism for that, and a great deal of good-natured kidding in the Senate. I knew it would become monotonous. I meant it to be monotonous, because through the monotony itself I hope to make crystal clear the position in which the lamb producers of my State found themselves—and I did. But it was during that debate, Mr. President, that I had my first run-in, so to speak, with this practice of limiting debate through unanimous-consent agreements.

The Chair will recall that the issue then pending before the Senate was of such importance that it resulted in the practice of yielding the floor at the close of the day to some Member of the Senate so that he might have the floor and make a speech at the beginning of the next day. It had been the practice, after obtaining the floor under such a unanimous-consent agreement, to yield the floor again to colleagues in the Senate so that they might do what is so frequently referred to as the floor-chore work—the introduction of bills, the presentation of memorials, the submission of material for insertion in the RECORD, and the making of brief speeches on subjects foreign to the one pending before the Senate. That had been the common practice.

However, on this particular afternoon when the junior Senator from Oregon obtained the floor to make his daily presentation of the most recent facts in connection with the situation of the Oregon lamb market, he was startled by the statement from the then holder of the floor that he would be yielded 5 minutes of time. I knew that that was not consistent with untrammeled debate in the United States Senate. I protested, but to no avail. So I used the time allotted, with the statement that when I obtained the floor in my own right I would discuss the procedural principal involved. The next day I did so at some length. I think the RECORD will show approximately a 45-minute discussion of it, in which I stated that it seemed to me the whole practice of unanimous-consent agreements for limitation of debate had a great many dangers in it, and that I felt that each request should be weighed very carefully, because as a general rule I would thenceforth object to unanimous-consent agreements, which I did.

The RECORD will show that during the Seventy-ninth Congress I objected many times to unanimous-consent agreements. I tried to be reasonable about it and I think I was, because the RECORD will also show that on some occasions when it was perfectly clear to me that it was the will of every other Member of the Senate to vote on an issue, and if I had satisfied myself that that was true, I gave consent; but each time I made it very clear that so far as I was concerned each request would have to be carefully scrutinized, and that unless I was satisfied that it was a highly meritorious request I would object. That has been my policy.

In the last session of Congress a great many of my Republican colleagues, shall I say, were not opposed to the position I had taken. I think I could go even further and say that on a good many occasions they welcomed my objection, because they felt that it gave them some advantage, although my objection was based upon my feeling that the use of the unanimous-consent procedure should be limited.

In this session of Congress I think the majority leader, the whip, and the chairman of the policy committee could be offered as my witnesses, who, under examination, would have to testify that the fact is that I have been extremely cooperative in regard to working out unanimous-consent agreements. I have been cooperative, although it has seemed to me at times that some unanimous-consent agreements which were entered into when I was absent from the Chamber were not particularly fair to me—not that any Senator thought for a moment about my interest in the matter or intended to be unfair; but I think the result was that they were unfair.

Take, for example, the recent incident involving the National Science Foundation bill. We had before us the Kilgore amendment which called for a geographical distribution of funds on a certain percentage basis, and we had before us, my amendment which called for the application of a similar principle, but with some variations.

I was called from the Chamber one afternoon on a very important conference over the coffee cups in the Senate restaurant below, the conference dealing with the Swan Island Shipyard in my State. A unanimous-consent agreement was entered into on the floor of the Senate to take up the Kilgore amendment the next day, which was Friday, at 1 o'clock. That was perfectly proper under the rules. The effect of it, of course, was to place my own amendment in a more difficult position, because as yet I had not discussed my amendment, although I had hoped to do so that afternoon at some length, and I had my material on this desk for a discussion of it. It was simply one of those unfortunate and unhappy circumstances for which no one was responsible so far as any wrong doing was concerned; but the agreement was entered into without a quorum call. The rules do not require it. However, my amendment was prejudiced. I stated at that time, and I stated at a meeting before my Republican colleagues, that I thought we ought to be more careful in exercising requests for unanimous consent agreements in order to make certain that the rights and interests of no Member of the Senate should be prejudiced thereby. I suggested that as a practice a quorum be called in order to provide that safeguard.

I think that what I am saying, Mr. President, is important as a background for an understanding of my position on unanimous-consent agreements. With my view of them—and I am entitled to that view—and with the cooperation which I have extended to the Republican leadership in the Senate in this session of Congress, I think it is fair from the standpoint of the rights of a minority, that we not insist on any unanimous-consent agreements. It really is not necessary. The one suggested yesterday afternoon with regard to a vote on the veto message today was not necessary, in view of the fact that it involved the one piece of legislation to which in this session of Congress I have devoted more time than to any other, and it involved a piece of legislation on which I have a very deep conviction.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BALL in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. CAPEHART. What is the question before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the able Senator from Oregon feel that he is discussing the merits or demerits of the question before the Senate?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am very glad to answer that question. I think it is a very fair question, and I am sure it is asked by my good friend from Indiana in a very kindly spirit of wanting to cooperate with the junior Senator

from Oregon. My answer to the question is "Yes." I think it is necessary for me to lay the foundation which I am laying in my introductory remarks for my discussion of the merits of the veto message.

But, to go back, Mr. President, to the point I was making, I think that in view of the fact that I have these views on unanimous-consent agreements, it was due me, although no one need recognize the obligation if there be one, not to press for such a unanimous-consent agreement on this particular piece of legislation, in view of the cooperation I have extended on unanimous-consent agreements and other matters in this session and in the last session also, for that matter, and knowing at the same time that this whole practice of unanimous-consent agreements is tending to become abused in the Senate; in fact, it is putting into practice—a loose practice, I admit—a form of limitation of debate in the Senate.

I want to clear up another matter, because there is an ugly rumor afloat in the Senate. It was mentioned to me by the President pro tempore, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] early last evening by way of a question which he put to me in conversation, and a similar question was put to me by my good friend the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON]. I think I state the question accurately when I say they wanted to know from me if at any time I had agreed to go along with the unanimous-consent agreement to vote on this bill at 5 o'clock on Saturday. I told them I had not, which is the truth, Mr. President, so help me God. I take my oaths very seriously, and I am very glad to spread on the RECORD what I know about any basis for any such rumor.

For a good many weeks, I have been planning that at the close of the Washington schools my family and I would take a little trip by automobile to Madison, Wis., for a family reunion picnic which is to be held tomorrow. In fact, it has been a topic of considerable conversation. It has been looked upon by us in the family as not exactly a vacation, but somewhat as a reward for the success of each one of us in the family, including the parents, in passing some very difficult courses this year. I have been going through the fifth grade and seventh grade and sophomore courses in high school, and I am afraid it has not been at all times with very good grades, from the standpoint of my preparation of answers to questions. I had quite forgotten all I knew about plane geometry, and I discovered that percentages with fractions were a little far removed from the ordinary work of the Senate. But we passed. In fact, those who have actually received their grades did pretty well. So this little trip was a sort of reward. On Thursday—time is slipping so rapidly that I for the moment find it difficult to recall the date—before I left the floor of the Senate, I spoke to my good friend, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] about whether he knew what the procedure would be if the President should send a veto message. Of course we did not know on Thursday. The best guess was that he would, but we could not tell with absolute certainty.

So the Senator from Nebraska—and I am giving my best and honest recollection of the conversation—said, "Well, WAYNE, I just don't know. I suppose there will be an attempt to vote shortly after we get the message, but it is hard to tell." He said, "I understand that some of the men on the other side are away, and there is some question as to whether they can get back. For example," he said, "I understand that Senator THOMAS of Utah is in Europe, and that if the Senators on the other side think the vote is going to be close enough, they may try to get him back. I simply can't tell you."

I said "I want to go to Wisconsin with my family; but, of course, in view of the fight I have made on this bill, I certainly cannot justify not being here when a vote is taken. So I guess I had better cancel my trip."

He said, "I don't know how to advise you. I think you are probably right; probably you shouldn't take any chances."

I said, "Very well; I will think it over."

Mr. President, I shall relate two or three other conversations. I wish to make very clear that in that conversation there was no discussion of any position on any unanimous-consent agreement. There was no request as to whether I would go along with any agreement, if such an agreement were offered. It was simply a discussion, as I have recalled it here, in which I laid my problem before the Senator from Nebraska. Let me say that he was most courteous and friendly about it.

Then I went over to my office. I was doing some work, prior to going home, and I got a telephone call from my good friend the Senator from Nebraska. He said, "Wayne, I think I ought to tell you that I have just had a talk"—I think he said "with Mr. MARTIN"; but I may be in error about that. If he did not have it directly with Mr. MARTIN, he had it with someone who had had a talk directly with Mr. MARTIN. I cannot recall which of those two alternatives is correct; but it is either one or the other. "And," he said, "It looks as though we are going to have a veto. No one knows it for a certainty, but everything points that way. MARTIN says he thinks the House will get the veto message over to the Senate by 1:30, if it comes down from the President." He said, "If that happens, I don't see how we can miss taking it up." He said, "I think an attempt will be made to get a vote before the week end is over."

I said, "I haven't decided what to do yet."

He replied, "You certainly probably are in the best position to know whether the boys over on the other side are going to make any long speeches on it."

I said, "Ken, the truth is, I don't know. They haven't told me what their pleasure is in regard to it."

Mr. President, that was the sum and substance of that conversation. Again I emphasize that I am sure that KEN WHERRY, of Nebraska, will testify to the same thing, namely, that there was no discussion that by any stretch of the imagination involved any unanimous-consent agreement or any commitment on my part to any unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. President, in view of my position on unanimous-consent agreements, the leadership of my party in this body always puts to me, point blank, "Will you or will you not go along with such and such an agreement?" Mr. President, here was a conversation that had been initiated by me in seeking information from my leadership as to whether it thought a vote on this matter would be pressed before the week end was over, because if there was not going to be any, I wanted to know whether it would be safe for me to go to Wisconsin.

Mr. President, I want to make very clear at this point that, so far as I know, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] does not hold to the view that I made any commitment on a unanimous-consent agreement. He will have to speak for himself. I think it was a matter which he took for granted because I was raising a question as to whether or not it would be safe for me to go to Wisconsin. Any intimation to me that any offer was being made by anyone to bind me to vote on this question before the week-end would have immediately brought from me my objection.

In the telephone conversation with the Senator from Nebraska the matter was left hanging in the air again as to any definite information on the basis of which I felt I was justified either in going to Wisconsin or canceling my trip. So I tried to get in touch with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], but unfortunately I had lost the little book of telephone numbers, and could not reach him. I found that perhaps the operator could help me. I could not reach him before I left my office, but by the time I reached home the Senator from Ohio very kindly called me. My recollection of that conversation, which I think the Senator from Ohio will also verify, is that he, too, said no one could be sure. He said, "I do not know what they are going to do." He laughed and said, "I think probably it will be a little risky if you want to vote on the question, but you know the Senate."

Mr. President, at no time in that conversation was there any suggestion that I was to go along with any unanimous-consent agreement. Had the request been made to me I would have objected, as I did when it was made on the floor of the Senate, because I have felt that the veto message should receive very careful and thorough debate on the floor of the Senate In fact, for some time I have been checking on the congressional history of vetoes. I forget the exact date, but I think probably 3 or possibly 4 weeks ago I called upon the Library of Congress to prepare a memorandum for me, based upon an analysis of whether or not at the time of the Constitutional Debates, and on down through our history since the Constitutional Debates, there was any basis for the view that under our check and balance system a

veto should be given the benefit of a presumption, as we say in the law.

It is a little mooted; there are arguments both ways on it, but I cite that at this point—and I shall come back to it later in detail—to witness the fact that it has been my intention over a considerable period of time to call for a thorough debate of the veto message, if one should be handed down.

Mr. President, I think that background is important in weighing and appraising rumor as to my seeking information as to what my party leadership thought the chances were, first, that the bill would be vetoed, and, second, if it were vetoed, whether we would vote on it before the end of the week.

I wish to make clear again, Mr. President, that to my knowledge neither the Senator from Nebraska nor the Senator from Ohio takes the position that I made any commitment to them. I do not know how a rumor like that got started. I shall refer to another telephone conversation in a moment; but I do not know how a rumor like that got started. I presume it was started when feelings were running a little high, and out of the knowledge that someone had that I had talked with the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Nebraska along the lines I have discussed; but really out of the whole cloth, has come sufficient cloakroom discussion of this matter so that my colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon, and the senior Senator from Michigan, put the question to me. Each one of them, when I told him there was no foundation in fact for the rumor, said, "That settles it with me." As I have said before, I repeat, a man's coin in the Senate is his word, and no one is more jealous of his word than is the junior Senator from Oregon.

Again, Mr. President, it does shed a little light on the laxity which I think is developing in our attitudes toward unanimous-consent agreements, because if there is a desire to ascertain whether a Senator is to be a party to a unanimous-consent agreement, it is very simple to find out whether he is going to be a party to it or not by asking him point blank. I do not know of any other way of entering into such an agreement, and if I want to know whether or not a Senator is willing to go along with a unanimous-consent agreement, I am going to ask him in so many words whether he will or will not.

No such question was ever put to me by any Member of the Senate, no commitment was ever obtained from me by any Member of the Senate, and the first request for a unanimous-consent agreement that was put to me was put on the floor of the Senate yesterday afternoon, when I rose at my place and objected to it.

I entertain the hope that that statement will clarify a matter which has hurt me very deeply, because it is not pleasant to have anyone in the Senate spread a rumor which is not based on fact. Certain of my colleagues in the Senate do not know me very well, but those who do, know that if any request were ever made of me to go along with a unanimous-consent agreement, and I said I would, no power could possibly get me to change my position, unless I were released by those asking the consent.

I may say, Mr. President, that contrary to the notion of some, I do not like to be looked upon as a constant dissenter with any of my party organization in the Senate of the United States; it is not a pleasant position. I know that my views on republicanism do not coincide with the views of many of my colleagues within the Senate; and there are minority views within the Senate; and so I find myself frequently voting contrary to that of most of my Republican colleagues. Whether they are sound Republican views, or whether they represent the views of a majority of Republicans in the country, can not in my opinion, be determined in the Senate of the United States. I think that issue must be determined on the campaign platforms, I think it must be determined by the rank and file of the Republican voters of America. With perfectly good nature I may say, Mr. President, that I am willing to take my chances in that forum. I think there is a place for my views in the Senate of the United States, on this side of this aisle, just as I think there is a place for the views of those to whom we refer as more conservative; because our party finds its greatest strength and its only hope for progress in hammering out a middle-of-the-road pattern, a fair and conscionable compromise between and among our views. I have a little hunch that in 1948 some of my critics, possibly some even in the Senate of the United States, at that time, in the heat of a campaign will say, "Well, after all, he is not such a bad fellow; we do not agree with him, but we cannot question that he, too, believes in this form of government of ours; such differences as we may have with him are pricipally differences of degree; he, too, believes that the only way we can check the spread of leftist philosophies, Fascist and Communist concepts of government, is to make this system of ours work." That is the answer; and that means there is going to have to be a give and take in modifying the views of each one of us in the common interest of a sane and progressive Republican Party. There have been others, in times gone by, who have run into some disfavor now and then with men in their party who may be at a given time in a position of party leadership; but I submit that the Republican Party in the long run has never been strengthened by disciplining the progressives within it; and such will be proved to be true, in my judgment, in the years of the immediate future. I think we ought to stop it. I do not say that out of selfish personal interest, because, as I have said once before in the Senate, after all, it is difficult on the floor of the Senate, at least, to discipline a man who refuses to be disciplined. Oh, the leadership may keep him off committees; it may adopt a policy whereby not a single Republican Senator from the Pacific coast can have a seat on the Foreign relations Committee of the Senate; but four from the Middle West, and three from the east coast can have. The leadership can keep a Senator from the Pacific coast off; I suppose it could even be done in the name of party discipline, but I do not think that is the way to build a strong party, I think it is a short-sighted policy.

Likewise, Mr. President, one in the Senate who bears the label "progressive" can be denied a seat, for example, on the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, even though that Member of the Senate, along with three of his colleagues frequently referred to as progressive, submitted on the floor of the Senate in the Seventy-ninth Congress a series of four amendments, as I did on behalf of myself and three of my colleagues, and made speeches in support thereof. Those amendments, I think it must be admitted, were very instrumental in passing the so-called full-employment bill of 1946, and after the submission of the amendments and the acceptance of the principle they embodied then by the other sponsors of the bill, these four so-called progressive Republican Senators became cosponsors of the bill proper. Yet each and every one of those Senators were kept off the very important committee called for to be appointed under that act, which committee was appointed, because the power was there to impose that type of discipline. I do not think that is the way, however, to build a strong Republican Party in the Senate, Mr. President. I do not think such action lends itself to the maximum of cooperation within the party, particularly when note is taken of the fact that two exceedingly able, and very fine, and certainly qualified, freshmen Senators were put on that committee.

Oh, there are many other interesting little disciplines that can be used against the minority. Not only can minority members be discriminated against when it comes to appointments to Senate committees, but they can be discriminated against when it comes to the appointment of party organization committees. They can be kept off such committees. It can be made very sure that little or no recognition will be given to them or prestige added to them, but the vacancies are filled as they arise, by appointment of very able, fine men, but men who are new in the Senate and junior in seniority, and use can be made of the seniority rule when maybe it meets one's purpose, or maybe not.

I mention these things because I think they have a bearing on the procedure which is now followed in the Senate. I suppose the mentioning of them shows that I am a pretty human person after all. But it is not the personal aspect of it that is important. The important thing is that it is not good for the Senate to have developed within it on the part of anyone, such a situation—I am not alone, Mr. President, because too many men have come to me, including freshman Senators in the present term of Congress, and said, "We want you to know, Wayne, that although we are not voting with you on some of these questions, we do not like what is being done to you and some others on our side of the aisle."

The time will come, Mr. President, when those men will not be freshman Senators and will be more inclined—and I certainly understand their present position—they will be more inclined, I am sure, to express themselves in regard to the question I am raising.

No, we do not need discipline in the Senate, Mr. President. We merely need to recognize that we have some sincere and some honest differences of opinion involving issues which are raging throughout the country, and which will continue to rage for some years to come, because of the fact that great social turmoil exists here and abroad and the globe around, and we need all points of view in the Senate consistent with principles of our form of government. We need the utmost of cooperation among all of us, freed from any feeling that because some do not share the view of others, disciplinary measures must be resorted to.

I am making no charges against any individual. I am just baring my heart on this subject for the good of the party.

Because a majority of men in my party in the Senate may not share my predominant points of view on various issues does not change the fact, Mr. President, that millions of Republicans in this country do, and they are being heard from more and more, month by month. I think they are going to make clear—pretty clear in 1948 and very clear in 1952, that if the Republican Party wants their continued support it had better move over into the middle of the road and follow the course I seek to follow.

With that as a background, a little different light is shed, Mr. President, on my feelings concerning the action which has been taken on the proposed unanimous-consent agreement of yesterday. I think it was entirely unnecessary, for the majority to insist upon that agreement, in view of the sincere and deep and honest convictions which I hold and which some others, too, hold with regard to the inadvisability of that agreement. I believe that a real test of the bigness of a majority is its ability to safeguard the rights and respect the prerogatives and privileges of the minority. We must not forget that. We should remember that we may be in the majority today but in the minority tomorrow. We may be in the minority today and the majority tomorrow.

Mr. President, the matter of human minds acting upon highly volatile and controversial issues is a very interesting phenomenon.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MALONE in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. BREWSTER. The very able Senator from Oregon is carrying on a very valuable discussion of this measure in very extended fashion, which equals the record of many men who have held the floor in this Chamber. I am sure that he does not wish to take any advantage of others who have competed with him for a long-distance record in discussion. It is necessary, in order to qualify under the championship rules here, that a Senator shall not avail himself of any aid in carrying on the discussion. I do not know whether the Senator from Oregon has in mind to qualify in this long-distance derby, but the rules require that he shall not lean upon the desk or have any other material aid.

I call this matter to the attention of the Senator not for the purpose of disrupting his discourse or disturbing him, but in order that he may realize what has been the practice which has prevailed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is my understanding that my good friend from Maine is in error in his point of order. I shall be perfectly willing to have the Chair rule upon it, and, after the ruling, discuss it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that there is no written rule on the subject.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I refer to the precedents.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that there is nothing in the rules or precedents with respect to leaning. The Senator is merely required to stand.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I can assure the Senator from Maine, from the sensation on the bottoms of my feet, that I am standing.

Another word or two with regard to the filibuster. I am not one to deny for one split second that the debate which is going on in the Senate of the United States is a form of filibuster. As I stated earlier, I say that as one who is opposed to filibusters, and who will vote to outlaw them from the Senate; also as one who will vote to surround the unanimous-consent agreement procedure with greater protection so far as minorities are concerned.

I wish to call attention to a few elements of this particular filibuster. This is not a filibuster which seeks to prevent a vote on this measure. It is not a filibuster which seeks to kill a given measure by consuming whatever period of time may be necessary until other Members of the Senate agree to withdraw the legislation in its entirety. Those are the typical filibusters. This is only a little battle over procedure. We are ready to vote on this measure on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, or any other day beginning with Monday. We have given our reasons why we think a delay for that period of time is justified.

No; we are not filibustering to kill a measure, in the sense that it shall not come to a vote. I think it was entirely unnecessary from a procedural point of view for the majority to force the minority into this position. I am willing to take my share of the responsibility for the filibuster, judged from the standpoint of the reasons which I have advanced as to why I think it is necessary and justified. I am willing to let the American people judge as to who is truly responsible for the spectacle which the United States Senate has put on for the past several hours. I do not think it was wise or desirable. It certainly was not necessary for the majority to say, in effect, "You are going to take it and like it." We shall see. We do not like it. We dislike it very much. But if our forces hold out—and I believe they will—I think we shall be able to take it.

I think that on the basis of public discussion which will take place in this country in the next 48 hours on the veto, the message, and on the procedure in the Senate, the American people will have a much clearer understanding of what is in hand and involved in this labor bill than if those of us in the minority had not been willing to "lead with our chins," so to speak. Of course when we are in the minority that is one of the prices which has to be paid in politics. One cannot "lead with his chin" without its getting hit now and then. Usually, sooner or later, a knock-out blow is delivered politically. The important thing to remember about most men who fight a minority fight is that that does not bother them. They know that that is reasonably certain to be the final price for the exercise of independence of judgment on issues as the minority sees them.

Of course, we must have a sense of humor, Mr. President, with reference to some of these blows on the chin. We also must have a sense of humor about some of the blows delivered beneath the belt. It certainly is true that politics frequently is not a very nice game; yet we all know that we must be willing to stand up and be counted. We must be willing to exercise honest independence of judgment on the merits of issues as we see them. We must be willing at times, under our representative system of government, to act against and vote contrary to the wishes of a temporary majority. I discussed that at some length on June 5, Mr. President, and I shall not now repeat it.

After that speech I got a little wallop, not very high up in the anatomy, figuratively speaking, but as in most such instances political bruises will heal in due course of time as the people come to understand the facts in regard to the subject.

In that speech of June 5 I pointed out that a considerable amount of pressure was being placed upon me both by labor groups, employer groups, and public groups generally, to take a position favorable to their respective points of view on the labor bill. I pointed out that from the communications which I had received it was being made pretty clear to me that apparently the majority of the people in my State as of that particular moment were of the opinion that I should vote for the labor bill. I explained in that speech that it was a very difficult situation in which to find oneself. I think the speech will show that I used the phrase that it was not "politically comfortable." But it raised the question, as I see it, under our representative form of government, as to what my real duty was. Was it my duty to vote on the basis of a Gallup-poll approach to the question and vote for a bill which I thought was bad legislation and would not carry out the objectives of the people of my State as they sought those objectives in labor legislation and which contained provisions which, in my judgment, were unconstitutional? Or should I take the position that I should be willing to

run the political risks involved and subordinate personal selfishness to the responsibility and obligation of voting on the basis of what I honestly believed and knew to be the fact in regard to the particuluar bill?

In that speech I developed the theme that it is the solemn obligation of a Member of this body to vote in accordance with what his best judgment tells him is legislation which will meet the desires and the objectives of the majority of his constituents, and then be willing to go before those constituents and give them his reasons for so voting. If the reasons are not sufficient to change the point of view they held prior to the time they learned of them, then, under our representative form of government, it is the privilege and the right of the constituents to defeat such an officeholder at the next election.

I said in that speech that that was the position I had taken and intended to continue to take in the Senate; that I believed it was the position that, upon reflection and analysis, my constituents would want me to take, and therefore, on the basis of that principle, I would not vote for the labor bill. However, in the course of that discussion I mentioned the telegrams I was receiving from home, particularly from employers who were urging me to vote for the bill. I related—and I think it is obvious from the RECORD that I did so in very good humor—the activities of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States in my State in recent weeks, functioning through one of their advisers, a man by the name of Jacob Allen, who had been making speeches before audiences in Oregon—so far as I knew, largely chamber of commerce audiences. In fact, I read into the RECORD a newspaper item from the Capital Journal, published in the capital city of my State, reporting that Mr. Allen, the representative of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, had asked his auditors to urge upon me by communications that I vote for the bill; and in my speech I pointed out that he had been reasonably successful, at least, in getting a good many such communications sent to me. I read one example from a very good friend of mine in the lumber industry—in fact, not only a good friend of mine but one of my active and ardent supporters in the campaign. In that telegram he advised, in effect—I do not quote it exactly—that he believed that my constituents—farmers, lawyers, working people, and the public generally—wanted me to vote for this legislation.

Mr. President, I had been confronted with quite a mass of communications of that type, not many of which were worded in such a friendly vein as that in which that particular friend of mine worded his; but inasmuch as he is one of the outstanding leaders in the lumber industry in Oregon, I knew that a telegram going to him and making perfectly clear that I was not going to vote for that legislation would undoubtedly receive considerable circulation among lumbermen in the State, or I thought the chances were good, at least, that he would make clear to a good many employers with whom he came in daily contact that it was not going to do any good to try to get me to change my mind on this bill. So I sent him a telegram, and I put my reply in the RECORD for June 5. In that telegram I said:

> Thank you for your wire. Deeply regret that I cannot vote for conference report bill. I am satisfied that it is unsound legislation in its present form. However, if I knew that every person in the State of Oregon wanted the bill passed, I would still vote against it because my obligation in this job is to vote for what I consider to be sound legislation in the public interest and not for legislation which a temporary majority may think it wants when you and I know that a majority of the people of Oregon have not analyzed the weaknesses and limitations of this legislation. I can assure you that it is not an easy decision for me to make because I agree with you that undoubtedly a majority of my constituents think they want this legislation. However, what they really want is legislation which will check the major labor abuses and bring about a maximum degree of industrial peace. Unfortunately this legislation will not accomplish those objectives and hence I cannot and will not vote for it.
>
> Regards.

Mr. President, that is a fairly clear statement of an unequivocal position.

But, Mr. President, in my speech, after I read that telegram into the RECORD, I went on to say some other things; and I wish to read them into this RECORD before I make a comment regarding the use which was made of my telegram by the press.

I said, following the reading of that telegram:

> Mr. President, it is not at all pleasant, it is not at all politically comfortable, to find oneself in a position in which he is satisfied that the majority of the people of his State have been so propagandized with regard to a piece of bad legislation that they really believe it is the piece of legislation that should be passed.
>
> On the other hand, as I read the constitutional debates on the basis of which this Government came into being it was not contemplated that under a represenative form of government a man in the Senate of the United States should vote in accordance with the dictates of a majority as determined by a Gallup poll or some other method of determining a temporary majority opinion. Rather, the basic theory of representative government requires a Senator to assume the solemn obligation, intended by the founding fathers, and vote for legislation which he believes to be in the public interest, even though he knows that as of that moment a majority of his constituents would vote contrary to his judgment. Then it is his obligation of political leadership to stand up and tell his constituents why he took the action which he did. If his reasons are not satisfactory to them then it is their opportunity and privilege to remove him from his seat at the next election. I think the people of my State want me to represent them by exercising an honest independence of judgment on the merits of issues as I find them back here. They want me to weigh the views of those constituents who write and wire me, but cast my votes free of political pressures and unmoved by threats of loss of political support if I do not do the bidding of some pressure groups.

Let me digress a moment from that part of the speech—and I shall return to it in a moment—to say that I tried to, and I think I did, make as clear as the English language can make clear that it is our responsibility to weigh and carefully consider the views of our constituents who write and telegraph us. That is one reason why I think there should be a delay over the week end, for the final vote on the labor bill. First, I think our constituents have a right to make their views known to us, I think we have an obligation to give them that opportunity, and we have a duty to weigh and consider their views before we vote.

It has been said that it is not probable that any Senator would change his views on the basis of any home representation. I do not accept that, Mr. President. I think there is always the possibility that some point of view, which either has not been presented to us, or has not been presented to us in the light of all of its facets, might change our opinion. If that possibility did not exist, then we would be in a bad state of affairs in representative government in America. But I know the possibility does exist.

We have seen it illustrated on the floor of the Senate many times. On issues which appeared to be hopelessly lost, with no chance of saving them, we have seen an aroused public opinion on those issues present itself in such a clear form by way of giving to us unanswerable arguments, and pointing out to us things we had never thought about, that votes were changed in the Senate of the United States. So I say that with that possibility, of which I think we could almost take judicial notice, we owed it, and we still owe it, to the people of America, to give them an opportunity over this week end to consider the veto, and make known to us their views. Then, in accordance with the principles I enunciated in the June 5 speech, so far as I am individually concerned, I feel it my obligation to give full consideration to those views, and I shall then do what I think is best from the standpoint of passing sound legislation on the basis of the merits of the case, modified in whatever way my action should be modified by the merits of representations made to me by the people of my State and the American public.

In keeping with the spirit of that principle, I said this also in my speech on June 5:

> It is only on the basis of that principle of representative government, Mr. President, may I say from this platform today to the people of my State, that I desire to remain in the Senate of the United States. It was on the basis of that principle that I ran for this office and the people of Oregon elected me on the basis of that abstract principle. I believe they will keep me here to apply it.

I digress at that point to say how well I remember how I enunciated that principle in my campaign in 1944 before audience after audience. Neither one of those campaigns of mine in 1944 was an easy one. I campaigned against very able men. I campaigned against men who were just as determined to win as I was determined to win, with the result that I think we had a campaign, both in the primary and in the general election, which provided the State of Oregon with some very interesting discussions, not only on the then pending issues, but on the entire system of representative government. Before audience after audience I said in that campaign that I was

not making any political promises, that I did not want to go back to the Senate of the United States with my hands tied with any commitments.

I now say verbatim, Mr. President, what I said in many and many a speech. I would say to my audiences, "If you don't want me to exercise an honest independence of judgment on the merits of issues as I find them, and in accordance with the evidence as I believe it to be after careful study of the issues, then don't send me to Washington." Almost invariably my audiences would applaud vigorously that statement. Then I would laugh and say, "Yes; you like that, in the abstract, but let us be frank about it; you are not always going to like it, when I come to apply it to specific issues"; and then they would laugh, because they, too, recognized how truthful that statement was. But I said, "After all, in this campaign we are going to have to decide some great issues in the next session of Congress, so controversial in nature that if I laid them out on this platform tonight before this audience, we would not find the audience breaking up into two divisions, those that agreed one way or another way on these issues; it is not so simple as that. We would find a great variation of views among people in this audience, because the most of these issues are not either black or white; these issues have a great many mixed issues within them." They understood that, and I told them I thought it was a mistake for men to run for the Congress of the United States on the basis of a lot of promises and pledges as to what they were going to do in regard to specific issues, as times change too rapidly. Issues themselves take on new colorings, as human, economic, political, and world events change. My people understood that. It is no surprise to a majority of the people of the State of Oregon that I took the position that I took on June 5 on the floor of the Senate. That did not come as news to them, but what did come as news to them, Mr. President, was a very limited and a taken-out-of-text report of that speech. What happened? The press of Oregon carried an AP dispatch in newspaper after newspaper. I do not know how much of the speech the AP sent out, but, in newspaper after newspaper, this part of one sentence, and only this part of the speech, was quoted, and this partial sentence was taken out of the telegram which I sent to the Oregon Lumberman, in which telegram I sought to make as clear as I could that I felt this was bad legislation. And here is the part of the sentence, the only report of the speech carried in the newspaper stories, as follows:

However, if I knew that every person in the State of Oregon wanted the bill passed, I would still vote against it.

I do not have to tell Senators that that partial sentence quotation used up a considerable amount of printer's ink and newspaper print in discussions of it in following issues of the newspapers, and in some instances the comments were highly critical, and were made prior to getting a full statement of the speech. Of course, as is usual under such circumstances, once a statement taken out of context such as that was taken out of context is printed in the press, the damage is done; there is not much that can be done about it, then and there, at least. It simply presents one with another case of where he must roll with the punches. But, Mr. President, that is what I had in mind when I said that sometimes the blows one gets in politics do not even get up as high as the chin, because, even if the full sentence had been quoted, an understanding of my position would have been much clearer; and, of course, if the remainder of the telegram had been quoted, a very clear understanding of my position would have followed. Let us look at the full sentence again:

However, if I knew that every person in the State of Oregon wanted the bill passed, I would still vote against it—

Not "period," Mr. President, not "period." No period follows the word "it." The word "because" follows it. The very seeing of the word "because" should have served clear notice that reasons for, explanation of, clarification of, the first part of the sentence was about to be set out in the second part of the sentence. That is exactly what I did—

because my obligation on this job is to vote for what I consider to be sound legislation in the public interest, and not for legislation which a temporary majority may think it wants, when you and I know that a majority of the people of Oregon have not analyzed the weaknesses and the limitations of this legislation.

That is the full sentence. That is why I said I was going to vote against the legislation, because I knew, and, as the sender of the first telegram knew, most of the people who were telegraphing me, most of the people who had been stirred up to put the political heat on me, acting on such advice as Mr. Jacob Allen, of the United States Chamber of Commerce, had so kindly given them, had not studied the weaknesses of the legislation; and it was my conviction, and it is now my conviction and firm belief, that not only a majority of the people of the State of Oregon, but an overwhelming majority, once they come to understand the weaknesses of the legislation, will take the position that I did exactly right in voting against it.

I am willing to give it a test, Mr. President, and I am going to test it in 1950, God willing. Do Senators know what I think? I think many of the businessmen who fell for Mr. Allen's United States Chamber of Commerce advice are going to be right in there backing me up in 1950 because they are just as interested as I am in perpetuating the American system of government with its economic democracy which rests upon sound principles of capitalism. They know when the dice are down, so to speak, that I can always be counted upon to fight for that form of government and its economic system of a private property economy.

So, I said in my speech on June 5 that when the United States Chamber of Commerce representative got to my home town of Eugene, Oreg., and suggested to my friends in the chamber of commerce there at their luncheon meeting, where he spoke, that he hoped they would send up a little prayer for me, that in effect—and I paraphrase, because I do not have the clipping before me—that in effect he hoped I would see the light and vote for the bill, I was indeed reverently moved. There are not very many progressives in America who have the United States Chamber of Commerce beseeching the Almighty to be of aid to them. But I am not fooled by it either, Mr. President. I believe, however, that in due course of time the businessmen who have temporarily—a majority of them, I think, in my State—been convinced that this labor legislation ought to be passed because they believe it will further their objectives, will express their approval of the action I have taken in opposing the legislation. So I said in the June 5 speech:

If we cannot exercise that type of independence of judgment in representing the people of our States, then I want to say that I do not desire to serve in the Senate of the United States if I have to serve subject to yielding to the type of pressures that management and labor groups are seeking to bring to bear upon the Members of the Senate for votes on this labor bill. I have a hunch, Mr. President, that after the present wave of emotion passes and after the people of my State come to see in actual operation the effects of such legislation as is now being proposed, if it is placed on the statute books, a large majority of them will come to thank me for exercising the independence of judgment which I intend to exercise in casting my vote against this bill.

It has been interesting, Mr. President, to note the change in reaction in my State which has occurred since the newspapers have come to understand the full text of my speech of June 5. Early in the controversy the Portland Oregonian, one of the two largest newspapers in the State, very much exercised about the partial sentence which had been quoted out of context by the Associated Press, wrote an editorial saying that if such a hypothetical situation existed as I raised, then I should not go on the floor of the Senate and vote; that I should resign. That was a pretty strong statement, was it not. I read the editorial, and I am still here, and I intend to stay here until the end of my term, again, may I say, God willing. I will have an interesting little fight to come back, too. Far be it from me to predict what any newspaper might do in a campaign, but the Oregonian supported me last time; in fact, the then publisher of the Oregonian was the person who first suggested to me that I run for the position. He is now editor of the Denver Post, but he left behind him at the Oregonian a good many other men, Mr. President, who I am satisfied upon a further reflection on the full text of my speech cannot be nearly so disturbed about it as that editorial would seem to indicate. As I have made clear to them, it was their privilege to write the editorial; the people of Oregon will have to be the judges.

However, there have been other editorials of quite a contrary nature, based upon the full text of the speech. The Oregon Journal, a great democratic newspaper, opposed me in the campaign, both in the primary and in the general election—and how they opposed me. Some of their editorials, as they ex-

pressed, were dipped in my blood. But that was a campaign. Newspapers, too, sometimes become partisan, as the distinguished present Presiding Officer of the Senate [Mr. DWORSHAK] would agree, in private conversation, at least, because he is fully familiar with the problems which confront a newspaper editor in a political campaign, both as an editor and as a candidate. What newspapers say in a campaign when they have taken a partisan side and have decided to support certain candidates involves matters which require one to "roll" with the punches. There is no campaign in Oregon now. I shall send for the editorial from the Portland Journal. I wish I had it here. In fact, I shall be speaking long enough so that it can be brought to me. In essence, the editorial quoted at length from the speech and sustained the position which I took.

There is another newspaper in the State which published an editorial on the subject. I want to refer to that editorial too. The newspaper to which I refer is the Oregon Statesman, of Salem, Oreg. The publisher and editor is an outstanding public servant, with a record of public service in keeping with the name of his newspaper, the Oregon Statesman. He is a former Governor of the State, a fine man, a Republican progressive, according to my definition, a man of great independence of judgment. When he does not like some position I take in the United States Senate, he tells me so in unequivocal terms in an editorial in his newspaper; and when he approves of something which I have done, he likewise defends my position.

So in this instance, Mr. President, he, as did the Oregon Journal, wrote, from my standpoint, a splendid editorial in which he discussed the political theory raised by my remarks. He said, in answer to the position taken by the Oregonian, that a Senator who stands for such principles should not resign, but continue to exercise that type of judgment and carry his position to the people of the State in the next election, which is exactly what I intend to do.

I mention these things, personal though they may be, because they illustrate a part of the problem which has confronted some of us who have opposed this legislation. It has not been a popular stand in many quarters. In fact, taking the position which I have taken assures one of being hit from both sides—or shall I say all sides?

I did not say anything at the time, because I knew exactly what he had in mind and how he meant it, but I was interested in a little point which my good friend the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] made in his remarks some hours ago. As I understood him—and the RECORD will have to speak for itself—he referred to me as one who has sincerely and conscientiously performed many services for labor in the United States Senate. The Senator from Kentucky did not mean to be amusing, but it was an amusing statement. It was not an accurate statement. He had no intention of being inaccurate. Unquestionably he was thinking in terms of the fact that I have been opposed to this bill, and that in my opposition to the bill I had performed a service for the legitimate rights of labor. In my judgment the real service which I have performed has been for the public interest.

When I say that his statement is somewhat amusing, I mean this: Labor does not like my labor legislation proposals. I can supply ample evidence of that fact. Labor is highly critical of each and every one of the proposals I made in each and every one of the bills which I have introduced in this session of Congress. They have told me so, just as employers have given me their criticisms because, according to their sights, I have not gone far enough with legislation which would be drastic and punitive in nature.

I am used to that position too, because one cannot decide the number of labor cases that I have decided over the years, hand down decisions based upon the evidenciary record before him, and document his decisions to the evidence, as I always have done, and not find, in a labor case, that usually both sides, if it is a fair decision, do not like the decision. Whenever I found myself in a position, Mr. President, where one side liked it and the other side did not, if it was a complicated case involving many issues, I was worried about the decision, because I was afraid that I must have overlooked something in the record. More than once, even after the decision was handed down, I have gone through it again to make certain that I was right about it, because I found that one side liked it and the other side did not.

These cases, as I said earlier in this debate when I was asking questions of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], are not simple little legal cases. They are cases which go to all the economic problems that confront a plant or an industry or a transportation system. If they are decided on the evidence it will usually be found that on some issues the employers are right and on some they are wrong; on some issues labor is right and on some it is wrong. So I say I am used to being in a position where I get kicked by both sides. But untenable certainly is the charge that I am supposed to be prolabor because I have always spoken out against restrictive labor legislation which destroys legitimate labor rights for the simple reason, as the President said in much better language than I can use—though I shall use my faulty language—that we cannot legislate good faith; we cannot legislate into the hearts of men the desire to work cooperatively. They must do that for themselves.

In 1936 or 1937, when labor in my State was guilty of the most inexcusable abuses—rank racketeering, goon-squad methods, broken windows, burning of box factories, a program of direct action that can never be countenanced in this country by labor or any other group if Government by law is to be preserved—the people of my State became so aroused that a sufficient number of signatures were put on an initiative petition to have a referendum vote on an antipicketing bill.

It will be remembered that in 1936 and 1937 there was an epidemic of such laws. Several States passed them, but no State passed a more stringent one than did Oregon. Oregon passed it by a large vote. Oregon would not have passed it except for the votes of the workers and their families. It was perfectly obvious that the law was put on the books not only by citizens who were nonworkers in the sense of not belonging to organized labor, but it was put on the books by the votes of workers and their families, because workers are, first, Americans. They were striking at a practice which they knew was indefensible.

I was on the spot in those days, too, Mr. President. When one fights for government by law he frequently finds himself on the spot because he must hold out against a temporary majority opinion. I was dean of the law school of the State university, and I was interested in some labor arbitration work at the time. I studied that bill and took to the air after that study and the completion of my analysis. It was during the campaign for passage of the bill. I argued against its passage. To indicate how successful I was in my argument, Mr. President, the bill passed by an overwhelming majority.

What were the heart, the core, and the essence of my argument? I said, "This law is unconstitutional, and for these reasons." I took the position then that I take now, that we cannot justify passing legislation which we believe to be unconstitutional.

That speech can be evaluated in any way in which one wants to evaluate it. It can be said that I just had a lucky case. It can be said that my hunches proved to be true; or one can be more kind and say that my analysis of the unconstitutionality of the law was sound, because some little time after the law was passed, in the case of a similar law in another State, which was taken as a test case, the United States Supreme Court declared such legislation unconstitutional. Interestingly enough, the major points that I made in my radio speech against the Oregon antipicketing law were contained also in the theory of the Supreme Court's decision.

The heat was put upon me after that radio speech. I was paid by the taxpayers. The usual argument was made that no member of the faculty of the State university should be tolerated who took such a radical position as to argue against that law on constitutional grounds in a radio hook-up throughout the State.

Mr. President, I like the type of radicalism which is based on defense of the United States Constitution. That is pretty good radicalism, and we need more of it in America. It is quite a different type of radicalism from the philosophy of those leftists who are making so much propaganda these days to the effect that there is no hope for our economic system, that capitalism is doomed, that we cannot have a workable political and economic democracy in America. That is dangerous radicalism because it is based upon the notion of a state economy and a totalitarian government. The movement of the leftists in America in my humble judgment is a move which would take

us away from the guarantees of the United States Constitution, away from the individual rights and liberties of every person as guaranteed to us under the Constitution and its Bill of Rights. That is why I say to my progressive friends, "Have no part in the leftist movement in America, because if you become fellow travelers with them, even for purposes of political expediency, you betray true political progressive action," because, Mr. President, we cannot retain our representative form of government if we pay homage in any degree whatsoever to police-state methods or to the totalitarian philosophy of the leftists. They are of the same stripe, regardless of whether they are Communists or Fascists. Their end-object is the same, namely, to substitute the state as the dominant force operating the economy of the country, and to make the individual subordinate to the police-state methods of the leftists.

Mr. President, I have counted myself out, as clearly as I can, of any charge of "having any truck" whatsover with the leftists, and I shall continue to do so, because there is not a Member of the Senate who is more determined than I am to make democracy work. The leftist has no program of democracy. Whatever his brand of leftism, whatever label he wears, he stands for totalitarianism. That is a battle in the world today. We cannot afford to ignore it in the Senate of the United States, either. We cannot afford to play into the hands of propagandists who constantly agitate and seek to give the impression that we cannot make democracy work. I know we can. I know we can by the type of cooperation between and among all of us and all groups within our country, a type of cooperation for which President Truman pleaded so ably in his magnificent veto message.

Mr. President, we hear much about Americanism. Today I offer the President's veto message as my exhibit A of Americanism. In due course of time I wish to read to the Senate again the principles of the veto message because I do not think they can be read too frequently. The principles of the veto message show the President's understanding of and appreciation for the legitimate rights of labor and employer. They show his recognition of the fact that we are not going to have economic stability in the United States by enacting legislation which he believes, and which I believe, and which the opponents of this proposed law believe, will stir up labor strife rather than prevent it, and will intensify feelings of class consciousness in the United States. I think that is a serious matter.

Let me say, Mr. President, that I am very happy to see the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] return to the Chamber. I am very fond of him. I like his independence of judgment—a quality of which I have been speaking in defense of so much during the past few hours. I hope to hear from him later today as to his views in regard to this great veto message of the President of the United States.

But, Mr. President, to get back to the point I was making, I think the Senate of the United States and the people of this country should not overlook the dangerous implications of any growth of class consciousness in America. When there are classes pitted against classes, when there is instilled into the hearts of the working people of this country in any considerable number the feeling that a piece of legislation is unjust to them, as the President indicates in his splendid message, we make it much more difficult for true collective bargaining to be carried on between employer and employee. After all, when all is said and done, the most effective answer to our labor problems is to get into the minds of American emyloyers and workers an understanding of the fact that it is not possible to have true collective bargaining, good-faith relationships between the two, if one of the parties believes that the other has been given an unfair advantage by way of legislative weapons. That is what was wrong with the Wagner Act. That is why ever since 1937 I have taken the position that the Wagner Act should be amended. That is why in this session of Congress I proposed a series of amendments to the Wagner Act, and I am willing to stand on those proposals, and each and every one of them is opposed, so far as I know, by the major labor leaders of the country.

If we can be successful in sustaining this veto—and I still have hopes that we may—I shall proceed, as I stated yesterday, to offer anew and in revised form, based upon the constructive work that was done in the Senate committee, specific proposals for amendments to the Wagner Act.

I do not accept the indefensible proposition, Mr. President, that unless we pass the particular piece of legislation which is now before us for consideration there is no chance of labor legislation at all at this session of Congress. That is up to us. That is up to the majority party in this session of Congress. They cannot get away from the fact that if they have the will to, they can get through both Houses of the Congress within 10 days a new series of labor bills.

I am not one to say in any spirit of personal pride, "I told you so," but, Mr. President, on March 10 I made a 4-hour speech, I believe it was, on the floor of the Senate, setting forth my views and proposals for labor legislation. At some length I pointed out why I thought it was a mistake for us to pass an omnibus labor bill. At a later time I put into action the suggestions I made in that speech in opposition to an omnibus labor bill by moving to break up the Senate bill into four separate and distinct bills.

Many Members of the Senate told me I was right about that as a matter of principle and sound legislative policy, that I was wrong about it from the standpoint of Republican Party policy, because the majority party in the Congress had decided as a matter of policy that they would go for a one-shot bill, as some of them referred to the omnibus bill.

They had their way, but I think all the dangers and limitations of an omnibus bill which I pointed out in my March 10 speech are to be found in the final bill, and I am sure we could have avoided many of those dangers if we had taken these problems up, issue by issue. I am inclined to believe, in the light of developments, that we probably could have saved some time, too. Perhaps not, but I think so.

Mr. President, this legislation is not the answer to a preventive move so far as the development of class consciousness is concerned. I predict it will be provocative thereof.

I wish now to return to the editorial in the Portland Journal. I like it, Mr. President. After we read so many bad ones, we like to hear from somebody once in a while who recognizes that we are trying to do an honest job, acting in good faith, and doing what we think is best for the country.

I do not deny being human, so I like this editorial, in a way. I have liked it for many reasons. I suppose I like it because the newspaper in which it appears, which has not always written in such a kindly vein, did so at least on this occasion.

The editorial reads:

SENATOR MORSE AND THE VOTERS AT HOME

Oregon's junior United States Senator, WAYNE MORSE, probably read in his school days the motto of a famous frontiersman, David Crockett. Said Davy in the heat of the War of 1812:

"I leave this rule for others when I'm dead: Be always sure you're right, then go ahead."

Senator MORSE awoke quite a bit of comment, not all of it flattering, when in the Senate debate on the Taft-Hartley labor-control bill he declared: "However, if I knew that every person in the State of Oregon wanted the bill passed, I would still vote against it."

Pretty ostentatious affirmation that. Reminded of Fitz-James in Scott's Lady of the Lake:

"Come one, come all! This rock shall fly
From its firm base as soon as I."

But, just for the record, the single phrase quoted wasn't all that Oregon's junior Senator said. He had received from a constituent in Oregon (he said in the Senate on June 5) an appeal to join the Senate majority in support of the Republican labor-control bill. Senator MORSE then quoted his answer.

I think that is pretty good journalism, Mr. President, not only because I like it, but because I think it is just, fair, and decent. I continue the quotation from the editorial:

"Deeply regret that I cannot vote for conference-report bill. I am satisfied that it is unsound legislation in its present form. However, if I knew that every person in the State of Oregon wanted the bill passed, I would still vote against it because my obligation in this job is to vote for what I consider to be sound legislation in the public interest and not for legislation which a temporary majority may think it wants when you and I know that a majority of the people of Oregon have not analyzed the weaknesses and limitations of this legislation. I can assure you that it is not an easy decision for me to make because I agree with you that undoubtedly a majority of my constituents think they want this legislation."

More could be quoted. Enough has been repeated to suggest that Senator MORSE didn't intend merely to be pigheaded. The old copy books used to be filled with maxims about standing by the right whatever the cost. To stand out, one against all, creates the presumption that the total just can't be that wrong. But the indirect suggestion that Senator MORSE had better resign sits less well than his stanch opposition against

a labor bill in which a lot of other thoughtful people have found flaws. There will be plenty of time before Senator MORSE comes up for reelection in 1950 to exonerate or condemn his judgment on the labor bill. Whether the former or the latter, the voters will say it—with votes.

I agree with the last comment, Mr. President; I am perfectly willing to have the voters of my State "say it—with votes." I am not different from anyone else. If I am not truly representing the long time interests of the people of Oregon, they should remove me in 1950. But they are entitled to know, and I shall give to them, my views as to why I think the position I have taken on labor legislation is in their best interest, whereas the legislation that the President vetoed would not be in their best interest.

Now, Mr. President, I have this to say about the legislation, in addition to what I have already said. The RECORD very clearly shows, I think, my position on this legislation. As I have publicly indicated on several previous occasions, I shall vote to sustain the President's veto, because I see very little in this legislation that will improve and encourage the use of collective bargaining procedures and I see very, very much that will hamper it and even destroy it. And I must emphasize again, as I have so often in the past, that whatever tends to weaken or retard collective bargaining is bad, not only for workingmen and labor unions, but for employers and the whole country, because it will drive down wage and living standards, it will reduce purchasing power, and sooner or later it will throw us into another serious economic depression.

Ordinarily, having already made my position clear, I would not feel called upon to make any further comments at this time. However, events, since I last spoke on this subject, have seemed to me to emphasize and confirm the accuracy of my conviction that this bill is a very bad, unsound piece of legislation. I am now more than ever convinced that it will be impossible to administer it effectively and efficiently to reduce labor troubles, and that its over-all effect is going to be to destroy labor unions, to cause working men to resort to strikes and violence, to protect their rights and working standards, and that they will not go to the Board for elections or for correction of unfair labor practices by employers. In fact, Mr. President, I think one of the most likely dangers of passing this legislation is that strong unions will boycott the Board, that strong unions, because they do not like the procedures of the act, because they believe that the administration of those procedures will result in the destruction of their legitimate rights, will simply say to an employer, "You will have to bargain with us independently of any Board action." If he says, "Oh, no; I won't; you have got to go through the Board," I am afraid that there will be many unions that will say, "But we won't go through the Board; we aren't going to come under the jurisdiction of the Board." That is not going to lead to much industrial peace, either. John L. Lewis, of the United Mine Workers, has never gone through the Board. They do not ask the Board for any certification. As I say in this speech, I think that this legislation would cause a spread of that technique. I do not think that is going to be very good for American industry.

On the other hand, Mr. President, the bill will encourage antilabor employers who want to beat down the wages of their employees and it will encourage Communists and extremists in the labor movement. I do not think I would be doing my duty either to the people of my State or to the Senate if I let such legislation become law without raising my voice at every opportunity to oppose it and to point out its disastrous consequences as I see them.

I have never had the slightest doubt in my own mind that the bill did not deserve to become law. But I must confess that I was not always entirely comfortable in that conviction, because I did recognize that the bill was supported by many Senators and Representatives whose records certainly belied any anti-union bias. I recognize further that the proponents of the bill—because I worked with them on the Senate side, and I am sure that is true on the House side also—want to do what they think is in the best interests of labor and industry and the country as a whole. My difference with them is that I think they fell far short of the mark in their efforts to accomplish that purpose. I recognized that I could be wrong and they could be right about the bill. But we now have the views of others, including the President, whose public spirit and sincerity I also respect, as to the disastrous consequences of the bill. We now have the opinion of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, and of such sincere and informed public servants and experts in labor relations as William Davis, Frank Graham, Lloyd Garrison, George Taylor, Edwin Witte, and Nathan Feinsinger, and many others whose names I have previously placed in the RECORD.

These people have no prejudices against labor legislation; they have no axes to grind; they have no personal, selfish interests that will be served if the bill does or does not become law. Nor are they men whose principles and judgments can be warped by pressure from private groups whose votes they need, or by other political considerations or party discipline. These men speak from free conviction and a sense of public duty and responsibility. Moreover, they represent the very top flight of men, who, serving as public members of the War Labor Board, held the balance of power between labor and management in developing and administering the country's successful wartime industrial relations policy.

Before I conclude, Mr. President, I want to read some of the outstanding decisions these men wrote during the war. They were great civilian generals. They made great contributions on the home front to a successful prosecution of the war. One cannot consider the magnificent production record that industry and labor made in the war without recognizing that those men, who now testify against the bill, made major contributions to industrial stability at home during the war. Later I want to read some of their opinions, not only in tribute to them but also because the opinions themselves, I think, show very clearly the types of problems involved in most labor disputes, and merely the reading of their decisions, I think, will make clear why the bill will not work, and will make clear how sound the President is when he says in his veto message that it is an unworkable bill.

Referring again to these experts who have made public statements in opposition to the bill, after an analysis of the bill, I wish to say that they have had almost unparalleled experience and responsibility in labor relations; they know what they are talking about; and, let me emphasize, they represent neither the narrow interests of labor nor of management; they have no political pressures on them; they speak only for the public interest as they see it.

Their unanimous view is that this bill is unworkable, inequitable, and unsound. They all agree that, on the whole, the bill will be a handicap to good management-labor relations, that it will be detrimental to the national welfare, and that it provides no real answer to the basic problem that gives concern: What shall we do to prevent or minimize the causes of strikes, especially strikes that endanger the national welfare?

As Senators know, the National Catholic Welfare Conference includes Catholic bishops all over the country. I do not need to dwell upon their high purposes. Certainly these Catholic bishops are opposed to communism, as I am; certainly they would be among the first to support any measures that will stamp out or minimize Communist influences in American life; certainly they have had practical experience in combating such influences. Their opinion is—and I am reading from an official statement they have issued, which, as I understand, has been sent to the President, the chairmen of the Senate and House Labor Committees, and the members of the conference committee:

> The provision in the bill which would deny official certification to a union unless all of its officers declare under oath that they are not members of the Communist Party and that they do not favor the forceful or unconstitutional overthrow of the Government is likely to lead to serious confusion. Likewise, it will prove to be very embarrassing to the great majority of sincere anti-Communists in the American labor movement.

Let me digress a moment at this point. Imagine how men like John Lewis, William Green, Dan Tobin, Philip Murray, and Walter Reuther will feel at being required to appear before a notary public to testify under oath that they are not members of the Communist Party and that they do not favor the forceful or unconstitutional overthrow of the Government. How would Mr. Avery, of Montgomery Ward, feel, or Mr. Charles E. Wilson, of General Motors, or Mr. Henry Ford? These gentlemen of management are not required, however, to suffer that indignity; only the leaders of labor are under suspicion.

Without any reference whatsoever to the leaders of industry just named, but because the thought comes to mind at this point, let me say that I think there

is some danger of communism in America. About an hour ago, or half an hour ago, I expressed my views as to why I thought we must be on vigilant guard against leftist movements. I think there is danger of facism, too. That is the point I wish to make. It will be our form of fascism. It will not take on the pattern of European fascism in toto.

But, Mr. President, there are certain misguided American businessmen. I am satisfied that they are a very small minority of American businessmen, because my contacts, experience, and association with American businessmen convince me that they are just as desirous as are members of this body or of the labor unions, the farm organizations, or any other group in the country, to preserve our American system, a system which recognizes the right of the individual, a right which will be lost if we have any form of economic fascism in America.

We have some bad actors among big business, and little business, too. We have men in this country who really are saying that there is no way out of the economic situation in America except through a depression. Their argument is that we should go through the economic wringer, devaluate the dollar, adopt a form of repudiation by cheapening the dollar, and by suffering all the economic hardships and cruelties which will be visited upon the masses of our people through another depression.

These few Fascist-minded businessmen—and I say that advisedly—who are arguing for a depression unknowingly, unwittingly—I believe, and hope, in most instances—are falling for a Fascist line. The end result if they should prevail would be the same as though the leftists were to prevail.

When we come to this bill, its Communist-control provisions are not going to work. That is not the right approach to the handling of either communism or fascism, except that so far as fascism is concerned it does not offer any procedure for control. It is supposed to equalize the procedures effective upon industry and labor.

But let me go back to the statement of the Catholic conference, because that is a most important and genuinely unbiased opinion of the effects of this bill. The statement says:

> Simply by refusing to sign the required affidavit, a single Communist officer could prevent an otherwise decent and legitimate union from being legally certified for purposes of collective bargaining. This provision of the bill is calculated, therefore, to play into the hands of the Communists, who thrive on confusion and disorder. * * * The bill reveals an uncritical tendency to try to solve complicated problems of industrial relations by an oversimplified legalistic approach; an approach which, in the present instance, is rejected as worse than useless by the vast majority of those who have had practical experience in combating the influence of the Communist minority in the labor movement.

As to the over-all consequences of the bill, considered in its entirety, the Catholic conference statement is equally condemnatory. Indeed, I know of no matter of recent public interest on which the conference has expressed its views so strongly and critically as on this matter. The statement says:

> The Taft-Hartley bill does little or nothing to encourage labor-management cooperation. On the contrary, it approaches the complicated problem of industrial relations from a narrow and excessively legalistic point of view. * * * Instead of encouraging labor and management to work together in harmony for the general economic welfare, the bill puts a number of legal restrictions on collective bargaining and particularly on the activities of trade-unions—restrictions which will almost inevitably lead to industrial strife and unrest. The bill is an open invitation to management to have recourse to the courts and to the Labor Board at almost every turn and thus to sidetrack or evade the normal processes of constructive collective bargaining. It will also result in strikes of all sorts during the long period in which the administration and the legality of the bill are being clarified. It will create the sort of confusion which prevailed in American industry during the period in which the National Labor Relations Act was being tested in the courts. There is no sufficient reason to risk such wholesale confusion at the present time.

I do not need to recite in detail why I agree with every one of these criticisms of this bill, and why I am convinced they are valid. I think the RECORD already clearly shows that. Nor shall I again document, by reference to the specific provisions of the bill, the ways in which these objections are deserved. The RECORD, I think, already clearly reflects my position and the positions of others who agree with me on that score.

The RECORD already shows how this bill broadens the liability of unions for the acts of agents beyond that contained in the Norris-LaGuardia Act, while it narrows that of employers in disregard of the realities of labor relations; how it enlarges the jurisdiction of the Federal courts in labor matters as to injunctions and suits for damages in such a way as to go far beyond even those dark days when unions were prosecuted as illegal conspiracies and the test of whether the activity was unlawful was the primary objective of the strike; now the strike is unlawful if any objective is improper. The RECORD already shows how it imposes hopelessly detailed registration requirements, as to which no proceeding can possibly be wholly immune from attack, before the Labor Board may take jurisdiction in a labor dispute or hold an election among the employees; how it enacts a so-called free-speech amendment, which certainly invites and encourages wholesale objections by counsel at all Board proceedings, as to the propriety of almost every question put to a witness which involves anything he may have said or written and makes many unfair labor practices virtually impossible to prove; how, at the same time, it requires the Board to follow the technical rules of evidence so far as practicable; how it exposes employees to discharge for union activities, if the employer can find some other cause for discharge that he can advance as a pretext; how it enacts an ambiguous and completely unclear provision prohibiting unions from asking an employer to pay for services which are not performed; how it redefines collective bargaining so as to excuse an employer from even discussing matters with the union unless a contract is made which covers it; and how in many other ways it invites and throws open the doors to lawsuits and legal proceedings at every step of union organization and collective bargaining. The record also shows how the administrative and procedural provisions of the bill shackle the National Labor Relations Board in a series of special restrictions and requirements unknown to any other administrative agency and inconsistent with the Administrative Procedure Act of 1946 and that they are contrary to the basic concepts of sound administrative law.

I think that is one of the worst features of the bill, Mr. President. I opposed the principle of it in committee. I opposed an attempt to set up a so-called prosecution end of the Board in the Department of Justice. I got that washed out in committee. I proposed and insisted upon the following of the Administrative Procedure Act of 1946 as it relates to the Board. As the Presiding Officer knows, for 2 or 3 days it was in and out. It would be out one day, and we would come back and argue some more and would get it back in. We finally kept it in the Senate bill. I think it is basic. Either we are going to have an administrative law procedure or we are not going to have it. It should not be a hybrid. As I said in discussing the matter with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], I forget how many hours ago—it was sometime ago—this was an attempt really to do an administrative-law job primarily with common-law court procedure. It will not work. The President knows that. He told us so. I think we ought to ponder it. We not only change the procedures provided for in the Administrative Procedure Act applicable to all other administrative law tribunals, such as the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Radio Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, and all the rest of them, but we say, "Ah, here we have one. It deals with the rights of workers. We will make an exception. We did not mean it when we passed the Administrative Procedure Act in the Seventy-ninth Congress." It was a uniform Administrative Procedure Act, the product of many years' work, Mr. President.

No one should get the notion that the Administrative Procedure Act of 1946 was the product of the work of the Seventy-ninth Congress. That work was done by outstanding legal and administrative law experts of this country for years, going back to the time that Justice Jackson was Attorney General. There was an Attorney General's Committee then. I am not sure of it, Mr. President, and I wish the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] were on the floor, because he could give us accurate information. That distinguished Senator is deserving of the highest tribute for the great work he did over the years on the Administrative Procedure Act. What I was about to say was that when Homer Cummings was Attorney General there was an Attorney General's Administrative Law Committee working on the problem of a uniform Administrative Law Procedure

Act so that a lawyer going before one administrative law tribunal under Federal jurisdiction would be bound to follow the same procedure. The desire was to make the rulings or the basis for the rulings uniform, the jurisdiction uniform, and the rules of evidence uniform. I shall say something about that in a minute.

The United States Department of Justice, through a series of Attorney General's committees, worked on that problem. Then, over that period of time, eminent scholars in the field of administrative law, such as another distinguished member of the Supreme Court of the United States, Mr. Justice Felix Frankfurter, one of the recognized American authorities, in fact, one of the recognized international authorities, in the field of administrative law, did monumental work, as did legal scholars in many of the law schools, over the years, in the development of the uniform Administrative Law Procedure Act which the Congress passed in 1946, in the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Then there was the work of the American Bar Association's Committee on Administrative Law, working in close cooperation with the United States Department of Justice and with the law schools and, I believe, also with the American Law Institute. That was no fly-by-night work, Mr. President; that was no bill that was laid and hatched in one session of Congress by Members of Congress. With the statesmanlike generalship that characterizes his work in the Senate, the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] piloted that bill through this body.

Mr. President, if we study the debates of the Seventy-ninth Congress, as I have—I thought I recalled them, but I double-checked on them when we were having our discussions in the committee—we find there was no attempt to provide separate rules for the National Labor Relations Board, under that act when it was before us; not at all. In fact, when I made my argument in the Seventy-ninth Congress for the substantial evidence test, rather than the "some evidence" test, which heretofore had prevailed in too many of our administrative law tribunals, including the National Labor Relations Board, the record will show that I pointed out the great need for reform, in that respect, applicable to all these agencies. I was seated several rows back of my present seat in this Chamber and the Senator from Nevada had a seat almost in the same location, if not the same location, as his present seat; and I recall clearly that I raised a question about that matter because I wanted to have him, as leader in charge of the bill, make a statement which would make crystal clear to any court, in the case of subsequent court interpretation as to the congressional intent, what his intent was in regard to the meaning of the substantial evidence test, to be found in that bill. He made clear that it threw out the "some evidence" or "any evidence" or "scintilla of evidence" rule, and that it meant what the courts have held, namely, substantial evidence on the basis of the whole record.

I fought for that in committee, because I felt we had made a great contribution to administrative law procedure in the Seventy-ninth Congress, and I did not want to undermine it by passing a bill in the Eightieth Congress which made such a serious exception to the Administrative Law Procedure Act of 1946. Mr. President, I regret very much that the conference committee returned a bill which undermined, in my judgment, the Administrative Law Procedure Act of 1946. The President sees the danger of it. He pointed it out very clearly in his veto message, as I shall show when I read the veto message again.

But I was saying that perhaps the most serious and damaging of these changes in administrative law is the creation of a statutory office of general counsel. Mr. President, that general counsel will be the "super duper" of all general counsels in the Federal Government. His job is going to be some job; it will be not only a very valuable job from the standpoint of economic status, but a job of tremendous power, in fact, too much power for any one man in this Government to have, more power than any other general counsel has ever been given, and from the standpoint of the independence of the power within the jurisdiction of the office, more power than the Attorney General of the United States has. We do not give to the Attorney General of the United States, in his relation to the American judiciary, anything that bears any resemblance, in breadth of jurisdiction and power, to what we give to the general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board in his relationship, under the bill, to the Board. The President saw that one, too. He nailed it to the floor in this veto message. He minced no words about it. That is another reason why I say this veto message is a great message of Americanism, and it is a great message that shows a deep understanding on the part of the President of the United States that we cannot afford to place and should not risk the danger in this country of placing in mere men such tremendous powers as are placed in the general counsel of this Board.

We talk about a government of laws rather than a government of men, and then we, the Congress, pass a bill which gives to one human being that vast power over the workers and employers of America? Not with my vote, Mr. President. It is independent power, sole power to determine what complaints shall issue and what shall not. Let a United States district attorney, let an Attorney General of the United States, seek to exercise administratively any such power as we specifically give to this general counsel, and he would have the Federal judiciary of this country down on his neck so fast that figuratively he would not know what hit him.

Let us take another look at these powers. All these restrictions are imposed at the very time when the Board is given a tremendous number of new and novel responsibilities, in connection with which it necessarily needs the utmost freedom and flexibility to devise satisfactory procedures.

Mr. President, in the case of the simple little procedure of the War Labor Board, in the midst of the war, a great many weeks yes, almost a year, were required to enable it to function. My colleagues might dispute that statement and say that it never really functioned effectively; and I do not think it was an effectively operating procedural body, with such jurisdiction as it had, small in comparison with the broad jurisdiction the National Labor Relations Board had. It took the better part of a year to get the machinery of the War Labor Board working even with creaks in it.

Mr. President, that is one of the bad things about this bill, the changes are so many, the new responsibilities so novel and sweeping, that naught but confusion will come out of it for a long, long time.

What is going to happen to labor disputes in the meantime? As I have said before, we are not going to change human nature one whit by passing legislation. We are not going to satisfy the workers of the country by advising them that, according to the statistics and the record of this debate, the Board is from 18 to 24 months behind, so far as its docket is concerned, in a simple certification case, with the result that the chairman of the board—and a very able chairman he is, too, Mr. President, Mr. Paul Herzog—when he testified before our committee at public hearings, said in his formal statement that there was no escaping the fact that the delays in the procedures of the Board were because of a good many strikes, not against the employer so much as against the Board itself for delay.

Why is that so? It is because men are human, because in many instances when feelings are high in a labor dispute, when the men think their cause is just and all they ask for is the determination of it on its merits, a labor leader has a difficult time selling to them the proposition that the only reason why they are not getting a settlement of the case is that the Board is so far behind in its docket. That does not go down in many cases. They say, "Well, we cannot wait for the Board. We are not going to wait 2 years for a decision as to whether or not we can be certified as having the right to bargain with this employer. You, Mr. President, of this union, make clear to John Doaks, our employer, tomorrow, that if he does not negotiate a contract with us, certification or no certification, in the next 10 days, we will hit the bricks." They move that in a union meeting, by democratic processes.

Oh, we hear much about labor leaders. Some of them, as I have said before, are bad actors, but there are not many such. When we take the totality of local unions throughout the country, and when we look into how they operate, it is surprising to find how many times a strike supposed to be called by one of the labor bosses is called as the result of a motion overwhelmingly or unanimously passed at a union meeting, in which the one who was on the spot was the union officer himself, who was subjected to most vigorous criticism on the floor of the union for not having the case settled months before, and who was told, "They are all fed up with the alibi that the National

Labor Relations Board was too far behind in its docket to give them immediate consideration of their case." I do not condone strikes against the Board. I will say that passing legislation which increases the delays will not reduce the strikes. That is another reason why I think this is an unworkable piece of legislation.

I was saying, Mr. President, so far as the general counsel is concerned, if all these restrictions are imposed at the very time when the Board is given a tremendous number of new and novel responsibilities in connection with which it necessarily needs the utmost freedom and flexibility to devise satisfactory procedure, the inevitable effect of this must be, and I think will be, to create confusion and uncertainty, and to let loose an avalanche of litigation, at the very time we need stability and certainty in labor relations.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. For what purpose?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I want to ask a question. If I can obtain unanimous consent to suggest the absence of a quorum, would the Senator from Oregon object, if I obtained unanimous consent for that purpose, and did not take the Senator off the floor?

Mr. IVES. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is raised. The Senator from Oregon may proceed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon will state it.

Mr. MORSE. For future protection, Mr. President, because I do not want to be taken off the floor; I am in the position of being in the midst of my first speech on the bill. I feel fine. [Laughter.] I am going to make another speech tomorrow and I think, if within the rules, this protection is due me. I merely want to know hypothetically, if I had made the mistake of yielding for the purpose stated by my good friend the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and if my good friend from New York [Mr. IVES] had not objected, and, during a temporary lapse of clearheadedness, I might have gone along with that request, and a quorum had been called; would I then have made one speech?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that, had the Senator yielded for the purpose of a quorum, it would have been considered that he had made one speech; after the quorum call, he would be in his second and last speech.

Mr. MORSE. I thought so.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MORSE. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair might further state that the Senator from South Carolina, however, had asked that that be done without loss of the floor by the Senator from Oregon. That could have been done by unanimous consent.

Mr. MORSE. Ah.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, that is why I objected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York objected to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. MORSE. Ah! The Senator from South Carolina said it would be without my losing the floor. I might not have lost the floor if unanimous consent had been granted, but it was not included in the request that I not only not lose the floor, but that I not be counted with a second speech. One surely has to be watchful at the tail end of one of these situations, does he not? And, of course, my good friend from South Carolina was just trying to help me. I have some fine helpers here, Mr. President; Senators would be surprised at their number. In fact, I am looking forward to the time when, on some issue, my good friend the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and I are going to be on the same side. I think that is going to happen; I do not know how soon.

But now to proceed with my principal remarks, I must mention, Mr. President, in this connection the devious course of the legislative history of this bill, and how that, too, will aggravate even more seriously the proclivities of this bill to bring about litigation, court tests, and disputes. The President mentioned that, too, in his veto message. I confess, the more I think of that veto message, the more I marvel at how that man grasped the significance of the many weaknesses of the bill. I feel a little good about it too, Mr. President, because I notice that so far as the procedural objections to the bill are concerned, the message makes mention of most of the procedural objections to the bill which I raised in my speech on June 5; but they impress me more, Mr. President, when I find them supported by the President, because, just think of the responsibility that man had before he wrote that message. Stop and ponder for a moment the tremendous pressures that were on him—"Sign it" "Don't sign it!" "Don't sign it!" "Sign it!" How he kept his head through it all, how he said he was going to study it, he was going to make up his mind on the basis of that study and do what he thought was in the best interest of the country; and that, I think he did. That is one reason it makes it such a powerful veto message. I think he did well to point out that the procedures under the bill and the jurisdiction given in the bill will be causative of much litigation.

As I once said, with respect to the effectiveness of a union, so far as protecting its members is concerned, in some particulars it can be said to be no stronger than its treasury. And, of course, all the grounds for litigation that are made possible under the bill, as I see it, are going to help break the treasury of a great many unions so that they will become weak unions. There are antilabor employers who are interested in having unions only if they are weak. I do not think, when those employers say they believe in collective bargaining, that they believe in unionism, or are shooting very fair, or are being very "crickety"; because, if they believe in free collective bargaining, they should believe in bargaining collectively with strong unions, capable of protecting the economic interests of their members. But one of the results of the bill is to give to such antilabor employers as there are—and there are too many of them, unfortunately—the power to litigate into weakness a great many unions; thus, once with a bankrupt treasury, they cannot be very successful in a strike, because strikers have to eat, too. If the union cannot pay strike benefits, there is not very much chance of winning the strike. I think clearly the President had that in mind when he wrote the veto message.

Mr. President, I think one thing must be perfectly plain to every Member from even a casual acquaintanceship with the bill and the debates. That fact is, that the language of the bill, on its face, should not be depended upon for its intended meaning or effect. As guides to its purposes, we must look, therefore, first, to the separate reports of the House committee and the Senate committee when the original bills were reported.

Mr. President, if I may be permitted, I desire to repeat the sentence. It was thoughtful of me to say, "if I may be permitted," though I suppose there is not much that can be done about it, but, at least, I want the Presiding Officer to know of my desire to be exceedingly gracious in the matter of repetition. I do not like to repeat. If I may repeat I will say then we must look to the debates on the floor of this body, with respect to the amendments made to the Senate bill before its passage. We must look, also, to the conference report printed as House Report No. 510, and which presumably also reflected the views of the Senate conferees who supported the bill.

Furthermore, we have a separate "Summary in detail" submitted by the Senator from Ohio, which, as I read it, contains many significant omissions and departures from the conference report. And finally we have a "Supplementary Analysis" of the conference bill, also submitted by my good friend, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

What do all these analyses mean? It is my judgment that quite obviously they indicate a feeling of uncertainty and insecurity on the part of the sponsors of the bill as to the real meaning of the bill or as to the meaning which the courts might give to the bill unless the record were filled with report after report after report as to what the bill means. They indicate also, I think, that many of the criticisms which have been made as to the unworkabilit, and ambiguities of this bill, as written, and as to its serious consequences on industrial relations, have struck home and have impressed even the sponsors of the legislation with the necessity of making some kind of legislative history that may at least blunt the edge of the criticisms. In some few instances, even, they have apparently tried to make legislative history that would tend to avoid the disastrous consequences that have been predicted. I doubt very much whether such statements, some made after the bill had passed both bodies of the Congress, carry any force as to the legislative intention. Certainly it is extremely doubtful that they can operate to override the plain language of the statu-

tory provisions, or to overcome statements contained in the House report, which apparently reflects the official views of the conference committee.

So far as I recall, most of the cases of the Supreme Court on legislative intention that I have ever read or studied stress the point that legislative intention must be determined by the committee hearings, reports, and conference reports, and the statements made during the debates on the floor of the two Houses of Congress, giving dominant weight, of course, and, when there is any conflict, controlling weight, to the views expressed by the Senator in charge of the bill on the floor.

So I say that I seriously doubt whether some of the reports which have been prepared subsequent to the passage of the bill can be given by the Supreme Court any controlling weight in determining the meaning of the legislation from the standpoint of congressional intent so far as legislative history is concerned. At least, I think it is a very mooted question, and although I am "curbstoning," which is not a very safe thing for a lawyer to do, I think I have quite clearly enough enunciated the standing which would have to be given to at least the reports which have been prepared by the Senate conferees subsequent to the passage of the bill.

But, putting that doubt aside, that is not the way to legislate on labor relations. That kind of legislation merely provides lawyers with a magic box of litigation, profitable for them, but disastrous for the country. I understand that at present lawyers generally throughout the country are doing pretty well. They do not need to worry about the future, because if this bill becomes law it will operate as a full employment bill for lawyers—that is, if the workers have any money left with which to pay them, so far as the labor lawyers are concerned.

I say that to emphasize anew the point that the bill will prove to be causative of much litigation.

To legislate in this way means that virtually every significant provision of this bill must be the subject of interminable and delaying lawsuits until its correct meaning can be determined by the Supreme Court. But what will happen to labor relations while all this is going on? The answer, of course, is obvious. The very nature and wealth of the legislative history which the sponsors have found it necessary to make, in and of themselves, will throw the country back into the lawless and reckless days between 1935 and 1937, when every action of the Labor Board under the Wagner Act was being fought through the courts. We simply cannot afford to go back to that kind of situation in the next few years. I do not see how we can possibly avoid it under this bill, however, because for every troublesome, litigious issue presented by the original Wagner Act, this bill presents a hundred.

I feel that I cannot let the record of my opposition to the bill close without a brief reference to several further aspects of the analyses of the bill's provisions. As I have said, I do not intend to burden the Senate with detailed discussions of specific provisions which are objectionable to me, where the RECORD is already clear as to my position. But I do want to make and emphasize certain further points.

I have tried to make my record clear. There is some evidence as to how hard I have worked in this session of Congress to have some labor legislation passed. I have made quite a few speeches on the subject, starting with a speech on March 10, 1947, one on March 14, one on April 17, one on May 2, one on May 7, one on May 8, one on May 9, one on May 13, and one on June 5. I think the RECORD will show some others which have not been reprinted.

What was my purpose in making all those speeches? I was trying to build a record containing sound objective data and arguments in support of legislative proposals which I thought would be helpful in checking the labor abuses which we all agree should be checked, and at the same time protecting the proper rights of labor and industry; and, of course, most important of all, giving to the American public the protection which it needs.

To be honest about it, I made them for another purpose, Mr. President, because I knew that in some quarters my position would be criticized, that even in some instances an attempt would be made—and it has been—to give the impression that I did not want any labor legislation at all. The RECORD answers that criticism; my vote for the Senate committee bill answers it; my vote on the floor of the Senate for the Senate bill answers it.

A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LODGE in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. I have been observing the various positions which I have been taking in the course of this speech, and I wonder if it would be proper for me to inquire whether it is all right for me to lean against this desk so long as I keep my feet on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Rule XIX provides as follows:

> When a Senator desires to speak he shall rise and address the Presiding Officer.

The verb "rise" is the verb which the Senator must observe in this case.

Mr. MORSE. Is it the opinion of the Chair that when I lean against this desk and keep my feet on the floor I have risen?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is not going to have an opinion on that question until the point is raised regarding it.

Mr. MORSE. I shall be very careful, Mr. President. I do want to say, however, for the benefit of the present occupant of the chair, that earlier in my speech—it was much earlier than I thought—the question was raised by my good friend the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], who has left the floor, I see. I do not blame him. He stated, when I leaned forward on these books with the very obvious purpose of making my speaking a little more restful, that I was in violation of the rule, and the then occupant of the chair ruled that I was not in violation of it. So I am in this predicament now, as to whether I need to raise this inquiry as the occupancy of the chair changes from time to time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair does not consider that the last statement constitutes a parliamentary inquiry. The Chair will meet the issues as they are brought up, if they are brought up, in accordance with rule XIX which the Chair has just quoted.

Mr. MORSE. I do not mean to be facetious; I am in dead earnest about it.

I should like to put another parliamentary inquiry, and I am in dead earnest about it also.

I should like to know, after having received a favorable ruling as to my right to lean on these books so long as I kept my feet planted on the floor, whether I will thereafter have to run the risk of a reversal of that ruling upon a change of Presiding Officers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The only language on the subject is rule XIX, which the Chair has already quoted, but will quote again:

> When a Senator desires to speak he shall rise and address the Presiding Officer.

The Chair will be guided by that language when, as, and if the issue is raised.

Mr. MORSE. I just wanted to make my record on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I think the Senator has made his record.

Mr. MORSE. I was talking about these speeches of mine, and I want the RECORD to be perfectly clear that the points contained in the speeches were made before a vote on the bill was taken in the Senate, because I do not think that anyone, on the ground of innocence as to the defects of the bill, should be allowed to ignore the record which has been made against the bill from time to time by the junior Senator from Oregon.

So I say, Mr. President, I feel that I cannot let the record of my opposition to this bill close without a brief reference to several further aspects of the analysis of the bill's provisions. As I have said, I do not intend to burden the Senate with detailed discussions of specific provisions that are objectionable to me, when the RECORD is already clear as to my position, but I do want to make and emphasize certain further points.

My first point has to do with the jurisdictional strike provision in section 8 (b) (4) (D) of the bill. Originally, that provision would have prohibited jurisdictional strikes involving disputes between unions as to which of the unions was to do particular work. As I have said on many occasions, such strikes are wholly indefensible and should be prohibited. The section was amended in conference, however, so that it now prohibits strikes designed to force or require any employer to assign particular work to employees in a particular labor organization rather than to employees in another labor organization or in another trade, craft, or class. The Senator from Ohio has stated in the supplementary analysis of the bill, which was included in the RECORD on June 12, after the bill had passed, that this is intended not only to outlaw disputes between unions over work assignments, but also to prohibit a union from striking because

work is assigned to nonunion employees. He states, further, that all it does is make it illegal for unions to coerce employers into doing something which the employer is already prevented from doing under section 8 (3) of the present Wagner Act.

To me, this provision, as amended, involves so shocking and unfair a restriction on the legitimate and accepted rights and practices of labor unions, and one so readily conducive to destroying all craft unions, that I can scarcely believe a Congress of the United States, sitting in the year 1947, could enact it into law, if it understood all its implications as interpreted by the Senator from Ohio. Moreover, I am in complete disagreement with the Senator's statement that this is in effect a restatement of existing law.

Let me take a concrete example. Suppose members of the teamsters' union do both the hauling of freight by truck, and the loading and unloading, for employers in this city. Let us suppose, further, that one employer now decides to transfer the loading and unloading to nonunion men. Under this provision, if the teamsters' union struck in order to induce the employer by economic pressure to continue making such work available for members of the teamsters' union, they would be guilty of an illegal jurisdictional strike and subject to unfair labor practice charges, loss of jobs, a district court injunction, and suits for damages in the district court under section 303 (b) of this bill.

Mr. President, speaking at such length on the floor of the Senate has one thing to recommend it: A Senator who does so is not constantly called out to meet with this delegation or that delegation or this person or that person; at least he is able to follow his own line of reasoning without interruption.

I do not know for the life of me what so many Senators are here for at this time. I do not know why they do not go home and get some rest, for they will need it. We have another night and another day and Monday morning. That is a long time. I think everyone should get some rest. Of course, that is a gratuitous suggestion on my part; but it shows my human interest even in the opposition.

Mr. President, I wish to pause to say how much nicer it would have been if all of us could have cooperated on this matter and could have a unanimous-consent agreement to vote after the week end, on Monday or Tuesday or Wednesday or some other day after the week end, after the people of the country had an opportunity to focus their attention on the President's veto message, prior to final action by the Senate. I think that is the way it should have been done, and I said so at the time, and I say so now. I do not think the majority should have forced its will upon the minority simply because we did not immediately fall into line and accept the unanimous-consent agreement. I know the majority was motivated by just as sincere a desire for quick action as we motivated by a sincere belief that the President was entitled to a few days of public consideration of his veto message, before the Senate took final action. As I said earlier in my speech, I think he had that coming to him.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I think it should be made clear that another factor was involved, and I can see from the standpoint of parliamentary strategy why the majority wanted to force action by way of a unanimous-consent agreement to vote this afternoon at 5 o'clock.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. MORSE. For what purpose?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. For a question.

Mr. MORSE. Yes; I yield for a question.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should like to ask the Senator a question in order to clarify my understanding of his philosophy. I understand that the Senator is now criticizing the majority for attempting to handle the affairs of the Senate as the majority feels they should be handled. If that is the case, I wonder how the Senator from Oregon squares that philosophy with his philosophy, for instance, when the FEPC bill was before the Senate for consideration and when the Senator from Oregon caustically castigated the minority for interfering with the will of the majority. I fail to quite reconcile those two philospohies, except on the basis of the philosophy of whose ox is being gored.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think it was in the absence of the Senator from Iowa that I discussed that point, but I shall be very glad to rediscuss it.

I said earlier in this speech that I am opposed to filibusters. I will vote for a Senate rule that will outlaw filibusters. I have such a proposal in the hopper; it has been there all during this session of Congress. I also said I would vote for some changes under the unanimous-consent rule; I said that in my judgment, as that rule is now being practiced in the Senate, it takes unfair advantage of minorities in the Senate, because unless a Senator goes along and gives his consent in connection with such a unanimous-consent request, all the types of pressures which I have previously discussed in this speech and all the niceties of party discipline are brought down to bear upon a Senator.

Mr. President, I think we are overusing the unanimous-consent agreement. I think we are using it in such a way that, in practice, it is becoming a rule of limitation on debate which almost automatically is applied when it is requested, or else a Senator is frowned upon if he does not go along with the party majority and give consent.

So I said earlier in my speech that here, right on this floor, is the last great citadel of unlimited free speech among the parliamentary bodies of the world. I am willing to outlaw filibusters, and I am willing to put some limitations upon the unanimous-consent rule so as to make absolutely certain that there will be retained unlimited debate on the merits of issues.

I also said earlier in this speech that there are, probably, filibusters and filibusters. I said that, much as I am against filibusters, no Member of the Senate can begin to appreciate how difficult it was for me to participate in this filibuster. But so long as the filibuster practice is going to be permitted and so long as a majority attempts to do what this majority did when the unanimous-consent agreement was proposed, I am going to make the fight for the protection of two things—minority rights in the Senate and the right to have some time to discuss on the merits a matter of such fundamental importance to the people of the United States as is this labor bill and the veto message.

So I said, and now repeat, that it is one thing to use a filibuster to try to kill a bill by preventing it from ever coming to a vote. That is not our position. What did we propose? Just a week-end delay, to vote on the first of the week, after the country had had an opportunity to respond to the President's veto message.

When our motives were such, and when we made perfectly clear that there was no intention on our part to prevent a final vote by way of filibuster on the bill, I repeat what I said earlier, I think the majority owed it to the minority to cooperate with us and give us a unanimous-consent agreement for a vote after the week end.

Oh, this is no filibuster to prevent a vote on the labor bill. This is a filibuster, which necessarily had to take place in the light of the action taken by the majority, to assure the protection of unlimited debate on the floor of the Senate, and to give the people of this country an opportunity to respond to and react to the President's message, and also give to the Members of this body an opportunity to weigh and consider the views of constituents who might be heard from on the veto message.

Mr. President, I do not like the situation, but we did not need to have it, if that degree of comity and cooperation which I think should exist between us, even when we have differences of opinion, had prevailed in the Senate at the time the unanimous-consent agreement was offered and objected to. I gave at the time of my objection my reasons for objecting. As I have also said earlier in this debate, I do not stand alone in these objections, as evidenced by the fact that I have ample support to carry this battle over the week end, and after the week end I shall be ready, I say to the Senator from Iowa, to have a vote on the veto message.

I was in the process of pointing out another reason for objecting to the unanimous-consent agreement, and I was saying that I could see the parliamentary strategy on the part of the majority—and I think it was proper strategy, so far as it went—but I think it should have been abandoned when colleagues in good faith expressed their honest objections to the unanimous-consent agreement.

Let us look into the strategic position here on the floor of the Senate. This is my interpretation; I think it is correct: When the unanimous-consent agreement was offered for a vote on the bill this afternoon at 5 o'clock, the majority knew they had us licked. The individual Sen-

ators with whom I talked told me so, good naturedly, and I agreed with them. They had us licked. However, some Senators were away, and as I have said, I do not know that those absentees had the slightest idea that in being away they were running a risk of a vote on this question being brought up on the week end. I had no way of knowing what their views or wishes would be if they knew that danger existed. Here is a vital, a very vital issue, an economic issue, not without its political aspect. I do not want to see it a political issue, but I do not suppose there is anything any of us can do about that—it will become such.

Therefore, I felt that in accordance with a spirit of friendly cooperation with each other, we should not put any of our colleagues on the spot, so to speak, by going ahead with the unanimous-consent agreement before we knew of their wishes or their views in the matter, or before they had ample opportunity to return to the Senate.

I do not think that in the heat of the debate and in our zealousness to get this matter out of the way—and I mean no criticism by what I now say—or zeal to take advantage of a victory which the majority knew it had in the palm of its hand, if it could only get this matter to a vote by Saturday at 5 o'clock—I say, that I do not think that through zeal, when one good faith, sincere objection to the unanimous-consent agreement was raised, the agreement should have been pressed, and that the minority should have been required to go into this prolonged session.

Those things leave scars; they are bound to. Lean over backward as we will, when the smoke clears away from the battle and we go out in the cloakrooms and laugh about it from the standpoint of the fight we had to put up for our respective points of view, nevertheless, we are going to nurture down in our hearts—and I do not think there is any escaping it—a feeling, depending upon which side of the battle one is on, because we cannot get away from the fact that this is no minor skirmish in the Senate of the United States. There is bound to be nurtured in the hearts of Senators at least a feeling which should never have been brought about. If they are in the majority they will feel that the minority should not have called their hand, and if they are in the minority, the feeling is bound to be that the majority should not have taken advantage of a parliamentary situation and forced us into this battle.

Mr. President, I am extremely disappointed about it. I really do not think that we proceeded on the plane on which we should have moved. I do not think it is good for the spirit of cooperation in the Senate; I do not think it is good for the country; I do not think we should have been forced to do it, as I think those of us with the convictions we held were forced to do it for the reasons I have heretofore mentioned in my remarks.

Mr. President, I have talked about the strategy of the majority. The minority has not been without its strategy, either. As I said, I think there is one reason which has no relationship whatever to the strategy, which can stand alone, in support of the course of action the minority has followed in this battle; that is, that after the President of the United States hands down a veto of such major significance, dealing with a problem so vital to the economic welfare of the country as this veto on the labor bill does, we should have postponed final action on the veto until the country had had an opportunity——

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. MORSE. As soon as I finish my sentence—that we should have postponed the final action on the veto until the country had had an opportunity to respond to and react to both his veto message and to his Nation-wide broadcast. I feel that very deeply. My respect for that great office is such that I do not think it would have been proper treatment for us to vote within relatively a few hours after his appeal to the people of the Nation. I now yield—for a question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask this question of my able colleague from Oregon: Is it his position that when there has been ample notice that important business will be before the Senate of the United States at approximately the date when every Member of the Senate knew it would be before the Senate for consideration, 94 or 95 Senators should be delayed in transacting the public business because 1 or 2 or 3 Senators are away from their place of business in Washington?

Mr. MORSE. I shall be glad to respond to the question. I may say that I think, even under such a case as the Senator from California suggests, we still have a very difficult time justifying holding the Senate in a Saturday session, which is very uncommon. We have had other very important legislation before this body, and as a practice we have not met on Saturdays; and so I say, in view of the fact that the Senators were away, and our practice is not generally to hold Saturday sessions, that it would have been the nice thing for us and the cooperative thing for us to have postponed action until Monday.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan merely desires to ask a question. Is there any doubt in the able Senator's mind that all Senators were advised that the message would come to the Senate on Friday?

Mr. MORSE. I understand that that was so.

Mr. FERGUSON. So there was plenty of warning that the message would come in on the last day, and that would be Friday?

Mr. MORSE. I understand that that was what the Senators who were away knew.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is it not true that Senators could not have been warned of a veto message, because nobody knew whether there would be one? Is it not true that we discussed here on the floor that in the event there was a veto message, it would have to come on Friday, but until the veto message was sent here, nobody could be certain that there would be a veto message?

Mr. MORSE. That is true; but I think, Mr. President, that this may be said, dealing with the point raised by both the Senator from California and the Senator from Michigan, that, so far as I know, Senators who were away understood that if the bill were vetoed, it undoubtedly would be vetoed on Friday; but it does not follow from that in my opinion that the majority was justified in taking the position that because the veto message came down on Friday, we should have a vote on Saturday; and that is where we part company.

I say that, at that point, the nice thing to have done, the cooperative thing to have done, would have been to say, "Well, we know that some of you fellows have these engagements of long standing. We know that one of your number is in Europe; it would take him some little time to get back; and we also know that this is a pretty vital issue, of interest to the country, and we think that some time ought to elapse from the time we received the message to the time we vote on it; the country ought to be allowed to respond to it or to react to it; and so we suggest that we vote on it after the week end." When one thinks of the many vital issues which have been pending before the Senate even in this session of Congress, on Friday nights, with not a suggestion made that we meet on Saturday, from time to time, I say I think that in view of that practice it is pretty difficult to rationalize forcing the minority either to agree to vote on Saturday at 5 o'clock, "or else." We have heard much in the debate, Mr. President, about the tactics of powerful unions against employers, who find themselves in the dominating position in a dispute. We have heard it pointed out, and rightfully so, that some of those unions, or their officials, go before an employer and "lay it on the line," and say "take this, or else." I say, Mr. President, we in the minority feel that we were accorded that kind of treatment when this unanimous-consent agreement was offered, and we objected to it. We were told, in effect, "take this, or else." We have taken it thus far.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have a question to ask. If the theory of the Senator from Oregon is carried out, do we not find ourselves in the position, in the case of a veto by the President, which takes a two-thirds vote to overcome, of having

94 Senators held up because the Senator from Oregon desires to protect the rights of one Senator who is in Europe, and who, as I understand, must have realized that a vote would come, and perhaps the rights of other Senators who are away? The Senator from Michigan could well have been away yesterday, but he realized that it would be necessary to be here, because a message one way or the other would be here. If the theory of the Senator from Oregon were carried out, would not the situation be as I have stated it?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to protect myself.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator is protecting himself. This is a question.

Mr. MORSE. I want the Chair to assure me that I am protecting myself. I am perfectly willing to let the Senator from Michigan continue with extended remarks, with a question mark at the end, if the Chair so rules; but I want to be sure this is a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, if the Senator does not desire to answer it, it is all right.

Mr. MORSE. O Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan does me a great injustice by that remark. I want to answer any question the Senator from Michigan desires to put to me, but I want to say to the Senator from Michigan that, before he came in, the junior Senator from Oregon recognized that he must be very careful about yielding for anything other than a question, and that, even though he yields for a question, should a Senator start talking in a form other than that of a question, the Senator from Oregon is fearful he might lose the floor. All the Chair has to do is to protect the Senator from Oregon in this matter, and rule that what the Senator from Michigan is asking is a question, and I shall be glad to hear him for an hour.

I think I know what the Senator from Michigan has in mind, and I am going to talk about it, and I think he will find my talk to be a response to what he wanted to ask. The Senator from Michigan and I are too good friends to get into any difficulty over a matter such as this.

Mr. FERGUSON. There will be no difficulty between us——

Mr. MORSE. For a question I yield, Mr. President.

Mr. FERGUSON. May I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to advise the Senator from Oregon that I do not wish to embarrass him at all? I wish to ask a question merely, and to place enough in it so that the Senator will understand what I mean, so he can explain to the Senate exactly what his philosophy is respecting the proposition he is now debating.

Mr. MORSE. I know, Mr. President, that that is the desire of the Senator from Michigan, and I may be overtechnical, but I think the Chair will appreciate my position. I have sat here and too many times have seen Senators taken off their feet on the floor of the Senate to take any chances. I am simply asking the Chair to protect me in these matters. I am going to make a statement and see if it does not answer what the Senator from Michigan has in mind. I want to say that I do not agree with the Senator from Michigan that any great inconvenience would have resulted to 94, or whatever the number was, other Senators in the Senate by our following our customary practice of not holding sessions on Saturday. We have adjusted our program pretty much to that practice, and I think the RECORD will show that usually the majority leader, some days before the Saturday session, notifies us of a Saturday session so that we can make our plans accordingly. Perhaps that was done in this instance; but if it was done, I missed it. We cannot catch everything that occurs in the Senate. One does not hear all the announcements made in the Senate. So I say, if it was done, I missed it.

Therefore, assuming for the moment that we were not given any considerable notice of a Saturday meeting, I fail to see how anyone would be greatly inconvenienced by the position taken by the minority that we should follow the ordinary practice and go over until Monday. There is nothing wrong about that. Mr. President, because of the fact that a veto message of such great importance came to the Senate, I think it was right and proper to delay acting upon it over the week end until the Senate and the President and the people of the country generally could see what the public reaction to the message was.

Mr. President, I have no intention of eliminating from the discussion the matter of floor strategy. That is there, too. It is true that as of this afternoon, as I said, we would be licked. We may be next week; I do not know. But as the old saying is, "While there is life there is hope." So long as we have not been licked yet, Mr. President, we are not licked. There is a chance—so some of my friends with the pencils have told me—there is a chance that we might win by week end delay. If that were the only contest, if that were the only factor involved, then from a purely parliamentary strategic point of view there is a defense that can be made, in my judgment, for the position taken by the majority in the case of an old parliamentary rule. To the extent that a defense can be made for the majority, Mr. President, on that ground, so likewise a defense rests with the minority for the position they have taken in that fight, because if it is reduced solely to winning or losing this fight, then both sides are entitled to apply the rules of the Senate in the interest of winning.

Mr. President, I wanted to place the matter on a plane much higher than that, because that is where I think it belongs. On that plane, Mr. President, I say, speaking the views of the minority, that I think it would have been more fair and reasonable and cooperative, once a good-faith objection was raised to the unanimous-consent agreement, to let the matter go over until Monday.

Why do we have unanimous-consent agreements? Let us analyze the purpose back of that question for a moment. Why do we require unanimous-consent agreements? As I understand the history of the Senate and its rules, here is a great parliamentary body which has sought over the decades to assure protection to the minority, and therefore, before we could modify the procedures of the Senate to the degree that the gentlemen of the majority wanted to modify them in this instance, our forebears in this body provided it had to be done by unanimous consent. I think that implies something. I think it implies, Mr. President, that unanimous consent should be respected, and that a minority which felt that it should not be applied as of a given day should have its rights protected. I think that is what it is bottomed on.

But has there been application of that principle in this instance? I do not think so, Mr. President. I want to say in all kindness and with complete parliamentary politeness to my friends of the majority, I do not think they have been just to the original intention of the unanimous-consent rule. I think they have overlooked the fact that it was put in the rules for the purpose of protecting the minority from being overridden by a dominant majority.

Our forebears in this body were aware of the fact that a dominant majority existing for a temporary period of time can be tyrannical. They were much concerned about the tyrannies of majorities. That is why they built up in this country a republican form of government, with checks and balances and safeguards which protect us from tyrannical majorities.

As I see this rule in particular, Mr. President, I think it was put in the Senate rules to cover just such a situation as existed here on Friday when the unanimous-consent agreement was offered, but the purpose of which was not carried out by the majority in this body. That is one reason why I objected, and that is one reason why I made up my mind that I would take my stand on this matter in two speeches, and I would fight for the principle of minority rights involved in this case if necessary, until I dropped upon the floor of the Senate of the United States before I would go down before the type of tactics employed by the majority in this body.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon whether he feels that his present position is entirely consistent with that which he expressed on February 6, 1946, in the Senate, when he used the following language:

> I still believe that the Journal should be immediately approved——

Mr. MORSE. Just a moment. Mr. President, is it perfectly proper to put a question in that form?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the opinion of the Chair, it is up to the Senator from Oregon to decide, and to refuse to yield if in his opinion a question is not being asked.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator will give me the language, I shall be glad to read it.

Mr. BREWSTER. I will hand the copy of the RECORD to the Senator. I hope he will read it with appropriate emphasis.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator will stand behind me and poke me when he wishes me to emphasize, I shall be glad to do so.

As I understand the question, Mr. President, the Senator from Maine asks me if I believe that my present position is consistent with the language which I used on February 6, 1946, in a colloquy with my good friend the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], when I used these words—I shall read the entire paragraph.

Mr. BREWSTER. Very well.

Mr. MORSE. The language is as follows:

> Mr. MORSE. I understand that the purpose of the recess which is about to be taken a few minutes before 4 o'clock in the afternoon, is to enable the majority party to hold a conference in regard to the situation involving the FEPC bill which now confronts the Senate. I am well aware of the fact that the majority should perhaps hold a conference, but I regret that it is to be held at such an early hour. I wish the majority would hold its conference at a later hour in the day, because I am still of the belief that the Senate of the United States should proceed with the business now pending before it. I still believe that the Journal should be immediately approved, and that we should proceed, under the usual parliamentary procedure, to consider the merits of the FEPC bill. We should return to what I believe is to be the great obligation of the Senate, namely, that of voting, and thereby be enabled to proceed with other vital problems now confronting America. More important than that, Mr. President, the great Senate of the United States should be enabled again to return to the principle of majority rule.

Let me say that, on the face of it, its form is not consistent. I wish to say, however, that there are marked differences between the two situations, and I wish to explain my view as to those differences.

The FEPC filibuster sought to do what? It sought to hold the Senate in a position where it could not transact business until there was an agreement to withdraw that legislation, or until there was a counting of noses which would make it perfectly clear to those who were conducting the filibuster that the bill could not pass.

There is no such attempt on the part of those of us who are conducting this filibuster. We are not seeking to prevent a vote on the veto message. We have been willing at all times to enter into an agreement to vote on it Monday. In the FEPC case we were dealing with a question which had been under discussion for a long time. In this case the veto message was presented to us on Friday afternoon. It was a long document. It deserved our careful study. The President had announced that he would speak to the Nation on a radio hook-up at 10 o'clock. We knew that the message and the talk would have a tremendous public discussion all over the land, and so we pleaded against the unanimous-consent request, asking that the vote on the veto message be allowed to go over the week end. I think there is quite a difference between the two sets of operative facts.

Let me say another thing. I recall the FEPC filibuster very well. As I remember, it lasted between 14 and 18 days. For a period of between 14 and 18 days the Senate was tied up in a filibuster on the FEPC, a filibuster which was made to kill a bill which a clear majority wanted. Night after night I stood on the floor of the Senate and pleaded that this body go into continuous session, 24 hours a day, for as many days as were necessary to break the filibuster. Where were my supporters? Not a single Senator supported me on the proposal to break a filibuster which sought to kill a bill, and which lasted between 14 and 18 days.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I have one or two further sentences, and then I shall be glad to yield.

In this case, almost immediately after the veto message was presented we had a request for a unanimous-consent agreement. There were honest, sincere, and good-faith objections to it. What was the minority met with? Continuous sessions of the Senate, or a quick vote without any debate on the merits of the veto message. At the present time we must agree either to take such an arrangement or be held in session. We were held in session; last night speaks for itself. I do not like it. I think it was unnecessary. I do not believe that we ought to act that way toward each other.

Mr. President, there is an additional difference between the two cases. One was an out-and-out filibuster. In my judgment, this one was really provoked by a unanimous-consent request in connection with which, in my judgment, and speaking for myself alone, the majority lost sight of the original intention of protecting the minority in relation to unanimous-consent agreements.

So I believe that on the face of the quoted language there is an inconsistency. Earlier, when I believe the Senator was not present, I stated that it was very difficult for me to go into this fight, because I do not like filibusters. But I had to make a choice between a principle which I think is at stake in this fight, one about which I have just spoken, namely, the underlying purpose, spirit, and intent of the unanimous-consent rule when it was first placed in our rules by the framers thereof, and which I felt was being sacrificed, or was certainly not being observed by the majority in this instance, and on the other hand my honest, sincere belief that by rule we ought to abolish filibusters in the United States Senate. However, I think it must be said that so long as the rules permit them, when we are in a situation such as the one in which we found ourselves on Friday afternoon, we are justified, until the rule is changed, in using the rules to protect our position.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. BREWSTER. Do I correctly understand the position of the Senator from Oregon to be that there are good filibusters and bad filibusters, determined by the purpose or intent of the one who conducts the filibuster?

Mr. MORSE. I do not think there are any good filibusters, but I think there are differences in filibusters, and I think filibusters are differently motivated. I think they may be used, under the rules, to protect a right which accrues to the minority under another rule the spirit of which the minority feels is being violated. That is our feeling in this instance.

Mr. BREWSTER. Has the Senator from Oregon checked as to what has been the practice of the Senate in connection with voting on veto messages?

Mr. MORSE. No; the Senator from Oregon has not checked on that.

Mr. BREWSTER. It has been my impression, and I wondered whether the Senator from Oregon had any different impression, that it has been the usual custom here to vote upon veto messages rather promptly on their receipt. Has the Senator any recollection in conflict with that?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Oregon will say that he has not checked it. I think that ordinarily veto messages have not involved such vital issues as does this one which has such tremendous public interest. I do not know of any other one since I have been in the Senate as to which, at the time it was delivered to the Senate, it became known that the President of the United States would discuss it on a Nation-wide hook-up that night. When that became known to us—I do not ask anyone to agree with me, but I think it is a very valid point and a decent point—when we did know that, I think that out of the respect that we owe to the office of the Presidency of the United States we should have said, "Let it go over until Monday and then vote on it."

Mr. BREWSTER. Would the Senator recognize that there is any distinction between the appropriate time to consider a veto message of the President in a matter of this importance and the time involved in carrying on a crusade in the country, either by the President or any other group, in the matter of the deliberations of the Senate?

Mr. MORSE. I think the Senator from Maine refers in that question to what I would call the rule of reasonableness. It is a question as to whether we were asking for a reasonable postponement of a final vote. I am willing to be judged on whether a request to postpone from Saturday at 5 o'clock to sometime on Monday afternoon is a reasonable request. I think most reasonable, prudent men, given that question, would say that the minority was clearly reasonable in its request, so far as the time element was concerned.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator from Oregon does not mean to imply, does he, that the time between Friday noon and Saturday afternoon was all that the Senate had given to the consideration of this question?

Mr. MORSE. The veto message?

Mr. BREWSTER. I am talking about the subject.

Mr. MORSE. Oh, no. We have had a prolonged discussion of the bill and we have acted on it. All that was left

to act upon was a veto message of some five thousand words, detailed, incorporating by reference various parts of the bill. But it is a complicated bill. I do not think the Senator will disagree with me—he knows this to be true—when I say that there are men in this body who say to us individually that they are not familiar with all the details of this bill. We have to place confidence in each other. Senator X will say, "Senator Y tells me this is a pretty good bill, and I kind of lean on him on this type of legislation, and am going along with him on it."

When it comes to the subject of forestry in my State I try to familiarize myself as best I can with forestry problems, but when I have one to handle I go to the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] who I think is one of the best informed men not only in the Senate but in the country on forestry problems. I lean very heavily on him.

I think that is what has happened in the case of the labor bill. Although there has been prolonged debate on it it has been a restricted debate so far as both participants and auditors are concerned. Those of us who have been vitally concerned with it have done most of the debating and have listened to each other, and the Senate as a whole has not listened to a great percentage of the debate because of the fact that we have been leaning on each other, as I say. But there came a veto message. I say to the Senator from Maine that there are men in the Senate who have not been going along with me on the labor bill, but on Friday afternoon they came to me and said, "It makes me scratch my head." There was one Senator who said to me—he is not here at this time, but he was present not very long ago—"There is one large segment of this veto message that covers for the most part the major points you made in your speech on June 5." I said, "That flatters me. I thought I was right then; I am convinced that I am right now." He said, "It bothers me."

I simply cite that to show that there was one Member of the Senate who, following the veto message, had become perplexed. He was not so sure that his leaning on someone else had produced the best results. When I heard such expressions of perplexity I did not give up hope that maybe a little longer debate on it, a little further consideration of the veto message, might change some votes in the Senate. I do not think I should be criticized for that. That is my responsibility and also my obligation. But I say to the Senator from Maine that I do not think that from Friday afternoon until Saturday afternoon at 5 o'clock was ample time within which to consider the veto message. Reasonable men can differ on that.

Mr. BREWSTER. Would the Senator consider it any reflection to suggest that the President of the United States, with his preoccupation with many matters, particularly at this time, and with his very broad range of responsibilities, is not perhaps himself entitled to as much respect in consideration of a matter of this kind as is the Senator from Oregon who has devoted much of his life to these problems, has had a vast experience, and has contributed very greatly to the discussion of the question, as have other Members of this body who have given much time and study to it, and as have also Members of the other House? The subject had been very thoroughly explored. I say that not to deprecate the President's work, but to inquire whether the Senator from Oregon does not feel that the subject has been rather exhaustively surveyed by men of great competence in the Congress, so that the President contributed little that was new. Is not that a fair comment?

Mr. MORSE. I want to answer the question put to me by the Senator from Maine by saying that as between my own view and that of the President on this issue, I would rather take the President's view. I think we want to give full weight and consideration to what the responsibility of that job adds to a man. I think I know that over the recent weeks the President of the United States has been deeply concerned about this issue. I do not think that the veto message represents the views of someone else. I think the veto message represents the study and the considered judgment of the President formed after he had many and prolonged conferences with the labor experts within the administration.

I would have to say, in answer to the question, that after we had weighed the views of those in Congress who had worked on the legislation, we still owed it to our President to spend more time, on a message as carefully prepared as that one, than from Friday at noon to Saturday afternoon at 5 o'clock. But there, again, that is my judgment.

Mr. BREWSTER. Would the Senator from Oregon think it at all pertinent to reconcile the President's views expressed a year ago when he desired us to enact legislation of as drastic a character as was ever proposed in this or perhaps in any other democratic body, a proposal to draft labor? What effect does that have upon the Senator's expression of his views?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Maine knows that the Senator from Oregon vigorously opposed the President of the United States on that matter. In fact, the Senator from Oregon was so shocked by the President's proposal in that instance that, as I said earlier in my speech in the wee hours of the morning, I felt that I expressed my opposition to the President's suggestion in language that was unfair to the President. I have said so on the floor of the Senate. I think the President made a terrible mistake; but I think he, as everyone else, learns by mistakes; and I think he has a better understanding of American labor problems as a result of the mistake. I think it has made him a much more careful student of American labor problems, during the intervening year.

All I say is that his veto message satisfies me that he has learned a great deal since the mistake he made in the railroad case. That is about all I can say in answer to the question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question? If he will, I shall not interrupt him again.

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the able Senator from Oregon this question: With reference to his previous statement that the only request had been to go over until Monday, does not the Senator recall that our colleague from Idaho had suggested that the matter go over until perhaps Thursday? So, when the Senator states that his request was that it go over to Monday, he was not the only one, of course, entitled to consideration under the unanimous-consent request; and does not the Senator also recall that the matter that was finally before the Senate was whether it would go over until perhaps Thursday of next week or later?

Mr. MORSE. Let me say to the Senator from California that I think it was right at that point that negotiations should have been started. I think we could have easily reconciled our differences. I recall that something to that effect was said by the Senator from Idaho; but so far as I know, we never talked it over with him, and I do not think any request was made to have the vote postponed until Thursday.

But I talked to the chairman of our conference, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]. I wish he were here at this time. I told him, in the cloakroom, that I thought something should be done to iron out this difficulty. I talked to some other Senators, too. I said I thought we were making a great mistake, and that we ought to try to understand each other in this matter.

I wish to say to the Senator from California that I think the mistake was that we should have let some Senator proceed with a speech, and all other Senators involved should have gotten into a huddle and should have started right out with the premise, "We are not going to take the adamant position that unless we can get a unanimous-consent agreement now as to Saturday, there will not be any unanimous-consent agreement at all." I think that atmosphere and that attitude were created in the Senate at the very critical time when we should have been doing some collective bargaining.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. MORSE. For a question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does not the Senator recollect, however, that so far as concerns the session which began yesterday and lasted through the night and into today, a move was not made to do that until a threat had been made on the floor of the Senate of a filibuster that might continue well into next week?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, so much has transpired, and I have been on my feet so long, that I cannot recollect every conversation. But I wish to say that if it may be done without causing me to lose the floor or lose on any ruling that I shall have made more than one speech if the Senator from California does expound further on the matter, I wish the

Senator would refresh my recollection as to who made that threat, because I wish to say to the Senator from California that, for the life of me, in standing here now and trying to think back to the last few hours, I do not know of any threat that was made.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield for a question, I think I can frame the matter as a question, so that my colleague will not lose the floor.

Mr. MORSE. I appreciate that.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Does not the Senator from Oregon recall that our able colleague, the Senator from Idaho—I do not see him in the Chamber at this time—suggested on the floor of the Senate that a filibuster—and that word was used—might be necessary in order to carry this discussion over until Thursday? Does not the Senator recall that the Senator from Idaho made mention of the fact, if the Senator from Oregon will recall—and I am sure the Senator does recall—that certain Senators were out of town, that certain Senators were expected to return shortly, but that certain other Senators had to go to the southern part of the country—to Warm Springs, I believe; and at that point he suggested—if the Senator will recollect—that it might be necessary to conduct a filibuster until Thursday?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if the Senator from California says that statement was made, his assurance is good enough for me. I must have been engaged either in a conference or in a conversation, or else I must have been out of the Chamber at that time, for I did not hear that statement made.

But I say this: After the Senator from Idaho made that statement, then, again, I think it was the basis for quick negotiations and conferences with the Senator from Idaho, because—and let us be perfectly honest about the matter—all of us know that in the heat of debate on the floor of the Senate, when things are moving at a rapid pace, many men—each one of us, as a matter of fact, and certainly the present speaker is no exception—very frequently make statements—that they wish to have quickly modified—insofar as concerns what is going to happen if such and such takes place from the standpoint of strategy.

As I have said, what the Senator from California says was said is good enough for me. If he heard it, it was said. But my point is that I do not think that justified our taking an adamant position and for saying "Very well; we are going to keep going."

I think that what we should have done would have been to get the great pacifier on the other side of the aisle, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and a few other Senators on that side of the aisle and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and the Senator from Maine and the Senator from Ohio, and the other leaders on this matter on this side of the aisle, including the Senator who objected to the proposed unanimous-consent request, to form a huddle, and then I think we could have threshed out the very reasoning we are talking about now on the floor of the Senate, almost a day later—it is not actually that much later, but it seems that way—and could have ironed out the difficulty. That is where we made our mistake. Let us be frank enough to admit it. I think we all made a mistake at that point. Something happened. One group went one way and the other group went the other, and there was no one to bring us back into wedlock. It was too bad. Let me say that it is not too late to have a unanimous-consent agreement for a vote on Monday.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Maine for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. BREWSTER. It seems entirely evident that there would be no difficulty, as I understand the Senator from Oregon, in arriving at a unanimous-consent agreement——

Mr. MORSE. There never was.

Mr. BREWSTER. So long as it complies with the specifications of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I suppose if the Senator from Maine wants to take that position, that unless the Senator from Oregon accepts the unanimous-consent agreement which was offered for a vote on Saturday at 5 o'clock, then he is guilty of taking the position that the only unanimous-consent agreement that would satisfy is a unanimous-consent agreement to vote as of the hour he fixed on Monday. But I think that ignores every point I have made as to why I think Saturday is an unreasonable day, and some hour on Monday is reasonable. I wish the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] were present, because I would rather talk about the conference I had with him. I wish the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] were present, because the Senator from Ohio would have to testify that when he came over to my desk the suggestion was at one stage for a vote on Monday at 5 o'clock, then Monday at 1 o'clock, and I said, "Bob, I think Monday at 3 is a reasonable in-between figure. Why don't we agree on Monday at 3?" I do not know what he did with that, but I surmise that when he went back and tried to sell it, he did not have any buyers.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Oregon whether or not the question as to yielding to the views of the Senator from Oregon specifically was not warranted, because he not only disagreed with the majority on Saturday, but, as I understand him now, he apparently disagreed with his own colleague on the Thursday date. He felt there was just one time which was the ideal, which was what he had picked. The Senator from Idaho, who wanted the debate to proceed very much longer, was as much out of range on the agreement as the other Senators who wanted it to go on a more limited time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I do not think that is a correct interpretation of my position; at least, it is not the position I intend to take or mean to take. I never talked with the Senator from Idaho about the matter. I will say that when I first talked with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] I thought Tuesday was a better date, because I thought that on Monday whatever reaction there was to be from the country would be observed by the Members of the Senate, for whatever value it might prove to have, so far as affecting the final vote was concerned. So I preferred Tuesday. I was willing, very early, to take a Monday figure. But the Senator from Maine is correct, that I think the only thing which made it impossible to avoid this filibuster was the position of the majority, that we had to go along with a Saturday date at 5 o'clock, and, as I have said in regard to that—and I do not ask for agreement on it, but I ask for an understanding of my position, that is all—I do not think the majority was carrying out the real spirit and intent of the unanimous consent agreement rule.

If we could not get beyond the Saturday date, I think the Senator from Maine then is perfectly correct in saying that the Senator from Oregon refused to agree, unless he could have an agreement which would take effect after the week end. That was my position; it is my position now. I shall have to continue to talk, and talk tomorrow, if the only choice is an agreement which provides for a vote of 5 o'clock this afternoon, because my honest opinion is that that is not a fair agreement.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is it within protocol for either the Senator from Oregon or myself to have a unanimous-consent agreement for the insertion in the RECORD of four editorials from the leading newspapers of Washington and New York this morning dealing with the subject of this veto?

Mr. MORSE. I shall have to address that question to the Chair, and put it in the form of a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his inquiry.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Maine wants to know whether it would be possible for us to agree to introduce into the RECORD four editorials, appearing in today's newspapers, with the unanimous-consent understanding that it would not in any way, shape, form, or manner affect the right of the Senator from Oregon to keep the floor, and to keep the position which he now occupies of being in the midst of his first speech on this question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Due to the fact that the able Senator from Maine has made the request, I do not like to object to it, but I shall be forced to do so, because I have objected to similar requests from other Senators on the floor of the Senate, and on a strict interpretation of the rules, without such unanimous consent, it would be intervening business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am sure that under those circumstances the Senator from Maine will understand I shall decline to yield.

I return to the point I was making on this hypothetical case.

Moreover, if the union believed that the working standards and jobs of its members in the entire city were threatened by the employer's action, and if it brought pressure to bear upon other employers in order to defend itself, it would be guilty of an illegal secondary boycott and subject again to all of the penalties mentioned, as well as a mandatory, immediate court injunction. And these penalties would be applied even though it turned out, a year or 2 years later, when the Board issued its final decision in the case, that the employer had deliberately transferred the work to the nonunion men in order to rid himself of the union and to provoke the strike.

I cannot believe that any fair-minded person would regard union action for that purpose and under such circumstances to be improper.

What are unions for if not to protect workingmen against that kind of treatment by employers? Nor is there anything in the present Wagner Act, so far as I can see, which would prohibit the union from taking appropriate action to protect itself and its members. Yet this bill leaves the union and its members completely helpless under the meaning given the conference amendment by the Senator from Ohio.

The supplementary analysis also attempts to defend the conference amendments that change the law with respect to the responsibility of labor unions and employers for the acts of officials or agents. The analysis states that the amendments are criticized in one breath as imposing too harsh a liability upon unions for the acts of their officers and representatives and as too mild with respect to the liability of employers for the acts of their managerial and supervisory personnel. "Of course," the analysis announces, "the definition applies equally in the responsibility imputed to both employers and labor organizations."

This attempted explanation and justification is, I believe, entirely unsound and, because of its specious reliance upon a spurious equality of treatment, even misleading. The effect of the amendment is, on one hand, to broaden the liability of labor unions, as now limited under the Norris-LaGuardia Act, and on the other hand, to narrow the liability of employers under the National Labor Relations Act, as now established by decisions of the Supreme Court. The rule of the Norris-LaGuardia Act, now changed by this bill, has its roots in years of bitter experience with the practice of some employers of hiring spies and agents provocateurs for insertion in union ranks to commit unlawful activities for which the union could be charged with responsibility in the courts The records of the La Follette committee are full of such abuses by employers and friendly courts. And the rule of responsibility of employers under the National Labor Relations Act has its firm roots in the realities of labor relations at the plant level, where the "boss" is not a distant corporation, or directors, or officers, but the foreman. No justification is shown for changing either of these sound rules of responsibility, now contained in the law.

A third comment contained in the supplementary analysis, which I believe is also specious and misleading, is that with reference to the free speech amendment of section 8 (c) of the conference bill. It is stated that the critics of the provision—including myself—are in error when they say that the prohibition against using expressions of opinion would prevent the Board from applying ordinary rules of evidence in its proceedings, and that it goes much further even than the rules with respect to admissibility in a criminal or civil trial. These critics overlook, the analysis asserts, the facts that the privilege of this subsection is limited to expressions of views, arguments, or opinions, and that it has no application to statements which are acts in themselves or contain directions or instructions.

Frankly, it embarrasses me to comment on statements like that, because I do not believe that they are intended to convey the meaning which, by interpretation, they may appear to convey. I think we ought to be perfectly candid with one another. Everybody knows that so far as an employee is concerned there may be very little difference between his employer's views, arguments, or opinions about unions and his instructions or directions. Anything an employer says can be couched in terms of views, arguments, or opinions. Yet in actual practice, the employee may well treat his statements as instructions or directions, depending on surrounding circumstances. And how can one draw a realistic line between statements of opinion which are acts and those which are not? I can only say that the effect of this bit of ex post facto clarification of the legislative history is to leave me hopelessly confused. But I do not think it will operate to diminish any of the serious consequences I see in this provision.

Another clarifying item in the supplementary analysis to which I must address myself is the attempt to justify the conference amendment to section 10 (c), pursuant to which trial examiners' recommended orders automatically become the Board's order if no exceptions are filed within 20 days. Critics of this provision, including myself, have pointed out that this would permit unsuccessful litigants to bypass the Board and go directly to the courts without giving the Board an opportunity to correct error of the trial examiner. The supplementary analysis attempts to meet this criticism by asserting, first, that this could not happen because section 10 (c) provides that "No objection that has not been urged before the Board, its member, agent, or agency, shall be considered by the court"; that, in any event, the attorney trying the case would presumably file exceptions; and, finally, that the general counsel would not go forward with enforcement if the order was erroneous.

Again, I can only express my concern at the specious and, in my opinion, irrelevant character of the comment. Here, again, we have an answer that seems plausible on its face, but, in my opinion, is found to be beside the point when its surface is scratched. In the first place, the case assumed in the criticism of the provision was one in which the objection had been made before the trial examiner, who had ruled erroneously. Accordingly section 10 (c) would appear to be complied with, even though the objection was not renewed by exceptions before the Board, for the objection would have been one that had been urged before an agent of the Board. That is all that section 10 (c) seems on it face to require.

Secondly, it is assumed by the criticism that the unsuccessful attorney desired to reverse the Board in the courts without giving the Board itself opportunity to correct the error, and the successful attorney could hardly be expected to or be in a position to file exceptions to a decision in his favor. Finally, it is entirely irrelevant to assert that the Board's general counsel would not proceed with enforcement, since the point of the criticism is that the unsuccessful private litigant would seek judicial review in order to set the order aside.

Still other confusing and even irrelevant statements made in the supplementary analysis have to do with my criticism of the amendments to sections 8 (d) and 7 of the conference bill. In answer to my point that section 8 (d) undesirably weakens collective bargaining when it redefines the duty to bargain during the term of a contract, the analysis replies in substance that the parties still may meet voluntarily and discuss changes in the contract, but that it is not an unfair labor practice for them to refuse to do so.

That is the crux of the matter. In fact, all through the bill, Mr. President, we see time after time rights of form but not of substance given to the worker.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; for a question.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to ask for information. The part of the bill that concerns me is the prohibition of expenditures for political purposes. I hold in my hand——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

Mr. AIKEN. It is going to be a question. I can assure the Senator I am seeking information. I want the right to ask——

Mr. MORSE. I know the Senator does, but he does not know how careful I have to be.

Mr. AIKEN. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. MORSE. Ask the question. The whole thing must be a question.

Mr. AIKEN. Let me ask this question, Mr. President. How in the world am I ever going to find out what I want to know if I cannot ask a question?

Mr. MORSE. That is what bothers me.

Mr. AIKEN. I am sure no one on this floor will deny that it is a question when he hears it.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator may think so, Mr. President.

Mr. AIKEN. Perhaps I can get some of the proponents of the bill to answer the question.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont has not been in the Chamber recently and heard some of the exchanges which have taken place. If he were in my position, I am sure he would understand why I am exercising the great degree of care I am obliged to exercise. I wonder if he will not prepare a question to ask both the proponents and some of us who oppose the bill, and present his question to such Senators in the cloakroom.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, may I address the Chair long enough to say that that is exactly what I want to do.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if the Senator is making a parliamentary inquiry——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know that it is in the form of a parliamentary inquiry. I want to tell the Chair that what I intended to do was to ask both proponents and opponents of the bill the same question, but not in the cloakroom, because I want the answer on the record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

Mr. MORSE. I may say, because I want to be of assistance to the Senator from Vermont, that if he will write out his question and hand it to me and his statement in explanation of his question, I will read it, and I will answer it if I can answer it. But I am not going to take any chances of losing the floor, because I still think we can win this fight.

Repeating the paragraph, Mr. President, still other confusing and even irrelevant statements made in the supplemental analysis have to do with my criticism of the amendments to sections 8 (d) and 7 of the conference bill. In answer to my point that section 8 (d) undesirably weakens collective bargaining when it redefines the duty to bargain during the term of a contract, the analysis replies in substance that the parties still may meet voluntarily and discuss changes in the contract, but that it is not an unfair labor practice for them to refuse to do so. But the point of my criticism is, that we undesirably dilute and water down collective bargaining when we tell labor and management that if they have a contract they are not under any legal obligation to discuss changes in its provisions that will take effect during its term; and that they may engage in strikes, lock-outs, or lawsuits instead.

That is not going to produce labor peace. That is not going to promote the objective which I think the great majority of the people of the country want us to accomplish, namely, the objective of passing legislation which will promote industrial harmony, which will encourage the settlement of disputes through good faith collective bargaining, which will provide collective and workable procedure for the peaceful solution of disputes. That is not done, Mr. President, when there is set up a procedure such as I think has been set up in this measure, and in accordance with the point I have just made, that the real alternative is not collective bargaining at all under the provision, but the engaging in strikes and lock-outs or lawsuits instead.

Industry and labor had voluntary collective bargaining even before the Labor Relations Act. But my notion of the act is that its purpose was to make it legally compelling for the parties to bargain; that it was designed to foster, protect and encourage collective bargaining as a stubstitute for strikes and lock-outs. This amendment does not conform to that purpose; it contradicts it. I think it would be far better if the sponsors of the bill, who advocate such a provision, admitted frankly that it has that purpose and effect, and attempted to explain why they thought it was desirable to make the change. The bill would at least be less confusing, it would be subject to less misinterpretation, and it would be much less litigious.

The same point can be made of the comment in the analysis in answer to my objection to the amendment to section 7 of the conference bill, writing into the law a national policy to protect the right to refrain from collective bargaining. Of course, it is true, as the analysis says, that this is already the law and that the Board has so interpreted the present act. But the point is, that writing such a policy into the statute designed to encourage collective bargaining, will only confuse administration of the law, weaken its protections, and give lawyers and antiunion employers a handy tool with which to try to defeat union organizational campaigns.

I do not intend to catalogue all of the difficulties and the confusion I have with the various analyses and explanations of the bill. The examples I have given are enough, I think, to show how tortured the search for the correct meaning and effect of this bill will be if it becomes law.

These subtle legalisms, adroit arguments, and ambiguous words are suitable for lawyers; they are the currency of those who speak for special interests in advocacy of their causes. But businessmen and workers do not talk that language. They need candor and frankness, a belief in the sincerity and good faith of one another, a conviction that neither is out "to put one over" on the other. They need trust and fairness in their dealings. That is the way labor relations and collective bargaining operate; and it is the only way they can operate in a free democracy.

This bill is the very antithesis of fairness and candor. It puts all the cards under the table or up the sleeve of the lawyers for both parties. Such legislation will never receive my vote.

In closing this part of my speech, I must say that to me this is a tragic moment in American industrial history. I think we had a great opportunity. I think we still have a great opportunity in this session of Congress—perhaps an unparalleled one—to do something good and constructive. We had a great opportunity to write a fair, reasonable law, to improve collective bargaining, and to promote industrial peace. The whole country was looking to us, to the Republican Party, to correct and improve our industrial relations, in accordance with a sound party program. But I think, so far, Mr. President, we as a party holding majority control in the Eightieth Congress have muffed that wonderful opportunity; and I think it is a great and tragic loss for all Americans and for the economic stability and prosperity of our country.

Mr. President, it is not too late to recover the ball. It is not too late to make a touchdown in this game of industrial relations. It means that the Republican majority in this session of Congress must raise its sights. It must change its method of play. It must keep its eyes on the ball.

We must not be misled by certain elements in the cheering section, because I fear there are elements in the cheering section who are cheering when we muff the ball, because they want us to muff the ball. We can pass some good labor legislation if we have the will and the determination to do what it takes to pass it. As I said earlier in this speech, we can pass it in 10 days. We can pass it by sustaining this veto message and going to work at once, resubmitting to the committee separate pieces of legislation on the vital issues which are involved in the whole question of improved labor relations.

It is not going to require a considerable amount of time to get this bill back on the floor of the Senate. I think we can get it out of the Congress and into the White House, if we have the will to do it, on the basis of the rich experience we have had on labor legislation thus far in this session of Congress. I say I think we can do it in a period of 10 days; and I think we should do it. I think it is our obligation to do it.

Mr. President, in one letter which I have written on the problem of our responsibility to pass legislation I said this, after discussing procedural defects in the bill, as I pointed them out in my June 5 speech:

> In view of these procedural defects in the bill, I am at a complete loss to understand your support of the bill. To date I have read nothing on the bill except very weak rationalizations of what I consider are unsound procedural provisions. You make the point that the only choice there is is between this bill or no bill at all. Of course, you know better than that.
>
> I think that is the same line the Republican leaders in this session of Congress have been telling the American people. It is based upon what appears to me is subject to the interpretation of being a political threat that if the President does not let them have their way by signing the type of antilabor bill they want, they will sulk in their tents and pass no labor legislation at all. If this undesirable bill should be vetoed—

I wrote this letter before the veto—

> and I hope it will—and if enough Senators take the time to study its bad features and thereafter vote to sustain a veto, and I feel they could—a new and fair labor bill could be passed through the Congress within 10 days thereafter. That is, it could if the Republican leaders of this Congress are willing to put partisan politics aside long enough to serve the best interests of all the people of the country.
>
> Your argument that the defects in this bill can be corrected by the joint Senate-House

committee some time in the future is a very unsound premise on the basis of which to ask Members of Congress who are trying to do a conscientious job in the public interest to vote for any piece of legislation. In my judgment, no Member of Congress can justify hiding behind the face-saving rationalization you offer him because this bill is absolutely unsound and procedurally unworkable.

I wrote that, Mr. President, before the President's veto message was received, and I am very happy to find that my observation is shared also by him.

The letter continues as follows:

From the moment of its enactment great injustices to the legitimate rights of both labor and industry will start to accrue. No Member of Congress has any right to vote for a piece of legislation which is so imperfect that even its proponents admit its serious imperfections before it is passed—by attempting to justify their wrongdoing by standing up on the floor of the Senate, or by writing editorials based on the rationalization that some time in the future the injustices of the law should be corrected by modifications and amendments. Obviously it is the duty of Congress to pass sound legislation in the first place.

Those Members of Congress who are attempting to alibi for the serious, known defects and injustices of the Taft-Hartley bill should not be aided and abetted. The legislative principle you have adopted in your attempt to front for this legislation is so destructive of a sound legislative process that I hope you will not apply it generally to all legislation which comes before the Congress.

In the ordinary course of events the Congress will pass plenty of legislation with imperfections in it of which its Members are not aware at the time of passage, and which imperfections necessarily will need correcting in the future. However, in the name of good government it cannot pass legislation which it knows in advance is full of serious imperfections and gross injustices, and then try to excuse itself to the American people on the basis of the alibi that it provided within the bill for a committee to study the administration of the act and make recommendations in the future. Such a run-out isn't going to provide any comfort or protection to those unions and workers whose legitimate economic rights will be weakened or destroyed by anti-labor employers who are given such great advantages by the Taft-Hartley bill.

Such a postponement of correcting the many injustices which are inherent in this bill is not going to promote good employer-employee relations in this country. Right now is the time to pass labor legislation which does not include the injustices and imperfections of the Taft-Hartley bill. Right now is the time for the Republican leadership of the Republican majority in the Eightieth Congress to pass sound labor legislation so necessary to check labor and employer abuses.

Right now is the time for all great newspapers to make a fight for sound legislation, and to rationalize legislation which admittedly has serious imperfections in it.

Mr. President, I ask the Official Reporter to include in the RECORD only the parts of the letter I have just read, in accordance with the corrections and modifications I have made as I have gone along in reading it. I say that because I want the Official Reporter to understand that I do not want the name of the recipient of the letter to be shown in the RECORD, and also I made certain changes in reading the letter as I went along, which I am sure are made clear in the reporter's notes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in full in the RECORD?

Mr. MORSE. No, Mr. President, I do not want the letter to be printed in full. I am simply telling the Official Reporter that I have handed him the letter. I do not mean to have the letter printed in full in the RECORD. I simply have handed the letter to the reporter, for I thought it might be helpful to him to have the letter in his possession as he prepared the RECORD. But I wish to make clear to him that I made corrections as I read the letter, and I also wish to make clear to him that I did not mention the recipient of the letter. I think the Chair is quite correct, namely, that my statement sounded as if I wanted the entire letter printed in the RECORD. However, that is not my desire. I simply want the Official Reporter to understand that I wish him to put in the RECORD the verbatim statement I made, which he has reported in his notes. But I think he will find the letter helpful to him in going over his notes.

Mr. President, under date of June 20, yesterday, I received a copy of a letter which was sent to my good friend the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. The letter is signed by Mrs. Anna Lord Strauss, president of the League of Women Voters, with an office in Washington, D. C. I think she is known to most of us. I think her high standing and her objective attitude and her desire to have the Congress enact only legislation which will be in the public interest are also well known to us. I shall read this letter into the RECORD.

Mr. President, first let me make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. I do not wish to seem always to be seeking advance rulings but I am going to read these communications, and my parliamentary inquiry is as follows: If I ask to have anything which is before me inserted in the RECORD, I shall have to obtain unanimous consent to that effect, and then I may be likely to get in trouble, may I not, on the ground that I am asking to have new business transacted, and some Senator will be able to object and have his objection sustained, and then I shall find myself in the position of being on my way to making a second speech?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the opinion of the Chair, the Senator would run that risk if he made such a request.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Chair. I almost got caught that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is not trying to catch the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Oh, no, not the Chair. I would not say such a thing of the present occupant of the chair. I have nothing but love for the present occupant of the chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair is very appreciative.

Mr. MORSE. I know he will always try to give me fair and impartial treatment under the rules.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair will try to do so.

Mr. MORSE. And I have nothing but love and affection for the other Senators around me, too; but I know that some of them will try to catch me just the same. [Laughter.]

So, Mr. President, I think I had better read the letter, rather than run any risk:

DEAR SENATOR BARKLEY: In connection with the discussion of the Taft-Hartley labor bill (H. R. 3020), may I point out the following very serious aspect of one of its provisions which so far as we know has received no attention.

Mr. President, I digress from the letter long enough to say that I do not think that should surprise Mrs. Strauss. I imagine that there is quite a great deal in the bill that has not yet received any consideration. As the years pass by, if this bill becomes law, I think the lawyers will find newer and newer aspects of the bill which will receive, because of their diligent research, the serious consideration of a number of courts.

But, Mr. President, going back to the letter, Mrs. Strauss says further.

Section 304 of the bill forbids any corporation or any labor union to make a contribution or expenditure in connection with Presidential or congressional primaries or elections. The league has taken no position on the labor bill, either pro or con. However, we are informed by lawyers and experts who have worked on the legislation that this provision would apply to incorporated organizations such as the League of Women Voters. I am sure you are familiar with the nonpartisan election material, designed to stimulate a larger and more informed vote, which the league has been issuing for the past 27 years. This type of activity, which we consider of vital importance to the maintenance of a participating electorate, would, we understand, be prohibited by this section of the bill. This would affect not only the League of Women Voters but all other incorporated civic groups who have been accustomed to providing roll calls and other election tools for the benefit of the voter who seeks to cast an intelligent ballot.

We hope you may be able to point out to the Senate the extremely serious consequences which can emerge from such a stifling of our rights as active citizens.

Mr. President, I do not know whether she is right or wrong. I have not seen the letter before, and I have not taken time to study the problem she raises. But if she is right it is a rather serious situation, and of course it involves something that would have to be corrected. We shall certainly hear about it if she is right.

Mr. President, this little parliamentary situation is all over the President's veto message, and it all comes about because a majority insisted on a unanimous consent agreement to vote on the bill at 5 o'clock this afternoon.

Some of us felt that the request, under all the circumstances, was unreasonable, and I objected to it, although had I not objected, others would have.

I have already given my main reasons as to why I objected, but I wish to repeat that probably along with my reason that the President should have been shown what I consider to be a greater degree of consideration than the unanimous-consent agreement request for a vote at 5 o'clock today did show to him, was the reason that I do not think that under the unanimous-consent rule a ma-

jority should force its will upon the minority under such circumstances as are present in this case.

As I said earlier this afternoon, I think that when that rule was put into the rule book, it was for the purpose of guaranteeing the minority that no action was going to be taken or could be taken, under just such circumstances as those which are present in this particular case, unless all agreed. I think that is why the rule was adopted. I do not think it was put into the book with tongue in cheek. I do not think the propounders of the rule sought to protect the minority with the one hand and snatch their rights away with the other. I do not think the propounders of the rule had in mind that when the majority could not get unanimous consent, then it should consider itself perfectly free to drive the minority into a unanimous-consent agreement by forcing it either to accept the agreement or start a filibuster.

I cannot believe that. I think they were much more considerate of the minority. I think that rule was adopted, among other reasons, for the purpose of enabling the Senate to expedite its business by unanimous consent. That is why I think it was adopted. I do not think it was put into effect for the purpose of enabling a dominant majority to expedite the business of the Senate by saying to the minority, in effect, "You either accept this unanimous-consent agreement or start talking."

It is not reasonable to think that any such motivation or intent could have been entertained in the minds of those who wrote the rule book from period to period, in the interest of making this an effective and efficient parliamentary body, whereby the majority could transact business, but within reasonable restraints which protect minority interests.

There are other ways of doing business. It can be done by motion, and there are a great many other ways within the rule book, but for purposes of expedition and speeding up it was provided that the rules could be set aside by unanimous consent. I think it was a rule based upon a gentleman's understanding and agreement. That is the way I like to think about it. But, Mr. President, I think it is being abused; I think it is being terribly abused in this instance, and I think that if we do not show up anything else in this debate, we are going to add another chapter to the record in support of the argument that we need some revision of our rules so as to protect against abuse, including the abuse of filibustering, including the abuse of the unanimous-consent agreement.

We do not get an efficient, smoothly operating Senate out of following parliamentary practices and procedures which did not stem from a good faith, friendly, cooperative comity relationship between each other. That is what hurts me so much about this particular battle, Mr. President. That is what so deeply grieves me, because we are not together, on what I think is a clear objective of the rules. Surely there come times in the life of a parliamentary body when the lines of difference are so deeply drawn that the strictest application of the rules must be followed; but certainly not a time so short after the presentation of a veto message as was the case in this instance. But, along with this point of mine, I think—and again I present my views, and I reflect on no one; at least intentionally or meaningly—I think we have done violence to the unanimous-consent agreement rule in this case. I think violence was done to it when the majority took the position we had to vote Saturday afternoon or we were going into continuous session. I am sorry the majority did that. Something tells me that from down deep in the hearts of certain of my very good friends on the majority side, a message is going to their consciences, telling them that it would have been a great deal better if they had not been so insistent upon enforcing their technical power. I do not say rights, Mr. President, because I really am inclined to deny that, within the meaning of the rule, the right really exists; but the power to do what they are doing clearly is present; and because I know them to be fair-minded men, I have a hunch that already they know to their own satisfaction, even though they may defend their position " 'till the cows come home," as we used to say when I was a kid, I think they know that they are rather hard on the minority in this instance. But this, like other things, will pass, and we shall be working together again. Next time, as so characteristic of the Senate, we shall all be jumbled up, so far as alinements are concerned, and they will probably let their hair down, and I will, too, and we will admit what I tried to point out here a few minutes ago, that we did not engage in enough collective bargaining before we got into this mess. Of course, Senators know how it is. In the midst of a parliamentary battle, someone begins to see some great principle involved, and someone feels, as one Senator apparently felt when he talked to me today in the cloakroom, that "we have got to break you on this; we will break you if it takes to Monday morning." I do not know whether they are breaking us or not. I do not know what is meant by "breaking us."

Mr. LUCAS entered the Chamber.

Mr. MORSE. There is the Senator from Illinois. I am glad to see him.

Mr. LUCAS bowed his acknowledgment.

Mr. MORSE. May I say that I hope the Senator from Illinois will proceed to give very careful consideration to what has transpired since he was last in the Senate Chamber. Knowing him to be a man of great fairness, and also a determined fighter for the rights of the minority, in the Senate of the United States, perhaps after he catches up on the transactions of the Senate since he left, tomorrow morning about 4 o'clock I can get some help from the Senator from Illinois. I do not know of anyone, Mr. President, I would rather hear on this subject, about 4 o'clock tomorrow morning, than the Senator from Illinois.

Now, Mr. President, as I was saying, I think we are going to come out on this all right.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. LUCAS. In view of the fact that the Senator from Illinois has been away, may I inquire of my able friend how long he has been speaking?

Mr. MORSE. I would not know. [Laughter.] Will the Chair inform the Senator how long I have been speaking?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It seems like a couple of weeks to the chair. [Laughter.]

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. First, I should like to say to my good friend, the senior Senator from Michigan, who now occupies the chair, that if he feels that way now I wonder what his feeling will be about Monday morning?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Simply numb, about that time. [Laughter.]

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is advised that the Senator from Oregon has been speaking 7 hours and about 50 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. That is not long enough.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is a matter of opinion.

Will the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. MORSE. For a question only, Mr. President.

Mr. FERGUSON. Having been advised by the Chair of the length of time the Senator has been speaking, can he advise the Senate as to how long he will continue to speak?

Mr. MORSE. No; I cannot. I have a glass of milk here which I am going to drink. I am very fond of milk, and it has a very invigorating effect on me. [Laughter.] I do not know what might happen after I drink it. I shall wait for a few whispered instructions from certain of my colleagues, in the course of another hour or so. I may then be able to answer the Senator's question.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. MORSE. For a question, Mr. President.

Mr. LUCAS. In view of the fact that the distinguished President pro tempore has stated that it seems as though it has been 2 weeks that the Senator from Oregon has been talking, as a premise for the Senator's reply as to how long he might talk, can he give us any notion as to how long he might talk, in view of the statement made by the distinguished President pro tempore?

Mr. MORSE. It pains me very much to know that my friend from Michigan is suffering any fatigue as the result of my talking, because I think that is implied in his remarks. I do not blame him at all. He ought to be down here doing this job. He knows something about fatigue. I think I will talk for—oh, I cannot say.

I do not know, Mr. President, whether all Members of the Senate have been able to study and restudy and examine and reexamine the President's message, but that is what this battle is about. I think we ought to pause to reflect on it

from time to time. So, Mr. President—I had better make, first, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. There is nothing in the rules, is there, that would prevent my reading the President's veto message and commenting on it as I go along, even though it has already been read once into the RECORD by the clerk?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is quite safe in doing that.

Mr. MORSE. I want to reemphasize the message and call renewed attention to its provisions, because I have such great difficulty in seeing how people can study that message and not recognize that every presumption should be rendered in its favor, and vote to sustain it, and then get busy in the Congress in passing new legislation that will meet the objections that are raised in the message.

Thus, the President said to us in his veto message:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 3020, the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947.

I am fully aware of the gravity which attaches to the exercise by the President of his constitutional power to withold his approval from an enactment of the Congress.

I share with the Congress the conviction that legislation dealing with the relations between management and labor is necessary. I heartily condemn abuses on the part of unions and employers, and I have no patience with stubborn insistence on private advantage to the detriment of the public interest.

But this bill is far from a solution of those problems.

When one penetrates the complex, interwoven provisions of this omnibus bill, and understands the real meaning of its various parts, the result is startling.

The bill taken as a whole would reverse the basic direction of our national labor policy, inject the Government into private economic affairs on an unprecedented scale, and conflict with important principles of our democratic society. Its provisions would cause more strikes, not fewer. It would contribute neither to industrial peace nor to economic stability and progress. It would be a dangerous stride in the direction of a totally managed economy. It contains seeds of discord which would plague this Nation for years to come.

Because of the far-reaching import of this bill, I have weighed its probable effects against a series of fundamental considerations. In each case I find that the bill violates principles essential to our public welfare.

I. The first major test which I have applied to this bill is whether it would result in more or less Government intervention in our economic life.

Our basic national policy has always been to establish by law standards of fair dealing and then to leave the working of the economic system to the free choice of individuals. Under that policy of economic freedom we have built our Nation's productive strength. Our people have deep faith in industrial self-government with freedom of contract and free collective bargaining.

I find that this bill is completely contrary to that national policy of economic freedom. It would require the Government, in effect, to become an unwanted participant at every bargaining table. It would establish by law limitations on the terms of every bargaining agreement, and nullify thousands of agreements mutually arrived at and satisfactory to the parties. It would inject the Government deeply into the process by which employers and workers reach agreement. It would superimpose bureaucratic procedures on the free decisions of local employers and employees.

At a time when we are determined to remove, as rapidly as practicable, Federal controls established during the war, this bill would involve the Government in the free processes of our economic system to a degree unprecedented in peacetime.

This is a long step toward the settlement of economic issues by Government dictation. It is an indication that industrial relations are to be determined in the Halls of Congress and that political power is to supplant economic power as the critical factor in labor relations.

II. The second basic test against which I have measured this bill is whether it would improve human relations between employers and their employees.

Cooperation cannot be achieved by force of law. We cannot create mutual respect and confidence by legislative fiat.

From a literary standpoint those are two beautiful sentences. In addition, they represent a great truth which we Members of Congress and the people of this country should never forget. Says the President:

Cooperation cannot be achieved by force of law. We cannot create mutual respect and confidence by legislative fiat.

The President continues:

I am convinced that this legislation overlooks the significance of these principles. It would encourage distrust, suspicion, and arbitrary attitudes.

I find that the National Labor Relations Act would be converted from an instrument with the major purpose of protecting the right of workers to organize and bargain collectively into a maze of pitfalls and complex procedures. As a result of these complexities employers and workers would find new barriers to mutual understanding.

The bill time and again would remove the settlement of differences from the bargaining table to courts of law. Instead of learning to live together, employers and unions are invited to engage in costly, time-consuming litigation, inevitably embittering both parties.

The Congress has, I think, paid too much attention to the inevitable frictions and difficulties incident to the reconversion period. It has ignored the unmistakable evidence that those difficulties are receding and that labor-management cooperation is constantly improving. There is grave danger that this progress would be nullified through enactment of this legislation.

III. A third basic test is whether the bill is workable.

There is little point in putting laws on the books unless they can be executed. I have concluded that this bill would prove to be unworkable. The so-called emergency procedure for critical Nation-wide strikes would require an immense amount of Government effort but would result almost inevitably in failure. The National Labor Relations Board would be given many new tasks, and hobbled at every turn in attempting to carry them out. Unique restrictions on the Board's procedures would so greatly increase the backlog of unsettled cases that the parties might be driven to turn in despair from peaceful procedures to economic force.

IV. The fourth basic test by which I have measured this bill is the test of fairness.

The bill prescribes unequal penalties for the same offense. It would require the National Labor Relations Board to give priority to charges against workers over related charges against employers. It would discriminate against workers by arbitrarily penalizing them for all critical strikes.

Much has been made of the claim that the bill is intended simply to equalize the positions of labor and management. Careful analysis shows that this claim is unfounded. Many of the provisions of the bill standing alone seem innocent, but, considered in relation to each other, reveal a consistent pattern of inequality.

The failure of the bill to meet these fundamental tests is clearly demonstrated by a more detailed consideration of its defects.

1. The bill would substantially increase strikes.

(1) It would discourage the growing willingness of unions to include "no strike" provisions in bargaining agreements, since any labor organization signing such an agreement would expose itself to suit for contract violation if any of its members engaged in an unauthorized "wildcat" strike.

(2) It would encourage strikes by imposing highly complex and burdensome reporting requirements on labor organizations which wish to avail themselves of their rights under the National Labor Relations Act. In connection with these reporting requirements, the bill would penalize unions for any failure to comply, no matter how inconsequential, by denying them all rights under the act. These provisions, which are irrelevant to the major purposes of the bill, seem peculiarly designed to place obstacles in the way of labor organizations which wish to appeal to the National Labor Relations Board for relief, and thus to impel them to strike or take other direct action.

(3) It would bring on strikes by depriving significant groups of workers of the right they now enjoy to organize and to bargain under the protection of law. For example, broad groups of employees who for purposes of the act would be classed as supervisors would be removed from the protection of the act. Such groups would be prevented from using peaceful machinery and would be left no option but the use of economic force.

(4) The bill would force unions to strike or to boycott if they wish to have a jurisdictional dispute settled by the National Labor Relations Board. This peculiar situation results from the fact that the Board is given authority to determine jurisdictional disputes over assignment of work only after such disputes have been converted into strikes or boycotts.

In addition to these ways in which specific provisions of the bill would lead directly to strikes, the cumulative effect of many of its other provisions which disrupt established relationships would result in industrial strife and unrest.

2. The bill arbitrarily decides, against the workers, certain issues which are normally the subject of collective bargaining, and thus restricts the area of voluntary agreement.

(1) The bill would limit the freedom of employers and labor organizations to agree on methods of developing responsibility on the part of unions by establishing union security. While seeming to preserve the right to agree to the union shop, it would place such a multitude of obstacles in the way of such agreement that union security and responsibility would be largely canceled.

In this respect, the bill disregards the voluntary developments in the field of industrial relations in the United States over the past 150 years. Today over 11,000,000 workers are employed under some type of union-security contract. The great majority of the plants which have such union-security provisions have had few strikes. Employers in such plants are generally strong supporters of some type of union security, since it gives them a greater measure of stability in production.

(2) The bill would limit the freedom of employers and employees to establish and maintain welfare funds. It would prescribe

arbitrary methods of administering them and rigidly limit the purposes for which they may be used. This is an undesirable intrusion by the Government into an important matter which should be the subject of private agreement between employers and employees.

(3) The bill presents the danger that employers and employees might be prohibited from agreeing on safety provisions, rest-period rules, and many other legitimate practices, since such practices may fall under the language defining "feather bedding."

3. The bill would expose employers to numerous hazards by which they could be annoyed and hampered.

(1) The bill would invite frequent disruption of continuous plant production by opening up immense possibilities for many more elections, and adding new types of elections. The bill would invite electioneering for changes in representatives and for union security. This would harass employers in their production efforts and would generate raiding and jurisdictional disputes. The National Labor Relations Board has been developing sound principles of stability on these matters. The bill would overturn these principles to the detriment of employers.

(2) The bill would complicate the collective bargaining process for employers by permitting—and in some cases requiring—the splitting up of stable patterns of representation. Employers would be harassed by having to deal with many small units. Labor organizations would be encouraged to engage in constant interunion warfare, which could result only in confusion.

(3) The bill would invite unions to sue employers in the courts regarding the thousands of minor grievances which arise every day over the interpretation of bargaining agreements. Employers are likely to be besieged by a multiplicity of minor suits, since management necessarily must take the initiative in applying the terms of agreements. In this respect, the bill ignores the fact that employers and unions are in wide agreement that the interpretation of the provisions of bargaining agreements should be submitted to the processes of negotiation ending in voluntary arbitration, under penalties prescribed in the agreement itself. This is one of the points on which the national labor-management conference in November 1945 placed special emphasis. In introducing damage suits as a possible substitute for grievance machinery, the bill rejects entirely the informed wisdom of those experienced in labor relations.

(4) The bill would prevent an employer from freely granting a union-shop contract, even where he and virtually his entire working force were in agreement as to its desirability. He would be required to refrain from agreement until the National Labor Relations Board's work load permitted it to hold an election—in this case simply to ratify an unquestioned and legitimate agreement.

Employers, moreover, would suffer because the ability of unions to exercise responsibility under bargaining agreements would be diminished. Labor organizations whose disciplinary authority is weakened cannot carry their full share of maintaining stability of production.

4. The bill would deprive workers of vital protection which they now have under the law.

(1) The bill would make it easier for an employer to get rid of employees whom he wanted to discharge because they exercised their right of self-organization guaranteed by the act. It would permit an employer to dismiss a man on the pretext of a slight infraction of shop rules, even though his real motive was to discriminate against this employee for union activity.

(2) The bill would also put a powerful new weapon in the hands of employers by permitting them to initiate elections at times strategically advantageous to them. It is significant that employees on economic strike who may have been replaced are denied a vote. An employer could easily thwart the will of his employees by raising a question of representation at a time when the union was striking over contract terms.

(3) It would give employers the means to engage in endless litigation, draining the energy and resources of unions in court actions, even though the particular charges were groundless.

(4) It would deprive workers of the power to meet the competition of goods produced under sweatshop conditions by permitting employers to halt every type of secondary boycott, not merely those for unjustifiable purposes.

(5) It would reduce the responsibility of employers for unfair labor practices committed in their behalf. The effect of the bill is to narrow unfairly employer liability for antiunion acts and statements made by persons who, in the eyes of the employees affected, act and speak for management, but who may not be "agents" in the strict legal sense of that term.

(6) At the same time it would expose unions to suits for acts of violence, wildcat strikes and other actions, none of which were authorized or ratified by them. By employing elaborate legal doctrine, the bill applies a superficially similar test of responsibility for employers and unions—each would be responsible for the acts of his "agents." But the power of an employer to control the acts of his subordinates is direct and final. This is radically different from the power of unions to control the acts of their members—who are, after all, members of a free association.

3. The bill abounds in provisions which would be unduly burdensome or actually unworkable.

(1) The bill would erect an unworkable administrative structure for carrying out the National Labor Relations Act. The bill would establish, in effect, an independent general counsel and an independent Board. But it would place with the Board full responsibility for investigating and determining election cases—over 70 percent of the present case load—and at the same time would remove from the Board the authority to direct and control the personnel engaged in carrying out this responsibility.

Earlier in my speech, Mr. President, I pointed out what I considered to be the very dangerous implications of the section of the bill which gives sweeping and independent powers to the general counsel. I said than, in effect, that I was pleased that the President, too, had emphasized this particular point. I wish to emphasize it again. I repeat that I think it is highly dangerous to give to one mere man the tremendous power which this bill places at the disposal and under the jurisdiction of the general counsel of the new and revised National Labor Relations Board.

The language of the section condemns it. I do not know where we will find this superman in all America to be trusted with the arbitrary and highly discretionary power to say to American workers and employers, "I, and I alone, will determine whether or not a complaint shall issue in this case."

Mr. President, I have studied that section; I have tried to read it backwards and forwards and crosswise; I have tried to convince myself that I must be wrong, that it does not say what it seems to say; I have talked with other lawyers about it, and I am aghast that the Congress, within this democracy, would place such arbitrary and sweeping powers over the economic destiny of workers, and employers as well. It says he shall have this power independent of the Board.

Oh, I suppose a fight could be made alleging in some case that he was guilty of gross malfeasance in office, or guilty of capricious and arbitrary action, the type of action which is brought against a Federal judge or other Government official sometimes; but that is not the point. The point is not whether by going around some legalistic barn we could find a door somewhere, and entering it, take away some of the power of this general counsel. That is not the point. The point the President makes is that the general counsel would "decide, without any right of appeal by employers and employees, whether charges were to be heard by the Board, and whether orders of the Board were to be referred to the court for enforcement. By virtue of this unlimited authority, a single administrative official might usurp the Board's responsibility for establishing policy under the act."

I do not see how that conclusion can be escaped. I think the general counsel is charged with the responsibility of doing that very thing. We say to him, "You shall act independently of the Board." What right has he, under that language, to go to the Board and say, "Now, you determine what the policy shall be." If he did that, Mr. President, in my opinion he would not be carrying out the powers we specifically and unequivocally give him in that language.

In this country, throughout our history, we have beeen surrounding public officials, and rightly so, with checks against arbitrary power. Why establish in this bill, Mr. President, a different principle? If we do, in other bills the precedent will be followed.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I cannot hear the speaker.

Mr. MORSE. I have missed the Senator from Indiana most of the afternoon. I am very glad he has returned.

Mr. JENNER. I am a nice man. [Laughter.]

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Indiana is a nice man, and I am very fond of him. I have worked with him on the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and he has been a splendid colleague on that committee. It goes to show that one may agree with a colleague in the Senate on some issues, and disagree with him on others. By and large, the Senator and I are pretty much in agreement in the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs. There are some minor differences. On the particular legislation we are now considering we are apparently poles apart. Nevertheless, I am very much complimented whenever the Senator from Indiana comes on the floor while I am speaking. I consider it a great personal tribute.

I was trying to convey the thought that so far as the particular section of the bill is concerned to which I have just referred, I think in this period of troubled times and conditions, internal and external, we must watch out lest the pattern be established in public thinking that these problems can be settled by some man, that what we need to do is to put the power in some individual and let him go to work on it, let him issue the orders, and let him make the decisions and checks, and our problems will be solved.

I do not want to labor the point, and I do not want to exaggerate it, but I shall not run away from what I think at this hour in the life of America is a very definite trend, that is, that there is already too much of a tendency in the United States to delegate arbitrary and discretionary and capricious power over the welfare of all our people to mere individual men.

I do not know where a better example could be found than in the section of the pending labor bill. Again I say, Mr. President, not with my vote. I shall never put that on my record. I do not propose to say to the employers of America and to the workers of America, "Whether or not you have got a case under the new law, we will allow you the issuance of a complaint on your petition claiming injury." It is going to be left up to a single individual, designated and empowered under the law, as the general counsel of the Board. We never have to worry about the strength and the perpetuation of our system of government. We are always careful to surround the creatures of government with the system of checks and balances that characterized the very foundation on which our Government structure was built. That was not done here, and I am not going to be a party to it, from the standpoint of the interests of the public, employers, and of labor.

I read further from the President's veto message:

(3) It would strait-jacket the National Labor Relations Board's operations by a series of special restrictions unknown to any other quasi-judicial agency. After many years of study, the Congress adopted the Administrative Procedures Act of 1946 to govern the operation of all quasi-judicial agencies, including the National Labor Relations Board. This present bill disregards the Procedures Act and, in many respects, is directly contrary to the spirit and letter of that act. Simple and time-saving procedures, already established and accepted as desirable by employers and employees, would be summarily scrapped. The Board itself, denied the power of delegation, would be required to hear all jurisdictional disputes over work tasks. This single duty might require a major portion of the Board's time. The review function within the Board, largely of a nonjudicial character, would be split up and assigned to separate staffs attached to each Board member. This would lead to extensive and costly duplication of work and records.

(4) The bill would require or invite Government supervised elections in an endless variety of cases. Questions of the bargaining unit, of representatives, of union security, of bargaining offers, are subject to election after election, most of them completely unnecessary. The National Labor Relations Board has had difficulty conducting the number of elections required under present law. This bill would greatly multiply this load. It would, in effect, impose upon the Board a 5-year backlog of election cases, if it handled them at its present rate.

Of course, I think I should digress at this point to say that we have a very definite responsibility also, if we are to handle the backlog of cases, to provide the Board with adequate appropriations; which I think means increased appropriations, even if it were to continue to exercise only its present functions.

Under the Taft-Hartley bill, many questions of policy and procedure are to be developed, and the result will be increasing delay in handling cases, which means, as I see it, Mr. President, that, in all fairness, we are going to have to make substantial increases in the appropriations, so that they can increase their staff at the very beginning of operations, under this new act, in the interest of speed and in the interest of cutting down direct action taken by to handle their cases expeditiously and without undue delay. I do not think that, on the basis of the action that has workers against the Board for its failure been taken, from an appropriation standpoint, the Board can do the job that needs to be done, even under the old act, from the standpoint of reducing the time that it takes a case to go through the procedures of the Board.

Oh, I think this is an excellent message, Mr. President. I thought it was a powerful message the first time I read it. I was even more greatly impressed with it the second time, and now, my third time through, I want to say that I think the American people should be proud of the fact that we have at the head of our Government a man who will make the penetrating analysis he has made of a piece of major legislation of such a character as this, and with the forthrightness which characterizes the message, state why he thinks it is unworkable legislation and decidedly not in the public interest.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. For a question.

Mr. TAYLOR. For a question only. I want to ask the Senator if he does not feel, as I stated here last night, that if the American people have an opportunity thoroughly to become acquainted with President Truman's message it will cause a great turn-over in their feelings toward this misrepresented bill?

Mr. MORSE. I think so. I hope so.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. MORSE. After I finish the sentence. I may say to the Senator from Idaho that one of the reasons which I have presented here several times for conducting the filibuster against the bill is that I think the American people have the right to have time to study the bill and make known their wishes to the Senate before we finally vote upon it.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question, Mr. President.

Mr. TAYLOR. I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon this question: Has it not been a rather simple matter heretofore in the Senate to obtain agreements to vote at a definite time ahead on different pieces of legislation, with a provision that we could then proceed in the interim and take up other legislation? Is it not the fact that this is the first time Senators have ever insisted on voting immediately upon the reading of a President's message? Is it not true that some Senators wanted to vote on the question even before the President could go on the air with his message, and is it not further true that we will probably reach an agreement now to vote at some time later, and would it not have been just as sensible to have reached that agreement in the first place?

Mr. MORSE. I think I can answer all those questions in one reply. I made a statement today at a time when the Senator from Idaho was resting from the splendid job he did last night, when he made the same fight for the protection of minority rights in the Senate that I am attempting to make by this speech. I have not had a chance to see the Senator from Idaho since that speech. I not only commend him for the fight he is making in this instance, but I want to say to him that, despite the brickbats and criticisms we will receive from those who will not take the time to study the fundamental principles for which we are making this fight, he can always live with the record he made in this fight. He can know that, irrespective of what political fortune may bring to those of us who are making this type of fight in the Senate of the United States, at least we were true to what we believed to be important principles affecting minority rights in the Senate of the United States, principles which ought to be protected, and which in our judgment were not being protected by the unanimous-consent agreement which had been requested.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. TAYLOR. I wish to ask the Senator from Oregon if he does not agree with the Senator from Idaho that he would rather not be a Senator than not be able to stand up and fight for what he thinks is right regardless of what the political consequences may be?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Oregon hours ago in his speech discussed that point at considerable length because of certain developments in his State since his speech of June 5 on this floor, in which he made the very point, which he reiterated again today, that he thinks it is his primary obligation, under a representative form of government, to sit here in the Senate of the United States and exercise an honest independence of judgment on the merits of issues as he finds them here, and then make his decisions and take his stands on those issues at all times to the people of his State, and be willing to defend himself before them and rely upon their judgment, whatever it may be, at election time as to whether he shall be returned or removed from the Senate.

I think that is our primary obligation as representatives under our form of government. I am perfectly willing to stand

on my record so far as labor legislation is concerned in the present session of Congress, and I am convinced that when the people of my State come to understand my record, criticisms will change to approval.

(5) The bill would introduce a unique handicap, unknown in ordinary law, upon the use of statements as evidence of unfair labor practices. An antiunion statement by an employer, for example, could not be considered as evidence of motive, unless it contained an explicit threat of reprisal or force or promise of benefit. The bill would make it an unfair labor practice to induce or encourage certain type of strikes and boycotts, and then would forbid the National Labor Relations Board to consider as evidence views, argument, or opinion by which such a charge could be proved.

(6) The bill would require the Board to determine jurisdictional disputes over work tasks, instead of using arbitration, the accepted and traditional method of settling such disputes. In order to get its case before the Board a union must indulge in a strike or a boycott and wait for some other party to allege that it had violated the law. If the Board's decision should favor the party thus forced to violate the law in order that its case might be heard, the Board would be without power over other parties to the dispute to whom the award might be unacceptable.

Oh, I think it is a serious mistake, Mr. President, to place the settlement of jurisdictional disputes within the Board. I want to tell the Senate no more tough case can go to any officer functioning in an administrative law capacity than a jurisdictional dispute. On that point, Mr. President, I can speak with some experience. Feelings are tense in those cases. The issues are exceedingly complicated. In many such cases it is necessary to dig back through years of contracts. It is necessary to trace the history of work practices and past practices in an industry, frequently 10, 20, or 30 years back. When the arbitration of a jurisdictional dispute is finished the record is usually so voluminous that by comparison it makes the material about my desk look like a simple little memorandum. Frequently the records consist of thousands of pages. Usually long hearings are conducted—so far as my arbitrations were concerned, under a temporary work order whereby we could go ahead and get the job done, and arbitrate the merits of the dispute while we worked.

The unions do not like that. In every arbitration into which they are forced, or which they finally agree to enter in connection with a jurisdictional dispute, they say, "We are arbitrating away our very existence as a union."

Under our procedure I cannot ask any questions, but it would be very interesting to hear the testimony of the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] on the question of handling jurisdictional disputes. He knows about the problems. I am willing to venture the suggestion that on the basis of the jurisdictional disputes which he has seen in operation he would at least say, "There is some merit in what MORSE says."

As a result of my experience I can testify that there is much merit in it. Many union officers are kicked out of their union offices at the very next election because of the resentment built up over those officers agreeing to a voluntary arbitration contract, or by reason of their going into an arbitration on a jurisdictional dispute. They feel very deeply about the matter of jurisdictional disputes. They have no love for the man who decides one of them, either, after it is over. They do not run to him with open arms and ask him to come back and arbitrate something else. They are through with him. Jurisdictional disputes are pretty basic in labor relations.

As I have said, there is no excuse for any economic action on the part of unions in settling a family quarrel between themselves. I do not countenance it. I shall point out again momentarily what I propose to do about it, which is not done in the bill.

The bill would allow the Board to decide the question. Under other provisions of the bill the Board could not begin to do within a reasonable period of time all the work that we are imposing upon it.

We made another mistake in the bill. Instead of having a seven-man board, as I proposed—which proposal I got through the Senate committee and through this body—we came out of conference with a five-man board.

What is the advantage of a seven-man board? The advantage is crystal clear, Mr. President. With a seven-man board it is possible to have two departments, consisting of three members each, sitting week after week, functioning on a departmentalized basis, leaving the seventh member of the Board to fit in here and there as a relief member and to carry on the major administrative work of the Board. Such an arrangement would have given effective machinery for breaking down the huge backlog of cases. But oh, no; for reasons which I cannot make out from the conference report, the number was reduced from seven to five. How could two three-man departments be made from that number? If it was done in the interest of economy, it was a wasteful change, because seven members are required really to operate a two-department board. It cannot be done effectively with a five-man board. A man cannot be in two places at once. Moreover, if there is one place where proxy voting should never be tolerated, it is in a quasi-judicial tribunal. I shall not go into that question now, but I do not think it ought to be permitted in Senate committees, either. The members ought to be present and hear the evidence before they vote. If they are not present to hear the entire evidence, they should not be allowed to vote in the committee. My friend the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] and I agree on that point, I think, because he and I have stood together in our opposition to proxy voting in the United States Senate. I have told him that I will always go along with him on any committee on which he and I happen to be serving together, in trying to get a rule through the committee that there shall be no voting by proxy.

Mr. President, when it comes to the handling of a labor case we do not want any proxy voting. Therefore, with a five-man Board, I do not see how it would be physically possible to function with a two-department, three-man board organization, because a man cannot be in two places at once and someone would have to exercise his proxy. That simply cannot be countenanced, in my opinion, in a judicial process. So I believe it was a great mistake to reduce the number of members from seven to five.

We gave to the Board jurisdiction over the troublesome jurisdictional dispute cases. If that is the way to enable the Board to make friends and influence people, I can think of no better way of weakening the prestige of the Board with the labor organizations which will come in under its jurisdiction in jurisdictional cases. Such a system will develop antagonism and loss of confidence on the part of the union which feels that basic jurisdictional rights have been taken away from it by some board decision.

Furthermore, Mr. President, do not forget that whereas you and I as private citizens may go before an individual common-law judge in a civil court once—and probably never again—these labor people go before the Board year in and year out. They will not look kindly, in many instances, upon a board which is charged with the responsibility over jurisdictional disputes. Furthermore, I think it will be another cause of tremendous delay in the Board. Priorities should be given to jurisdictional disputes for the quickest possible determination. That means that in the meantime many other cases will have to be sidetracked. I think that provision will prove to be absolutely unworkable. Yet, I am in complete agreement that something must be done by way of procedure in the case of jurisdictional disputes.

I think there is much loose thinking, Mr. President, in regard to the effectiveness of injunctions in jurisdictional disputes. In some instances the operative facts of the case get into a certain type of pattern so that a temporary injunction might be of some help; but they are quite different from the secondary-boycott case in which the injunction is more helpful. The question is, Who is going to do the work? The poor employer is caught in between and throws up his hands and says, "I do not care who does the work; but will not someone do it? Will someone tell me how I should negotiate this contract? Will someone please tell me who has the right to do the work?" There not only have been hundreds of employers, but thousands of them who have been faced with that problem, and in too many cases there is great economic loss to them.

I became involved in a row last summer over jurisdictional disputes at Coos Bay, Oreg., between the A. F. of L. and the CIO. The fight involved the question of who should load and unload the vessels that came into that great lumber port. Prior to that dispute, there was being shipped out of that port more lumber than from any other port on the Pacific

coast. It gives some indication of the importance of that port to the veterans' housing program, for example.

In the latter part of June until well into November, not a single ship loaded a stick of lumber in that port; not a ship left that port with lumber. Lumber was piled high all along the docks while two great labor organizations participated in an absolutely inexcusable war between themselves as to who should do the work. It did not make sense. I said so, and I sent a telegram to Dr. John R. Steelman, a very good friend of mine, a man for whom I have a very high respect, a man who has a great record in the field of labor relations. He was for many years the head of the Conciliation Service of the Department of Labor, and in a very real sense was one of my tutors on this question of labor arbitration. He is one of the close advisers to the President of the United States. I sent him a telegram asking him to call the attention of the President of the United States to this very serious jurisdictional dispute at Coos Bay, and to suggest to the President that, in my opinion, he should call upon the parties to accept an arbitrator to be appointed by him or by the Secretary of Labor, and one of their own choosing, to arbitrate a settlement of that case. I released the telegram to the press, as I thought the parties were entitled to it. I received just the type of response that is always received as the first response in these jurisdictional disputes. That is, "Why, you have suggested to the President of the United States that we agree to arbitrate the very existence of our union."

I replied to the president of that union, in effect, "If you are so sure of the merits of your case you do not have to worry about the existence of your union being preserved under arbitration. If you have a case that will hold water, do not worry about arbitration. But you have no right from the standpoint of the public interest to continue this economic warfare and cause these great losses to the veterans' housing program." The boys kicked that one around for a while. I know their tactics. I know their thinking. I know that when they know they are "behind the eight ball"—and they knew I had them "behind the eight ball" on that occasion—they might agree. The American Federation of Labor accepted the proposition, but the CIO continued to kick me around in the press.

It was a little interesting to some of my critics who think I am the fair-haired boy of labor. If they would read some of my mail and observe some of the abuse I take by following a course of action in which I say to labor, when it is wrong, "You should be required to do what is right," and the same to employers, they would have a little better understanding of my conviction that our only hope in the field of labor relations is to make clear to both employers and unions that they must stop turning to the Government to solve all their problems for them and get busy around a collective-bargaining table in good faith and do some of the things for themselves. Many employers now want the Government to do things for them under this bill, just as the President of the United States so cogently points out in his grand message.

In the Coos Bay case they did not go to arbitration, but they finally got the matter worked out on a compromise basis for themselves, but not until after great loss was suffered by the people of the United States. Businessmen in Coos Bay will be years recovering from the losses incurred because the inexcusable jurisdictional strike victimized them. It never should have been tolerated, in my judgment, by labor leaders if they deserve the name of industrial statesmen.

I use that case as a little example, Mr. President, of my views as to how I think jurisdictional disputes should be handled. Let me tell you, Mr. President, it is not a mild remedy, and let me tell you that I know of no labor leader in the country who approves of it; but that does not make one whit of difference to me, because they are wrong, dead wrong, 100 percent wrong in their attitude on jurisdictional disputes.

But, Mr. President, I have proposed that procedure in the bill I have introduced, Senate bill 858. I have discussed it in speech after speech, not only here in the Senate, but all over the country. I have been before labor audiences that have hissed me when I have proposed it. I am used to that. Hisses do not hurt a person, they simply reflect on those who hiss. It was put in into practice on the War Labor Board. I have told some Senators that story before, but I have to say something to kill time, so I might as well repeat it.

Of course, Mr. President, the conditions on the War Labor Board were very favorable, because we had great power. Talk about arbitrary power, Mr. President. Talk about giving to mere men tremendous power. We had it, and I never liked a moment of it. We must not countenance it in peacetime. As I said in several decisions, this is an awful power that we wield, in the dictionary sense of the term "awful." But we were at war, and the underlying and fundamental principle on which we acted—as I said in decisions, because the parties were entitled to know it—was not to give precise justice, we did not give it, we could not. Time did not permit. The legion of cases we had to decide almost instantly did not permit of that. But we did justice from the standpoint of equity and good conscience. On that principle we bottomed our decisions—and the ones to which I now refer are only a part of the decisions; they are the ones which were rendered in 1942–44, before I left the Board. The Board was greatly enlarged after I left. I surmise that the total decisions of the Board, including the decisions of the regional boards which were sustained by the so-called big Board in Washington, are probably three times that many, if not more, in number.

But I said in many of those decisions that the parties should understand that the guiding principle of that Board was to adjudicate those cases in a manner which would result in the most effective prosecution of the war.

Mr. President, that was all right for wartime; the chips were down. We could not take the time to deal with all the niceties of legal theories and technicalities that the parties wanted to advance before us. We had a job to do, and we kept saying to them, "And you have a job to do. Your job is to get to work on a friendly and cooperative basis in accordance with the principles of free collective bargaining, and aid in the maximum production of war materials."

I had the worst job, I think, on the Board; every one of my colleagues always admitted it. I had the hatchet job, the job of being the enforcement officer, in addition to being one of the judges of cases.

Sometimes we had to be arbitrary. Talk about whether they would or would not arbitrate cases, with men dying by the thousands, the world around, wearing our uniform. Talk about whether they should arbitrate a case. Well, Mr. President, I did not like the role, but sometimes I was very arbitrary. I always said so on the record, because the parties were entitled to know that I knew what I was doing from the standpoint of using the maximum possible degree of the war powers which were available to the Board. So sometimes I had to say, "All right, either arbitrate the dispute or we will take the case to the White House with the recommendation that we will have to seize the plant."

Mr. President, do you think we liked that? This gives me a good opportunity to make a statement on the record which I do not think has been officially made, and is long overdue—namely, that as the enforcement officer of the War Labor Board, after the Board voted in a defiance case that there was no other course but seizure to recommend to the President, there was not a single one of those cases in which Franklin D. Roosevelt did not insist that everything possible short of seizure be done to get the case settled. He never willingly signed a single seizure order that I took to him. He deplored it, and he had to be convinced, and it took some tall convincing, sometimes, that there was no other course of action. I remember one case which had a little streak of humor in it, as it turned out, although it was not very funny to us at the time. It was a case dealing with a certain railroad. We could not get the railroad to accept arbitration. We did everything, but we could not even get them into a hearing, on one occasion. The officials of the railroad made it perfectly clear that they were not going to arbitrate the case. It was one of our early defiance cases. We were working out the procedure and policy to be followed in those cases. Our authority was not too clear. I am going to read the Little Steel case before I close. We used that case thereafter as the pattern case in these defiance matters.

The railroad in question merely said, in language not nearly so polite as this, I can assure the Senate, that we could just "go to," that they were not going to arbitrate the case, and so we had to take the case to the White House. Will Davis went with me that night, and I

will never forget it. I prepared all the papers, had them checked with the Department of Justice, and got the Attorney General's approval, and he, too, shook his head. He did not like it, either, nor did I. We knew that if a single employer ever got by with a successful defiance of that Board, we were through, and with that Board out of existence we knew that the country would lose from the standpoint of the machinery of the Board, the only workable procedure available for the settling of wartime labor disputes. We knew also that if a union got by with a defiance of the Board, the prestige and influence and effectiveness of the Board would be greatly damaged. I shall have something to say about that later, too. I can talk more easily of this right now than about anything else.

In speaking of this now, I am directing attention to some very fundamental principles we should not forget in connection with the handling of labor disputes, this whole problem of getting away with arbitrary power in peacetime, such as the President talks about in his message.

We went to the White House with the papers. The President said he did not think it was necessary, he could not believe in the seizing of a railroad in time of war in order to promote the most effective prosecution of the war. We outlined the record to him, showed him defiance after defiance. He finally said, "Will you send one more wire?"

We said, "Yes, but it will not do any good, Mr. President."

He said, "Let us try it once more. Wire that you are here at the White House. I prefer not to sign the papers. I should like to have a final word from him as to whether he will not give a favorable reply to you about arbitrating the dispute."

In this case, as in so many cases, there were other parties watching what we did, because this was the one up against the gun, so to speak.

As I recall, it was about 7:30 o'clock when the answer came back from the railroad, addressed to the President of the United States, a 17-page wire, as I recall, sent collect. The President had a good sense of humor about it. He laughed and said, "You win. Give me the pen," and he signed the papers.

I make these statements because there are forces in America who have been pretty unkind to Franklin D. Roosevelt in regard to his exercise of war powers and who have sought to give the impression that he just itched to seize a plant. It is a falsification of that man's real attitude in regard to seizure cases. He knew the danger, he fully recognized the undesirability of wartime precedents of seizure. He knew they had to be guarded against with the greatest of care, and he was quite right.

He was always putting us on the defensive and making us prove beyond the question of a doubt that there was no other course of action. We took the railroad, and we had to hold it for the remainder of the war.

Once it became pretty clear that we were establishing a pattern and insisting upon carrying out the orders of the Board, the task was easier. The senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] is present.

He was one of my distinguished colleagues on the Board for a time, and let me say to the credit of the labor and industry members of the Board, Mr. President, that even though in a specific case they would vote against our decision—perhaps it was a decision against a union and the labor men might vote against it, or a decision against the employer and the industry men might vote against it—that was not always true. In fact, I think the statistics show that at one time for about a 2-year period that 12-man Board, the big Board, was unanimous in about 85 percent of the cases, minus the union-security cases, and that is a pretty remarkable record for any quasi-judicial tribunal.

I remember one case which illustrates my point as to how the employers backed us up in our defiance cases. Again I think this bears out what I want to call attention to; that is, the complicated nature of the labor cases. They are not simple little court cases. They run the gamut of economic problems and business problems.

I remember the fishing boat cases. That was not the exact title, but it was a case involving fishing boats in Boston, Mass. The two Senators from Massachusetts will be interested in this case. In fact, I think the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] was probably governor at the time. It involved a fleet of fishing boats, about 50 or more. They really were operated by what amounted to an employers' association or a fishing-boat owners' association, and they had an interesting arrangement with the workers in regard to how they divided up the profits from the take of the fish. They were having their troubles, and we heard them, and of course in the early days of the Board the fight was on jurisdiction. What right did we have to take jurisdiction over a case that involved fishing boats running out of Boston? It was not an easy one to decide, but we knew the policy that had to be followed; and that, after all, was already in wartime. It was impossible to distinguish between the cases that were affected by the war, so far as the prosecution of the war was concerned and those that were not. But we were feeling our way. The advice of counsel and the arguments in hearings as of that time had convinced the majority of the Board that we had to find some relationship between the business that was involved in the dispute and the war effort. I "went fishing," so to speak, Mr. President, on that one. I found that they used the livers of the fish for medicinal purposes, and they were used by the Army and the Navy in great quantities. So I said to the Board, "I think that is enough" and the Board sustained me unanimously; so we ordered an arbitration of the dispute. The employer-owners of the boat, or, rather, the secretary of the employers' association, who really had had delegated to him all the duties of management over the boats, said he would never arbitrate. We knew that was a very tough one. What were we going to do with 54 fishing boats? We had heard that they were trying to sell some of them to the Maritime Commission as submarine observation boats and for Coast Guard duty, so we got an order stopping those negotiations until we could get compliance with our decision. Their counsel made very clear to us that they were going to defy, and we would have to take the case to the White House. I did not want to take that case to the White House. I felt I could not see the President taking 54 fishing boats. He would say, "What are we going to do with 54 fishing boats?" And I knew I would have to say, "Well, Mr. President, that is not the important issue. The important issue is, What are we going to do with the War Labor Board if it is ever successfully defied by any labor group or by any employer group? That is the issue."

I got a tip, and ran it down to get the real owners of the boats. I shall not mention any names, but it was an interesting list, on which were the names of two very prominent officials, and so we named them, along with others. I sat in the board office of Roger Lapham, now mayor of San Francisco, and I heard him talk over the telephone to one of the owners who had taken great exception because of the fact that he was receiving publicity, owing to the fact that an association subsidiary was operating one of his boats, but from which he was getting his profits, in defiance of the War Labor Board. Lapham said, "Tomorrow we will take the case to the White House, and your name will be on the orders." He said to Lapham, "What can we do to settle the case immediately?" Lapham said, "You can accept the decision of the Board to arbitrate the case." He agreed to get in touch with the other owners and within 24 hours the agreement to arbitrate was entered into.

I cite these cases not only to kill time, but because I think they involve one principle which I want to emphasize in connection with these jurisdictional disputes, and that is, that when the parties reach such loggerheads they simply cannot as two unions negotiate a settlement between them then they owe it to the employer concerned, whose livelihood, whose economic well-being, after all, is determinative of economic well-being of the unions too—they owe it to the employer and they owe it to all the rest of us, the public, to agree to enter into voluntary arbitration of such disputes, and the great labor organizations of the country should have an agreed upon arbitration procedure, and a tribunal of their own selection to settle their disputes. That trend is current; there is more of that than there was a few years ago. I think one of the valuable contributions the War Labor Board made was that it succeeded in giving great impetus to voluntary arbitration agreements. I think an analysis of the record will show that through the good offices of the Board, and particularly the regional boards, a great many such agreements were entered into during the war and carried over after the war. They had voluntary arbitration clauses in them. That is the perfect way, that is the best way, that is the desirable way. The $64 question,

Mr. President is, What are we going to do when they will not agree to voluntarily arbitrate? We, the public, and the employer should not have to take it on the economic chin, merely because unions in jurisdictional disputes lack the foresight and the statesmanship industrially to work out peaceful procedure for settlement short of strike action. So there comes a time, Mr. President, when all voluntary procedures break down, and there is still a dominant public interest that needs protection.

It is my view, and I have said it many times, that under those circumstances any government that deserves the name "Government" and can be trusted with the rights and freedoms and liberties of its people owes the duty to its people to step in by compulsion of government to the extent that it can be helpful and successful in the voluntary settlement of such disputes and insist upon a compulsory determination of the issues.

No one dislikes compulsory arbitration more than I do. No one could be more opposed to it in disputes between employers and workers than I am. That is why I have said to employers and labor unions innumerable times, "Do not support compulsory-arbitration tribunals for the settlement of disputes over wages, hours, and conditions of employment under any plausible bill, I do not care how innocently worded, that seeks to offer you a Utopia by way of compulsory arbitration, because if you go for it you will lose your economic shirt."

Why? Because, Mr. President, when to an arbitrator, or to a board of arbitration, or to a court of arbitration, by legal authority and sanction, is given the power to determine what wages shall be paid and under what conditions American workers shall work and receive wages, what policies the employer shall follow, what production methods he shall use—when that power is given to an arbitrator functioning under the authority of compulsory arbitration in disputes between workers and employers, there has been put into operation the most effective instrumentality for taking over the economy of the country by government. That is why I am opposed to it. Set up a compulsory-arbitration tribunal to determine wages, hours, and conditions of employment, Mr. President, and there has been set up an agency which will take away from both employers and workers the precious thing we call a private-property economy in this country, because the private property will be used only in accordance with the dictates of such a tribunal.

There is a strong movement in America for that. That movement must be watched. Again, it may be said a plausible case can be made out for it. It is a short cut to the job of working out by free collective bargaining the complex disputes between workers and employers, but it is dangerous. I cannot begin to emphasize sufficiently how dangerous I think it is. It can lead to a modified form of totalitarianism in this country. It can lead to a type of economic fascism. The greatest feeling of comfort that I have in regard to it, Mr. President, is that there really is little danger of it going too far in this country because it will not work. The parties will soon become sick and tired of it.

It may be said, "How in the name of consistency and logic can you argue so strongly against compulsory arbitration in determining questions of wages and hours and conditions of employment, and then answer the $64 question as to what you are going to do with jurisdictional disputes by saying, 'Well, if all these voluntary procedures will not work, my final proposal is that the parties must by operation of law be required to submit their disputes to compulsory arbitration' "? The two situations cannot, in all respects, be distinguished. I think that has to be frankly admitted. But there are such differences as I believe make them clearly distinguishable and throw the balance in favor of my proposal for compulsory arbitration of jurisdictional disputes in contrast with what I think is the unworkable proposal contained in the pending labor bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Oregon, without losing the floor, may be permitted to yield to me for the purpose of submitting a unanimous-consent request for fixing the time to vote upon the pending measure.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the preliminary request made by the Senator from Nebraska? The Chair hears none.

The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, without making a speech on the whys or wherefores of a proposal, I immediately submit to Members of the Senate the unanimous consent request that the Senate vote upon the pending measure at the hour of 3 o'clock on Monday, June 23; that upon the convening of the Senate at 12 o'clock, and between that hour and 3 o'clock, p. m., the time be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of the bill, the time to be controlled on behalf of the proponents by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and on behalf of the opponents by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I will say frankly to the Senator from Nebraska that personally I would prefer to fix the hour at 5 o'clock instead of 3 o'clock, for reasons which I have explained to the Senator from Nebraska. However, inasmuch as yesterday I myself made the proposal for a unanimous consent agreement to vote at 3 o'clock on Monday, I shall not object. I cannot speak for any other Senator. Frankly, still under the reservation, I hope that we may be able to make the agreement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement as entered into was reduced to writing as follows:

Ordered, That on the calendar day of Monday, June 23, 1947, at the hour of 3 p. m., the Senate proceed to vote, without further debate, upon the question, Shall the bill H. R. 3020, the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Ordered further, That the time intervening between the meeting of the Senate and the said hour of 3 o'clock on said day be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of the bill, to be controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon. I wish to say that it is our intention to continue in session, because there are three or four speeches yet to be delivered in the Senate this afternoon, all of them of deep importance. Because we have the unanimous-consent request, that does not mean that we should not give these speeches our fullest consideration.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me to propound a question——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am very happy to yield the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wanted to ask the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], or both of them, whether, in view of this agreement, it is the intention to try to hold the Senate in session late tonight.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I defer to the Senator from Nebraska, who has conducted the negotiations up to this time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it is not our intention to remain in session any longer than is asked by Members of the Senate. It is certainly not our intention to hold the Senate in session later than midnight in any event. There will be no session tomorrow, Sunday.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am sure that all of us would like to give consideration to the desire of Senators who have expected to address themselves to the Senate on this subject. There are several Senators now in the Chamber who had anticipated addressing the Senate this afternoon. The time on Monday to be divided between the proponents and the opponents will be limited, and I think Senators would like to be courteous to their colleagues by giving them an opportunity to speak at their pleasure.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I thoroughly agree with the Senator. My inquiry was prompted by the desire to know, if possible, within some reasonable limitation, how long it was expected to hold the Senate in session tonight.

Mr. WHERRY. The only limitation I can indicate without further consultation is that the session will not be extended beyond midnight.

Mr. BARKLEY. But the Senator hopes that it will not be extended that long.

Mr. WHERRY. I certainly do.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Nebraska has clearly stated the sentiment on this side. It is felt that Senators who have speeches which they wish to deliver on this general subject matter should have a rea-

sonable opportunity this afternoon; but it is also very definitely the hope on this side that at some reasonable hour we may take a recess until Monday.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am sure that that is as definite a statement as I can get.

THE BREAKING OF FILIBUSTERS—ARTICLE BY SENATOR MORSE

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I had intended to read this article on the floor of the Senate. However, in view of the agreement which has been reached, I shall merely ask to have it printed in the body of the RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an article appearing in Collier's magazine for June 15, 1946, entitled "How To Bust a Filibuster," the author being the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I shall read the few lines which precede the article in Collier's magazine:

In this article Senator MORSE issues a call to battle against dictatorship in Congress. He has evolved a plan based on parliamentary procedures which offers hope to all legislators who have fumed while the activities of Congress were stopped by Senators who wear down the majority by reading for days from cookbooks and telephone directories. These minorities, who on occasion can subvert the will of the majority, must lose their power if democracy is to be returned to Congress, Senator MORSE holds. His plan, which is aimed at both the filibuster in the Senate and the Rules Committee in the House, may be successful if he can muster sufficient congressional support.

The article follows, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Collier's Magazine of June 15, 1946]

HOW TO BUST A FILIBUSTER

(In this article Senator MORSE issues a call to battle against dictatorship in Congress. He has evolved a plan based on parliamentary procedures which offers hope to all legislators who have fumed while the activities of Congress were stopped by Senators who wear down the majority by reading for days from cookbooks and telephone directories. These minorities, who on occasion can subvert the will of the majority, must lose their power if democracy is to be returned to Congress, Senator MORSE holds. His plan, which is aimed at both the filibuster in the Senate and the Rules Committee in the House, may be successful if he can muster sufficient congressional support.)

On the floor of the Senate a small band of willful men had been holding up Senate action on a bill to promote equal employment opportunity for all Americans, regardless of race, religion, or color. A clear-cut majority of the Senate favored the principles of the bill. President Truman, on behalf of the Democrats, had asked for the legislation. The Republican Party platform of 1944 had pledged itself to the principles of the measure. Nevertheless, a group of southern Democrats had banded together to talk the bill to death. Hearing it, a young veteran burst out to me:

"But, Senator, it's dictatorship."

The air in the Senate was fervid with oratory. Senator WALLACE WHITE, of Maine, the Republican leader, defended the filibuster, although not a party to it, by stating that: "There may be times and circumstances in which minorities can in one way alone successfully resist the power of a temporary majority."

My veteran friend was bewildered. "If the Senate's rules allow a minority to control it," he asked, "where's democracy in Congress?" And if we don't have democracy in Congress, how can we preserve democracy in the United States?

Millions of people are asking these same questions. Not only because they have witnessed the disgraceful spectacle of filibustering in the Senate, but also because in the House of Representatives they have seen the principle of majority rule stifled by the small but powerful Rules Committee.

It is common knowledge that 7 members of this 12-man committee wield what amounts to dictatorial power over the entire House. These men have time and time again prevented important measures from being properly considered in debate by the House as a whole, or even from reaching the House floor.

The theory behind the Rules Committee is that it should act as a traffic director on the legislative highway. In actual fact, the committee has become an obstruction to orderly traffic. Like fuedal barons who levied a toll upon those who used their roads, the committee often allows bills to come before the House only on the condition that certain amendments be written into them. It frequently usurps the functions of the regular legislative committees by conducting hearings on bills that already have been carefully studied by the proper legislative committee confining itself, as it should, to questions of procedure.

UNFAIR CONTROL OF LEGISLATION

There have been notable occasions when the Rules Committee, in effect, has originated legislation, although it was never contemplated that it should exercise this privilege. Recently, it will be recalled, the House Labor Committee approved the kind of bill it thought would contribute to labor peace. But a majority of the Rules Committee favored the Case bill, which the legislative committee had rejected. So it ruled that the Case bill be considered by the House rather than the Labor Committee's bill.

The job of the Rules Committee is to report to the House, in conjunction with a bill, a resolution setting the terms of debate upon the measure. Often the committee blocks the legislative road completely by failing to give a bill the right of way to the House floor under any rule of debate. Sometimes the committee works its will upon the entire House membership by imposing "gag rules" that restrict the time allowed for debate and the circumstances under which amendments may be offered.

There is no hope for government by the majority in Congress until the rules are thoroughly overhauled to free the House and the Senate from the legislative tyranny of a willful minority in either branch. These two infections of the body politic—the powers of the Rules Committee and the filibuster—are sources of intolerance and reaction. The Rules Committee must be assigned its original role of traffic director for House bills, and the Senate must adopt rules empowering a majority to end a filibuster.

It must be made clear to the voters that their substantive rights in the passage of all sound legislation needed in the interests of the general welfare cannot be separated from their procedural rights in attaining passage of such legislation. The people must be made to realize that the archaic rules of Congress permit self-seeking minority blocs to defeat legislation the people want without letting it come to a vote.

Most writers dip their pens in despair when they attempt to make suggestions for remedying these two evils. They point out that any resolution to reform the House Rules Committee would be referred to that committee itself—which group could be expected to protect its dictatorship by quietly filing the proposal.

They call attention to the fact that the rules of the Senate have been carefully devised to protect the filibuster. A third plus one of the Senators can now prevent cloture—put a limit on the length of time a Senator may talk—thereby allowing a filibuster to continue until the legislation against which it is directed has been withdrawn or emasculated. Thus most critics say it is almost hopeless to propose a resolution to eliminate the filibuster because the proposal itself would be subject to the filibuster technique.

The Senate has a Rules Committee, too. Although it does not have the sweeping powers possessed by the House Rules Committee, it does have jurisdiction over any proposal to change the rules and procedures of the Senate. Judging from the past, this committee could be counted upon to bury alive any proposal referred to it which seeks to reform the procedures of the Senate in the interest of majority rule.

EXAMPLE IN SELF-DEFENSE

A good example of the way the Rules Committees of both Houses protect what they believe to be their vested interests is the action which they took in passing upon the resolution setting up the La Follette-Monroney committee to make recommendations for the reorganization of Congress.

Since early 1945 this committee has been making an exhaustive study of various proposals for the reorganization of Congress, and it recently submitted a splendid report on the subject.

However, although the report presents sound proposals for reorganizing most other congressional committees, it makes no recommendations whatsoever in regard to the House Rules Committee, and says nothing about the colossal waste of congressional time occasioned by the filibuster. The omissions are startling, but no fault of the La Follette-Monroney committee.

The resolution that set it up was rewritten by Senate and House Rules Committees specifically to prohibit the special committee from making "any recommendations with respect to the rules, parliamentary procedures, practices, and/or precedents of either House."

But the problem is not as hopeless as the experts seem to think it is, provided enough Members of the Congress have the will to make the fight. The situation calls for a two-front attack in both Houses of Congress. The time to attack is on the first day of the new Congress next January.

On the first day of a new Congress the House adopts the rules that will guide it for the next 2 years. Usually the rules of the last Congress are accepted without change, by a routine motion. But that need not be the case. During that brief period on the opening day between the time that the Speaker of the House opens the session of the new Congress and the time when the House passes a motion adopting the rules of its previous session with whatever changes it may wish to authorize, the Rules Committee is temporarily stripped of power.

Hence it is at this time that the proponents of majority rule must strike their blows against the dictatorship of the committee. They must be prepared to offer at precisely the right moment an amendment to the rules depriving the committee of its broad powers over legislation, limiting it to the task of directing legislative traffic on the House floor.

This proposal would become pending business of the House, open to full debate on the floor and not subject to reference to the Rules Committee. The changes would become effective if approved by a majority of the House.

If the majority of the Members of the new Congress elected next November really want to establish majority rule in the House and be freed from the dictatorial domination of the Rules Committee, let them stand up and be counted on the opening day of the new session.

A similar fight for democracy should be waged in the Senate on the first day of the next session of Congress. On that day all Senators who believe in the establishment of majority rule in the Senate should support a resolution aimed at preventing any future filibusters. By a majority vote such a resolution can be made the subject of Senate business and disposed of without reference to committee. There is little doubt, of course, that the introduction of such a resolution will be vigorously opposed by the defenders of the filibuster. The sponsors of Senate rule by the minority already have made themselves clear. During the recent FEPC filibuster, Democratic Senator TYDINGS of Maryland stated: "The rule of the majority. The rule of votes. Majority to Hades * * *. Let us not fool ourselves with the silly thought that majorities are always right."

Democratic Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, rejected the idea of "a pure democracy, where every man's vote would be counted on every issue," and then later referred to the filibuster as a "bulwark against oppression by a mere popular majority."

WILL USE OBSTRUCTIVE TACTICS

It is clear that these Senators will wage a last-ditch fight against antifilibuster legislation with their customary weapon, the filibuster. However, a filibuster can be defeated. The recent FEPC filibuster could have been broken if a serious attempt to do so had been made by the Democratic Senators.

At that time the Democratic majority in the Senate, supported by many Republicans, recessed the Senate between 4 and 6 o'clock each afternoon during the filibuster, and on Friday afternoons recessed until each following Monday at noon. The Democratic administration made public statements in support of the FEPC, but took no effective action against the filibuster. No Democratic Senator and only a few Republican Senators were willing to join in my suggestion at that time to hold the Senate in continuous session for 24 hours a day for as many days, weeks, and months as might be necessary to break it. An opportunity to establish, once and for all, majority rule in the Senate was passed up. It should not happen again.

Under the filibuster, with all its insidious effrontery, the principle of rule by a majority is denied the people in the determination of congressional policy. I do not say that the majority is always right; but I do say that under our form of representative government a minority of Senators should not be permitted, by means of the filibuster, to block legislation favored by the majority. If the majority passes legislation which the people of the country do not favor, it must answer to the voters of the country for their action on that legislation, and the voters will then have a chance to send men to the Senate under instructions to repeal any legislation that the people do not want.

There is no way to smash a filibuster but to exhaust the filibusterers by forcing them to speak day after day for 24 hours a day.

In a very real sense a filibuster is an endurance test. If a majority of the Senators really want to free themselves from the dictates of a willful minority, they must be willing to take the time and undergo the physical strain that may be necessary to abolish once and for all the filibuster travesty.

If a majority of the present Senate really doesn't want to make that fight, then the voters should start finding it out in the 1946 elections. They should see to it that they send back to the Senate men pledged to make that fight. For my part, I am determined that the fight shall be made. But it cannot be made without the assistance of Senators in both parties. It will not be a pleasant fight. But with demonstrated public backing, it undoubtedly would end quickly.

FOR THE DIGNITY OF THE SENATE

When continous sessions were proposed as the only effective method of beating the recent FEPC filibuster, the criticism was made that the procedure was beneath the dignity of Senators. That, of course, was pure nonsense. Nothing could be more undignified than the manner in which the Senate record is disgraced with long-winded ranting and meaningless talk during a filibuster. My proposal for continuous sessions of the Senate has been criticized as too dramatic. That argument is without weight. It is highly important that this issue be fully dramatized in order to impress upon the American people its vital importance to their legislative rights.

There are two reasons why it is important that the fight to pass an antifilibuster resolution should be waged at the beginning of the next session of Congress: First, it should be conducted concurrently with the fight to establish majority rule in the House in order that public attention may be focused on the same basic issue; namely, the need of democracy in both Houses of Congress.

Second, if the resolution is followed by a filibuster, it will not hold up any other legislation, since none will be ready for Senate action. It would be very difficult to break a filibuster near the close of a session, because the unity of action required on the part of Senators is difficult to obtain when so many of them are anxious to recess and go home. It is likewise difficult to wage a successful fight against a filibuster in the middle of a session, since the argument is always made that taking the time to defeat a filibuster blocks action on other legislation vital to the welfare of the country.

One rule in political strategy, as in boxing, is never to telegraph your punches. But this fight involves more than political strategy. This is a fight to establish the people's rights to democratic procedures in their Congress, and it is important that the people themselves should become understanding participants. Everyone should know months ahead of time that January 7, 1947, or whatever day Congress reopens will be D-day on Capitol Hill—Democracy Day for reasserting and reestablishing majority rule in the Congress of the United States; Duty Day for all Members of Congress to restore representative government to the legislative processes of Congress.

If majority rule is to characterize the procedures of Congress, the voters of this country must make that clear to congressional candidates in November. Either we are going to reestablish the principle of majority rule in our Congress or we are going to continue to drift into government by minority interests and bloc pressures. This is another test of liberalism versus reactionism.

It is important that the American people recognize that our form of government can protect their rights only so long as they keep it strong and effective. Representative government is not a machine that works automatically. It is but a set of rules and principles which the people by their own consent have decreed shall be binding upon their own conduct. These principles cannot work unless they are administered by men and women responsive to the will of the voters who elected them.

The people must be ever watchful against institutions, like the filibuster and powers of the House Rules Committee, which permit the perversion of free government by self-seeking men. If the people relax their vigilance, they may lose the fruits of democracy which promote the greatest good for the greatest number within the framework of our private-property economy.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3444) to amend section 251 of the Internal Revenue Code, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HEARINGS OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to announce the program of the hearings for the Senate subcommittee on the Government corporations appropriation bill. The schedule for hearing the various agencies is as follows:

Tuesday, June 24, 2 p. m.: Panama Canal, followed by the Export-Import Bank and the Inter-American Affairs and Inter-American Educational Foundation.

Wednesday, June 25, 2 p. m.: Tennessee Valley Authority.

Thursday, June 26, 9:30 a. m. and at 2 p. m., if necessary: National Housing Administration and constituent agencies.

Friday, June 27, 9:30 a. m.: Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, followed by Federal Intermediate Credit Bank, Production Credit Corporation, Regional Agriculture Credit Corporation and Federal Prison Industries, Inc.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote the national defense by increasing the membership of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITION

Mr. PEPPER presented a resolution of the Senate of the State of Florida, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 14

Resolution by the Senate of the State of Florida requesting the Congress of the United States of America to enact into law immediately the necessary legislation requiring the Forest Service of the United States Department of Agriculture or any other governmental agency having title thereto, to sell or exchange certain lands in the Apalachicola National Forest

Whereas the Apalachicola National Forest has within its boundary approximately 55 percent of the total acreage of Liberty County, Fla., and practically all of the lands that are suitable for agricultural and improved pasture purposes; and

Whereas it is absolutely impossible for any progress to be made in the agricultural and livestock industry, or any other industry in this entire area due to the fact the Government will not sell or otherwise dispose

of any of its fertile lands in the Apalachicola National Forest; and

Whereas the United States procured the lands in question approximately 10 years ago from large landowners at a price of from $1 to $2.75 per acre; and

Whereas this property has never at any time been made available to the citizen of small or average means for the development of farms or improved pastures; and

Whereas this land in question has always been sold in large blocks, which prohibited the average citizen from acquiring the same and the development of farms and pastures were thereby prevented; and

Whereas the United States Forest Service has sold and permitted to be cut and removed from the lands in question a sufficient amount of merchantable saw timber, pulpwood, tar wood, etc., to more than reimburse the Government for the original purchase price, plus all improvements; and

Whereas a considerable amount of these lands are ideal for growing tobacco, sugarcane, potatoes, corn, beans, and many other general agricultural products, also ideal for improved pastures for cattle; and

Whereas during the 1947 session of the Florida Legislature the adjoining counties of Gadsden and Leon passed a local no-fence law; and

Whereas it is obvious to the members of the Senate of the State of Florida, also to the general public of Florida, that in the very near future the State of Florida will have what is known as a State-wide no-fence law; and

Whereas all livestock will have to be placed under fence, and within the area of the Apalachicola National Forest which includes practically all the lands in the south half of Liberty County, there will be no lands owned by individuals, and it will become necessary that the many thousands of cattle, hogs, etc., now in the area will have to be disposed of as there will be no lands available upon which to graze cattle; and

Whereas the financial structure of Liberty County and Wakulla County, Fla., need additional lands for tax purposes as well as for development and progress within the area which will give the counties in question a balanced economy, and as long as the areas that are suitable for development are owned by the Federal Government and cannot be used for any purpose toward the development of the area, the counties will never make any progress and development; and

Whereas it is the expressed desire and urgent request of the citizens in the area that United States Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, United States Senator SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, and Representative BOB SIKES, of the Third Congressional District of Florida, recognize the deplorable conditions now confronting their constituency in this area, and take immediate action to comply fully with the provisions contained in this resolution by introducing and enacting into law at the earliest possible date the necessary legislation to meet the objective: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Florida:

1. That the Congress of the United States be requested to pass the necessary legislation requiring the Forest Service of the United States Department of Agriculture or any other governmental agency having title to said lands, to sell or exchange said lands to and with individuals, firms, or corporations, however, only to such applicants as may be approved by a committee which shall consist of three members, namely, the clerk of the circuit court of the county in which the lands are located, one member of the board of county commissioners in which commissioner's district the lands are located, and the State senator of the fifth senatorial district of Florida, any acreage from 1 acre to 2,560 acres, but not to exceed 2,560 acres to any one individual, firm, or private corporation, at a price not to exceed the original purchase price which the United States Government paid for such lands as hereinafter described in the Apalachicola National Forest, to wit:

All that part of the Apalachicola National Forest in Liberty County, Fla., that is south and west of the following line: Begin at the northwest corner of section 4 of township 3 south, range 8 west, and run east to the northeast corner of section 1 of township 3 south, range 8 west; thence run south on the range line between ranges 7 and 8 west to the southeast corner of section 12 of township 5 south, range 8 west; thence run east to the northeast corner of section 17 of township 5 south, range 7 west; thence run south to the Liberty-Franklin county line.

All that part of the Apalachicola National Forest that is now in Franklin County, Fla., however, a bill has been introduced in the 1947 session of the Florida legislature to put it into Liberty County, Fla., that is west of the following line: Begin at the one-half section line between sections 29 and 30 of township 5 south, range 7 west, and run south along the east line of sections 30 and 31 of township 5 south, range 7 west, and sections 6, 7, 18, 19, and 30 of township 6 south, range 7 west, to the southeast corner of said section 30 of township 6 south, range 7 west; thence run west along the south line of section 30 of township 6 south, range 7 west, to a point where Fort Gadsden Creek intersects the south line of section 30 of township 6 south, range 7 west, thence run down the center of Fort Gadsden Creek in a meandering westerly direction to the center of the mouth of Fort Gadsden Creek.

2. That a certified copy of this resolution be transmitted to each of the following: Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER and Hon. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, both United States Senators from Florida, and the Honorable BOB SIKES, Member of the House of Representatives of the United States from the Third District of Florida.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. BALDWIN, from the Committee on Civil Service, to which was referred the bill (S. 203) to increase the equipment maintenance of rural carriers 2 cents per mile per day traveled by each rural carrier for a period of 3 years, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report (No. 337) thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1488. A bill for the relief of Louisa B. Sank; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MAYBANK:

S. 1489. A bill to renew and extend certain letters patent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN (by request):

S. 1490. A bill to transfer the Panama Railroad pension fund to the civil service retirement and disability fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Civil Service.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 3444) to amend section 251 of the Internal Revenue Code was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT ON VETO OF LABOR RELATIONS ACT

[Mr. BALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by Senator TAFT on the veto of the Labor Relations Act on June 20, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF CLAYTON ACT—ADDRESS BY ED. WIMMER

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address relating to the bill to amend the Clayton antitrust law by Mr. Ed. Wimmer, vice president of the National Federation of Small Business and editor of Forward, America, which appears in the Appendix.]

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS—VETO MESSAGE

The Senate resumed the reconsideration of the bill (H. R. 3020) to prescribe fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management in their relations with one another which affect commerce, to protect the rights of individual workers in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce, to recognize the paramount public interest in labor disputes affecting commerce that endanger the public health, safety, or welfare, and for other purposes.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise to join my distinguished colleagues in congratulating our President upon his carefully studied and courageous action in vetoing the Taft-Hartley bill. Every line of his able message breathes a spirit of fairness to employers and employees and a genuine concern for the economic and social future of our country.

During the debates on the Taft-Hartley bill, we have had frequent occasion to turn to two other able Presidential statements touching labor: His veto message returning the Case bill in 1946 and his state of the Union message of January 6 of this year. In those documents the President outlined, and now repeats, a program of labor-management relations which has won the confidence of, and will continue to commend itself to, the country.

The people know that the President is not a partisan in labor matters. He speaks in the name of the whole of the American people. I am confident that the rank and file of our citizens who have not had the President's opportunity to study this bill will be guided by his views.

Time has now elapsed, since passage of this measure, for a maturer view to make itself felt. On June 13 I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, an important religious, and certainly impartial, body, which said:

> The Taft-Hartley bill does little or nothing to encourage labor-management cooperation. On the contrary, it approaches the complicated problem of industrial relations from a narrow and excessive legalistic point of view.

It confirms our view that enactment of this measure would mean a renewal of the violence and warfare which characterized a shameful era in American labor relations before passage of the National Labor Relations Act.

The former Chairman and the public members of the National War Labor Board have denounced the measure. A distinguished group of labor lawyers and economists is reported by the New York Times of June 19 to say:

> This omnibus bill includes many provisions which are extremely unwise, unfair, or

unworkable. It goes far beyond the legitimate purpose of curbing union abuses or providing equality of bargaining rights and duties.

These are impartial experts talking. They confirm everything we have said about this measure. And now the President, in an able and forthright statement, has adopted, once again, the fair and frank course. His message is consistent with all that he has heretofore said. He has shown that he can be unimpressed by the synthetic din which has been raised to drown out this assault upon the rights and liberties of the citizen.

The people will long owe a debt of gratitude to the President for his courage and statesmanship on taking this step to preserve from emasculation the large body of laws, which have been developed at great sacrifice, for the fair and equitable adjustment of disputes growing out of labor-management relations. Every fair analysis of this bill supports the President's veto, and the best interests and welfare of our country demands that it be sustained.

Mr. President, on Thursday, June 12, 1947, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at page 6858, a supplementary analysis of the Taft-Hartley Labor bill. That analysis was intended as an answer to an analysis prepared by the Labor Relations Board at my request and placed in the RECORD in connection with my remarks on June 6, at page 6501.

This matter was brought up on the floor yesterday, and I want to call attention to the remarks made at that time by the Senator from Ohio. He said, at page 7370 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

> Mr. TAFT. The veto message goes over, point by point, the points raised in a memorandum put into the RECORD by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], to each item of which the Senator will find an answer which I put into the RECORD. Does not the Senator think that the veto message substantially and in detail follows the Pressman memorandum which the Senator from Montana put into the RECORD?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SALTONSTALL in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to correct that statement. I did correct it in a Nationwide broadcast which I made last night. There are two memorandums. The one prepared by Mr. Pressman was put into the RECORD in the House by Mr. MARCANTONIO, and there is the memorandum which the Senator from Montana put in, which does not show its origin. My impression is that it came from the National Labor Relations Board, or perhaps from members of their staff. I wish to correct the statement to which the Senator referred. I am sorry I made the mistake, but it was corrected to the whole country last night.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Senator for the correction, because it would be unfair to let that impression stand. Of course, when the statement was made by the able Senator from Ohio it was immediately taken up by the press and highlighted in the newspapers. People all over the Nation were led to believe that the analysis which I had filed in connection with my remarks on that occasion was prepared by Lee Pressman, which, of course, as the Senator now acknowledges, is not the fact. The statement which I submitted with my remarks was a statement prepared for me, at my request, by the National Labor Relations Board, and it was inserted in the RECORD at the close of my remarks on that occasion.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I happened to be called off the floor for a few minutes before the present discussion. I was a little surprised last night that the Senator from Ohio repeated the statement about the Pressman analysis that was put into the RECORD by the Senator from Montana, in view of the fact that I understood the Senator to say in his radio speech last night that the Senator from Montana had put the Lee Pressman analysis in the RECORD in the Senate, and that Mr. MARCANTONIO had put it in in the House.

Mr. TAFT. No; the Senator is mistaken. I just put my last night's broadcast into the RECORD today. I referred to a different memorandum in the broadcast last night.

Mr. PEPPER. I heard the able Senator's speech last night, and I find it before me in the Evening Star. If the Senator from Montana will yield further——

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Maybe the Senator did not so intend it, but in the context it does leave that impression. It says:

> The President's message follows in many details the analysis of the bill prepared by Lee Pressman, general counsel of the CIO, inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on June 3 by Congressman MARCANTONIO, and another memorandum inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on June 6 by Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana.

The proximity of the two led me to infer that the Senator meant to say it was the same memorandum.

Mr. TAFT. No; it was not.

Mr. PEPPER. I am glad to hear the Senator make that clear.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am very glad the distinguished Senator from Ohio has made the correction here today. However, I regret very much that it was not made yesterday, so that it would have been carried over the newspaper wires and published broadcast throughout the Nation. I realize that the Senator from Ohio did not intend to make any misrepresentation of the facts. He probably was honestly and sincerely misled. Nevertheless, a great injury is done by incorrect statements of that kind. People should be a little more careful about making statements attributing to another Member of this body an action which he did not commit.

But I am very glad now that it has been cleared up here on the floor, at least, although I do not believe it is completely cleared up in the country, because when a false impression goes throughout the country by means of the press of the Nation, it is usually very difficult to overcome it. Of course, I think we have done the best we could to correct the false impression, and we shall have to let the matter stand as it is.

Mr. President, I should like to consider for a while the analysis which was presented by the Senator from Ohio, by which he seeks to bolster up this reactionary bill and justify it as sound legislation.

At the outset, the Senator from Ohio stated that certain arguments which we have directed at specific provisions of the bill are not justified either by the text of the bill or the background of decisions against which it was written and claimed that certain completely erroneous statements had been made. I have read the analysis presented by the Senator from Ohio and I have considered it in the light of the arguments which we have previously made against the bill.

Upon considering the whole matter, I am convinced that the analysis introduced by the Senator from Ohio is subject to serious reproach on the ground that its statements and arguments are not justified and that it contains many erroneous statements.

First, with respect to the amendment of section 2 (2) of the National Labor Relations Act exempting Federal Reserve banks from the coverage of the statute, the statement of the Senator from Ohio contains significant omissions. The Senator's statement does not point out that all of the stock of the member Federal Reserve banks is held by privately owned banking institutions and that the Board of Directors of each Federal Reserve bank is in large part elected by the private banks which hold such stock. While these banks do perform certain functions which are useful to the United States Government, that is also true of many other private corporations and is true of our entire national banking system. All the arguments which could be made for exempting Federal Reserve banks from the coverage of the act could also be made with respect to private national banks. While the Board of Governors in Washington exercises a supervision over the member banks in the Federal Reserve system, there are large areas in which collective bargaining may be both feasible and practicable.

With respect to the amendments to section 2 (2), 213, and 301, concerning the definition of the word "agent," it is stated that the amendment merely restores the definition of "agent" as it existed at common law.

The treatment of the matter of agency illustrates to my mind in the clearest fashion the bias which lies behind this bill. In the first place, as this so-called supplementary analysis, the report of the conferees, and the entire legislative history of the bill indicate, it is proposed to weaken the responsibility of management for the acts of its foremen and superintendents in dealing with the men under them, so that a foreman or superintendent must now be shown to be act-

ing within the actual or apparent scope of his authority before the employer may be held responsible for what he does. The vice in this approach is that under modern industrial conditions the worker who receives his orders from and is solely responsible to his foreman, who never has an opportunity to see any company official of higher than superintendent rank, considers that these men are management, as they in fact are, for the purposes of directing work and supervising the work of the employees under them. Quite obviously the worker who is dependent for his daily wage upon those immediately superior to him, who stands in a master and servant relationship, in effect, to his superiors, cannot be treated on an equal footing with an independent representative for the purposes of arms-length dealing. Yet the common-law doctrines of agency were developed, not in connection with management-labor relations, but with those social and economic relationships which involve bargaining between parties of equal economic strength and equivalent bargaining power. The legalism with which this problem is now approached as a means for justifying a weakening of the protection of workers is typical of the specious view of industrial relations which underlies the whole bill.

While, on the one hand, responsibility of the employer for acts of foremen and supervisors is to a large extent removed, section 2 (3) removes supervisors from the coverage of the act. The principal reason asserted for doing so was that management was responsible for the actions of its supervisors and therefore should have an absolute and unfettered control over their activities. I need not point out that the principal reason for eliminating supervisors fails, if management is no longer to be responsible for the activities of its supervisory employees, unless those acts are specifically authorized. Hence, management, from this point on, may have it both ways; in the first place, they can, by the easy device, of posting a notice disclaiming any responsibility for what their superintendents or foremen do, avoid any responsibility for their actions; and, on the other hand, they may deny to supervisory employees the rights they should have on the plea that they are responsible for the actions of their supervisors.

Let us now consider the responsibility of unions for the acts of their agents. To begin with, I suggest that it is fundamental to this whole problem to point out that, although the Senator from Ohio may not think so, there are differences between corporations and labor unions. A corporation is organized for profit. It is normally a tightly controlled hierarchy, with complete power in top management to dismiss from its employment any person who fails to follow orders issued by the top echelons. Persistent disregard of instructions invariably leads to disciplinary measures which insure the careful carrying out of orders. On the other hand, trade-unions are not organized for profit. They are voluntary groups of individuals, and their ranks are open without discrimination, except in the rarest cases, to all employees in an industry. Their officers are elected at all levels. The only power which the top officers have over subordinate officers or the rank and file of the union is the power of persuasion, and again, in all but the rarest instances, they have no powers of discipline or removal. Policies are fixed, not as a result of decisions of a few individuals, but in national conventions including representatives of all members of the union.

We have had over the years some experience with the common law rules of agency as applied to trade-unions. The La Follette committee showed with what persistence and with what success management had succeeded in placing labor spies in prominent positions in unions, and showed further how those labor spies have deliberately used their positions of power to commit or encourage the commission of illegal acts, in order to bring discredit upon the union, though such individuals were in reality agents of management, not agents of the union. It was frequently held, prior to the passage of the Norris-LaGuardia Act, that the union was responsible for the acts of its agents. Further, the courts in many cases found it unnecessary to resort even to common-law rules of agency; by treating the union as a conspiracy for an illegal purpose, they were able to hold each member and officer of the union as both the agent and principal of all the others. The result of these doctrines were the outrageous results in the Danbury Hatters, Bedford Cut Stone, and Duplex and Deering cases, which set up a wave of agitation, culminating in passage of the Norris-LaGuardia Act. Yet now, in the case of unions, it is proposed to restore those infamous doctrines in order to charge the central treasury of a union with responsibility for the acts of any officer or agent, whether actually authorized or ratified or not.

Inequality can be obtained quite as well by applying the same rule to different types of organizations as it can be by applying different rules to similar organizations. I have pointed out that by applying similar standards of responsibility for acts of agents to organizations as diverse as corporations and labor organizations, inequality of treatment has resulted; but this bill does not stop there. If management is, because it is entitled to their wholehearted allegiance, to be absolved of responsibility for the actions of its supervisors, then, if the same rule were to be applied, trade-unions should be absolved of responsibility for the acts of their subordinate officers. Yet, as I have pointed out, not only are they to be charged with such responsibility—as they now are—if the action of the subordinates has been authorized or ratified, but they are to be charged with it if any basis exists which might lead a court to conclude that an apparent agency existed. Thus, with respect to the single problem—responsibility for acts of agents—this bill gives employers a dual protection, but it visits a penalty upon trade-unions. I insist that this is patently unfair, clearly biased, thoroughly unworkable, and is done in a specious and legalistic fashion.

With respect to section 3 (d) of the bill, which is designed to accomplish a separation of functions within the Board, the supplementary analysis points out that a person aggrieved by the refusal to issue a complaint in a case may appeal the matter to Washington. It contains the statement that "the assumption that the Board itself presently reviews these appeals, however, is utterly erroneous." I have checked this matter with the National Labor Relations Board, and I find that the procedure, which is set forth publicly in the Federal Register for September 11, 1946, is that these appeals are considered in the first instance by a committee consisting of the Director of the Field Division of the Board and the associate general counsel in charge of litigation. This committee prepares recommendations to the Board itself, which presently reviews all such recommendations, and on fairly frequent occasions reverses the action of the appeals and review committee. The action of the committee does not become final until approved by the Board. It is by this means that the integration of policy with prosecuting functions which is the objective of administrative procedure is achieved.

It is obvious that this is no longer to be the case. The report of the statement of the managers on the part of the House says at page 37 that the "general counsel is to have the final authority, and in the name of, but independently of any direction, control, or review by, the Board in respect of the investigation of charges and the issuance of complaints before the Board. By this provision, responsibility for what takes place in the Board's regional offices is centralized in one individual." It is the clear legislative intent that the Board shall have nothing to do with these matters which opens the way to the evils, which we have previously described, of dispersion of authority, uncertainty in the meaning and application of the law, overzealousness in the prosecution of cases, harassment of employers and trade-unions, and the other disadvantages which the Attorney General's committee on administrative procedure pointed out necessarily flow from such separation of functions. The report of the House managers makes clear a congressional insistence that the general counsel is to have that "unfettered discretion" which the supplementary analysis of the Senator from Ohio denies to exist.

The supplementary analysis presented by the Senator from Ohio denies that section 7 is intended to revive the "yellow dog" contract. The supplementary analysis states that this language is contained in the Norris-LaGuardia Act. I assume that section 2 of the Norris-LaGuardia Act is referred to, and I should like to quote the full context:

> Whereas * * * the individual unorganized worker is commonly helpless to exercise actual liberty of contract and to protect his freedom of labor and thereby to obtain acceptable terms and conditions of employment, wherefore, though he should be free to decline to associate with his fellows, it is necessary that he have full freedom of association, self-organization, and designation of representatives of his own choosing, to negotiate the terms and conditions of his employment, and that he shall be free from the

interference, restraint, or coercion of employers of labor, or their agents, in the designation of such representatives or in self-organization or in other concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection; therefore, the following definitions of, and limitations upon, the jurisdiction and authority of the courts of the United States are hereby enacted.

The supplementary analysis would lead one to believe that there is something in the Norris-LaGuardia Act which protected the right of persons to refrain from joining any trade-union activity. Such is simply not the case. That right has not been threatened from any source. On the contrary, the employers of this country, banded together in the Associated Industries and the National Association of Manufacturers, have for years thrown their vast economic power into protecting that right. If an employee has the right guaranteed by law to refrain from union activity, and if that right is as a matter of public policy deserving of public protection, I cannot see how any court could say that an employee no longer had the right to enter into a contract agreeing to refrain from such union activity. This act succeeds the Norris-LaGuardia Act by 15 years; in many respects, it intends to and does supersede or wipe out the protections of the Norris-LaGuardia Act. As the expression of the latest congressional intent on the subject, it may well be designed to override the Norris-LaGuardia Act in this important respect as well. If, as I think, this bill presents a real threat of the revival of the yellow-dog contract, the matter is not concluded there. Senators will recall the decision of the Supreme Court in the Hitchman Coal & Coke case, where the Supreme Court held that a person in attempting to organize workers who had signed yellow-dog contracts was seeking to induce a breach of such contracts, and therefore might be enjoined from proceeding with efforts at organization. If workers were thrown into concentration camps and surrounded by picket fences it would not have been a more effective device to prevent organization, for both employees and organizers could be summarily punished for contempt for breaking or inducing a breach of such a contract.

Further, when read in connection with section 8 (b) (1), the supplementary analysis conceded what is the obvious intent of the legislation, namely, that this is intended to "apply to coercive acts of unions against employees who did not wish to join or did not care to participate in a strike or a picket line." This makes it clear that the Federal Government is now to take on the responsibility of guaranteeing that employees who did not wish to participate in a strike and strikebreakers are to be escorted through picket lines by Federal officials under the protection of the Federal courts.

The report of the House managers at page 40 states that—

> It is apparent that many forms and varieties of concerted activities which the Board, * * * regarded as protected by the act will no longer be treated as having that protection.

The report of the House managers states that—

> This provision of the Senate amendment in its general terms covered all of the activities which were proscribed in section 12 (a) (1) of the House bill as unlawful concerted activities.

Section 12 (a) (1) of the House bill included among unlawful concerted activities the use of force or violence or threats thereof to prevent any individual from quitting or continuing in the employment of or from accepting or refusing employment by any employer; or preventing any individual from freely going from any place and entering upon an employer's premises or leaving such premises; or picketing an employer's place of business in numbers or in a manner otherwise than is reasonably required.

By this kind of legerdemain the House managers have indicated their belief that section 8 (b) (1) has carried into the completed bill those extreme provisions of the Hartley bill which have been so strongly denounced by the country at large.

Further, at page 42, the report of the House managers pointed out that the House bill allowed such activities to be "enjoined upon suit by a private employer, specific provision was made for suits for damages on the part of any person injured thereby, and employees participating therein were subject to deprivation of their rights under the act." The House managers then make this significant assertion:

> The conference agreement, while adopting section 8 (b) (1) of the Senate amendment, does not by specific terms contain any of these sanctions.

The failure of the House managers to deny that they recede from their position that injunctions at the suit of private employers were not outlawed by the conference agreement indicates a clear legislative intention on the part of the House, at least, that the door has not been closed on suits on private injunctions obtained by employers contrary to the Norris-LaGuardia Act under this provision of the conference report. The assurances given by the Senator from Ohio as to the meaning of this bill are pleasant to the ear but it is obvious that he alone is not the sole author or sponsor of this bill and that the legislative history in the coordinate branch is far more important as a matter of legislative history than a statement introduced by the Senator from Ohio a week after enactment of the bill. Despite the assurances that the Hartley bill has been laid to rest it is entirely clear that the managers on the part of the House, do not think it has been, nor is there anything in the legislative history in the Senate to disclaim this.

The supplementary analysis provided by the Senator from Ohio attempts to answer the arguments so ably presented by the senior Senator from Kentucky concerning the requirement that under section 8 (a) (3) of the bill a majority of those eligible to vote, rather than a majority of those voting, are necessary to authorize the validity of a union security agreement. The supplementary analysis states that "an average of over 90 percent of the eligible employees participate in Board conducted elections and a 100 percent vote is not unusual." I have checked this figure with the National Labor Relations Board and find that actually the percentage of eligible employees voting in Board elections is 83 percent and further that a 100 percent vote is quite unusual. Be that as it may, it is apparent that under present Board rules the employer has no motive for keeping employees away from the polls; indeed employer campaigns against unions are almost invariably directed at appeals to employees to get out and vote since there is a widespread feeling that union members are more apt to vote in such elections than nonunion employees. Precisely the opposite would result under this act. While it is true, as the supplementary analysis states, that Board elections are frequently conducted on company time and property, this must obviously always be done with the employer's consent.

Such consent is usually forthcoming because of the employer's desire that all employees vote. By insisting that employees who do not vote in effect vote against union-security agreements, it will be apparent that the employer will have every interest to see that such elections are held under conditions which make it onerous for employees to vote since, if less than a majority vote in the election, the defeat of a union-security clause is assured.

The supplementary analysis in its discussion of section 8 (b) (4) dealing with illegal strikes and boycotts confirms our worst fears concerning the intent in changing the language of the section in conference. As passed by the Senate it was stated that a strike or boycott was illegal if it was for the purpose of certain practices. The conferees changed this to read, "where an object thereof if." The supplementary analysis states, "the intent of the conferees was to close any loophole which would prevent the Board from being blocked in giving relief against such illegal activities simply because one of the purposes of such strikes might have been lawful."

To begin with, it is nonsense to talk here of closing loopholes which would prevent the Board from being blocked in giving relief since the injunctive provisions with respect to these practices are mandatory upon the Board, which therefore has no discretion in the matter. Further than that, however, our objection to this change was premised upon the ground that it removed the primary objectives tests which was developed by the Supreme Court under the Sherman Antitrust Act in order that every strike would not be considered illegal; manifestly there may be several purposes in any strike and various strikers may have different motives. The Supreme Court therefore developed the doctrine that it would look to the primary objective and not to all objectives. I know of no assertion which has

been made on the Senate floor, as the supplementary analysis states, that even if one of the strikers had an improper motive he would thereby make the union liable for an unfair labor practice and to an action for damages brought by the employer; and I ask the Senator from Ohio to point to any such assertion made on this floor. We have insisted and continue to insist that a single strike may have several motives or that a considerable group of strikers may have motives other than those which impel the majority to strike.

The supplementary analysis confirms our argument that this throws the law back beyond anything which the courts have ever held. I do not understand the relevance of the argument made in the supplementary analysis that the hidden motives of the union or the employees would be immaterial. We have not argued that these motives would be hidden, but the point of our argument has been that an entire strike may be enjoined because some group of strikers or union leaders had a motive which some court might feel was improper.

The supplementary analysis, in discussing section 8 (b) (5) relating to the power of the Board to supervise initiation fees charged by the unions does not meet the arguments we raised. While it is true that, as stated by the supplementary report, this applies only to cases in which a union has received a union-shop or maintenance-of-membership agreement, such agreement now covers approximately 70 percent of the employees under contract, and I know of no union which does not at some point hold a union-security or maintenance-of-membership agreement. Hence, every union would be subject to the supervision of the Board in the fixing of the amounts of its initiation fees. The supplementary report states that this provision was included because unless such a provision was inserted, the restrictions on a union shop in section 8 (3) could be easily circumvented. The speciousness of this argument must be immediately apparent, for under section 8 (a) (3) "no employer shall justify any discrimination against an employee for nonmembership in a labor organization (a) if he has reasonable grounds for believing that such membership was not available to the employee on the same terms and conditions generally applicable to other members. Hence, if union members wish to exclude a person from membership under a union-security agreement they would be required to charge themselves the same initiation fees charged applicants for membership. Such an argument requires the conferees to assume that the vast majority of union members would be willing to tax themselves to exclude a few persons whom they did not desire to take into membership. We insist that the existence of such power in the hands of the Government is an open door to control of all union affairs since, if the Government controls the purse strings of the union, it will be clear that it will control all activities of the union.

The supplementary analysis in discussing section 8 (b) (6), the provision of the bill outlawing so-called featherbedding practices again confirms our fears concerning the meaning of this section. It states that:

> What is prohibited is extortion by labor organizations or their agents in lieu of providing services which an employer does not want.

Let us suppose a group of 10 men working on an assembly line would decide that it is physically impossible for them to keep production going without extra aid. If they request the employer to provide additional help and the employer says he does not want them, they are, under the bill as clarified by the supplementary analysis, engaging in a feather-bedding practice. If the employer does not wish to maintain a safety man below a heavy overhead crane in a factory to warn employees of impending danger the union would be guilty of a feather-bedding practice.

The supplementary analysis attempts to answer the argument that under the free speech provision statements of an employer could not be used in evidence. That such was its explicit intent is clear from the statement of the senior Senator from Ohio during the debate which preceded the passage of the bill, to be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Thursday, June 5, 1947, at page 6446. The Senator from Florida stated that—

> Under the criminal law at the present time any statement a man may make prior to a given act which the court may try to evaluate may be admitted in evidence as having some relationship to his intentions. But the conference report deliberately excludes statements of that sort, unless the statement contains an actual threat, thereby depriving the Board of the full evidence in the case.

In response the senior Senator from Ohio stated:

> So long as the Board has a practice of that kind the employer's mouth is practically shut. In case he makes a speech later on and is charged with some unfair or unlawful labor practice, and that can be considered in evidence, it means that he cannot afford to speak at all. Without that provision there is not freedom of speech.

I need not point to the distorted concept of freedom of speech which is contained in the statement of the Senator from Ohio. From time immemorial the law has recognized that while a man may have a right to speak as he wishes he cannot escape responsibility for what he said under the laws of libel and slander. The use of any statements in evidence, liability for fraud, or misrepresentation, have not at any time been thought to infringe the right of freedom of speech. To deny the use of such statements as evidence in Labor Board proceedings is to give employers a license possessed at no time by any group in the community.

The supplementary analysis adopts a curious distinction in saying that this section "has no application to statements which are acts in themselves or contain directions or instructions. These, of course, could be deemed admissions and hence competent under the well-recognized exception to the hearsay rule." But the rule governing the use of admissions in evidence is applied only to admissions against interest. If an employer states that, "I do not like labor unions and consider them bad for my boys," it would be obvious on its face that this was not an admission against interest. It could not therefore be received in evidence as stated by the supplementary report. Further, I call attention to the fact that the supplementary report does not draw any line—and I am confident no such line can be drawn—between "views, arguments, or opinions" and "statements which are acts in themselves or contain directions or instructions." Even if such a distinction could be drawn it would have farcical results. It means that clear language explaining a direction or instruction would not be admissible even though the direction or instruction might be.

The supplementary statement distorts the record in yet another way. It states that—

> The Board has permitted employers' expressions of opinion on unionism to be used to sustain the theory that he was guilty of violations of the National Labor Relations Act.

While this is true and, in my judgment, proper, the supplementary report neglects to state that the Board has also used employers' expressions of opinion about unionism as a basis for acquitting an employer of a charge that he has violated the act. It must be remembered that while statements hostile to unionism are excluded by this action, statements of employers friendly to unions are also excluded, relevant as they may be in determining the employers' attitude and motives.

The supplementary analysis also neglects to mention the impact of this section on the unfair labor practices by unions which the bill would reach. In its very nature a boycott is hardly more than a statement of views, argument, or opinion which a union circulates in an effort to inflict an economic loss upon an employer. Yet, under this absurd provision such leaflets or other material would not be admissible in evidence.

In discussing section 8 (b) (4) (D), dealing with jurisdictional strikes, the Senator from Ohio again concedes the validity of the argument which we have made that this went far beyond the prevention of jurisdictional strikes by stating that—

> I have no hesitation in saying that this subsection applies not only to strikes over the assignment of particular work to one union rather than another, but also to the assignment of work to one union rather than another group of employees.

The Senator from Ohio, however, attempts to justify it by saying that it would be an unfair labor practice for an employer to assign work to nonunion employees in an effort to defeat a union, and by the same token that it should be an unfair labor practice for a union to attempt to compel assignment of work being done by nonunion men to themselves.

The Senator from Ohio misses the essential point which we made in our argument. By defining such disputes as jurisdictional disputes the injunctive provisions of the act may be brought into play. This section as now drafted defines as a jurisdictional strike an effort of employees to prevent an employer

from assigning work to nonunion employees in order to protect themselves. Hence, if such employees strike against employer action, which the Senator from Ohio concedes would be an unfair labor practice, they are guilty of a jurisdictional strike and subjected to the penalties of injunctive relief, suits for damages in the Federal courts, and probable triple damages under the Sherman Antitrust Act. If employees can strike against such unfair labor practices of employers only under such penalties we may confidently anticipate that antiunion employers will seize upon this as a device for breaking up any craft union.

We had previously criticized section 8 (d) of the act on the ground that it eliminated by its explicit provisions any duty on the part of the parties to meet and discuss modifications of an existing contract. The supplementary analysis points out what is perhaps true that "parties may meet and discuss the meaning of the terms of their contract and may agree to modifications on change of circumstances, but it is not mandatory that they do so." In the first place it must be evident that the inclusion of such a provision in the law will encourage employers who wish to remain adamant in their construction of the meaning of the contract to refuse to meet and discuss such meaning of the provisions of the contract since there is now an explicit statutory mandate that they need not do so. We have previously pointed out that existing law does not require the employer to agree to any changes and requires no more than that the parties meet and discuss the matter. We have no hesitation in saying that meetings and discussions between management and employees to discuss outstanding differences are highly desirable and industrially important. It is indeed the basic premise of the entire statute. Why in this area it should be less desirable than in the negotiation of the agreement itself the supplementary report leaves completely unexplained.

We had criticized section 9 (c) (4) as forbidding the Board from holding prehearing elections, a useful device which is now being used in some 800 cases a year coming before the Board. In only 15 percent of such cases do hearings result; if the union loses the election the matter normally ends there, and if the union wins the election the employer is very frequently willing to recognize them without further hearing. Since the Board holds approximately 5,000 to 6,000 elections a year it is obvious that this is not an "inconsequential percentage of cases" as the supplementary report states and it is statistically untrue, as the supplementary report states, that "more often than not a subsequent hearing was still necessary."

The Senator from Ohio attempts to answer our criticisms of the prohibition on use of the "extent of organization" theory by stating that "it is sufficient answer to say that the Board has evolved numerous tests to determine appropriate units, such as community of interest of employees involved, extent of common supervision, interchange of employees, geographical considerations, etc., anyone of which may justify the finding of a small unit." This suggestion is an invitation by the Senator from Ohio to the Board to make this provision work by disregarding it and instead of frankly resting its decisions on the extent of organization theory, to find some subterfuge by which the impact of this provision can be discounted. While I agree that the bill is an open invitation to subterfuge if employers, unions, and the Board are to continue its work, it seems to me undesirable for proponents of the measure to suggest a kind of deceit in its administration.

The extent of organization theory is criticized on the ground that "its use has been particularly bad where another union comes in and organizes the remainder of the unit which results in the establishment of two inappropriate units." Consider the situation in the coal-mining industry. The Progressive Mine Workers, strong in certain areas of Illinois, West Virginia, and Indiana, have for years waged a bitter battle against being represented by the United Mine Workers. If under the bill the Board were required to find a unit appropriate apart from the extent of organization, it would be in the position of forcing employees who desire to be represented by the Progressive Mine Workers of America into being represented by the United Mine Workers in order to meet the intellectual desires of the proponents of the measure. Herrin, Ill., was the scene of a small civil war on this issue; there was a pitched battle with much loss of life between miners who wished to be represented by the Progressive Mine Workers of America and others who wished to be represented by the United Mine Workers. Sitting in their ivory tower, it is well enough for the proponents of the measure to suggest that by disregarding the extent of organization theory the Board should in effect compel the renewal of that civil war.

The supplementary analysis undertakes to answer only a minor argument which we made against the provision which requires all union officials, international, local, and others, to certify that they are not Communists; namely, that this would create delay. The analysis in effect admits this to be true, since it says, "There is no delay unless an officer of the moving union refuses to file the affidavit required." It is, of course, precisely in this situation that we pointed out that delay would result.

Delay will result for still another reason. The section as drafted is now sufficiently broad to include officers down to the level of shop steward. This is a large and fluctuating group; the illness, absence from the country, negligence, of any single union officer would defeat the union's right to resort to governmental processes. Further, new officers are constantly being elected or replaced; to maintain such a voluminous file of affidavits continually up to date will obviously impose the most serious burdens upon unions.

Another problem arises in this connection. The bill requires that these affidavits be filed not only by the local officers but by "the officers of any national or international labor organization of which it is an affiliate or constituent unit." The American Federation of Labor has for many years been affiliated with the International Federation of Trade Unions, which includes representatives from many countries throughout the world. I am not at all sure of the political affiliation of each member of the IFTU but I rather surmise a Communist might be found among them and might be found among its officers. Are all American Federation of Labor unions thereby deprived of the right to file petitions with the Board? The railway brotherhoods have recently affiliated themselves with the International Transport Workers, an organization representing transport workers throughout the world. I know that the orientation of that organization has been strongly anti-Communist, but it is entirely possible that some Communist representing some group of transport workers somewhere in the world is an officer of that organization. The Congress of Industrial Organizations has been affiliated for some time with the World Federation of Trade Unions in which the Soviet trade unions are represented. Does the bill require that as a condition of filing cases with the National Labor Relations Board every CIO affiliate have on file an affidavit by the Russian officials of the WFTU that they are not Communist Party members? While such absurd consequences may not follow, the real point, of course, is that the filing of these affidavits has nothing to do with the function which our national labor policy has entrusted to the National Labor Relations Board; namely, the encouragement of collective bargaining.

We criticized section 10 (b) of the bill, which requires that proceedings shall "so far as practicable," be conducted in accordance with the rules of evidence applicable in the district courts of the United States. The Senator from Ohio attempts to explain away this provision by stating that "this is more a preventive measure than one to cure existing abuses" and that the use of the words "so far as practicable" gives to the trial examiner considerable discretion as to how closely he will apply the rules of evidence. The House conferees, however, had a quite different view of the matter. Their report states, at page 53, that "if the Board is required so far as practicable to act only on legal evidence, the substitution, for example, of assumed 'expertness' for evidence will no longer be possible." The House managers thereby indicate a clear intention that only such evidence shall be admitted, unless there is some overwhelming reason to the contrary, as would be admitted in a court of law in a case being tried by a jury. It is interesting that the sponsors of this measure in the Senate have not even denied the House statement that the Board is no longer to use its "expertness" in deciding cases. This ambition to replace informed and careful judgment with inexpertness has not, so far as I am aware, previously been made with respect to any governmental function.

Our criticism of section 10 (c), which allows an order of a trial examiner to become final in the event no exceptions are filed before the Board, was directed at a real danger. If, as occasionally

happens, a trial examiner filed an erroneous report granting a union, let us say, full relief, the employer could by waiting 20 days take his case directly to court without giving the Board an opportunity to correct the error committed by its trial examiner. The supplementary report answers that the "general counsel in any event would not go forward with enforcement if the order was erroneous"; but our argument rested squarely upon section 10 (f) of the Taft-Hartley bill, which allows any person to obtain a review of such order. The general counsel, of course, would have no power to prevent a review of such an order. Nor is there any answer, as the supplementary report states, in section 10 (c), which forbids the court from considering any objection which has not been urged before the Board, its member, agent, or agency. The illustration which we gave rested upon the premise that an objection had properly been made before the trial examiner, but improperly disregarded by him.

We objected to section 11 on the ground that the bill directs the Board to issue subpenas regardless of the materiality or relevancy of the evidence sought. The language of section 11 states: "The Board or any member thereof shall upon application of any party to such proceedings forthwith issue to such parties subpenas requiring the attendnace and testimony of witnesses or the production of any evidence in such proceeding or investigation requested in such application." Nothing in this statement requires that the matter sought be relevant or material; that this is the clear intent of section 11 as now drafted is clear from the following sentence which allows the party subpened to petition the Board to revoke the subpena if "the evidence does not relate to any matter under investigation or any matter in question in such proceedings or does not describe with sufficient particularity of evidence whose production is required." We did not, as the supplementary report states, at any point disregard the remainder of the paragraph providing for revocation of the subpena but it is clear from our earlier arguments that our objection went to the requirement that the citizen be put to the trouble of coming in and defending himself even though the subpena is on its face frivolous or irrelevant.

In criticizing section 206 dealing with national emergency strikes we criticized the insertion by the conferees of language which would make injunctive powers available if the strike was one "affecting an industry or a substantial part thereof." The supplementary report states that we ignore the remainder of the paragraph which imposes the additional requirement that such strike imperil the national health or safety.

This is hardly accurate. Our objection went to the fact that by thus enlarging the circumstances under which an injunction might issue almost any strike could be brought within the terms of the bill. There was some slight safeguard against arbitrary or too frequent use of the injunctive process against strikes in the version of the bill which passed the Senate in that it was necessary that such a strike affect substantially an entire industry. Now, however, it is enough if in the judgment of the President or the Attorney General some segment of an industry is affected. Thereby the salutary safeguards of the Norris-LaGuardia Act, insofar as they are not already removed by other sections of the bill, are by this section largely taken away.

I have dwelt at some length upon the supplementary report because I think it illustrates so typically the manner in which the full scope and content of this measure has been concealed from the Senate and from the public generally. The clearest legislative history found in the bill itself, or in the report of the House managers, or in the report of the majority of the Senate conferees, is on the floor of this body twisted, distorted, or concealed in such a manner as to lull the Senate into a feeling of security that none of the results which we prophesy will follow from this measure.

Perhaps no piece of legislation which has ever passed the Congress has had a more voluminous legislative history. Merely in the topics upon which I have touched there is material for extensive litigation for the next 10 years. The mere assurance by the Senator from Ohio that a certain intent was embodied in the bill or that a certain result will flow from it is far from being the whole story. The report of the managers on the part of the House is a particularly glaring example of the way in which matters which we have thought laid to rest are again revived. It is clear that the report of the managers on the part of the House read in connection with the conference bill makes this measure stand exactly where the Hartley bill stood when it passed the House. I do not, of course, insist that the courts would treat the report of the House managers as the entire legislative history of this measure; I do insist that in any consideration of the bill by the courts that report is a vastly more important part of the legislative history of the measure than are the individual views of the Senator from Ohio, particularly when stated for some days after enactment of the bill. If the bill becomes law we may be certain that the major portion of the views expressed by the House managers in 20 pages of fine print in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will, in most cases, prevail, since in a great bulk of instances the positions asserted by the managers on the part of the House have not been denied by the Senate conferees either in their report or on the floor of the Senate.

It is important that the Senate understand that as the legislative history of the measure now stands we are voting for what is with only the rarest and most minor exceptions the Hartley bill, a bill which has been denounced from one end of the country to the other as being too harsh and which the chairman of the House Labor Committee admitted was drafted only for the purpose of wringing further concessions from the Senate. The Senate must understand that even those Members of this body who voted for this measure with reservations but with the hope that it could somehow be patched up in administration or by subsequent congressional action have had the wool pulled over their eyes by the House conferees.

It is interesting that those Senators who feel that the joint congressional commission provided by this bill offers an opportunity for correcting the defects which they concede are contained in this measure, are themselves in a minority within their own party. On some issues they made a valiant fight to exclude some of the worst proposals, yet it was only with the support of Senators on this side of the aisle that they were able in a few cases to defeat a number of vicious provisions. For that group now to suppose that they will have the assistance of their party in correcting this measure is thoroughly illusory. If anything, in the event this bill becomes law, they will find themselves faced with fights to ward off even more repressive and unjustified action on the part of a majority of their colleagues.

We, of the minority in the Labor Committee, have consistently offered our services on a bipartisan basis to sit down and draft a measure following the procedures so successfully adopted by the junior Senator from New York before he reversed his position after coming to this body. We have introduced legislation to implement that proposal we made; legislation which may still be passed at this session of the Congress and which I feel sure would be gladly signed by the President since it contains his own recommendations in his state of the Union message. For the comfort and well-being of the United States, the Senate would do well to admit its mistake, to concede that, as Chairman HARTLEY put it, "There is more in this bill than meets the eye," to start afresh on a bill of the kind which we have proposed, and to advance into this tortuous, complex field slowly and step by step, gaining a secure foothold before we move to the next step.

Mr. President, I think it would be appropriate at this time for me to call attention to the fact that the National Association of Manufacturers has been the principal organization behind this legislation.

We have witnessed in this present attempt to pass a vicious and pernicious labor bill the machinations of a power combine of big business, the NAM. How it works in behalf of monopoly big business, while at the same time fooling the vast majority of even its own membership among manufacturers, has been disclosed once more by two articles appearing in the last two issues of the official paper of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, the Trainmen News.

I call attention to these articles, and ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPENDS MILLIONS TO UNDERMINE LABOR—NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS: A TOOL OF MONOPOLY-MINDED BIG BUSINESS

(Part I)

The National Association of Manufacturers, bitter, powerful, and relentless foe of organized labor, has been at its job trying to beat back labor's advances for a long time now.

Since it was first organized in 1895 NAM has performed a great many services for its monopoly-minded big-business owners who shell out millions that go into its propaganda machine and come out as "influence" exerted on thousands of unknowing and unsuspecting voters.

The NAM was never so effective as just now when its long years of skillful efforts and its vast expenditures of money are paying off in the Republican reactionary Congress' support of the Taft-Hartley labor bill.

WORK FOR CORPORATION BIGWIGS

When an organization has been around doing business for half a century we begin to take it for granted. Having satisfied ourselves at one time or another of the character of the NAM, we have it "tagged" as a vicious, labor-baiting, reactionary tool of the handful of hard-boiled corporation millionaires—du Pont of the vast du Pont family interests, oil man Pew, Republican bigwig of Pennsylvania, Colby of General Foods, Weir of Weirton Steel, Hutchinson of Chrysler Corp., Hargrave of Eastman Kodak Co. and Hook of American Rolling Mills.

These men, with a few others of the same stripe, sitting in the top executive committee of NAM, pull its strings, make up the special programs to influence legislation, and find the money to pay their costs. But how they work is seldom revealed to the public. Let's take a look behind the scenes.

NAM's public relations chief probably revealed much more than his bosses would like when he boasted in a December 21, 1946, interview with Editor and Publisher of the propaganda program carried on by NAM during last year. That program cost slightly less than $3,000,000 and an even larger amount is budgeted to be spent during 1947. Judging by the way in which NAM is spending money right now, its propaganda campaign in putting over the Taft-Hartley bill has cost them much more.

You can buy a lot of influence with $3,000,000, even in a big country like the United States, if you know how to spread it around. Here's how it was spread by NAM's bright boys.

There were two jobs NAM sought to put over on the American people in 1946. One was to prepare the ground still further for the fight to destroy the Wagner act during the 1947 Congress. The other was to kill off OPA so that the specially favored few manufacturers could reap lush profits from the sale of scarce goods at uncontrolled inflated prices. NAM takes credit for destroying OPA. Of course, it had considerable assistance in the United States Senate from TAFT of Ohio and WHERRY of Nebraska, the same two who are by some strange coincidence lending such leadership to the labor bill now being enacted by the Republican Congress.

"When NAM started the campaign (against OPA)," boasts Holcombe Parkes, its public relations man, "a survey showed 85 percent of the people believed OPA was absolutely necessary. In November, 1946, after the campaign spearheaded by NAM, only 26 percent of the people believed OPA was vital."

FOUGHT OPA PROGRAM

People's irritation with (1) the shortages of goods when peace came, (2) the offering of shoddy merchandise, and (3) the black market were fanned into emotional flames against OPA by 1,000 talks given to women's clubs, foremen's groups, civic organizations and the student bodies of high schools and colleges by well-coached NAM staff speakers, Working through some local manufacturer who held a respected position in the community, NAM organizers developed what appeared to be wholly impartial community conferences attended by the wives of leading businessmen, church, and civic leaders club officers and school officials. All got the same intensive cultivation from NAM headquarters, leading to the well-planned conclusion that OPA was harmful, that it must go if goods were to become of top quality and abundant, and that prices would not go high, and even if some of them did rise momentarily, they would soon come down.

NAM saw to securing its results by "tailoring" its publications to the special interests of particular groups.

Each group of opinion molders got its specific NAM propaganda. "Trends," a specially designed publication, went to a selected group of 37,000 school superintendents, principals, and teachers. "Understandings" went to 15,000 clergymen. "Farm and Industry" was sent regularly to 35,000 farm leaders. "Program Notes" was especially developed to be used by 40,000 leaders in women's clubs.

But while all this effort was calculated to get the ground well cultivated and fertilized for widespread acceptance of NAM's programs, "we must be sure that our stories are told exactly the way we want them told," said NAM's public relations head. "Paid advertising is the only sure way of doing this" So, over $1,500,000 went into direct advertising. How much good will such a juicy plum produces for NAM among the publishers of the Nation who receive a share of it is anybody's guess. But it makes doubly sure that good use will be made of NAM's clip sheet which feeds stuff all ready to go to print to 7,500 weekly newspapers, and its special publication Industry's Views which goes regularly to 2,500 busy columnists and editorial writers.

SOME NAM PROPAGANDA

NAM has made much of its devotion to the "American enterprise system." It tries hard to make this long-continued build-up pay off in its deft use of our traditional American opposition to monopoly by seeking to pin that label on organized labor.

But when these big businessmen talk so loudly about the American system of enterprise, how much do you hear them shouting about "free competitive" enterprise? Who are the corporations who used World War II as a means of further concentrating the wealth of the Nation into still fewer hands? Which corporation executives refused to expand production facilities even when their patriotism was appealed to by the President until they were guaranteed tax write-offs? Who are the corporations listed among the monopolies and near monopolies in the exhaustive studies of the TNEC? What corporations defy the Sherman and Clayton Antitrust Acts. drag out suits brought against them by the Federal Government to lengthen the time during which they can garner monopoly profits? Start naming these corporations, and see how closely they fit the roster of the inner circle of giant companies making and guiding the policies of NAM.

Let's read the record of NAM! Look at these black spots:

The NAM opposed the child-labor amendment. It fought for years to put over on the workers and the public the notion that their interests were best furthered by an open shop in industry and a company-sponsored welfare program calculated to achieve NAM's brand of corporation-dictated industrial democracy. When labor got stronger with the election of Franklin D. Rosevelt and the introduction of the New Deal, then NAM likewise found its treasury swollen by the contributions of those industrialists whose hatred of "that man" was so intense.

NAM used the money to influence voters and their elected representatives to oppose workingmen's compensation, the social-security program of old-age pensions and unemployment compensation, bank-deposit insurance, the Wages and Hours Act, legislation offered to strengthen independent competitive small business, public-health programs, and Federal aid for public schools, and other measures which have proved so beneficial not only to the common people of this country but to the very business community which opposed such legislation.

DOESN'T FIGHT FAIRLY

The NAM has every right in our democracy to oppose openly such proposals, if it chooses. For that is the straightforward, American way of fighting. But a congressional investigation showed that the NAM didn't fight fairly and in the open. On the contrary, says the La Follette committee, it "blanketed the country with a propaganda which in technique has relied upon indirection of meaning, and in presentation upon secrecy and deception. Radio, speeches, public meetings, news, cartoons, editorials, advertising, motion pictures, and many other artifices of propaganda have not, in most instances, disclosed to the public their origin with the association."

And what the committee considered most dangerous to our democratic form of government was the fact that the NAM's campaign of propaganda stems from the almost limitless resources of corporate treasuries. Not individuals but corporations constitute the membership of the association and supply its funds.

Probably few of the people subjected to the barrage of propaganda last year in the 1,600,000 pamphlets and booklets, sent to schools, libraries, and individuals, the more than 46,000 showings of NAM films, viewed by over 600,000, and a Nation-wide weekly radio broadcast, could see through the skillfully designed curtain of secrecy to distinguish the guiding hand and selfish purpose of a few dozen giant corporation executives who manipulate NAM so largely for their own ends. Yet, this is exactly what happens. How it takes place, and with what results, will appear in a second and concluding article.

WHAT IS THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS?

(Part II)

In the previous article on NAM's program of propaganda we traced how big business' $3,000,000 was spent in 1946 to cultivate the grassroots of the Nation and influence the Congress to repeal OPA and prepare for the passage of the Hartley-Taft-Ball slave labor bill in the 1947 Congress. Here we sketch the way NAM is set up to do such dirty work for a handful of powerful corporations which dominate American business.

NAM was established in 1895, incorporated in New York State as a nonprofit organization. Just now it boasts its greatest membership, slightly more than 15,000 manufacturing businesses. While only manufacturing firms can belong, the interlocking tieups with utilities and trade groups make NAM the "front" and guiding spirit of the powerful leaders in most branches of American business. But more of this later.

How NAM gets and holds onto its members is of first importance. For members spell both political pressure and money for NAM's work. No individual belongs to NAM. A membership is sold to a manufacturing company, and memberships are sold as low as $25 a year. Dues are based on the number of employees in the firm. Here is one key to where the power is lodged in NAM, for the old adage applies—"he who pays calls the tune." The big boys heading corporations having thousands of workers set its antilabor policies and guide its reactionary program.

While NAM has some 15 salesmen in the field contacting manufacturing firms all the time, selling memberships, the real pressure that produces results is what is known inside the shop as the chain membership program. This is the tough bludgeoning device which few even of the most independent smaller businessmen can afford to resist for long. Here is how it works. The NAM staff prepares a letter on the stationery and for the signature of one of its big members,

say for example, Alfred Sloan of General Motors Corp. He explains in the letter that as a member of a special promotional committee of NAM he wants to tell the firm to which the letter is being sent just why it is important to that firm to belong to NAM. He asks the head of the firm to write him personally his decision. He very kindly includes in the letter a scale of membership fees to guide his correspondent in making out his check to NAM.

When such a letter goes out to the heads of all the companies which sell to or have important business dealings with General Motors, such pressure gets results. Under such pressure manufacturers become members of NAM—but what kind of members? Are these 15,000 firms active members? Do they shape the policies and approve the programs carried on by NAM? Should they be forced to bear the brunt of public disapproval of NAM, even though they are really only silent, and probably many are unwilling members in that organization?

In American business a man doesn't often get to the head of a manufacturing firm of sufficient size to be pressured into membership in NAM without having learned one important rule of the game—to take what is handed out by the bigger and more powerful above him without protesting too much. So, whether he likes the reactionary anti-labor program of NAM or not, he seldom questions the right of the handful of men who run NAM to impose such a program, even by dictatorial, Fascist-like methods. For NAM is not set up to operate as a democratic organization expressing the will of its membership. To be sure, it has a board, composed of some 60 members, which is selected to cover the various sections of the country and give the outward impression of being a representative body.

The board meets once a month, usually in the swanky Waldorf-Astoria in New York, except for some few winter meetings held at some favorite spot in Florida or in the horsey country of Virginia where a few of the more powerful members may be sojourning away from the inclement weather of New York. But even these board meetings, which are attended by a couple of dozen regulars who make it their business to always be on hand, are more in the nature of the window-dressing, giving outward approval of the program and policy already agreed to by the small, well-knit executive committee of big business officials.

Formerly, big corporation executives held the high offices in NAM and spoke for the organization. Then, they began to heed the advice of smart public relations promoters, and went underground. They developed a well-studied plan of window dressing calculated to impress the public with the representative character of NAM. One feature was to deliberately select a president of NAM who was the head of some comparatively small but quite reputable manufacturing firm. The scheme has worked well, for many businessmen are led to believe that NAM is not the tool of a handful of giant corporations, but their own organization.

The public hears from NAM's president as the representative of a vast number of manufacturers who are banded together to preserve and strengthen the free-enterprise system and the American way of life. While the real power in NAM affairs rests securely in the handful of likeminded, likepurposed big corporation executives who compose its inner circle in the executive committee. Here the program to kill OPA was hatched. Here the budget was agreed to for spending some $3,000,000 getting ready to put over the Hartley-Taft-Ball labor bill. It is this group that has fought over the years against the abolition of child labor, the enactment of Social Security, the levying of taxes based on the ability-to-pay principle.

It is within this inner circle that the big funds are pledged and raised to pay for NAM's program of propaganda, funds which, by the way, are tax-exempt contributions, for by some means NAM has succeeded in convincing the Internal Revenue Bureau that it is a nonprofit organization engaged in nonpolitical, philanthropic, educational work.

Once agreed to ir the executive committee, passed on by the Board in which these executive committee members are the dominant figures, NAM has its program and budget. The rest is a job of promotion, done most skillfully by a staff of some 300 in New York, about 30 in Washington, D. C., and lesser numbers scattered strategically over the country in offices in the larger industrial centers.

Described thus, NAM appears much like many other pressure organizations. But NAM is more subtle and devious than that. When it found that the public, and even the business community, had its organization tagged as being reactionary and out of step with American needs, it cooked up a scheme for hiding itself and widening its influence by working through other more local groups. So the National Industrial Council was created. Sweetened in recent years by an annual contribution from NAM of some $200,000 to defray certain expenses, NIC federates and coordinates the political-legislative program of three constituent bodies, (1) the State manufacturing associations such as the Illinois Manufacturing Association, the Associated Industries of New York, the Iowa Manufacturers Association; (2) the various employers' associations, such as the Employers Association of Cleveland, the Open Shop Association of Atlanta; (3) the trade association group, which is a federation of most trade associations, such as the National Electrical Manufacturers Association and the Lumber Dealers Association.

The degree of control that NAM has over these several groups varies. On some of the most important issues, such as the program to destroy OPA last year, or the Taft-Hartley-Ball labor bill just now, there is almost 100 percent agreement.

NAM looks upon the various State manufacturers' groups as the means of fighting labor within the several States, and as a grass-roots contact which is maintained year round. Many of these State groups have memberships from the public utilities, which affords NAM a means of cross-fertilizing, of bringing influence to bear on these powerful business groups, and securing the support of their substantial political organizations both in national and local fights.

The local employers organizations, while powerful in their own towns or States, often lack broad program materials and research reports, especially dealing with national issues. Here, again, NAM finds a profitable alliance ready to serve its purposes.

The national trade associations on NAM's list number about 300. While independent of NAM, they hold their annual trade association group meeting in conjunction with NAM's. Broad policy agreements are effected. NAM works through these trade associations when it is advantageous to do so. For example, in the 1946 OPA fight, NAM was able to get the trade associations to spearhead the job, particularly at the local contact level, for each association was anxious to make the record of having destroyed OPA and thus secure higher prices for its members. Usually, however, trade associations shy away from activities which might label them as lobbyists. Hence, they are quite willing to let NAM do that part of the job.

The NAM doesn't just throw into the common "kitty" its $200,000 annual contribution to the National Industrial Council. Its money is spent to maintain the central office in New York, to pay the salaries of the staff there and of the council's office in Washington, D. C. Thus, NAM has a direct hold on the activities of the NIC. To further tighten this hold, the representative of State and local groups in NIC are brought to Washington once a month where they are addressed by NAM's staff officers, meet with selected Members of Congress and Government officials. Plans for supporting or opposing pending legislation are formulated at these meetings.

It must be borne in mind that the keynote of all these meetings is anti-New Deal, and particularly antilabor. One long-time member of these meetings asserts that, conservatively estimated, three-fourths of the time is devoted to labor problems.

NAM doesn't stop here in exerting pressure on the people and Congress. It has an excellent means of approach to individual Members of Congress which affords its lobbyists a ready welcome by working through industrialist friends of Senators and Congressmen who are members of NAM. If you haven't seen Congress in action, with its Members, especially the influential ones, carrying a stupendous load of work that allows them little free uninterrupted time, you can't appreciate how important it is for the NAM lobbyist to have access to the ear of Senator T and Congressman H.

NAM staff men have developed great skill in using this entree, for they don't want to wear out their welcome or embarrass their friends in Congress by a too obvious show of such close relationships. But even more important is NAM's desire to preserve its status as a tax-exempt, nonpolitical organization. That is why a very few amongst its large paid staff so reluctantly registered under the new lobbying law, for, if NAM is adjudged because of that to be an organization engaged primarily and directly in influencing legislation and supporting candidates for office, the very attractive bait of tax exemption held out to its heavy contributors won't be possible any more.

Shorn of its big contributions, NAM would lose its greatest means of effective action, for NAM doesn't depend primarily on the dues collected from its manufacturing-firm memberships for its program. That way it raises and reports to its members an annual budget of from $1,000,000 to $1,500,000. But it has a sponsored subsidiary organization, the National Industrial Information Committee. That organization raises some $3,000,000 or more a year directly from industry to finance its far-flung program of propaganda. To get that sizable budget, each State is assigned its quota, and the industrial leaders pledge their share of these tax-deductible contributions.

This recital would not be complete without mention of the role played by so-called impartial scientific research conducted by NAM's own research organization, and by other affiliated bodies or kindred research bureaus. One of these, the National Industrial Conference Board, publishes basic studies on a wide range of social-economic subjects. They are often done by scientists of reputation. They frequently make substantial additions to our knowledge. They find much use as teaching materials in our schools and colleges. They are quoted widely by public speakers. They become important data in labor negotiations and court actions.

Supported by contributions from the same group of financial giants as operate NAM, working on subjects of great significance to NAM, it's small wonder that the product of such research agencies bolsters NAM's views. They provide scientific facts and the feeling of profundity that gives NAM such advantage when it quotes scientific research in support of its position. For NAM has learned the value of a big research program, and it makes good use of it.

In the passage of the Hartley-Taft-Ball labor bill by the 1947 Congress, organized labor faces one of the most hazardous and chaotic periods of its existence. It will inevitably be forced more and more into politics to make its position fully understood by

the American voters. In this arena of publics affairs, it will meet NAM head-on. In its relentless fight against organized labor, NAM will not be satisfied even if this vicious Taft-Hartley labor bill becomes law, but will press for the complete emasculation of the Wagner Act. Should NAM be fortunate in the 1948 elections and a reactionary Republican administration be voted into office, that is exactly what can be expected. For NAM was organized by American big business to fight labor. That is what its highly paid staff of experts gets paid to do. That is what it spends in excess of $3,000,000 a year in devious and oft-times deceitful propaganda to accomplish.

In our type of democratic government NAM, and any other pressure organization, has the right to bring every legitimate influence to bear on the voters and their elected representatives. The utmost freedom of action of citizens to organize, to express their views, to petition for redress of grievances, to show their approval or disapproval of their elected officials, are absolutely essential to the vigorous functioning of American democracy.

But any pressure organization like NAM must accept the consequences of its acts. The very foundations of representative democratic government are threatened by the secret, evasive action of an organization which fears the light of full disclosure of its sources of funds, its membership, its true purposes, its techniques of exercising influence, its paid representatives, how much it spends, to whom it accounts for these expenditures, and its connections with other organizations, dummy and real.

Any group formed to influence public decisions must be forced by law to work in a goldfish bowl. No group intent upon directly lobbying for or against legislative measures has the right under existing law to be supported from tax-exempt contributions.

In many of these respect NAM is guilty, for, as the La Follette Senate investigating committee pointed out, it "blanketed the country with a propaganda which in technique has relied upon indirection of meaning, and presentation upon secrecy and deception."

Once forced into the open, where the general public, the members of State legislatures, and the Congress of the United States can see NAM's trade-mark on all its wares, it will be exposed as a tool of a handful of industrial giants who have long sought to destroy the gains of labor and thwart the advances made toward greater social security and economic prosperity in the United States. Once exposed, even the huge funds at the disposal of NAM's bright boys will not be fearsome, for the plain people have an almost uncanny ability to make up their own minds in their own interests. And they will soon find that their interest runs counter to that of the big business corporation leaders who run NAM.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, there has been much misunderstanding in the country as a result of the propaganda which has been put forth in connection with this legislation. I have received letters from my own State of Montana insisting that I should vote for the legislation, but when the matter was explained to my constituents I frequently found that I received letters telling me that they were entirely in accord with my judgment in the matter, since they were led to believe that the bill was not a repressive bill, and that all it sought to accomplish was to correct the few evils which existed in the field of labor relations. I shall not take the time to read any of those letters at this time, but there is considerable misunderstanding in the country. However, I wish to call attention to some statements which have been made by well-known businessmen in regard to legislation of this kind.

Here is a statement which comes from a Cleveland manufacturer, Mr. Alexander Printz, president of the Printz-Biederman Co., of Cleveland, and chairman of the National Coat and Suit Industry Recovery Board, at the June 20 session of the twenty-sixth convention of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union at the Public Auditorium in Cleveland. This is a lengthy statement, and I shall not take the time to read it in detail. I call attention to a few excerpts from it. During the course of his statement Mr. Printz said:

In those industries in which the worker-employer concord has not reached a point at which a program such as that of the recovery board can be introduced and developed, a beneficial purpose would, in my opinion, be served through joint conventions of representatives of labor and management. This would constitute a forum for the interchange of views and ideas, not under the stress of contract negotiation, but in the spirit of mutual enlightenment. * * *

Advancement toward an equitable management-labor relationship in industry in general cannot be achieved through depriving conscientious labor groups of their effectiveness. It is true that jurisdictional disputes, secondary boycotts, and similar actions have evoked much justified criticism but it would be everlastingly regrettable if, in attempting to curb these, the very life of wholesome unionism were to be endangered.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire statement be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANAGEMENT SPEAKS TO LABOR

(Address by Alexander Printz, president of the Printz-Biederman Co., of Cleveland, and chairman of the National Coat and Suit Industry Recovery Board, at the June 20 session of the twenty-sixth convention of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union at the Public Auditorium in Cleveland)

It is, indeed, an honor to be invited to address this great convention. I look upon the invitation as tendered to me not as an individual employer, nor even as chairman of the National Coat and Suit Industry Recovery Board, but as symbolizing the admirable progress that has been made over the years in harmonious management-labor relationship in the industries with which your organization is identified.

As a Clevelander, who has been in the garment-manufacturing business here for more than half a century, it is a source of particular pride to me that this city should be the scene of your triennial meeting. I want to join with other of my fellow citizens and the industry members of this city in bidding you welcome and in expressing the confidence that you will find Cleveland so satisfactory a meeting place that you will come here soon again.

I had the privilege of speaking at your convention in Atlantic City more than 10 years ago and again at your noteworthy gathering in Boston in 1944.

Each time you have asked me to speak I have accepted your courteous invitation, not because I felt that I could make any significant contribution to your deliberations but because it seemed to me that it was fitting and proper that a representative of management should, when afforded the opportunity, report to labor on matters of common concern.

The fact that there is a community of purpose between management and labor in the wholesome functioning of an industry was cogently expressed a number of years ago, at a time of grave depression, by the late Morris Hillquit, the able counsel to your union and a truly distinguished figure of his time. He declared that labor was interested in the creation of proceeds by industry; that, without such proceeds, there would be nothing with which to give adequate remuneration to labor.

AN INSIGHT INTO MANAGEMENT'S ROLE

It would, I sincerely believe, aid in the consistent improvement in worker-employer relationship for management to accord to labor an insight into management's role in the operation of an industry. Such an insight is made possible in the coat and suit industry through the National Coat and Suit Industry Recovery Board, which serves as a medium of common consideration of industry affairs by management and labor. The meetings of the executive committee of the board, which comprises representatives of your union and the employers' associations in the various coat and suit manufacturing centers throughout the Nation, has been aptly described by your president, David Dubinsky, as the "Parliament of the industry."

This is an attitude free of the isolationism that precipitates controversies and that causes the waste inherent in suspicion and in conflict. It is a form of relationship in which neither side surrenders its individuality nor dilutes its partisanship but which recognizes the sound precept that labor and management are not traditional enemies or ingrained adversaries.

It requires courage for union leadership to take part in such a program as that represented by the recovery board. It is not as dramatic or colorful as are more belligerent forms of union activity; it does not have the popular appeal of fist brandishing or saber rattling. It is a broad-visioned pattern for peaceful progress worthy of the widest possible emulation.

CONSTRUCTIVE INTERCHANGE OF VIEWS

In those industries in which the worker-employer concord has not reached a point at which a program such as that of the recovery board can be introduced and developed, a beneficial purpose would, in my opinion, be served through joint conventions of representatives of labor and management. This would constitute a forum for the interchange of views and ideas, not under the stress of contract negotiation, but in the spirit of mutual enlightenment.

Not to presume upon your kindness in inviting me here today, I do, however, wish to dwell for a moment upon the true character of management's role as the marketing agent of the grist of the skill and effort of an industry's workers. An outline of management's duties in the apparel industry quickly discloses it to be a many-sided, arduous job that merits the respect, not of labor alone, but of the public as well.

It is management's task to utilize to the utmost its knowledge and ingenuity, not merely in intraindustry competition but in the broader intercommodity rivalry.

Management in the apparel industry does not rest upon laurels of the past; it recognizes the fact that each season poses a separate challenge. Fabric and other resource markets must be exhaustively studied and conclusions concerning them must be supported by substantial investment. Management must direct extensive styling activities, hazarding a sizable part of its capital in the preparation of its lines. Management must engage in intensive merchandising and dis-

tribution procedure and must underwrite and coordinate a great many other functions that make for lasting good will and for product improvement.

STABILIZED LABOR CONDITIONS ESSENTIAL

To enable management to center its attention upon the capable performance of its manifold duties, orderly and stabilized labor conditions are not merely desirable; they are unquestionably essential.

It is, indeed, my opinion that the weakening of constructive unionism would be as injurious to conscientious employers as it would be to labor itself. In an industry such as ours, made up of numerous comparatively small firms, a responsible labor organization is necessary to prevent an unreasonable and unfair minority of employers from undermining those who depend for survival upon the merit of their product and their service.

Advancement toward an equitable management-labor relationship in industry in general cannot be achieved through depriving conscientious labor groups of their effectiveness. It is true that jurisdictional disputes, secondary boycotts, and similar actions have evoked much justified criticism but it would be everlastingly regrettable if, in attempting to curb these, the very life of wholesome unionism were to be endangered.

The fact that there has been some unsavory union leadership does not justify any generalizations that ignore the role of organized labor in our Nation's march of progress.

LEADERSHIP OF HIGH INTEGRITY

You of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union are to be congratulated upon the leadership of your organization—men of high integrity and proven ability. They give aggressive representation to your great organization and although we, as employers, disagree with them on many occasions, they have our sincere and enduring respect.

In closing, let me voice my belief that there is an awareness among reasonable and capable employers that strong unions, led by men of vision and probity, are indispensable to industrial orderliness and stability.

Speaking out of my own experience, I withstood the unionizing of my firm for a quarter of a century—from 1910 to 1935. Now, after 12 years of conducting a union plant, I feel that, despite the occasional problems and differences that are inevitable in any relationship, I would not want to revert to a nonunion status and I would view with regret any developments that would place unionization in our industry as a whole upon a demoralizing defensive.

The task of making way for a better tomorrow in our Nation is, properly, a joint endeavor of us all. It is the common goal of worker and employer—of management and labor. Drastic curbs upon either labor or management will not attain this eagerly desired objective.

Mutual confidence and good will, as exemplified by your extending to me the privileges of this platform, are the basic essentials for lasting betterment for ourselves and for the generations to come.

NATIONAL COAT AND SUIT INDUSTRY RECOVERY BOARD.

Mr. MURRAY. Reference has been made during the course of the debate to a statement made by Mr. Cyrus S. Eaton, of Cleveland, Ohio. I wish to call attention to his complete statement. I do not think it has been placed before the Senate during the debate. It has been printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, but it has never been discussed during the course of the debate.

Mr. Eaton is one of the country's leading industrialists and financiers, one who has taken a great pride in the development of industry in the United States, and he is recognized as a man entitled to speak on behalf of American industry. In an article which he has contributed to the Chicago Law Review he has much to say with reference to the proposed labor legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Eaton's statement be printed in full in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CYRUS S. EATON BIDS CAPITALISTS PLACATE LABOR—INDUSTRIALIST WARNS AGAINST LEGAL CURBS, CALLS FOR MUZZLING OF THE NAM

CHICAGO, June 14.—Cyrus S. Eaton, Cleveland industrialists and banker, said today that "to avoid extinction" capitalists will "have to make immediate and radical changes in our attitude toward labor and our methods of dealing with labor."

"We will have to begin by muzzling such organizations as the National Association of Manufacturers and by recognizing and sincerely regretting that there is bad feeling on both sides," he said.

In an article entitled "A Capitalist Looks at Labor," published in the current issue of the University of Chicago Law Review, he discussed labor legislation, saying, "Let no businessman be naive enough to believe * * * that restrictive legislation will be any more effective in bringing about industrial harmony than the Volstead Act was in discouraging drinking."

WARNS CAPITALISM

Mr. Eaton, who has broad interests in the iron-ore, steel, coal, and railroad industries; asserted that "capitalism cannot survive without the support of labor." He added:

"The casualness with which we capitalists seem willing—nay, even eager—to invite the collapse of our economic system in almost every industrial dispute for the sole purpose of thwarting labor is utterly incomprehensible. Labor not only produces the goods and consumes a large part of them; labor also has the votes. * * *

"Eventually (labor) unity is practically a foregoing conclusion. The prospect of labor united should be sobering to even the most embittered and embattled capitalist.

"I also believe we may ultimately see a strong alliance between labor and the farmer, accompanied by a tremendous expansion of the manufacturing and selling coperatives. The effecting of such a formidable combination awaits only the magic touch of some dynamic personality.

"Then, if capitalism has not already gone by the board, its continued existence will be completely at the mercy of an estranged 95 percent of the electorate."

LAUDS LEWIS FOR RESTRAINT

He credited John L. Lewis, head of the United Mine Workers, an affiliate of the American Federation of Labor, with exercising wisdom and restraint during the soft-coal controversy last fall and accused the mine owners of working "under cover * * * feverishly night and day to keep a torrent of abuse turned on the miners and their leaders through every channel of publicity and to urge all three branches of Government—executive, legislative, and judicial—to crack down on labor."

"Throughout the entire time," he added, "John L. Lewis never uttered a syllable of complaint and never issued a statement criticizing anybody."

Mr. Eaton said the Supreme Court decision against the miners "will be productive of untold evil in the whole field of labor relations."

In an article in the same publication Senator WAYNE MORSE, Republican, of Oregon, said the American people are "expecting entirely too much of labor legislation as a panacea for industrial ills."

"I am afraid that to many, both in and out of Congress, have misled themselves into thinking that a maximum of industrial freedom in this country can be attained by putting American labor in a strait-jacket," he added.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I call attention to an article published in the New York Times of last Sunday, written by Mr. C. F. Hughes. Mr. Hughes says:

With respect to the labor bill, the early enthusiasm of industrialists for a restrictive measure has more or less evaporated as they view the prospect for more confusion in their labor relations and the promise of endless litigation if the bill becomes law. It has been called a field day for lawyers in the analyses which have been circulating among business concerns.

Mr. Marquis Childs, the well-known columnist whose column appears in the Washington Post, on June 11 called attention to the fact that the legislation would be a feast for lawyers. In his statement Mr. Childs said:

MEAT FOR THE LAWYERS

(By Marquis Childs)

The flood of comment on the labor bill has been in terms of (1) politics, and (2) the changes which it will, or will not, bring about in our system of industrial relations over a period of years. It would be well to consider for a moment what will happen during the next 2 years.

The first prospect is for a test in the courts. We sometimes forget that we have a third coordinate branch of our Government. Harsh and cynical critics have called the Supreme Court a House of Lords which has power to veto or ratify legislation approved by Congress.

Organized labor is certain to challenge the provisions of the new law in Federal court. The machinery of the law courts grinds slowly and the Supreme Court is not likely to hand down a decision before 2 years from the present date.

That means 2 years of comparative uncertainty while the enlarged National Labor Relations Board is trying to administer a complicated new law. The members of the Board will naturally learn a great deal in the next few months about the workability of the law. Presumably they should be able to go to reasonable men on Capitol Hill—men such as Senator IRVING M. IVES, of New York—to report what they have discovered and then to make the necessary changes.

But next year is a Presidential election year. In the political football game of '48, labor legislation will be one of the issues to be kicked around. Neither side—the Democrats in the executive branch nor the Republicans in Congress—will be able to make any concessions to reason and workability.

A great deal has been said about who will benefit by the new measure. "Slave labor," says the AFL in tones of anguish paid for at the full advertising rate. A charter of freedom for the workingman says Senator ROBERT A. TAFT in solemn self-congratulation.

There is one group, however, that will benefit beyond a shadow of a doubt—those are the lawyers. A vast new realm of law has been created and battalions of lawyers will be required to interpret it.

The fact is that, in conference between Senate and House, a lot of the so-called modernation was taken out of the measure adopted by the Senate. This was done in part by complicating the legal machinery.

A good case for a veto can be made on the cumbersomeness of the bill sent to the President for his approval or disapproval.

One of the most experienced men in the labor-relations field, whose position has been moderate and who has suffered under attacks from the unions, made a careful study of the effects of the bill. He concluded that the functions of the Labor Board are so weighted down with new legal restrictions that labor might prefer to strike rather than resort to such circuitous and difficult procedure.

One of the curious things the new bill does is to create an independent "general counsel," to be appointed by the President. This general counsel has final authority over the investigation of charges and the issuance of complaints. This man can become a czar over all labor, if he chooses, since he can decide what cases should and what cases should not be heard by the Board. There is no appeal from his decision either to the Board or to the courts.

In a variety of ways, the bill puts new hedges around the collective bargaining process. Most of them apply only to employees. Some apply to employers as well. These are in many instances so technical that only lawyers specializing in the labor field will comprehend what they do.

In the last analysis, you can say that the leaders of organized labor are to blame for what is about to happen to them. Their foolish, unyielding, ostrich-like attitude has brought the omnibus bill. If they had been able to agree on certain minimum steps to correct flagrant abuses, Congress would in all likelihood have adopted a less complicated and restrictive measure.

The proof of the cake will be in the eating of it. One test will be the degree of industrial peace which follows. Let no one suppose that it is a magic wand waved over the industrial battlefront. The Labor Board, including its regional offices, has 5,500 pending cases under the present law, more than 500 waiting final decision by the Board in Washington. Under the complicated new law, we may see even more industrial strife than we have had in recent months. There is no final formula in law that will guarantee peaceful collective bargaining.

Mr. President, another article which I should like to call to the attention of the Senate is one appearing in Harper's magazine for June 1947, at page 510. This is an article by Mr. Charles Luckman, president of Lever Bros. Co. Mr. Luckman has given a great deal of study to labor-management relations, and has written a very able article discussing the road to industrial peace. In the closing part of the article he says:

In the end we must accept one glaring truth: Labor unions are here to stay, and, whatever our private thoughts on the matter, we are going to have to get along with them if our Nation is to prosper. We can fight them, and curse them, and legislate against them, and otherwise belabor the surface of the problem to our hearts content; but we know deep down that this superficial attitude is not going to accomplish any constructive results. For our own sake, for our children's sake, for the sake of the Nation, and very likely for the sake of a goodly portion of the world, we are going to have to cut right down to the fears and prejudices and pride and ache for security that made people form unions in the first place.

I sincerely believe that much can be done to allay fears, remove insecurity, and stir latent pride by adapting to the varying needs of different industries those programs that have almost invariably proved successful in the creation of healthy industrial relations.

There are a great many large corporations in this country which have sound labor relations. Some of them have not had a strike for 30 years. That is because of the enlightened attitude which they take in regard to the problems of labor relations. Mr. Stuart Chase, in the Reader's Digest for May 1947, has an article on this subject entitled "The Road to Labor Peace," in which he gives some examples of how several large corporations have handled their labor relations problems, showing that with a wise treatment of this subject, and careful dealing with the unions, the unions can be brought to cooperate and to greatly aid the corporations in increasing production and maintaining peaceful relations.

I ask that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point:

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROAD TO LABOR PEACE

(By Stuart Chase)

We were talking about the annual contract between the union and the management which was about to come up for renewal. The man across the table from me was big and bald, with kindly blue eyes. He was a pipe fitter for the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, and one of the union officials who would negotiate the contract.

"Suppose you can't agree, and the whole collective-bargaining machinery breaks down?" I asked.

He scratched his head. "Well, it never has broken down."

"But suppose for once it did."

"I don't think it would make a great deal of difference. We'd carry on all right."

"Why?"

"Well, you see, we trust each other."

It sounded natural and commonplace enough the way he said it. But what a vista that remark opens up on labor relations all over America today. "We trust each other." They do not trust each other in the coal fields, or in the automobile plants, or on the water front, in the packing plants, or even on the railroads, to judge by recent troubles.

A big strike ruins mutual trust for a long time to come, no matter how the contract reads. They can't call one another "profiteer" and "exploiter," or "Communist" and "agitator"—and expect to kiss and make up in a few minutes, after the picket lines have been withdrawn. Union leaders and company executives have to live with each other; hate caused by the struggle and the name calling does not soon blow over.

Yet, until workers and managers can operate together as a producing team, can anything ever be really settled? Peter F. Drucker puts it this way: "What is needed is a radical change in the basic concept that management has of the worker—a change from the rabble hypothesis which regards him as an economic automaton to respect for the worker as a human being."

Leaders of big unions will have to shift their attitude, too. And Congress, in considering new labor laws, should aim at making it easier for men and management to trust each other. To legislate revenge against John L. Lewis might cause most Congressmen to feel better, but if the legal artillery which knocked him out should also infuriate 15,000,000 trade-union members and their families, the price would be too high. It could bring the country close to a general strike, which is another name for civil war.

The labor genie is now out of the bottle, and he cannot be stuffed back into it. People in all walks of life are prepared to quit work for what they consider to be their rights. The vitality of this mass movement can hopefully be led into constructive channels, but it cannot be suppressed by passing laws. It is too late for that.

I would like to see Congress make a careful investigation of the labor problem. The industrial woods are full of good labor-management programs; some have been operating for many years. All kinds of helpful plans are available if one has the patience to look for them.

Take, for example, the experience of the men's clothing industry, where the union took the initiative for industrial peace, and the experience of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, where management took the initiative. In neither case has there been a serious strike for 30 years.

In the first instance, the late Sidney Hillman led the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union, after years of violence in a sweated business, into a policy of actively cooperating with employers to keep the industry prosperous. A sick industry means unemployment and low wages. Management and union under Hillman's urging combined to hire production engineers to increase efficiency. The union did not stop making demands, but it went easy on employers who were in financial difficulties. On one occasion it loaned a large clothing manufacturer a substantial amount and saved him from bankruptcy. Why not? A bankrupt employer means men on the street.

In Standard Oil of New Jersey, management took the lead. Somebody had to do something, for labor relations in 1916 were spectacularly bad. Two big strikes within a year had flared into pitched battles, with dead and wounded on both sides. One of the demands of the strikers read: "We request humane treatment at the hands of the foremen and superiors in place of the brutal kicking and punching we now receive without provocation." This charge may or may not have been true, but the men felt that it was.

Yet, in 1946 a pipe fitter could tell me that worker and company could get along, no matter what happened to the collective-bargaining machinery, because "we trust each other." That is a big change.

My chief impression as I visited the Jersey Standard refineries recently was the absence of tension. Seldom have I found a company with such a friendly and democratic atmosphere. Nobody seemed to be pushing anybody around.

My impressions were backed up by a series of worker-opinion polls conducted by Elma Roper, who sampled about 12,000 employees with some 35 questions. The results showed clearly that the workers liked their jobs, their fellow workers, the top management, their foremen, the promotion system, and the company benefit policies. Though Negro workers, women workers, and technicians were somewhat less satisfied than the others, it is impossible to study the reports without being convinced that men and management have somehow established a unique atmosphere of mutual trust.

In the fall of 1945, 60,000 oil workers declared a strike. It hardly touched Jersey Standard's many plants; one small plant in Texas shut down for 3 days, and that was all. We also note that 92 percent of all former employees in the armed services have headed back to the company upon release. The ratio for all American companies is about 50 percent. We find labor turn-over rates phenomenally low at Standard. In one refinery 75 percent of the men have been with the company for more than 20 years.

How did this all come about? First, no manager is long retained who doesn't like people, and so does not know how to get

along with them. Workers are not "hands" at Standard, not commodities to be bought as cheaply as possible; they are human beings and are respected as such. No matter how competent a boss may be in the technology of oil, if he is not competent in human relations he does not hold his job.

Secondly, management has been on its toes to invent not only new methods for cracking gasoline but new methods for dealing fairly with people. Here is a partial list:

1. Provision for regular joint conferences between management and workers' representatives.

2. Machinery for handling grievances rapidly—before they snowball to enormous proportions. Appeal can be taken by an aggrieved worker right up to the president of the company.

3. A personnel department charged with working out fair rules for hiring, firing, transfer, and for counseling workers, with no discrimination. Lists of specific offenses for which a worker can be discharged are published for all to see. For offenses that are not on the list a foreman cannot arbitrarily fire a man.

4. Real collective-bargaining machinery for the independent unions and the six CIO and four AFL locals.

5. A firm policy of paying prevailing wages or better.

6. Generous sickness, accident, death, and disability benefits.

7. Training schools for workers who want to better their positions.

8. Promotion according to both ability and seniority.

9. A special savings plan for workers, to which the company makes substantial contributions.

10. A coin-your-ideas plan, to stimulate improved methods and inventions by employees.

11. A policy of letting employees know well in advance of unavoidable lay-offs.

12. A policy of printing all major provisions concerning labor-management relations, and distributing the list to employees, so that they have the company's promised word in black and white.

There are still disagreements at Standard, of course, but no abiding hate. "Sure we get mad at each other," said a plant manager to me. "I get mad as hell. And John here—pointing to the president of the union—he gets mad as hell. But we're careful not to get mad at the same time."

It must be remembered that all this has taken place in an expanding industry. More and more cars on the roads have meant more and more gasoline. Managers can afford to be generous and human when they are not constantly bedeviled by red ink. Things are different in the coal business, where losses are the order of the day for many companies. Except in wartime, coal miners are lucky to get 200 days' work a year.

This points to the fact that one excellent recipe for stopping strikes is steady employment. When the worker feels secure in his job he finds it hard to "hate the company." If something can be done about helping to maintain secure employment at a reasonably high level, a great step forward in labor relations will have been taken.

But even more fundamental is the attitude of managers toward men. The master-servant relationship is out the window. Only a fraternal attitude, where nobody looks up and nobody looks down, where men and managers look horizontally across the table at one another, can be depended on in this democracy.

This is a long way from the doctrine of the class struggle. The Communists hold that the boss is a special kind of devil, never to be trusted. If he seems decent, beware—it is only a subtle plot to draw the worker deeper into his clutches. According to the Communists, the only solution to the labor problem is to toss the boss out, and let the workers run the plant.

This idea may or may not have been justified in Europe when Karl Marx wrote a hundred years ago. But it certainly makes no sense in the America of 1947. Modern, high-speed, mass-production economy cannot operate, much less maintain high living standards, without cooperation among all groups—workers, farmers, businessmen, government.

The only possible road to labor peace lies through mutual trust between men and management.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed a statement signed by 642 prominent religious leaders from all parts of the country.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 17.—A statement signed by 642 prominent religious leaders in all parts of the country urging a veto of the Taft-Hartley labor bill will be presented to President Truman today. Representing the National Clergymen's Committee on the Taft-Hartley bill, a four-man delegation bearing the petition will arrive at the northwest gate to the White House at 2:15 p. m. The delegation will include the Reverend John Duffy, of New York City; Rabbi Ira Sud, of Arlington, Va.; Father Charles Owen Rice, of Pittsburgh; and the Reverend Sheldon Rahn, secretary of the committee.

Among those supporting the delegation are Bishop William Scarlett, of Missouri; Father William Kelly, of Brooklyn; Dr. David De Sola Pool, of New York City; Dr. Sidney E. Goldstein, of New York City; Dr. Liston Pope, of New Haven, Conn.; Father Wilfrid Parsons, of Washington; Rabbi Bernard Segal, of New York City; Rev. Donald Harrington, of New York City; Rabbi Julius Mark, of Nashville; Bishop Charles K. Gilbert, of New York City; Rev. Ernest Fremont Tittle, of Chicago; Bishop Edward L. Parsons, of California; Bishop Francis J. McConnell, of New Haven; Rev. William Lloyd Imes of Dundee, N. Y.; Father Richard B. Lavelle, of Brooklyn; Dr. Howard Thursman, of California; Father Joseph F. Buckley, of Brooklyn; Rabbi Manuel Laderman, of Denver; Father M. Sidney Rushfort, of Brooklyn; Father Philip Dobson, of Jersey City; Dean Walter Muelder, of Boston; Father Joseph Hammond, of Brooklyn; Rev. Edwin McNeill Poteat, of Rochester, N. Y.; and Bishop Walter Mitchell, of California.

Catholic members of the committee pointed out today that strong opposition to the Taft-Hartley bill has been voiced by such leaders as Archbishop Robert E. Lucey, of San Antonio; Bishop Bernard J. Sheil, of Chicago; and many priests in local communities throughout the country. The National Catholic Welfare Conference, representing America's Catholic bishops, in opposing the bill, has said it "will almost inevitably lead to industrial strife and unrest."

The formal statement of Protestant and Jewish leaders follows:

"We appeal to you to veto the Taft-Hartley labor bill because it would violate human freedoms essential to the ethic of both democracy and religion. Basically it substitutes Government regimentation for sound collective bargaining and wise attention to the fundamental economic and psychological causes of industrial strife. It is a measure calculated to destroy the real strength of a free labor movement by undermining basic principles of collective bargaining, making the Government of the United States a ready instrument of employer resistance to legitimate needs of workers, and subjecting unions to a process of decimation and frustration under Government control.

"The closed shop and the union shop developed historically as a defensive union measure against determined employer resistance to independent unions. Many industries, such as clothing, have combined closed shops with some of the best and most constructive industrial relations in America. But in addition, just as every town resident must share the costs of community services by paying taxes, so every worker in the industrial community bears an obligation to share the costs of collective bargaining through the agency designated by a majority of the employees. Just as some towns have occasionally enforced tax collections under tyranical administrations, so a few industries have had closed shops under tyrannical and dishonest union controls. But the remedy lies, not in abolition of compulsory union dues or town taxes, but rather in the enlightened concern of free community and union members. This legislation would destroy constructive industrial relations already achieved.

"We look to you for a vigorous veto message."

SIGNERS OF VETO APPEAL

Alabama: Rev. A. B. Carlton, Geneva; Rev. C. C. Garner, Stockton; Dr. Howard I. Kerr, Huntsvil'e; Rev. William H. Marmion, Birmingham; Rev. John Bransford Nichols, Prattville; Rev. Andrew S. Turnipond, Montgomery; Rev. Cullen B. Wilson, Fairhope.

Arizona: Rabbi Nathan Barach, Phoenix; Rev. Francis T. Brown, Phoenix.

Arkansas: Rev. S. F. Freeman, Jr., Little Rock; Rev. John P. McConnell, Fayetteville; Rev. Glenn F. Sanford, Conway.

California: Rev. Gross W. Alexander, Redlands; Rabbi Elliot M. Burstein, San Francisco; Rabbi S. A. Dalgin, Los Angeles; Rev. Alfred G. Fisk, San Francisco; Rev. Owen M. Geer, Los Angeles; Rev. John M. Hestenes, Fresno; Rabbi Harry Hyman, Huntington; Rabbi Louis Kaufman, Sacramento; Rabbi Jacob Levine, Los Angeles; Bishop Walter Mitchell, Rancho Santa Fe; Rev. Hu C. Noble, Los Angeles; Rev. Edward W. Ohrenstein, Berkeley; Rev. Kirby Page, La Habra; Bishop Edward L. Parsons, San Francisco; Rev. Edwin P. Ryland, Los Angeles; Rev. Alfred F. Schroeder, Oakland; Rev. Howard Thurman, San Francisco; Rev. George A. Warmer, San Diego; Rev. Hugh Vernon White, Berkeley; Rabbi Bert A. Woythaler, Los Angeles.

Colorado: Rabbi Manuel Laderman, Denver; Rev. Samuel W. Marble, Denver.

Connecticut: Rev. A. N. Avrutick, Hartford; Dr. James Good Broun, Ansonia; Rev. J. George Butler, Hartford; Rev. Merrill F. Clarke, New Canaan; Rabbi Hyman Cohen, Meriden; Prof. John W. Darr, Middletown; Rev. Lewis H. Davis, Torrington; Rabbi Maurice J. Elefard, Hartford; Rev. Meredith F. Eller, Hartford; Rev. Richard A. G. Foster, New Haven; Rev. George B. Gilbert, Middletown; Rev. Donald Hamblin, Hartford; Rev. Emerson G. Hangen, Meriden; Rev. Earl C. Heck, Hartford; Rev. Charles X. Hutchinson, Hartford; Rev. Edgar N. Jackson, Bridgeport; Rev. Fleming James, Sr., North Haven; Rabbi M. Aaron Kra, Ansonia; Rev. Roderick MacLeod, Winsted; Rev. Sidney Lovett, New Haven; Rev. Harry L. MacKenzie, Greens Farms; Rabbi Moses S. Malinowitz, New London; Rev. Edward L. Peet, Hartford; Dr. Liston Pope, New Haven; Rabbi Stanley Rabinowitz, New Haven; Rev. Richard H. Ritter, Southington; Rev. W. Glenn Roberts, Hartford; Rev. Alfred Schmalz, Darien; Rabbi Aaron Shuchatowitz, New Haven; Rabbi Morris Silverman, Hartford; Rev. Elsie F. Stowe, Seymour; Rev. Willard Uphaus, New Haven; Rev. Wallace T. Viets, Hartford; Rabbi Max R. Wasser, Torrington; Rev. C. Lawson Willard, Jr., New Haven; Rev. Loyd F. Worley, Stamford; Rabbi Harry Zwelling, New Britain.

District of Columbia: Rabbi Samuel H. Berkowitz; Rabbi David Pruzansky.

Delaware: Rabbi Joseph I. Singer, Wilmington.

Florida: Rev. Floyd M. Irvin, Eustis; Rev. Edward Maxted, Warrington; Rabbi M. Meschelоff, Miami Beach; Rabbi Sanders A. Tofield, Jacksonville; Rev. Edward W. Ulirich, Miami; Rev. G. W. Washington, Jacksonville.

Georgia: Rabbi Hyman R. Friedman, Atlanta; Rev. David N. Howell, Atlanta; Rabbi Charles M. Rubel, Macon; Rabbi Abraham I. Rosenberg, Savannah.

Illinois: Dr. James Luther Adams, Chicago; Rev. J. Frank Anderson, Tinley Park; Rev. Karl Baehr, Chicago; Rev. Frederic E. Ball, Seneca; Rev. Ray E. Bond, Chicago; Rev. H. N. Brockway, Oak Park; Rev. Hugh Elmer Brown, Evanston; Rev. Albert W. Buck, Chicago; Rev. Edwin T. Buehrer, Chicago; Rabbi E. Louis Cardou, Springfield; Rev. William Clark, Chicago; Rev. Harold E. Craw, La Grange; Rev. Paul B. Deferson, Chicago; Rev. Herbert J. Doran, Urbana; Rev. Clifford Earle, Chicago; Rev. Fred Eastman, Chicago; Rev. Robert Worth Frank, Chicago; Rev. Herbert George, Chicago; Rabbi David Graubart, Chicago; Rabbi Philip Graubart, Chicago; Rev. Armand Guerrero, Chicago; Rev. George Halsted, Chicago; Rev. Louis U. Huber, Jerseyville; Dr. Homer Jack, Chicago; Rabbi Solomon Kahn, Chicago; Rabbi Monroe Levens, Oak Park; Rev. C. Sumpter Logan, Lawrenceville; Rev. William N. Lovell, Chicago; Rev. Harold L. Lunger, Oak Park; Rev. Hugh S. Mackenzie, Chicago; Rev. Douglas V. Machan, Chicago; Rev. Frank B. McCulloch, Chicago; Rev. William O. McGill, Chicago; Rev. J. B. McKendry, Oak Park; Rev. John Magill, Monmouth; Rev. Paul L. Meacham, Carmi; Rev. Carl T. Michel, Chicago; Rabbi Jacob J. Nathan, Chicago; Rev. Clyde K. Newhouse, Cobden; Rev. Duane Nichol, Chicago; Dr. Victor Obenhaus, Chicago; Rev. Douglas Patterson, Chicago; Rev. Leslie T. Pennington, Chicago; Rabbi Shlomo Rapoport, Chicago; Rev. Conrad Reiner, Chicago; Rev. Frederick W. Ringe, Franklin Park; Rev. Orville Sampson, Chicago; Rev. John T. Shaefer, Elgin; Rabbi H. Schamban, Chicago; Rabbi Mordecai Schultz, Chicago; Rabbi Ralph Simon, Chicago; Rabbi Harold P. Smith, Chicago; Rabbi Melford E. Spiro, Evanston; Rev. Howard E. Spragg, Chicago; Rev. Frederick K. Stamm, Chicago; Rev. Leroy Stanford, Chicago; Rev. Rolland C. Stone, Chicago; Rabbi Shmaryahn Swirsky, Chicago; Rabbi Julius Hyatt, Peoria; Rev. Walter Telfer, Chicago; Rabbi Benjamin L. Teller, Chicago; Rev. Leonard Tinker, Chicago; Rev. Ernest F. Tittle, Evanston; Rev. David Todd, Chicago; Rev. Alva Tompkins, Chicago; Rev. Bernard Vanderbeek, Deerfield; Rev. Philip VanZandt, Chicago; Rev. H. Walter Yoder, Chicago; Rev. James A. Crain, Chicago.

Indiana: Rev. F. E. Davison, South Bend; Rev. Newton D. Fowler, Gary; Rev. Aron S. Gilmartin, Fort Wayne; Rev. Leonard R. Hall, New Castle; Rabbi Eli J. Kahn, East Chicago; Rabbi David Korb, Whiting; Rev. R. Lehrmann, Evansville; Rev. Hugh F. McGlasson, East Chicago; Dr. E. Burns Marten, South Bend; Rabbi Maurice Parzen, South Bend; Rabbi Aaron M. Rine, South Bend; Rabbi Harry Z. Schectman, South Bend; Rabbi David S. Shapiro, Indianapolis; Rev. Walter W. Shea, Indianapolis.

Iowa: Rev. Fred Coley, Council Bluffs; Rev. Elmer C. Djerks, Iowa City; Rev. M. E. Dorr, Dayton; Rev. Alped S. Nickless, Davenport; Rabbi Irving A. Weingart, Des Moines.

Kansas: Rev. Ray B. Bressler, Turou; Rev. Drury H. Fisher, Manhattan; Rev. Sam Hedrick, Baldwin; Rabbi C. Manelew, Wichita; Rev. J. D. Schmidt, Whitewater; Chaplain Harold H. Wilke, Topeka.

Kentucky: Rabbi B. Brilliant, Louisville; Rev. T. B. Cowan, Lexington; Rev. Charles E. Craik, Jr., Louisville; Rev. C. M. Hanne, Louisville; Rev. Myron Taggart Hopper, Lexington.

Louisiana: Rabbi Leo Brener, Shreveport; Rabbi Irving L. Goldman, New Orleans; Rabbi Moses I. Goldberg, New Orleans; Rev. A. J. Scherer, New Orleans.

Maine: Rev. Lindley J. Cook, Portland; Rev. William E. Gardner, Bangor.

Maryland: Rev. Charles L. Carhart, Chevy Chase; Rev. R. T. Dickerson, Baltimore; Dr. Nathan Drazin, Baltimore; Dr. Eddy L. Ford, Baltimore; Rabbi Mayer Greenberg, College Park; Rev. John F. McClelland, Silver Spring; Rabbi Uir Miller, Baltimore; Rabbi Jacob Pearlmutter, Baltimore; Rabbi Manuel M. Poliakoff Baltimore; Rabbi Morris D. Rosenblatt, Annapolis; Rev. S. Paul Schilling, Westminster; Rabbi Ephraim F. Shapiro, Baltimore; Rev. Gottlieb Siegenthaler, Baltimore; Rabbi I. Tabak, Baltimore.

Massachusetts: Rev. and Mrs. Harry Abbe, Newtonville; Rev. Philip E. Anthes, East Boston; Rev. Clarence F. Avey, Athol; Rev. Fred I. Cairns, Needham; Rev. Colin J. Cameron, Amesbury; Rev. Clarence Carr, Great Barrington; Rev. Gardiner W. Day, Cambridge; Rev. T. Chipman Day, Littleton; Rabbi Morris V. Dembowitz, Boston; Rev. Earl Douglass, Boston; Rev. Frederick May Eliot, Boston; Rabbi Alexander Friedman, Worcester; Dr. Earl H. Furgeson, Cambridge; Rev. Bradford S. Gale, Salem; Rabbi Sidney Guthman, Worcester; Rev. Clement S. Hahn, Worcester; Rabbi Israel I. Halpern, Greenfield; Rev. Albert K. Herling, Natick; Rev. L. Earl Jackson, Somerville; Prof Paul E. Johnson, Boston; Rabbi Israel J. Kazis, Salem; Rabbi Isaac Klein, Springfield; Rev. Earl Knudsen, Plymouth; Rev. James H. Laird, Peabody; Rabbi Arnold H. Lasker, Holyoke; Rev. Samuel L. Laviscount, Roxbury; Rabbi Mendell Lewittes, Dorchester; Rev. John K. Montgomery, North Quincy; Rev. Garfield Morgan, East Lynn; Rev. Walter G. Muelder, Boston; Margaret Munsterberg, Boston; Rabbi Judah Nadich, Brookline; Rev. Donald B. Nedrich, Dennis; Rabbi Isaac I. Nelson, Fall River; Rev. George L. Paine, Boston; Rev. Prentiss L. Pemberton, Boston; Rev. Robbins Ralph, Northampton; Rabbi Gershon Romanoff, Chelsea; Rabbi Joseph Rothstein, North Adams; Rabbi Samuel S. Ruderman, Fall River; Rev. Victor F. Scalise, Lowell; Rev. George Selleck, Cambridge; Rev. Frank C. Seymour, Lancaster; Rev. Edwin M. Slocombe, Lexington; Rev. Arthur B. Soule, Marlboro; Rev. Howard D. Spoerl, Springfield; Rev. John H. Taylor, Sandwich; Rev. Fleleree Uluch, Leominster; Rev. Charles C. Wellman, Rockport; Rev. William E. Wimer, Boston; Rabbi Shalom S. Yellin, Newburyport.

Michigan: Rabbi Morris Adler, Detroit; Rev. Paul J. Allured, Deckerville; Rev. Edward H. Bean, Detroit; Rev. Edward W. Blakeman, Ann Arbor; Dr. J. Burt Bowman, Lansing; Rev. Oviatt E. Desmond, Battle Creek; Rabbi Nathan Gaynor, Pontiac; Rev. Paul Silas Heath, Kalamazoo; Rev. Charles A. Hill, Detroit; Rabbi Jacob Hurwitz, Flint; Rev. Charles C. Jatho, Royal Oak; Rev. William Klerekoper, Detroit; Rev. Joseph Lindsay, Flint; Rev. F. H. Littell, Ann Arbor; Rev. C. H. Loucks, Ann Arbor; Rev. N. U. McConaughy, Iron Mountain; Rev. F. Ricksford Meyers, Detroit; Rev. Paul E. Robinson, Harbor Springs; Rev. Philip L. Schenk, Ann Arbor; Rabbi Edward M. Tenebaum, Saginaw; Rev. Thomas S. Vernon, Bay City.

Minnesota: Rabbi David Aronson, Minneapolis; Rev. Warren C. Behar, Minneapolis; Rabbi Morris C. Katz, St. Paul; Rev. Karl W. Mahle, Medelia; Rev. F. A. Spong, Minneapolis; Rev. C. A. Wendell, Minneapolis; Rev. W. A. Werth, Fairmont.

Mississippi: Rabbi W. J. Goldman, Gulfport; Rev. Bert R. Johnson, Jackson.

Missouri: Rev. Ralph C. Abele, St. Louis; Prof. Elmer J. F. Arndt, Webster Groves; Rev. Gene E. Bartlett, Columbia; Rev. Clark W. Cummings, St. Louis; Rabbi Gershon Hadas, Kansas City; Rabbi Abraham Halpern, St. Louis; Rev. J. H. Horstmann, Maplewood; Rabbi Robert E. Jacobs, St. Louis; Rev. S. D. Press, Webster Groves; Rt. Rev. William Scarlett, St. Louis; Rev. Sidney E. Sweet, St. Louis; Rev. Edwin Winnecke, Pilot Grove.

Nebraska: Rabbi Myer S. Kripke, Omaha.

New Hampshire: Rev. A. Brownlow Thompson, Bristol; Rev. J. Lester Hankinow, Dover; Rev. Norris E. Woodbury, Madison.

New Jersey: Rev. Bedros K. Apelian, Fair Lawn; Rev. Henry Reed Bowen, Glen Ridge; Rabbi Eliezer Cohen, Hillside; Rev. James Dykema, Paterson; Rev. Norman D. Fletcher, Montclair; Rabbi Israel Gerstein, Passaic; Rabbi Hirsh Goldberg, Jersey City; Rev. J. Edward Gonzales, Plainfield; Rabbi Nisan Heifetz, South River; Rev. George G. Heneveld, Wyckoff; Rev. Chester E. Hodgson, Newark; Rev. Richard Jones, Kearny; Rabbi Reuben Kaufman, Paterson; Rabbi Gilbert Klaperman, West New York; Rabbi S. Joshua Kohn, Trenton; Rabbi Sischa Levy, Perth Amboy; Rabbi Philip L. Lipis, Camden; Rev. L. W. McCreary, East Orange; Rabbi Bernard Medwick, Union City; Rabbi Raphael Melamed, Elizabeth; Rev. Fred E. Miles, Nutley; Rabbi Jacob Nislick, Freehold; Rabbi Ahren Opher, Paterson; Rev. Don Ivan Patch, Westfield; Rev. Harry R. Pine, Trenton; Rev. Theodore A. Rath, Frenchtown; Rev. Walter E. Roughgarden, Clifton; Rabbi Mordecai J. Simekes, Kearny; Rabbi Benjamin Sincoff, Summit; Rabbi Joseph Smith, Burlington; Rev. Seaman W. Townsend, Perth Amboy; Rabbi Baruch I. Treiger, Hoboken; Rev. Charles Unger, Plainfield; Rabbi B. Reuben Weilerstein, Atlantic City; Rev. Luke M. White, Montclair.

New York: Rev. Leon M. Adkins, Schenectady; Rabbi Abraham D. Barras, Monticello; Rabbi Henry J. Benn, Haverstraw; Rev. Walter L. Bennett, Lowville; Rabbi Jeremiah J. Berman, Yonkers; Rev. Joseph R. Bogle, Schenectady; Rev. Paul F. Bollen, Far Rockaway; Rabbi Ben Zion Bokser, Forest Hills; Rabbi Philip Brand, Queens Village; Rev. Charles E. Byrd, Poughkeepsie; Rabbi Jonah E. Caplan, Long Island City; Rev. Harold L. Clark, Rochester; Rabbi Jacob Cohen, Tarrytown; Rev. Edwin T. Dahlberg Syracuse; Rabbi Josiah Derby, Rego Park; Rabbi Gershon Feigon, Tuckahoe; Rabbi Theodore Friedman, Elmhurst; Rev. John Gass, Troy; Rev. Leo Gates, Livonia; Rabbit M. M. Gold, Cedarhurst; Rabbi Robert Gordis, Rockaway Beach.

Rabbi Solomon Gordon, Jamaica; Rabbi Benjamin H. Gorrelick, Albany; Rabbi Aaron Greenbaum, Yonkers; Rev. Herman J. Hahn, Buffalo; Rev. Charles P. Harder, Greenville; Rev. John H. Hatt, Pleasant Valley; Rev. Ralph N. Helversen, Ithaca; Rev. Paul C. Hoffman, Lancaster; Rev. E. Robert Hughes, Franklinville; Rev. Paul Hydon, Gloversville; Rev. Wm. Lloyd Imes, Dundee; Rabbi Melvin Kieffer, Niagara Falls; Rabbi I. Usher Kirshbium, Kew Gardens; Rev. Howard A. Kuhnle, Rochester; Rabbi Israel Klavan, Mount Vernon; Rev. Felix D. Lion, Dunkirk; Rabbi Jerome Lipnick, Utica; Rev. Gilbert Lovell, Buffalo; Rev. Frederick C. Maier, Baldwin; Rev. Antonio Marino, Mount Vernon; Rabbi Chaim Meskin, Long Island City; Rev. Charles C. Noble, Syracuse; Rabbi William Nowek, Lynbrook; Rev. Robert W. Packer, Greene; Rabbi Menachem M. Perr, So. Ozone Park; Rabbi Frank D. Plotke, Kingston; Dr. Edwin McNeill Poteat, Rochester; Rabbi H. Elihu Rickel, Buffalo; Rabbi Stuart E. Rosenberg, Rochester; Rabbi Moses Rosenthal, Suffern; Rev. Cuthbert R. Rowe, Cicero; Rabbi Edward T. Sandrow, Cedarhurst; Dr. Paul M. Schroeder, Rochester; Rabbi Charles J. Shoulson, Elmira; Rabbi Reuben Slonim, Troy; Rev. H. Otheman Smith, Yonkers; Rabbi Mordecai A. Stern, Richmond Hill; Dr. George L. Tappen, Binghamton; Rev. Donald B. Tarr, Syracuse; Rev. Harry B. Taylor, Syracuse; Rev. Robert B. Thomas, Peru; Rev. Ralph S. Thorn, Jr., Rhinecliff; Rev. Charles E. Vermilya, Binghamton; Rev. Carl G. Vogelmann, Buffalo;

Rev. Wheaton P. Webb, Binghamton; Rev. David Rhys Williams, Rochester; Rev. Wm. H. Willits, Elmira; Rabbi Aaron M. Wise, Rabbi Joseph H. Wise, Staten Island.

New York City: Rev. Paul Abrecht, Rev. Charles B. Ackley, Rabbi Abba Abrams, Rabbi Philip R. Alstat, Rev. Wade Crawford Barclay, Rev. John C. Bennett, Rabbi Morris J. Besdin, Rabbi Abraham J. Bick, Dr. Beverly Boyd, Rev. Clarence E. Boyer, Rabbi Alexander J. Burnstein, Rev. Dwight J. Bradley, Rabbi Abraham M. Cassel, Rev. Allen Knight Chalmers, Rabbi Jack J. Cohen, Rev. John W. Darr, Jr., Rev. Mark A. Dawber, Rev. Robert C. Doggett, Rev. John F. Duffy, Jr., Rabbi Mitchel S. Eskolsky, Rabbi Morris H. Fine, Rabbi Sol B. Friedman, Rabbi Joel S. Gaffen, Bishop Charles K. Gilbert, Rabbi Morris Goldberg, Rabbi Jacob D. Gordon, Rabbi Simon Greenberg, Rev. Donald Harrington, Rabbi Isidor B. Hoffman, Rev. Ambrose Hering, Dr. John Haynes Holmes, Rev. George L. Hood, Rev. Charles W. Iglehart, Rabbi Leo Jung, Rabbi Max Kadushin, Rabbi Mordecai Kaplan, Rabbi Abraham J. Karp, Rabbi Harry Katchen, Rev. William C. Kernan, Rabbi Morris Kertzer, Rabbi Simon G. Kramer, Rabbi Joseph H. Looksh, Rev. Edgar Love, Rabbi Nathan Lublin, Bishop Francis J. McConnell, Rabbi Bernard Mandelbaum, Rev. John A. Maynard, Rabbi Israel Miller, Rabbi Joseph Miller, Rabbi Abraham E. Millgram, Rev. Arthur C. Moore, Rev. A. J. Musto, Rev. James Myers, Rabbi O. Neichel, Rev. Robert Hastings Nichols, Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, Dr. David De Sola Pool, Rev. Sheldon Rahn, Rabbi Herschel Schacter, Rev. Paul Scherer, Rev. Marshal S. Scott, Rabbi Bernard Segal, Rev. Guy Emery Shipler, Rev. H. Norman Sibley, Rabbi Solomon N. Skaist, Rev. E. Harold Smith, Dr. Stanley I. Stuber, Rev. Arthur L. Swift, Jr., Rev. John M. Swomley, Rabbi Milton Tittlebaum, Rabbi Nathan Toragin, Rev. Theodore D. Walser, Rabbi Max Vorspan, Rev. Eliot White.

Brooklyn, N. Y.: Rabbi S. H. Barenholt, Rabbi Abraham Berstein, Rabbi Jacob Bosniak, Rev. John M. Coleman, Rev. Lewis A. Conois, Rev. David M. Cory, Rabbi L. William Drazin, Rabbi B. Faikelson, Rabbi Samuel Finkel, Rabbi Alfred Fruchter, Rabbi H. Z. Gottesman, Rabbi Harry Halpern, Rev. L. H. R. Hass, Rev. John Paul Jones, Rabbi Herschel Koenigsberg, Rev. John Howard Lathrop, Rabbi Israel H. Levinthal, Rabbi Mordecai H. Lewittes, Rabbi Isadore Marine, Rabbi Morris Schatz, Rabbi Isador Signer, Rabbi Mordecai H. Simon, Rabbi Philip Fatz, Rabbi D. Steigman, Rabbi A. Werkeim, Rabbi Solomon Wind, Rabbi Simon Zipper.

North Carolina: Rev. A. Wilson Cheek, Hickory; Rev. Moses N. DeLaney, Raleigh; Rabbi Elliot Erickam, Durham; Rev. D. L. Fauts, Weldon; Rev. Charles Jones, Chapel Hill; Rev. Thomas Kilgore, Raleigh; Rev. Henry V. Lofquist, Sr., Asheville; Rev. D. McGeachy, Montreat; Rabbi A. Manskon, High Point; Rev. Henry G. Ruark, Chapel Hill; Rev. Lee C. Sheppard, Raleigh; Rev. Thomas P. Inabinett, Wilson; Rev. R. E. Walston, Grifton.

North Dakota: Rabbi Abraham H. Allen, Minot; Rev. Marvin R. Brandt, Fargo; Rev. Hubert N. Dukes, Grand Forks; Rev. Paul G. Hayes, Bismarck.

Ohio: Rev. Edwin Bobbitt, Warren; Rabbi Moshe V. Goldblum, Mansfield; Rev. Stewart H. Butter, Salineville; Rev. George Gardner, Toledo; Rev. Alva Cox, Akron; Rev. B. F. Crawford, North Lewisburg; Rev. R. C. Ditter, Cleveland; Rev. N. S. Elderkin, Akron; Rabbi Louis Engreby, Cleveland; Rev Gerson S. Englemann, Cincinnati; Rev. Gustav F. Hansser, Spencerville; Rev. Robert W. Holmes, Lucasville; Rev. Eldred Johnston, Marion; Rev. M. O. Johnston, Chillicothe; Rabbi Nehemiah Katz, Toledo; Rev. Reuben M. Katz, Akron; Rev. Huber F. Klemme, Cleveland; Rev. James W. McKnight, Marblehead; Rev. H. Laurence McNeal, Dayton; Rev. H. P. Marley, Dayton; Rev. W. W. Mathias, Corncant; Rev. Kenneth L. Maxwell, Granville; Rev. Leon D. Sanborne, Columbus; Rev. John Sommerlatte, Cleveland; Rev. Alden L. Stone, Dayton; Rev. E. H. Wierth, Marion.

Oklahoma: Rev. Jackson E. Smith, Tulsa.

Oregon: Rabbi Philip Kleinman, Portland; Rev. Lloyd B. Thomas, Hood River.

Pennsylvania: Rev. George J. Baisler, New Kensington; Rabbi Solomon M. Barsel, Philadelphia; Rev. Herman D. Beatty, Chambersburg; Rabbi Samuel Blinder, Williamsport; Rev. Ward B. Booker, Clymer; Rev. James E Bristol, Philadelphia; Rev. Burns Brodhead, East Lansdowne; Rev. James H. Brown, Parkesburg; Harold Chance, Philadelphia; Rabbi Hyman Chanover, Philadelphia; Rabbi Elias Charry, Philadelphia; Rabbi Pinchos J. Chazin, Philadelphia; Rev. C. W. Clodfelter, Lancaster; Rev. Rodney F. Cobb, Smethport; Rabbi Mortimer J. Cohen, Philadelphia; Rev. Robert H. Eads, State College; Rabbi Amos Edelheit, Lansdale; Rev. K. S. Ehrhart, Brodbecks; Rabbi Maxwell N. Farber, Philadelphia; Rev. W. Arthur Faus, Clearfield; Rev. Edward S. Frey, Lemoyne; Rev. Harmon M. Gehr, Philadelphia; Rabbi Morris S. Goodblatt, Philadelphia; Rev. Maurice R. Gortner, Lansdowne; Rabbi Solomon Grayzel, Philadelphia; Rabbi Sidney Greenberg, Philadelphia; Rabbi William Greenburg, Allentown; Rev. Walter D. Howell, Philidelphia; Rabbi Benjamin Kahn, State College; Rabbi Harold M. Kamsler, Norristown; Rabbi Jacob Kabakoff, Philadelphia; Rabbi Maurice I. Kliers, Philadelphia; Rabbi Max H. Leader, Washington; Rabbi N. Levinson, Philadelphia; Rev. Walter Longstreth, Philadelphia; Rabbi Reuben J. Magil, Harrisburg; Rev. Willis S. Mathias, Allentown; Rabbi David Matt, Philadelphia; Roy McCorkel, Philadelphia; Rabbi A. Elihu Michelson, Altoona; Rev. Ralph N. Mould, Philadelphia; Rev. R. Roland Ritter, Warriors Mark; Rev. Charles D. Rockel, Philadelphia; Rev. William K. Russell, Wilkes-Barre; Rabbi Melech Sehachter, Philadelphia; Rabbi Morris Schnall, Philadelphia; Rev. Dewees F. Singley, Philadelphia; Rabbi M. N. Stiskin, McKeesport; Rev. Newton H. Swanson, Girard; Rabbi Benjamin H. Tumum, Philadelphia; Rev. Fred D. Wentzel, Philadelphia; Rabbi A. N. Winokur, Wilkes-Barre; Rev. Arthur Yeagy, Newtown Square.

Rhode Island: Rabbi Israel M. Goldman, Providence; Rev. Hinson V. Howlett, West Warwick; Rabbi Jules Lipschutz, Newport; Rev. Horace M. McMullen, Providence; Rev. U. Stanley Pratt, Rumford; Rev. Richard W. F. Seebode, Providence; Rev. Frank W. Thompson, Cranston.

South Carolina: Rev. Pierce E. Cook, Dillon; Rev. F. Clyde Helmo, Columbia; Rabbi S. W. Rubenstein, Charleston.

South Dakota: Rev. Clay E. Palmer, Yankton.

Tennessee: Rev. H. D. Bollinger, Nashville; Rev. W. J. Faulkner, Nashville; Rabbi Isador Goodman, Memphis; Rev. Bernie H. Hampton, Athens; Rev. William P. King, Nashville; Rev. Lyndon B. Phifer, Nashville; Rev. Alva W. Taylor, Nashville; Rev. Marshall Wingfield, Memphis.

Texas: Rabbi Rath DeKween, Austin; Rev. John C. Granbery, San Antonio; Rabbi Emanuel D. Rothenberg, Waco; Rabbi David Tamarken, San Antonio.

Utah: Rev. Ed F. Irwin, Provo.

Virginia: Rabbi Jesse J. Finkle, Newport News; Rev. Harold E. Kettering, Stanardsville; Rabbi Nathan Kollin, Richmond; Rev. Eugene W. Lyman, Sweet Briar; Rabbi Max Koufustein, Danville; Rev. William Reed, Luray; Rabbi Tobias Rothenberg, Roanoke; Rabbi Ephraim Shimoff, Richmond; Rabbi Ira Sud, Arlington.

Vermont: Rabbi Jacob Hanchen, Rutland.

Washington: Rabbi Solomon Maimon, Seattle; Rev. Fred W. Shorter, Seattle; Rabbi Lee Trepp, Tacoma.

West Virginia: Rabbi Samuel Corps, Charleston; Rev. Albert C. Hofrichter, Jr., Martinsburg; Rev. F. J. Waldrop, Weston.

Wisconsin: Rev. Oscar M. Adam, Madison; Rev. George R. Bell, Reedsburg; Rev. W. Hess Cramer, La Crosse; Rev. August Grolimus, Black Creek; Rabbi Irving Miller, Racine; Rabbi Harry Shapro, Kenosha; Rev. Moran W. Van Tarrell, Greendale.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, it seems to me that much can be done by corporations working along the lines set forth in Mr. Chase's article, and there is a movement in the country now to encourage programs of that kind.

In view of the lateness of the hour, I do not care to continue the discussion at any great length. I think that I have sufficiently shown by my analysis of the bill that the bill is a dangerous one, and that if enacted it will create chaos and trouble in the field of labor relations, and the proper course we should follow would be to sustain the President's veto.

Mr. IVES. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a few editorials apearing in today's newspapers. One is from the New York Times; one is from the New York Herald Tribune; one is from the Washington Post; one is from the Evening Star of Washington; and one is from the Philadelphia Inquirer. They are all most pertinent in connection with the subject under discussion and, I think, should be before the Members of the Senate when we convene next Monday. I suggest to all the Members of the Senate that they read these editorials very carefully.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The editorials are as follows:

[From the New York Times of Saturday, June 21, 1947]

UP TO THE SENATE

In the congressional elections of last November the American voters revolutionized the political complexion of the House of Representatives through the recall of 51 Democratic Members and the election of 57 additional Republicans. Even in the Senate, where change is normally a more or less gradual process, the results were almost as emphatic. The Democratic Party, which had dominated that Chamber by the comfortable margin of 55 to 38 in the Seventy-ninth Congress, suddenly found itself in possession of only 45 seats to the Republican 51.

No realistic person could possibly have misunderstood the significance of that national political upheaval. In allocating the responsibility for the Democratic Party's heavy losses among the administration's various individual policies there may have been areas of disagreement, but there was little room for doubt that the returns reflected a widespread protest against the reluctance of the administration to lay hold of the thorny problem of labor strife.

So sweeping was the popular verdict that the President himself publicly announced his acceptance of the decision at the polls and pledged his full cooperation with the new Congress in a nonpartisan spirit. Said he:

"The people have elected a Republican majority to the Senate and House of Representatives. Under our Constitution the Congress is the lawmaking body. The people have chosen to entrust the controlling voice in this branch of the Government to the Republican Party. I accept this verdict in the spirit in which all good citizens accent the results of any fair election."

How has the President kept that high-sounding statement of faith in the American system of democratic government?

Last Monday they cooperated with the Congress by vetoing a tax-reduction bill—the first time a President has had the temerity to invalidate such a measure in the entire history of the Government of the United States despite the fact that it had passed in the House by a more than two-thirds majority and in the Senate by a margin only slightly less. He accompanied his veto with a message which was palpably weak and unconvincing.

Yesterday Mr. Truman went even further. Because the Republican majority interpreted the November elections as a clear-cut mandate to do something about the labor problem, it has devoted more than 5 months of time and effort to the formulation of legislation in this field. In the process it listened to scores of witnesses and took thousands of pages of testimony. The measure was deliberately tempered to the possibility of a Presidential veto, which had been talked of even before the bill was written. It was gone over with a fine-tooth comb in committee in both Houses, and particularly in the Senate, where members of decidedly pro-labor tendencies held the balance of power between the Republicans and the opposition. It was debated on the floors of both Houses. And, finally, it was checked in conference, where features still regarded as being controversial were weeded out. Then it went back to the two Houses for final approval. The Senate endorsed it by a heavily one-sided count of 3 to 1 and the House passed it by the overwhelming majority of 4 to 1.

Throughout all these months the President made no move to cooperate with Congress. Yet yesterday this Executive under whose administration the record of labor-management strife has been far and away the worst in the Nation's history, and who in the course of 2 years in office has shown no evidence that he had any labor policy of his own or any intention of developing one, figuratively slapped the Congress in the face by issuing his second veto of the week. With the veto went a 5,500-word message which can best be described as a catch-all for every discredited argument advanced against the bill over the past several weeks.

From the time this message was laid before Congress yesterday the details of the labor bill ceased to be the primary issue. By the course which he has pursued throughout the history of this legislation, culminating in yesterday's violation of his own professed acceptance of the "verdict of the voters" last November, the President has raised an issue and presented a challenge more important than the merits of the bill itself.

The House is to be applauded for the unhesitating and decisive manner in which it accepted that challenge yesterday, when it reiterated its position on the measure by a count of 331 to 83. The Senate cannot do less and still preserve its self-respect.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of June 21, 1947]

THE ISSUE IS POSED

President Truman, it is reported, penned his veto of the labor bill "more in sorrow than in anger." The tone of his message, indeed, was not rhetorical; it dealt with the bill in great detail and with every appearance of reasonableness. It was not convincing to the House, to be sure, as the swift repassage of the measure there, by only 1 vote short of 4 to 1, demonstrated. But enactment of the bill over the President's veto, despite the great practical importance of such an outcome, would not give the whole measure of the significance of Mr. Truman's action. It would not gage all the prestige he has lost among the public at large, nor assess all the political consequences which are certain to flow from his recent course.

Mr. Truman did more than point out certain objectionable features in the Taft-Hartley bill. That would have been easy; the measure is not perfect. He did more than conclude that the sum of the bill's errors made it impossible for him to sign. Although he involved himself, often enough, in contradictions, there was one fairly clear line that ran through the veto message. The President attacked so many of the principles and practices involved in the bill that at the end there seemed little possibility of Presidential approval for any labor legislation that would alter the status quo. His only constructive suggestion was the lame and familiar one—a new investigation from the ground up.

This is a far cry from the stringent "emergency" legislation which Mr. Truman advocated during the railroad strike, just a little more than a year ago. It is almost as far removed from the considered judgment of the American people, which has been formed on the basis of so many investigations of the labor situation, so many illustrations of the unbalanced state of labor laws today. Mr. Truman's erratic labor policy appears typical of the schizophrenia which afflicts his party, whose right wing flagellates organized labor while the left wing caresses it.

The issue which is now posed was not of Republican making. That party has its own divisions, but it has endeavored, with great success, to compromise them in bringing forth the Taft-Hartley bill. The Democratic split, however, whereby the administration apparently hopes to win credit both for the veto and for the passage of the bill, virtually destroys any hope of constructive legislation so long as the present relationship of the parties endures. While the Republicans are still seeking to carry out, in good faith, the pledges made in 1946, the Democrats have preferred to open the campaign of 1948. Mr. Truman has in effect renounced any further effort to guide, or work with, the present Congress; he has defied the verdict of the last elections and the wishes of a large segment of those who voted for Democratic candidates. He has precipitated a wasting, paralyzing struggle that can only end when a Republican Congress and a Republican President can cooperate to create a coherent administration.

[From the Washington Post of June 21, 1947]

VETO OF THE LABOR BILL

"The first major test which I have applied to this bill," President Truman wrote in his message vetoing the labor bill, "is whether it would result in more or less Government intervention in our economic life." He found that it would entail more such intervention—that it would run contrary to what he calls our "national policy of economic freedom." This argument has often been made by industrialists and labor leaders. We did not expect it to be brought forward as the chief justification for the President's veto of the labor bill, for, if it is taken seriously, it would not only seem to close the door to any comprehensive legislation dealing with labor-management relations but would also call for repeal of the Wagner Act.

The Government became "deeply injected" into the relations between employers and their employees when it set up the National Labor Relations Board. It did so on the theory that governmental intervention was essential to protect the rights of workers and to promote the peaceful settlement of disputes burdening interstate commerce. The NLRB has corrected a great many abuses. Under its protection organized labor has become a great and powerful force in the Nation—so great and so powerful that it is now trampling under foot some of the rights of employers and individual workers, which, in any democratic society, ought to be protected. But when Congress now legislates to correct these abuses, the President rejects the measure as an interference with our economic system. We think that is a shabby resort to sophistry.

If the President really believed that the Government should not "superimpose bureaucratic procedures on the free decisions of local employers and employees," he ought to call for repeal of the Wagner Act. But he makes no such suggestion. On the contrary, he agrees with Congress that some sort of labor legislation is necessary. His message refers specifically to his request of last January for legislation to prevent strikes from crippling the entire country. He also asks for a "thorough and nonpartisan investigation * * * covering the entire field of labor-management relations." What would be the point of such an investigation if the Government were going to withdraw from the labor relations field? In other words, the President's chief argument against the bill simmers down to a careless use of emotionally charged words.

Another test applied by the President is that of fairness. He finds that the bill applies unequal penalties for similar offenses. Perhaps the bill errs in making the penalty for some unfair labor practices on the part of employees too severe. They could be fired for failing to abide by the rules of fair bargaining. Of course, it is impossible to fire an employer. He can only be ordered to cease and desist from unfair practices, the order being enforced by the courts if necessary. Would the President prefer similarly to use court injunctions against employees violating the rules of fair bargaining? That would, of course, run contrary to his objection to further use of the injunction, and it would substitute governmental action for direct employer-employee action, which he also opposes. But the major point here is the insignificance of the unfairness to which the President refers beside the gross unfairness of prosecuting only employers for offenses against the collective bargaining code and giving unions blanket exemption. That is the situation that the President would perpetuate by his veto.

We think that some of the President's detailed objections to the bill are well founded. The bill would deny supervisory employees all protection of the NLRB. It was not necessary to go that far to prevent rank-and-file unions from encroaching upon the functions of management. The tendency of the bill to substitute damage suits for grievance machinery, to which he points, must also be deplored. We think the President makes some telling points, moreover, about the weakness of the provisions designed to cope with national emergencies of the type that John L. Lewis is wont to inflict upon the country. Even this inadequate section, however, would enable Mr. Truman to use the fact-finding and public-pressure technique during the 75-day period in which strikes imperiling the national health and safety could be halted by injunction. If the veto is sustained, it will leave him stripped of any statutory power to cope with such emergencies.

One other disturbing fact about the message is that the President was not satisfied to object to the real weaknesses of the Taft-Hartley bill. He lambasted even such reasonable provisions as that for the regulation of union welfare funds. And he stooped to the technique of putting the most extreme interpretation on some provisions of the bill in order to make them appear obnoxious. Some experts say there is no warrant for his assumption that the bill would force unions to strike or to boycott if they wished to have a jurisdictional dispute settled by the NLRB. Mr. Truman saw danger of safety provisions and rest-period rules being thrown out under the provision making "feather bedding" an unfair labor practice. He says the way would be open for dismissal of

employees on the pretext of a slight infraction of shop rules. But these complaints seem to us an insult to the NLRB, which would administer the act. One has to assume that any measure will be administered intelligently and not in the most arbitrary fashion conceivable.

If the President's views, particularly on the section of the bill dealing with national emergencies, had been expressed months or even weeks ago in a conference with Senate leaders, they might have resulted in some improvement in the bill. But the President did not initiate such a conference, and congressional leaders did not seek his cooperation. Not until yesterday did he call a group of legislators to the White House for a frank discussion, and that eleventh-hour bid for support can have little bearing upon the outcome. For even Senators who may be amenable to persuasive arguments before they have publicly voted can scarcely afford to reverse themselves after a visit to the White House.

We cannot escape the conclusion that the President has played his cards with singular lack of skill. The weakness of his position was indicated when the House voted nearly 4 to 1 to override his veto. We think the Senate will be well advised to do likewise. It is apparently impossible now to keep this economic issue out of 1948 politics. But we suspect that the fight will be less turbulent and less damaging to our economy and our position of democratic leadership in the world if the labor bill becomes law.

[From the Washington Evening Star of June 21, 1947]

A POLITICAL VETO

There is nothing in the President's veto of the Taft-Hartley labor bill which counteracts the impression that his disapproval rests primarily on political considerations.

On Tuesday Mr. Truman said that he had not yet read the bill as finally passed and that his mind was still open. Two days later he had made up his mind against the bill and was drafting a 6,000-word veto message which consisted for the most part of sweeping and unsupported generalities. Congress spent months working on this measure. But the President found in it not a single provision worthy of commendation. He simply denounced it from beginning to end.

It is not feasible here to review either the bill or the veto message point by point. But there is one point which serves to illustrate the character of the bulk of Mr. Truman's statement.

He denounced as being ineffective and discriminatory the section aimed at major strikes which imperil the national health and safety. It is true that this section does not prohibit and would not necessarily prevent such strikes. In its essentials, however, it provides for a board of inquiry to investigate and report publicly on the facts of the dispute; it empowers the Attorney General to obtain an injunction which would postpone such a strike for a maximum of 80 days, and it authorizes a secret vote by the workers as to whether they wish to accept the employer's last offer of terms.

If this verdict were in the negative the strike could be called. The President condemns this as ineffective, although the only effective alternative would be compulsory arbitration, which he also opposes.

In this connection, it is interesting to turn back to a "fact-finding" proposal which the President himself made some 2 years ago, and which he discussed in January of 1946 in a radio address.

With respect to strikes vitally affecting the national public interest, the President asked authority for a Government commission to step in, ascertain all the facts and report them to the people. Meanwhile, he wanted Congress to impose by law a 30-day "cooling off" period in which the workers could not strike. And he was confident that the force of public opinion, once the public knew the facts, could assert itself in "a practical way."

Now there is no important difference between that proposal, desired by the President 2 years ago, and the provision in the Taft-Hartley bill, for which he has not a single good word to say. Yet in 1946 he chided the legislators for not giving him what he wanted. "I had hoped," he said, "that the Congress either would follow my recommendations or would at least propose a solution of its own. It has done neither."

But the President was even more emphatic later on in that speech when, referring to his labor plan and other legislative proposals, he declared: "If the measures which I have recommended to accomplish these ends do not meet the approval of the Congress, it is my fervent wish—and I am sure that it is the wish of my fellow citizens—that the Congress formulate measures of its own to carry out the desired objectives. That is definitely the responsibility of the Congress What the American people want is action."

When Congress acted, however, what did the President do? When the legislators passed the Case labor bill, shortly before last year's elections, he vetoed it. Now that the Taft-Hartley bill has been passed, and with a Presidential political campaign beginning to take form, he vetoes that. And this in the face of the fact that the people, through their Representatives in the House, have expressed repeatedly for 9 years their desire for new labor legislation—only to be thwarted time and again by an administration-controlled Senate Labor Committee or a Presidential veto.

The strength of this sentiment for a change is shown by the crushing House vote to override this latest veto—331 to 83. On this issue the President could not even muster a majority of his own party, the Democratic vote being 106 to override and only 71 to sustain the veto.

These are facts and figures which argue persuasively that the President is catering to pressure groups and ignoring the wishes of the people of the country. The people want a new deal in labor legislation. There is real need for a revision of the labor laws. The Senate should see to it that the change is made by joining with the House in overriding this political veto.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer]

HOUSE OVERRIDES A POLITICAL VETO

For the second time within a week President Truman has used his veto to play politics with the country's welfare.

He got away with it in blocking tax relief. Yesterday he received a sharp rebuke when the House gave a thunderous "no" to Mr. Truman's attempted dictation by overriding his veto of the labor-reform bill with a vote of 331 to 83.

To their credit, 106 members of the President's own party joined with their Republican colleagues in refusing to cringe before the threat of the labor-union bosses.

As for President Truman, he has opened his campaign for reelection a year ahead of time. In typical New Deal fashion he has made a bold bid for support by a special group of the electorate which seeks to maintain its exclusive privileges that have wrought grave injury to the rest of our people.

Never before has the Nation witnessed such a powerfully organized pressure drive as has been waged for weeks and months against this imperatively needed legislation.

Never in our history has there been such an outpouring of misleading propaganda, fraudulent on its face, as that utilized by opponents of labor relations reform and brought to bear, first upon Congress and then upon the occupant of the White House.

And never, be it said, had Mr. Truman, since he assumed his high office, a clearer opportunity to make good his pledge to cooperate with Congress "for the welfare of all our people."

By his action yesterday that pledge has become a mere scrap of paper. By his surrender to the organized labor pressure group he has launched his own drive for the votes which he hopes will keep him in his position of power.

This conclusion, aroused by the President's veto of tax relief which he was unwilling to have granted this year by a Republican Congress, is confirmed by his attempts to torpedo relief from the gross abuses perpetuated by our unfair labor laws.

As for Mr. Truman's wordy message to Congress, in which he tries to justify his latest antipublic veto, it is less a message than a mess—of quibbling technicalities about the new set-up of the NLRB, of charges that it would be difficult to enforce, that it would give rise to endless litigation, and so on.

He does grudgingly admit the need for "some" new labor legislation and "heartily condemns" abuses by either unions or employers. But from start to finish there is not one word about the constant invasion of the rights of employers and the public by the labor monopoly which present one-sided laws have so firmly intrenched.

On the contrary, Mr. Truman's chief complaint against this bill is that it would reverse our national labor policy." A policy that says labor can do no wrong, that the employer has no standing before the Labor Board except as a defendant, that unions can indulge in practices for which any other group or individuals would be punished, needs to be reversed.

He asserts that this bill would cause "more strikes, not fewer." How about the tripling of strikes under the Wagner Act? He says this measure would cause confusion by nullifying thousands of existing contracts. Did he read the bill? It provides for continuance of closed-shop contracts until they expire. If signed during the first 60 days after the bill becomes a law, they could continue for a year.

Whatever the ultimate fate of this first attempt by a Congress in many years to reestablish labor relations on a basis fair to all, to open the way for the peaceful adjustment of disputes before they reach the strike stage and imperil the general health and safety and the Nation's prosperity, President Truman's record of opposition to these pressing reforms will still stand.

He has made his choice. It is to put politics above the people's welfare, to choose the worse, not the better part. His eyes are fixed on 1948. And it will be a sad day for the country if his ambitions are fulfilled.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have some material here which I had desired to insert in the RECORD by reading it, but inasmuch as the Senate has already agreed on an hour when the vote on the bill will be taken, I do not deem it necessary to take up any extended time of the Senate; but I do wish it made clear at this time the position I take in regard to the veto by the President.

I have contended all along that the proposed legislation would not perform the miracle which a great many people thought it would, or at least said it would. I am one who believes it is going to bring about a great deal of confusion in the labor field. I entertain that feeling because I am fully convinced, from personal experience, that it is not possible to force a human being into agreeing with another against his will.

Another thought is that problems, as between capital and labor, cannot be

solved by legislation. That is a foregone conclusion, so far as I am concerned. I speak again from personal experience, having been a laborer for 10 or 12 years, and having observed the feeling that exists between capital and labor.

That feeling cannot be broken down by one piece of legislation. When an attempt is made to pass legislation taking away the rights of the laboring people, at this particular time, when they have done such a wonderful job in the past in building up the United States, so that today it is one of the richest and most outstanding nations in the world, I fear it will be a step backward if we vote otherwise than to sustain the President's veto. I think the President in his message to Congress has explained in a great many ways how this legislation will bring about confusion and chaos in the field of labor and management.

This measure, House bill 3020, has been returned by the President to Congress without his approval; and I, for one, am going to vote to sustain his veto. I urge upon this body that it join with me and do likewise.

I am going to try to prevent this bill from becoming law because I think it is a viciously misleading measure. It is long and complicated, and the skill of expert draftsmen has been lavished upon it, so that its true antilabor character is masked behind technical language that only a trained lawyer can understand, and then only after careful study and painstaking analysis. Although its proponents, supporters, and sponsors have characterized it as mild, reasonable, and fair, its true purpose is to turn the Federal Government into an instrument of oppression against organized labor. This is no empty accusation, as I shall presently show.

Furthermore, it will not even accomplish what has been urged as its most immediate purpose. It will not enable the Government to deal effectively with a coal strike after the mines are returned to private ownership. We have been eloquently told that it is now or never; that if this bill does not become law the Government will be impotent in the face of the diabolical ingenuity of the head of the miners' union. I assert, Mr. President, that this bill will deliver the country directly into his hands.

In the first place, we are all well aware that coal mining is an unusually hazardous employment, even under the best of conditions. Stripping old mines is especially dangerous, as we have recently been reminded by the Centralia disaster.

Safety standards in mines, under State laws, are notoriously honored more in the breach than in the observance, and Federal standards are only advisory and may be ignored with impunity. When criticism was made of the Federal Government because of what occurred in Illinois, condemnation should have been made of the State of Illinois for its failure to do its duty in the inspection of the coal mines. That condemnation should not have been directed against the Federal Government.

But this bill provides that if workers quit work in good faith singly or collectively, because of abnormally hazardous conditions at the place of their employment, their action is not a strike within the meaning of the bill. If Mr. Lewis calls his strike in July and keeps his miners out because their working conditions are unsafe, the emergency provisions of the bill would not even apply, unless, I suppose, it could be satisfactorily shown that the required good faith was absent. In view of the facts concerning the hazards of coal mining, of which the courts might well take judicial notice, I submit, Mr. President, that such a challenge to the good faith of the miners would be difficult to sustain.

But even if the strike involves declared issues other than safety, and even if the emergency provisions are invoked, will they keep or restore the peace between miners and operators and keep the Nation supplied with coal? They will not, and I shall show you why.

Suppose the strike is called and begins in the middle of July. The President, forthwith appoints an emergency board of inquiry with subpena powers, which investigates the situation and makes a report. The miners are still out at that time, so the President directs the Attorney General to apply for an injunction to send them back to work. We can estimate that thus far 2 weeks have been consumed. Now the parties are required to sit down and bargain, with the Federal Mediation Service as intermediary, and to try to settle their dispute in 60 days. Can we imagine that they will succeed? The employers will not have the incentive to bargain through to a closed deal, because they will know that the miners are powerless to strike during that period. The miners, for their part, will be free to assume that any offer made them during the 60 days will not be the best they can get, and will therefore be inclined to hold out. I think that would be the natural tendency. I think the recommendations of the Mediation Service are in no way binding on the parties. At the end of the 60-day period, the miners and the operators are still stalemated.

During all this time, the Board of Inquiry has been reconvened, and at the end of the 60 days it reports to the President the current status of the dispute, the positions of the parties, and the employer's last offer of settlement. We may note, by the way, that the Board has no power to make any recommendations at any time.

The dispute being no nearer settlement, the National Labor Relations Board within the next succeeding 15 days is required to take a secret ballot of the employees of each employer separately, to determine whether they wish to accept his last offer as stated by him. I commend the childlike confidence of the sponsors of the bill in the efficacy of a ballot of this kind as a deterrent against strikes. It requires more courage than I confess I have, to fly in the face of experience in that way, ignoring the dismal record of the failure of similar provisions of the War Labor Disputes Act to accomplish this effect. But perhaps there is more in this than meets the eye. Perhaps it is a deliberate strategy to permit, or even encourage, the breakdown of any progress that might have been made toward settlement by industry-wide bargaining in the 60-day period by requiring separate offers from each employer to be voted on by his employees.

After the balloting has been concluded, the National Labor Relations Board certifies the results to the Attorney General within the next 5 days. He then moves the court to dissolve the injunction, and the motion is granted.

Let us now review the timetable of these proceedings. We have assumed a 2-week period for the initial investigation and securing the injunction, which brings us to the end of July. Sixty days for negotiations, and further investigation carries it over to close to the end of September; another 15 days for voting brings us to the end of the second week in October; and 5 days to secure the dissolution of the injunction makes it the third week in October by the time the barest minimum requirements of the law have been fulfilled. By the third week in October, fall is well under way, and the cold-weather season is approaching. Mr. Lewis is now free to call his miners out again, and the Government could hardly have chosen a better time for him to do so.

Of course, what I have said so far has left entirely out of consideration the possibility that there might be some issue involved that would further complicate matters—a union security demand, for example. Even if there were no opposition from the employers to this particular demand, the Government could not possibly sponsor a settlement and a contract until the union was qualified to ask for union security. This would place the Government in a neat dilemma. It would either have to postpone using its emergency powers until two elections had been conducted by the National Labor Relations Board—one to qualify the union as bargaining representatives and one to establish its eligibility for union security—or risk exhausting the emergency powers before the union was in a legal position to agree on all contract terms. I would not venture to predict the time these proceedings would consume. I think, however, that I have effectively shown the uselessness of this bill in the face of a possible coal strike, except as an elaborate exercise in expensive futility.

The reason I mention the coal strike is because the Nation today is led to believe that if the pending bill is enacted into law all matters connected with coal strikes will be taken care of. I want the people of the Nation to know that the bill will not become law and go on the statute books with my approval, with the people believing that they are getting something that will prevent John L. Lewis from calling a coal strike. They are getting nothing in that particular field.

I shall go on now to discuss in further detail my principal objection to this bill: That it will not do for labor-management relations what its proponents claim, and that it is a misleading, antilabor measure, full of traps and pitfalls for unions and escapes for employers. The bill was misnamed when it was called a labor bill. It should have been

captioned in every newspaper of the land as the antilabor bill.

It will not be necessary to exhaust the provisions of the bill; some representative examples should suffice to show what I mean.

I will take as my first instance the "closed shop" provisions of the bill. These have a delayed action, both because of the clause saving the validity of existing closed-shop contracts and because of the 60-day grace period during which new closed-shop agreements can be made, to run for a year. I should expect that if this bill becomes law there will be a wave of new agreements made and old ones renegotiated during the 60 days. The closed shop is not always regarded as an abuse by employers; indeed, many prefer it as a means of inducing stability in their collective-bargaining relations and securing the assistance of the unions in matters of plant discipline. Employers have found that they can operate their concerns in a great many instances better if they have a closed shop. So they look to the union entirely to take care of employee matters. A great many employers believe in the closed shop.

But what does H. R. 3020 do with respect to new union security agreements, where, for one reason or another the parties have not made one within the 60-day grace period?

In the first place, the employer need not even consider such a proposition by a union unless two conditions are fulfilled in addition to those concerning filing of information: The union must be the certified bargaining representative of the employees involved, and, if it is, it must present a petition to the National Labor Relations Board, alleging that 30 percent or more of the employees in the covered bargaining unit want a union security agreement, and must then secure a majority vote, not of these voting but of those eligible to vote, in an election by the Board, in favor of making such an agreement. The majority rule in this provision is a novelty indeed, and shows a far more tender concern for the rights of workers absent from the polls than has ever been shown for the rights of absent Senators or for those of absent voters in any election to public office, whether municipal, county, State, or Federal.

I wonder how many Senators would be in the Senate today if they were obliged to receive 50 percent of the votes of all eligible voters in their particular States.

It may seem frivolous to suggest that the employer might stage a counterattraction simply to keep his employees from voting. Of course the necessity for at least one and possibly two votes wherever union security is an issue will interpose time-consuming delays in the collective bargaining process.

Having hurdled these obstacles, the union can now, if the employer is willing, gain its union-security agreement, for whatever that may be worth. I am inclined to think, Mr. President, that it is not worth much.

If we read on a little further in section 8 (a) (3) of this bill, we find that an employer may not, under the agreement, discriminate against a nonmember of the union if he has reasonable grounds to believe that membership was not available to him on the same terms and conditions as to other members generally, or that he lost his membership for any reason other than nonpayment of dues or initiation fees. Note, Mr. President, that the employer is not even required to ascertain the truth of the situation. He can disregard the agreement on the simple ground that he "had reasonable grounds to believe." And further on, in section 8 (b) (2) it is made an unfair labor practice for a union to attempt to cause an employer to discriminate against an employee whose union membership has been denied or terminated on grounds other than nonpayment of dues or initiation fees. Thus from an effective weapon to enforce plant discipline the union-security agreement becomes merely an instrument to enforce the payment of union dues. The union may have expelled a member for rank dishonesty, even criminality, for acts violating the letter or spirit of a collective-bargaining agreement, violent conduct, troublemaking, or any one of a number of other excellent reasons, but it could not go to the employer and ask that the man be fired so long as he has paid his dues, even where it would be manifestly in the employer's interest to comply with such a demand. If I were a union leader, I think I should scorn to make a union-security agreement which was such a mockery.

Finally, as if to add insult to injury, the bill would not even establish a uniform national policy with respect to union security agreements. The policy of the bill would override State policy where it was liberal in favor of union security, but jurisdiction would be ceded to those States whose laws are more restrictive than the rules here laid down.

Does that look as though they are trying to look after the welfare of labor? No, Mr. President, they do quite opposite everywhere they can.

As we all know, the chief recommendation that this bill has had is that it will restore equality and redress the balance between employers and unions. This slogan has had wide currency here in these halls, and has been enthusiastically picked up and echoed by much of the press. I do not know what ideas of equality and fairness are held by those who cry the slogan; I know that the bill fails to satisfy any of my own. Prejudice, of course, does not readily emerge from dry technical language, and still less easily does it appear from provisions which apply to both sides alike. Yet upon digging into this bill, I am irresistibly reminded of Mark Twain's famous comment upon the equality of a tax policy: "The rich man pays a dollar and the poor man pays a dollar. What could be equaler?" Senators on the other side of the aisle must have been thinking about that when the tax bill was passed this year. Or of another equally well-known expression of the equality between rich and poor: One is as free as the other to sleep on a park bench.

To prove that these observations concerning the bill will stand scrutiny, let us first look at what this bill does about company unions. "Company unions," I might say, is an ugly term, and it is not used in the bill, which discreetly refers to nonaffiliated unions. If one were to tell a laborer that he must belong to a company union he would almost be willing to fight. During my political activities in my State I have heard much about company unions and employees would want to have a union called almost anything else than a company union.

The bill would decree equality between affiliated and nonaffiliated unions by requiring that the National Labor Relations Board use the same kinds of evidence and precedents in establishing company domination of the one as of the other. If it fails to do so, it must include the nonaffiliated union on the same ballot with the affiliated union in representation proceedings.

If the nonaffiliated union really represents the free choice of the employees, I suppose no harm is done by allowing them to vote for it and giving it an even break on the ballot. But it is within the memory of all of us that the company union—misnamed independent—was a favorite device used by employers to prevent their employees from joining an outside union whose policies and behavior the employers could not control. Employer encouragement to the inside union took many forms, and it was entirely reasonable for the National Labor Relations Board to deny such unions a place on the ballot where it had found such encouragement to exist, and to take note of the obvious differences in circumstances between the company union and the outside union in making such a finding. By legislative fiat, however, this bill would now establish as a rule of law that there is no difference between a company union and an outside union. To me this is as absurd as making a law that there is no difference between night and day. But it is worse than that, because, under the guise of securing employees their freedom of choice of a union, this provision secures to the employer the whip hand over his employees—and the whip is the company union. Down home we used to say, "You belong to the Red Apple Club." Many such organizations sprang up.

Another example of spurious equality appears in the free-speech provision of the bill. I believe with all my heart that free speech should be guaranteed to everyone, but that is not what this provision does. It does not say that utterances shall not be unfair labor practices unless they are actual threats or promises. It says that they shall not even be evidence of unfair labor practices unless they contain threats or promises. When a man is charged with first-degree murder, a capital offense wherever capital punishment exists, his relevant statements can be used to establish his intention to do the act of which he stands accused. But it will be noticed that a provision is placed in the bill that it must be an actual threat or promise. Any lawyer within the sound of my voice will have to acknowledge that that is something new in the field of law, especially in the field of criminal law—not to be able to go back behind what was taking place, what utterances

were made, in order to prove what actually had happened. But when the employer is brought before the National Labor Relations Board to answer charges of unfair labor practices, his statements, propaganda, or utterances of any kind are ruled completely out of the hearing unless he has made actual threats or promises. Brief consideration of this provision in connection with the provisions on company unions will show to what extent this grant of free speech gives the employer the advantage. Acts of gentle persuasion on his part, directed to encouraging employees to join the employee-representation plan—incorporating no threat or promise but merely expressing a preference on his part—cannot be used as evidence of interference with the exercise of rights by employees. What such golden opportunity is open to the outside union seeking to organize a plant for the first time? The employer may even engage in a violent antiunion campaign, with posters, leaflets, speeches, and any other kind of publicity representing the union as a menace to the community, but so long as he influences his employees' minds without threats or promises, his immunity is complete. Has the union any chance equal to this? I think not, for the simple reason that the employer, not the union, is the source of the weekly pay check, and it is axiomatic that he who pays the piper calls the tune.

Still another case of superficial fairness appears in the simple provision that employees on strike who are not entitled to reinstatement may not vote in a representation election during the dispute. "For ways that are dark and for tricks that are vain," this provision stands convicted, as I shall demonstrate.

Strikers who are not entitled to reinstatement may fall into many categories, and one of them is the category of those who strike for economic reasons—wages, hours, contract terms, and so forth—and who have been replaced by the employer with other help. For present purposes let us make the likely assumption that the strike has been called by the duly certified bargaining representative, and that the employer has not refused to bargain but has merely refused to grant what the union regards as important demands. The strike promises to last awhile, as the union has been strong in the plant and is insistent, so replacements are hired to man the idle machines, and with nearly a full complement the plant goes back into operation. I have seen this happen many a time, even prior to the enactment of the Wagner Act.

The employer now reflects that his lot will be easier if the pertinacious union is off his back. Accordingly, he petitions the Board for a new election, on the ground that some individual or some other labor organization is now claiming recognition as bargaining representative. Or, in the alternative, he suggests to some of his new employees—which he may do, since his freedom of speech is guaranteed—that they petition the Board either for a regular representation election or for an election to "decertify" the former bargaining representative. The Board conducts the election, as it is required to do, and the strikers are barred from the voting. It is inevitable that the union loses its majority status, since it is unthinkable that the strike-breaking employees would be members of the striking union. Thus, while formerly a union on strike for higher wages had a good fighting chance to keep a majority throughout the strike and possibly, in the end, to gain some concessions from the employer in the course of the ordeal by battle, it now would have the unpleasant alternatives of failing to protect the welfare of its members or striking and losing all claim to bargain with the employer on their behalf. I presume it is not unfair to suggest that there are at least some employers who would welcome the opportunity to break up a union by the means outlined.

For the information of the Senate, prior to the Wagner Act going into effect I witnessed many examples illustrating how much employers wanted to break down unions. I have heard employers confess that they employed a thousand or more employees while a strike was in progress. One employer engaged a Pinkerton agency to tell him exactly how to break the strike. He confessed to me, as Governor of South Carolina, that he would have a little girl come into the community, and they would go into the homes selling stockings. He would enter the home, and, of course, the lady of the house would say, "We cannot buy any stockings. We are on strike." He would say, "I have heard something about that strike. It is a bad thing. You could be making much more money if your husband and children were back at work."

He would go to the next house, spreading the same propaganda in every home in the mill village, and to every worker.

He did not stop there. That employer confessed to me that billiard cues were cut off to make billies about a foot and a half long, and that some of those who came in from outside the State of South Carolina used them in order to break the strike. Those men stirred up fights and discontent.

While I was Governor of the State of South Carolina, to illustrate how attempts were made to place the responsibility upon unions for things that were done, one man was employed at $125 a month. He was permitted to drive a taxi and make all the money he could out of the taxi. He would tell the workers that he was with them. He had two little boys working with him, and they were to burn down the grandstand at the baseball field. It was arranged that the three of them would be caught just about the time they got there. The taxi driver was the leader. They were immediately rushed into court and two of them were convicted. The taxi driver was released.

How did I find it out? The taxi driver was such a criminal that in a few short weeks thereafter he drove some other men over and robbed a bank. He was caught and tried and in a few short months he found himself in the penitentiary. The company had no better sense than to send a check to the penitentiary for the work which he had done in trapping those little boys and trying to break up the strike and the union.

How did I find that out? When the check came to the penitentiary the superintendent called me. I called the man into the office at the penitentiary and discussed the matter with him. He acknowledged the purpose for which he had received the check and acknowledged what had taken place. Immediately the other two boys were released from the State penitentiary. The leader is probably still there serving his sentence for robbing the bank.

Mr. President, I am citing some illustrations showing the extremes to which employers will go to try to break up unions. I say that the bill does not treat the laboring men of this Nation justly. I believe in square deals. I believe that the unions have brought us to the high pinnacle on which we stand today. The income of this Nation amounts to approximately $176,000,000,000 a year—almost three times the amount it was when the Republicans had charge of our Government, and approximately three times the national income when the Wagner Act went into effect. As I see it, the Wagner Act has not hurt the United States. I believe that if it were to continue in effect wages would continue to increase.

I remember the days when there were no unions. I remember when I worked for 30 cents a day—not 8 hours, but 10 and 11 hours a day—year in and year out. I remember working many days for 50 and 60 cents a day when there were no unions. I do not want to go back to those days. I want to protect any agency that will improve wages and living standards among our workers. I do not want to do anything that might make life harder for the laboring people of this Nation. I believe that anyone within the sound of my voice who has read the bill must confess that he believes that the bill will not protect labor as it has been protected in the past, and that it would give the employer greater power to handle labor than he has had in the past.

I am willing to meet Senators who vote to override the President's veto anywhere at any time and discuss with them and with the people the workings of the bill, and let the people judge.

I warn Senators that the bill will have a great effect upon the election of 1948. I believe that it will be the determining factor, and that the result will be that there will be more Senators on this side of the aisle than there are now, because I believe that it will be found that the bill will not work, and will not give workers what they expect. At the same time, it will punish labor. How any laboring man could ever be friendly with any Member of Congress who voted for a bill of this kind, I cannot conceive.

To add to the list I have already compiled, there are provisions in the bill which make employers and unions responsible for the acts of their agents, and which declare that in establishing an agency, the question of actual authorization or subsequent ratification of the acts complained of shall not be controlling. Those provisions on their face show what equity judges call "mutuality," but it takes some knowledge of the

realities of labor relations to show the gross unfairness they perpetrate.

In the first place, we learn from the conference report that these provisions are meant to repeal section 6 of the Norris-LaGuardia Act. This section requires that before a person can be held responsible for the unlawful acts of another, there must be clear proof that he actually authorized or ratified those acts. The reason for this section was that in many Federal courts it was the rule that labor unions could be presumed guilty on the basis of ex parte allegations by the employer of unlawful acts by members. The unions were helpless in the face of this rule, since many employers were given to planting their own under-cover agents—often hired detectives—to do or to provoke the acts for which the union was held to be responsible; and, of course, the greater the skill of the employer in planting such people in the union, the more difficult it was for the union to disprove that these men were its agents. The labor spy practice was one of the ugliest and most shameful that marked the area of "government by injunction." H. R. 3020, by repealing section 6 of the Norris-LaGuardia Act, gives promise of reviving it in all its former strength.

I have saved for the last one of the most shocking instances of inequality in the whole bill—an inequality and unfairness scarcely even hidden except by the complexity of the language in which it is phrased and the scattering of the relevant provisions in various places in the bill. I refer to the inequality of treatment as between unions and employers.

Section 8 (b) 4 of the bill makes it an unfair labor practice for a union to engage in certain kinds of strikes, boycotts, or other concerted action. Without going into detail as to which particular acts are so proscribed, I will merely mention that they go far beyond what is needed to correct existing abuses. But I am here concerned only with the remedies that the bill provides.

Here, in a nutshell, are the remedies available against the union for committing these acts. First, the employer may file a charge with the Board. If the Board considers the issuance of a complaint warranted, it is under a mandatory duty to go to a Federal district court and get an injunction against the union. This of itself virtually gives the employer the same right to an injunction that he had before the Norris-La Guardia Act; I cannot see that it matters very much whether he or the Board is required to give the employer's charge priority over everything on its docket except similar charges, and if the evidence sustains the complaint, it issues a cease and desist order against the union, possibly requiring the union to pay back-pay to employees of the employer.

This remedy is, however, not exclusive, for a separate provision gives a right to sue for damages for the acts complained of: not only to the employer, but to outsiders to the dispute who may have been injured. Even under the old law, under the antitrust laws, injuries to outsiders were usually damnum absque injuria but under this bill outsiders, too, may join an employer in his drive to break the union or drain its treasury dry.

Let us see what redress the union may obtain. It has, as before, the opportunity to file a charge with the Board, but it has no right to an interim injunction. When the union files the charge, the power of the Board to seek an injunction is discretionary only, not mandatory. Ultimately, however, the Board may issue a cease-and-desist order against the employer. I say ultimately, because the union's charge gets no priority, and may have to await the determination of a number of charges by employers before it is even reached for hearing.

The union has no right to sue for damages under the bill, and it is significant that it can secure no protection against outsiders to the dispute—vigilante groups, citizens' committees, and the like—who, out of their natural sympathies, commit unfair labor practices on the employer's behalf. Such protection was available under the National Labor Relations Act, because the definition of employer included anyone acting in his interest. H. R. 3020 would narrow this down to include only persons acting as the employer's agents. So, although the union would be responsible to outsiders for its own misbehavior, they would in no way have to answer to the law or the union for theirs.

I want it plainly understood that I believe that we should have some labor legislation this year.

It will be recalled I offered an amendment to the bill on the floor and there was a record vote on it. That is proof that we wanted some labor legislation, we thought it was necessary, but we did not believe that it was necessary to take everything away from labor that it had gained in the past and give a great many things to the employer that we do not think are necessary. But the controlling powers in the Senate and in the House thought it an excellent opportunity to take advantage of the situation in America and take away from labor the rights manufacturers and employers wanted to have taken from them. This is a manufacturers' bill; it is an employers' bill. I started to say I would like to know exactly who wrote it. I would like to know who advised the sponsors in every move they made. I can see some handwriting in it. Having represented labor in many cases I can see that all the places were closed where labor had a resting place.

Mr. President, I hope I have unmasked enough of this bill to show it for what it is, and to prove my original contention that it is a vicious, vindictive, anti-labor measure. I trust enough Senators will agree with me to sustain the President's veto.

All I am asking is that when Senators go home tonight they will give thought to what they are to do Monday. We will adjourn soon. I came here prepared to speak for 10 or 12 hours, but we have agreed on a time to vote. I do not see many Senators present, and I do not know how many will read my speech, but I ask Senators to do what I think is only fair and just tonight before they lie down to sleep, ask their Heavenly Father to guide and lead them in the votes they will cast on the bill. Then, if they follow the dictates of their Maker, I have no fear of the outcome of the vote on Monday. I think that is fair enough to anyone, and if they will just go to sleep with their consciences and ask the help of God, they will come to the Senate Monday and cast a vote that will be fair to capital and fair to labor, and if necessary will vote for other legislation that may cure some of the evils that we all agree there are. Then we will have plenty of time to pass the necessary legislation, what the President of the United States wants and what I know the majority on this side of the aisle would agree to, and we would make all the people of the United States, instead of those benefited under the pending legislation, the beneficiaries of our action.

This is a serious thing we are considering doing. It is more far reaching than a great many of us would ever think it could be. Mr. President, legislation of this kind affects our economy. If we cut down the purchasing power of the Nation, we jeopardize every bond the people hold and we jeopardize the price the farmer will receive for his cotton. Mr. President, we gave away $3,750,000,000 to Great Britain in order to increase her purchasing power, so that she could purchase things from us. I say that if we pass this bill, I fear the result will be to cut down the purchasing power of this Nation, and in a few short years we shall have, first, a recession. Watch and see whether my predictions come true, Mr. President. See how true they will be shown to be. First the laboring people will begin to have their wages cut. Next, they will be unemployed. Whereas some mills today are running three shifts, at that time they will have only two shifts; and some which now have two shifts will have only one shift then. The man who sells his produce today will have to throw it in the ditch then, for he will have no buyer.

Then what will come next? Unemployment will spread over the Nation. It will be possible to purchase things cheaply, but our people will not have any money with which to make purchases—the same circumstances which existed in 1933 when Roosevelt went into office.

Mr. President, when I was called upon to speak last year, just before the election, I went to Ohio. The other day I did not have an opportunity to complete my statement about this matter, so I shall do so now. I went to Ohio, where I was to appear at a forum with a Republican, and we were to answer questions. But the Republican did not appear; he hid out. What were the questions that were asked? We were told, "We want meat. Why can't we get meat?" Mr. President, do you know the way I answered that question? I said, "If I remember correctly, when the Republicans were in office in 1931, 1932, and 1933, the cry was, not 'more meat,' but 'more bread.'"

Mr. President, many a time during those days a man would walk into my office, and take a seat across from where I was sitting, and, with tears rolling down his cheeks, would say, "Olin, I haven't a bit of flour in the barrel at

home. I haven't any money to buy flour with. Can you let me have—give me—I hate to ask it—50 cents to buy some flour to feed my wife and children?" He did not even have milk for his little children. He had no job.

I predict that if the Senate follows the advice of the Senators on the other side of the aisle and passes legislation such as that which is before us at the present time, there wil be a recession. A strong economy cannot be built up in that way. There will be a recession; and after the recession, if the Democrats do not get back in control, there will be a depression. That is what will occur.

That is why I am fighting this legislation, because I believe that by doing so we do what is best for all the United States and what is best for building up a strong economy, whereby we shall be able to pay off the enormous debt of $258,000,000,000. Mr. President, with this year's expenditures added to that debt, the total will be more than has been collected in taxes since the beginning of the United States. All the taxes do not amount to that much, plus this year's running expenses.

So we must keep up the income of this Nation if we are to save ourselves. We can bond ourselves, we can go into debt; there will be a stopping place unless we keep up the national income. We cannot cut it back in the good old Republican way and expect to meet our obligations that are outstanding at the present time.

Mr. President, it hurts me to think that the leaders of the United States cannot see those things and cannot appreciate them and cannot understand that bills of this nature are liable to bring chaos in their wake.

We hear much about Communists, Mr. President. If we ever go back to the days of 1933, with the enormous debt we now have, if anyone can tell me how to keep out of the hands of the Communists then, I should like to know it. That is the danger we are facing today; and we are putting wood on the fire when we pass such legislation as that which we have before us at this time. Mr. President, my wish is that God may guide the Senate in its vote on next Monday.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m.) on Saturday, June 21, 1947, the Senate took a recess until Monday, June 23, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JUNE 20, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord God of Hosts, who art the soul of the universe and the mind of man, we do not fear nor tremble in Thy presence. By infinite right, blessing, honor, and glory belongeth unto Thee. We therefore praise Thee.

We are grateful, our Lord, that we live in a land of freemen, where opportunities and privileges give us food, clothing, and education. The past lives in the throbbing heart of the present. Grounded in the glorious liberty which is our blessed heritage, enable us to stand fast in the purpose of Thy will. Enjoin us that through grateful love of country, not coercion nor pressure, and without threat, we are enabled to preserve a sound and healthy America, without which there is little hope for the world. To this end we would fear God and keep His commandments, for this is the whole duty of man.

Through Christ our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 53. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Clerk of the House in the enrollment of the bill H. R. 3203 to make certain changes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution to establish a commission to formulate plans for the erection in Grant Park, Chicago, Ill., of a Marine Corps memorial.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1230. An act to amend sections 2 (a) and 603 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 254) entitled "An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Glenna J. Howrey," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MOORE, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. MCGRATH to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3203) entitled "An act relative to maximum rents on housing accommodations, to repeal certain provisions of Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 814) entitled "An act to provide support for wool, and for other purposes."

TO AMEND SECTION 251 OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of H. R. 3444, to amend section 251 of the Internal Revenue Code.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 251 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to income from sources within possessions of the United States) is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection to read as follows:

"(i) Prisoners of war and internees: In the case of a citizen of the United States taken as a prisoner of war while serving within a possession of the United States as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States, and in the case of a citizen interned by the enemy while serving as an employee within a possession of the United States—

"(1) if such citizen was confined in any place not within a possession of the United States, such place of confinement shall, for the purposes of this section, be considered as within a possession of the United States; and

"(2) any compensation received within the United States by such citizen attributable to the period of time during which such citizen was a prisoner of war or interned by the enemy shall, for the purposes of subsection (b), be considered as compensation received outside the United States."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this act shall be applicable to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1941.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of H. R. 3444 is to restore to United States citizens certain legal rights and exemptions under the law when they became interned in Japanese prisons outside of the possession of the United States. It refers particularly to those engaged in trade and in the military and naval service in the Philippine Islands who were captured by the Japanese and incarcerated in prisons outside of the territory of the Philippine Islands.

Under a statute enacted about 1921 to encourage trade in the Philippine Islands, at a time when to be stationed there, or were there to establish a trade, was inimical to life and health, it was provided that persons engaged in trade or employed in business or trade should be relieved of the burden of their income tax provided that at least 80 percent of their income was derived from sources within a possession of the United States, and if at least 50 percent of their gross income was derived from the active conduct of a trade or business within a possession of the United States. Later, by regulations, this provision was expanded to include citizens serving in the military and naval forces of the United States who were stationed in the Philippine Islands.

When the "death march" started, several thousand American citizens were marched out of the Philippines by the Japanese at the point of a bayonet. They suffered indescribable indignities; some, of course, falling by the wayside from exhaustion never to recover. Under the 1921 law the income-tax exemption granted was denied to thousands of military people and civilians who were

incarcerated in prison outside the Philippine Islands. The exemption will continue to be denied to these unfortunate people unless H. R. 3444 is enacted into law.

What our people suffered at the hands of the Japanese in their prisons is best described in the book The Three Came Home, written by Mrs. Agnes Newton Keith, who with her husband and small child spent three and a half years in a Japanese prison camp. I quote from Mrs. Keith's book:

At the end of the first month the children came down with what we called dysentery, although no laboratory examination could be made. They became nauseated, had diarrhea, passed mucus and blood, and lay about the barracks very limply. Most of them were past the diaper age, and we had no provisions for stopping the wet ends. The camp became a trail of blood stools left in the wake of weeping children, who in their turn were followed by creeping infants who crawled through mud and gore. And after the infants would come some childless woman with dainty tread to report to the mother, "Mrs. So and So, your child has had an accident. Please clean it up."

But we had no waste cloths to clean anything up with. In addition to dysentery, they had influenza, they had worms, they had impetigo, they had malaria, and always they had colds. We didn't have medicines unless we smuggled, traded, or stole them. After a few months in camp I developed beriberi, a disease of undernourishment and vitamin deficiency. My legs and face swelled. By evening my legs were so numb that I could not stand on them. The doctor said I must eat all the green stuff I could get hold of. From there on throughout camp life I collected greens, ferns, weeds of any sort, and boiled and ate them.

H. R. 3444 has the approval of the Ways and Means Committee. I introduced this bill May 13, 1947, and I urge its passage in order to do justice to 30,000 of our service people and 10,000 civilians. The great sacrifices they made and the suffering they experienced in Japanese prison camps should not be aggravated by permitting their rights to be sacrificed at the point of Japanese bayonets. I am sure that there will be no objection or opposition to the passage of this bill by unanimous consent.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—PERMISSION TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may have until midnight Saturday night to file certain reports on certain bills.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT, 1947—VETO MESSAGE (H. DOC. NO. 334)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 3020, the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947.

I am fully aware of the gravity which attaches to the exercise by the President of his constitutional power to withhold his approval from an enactment of the Congress.

I share with the Congress the conviction that legislation dealing with the relations between management and labor is necessary. I heartily condemn abuses on the part of unions and employers, and I have no patience with stubborn insistence on private advantage to the detriment of the public interest.

But this bill is far from a solution of those problems.

When one penetrates the complex, interwoven provisions of this omnibus bill, and understands the real meaning of its various parts, the result is startling.

The bill taken as a whole would reverse the basic direction of our national labor policy, inject the Government into private economic affairs on an unprecedented scale, and conflict with important principles of our democratic society. Its provisions would cause more strikes, not fewer. It would contribute neither to industrial peace nor to economic stability and progress. It would be a dangerous stride in the direction of a totally managed economy. It contains seeds of discord which would plague this Nation for years to come.

Because of the far-reaching import of this bill, I have weighed its probable effects against a series of fundamental considerations. In each case I find that the bill violates principles essential to our public welfare.

I. The first major test which I have applied to this bill is whether it would result in more or less Government intervention in our economic life.

Our basic national policy has always been to establish by law standards of fair dealing and then to leave the working of the economic system to the free choice of individuals. Under that policy of economic freedom we have built our Nation's productive strength. Our people have deep faith in industrial self-government with freedom of contract and free collective bargaining.

I find that this bill is completely contrary to that national policy of economic freedom. It would require the Government, in effect, to become an unwanted participant at every bargaining table. It would establish by law limitations on the terms of every bargaining agreement, and nullify thousands of agreements mutually arrived at and satisfactory to the parties. It would inject the Government deeply into the process by which employers and workers reach agreement. It would superimpose bureaucratic procedures on the free decisions of local employers and employees.

At a time when we are determined to remove, as rapidly as practicable, Federal controls established during the war, this bill would involve the Government in the free processes of our economic system to a degree unprecedented in peacetime.

This is a long step toward the settlement of economic issues by Government dictation. It is an indication that industrial relations are to be determined in the Halls of Congress and that political power is to supplant economic power as the critical factor in labor relations.

II. The second basic test against which I have measured this bill is whether it would improve human relations between employers and their employees.

Cooperation cannot be achieved by force of law. We cannot create mutual respect and confidence by legislative fiat.

I am convinced that this legislation overlooks the significance of these principles. It would encourage distrust, suspicion, and arbitrary attitudes.

I find that the National Labor Relations Act would be converted from an instrument with the major purpose of protecting the right of workers to organize and bargain collectively into a maze of pitfalls and complex procedures. As a result of these complexities employers and workers would find new barriers to mutual understanding.

The bill time and again would remove the settlement of differences from the bargaining table to courts of law. Instead of learning to live together, employers and unions are invited to engage in costly, time-consuming litigation, inevitably embittering both parties.

The Congress has, I think, paid too much attention to the inevitable frictions and difficulties incident to the reconversion period. It has ignored the unmistakable evidence that those difficulties are receding and that labor-management cooperation is constantly improving. There is grave danger that this progress would be nullified through enactment of this legislation.

III. A third basic test is whether the bill is workable.

There is little point in putting laws on the books unless they can be executed. I have concluded that this bill would prove to be unworkable. The so-called emergency procedure for critical Nation-wide strikes would require an immense amount of Government effort but would result almost inevitably in failure. The National Labor Relations Board would be given many new tasks, and hobbled at every turn in attempting to carry them out. Unique restrictions on the Board's procedures would so greatly increase the backlog of unsettled cases that the parties might be driven to turn in despair from peaceful procedures to economic force.

IV. The fourth basic test by which I have measured this bill is the test of fairness.

The bill prescribes unequal penalties for the same offense. It would require the National Labor Relations Board to give priority to charges against workers over related charges against employers. It would discriminate against workers by arbitrarily penalizing them for all critical strikes.

Much has been made of the claim that the bill is intended simply to equalize the positions of labor and management. Careful analysis shows that this claim is unfounded. Many of the provisions of the bill standing alone seem innocent but, considered in relation to each other, reveal a consistent pattern of inequality.

The failure of the bill to meet these fundamental tests is clearly demonstrated by a more detailed consideration of its defects.

1. The bill would substantially increase strikes.

(1) It would discourage the growing willingness of unions to include "no strike" provisions in bargaining agreements, since any labor organization signing such an agreement would expose itself to suit for contract violation if any of its members engaged in an unauthorized "wildcat" strike.

(2) It would encourage strikes by imposing highly complex and burdensome reporting requirements on labor organizations which wish to avail themselves of their rights under the National Labor Relations Act. In connection with these reporting requirements, the bill would penalize unions for any failure to comply, no matter how inconsequential, by denying them all rights under the act. These provisions, which are irrelevant to the major purposes of the bill, seem peculiarly designed to place obstacles in the way of labor organizations which wish to appeal to the National Labor Relations Board for relief, and thus to impel them to strike or take other direct action.

(3) It would bring on strikes by depriving significant groups of workers of the right they now enjoy to organize and to bargain under the protection of law. For example, broad groups of employees who for purposes of the act would be classed as supervisors would be removed from the protection of the act. Such groups would be prevented from using peaceful machinery and would be left no option but the use of economic force.

(4) The bill would force unions to strike or to boycott if they wish to have a jurisdictional dispute settled by the National Labor Relations Board. This peculiar situation results from the fact that the Board is given authority to determine jurisdictional disputes over assignment of work only after such disputes have been converted into strikes or boycotts.

In addition to these ways in which specific provisions of the bill would lead directly to strikes, the cumulative effect of many of its other provisions which disrupt established relationships would result in industrial strife and unrest.

2. The bill arbitrarily decides, against the workers, certain issues which are normally the subject of collective bargaining, and thus restricts the area of voluntary agreement.

(1) The bill would limit the freedom of employers and labor organizations to agree on methods of developing responsibility on the part of unions by establishing union security. While seeming to preserve the right to agree to the union shop, it would place such a multitude of obstacles in the way of such agreement that union security and responsibility would be largely canceled.

In this respect, the bill disregards the voluntary developments in the field of industrial relations in the United States over the past 150 years. Today, over 11,000,000 workers are employed under some type of union-security contract. The great majority of the plants which have such union-security provisions have had few strikes. Employers in such plants are generally strong supporters of some type of union security, since it gives them a greater measure of stability in production.

(2) The bill would limit the freedom of employers and employees to establish and maintain welfare funds. It would prescribe arbitrary methods of administering them and rigidly limit the purposes for which they may be used. This is an undesirable intrusion by the Government into an important matter which should be the subject of private agreement between employers and employees.

(3) The bill presents the danger that employers and employees might be prohibited from agreeing on safety provisions, rest-period rules, and many other legitimate practices, since such practices may fall under the language defining "feather bedding."

3. The bill would expose employers to numerous hazards by which they could be annoyed and hampered.

(1) The bill would invite frequent disruption of continuous plant production by opening up immense possibilities for many more elections, and adding new types of elections. The bill would invite electioneering for changes in representatives and for union security. This would harass employers in their production efforts and would generate raiding and jurisdictional disputes. The National Labor Relations Board has been developing sound principles of stability on these matters. The bill would overturn these principles to the detriment of employers.

(2) The bill would complicate the collective bargaining process for employers by permitting—and in some cases requiring—the splitting up of stable patterns of representation. Employers would be harassed by having to deal with many small units. Labor organizations would be encouraged to engage in constant interunion warfare, which could result only in confusion.

(3) The bill would invite unions to sue employers in the courts regarding the thousands of minor grievances which arise every day over the interpretation of bargaining agreements. Employers are likely to be besieged by a multiplicity of minor suits, since management necessarily must take the initiative in applying the terms of agreements. In this respect, the bill ignores the fact that employers and unions are in wide agreement that the interpretation of the provisions of bargaining agreements should be submitted to the processes of negotiation ending in voluntary arbitration, under penalties prescribed in the agreement itself. This is one of the points on which the National Labor-Management Conference in November 1945, placed special emphasis. In introducing damage suits as a possible substitute for grievance machinery, the bill rejects entirely the informed wisdom of those experienced in labor relations.

(4) The bill would prevent an employer from freely granting a union-shop contract, even where he and virtually his entire working force were in agreement as to its desirability. He would be required to refrain from agreement until the National Labor Relations Board's work load permitted it to hold an election—in this case simply to ratify an unquestioned and legitimate agreement.

Employers, moreover, would suffer because the ability of unions to exercise responsibility under bargaining agreements would be diminished. Labor organizations whose disciplinary authority is weakened cannot carry their full share of maintaining stability of production.

4. The bill would deprive workers of vital protection which they now have under the law.

(1) The bill would make it easier for an employer to get rid of employees whom he wanted to discharge because they exercised their right of self-organization guaranteed by the act. It would permit an employer to dismiss a man on the pretext of a slight infraction of shop rules, even though his real motive was to discriminate against this employee for union activity.

(2) The bill would also put a powerful new weapon in the hands of employers by permitting them to initiate elections at times strategically advantageous to them. It is significant that employees on economic strike who may have been replaced are denied a vote. An employer could easily thwart the will of his employees by raising a question of representation at a time when the union was striking over contract terms.

(3) It would give employers the means to engage in endless litigation, draining the energy and resources of unions in court actions, even though the particular charges were groundless.

(4) It would deprive workers of the power to meet the competition of goods produced under sweatshop conditions by permitting employers to halt every type of secondary boycott, not merely those for unjustifiable purposes.

(5) It would reduce the responsibility of employers for unfair labor practices committed in their behalf. The effect of the bill is to narrow unfairly employer liability for antiunion acts and statements made by persons who, in the eyes of the employees affected, act and speak for management, but who may not be "agents" in the strict legal sense of that term.

(6) At the same time it would expose unions to suits for acts of violence, wildcat strikes, and other actions, none of which were authorized or ratified by them. By employing elaborate legal doctrine, the bill applies a superficially similar test of responsibility for employers and unions—each would be responsible for the acts of his agents. But the power of an employer to control the acts of his subordinates is direct and final. This is radically different from the power of unions to control the acts of their members—who are, after all, members of a free association.

5. The bill abounds in provisions which would be unduly burdensome or actually unworkable.

(1) The bill would erect an unworkable administrative structure for carrying out the National Labor Relations Act. The bill would establish, in effect, an independent general counsel and an independent Board. But it would place with the Board full responsibility for investigating and determining election cases—over 70 percent of the present case load—and at the same time would remove from the Board the authority to direct and control the personnel engaged in carrying out this responsibility.

(2) It would invite conflict between the National Labor Relations Board and its general counsel, since the general counsel would decide, without any right of appeal by employers and employees, whether charges were to be heard by the Board, and whether orders of the Board were to be referred to the court for enforcement. By virtue of this unlimited authority, a single administrative official might usurp the Board's responsibility for establishing policy under the act.

(3) It would strait-jacket the National Labor Relations Board's operations by a series of special restrictions unknown to any other quasi-judicial agency. After many years of study, the Congress adopted the Administrative Procedures Act of 1946 to govern the operation of all quasi-judicial agencies, including the National Labor Relations Board. This present bill disregards the Procedures Act and, in many respects, is directly contrary to the spirit and letter of that act. Simple and time-saving procedures, already established and accepted as desirable by employers and employees, would be summarily scrapped. The Board itself, denied the power of delegation, would be required to hear all jurisdictional disputes over work tasks. This single duty might require a major portion of the Board's time. The review function within the Board, largely of a nonjudicial character, would be split up and assigned to separate staffs attached to each Board member. This would lead to extensive and costly duplication of work and records.

(4) The bill would require or invite Government supervised elections in an endless variety of cases. Questions of the bargaining unit, of representatives, of union security, of bargaining offers, are subject to election after election, most of them completely unnecessary. The National Labor Relations Board has had difficulty conducting the number of elections required under present law. This bill would greatly multiply this load. It would, in effect, impose upon the Board a 5-year backlog of election cases, if it handled them at its present rate.

(5) The bill would introduce a unique handicap, unknown in ordinary law, upon the use of statements as evidence of unfair labor practices. An antiunion statement by an employer, for example, could not be considered as evidence of motive, unless it contained an explicit threat of reprisal or force or promise of benefit. The bill would make it an unfair labor practice to "induce or encourage" certain types of strikes and boycotts, and then would forbid the National Labor Relations Board to consider as evidence "views, argument, or opinion" by which such a charge could be proved.

(6) The bill would require the Board to "determine" jurisdictional disputes over work tasks, instead of using arbitration, the accepted and traditional method of settling such disputes. In order to get its case before the Board a union must indulge in a strike or a boycott and wait for some other party to allege that it had violated the law. If the Board's decision should favor the party thus forced to violate the law in order that its case might be heard, the Board would be without power over other parties to the dispute to whom the award might be unacceptable.

(7) The bill would require the Board to determine which employees on strike are "entitled to reinstatement" and hence would be eligible to vote in an election held during a strike. This would be an impossible task, since it would require the Board arbitrarily to decide which, if any, of the employees had been replaced and therefore should not be allowed to vote.

6. The bill would establish an ineffective and discriminatory emergency procedure for dealing with major strikes affecting the public health or safety.

This procedure would be certain to do more harm than good, and to increase rather than diminish widespread industrial disturbances. I am convinced that the country would be in for a bitter disappointment if these provisions of the bill became law.

The procedure laid down by the bill is elaborate. Its essential features are a Presidential board of inquiry, a waiting period of approximately 80 days—enforced by injunction—and a secret-ballot vote of the workers on the question of whether or not to accept their employer's last offer.

At the outset a board of inquiry would be required to investigate the situation thoroughly, but would be specifically forbidden to offer its informed judgment concerning a reasonable basis for settlement of the dispute. Such inquiry therefore, would serve merely as a sounding board to dramatize the respective positions of the parties.

A strike or lock-out might occur before the board of inquiry could make its report, and perhaps even before the board could be appointed. The existence of such a strike or lock-out would hamper the board in pursuing its inquiry. Experience has shown that fact-finding, if it is to be most effective as a device for settlement of labor disputes, should come before the men leave their work, not afterward. Furthermore, an injunction issued after a strike has started would arouse bitter resentment which would not contribute to agreement.

If the dispute had not been settled after 60 days of the waiting period, the National Labor Relations Board would be required to hold a separate election for the employees of each employer to find out whether the workers wished to accept the employer's last offer, as stated by him. Our experience under the War Labor Disputes Act showed conclusively that such an election would almost inevitably result in a vote to reject the employer's offer, since such action amounts to a vote of confidence by the workers in their bargaining representatives. The union would then be reinforced by a dramatic demonstration, under Government auspices, of its strength for further negotiations.

After this elaborate procedure the injunction would then have to be dissolved, the parties would be free to fight out their dispute, and it would be mandatory for the President to transfer the whole problem to the Congress, even if it were not in session. Thus, major economic disputes between employers and their workers over contract terms might ultimately be thrown into the political arena for disposition. One could scarcely devise a less effective method for discouraging critical strikes.

This entire procedure is based upon the same erroneous assumptions as those which underlay the strike-vote provision of the War Labor Disputes Act, namely, that strikes are called in haste as the result of inflamed passions, and that union leaders do not represent the wishes of the workers. We have learned by experience, however, that strikes in the basic industries are not called in haste, but only after long periods of negotiation and serious deliberation; and that in the secret-ballot election the workers almost always vote to support their leaders.

Furthermore, a fundamental inequity runs through these provisions. The bill provides for injunctions to prohibit workers from striking, even against terms dictated by employers after contracts have expired. There is no provision assuring the protection of the rights of the employees during the period they are deprived of the right to protect themselves by economic action.

In summary, I find that the so-called "emergency procedure" would be ineffective. It would provide for clumsy and cumbersome Government intervention; it would authorize inequitable injunctions; and it would probably culminate in a public confession of failure. I cannot conceive that this procedure would aid in the settlement of disputes.

7. The bill would discriminate against employees.

(1) It would impose discriminatory penalties upon employers and employees for the same offense, that of violating the requirement that existing agreements be maintained for 60 days without strike or lock-out while a new agreement is being negotiated. Employers could only be required to restore the previous conditions of employment, but employees could be summarily dismissed by the employer.

(2) The bill would require the Board to seek a temporary restraining order when labor organizations had been charged with boycotts or certain kinds of jurisdictional strikes. It would invite employers to find any pretext for arguing that "an object" of the union's action was one of these practices, even though the primary object was fully legitimate. Moreover, since these cases would be taken directly into the courts, they necessarily would be settled by the judiciary before the National Labor Relations Board had a chance to decide the issue. This would thwart the entire purpose of the National Labor Relations Act in establishing the Board, which purpose was to confer on the Board, rather than the courts, the power to decide complex questions of fact in a special field requiring expert knowledge. This provision of the bill is clearly a backward step toward the old abuses of the labor injunction. No similar provision directed against employers can be found in the bill.

(3) The bill would also require the Board to give priority in investigating charges of certain kinds of unfair labor

practices against unions, even though such unfair labor practices might have been provoked by those of the employer. Thus the bill discriminates, in this regard, in the relief available to employers and unions.

(4) It would impose on labor organizations, but not on employers, burdensome reporting requirements which must be met before any rights would be available under the act.

(5) In weakening the protections afforded to the right to organize, contrary to the basic purpose of the National Labor Relations Act, the bill would injure smaller unions far more than larger ones. Those least able to protect themselves would be the principal victims of the bill.

8. The bill would disregard in important respects the unanimous convictions of employer and labor representatives at the national labor-management conference in November 1945.

(1) One of the strongest convictions expressed during the conference was that the Government should withdraw from the collective-bargaining process, now that the war emergency is over, and leave the determination of working conditions to the free agreement of the parties. This bill proceeds in exactly the opposite direction. In numerous ways the bill would unnecessarily intrude the Government into the process of reaching free decisions through bargaining. This intrusion is precisely what the representatives of management and labor resented.

(2) A unanimous recommendation of the conference was that the Conciliation Service should be strengthened within the Department of Labor. But this bill removes the Conciliation Service from the Department of Labor. The new name for the Service would carry with it no new dignity or new functions. The evidence does not support the theory that the conciliation function would be better exercised and protected by an independent agency outside the Department of Labor. Indeed, the Service would lose the important day-to-day support of factual research in industrial relations available from other units of the Department. Furthermore, the removal of the Conciliation Service from the Department of Labor would be contrary to the praiseworthy policy of the Congress to centralize related governmental units within the major Government departments.

9. The bill raises serious issues of public policy which transcend labor-management difficulties.

(1) In undertaking to restrict political contributions and expenditures, the bill would prohibit many legitimate activities on the part of unions and corporations. This provision would prevent the ordinary union newspaper from commenting favorably or unfavorably upon candidates or issues in national elections. I regard this as a dangerous intrusion on free speech, unwarranted by any demonstration of need, and quite foreign to the stated purposes of this bill.

Furthermore, this provision can be interpreted as going far beyond its apparent objectives, and as interfering with necessary business activities. It provides no exemption for corporations whose business is the publication of newspapers or the operation of radio stations. It makes no distinctions between expenditures made by such corporations for the purpose of influencing the results of an election, and other expenditures made by them in the normal course of their business "in connection with" an election. Thus it would raise a host of troublesome questions concerning the legality of many practices ordinarily engaged in by newspapers and radio stations.

(2) In addition, in one important area the bill expressly abandons the principle of uniform application of national policy under Federal law. The bill's stated policy of preserving some degree of union security would be abdicated in all States where more restrictive policies exist. In other respects the bill makes clear that Federal policy would govern insofar as activities affecting commerce are concerned. This is not only an invitation to the States to distort national policy as they see fit, but is a complete forsaking of a long-standing constitutional principle.

(3) In regard to Communists in unions, I am convinced that the bill would have an effect exactly opposite to that intended by the Congress. Congress intended to assist labor organizations to rid themselves of Communist officers. With this objective I am in full accord. But the effect of this provision would be far different. The bill would deny the peaceful procedures of the National Labor Relations Act to a union unless all its officers declared under oath that they were not members of the Communist Party and that they did not favor the forceful or unconstitutional overthrow of the Government. The mere refusal by a single individual to sign the required affidavit would prevent an entire national labor union from being certified for purposes of collective bargaining. Such a union would have to win all its objectives by strike, rather than by orderly procedure under the law. The union and the affected industry would be disrupted for perhaps a long period of time while violent electioneering, charges, and countercharges split open the union ranks. The only result of this provision would be confusion and disorder, which is exactly the result the Communists desire.

This provision in the bill is an attempt to solve difficult problems of industrial democracy by recourse to oversimplified legal devices. I consider that this provision would increase, rather than decrease, disruptive effects of Communists in our labor movement.

The most fundamental test which I have applied to this bill is whether it would strengthen or weaken American democracy in the present critical hour. This bill is perhaps the most serious economic and social legislation of the past decade. Its effects—for good or ill—would be felt for decades to come.

I have concluded that the bill is a clear threat to the successful working of our democratic society.

One of the major lessons of recent world history is that free and vital trade-unions are a strong bulwark against the growth of totalitarian movements. We must, therefore, be everlastingly alert that in striking at union abuses we do not destroy the contribution which unions make to our democratic strength.

This bill would go far toward weakening our trade-union movement. And it would go far toward destroying our national unity. By raising barriers between labor and management and by injecting political considerations into normal economic decisions, it would invite them to gain their ends through direct political action. I think it would be exceedingly dangerous to our country to develop a class basis for political action.

I cannot emphasize too strongly the transcendent importance of the United States in the world today as a force for freedom and peace. We cannot be strong internationally if our national unity and our productive strength are hindered at home. Anything which weakens our economy or weakens the unity of our people—as I am thoroughly convinced this bill would do—I cannot approve.

In my message on the state of the Union which I submitted to the Congress in January 1947, I recommended a step-by-step approach to the subject of labor legislation. I specifically indicated the problems which we should treat immediately. I recommended that, before going on to other problems, a careful, thorough, and nonpartisan investigation should be made, covering the entire field of labor-management relations.

The bill now before me reverses this procedure. It would make drastic changes in our national labor policy first, and would provide for investigation afterward.

There is still a genuine opportunity for the enactment of appropriate labor legislation this session. I still feel that the recommendations which I expressed in the state of the Union message constitute an adequate basis for legislation which is moderate in spirit and which relates to known abuses.

For the compelling reasons I have set forth, I return H. R. 3020 without my approval.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 20, 1947.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and the message and the bill will be printed as a House document.

The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY].

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, the contentions on both sides of this measure have been loud and long. It has been debated at greater length in the Congress, in the press, and over the radio than any other legislation in my memory. The veto message of the President raises no contention which has not been thoroughly explored and discussed. I do not see that any further debate will be material. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LESINSKI. I believe we are entitled to some time on this on the minority side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman insists on making the point of order that a quorum is not present, the Chair will accommodate him and count. [After counting.] Three hundred and forty Members are present, a quorum.

The previous question has been ordered.

Under the Constitution, this vote must be determined by the yeas and nays.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 331, nays 83, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 85]

YEAS—331

Abernethy	Colmer	Hall,
Albert	Cooley	Edwin Arthur
Allen, Calif.	Cooper	Hall,
Allen, Ill.	Corbett	Leonard W.
Allen, La.	Cotton	Halleck
Almond	Coudert	Hand
Andersen,	Courtney	Hardy
H. Carl	Cox	Harness, Ind.
Anderson, Calif.	Cravens	Harris
Andresen,	Crawford	Harrison
August H.	Crow	Hartley
Andrews, Ala.	Cunningham	Hays
Andrews, N. Y.	Curtis	Hébert
Arends	Dague	Hendricks
Arnold	Davis, Ga.	Herter
Auchincloss	Davis, Tenn.	Heselton
Bakewell	Davis, Wis.	Hess
Banta	Dawson, Utah	Hill
Barden	Deane	Hinshaw
Barrett	Devitt	Hobbs
Bates, Mass.	D'Ewart	Hoeven
Battle	Dirksen	Hoffman
Beall	Domengeaux	Holmes
Beckworth	Dondero	Hope
Bell	Dorn	Horan
Bender	Doughton	Howell
Bennett, Mo.	Drewry	Jackson, Calif.
Blackney	Durham	Jarman
Bland	Eaton	Jenison
Boggs, Del.	Elliott	Jenkins, Ohio
Boggs, La.	Ellis	Jenkins, Pa.
Bolton	Ellsworth	Jennings
Bonner	Elsaesser	Jensen
Boykin	Elston	Johnson, Calif.
Bradley	Engel, Mich.	Johnson, Ill.
Bramblett	Engle, Calif.	Johnson, Ind.
Brehm	Evins	Johnson, Tex.
Brooks	Fallon	Jones, Ala.
Brown, Ga.	Fellows	Jones, N. C.
Brown, Ohio	Fenton	Jones, Ohio
Bryson	Fernandez	Jonkman
Buck	Fisher	Judd
Buffett	Fletcher	Kean
Bulwinkle	Foote	Kearney
Burke	Fulton	Kearns
Burleson	Gallagher	Keating
Busbey	Gamble	Keefe
Byrnes, Wis.	Gary	Kerr
Camp	Gathings	Kersten, Wis.
Canfield	Gavin	Kilburn
Carson	Gearhart	Kilday
Case, N. J.	Gillette	Knutson
Case, S. Dak.	Gillie	Kunkel
Chadwick	Goff	Landis
Chapman	Goodwin	Larcade
Cheif	Gore	Latham
Chenoweth	Gossett	Lea
Chiperfield	Graham	LeCompte
Church	Grant, Ala.	LeFevre
Clark	Grant, Ind.	Lewis
Clason	Gregory	Lodge
Clevenger	Griffiths	Love
Clippinger	Gross	Lucas
Coffin	Gwinn, N. Y.	Lyle
Cole, Kans.	Gwynne, Iowa	McConnell
Cole, Mo.	Hagen	McCowen
Cole, N. Y.	Hale	McDonough
McDowell	Poage	Simpson, Pa.
McGarvey	Potts	Smathers
McGregor	Poulson	Smith, Kans.
McMahon	Preston	Smith, Maine
McMillen, Ill.	Price, Fla.	Smith, Va.
MacKinnon	Priest	Smith, Wis.
Macy	Rains	Snyder
Mahon	Ramey	Springer
Maloney	Rankin	Stanley
Manasco	Redden	Stefan
Martin, Iowa	Reed, Ill.	Stevenson
Mason	Reed, N. Y.	Stigler
Mathews	Rees	Stockman
Meade, Ky.	Reeves	Stratton
Meade, Md.	Rich	Sundstrom
Merrow	Richards	Taber
Meyer	Riehlman	Talle
Michener	Riley	Taylor
Miller, Conn.	Rivers	Teague
Miller, Md.	Rizley	Thomas, N. J.
Miller, Nebr.	Robertson	Tibbott
Mills	Robsion	Towe
Mitchell	Rockwell	Trimble
Monroney	Rogers, Fla.	Twyman
Morton	Rogers, Mass.	Vail
Muhlenberg	Rohrbough	Vinson
Mundt	Ross	Vorys
Murray, Tenn.	Russell	Vursell
Murray, Wis.	Sadlak	Wadsworth
Nixon	St. George	Weichel
Nodar	Sanborn	West
Norblad	Sarbacher	Wheeler
Norrell	Sasscer	Whitten
O'Hara	Schwabe, Mo.	Whittington
O'Konski	Schwabe, Okla.	Wigglesworth
Owens	Scoblick	Williams
Pace	Scott, Hardie	Wilson, Ind.
Passman	Scott,	Wilson, Tex.
Patterson	Hugh D., Jr.	Wolcott
Peden	Scrivner	Wolverton
Peterson	Seely-Brown	Wood
Phillips, Calif.	Shafer	Woodruff
Pickett	Short	Worley
Ploeser	Sikes	Youngblood
Plumley	Simpson, Ill.	Zimmerman

NAYS—83

Angell	Harless, Ariz.	Miller, Calif.
Bates, Ky.	Hart	Morgan
Bishop	Havenner	Morris
Blatnik	Hedrick	Morrison
Bloom	Heffernan	Murdock
Brophy	Holifield	Norton
Buchanan	Huber	O'Brien
Buckley	Hull	O'Toole
Butler	Jackson, Wash.	Pfeifer
Byrne, N. Y.	Javits	Philbin
Cannon	Johnson, Okla.	Phillips, Tenn.
Carroll	Jones, Wash.	Price, Ill.
Celler	Karsten, Mo.	Rabin
Clements	Kee	Rayburn
Crosser	Kennedy	Rayfiel
Dawson, Ill.	Keogh	Rooney
Delaney	King	Sabath
Dingell	Kirwan	Sadowski
Donohue	Klein	Sheppard
Douglas	Lane	Somers
Eberharter	Lanham	Spence
Feighan	Lemke	Thomas, Tex.
Flannagan	Lesinski	Thomason
Fogarty	Lynch	Tollefson
Folger	McCormack	Walter
Forand	Madden	Welch
Gordon	Mansfield,	
Gorski	Mont.	
Granger	Marcantonio	

NOT VOTING—15

Bennett, Mich.	Kefauver	Patman
Combs	Kelley	Powell
Dolliver	Lusk	Smith, Ohio
Fuller	McMillan, S. C.	Van Zandt
Gifford	Mansfield, Tex.	Winstead

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the bill was passed, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Van Zandt and Mr. Dolliver for, with Mr. Kefauver against.

Mr. Gifford and Mr. McMillan of South Carolina for, with Mr. Kelley against.

Mr. Fuller and Mrs. Lusk for, with Mr. Powell against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Bennett of Michigan with Mr. Winstead.

Mr. Smith of Ohio with Mr. Combs.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago we listened to the reading of the veto message of the President upon H. R. 3020, the Labor-Management Relations Act. Immediately following the reading of the message, as provided by law, the roll was called. The question submitted was, Shall the House pass the bill notwithstanding the veto? Three hundred and thirty-one voted "aye," and 83 voted "no"—4 to 1. Only 71 Democrats voted to sustain the veto—4 to 1 to override the veto.

The President states:

> I share with the Congress the conviction that legislation dealing with the relations between management and labor is necessary. I heartily condemn abuses on the part of unions and employers, and I have no patience with stubborn insistence on private advantage to the detriment of the public interest.

The President agrees with the Congress that legislation was and is necessary and that three groups have a vital interest in the legislation—labor, management, and the American people as a whole. I have always insisted that—

First. Labor has rights that should be and must be respected and protected.

Second. Management has rights that should be and must be respected and protected.

Third. The American people as a whole have rights that should be and must be respected and protected.

I have always believed that the workers of this country should have the right to organize to protect their just rights and interests and the right to bargain collectively with management and to have that high standard of wages that will make it possible for them and their families to maintain the high American standard of living for themselves and their families, and, proper working conditions and reasonable hours and also the protection of their health and old-age requirements. Every fair-minded consumer should be willing to pay such sum for food, clothing, shelter, and other goods and materials as will enable the producers to pay real American wages and a reasonable profit to those whose money is invested.

Many persons have the notion that Members of the House and Senate were born with a silver or a gold spoon in their mouths. This is not true. I am informed that more than 85 percent of the Members of the House and Senate earned their living and got their start in life by working with their hands. They came from the homes of families with few opportunities or from the great middle class of this country. They know what it means to toil on the farms, in the shops, mills, mines, and on the railroads of our country. I was born the son of a tenant farmer and worked in carshops, foundries, on the farm and the sawmills, in the log woods and at anything that I could find to do with my hands

that was honorable. For the most part, I did my own cooking and washing while trying to secure some education. I think I know something about the viewpoint of those who toil. In all of my years of practice of the law, I never took a case against an injured worker or against the widow and orphan of a deceased worker.

This bill was not written by a lot of corporation lawyers. It is the result of the efforts of a committee of the House that held hearings for more than 6 weeks and all those who desired to be heard were heard, giving to this committee facts and views. This included of course the workers and their representatives, management and its representatives, and many persons in every walk of life. The committee then considered the bill for weeks. The bill was considered for many days in the House. Every line of the bill was read, many amendments were offered and some were adopted and many speeches were made by each and every Member of the House who desired to express his or her views. On a roll call, the House then passed the bill by a vote of 307 to 108. The bill then went to the Senate where it was considered by a Senate committee and then on the floor of the Senate and I am glad to say that it was greatly modified in the Senate. I was frank to say that I was not for the Hartley bill as it was written and would have voted against it had it been the bill that was submitted for final consideration. The Senate, after many days of consideration, and after many amendments were offered and many were adopted, passed the bill on a record vote by an overwhelming majority. As there were differences between the House and Senate bills, they were referred to a conference committee, made up of 5 Senators and 5 Representatives from the appropriate committees of the House and Senate, and after long consideration, the conferees of the House and Senate submitted the final compromise bill. The conference report was considered in the House and adopted by a record vote of approximately 4 to 1. A majority of Democrats, as well as Republicans, voted for the compromise bill, in the Senate, and that is the bill that went to President Truman for his consideration and that is the bill that was vetoed today by the President and passed by the House by a vote of 4 to 1. I know of no piece of legislation that has received more thorough consideration, every word and every line in the bill, as this bill.

Now, the President in his veto message, undertakes to say that everything in the bill is wrong. In all of my years of service in the House and Senate, I have never read a veto message that was so unfair and that had so little regard for the facts and for reason, commonsense, and justice as this veto message. I am led to wonder if the President ever had the time or took the time to read this bill which they say contains scores of pages. Who wrote the veto message? I said on the floor today that in my opinion this veto is a political message and that it would not have been made but for the fact that former Vice President Henry Wallace has been speaking throughout the Nation to tremendous crowds who were paying from $1 to $3 to hear him speak, and in these speeches he was denouncing many of the policies of President Truman and was favoring a third party. This veto message, in my opinion, is an effort on the part of President Truman to appease the apparent strong following of Mr. Wallace, especially the radical element of that following and turn them away from Wallace to President Truman. He and his leaders, of course, realize the threat to his chances next year if Mr. Wallace continues in this course.

But, according to Mr. Truman, there is nothing good in this bill. There is no doubt but what the Members of the House and Senate have had one real purpose in mind and that is to bring out a bill that will be fair to management and labor and at the same time, protect the interest of the American people as a whole and promote the welfare of our Nation.

LEGISLATION NECESSARY

In his veto message, the President said that legislation was necessary. That appears to be the opinion of approximately 85 percent of the American people according to the Nation-wide polls taken and the Congress is in general agreement with the President that legislation is necessary, not only to bring about more just and fair relations between labor and management, but also in the interest of the American people as a whole. What is the record on this matter?

The records of the Government show that for the 6-year period before the adoption of NIRA—Blue Eagle—there was an average each year of 700 strikes involving on an average 270,000 workers. This average increased from year to year so that by the year of 1946 there were 4,985 strikes involving millions of workers with 119,000,000 man-days lost. We had a number of disastrous strikes last year which resulted in loss of billions in wages to the workers, tremendous losses to management, a curtailment of production and great inconvenience and loss to America. It is believed that all the fundamental essential rights of the workers have been preserved in this bill and it provides for equal justice between management and labor. It, in my opinion, strengthens conciliation and mediation of the differences between management and labor and if both sides will keep always before them the Golden Rule and realize fully what it means to be an American and have a part in this great country and what their joint efforts can do not only for themselves and for the American people, and be men of "good will" and not "ill will," I am very hopeful that this measure will benefit them and the American people as a whole. No one can claim perfection of this bill or any other bill of such vast importance. This bill provides that there shall be a thorough study made of this whole problem of labor-management relations in the hope that if the Congress has not done the best thing that could be done, that amendments may in due course correct whatever may be inequitable or unfair either to labor or management.

It grieves me very much that after so much sincere, honest, and faithful work has been put upon a bill that the President denounces all of this work, denounces the bill in toto, says it is all wrong and undertakes to say that the overwhelming majority of Congress has labored without results. The President seems deeply concerned about the workers. He had an opportunity the other day to sign a bill that passed the House by more than 3 to 1 and in the Senate by nearly 2 to 1 granting a 30-percent tax reduction to approximately 30,000,000 low-income taxpayers. These were largely made up of working people, teachers, and so forth. It would give considerably more relief than the 30 percent to 1,500,000 persons 65 years of age or over. It only gives 20-percent relief to the 17,000,000 more income-tax payers in the middle income brackets and 10½ percent to less than 1,000 of the top income-tax payers. The President could also do a lot for labor in bringing down prices of food, clothing, and so forth. Under his policy we are stripping this country of its meat, corn, wheat, fruits, clothing, equipment, and other supplies and shipping them to foreign countries either as gifts or on credits extended by our country, but which will never be repaid. With this money we are loaning to them they come into our country and our markets and compete with our own consumers and up goes the prices of almost everything we consume. Why does not the President show a little more concern in this regard for American workers?

THE RAILROAD LABOR ACT

This bill does not cover railroad workers, but the bill vetoed today in many respects follows the Railroad Adjustment Acts that were passed with the cooperation of the railroad workers of the Nation, and which acts have proved to be the finest and most satisfactory labor laws ever passed by the Congress. It was urged that the Hartley-Taft bill requires a cooling-off period where differences arising between labor and management in industries cause the stoppage of work which would endanger the public health and security of our Nation. This provision does not apply to the health and security of a community, but to the public health and security of the Nation as a whole. If either management or labor plans to have a shut-down of an industry when such action will impair the national health and national security, what reasonable man would not be in favor of a cooling-off period and give the parties ample opportunity to try to adjust their differences themselves with the aid of the mediation and conciliation services of the Government which is set up as an independent agency by this bill? It seems that such action would be in the interest not only of management but of labor as well, and in the interest of the health and security of our country. It is a very serious matter in peace or war for one of our great

Nation-wide industries to close down abruptly. It of course means a great loss and hardship not only to the particular hundreds of thousands or millions of laborers involved, but it is a real threat to the security of this country and the health of the people of the Nation as a whole; but this bill expressly provides that any worker can quit his work at any time; and it also expressly provides that no man may be compelled to work against his will; and this, of course, is not a slave bill and it violates no law of this country against slavery or forced labor. When a railroad or other industry or utility closes down, that threatens the health or security of the Nation as a whole; that not only stops that particular industry, but it closes down thousands of factories, shops, and mills and perhaps will throw several million people out of work who were in no way responsible for the shutdown of this particular industry; and, of course, it will affect the hospitals, the schools, the churches, the homes, and the activity of millions of Americans, and threaten their health and security.

This bill eliminates the so-called closed shop. The railroad adjustment acts that have worked so well do the very same thing. It has been in the law since the Railroad Adjustment Act was first passed more than 25 years ago. In fact, those acts expressly forbid the closed shop and the railroad workers, as a general rule throughout the Nation, have themselves opposed the so-called closed shop and the railroad workers have never asked for or been granted the check-off system. Membership in the railroad brotherhoods is entirely voluntary. I have talked with many of them and they claim that they try to run their organizations and make them so attractive that railroad workers will want to belong to them and receive the benefits provided by law. Many polls within the last year or two of the American people and also of organized labor have expressed opposition to the closed shop. In fact only 8 percent of the American people favor closed shops, and a majority of the union workers have expressed themselves against the closed shop.

This bill provides for a union shop and the right to bargain collectively through bargaining agents chosen by the workers themselves. It provides that if 51 percent of the workers in any shop or plant or industry express a desire to form a union shop they have the authority and right under this bill to form such a union shop and select their collective bargaining agent.

THE GOVERNMENT BY INJUNCTION

It has been urged that this bill authorizes the issue of an injunction in any and all cases. This is not true. The use of the injunction, in my opinion, is more limited than it is under the present law. It does permit the Federal Government to issue an injunction in cases where there is or about to be a stoppage of work in an industry which threatens the public health and security of the Nation. It must be in a Nation-wide dispute and it must be clearly shown to the court that the public health and security of the Nation are threatened. This injunctive proceeding is a matter of temporary relief. The purpose of it is to hold matters in abeyance until the differences may be adjusted by collective bargaining, and if this fails, to try to reach a settlement through independent conciliation and mediation boards that are provided for in this bill, and this injunctive process cannot be held for more than 80 days. This does not prevent, however, any worker from quitting his job at any time he may desire.

Where the disputes or differences arise in plants or industry that do not affect the public health or security, every opportunity and right is given to labor and management to adjust their own differences and, of course, in such cases some stoppages of work may be extended over a considerable period of time. It is the hope of the Congress that labor and management will, more in the future than in the past, respect the rights and the self-interest of their joint undertakings. Labor and management has always reminded me of a good team of horses. Where they pull together, the equipment is preserved and the load is moved. Where one horse starts to pull while the other balks, the equipment and harness are generally broken and torn and the load is not moved. Labor needs the jobs and the pay. Management cannot get along without labor. Great prosperity and unusual benefits are the rewards of management and labor when they pull together. Loss, misery, and unhappiness are the fruits of discord.

GOOD WILL AND ILL WILL

The Congress here has done its very best to pass a law that will do the job for men of good will, both of labor and management. It will improve present conditions if labor and management are of good will. No law on labor and management relations can be passed by Congress that will work successfully if those engaged in each group are men of ill will. Each group must bear in mind all the time that one cannot get along without the other and that their failure to make the most of their opportunities and get along result in loss to themselves and great loss to their neighbors and to their fellow Americans. Many of the important labor leaders of the country for some years have expressed great concern about the so-called jurisdictional strikes and sympathy strikes but these labor leaders have expressed the opinion generally that they have worked hard to cut out jurisdictional and sympathy strikes and that they will continue to do so, but they seem to be unable to carry out this purpose. President Truman has expressed disapproval of jurisdictional and sympathy strikes. A study of the facts show some interesting and almost unbelievable situations arising daily in this country by reason of jurisdictional and sympathy strikes. These disputes and strikes often occur in one or more of our large labor unions, one branch of the union striking against another branch of the same union, and sometimes the members of one great union strike against the action of another union. For instance, there has come to our attention that building equipment manufactured in a union shop where management and labor were getting along happily had been sent to some city to be installed in buildings and homes. These buildings were being constructed by union men belonging to another union and they refused to install this equipment and finish constructing the job because the equipment was manufactured by union men of a different union. It is surprising how many instances there are of this kind.

Now, there are the contractors and owners of this construction who must lie idly by because of this unusual and unfair, and I might say un-American, situation. Again some differences may arise in a union shop between management and labor, and the workers strike. While that strike is in progress the union men in some other part of the country belonging to a different union go on a so-called sympathy strike. The men in the latter shop have a good union contract and are getting along without any trouble with management. These two types of strikes are outlawed and if this law is followed and is properly administered, many strikes will be eliminated.

CONTRACT RESPONSIBILITY

For a number of years high, responsible labor leaders have stated over and over that they believe in the observance of contracts by both parties. One of the purposes of organizing and collective bargaining is to make a contract by management and the workers. This bill provides that management and labor each shall fairly and honestly live up to the terms of their contract and if either party breaks the contract and the other suffers loss or damage thereby, the party who is at fault must respond in fair and just damages. If the parties do not intend to live up to their contract, why should they take the time, trouble, and incur expense of making a contract? Ever since I have been old enough to know anything I have always believed that each party should keep his or her contract if it is reasonably possible to do so. It seems to me that this is simply old-fashioned honesty and square dealing. Of course, times are flush now and employment is plentiful but the time may soon come when conditions change and management may find it convenient to close down their plant and break their 1-year or 2-year collective-bargaining contract with their workers and shut down the plant and throw the workers out of employment. Would not the workers then be very glad to have a provision in the law that would protect them from any such conduct on the part of management?

FORBIDS VIOLENCE BY EITHER PARTY

This bill would protect the workers against unfair treatment and violence on the part of management and at the same time it would prohibit violence and the unlawful destruction of property on the part of workers. That is now the law, and it has always been the law in this country and, in this connection, this bill

is opposed to the so-called mass picketing. It preserves the right of the workers to engage in peaceful picketing. The courts of this country have denounced mass-picketing and violence. There have been cases in this country where literally thousands of persons have picketed a plant and engaged in violence. In my honest opinion, labor nor management never did help its cause by engaging in lawlessness, violence, and the destruction of the property of others, and under this bill and the law the company cannot mistreat, browbeat and engage in volence and lawlessness against the workers.

This measure undertakes to provide fair treatment and protection for both labor and management in all of their relations to eath other. The workers are allowed a union shop provided a majority of the workers vote for it. The polls show a majority of the union workers favor the union shop, but not the closed shop. Industry-wide bargaining is authorized. It is necessary in many of our Nation-wide industries. Welfare funds are allowed if jointly controlled by labor and management. This does not prohibit welfare funds heretofore created by collective bargaining. Union workers under this bill have greater rights and greater protection in their unions than they have under the present law. Supervisors, those who have the right to hire and fire and direct workers, are permitted to form and join unions, but they are not covered by the Wagner Act. The workers have the right to a secret vote as to whether they will accept the last offer by their employer. These elections are generally conducted by the Director of Mediation and Conciliation. The union cannot have so-called subversive union officers. It is found that Communists and other subversive groups have wormed their way into Government offices, the churches, labor unions, and other American organizations. This would mean the Congress is trying to aid the unions in ridding themselves of Communists.

FORBIDS EXPENDITURE OF STOCKHOLDER OR UNION FUNDS

This bill makes it unlawful for the officers of any corporation or business association to expend the funds of such corporation or association for political purposes for the election of a President, Vice President, Senator, or Representative. These funds belong to the stockholders, and the officers have been forbidden by law for years from using the stockholders' funds in an election for these Federal officers. This bill applies that same law to the officers of a labor union. They cannot use the funds of a labor union to aid in the election of Federal officers—President, Vice President, Senator, and Representative. These funds belong to the members of the union. The Congress is of the opinion that it is unfair to the members to use their funds to elect Federal officeholders. It was generally the case of some of the officers of the corporations or business associations belong to different political groups and not interested in the same man or party and, therefore, the law says that the officers cannot use the funds of these stockholders as it is in many cases to help elect men to office who are opposed by the stockholders or some of them. In almost every instance part of the members of the union favor one particular candidate or party while the other members are opposed to such candidate or party, and the question arises—Is is fair for some two or three officers of that union to use the funds to help elect their particular candidate or candidates and use the money against the candidate or party of the other members? The President urged that this provision is unfair to both labor and management and that we have no right to pass such a law. The laws as to corporations and associations have been on the books for many years. This will not prevent the publishers of labor papers and editors of such papers from expressing themselves freely whether they are a journal of business or labor. All of the lodges that I know anything about forbid the use of the funds of the lodge to aid any candidate or party. There again the funds belong to the members of the lodge and there is usually a division as to their political affiliations.

I might say that during all of my years of service I have never called on any business concern or labor organization to put any money into my campaign, and so far as I know they have never done so. They have at times spoken complimentary of me and my record in their journals, and I think they have under this bill the right to do whatever they have done for me heretofore.

This, of course, does not limit in any way any officer or stock-holder or any officer or member of a labor union from making such contributions out of his or her funds as is now provided by law to the candidate or party of his or her choice. The limitations of expenditures of the funds of corporations and others should have but one purpose and that is to make our elections as fair and clean as possible. I never heard one of our labor friends complain because the law forbids officers of corporations and business associations from making contributions to candidates or parties. All of us have agreed that has always been a good law as the great corporations could outspend the labor groups or individuals.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ARNOLD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a survey by Kentucky veterans. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $568, but I ask that it be printed, notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in Foreign Commerce Weekly.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD regarding a bill he is introducing today.

Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in a New York newspaper.

Mr. KEARNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by Eric Johnston before the Young Men's Republican Club at Milwaukee and an editorial.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

WHITE HOUSE COOPERATION NEEDED

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, we have heard much during the past 6 or 7 months about cooperation, and working together harmoniously. I fail to see where we are getting any cooperation whatsoever from the White House. It seems strange to me when the House of Representatives by a vote of 331 to 83 voted to override a Presidential veto, as it did this afternoon, that such a great majority would be wrong and the Chief Executive and 83 Members right. The Chief Executive seems to think he is the only one who is right. His promise to cooperate with the Republican House and the Republican Senate has gone out the window, and the only way the American people may hope for cooperation is to put somebody in the White House who will cooperate with the majority of the Members of the House and Senate of the United States.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the Truman foreign policy and include an editorial on the same subject.

Mr. ROBSION asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD following the action on the veto and include some extraneous matter.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and include certain excerpts in each.

THE LABOR BILL

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Speaker, we heard the message of the President urging us to kill the labor bill, and the House on a record vote here has voted 331 to override the President's veto and

83 in support of his veto. Only 73 Democrats voted to sustain the veto. I do not think we ought to be too hard on President Truman. He has had some hard problems, and his hardest problem is not in this labor bill, it is Henry Wallace. The vetoes on the tax bill and on this labor bill in my honest judgment are an effort to stop Henry Wallace. Former Vice President Wallace has been speaking to great audiences throughout the country, ranging from 5,000 to 30,000 people and the press reports that persons are paying from $1 to $3 to hear him speak. In these speeches, he vigorously criticized many of the Truman policies and has strongly indicated that he favors a third party. He spoke to a large audience here in Washington last Monday night and repeated his criticisms and stated more definitely his position on a third party.

Mr. Wallace's activity has caused Democratic leaders here and over the Nation to get busy and they have been urging the President to veto the tax-relief bill and the labor-management relations bill, and the President has now vetoed both bills. The tax bill failed by three votes to get a two-thirds majority, and 35 Democrats voted to override the veto on the tax bill and there will be no tax relief for the fifty million income taxpayers of America this year. The President's veto message on the labor-management bill disregarded the records and the facts and expressed opinions and stated conclusions that are certainly not supported by the record or the facts. I am strongly of the opinion, and I have heard many others express the same view, that he would not have vetoed either bill or submitted such an unfair and misleading veto message if he and many of his leaders were not deeply concerned over Mr. Wallace and his third party. Was he trying to take away the thunder and the supporters of Mr. Wallace? Only 73 Democrats were willing to follow and support the veto of the President. This bill could not have been passed over the President's veto by a 4-to-1 margin if it was not just and fair and supported by the record and the facts.

SHIPMENT OF OIL TO RUSSIA

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, news reports show that the loading of Russian tankers at San Pedro, Calif., is proceeding. The capacities of the 10 tankers which will carry our oil to the Russian naval base in Siberia indicate that the total amount of products will be in excess of one-half million barrels. Does this remind you of the days when oil and steel moved in great quantity to Japan?

Certain of the administration officials say our oil supply situation here is in precarious balance with demand, and that the utmost in good management is necessary to make the proper distribution of supplies. With one hand, we send money abroad to prevent the extension of communism and with the other, we provide the mother country of communism with our goods.

There is a law on the books providing for controls of exports. The control on oil shipments was removed months ago by the controllers. They were given authority to apply controls, or take them off as they pleased. I understand, it is an exercise of administrative will that oil is being permitted to go to Russia.

The administration is asking for a renewal of the authority. What better proof can be supplied of the dangers of unchecked discretion than the failure to apply the controls to diversion of our oil supply to Russia.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN] has just made a disturbing observation relative to shipments of great quantities of oil to Russia, just revealed by the press. As chairman of Subcommittee No. 3 of the Armed Services Committee, I rise at this time to assure the gentleman and all other Members that I intend to stop these shipments if it is humanly possible. I have already summoned officials of the Office of International Trade to appear before my subcommittee tomorrow morning to explain why such shipments of oil to Russia are being permitted in the face of an apparent shortage of oil in America.

Mr. Speaker, we have an Export Control Act which is intended to protect the American people against the shipping abroad of items in short supply in this country. The Office of International Trade is now seeking an extension of that act, which expires June 30. My committee has held hearings on a bill to extend the act and has reported it favorably. I appeared before the Rules Committee 2 days ago to bring it before the House.

During the hearings tomorrow I intend to ascertain why the Congress should continue the Export Control Act if the Office of International Trade does not do what the act intends. I assure you, Mr. Speaker, a report of my findings next Monday. And let me add, unless these shipments of oil to Russia are stopped, I shall withdraw my support of any effort to continue export controls.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN—THE TAX BILL AND THE LABOR BILL

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] I desire to say that he is far wide of the mark when he accuses President Truman of not cooperating with Congress, merely because he exercised his official prerogative in vetoing the so-called labor bill.

I voted to override the veto, because I think the people of the entire country, including organized labor, will be better off if the measure becomes a law.

But that does not mean I would accuse the President of refusing to cooperate with Congress merely because he did not agree with me on this particular measure.

Harry Truman is one of the most conscientious men who ever occupied the White House, and I am sure he was sincere in the stand he took on this bill, even though I disagreed with him.

I voted to sustain him on the tax bill, for the simple reason that it took too much tax off the big taxpayers and not enough off the little ones.

But for the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION] to say that Henry Wallace intimidated or frightened President Truman into vetoing these two bills is just about as ridiculous as it would be to accuse a jack rabbit of chasing a bulldog out of the field, or a lightning bug of dimming the rays of the noonday sun.

In addition to being one of the most conscientious men I have ever known, Harry Truman has as much courage as any man who has ever occupied the Presidency—at least during your lifetime and mine.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARRIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Hon. W. F. NORRELL at the fifty-sixth commencement exercises of the College of the Ozarks on May 25, 1947.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a very interesting article.

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by Alexander Printz on Management Speaks to Labor.

Mrs. DOUGLAS asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in four instances and to include certain extraneous matter.

THE HOUSING BILL

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to inform the Members of the House that I have today placed on the Clerk's desk a petition to discharge the Committee on Rules from further consideration of a resolution providing for the consideration of the long-range housing bill which has been introduced in the House of Representatives by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and in the other body by Messrs. TAFT, ELLENDER, and WAGNER.

Mr. Speaker, it is perfectly apparent that we are not going to have hearings on this bill. I do not mean at this moment to discuss the need for housing in the country. I think most of the Members are aware of the need for housing.

This bill will give Members an opportunity to show where they stand on this matter which is of the most vital importance to the people of America.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

RELIGIOUS SITUATION IN EUROPE

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, Secretary Patterson, in arranging for a group of clergymen to tour Europe at Government expense and to report back on the religious situation in that part of the world, is playing into the hands of those who want to further appease Russia.

The Secretary has permitted the notoriously Red Bishop Oxnard, of the Federal Council of the Churches of America, to load down the mission with pro-Russians. While there are some good men in the group, the Oxnard crowd predominates, and it is a foregone conclusion that it will be a divided report that the group will make, which will provoke widespread controversy and do more harm than good.

I should like to know by what authority does Secretary Patterson authorize and arrange for this mischievous business? Is he taking over the functions of the Department of State, or is this a military mission? The trip should be canceled.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KERR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Evening Star of June 14, 1947, by J. G. Hayden.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. FALLON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter and a resolution.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a copy of an editorial.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Senator WAGNER and a news article from the Syracuse Herald-Journal of May 22, 1947.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address recently made by Alexander Powell.

FOREIGN LIQUIDATION COMMISSION

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, permit me to call the attention of the House to a very flagrant act on the part of the Foreign Liquidation Commission. One of my constituents complained of the treatment he had received after the transaction had occurred.

It was brought to my attention yesterday that bids had been heretofore requested looking toward the sale of part of the Canol property in Canada. One bid had been received, and the dead line for the effectiveness of the bid, as stated by the bidder, was 4 p. m. yesterday. My constituent, the second bidder, delivered his bid to the office of the Foreign Liquidation Commission about 3 p. m. yesterday. The bid was received and was in good order. Just a few minutes before 4 o'clock one of the bidders, while in one of the offices of the Foreign Liquidation Commission, received information by eavesdropping that his bid was $25,000 low. He immediately changed his bid and bid $1 more than the other bidder. Then this bid was accepted by the Foreign Liquidation Commission after 4 p. m.

The irregularities were called to the attention of Maj. Gen. Donald Connolly, Commissioner, and members of his staff of the Foreign Liquidation Commission who participated in the negotiations. They then threw out all bids, thus giving an opportunity to the eavesdropper to profit by his own unsavory conduct.

General Connolly and his staff took an uninterested attitude, and condoned the unfairness of the whole transaction by receiving the first bidder's changed bid after 4 p. m. had passed. I am wondering how many similar transactions have occurred like this where ordinary decency, fair play, and common honesty were ignored. I am also wondering whether this deal was cut and dried for the first bidder to get the award promptly at 4 p. m. This and other matters should be carefully investigated.

General Connolly's attitude is clearly in disregard of good business practices and fairness. No wonder the people are up in arms and are losing confidence in some of the Federal agencies. The general should resign his office immediately. And surely the Army should not take him back in good standing because his conduct has reflected upon his uniform and the two stars he wears. I have asked that an investigation be made of this transaction and of other transactions of the Foreign Liquidation Commission. The whole affair smells to high heaven.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, when the so-called Hartley bill, which was the original bill submitted to the House, was under consideration, I urged with all the sincerity at my command that it be rejected. At that time I informed the House that the bill was an ill-advised, poorly drafted, complex collection of thoroughly confusing policy considerations and unworkable administrative techniques. My opposition to the bill primarily was based on the fact that it would create rather than diminish industrial unrest and would ultimately lead to class warfare in our Nation.

Members of the House who have followed closely the press and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD since that date are well aware that my position respecting the so-called Hartley bill found very substantial support in the editorial pages of the press of the Nation and, almost unanimous endorsement by students of industrial relations and the trade-labor movement. That bill was characterized with surprising unanimity as a harsh and a repressive measure that would lead to rather than avoid discord.

After the Senate enacted the so-called Taft bill, editorial comment, students of the subject of labor relations, even industrialists, members of the bar, and almost every informed group and association that commented characterized the Taft bill as a milder bill than the repressive Hartley bill. Comment was varied. Some had hopes; others fears. But at least it did not receive the condemnation that greeted the House bill.

After action by the Senate and the House, conferees of both chambers met and reached agreement on the so-called Taft-Hartley bill.

At the time this measure was before the House time did not permit me to call attention to the manner in which the so-called Taft bill had been made far more drastic and, indeed, very nearly as restrictive as the original Hartley bill.

Since passage by both Chambers of the conference bill, predictions that such a measure would result in industrial unrest and would be resented both by management and labor have been proved true. Witness the release of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, which is made up of all the Catholic bishops of the United States, who, as everyone knows, have neither political motives nor special interests to serve. Theirs is an unbiased, scholarly, high-minded and ethical approach to the most dynamic, domestic issue of our times. Their interest is directed not toward any one segment of society, but their concern is the welfare and well-being of all the peoples at all times. Their statement, which appears in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page A2833, reflect my own views in a striking manner.

When the conference bill was last before the House, I was not permitted sufficient time to elaborate on my position and necessarily in the time permitted unhappily could only make limited observations to characterize the bill.

Although thereafter I reduced my position to writing with the intent of placing it in the RECORD, the statement by the National Catholic Welfare Conference so

accurately reflects my feelings and expresses them so pointedly that I can do nothing better than to adopt them as my own.

The President's message has said all that needs further to be said about the bill. If each of you will pause and reflect, if each of you will search your own hearts and minds, if each of you will weigh the serious implications of his message and its meaning to our domestic situation, our international situation, and the future of this great country, I think that you will conclude that today is not the time for hasty, ill-considered action on this subject and will take this opportunity to make haste slowly for the future generations to whom we owe so much. The Nation was blessed in its recent hour of crisis when labor and industry as a team, working in cooperation, accomplished miracles in the defense of democratic principles. Should the supreme misfortune of another such crisis confront this Nation, and God willing that it does not, our hope and our strength will be found in the hearts of our citizens and what we receive at that moment will be in direct proportion to the love and inspiration we find because of their feeling toward democracy. God willing, labor will still believe that it has a stake in America. Whether we inspire that feeling and belief is our choice today.

This is not to mean that labor has done no wrong, or is above reproach. There is a wide area in which corrective action is necessary—either by the house of labor itself or, if needs be, by the Congress. For many years I have informed the leaders of labor in America that the public will not long tolerate some of its practices, in particular the unnecessary boycotts and jurisdictional disputes; that so long as such conduct remains uncorrected by labor itself it will be the responsibility of Congress to take action in the interest of the public. But this measure goes too far—it strikes at the heart of collective bargaining. We cannot correct one wrong by committing another. We cannot remove the causes of industrial unrest by restricting the processes and agencies necessary to the adjustment of differences. If this measure corrected abuses only, I would support it. But I cannot, in the interest of correcting admitted abuses, join in further hampering the processes of collective bargaining.

I stand ready to support at any time any measure which will preserve collective bargaining and labor's rights but which will reach the abuses the President has so eloquently called to our attention. In the interest of America, it would be unwise to go further.

I consider the message of the President today one of the most constructive, courageous, and informative messages I have ever heard delivered to the Congress. I regret that his veto was not sustained. I hope the Senate will sustain his veto, and I predict that history will record that the best interests of America were served by the sound, courageous position taken by President Truman in vetoing H. R. 3020.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, President Truman, in his message vetoing H. R. 3020, known as the Taft-Hartley labor bill, delivered one of the most courageous and statesmanlike documents the Congress has received in a long time. Every American should read and study the President's veto message of this legislation.

Since the open hearings started on labor legislation in the Committee on Education and Labor February 5, volumes of propaganda has been sent over the country by newspapers and radio in an effort to prejudice the minds of the American people against labor unions generally. The strategy of this campaign was to drive a wedge between the labor union membership and its leadership. The facts and the true analysis of the final legislation which was passed by the Senate and House conferees has never been fully analyzed by the American public. If this legislation is enacted into law, it will not only set back labor's progress a quarter of a century, but it will promote industrial confusion and chaos in the heavy industries throughout the country.

President Truman, in his message, has clearly set out a number of provisions in this bill which will involve management and employees in highly complicated legal entanglements. One of the numerous involvements restrict even nonlabor newspapers from recommending or participating in political campaigns. It is unfortunate that the conference report was brought in before the House 2 weeks ago and the membership was compelled to vote on the seventy-odd pages without any opportunity of studying its contents. Had the message which President Truman sent to Congress vetoing H. R. 3020 been delivered to the American people over a month ago, so as to acquaint the public with the facts, I believe this legislation could not have passed the House in its present form.

Several years ago the so-called Smith-Connally bill was passed in Congress under the same conditions of speed, propaganda, and public frenzy, but today even its congressional sponsors admit that that legislation was a mistake and contributed nothing to management-labor relations.

President Truman's message is a factual masterpiece and when the American people have digested the facts of this legislation, the repercussions against the Taft-Hartley bill will be astounding. My only fear is that if it becomes a law, industrial production will have to suffer a period of chaos, confusion and strife until this legislation is drastically amended or repealed. America cannot afford to go through this period during these critical times.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that no time was allowed to speak on the President's veto immediately after it was delivered, so I rise at this time in support of the President's veto of the pending Taft-Hartley bill.

On page 6383 of the RECORD dated June 4, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY], the sponsor of this legislation, stated on the floor when he brought in the conference report:

> I call your attention to what is left in this bill, because I think you are going to find there is more in this bill than may meet the eye and may have been heretofore presented to you.

No truer words were ever spoken as anyone who has taken time to try and study this bill and conference report will know, because, in my opinion, should this bill become a law, it will be years before it will be clearly defined so that both labor and management will be able to understand it.

While there are some good and needed provisions in the Taft-Hartley bill, I have felt all along that the bill itself should have been divided into three sections: One to consider changes in the Wagner Act, and the other two dealing with the Conciliation Service and the emergency handling of utilities strikes affecting the national interest. Only by this means do I think any Member of Congress would have had a chance to understand the type of legislation voted on. As a matter of fact there was no attempt made in the House to divide the bill into sections so that we could achieve needed labor reforms this year. Furthermore, when the attempt was made in the Senate to consider the present labor bill in three sections, it was voted down by an overwhelming majority in that body. To me this indicated that the Congress was not interested so much in trying to enact legislation which would remedy the inequalities between labor and management but was in fact determined to pass an omnibus measure in which both good and bad legislation would be considered together and thereby create a situation which would bring no good to labor or management but in the long run would be detrimental to both.

Although there are some parts of the conference report having to do with needed reforms, which I approve, I cannot see my way clear to support this measure, because I feel strongly that the Taft-Hartley labor bill is unfair to organized labor and that the measure itself is a device for making unions so weak that they cannot carry out effective collective bargaining. The bill does not result in equalizing the rights of labor and management as it should, but under this measure management is given such an advantage over labor that it can prevent effective collective bargaining by unions.

The conference report was brought before the House and it was impossible for any Member to thoroughly analyze the 75 pages contained in it in the time allotted

to us. However, on the basis of my study—and I have gone through the report and the bill—I am completely convinced that it is an impractical and unadministrable law.

Virtually every amendment which has been made threatens the legitimate rights of the American workman, and the net effect is to discourage and stifle collective bargaining and to impede, if not make impossible, effective enforcement of the National Labor Relations Act.

Under the conference report every organizational drive by unions, every effort to achieve collective bargaining, and every strike could be met and defeated by destructive lawsuits in the courts.

In my opinion, any legislation that invites and encourages litigation over labor relations is not going to solve the problems of labor's unrest nor is it going to bring about harmonious relations between employees and employers.

Furthermore, although the contention made is that the Norris-LaGuardia Act is amended to bring about more favorable labor-management practices in effect and through indirection, the Norris-LaGuardia Act is set aside.

The measure passed by the House will be the cause of a series of United States Supreme Court decisions to interpret and iron out the ambiguities which run rampant throughout the entire measure. It will open wide the doors to employers to bring a multiplicity of suits which will empty the unions' treasuries because of the costs of litigations, and, in my further opinion, the act itself will be administratively unworkable.

Under this measure tremendous power has been given to the general counsel of the Board to administer this act and with such authority over the handling of labor-relations cases to such an extent that I do not think one man can handle the job nor do I think any one man should be entrusted with such a job.

The bill itself is unfair to labor. It is destructive of legitimate labor rights. In my opinion it will cause more labor strife and chaos and the net result will be, I repeat, not only injury to the American workman but in the long run injury to the American employer as well.

In addition to what I have already said, it forbids or removes collective bargaining on such vital issues as the closed shop, the union shop, the check-off system, health and welfare funds and it allows injunctions in a variety of situations.

It requires unions as a condition of seeking legal redress, to file reports so detailed and burdensome as to paralyze effective action. It makes it illegal for unions to expel from membership a labor spy or one who has stolen union funds or who has led wildcat strikes; it eliminates the power of unions to remain internally strong and united.

New provisions were put into the conference report which we were not allowed to debate even though points of order were raised against them. The Conciliation Service, despite its fine record, was removed from the Department of Labor. It leaves to the authorities in a State the question whether a Federal law shall be in effect in that State. It thus makes possible that any State legislature may nullify an act of Congress by passing a law of a different effect. This is something entirely new and radical and, in my opinion, extremely ill-advised.

It forbids labor papers, supported by dues-paying union members to print anyone's voting record. This is a denial of freedom of the press and of free speech.

The way to industrial peace lies partly through collective bargaining on a plane of equality and partnership between labor and management and partly in a Government policy which will eliminate the cause of industrial conflict. Only a domestic program based on a good wage policy, the lowering of the cost of living coupled with full production and full employment can give America industrial peace. This Congress has not done anything to meet its real responsibilities in many fields affecting the ordinary workingman, and the result is that the minimum wage remains at 40 cents an hour; the low-cost housing bills remain in committee; and the Labor Department has been starved for appropriations, with the result that child labor is on the increase, and the NLRB has a backlog of more than 5,000 cases.

No one really knows what this bill contains and no one, including the authors of this measure, have any idea of its full implications as has been aptly stated. If this bill is passed over the President's veto, it will give the lawyers of the country a field day, because practically every section of this act will have to be taken to the courts for final judgment. I am deeply sorry that the Congress has not seen fit to produce a bill which I could have consistently and conscientiously supported. I personally recognize the mistakes of labor as I recognize the mistakes of business too, but I do not see this bill as being any solution to the problem that it seeks to remedy. I shall, therefore, vote to uphold the President's veto.

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Washington Post by George Gallup, showing how the American people approved the action on the vote taken to defeat the tax bill.

VOTE TO OVERRIDE THE PRESIDENT'S VETO OF THE LABOR BILL

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but extend to the Republican Members my deep-felt sympathy, because I know that most of them voted to pass the labor bill over the President's veto against their desire and against their best judgment, but being driven by that strong, powerful machine——

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask that those words be taken down. He is accusing the Republicans of voting because of the orders of some machine.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman withdraw the words?

Mr. SABATH. Which? The word "strong" or the word "machine"? I will just change it to "organization."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois will proceed in order.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I ask that the words be taken down.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois will proceed in order.

Mr. SABATH. The strong organization that the Republican Party has; and, of course, I myself believe in an organization, but I believe in an organization that works in the interest of the people of the country.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask that the words be taken down.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLACKNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the State Journal, of Lansing, Mich.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an article from the current issue of Newsweek.

Mr. LEMKE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from the United Farmer.

Mr. ROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. TWYMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Chicago Daily News.

PERMISSION TO FILE MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have until midnight tonight to file minority views on the bill H. R. 1639, the Employers Liability Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

SOPHISTRY OF THE VETO MESSAGE ON THE LABOR BILL

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, after very careful consideration of the veto message I have come to the conclusion that it contains more sophistry and more misrepresentation than any message I have listened to from the White House in the 10 years I have been here. I say and I think I can say it without successful contradiction that President Truman in this veto message out-Roosevelted Roosevelt in every sense of the word.

ILL-ADVISED SHIPMENTS OF OIL AND GAS TO RUSSIA

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, this business of shipping oil to Russia is a matter that should be given more than passing consideration from this Congress. When we consider that the Treasury Procurement Division reports that Russia today has a reserve of oil and gas ready for use of 150,000,000 barrels and that the United States ranks fourth among the nations of the world in oil reserves ready for use, having only 50,000,000 barrels, meaning that Russia has three times more than us, I think we should pause and consider whether we should continue shipping oil and gas to Russia at the rate of a million barrels per month.

Whom the gods would destroy they first make mad. I am wondering if we are not mad already in shipping 1,000,000 barrels of oil and gas to Russia when they already have a reserve of 150,000,000 barrels and we rank fourth among the nations of the world with only 50,000,000 barrels.

There is something rotten-smelling in Washington and we ought to do something about it. There are plans being formulated to reinstitute gas rationing in our Nation. Think of it—rationing gas to American citizens and shipping 1,000,000 barrels per month to Russia.

RESERVES

According to Treasury Department reports Russia today has a reserve of processed ready to use fuel oil and gasoline of 150,000,000 barrels. Of all the nations of the world in reserve oil and gas ready to use the United States is fourth with 50,000,000 barrels. I repeat Russia is first with 150,000,000 barrels. In case of war today to fly planes, and run ships and tanks Russia has a reserve of 150,000,000 barrels and we the United States have only 50,000,000 barrels, yet we are shipping oil and gas to Russia.

RUSSIA'S DEMANDS TODAY AS COMPARED TO PREVIOUS

Incidentally Russia is requesting from us today more oil and gas than she requested during the war.

The heads of our military in a communication to the committees in Congress has warned that the supply of oil and gas in the United States is only enough for normal military peacetime operations. In fact many normal operations have been cut out because of the small supply of oil and gas in America. The tragedy is that if war broke out today our military could not meet the emergency. This communication brought out the shortage in America will be critical until we get oil in abundance from Persia.

Government officials in Washington are warning that in the next 30 days it may be necessary to ration gasoline in the United States of America. At the same time a week ago in a Los Angeles harbor a Russian tanker sailed with 50,000 barrels of gasoline and oil. A few days ago two more Russian tankers were loaded with an equal amount. Ten more Russian tankers are waiting to be loaded with equal amounts in next 30 days. Almost 1,000,000 barrels in 30 days.

THE SHIPMENT OF OIL AND GAS TO RUSSIA

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include two clippings from the Chicago Journal of Commerce of June 17.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, supplementing what the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] just said, I wish to call the attention of the House to the newspaper I have here. Under date of June 17, just a day or so ago, the Chicago Journal of Commerce reported three Russian ships loading in California harbors, with oil and gas for Vladivostok. Here is what the article says:

CALIFORNIA PORT LOADS RECORD OIL SHIPMENT TO RUSSIA

SAN PEDRO, CALIF., June 16.—Loading of what the Marine Exchange described as the largest shipment of petroleum supplies to Russia ever made from this port proceeded today.

The 50,000-barrel Soviet tanker *Elbrus* was loading with gasoline and oil. Two more 50,000-barrel tankers, the *Emba* and the *Krasnaia Armia*, arrived and were prepared to load. The 65,000-barrel *Taganrog* is due Thursday.

Two more Soviet ships, the *Maikop* and the *Belgorod*, have undergone repairs and are making ready to sail, and the exchange said eight other Soviet tankers were due in June.

Purchases were being handled through the Amtorg Trading Co. and consignments were to Vladivostok.

In the same paper there is an editorial entitled "Oil—Why a One-Way Iron Curtain?" It reads as follows:

OIL—WHY A ONE-WAY IRON CURTAIN?

(By Keith Fanshier)

A dispatch from an important west coast port tells of current record-breaking shipments from that point of petroleum products, consigned to the Soviet Russian port city of Vladivostok.

Considering the growing threat of petroleum shortage in the United States, large-scale exports of petroleum bound for destination in the Communist land itself have a strange aspect indeed.

So also the recent movement of pipe to Russia while the needs of American operators for that very pipe are contributing to the present supply stringency of the petroleum industry.

In Washington today high Government officials are taking time from their routine duties to study the short oil supply and its implications. Members of the industry too are deeply concerned with the same situation. Many key men have been appointed to groups named to study the threatening situation, as one phase of which the Government reports itself unable to obtain the petroleum needs of its military services.

Yet apparently not only materials and equipment needed by the petroleum industry, but also the very oil products themselves can move by the hundreds of thousands of barrels right through the iron curtain.

This would seem to be the very thing which the chairman of the National Petroleum Council recently protested as watering the roots of communism.

The White House professes itself to be outraged by recent developments on the continent of Europe which clearly are Communist-inspired and by which Red domination of nearby nations is intensified. This Government is supposed to be casting about for means to express its position.

Why would not a way to do this be to regard the iron curtain as a two-way rather than a one-way institution, and treat it as such?

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. O'KONSKI. It should be brought out that there are rumors it may be necessary to impose gasoline rationing in the United States of America in the next 30 days.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Is it not true that the President has the power at the present time to control these exports?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Yes; that is my understanding. I think the gentleman's point is well taken.

THE PRESIDENT'S VETO MESSAGE

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, the President's veto message states that "labor-management cooperation is constantly improving."

Nothing is further from the truth according to the statistics published by the United States Department of Labor. They are as follows:

Year:	*Man-days idle through work stoppage*
1927	26,219,000
1928	12,632,000
1929	5,352,000
1930	3,317,000
1931	6,893,000
1932	10,502,000
1933	16,872,000
1934	19,592,000
1935	15,456,000
1936	13,902,000
1937	28,425,000
1938	9,148,000
1939	17,812,000
1940	6,701,000
1941	23,048,000
1942	4,183,000
1943	13,501,000
1944	8,721,000
1945	38,025,000
1946	116,000,000

Certainly an existence of more than three times as many strikes as ever before existed in the history of this country is not evidence of "labor-management cooperation." It is, however, interesting to note the President's use of the word "cooperation" because it was also cooperation that the President promised to

give this Congress. It is apparent from the President's actions with respect to the labor bill and the tax bill, and his use of the word "cooperation" in his veto message on the labor bill that his definition of cooperation does not fit that of any standard dictionary of the English language.

Mr. Speaker, I have read the veto message and I have heard it read, and I have one observation to make. The President has in every instance in which he construes the bill resorted to a specious construction of its provisions, and in no instance has he resorted to a reasonable construction of the language of H. R. 3020. In the President's veto message there are many misstatements of the contents of the bill and no one can read the President's message on this subject, his veto message of the Case bill last year, and conclude that he favors any legislation to cure any of the substantial evils which are presently existing in the labor-management field. His lack of any consistency in dealing with this problem is apparent particularly in his comments in paragraph 6 of his present veto message with respect to major strikes that effect the public health or safety. He objects to this provision and yet the President was the man who proposed drafting striking railroad workers into the Army. For the life of me I cannot understand a person who makes such a proposal and still objects to a reasonable proposal to allow mediation in such matters of great national concern. One can reach no other conclusion from his actions expect that he is against any labor bill that is not exactly as he wishes it. If this is coooperation I cannot know the meaning of the word.

The veto message is a vicious attack against the labor bill. With respect to that feature of his message I point out that if the bill were as drastic as his veto message attempts to paint it, then why did it take him so long to make up his mind as to whether he should veto the bill or sign it.

Mr. Speaker, it was for the foregoing reasons that this House of Representatives was thoroughly justified in its action of overriding the President's veto by 331 to 83. I am informed that this is the most stunning rebuke that any President of the United States has ever received on a veto message in the entire history of our country. A clear majority of the Members of both parties voted to override. That was their answer to the pressure campaign in which labor organizations by their own admission spent millions of dollars. The House has this day by their action restored the faith of many in representative government.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an Associated Press article from Durham, N. C., on the banning of two filthy screen films being shown by moving picture shows in that city.

Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by one of his constituents.

SHIPMENTS TO RUSSIA

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, we have just learned from the gentleman from Wisconsin regarding the shipment of oil to Russia. Some time this afternoon we will again discuss the so-called Voice of America. They will tell us that the Voice of America will be used to fight communism.

Mr. Speaker, is is inconceivable that we should be shipping oil, locomotives, manufactured articles, and other equipment from this country to Russia, then spend $31,000,000 to tell the people of the world that we are out to fight communism. Mr. Speaker, I just cannot quite comprehend this.

ACTION OF THE HOUSE IN OVERRIDING PRESIDENT'S VETO

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, with corporation profits the highest in the history of America, with inflationary prices and the cost of living the highest we have known in many, many years, with the housing and building program falling off due to unrestrained material prices, 16,000,000 organized workers in America and their families will look with fear today upon the action of this body. They can only await with prayers in their heart and hope that the action of the other body will be more favorable to their needs.

THE VOICE OF AMERICA

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I understand there is some delaying action going on at this time on the floor of the House against the Voice of America, to hamper the bringing up of this bill. Therefore I am going to get my 2 cents' worth in at this time by reading a letter I have just received from a manufacturer in my district who has returned recently from Germany:

I find the Communist Party active and distributing their literature and posters without regard for expense. The people of Germany and Europe in general are pitifully unacquainted with the other side of the story. Although I am heartily in favor of economy, I deplore the possible cancellation of funds for the Voice of America, and any other similar agencies that are tending to neutralize Communist propaganda.

I believe, in view of this, it is a mistake to filibuster any longer on this bill.

Let us get on with the business of the day.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPRINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

AUTOMOBILES FOR AMPUTEES

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include an article by General Rusk appearing in the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, General Rusk, who was a very famous flight surgeon during the war, a rehabilitation man, now the medical editor of the New York Times, wrote an article away back last December stating that in the last session the Congress passed a bill which gave automobiles to certain of the leg amputees. He now endorses very strongly the taking in of the amputees who were left out of that bill and certain paraplegic cases that were not included. He said it was discriminatory. I talked to General Rusk at the time the bill was introduced. He was not so enthusiastic about it then as a rehabilitation measure, but he told me last autumn it was a very fine piece of legislation for rehabilitation. It gives these men who are too disabled to get to and from work or to get to and from college and from on-the-job-training a chance to get there, a chance to learn and to become productive in business. It gives them a chance in the sun, and it will bring back money to the Government in taxes also. I will say, Mr. Speaker, that we should not economize when it comes to the disabled veterans. That is the last thing the people of the United States want. They insist that the disabled be cared for—and helped first of all—they demand action for disabled veterans.

The gentleman from New Jersey, Judge MATHEWS, made a masterly plea for his bill which includes veterans who were left out of the measure last year which was discriminatory. Last year's bill left out certain disabled veterans whose disabilities always have been classed together for rating purposes and for other benefits.

The article in the New York Times is as follows:

REHABILITATION ANOMALIES ARE NOTED IN THE LAW ON CARS FOR AMPUTEES—EARLY ADJUSTMENT IS HELD LIKELY AS THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS CONVENES

(By Howard A. Rusk, M. D.)

In ward 3D at the veterans' hospital in the Bronx, New York City, two severely disabled men occupy adjoining beds. Both are victims of spinal-cord injuries which have left them partially paralyzed. Both are classified as being totally disabled. Both draw maximum Government pensions. They differ, however, in degree of paralysis. The first is a paraplegic suffering from paralysis of both legs; the second is a quadruplegic with paralysis not only of the legs but of both arms and the trunk. Two weeks ago the paraplegic received a new specially equipped 1946 automobile from the Government. Ironically, the quadruplegic, even though his

disabilities are much more severe, is not entitled to receive a car.

The widely publicized "cars for amputees" bill which was passed by Congress last sesion denies a car to this second man because of his inability to pass an examination for a State driver's license. The act, Public Law 663, provides that veterans who have lost one or both legs, or the use of their legs, as a result of military service are entitled to a car at Government expense, but only if they hold a State driver's permit. This automatically excludes veterans paralyzed in the upper extremities.

ONE HUNDRED IN DIRE NEED FOR CARS

The number of men in military and veterans' hospitals who suffer paralysis of both upper and lower extremities is less than 100. Their need for cars, however, is even greater than the paraplegics and leg amputees who, with prosthesis and rehabilitation, can, in most cases, learn to walk. The man paralyzed in all extremities is unable to walk or use public conveyances. His chances for rehabilitation and recreation are contingent upon his traveling.

Amputees and paraplegics have many avenues open to them for employment, while men with paralyzed arms are unable to augment their Government pensions by earning money, except in rare cases. Thus, from a financial standpoint, they are in greater need. Without a car, they are completely home-bound. The fact that they themselves cannot drive should not mean they are to be imprisoned within the four walls of their homes. Members of their families and friends can drive for them. The important thing is that they are not permanently home-bound.

When the bill providing cars for amputees was pending in Congress last July, this column warned that the bill, as framed, would create inequalities, for its provisions were restrictive and did not establish need as the basis for its benefits.

BRADLEY CONCURS IN VIEW

This same vein was taken by General Bradley, Veterans' Administrator, and the major veterans' organizations. Those inequalities are shown by the paradoxical situation in which the most seriously disabled veterans are denied cars at Government expense while they are given to those with lesser disabilities.

Many veterans who suffered double arm amputations are bitter about the law, as they feel that they, too, have been discriminated against as their disabilities are more serious and incapacitating than the loss of one or both legs. These men are able to drive with the aid of special controls, and many hold State driver's permits. The law, however, restricts benefits to leg amputees and those who have lost the use of their legs.

Another anomaly of the law is evidenced by a letter received this past week from a paralyzed first lieutenant in the Army-Navy General Hospital, Hot Springs, Ark. This officer is not eligible for a car because he is still in the Army and the law applies only to veterans. Although he lost the use of his limbs in service, he will be hospitalized for such a long period before being discharged from the Army, he may not become a veteran before the law expires in June of next year. The obvious intent of Congress was to furnish this man with a car, but the technicalities of the law prevent it.

Although General Bradley vigorously opposed the law last summer in its present form, the VA took immediate steps to carry out its provisions. Within 30 days the first car, a hydramatic Oldsmobile sedan, was delivered to Richard A Tennelly of Washington, an ex-marine combat correspondent who lost his left leg at Iwo Jima.

ONLY 75 CARS DELIVERED

Up until October 1, out of 8,000 applications, only 75 cars had actually been delivered. The VA attributes this to the unavailability of cars from manufacturers. The Disabled American Veterans in the lead editorial of the last issue of their official organ point out that the maximum amount which can be paid for a car under the law is $1,600 which includes all accessories, special driving controls, and taxes. The veteran is not permitted to purchase a more expensive car and personally pay the difference. The price of cars has risen since the law was passed. This, plus delivery costs to those living at great distances from the factory, often bring the price of the car above the established ceiling. The DAV suggests the technicalities of the law can be circumvented by eligible veterans purchasing cars without any accessories except the necessary driving controls and then purchasing additional accessories later from their own resources. If this does not bring the car within the limit of $1,600, the other alternative is to go to the factory and drive the car home, thus eliminating delivery costs. The latter course, however, is often most impractical.

Sales taxes in many States help bring the car's cost above the price limit. The DAV calls attention to the fact that in Ohio cars purchased under the act are exempt from sales taxes and suggest this practice should be adopted in all States.

LAW WAS PASSED AS RIDER

Public Law 663 was passed by Congress in the closing days of last summer's session, and then only as a rider on the servicemen's terminal leave law which was "must" legislation. The critics of the bill at that time, including this writer, did not question the fairness of the principle of automobiles for certain disabled veterans at Government expense or the need of many disabled veterans for automobiles. They did, however, question the feasibility of the law as drawn, believing it sacrificed thoroughness and equality for the sake of expediency.

With the reorganization of the House of Representatives in the coming session, due to the Republican majority, it is assumed that Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS, ranking Republican member of the House Veterans Committee, will replace Representative JOHN RANKIN as head of that committee. Mrs. ROGERS was one of the original sponsors of the "cars for amputees" bill and has long been a champion in the cause of the disabled veteran. Mrs. ROGERS will, if appointed to the post, probably work for immediate revision of the present law to remove the present unjust and illogical restrictions. It should be one of the first items of business on the crowded agenda of her committee.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

FILIBUSTER

Mr. HOFFMAN. Now, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] charged—at least he intimated—that a filibuster was going on here. Well, be that as it may, I want to congratulate the gentleman on contributing his 1 minute to the filibuster.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. TWYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 29, noes 84.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 86]

Andrews, N. Y.	Gallagher	McMillan, S. C.
Banta	Gifford	Mansfield, Tex.
Bell	Granger	O'Toole
Bennett, Mich.	Gross	Patman
Bland	Hall,	Plumley
Bonner	Leonard W.	Poulson
Boykin	Hart	Powell
Brophy	Hartley	Ramey
Burke	Heffernan	Rayfiel
Byrne, N. Y.	Jenkins, Pa.	Rich
Celler	Jennings	Sabath
Clark	Johnson, Okla.	Seely-Brown
Combs	Jones, Wash.	Shafer
Coudert	Kefauver	Sheppard
Davis, Tenn.	Kelley	Smith, Ohio
Dawson, Ill.	Kennedy	Taylor
Delaney	Keogh	Thomas, N. J.
Dingell	Kerr	Van Zandt
Dolliver	Larcade	West
Fellows	Lea	Winstead
Fogarty	Lusk	Youngblood
Fuller	Lynch	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 365 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

INFORMATIONAL SERVICE, STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3342) to enable the Government of the United States more effectively to carry on its foreign relations by means of promotion of the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills between the people of the United States and other countries, and by means of public dissemination abroad of information about the United States, its people, and its policies.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma) there were—ayes 102, noes 11.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground a quorum is not present and make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and fifty-eight Members are present, not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 303, nays 63, not voting 63, as follows:

[Roll No. 87]

YEAS—303

Abernethy	Andersen,	Bakewell
Albert	H. Carl	Barden
Allen, Calif.	Anderson, Calif.	Barrett
Allen, Ill.	Andrews, Ala.	Bates, Ky.
Allen, La.	Arends	Battle
Almond	Arnold	Beall

Beckworth	Gwynne, Iowa	Mundt
Bell	Hagen	Murdock
Blackney	Hale	Murray, Tenn.
Blatnik	Hall,	Nixon
Bloom	Edwin Arthur	Nodar
Boggs, Del.	Hall,	Norblad
Boggs, La.	Leonard W.	Norrell
Bolton	Halleck	Norton
Bradley	Hand	O'Brien
Bramblett	Hardy	O'Konski
Brooks	Harless, Ariz.	Pace
Brown, Ga.	Harris	Passman
Bryson	Harrison	Patterson
Buchanan	Hart	Peden
Buck	Hartley	Peterson
Buckley	Havenner	Pfeifer
Burleson	Hays	Philbin
Busbey	Hedrick	Phillips, Calif.
Byrnes, Wis.	Heffernan	Pickett
Camp	Hendricks	Plumley
Canfield	Herter	Poage
Cannon	Heselton	Potts
Carroll	Hill	Poulson
Carson	Hinshaw	Preston
Case, N. J.	Hobbs	Price, Fla.
Case, S. Dak.	Hoeven	Price, Ill.
Chadwick	Holmes	Priest
Chapman	Hope	Rabin
Chelf	Howell	Rains
Chenoweth	Huber	Ramey
Chiperfield	Jackson, Calif.	Rayburn
Clark	Jackson, Wash.	Redden
Clason	Jarman	Reed, Ill.
Clements	Javits	Rees
Coffin	Jenkins, Ohio	Reeves
Cole, Kans.	Johnson, Calif.	Richards
Colmer	Johnson, Okla.	Riehlman
Cooley	Johnson, Tex	Riley
Cooper	Jones, Ala.	Rivers
Corbett	Jones, N. C.	Robertson
Cotton	Jones, Ohio	Rogers, Fla.
Courtney	Jonkman	Rogers, Mass.
Cox	Judd	Rohrbough
Cravens	Karsten, Mo.	Rooney
Crawford	Kean	Ross
Crosser	Kearney	Russell
Crow	Kearns	Sabath
Cunningham	Keating	Sadlak
Curtis	Kee	Sadowski
Dague	Keefe	Sarbacher
Davis, Ga.	Kersten, Wis.	Sasscer
Davis, Wis.	Kilburn	Scoblick
Dawson, Ill.	Kilday	Scott, Hardie
Dawson, Utah	King	Scrivner
Deane	Klein	Shafer
Dingell	Kunkel	Short
Dirksen	Lane	Simpson, Ill.
Domengeaux	Lanham	Simpson, Pa.
Donohue	Larcade	Smith, Maine
Dorn	Latham	Smith, Va.
Doughton	Lea	Smith, Wis.
Douglas	LeCompte	Snyder
Drewry	LeFevre	Somers
Durham	Lewis	Spence
Eaton	Lodge	Stanley
Eberharter	Love	Stefan
Elliott	Lucas	Stevenson
Ellsworth	Lyle	Stockman
Elsaesser	McConnell	Stratton
Elston	McDonough	Sundstrom
Engel, Mich.	McDowell	Talle
Engle, Calif.	McMahon	Teague
Evins	McMillen, Ill.	Thomas, N. J.
Fallon	MacKinnon	Thomas, Tex.
Feighan	Macy	Thomason
Fenton	Madden	Tollefson
Fernandez	Mahon	Towe
Fisher	Manasco	Trimble
Flannagan	Mansfield,	Twyman
Fletcher	Mont.	Vail
Fogarty	Marcantonio	Wadsworth
Folger	Martin, Iowa	Walter
Foote	Meade, Ky.	Weichel
Forand	Meade, Md.	Welch
Fulton	Merrow	Wheeler
Gamble	Meyer	Whitten
Gary	Michener	Whittington
Gathings	Miller, Calif.	Wigglesworth
Goff	Miller, Conn.	Williams
Gordon	Miller, Nebr.	Wilson, Tex.
Gore	Mills	Wolcott
Gorski	Mitchell	Wolverton
Gossett	Monroney	Wood
Grant, Ala.	Morgan	Worley
Grant, Ind.	Morris	Zimmerman
Gregory	Morrison	
Gwinn, N. Y.	Morton	

NAYS—63

Banta	Buffett	Dondero
Bender	Butler	Ellis
Bennett, Mo.	Church	Gallagher
Bishop	Clevenger	Gavin
Brehm	Clippinger	Gearhart
Brophy	Cole, Mo.	Gillette
Brown, Ohio	D'Ewart	Gillie
Graham	McGregor	St. George
Griffiths	Maloney	Sanborn
Gross	Mason	Schwabe, Mo.
Harness, Ind.	Mathews	Schwabe, Okla.
Hess	Miller, Md.	Scott,
Hoffman	Muhlenberg	Hugh D., Jr.
Hull	Murray, Wis.	Smith, Kans.
Jenison	O'Hara	Springer
Jennings	Owens	Taber
Jensen	Phillips, Tenn.	Tibbott
Johnson, Ill.	Ploeser	Vursell
Johnson, Ind.	Rankin	Wilson, Ind.
Landis	Reed, N. Y.	Woodruff
Lemke	Rizley	
McCowen	Robsion	

NOT VOTING—63

Andresen,	Fuller	Mansfield, Tex.
August H.	Gifford	O'Toole
Andrews, N. Y.	Goodwin	Patman
Angell	Granger	Powell
Auchincloss	Hébert	Rayfiel
Bates, Mass.	Holifield	Rich
Bennett, Mich.	Horan	Rockwell
Bland	Jenkins, Pa.	Seely-Brown
Bonner	Jones, Wash.	Sheppard
Boykin	Kefauver	Sikes
Bulwinkle	Kelley	Smathers
Burke	Kennedy	Smith, Ohio
Byrne, N. Y.	Keogh	Stigler
Celler	Kerr	Taylor
Cole, N. Y.	Kirwan	Van Zandt
Combs	Knutson	Vinson
Coudert	Lesinski	Vorys
Davis, Tenn.	Lusk	West
Delaney	Lynch	Winstead
Devitt	McCormack	Youngblood
Dolliver	McGarvey	
Fellows	McMillan, S. C.	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Additional general pairs:

Mr. August H. Andresen with Mr. Keogh.
Mr. Cole of New York with Mr. Vinson.
Mr. Coudert with Mr. Delaney.
Mr. McGarvey with Mr. McMillan of South Carolina.
Mr. Seely-Brown with Mr. Lynch.
Mr. Rich with Mrs. Lusk.
Mr. Horan with Mr. Holifield.
Mr. Bennett of Michigan with Mr. Bonner.
Mr. Auchincloss with Mr. Rayfiel.
Mr. Angell with Mr. Lesinski.
Mr. Andrews of New York with Mr. Combs.
Mr. Gifford with Mr. Kefauver.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Kirwan.
Mr. Rockwell with Mr. Celler.
Mr. Devitt with Mr. Hébert.
Mr. Dolliver with Mr. Sheppard.
Mr. Vorys with Mr. Stigler.
Mr. Weichel with Mr. O'Toole.
Mr. Smith of Ohio with Mr. Granger.
Mr. Knutson with Mr. Byrne of New York.
Mr. Jones of Washington with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Jenkins of Pennsylvania with Mr. Kennedy.
Mr. Youngblood with Mr. Kelley.
Mr. Burke with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.
Mr. Bates of Massachusetts with Mr. Kerr.
Mr. Goodwin with Mr. Boykin.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3342, with Mr. JENKINS of Ohio in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN: Page 13, line 3, after the word "States", insert a period and strike out the words "and in other countries."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, on the floor and in the lobby there has been not a little comment during the three preceding days that this bill has been under discussion all to the effect that some folks were filibustering, delaying proceedings.

Permit me most respectfully to call attention to the fact that on practically every vote that has been taken, rising vote or teller vote, that only once during all that voting has more than one-third of the Republicans of this House voted in favor of keeping this bill alive, or in opposition to the amendments which have been offered. That one occasion was when 53 Republicans voted to keep the bill alive and 78 voted to strike the enacting clause. The 53 won because they were joined by a solid Democratic vote. So, if there is delay, that delay is not caused by those who are opposing this legislation. It is due to the fact that a minority group of the majority party has insisted for 4 days in having its way. This bill has been kept alive and this bill is today before the House and before the Committee because the minority of the Republicans supported by the minority party as a unit want it to be here and want it passed, so there is no question of a lack of party regularity on the part of those of us who oppose this legislation.

Now, this amendment has this effect. On page 12 there is a provision in subsection (1) authorizing the Secretary of State "to make grants of money, services, or materials to State and local governmental institutions in the United States, to governmental institutions in other countries, and to individuals and public or private nonprofit organizations both in the United States." And then these words which I ask be stricken "and in other countries."

All this amendment seeks to do is to strike from that subparagraph the authority of the Secretary of State to make grants of money, services or materials to individuals and to public or private nonprofit organization in other countries. We had UNRRA and we had this and that organization legalized by Congress peddling our money all over the world. In general, the funds were wasted and misapplied. Whether it was legalized or not, we now know that some one, Treasury, State, or War Department, authorized the Russians and the Italians to print invasion money, which apparently we now must redeem, to the amount of some $400,000,000.

The argument now made is this, that it is about time that the United States of America quit authorizing anyone, Secretary of State or anyone else, to give away the money which we raise through taxation. It is time now that we end that. A former President of the United States suggested the other day, as he has at various times in the past, and as Members of this House for the last 3 or 4 years repeatedly asked, that we take an inventory and learn what, if anything, we have left; how much we can afford to give away. The Members in the other body, the great international statesmen just recently fell in with that idea and said that it might be a good thing before we gave away or pledged ourselves further to ascertain whether we had anything to give away. It is self-evident that we do not have the money; that every dollar that is going to be appropriated under this legislation will have to be

borrowed, and so why should we now authorize the Secretary of State to give away as much as $34,000,000 that this bill will ultimately call for to individuals and public or private nonprofit organizations in other countries. Let him do it? I cannot understand it, and I hope that someone will enlighten me and relieve my ignorance, and that the committee will adopt this amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in the first part of his remarks the gentleman from Michigan indicated that he was speaking for the majority of the members of the Republican Party and that most of the members of the Republican Party had voted as he had on the various measures and amendments up to now. I do not know whether the Republican Members of the House are following the foreign policy proposals of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], whether they are following the recommendations of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, or whether they are following the impulses of their own convictions. Each of you has to decide that for yourself on the measures which come before us.

I think, however, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has drawn the issue pretty clearly. I think he has dramatized the division which exists among Republicans and Democrats alike on matters of this kind. I want it understood, at least for myself, that I do not propose to follow any foreign policy pattern which isolates America from the peace.

I think there are some things about so-called isolationism which might be justified at times, when you attempt to isolate a country from war, but when you attempt to isolate a country from peace, when you attempt to break down the peace machinery of America, when you tell the State Department, "We will deny you the tools that you tell us you need to build the temple of peace," I want no mistake in the record about where I stand. I do not stand for that kind of isolationism, and I do not believe the Republican Party does either.

May I point out about the particular amendment in question that it is just one little isolationistic clause which would say that you cannot aid American institutions such as the great American university at Beirut in Syria, which our former Minister to Syria, Mr. George Wadsworth, tells us has done more to help maintain friendly relations with the Arab people and maintain American prestige in the Middle East than any other one thing. It would say you cannot aid Roberts College at Istanbul, Turkey, a country in which we are spending $250,000,000 of the American taxpayers' dollars. This amendment would say you cannot go in there and help the people of Turkey understand America by aiding Turkish students to learn the truth about us in this great American college.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is an unwise amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does that bar debate on other amendments which are on the desk?

The CHAIRMAN. On this section only.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN: On page 13, at the end of line 4, insert the following: "*Provided, however,* That no grant of money, services, or materials shall be made under this subsection to any governmental institution or to individuals or public or private organizations in any country which has a socialistic or communistic form of government or which is under the domination of any government having a communistic government or which advocates or teaches communism."

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

SEC. 702. In carrying on activities which further the purposes of this act, subject to the approval of such activities by the Secretary, the Department and the other Government agencies are authorized—

(1) to place orders and make purchases and rentals of materials and equipment;

(2) to make contracts, including contracts with governmental agencies, foreign or domestic, including subdivisions thereof, and intergovernmental organizations of which the United States is a member, and, with respect to contracts entered into in foreign countries, without regard to section 3741 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 22);

(3) under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, to pay the transportation expenses, and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses, of citizens or subjects of other countries, without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and the Subsistence Act of 1926, as amended;

(4) under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and the Subsistence Act of 1926, as amended, to provide for planned travel itineraries within the United States by groups of citizens or subjects of other countries, to pay the expenses of such travel, and to detail, as escorts of such groups, officers and employees of the Government, whose expenses may be paid out of funds advanced or transferred by the Secretary for the general expenses of the itineraries;

(5) to make grants for, and to pay expenses incident to, training and study;

(6) to provide for, and pay the expenses of, attendance at meetings or conventions of societies and associations concerned with furthering the purposes of this act when provided for by the appropriation act; and

(7) to provide for, and pay the expenses of, the purchase of health and accident insurance for persons not employed by the United States Government while away from home under the authority of this act, or for Philippine trainees who receive training from a Government agency in the United States under authority of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, as amended (Public Laws 370 and 597, 79th Cong.), and to defray the expenses of preparing and transporting to their former homes the remains of such persons who may die.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 16, line 2, after the semicolon insert the word "and."

On page 16, line 6, strike out all after the word "appropriation", and all of lines 7 to 18, inclusive, and insert the word "act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, a few days ago when this bill was under consideration I was shocked and humiliated and aggrieved to hear the genial gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS], whom we affectionately call Toby, unbosom himself of these words:

Why, you ask most any school child in America where the largest trees are and he will say, as I heard it alleged on the floor of the House, that they are out in California. But the biggest trees in the world are not in California. We think so. Why? Because it is so easy for us all to become big headed, to think that everything we have is the biggest and best in the world.

When I recovered from the impact of those words I went scurrying to the Encyclopedia Britannica and found in volume 20, page 339, these comforting words:

The redwood tree, the Sequoia sempervirens, is the tallest of trees. Many specimens attain a height of over 300 feet, and one now standing near Dyerville, Humboldt County, is by careful measurement 364 feet. Maximum diameter of the redwood is about 18 feet, considerably less than the big tree, although exceeded by very few others. Mature trees vary in age from about 400 years to about 2,000. * * *

The big tree, the Sequoia gigantea, is the largest of all trees in bulk and commonly reputed to be the oldest living thing. Largest specimen is "General Sherman" in Sequoia National Park measuring 101½ feet in circumference at base, mean base diameter 32 feet, diameter 8 feet above ground 27 feet, diameter 100 feet above ground 18½ feet. Height above mean base 272 feet, diameter of largest branch (130 feet above ground) 6½ feet, total weight estimated at 2,150 tons of which the foliage alone constitutes 155 tons (Frye and White, 1938). A few specimens stand over 300 feet high but are less in total bulk than "General Sherman." Age, based on ring counts, is known to exceed 3,000 years in some instances.

So, Mr. Chairman, whether the school children of America are big-headed or not, according to how the genial gentleman from Oklahoma meant it, they are quite right in believing that the tallest of trees and the largest in bulk are still growing in California.

So we must in this instance credit to California the honor of offering the hospitality of its soil to the oldest, the tallest and the largest living things on the face of the earth, its Sequoia gigantea and Sequoia semperviren, monarchs of the forests, giants of antiquity that they are.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEARHART. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MORRIS. The largest trees in the world, according to authentic information that I have, are in the Belgian Congo. I just wonder if this article

might not have been written by Paul Bunyan.

Mr. GEARHART. So far as I know Paul Bunyan is not a contributor to the Encyclopedia Britannica. The gentleman will recall that it was on the 6th day of June that his objected-to remarks were uttered, so the gentleman from California has had ample opportunity to make a very, very careful check of the authorities, not only of the Encyclopedia Britannica, but with the Forestry Service and the Architect of the Capitol, and they agree and report to him that without question the tallest and biggest trees, the oldest living things on the face of the earth, still grow in California. I merely rise to make announcement of the immutable facts of the forest. With the modesty of a true Californian, I submit them to my good friend, the gentleman of the great State of Oklahoma. The proofs are before you.

Mr. MORRIS. I think I can prove to the contrary.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] has expired.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, some time ago when I read this letter before the House, we were in such a furor that I doubt very much that many Members got the contents of it, and I am going to read it again. I think after I read it you may wake up to the fact that we do need this bill.

This is a letter written to me, incidentally, by the president of a small manufacturing company in my district who had recently visited the continent of Europe and had gone particularly into Germany.

He writes:

> I find the Communist Party active and distributing their literature and posters without regard for expense. The people of Germany and Europe in general are pitifully unacquainted with the other side of the story. Although I am heartily in favor of economy, I deplore the possible cancellation of funds for the Voice of America, and any other similar agencies that are tending to neutralize Communist propaganda. The funds required for this purpose are moderate compared with what is being spent in larger quantities for less essential purposes.

That was signed by a reputable manufacturer in my district, who knows what he is talking about, and certainly cannot be inferred to be a Communist.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I am sorry; my time is limited.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. What does the gentleman manufacture? Radios?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Well, now, since you are on that subject of radios, I am going to take a minute and say that apparently some of the opposition to this measure may be coming from a lack of conviction on the part of some of the membership of this House as to the effectiveness of the radio in telling the truth. I am not talking about propaganda. I am not talking about advertising. I am talking about the ability of the radio to disseminate the truth. I think it is high time that the people of Europe are given the truth. The Voice of America has been accused of being subversive; that is, the activities of the "Voice of America" have been called subversive, and some of the individuals connected with the program are accused of being subversive.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I cannot yield. My time is limited.

The truth is that what this House should do at this time in considering this bill is to write into this legislation enough assurance against the activities of any subversive people so as to guarantee the Voice of America to be the voice of America; and I see no reason why we cannot do it. That is one reason I am for this bill.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. Why do not we appropriate money to secure radios to distribute over in those countries so they can listen to the program when it does go through?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. This is a step in the right direction. You can bring radios in too.

Mr. GAVIN. They have not got any radios.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. That is something we can consider a little later. I do feel, however, that it is timely to give consideration to this because we cannot afford according to the letter of this gentleman to go very much further allowing these lies, innuendoes, and adverse propaganda to be going into the various countries of Europe where we have attempted to do everything we could for them.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. CORBETT. I wonder if the gentleman thinks it possible that some of the Members do not believe radio is here to stay?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman thinks as I do, that probably there is a feeling on the part of some of the Members that radio is not effective; but let me give you an example. Many Members of the House have had to counteract adverse and vicious propaganda back home while they were down here on the job, while they were attending to their official duties and pursuing the job which the people elected them to fulfill. Many Members have been actually defeated back home because they were unable to get back home to defend themselves against these vicious lies and innuendoes that subversive individuals back home have spread about them.

The point is that the radio in many cases has enabled them to carry the truth of their convictions back home and to tell the people correctly of their position. I say the same thing can be done with the United States.

Let us tell the other countries the truth by developing the Voice of America, so that it is loud enough and strong enough to be heard all over the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we cannot arrive at a limitation of debate. I see seven Members on their feet.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, while the House has been discussing that example of sheer madness, the Voice of America, our State Department has been engaged in a wholesale propaganda campaign here at home to sell this piece of sheer madness to the American people. Commentators, newspapers, all kinds of opinion-forming groups in American life have been peddled this idea of wasting $30,000,000 on hot air.

At the same time that this piece of sheer madness has been peddled around the country we find that the State Department has delivered itself of approximately a dozen major foreign-policy speeches which conservatively estimated that we will spend anywhere from six to eight billion dollars a year for the next 4 or 5 years to reconstruct the economy of Europe.

Numerous uggestions have been made that Mr. Truman will call the Congress back into session in September and lay before us a six or eight billion dollar program to execute the Truman and Marshall doctrines in Europe.

Perhaps the House should begin to examine the way in which the State Department spends money on publicity and propaganda within the United States. In my opinion the State Department is engaged in a wholesale propaganda campaign right here in America using the taxpayers' money to pressure the Congress into voting not thirty million but $30,000,000,000 for the reconstruction of Europe.

Somehow or other the State Department does not seem to think that the American taxpayer wants to spend this money else why would the State Department be engaged in this propaganda campaign here at home?

The whole publicity and propaganda set-up of the State Department should be investigated. The Voice of America should, of course, be eliminated, and best of all, of course, would be the removal from office of the present administration in 1948. This insane policy of pouring out billions of dollars on objectives which are unlimited and the principal consideration of which is to rearm the world for another world war, this policy will only be defeated by the removal from office of the group of State Department bureaucrats to whom nothing is sacred except their own prestige and personal bureaucratic power.

Sheer madness is the only way that John Q. Citizen can describe the proposals which have been put before us. Sheer madness is the basis of our present

foreign policy. To launch this Nation upon a world-wide system of entangling military alliances and unilateral economic grants will end only in the bankruptcy of our Nation. This House should say a firm and decisive "No" to the proposal for a phony Voice of America.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which has been at the desk for a long time and I have been sitting here to get a few minutes to discuss it. Now I finally wind up with 4 minutes on this important amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEEFE: Page 15, strike out all of subparagraphs 3 and 4 and on page 16, strike out subparagraph 6.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Would the gentleman be willing to divide his amendment into two parts, one having to do with subparagraph 3 and the other having to do with 4 and 6. The committee is willing to accept 4 and 6, but 3 has been in the law and regulations since the beginning of the program, and we feel we must oppose that. Is the gentleman willing to divide his amendment?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to divide the amendment in view of the statement just made by the distinguished gentleman, a member of the committee. Do I understand that the committee is willing to accept the amendment as divided so as to strike out paragraphs 4 and 6 and allow another amendment to be submitted separately to strike out paragraph 3? If so, I will be glad to do that, and I ask unanimous consent to so modify the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman's amendment will be modified accordingly.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentiary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEEFE. Will that require then the submission of a new amendment in order to accomplish the purpose of striking out subparagraph 3?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; that will require a new amendment.

Mr. KEEFE. I shall try to do so as soon as I can get time to write it out.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I would like to inquire if the committee will not accept the amendment as amended. I understand they will accept it, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the modified amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEEFE as modified: On page 15, strike out all of subparagraph 4; and on page 16, strike out all of subparagraph 6.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, we will accept the amendment in that form.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KEEFE. Now, Mr. Chairman, I would now like to offer an amendment to strike out the provisions of subparagraph 3.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEEFE: On page 15, strike out all of subparagraph 3.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I had an amendment on the desk to strike that paragraph.

Mr. KEEFE. I will withdraw the amendment then, Mr. Chairman, and ask unanimous consent so to do.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; if it is the same one, the gentleman can offer it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. HOFFMAN. If the gentleman from Wisconsin moves to strike subparagraph 3, that is all right with me.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEEFE. May I inquire of the Chair just what the status is at the present time? I did offer an amendment to strike subparagraph 3.

The CHAIRMAN. That amendment is now pending.

Mr. KEEFE. Am I recognized then for that purpose?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized within the 4 minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment. I do not have any time. I only have about 30 seconds under that situation. I will not have any time to discuss it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN: Page 15, strike out all of subsection 3.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I hoped the gentleman from Wisconsin would offer this amendment because I thought the committee might accept it in order to avoid opposition. Though I suspect that in the end we will find the original provisions back in the bill.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will make a correction right now myself. I want to state that the gentleman from South Dakota inadvertently—get that word—misstated my position a while ago when he stated that I was speaking for the Republican Party. I never, never in my life tried to speak for anyone except the Representative from the Fourth Michigan District. Now get that thoroughly in mind. The only thing I was calling attention to when I said this was not a Republican measure was when the motion was made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], to strike the enacting clause, 78 Republicans went down the aisle past the tellers to do that very thing, and 53, and only 53, were in favor of keeping this bill alive. That was the point I was trying to make. Seventy-eight voted to kill the bill. It is alive and here on the floor because a minority of the Republicans aided by an almost solid Democratic bloc keeps life in it.

As to this amendment, the amendment is that we strike out subparagraph 3. My amendment was that we change the $10 to $5. I just thought that $5 a day was enough. I can see no reason why we should pay these men more than we pay the returned veterans who are in this country or elsewhere. I cannot understand it. Rear Admiral Zacharias, who testified before a House committee yesterday and today, was asked about this Voice of America program. He said, as many of us believe, that if you keep the machinery and get rid of those who are operating and feeding it, there would be some good accomplished.

Every Member of this House who is advised of the situation knows that in the State Department there have been over the years not one but many Communists, and we have every reason to believe that some of them are there yet. Now, why should we let the State Department peddle this Voice of America through people who believe as these people do believe? People who do not believe in America. If the committee wants to keep the machinery alive, all well and good, but then get some competent engineers, some competent people to write and speak the output, so that really and truly it will be the Voice of America which today it is not. They should not only quit sending across those pictures of the fat woman, a disgrace to all of us, but they should quit sending out the false information and the doctrine in which no American believes.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JUDD. Are these amendments to be voted on as they are offered or at the end of the allotted time?

The CHAIRMAN. As they are offered.

Mr. JUDD. Then I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman claim the time of the committee?

Mr. JUDD. Yes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment because I think the gentleman who offered it believes the authorization in subparagraph 3 is something new or makes more liberal grants than heretofore. As a matter of fact, it has been in the appropriation acts and the regulations issued under them for several years. You can find on page A2982 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the portion of the 1947 State Department Appropriation Act, which specifically authorizes for this year such a grant for travel expenses in lieu of subsistence. I have here the Federal Register for August 23, 1944, con-

taining the travel regulations which Cordell Hull established then and under which the program still operates.

It divides those who come here or go abroad into two groups. One is the leaders, who are defined as "professors and instructors, persons of influence, and persons of outstanding accomplishment or possessing special qualifications in a professional, technical, cultural, or specialized field." The other group is the students, internes, trainees.

Under "Grants to foreign leaders" the regulations state:

Per diem of $10 in lieu of subsistence and all incidental expenses including gratituitous fees, taxi fares, head tax, visa fees, telegraph and telephone charges, etc., while traveling to and from the United States except for the period spent on seagoing vessels.

When it is reduced to $5 as a later paragraph stipulates:

Provided, That when a traveler is furnished meals and/or lodging without charge by a United States department or agency, one-fifth of the authorized per diem shall be deducted for each meal or night's lodging.

Under "Grants to foreign students," it is provided that students traveling by land or by air get $7 a day in lieu of subsistence and when by sea $3.50 a day.

Later in the regulations is a section headed, "Maxima not controlling" under which it is made clear that the $10 figure is the maximum that can be paid. Smaller per diem where indicated can be specified in the contract or the grant to a student or a professor at the time his appointment is made.

It seems to me the committee would not consider it proper to bring here a distinguished scientist or a professor or the president of a university, some great scholar or inventor or cultural or religious leader, from this or that country, and pay for his ticket, but not make suitable provision for him to get a place to sleep or food to eat en route. The per diem applies only when he is traveling. The average total cost for a foreign student living in this country is $1,800 a year. The average total amount furnished by the State Department is less than $700 a year per student, less than half the average amount paid to a GI student per year.

We have always provided this travel per diem heretofore. It has not been abused. I do not believe we ought to strike it out now.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, the further this debate goes the more confused I become. My good friend from California talked on trees, California's great trees. I think it would be more profitable for me if I took the short time allotted to me to discuss Pennsylvania grade crude oil, one of the finest lubricating oils in the world. An oil that is known the world over and ever since oil was discovered in my State—the great State of Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania grade crude oil is recognized as the outstanding lubricant of the Nation.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield.

Mr. GEARHART. Do I understand from the gentleman's remarks that he would like to have this bill in the grease?

Mr. GAVIN. Not exactly that, but I might say to the gentleman from California who gave such a splendid talk on California trees that in the future he use Pennsylvania grade crude oil in his car when traveling through the California forests.

Mr. GEARHART. That I will.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the voice of Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. GAVIN. My time is limited; however, I cannot help but yield to my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania, one of the outstanding Members of the Pennsylvania delegation, a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, a man who commands the respect and admiration of the Congress for his fine work, and I might add, a man who has won for himself the hearty commendations of the membership on both sides of the aisle. I am glad to yield to my good friend and colleague.

Mr. GRAHAM. I thank the gentleman. I wish the gentleman would make that speech in my district some time. Will the gentleman please call attention to the fact that the only standing tract of virgin timber left in the United States east of the Mississippi River is in our own State of Pennsylvania in Cook Forest?

Mr. GAVIN. Yes, and it is a gorgeous tract of timber, 8,700 acres of virgin pine that we have preserved to show future generations of Americans the beauties of the Pennsylvania woods.

Now, Mr. Chairman, to get back to this bill. I might say I have a great respect and admiration for all the members of the committee.

The bill as it now stands is a hodgepodge of confusing, conflicting pronouncements so muddied up by amendments that no one can tell exactly what it contains.

It is evident that the committee has been quite willing to accept any and all amendments offered, in the hope, I presume, of getting votes, merely to pass a bill, any kind of a bill.

This proposed legislation has been poorly presented; the evidence submitted is but little more than vague promises of what will or will not be done. The committee has not presented a case based on facts that we, as representatives of 140,000,000 people, can intelligently cast our vote for to create a vehicle to sell America to the world at a terrific cost to the American taxpayer, when in reality we have oversold ourselves already.

I have no confidence in this branch of the State Department which has been handling this matter. I have no faith in the integrity or ability of these individuals to do the kind of a job that should be done.

They say that Secretary of State Marshall will clean house. Well, he should have cleaned house before he came to Congress for a blank check to permit this blundering outfit to continue. We have heard repeatedly about cleaning house; but once the legislation is on the books the old gang takes over and carries on in any way they see fit.

How is Secretary Marshall going to look after this outfit? He will have plenty to do looking after Uncle Sam's affairs for the next 2 or 3 years without looking after the Voice.

I am tired of listening to a lot of glittering generalities. I want sound facts.

Let me ask you this; if you were the president of a corporation accountable to your stockholders and you listened as we have for 3 days to testimony and you were asked to approve the spending of ten, twenty, or thirty million dollars of your company's money for such a program as has been proposed, what would you do? Why, you would not give them a thin dime.

Well, you are directors in a great corporation, elected to look after the taxpayers' dollars and if you can reconcile yourself to approving this program to carry on with an element who have been tossing the American taxpayers' money down a rat hole, I cannot. This bill should be recommitted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I hope the members of the committee will not be confused about who will come to the United States to study, should this bill be passed. There have been a great many amendments adopted. In fact, the amendment that I was going to offer was offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] and the committee accepted it. I think it helps the bill, but even with these amendments there are many things in this bill that are not satisfactory.

I would call your attention to the fact that the State Department reported to me the first of the week that there were 16,956 students from many foreign countries now studying in the United States. Of this number, 60 are from Hungary, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria, which is now behind the iron curtain. The number of students, mostly GI's, from the United States studying in foreign countries is 3,163. They are studying in a great many universities.

I also call your attention to the fact that without this bill these students are here. Without this bill they are going to continue to be here. Every university in the country has exchange scholarships with universities in other countries, which will continue to go on.

It must be quite evident to the members of the committee that the State Department, in bringing this bill through the committee, is trying to build up a large bureau or agency in the State Department, and making it a permanent bureau. The bill goes far beyond the original intent of the will of Congress and does not reflect the publicity which goes out on this legislation.

When Secretary Marshall was before the Senate committee he said we must have some means of broadcasting to other countries. With that I agree. I agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] when he said we should sell America to the rest of the world. I want to do that, but I

contend, and I feel sure you will agree, that this bill goes far beyond that purpose.

I hope at the proper time, unless it is offered by someone on the minority side, to offer a motion to recommit, to make this bill just a broadcasting bill.

The other body has reported out a bill that is just a broadcasting bill and I think we ought to conform to that language and the original intent of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MATHEWS: Add a new subsection to section 702, as follows: "Due to the crowded conditions in the institutions of learning of this country, which are interfering with the opportunities of veterans and others to obtain their educations, and to presently prevent the diversion of further Federal funds from use for the education of our own veterans, as now provided by law, subsections (3) and (5) of this section shall not become effective until 1 year after the effective date of the remaining provisions of this act."

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is perfectly clear. It is to defer the effectiveness of subsections (3) and (5) of this particular section for 1 year, for the reasons stated in the amendment itself.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] having failed, the per diem allowance still remains at $10 per day, or $300 a month, which is five times the rate paid to our own veterans in the institutions of learning, which are now overcrowded. This bill, of course, will overcrowd them more by bringing in foreign students and foreign teachers.

During the colloquy with the gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. JUDD, the other day, as brought out here today, there is already authorization apparently for the State Department to conduct this Latin-American program. It will not affect that at all. In fact, I would like to see them concentrate on Latin America for the next year, under previous authority granted. Not only that, but the colleges themselves can exchange students and can exchange professors without the necessity of this act. There will be nothing whatsoever to interfere with the purposes of this act, except that during this period when we are told that we cannot grant even certain necessary funds for disabled veterans during this year because of economy, we should spend $10 a day or $300 a month to bring foreign students here, to crowd our own students out of the universities.

I spoke on this matter the other day. I think this is a very reasonable amendment and ought to be accepted, because I do not think this Government should be spending that money at a time when we are only spending a little bit for our own veterans to get their education, when the other objectives can be accomplished. At the end of the year we will know better where we stand and what world conditions are.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATHEWS. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. And the program for the exchange of teachers and students will go on whether this bill is passed or not?

Mr. MATHEWS. That is exactly right.

Mr. DONDERO. Through our own colleges and universities?

Mr. MATHEWS. Yes, sir. And our program with Latin America will still go on under Government expense.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATHEWS. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Nobody comes in under this program except graduate students, who go to graduate schools, usually on a fellowship, or doing special work with a particular professor or research man.

They do not interfere with the GI's, most of whom, of course, are undergraduates. Even if you consider all of the foreign students under this program as undergraduates, they would constitute only one-twentieth of 1 percent of the total number in our colleges. If this program were to displace any GI's I would go along with the gentleman in opposition; but knowing what kind of students are coming under this legislation I do not see how they would interfere with or prevent the education of GI's.

Mr. MATHEWS. How can the gentleman know what students are coming? He does not have charge of the students.

Mr. JUDD. Because the committee has gone over the lists from the countries that come under the program. Most of the foreign students in this country do not come under the State Department. Only a handful come under this program.

Mr. MATHEWS. Does the committee hand-pick and check the students?

Mr. JUDD. No. They are selected by committees of scholars and Americans abroad and are placed and supervised in this country by the Institute of International Education—a private association of educators. I will have something to say about that later.

Mr. MATHEWS. I do not understand the gentleman's statements. How does he reconcile them?

Mr. JUDD. If I said the committee went over the individual students on the lists, I misspoke myself. What I meant to say was that we have gone over the list showing the number and kind of students—that is, scientific, agricultural, medical, and so forth—from each of the countries from which they are received; and I said further that most of the students are coming primarily for special graduate training, students who have passed competitive examinations and been selected for their special ability. Most of the foreign students in this country came on their own, have scholarships, or are able to support themselves from their own resources, but some of the ablest are not. This program is designed especially for that class.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Ninety-two Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 88]

Andresen, August H.	Fogarty	Pace
Auchincloss	Fuller	Patman
Bennett, Mich.	Gallagher	Phillips, Calif.
Bland	Gifford	Powell
Boggs, La.	Goff	Rayfiel
Bonner	Gossett	Rich
Brophy	Granger	Robsion
Buckley	Hagen	St. George
Buffett	Hartley	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Bulwinkle	Hébert	Seely-Brown
Burleson	Hedrick	Sheppard
Carroll	Heffernan	Simpson, Ill.
Celler	Hill	Smith, Ohio
Chapman	Hope	Stratton
Clark	Jenkins, Pa.	Thomas, N. J.
Cole, N. Y.	Jones, Wash.	Thomas, Tex.
Combs	Kefauver	Thomason
Coudert	Kelley	Van Zandt
Davis, Tenn.	Keogh	Vinson
Deane	Kerr	Vorys
Delaney	Kirwan	West
Dingell	Klein	Wilson, Tex.
Dolliver	Knutson	Winstead
Domengeaux	Lesinski	Wood
Drewry	Lusk	Worley
Elliott	Lynch	Youngblood
Feighan	McGarvey	Zimmerman
Fellows	McMillan, S. C.	
	Mansfield, Tex.	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JENKINS of Ohio, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having under consideration the bill H. R. 3342, and finding itself without a quorum, he directed the roll to be called, when 343 Members responded to their names, disclosing that a quorum was present; and he handed in the names of the absentees for printing in the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its session.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MATHEWS].

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported.

There being no objection, the Clerk again read the amendment offered by Mr. MATHEWS.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MATHEWS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MATHEWS) there were—ayes 40, noes 89.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, the remarks I am about to make were intended to apply to subparagraph 4, but since that paragraph has been eliminated, I conclude they are quite germane to subparagraph 3.

The real purpose of my comments is to support the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] in setting forth the merits of the State of California, as one of the chief stops in this series of travels which I understand is being contemplated for the various scientists of foreign lands.

I would invite your attention to this full page of beautiful pictures. Just see those magnificent beaches at Long Beach, Calif.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JENNINGS. The Committee, in the shadow of the great trees of California, is out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will be in order.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, these beaches are as broad as the purposes of this bill. As you look along them you can no more see their end than you can see the end of the ramifications of this legislation. And now look at this lower picture. You see a crowded beach. With our usual Californian modesty, we note that we expect only a million people there on the next Fourth of July; but, Mr. Chairman, we can squeeze that million up a little and work in a few thousand of the best of these professors and students, especially so if the Government pays their expenses.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy that on this occasion I have been able to get ahead of Florida, and I hope that the chambers of commerce of the Golden State will take due notice of this most worthy accomplishment.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from the great State of California yield?

Mr. BRADLEY. Gladly to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEARHART. My heart palpitated with happiness and gratitude when I heard the gentleman speak so eloquently of our beaches, the glory of our great State. Tomorrow I shall introduce a resolution to move those beaches up to my trees in Kings Canyon National Park, so that it may become possible for the thousands upon thousands of our visitors to sit in the shade as they gaze out over the mighty Pacific, contemplating its wonders, marveling at its greatness.

Mr. BRADLEY. May I remind the gentleman from California that my beaches are older than his trees. They are larger than his trees. I think if either were to be moved, his trees should be brought to our southern California beaches. There, they would prove to be a great added attraction—not that any such is really needed, but, nevertheless, additional attractions are always welcome.

Mr. GEARHART. The gentleman's comment is well made. I bow my head in recognition of the great age and the incomparable wonders of the great beaches of southern California. On second thought I think I will leave my trees where they are. What do you say, you keep your beaches and I will keep my trees.

Mr. BRADLEY. It is a deal. I thank the gentleman from the Ninth District of California for his valued contribution to this exposition of the merits of our beloved State.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

All time on this section has expired.

The Clerk will read the committee amendment.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MASON moves that the Committee do now rise.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MASON) there were—ayes 44, noes 115.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment on page 16.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: page 16, line 19:

"MAXIMUM USE OF EXISTING GOVERNMENT PROPERTY AND FACILITIES

"SEC. 703. In carrying on activities under this act which requires the utilization of Government property and facilities, maximum use shall be made of existing Government property and facilities."

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as time is being utilized today in the creation of a State admiration society, and having heard the excellent remarks of the gentlemen from California and Pennsylvania, I, coming from the great State of Illinois, might as well join the parade by reminding you that Illinois has in it the city of Chicago, the flower of the universe.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not speaking in order.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the point of order and I want to be heard on it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. Can we not be heard in support of or in opposition to the point of order? The gentleman wants to talk about Chicago?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, my statement is in order, because I am rising in defense of Illinois. When this matter first came to the floor 2 weeks ago I was not on the floor. I came on the floor the following Tuesday afternoon. I had in the meantime read the report, the bill and the hearings, and after listening to the debate I made a statement with reference to this bill. The following Sunday there appeared certain statements in the newspaper directly charging me and other Members from Illinois with being isolationists. That same afternoon I heard my name again mentioned. It was stated that I and the other isolationist Members of Illinois were holding up consideration of the bill. The following morning I saw an article in the paper, the Washington Post, again stating that the Members from Illinois were holding up this bill, engaged in a concerted plot to resist it, at least, that that was the theory of the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. That was stated right in the article. I want the members of that committee to answer what I have asked them many times before: Is the word "isolationist" the antonym of the word interventionist? They would have to answer that it is. That being so, if I am going to be charged with either being an interventionist or isolationist, I shall choose the latter every day of the week. They can intervene all they want in the affairs of other nations. That is what is being done by this bill. But they should not attempt to cast odium upon those who honestly oppose it.

Mr. Chairman, as I have said before, if we are going to spend the money of America in other places, let us watch carefully as to what we are doing with it in this Nation. We have bills pending providing aid to education and for other needed support in our own country and the very people who are asking for that aid are those who would be willing to send our money over to other nations, money that should stay here. The portion of the bill just read says: "In carrying on activities under this act which require the utilization of Government property and facilities, maximum use shall be made of existing Government property and facilities."

I say to the committee that it had better check into what is being done with the property and facilities of this Nation in foreign countries right now. There are certain men who are assistants to the assistant to the assistant of the Secretary of State who by one stroke of the pen are depriving people of the things that they should have over there and by the same stroke of the pen they are spending hundreds of millions of dollars of our money without our having one thing to say about it. I can give you absolute proof of that fact. Instead of charging the Members from Illinois, who are trying to do their best here, with isolationism, they ought to look into these other things. When I first came here in the consideration of this bill I had not spoken with one Member of the Illinois delegation nor any other Member concerning this matter. I addressed the committee from my own knowledge of the bill and what is contained in it and what I heard in the debate. When the committee charges us with being isolationists, and charge us with being opposed to this, and in view of the fact that the newspapers state that the basis for the remarks came from the committee, I think the members of that committee should respond.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OWENS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I know the gentleman comes from Chicago, one of the great metropolises of all the world, one of the leading cities of the world. I know that if the people of Chicago heard him today they would be proud of the stand he is taking.

Mr. OWENS. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWINN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I voted to strike out the enacting clause. I voted for all the amendments on this bill with some realization that if we take seriously that we are in an atomic age, and that the next war will be fought with atomic power, most of what we have been doing to prepare ourselves for defense is probably wasted. Most of the ten to eleven billion dollars that we have appropriated for the usual armaments along traditional lines we feel in our hearts even now probably to be useless.

It is likely that we have not accepted seriously the atomic age and the atomic power. If we do accept it, then our only defense is the defense of ideas, and that is all. We have got to send, somehow or other, ideas to the people who may attack us; ideas that are better than warfare. Those ideas have to do with how to raise food in the countries where the people are striving. We cannot go on appropriating funds to feed them only to find that when we stop feeding them, their anger rises against us. They must take care of themselves.

We have, therefore, it seems to me, come to the place where the dissemination of ideas is about our only resort. If that is true, then the spending of $10,000,000 or $20,000,000 or $35,000,000 is not a crippling undertaking compared to the reliance that we have on billions of dollars, probably, for useless defense. I made up my mind as a result of this debate that we must face it. We have a board now of our own citizens, a bipartisan board, to set forth the ideas that freedom does work at home; that it is the source of food, of houses, and of health, and also must be the source abroad, if they will only take it. If they do accept they will be content at home; they will not drop bombs on us for our food and houses. They will destroy their own dictators and be at peace. If they keep the ideas they now have and the dictators they have, they will ride the bombs that we discovered and drop them upon us. That is the issue.

We had better go to work on ideas of freedom to show that the freedom that works here will work abroad.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to participate in the debate on this bill. I sat through the four sessions during which we considered the bill and its various amendments, but in view of the turn that the debate has taken I do want to take these few minutes to place in the RECORD my conclusions as to this bill. I am going to vote for the bill when it comes to final passage.

Whenever a responsible Member of this House states that every official charged with our national defense and our national security and the future peace of this Nation tells us that they want certain legislation passed, I will waive any doubt I might have in my mind as to certain provisions of the bill and vote for the bill.

This I do know, that the more the people of the world understand our Government and our people, and the more we understand the other peoples of the world, the better are the chances for peace. As I understand it, that is the purpose of this bill. I have confidence enough in Secretary Marshall to believe that the bill will be administered in such a way that that program will be carried out. Many Members of the House are not pleased with the way the program has been carried out in the past and neither am I, but I believe that, as the majority leader said at the time we considered the labor bill, this is but the first step in the legislative process. By the time the bill is ready to go to the President for his signature, it will be an improved bill. If it contributes one iota to increasing our chance for world peace, then I want to be recorded as favoring the legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE VIII—FUNDS PROVIDED BY OTHER SOURCES

REIMBURSEMENT

SEC. 801. The Secretary is authorized, when he finds it in the public interest, to request and accept reimbursement from any cooperating governmental or private source in a foreign country, or from State or local governmental institutions or private sources in the United States, for all or part of the expenses of any portion of the program undertaken hereunder. The amounts so received shall be credited to the then current and applicable appropriation available to the Secretary for carrying out the purposes of this act and shall be available for the purposes of such appropriation.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 17, line 4, strike out "is authorized" and insert "shall."

Line 5, strike out "to."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEEFE: On page 17, in line 10, after "be", strike out the balance of the line and all of lines 11, 12, and 13, and insert the following: "covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts."

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, the only purpose of this amendment is to prevent the possibility of another revolving fund. The amendment would simply require that any reimbursements received as a result of this program shall be covered as miscellaneous receipts into the Treasury of the United States, thus preventing the re-use of these funds out of a revolving fund, and will require appropriations to be made by the Congress before such funds can be re-used.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's point fully. It was brought up during the hearings. When we raised the question, we were assured that this language would take care of it. I respect the gentleman's judgment, however. He is rapidly developing a merited reputation as one of the most effective watchdogs of the Treasury. We want this legislation to do what he says his amendment provides and we are happy to accept his amendment in this connection. It is an additional safeguard which is meritorious and it makes doubly certain that the intent of the committee and of Congress will be completely and carefully carried out. I ask that the amendment be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I fear that we learn very little from the lessons of history. We seem to have lost sight of that great lesson following the First World War when we, having successfully completed our military mission, merely sat down and let the cumulative forces that lead to war pile up until we finally were thrust into another conflict of armed might—the greatest war of history. That, it seems to me, should have taught us that we must work constructively toward peace, just as in time of war we must exert our every fiber to the task of attaining ultimate victory.

Peace in this world cannot come to us by chance. As we look about us we can readily see that the earth is encompassed by clouds of fear and doubt, of uncertainty, of misunderstandings between nations. These unsavory conditions are seeds of war and must eventually lead to armed conflict unless something is done to destroy them. These fears, doubts, and misunderstandings do not automatically dissolve themselves, but must of necessity be obliterated by a definite and deliberate action. No one of us can possibly know just what road will lead to universal and permanent peace, for that road has never been traveled, but I am willing and anxious to travel the road which I believe will offer the greatest possibilities in that direction.

The program outlined in this bill offers tremendous possibilities for the dispelling of doubts and misunderstandings in foreign countries about the United States and vice versa. An iron curtain about the United States would be far more disastrous than such a curtain about the Soviet Union, for I am convinced that we have in our democratic system the ultimate hope for the world. We must sell it to the world, by letting the world know how it operates.

I received a letter from the superintendent of the Greenville, S. C., city schools. This letter is a glowing tribute to the international teacher exchange

plan in practical operation. The letter follows:

GREENVILLE CITY SCHOOLS,
OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT,
Greenville, S. C., June 11, 1947.

Hon. JOSEPH R. BRYSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BRYSON: The purpose of this letter is to give you a little more information concerning the international teacher exchange plan in which the Greenville city schools have participated during the past year.

As I told you in the day letter forwarded yesterday, the British exchange teacher we have had this year was highly satisfactory. Because I am eager for you to know just how fortunate we considered ourselves in having her here, I am sending you a copy of a letter of recommendation prepared for her on May 29, a duplicate of which was sent to the director of the exchange.

The detailed information which I have received from the exchange committee leads me to believe that the teacher we are expecting during the coming year will be equally satisfactory. You perhaps know that teachers who are accepted for the exchange must be outstanding instructors with good recommendations. A great deal of information comes to the school systems involved before the teacher ever arrives. I am sure that no school system would be required to accept any person who appeared undesirable.

There seems to be some fear on the part of a few Congressmen that some of the teachers who come to the United States may act as foreign agitators. This is, of course, a possibility. There also is the possibility that some of our teachers may do a little agitating for some of our institutions and our way of life which, in the opinion of some people, would be a good thing. I hope any teachers we send believe in this country enough to speak well of it. Since we always send as many teachers abroad as we accept, I have an idea that the influence of the foreigners here will be pretty well counteracted by our teachers abroad.

Frankly, I have very little patience with Congressmen who oppose the plan. In a world such as ours is today, we need to do everything we can to see that there is more association with the peoples of other countries, not less. If the teachers who come into our schools attempt to spread undesirable propaganda or to behave in any improper manner, I am sure that we could appeal to exchange officials and secure their removal. There certainly is no point in sabotaging a splendid plan because we may get or send abroad one or two undesirable teachers.

Thank you for all your services in the past.

Yours respectfully,
W. F. LOGGINS,
Superintendent.

JUNE 11, 1947.

To Whom It May Concern:

It affords me real pleasure to have the opportunity to write a letter of recommendation for Miss Ethel Davis, British exchange teacher who has been in the Greenville city schools this year.

Miss Davis has been highly praised by her principal and fellow teachers for her ability as a teacher, for the fine relationship she has had with her pupils and coworkers, and for the ease with which she apparently has adjusted to all the differences which exist between the schools of Great Britain and the United States. Her principal naturally followed her work closely because he wanted to be helpful in every possible way, but he found that she required very little assistance. She is able, self-reliant, and has a good sense of humor.

Not only is Miss Davis an excellent teacher of elementary school children; her general information is outstanding. She is highly intelligent and well-informed. During the year I have found myself constantly amazed at the amount of information she has concerning many matters and have sometimes wondered if our American teachers know as much as she does about our Nation and world affairs.

No letter would be complete without some mention of the contribution Miss Davis has made to Greenville and surrounding communities. She is a charming public speaker and has given generously of her time to speak before professional, cultural, civic, and church groups. All who have heard her are delighted with her personally and are impressed with the things she has to say.

A Greenville newspaper columnist devoted part of a recent day's writing to her, stating, in part:

"If a survey were made, it probably would show that Miss Davis has made more speeches during the last 9 months than any other person in Greenville. He fine sense of taste, her frankness and tolerance have made her a favorite in our city and young and old alike regret to see her return to her native England in the early future. Whatever person in England made such a wise choice as the selection of Miss Davis as an exchange teacher is due a vote of thanks from every one of the 107,000 persons of greater Greenville."

I think he has voiced the sentiments of all of us. Miss Davis has sold the teacher exchange plan to the people here.

I am delighted to recommend her unreservedly for any position she feels she is equipped to fill.

Yours truly,
W. F. LOGGINS,
Superintendent.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, during all the years of my service in Congress I have consistently refrained from indulging in the slightest criticism of my associates. It is not my intention to be critical now. Far be it from me to question the motives of any Member of this body or to voice objection to his free expression of his informed views on any subject. I do, however, question such views when and if they are apparently based upon misinformation or inspired by prejudice.

Until now I have listened in silence to the long and frequently bitter debate upon the pending measure. In many respects it has been a remarkable and disappointing exhibition. As an informative discussion it has had but little appeal. On the other hand it has forced upon me the conclusion that much of the opposition to the bill under consideration stems from a lack of understanding of the intent and purpose of the measure and lack of appreciation of the vital necessity of the action it authorizes.

In addition to this, throughout the debate there has frequently been evidenced a partisan political predjudice against our State Department and all its works. Day after day we have heard what might well be termed unreasoning criticism directed at the Department—criticism so undeserved as to indicate that, to the minds of the critics, anything commended by our State Department should at once be subject to condemnation.

I hold no brief for any department of our Government. In my opinion the men who head our departments are amply able to take care of themselves, and there is not one of them who, if given the privilege of the floor of this House, could not come here and answer his critics face to face with credit and honor to himself. Unfortunately he has not this privilege. An attack made upon him here can be answered only by silence, while his critic preens himself upon the courage of his performance.

Our Secretary of State and his assistants are today engaged in the performance of a task of unprecedented difficulty and importance. The difficulty of this task cannot be magnified—the results of a failure in performance cannot be measured. All of us know or should know that upon the success of these efforts depend the security of a distressed world. That success or failure may spell the difference between a continuation of democratic processes in government and the end, throughout the world, of all liberty and freedom. Success may mean peace—failure may mean war. Faced with this critical situation, who will say that the men of our Department of State should not be given the confidence and trust of the Nation they serve? Who will say that they should not be supplied with every instrumentality necessary to the success of their undertaking.

One of the questions raised by the bill now under consideration is whether or not there is need for continuation of the broadcasting program provided for in the measure. During the debate we have been told over and over again, and truthfully, that the Soviet Union has for many months been broadcasting a program designed to injure the United States of America and bring upon our country the hatred and contempt of the peoples of other nations. We are told that day after day and month after month the official broadcasting stations of the Russian Government have been, and are now, beaming to all countries in Europe and to other nations of the world, in the language of the peoples sought to be influenced, a mass of untruths, distorted information, garbled news, and false propaganda against our people and our Government. Day after day and night after night this insidious propaganda is being hammered into listeners in scores of countries over the globe.

Until the Voice of America came on the air not a word of denial or correction of the Russians' statements was heard. Not a single truth about America was uttered. Not a single voice was raised in our defense. Who is it who cannot foresee the results if we now become and remain silent? Our need for the Voice of America is great. It must not be silenced.

Now is the time when our great democratic Nation must be presented to the world in its true light, and not in the distorted image created by the Russian Communists. We know that the Russian objective is to undermine the Government of the United States and destroy all confidence of the world in our democratic form of government. They know that a lie, however incredible, if constantly repeated and unchallenged, will ultimately be accepted as the truth. This was the Hitler philosophy once; it

is the Russian policy now, and to carry it on the Soviet Government is spending on its broadcasting program more money than all other governments combined are spending for the same purpose. If the opponents of the pending bill have their way and defeat this measure, the field will be open for Russia to work her will with the peoples of the world.

The United States of America saved Russia from destruction. During World War II our ships, loaded with desperately needed materials of war, crowded the sea lanes leading to her shores. We drew upon our resources to arm, clothe, shelter, and feed her armies. We fed and clothed her noncombatant population. We gave without stint in order that she might have the strength to drive from her soil the invading armies of Hitler. Russia was made strong through the will and generosity of a free and democratic nation. Today, awakened to her power and strength, her Government is spending something like $100,000,000 a year to tell the world that the United States of America is imperialistic, grasping, and domineering; that it threatens the security and freedom of all peoples and is endangering the peace of the world.

We cannot afford to let a campaign like that go on unrebuked and unchallenged. We cannot afford to keep silent. Our voices must be heard. The people of all countries must be told the truth. The prestige of our Nation is at stake and the interests of the American people demand the passage of the pending measure.

The bill under consideration provides a further answer to the problem we are facing. This is found in its provision for the exchange of students, skills, and information. It calls on the nations of the world for open doors, for a friendly exchange of the knowledge necessary to human progress. It will permit the youth of our country to visit other lands, to see their cities and towns, to enter their schools, to visit their homes, to mingle with their people, to learn to understand and to speak their language, to observe their habits and customs, to meet them face to face and to know them for what they are.

This bill, if passed, will bring the youth of other nations to America for the same purpose and grant to them the same privileges. Those who come here will visit our educational institutions, our museums, our libraries, our galleries of art. They will study in our colleges and universities. They will, as do those we send abroad, visit with us in our American homes and note our way of life. They will see democracy in action and learn at first hand the true meaning of freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom from want, and freedom from fear.

And, then, those who come here and those we send there will return to their respective homes carrying with them a new concept and understanding of each country and people they have visited. This new concept will be put into words—into friendly words—to enlighten those at home; and in every community from which a visitor was sent, there will grow and flourish a new respect of one people for another—a friendly respect born of knowledge and understanding.

Now, more than at any time in its history, is it necessary for the United States to cultivate and win the friendship and cooperation of other nations. Russia's propaganda campaign against us has already been effective in many countries. If her broadcasted untruths became fixed in the minds for which they are intended, they will never be uprooted. They will grow, flourish, and expand into a deep distrust and hatred. Our world leadership will pass to another nation headed by an individual whose will is law and whose power is fear. If that time should come, we will again face the alternative of a loss of liberty and freedom or a war to preserve our most precious heritage—and this time we will face that crisis alone.

It is my earnest hope that this House will pass the measure now under consideration. Its passage will mean that the Voice of America will not be silenced and that a student-exchange program will be established. Both programs are needed instrumentalities for world-wide and a lasting peace.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, much has been said during the last hour or two about our veterans. Certainly, I yield to no man in this Chamber or in the country in my appreciation of the conduct of the veterans during the last war as well as during World War I. That being the case, and since that appreciation is unanimous on our part, it occurs to me that now is probably an appropriate time to ascertain who is for and who is against this bill.

First, the subcommittee which is in charge of it here held very extensive hearings and indulged in a unanimously favorable report to the full committee. Then, the full committee after mature consideration after the subcommittee had amended the bill very generously, and after a number of other amendments were made, unanimously reported the bill to the House.

On what did the members of the committee base their unanimous report? Who appeared for the bill? Among others, Secretary of State Marshall, Chief of Staff during the war; General Eisenhower, commander of the Allied Armies during the war, and present Chief of Staff; General Walter Bedell Smith, General Eisenhower's chief of staff during the war, and presently Ambassador to Russia who spoke not only with his war experience as a background but as an American diplomat now in one of the large foreign countries and who has heard this program, seen its activity, and observed the reaction.

Who else? The leadership of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the American Veterans of World War II.

That, my colleagues, I submit, includes practically all the veterans of the last war as well as of World War I. They unanimously, through their leaders, came to our committee and many of them spoke with experience, such as Marshall and Eisenhower. They not only unanimously approved this legislation but urged its enactment.

Who appeared against the bill? Despite the invitation which I personally heard extended by the chairman of the subcommittee, which was a very cordial invitation through the press, which was well represented, for anybody to appear in opposition, not one single person, my colleagues, appeared in opposition to the bill.

Now, who are you going to follow in casting your vote when the roll is called?

Are you going to follow the leadership of our veterans, General Marshall, General Eisenhower, and General Smith, and the leaders of all veterans' organizations, or are you going to cast your vote against what these illustrious patriots are all very positively convinced is for the best interests of the country we love because of the fact that you heard some rumor that your uncle's grandpa's niece's cousin's stepdaughter said that this bill was not good? On what are you going to base your vote? In reaching your conclusion, remember that while these soldiers brought this war to a glorious and successful conclusion, remember that the psychological warfare is still on, and remember, too, that the money proposed to be contributed toward the success of this warfare is some $30,000,000, as against some $300,000,000,000 spent during the war and many more billions that would be necessary to win another war, to say nothing of the hundreds of thousands of precious lives. Certainly, my colleagues, does not statesmanship, does not love of country, does not respect for these gentlemen who know whereof they speak demand that you stop, look, and listen?

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. The gentleman stated that the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars were sponsoring this bill. At what national convention did they state by any resolution that they were sponsoring it?

Mr. JARMAN. The gentleman belongs to both organizations and he knows that between conventions their respective committees act for these bodies, and it was the executive committees which approved the resolution approving this bill, both the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I just wanted to say that as far as I am personally concerned, I am going to vote on this legislation as a result of my own study of it and I think every other Member has intelligence enough to study this bill and to come to a conclusion upon the bill, regardless of what anybody else may have told him.

Mr. JARMAN. I certainly commend the gentleman for voting on that basis and I hope that all others will do the same. If so, if they will really thoroughly familiarize themselves with the real bill, its purposes and its possibilities for accomplishment for our country, there will be no doubt whatever of its overwhelming passage.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my request for time at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. All pro forma amendments are withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ADVANCES OF FUNDS AND PROPERTY

SEC. 802. If any governmental, intergovernmental, or private source shall express the desire to provide funds, property, or services to be used by this Government, in whole or in part, for the expenses of any part of the program undertaken pursuant to this act, the Secretary is authorized, when he finds it in the public interest, to accept such funds, property, or services. Funds so received may be established as a trust fund or special deposit account in the Treasury of the United States, to be available for reimbursement of appropriations or direct expenditure for the purposes and under the provisions of this Act. Any unexpended balance of the trust fund or special deposit account and other property received under this section and no longer required for the purposes for which provided shall be returned to the source providing the funds or property.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEEFE: On page 17, line 14, strike out all of line 14 and all of section 802.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I may say that this amendment is prompted by some research into the problems that are presented in this bill in section 802. When I read the bill and studied it, I came to the conclusion that if this grant of authority were permitted to remain in this bill, it would be possible for a State Department, so inclined, to completely circumvent the will of the Congress of the United States, and to bypass the Appropriations Committee entirely and to accept voluntary grants and contributions from private agencies of one kind or another, to pay the expenses of carrying out a purely governmental function. That has been contrary to public policy ever since this Nation was established as a nation.

There has never been a time when an expenditure of money for such a purpose could be properly justified, or the acceptance of money for expenditure by the Government for a purely governmental purpose could be justified unless and until the Congress of the United States expressly gave its approval.

I have here as a result of research a great long list of acts passed by the Congress of the United States dealing with the acceptance of donations, and I do not find a single one that related to a situation such as is envisioned in this section 802.

I think it would be a dangerous thing to allow any private organization to go to the State Department and say: "Mr. Secretary, the Congress of the United States has refused to give you the amount of money that you want to carry on this program. We will give it to you and provide the money"; and he would have the right to accept it and to thumb his nose at the Congress and its control over appropriations.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the Members of the House that the gentleman from Wisconsin was thoughtful enough to come before our subcommittee to discuss this problem to which he has devoted a great amount of research in tracing down the genesis of these provisions to which he has referred.

This section is not basic to the legislation at all, and rather than take an unnecessary chance we have told him we will be happy to accept the amendment.

I wanted him, however, to give the explanation to the House. I thank him for it. It is a constructive amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto do now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE IX—MISCELLANEOUS

LOYALTY CHECK ON PERSONNEL

SEC. 901. No individual may be employed or assigned to duties under this act unless the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, after such investigation as he deems necessary, certifies that, in his opinion, such individual is loyal to the United States and such employment or assignment is consistent with the security of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 18, line 8, after the figure "901", strike out the balance of the section and insert in lieu thereof the following: "No citizen or resident of the United States, whether or not now in the employ of the Government, may be employed or assigned to duties under this act unless the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, after such investigation as he deems necessary, certifies that in his opinion such individual is loyal to the United States and that such employment or assignment to duties is consistent with the security of the United States: *Provided, however*, That any present employee of the Government, unless an unfavorable report as to such employee is rendered sooner by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, may, without such certification, be employed or assigned to duties under this act for the period of 6 months from the date of its enactment. This section shall not apply in the case of any officer appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment for the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. RICHARDS to the committee amendment: "No citizen or resident of the United States, whether or not now in the employ of the Government, may be employed or assigned to duties under this act until such individual has been investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and a report thereon has been made to the Secretary of State: *Provided, however*, That any present employee of the Government, pending the report as to such employee by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, may be employed or assigned to duties under this act for the period of 6 months from the date of its enactment. This section shall not apply in the case of any officer appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I am offering this substitute amendment for the consideration of the House because I think it my duty to do so.

Both section 901 and the committee amendment provide that no one may be employed under this act until he has been investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation from a loyalty and security standpoint.

In my humble opinion, so far, so good. I believe these people should be investigated, those coming in and those already there. If there are Communists or Communist sympathizers in this outfit, or in any other department of the Government, they should be and must be ruthlessly weeded out. There is no room in any department or agency of our Government for those who do not owe their allegiance solely and wholeheartedly to the United States.

As a matter of fact, there have been so many wild rumors about Communists boring into the State Department that I believe such an investigation would be welcomed by 99 percent of the employees there.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation has the machinery, the experience, and the know-how to do this job. You already know that the President has requested scrutiny and screening of all Federal employees from the loyalty standpoint. Secretary of State Marshall, shortly after his return from Moscow, filed a specific request with the FBI that top priority be given investigation of employees in the State Department. Assistant Secretary of State in Charge of Administration John E. Peurifoy realizing that a man in his position must be, like Caesar's wife, above suspicion, immediately upon his appointment some weeks ago requested that he himself be investigated by the FBI. There is no doubt what this investigation will reveal as to Mr. Peurifoy. I have known him for many years and his family all my life, and I can testify that he is able, trustworthy, and efficient, and that there is no man in Government service today more loyal to the United States Government and our way of life.

But the committee amendment goes too far. In addition to requiring an investigation by the FBI, it further provides that, before the Secretary of State can employ anyone, the Director of the FBI must certify "that, in his opinion, such individual is loyal to the United States and that such employment or assignment is consistent with the security of the United States."

So far as I know, no such requirement as to the employees of this or any other department of the Government has ever before been enacted into law.

My substitute amendment provides that the FBI is to investigate and report its findings to the Secretary of State, but strikes out the requirement as to certification.

I have not communicated with either Secretary Marshall or Mr. Hoover about this certification requirement. I am not authorized to speak for either of them. But I am certain that Mr. Hoover does not approve this requirement because it was never intended that the FBI have this super-power over the Secretary of State himself. The FBI is an investiga-

tive agency; it is a fact-finding body; it has peculiar facilities for making investigations. Its services are needed here. Its proper function is to investigate and present the facts to our courts and the departments of the Government. It may be assumed that the Secretary of State, to whom the results of FBI investigations are made known, will act for the best interest of this country. To assume otherwise would be to impugn the loyalty of the Secretary of State and his Assistant in Charge of Administration. To assume otherwise would be to admit a fatal weakness in our system of government.

I am strong for this bill. The true story of the United States must be carried to the world, if we are to be understood. Our democratic way of life must be championed in the forum of the world. Right now Russia is spending millions propagandizing the world on the virtues of the communistic state. We must combat this stuff or reap the whirlwind later on. We must combat it by doing everything possible to see that foreigners are told the truth. But we should do it through democratic processes.

This bill sets up the machinery for getting our story told. We want the world to know that this is a Government of free men; that the United States is not a police state and, with the help of God, will never be.

That being true, it is inconsistent and destructive of our purposes to allow to remain in this bill a provision which makes the Federal Bureau of Investigation a superpolice body with final say-so over the personnel and activities of the State Department. The provision of the committee amendment, if enacted into law, would in itself create in this country the germ of the police state, the very thing that this bill proposes to combat abroad. We would thereby help to create a Frankenstein which could finally destroy our democratic system and our way of life.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS to the substitute: In the substitute offered by Mr. RICHARDS, after the word "safe", line 5, insert "who shall certify that in his opinion such individual is loyal to the United States and that such employment or assignment to duty is consistent with the security of the United States."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee, because I would like to explain what is wrong with the approach that these two gentlemen are making to this proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, is the gentleman choking off debate on this important bill when many Members have not had a chance to speak on the bill at all?

Mr. MUNDT. I scarcely think it has been choked off, but I will modify my request and make it 15 minutes if the gentleman cares to have some time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. My amendment to the substitute is designed to strengthen it and to meet some objections which I think might occur on the Republican side of the aisle. My amendment vests the obligation to certify in the Secretary of State, because I believe that the Members on the Republican side of the aisle want to be sure that in this particular program it should be somebody whom they have confidence in who will vouch for the loyalty and the security of the personnel involved. Under my amendment the Secretary of State is required to certify to the loyalty and security of each individual employee in the program.

I beg leave to inform the Committee why this entire proposal is important, although it is not in the main stream of the bill. The head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation is not a Cabinet officer. He is an officer appointed by the Attorney General. The Secretary of State is a Cabinet officer, and of high rank. Yet, by what we are doing in the bill, we are saying that an officer of lower rank, in a bureau which is charged essentially with criminal investigation, has the power to bind the Secretary of State on a certification of the loyalty of important personnel in the Department of State; hardly an expression of confidence in the Secretary of State of the United States. Also as my colleague on the Foreign Affairs Committee from South Carolina so eloquently said, it opens the possibility of a political police bureau of our own. In the bill for relief assistance to Greece and Turkey we included a similar provision, but that provision called for no such certification by the FBI. It said only that a person "shall have been investigated as to loyalty and security by the Federal Bureau of Investigation."

Now, I yield to no one in my solicitude for the passage of this bill, and I would like to say a word while I am on my feet on two of the arguments that have been made here today about the bill.

We have been asked what is an antonym for isolationism. An antonym for isolationism is security, and I would like to give the gentleman three synonyms for isolationism—one is insecurity, the other is impracticability, and the third is unrealism. I cannot believe that anybody who went through the last war could still stand up here and claim to be an isolationist and find any virtue in that position.

One other point—a good deal has been made about the fact that a majority of the Republicans went through the middle aisle on a teller vote to shelve this bill, and that a minority of the Republicans supported the move to continue on with this bill, argue it out and come to a vote. But, I would like to point out that when the Greek-Turkish assistance bill was before this Committee, on the question of whether we were going to be isolationists or whether we were going to be realists, a majority of the Republicans who voted, 58 percent, voted to be realistic, voted aye, in recognition of the fact that national security was a part of world security and that the preservation of freedom here required it to be fought for in places far removed from here.

I prefer to believe that what Republican Members want is a clarification of this bill; they want some amendments; they want a complete discussion. I refuse to believe that a majority will be so unrealistic as to want to kill this bill, finally. The Republicans were in the minority in the Congress for a long time, and it is because new men have come in that the Republicans are in the majority. Mr. Chairman, I am of the opinion that the great majority of the new men who received the mandate of the people in November 1946, realize the inseparability of foreign policy and the means for explaining it to the people of the world, and will vote "aye" when the roll is called on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE].

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that there is anything that I can add to the discussion of this bill. It occurs to me that at this time everyone should be given an opportunity to express himself. This is very important legislation. This is legislation dealing with the future of this country and the world. If I understand the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina, although I have not had a chance to study it—I just heard it read—it seems to me that the amendment ought to be adopted. I have no understanding of the amendment that was just offered by the gentleman from New York. It may be a good suggestion.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. All that it does is that it takes exactly the thought of the gentleman from South Carolina and gives the power of certification to the Secretary of State. The amendment as presented by the gentleman from South Carolina just states that the Secretary of State shall have a report of the investigation. My amendment requires in addition that the Secretary of State, after having that report from the FBI, shall certify.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICHARDS. I very much appreciate the gentleman's remarks about this amendment. If I understood correctly what he said, he has a clear conception of what my amendment does.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I confess that I have not had any chance to study it, but it seems to me that it is a good amendment.

Mr. RICHARDS. My substitute provides for an investigation by the FBI. It provides for a report from the FBI to the Secretary of State, but it cuts out the requirement for certification by the FBI to the Secretary of State before an employee can be added to the rolls of the State Department.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I see nothing wrong with that.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. The thing that strikes me with peculiar force is, Who is going to tell the Secretary of State or give him the facts with reference to these people that he may select? He has no personal knowledge of them. Will he get his information and his certification from some of those who are in that agency, that the President recently said he wanted $50,000,000 to investigate and get rid of?

Mr. LECOMPTE. He will get his information from the FBI. That is one of the big departments in this Government and is one of the departments that stands high in the estimation of the American people.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I agree with the gentleman who now has the floor and also the gentleman from New York that the State Department is an important branch of the Government, tied into the Cabinet, and that the FBI is not, but I am not unmindful of the fact that the FBI is the investigating arm of the United States Government.

Mr. LECOMPTE. If we cannot depend on the FBI, on whom can we depend?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not propose to turn that arm of the Government over to the State Department. Further, the State Department is entrusted more than any other department of the Government with the welfare of the country. The employees of that Department should be investigated by the FBI before they are permitted to deal with the destinies of the United States.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I am confident that General Marshall does not want anybody in whom he does not have complete confidence.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. This is the way this situation appears to me. Nobody may be employed until after he has been investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Without the certification, Secretary Marshall then would take that report, and I cannot think that anyone in this House, having the faith and confidence in him that we do, would believe that Secretary Marshall would appoint to any position anybody upon whom the FBI had made an unfavorable report.

Mr. LECOMPTE. That is the position I am trying to take, but I thought that was the purpose and the object of the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICHARDS. That is exactly it.

Mr. LECOMPTE. As near as I could understand it, that is what I thought should be written into the bill.

Mr. RICHARDS. That is correct.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. The committee is up against this hard situation, however. We know of instances where a Secretary of State has employed or continued in employment individuals on whom the FBI made distinctly unfavorable reports. Still they were retained in the State Department.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Was the Secretary of State conscious of that fact?

Mr. JUDD. Well, the FBI turned in an unfavorable report in one case and, I understand, the Secretary did not look at the report. If he had looked at the report of course he could not have employed the man; but for various reasons it apparently was thought that to discharge the man for his pro-Communist activities might get us into trouble with Russia so the man was continued in employment although there was reason to believe he was not working primarily in the interest of the United States.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. I have plenty of faith in Edgar Hoover, but I certainly do not have any more faith in Edgar Hoover than I have in George Marshall.

Mr. JUDD. Neither do I; but George Marshall is not in charge of investigating the activities of a given person, and Edgar Hoover is.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JARMAN].

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to emphasize what the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from South Carolina have said. Really, when you require the FBI to report to the Secretary of State on an investigation of a proposed employee, as the amendment of the gentleman from South Carolina would require, it is the same thing as requiring the FBI to report on his loyalty, because I, too, cannot conceive of Secretary of State Marshall employing anyone about whom he has received a report from the FBI that he is disloyal to this country.

Mr. Hoover does not want this. Just as in the case of the United Nations, if we continue, as has been attempted in the House, to load the United Nations with many things which it is not equipped to do, that is the easiest way to kill it. Similarly, if we continue to load duties on our FBI, it cannot continue to function on the high plane and with the efficiency that it has always operated heretofore. I repeat, Mr. Hoover does not wish to have this duty. No other law has ever been passed by Congress in which such a provision has been placed.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I, too, have every respect for Edgar Hoover, but I, too, do not wish to run any risk whatever, just as the gentleman from South Carolina does not wish to run the risk, of the possibility of an accusation from any foreign country or from any "pinkos" in our own country that we are tending toward an NKVD in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, we are carrying forward in this proposed amendment a program on which we are now embarked. We wrote it into the relief legislation and we wrote it into the Turkish-Greek Loan Act. In fact I was the author of the FBI protective amendments in both of those bills. We provided that employees dealing with certain aspects of our international affairs should be screened by the FBI. I think that is a sound and prudent policy.

We have put it in this bill in this fashion deliberately because we feel this is one of the great struggles in which our country is engaged in order to defeat the activities and efforts of Communists abroad. We want the people carrying out this new program to be free from suspicion. We want to put an end to the suspicions and rumors of which we have heard so much during this debate. We want these new employees to be audited and to be screened and to be examined and to be checked by the FBI and we want them affirmatively certified. We believe that Secretary of State Marshall will be happy to have that responsibility taken off his shoulders.

I have never had too much confidence, Mr. Chairman, in an audit of a bank which is made by the wife of a cashier in the bank. I think the FBI, being outside of the State Department, should have the responsibility of investigating. The State Department is not set up as an investigating agency. This is in line with legislation which I hope the House and Senate will enact before we adjourn which will establish throughout all Federal agencies that the FBI shall clear all Federal employees as to loyalty and also clear them in the matter of security for this country.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a negative vote on the proposals of both the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS] for the committee amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JARMAN) there were—ayes 65, noes 87.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

SEC. 902. If any provision of this act or the application of any such provision to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and the applicability of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago the question was raised as to the endorsement of this legislation by the American

Legion. I have in my hand a letter from John Thomas Taylor, director of the national legislative committee, in which he says:

The American Legion, at the meeting of the national executive committee held May 5–7, 1947, at Indianapolis, Ind., considered the situation relative to the dissemination of American information to countries overseas. Appreciating the seriousness of the situation and efforts of the State Department to remedy this, they adopted the attached resolution which I am enclosing for your information, with the request that it be included in your record of the hearings as the established position of the American Legion on this vital subject.

The hearings referred to in the letter relate to the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, which was considering this subject.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. JARMAN. In other words, the national executive committee of the American Legion acted on this matter after the issue came before the Congress?

Mr. GARY. And adopted this resolution. Yes.

RESOLUTION 97, NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, INDIANAPOLIS, IND., MAY 5–7, 1947

CONTINUED WORLD-WIDE DISSEMINATION OF THE OPERATION AND PROGRESS OF AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

Whereas it is vitally necessary that the peoples of the world be fully and constantly informed of the operation and progress of American democracy and of the unselfish aims and purposes of the United States of America in opposing the encroachment of tyrannical and totalitarian ideologies by some nations beyond their own boundaries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge the continuation of world-wide dissemination by our Government, through international radio, motion pictures, and otherwise, of the fundamental facts of the American form of government and way of life and of the basic character and objectives of our foreign policy.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. ELLIS. The resolution did not endorse this bill.

Mr. GARY. It endorsed the program which this bill provides for.

Mr. ELLIS. But it did not endorse H. R. 3342.

Mr. GARY. It endorsed the program which this bill provides for.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. MASON. And no one could endorse this bill now because no one knows what is in it.

Mr. GARY. I have read the resolution and the resolution speaks for itself.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. This committee, through its chairman, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], did receive a letter from the Veterans of Foreign Wars specifically approving this particular measure.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY] has expired.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 7 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, for many days the opposition to H. R. 3342 has succeeded in successfully bottling up a final vote on what is to some of us a most important measure if the United States is to combat successfully the advance of other ideologies considered by us to be inimical to the self-interest and the safety of the United States.

H. R. 3342, regardless of what its critics may say, was drawn up in honesty and sincerity. After several days of the bitterest debate, the members of the committee, who reported the bill with a surprising degree of unanimity of thought, are in no manner dismayed by the attack and are determined to bring the matter to a vote. As Henley said in his immortal Invictus:

> In the fell clutch of circumstance,
> I have not winced nor cried aloud;
> Under the bludgeonings of chance,
> My head is bloody but unbowed.

So it is with the collective head of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. We offer no apologies for our convictions, nor are we prepared to sacrifice this bill to the demands of those who would use their prejudice against certain portions of it as a lever to collective bargaining. The committee, in the interest of some degree of harmony, has accepted amendments which have not had the effect of emasculating the measure. We are prepared to accept others, so long as the weapons of ideas which we unanimously urge are not dulled beyond the possibility of use.

Time does not permit the listing of those who support this measure throughout the country. Captains of industry, the press, the radio, educators, churchmen, veterans, and laymen have joined together in support of the principles herein set forth.

I should like particularly the attention of the Republican side of the House.

Joined to this national voice last week was that of the platform committee of the Young Republican Clubs, meeting in national convention in Milwaukee. I quote from the statement of principles adopted by the convention. Under the heading, "The United States and the world," the future Republican leaders of America stated:

We advocate effective opposition to the spread of communism and other totalitarian ideologies. We must have a positive, vibrant approach to the rest of the world which is designed to show our faith in the objectives and operation of our free institutions. This approach should be implemented by educational programs for the purpose of informing others of the virtues of our way of life, and by a program of economic help for other nations to the end that they may be self-supporting.

That is the voice of the Young Republicans, now; it is not the Young Democrats; it is not the American Youth for Democracy; and it is not the Young Communists.

In short, the Young Republicans of the United States call for positive action, and for a vision which extends over and beyond their neighbor's cornfields.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I am sorry; I cannot.

Mr. HUBER. I do not like the reference to the National Youth outfit and the Young Communists.

Mr. JACKSON of California. The implementation of our foreign policy has changed materially since our forefathers stood before Concord Bridge and fired the shot heard "round the world," although some of the statements made in opposition to the measure under consideration would indicate that some minds are still muzzle loaded, and that some concepts of our present day relationships to the rest of the earth could well have been voiced on the quarterdeck of the Santa Maria, or on the poop deck of the Mayflower.

Mr. Chairman, this is 1947, in the era of the atom. Upon one thing all men of good conscience are agreed. The world, its great distances shortened from terms of days and months to terms better expressed in minutes, cannot survive against the unleashed atom. The bundles of currency saved by defeat of this measure will burn as furiously as any others in the hot fires of the next war.

The gentlemen in opposition claim realism as their guide, and economy as their shield. Today there is no realism in silence and no protection behind a shield of dollar signs. To paraphrase a famous line from the marriage ceremony, we must speak now or forever lose our peace.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. In view of the doubt as to the type of personnel to be selected for these posts under this act, I think it is especially important that the veterans be given preference in the selection of such personnel. Millions of veterans served overseas in foreign countries and know conditions in those countries. I understand an amendment to this end will be introduced by a Member, the very able and distinguished chairman of the Civil Service Committee [Mr. REES], who is very thoroughly qualified to sponsor such an amendment.

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY

SEC. 903. The Secretary may delegate, to such officers of the Government as the Secretary determines to be appropriate, any of the powers conferred upon him by this act to

extent that he finds such delegation to be in the interest of the purposes expressed in this act and the efficient administration of the programs undertaken pursuant to this act.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN: On page 19, strike out all of section 903.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, however the other Members of the House may feel, personally I am deeply grateful to the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON], who just spoke so eloquently and so enlighteningly a few moments ago. He remarked that some of us in our thinking apparently were loaded at the muzzle. Perhaps that is right. I would like to plead guilty to that, if he meant what I think he meant, but I will say to the gentleman from California that I am not so heavily loaded with foreign propaganda that I blow out at the breech all the time.

I regret that the gentleman from South Dakota, for whom I have great respect and admiration, raised the issue of isolationism or nationalism a little while ago; and as is so often the case with gentlemen who think as he apparently does, they make very little distinction between isolationism and a lack of patriotism. The internationalists seem to be thinking of ways we can hamper ourselves while aiding others—of the interests of other nations rather than of the welfare of the United States of America. We will let that stand as it is. The gentleman said that we should line up and do everything we can for all other nations. I most respectfully call his attention to a recent statement of a former President of the United States, Mr. Hoover, who certainly cannot be characterized as an isolationist. You will remember that President Hoover warned us not once in the last few months, but several times, that there is such a thing as expanding and extending our giving and lending program until after a while we will not only be unable to give or to aid other people but we will not have a shirt left to cover our own national back. Muzzle loading? Yes. Some of us from the Midwest are. And, after all, our freedom was won, and for many years maintained, by muzzle-loading ancestors who shot true and often with muzzle-loading guns; and if the present generation of breech-loading gentlemen who shoot foreign ideology all the time will do as well, our welfare will be assured.

We are wondering whether those who advocate day in and day out that we must give this, that, and the other to everyone all over the world, while taking from our own people, are finally going to get us into a condition where we will not be able to help anyone and will not be able to carry on for ourselves. I go to the statement made earlier in the day: When are we going to take an inventory and find out what we have? We have not a nickel in the bank, we have not a thing in the cupboard any more; we have been giving away until finally we will find ourselves stripped.

Let us take a glance at this section on page 12 which reads: "In carrying out the purposes of this act, the Secretary is authorized, in addition to and not in limitation of the authority otherwise vested in him (1) in carrying out title II of this act, within the limitation of such appropriations as the Congress may provide, to make grants of money, services, or materials" to everybody.

Now, let us go over to the section I want to strike, section 903:

The Secretary may delegate, to such officers of the Government as the Secretary determines to be appropriate, any of the powers, conferred upon him by this act.

First, what do we do? Instead of controlling the money and the way it is to be spent, we delegate that power to the Secretary of State. Then we tell the Secretary of State that he can delegate any or all of those powers or any or all of the powers which we give him to spend every dollar which the Congress may appropriate to anyone that he may select. That is a second-degree delegation of authority. I have called your attention to the printing of money in Italy and Russia, which has to do, I presume, with the duties of Secretary of the Treasury. Here we are dealing with the Secretary of State and we authorize him to delegate all of the authority given by this bill. Do you think that is right?

I ask that that section, that second delegation of authority, that double delegation of authority, first to the Secretary of State and then by him to someone else, be cut out of the bill and that we at least have the good judgment to delegate authority only to the Secretary of State himself, not permit him to redelegate the authority.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I think I should say simply in connection with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], that if we were to adopt that, we would certainly cripple the State Department in its administration of the act and make it impossible for the Secretary of State to do an efficient job, because obviously the Secretary of State must delegate to other people not only in the State Department but outside of the State Department some of these functions. For example some of them will deal with the census bureaus of other countries.

Obviously you could not expect the Secretary of State to work with the census experts of another country. Some questions will deal with the problem of agriculture. A great many of them will deal with the problems of agriculture, I may say, since hunger is today a serious world problem, and surely the Secretary of State should be permitted to delegate to the people in the Department of Agriculture those portions of the program in which we work with specialists of other lands from the standpoint of agricultural problems and the battle against starvation.

In addition to that, the educational exchange features will require the advice and cooperation of people in the Bureau of Education, so they are going to work in certain aspects of this matter. If we limit it to the Secretary of State and tie him down to his Department, without any delegation of authority inside or outside of his Department, obviously you phrase this legislation in such a way that it is unworkable, and it is unthinkable that this Congress is going to pass legislation with unworkable or crippling amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

RESTRICTED INFORMATION

SEC. 904. Nothing in this act shall authorize the disclosure of any information or knowledge in any case in which such disclosure is prohibited by any other law of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 19, line 23, after "United States", insert a comma, and "or (2) is inconsistent with the security of the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

REPEAL OF ACT OF MAY 25, 1938, AS AMENDED

SEC. 905. (a) The act of May 25, 1938, entitled "An act authorizing the temporary detail of United States employees, possessing special qualifications, to governments of American Republics and the Philippines, and for other purposes," as amended (52 Stat. 442; 53 Stat. 652), is hereby repealed.

(b) Existing Executive orders and regulations pertaining to the administration of such act of May 25, 1938, as amended, shall remain in effect until superseded by regulations prescribed under the provisions of this act.

(c) Any reference in the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 999), or in any other law, to provisions of such act of May 25, 1938, as amended, shall be construed to be applicable to the appropriate provisions of titles III and VIII of this act.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, the extreme internationalists seem to think that any man who is opposed to feeding every lazy lout from Tokyo to Timbuctu out of the pockets of the American taxpayers is an isolationist. They seem to think that anyone who is in favor of looking out for the American people first is an isolationist, and subject to condemnation.

Now, let me tell you this, if you do not know it now, you will find it out—and I am speaking to Members on both sides—at least 75 percent of the American people are nationalists. They believe in the fundamental principles laid down by George Washington and Thomas Jefferson when they said that our foreign policy should be one of "peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations; entangling alliances with none."

That policy, if followed today, would make America the strongest and most powerful nation under the shining sun, but when you go off under the guise of carrying the Voice of America abroad and bring in legislation here that tears down our immigration laws, imports Communist professors, if you please, from behind the iron curtain, and violates every principle of the foreign policy Washington and Jefferson and the great leaders who founded this Republic believed in, you are not doing the country any good, and you are not carrying out the will of the American people.

I shall vote to recommit this bill in its present form to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in my opinion, if you pass it in its present form, it will be as dead as a dodo.

I do not believe it will ever again see the light of day. I am sure it would not if the Americans could have their way.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 9 minutes.

Mr. REED of New York. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, like every other Member that is serious-minded I want to do the right thing about this piece of legislation, but I am tremendously confused. I do not know what is in it and nobody else who votes on this bill will know what is in it.

I noted in this morning's paper that certain agents of the Department of Agriculture went down to the National 4–H Club meeting yesterday and very earnestly and seriously told those 4–H boys and girls that any of them who possibly can should go to China to learn how to farm.

There was a time when foreigners came here to learn to study our methods, our manners, our ways, our religion, and so on, but since the New Deal has come into effect we have gone haywire and have been sending people out all over the world to learn foreign methods and to bring foreign methods here. Today when a foreigner comes to our shores we welcome him with open arms and he usually goes home with a loan that turns out to be a gift. It is said one of the recent visitors who addressed this House took along home $4,800 for each word in his speech. I speak for much less. So to satisfy my conscience, with which I have to live, I am going to vote against this whole business. If they want to bring a bill in here that will take our information and our way of life to these countries to help them, all right, but if we are going to invite the world in here with their isms and their cockeyed ways of doing things, I am against it, so I am going to vote "no," and I believe a majority of you will, and I believe all of you should.

The House did a good job with the President's veto in overriding it. The message was inflammatory, weak, misleading, and very erroneous, and inconsistent as well as contradictory throughout. What the Senate will do remains to be seen. I am told that the 15 Democratic Senators who voted against it were summoned to the White House for lunch with the President today. That really is turning on the heat.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to call to the attention of the House that we are $260,000,000,000 in the hole. A million dollars is a thousand thousand dollars, and a billion dollars is a thousand million. We owe two hundred and sixty thousand million dollars that the American taxpayer eventually must pay. Now the State Department is developing programs for bigger and better spending; as my good friend and colleague would say, "Where are we going to get the money?"

I hold here an article by Walter Trohan which reads as follows:

UNITED STATES CONDUCTING PROPAGANDA FOR GLOBAL SPENDING

The State Department is conducting an undercover campaign to win support for its dollar-spending foreign policy.

The diplomats are holding a series of off-the-record seminars on foreign affairs for "influential" citizens only. The meetings are being held in Washington and around the country. The persons of influence, as they are characterized by State Department protocol, are being brought to Washington at Government expense.

The "influential" citizens attending the conferences are told by the State Department they have been selected because they are regarded as molders of opinion and leaders in their communities for support of the Department's foreign policy.

The Truman doctrine is being explained to representatives of women's clubs, church groups, fraternal organizations, and independent voters' leagues as well as individuals of standing in various communities. These include ministers, doctors, and lawyers.

The press is barred from the propaganda meetings.

I repeat, the press is barred from the propaganda meetings.

It is said that the secrecy is calculated to impress those invited and win them over to support of the Department on the theory that they are being initiated into inside secrets, when all they are getting is a rehashing of global-spending diplomacy.

At a 3-day meeting early this month——

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. Not at this point.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I plead with the gentleman to yield.

Mr. GAVIN. I decline to yield to my very dear and able friend from Pittsburgh.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. Yes, Pennsylvania, and the gentleman comes from the great city of Pittsburgh of which we Pennsylvanians are proud.

At a 3-day meeting early this month the State Department had 250 persons representing groups of a total membership of 75,000,000 persons.

During the sessions, it was learned, the delegates were told the United States must give financial and political assistance around the world to stop Russia; that the State Department information program, now aground on congressional rocks, is necessary to save the world; that they must educate the general public to support the State Department; that President Truman is a great statesman; that General Marshall is a great diplomat, and that the State Department could use more money.

The wide range of organizations at the large meeting included representatives of the Southern Council of International Relations, the League of Women Voters, Community Discussion Council of Muncie, Ind., the National Conference of Christians and Jews, the Southern Baptist public affairs committee, Junior Leagues of America, Daughters of the American Revolution, Girl Scouts, and the B'nai B'rith, which supports and maintains the antideflation league.

And yet in face of this information we are shipping thousands of barrels of oil and gasoline—right now from California to Russia—so I cannot see how we can ever stop Russia in this manner.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. Not at this point.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Please.

Mr. GAVIN. Please. I have a high regard for my very dear friend, and I ask that he please permit me to continue.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I have a letter from the Secretary of State at the Clerk's desk which I would like to have read at this time since I believe it effectively replies to the statements made by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] and to some of the other arguments that we have heard this afternoon. It tells the House clearly in his own language, over his own personal signature, exactly and definitely what Secretary of State Marshall needs and desires in his efforts for peace. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the Clerk may read the letter so that no Member may be led into denying the Secretary of State the weapons for peace, which he needs, through any misunderstanding about what Mr. Marshall says these requirements actually are. A Member of Congress assumes a frightening burden indeed when he votes to disarm our emissaries of peace.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, June 19, 1947.

The Honorable KARL MUNDT,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MUNDT: I learn from the Department's legislative counsel that the House is about to take final action on H. R. 3342, authorizing an international-information program and educational exchanges.

Since I appeared before the Foreign Affairs Committee in support of this bill on May 17, Members of Congress have attributed to me a great variety of opinions concerning the bill. I want to make my position plain.

I consider American security to rest not only on our economic and political and military strength, but also on the strength of American ideas—on how well they are

presented abroad—and on how clearly we are understood abroad.

There is no question that some other nations are using ideas as weapons and distorting facts to fit their ideas. We do not propose to follow suit. But I am convinced that we must present ourselves clearly, candidly, and affirmatively if we are to achieve the kind of peace we believe in. I know from personal experience that we are grossly misunderstood or misrepresented in many parts of the world.

I gave your committee my view that the facts about the United States must be spread in various ways. In some countries we must rely largely on radio. In others, we use also the press or motion pictures or exchanges of students and books or the assignment of government advisers. All are important and must be used if we are to be successful. To remove any one of these activities from the bill would be a form of demobilization. Peace cannot be served by any rationing of American facts or by limiting the methods for making them known.

I have informed committees of both Houses of Congress that authority for this type of program is necessary if the State Department is to fulfill its responsibilities to the President and the Nation. Without legislative authorization it has become almost impossible to recruit additional highly trained personnel to work on this program, either at home or abroad.

I am asking for the tools which are necessary to meet present circumstances in world affairs.

Faithfully yours,

G. C. MARSHALL.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 20, line 17, insert:

"UTILIZATION OF PRIVATE AGENCIES

"SEC. 906. In carrying out the provisions of this act it shall be the duty of the Secretary to utilize, insofar as is practicable, the services and facilities of private agencies, through contractual arrangements or otherwise.

"OFFICE OF INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

"SEC. 907. Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the establishment of any new Government agency; except that for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act the Secretary is hereby authorized to establish in the Department of State an office to be known as the Office of Information and Educational Exchange.

"TERMINATION PURSUANT TO CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF CONGRESS

"SEC. 908. The authority granted under this act, or under any provision thereof, shall terminate whenever such termination is directed by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of the Congress.

"REPORTS TO CONGRESS

"SEC. 909. The Secretary shall submit to the Congress semiannual reports of expenditures made and activities carried on under authority of this act."

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JUDD: On page 20, line 21, after the period, add a new sentence, as follows:

"It is the intent of Congress that the Secretary shall encourage participation in carrying out the purposes of this act by the maximum number of different private agencies in each field, consistent with the present or potential market for their services in each country."

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment on behalf of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN]. As a result of the consideration given the matter of his subcommittee on appropriations when dealing with it, he and other members of that committee worked out this amendment. They discussed it with our committee, and we are perfectly agreeable to it. In essence it is this: It makes clear that it is the intent of Congress that the Department of State will always use private agencies, for example, the United Press and the Associated Press, whenever the market for their services in various countries is such as to permit those private agencies to carry on their informational activities.

The committee has no objection, and I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] may extend his remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I have studied the bill which my colleague KARL MUNDT's subcommitee has devised for a foreign information program.

Surely most of the Members here present realize that many of their objections and questions are the kind which can be answered only on the basis of administration. The weeks of debate and criticism—both in the press and in the Congress—must by now have served to notify the President, the Secretary of State, and their subordinates of the kind of administration the people want in this program.

Certainly such a program must have checks on its administration—chief among which must be approval by the Appropriations Committee of each individual activity to be undertaken, and the fact that under terms of the bill the Congress itself can terminate the program upon 30 days' notice, should it so determine. These provisions are and should be much more stringent than those placed upon almost any other phase of governmental activity.

I sit on the subcommittee which handles appropriations for the State Department. We have to study these matters and make our recommendations to Congress. Because of this our attention has been directed to the fact that enormous numbers of Americans have foreign relations of their own through individuals, corporations, institutions, and other firms.

I should like at this time to direct the attention of the Members to this program as an attempt to utilize this latent talent and to organize it in an orderly way.

As the Members of this House may recall, I spoke at some length during the discussion of the House bill for State Department appropriations concerning the necessity of recognizing the strong part that private enterprise—the keystone of our American social-economic system—had to play in our international affairs. I would like to see the role of competitive private enterprise strengthened in this bill. For that reason, I have asked for these few minutes to discuss an amendment which I shall propose and which I already have submitted to the committee and which they have agreed to accept.

The present bill does make a provision for the use of privately owned facilities through contractual or other arrangements in carrying out the State Department program. I feel, however, that without amendment the bill does not provide for the fostering of competitive private agents. In fact, the present terms, if improperly administered, could tend to perpetuate a system whereby the present OIC has let contracts with such firms as the Radio Corp. of America and National Broadcasting Co. to produce programs at a profit without worrying about selling them to a customer. I can see why the heads of these great corporations, which only a few years back were forced to sell the Blue network under charges of monopoly, would see nothing wrong with that setup.

However, I consider it most necessary to strengthen the position of pioneer independent broadcasters like World-Wide—WRUL—in competition with any Government "chosen instrument."

The possibility here sounds to me altogether too much like the bills recently discussed in Senate committees to set up a "chosen instrument" world air line. There, again, the president of the air line company which has most to gain through establishment of a Government-sponsored monopoly thought the idea was fine. I am given to understand there are a dozen or more other air-line operators who believe in and welcome competition and who do not agree with that point of view.

Competition is the backbone of the free-enterprise system. Any program of Government support in foreign commerce, whether it be in the information services, transportation, or any other phase, must and should be based upon the encouragement of more than one entry in each field.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the Members of this House, and much less the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, will not want to find themselves in the position of approving Government-sponsored monopolies in the field of foreign commerce—while at the same time conducting a "trust-busting" campaign at home. The aim of the amendment I am proposing is that, through Government encouragement, competitive American enterprise will, as quickly as possible, be put in a position to "carry the ball."

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include four items—an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor for May 20 regarding the field for nongovernmental foreign broadcasting; an article from the same paper for May 21, outlining a definite program which is today successfully operating a privately owned international radio activity; a portion of

an announcement by the McGraw-Hill Co., published in the Washington Post for May 21, telling of that firm's recent expansion of its activities in foreign publishing; and an Associated Press dispatch from London, quoting a statement of W. Randolph Burgess, vice president of the National City Bank of New York, regarding the role of private investments in our foreign rehabilitation work.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: On page 21, line 7, after the word "terminate", insert the following: "two years after it becomes law, or."

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I am wondering if the committee will not accept this amendment. This amendment simply puts after the word "terminate", on line 7, "two years" when terminated by concurrent resolution. I submit to the membership of the House that all legislative procedures must come back to this House after 2 years for reexamination. What is wrong with that? I ask the chairman if he will not accept this amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. If I understand the gentleman's amendment, the committee cannot accept it. I believe he places a 2-year limitation on the bill. We placed "a concurrent resolution" in there so that the two Houses of Congress would be able to keep complete control of the legislation. Certainly we do not want to engage in a battle of ideas around the world and then announce to the world that we are doing it only on a 2-year basis. If as we proceed with this program we find portions of it not working effectively we can repeal them or the legislation as a whole by a concurrent resolution which can be presented at any time.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I do not think you can cite any legislation that has ever been ended by a concurrent resolution of this Congress. It just is not done. Every agency, whether the RFC, the CCC, or the OPA, or any other agency has had to come back to the Congress and justify its existence every 2 years, and sometimes every year. I would like to see some legislation that is not going to be permanent, because in my own mind the State Department has one thought in mind and that is to build up a tremendous large agency that will go on and on and on and will never be terminated by concurrent resolution of this House.

So I submit to the membership that you should give this your honest and sincere consideration. I am sincere in offering this. I think it is only right and proper that an agency that has had so much controversy from both sides should come back and ask the Congress to justify its existence in 2 years. I saw an amendment offered a short time ago by a gentleman on the other side [Mr. RICHARDS], and it was a very close vote. Still there was complete disagreement as to the type of amendment. We have placed many amendments on this bill. I submit it is only right and proper that this agency should come back to Congress and justify its existence in 2 years, and not leave it to a concurrent resolution of both Houses.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The question was taken; and on division (demanded by Mr. MILLER of Nebraska) there were—ayes 80, noes 112.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MUNDT. I wish to inquire about the status of the legislation.

As I understand, the Clerk has read clear through to the conclusion of section 909 at the end of the bill, all of which following section 905 is part of the committee amendment, and that any portion of this committee amendment is now open to amendment. Is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. In view of that, Mr. Chairman, and the lateness of the hour, I think it would serve the convenience of a great many Members if we would defer the final vote on this legislation until Monday or Tuesday. This would still give opportunity for consideration of this amendment before the final vote next week. Reports have reached the committee that an objection would be raised to voting late today without having an engrossed copy of the bill before us and without Members having an opportunity to see the legislation in its present form. So no purpose is to be served by holding Members here longer this evening.

If this suggestion prevails, I am going to ask unanimous consent therefore, Mr. Chairman, in the interest of clarity and good legislation and in response to request that the entire bill as now amended be printed in the RECORD at this point so Members will have an opportunity to study it carefully between now and Monday and to inform themselves fully as to the exact contents of the legislation now that a number of important restrictive and regulatory new amendments have been agreed upon. By this method every Member will have full opportunity to study the many careful safeguards and controls included in this legislation which has now been divested of the features and phases to which Members have raised substantial objections.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

The bill as amended reads as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

TITLE I—SHORT TITLE, OBJECTIVES, AND DEFINITIONS

SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the "United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1947."

OBJECTIVES

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declares that the objectives of this act are to enable the Government of the United States to promote mutual understanding between the people of the United States and of other countries, which is one of the essential foundations of peace, and to correct misunderstandings about the United States in other countries. The means to be used in achieving these objectives are—

(1) the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills;

(2) the rendering of technical and other services to other countries on the basis of mutual cooperation; and

(3) the dissemination abroad of public information about the United States, its people and the principles and objectives of its Government;

(4) the dissemination abroad of public information about the United Nations, its organization and functions, and the participation of the United States as a member thereof.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. When used in this act, the term—

(1) "Secretary" means the Secretary of State.

(2) "Department" means the Department of State.

(3) "Government agency" means any executive department, board, bureau, commission, or other agency in the executive branch of the Federal Government, or independent establishment, or any corporation wholly owned (either directly or through one or more corporations) by the United States.

TITLE II—INTERCHANGE OF PERSONS, KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS

PERSONS

SEC. 201. The Secretary is authorized to provide for interchanges, on a reciprocal basis, between the United States and other countries of students, trainees, tachers, guest instructors, professors, and leaders in fields of specialized knowledge or skill. The Secretary may provide for orientation courses and other appropriate services for such persons from other countries upon their arrival in the United States, and for such persons going to other countries from the United States. When any country fails or refuses to cooperate in such program on a basis of reciprocity, the Secretary shall terminate or limit such program, with respect to such country, to the extent he deems to be advisable in the interests of the United States. If the Secretary finds that any person from another country, while in the United States pursuant to this section, is engaged in activities of a political nature, or in activities not consistent with the security of the United States, the Secretary shall promptly report such finding to the Attorney General, and such person shall, upon the warrant of the Attorney General, be taken into custody and promptly deported.

BOOKS AND MATERIALS

SEC. 202. The Secretary is authorized to provide for interchanges between the United States and other countries of books and periodicals, including government publications, for the translation of such writings, and for the preparation, distribution, and interchange of other educational materials.

INSTITUTIONS

SEC. 203. The Secretary is authorized to provide for assistance to schools, libraries, and community centers abroad, founded or sponsored by citizens of the United States, or serving as demonstration centers for methods and practices employed in the United States. In assisting any such schools, however, the Secretary shall exercise no control over their educational policies and shall in no case furnish assistance of any character which is not in keeping with the free democratic principles and the established foreign policy of the United States.

TITLE III—ASSIGNMENT OF SPECIALISTS

PERSONS TO BE ASSIGNED

SEC. 301. The Secretary is authorized, when the government of another country is desirous of obtaining the services of a person having special scientific or other technical or professional qualifications, from time to time to assign or authorize the assignment for service, to or in cooperation with such gov-

ernment, any person in the employ or service of the Government of the United States who has such qualifications, with the approval of the Government agency in which such person is employed or serving. Nothing in this act, however, shall authorize the assignment of such personnel for service relating to the organization, training, operation, development, or combat equipment of the armed forces of a foreign government.

STATUS AND ALLOWANCES

SEC. 302. Any person, while assigned for service to or in cooperation with another government under the authority of this act, shall be considered, for the purpose of preserving his rights, allowances, and privileges as such, an officer or employee of the Government of the United States and of the Government agency from which assigned and he shall continue to receive compensation from that agency. He may also receive, under such regulations as the President may prescribe, representation allowances similar to those allowed under section 901 (3) of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 999). The authorization of such allowances and other benefits and the payment thereof out of any appropriations available therefor shall be considered as meeting all the requirements of section 1765 of the Revised Statutes.

ACCEPTANCE OF OFFICE UNDER ANOTHER GOVERNMENT

SEC. 303. Any person while assigned for service to or in cooperation with another government under authority of this act may, at the discretion of his Government agency, with the concurrence of the Secretary, and without additional compensation therefor, accept an office under the government to which he is assigned, if the acceptance of such an office in the opinion of such agency is necessary to permit the effective performance of duties for which he is assigned, including the making or approving on behalf of such foreign government the disbursement of funds provided by such government or of receiving from such foreign government funds for deposit and disbursement on behalf of such government, in carrying out programs undertaken pursuant to this act: *Provided, however*, That such acceptance of office shall in no case involve the taking of an oath of allegiance to another government.

TITLE IV—PARTICIPATION BY GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

GENERAL AUTHORITY

SEC. 401. The Secretary is authorized, in carrying on any activity under the authority of this act, to utilize, with their approval, the services, facilities, and personnel of the other Government agencies. Whenever the Secretary shall use the services, facilities, or personnel of any Government agency for activities under authority of this act, the Secretary shall pay for such performance out of funds available to the Secretary under this act, either in advance, by reimbursement, or direct transfer. In utilizing the Government agencies, it is the sense of the Congress (1) that the best available and qualified Government services, facilities, and personnel shall be sought, in order to ensure professional competence and avoid duplication; and (2) that the Secretary shall consult the appropriate technical agencies of the Government concerning any activity authorized by titles II, III, and IV of this act which comes within the competence of such agencies.

TECHNICAL AND OTHER SERVICES

SEC. 402. A Government agency, at the request of the Secretary, may perform such technical or other services as such agency may be competent to render for the government of another country desirous of obtaining such services, upon terms and conditions which are satisfactory to the Secretary and to the head of the Government agency, when it is determined by the Secretary that such services will contribute to the purposes of this act. However, nothing in this act shall authorize the performance of services relating to the organization, training, operation, development, or combat equipment of the armed forces of a foreign government.

POLICY GOVERNING SERVICES

SEC. 403. In authorizing the performance of technical and other services under this title, it is the sense of the Congress (1) that the Secretary shall encourage through the Government agency with appropriate legislative authority the performance of such services to foreign governments by qualified private American individuals and agencies; (2) that if such services are rendered by a Government agency, they shall demonstrate the technical accomplishments of the United States, such services being of an advisory, investigative, or instructional nature, or a demonstration of a technical process; (3) that such services shall not include the construction of public works or the supervision of the construction of public works, and that, under authority of this act, a Government agency shall render engineering services related to public works only when the Secretary shall determine that the national interest demands the rendering of such services by a Government agency, but this policy shall not be interpreted to preclude the assignment of individual specialists as advisers to other governments as provided under title III of this act, together with such incidental assistance as may be necessary for the accomplishment of their individual assignments; (4) that such services shall not be undertaken for a foreign government if, in the opinion of the head of the Government agency, such services will impair the fulfillment of domestic responsibilities of that agency; and (5) that the Department shall invite outstanding leaders in the United States, both within and outside the Federal Government, in the various fields of activity covered by this title, to review and extend advice on the Secretary's policies in rendering technical and other services to another government pursuant to this title.

TRAINING

SEC. 404. Any Government agency, at the request of the Secretary, is authorized to provide to citizens of other countries, and to citizens of the United States going to other countries in connection with the carrying out of this act, technical and other training within the fields in which such agency has competence, or to provide for such training through State and local governmental agencies or private institutions and organizations.

INTERCHANGE OF SPECIALIZED KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS

SEC. 405. A Government agency, at the request of the Secretary, is authorized to promote the interchange with other countries of scientific and specialized knowledge and skills, within the fields in which such agency has competence, through publications and other scientific and educational materials.

INTERDEPARTMENTAL COORDINATION

SEC. 406. In order that the activities of Government agencies authorized by titles II, III, and IV of this act may be effectively coordinated and interdepartmental relationships as authorized by this act may be clearly defined, the Secretary may establish upon direction of the President an interdepartmental committee to advise the Secretary on the development and administration of these activities.

TITLE V—DISSEMINATING INFORMATION ABOUT THE UNITED STATES ABROAD

GENERAL AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 501. The Secretary is authorized, when he finds it appropriate, to provide for the preparation, and dissemination abroad, of information about the United States, its people, and its policies, through press, publications, radio, motion pictures, and other information media, and through information centers and instructors abroad. All such press releases and radio scripts shall in the English language be made available to press associations, newspapermen, radio systems, and stations in the United States and to Members of the Congress of the United States upon request, within 15 days after release as information abroad.

POLICIES GOVERNING INFORMATION ACTIVITIES

SEC. 502. In authorizing international information activities under this act, it is the sense of the Congress (1) that the Secretary shall encourage and facilitate by appropriate means the dissemination abroad of information about the United States by private American individuals and agencies, shall supplement such private information dissemination where necessary, and shall reduce such Government information activities whenever corresponding private information dissemination is found to be adequate; (2) that nothing in this act shall be construed to give the Department a monopoly in the production or sponsorship on the air of short-wave broadcasting programs, or a monopoly in any other medium of information; (3) that the Department shall invite outstanding private leaders of the United States in cultural and informational fields to review and extend advice on the Government's international information activities; and (4) that all printed matter, films, broadcasts, and other materials in the fields of mass media shall, when disseminated by the Government, be identified as to Government or private source.

TITLE VI—ADVISORY COMMISSION TO FORMULATE POLICIES

FORMULATION OF POLICIES

SEC. 601. There is hereby created a United States Information and Educational Exchange Advisory Commission (hereinafter in this title referred to as the "Commission") to be constituted as provided in section 602. The Commission shall formulate and present to the Secretary of State the policies to be followed and adhered to in connection with the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills, the assignment of specialists, the preparation and dissemination of information about the United States, its people and its policies, and the carrying out of the other provisions of this act.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 602. (a) The Commission shall consist of 11 members, not more than 6 of whom shall be from any one political party, as follows: (1) Ten members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; and (2) the Secretary of State or such officer in the State Department as may be designated by such Secretary.

(b) The members of the Commission shall represent the public interest, but of the persons appointed under clause (1) of subsection (a) of this section, one shall be selected from among educators, one from among individuals formerly in active service in the armed forces of the United States, one from representatives of labor, one farmer, one from the newspaper business, one from the motion-picture industry, one from the radio industry, and three from persons having general business experience. All persons so appointed shall be persons of national reputations in their respective fields. No person holding any compensated Federal or State office shall be eligible for appointment under clause (1) of subsection (a) of this section.

(c) The term of each member appointed under clause (1) of subsection (a) of this section shall be 3 years except that the terms of office of such members first taking office on the Commission shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, three at the end of 1 year, three at

the end of 2 years, and three at the end of 3 years from the date of the enactment of this act. Any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor is appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term. Upon the expiration of his term of office any member may continue to serve until his successor is appointed and has qualified.

(d) The President shall designate a chairman and a vice chairman from among members of the Commission.

(e) The members of the Commission shall receive no compensation for their services as such members but shall be entitled to reimbursement for travel and subsistence in connection with attendance of meetings of the Commission away from their places of residence.

(f) The Commission is authorized to adopt such rules and regulations as it may deem necessary to carry out the authority conferred upon it by this title.

(g) The Commission is authorized, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to appoint and fix the compensation of such clerical assistants as may be necessary in carrying out the provisions of this title.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND REPORTS

SEC. 603. The Commission shall meet not less frequently than once each month and shall, from time to time, prepare and transmit to the secretary and to the Congress its recommendations for carrying out the various activities authorized by this act, and shall submit to the Congress a quarterly report of all programs and activities recommended by it under this act and the action taken to carry out such recommendations.

TITLE VII—APPROPRIATIONS

GENERAL AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 701. Appropriations to carry out the purposes of this act are hereby authorized.

TRANSFERS OF FUNDS

SEC. 702. The Secretary may authorize the transfer to other Government agencies for expenditure in the United States and in other countries, in order to carry out the purposes of this act, any part of any appropriations available to the Department for carrying out the purposes of this act, for direct expenditure or as a working fund, and any such expenditures may be made under the specific authority contained in this act or under the authority governing the activities of the Government agency to which a part of any such appropriation is transferred, provided the activities come within the scope of this act.

TITLE VIII—ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES

THE SECRETARY

SEC. 801. In carrying out the purposes of this act, the Secretary is authorized, in addition to and not in limitation of the authority otherwise vested in him—

(1) In carrying out title II of this act, within the limitation of such appropriations as the Congress may provide, to make grants of money, services, or materials to State and local governmental institutions in the United States, to governmental institutions in other countries, and to individuals and public or private nonprofit organizations both in the United States and in other countries;

(2) to furnish, sell, or rent, by contract or otherwise, educational and information materials and equipment for dissemination to, or use by, peoples of foreign countries;

(3) whenever necessary in carrying out title V of this act, to purchase, rent, construct, improve, maintain, and operate facilities for radio transmission and reception, including the leasing of real property both within and without the continental limits of the United States for periods not to exceed 10 years, or for longer periods if provided for by the appropriation act;

(4) to provide for printing and binding outside the continental limits of the United States, without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111);

(5) to employ without regard to the civil-service and classification laws, when such employment is provided for by the appropriation act, (i) persons on a temporary basis, and (ii) aliens within the United States, but such employment of aliens shall be limited to services related to the translation or narration of colloquial speech in foreign languages when suitably qualified United States citizens are not available; and

(6) to create such advisory committees as the Secretary may decide to be of assistance in formulating his policies for carrying out the purposes of this act. No committee member shall be allowed any salary or other compensation for services; but he may be paid his actual transportation expenses, and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses, while away from his home in attendance upon meetings within the United States or in consultation with the Department under instructions.

GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

SEC. 802. In carrying on activities which further the purposes of this act, subject to approval of such activities by the Secretary, the Department and the other Government agencies are authorized—

(1) to place orders and make purchases and rentals of materials and equipment;

(2) to make contracts, including contracts with governmental agencies, foreign or domestic, including subdivisions thereof, and intergovernmental organizations of which the United States is a member, and, with respect to contracts entered into in foreign countries, without regard to section 3741 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 22);

(3) under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, to pay the transportation expenses, and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses, of citizens or subjects of other countries, without regard to the standardized Government travel regulations and the Subsistence Act of 1926, as amended;

(4) to make grants for, and to pay expenses incident to, training and study; and

MAXIMUM USE OF EXISTING GOVERNMENT PROPERTY AND FACILITIES

SEC. 803. In carrying on activities under this act which require the utilization of Government property and facilities, maximum use shall be made of existing Government property and facilities.

TITLE IX—FUNDS PROVIDED BY OTHER SOURCES

REIMBURSEMENT

SEC. 901. The Secretary shall, when he finds it in the public interest, request and accept reimbursement from any cooperating governmental or private source in a foreign country, or from State or local governmental institutions or private sources in the United States, for all or part of the expenses of any portion of the program undertaken hereunder. The amount so received shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

TITLE X—MISCELLANEOUS

LOYALTY CHECK ON PERSONNEL

SEC. 1001. No citizen or resident of the United States, whether or not now in the employ of the Government, may be employed or assigned to duties under this act unless the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, after such investigation as he deems necessary, certifies that in his opinion such individual is loyal to the United States and that such employment or assignment to duties is consistent with the security of the United States: *Provided, however,* That any present employee of the Government, unless an unfavorable report as to such employee is rendered sooner by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, may, without such certification, be employed or assigned to duties under this act for the period of 6 months from the date of its enactment. This section shall not apply in the case of any officer appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

SEPARABILITY OF PROVISIONS

SEC. 1002. If any provision of this act or the application of any such provision to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act and the applicability of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY

SEC. 1003. The Secretary may delegate, to such officers of the Government as the Secretary determines to be appropriate, any of the powers conferred upon him by this act to the extent that he finds such delegation to be in the interest of the purposes expressed in this act and the efficient administration of the programs undertaken pursuant to this act.

RESTRICTED INFORMATION

SEC. 1004. Nothing in this act shall authorize the disclosure of any information or knowledge in any case in which such disclosure (1) is prohibited by any other law of the United States, or (2) is inconsistent with the security of the United States.

REPEAL OF ACT OF MAY 25, 1938, AS AMENDED

SEC. 1005. (a) The act of May 25, 1938, entitled "An act authorizing the temporary detail of United States employees, possessing special qualifications, to governments of American Republics and the Philippines, and for other purposes," as amended (52 Stat. 442; 53 Stat. 652), is hereby repealed.

(b) Existing executive orders and regulations pertaining to the administration of such act of May 25, 1938, as amended, shall remain in effect until superseded by regulations prescribed under the provisions of this act.

(c) Any reference in the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 999), or in any other law, to provisions of such act of May 25, 1938, as amended, shall be construed to be applicable to the appropriate provisions of titles III and VIII of this act.

UTILIZATION OF PRIVATE AGENCIES

SEC. 1006. In carrying out the provisions of this act it shall be the duty of the Secretary to utilize, insofar as is practicable, the services and facilities of private agencies, through contractual arrangements or otherwise.

It is the intent of Congress that the Secretary shall encourage participation in carrying out the purposes of this act by the maximum number of different private agencies in each field consistent with the present or potential market for their services in each country.

OFFICE OF INFORMATION AND EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

SEC. 1007. Nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the establishment of any new Government agency; except that for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act the Secretary is hereby authorized to establish in the Department of State an office to be known as the Office of Information and Educational Exchange.

TERMINATION PURSUANT TO CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF CONGRESS

SEC. 1008. The authority granted under this Act, or under any provision thereof, shall terminate whenever such termination is directed by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of the Congress.

REPORTS TO CONGRESS

SEC. 1009. The Secretary shall submit to the Congress semiannual reports of expenditures made and activities carried on under authority of this act.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JENKINS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3342) to enable the Government of the United States more effectively to carry on its foreign relations by means of promotion of the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills between the people of the United States and other countries, and by means of public dissemination abroad of information about the United States, its people, and its policies, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARLESS of Arizona asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. MORRISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and to include in each extraneous matter, one extension being on the St. Lawrence waterway.

Mr. CARROLL (at the request of Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from yesterday's Washington Evening Star entitled "A Proper Veto."

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I recently obtained permission to extend my remarks and include certain extraneous matter. This has been returned to me by the Government Printer because it exceeded the limit. I am advised that the amount will be $266.25. Notwithstanding that it exceeds the limit I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the cost, without objection the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a report on the RFC Extension Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes today after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOLVERTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the President's veto of the labor bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the State Department.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 10 minutes.

TO CLARIFY THE SITUATION WITH REGARD TO REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 3

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, this delivery is something in the nature of a post mortem. It is an attempt to shed some light on an issue which was summarily dismissed on this floor 2 days ago, an attempt to clarify the facts that bear upon this issue in order that the temperate Members of the other body may see the issue in its true light.

I am referring to the President's Reorganization Plan No. 3 and to House Concurrent Resolution No. 51, expressing disfavor with that plan, which was passed on the floor of this House 2 days ago without a great deal of notice and without the consideration which it so richly deserved.

Let us look briefly at the situation with which Reorganization Plan No. 3 attempted to deal.

Executive Order No. 9070, issued by the President on February 24, 1942, under the authority of the First War Powers Act, consolidated the Government's housing functions in a single administrative unit, the National Housing Agency. This action was made necessary by the war emergency, a state of affairs in which we could no longer afford the luxury of dispersion and lack of cohesiveness in the Nation's housing program.

The National Housing Agency proved its value in lending directivity and coordinated effectiveness to the field of housing. No one would deny that errors were made, but they were errors born of war confusion and of the novelty of large-scale administration in this field. In no way do these errors constitute a valid criticism of a policy of coordination among the Government's housing activities.

At the present time, although the war is over, we are faced with a housing shortage of unprecedented magnitude. In order to deal with this shortage, the President has sought to maintain the consolidation of Federal housing activities in a single unit, a unit similar in most ways to the wartime National Housing Agency. In seeking to achieve this consolidation on a peacetime basis the President is only discharging the responsibility placed upon him by the Reorganization Act of 1945. Let me quote to you the six statements of congressional intent given in section 2 (a) of that act:

> The President shall examine and from time to time reexamine the organization of all agencies of the Government and shall determine what changes therein are necessary to accomplish the following purposes:
>
> (1) to facilitate orderly transition from war to peace;
>
> (2) to reduce expenditures and promote economy to the fullest extent consistent with the efficient operation of the Government;
>
> (3) to increase the efficiency of the operations of the Government to the fullest extent practicable within the revenues;
>
> (4) to group, coordinate, and consolidate agencies and functions of the Government, as nearly as may be, according to major purposes;
>
> (5) to reduce the number of agencies by consolidating those having similar functions under a single head, and to abolish such agencies or functions thereof as may not be necessary for the efficient conduct of the Government; and
>
> (6) to eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort.

When we look at the details of Reorganization Plan No. 3, we see that the plan can be supported in terms of all of these objectives.

In evaluating the effect of the plan, we must consider what would happen in its absence. If this plan is rejected in both Houses, the housing functions, now grouped in the National Housing Agency, would upon expiration of the First War Powers Act, revert to a total of five executive departments and agencies. Try to imagine the chaos, confusion, inefficiency, and expense that would result.

The Federal Housing Administration would revert to the Federal Loan Agency, an agency which exists only as a structural shell at the present time and which would have to be completely reconstituted as an administrative unit. The United States Housing Authority would revert to the Federal Works Agency, an agency unequipped at the present time to deal with the problems of slum clearance and low-cost housing control. The Defense Homes Corporation would revert to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The defense housing constructed under the authority of the Lanham Act would be turned over to the Federal Works Administrator. The defense housing, exclusive of military reservations, constructed by the Army and Navy before and during the war, would revert to the War and Navy Departments. The nonfarm housing constructed by the Farm Security Administration, including the 3 "green" towns and some 30 rural proj-

ects, would revert to the Department of Agriculture. The Federal Home Loan Bank System, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and the Home Owners' Loan Corporation would all revert to the Federal Loan Agency.

The fantastic process of reversion described above, if allowed to materialize, would be twofold in its confoundedness.

In the first place it would be tremendously costly. There would be an initial expense of many millions of dollars necessary in reconstituting the various, separate administrative units required. There would be a continuing uneconomic expense necessary in maintaining these isolated, duplicating, and overlapping facilities in five departments and agencies scattered about the executive branch.

In the second place this process of reversion would rob the Government's housing programs of any semblance of coordination. No one man would be able to study the whole picture of the Nation's housing problem and meet that problem intelligently and effectively with a combination of the private-loan management and low-cost development facilities available to him. The segregated housing activities would be competing with each other for the support of Congress and the public.

Now let us see what Reorganization Plan No. 3 actually does. First of all it does not continue any function beyond the time set by law for its expiration. It does not, as has been alleged, make permanent any housing function which Congress did not establish as a permanent function.

The plan establishes a Housing and Home Finance Agency, with an administrator, to replace the present, tenuous National Housing Agency as the coordinating unit for Federal housing activities. Under this unit the plan establishes three constituents, each with a high degree of autonomy, as follows:

First. The Home Loan Bank Board, consisting of three members, to supervise the operation of the Federal Home Loan Bank System, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. The function of all of these activities is one of insuring investments in local savings and loan associations.

Second. The Federal Housing Administration, with a Commissioner, to exercise the functions of the present Federal Housing Administration. These functions are primarily concerned with the insurance of mortgage loans and loans without collateral security for the construction, remodeling, and repair of residential units and real property.

Third. The Public Housing Administration, with a commissioner, to control the United States Housing Authority, the Defense Homes Corporation, the defense housing constructed under the authority of the Lanham Act, and the general housing—referred to earlier—constructed by the Departments of War, Navy, and Agriculture. The functions of the Public Housing Administration are those of disposing of war housing and of encouraging, where necessary, the clearance of slum areas and the construction of low-rent housing by means of capital loans and annual subsidies to aid local public housing agencies.

Finally, the plan establishes a National Housing Council to coordinate the work of the Housing and Home Finance Agency with that of other Executive departments and agencies concerned with the availability of housing. These other agencies include the Department of Agriculture, the Veterans' Administration, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

This, then, is what Reorganization Plan No. 3 proposes to do. To an unprejudiced student of the housing problem this seems like an eminently sane solution. Let us look at some of the objections of the plan.

A. Many critics of the Plan say that it does not lead to any economies. Consideration of the foregoing material shows clearly, however, that while the plan offers no great change from the present temporary structure, it avoids the tremendous expense of the reversion process that would be necessary in its absence.

B. There are those who feel that it would be dangerous—the word "socialistic" has even been used—to place the Government's home loan and mortgage insurance functions under the control of an administrator who was also concerned with slum clearance and the construction of low cost housing. These people hold the irrational fear that this man might be public housing conscious and that the home finance functions would be deliberately throttled.

This is an ingenious argument. Its invalidity becomes apparent upon examination, however.

In the first place, the functions of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator are, and always will be, established by the Congress. The reliance which he places upon the various housing facets with which he works will be predetermined by law.

In the second place, and of even greater importance, the centralization of housing functions provided for in this plan effectuates the congressional principle already referred to in the Reorganization Act of 1945: "to group, coordinate, and consolidate agencies and functions of the Government, as nearly as may be, according to major purpose." Certainly the major purpose here is the provision of adequate housing for the Nation. Those who advocate putting the Federal home-finance functions in a separate agency apparently consider the housing shortage as a fertile field for speculation in real-estate loans, rather than considering the home-finance functions as a really effective weapon with which to attack the housing shortage. This is tantamount to placing the cart before the horse.

C. Finally, it is contended in some quarters that the National Housing Agency was a wartime consolidation which has had no justification in the peacetime picture of government.

To refute this argument it is only necessary to study the recent history of housing in this country. Our present housing shortage is the result of stagnation in housing construction during the 1930's, stagnation that could have been overcome by sensible, long-range planning and the provision of financial incentives to private construction concerns.

We cannot afford to slip back into the chaos of a disintegrated housing program. It is necessary that a single administrative unit be able to control the entire picture, providing every possible inducement to private industry and carefully controlling the expenditure of public funds in those areas where private companies decline to operate—funds such as those envisaged in the Taft-Wagner-Ellender bill. Only in this way can costly competition between the so-called private and public housing activities be kept under control, to the advantage of the country as a whole.

The real-estate lobbies—in particular, the National Association of Real Estate Boards, the National Home and Property Owners' Foundation, and the National Association of Home Builders—object to Reorganization Plan No. 3, just as they objected to the continuation of effective rent control and the passage of the Taft-Wagner-Ellender bill. These real-estate interests have a peculiar way of making their objections felt. Their batting average has been tragically high in this Congress.

They base their objection to this plan on the fact that it approaches the present housing shortage from the point of view of increasing the supply of housing in critical categories rather than from the point of view of speculating in the current demand.

These real-estate lobbies have been successful in defeating Reorganization Plan No. 3 in the House. The foregoing evaluation of the issue is offered here in the hope that the facts may be made clear and that this success will not be repeated in the other body.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. VINSON, for an indefinite period, on account of important business.

To Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. GRAHAM), for 2 days, on account of attending funeral.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution to establish a commission to formulate plans for the erection, in Grant Park, Chicago, Ill., of a Marine Corps memorial; to the Committee on House Administration.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the

following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3203. An act relative to maximum rents on housing accommodations; to repeal certain provisions of Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 814. An act to provide support for wool, and for other purposes.

S. 1230. An act to amend section 2 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on June 19, 1947, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3792. An act to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 23, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

817. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a list of various institutions and organizations which have requested donations from the Navy Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

818. A letter from the Chairman, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to promote the national defense by increasing the membership of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; to the Committee on Armed Services.

819. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of its newly issued Electric Utility Depreciation Practices; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

820. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 20, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Great Lakes connecting channels, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on February 11, 1941 (H. Doc. No. 335); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with 15 illustrations.

821. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

822. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an appropriation for the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration for administrative expenses of United States agencies incident to the liquidation of United States participation in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (H. Doc. No. 336); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

823. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision relating to an existing appropriation of the War Department (H. Doc. No. 337); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

824. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of $3,370,000 for the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency (H. Doc. No. 338); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DEVITT: Committee on the Judiciary. Part II, minority views on H. R. 1639. A bill to amend the Employers' Liability Act so as to limit venue in actions brought in United States district courts or in State courts under such act; without amendment (Rept. No. 613). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. TWYMAN: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 1821. A bill to provide for the collection and publication of statistical information by the Bureau of the Census; with amendments (Rept. No. 618). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ELSTON: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 3051. A bill to amend the act of July 19, 1940 (54 Stat. 780; 34 U. S. C. 495a), and to amend section 2 and to repeal the profit-limitation and certain other limiting provisions of the act of March 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 503; 34 U. S. C. 495), as amended, relating to the construction of vessels and aircraft known as the Vinson-Trammell Act, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 619). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 3888. A bill to provide increased subsistence allowance to veterans pursuing certain courses under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 620). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. VURSELL: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. House Joint Resolution 221. Joint resolution to provide for permanent rates of postage on mail matter of the first class, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 621). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAND: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 3494. A bill to integrate certain personnel of the former Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation and the Bureau of Customs into the Regular Coast Guard, to establish the permanent commissioned personnel strength of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 622). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SHAFER: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 3471. A bill to authorize leases of real or personal property by the War and Navy Departments, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 623). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 3861. A bill to allow to a successor railroad corporation the benefits of certain carry-overs of a predecessor corporation for the purposes of certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code; with amendments (Rept. No. 624). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LANDIS: Committee on Education and Labor. H. R. 3682. A bill to extend the period for providing assistance for certain war-incurred school enrollments; with an amendment (Rept. No. 625). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 3916. A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and to extend the succession and certain lending powers and functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 626). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 751. An act to continue a system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of school-age and under-school-age children in the District of Columbia through June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 627). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 2173. A bill to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended; with an amendment (Rept. No. 628). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'HARA: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3131. A bill to extend for the period of 1 year the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended; with an amendment (Rept. No. 629). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BEALL: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3433. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to classify the officers and members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1906, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 630). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. O'HARA: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3744. A bill to authorize the construction of a railroad siding in the vicinity of Franklin Street NE., District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 631). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. O'HARA: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3864. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act with respect to contribution rates after termination of military service; without amendment (Rept. No. 632). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 3916. A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and to extend the succession and certain

lending powers and functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 3917. A bill to amend section 5 (a) of the Farm Credit Act of August 19, 1937 (50 Stat. 703); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COX:

H. R. 3918. A bill to amend section 201 of the Federal Power Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ELLIS:

H. R. 3919. A bill to amend sections 812 and 861 of the Internal Revenue Code so as to allow the deduction of the amounts of bequests, legacies, devises, or transfers to or for the use of veterans' organizations in determining the net estates of decedents subject to Federal estate taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 3920. A bill to exclude certain vendors of newspapers from certain provisions of the Social Security Act and Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3921. A bill to amend subsection (c) of section 3108 of the Internal Revenue Code (53 Stat. 359; 26 U. S. C. 3108 (c)) and the second paragraph of subsection (a) of section 3114 of the Internal Revenue Code (53 Stat. 360; 26 U. S. C. 3114 (a)); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 3922. A bill to provide for the admission of certain former members of the armed forces to practice law in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 3923. A bill to authorize retroactive payment of compensation or pension barred because of capture, internment, or isolation by the enemy during World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 3924. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act in regard to certain matters of personnel and administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 3925. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide grants to postgraduate schools of public health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MICHENER (by request):

H. R. 3926. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to designate the location of the offices of United States marshals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3927. A bill to amend the act of September 7, 1916, to authorize certain expenditures from the employees' compensation fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3928. A bill to prescribe the measure of damages on account of trespass upon, unlawful use of, and unlawful enclosure of lands or resources owned or controlled by the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3929. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide additional protection for owners of patents of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1910, as amended, so as to protect the United States in certain patent suits; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REEVES:

H. R. 3930. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended, in relation to extensions made pursuant to wage earners' plans under chapter XIII of such act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES:

H. J. Res. 221. Joint resolution to provide for permanent rates of postage on mail matter of the first class, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. Res. 251. Resolution to provide that Members of the House of Representatives and officers shall, for their convenience, be furnished with identification cards; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 3931. A bill for the relief of James W. Keith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENKINS of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 3932. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Bohm and Edith Bohm Staub; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROHRBOUGH:

H. R. 3933. A bill for the relief of Rev. John C. Young; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

656. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Petition of Mary Seeley and 23 other signers, all members of Battle Mountain Auxiliary, No. 1, United Spanish War Veterans, Hot Springs, S. Dak., requesting favorable consideration of H. R. 969 and H. R. 3516, which propose an increase in pensions of Spanish-American War veterans; to the Committee on Rules.

657. By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of Paralyzed Veterans Association of Bronx County, Bronx, N. Y., opposing any cut in the appropriation requested by General Bradley, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Appropriations.

658. Also, petition of the Human Relations Commission of the Protestant Church of the City of New York, urging (1) passage of the antilynching bill; (2) H. R. 2768, to create an Evacuation Claims Commission to adjudge claims made by Japanese-Americans for losses incurred in the evacuation; and (3) H. R. 2933, to stay the deportation of persons excluded from naturalization because of race; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

659. By the SPEAKER: Petition of T. S. Kinney, Orlando, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

660. Also, petition of Mrs. B. F. Crane, Zephyrhills, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

661. Also, petition of Mrs. Albina Bibeau, St. Petersburg, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

662. Also, petition of Mrs. Martha Moffitt, Sanford, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

663. Also, petition of Mrs. Carrie L. McManus, Sarasota, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 23, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We thank Thee, O Lord, that this land is still governed by the people's representatives. Let democratic processes be seen at their best in this time of testing. As these chosen men discharge their duties, guide them, O God, in the decisions they must make today. Give them the grace of humility, and shed now Thy guiding light into every mind. Break down every will that is stubborn against Thine or that has ignored Thee.

May what is done be so clearly right that it needs no incendiary justification. Soothe our still-smoldering hearts and minds with the spirit of forgiveness. Let us be swayed not by emotion or ambition but by calm conviction.

This we ask in Jesus' name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 20, and Saturday, June 21, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On June 20, 1947:

S. 321. An act to amend section 17 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 so as to increase the pay of cadets and midshipmen at the service academies, and for other purposes.

On June 21, 1947:

S. 26. An act to make criminally liable persons who negligently allow prisoners in their custody to escape;

S. 50. An act for the relief of Joseph Ochrimowski;

S. 125. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to extend the benefits of such act to the Official Reporters of Debates in the Senate and persons employed by them in connection with the performance of their duties as such reporters; and

S. 620. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ida Elma Franklin.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS—VETO MESSAGE

The Senate resumed the reconsideration of the bill (H. R. 3020) to prescribe fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management in their relations with one another which affect commerce, to protect the rights of individual workers in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce, to recognize the paramount public interest in labor disputes affecting commerce that endanger the

public health, safety, or welfare, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate is under the limitation of voting at 3 o'clock p. m. on House bill 3020. Prior thereto the time is to be equally divided and to be under the control of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in the absence of the Senator from Florida, I suggest that we have a call for a quorum, the time required to develop a quorum to be divided equally between the two sides. May we have unanimous consent that that be done?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is the universal practice. The clerk will call the roll, the time to be equally divided between the two sides.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Murray
Baldwin	Hawkes	Myers
Ball	Hayden	O'Conor
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Hoey	Overton
Bridges	Holland	Pepper
Brooks	Ives	Reed
Buck	Jenner	Revercomb
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Wyo.
Byrd	Kem	Russell
Cain	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Capehart	Knowland	Smith
Capper	Langer	Sparkman
Chavez	Lodge	Stewart
Connally	Lucas	Taft
Cooper	McCarran	Taylor
Cordon	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McClellan	Thye
Downey	McFarland	Tobey
Dworshak	McGrath	Tydings
Eastland	McKellar	Umstead
Ecton	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ellender	Magnuson	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Wherry
Flanders	Martin	White
Fulbright	Maybank	Wiley
George	Millikin	Williams
Green	Moore	Wilson
Gurney	Morse	Young

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed as a delegate to the International Labor Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is absent because of illness.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I yield 30 minutes to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized for 30 minutes.

LABOR BILL EXPANDS GOVERNMENT POWER

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I rise to speak in favor of sustaining the veto of the President of the United States of the pending so-called Taft-Hartley bill. I do this primarily on two grounds. The first of the grounds upon which I am now urging that the veto be sustained is that the bill, if it becomes a law, will set up a labor czar, with power and authority over the economy of the whole United States, greater by far than the power that was ever vested in any Government official under President Roosevelt or the New Deal.

The second ground upon which I urge this is that by the terms of the bill itself it becomes clear that the first action under the bill will be the institution of a violent intra-agency row between the newly established or expanded Labor Relations Board and the newly created independent general counsel of the Board. The bill ought to be called a bill to create a labor czar and promote discord.

Its first result will be to bring about a struggle for power within the agency between the Board itself and the general counsel; but the general counsel will win, because, by the language of the bill and the language of the conference report, he is to be an independent officer, appointed by the President, with the advice and the consent of the Senate; but he will be clothed—and I am quoting from the language of the proposed act—with "final authority on behalf of the Board in respect of the investigation of charges and the issuance of complaints." It is to me an amazing fact that the Republican majority of the Eightieth Congress, which we were told was elected to office upon the theory that there has been too much government in Washington, is by the bill setting up an office with more power over the life and death of American business, as I have already said, than was ever dreamed of by President Franklin D. Roosevelt and the New Deal.

No one will have the slightest idea of what the effect of the act will be until the general counsel has been appointed and confirmed, except that it is perfectly clear from the language of the bill itself that the general counsel and the Board will be locked in battle until one or the other wins.

Mr. President, if ever there was a job that should be well done by the Congress of the United States, this is it. We have not taken the time to do the job properly. We have had the advantage of the advice of a distinguished Member of this body, who is also a member of the majority, who served on the National Labor Relations Board, and who, speaking out of his experience, has told us that the bill is an administrative impossibility. We have not chosen to take the time that would be necessary to make the bill administratively feasible and to make it an agency for promoting labor-management peace, instead of an agency for promoting turbulent disputes within the agency and within American business.

All the weeks thus far devoted to the consideration of the problem have been weeks of jockeying for position. There have been those who have besought Congress to pass no labor legislation at all. They were not in the executive arm of the Government. They did not speak for the President. There have been those, however, Mr. President, who have been urging that Congress pass a punitive bill. The pending bill is a punitive bill.

SHALL CONGRESS ADJOURN OR LEGISLATE?

We are told now by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], whose name is attached to the legislation—and I listened to the Senator in his radio broadcast last night—that unless this particular bill is passed over the President's veto, we shall have no labor legislation at all. To me that means only one thing: It means that the Republican leadership in Congress regards it as of greater importance that Congress shall adjourn by the 26th of July, than that it should take the time to write a law such as the country needs, such as I think perhaps the country believes it is getting in the pending legislation instead of this bill which is so obviously defective as to make a settlement of the labor issue impossible under its terms.

Mr. President, I want to undertake, by reading the bill itself and the report, to demonstrate the accuracy of what I say. I am talking to those Members of this body upon the Republican side who actually believe—and I know the most of them do—that we have had too much government in Washington, and that we ought to restore control of the economy of the Nation to the people who carry on the economy. I have heard the condemnation, emanating from Republican sources over many years, of the concentration of executive power, the concentration of Government power, over business and over the lives of the people. During the campaign of last fall, the cry of the Republican campaign managers to the people of the United States was, "Have you had enough?"—meaning clearly that if the Republicans were to be entrusted with the management of Government, they would see that the amount of Government regimentation and control would be reduced. I undertake to show by reading the bill that, far from reducing Government control, this measure extends it.

READ AND UNDERSTAND

Let me read, Mr. President, from page 5 of the conference report, section 3 (d) of the measure. I have often discovered in my experience as a Member of this body that Senators frequently take legislation of this kind on faith without reading it. When a committee charged with the responsibility makes a report, and says that the bill reported will do this or that, Members of the Senate, like all people of the country, are likely to assume that what is said is correct. So much authority is concentrated here and we have so much legislation to act upon that we cannot read every bill. I know that perhaps a substantial majority of the newspapers of the United States seem to feel that this bill should become law, but I am sure that few editors have read the measure. They are taking it on faith too. But I undertake to show, Mr. President, by a reading of the bill, that many editorial expressions which demand of Senators to vote to override the veto have, in all likelihood, been written without a knowledge of what the bill does.

Let us read the language:

SEC. 3 (d). There shall be a general counsel of the Board who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a term of 4 years.

There, in words of one syllable, we are told that the general counsel of the Board will be appointed, not by the Board, but by the President of the United States, with the advice and consent of the Senate. He will be an independent

officer. He will not be subject to direction by the National Labor Relations Board with respect to his principal functions.

What are the powers to be given to this new official? These are the words of the measure itself:

The general counsel of the Board shall exercise general supervision over all attorneys employed by the Board (other than trial examiners and legal assistants to Board members) and over the officers and employees in the regional offices.

Can there be any misunderstanding of what that sentence means? It gives to this independent officer general supervision over all the lawyers, except trial examiners and the personal advisers of the members of the Board, and over all the employees in the regional offices of the Board. Can it be possible, Mr. President, that the sponsors of the bill, the members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and the members of the conference committee, actually desired to set up an independent officer who should have control and supervision over the regional employees appointed by the Board? That is what the bill does. Someone may say, "Why, that would be unthinkable. The general counsel no doubt appoints these people." That would be a mistake, Mr. President.

In section 4 (a) we find this sentence:

The Board shall appoint an executive secretary, and such attorneys, examiners, and regional directors, and such other employees as it may from time to time find necessary for the proper performance of its duties.

So the bill undertakes to authorize the Board to appoint attorneys and regional officers and other employees to help it to perform its duties—observe those words, its duties—and then it turns around and gives general supervision of those very employees selected by the Board to the independent officer, the general counsel. How can anyone imagine that such a bill could work successfully?

INTRA-AGENCY STRUGGLE FOR POWER

Let me read another sentence which demonstrates conclusively that a conflict would be bound to result if the veto is overridden. I am reading now from section 5:

The principal office of the Board shall be in the District of Columbia, but it may meet and exercise any or all of its powers at any other place. The Board may, by one or more of its members or by such agents or agencies as it may designate, prosecute any inquiry necessary to its functions in any part of the United States.

So here, Mr. President, we undertake to clothe this Board with the power to prosecute any inquiry anywhere in the United States, but at the same time we set up the independent officer, the general counsel of the Board, upon whom the Board must rely for advice, and we give him the independent power to control the employees in the regional offices throughout the United States, as well as to supervise all the work of the attorneys.

But one may say, "Surely that was not intended. Surely the situation will not develop in that manner." Ah, but, Mr. President, let us see what the conferees said they intended to do by this language. If anyone has the slightest doubt of what the language means, it is completely cleared up by what the conferees have said about it on page 37 in their own explanation of their purpose. It is their explanation, not mine.

The conference agreement does not make provision for an independent agency to exercise the investigating and prosecuting functions under the act—

That is what the Senate bill did, and the Senate conferees abandoned it—

but does provide that there shall be a general counsel of the Board, who is to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a term of 4 years.

I wish Senators would pay heed to this language coming from the report of the conferees when they undertake to tell the Members of the Senate and the Members of the House and the people of the country just what they had in mind when they were writing this conference bill. Here is their language:

The general counsel is to have general supervision and direction of all attorneys employed by the Board (excluding the trial examiners and the legal assistants to the individual members of the Board), and of all the officers and employees in the Board's regional offices, and is to have the final authority to act in the name of, but independently of any direction, control, or review by, the Board in respect of the investigation of charges and the issuance of complaints of unfair labor practices, and in respect of the prosecution of such complaints before the Board.

No one can misunderstand that. The independent officer appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, is authorized by the bill before us, as clearly stated in the conference report, to act for the Board, "but independently of any direction, control, or review by, the Board in respect of the investigation of charges and the issuance of complaints of unfair labor practices."

Can anyone wonder that I call the general counsel a labor czar? He acts for the Board, but independently of it, independent, as the conferees put it, "of any direction, control, or review." Make no mistake about it, Mr. Businessman, he will be telling us, not asking us, just as he will be telling the Board.

We will not know how he will use this power until he has been nominated and confirmed. When that takes place he will read the law. He will understand what Congress has said about his independence and it is inevitable that he will not surrender to the Board. Human nature, being what it is, he will take and exercise the power Congress is giving him. The Board will resist him, no doubt, but the Board will lose. Who knows what his point of view is going to be? Who can find the standards in this bill that will guide his imperious discretion?

CONCENTRATION FURTHER CONCENTRATED

I have said that the bill creates the most tremendous centralization of power over American business that was ever suggested in the United States. It takes only 3 or 4 minutes contemplation of the language which I have read, and of other language in the bill, to show that that is absolutely true.

It might be said in defense of the provisions which I have just read that the purpose in making the general counsel independent of the National Labor Relations Board was to make him a prosecutor, and make the Board a court to hear the cases. It might be argued that the purpose was to make the National Labor Relations Board a sort of court to deal impartially, and as a matter of first impression, with the cases which were to be worked up by the independent officer.

I have two criticisms of that argument. The first, of course, is that inasmuch as the general counsel is the legal adviser of the Board, the two functions have not been separated. There was a complete separation in the Senate bill, but now the two functions are joined, and the legal adviser of the Board is made independent of the Board.

But let us assume that that were not the fact. Let us disregard that criticism for a moment, and consider the other. It will be borne in mind that the bill creates a board and, by the language which I have just read, gives it the power to hold hearings and pursue inquiries anywhere in the United States; it makes no difference where. The bill gives the Board the power to delegate its authority. How many criticisms have we heard about the delegation of authority by executive function? It is worth while to place the language to which I refer in the RECORD at this point. I read from section 3 (b):

(b) The Board is authorized to delegate to any group of three or more members any or all of the powers which it may itself exercise. A vacancy in the Board shall not impair the right of the remaining members to exercise all of the powers of the Board, and three members of the Board shall, at all times, constitute a quorum of the Board, except that two members shall constitute a quorum of any group designated pursuant to the first sentence hereof. The Board shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noticed.

Observe that the Board is given complete and plenary power to delegate any or all of its power to any group of three; and then any two members of that group of three can speak for the Board. So we have a bill—and I invite the attention of lawyers in this body to this—which not only authorizes the Board to delegate its powers, but authorizes the Board to delegate its powers, and all of them, to less than a quorum of the Board. This we do in the name of reducing government in Washington. This we do in the name of returning control of the economic life of the people of the United States to the people of the United States; and we undertake a program of delegated powers which, so far as I know, has never been suggested before in the history of this Government.

I was speaking of the description which has been given by some of its supporters to this measure, or which might be given, as a bill intended to authorize the National Labor Relations Board to sit as a court and to hear cases.

On the Supreme Court of the United States we have nine justices. But before they are called upon to pass upon the controversies which arise in the administration of the laws of this Nation, the cases are all tried, as matters of first impression, by courts in the various districts, by courts of appeal, or by courts especially established for particular purposes. Under the structure of the judiciary system of the United States we preserve local and regional independence. We guarantee to the people the opportunity to have their disputes settled where they live. Do we do that in this case?

Mr. President, I stood upon this floor in 1937 and criticized the so-called court-packing bill because it would have authorized the appointment of traveling judges who would go out of Washington to all parts of the United States and pass upon the litigation of the people of the United States. Now the great Republican Party undertakes to create for our all-important labor-management economy a traveling judiciary system which will go all over the United States, with power to inquire into the economic labor-management controversies of the people and bring them back here to Washington for decision. They cannot be decided by the people or for the people in any local tribunal. They can be determined only by the central body in Washington.

Can anyone wonder, Mr. President, that I undertake to say that the bill goes further than any bill ever proposed—not to say any bill ever passed—toward the creation of arbitrary central Government power in Washington? It comes from the spokesmen of the Republican Party. All their denunciation of arbitrary central Government power will be of no more consequence than a breath of air if they support this bill. Let no Member of the majority ever again open his mouth in denunciation of arbitrary Government power over the lives of the people if he votes to override this veto.

He will have acted, as the clear language of this measure says, to give a single officer almost complete power over the economic life of the United States.

This, Mr. President, is just another step on the road toward centralization which we have been following for lo these many years. Why cannot Senators and Members of Congress take off the blinders and read the bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I yield three additional minutes to the Senator from Wyoming.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized for three additional minutes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I say, let Senators read the bill, and they will have no doubt in their minds that here we are taking another long stride in the trend of arbitrary power in Washington, in the destruction of the power of the people to run their own economy. Congress should act to protect and strengthen the power of the people, instead of increasing the power of Government, as this bill does. We ought to sustain the veto and then, if necessary, remain in Washington throughout the remainder of the summer to write a bill which will be——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should like to ask the Senator if it is not true that a majority of all the Democrats in both Houses of Congress have voted for this bill? When he talks about party responsibility——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, that is no argument. The leadership is the leadership of the Republican Party. I grant that some of my Democratic colleagues have been almost as blind as the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle have been.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I will again suggest that a majority of all the Democrats in the Congress of the United States have voted in favor of this bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is one thing I can say, and that is that a majority of the Democrats in the Senate have not yet been lured away by the blind leadership which is coming from the other side—doing the very thing they say should not be done.

EXPENDITURES IN CONNECTION WITH ELECTIONS

O Mr. President, let me take sufficient time to analyze another provision of the bill which has been completely misunderstood and misrepresented by the spokesmen for the bill. I was upon the floor of the Senate when the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] told this body that the conferees had written into this bill a provision which would prevent labor organizations from spending the money of their unions to affect in any way a presidential election. I read the provision, and when I read it I was amazed to find that there was not a word in it to support the interpretation given by the Senator from Ohio that this bill would prevent labor unions from publishing newspapers with their funds raised by dues but permit them to express political opinions in papers financed by subscriptions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has again expired.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Wyoming three more minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized for an additional 3 minutes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. He said, in response to the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], that the purpose of the bill was to permit labor unions to print newspapers if they did it by subscriptions. Let us see what is done. I will read from section 304 in regard to restriction on political contributions and expenditures. This is an amendment of section 313 of the Corrupt Practices Act:

It is unlawful for any national bank, or any corporation organized by authority of any law of Congress, to make a contribution or expenditure—

That is the new word used—

in connection with any election to any political office—

Observe that the language is "in connection with," not "to affect" any election—

or in connection with any primary election or political convention or caucus held to select candidates for any political office, or—

Observe this language—

or for any corporation whatever, or any labor organization to make a contribution or expenditure—

That is the new word "expenditure"—

in connection with any election at which Presidential and Vice Presidential electors or a Senator or Representative in, or a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to Congress are to be voted for.

Observe these words, "any corporation whatever or any labor organization to make a contribution or expenditure in connection with" such an election.

Mr. President, if a labor organization is prohibited from making an expenditure in connection with a Presidential election or any other election, then by this language "any corporation whatever" is also prohibited from doing so. Corporations and labor organizations are treated precisely the same. The section is not a prohibition against expenditures to "affect or influence" an election but "in connection with" an election.

I said to the Chicago Tribune representative a week ago Saturday when he called me up, and I say to the Associated Press, the United Press, and the editor of every newspaper in the United States that is published by a corporation, that if this measure provides what the Senator from Ohio says it does, then not only are labor organizations prohibited from making expenditures "in connection" with an election but so also are any corporation newspapers. An expenditure which is made to send a correspondent to Philadelphia to report the next Republican Convention is an expenditure "in connection with" the next election and is prohibited.

Editors who want to override the veto may comfort themselves that the bill will not be enforced. But I say to them and to you that this is an example of the careless manner in which this bill has been drawn. It is only one of many mistakes. The bill should be rewritten.

This is a time for patience, industry, and tolerance. Let us sustain the veto and write a good bill.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I had not intended to debate this question further; but so many fine people in my State and in the Nation are so confused and bewildered by the multiplicity of Government controls and conflicting interpretations of the proposed remedies, that they assume it is necessary to line up violently prolabor or promanagement.

This labor bill has become an intensely emotional issue. Prejudice and feeling apparently have taken the place of reason and logic. There are some among us who seem to think all that is desired in the way of improving conditions must be done by legislation, which may never be effective until great sums have been spent on litigation.

Mr. President, we appear to be continuing the policy of trying to save the country by dangerously stirring up class hatreds. We may be on the road to dissensions that form the wedge to cleavages that will lead to profound changes, at a perilous time, when unity is the most urgent need in sustaining our democracy. We confidently set up laws and regulations that divide men and women representing the workers and management into groups and classes, and which practically forbid the normal social relationships, and which are expected to bring worker-management peace.

I am therefore constrained to make my position crystal clear. I am not prolabor or promanagement. I am pro-United States.

Mr. President, it is time we correlate some of the trends which in themselves may be relatively innocuous, but which in their entirety are extremely dangerous, and which would lead the people of this country into a situation which they would not knowingly create by their votes at the polls.

This fateful procedure, step by step, each apparently simple and logical, may lead to that final plunge, which as this body will recall, in the progress of events took us into two world wars, and left the Congress, in each case, no alternative but to declare war, because when the question finally reached Congress it found we were already in the fight.

All this, we were shocked to find, boiled up out of the mess of catch words and slogans—historic phrases such as "make the world safe for democracy," "the four freedoms," "reciprocal trade," "the forgotten man," "economic royalists," "we owe it to ourselves," "we cannot be prosperous in a starving world," and dozens of other pithy expressions which inflamed the minds of men in those times of extreme nervous stress and strain.

Mr. President, I wonder if the American people will ever wake up and realize that some nation had better stay prosperous in a world that has had starving people through 5,000 years of recorded history, that this dream of reciprocal trade as now advocated in our world of plenty will prove to be just one more method of dividing our substance with the nations of low-wage living standards by importing the products made by their low-paid people, instead of helping them to help themselves? Will we ever realize that huge loans and gifts to foreign nations, made without hope of repayment, and without a definite international policy geared to our domestic economy, mean lower wages for Americans? Will we ever understand that the pouring out of such floods of our substance—whether released by the direct action of congressional appropriations, or by treaty commitments that force us to pay indirect reparations through one foreign nation to another, or by the funds which come through the Import-Export Bank or through the securities sold to the American public by the World Bank, and loaned in the same manner, or by means of trade treaties which stifle our own production by importation of the merchandise and commodities of the low-wage nations of the world—is all part of the manipulation directed to the same goal of lowering the standard of living of the American people?

Mr. President, will we ever realize that all this has been advocated by the administration for the past 15 years and that it is all part of a well-laid plan to enslave this Nation under a gigantic socialistic system or something worse, and that the weird system of administering labor legislation has been a part of this plan? Bear in mind it is this same administration, now raising the cry of communism, which officially recognized Russia a few months after coming into power in 1933, without providing safeguards of any kind whatsoever. It is this same administration that has produced some of the strangest administrative rulings and some of the most weird Supreme Court decisions in cases between labor and management that have ever occurred in the history of this Nation.

These are the reasons why I ran for the Senate of the United States in the first place. I did not win the first time. I won in the third round. The New Deal defeated me twice, with the help of a bipartisan coalition in 1934 and 1944. I am allergic to bipartisan combinations.

Mr. President, the solution, then, does not lie in superimposing another layer of complicated Federal laws and machinery on top of an act which itself, for the most part, should be repealed. The solution lies in the defeat of the administration in 1948, so that the Government may assume, in relation to worker-management disagreement, the role of making the rules and fairly administering them.

My reason for supporting the veto is not that I care to support an administration which, in my judgment, has reached the point of extreme incompetence through the creation of the greatest maze of bureaus, boards, commissions, and trick organizations ever assembled in any government, but because we have not found the answer in retaining the already top-heavy Wagner Act and by attempting to repair it through an act almost as lengthy, and which in one particular provision unduly weakens the workers' bargaining unit, as I have previously stated on this floor.

Mr. President, I believe in less Government meddling, not more, as applied to worker-management relations and all other Government functions in this Nation. It is time we stopped the labor-management pendulum from swinging back and forth and determine where that old dong ought to hang.

As I have repeatedly stated, I will vote to regulate both the workers' bargaining unit, and management, but I will not vote to break or unduly weaken either one.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Washington comes from a magnificent and sovereign State which is probably as highly organized in a labor sense as any State in our Nation. I have therefore been exposed to what is known as pressure of an unusual character and intensity. Few Senators in this Chamber have been given greater encouragement to vote to sustain the President's veto. Few Senators have been so threatened with political reprisals as has the junior Senator from Washington.

I have studied the legislation; I have listened to and read the endless words uttered before the committee hearings and on this floor; I have talked to as many labor leaders as time made possible; I have analyzed, as best I could, the President's veto message; I have welcomed the telegrams and letters and telephone calls, by what seem the thousands, which have come to me in recent weeks, on both sides of the subject, from the citizens of every walk of life in my own home State.

Mr. President, a man's opinion is no better than the information on which it is based. On the basis of a flood-tide of information on the subject of the labor bill before us, which I have worked and labored so hard to understand, I shall, without apology, but with hope for better human and industrial relationships in the future, vote to override the President's veto.

Mr. President, I have three basic reasons for my decision.

First, I am completely convinced that no thinking person, no intelligent person, and no real American in our land believes that a maintenance of the status quo is good for America. The President of the United States has urged, has he not, that our labor laws be changed. Without exception, every member of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee recommended changes in the prevailing legislation. During the course of our recent filibuster, no single opponent of the proposed labor legislation failed to agree that changes were in order. To vote against the conference report is to encourage industrial relations in this country to stand still. I cannot vote to retard progress.

Second, I am completely convinced and satisfied that the substance of the conference labor bill retains the right to strike, while at the same time it helps to enforce the right of a man or woman to work. Americans generally, including tens of thousands of union members, have registered in scores of ways their opposition to the senselessness and utter waste of secondary boycotts, for example, and jurisdictional strikes. The average American knows and is willing to say that the right of free speech belongs to everyone regardless of the class or group of which he is a part. Provisions to rectify past abuses in these fields are included in the conference report. I do not presume to know abolutely that the corrective provisions will cure the evils. No

man can be certain now that the legislation is the best legislation which can ultimately be written. What we do know is that reasonable and fair-minded Americans have done their best to correct the faults which have surrounded us in recent years. The conference bill, Mr. President, has sought to attain its single objective of keeping the wheels of industry in full production for the good of this Nation and of the world. I shall vote again for the conference report because its intention is good and fair and democratic.

Third, I shall vote for the conference report because its designers and the entire Congress know that the intended labor legislation is not an end in itself. There is nothing sacred in the instrument before us. I should vote to oppose the measure if I thought that its provisions were not to be subject to change. A joint congressional committee is charged with seeing that a performance of the provisions of the bill lives up to the bill's intentions and high promise. This can only be accomplished, Mr. President, by revision and change and modification and enforcement. There may, indeed, be included provisions and demands which will not work. If they do not work they must be changed so that they will work. If the bill is worth anything—and I think it is worth a very great deal—it is because this Congress, which represents the mass of America, will insist that the legislation changes form and character and direction in keeping with the demands of the difficult days which lie before us all.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Washington has expired.

Mr. CAIN. I should like to have an additional half minute, I say to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator whatever part of 5 minutes the Senator may require.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, as an American citizen and as a Senator in the Senate of these United States, I am privileged to vote for an instrument which is free from cynicism and futility and despair. This instrument says to America and to the world that we shall keep on trying until we find industrial peace and security at home. If the instrument fails to accomplish its high objectives, the very same men who wrote it, and supported it, and those far more able men who follow us all, will try and try again until men can work without fear of oppression or restraint from the abusers of privilege, be they of labor or of management.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, the question before us today is not whether we should support one man, but whether we should vote our best judgment in the interest of millions of working men and women, and the Nation.

The welfare of all the people in the United States is so much more important than our interest in or feeling for any one man or group of individuals that our duty demands that our action shall be in the interest of the body politic and economic.

No one claims that H. R. 3020 is a perfect bill, because it would be absolutely impossible for any set of human beings to enact a law governing the human relationships between employer and employee, which, as we go along, will need no amendments or changes.

Since the beginning of time we have been endeavoring to find a way to improve the human relationship which, in the old days, was the relationship of master and servant, but which today, after hundreds of years of effort and the invoking of Christian principles, has become the relationship of employer and employee.

All any laws that we or any other representatives of the people enact can ever be, under a system of freemen, are rules of the game of human relationship.

The Government should be a fair referee, to see that the rules of the game are properly administered and complied with. To succeed, the Government must apply the rules in a nonpartisan manner, ever watchful of the necessity for change in the rules of the game so as to correct unfairness and injustice.

Unless I misunderstand the people of this Nation, they do not want monopoly in the hands of any individual or group of individuals in the United States, whether serving as leaders in business and industry, or leaders in labor unions.

No sane or understanding American citizen or representative of the people would pursue a course, in or out of Congress, that would injure or destroy the legitimate rights of the working people of this Nation. If he did, he would injure himself and all other good Americans.

The essence of Americanism is to establish fair rules of conduct and human relationship, so as to keep the door of opportunity open for the poorest man in our country who complies with the established laws and rules of action to improve his status in American life.

But we must remove fear from the hearts of men and women and restore their right of freedom and safety in the pursuit of those rights, if we would preserve the American system of freemen, and the leadership to peace that has recently fallen upon our shoulders.

Every representative of the people must carefully weigh what is right and what is wrong, and he must recognize that, while there may be thousands of telegrams sent to him supporting one side, yet there are milions of people back home who would send telegrams if they felt it to be necessary.

Those silent millions, both in and out of the ranks of labor, expect us to do our duty, and abolish any rules of the game heretofore established which interferes with their pursuit of happiness and the rightful exercise of their desires to make a living in such a way as not to interfere with the welfare of the people as a whole.

Let us not listen only to the loud voice of those who think they have the biggest interest in the passage or defeat of this bill, whether they be in the ranks of employers or the leaders of workers. Rather let us listen to the silent voice of the millions back home who seldom speak, but who are waiting for peace, prosperity, and justice, and who still believe in the guaranties of the Constitution of the United States.

No law can be much better than the proper administration of it makes it. A bad law can be made fairly good if wisely and equitably administered. A good law can be made horribly bad by an administration of it with the objective and purpose of proving it unworkable and bad.

This bill, wisely and fairly administered, will bring prosperity to the country and its people, and, in my judgment, which is founded upon 45 years of intimate association with labor, of which I was a part for a number of years, it will bring injury to none of the legitimate rights and freedoms of labor.

No bill will bring prosperity if those in power wish to make it fail. No law will be good of itself, and the limitations for all law lie in the honesty, intelligence, and integrity of its administration.

Since 1935 we have been operating under a labor law which destroyed mutuality between employer and employee. It even destroyed, to a very substantial extent, the right of free speech guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. What happened to it? So far as I know, little or nothing has been done in 12 years to change the bad features of that law, until this Congress has finally offered a new set of rules which, in its opinion, will lead to substantial betterment in the relationship of employer and employee.

On the foundation of that relationship rest all the hopes of future years for prosperity at home and our leadership in the cause of justice and peace in world affairs.

I hope this Congress and succeeding Congresses will never make the mistake of letting any part of this law remain on the books as the guiding rule of human relationship one minute longer than it takes to analyze its effect and enact a cure in the form of amendments or replacements if they are needed to establish fair rules of human relationship between employer and employee—rules that are compatible with the preservation of our American system of freemen and the American system of making a living, based upon human rights and the security of property ownership—rules which do not stimulate friction and enmity between the groups which make up our American free competitive enterprise system.

Under our American system, the workingman of today can and has become the owner and employer of tomorrow. The rules of conduct or the laws governing the relationship of human beings are the foundation upon which we built, but the superstructure, which has made America great in the past, can only be preserved through friendly voluntary cooperation which recognizes that no good can come to any individual and remain with him permanently except through this process of voluntary cooperation, and a recognition by all that the welfare of the individual is absolutely dependent upon the over-all accomplishment and happiness of the people as a whole.

Believing these things, and recognizing the imperfections of human accomplishment on the one hand, and the power of the representatives of the people to correct things which are wrong on the other hand, I shall vote to override the Presidential veto.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I yield 20 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL].

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KNOWLAND in the chair). The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, as one who has been associated with the development of the pending legislation since its inception, and who has gone through all the many weeks of hearings and committee consideration, continuing over a period of about 5 months—which, of course, completely belies the suggestion and charge heard so often that this is hasty, ill-considered legislation—I studied the President's veto message very carefully.

I must say that I find it one of the most amazing documents to come out of the White House since I have been in the Senate. As I read that message, it appears to me that the President cannot find a single clause or section in the bill of which he approves. As far as I can recall, I think the only section on which he does not comment adversely is that prohibiting strikes by Government employees; which merely reenacts into permanent law a section which has been carried for 2 years in every appropriation bill.

That is an amazing situation, Mr. President. Here is a bill which has been evolved after 5 months of arduous effort by the committees of both Houses, which has commanded in each House over two-thirds of the votes of all the Members; and the President of the United States cannot find a single section of which he approves.

So far as the veto message is concerned, Mr. President, there are apparently no real abuses in the field of labor relations which need correction. I do not see how, in the light of that message, the Congress could possibly write a bill which would obtain Presidential approval.

I have known the present occupant of the White House for a long time. I served with him intimately on committees of the Congress. I do not believe that the President had time to study the bill carefully. I am convinced that the message and the ideas on which it was based were furnished to him by agencies of the Government, notably the National Labor Relations Board, on whose analysis of the bill there has been comment on the Senate floor.

I consider that analysis completely distorted, Mr. President. It disregards all the reports of the committees. It disregards the statements of the managers of the bill on the floor of the Senate and on the floor of the House, in order to put the harshest possible interpretation on every single section and sentence of the bill; as if the NLRB, which will have a major responsibility in administering it, will lean over backwards to make the law operate as harshly as possible on unions.

That kind of attitude, of course, we know is not going to prevail. I think it is rather significant that the analysis prepared by the attorneys of the Board follows so closely the analysis published and placed in the RECORD by Representative MARCANTONIO, of New York, and the analysis prepared by Lee Pressman, general counsel of the CIO, who could hardly be termed to be anxious for any kind of labor legislation.

Mr. President, this message is so studded with distortions of the clear legislative intent of the provisions of the bill that it would not be possible in the time allotted me to go into all of them, but I should like to refer to a few.

In his first comment, that the bill would substantially increase strikes, under paragraph (4), the President has this to say:

> The bill would force unions to strike or to boycott, if they wish to have a jurisdictional dispute settled by the National Labor Relations Board.

Mr. President, that statement is just not true. Every time the National Labor Relations Board now handles a representation case, the Board must first decide what is an appropriate unit; and in deciding what is an appropriate unit, it assigns certain work tasks to the people within that unit. So that every time there is a representation case, the Board, in effect, now decides that kind of jurisdictional dispute. Of course, when it is a dispute between two unions as to who shall represent all the employees in a plant, we know that the Board determines those disputes.

Mr. President, in his second list of objections to the bill, under paragraph (3) of his veto message, the President has this to say:

> The bill presents the danger that employers and employees might be prohibited from agreeing on safety provisions, rest-period rules, and many other legitimate practices, since such practices may fall under the language defining "featherbedding."

Mr. President, that again is a complete distortion of the actual wording of the section to which the President refers, which is 8 (b), which makes it an unfair practice for a labor organization—

> 6. To cause or attempt to cause an employer to pay or deliver, or to agree to pay or deliver, any money or other thing of value, in the nature of an exaction, for services which are not performed or not to be performed.

There is not a word in that, Mr. President, about "featherbedding." It says that it is an unfair practice for a union to force an employer to pay for work which is not performed. In the colloquy on this floor between the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Ohio, before the bill was passed, it was made abundantly clear that it did not apply to rest periods, it did not apply to speedups or safety provisions, or to anything of that nature; it applied only to situations, for instance, where the Musicians' Federation forces an employer to hire one orchestra and then to pay for another stand-by orchestra, which does no work at all.

Mr. President, in the third list of objections to the bill, in paragraph (1), the President says this:

> The bill would invite frequent disruption of continuous plant production by opening up immense possibilities for many more elections, and adding new types of elections.

Mr. President, the only new type of election added is the one at which employees have a chance to vote for the first time, by secret ballot, as to whether they want compulsory membership in a union. That is the only new type of election. As for requiring more frequent elections, the only provision in the bill relating to that is in section 9, providing that only one valid election may be held in a single year. Instead of increasing the possibility of having too frequent elections, the bill goes in exactly the opposite direction by saying there cannot be more than one election in 1 year. At present, the law is silent in that regard, and there have been cases where elections have been held as many as three or four times in 1 year.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I am sorry, Mr. President; my time is limited, and I want to finish. If I have time, at the end of my remarks, I shall be glad to yield.

In his fourth set of objections to the bill, in paragraph (1), the President, in his veto message, says:

> The bill would make it easier for an employer to get rid of employees whom he wanted to discharge because they exercised their right of self-organization guaranteed by the act. It would permit an employer to dismiss a man on the pretext of a slight infraction of shop rules, even though his real motive was to discriminate against this employee for union activity.

Mr. President, what that refers to is an explicit provision inserted in the bill in conference, saying that if the employer proves to the satisfaction of the Board that he discharged an employee for cause, he cannot be held guilty of an unfair-labor practice in discharging him. That is exactly the rule which the courts now require the National Labor Relations Board to follow. In other words, if the National Labor Relations Board finds that an employer discharged an employee for cause, they cannot find him guilty of an unfair-labor practice, and it is up to the Board to make the decision.

In paragraph (4), under the same division, the President says this:

> It—
>
> The bill—
>
> would deprive workers of the power to meet the competition of goods produced under sweat-shop conditions by permitting employers to halt every type of secondary boycott, not merely those for unjustifiable purposes.

Mr. President, neither the Secretary of Labor nor the Chairman of the NLRB was able to tell us in specific terms what a justifiable secondary boycott is. But further than that, the whole purpose of the present Wagner Act is to guarantee to employees full freedom in choosing their own representatives.

Mr. President, the whole purpose of a secondary boycott is for one union to force the employees of another employer to choose that particular union as their representative, regardless of their own desires. Every secondary boycott today is in its purpose in violation of the National Labor Relations Act, and yet the President tells us that some of them are justifiable.

Paragraphs (5) and (6) of the same division again distort the plain definition of "agent" in section 2 of this rewrite of the Wagner Act, which says that to prove agency one does not necessarily have to prove that the principal specifically ratified or authorized the acts of the agent.

Finally, Mr. President, in his seventh list of objections is the statement that the bill would discriminate against employees. In paragraph (1) the President has this to say:

> (1) It would impose discriminatory penalties upon employers and employees for the same offense, that of violating the requirement that existing agreements be maintained for 60 days without strike or lock-out while a new agreement is being negotiated. Employers could only be required to restore the previous conditions of employment, but employees could be summarily dismissed by the employer.

Mr. President, that is a rather startling criticism to come from the same President who a year ago recommended a special bill which would have drafted into the Army employees who refused to go back to work when ordered to by the President, and which would have subjected them to the penalties of court martial if they refused to go back. I think ours is a very mild provision, which merely says to unions, "You must have a 60-day reopening clause in your contract."

Mr. President, those of us who have worked with the bill are convinced that there is not a provision in it which will hurt any legitimate activity of labor unions. Instead it is in effect a bill of rights for small employers and for the rank and file of working men and women. It deals specifically and clearly with such things as the abuses of compulsory membership in unions through closed and union-shop contracts, with the abuses of secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes, with the potential abuses of welfare funds.

I may say, Mr. President, that the sponsors of the bill agree that the provision on welfare funds is a stopgap designed to keep the situation from degenerating into a racket until Congress has time to investigate the whole thing fully. The bill clarifies the status of foremen, which is an imperative step if the free enterprise system is to continue to function efficiently in this country.

Finally, it deals, admittedly not too strongly, with the problem created when industry-wide strikes or lockouts tend to paralyze the whole national economy. It is not a final answer, but I may point out, Mr. President, that that is one of the specific subjects for the joint committee set up in title IV to study.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I do not think the veto message contains a single legitimate argument against the bill which can be sustained by fair-minded men and women, and I sincerely hope that the Senate will again pass this measure and make it law.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I yield 10 or 15 minutes, whatever he wishes, to the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES].

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, when the conference bill was before this body on the day on which it was finally passed by the Senate, I expressed myself rather thoroughly concerning it. It is not my purpose at this time to repeat to any great extent what I said then.

However, the veto message accompanying the President's disapproval, as I see it, was utterly extreme, extreme in an uncalled-for manner, extreme in a sense which leaves no room by which there is a possibility to get together. Therefore, in the face of that veto message, I should like to make further comment.

As I said at that time, and I repeat now, this is not a perfect bill. No one knows that better than I do. However, I want to point out one very important thing, and that is that in all probability this is as near perfection, insofar as legislation of this nature is concerned, as we can hope to reach at this particular time of the Congress of the United States. It probably reflects more completely the composite thinking of the Congress of the United States at this time than would any other piece of legislation dealing with this subject.

So when the President comes forth and, as was pointed out by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], has nothing favorable to say about any part of the legislation, it causes one to pause, because I happen to know very definitely that most parts of this measure are very good indeed. It is not as bad as it has been pictured to be in the veto message. The message contains exaggeration after exaggeration. The worst possible interpretation again and again is placed upon the bill's provisions. Then it is inferred it is to be subjected, finally, to the worst possible type of administration that any act of this nature could possibly have. Of course, if that were the case, we would have chaos; but that is not the case. The bill, with sympathetic, sincere administration, can be made to work, and it can be made to work without any injury whatever to the legitimate objectives of organized labor. In fact, administered properly, the bill can strengthen organized labor, and I want to see organized labor strengthened.

The attitude of the President, the attitude of the critics of the legislation, causes me to wonder: Is there going to be a definite attempt to sabotage this legislation if it is enacted? I come to the point which I think is one of the three most important in connection with the bill, namely, Will the National Labor Relations Board, and the administration under that Board, seek to sabotage the legislation? I do not believe so. I have faith in the Chairman of that Board. He may not agree with the bill, he may not like it, but he is the type of man who will do his utmost to see that its provisions are carried out faithfully.

There may be sabotage in other places. That is what has to be watched.

It must be definitely understood—and this is the second most important thing in connection with this legislation—that we should have an appropriation sufficient to permit the Board properly to administer the law. Let no one deceive himself about that. Failure to appropriate a sufficient amount of money can in itself bring about the sabotage of this act. I trust that the Congress of the United States, in its wisdom, will see that sufficient funds are provided for this purpose.

Third, and finally, and most important of all, is the question of the joint congressional committee which has been referred to in the discussion today. Too little attention has been paid to the importance of that joint committee. However, I think its significance is now beginning to be realized. The joint committee itself, through its own operations and activities, can pave the way for the removal of any undesirable situation which may develop as a result of this legislation. That may sound like a rather extreme statement. I have had experience in this field, with this type of committee activity and this type of approach. I am not afraid of this bill, with the type of joint congressional committee which I assume will be established under it—seven members from the Senate and seven members from the House. This joint committee will have a grave responsibility. Presumably, its members will be named at the time the law goes into effect, which I assume will be 60 days after the enactment of the bill.

The joint congressional committee has two areas of responsibility in the very first instance. First, it must see that there is no sabotage in the administration of the law. That is one task which, above all others, it must assume—to see that the administration is as we intend it to be, that there is fairness and justice under the law and that the new law is interpreted as it is our intention that it should be interpreted.

The second main function of the joint committee this year will be the job of ascertaining those parts of the bill which may not be perfect, which may not work satisfactorily. There may be a few provisions which will not work as intended; but that should not be permitted to destroy the whole piece of legislation. The task of the committee will be to ascertain those unsatisfactory parts, to prepare appropriate amendments, and to see that these amendments are offered and properly supported at the next session of the Congress.

As I stated in my remarks 2 weeks ago, this bill is not an end product. This is not final legislation on this subject. That was the mistake which had been made in connection with the National Labor Relations Act, when it was first passed, and ever since. This type of legislation is subject to constant change and correction. If it were perfect today, 5 years from today many imperfections would very likely have shown up, in view of intervening circumstances. There can be no end product, no final legislation, in this field.

With that understanding, the joint congressional committee can go forward, looking for corrections which must be

made, and helping management and labor to get together and to work together. These things they can do, and I know it. The joint committee should act in part to help formulate administrative policy and procedure as well as to perform its functions as a strictly legislative agency at the inception of the new law. These things the committee can do, and I know it.

If the committee will go forward with the idea of helping to get labor and management together, the idea of correcting the defects in the legislation, and, finally, the idea of having a law which is absolutely fair and as nearly perfect as possible, then I predict that the bill passed today—as I believe it will be—will prove to be of great benefit to the country.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. IVES. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to say to the able Senator from New York that as chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor and Federal Security of the Committee on Appropriations, I quite agree with him that there must be sufficient funds for the National Labor Relations Board to carry out the purposes of the proposed act. As chairman of the subcommittee, I shall do everything in my power to see that adequate funds are supplied.

Mr. IVES. I thank the Senator from California.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] yield further?

Mr TAFT. Mr. President, I have no other speaker at the moment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, acting in behalf of the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] while he is absent from the Chamber, I shall parcel out the time until he returns, or until the Senator from Ohio again wishes to take time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. To whom does the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield 5 minutes to myself, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall not speak at length, as my announcement indicates; but I could. [Laughter.] I have been very much interested in some of the newspaper comments today, to the effect that those of us who spoke at length last Friday and Saturday in opposition to the attempt to force a vote Saturday at 5 p. m. on the President's veto failed to win our point. Some papers are saying that the filibuster petered out and fizzled.

I note in the Washington Post this morning another of its slanted editorials on the historic debate on labor issues which has been going on during this session of Congress. As to the debate of last Friday and Saturday, the editorial says that—

> The filibuster against the labor bill fizzled without bringing either credit or hope of victory to its sponsors.

It would be rather interesting if the press, and particularly the Washington Post in its editorials, would present the facts in regard to the filibuster of last week end. The news stories in the Washington Post were very accurate, but its editorial of this morning, like some of its other editorials on this labor legislation, was very misleading and inaccurate.

The facts are that the filibuster would have been in progress as of this hour if the majority in this body had not accepted the terms on which the filibuster was ended. We stated at the beginning of the filibuster that there would be no vote on Saturday at 5 o'clock, and that we would continue to talk through the week end until our point was granted, namely, that the majority in this body should not be allowed to force its will upon a minority exercising its rights. We had the right under the rules to object to the proposal for a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on the veto message at 5 p. m. on Saturday. We exercised that right. The majority became angry and in violation of our rights under the rule decided to force us into a continuous session unless we yielded to their demand that we forego our rights. We accepted their challenge. We said that the rule requiring unanimous consent of the Senate before debate could be stopped in the Senate would become meaningless if the majority were permitted to adopt the tactics with which they threatened us. We pointed out why we thought that no vote should be taken before 3 p. m. Monday. When the majority refused to extend to us the parliamentary courtesy to which we were entitled under the spirit and intent of the unanimous-consent rule, we proceeded to talk at length. We quickly organized a group of speakers to talk through the week end and until Monday at 3 p. m. Those are the facts.

It was my agreement with my colleagues to talk until half an hour past midnight on Saturday. I could have done so. I was taking care of myself in the debate all day Saturday from 6:30 a. m., so that I knew I could have done it. In 1941, at the Raleigh Hotel, in the settlement of the railroad case, I held representatives of the parties in session in several committee rooms for 36 continuous hours without a wink of sleep on my part. My carcass has not so deteriorated since 1941 that I could not have kept the Senate in session until half an hour past midnight last Saturday. We had the majority licked and they soon discovered it. The majority settled the filibuster by surrendering its untenable position in this fight. It accepted the terms which we laid down—that we would not vote before 3 o'clock this afternoon. That was our position throughout. It was the Republican leadership that fizzled and blundered by ever starting this fight. Let the Washington Post present that fact if it wants to be fair. It should square its editorials with the facts of its excellent news stories.

Let me make a point or two with regard to the merits of the great issue now before us. I have just listened to two very interesting and able speeches—one by my good friend from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] and the other by my good friend from New York [Mr. IVES].

I think these two distinguished Senators have overlooked one very fundamental point in drafting legislation, and that is that if legislation contains language which permits of abuse of power, it is bad legislation. To say that they believe that extreme interpretations have been placed on the legislation by the President and by some of us who have opposed the legislation on the floor of the Senate is to overlook the point that what the President has been pointing out, and what we have been pointing out, is that the language of the bill would permit abuse of power. It is subject to the interpretation we have put on it and party litigants under it will be entitled to those interpretations as a matter of legal right. This law will not and cannot, under its legal meaning, be interpreted and administered to please the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from New York. It must be given its legal meaning by the courts and I say that the courts are bound to apply it quite differently from the way Senator IVES and Senator BALL talk about it.

To try to alibi it, or rationalize it on the ground that if it is properly administered it will not be as bad as we think it will be, begs the whole question. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] and the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] cannot take away from the courts of this land their solemn obligation to give the legal meaning to the language used in this bill as the law requires. Employees will be entitled to decisions under it which, according to the language of the bill, will enable them to destroy many legitimate rights of labor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator wish to extend his own time?

Mr. MORSE. For 2 minutes, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is recognized for two additional minutes.

Mr. MORSE. The courts are bound to apply the language of this bill in accordance with its legal meaning; and when they do, many hardships will be imposed not only upon organized labor in this country but upon employers as well. It is a legal monstrosity which will cause much litigation and resulting labor strife.

The second point I would make on their speeches is that running through them is the tacit admission that before this bill is finally passed they recognize that it contains a great many imperfections. So does the Washington Post seem to recognize that fact in some of its slanted editorials. I say statesmanship calls upon us now to prevent the passage of legislation which even the sponsors themselves will admit contains many imperfections. These sponsors are engaging already in a confession and avoidance plea.

The last point I want to make is one in regard to Senator IVES' talk about sabotaging the bill. I do not know what he meant by sabotage, but, as I said on Saturday, if this bill goes on the books the junior Senator from Oregon will take the position that the forces of government must be used to carry out and enforce the bill. There cannot be government by law in this country on any other basis. But our insistence upon enforcement of the law is not going to change human nature. I am very much of the opinion that labor, recognizing the tremendous injury that this bill will inflict

upon its legitimate rights, will dig in along a united front and fight the administration of this bill to the extent that it visits upon labor gross injustices.

Will that produce industrial harmony in America? Will that give us the peace in industry that we want? Not at all, Mr. President. We shall not be able to escape the fact that before this bill is even dry on the statute books we shall have to proceed at once to work out substantial revisions of it. Why not do it now? Why not recognize the duty of statesmanship which rests upon each and every one of us and sustain this veto and then proceed, as was pointed out by another speaker this morning, the very able statesman from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] to work on a bill that will meet the objections which have been raised to this bill? I think that is the solemn duty of each one of us in this session of Congress. I shall not vote, Mr. President, for a bill which the proponents already recognize is one which should be started down the road of revision.

Mr. President, I do not believe that an issue more vital to the economic welfare and the over-all public interest of this country will be before the Members of this body for many a day. I am sure that at the hour of 3 o'clock this afternoon every man in this body will have an opportunity to make his record as to whether he will vote to protect the public interest or will vote for a bill so prejudiced in its terms that it will invite and invoke great industrial disharmony for years to come until the injustices of the bill are wiped once and for all off the statute books of America? I shall be glad to stand on my record of consistent opposition to this bill and in support of the President's excellent and unanswerable veto message.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me for a moment?

Mr. TAFT. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Wyoming.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, at this point in the debate I ask that an editorial in the New York Times, the leading Democratic newspaper of the United States, be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAST VOTE ON THE LABOR BILL

Today at 3 p. m. the fate of the Taft-Hartley labor bill will be decided. At that hour the Senate, by agreement, will vote either to override the President's veto or sustain it. If the veto is overridden, the bill will be automatically entered on the statute books and become the law of the land.

On Saturday the filibuster, which was certainly the poorest argument advanced against the bill, showed signs of collapsing through the sheer physical inability of the handful of Senators who engineered it to carry it on. At least, it accomplished the delay they sought. It may or may not have given the administration time enough to switch a few votes. Sometimes such tactics boomerang on those who invoke them. The tally today will show to what extent the last-ditch stand of the bill's opponents was effective.

No further debate, however, could possibly add any enlightenment to the consideration of the measure. Few measures in the history of Congress have been more fully discussed and debated. The Taft-Hartley labor-management bill has been in the making since January. Labor leaders, one after another, have appeared before committees of the two Houses to express their views in opposition or offer their advice. Not one of them admitted any need for reform or offered a helpful suggestion. Advocates of the legislation have received the same careful hearing. Liberal Senators and friends of labor like Senator IVES have been listened to attentively and have exercised a moderating influence on the legislation as it now stands. The formal debates in Congress have been exhaustive and no point at issue has been overlooked. The President has fully expressed his disapproval, both in his lengthy veto message and in his radio appeal to the people. Labor has had ample time to conduct an opposition campaign through extensive newspaper advertising and public meetings. By every rule of reason, the debate has ended.

And Congress has determined that it shall end. The measure is backed by huge majorities in both Chambers. In the House, which has already rejected Mr. Truman's veto, the vote was 4 to 1 against the President. In the Senate the majority in favor of the bill is almost as impressive. It includes many in the President's own party and men of both parties recognized as liberal and moderate. Only in the Senate, where the overriding majority must register at least two-thirds of those voting, does any doubt of the bill's passage remain. That doubt is about to be resolved.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES].

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I do not want it understood in this body that I indicated or intended to indicate in my remarks that this bill has all the matter with it which the Senator from Oregon would indicate I may have indicated. I think, on the whole, that the bill has very little the matter with it that will have to be corrected. Again I say that, on the whole, it is as good a piece of legislation, undoubtedly, as we can get together at this time.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, as a freshman Senator last January I sat in the Hall of the House at the joint session and listened to the President's message on the state of the Union. I have a copy of it here. I find that the matter of labor-management relationship is a matter which is dealt with in that message at greater length than is any other single subject. I think, Mr. President, that we are overlooking the fact that the President himself made many recommendations with reference to labor-management legislation. We seem to be laboring under the thought that the President himself has not expressed any opinion with reference to it until he expressed it in his veto message. That is not the fact. So, just for a moment or two, Mr. President, I should like to deal with some of the recommendations which the President of the United States made in that message. He said, in speaking of collective bargaining:

But as yet not all of us have learned what it means to bargain freely and fairly. Nor have all of us learned to carry the mutual responsibilities that accompany the right to bargain. There have been abuses and harmful practices which limit the effectiveness of our system of collective bargaining. Furthermore, we have lacked sufficient governmental machinery to aid labor and management in resolving differences.

Mr. President, this bill attempts to deal and, I think, does deal as effectively as possible with all of the generalities to which the President himself called attention in this part of his message.

Then he said this:

Certain labor-management problems need attention at once and certain others, by reason of their complexity, need exhaustive investigation and study.

This bill, Mr. President, does deal fairly and justly with certain labor-management problems.

I had occasion a short time ago to look into the matter of the length of time which was spent in hearings on the Wagner Labor Relations Act, that very vitally important piece of legislation which has so greatly affected and, I think, in most respects, affected for good, the labor-management relations of the people of this country. I found that the time spent in hearings on that vitally important piece of legislation was not more than half the time which has been spent upon this legislation with which we are dealing today. I think, Mr. President, if my recollection serves me correctly, that the same thing can be said of the time spent in debate on that measure. In my humble judgment, since I have been in the Senate, never has more careful and thorough attention been given to a piece of legislation than has been given to the bill with which we are now dealing.

The President said this:

We should enact legislation to correct certain abuses and to provide additional governmental assistance in bargaining. But we should also concern ourselves with the basic causes of labor-management difficulties.

I think this bill fairly deals with the things which the President mentioned.

He said further:

Point No. 1 is the early enactment of legislation to prevent certain unjustifiable practices.

First, under this point, are jurisdictional strikes. In such strikes the public and the employer are innocent bystanders who are injured by a collision between rival unions. This type of dispute hurts production, industry, and the public—and labor itself. I consider jurisdictional strikes indefensible.

This bill, Mr. President, deals, and I think fairly and justly, with the subject of jurisdictional strikes.

The President said, further:

The National Labor Relations Act provides procedures for determining which union represents the employees of a particular employer. In some jurisdictional disputes, however, minority unions strike to compel employers to deal with them despite a legal duty to bargain with the majority union. Strikes to compel an employer to violate the law are inexcusable. Legislation to prevent such strikes is clearly desirable.

While this bill may not be perfect in all details, Mr. President, an honest, earnest, and, I think, effective attempt has been made to deal with that subject matter.

The President further said:

> Another form of interunion disagreement is the jurisdictional strike involving the question of which labor union is entitled to perform a particular task. When rival unions are unable to settle such disputes themselves, provision must be made for peaceful and binding determination of the issues.

Mr. President, that is dealt with fairly and justly in this bill. The President said further:

> The appropriate goal is legislation which prohibits secondary boycotts in pursuance of unjustifiable objectives, but does not impair the union's right to preserve its own existence and the gains made in genuine collective bargaining.

Mr. President, the matter of boycotts, too, is effectively dealt with in this bill.

We could go down through that message, with item after item that the President himself has recommended as needing legislative attention, and we could lay those recommendations alongside this bill and, I believe, could show that every one of them has been dealt with in the bill in a fair and honest and earnest attempt to provide a remedy.

The President also recommended a joint commission. The Congress has seen fit to deal with that recommendation by providing for a joint committee to be appointed by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. That committee has a great responsibility, Mr. President. Its purpose is to watch the effectiveness of this legislation and to make amendments and changes where it believes that abuses under this new legislation may occur and where a more effective or just method can be found. I have enough confidence in my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in this Senate, and likewise in the Members of the House of Representatives, to believe that they will earnestly and fairly watch this legislation, and where abuses occur, will step in with amendments for their remedy. I myself will lend my full support to corrective measures if corrective measures may be necessary to take care of abuses which may appear under this bill.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Connecticut as a freshman Senator took the recommendations of the President of the United States very seriously. True, I was not on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, but I did read the hearings, I did listen to most of the debate, and I have seen every representative of an organized labor group who has come to my office, either back home in Connecticut or here in Washington. I talked with those people as earnestly and fairly as I could, to get their points of view, and, in some respects, when they made a point, I bore it to the committee in an effort to get some changes, and some corrective changes, along the line of those suggestions, as made to me.

Mr. President, our labor-management relations in Connecticut have been good—better, I think, than in most other parts of the country. But I, as a Senator in the Senate of the United States, must deal with this problem on a Nation-wide basis. I must exercise my own honest, best judgment to determine, in the light of what is presented here, whether by and large this bill will do what it is intended to do—improve labor-management relationships. In my humble judgment, it will do exactly that.

So, Mr. President, I was somewhat surprised and somewhat disappointed when we received a veto message which found fault with every single provision in this bill, without a word of recommendation as to how the changes should be made. Of course, we live in a political system; in a sense we are all politicians. God grant that we may be politicians in the true and correct sense to advance the science of free government. I do not want to cast any aspersions upon this veto message, but I do say that a veto message which apparently finds fault with every single part of this bill without any suggestion of solution loses, in my humble judgment, a great deal of weight in its effect upon the judgment of the Members of this Senate and in its effect upon the thinking of the entire people of the United States.

Last fall, after the election, the President had this to say—and I quote now from an editorial appearing in the New York Times. This editorial has already been inserted in the RECORD:

> So sweeping was the popular verdict that the President himself publicly announced his acceptance of the decision at the polls, and pledged his full cooperation with the new Congress in a nonpartisan spirit. Said he—

Now I quote further from this editorial, which purports at this point to quote the words of the President:

> The people have elected a Republican majority to the Senate and House of Representatives. Under our Constitution, the Congress is the lawmaking body. The people have chosen to entrust the controlling voice in this branch of the Government to the Republican Party. I accept this verdict in the spirit in which all good citizens accept the results of any fair election.

Mr. President, in light of that statement, I humbly raise the question whether this veto message fairly and justly lives up to the assertion of nonpartisanship.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Connecticut has expired.

To whom does the Senator from Ohio yield at this time?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. How many minutes are left to both sides?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Each side has 32 minutes remaining.

Mr. TAFT. I think it is probably the turn of the Senator from Florida at this point. Some six or seven Senators have spoken on our side, and only two Senators on the other side have spoken.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I desire to have 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time is under the control of the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, laying aside all consideration of the unfair provisions of the Taft-Hartley measure which the President has vetoed, and which is before us for final action today, I desire to make a very brief statement regarding it from a new angle.

For a considerable time, this bill has been a political football, as everyone is aware, with the two major parties striving for the most favorable position in the elections next year. This bill is sponsored by the Republican Party; and it was said by some, prior to the veto, that its passage by the Congress placed the President on the horns of a dilemma, inasmuch as approval of it by him would alienate large groups of voters, while, on the other hand, if the bill were vetoed and if the veto were sustained, it could be pointed out by his opponents, in cases of strikes or other industrial disturbances, that the President was fully responsible because the Republican Congress had passed the bill, and therefore the President was responsible, inasmuch as he did not permit the bill to be finally enacted.

Mr. President, I have listened to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut who has just concluded speaking. I challenge his statement that the President's veto is against every sentence and paragraph of that bill. The President particularly said that he wanted labor legislation, that he was against the secondary boycotts, that he was against jurisdictional strikes.

Now the President has vetoed the bill. I say to the Senate today that if this veto is overridden, the President of the United States will be a hero to the farmers and laborers for whom he fought, and every Senator who votes against sustaining the veto will, of course, take the consequences of his action.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from Nebraska is on the floor, because I wish to add my word to those spoken by the Senator from Oregon in expressing my astonishment at reading in the papers that the Senator from Nebraska said it had been proven that the majority had shown how to break a filibuster, namely, by just staying in session. In the first place, as I have repeated, I did not engage in a filibuster. It was merely a thoughtful interlude, to give the people time to think the matter over. The majority did not break anything. The debate could have gone on, the Lord knows how long, but they agreed to what we wanted in the first place, namely, a delay at least until after the President of the United States had had time to talk to the people of America. That is what we were after, and that is what we got. If that is a victory for the Republican majority steamroller, very well, I hope they enjoy many such victories.

Mr. President, this legislation is going to cause chaos in the United States. In fact, if I were Joe Stalin, I could not wish for anything more up my alley than the

labor bill that is about to be foisted on the people of America, because it is going to be unworkable. There will be more strikes, there will be confusion and chaos, and we all know that is what communism feeds on.

The people of America feel strongly about this matter, Mr. President. Senators will notice that the page boys are putting on my desk and the adjoining desks petitions signed by 54,681 citizens of America protesting this legislation, urging that it be vetoed, and urging that the veto be upheld. It takes a lot of work just to sign this many petitions. It goes to show how strongly the people of America feel about the matter. I dare say that if these petitions were rolled out and placed end to end, there would be enough to reach from here to the White House.

I will ask the boys to take the petitions away now. I just wanted the folks to see them. Here they are. I do not intend to read them into the RECORD in the 5 minutes at my disposal.

Mr. President, I wish to make a last-minute appeal to my southern colleagues. I desire to impress upon them that the Democratic Party must be a liberal party, if it is to be a party at all. I implore them to help us in the struggle to make the Democratic Party a liberal party, and in return I can assure them that those of us who consider ourselves liberals will not be unreasonable in our dealings with our southern friends. We want to advance the cause of the colored people, we insist that progress be made, but we do not insist on a revolution overnight in this matter. I do wish to extend this last-minute appeal to our friends from south of the Mason and Dixon's line, to join with us in upholding the hands of the President of the United States, and the leader of our party, in this crucial instance.

In closing, I should like to say to the Senator from Connecticut, when he calls attention to the fact that our President offered to cooperate with the majority party in passing legislation beneficial to the American people, that I agree he did, but the President of the United States did not agree to join the majority party or anybody else in enslaving the American people, cutting the heart out of the labor movement of America, and wrecking our economy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from Ohio if he will not have some speaker on his side proceed. I have been awaiting the return of the minority leader to the floor. It would be a convenience if the Senator from Ohio might have someone take the floor at this time.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, there is no other speaker to proceed at the moment. I have been in charge of the bill for some 5 months, and I should like to close the debate myself. I am ready to speak, but I have no particular desire to take the full time. There is no one else on this side who desires to speak at this time.

Mr. PEPPER. I shall address myself to the measure, awaiting the return of the minority leader, and desist in his favor upon his arrival.

Mr. President, I think all of us feel this is a critical vote we are about to cast this afternoon. As the President said in his message, the significance of the vote will be felt for decades yet to come. When the historian looks back upon this period, and seeks to discover some of the criteria of the sentiment of this era, I am sure this will be one of the votes upon which the historian will place his finger in accusing condemnation.

Mr. President, this is not the first time a decision has been made between the special and the general interests. This is not the first time the mighty storm of reaction has burst over a nation or a people. This is not the first time the mighty waves of selfishness have broken upon the helpless and defenseless masses of the people. But I am comforted by the memory, and by the testimony of history, that those victories of reaction have not been permanent, and that the masses of the people, however constantly pressed to earth, have, like truth, always risen again.

Mr. President, the Republican majority in this body cannot destroy the labor movement of America, nor can it retard the inevitable progress of both economic and political democracy. I foresee the day when we shall do in the Congress what the labor government in Great Britain did to the stupid legislation enacted after the general strike in Great Britain in 1926, which rankled in the breast of labor and the lovers of democracy until it was wiped from the statute books of that great nation. This, too, will not endure if it, in this moment of frenzy, in this moment of intolerance, in the sweep of reaction, shall come to be a part of the statute law of this land.

No, Mr. President, the common man is on the march; he is going forward, not backward. He is going to enjoy more democratic liberties, not less. He will have stronger collective-bargaining power, not weaker, and he will have more laws upon the statute books of a nation as his protecting shield, not fewer laws, in the bitter struggle to lift himself and his family up to the accepted American level and standard of decency.

Mr. President, while there may be passing comfort for those who may gain the victory in this cause—should they gain it—I venture to remind them of another who gained a victory. It was the great Pyrrhus, who lost his army in his victory, and to those who are—if they do—to achieve this political victory, it will be a pyrrhic economic victory in the first place, and I dare say a pyrrhic political victory as well.

The workers of America have been accustomed to economic and political democracy. They are not going to forget it, and they are not going to allow it to be snatched away from them. It has become a part of the American tradition. It has become a part of the heart and sentiment of American democracy.

Mr. President, neither should those who may feel a temporary disappointment or dejection consider there is any permanence in that sentiment, because the tide will inevitably turn, and whether this reactionary wave shall break upon the jagged rocks of another depression, or whether it shall finally be hurled back by the determined persistence of the masses of the working people of America, be sure, Mr. President, it will not endure.

Yet, the people could be spared so much tragedy, so much strife, so much bitter conflict. After the last war similar policies were adopted. Not I, but Gov. Harold E. Stassen, of Minnesota, said it was the antilabor policy of the United States Government, then in charge of the majority party of today in the Senate, that contributed to the depression of the late 1929's, and hurled America into the darkest economic abyss of our time. That, too, could have been spared. But we chose not to spare our generation that ordeal. If the same party shall be responsible for the same folly, Mr. President, they will have to take the responsibility for the same inevitable and tragic consequences.

So, Mr. President, I wish we could learn more from history. We might have been saved a depression and spared a war, could we have learned more, Mr. President, about economic democracy and about collaboration for world peace.

But, Mr. President, if we shall have to pay the cost of another depression, and, God forbid, another war, for our folly, then I shall still hope that, at long last, we may learn that economic and political democracy is best for all, Mr. President, not just for a favored class; it is best for all; and the American people are determined to have it, however bitter may be the temporary assults upon their struggle, whatever passing victories may be achieved by those who come into temporary command and authority.

I yield to the minority leader, the Senator from Kentucky, in case he cares to speak now.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky may be recognized for how many minutes?

Mr. PEPPER. For the time that remains on this side.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 18 minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida for his generosity in yielding to me the time that remains to those opposing the bill. I recognize the tenseness which surrounds our deliberations at this time regarding one of the most vital subjects that confronts the American people. I have from the very outset sought to divorce my consideration of this subject from politics, except that we all know that in our complex society, where the Government has been compelled to extend its authority more and more as time went on, we cannot very well escape considerations of politics, in the broad sense of that term.

As I have heretofore said on this floor, it is impossible to draw a straight line and say that all on one side is politics and all on the other is economics. The economic condition of our country and of the world may determine their politics, and frequently the political conditions which have existed and persisted have had a permanent influence upon our economics. I have tried to divorce my consideration of the pending legislation

from any coloring by partisan politics, and therefore I regret profoundly that there have been, in and out of Congress, those who have seen fit to impugn the integrity and the sincerity of the President of the United States in regard to the veto of the bill.

I do not know, Mr. President, whether the people of the United States at the last election gave a mandate to any political party or not. I imagine that every Member of the House and the Senate who was a candidate made his own platform, upon which he appealed to the people of his State or his district. There was no general platform upon which all ran for Congress. I have no doubt that the platforms probably varied according to the sentiment of the district. But we are constantly told that the American people issued a mandate to the Congress of the United States to do or not to do certain things.

Following that election, the President of the United States issued what I regarded then, and regard now, as a broad-minded and constructive statement, in which he accepted in good faith the results of the election. I hold in my hand an editorial from the New York Times of last Saturday, June 21, a paper for which I have the greatest respect, which I read every day and Sunday, and which I regard as one of the greatest newspapers in the world, if not the greatest. In this editorial the statement issued by the President last November is quoted. I do not wish to have the entire editorial placed in the RECORD, but I desire to quote that part of it referred to as containing the statement of the President:

> The people have elected a Republican majority to the Senate and House of Representatives. Under our Constitution the Congress is the lawmaking body. The people have chosen to entrust the controlling voice in this branch of the Government to the Republican Party. I accept this verdict in the spirit in which all good citizens accept the results of any fair election.

Because of that cooperative statement on the part of the President of the United States, in which he said he accepted the result, as we all accepted it, it is now claimed that he foreclosed himself against the exercise of his constitutional power in determining what his attitude shall be toward legislation which is placed upon his desk; that, because he accepted the result of the election, he cannot exercise the right of veto given to him by the Constitution, with respect to this labor legislation. The same newspapers which have quoted that statement as foreclosing the President in regard to the pending legislation also refer to it in regard to his veto of the tax bill; and yet the same press which condemns him for vetoing the tax bill and the labor bill, because he accepted the result of the last election, demands that he veto another bill now on his desk, the so-called wool bill.

If he violated his obligation under the Constitution and his statement made after the last election by vetoing the labor bill and the tax bill, where could we draw the line so as to retain in the Chief Executive of this Nation the right and the power and the judgment still to exercise his own prerogative conferred upon him by the Constitution as a part of the legislative process in dealing with any law that Congress may enact and send to the White House?

Mr. President, I have heard it said by Senators, I have heard it repeated in public and in private, that the President may be right in his analysis of the legislation, that it may be unworkable, that it may be discriminatory, that it may be unfair, that it may inject the power and interference of the Government into our economic system far beyond the requirements of the situation with which we are dealing, but nevertheless they feel constrained to vote to override the veto because, as they say, the people want a bill.

Mr. President, the people, I have no doubt, want a bill. The people have not read this bill. I do not know whether they want this bill or not. I myself would like to have a bill, but I will not vote for this bill.

Mr. President, I think the Senators of the United States owe some obligations to the people. If some of us feel that the bill is unworkable, that it is unwise, that it goes far beyond the precincts which it should inhabit in order to do something in the shape of a bill, it is my conception of our duty here to vote our convictions upon it and take upon ourselves the obligation to explain to our people why we take that course. That may require some swimming upstream, Mr. President, but I think it is better to swim upstream, if necessary, than to float downstream. It may involve political inconvenience. It is always easier to float downstream than to swim upstream, but swimming upstream gives infinitely more exercise and more character than mere floating with the tide.

There is a well-known species of fish in the West that swims upstream. It battles with the rapid currents of the mounting stream in order to find a spawning place in the upper reaches of the stream. Then it spawns and dies, and by that process nature provides mankind with fish of that variety.

If, in consideration of legislation here and elsewhere, we find it necessary among our own people to battle the ripples of the stream as we try to swim upstream, even though it might involve our political death, if we can render that service to society which this species of fish renders by surrendering its own life, it will be worth the effort, Mr. President.

The other day the integrity and sincerity and the very word of the President of the United States was brought in jeopardy by a prominent Member of the Congress of the United States, who stated that in vetoing the labor bill the President had violated his word to the American people. Before the bill ever went to the White House, Mr. President, I stated that I was confident the President would give it the most sincere consideration of which he was capable, that he would have it analyzed by those upon whom he had a right to rely, from a legal and economic standpoint, and would arrive at a judgment in accordance with his own conscience, without regard to its political effect upon him. I do not know what the political effect may be upon him. I do not know what political effect may result to the party of which he is the head, but since I have been a Member of the Congress of the United States for 34 years, more than 20 of which have been spent in this body, I have never seen any legislation so carefully and so meticulously analyzed as the labor bill was analyzed in the message of the President returning it to us without his approval. Notwithstanding statements that have been made by high-ranking Members of this body that the President did not understand the bill and does not now understand it, I make bold to say that nobody else on either side has analyzed it so carefully or explained it so meticulously as the President did in his message to Congress or to the House of Representatives.

Suppose it turns out that the President is right, Mr. President. Suppose it transpires that it does produce chaos instead of order. Suppose it turns out that it brings about more strikes instead of fewer strikes. Suppose it turns out that it throws our economic and industrial system into a revolving cauldron of disagreement, chaos, and misunderstanding, it will make little difference then who may have been right from a political or partisan standpoint in the consideration of this legislation.

Mr. President, I wish to read a letter which I have just received from the President of the United States, to confound those who said that he vetoed the bill for political reasons hoping that the Congress would override his veto and make it a law anyhow regardless of the veto. I am happy to say that Harry S. Truman is not that kind of a President, he is not that kind of a cheap politician. If he were, he would not be entitled to and would not enjoy the confidence of the American people. I read his letter:

> THE WHITE HOUSE,
> *Washington, June 23, 1947.*
>
> The Honorable ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
> *The United States Senate,*
> *Washington, D. C.*
>
> DEAR SENATOR BARKLEY: I feel so strongly about the labor bill which the Senate will vote on this afternoon that I wish to reaffirm my sincere belief that it will do serious harm to our country.
>
> This is a critical period in our history and any measure which will adversely affect our national unity will render a distinct disservice not only to this Nation but to the world.
>
> I am convinced that such would be the result if the veto of this bill should be overridden.
>
> I commend you and your associates who have fought so earnestly against this dangerous legislation.
>
> I want you to know you have my unqualified support, and it is my fervent hope, for the good of the country, that you and your colleagues will be successful in your efforts to keep this bill from becoming law.
>
> Very sincerely yours,
> HARRY S. TRUMAN.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. BARKLEY. I urge my colleagues, in a final word, to sustain this veto for the reasons given so eloquently and cogently in the President's message.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I wish to say at the outset that I have not the slightest doubt that the President of the United States is entirely sincere in submitting his veto message. I have no doubt also that he has analyzed the bill with the assistance of those in the executive branch of the Government who are unfriendly to this legislation. But I have no doubt that the President has reached what he considers to be an entirely honest decision on this measure.

Mr. President, I voted for this legislation when it came before the Senate. I voted for the conference report; and I shall have to vote to override the President's veto. My reasons are simple. Within 10 minutes, of course, I could not undertake and would not undertake to discuss the merits of the bill as such.

Almost 12 years ago, in July 1935, the Congress of the United States and the President of the United States approved the Wagner Act. I voted for the Wagner Act. I therefore do not appear on this floor as one unfriendly to labor. At that time I believed that it was necessary to pass the Wagner Act, although I realized that it was a very one-sided piece of legislation.

What has occurred in the interim? For nearly 10 years, at least, honest men in industry, and many in labor, as well as many not directly connected with either management or labor, have earnestly besought the American Congress to make some simple, sensible amendments to the Wagner Act.

What has happened? During all that long period of time the Committee on Education and Labor in the United States Senate has held the line, and aside from the present bill has brought to this floor only one other bit of legislation which would have corrected, in a small degree, the inequities and unbalance of the Wagner Act. I refer to the Case bill, which the President saw fit to veto about a year ago after it had been passed by the Congress of the United States.

I do not criticize the President for the exercise of his veto rights and powers; but I do assert that if there is to be any labor legislation in America, if we are to bring about any degree of balance in the unbalanced condition which has existed for almost 12 years, now is the time to do it, not in anger toward the workers of the Nation, not in resentment of their devotion to legislation which they thought was for their benefit, but simply and solely because this Nation, as a representative government, must somewhere down the road decide whether the people of the United States shall be allowed to function through their lawmaking bodies, or whether organized minorities are to control and dictate the legislation which we must have.

I speak plainly, but not in anger. There is but one way for us to break the strangle hold of labor bosses—not the rank and file of the workers, but labor bosses who have been unwilling to dot an "i" or cross a "t" for 12 long years. That is to pass this bill and invite labor and management to come to the Congress of the United States, where both should come, and sit around the table as honest men, representing conflicting and ofttimes hostile interests, be it conceded, and there iron out their differences.

In my opinion this is the final test of whether government is to function or whether minority groups, highly organized, are to dictate the type of legislation that we shall have. If there were no other reason for the passage of this legislation, I should assuredly support it.

In his address to this body the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], whom I hold in high esteem, asserted that if the bill should prove to be unworkable or have inequities and injustices in it, we could not excuse ourselves by saying that we would vote for it nevertheless. I would agree with him, but when I recall that for 12 years, whatever the merits of the proposal, the Senate Committee on Labor and Education held a stranglehold upon the throat of the American people and would not permit legislation to come before this body, then I must wholly reject the logic of the distinguished Senator from Oregon, which otherwise would be impeccable. This is the only chance that we shall have, but it is a magnificent chance for the American people. I speak not in anger or hostility toward the workers. I speak as one who voted for the original Wagner Act in the firm belief at that time that if inequities did appear and inequalities did exist, we could correct them as a legislative body. I have seen the hands of the legislative body tied. I have seen the legislative body of this Nation helpless in the face of organized minorities operating from outside.

So, Mr. President, I shall be compelled, much as I regret to do so, to vote to override the President's veto of this bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, it is now approximately 6 months since this Congress returned to Washington to consider the task which lay before it. Regardless of the issues in the election, there was unquestionably a demand at that time, as there is now, for labor legislation, for a reform of the abuses which had become apparent to the American people. They had been deluged with a series of strikes. They had been deluged with strikes ordered for men who did not desire the strikes. They had been deluged with strikes against companies which had settled all difference with their own men. They had been deluged with strikes in violation of existing collective-bargaining agreements. They knew of mass picketing. They knew that in those strikes men had been excluded from their own plants by force and violence. They knew that the men in the unions themselves had been arbitrarily treated by the leaders, and that unless they chose to please the leaders they lost their jobs. They were fired from the union and lost their jobs with the company, and in many cases they found it impossible to continue their own trade. They knew of feather-bedding practices. They knew the limitation on apprentices, so that men could not be obtained for necessary work. They knew of the limitation on the freedom of employers, and they knew of the many unjust provisions of the Wagner Act as administered by the National Labor Relations Board.

There was a demand that we act. I deny completely that there has been politics in the drafting of this legislation. It was participated in by all. Certainly, I felt that with the public demand for reform in this particular field the Republican Party, which happened to have control of the Congress, would be held to be delinquent if it failed to propose a reasonable labor-reform measure. To that extent, if that is politics, the bill is politics.

We went to work. Many bills were introduced. The committee held hearings and heard from labor leaders, from industrialists, from experts—it gave everyone a chance to be heard, until we were criticized for delaying the matter. There was nothing hurried in the development of the legislation.

Finally the committee produced a bill which 11 out of the 13 members of the committee supported when it came to the floor of the Senate. It was amended on the floor. There was an overwhelming vote in favor of some of the amendments. Other amendments were rejected. The bill went to conference, and in conference various provisions of the House bill were accepted. But, Mr. President, after 6 months' consideration, after a thorough debate on the floor of the Senate, after a thorough debate in conference, and another debate on the floor of the Senate on the conference report, the bill was agreed to and sent to the President of the United States.

Last Tuesday the President held a press conference in which he said:

> I do not know that there will be a labor veto. I have not made up my mind. I still have to study it.

The President replied to another question that he might act before Friday, but explained that he had not as yet read the bill in the form in which it passed both Houses of Congress. He said:

> I am going to study it for the next 2 days.

As the result of 2 days' study by the President of the United States, the work of many hundreds of men, the sincere and careful work of several dozen men who have gone into the details of this legislation from the beginning to the end has been set aside by the veto exercised by the President of the United States. Of course, he has the constitutional right to veto a bill, but it seems to me it is a case in which he might well have withheld the actual exercise of that right. To my good Democratic friends and Republicans who believe in Thomas Jefferson, let me say that Thomas Jefferson never vetoed a bill presented to him by Congress. He felt that that right should be exercised only in a time of the greatest emergency, and he questioned whether it should be exercised at all.

Mr. President, we have drafted this bill and it is based on the theory of the Wagner Act, if you please. It is based on the theory that the solution of the labor problem in the United States is free, collective bargaining—a contract between one employer and all of his men acting as one man. That is the theory of the Wagner Act, that they shall be free to make the contract they wish to make.

Many people have felt that the Government should come in certain cases and impose compulsory arbitration in the fixing of wages, if the parties cannot agree. Our provision for dealing with Nation-wide strikes has been criticized.

After 60 days, if they still want to vote for a strike, we have not forbidden it, because we believe that the right to strike for hours, wages, and working conditions in the ultimate analysis is essential to the maintenance of freedom in the United States. We have rejected every effort to impose upon any men any wages, hours, or working conditions to which they, through their representatives, do not agree.

We have been criticized on the ground that for that reason the bill is too weak. I do not think so. I think that if the Government is going to fix wages it will fix prices and the entire economy. I think our freedom depends upon maintaining the free right to strike. It can be limited. Surely it is not too much to ask men to maintain the status quo for 60 days rather than endanger the safety and health of the Nation. But in the last analysis, if it becomes a political strike, then the Government will have to act through some special emergency legislation for that particular case, as was done in connection with the general strike in England. We have based it upon free collective bargaining and have not modified that right in any material respect.

We have tried to deal with abuses. We tried to get testimony as to just what is wrong in this field, and there is testimony on the record as to each of the things which we have tried to correct.

We have tried to correct secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes. The truth is that originally, before the passage of any of the laws dealing with labor, the employer had all the advantage. He had the employees at his mercy, and he could practically in most cases dictate the terms which he wished to impose. Congress passed the Clayton Act, the Norris-LaGuardia Act, and the Wagner Act. The latter act was interpreted by a completely prejudiced board in such a way that it went far beyond the original intention of Congress, until we reached a point where the balance had shifted over to the other side, where the labor leaders had every advantage in collective bargaining and were relieved from any liability in breaking the contract after they had made the bargain. That was a condition under which strikes actually were encouraged and protected, no matter what the purpose or the character of the particular strike.

All we have tried to do is to swing that balance back, not too far, to a point where the parties can deal equally with each other and where they have approximately equal power. I think the largest companies today can deal with their employees throughout the Nation, but the smaller companies are practically at the mercy of the labor-union bosses. Whatever they have insisted upon in the last 4 or 5 years the employers have practically had to give to them. We want to get the situation back to the point where it is fair. If a man does have the power to enforce and obtain an unreasonable demand, he is much less likely to make an unreasonable demand. Strikes have largely been brought about by unreasonable demands to which the employer finally felt he could not possibly yield and at the same time maintain the integrity and independence of his business.

This is a perfectly reasonable bill in every respect. If we are to have free collective bargaining it must be between two responsible parties. Some of the provisions of this bill deal with the question of making the unions responsible. There is no reason in the world why a union should not have the same responsibility that a corporation has which is engaged in business. So we have provided that a union may be sued as if it were a corporation. We have provided that the union must file statements as corporations have had to file them, setting up their methods of doing business and making financial reports to the members and to the Secretary of Labor. That sort of reform actually strengthens the members in their collective bargaining. There will be no free collective bargaining until both sides are equally responsible.

We have set up a Mediation Service. We took it out of the Department of Labor because it was felt, rightly or wrongly, that as long as it was an agency of the Department of Labor it must necessarily take a prolabor slant and therefore could not be as fair in mediating differences between the parties. Then we outlawed secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes. There was no testimony in the record anywhere to the effect that secondary boycotts and jurisdictional strikes were justified. We asked the President's representatives as to what kind of secondary boycotts were justified, but we never got a satisfactory answer.

In this bill we prohibit secondary boycotts all over this country. There have been secondary boycotts in which a union has said, "We will not handle the goods of manufacturer X because we do not like the men who make his particular goods"; and in many cases where a manufacturer had a union certified to him—perhaps a CIO union—an AFL union has boycotted it, or vice versa. All over the country such things have occurred; and I know that in my own State, small manufacturers have absolutely been driven out of their business and have been destroyed by unions far off from their concern, unions in which they had no interest whatsoever. Yet the strikes have dragged on. We have tried to prohibit secondary boycotts, and we give the Board the power to decide the controversies.

Here and elsewhere the union leaders have said, "Yes; these are abuses, but leave them to us. We will get together; we will settle these abuses." But never at any time have they suggested legislation.

I say to the Senate that this bill could have been only one-half as strong as it is, if we please to call it strong, and yet there would be exactly the same opposition from every labor leader and we would have exactly the same propaganda that is going out today against this bill. Mr. President, it is not against the provisions of this bill. They try to pick out little things here and there and try to exaggerate their importance. Mr. President, it is not the provisions of this bill that they are concerned about; it is any legislation that would in any way reduce the power of the labor leaders. They have opposed it for 10 years.

I was quoted, perhaps, by the Senator from Wyoming, earlier today, as saying that if this bill does not pass, there will be no legislation. That was not an ultimatum from me; that was a conclusion by the labor leaders, and from the President's own message.

The President did not find one thing to approve in this measure. He has criticized it as he has the Case bill—in every section. Apparently he will veto any bill on the subject.

References have been made to breaking the bill into pieces and enacting the separate pieces. Apparently, if that were done, the President would criticize and would veto every piece.

The President has never yet recognized that there are abuses. There is nothing in his message really recognizing that there are abuses, except a little lip service, "Well, there are some things we should do something about." But the President has failed to point out any specific abuses whatever, and he has failed to point out any legislation to accomplish the desired result. His message mentions elimination of jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts, but we never got any real recommendation from him about taking care of those problems.

Mr. President, for the last 10 years we have had bills dealing with labor problems and labor legislation. We have in this body, men who know as much about labor legislation as anyone in the Government of the United States or anyone outside the Government of the United States does; and yet they would appoint another commission. That is the recourse of people who do not want any legislation at all.

So we face here the problem of whether, the Senate and the House of Representatives having agreed upon a constructive labor measure, we are going to put that through or whether we are going to say to the labor-union leaders, "No; there is no Congress of the United States, there is no President of the United States, who dares to stand up against your power." Certainly the power they exercise today is a threat to the welfare of the people of the United States.

Certainly the bill is complicated. Why? Because the Wagner Act was complicated; and in order to deal with it, we had to amend every section of the Wagner Act. That is what most of this bill is.

I sat in the hearings on the Wagner Act in 1939, and I can tell the Senate something about the power of the first Board which was set up. Talk about the power of the general counsel under this measure. Just think of the power of that first Board, made up of the two Smiths and Madden—people who regarded themselves as crusaders to put a CIO union, if you please, in every plant in the United States. That was their effort. There was no pretense of fairness or justice. I have never known of any other case in the United States

where there were such outrages or such injustices as those which were perpetrated by that Board.

The Board has gradually improved, and today we have somewhat a separation of powers. But at that time the Board was both the judge and the jury. True, the powers against labor unions which they had were not as great as the powers provided in this bill, because the powers that Board had were all against employers. In this bill we have changed that situation, so that now the bill recognizes that there are unfair labor practices on the part of employees, just as the former bill recognized that there were unfair labor practices on the part of employers. We have tried to balance up the two. We have not made unlawful a single act on the part of employees which was not made unlawful on the part of employers in the original bill. Otherwise we have left those provisions alone and untouched, except perhaps for the provision of freedom of speech. In the United States there is a demand that we restore complete freedom of speech to both sides, and that we have done. Otherwise there is no modification. No employer can beat down a union; no employer can discriminate; no employer can refuse to deal with a union which is duly certified to him.

So, Mr. President, I say that in this bill we have simply tried to equalize the Government's power as against the unions and as against the employers. We have tried to abolish special privileges conferred by preexisting legislation, and we have based this measure on freedom of contract and on free collective bargaining.

Mr. President, I have listened with interest to all the criticisms—the petty criticisms of this and the petty criticisms of that. All that we have done with the Board, as referred to by the Senator from Wyoming, is to make a separation of powers. Under this bill the Board is judicial. It is judicial today. Its counsel will be a prosecutor. He will not have any extraordinary powers—nothing like the power of the Attorney General of the United States, who decides whether criminal actions shall be brought against anyone in the United States. Under this bill, the counsel will have the right to make the decision as between employer and employee; but his decision will be subject to the judicial decision of the Board and, above the Board, the courts; and we have given the courts greater power to look into the decisions of the Board and to provide for the redress of any injustice.

Mr. President, the charges made against this act are wholly unjustified.

I appeal to the Senate of the United States to stand up to the work of the legislative body. This is a case of legislation. It is a case in which the President never should have intervened. It is a case in which the President could well have taken the position that, regardless of whether he liked or did not like the work that had been done, the public desire for equity between employer and employee should prevail, no matter what his personal opinion might be.

Mr. President, I trust that the President's veto will be overriden.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that for a moment, to yield to me for one matter?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator yield, so that there may be read at the desk a brief statement from the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], explaining the reason for his inability to be present?

Mr. TAFT. I am glad to do so.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I send the statement to the desk and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That can be done by unanimous consent. Without objection, the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

REASON FOR SENATOR WAGNER'S ABSENCE FROM THE SENATE TODAY

Senator WAGNER, the author of the act which the Taft-Hartley bill will amend, is not able to be present to cast his vote in favor of sustaining the President's veto. Because of his great devotion to the working men and women of this country, and because, in his estimation, this bill will destroy what he has so long labored to develop—industrial peace through democracy—every effort was made and every facility at the disposal of the great city of New York was made available to Senator WAGNER in order to have him present here on the Senate floor today. It was Senator WAGNER'S most ardent hope that the doctors would see fit to let him come. But it was the unanimous and expert decision of his two personal physicians, together with Dr. Edward M. Bernecker, commissioner of hospitals of the city of New York, and Dr. Samuel Frant, of the New York City Health Department, after final and thorough examination this morning, that "he not be permitted to make any trip whatsoever." It is their opinion that if he did so at this moment, it might well prove fatal. Senator WAGNER has a heart ailment, and his blood pressure, most unfortunately, at the moment is at such a level that any strain or excitement would be sufficient to result in his death.

From his sick bed he urges those Senators who are about to override the President's veto to reconsider, for he says—and these are his exact words: "The President would not lie at this crucial moment in history."

Mr. TAFT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Before the quorum is called, the Chair would like to state that the Senate Chamber is unusually full, both on the floor and in the galleries. The Chair earnestly requests the guests of the Senate to remember that the rules of the Senate prohibit demonstrations of any nature, and it will greatly facilitate the work of the Senate if it is allowed to proceed through this critical vote, and thereafter, if there are no demonstrations.

The Senator from Ohio suggests the absence of a quorum. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Bridges	Cain
Baldwin	Brooks	Capehart
Ball	Buck	Capper
Barkley	Bushfield	Chavez
Brewster	Butler	Connally
Bricker	Byrd	Cooper
Cordon	Kilgore	Pepper
Donnell	Knowland	Reed
Downey	Langer	Revercomb
Dworshak	Lodge	Robertson, Va.
Eastland	Lucas	Robertson, Wyo.
Ecton	McCarran	Russell
Ellender	McCarthy	Saltonstall
Ferguson	McClellan	Smith
Flanders	McFarland	Sparkman
Fulbright	McGrath	Stewart
George	McKellar	Taft
Green	McMahon	Taylor
Gurney	Magnuson	Thomas, Okla.
Hatch	Malone	Thye
Hawkes	Martin	Tobey
Hayden	Maybank	Tydings
Hickenlooper	Millikin	Umstead
Hill	Moore	Vandenberg
Hoey	Morse	Watkins
Holland	Murray	Wherry
Ives	Myers	White
Jenner	O'Conor	Wiley
Johnson, Colo.	O'Daniel	Williams
Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Kem	Overton	Young

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding? As required by the Constitution, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

The result was—yeas 68, nays 25, as follows:

YEAS—68

Aiken	Flanders	Overton
Baldwin	Fulbright	Reed
Ball	George	Revercomb
Brewster	Gurney	Robertson, Va.
Bricker	Hatch	Robertson, Wyo.
Bridges	Hawkes	Russell
Brooks	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Buck	Hoey	Smith
Bushfield	Holland	Stewart
Butler	Ives	Taft
Byrd	Jenner	Thye
Cain	Kem	Tobey
Capehart	Knowland	Tydings
Capper	Lodge	Umstead
Connally	McCarthy	Vandenberg
Cooper	McClellan	Watkins
Cordon	McKellar	Wherry
Donnell	Martin	White
Dworshak	Maybank	Wiley
Eastland	Millikin	Williams
Ecton	Moore	Wilson
Ellender	O'Conor	Young
Ferguson	O'Daniel	

NAYS—25

Barkley	Langer	Murray
Chavez	Lucas	Myers
Downey	McCarran	O'Mahoney
Green	McFarland	Pepper
Hayden	McGrath	Sparkman
Hill	McMahon	Taylor
Johnson, Colo.	Magnuson	Thomas, Okla.
Johnston, S. C.	Malone	
Kilgore	Morse	

NOT VOTING—2

Thomas, Utah Wagner

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Two-thirds of the Senate having voted in the affirmative, the bill is passed.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed over the President's veto.

Mr. TAFT. I move that the motion of the Senator from Nebraska be laid on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

The motion was agreed to, and Mr. WHERRY's motion was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I wish to announce for the benefit of some Senators who have asked what the business of the Senate would be for the remainder of the afternoon, that, if it is agreeable to the Senate, it is our intention to have a call of the calendar at the conclusion of consideration of the urgent deficiency bill.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bill and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 751. An act to continue a system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of school-age and under-school-age children in the District of Columbia through June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, and

S. J. Res. 113. Joint resolution authorizing the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to the Marine Corps dead of all wars.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 1628. An act relinquishing to the State of Illinois certain right, title, or interest of the United States of America, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1997. An act to provide seniority benefits for certain officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia who are veterans of World War II and lost opportunity for promotion by reason of their service in the armed forces of the United States; and

H. R. 2545. An act to provide funds for cooperation with the school board of the Moclips-Aloha district for the construction and equipment of a new school building in the town of Moclips, Grays Harbor County, Wash., to be available to both Indian and non-Indian children.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3611) to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. BATES of Massachusetts, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. MCMILLAN of South Carolina, and Mr. SMITH of Virginia were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3737) to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. BATES of Massachusetts, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. MCMILLAN of South Carolina, and Mr. SMITH of Virginia were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2369) providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the Territory of Alaska; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WELCH, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. SOMERS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

ELECTRIC UTILITY DEPRECIATION PRACTICES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of the Commission's report entitled "Electric Utility Depreciation Practices," 1945, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Chicago, Ill., favoring the enactment of House bill 2910, to authorize the United States during an emergency period to undertake its fair share in the resettlement of displaced persons in Germany, Austria, and Italy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Letters in the nature of petitions from John A. Nelson, of Los Angeles, Calif., and J. T. and Peggy Cowan, of Savanna, Ill., praying that the Senate override the President's veto of the Taft-Hartley labor relations bill; ordered to lie on the table.

Telegrams and a letter in the nature of petitions from the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local Union 1186, Honolulu, T. H.; Charles Lazzio, president, Dyers Local No. 1733, Paterson, N. J., and D. E. Covis, Columbus, Ohio, praying that the Senate sustain the President's veto of the Taft-Hartley labor relations bill; ordered to lie on the table.

A resolution adopted by the American Newspaper Guild at Sioux City, Iowa, commending Senators BARKLEY and MORSE in their efforts to sustain the President's veto of the labor bill; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition signed by 40 citizens of Manhattan, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A petition signed by 103 citizens of Spokane, Wash., praying for the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 76, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

"Senate Joint Resolution 51

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to halt all disposal of war surplus goods

"Whereas after World War I a scandal resulted from the corrupt manner in which the sale of surplus war goods was handled and futile investigations did nothing more than to serve as a warning against future recurrences of the same sort of scandal; and

"Whereas there is ample evidence at the present time of inefficiency, favoritism, dishonesty, graft, and corruption in the methods being employed in the disposal of war surplus goods; and

"Whereas the misuse of privities, unscrupulous dealings, and various other types of favoritism as well as the misuse of veterans' privileges in the disposal of war surplus goods is adversely affecting the rights of the honest veteran seeking to avail himself of his priorities in acquiring surplus goods; and

"Whereas in many instances unused but useable materials are being dishonestly disposed of as junk or scrap to favored buyers; and

"Whereas an improved system for the disposal of war surplus goods must be immediately developed if a major scandal is to be averted: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States is respectfully requested to provide by law for an immediate stoppage of all disposal of World War II surplus material until a new and adequate system of disposal can be worked out; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That Congress is respectfully requested to thoroughly investigate the present system of war surplus disposal and take steps to see that present corruption in the disposal of such goods is brought to light; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That duly attested copies of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the clerks of both Houses of the Congress of the United States and to each Member of the Congress from this State."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 3493. A bill making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 338).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 1585. A bill for the relief of Adolph Pfannenstiehl; with an amendment (Rept. No. 341);

H. R. 1956. A bill for the relief of Hugh C. Gilliam; with an amendment (Rept. No. 342); and

S. J. Res. 123. Joint resolution declaring that in interpreting certain acts of Congress, joint resolutions, and proclamations World War II, the limited emergency, and the unlimited emergency shall be construed as terminated and peace established; with amendments (Rept. No. 339).

By Mr. COOPER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 1461. A bill to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act; with amendments (Rept. No. 340).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 1491. A bill to amend the Social Security Act with respect to State plans for aid to the blind; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1492. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to provide unemployment compensation for Federal employees; to provide benefits for Federal employees involuntarily separated from employment; and for other purposes;

S. 1493. A bill to amend section 19 of the Veterans' Preference Act of June 27, 1944 (58 Stat. 387), and for other purposes; and

S. 1494. A bill to amend section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of June 27, 1944 (58 Stat. 387); to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 1495. A bill to amend section 346 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, so as to permit the making of copies by Government agencies of certain immigration and naturalization papers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1496. A bill relating to training on the job for veterans who are lawyers; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION—AMENDMENTS

Mr. RUSSELL and Mr. McCLELLAN each submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the bill (S. 564) to provide for the performance of the duties of the office of President in case of the removal, resignation, or inability both of the President and Vice President, which were severally ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. McMAHON submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 564, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

DAVID I. WALSH—TRIBUTE BY WILLIAM H. McMASTERS

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a tribute to David I. Walsh, by William H. McMasters, of Belmont, Mass., which appears in the Appendix.]

EXCERPT FROM A SPEECH BY SENATOR BREWSTER ON AMERICAN HELP TO OTHER NATIONS

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from a speech on the subject of American help to other nations, delivered by Senator BREWSTER on June 14, 1947, at Flag Day exercises in Philadelphia, which appears in the Appendix.]

IMPORTANCE AND ATTRACTIVENESS OF THE TEACHING PROFESSION—ARTICLE BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "So You Don't Want To Be a Teacher" written by him, and published in the June 21, 1947, issue of the magazine Forward—For Young People, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICA'S NEW ROLE IN WORLD LEADERSHIP—SPEECH BY SENATOR THYE

[Mr. McCARTHY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a speech entitled "America's New Role in World Leadership," delivered by Senator THYE at the commencement exercises at Carroll College, Waukesha, Wis., on June 9, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

FLOOD CONTROL—STATEMENT BY SENATOR MYERS BEFORE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement made by him before the House of Representatives Appropriations Subcommittee considering flood control and rivers and harbors items in the Army civil functions appropriation bill for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON BEFORE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by himself to be made before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

SPEECH BY SENATOR PEPPER IN SUPPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S VETO OF THE LABOR BILL

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio speech delivered by him on June 22, 1947, in support of the President's veto of the labor bill, which appears in the Appendix.]

HARRY F. SINCLAIR AND THE ANGLO-AMERICAN OIL TREATY—ARTICLE BY HAROLD L. ICKES

[Mr. TAYOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Harold L. Ickes, dealing with Harry F. Sinclair and the pending Anglo-American oil treaty, published in the New York Post of June 20, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

SPENDING BY GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS—ARTICLE BY HERMAN A. LOWE

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article dealing with the buying of 1948 supplies with 1947 funds by Government departments, by Herman A. Lowe, published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of June 19, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONGRESS AND HOUSING—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Congressional Failure," published in the Haverhill (Mass.) Gazette of June 2, 1947, and an editorial entitled "Housing—This Session of Congress?" published in the South Boston Gazette of June 13, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

PUBLIC POWER IN THE NORTHWEST—EDITORIAL FROM THE SEATTLE STAR

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "New Attack on Public Power Is Threat to Northwest," published in the Seattle Star of June 13, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, under date of June 11, 1947, the Social Security Administrator communicated to the President of the Senate a draft of a bill amending the Public Health Service Act. His communication and the draft of the bill were referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. That committee has examined the bill and has ascertained that all matters in it naturally come under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. So I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments be discharged from the further consideration of the communication and bill and that they be referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, where they evidently belong.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the change of reference will be made.

STATEMENT BY COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY DEALING WITH PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON PORTAL-TO-PORTAL ACT OF 1947

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, on May 14, 1947, the President of the United States signed the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947. On the same day he sent to the Congress a message with respect to his action on that measure. On the same day it was announced by the temporary Presiding Officer of the Senate that the message would be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Today the Committee on the Judiciary approved a statement with respect to the message from the President. I now present to the Senate, on behalf of that committee, the statement so approved, and ask unanimous consent that it be incorporated at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

ITEM I

This communication is sent you by reason of two portions of that certain message of May 14, 1947, from the President of the United States to the Congress of the United States in which he notified Congress of the fact that he had that day signed H. R. 2157, the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947.

ITEM II

The first of those two portions of said message is constituted of the first two sentences in the fifth paragraph from the opening of the message which paragraph reads as follows, namely:

"Section 2 of the act relates to existing claims. From my consideration of this section I understand it to be the intent of the Congress to meet the problem raised by portal-to-portal claims, but not to invalidate all other existing claims. The plain language of section 2 of the act preserves minimum wage and overtime compensation claims based upon activities which were compensable in any amount under contract, custom, or practice. Various provisions of the act such as sections 3, 9, and 12, would be rendered absurd or unnecessary under any other interpretation. Moreover a contrary interpretation would raise difficult and grave questions of constitutionality."

In order to recall what existing claims are comprehended within those from which is granted relief by section 2 of the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947, there are below quoted subsections (a), (b), and (c) of said section 2, as follows, namely:

"(a) No employer shall be subject to any liability or punishment under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, the Walsh-Healey Act, or the Bacon-Davis Act (in any action or proceeding commenced prior to or on or after the date of the enactment of this act), on account of the failure of such employer to pay an employee minimum wages, or to pay an employee overtime compensation, for or on account of any activity of an employee engaged in prior to the date of the enactment of this act, except an activity which was compensable by either—

"(1) an express provision of a written or nonwritten contract in effect at the time of such activity between such employee, his agent, or collective-bargaining representative and his employer; or

"(2) a custom or practice in effect, at the time of such activity, at the establishment or other place where such employee was employed covering such activity not inconsistent with a written or nonwritten contract in effect at the time of such activity between such employee, his agent, or collective-bargaining representative and his employer.

"(b) For the purposes of subsection (a), an activity shall be considered as compensable under such contract provision or such custom or practice only when it was engaged in during the portion of the day with respect to which it was so made compensable.

"(c) In the application of the minimum-wage and overtime-compensation provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, of the Walsh-Healey Act, or of the Bacon-Davis Act, in determining the time for which an employer employed an employee, there shall be counted all that time, but only that time, during which the employee engaged in activities which were compensable within the meaning of subsections (a) and (b) of this section."

If, for illustration, walking engaged in prior to the date of the enactment of the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947, done in the morning shortly prior to entry on his operation of a lathe by an employee, in going from the entrance of the plant in which he was employed to such lathe, was not compensable by either (1) an express provision of a written or nonwritten contract in effect, at the time of such walking, between such employee, his agent, or collective-bargaining representative and his employer; or (2) a custom or practice in effect, at the time of such walking, at the establishment or other place where such employee was employed, covering such walking, not inconsistent with a written or nonwritten contract, in effect at the time of such walking, between such employee, his agent, or collective-bargaining representative and his employer, there is no liability, and no punishment inflictable, under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, the Walsh-Healey Act, or the Bacon-Davis Act (in any action or proceeding commenced prior to or on or after the date of the enactment of the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947) on the employer on account of his failure to pay said employee minimum wages, or to pay said employee overtime compensation, for or on account of said walking.

For further illustration, if a woman employed to sew upon garments in a production line did, prior to the date of the enactment of the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947, for 2 hours per day for a week, after having engaged on each respective day in part of her day's sewing, wait in that production line for garments to reach her and neither (1) by an express provision of a written or nonwritten contract in effect, at the time of said waiting, between her, her agent, or collective-bargaining representative and her employer, nor (2) by a custom or practice in effect, at the time of said waiting, at the establishment or other place where she was employed, covering such waiting, not inconsistent with a written or nonwritten contract, in effect at the time of such waiting, between her, her agent, or collective-bargaining representative and her employer, was said waiting compensable, there is no liability, and no punishment inflictable, under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, the Walsh-Healey Act, or the Bacon-Davis Act (in any action or proceeding commenced prior to or on or after the date of the enactment of the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947), on her employer on account of his failure to pay her minimum wages, or to pay her overtime compensation, for or on account of said waiting.

Attention is called to the following quoted paragraph which is set forth in the course of the statement of the managers on the part of the House contained in House of Representatives Report No. 326, Eightieth Congress, first session, namely:

"The conference agreement (sec. 2 (b)) contains a provision not stated expressly in either bill, that an activity shall be considered as compensable under the above referred to contract provision or custom or practice only when it was engaged in during the portion of the day with respect to which it was so made compensable. Under this provision, for example, if under the contract provision or custom or practice an activity was compensable only when engaged in between 8 and 5 o'clock but was not compensable when engaged in before 8 or after 5 o'clock, it will not be considered as a compensable activity when engaged in before 8 or after 5 o'clock. So also, if under the contract provision or custom or practice an activity was compensable when engaged in before 8 but was not compensable when engaged in after 5 o'clock, it will not be compensable under the bill as agreed to in conference when engaged in after 5 o'clock. So also, if under the contract provision or custom or practice an activity was compensable during a certain portion of the regular workday but was not compensable when engaged in during other hours of the regular workday, it will not be compensable under the bill as agreed to in conference when engaged in during such other hours."

ITEM III

The second of those two portions, which are mentioned hereinabove in item I, of said message from the President of the United States reads as follows, namely:

"I wish also to refer to the so-called 'good faith' provisions of sections 9 and 10 of the act. It has been said that they make such employer his own judge of whether or not he has been guilty of a violation. It seems to me that this view fails to take into account the safeguards which are contained in these sections. The employer must meet an objective test of actual conformity with an administrative ruling or policy. If the employer avails himself of the defense under these sections, he must bear the burden of proof. He must show that there was affirmative action by an administrative agency and that he relied upon and conformed with such action. He must show further that he acted in good faith in relying upon that administrative action."

The above-quoted sentence which reads "He must show that there was affirmative action by an administrative agency and that he relied upon and conformed with such action" is not correct. The incorrectness of said sentence follows from the fact that an administrative practice or enforcement policy of an agency does not necessarily consist of affirmative action.

Such administrative practice or enforcement policy may consist solely of the absence of action, by an agency, provided such administrative practice or enforcement policy, consisting solely of such absence of action, is with respect to a class of employers and is such that an act or omission mentioned in section 9 or section 10 of the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947 could be in good faith in conformity with and in reliance on such practice or policy. For illustration such administrative practice or enforcement policy may consist solely of the absence of action, by an agency, to treat a specific class of employers as subject to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, the Walsh-Healey Act, or the Bacon-Davis Act, provided such administrative practice or enforcement policy, consisting solely of such absence of action, is such that an act or omission mentioned in section 9 or section 10 of the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947 could be in good faith in conformity with and in reliance on such practice or policy. Attention is called to the following quoted paragraph which is set forth in the course of the above-mentioned statement of the managers on the part of the House, namely.

"It should be noted that under both sections 9 and 10 an employer will be relieved from liability, in an action by an employee, because of reliance in good faith on an administrative practice or enforcement policy, only: (1) where such practice or policy was based on the ground that an act or omission was not a violation of the act, or (2) where a practice or policy of not enforcing the act with respect to acts or omissions led the employer to believe in good faith that such acts or omissions were not violations of the act."

FLASH FLOOD ON MEDICINE CREEK, NEBR.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I regret the necessity of having to take a few minutes of the time of the Senate when I know that the Senate is anxious to give consideration to other measures, but death and flood have struck again in the State of Nebraska. This time it happens to be in my old home town of Cambridge. At least 13 are dead.

This disaster struck at the very same point where a little over 12 years ago in May 1935, 112 lives were lost in the Republican Valley from a similar flash flood. Ever since that time, all of our representatives here, including former Senator Norris, have worked themselves to the limit to get construction started on flood-control dams and other structures to prevent a similar occurrence.

I will say that that work has been authorized for several years. Naturally its getting under way was prevented during the war period.

A few weeks ago, construction was officially begun on the first unit of a general flood-control and irrigation program for the Republican Valley with the dam at Enders on one of the tributaries of the Republican. This particular flash flood, however, came from the Medicine Creek, another tributary which empties into the Republican right at Cambridge. The dam on Medicine Creek, 8 miles up stream from Cambridge, has been authorized for several years, and the survey and design work is completed. According to officials of the Department of the Interior, however, construction of the Medicine Creek Dam cannot be started for over a year unless additional funds—one or two million dollars—are made available promptly for the fiscal 1948 budget. It is my intention to attempt to secure these funds either through the conference report on the general Interior Department supply bill or from the next deficiency bill at this session. I hope to have the cooperation of all Members of the Senate in this attempt. I may say that my colleague the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and the four Members of the House from my State are wholeheartedly with me on this question.

When one reads a list of 13 names of people dead from the old home town, it makes a very different impression than such a list from a town one never heard of. That has been my experience today.

Mr. President, we seem to have been able to find money to relieve distress abroad in all parts of the world. The

generosity of America has become a byword in every nation on the face of the earth. I hope we can find means to be at least as charitable in relieving distress and preventing recurrences of such disasters as we experienced yesterday at Cambridge, Nebr.

The plan that I hope to follow now, Mr. President, will be in connection with the report on the Interior Department appropriation bill, which is due within a few days, to include a clause somewhere in it, if it can be legally and properly done, providing that there be set aside from $1,000,000 to $2,000,000, earmarked for construction work on the Madison Creek Dam, which, as I say, has been authorized for several years. Work on that dam should have been planned for this year. From one to two million dollars is all they can use, probably, this year. The total construction cost will be four or five million dollars. Had the dam been constructed we would have 13 more people living in the town of Cambridge today than we now have. I hope I shall have the cooperation of Members of the Senate when the report on the Interior Department appropriation bill is presented.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a newspaper account of the disaster to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOWN INUNDATED—RAIN, WIND, AND FLOOD CLAIM AT LEAST 13 LIVES IN NEBRASKA

CAMBRIDGE, NEBR., June 22.—A 24-hour siege of rain, wind, and flood claimed at least 13 lives in Nebraska today—11 of the victims drowning in a flash flood here.

A wall of water from Medicine Creek swept over this south-central Nebraska town without warning about sun-up, catching many residents in their beds.

Insurance man J. M. Hollingsworth said tonight six bodies had been recovered and that five more persons were known dead, including two unidentified infants living in a cabin camp housing project for veterans.

The number of missing dropped to four as rescue and relief operations continued. Hollingsworth said it was feared the death toll eventually would reach 15.

Water receded rapidly during the day, leaving what the insurance man described as a devastated scene. He estimated the damage at $500,000.

Boats and trucks were used to rescue 196 marooned persons, some of whom had taken refuge in trees and on housetops.

The city water system failed and water was hauled in from nearby towns.

Two motorists drowned 60 miles northeast of Cambridge when their car plunged into a creek after hitting a highway wash-out.

Tornadoes near Loomis and Gothenburg, Nebr., injured at least nine.

Heavy rains moving eastward were general throughout Nebraska. Soil already saturated by previous rains was unable to absorb the downpour and flood conditions were general. Omaha received 3⅓ inches of rain during the afternoon.

With a few exceptions rail travel was virtually paralyzed in eastern and central Nebraska and telephone service was disrupted in the flood-hit areas. Several highways and bridges were washed out.

Holes were chopped in roofs of inundated homes here to free flood survivors, most of whom were taken to the high school auditorium where food and clothing were waiting.

About three-fourths of this town of about 1,000 population was under water, in some places 8 to 10 feet deep, according to L. J. Bible, of McCook, who flew over the area.

Project Engineer H. E. Robinson, of the United States Reclamation Bureau, said damage would run into hundreds of thousands of dollars.

The Second Air Force in Omaha arranged to fly to Cambridge 1,500 units of tetanus injections, 1,300 units of typhoid injections, and 15 Lister bags asked by Red Cross workers

Medicine Creek is a tributary of the Republican River, on which a 1935 flood took more than 200 lives. The Republican was rising only slightly today, Robinson said.

The flash flood here followed several weeks of unusually wet Nebraska weather which already had caused floods leaving heavy damage to farm fields, delayed growth of crops, and numerous highway and railroad washouts.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the flash flood on Medicine Creek in the Republican River Valley of southwestern Nebraska, which took at least 11 lives and caused uncounted property damage early Sunday morning in the town of Cambridge, is a tragic and forceful example of the penalty we are asked to pay when flood-control and reclamation projects are unduly retarded.

It is small consolation to the families of the dead for me now to stand on the Senate floor and say that the flood could have been avoided. But we must face realities. For at least 10 years there has been a plan on the drafting boards of Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation for a modest multiple-purpose reservoir upstream on Medicine Creek which would have halted this flood and rendered it harmless. The reservoir would have done more than that. It would have captured the water which wreaked havoc on the little town of Cambridge and impounded it for use as a benefit to reclamation crops later in the dry seasons of July and August.

I am taking the floor today to supplement the remarks of my colleague, the senior Senator from Nebraska, whose own farm home was in the path of the flood.

I merely want to call attention of the Senate to the fact that under the Pick-Sloan plan which it approved in 1944, the hazard of flash floods on Medicine Creek was recognized. At that time it was agreed the responsibility for eventual construction of the Medicine Creek Reservoir would be assumed by the Bureau of Reclamation. Plans have proceeded to the point where engineering studies and field investigations have been completed. The engineering design is practically finished, and I am informed that it could be ready for contract lettings within a very few weeks.

I am advised today by Reclamation Bureau officials that their program now calls for actual construction funds to be requested for the first time in the fiscal year 1949. Total current cost estimates amount to $4,918,500, with an estimated requirement for the first year's construction of $1,095,000.

Were this the first time that tragedy had struck in the form of flash floods in the Republican Valley, it might be considered an exception in which a year's delay is not too important. But flash floods have struck and struck again against these prosperous communities.

I am asking the Senate's consideration for the advancement of the Medicine Reservoir so that it might be included in the 1948 construction program of the Bureau of Reclamation. I believe this can be accomplished in the conference on the Interior Department bill which I submitted on the Senate floor a week ago, and which the Senate was gracious enough to adopt unanimously in the form in which our Appropriations Committee recommended it.

The best possible solution would lie in the approval of Congress for an additional $1,095,000 for the current Interior Department appropriations. However, since under conference procedure, sums approved by the two Houses may not be exceeded by conferees, it will probably follow that out of unearmarked funds the Bureau will be obliged to find this necessary sum. It is our earnest hope that no other deserving project will be materially curtailed because of this emergency. But I am sure that people whose lives are not at stake would not begrudge us this emergency action if it becomes our only choice.

CONVENTIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE INTERNATIONAL LABOR CONFERENCE—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As in executive session, the Chair lays before the Senate Executive R, convention concerning food and catering for crews on board ship; Executive S, convention concerning the certification of ships' cooks; Executive T, convention concerning social security for seafarers; Executive U, recommendation concerning agreements relating to the social security of seafarers; Executive V, recommendation concerning medical care for seafarers' dependents; Executive W, convention concerning seafarers' pensions; Executive X, convention concerning vacation holidays with pay for seafarers; Executive Y, convention concerning the medical examination of seafarers; Executive Z, convention concerning the certification of able seamen; Executive AA, recommendation concerning the organization of training for sea service; Executive BB, convention concerning crew accommodation on board ship; Executive CC, recommendation concerning the provision to crews by shipowners of bedding, mess utensils and other articles; and Executive DD, convention concerning wages, hours of work on board ship and manning, all of the Eightieth Congress, first session. These conventions and recommendations were formulated at the twenty-eighth (maritime) session of the International Labor Conference, held at Seattle, Wash., June 6 to 29, 1946. Without objection, the message from the President will be printed in the RECORD; and, without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the conventions and recommendations, and they will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations together with the message from the President. The Chair hears no objection.

The message from the President was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

In accordance with the obligations of the Government of the United States of America as a member of the International Labor Organization, I transmit herewith authentic texts of nine conventions and four recommendations formulated at the twenty-eighth (maritime) session of the International Labor Conference, held at Seattle, Wash., June 6 to 29, 1946.

I transmit also the report of the Secretary of State regarding those conventions and recommendations, together with a copy of each of the communications with respect thereto addressed to the Department of State by the Secretary of Labor, the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Commerce, the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, the Federal Security Administrator, and the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

I ask that the Senate give its advice and consent, subject to appropriate definitions in certain cases as indicated in the enclosed communications, to ratification of the following conventions:

Convention (No. 68) concerning food and catering for crews on board ship;

Convention (No. 69) concerning the certification of ships' cooks;

Convention (No. 70) concerning social security for seafarers;

Convention (No. 73) concerning the medical examination of seafarers;

Convention (No. 74) concerning the certification of able seamen;

Convention (No. 75) concerning crew accommodation on board ship; and

Convention (No. 76) concerning wages, hours of work on board ship, and manning.

I request advice and consent to ratification of convention (No. 72) concerning vacation holidays with pay for seafarers only in the event that the conditions explained in the accompanying report of the Secretary of State have been met.

In view of certain objections thereto, as explained more fully in the enclosed report and communications, I do not request at this time advice and consent to ratification of convention (No. 71) concerning seafarers' pensions.

The constitution of the International Labor Organization under article 19, paragraph 5, requires that recommendations be brought "before the authority or authorities within whose competence the matter lies, for the enactment of legislation or other action." Accordingly, I request consideration of the following recommendations:

Recommendation (No. 75) concerning agreements relating to the social security of seafarers;

Recommendation (No. 76) concerning medical care for seafarers' dependents;

Recommendation (No. 77) concerning the organization of training for sea service; and

Recommendation (No. 78) concerning the provision to crews by shipowners of bedding, mess utensils, and other articles.

Many of the provisions of the enclosed conventions and recommendations fall short of standards already in effect in the American merchant marine. Some of the provisions are disappointing to those who had hoped through these instruments to raise substantially the level of standards in all member countries. It is believed, however, that general acceptance of the instruments by member countries will result in definite progress being made where that progress is most needed. Any such progress will benefit the competitive position of American seafarers and shipowners. At the same time, participation by the United States will necessitate relatively small change in the statutes or regulations of this Government.

Inasmuch as concurrent action by the Senate and House of Representatives would be necessary for the implementation of any of the enclosed conventions or recommendations, I am transmitting to the House of Representatives authentic copies of the conventions and recommendations, together with a copy of this message, a copy of the report by the Secretary of State, and a copy of each of the above-mentioned communications. I call attention particularly to the need for extending the provisions of any implementing legislation to the Territories and insular possessions in accordance with article 35 of the constitution of the International Labor Organization.

(Enclosures: (1) Authentic text of conventions and recommendations; (2) report of Secretary of State; (3) from Secretary of Labor; (4) from Acting Secretary of the Treasury; (5) from the Attorney General; (6) from Secretary of Commerce; (7) from Chairman of United States Maritime Commission; (8) from the Federal Security Administrator; (9) from Assistant Secretary of Agriculture; (10) memorandum from Shipping Division, Department of State.)

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 23, 1947.*

MINE SAFETY CODE—HEARING BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, for the benefit of Senators who may be interested, the Subcommittee on Mines and Mining of the Committeee on Public Lands is in session today and will be in session again tonight. They are meeting now in the room of the Committee on the District of Columbia. At 7:30 tonight they will meet in room 224 in the Senate Office Building, which is the hearing room of the Committee on Public Lands. They are considering the proposal to adopt for a period of 1 year the mine safety code. I know that some Senators from mining States are interested, and they will be welcome to attend.

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 564) to provide for the performance of the duties of the office of President, in case of the removal, resignation, or inability both of the President and Vice President.

SECOND URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to consider House bill 3791, making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3791) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the amendments of the committee be first considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Independent Offices—Federal Security Agency—Office of Vocational Rehabilitation," on page 3, line 22, after the numerals "1948", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That the amount obligated and expended shall be based on an annual appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 of not to exceed $18,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Agriculture," on page 6, after line 3, to strike out:

SUGAR RATIONING ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses: Not to exceed $215,000 of the $898,000 transferred to the Department of Agriculture pursuant to section 3 (c) of the Sugar Control Extension Act of 1947 for the payment of terminal leave, is hereby merged with and made available for the fiscal year 1947 for the same purposes as other funds transferred to the Department of Agriculture pursuant to the same authority, notwithstanding the provisions to the contrary under the head "Office of Temporary Controls" in the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Animal Industry," on page 7, after line 4, to insert:

Control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1947, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to control and eradicate foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest as authorized by the act of February 28, 1947 (Public Law 8), and the act of May 29, 1884, as amended (7 U. S. C. 391; 21 U. S. C. 111–122), including expenses in accordance with section 2 of said Public Law 8, $1,500,000, to remain available until June 30, 1948.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in connection with the appropriation of one and a half million dollars for the Bureau of Animal Industry for the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, I should like to make a brief explanation of that item, for the reason that I stated on the floor, in connection

with a previous deficiency bill, that if we included $9,000,000, which we did, for the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico, it would carry us until June 30. However, in the light of the widespread character of the disease in Mexico and the necessity for moving with as much speed as possible, we found that unless an additional $1,500,000 were appropriated for use between now and June 30, there would be a very definite lapse in the prosecution of the work. For that reason, contrary to what we stated before, we have inserted an item of $1,500,000 to carry the work through to July 1.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 7, after line 4.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Post Office Department—(out of the Postal Revenues)—Field Service, Post Office Department—Office of the Second Assistant Postmaster General," on page 9, line 18, after the word "which", to strike out "$5,977,000" and insert "$6,097,000"; and in line 21, after the figure "$5,972,000", to insert " 'Post-office inspectors, salaries', $10,000, 'Post-office inspectors, travel and miscellaneous expenses', $10,000, 'Transportation of equipment and supplies', $50,000, 'Operating force for public buildings', $50,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "War Department," on page 11, line 7, after the word "until", to strike out "June 30, 1948" and insert "expended."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 8, to insert:

The funds provided in the preceding paragraph shall be available to an amount not exceeding $250,000 to take all action necessary to prevent erosion at Anaheim Bay, Surfside, Calif.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That concludes the committee amendments.

The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill, H. R. 3791, was read the third time and passed.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BALL, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. TYDINGS conferees on the part of the Senate.

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 564) to provide for the performance of the duties of the office of President, in case of the removal, resignation, or inability both of the President and Vice President.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of bills on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning with Calendar No. 288.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not desire to object, but I think we should have a quorum call to notify Senators that we are about to call the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia may have heard the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] notify the Senate that there would be a call of the calendar.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not. If the notification was given at a time when there was a full attendance, I withdraw the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska gave such notification.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I notified Senators that after the deficiency bill was concluded we would immediately proceed with a call of the calendar.

Mr. RUSSELL. At what time was the notice given?

Mr. WHERRY. Just prior to the consideration of the deficiency bill. Of course, there was some confusion in the Chamber.

Mr. RUSSELL. There was a great deal of confusion in the Chamber. I was present, and I did not hear the announcement. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Murray
Baldwin	Hawkes	Myers
Ball	Hayden	O'Conor
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Hoey	Overton
Bridges	Holland	Pepper
Brooks	Ives	Reed
Buck	Jenner	Revercomb
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Wyo.
Byrd	Kem	Russell
Cain	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Capehart	Knowland	Smith
Capper	Langer	Sparkman
Chavez	Lodge	Stewart
Connally	Lucas	Taft
Cooper	McCarran	Taylor
Cordon	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McClellan	Thye
Downey	McFarland	Tobey
Dworshak	McGrath	Tydings
Eastland	McKellar	Umstead
Ecton	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ellender	Magnuson	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Wherry
Flanders	Martin	White
Fulbright	Maybank	Wiley
George	Millikin	Williams
Green	Moore	Wilson
Gurney	Morse	Young

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The Senator from Maine asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of bills on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning with Order No. 288. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

The clerk will state the first measure on the calendar.

GAME REFUGE IN FRANCIS MARION NATIONAL FOREST, S. C.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 616) to authorize the creation of a game refuge in the Francis Marion National Forest in the State of South Carolina, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with an amendment, on page 1, line 5, after the word "birds" and the comma, to insert "and fish", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of providing breeding places for game animals and birds and for the protection and administration of game animals and birds, and fish, the President of the United States is hereby authorized, upon the recommendation of the Secretary of Agriculture, to establish by public proclamation certain specified federally owned areas within the Francis Marion National Forest as game sanctuaries and refuges.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture shall execute the provisions of this act, and he is hereby authorized to prescribe all general rules and regulations for the administration of such game sanctuaries and refuges, and violation of such rules and regulations shall be punished by fine of not more than $500 or imprisonment for not more than 6 months or both.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION OF BLACK BASS AND OTHER GAME FISH

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 682) to regulate the interstate transportation of black bass and other game fish, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with amendments, on page 1, line 9, after the word "carrier", to insert the words "and the term 'game fish' shall mean black bass and such other fish as are defined as game fish by the laws of the State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, in which the fish has been either caught, killed, taken, sold, purchased, or possessed, or from which it was transported"; on page 2, line 12, after the word "transported", to insert "or is contrary to other applicable law"; on page 2, line 18, after the word "transported", to insert "or contrary to other applicable law", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to regulate the interstate transportation of black bass, and for other purposes," approved May 20, 1926, as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"That when used in this act, the word 'person' includes company, partnership, corporation, association, and common carrier, and the term 'game fish' shall mean black bass and such other fish as are defined as game fish by the laws of the State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, in which the fish has been either caught, killed, taken, sold, purchased, or possessed, or from which it was transported.

"SEC. 2. It shall be unlawful for any person to deliver or knowingly receive for transportation, or knowingly to transport, by any means whatsoever, from any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, to or through an. other State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, or to or through any foreign country, any black bass or other game fish, if (1) such transportation is contrary to the law of the State, Territory, or the District of Columbia from which such black bass or other game fish is or is to be transported, or is contrary to other applicable law, or (2) such black bass or other game fish has been either caught, killed, taken, sold, purchased, possessed, or transported, at any time, contrary to the law of the State, Territory, or the District of Columbia in which it was caught, killed, taken, sold, purchased, or possessed, or from which it was transported or contrary to other applicable law; and no person shall knowingly purchase or receive any such black bas· or otLer game fish which has been transported in violation of the provisions of this Act; nor shall any person receiving any shipment of black bass or other game fish transported in interstate commerce make any false record or render a false account of the contents of such shipment.

"SEC. 3. Any package or container containing such game fish transported or delivered for transportation in interstate commerce, except any shipment covered by section 9, shall be clearly and conspicuously marked on the outside thereof with the name 'Game Fish,' an accurate statement of the number of each species of such fish contained therein, and the names and addresses of the shipper and consignee.

"SEC 4. All such black bass or other game fish transported into any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia for use, consumption, sale, or storage therein shall upon arrival in such State, Territory, or the District of Columbia be subject to the operation and effect of the laws of such State, Territory, or the District of Columbia to the same extent and in the same manner as though such fish had been produced in such State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, and shall not be exempt therefrom by reason of being introduced therein in original packages or otherwise.

"SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized (1) to make such expenditures, including expenditures for personal services at the seat of government and elsewhere, and for cooperation with local, State, and Federal authorities, including the issuance of publications, and necessary investigations, as may be necessary to execute the functions imposed upon him by this act and as may be provided for by Congress from time to time; and (2) to make such regulations as he deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this act. Any person violating any such regulation shall be deemed guilty of a violation of this act.

"SEC. 6. (a) Any employee of the Department of the Interior authorized by the Secretary of the Interior to enforce the provisions of this act (1) shall have power, without warrant, to arrest any person committing in the presence of such employee a violation of this act or any regulation made in pursuance of this act, and to take such person immediately for examination or trial before an officer or court of competent jurisdiction; (2) shall have power to execute any warrants or other process issued by an officer or court of competent jurisdiction to enforce the provisions of this act or regulations made in pursuance thereof; and (3) shall have authority with a search warrant issued by an officer or court of competent jurisdiction, to make search in accordance with the terms of such warrant. Any judge of a court established under the laws of the United States, or any United States commissioner may, within his respective jurisdiction, upon proper oath or affirmation showing probable cause, issue warrants in all such cases.

"(b) All fish delivered for transportation or which have been transported, purchased, received, or which are being transported, in violation of this act, or any regulations made pursuant thereto, shall, when found by such employee or by any marshal or deputy marshal, be summarily seized by him and placed in the custody of such persons as the Secretary of the Interior shall by regulations prescribe, and shall, as a part of the penalty and in addition to any fine or imprisonment imposed under section 7 of this act, be forfeited by such court to the United States, upon conviction of the offender under this act, or upon judgment of the court that the same were transported, delivered, purchased, or received in violation of this act or regulations made pursuant thereto.

"SEC. 7. In addition to any forfeiture herein provided, any person who shall violate any of the provisions of this act shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not exceeding $200, or imprisonment for a term of not more than 3 months, or by both such fine and imprisonment, in the discretion of the court.

"SEC. 8. Nothing in this act shall be construed to prevent the several States and Territories from making or enforcing laws or regulations not inconsistent with the provisions of this act, or from making or enforcing laws or regulations which shall give further protection to black bass and other game fish.

"SEC. 9. Nothing in this act shall be construed to prevent the shipment in interstate commerce of live fish and eggs for breeding or stocking purposes."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

PERMANENT EASEMENT TO MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE, MD.

The bill (H. R. 2654) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to grant to the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore, State of Maryland, a permanent easement for the purpose of installing, maintaining, and servicing a subterranean water main in, on, and across the land of the United States Coast Guard station, called "Lazaretto Depot," Baltimore, Md., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PRESERVATION OF HISTORIC GRAVEYARDS IN ABANDONED MILITARY POSTS

The bill (H. R. 577), to preserve historic graveyards in abandoned military posts, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PATENTING OF CERTAIN LANDS IN CLALLAM COUNTY, WASH., FOR HOSPITAL PURPOSES

The bill (H. R. 2411) to authorize patenting of certain lands to public hospital district No. 2, Clallam County, Wash., for hospital purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EASEMENT ACROSS THE LAND OF FORT McHENRY NATIONAL MONUMENT

The bill (H. R. 2655) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant to the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore, State of Maryland, a permanent easement for the purpose of installing, maintaining, and servicing two subterranean water mains in, on, and across the land of Fort McHenry National Monument and Historic Shrine, Md., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AGREEMENTS WITH RESPECT TO RIGHTS IN HELIUM-BEARING GAS LANDS IN THE NAVAJO INDIAN RESERVATION, N. MEX.

The bill (S. 1315) authorizing certain agreements with respect to rights in helium-bearing gas lands in the Navajo Indian Reservation, N. Mex., and for other purposes, was announced as the next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like to ask whoever is sponsoring the bill if the Indians' rights are protected and if they get their money before this is done. It involves an Indian reservation, and I want to know whether the Indians will receive their money.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I might make a brief explanation. The question which the Senator has asked is one which has given all of us considerable difficulty, and we have not been able to determine exactly how to formulate a bill, or whether this bill safely protects the Indians in getting a reasonable value for the land. However, we have added an amendment which gives the Indians 3 years' time in which to assert whatever rights they may have and bring suit in the court of claims. We think we have protected the Indians in that way.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. House bill 3372, the next order of business, is on the same subject covered by Senate bill 1315. Is there objection to the consideration of the House bill?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, do I understand that the House bill may be amended in accordance with the Senate committee amendment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed the House bill contains the language of the Senate committee amendment.

Mr. HATCH. And the House bill will be taken up?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3372) authorizing certain agreements with respect to rights in helium-bearing gas lands in the Navajo Indian Reservation, N. Mex., and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senate bill 1315 is indefinitely postponed.

DETERMINATION OF FAIR MARKET VALUE OF THE FIDELITY BUILDING IN KANSAS CITY, MO.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1231) authorizing and directing the Commissioner of Public Buildings to determine the fair market value of the Fidelity Building in Kansas City, Mo., and to receive bids for the purchase thereof, and for other purposes, which had been reported by the Committee on Public Works, with amendments, on page 2, line 6, before the word "employ", to strike out "shall" and insert "may;" on page 2, line 11, after the word "city" and the period, to insert "Funds continued available under the provisions of section 1 (a) of Public Law 413, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved June 14, 1946,

are hereby made available for the purpose of paying the necessary costs relating to the employment of such appraisers", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioner of Public Buildings is authorized and directed to cause to be determined by appraisal the fair market value of certain real estate in Kansas City, Mo., recently acquired by the United States, which real estate consists of the building known as the Fidelity National Bank and Trust Building and the tract of land on which said building is situated, said real estate being located at the southeast corner of the intersection of Ninth and Walnut Streets in said city. Said fair market value shall be determined, and the amount thereof shall be made a matter of public information, on or before September 1, 1947. For the purpose of making such determination, the Commissioner may employ, without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, three disinterested persons resident in Kansas City, Mo., who have knowledge of the value of real estate in Kansas City and are qualified appraisers of real estate used for industrial or commercial purposes in said city. Funds continued available under the provisions of section 1 (a) of Public Law 413, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved June 14, 1946, are hereby made available for the purpose of paying the necessary costs relating to the employment of such appraisers.

SEC. 2. From and after the date upon which such fair market value is determined as herein provided, and until December 31, 1947, the Commissioner of Public Buildings shall solicit and receive sealed bids for the purchase of said real estate from the United States. Said bids shall not be opened prior to January 1, 1948. On or after January 1, 1948, but in no case later than January 10, 1948, said bids shall be opened and made a matter of public information.

SEC. 3. On or before February 1, 1948, the Commissioner of Public Buildings shall transmit to the Congress a report of the action taken pursuant to this act and the results thereof, attaching to, and making a part of, said report (1) a digest of said appraisal and a statement as to the amount of the fair market value of said real estate as determined thereby, and (2) an abstract of all bids received for the purchase of said real estate, showing as to each bid the name of the bidder or bidders and the amount and terms of the bid. Said report shall serve as the basis for further action by the Congress with respect to the sale of said real estate by the United States.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 829) to provide for control and regulation of bank holding companies and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

RELIEF OF WILLIAM D. McCORMICK

The bill (S. 706) for the relief of William D. McCormick was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, and notwithstanding any provisions of section 12 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended (43 Stat. 153), William D. McCormick, of Windsor, Ontario, Canada, who is of Scotch ancestry and the husband of Mary Rita McCormick, who has been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, shall be deemed to have been born in Scotland rather than in India, where his parents were temporary residents at the time the said William D. McCormick was born.

RELIEF OF MRS. HILDA MARGARET McGREW

The bill (S. 305) for the relief of Mrs. Hilda Margaret McGrew was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel forthwith the outstanding order and warrant of deportation issued pursuant to sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155 and 156), in the case of Mrs. Hilda Margaret McGrew, any provisions of existing law to the contrary notwithstanding. From and after the date of enactment of this act, Mrs. Hilda Margaret McGrew shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which the outstanding proceedings rest.

QUALIFICATIONS OF PART-TIME REFEREES IN BANKRUPTCY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3769) to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to qualifications of part-time referees in bankruptcy, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments, on page 1, line 7, after the word "and", to insert the word "retired", and in line 7, after the word "enlisted", to strike out the word "men" and insert "personnel."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

JAMES HARRY MARTIN

The bill (H. R. 617) for the relief of James Harry Martin was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALLEN T. FEAMSTER, JR.

The bill (H. R. 381) for the relief of Allen T. Feamster, Jr., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. FREDERICK FABER WESCHE

The bill (H. R. 2915) for the relief of Mrs. Frederick Faber Wesche (formerly Ann Maureen Bell) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1070) to provide for the cancellation of the capital stock of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the refund of moneys received for such stock, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over, under objection.

Mr. REVERCOMB subsequently said: Mr. President, let me ask to what bill objection was just made, with the result that the bill was passed over?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It was Calendar No. 305, Senate bill 1070.

CLAUDE R. HALL AND FLORENCE V. HALL

The bill (H. R. 407) for the relief of Claude R. Hall and Florence V. Hall was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. FUKU KUROKAWA THURN

The bill (H. R. 1318) for the relief of Mrs. Fuku Kurokawa Thurn was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 229) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to construct a postgraduate school at Monterey, Calif., was announced as next in order.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under objection, the bill will be passed over.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will Senator withhold his objection long enough to permit me to make an explanation?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. GURNEY. I should like to explain that the Navy presently has an option on land at Monterey, Calif., and the option expires by the 30th of June. Therefore, I hope the Senator from Washington will contact the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] prior to the conclusion of the call of the calendar, to see whether it will be possible to satisfy the Senator, so that he will withdraw his objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I should like to accommodate both the distinguished Senator from South Dakota and the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, but I have serious objection to this measure. No money is now available for the construction of the school. The purpose of the bill is simply to permit the exercise of an option relating to a summer resort in California. When the Navy is ready to construct a postgraduate school, either in Washington, Oregon, California, or any other place, that will be the time for it to come to Congress and make such a request. There is no emergency about the option. The price of the property will not be any greater next year.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, it is obvious that we cannot handle this matter during the call of the calendar, but I give notice that I shall try to have the bill brought up for consideration at the earliest possible opportunity in the future.

ORDER FOR FINAL VOTE ON PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION BILL

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the so-called Presidential succession bill be had at 2 p. m. on Friday.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that the reason I have chosen Friday as the date for the vote is that a very considerable delegation of Senators will leave here tomorrow to participate in the dedication at Warm Springs, and may not return until sometime Thursday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum call is necessary prior to the entering of such an order.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a quorum call has been had only in the last few minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the requirement for a quorum call be waived.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is entitled to submit such a request, if he wishes to do so.

The Senator from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that the rule requiring a quorum call before the Senate fixes by unanimous consent a time for the final vote, be waived. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I object.

Mr. DONNELL. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to say for the distinguished minority leader that several Senators on his side of the aisle are interested in leaving the Senate for a very short time on business that is almost official, I would say; and we are trying to cooperate with them so as to secure a final vote on the question of passage of the Presidential succession bill at the hour I have suggested.

I should like to call attention to the fact that we have just completed a quorum call, prior to the beginning of the call of the calendar; and if that quorum call could be regarded as sufficient in this connection, I should appreciate it, for I certainly feel that the Senate is on notice. Because of that fact, I would deeply appreciate it if the Senators who have objected will withdraw their objection, for the benefit of those who are interested in being here on Friday afternoon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska has requested unanimous consent that the rule requiring a quorum call be waived.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, it appears to me that the rule is a very wholesome one, and I believe it desirable to follow it at this time, even though a quorum call has been had only recently. In deciding about the time of the final vote on the question of the passage of a measure, I think the rule is a wholesome one and should be followed. Therefore I object to the unanimous-consent request for the waiving of the rule.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. WHERRY. Then, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Chavez	Gurney
Baldwin	Connally	Hatch
Ball	Cooper	Hawkes
Barkley	Cordon	Hayden
Brewster	Donnell	Hickenlooper
Bricker	Downey	Hill
Bridges	Dworshak	Hoey
Brooks	Eastland	Holland
Buck	Ecton	Ives
Bushfield	Ellender	Jenner
Butler	Ferguson	Johnson, Colo.
Byrd	Flanders	Johnston, S. C.
Cain	Fulbright	Kem
Capehart	George	Kilgore
Capper	Green	Knowland
Langer	Morse	Stewart
Lodge	Murray	Taft
Lucas	Myers	Taylor
McCarran	O'Conor	Thomas, Okla.
McCarthy	O'Daniel	Thye
McClellan	O'Mahoney	Tobey
McFarland	Overton	Tydings
McGrath	Pepper	Umstead
McKellar	Reed	Vandenberg
McMahon	Revercomb	Watkins
Magnuson	Robertson, Va.	Wherry
Malone	Robertson, Wyo.	White
Martin	Russell	Wiley
Maybank	Saltonstall	Williams
Millikin	Smith	Wilson
Moore	Sparkman	Young

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The Senator from Nebraska will repeat his unanimous-consent request.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I renew the unanimous-consent request which was proposed a short time ago, before the quorum call was had, that a vote be taken upon the pending business, the so-called succession bill, and all amendments and motions pertaining thereto, without further debate, at 2 o'clock Friday afternoon; that the time be divided, between the hour of the convening of the Senate at 12 o'clock and 2 o'clock p. m., between the proponents and opponents of the bill, the Senators to control the time to be announced later.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and, frankly, I shall not object—would the Senator from Nebraska or any other Senator be inconvenienced if the hour were made 3 o'clock? I do not like to object, but unless there is some reason to the contrary, I should like to have the hour of 3 o'clock fixed instead of 2. The Senate will be in session Friday afternoon in any event.

Mr. TAFT. So many Senators like to leave early Friday afternoon that it is very difficult to hold the Senate in session to any late hour on that day.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have an amendment I wish to offer, and I dislike to have amendments taken up and voted on along with the bill. Adequate consideration is never had under such circumstances. But rather than inconvenience any Senator——

Mr. TAFT. I suggest to the Senator that there will be 5 minutes on each side to explain any amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know how many amendments will be offered. I know of at least one, the one that I shall propose.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to comply with the requests of all Senators. It is very difficult to get a unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Nebraska has been more successful in extorting unanimous-consent agreements from the Senate than anyone who has been a Member of the Senate in many years.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. I should be very much pleased if the Senator would not object, and I will say to the Senator, for whom I have the highest regard, that if there is some way we can work out the consideration of his amendment, or any other amendment, we will have 3 days in which to do it, and we will see if it cannot be accomplished.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator will include the suggestion of the Senator from Ohio, that there shall be 5 minutes on each side to explain any amendment which may be offered I shall not object.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not object to that. In order to get the unanimous-consent agreement, I shall be glad to include that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thinks the arrangement is generally understood, without repeating the formal request. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska? The Chair hears none, and the agreement will be reduced to writing for the information of the Senate.

The unanimous-consent agreement was reduced to writing, as follows:

Ordered, That on the calendar day of Friday, June 27, 1947, at the hour of 2 p. m., the Senate proceed to vote upon any amendment or motion that may be pending, or that may subsequently be proposed, to the bill (S. 564) to provide for the performance of the duties of the office of President in case of removal, resignation, or inability both of the President and Vice President, and upon the final passage of the bill itself: *Provided, however*, That no vote on any amendment or motion shall be had prior to the said hour of 2 p. m.

Ordered further, That the time intervening between the meeting of the Senate on said day of June 27 and the said hour of 2 o'clock be equally divided between the proponents and the opponents of the bill, to be controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and that after the said hour of 2 p. m., debate on any amendment or motion shall be limited to 5 minutes on each side, to be controlled by the abovenamed Senators.

APPOINTMENTS FOR SUPPLY DUTY IN THE MARINE CORPS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1371) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to appoint, for supply duty only, officers of the line of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments, on page 1, line 4, after the word "permanent" to insert "or temporary", and on page 2, line 8, after the word "permanent", to insert "or temporary", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That officers of the line of the Marine Corps of the permanent or temporary grades of captain, major, lieutenant colonel, and colonel may, upon application, and with the approval of the Secretary of the Navy, be assigned to supply duty only: *Provided*, That when so assigned they shall retain the lineal position and precedence which they hold at the time of assignment or may later attain and shall be promoted, retired, and discharged in like manner and with the same relative conditions in all respects as on the date of passage of this act, or as thereafter may be provided for other officers of the line of the Marine Corps, except as otherwise provided by law: *Provided further*, That the recommendation of selection boards in the cases of officers assigned to such duty shall be based upon their comparative fitness to perform the duties prescribed for them: *And provided further*, That officers of the permanent or temporary grades of captain, major, lieutenant colonel, and colonel assigned to supply duty only in accordance with this act shall, on assignment and on promotion up to and including the grade of brigadier general, be carried as additional numbers in grade.

SEC. 2. The number of officers so assigned in accordance with this act shall be in accordance with the requirements of the service as determined by the Secretary of the Navy: *Provided*, That all officers of the Marine Corps now assigned to assistant quartermaster duty only and assistant paymaster duty only are hereby assigned to supply duty only, without change in their lineal positions and precedence solely as a result of such change of assignment.

SEC. 3. The head of the Supply Department shall have the title of "Quartermaster General of the Marine Corps" and shall, while so serving, have the rank, pay, and allowances of a major general, and shall be in addition to the number of general officers otherwise provided by law. He shall be carried in the grade or rank from which appointed.

SEC. 4. When a vacancy shall exist in the office of Quartermaster General of the Marine Corps, the President may appoint to such office, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, an officer of the Marine Corps on the active list assigned to supply duty only of the rank of brigadier general, who shall hold office as such quartermaster general for a period of 4 years, unless sooner relieved.

SEC. 5. In such numbers as may be required to meet the needs of the service officers of the line may be detailed for duty in the Supply Department for a period of 4 years unless sooner relieved.

SEC. 6. The following laws and parts of laws are hereby repealed:

(a) Act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 609; 34 U. S. C. 625). Act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat 610; 34 U. S. C. 633).

(b) Sections 3, 11, and 14 of the act of May 29, 1934 (48 Stat. 811; 34 U. S. C. 625a, 667c, 667f).

(c) Act of July 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 537; 34 U. S. C. 632a).

(d) Act of March 24, 1944 (58 Stat. 121; 34 U. S. C. 625b).

SEC. 7. All other laws or parts of laws inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby amended accordingly.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

COMPENSATION TO CERTAIN PERSONS UNDER THE SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT OF 1940

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 167), to recognize uncompensated services rendered the Nation under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

TRANSPORTATION OF DEPENDENTS AND HOUSEHOLD EFFECTS OF CERTAIN SERVICE PERSONNEL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1376) to amend the acts of October 14, 1942 (56 Stat. 786), as amended, and November 28, 1943 (57 Stat. 593), as amended, so as to authorize transportation of dependents and household effects of personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard to overseas bases.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill from the distinguished Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, this bill was reported by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], who is absent from the Chamber at the moment.

Section 12 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 (56 Stat. 359, 365), authorizes payment by the United States of transportation for the dependents of officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the first three grades of the armed services when any such officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man is ordered to make a permanent change of station.

Subsequent to the outbreak of war, conditions arose where it was impossible or inadvisable, for security reasons, to permit the dependents of naval and Coast Guard personnel to accompany such personnel to their new stations. These conditions existed in all cases where the personnel in question were ordered overseas or to sea duty. There were also certain stations within the United States where, because of a shortage of quarters, or, occasionally, because of security reasons, dependents were not permitted.

The situation described in the foregoing paragraph was recognized by the Congress in the acts of October 14, 1942 (56 Stat. 786), and November 28, 1943 (57 Stat. 593). These laws provided that in those cases where the dependents in question were not permitted to accompany the personnel concerned, such dependents would be permitted to select any point in the United States, and the United States Government would pay the cost of transportation of such dependents and their household effects, including packing, crating, and unpacking thereof, from the duty station of such military personnel to such point.

Following the termination of hostilities, the Navy Department recognized it as desirable to permit dependents of military personnel stationed at overseas bases to join such personnel overseas. Requests for transportation were issued by the Navy Department and many of the dependents concerned have since been transported to various overseas bases. However, the Comptroller General, after consideration of the language of the acts of October 14, 1942, and November 28, 1943, held that dependents were entitled to transportation from the old duty stations in the United States to the overseas station concerned, less the cost of transportation already furnished from the old duty station to points of selection in the United States.

It is, therefore, now necessary for the Congress to recognize the entire travel performed, or it will be necessary for the Navy Department to collect from the personnel concerned the excess cost of transportation involved. The excess costs arise from the difference in the distance traveled by dependents between the last duty station to the point of embarkation via the point of selection as compared with the lesser cost of travel from the last duty station to the point of embarkation via the most direct route.

The transportation of such dependents to overseas bases is desirable and is an important factor affecting the morale of our occupation forces.

I believe this statement explains the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

UNITED STATES NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

The bill (H. R. 1379) to establish the United States Naval Postgraduate School, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask that the bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to construct a postgraduate school at a certain point be passed over. I do not quite understand the legislative reason for both bills being on the calendar, but probably the distinguished Senator from Wyoming could explain. As I understand H. R. 1379, it is merely an authorization to establish the United States Naval Postgraduate School, without reference to where or why or the time.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. With that clear understanding of the purpose of the bill, I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire just what the Navy's program is with respect to these postgraduate schools and to what extent they are to replace the existing educational system of the Navy. I have particular reference to the War College at Newport and to the institution at Annapolis.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. My understanding is that the bill will not affect the War College at Newport. It will place elsewhere the postgraduate academy located at Annapolis. The committee has already viewed sites on the Pacific coast, and the bill to designate the site at Monterey has been asked to be passed over already by the Senator from Washington.

Mr. McGRATH. Does it entirely replace the institution at Annapolis?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. It will eventually entirely replace, not the Naval Academy, but merely the postgraduate college.

Mr. McGRATH. Has the Senator from Maryland been consulted in this matter? I think that in the absence of the Senator from Maryland I shall ask that the bill go over.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will withhold his objection, I should like to say a word on this bill. The senior Senator from Maryland studied the bill and had no objection to it in committee. Furthermore, I may say the bill gives legislative authority for the postgraduate school at Annapolis, or wherever it may be moved. It also establishes professorships, and it establishes also the right to give degrees. The only bill that would transfer the postgradu-

ate school from Annapolis is on the calendar, No. 308, Senate bill 229. I do not believe that House bill 1379 would affect the postgraduate school now at Annapolis. Of course, the testimony before the committee was that the facilities at Annapolis are so crowded by the 4-year-term midshipmen that the Navy feels it almost impossible to keep the postgraduate school going at Annapolis, in view of the expansion the Academy itself has had. Therefore, Calendar 312, House bill 1379, was reported unanimously from the Armed Services Committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, just one moment. I want it clearly understood that my objection to Senate bill 229, Calendar 308, is not only on the ground that a school is to be established at a certain point, but also because a part of the bill carries authorization to the Secretary of the Navy to exercise an option on what I call a fine summer resort in California.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of H. R. 1379?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do not object to Calendar 312, House bill 1379.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, until I have an opportunity to find out the full effect of the bill, I shall ask that it go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. FULBRIGHT subsequently said. Mr. President, I endeavored to obtain recognition on the previous bill. I merely wanted to ask one question of the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services. The question is whether the committee had given consideration to eliminating the undergraduate work, and making the Academy at Annapolis a postgraduate college. I had heard that such consideration was to be given, and I wondered if the committee had studied the matter.

Mr. GURNEY. I did not quite get the first part of the question. As I understand it, House bill 1379 proposes only to set up a postgraduate school as a sort of college inside the Navy. It does not affect the Academy at Annapolis at all.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. My question was, Has the Committee on Armed Services given study to the suggestion I have made? I have seen it set forth in print, and I have heard it discussed, that the undergraduate work in the Academy at Annapolis be restricted; that is, to let the ordinary universities do some of the ordinary college work that is given there. I wondered if the committee had studied that question.

Mr. GURNEY. No; the committee has not put any time on the recommendations of the Board of Visitors, or the subcommittee that considered naval instruction in its entirety last year, with the exception of the bill for the establishment of a postgraduate school elsewhere. That is the only problem in this connection that has been taken up by our committee this year.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Did the Board of Visitors recommend to the committee that the undergraduate work be restricted, in order to give more time and space to the postgraduate work at Annapolis?

Mr. GURNEY. I cannot answer the question. I am not completely informed on what the Board proposed, but it is possible the Senator from Massachusetts can answer the Senator's question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill has gone over. Does the Senator wish to speak?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I asked for recognition when we were discussing the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is entitled to 5 minutes upon any bill at any time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I merely wanted to obtain information on this matter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is entitled to 5 minutes. He has 1 minute left.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I may obtain the information I want in 1 minute, from the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think I am correct in saying that at the Naval Academy about half of the future officers of the Navy will be educated. The other half will be educated at various universities of the country, under the so-called Holloway plan. There is the school proposed in California, which, if it is established, will be a school to which all graduates may ultimately go. At the present time there is a postgraduate school at Annapolis. I think I am correct in that, but I am not certain I am correct in saying that the postgraduate school at Annapolis has never been recognized as a separate entity. The purpose of the bill is to allow the school to give degrees and to have recognition as a separate entity. I am not certain of that, but I believe that is so.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, may I have 5 minutes on this bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is recognized. I think he has spoken twice on the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I merely wanted to clarify the matter by asking a question of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington is recognized for two clarifying moments.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The question is whether the bill we have been considering, which has been passed over, would merely establish the identity of a postgraduate school. If it stayed at Annapolis, it would still have the identity, and, if I recall correctly, it has never been fully recognized that a postgraduate school exists anywhere, whether it be at Annapolis or at any other place. I might say to the Chair that this is not only a clarifying question, but it is clarifying legislation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

PROMOTION TO COMMISSIONED WARRANT OFFICERS IN UNITED STATES NAVY

The bill (H. R. 1362) to permit certain naval personnel to count all active service rendered under temporary appointment as warrant or commissioned officers in the United States Navy and the United States Naval Reserve, or in the United States Marine Corps and the United States Marine Corps Reserve, for purposes of promotion to commissioned warrant officer in the United States Navy or the United States Marine Corps, respectively, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DISTINGUISHED FLYING CROSS TO REAR ADM. CHARLES E. ROSENDAHL, UNITED STATES NAVY

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 92) authorizing the presentation of the Distinguished Flying Cross to Rear Adm. Charles E. Rosendahl, United States Navy, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ISSUANCE POSTHUMOUSLY OF COMMISSION AS GENERAL, UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS, TO THE LATE LT. GEN. ROY STANLEY GEIGER

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 96) authorizing the President to issue posthumously to the late Roy Stanley Geiger, lieutenant general, United States Marine Corps, a commission as general, United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, may we temporarily set aside this bill? The Senator from Florida wishes to say a word on it. He has been called from the floor to answer a long-distance call.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming subsequently said: Mr. President, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] has returned to the Chamber. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Joint Resolution 96, order No. 315, which a moment ago was temporarily passed over until the Senator from Florida could return to the Senate Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 96, authorizing the President to issue posthumously to the late Roy Stanley Geiger, lieutenant general, United States Marine Corps, a commission as general, United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes.

Mr. HOLLAND. May I ask the distinguished Senator from Wyoming for a brief explanation of the measure?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, the purpose of the joint resolution is to promote posthumously the late Lieutenant General Geiger, United States Marine Corps, to the rank of general in the United States Marine Corps.

General Geiger would have been retired on February 1, 1947, but died on January 23, 1947. On his retirement he would have been advanced to the rank of general under section 12 of the act of June 23, 1938, as amended. His 39 years of service have been sufficiently outstanding as to distinguish him among his contemporaries. This resolution will place his name on the records in the rank to which he would have been advanced had he lived a few days longer. There will be no additional cost to the Government by the enactment of this resolution.

The Navy Department strongly recommends passage of this resolution, and its recommendation has been cleared by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I sincerely appreciate the fact that the distinguished Senator from Wyoming has seen fit to introduce and sponsor this legislation. If I may be allowed to take just a minute of the Senate's time, I want to say that General Geiger is one of the most distinguished military figures ever produced by the State of Florida, and that we are exceedingly proud of him.

Mr. President, in order that there may appear in the RECORD the verdict of his own service, the Navy, of which he was a part—of course, he was a Marine, and a Marine flier—I beg leave at this time to read from the official communication from Rear Adm. O. S. Colclough, of the United States Navy, Judge Advocate General of the Navy, in reply to a request from the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services with reference to this particular joint resolution. The report from Admiral Colclough reads in part, as follows:

General Geiger had an outstanding military record of over 39 years' service and was a qualified naval aviator of over 30 years' experience. During World War I he was awarded the Navy Cross for distinguished service while in command of a Marine Aircraft Squadron in France. In the present war he commanded with outstanding ability the First Marine Aircraft Wing, Fleet Marine Force, until April 1943, and was awarded a gold star in lieu of a second Navy Cross for extraordinary heroism and distinguished service in operations against enemy Japanese forces on Guadalcanal from September to November 1942. From May until October 1943 General Geiger served as Director of Marine Corps Aviation and was then returned to the Pacific to command the First Amphibious Corps, later the Third Amphibious Corps, Fleet Marine Force. For exceptionally meritorious service during operations on Bougainville in November and December 1943, he was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal. For similar services in the Marianas and the capture of Guam in July 1944, he received a gold star in lieu of a second Distinguished Service Medal. General Geiger led his corps into battle in the Okinawa operation beginning in April 1945 as a part of the Tenth Army; and, upon the death in action of Lt. Gen. Simon Bolivar Buckner, assumed command of that army and led it to the successful conclusion of the final land campaign of World War II. In recognition of his outstanding services in this operation, General Geiger was awarded the Army Distinguished Service Medal. From July 1945 to November 1946 he commanded the Fleet Marine Force, Pacific.

At the time of his death on January 23, 1947, General Geiger was awaiting retirement, which would have occurred on February 1, 1947, in accordance with section 9 of the act of February 21, 1946 (60 Stat. 28; 34 U. S. C. 410 (d)), which provides for retirement of any commissioned officer of the Regular Navy or Marine Corps, serving in a rank below that of fleet admiral, who has attained the age of 62 years. Upon retirement he would have been advanced to the rank of general in accordance with section 12 of the act of June 23, 1938, as amended (52 Stat. 949; 54 U. S. C. 404 (1)), which provides in part that "all line officers of the Navy who have been specially commended for their performance of duty in actual combat by the head of the executive department under whose jurisdiction such duty was performed, when retired * * * shall * * * be placed upon the retired list with the rank of the next higher grade and with three-fourths of the active-duty pay of the grade in which serving at the time of retirement."

In view of the foregoing, the Navy Department strongly recommended enactment of the joint resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 59.

Mr. President, my State is peculiarly proud of the attainments and the fine record of Gen. Roy Geiger. We are only sorry that he could not have survived a little longer to have received this grateful recognition of his service as tendered by the Navy to which he had rendered service for almost 40 years, which would also be an expression of the gratitude of all the people of the Nation wherever they may live.

I appreciate very greatly the fact that the distinguished Senator from Wyoming has permitted me to make this brief statement.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I am glad to have been of that small service to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am exceedingly glad that my distinguished colleague has put into the body of the RECORD the magnificent testimonial to General Geiger from the naval branch, which is attested by the letter of Rear Admiral Colclough.

We of Florida are proud of the record of General Geiger, proud of the distinguished service which he rendered in combat and in leadership in the recent war.

Having known General Geiger, known his record as a citizen, the beautiful life which he enjoyed in Florida, the distinguished and devoted family which he leaves behind, I too, for myself and the admiring citizenry of my State, which feels so attached to him and his memory, want to express appreciation to the Senator from Wyoming, and to the Senate, for making it possible for him to achieve the rank of general, from which he was cut short by death 8 days before he would have reached that rank, in the regular course.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, while I am very happy to join with the two distinguished Senators from Florida and other Members of the Senate in honoring the memory of General Geiger, a great general, I wish to say that for 5 years I have sought to obtain the rank of major general for Billy Mitchell, posthumously, which would not cost the Government a penny. Billy Mitchell was not only a great soldier, being the first man to fly over the enemy lines in an airplane in the First World War, but he was a prophet who dared to challenge the "brass hats," which means the closed minds of his generation. Apparently it is for that reason that recognition is still not forthcoming.

I trust that the distinguished Senators from Florida, who have so gloriously recognized the valor of a son of their State, will join me in seeking recognition of a prophet and a great soldier, so that eventually, in the years ahead, recognition will be forthcoming to gallant, farseeing, fighting Billy Mitchell, of Wisconsin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). The question is on the third reading and passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 96) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EASEMENT TO COUNTY OF PITTSBURG, OKLA.

The bill (H. R. 1807) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the county of Pittsburg, Okla., a perpetual easement for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a public highway over a portion of the United States naval ammunition depot, McAlester, Okla., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ARMY MAIL CLERKS

The bill (H. R. 2339) to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the designation of Army mail clerks and assistant Army mail clerks," approved August 21, 1941 (55 Stat. 656), and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SAMUEL W. DAVIS, JR.; MRS. SAMUEL W. DAVIS, JR.; AND BETTY JANE DAVIS

The bill (H. R. 1144) for the relief of Samuel W. Davis, Jr.; Mrs. Samuel W. Davis, Jr.; and Betty Jane Davis was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

S. C. SPRADLING AND R. T. MORRIS

The bill (H. R. 1067) for the relief of S. C. Spradling and R. T. Morris was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXTENSION OF CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1923

The bill (S. 490) to provide for the extension and application of the provisions of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to certain officers and employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service in the Department of Justice was announced as next in order.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill S. 490?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts requests an explanation of Calendar No. 320, being Senate bill 490. The Chair will recognize the author of the bill, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the bill provides for the extension and application of the provisions of the Classification Act of 1923 to certain officers and employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service in the Department of Justice. For example, it says:

Immigrant inspectors shall be divided into five classes, as follows: Grade 1, salary $2,100; grade 2, salary $2,300; grade 3, sal-

ary $2,500; grade 4, salary $2,700; grade 5, salary $3,000; and, hereafter inspectors shall be promoted successively to grades 2 and 3 at the beginning of the next quarter following 1 year's satisfactory service.

The bill was studied by the subcommittee of which the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] is chairman. I am sure he would say that the whole purpose is, briefly, as I stated, to create classification and provide compensation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 490) to provide for the extension and application of the provisions of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to certain officers and employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service in the Department of Justice was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the portion of the second paragraph of section 24 of the act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 893; 45 Stat. 954; 8 U. S. C. 109), as amended, reading as follows:

"Immigrant inspectors shall be divided into five classes, as follows: Grade 1, salary $2,100; grade 2, salary $2,300; grade 3, salary $2,500; grade 4, salary $2,700; grade 5, salary $3,000; and, hereafter inspectors shall be promoted successively to grades 2 and 3 at the beginning of the next quarter following 1 year's satisfactory service (determined by a standard of efficiency which is to be defined by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, with the approval of the Attorney General) in the next lower grade and to grades 4 and 5 for meritorious service after no less than 1 year's service in grades 3 and 4, respectively: *Provided further,* That"—

is hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. (a) That clause (ix) in subsection 3 (d) of title II of the act of November 26, 1940 (54 Stat. 1214; 5 U. S. C. 681 (d) (ix)), is hereby repealed.

(b) That upon approval of this act, the Attorney General shall adjust the compensation of, and allocate to the services and grades of the Classification Act of 1923 (42 Stat. 1488; 5 U. S. C. 661 and the following), as amended, the positions of inspectors in the Immigration and Naturalization Service heretofore established by that portion of the second paragraph of section 24 of the act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 893; 45 Stat. 954; 8 U. S. C. 109), as amended, which is repealed by the first section of this act. Such adjustment and allocation shall be effected in the same manner as other positions in the field service of the Immigration and Naturalization Service are adjusted and allocated under section 2 of the act of July 3, 1930 (46 Stat. 1003; 5 U. S. C. 678a), as amended.

(c) That nothing in this act shall be construed so as to decrease the existing compensation of any employee of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, but when his position shall become vacant it shall be filled in accordance with the regular compensation schedule applicable to such position.

SAMUEL AUGENBLICK

The bill (S. 292) for the relief of Samuel Augenblick was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Samuel Augenblick, age 19 years, who arrived at the port of the city of New York, N. Y., on July 9, 1946, on the steamship *Hobart Victory,* and who is in possession of a transit visa granted him by the American consul in Rome, Italy, to remain in the United States for a period of 2 months and then to depart for Cuba, be permitted to remain in the United States permanently.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 18) to establish uniform qualifications of jurors in Federal courts, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like an explanation of the bill. I call this point to the attention of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary: The bill, as I understand it, would allow women to serve on Federal juries in a State where they are not allowed to serve on the juries of State courts. If I am correct in that understanding, it does not seem to me it is a good bill.

Mr. WILEY. The bill was introduced by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], reported favorably by the subcommittee to the full committee, and reported by the full committee to the Senate. The purpose of the bill is substantially as outlined by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts. The bill provides that—

Any citizen of the United States of the age of 21 years and over, who, under the provisions of this act, is not disqualified for jury service, may be called to serve as a grand or petit juror in the district court of the United States for the district in which he or she resides.

It is my understanding that the purpose of the bill is to provide that the female sex shall have the same right to serve as jurors as the male sex.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Under those circumstances I respectfully request that the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

QUARTERS FOR THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

The bill (S. 175) to provide for the furnishing of quarters at Brunswick, Ga., for the United States District Court for the Southern District of Georgia was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (g) of section 77 of the Judicial Code, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the proviso thereof which reads as follows: "*Provided,* That no cost shall be incurred by the Government in furnishing quarters for holding court at Brunswick."

MARY LOMAS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1742) for the relief of Mary Lomas, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment on page 1, line 5, after the numerals "890", to strike out "54" and insert in lieu thereof "56."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

TROY CHARLES DAVIS, JR.

The bill (S. 258) for the relief of Troy Charles Davis, Jr., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Troy Charles Davis, Jr., of Denver, Colo., a merchant seaman entitled to medical treatment and hospitalization at Government expense, the sum of $211.32, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for reimbursement of medical and hospital expenses incurred by him in connection with an emergency operation which it became necessary for him to have performed in a private hospital in Denver, Colo., because of the lack of a marine hospital in that city: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

FRANKIE STALNAKER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1100) for the relief of Frankie Stalnaker, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$4,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Frankie Stalnaker, of Baltimore, Md., the sum of $2,000, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for reimbursement of medical and hospital expenses incurred by her, and for compensation for personal injuries sustained by her on December 7, 1944, in Baltimore, Md., as a result of being struck by a United States Government mail truck.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF SUCCESSION AND POWERS OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 135) to extend the succession, lending powers, and the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That (a) the first sentence of section 4 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is hereby further amended by striking out "June 30, 1947" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1948"; and the first sentence of section 14 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is hereby further amended by striking out "July 1, 1947" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1948"; and (b) section 5d of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended; the act approved January 26, 1937 (50 Stat., ch. 6, p. 5), as amended; and the act approved February 11, 1937 (50 Stat., ch. 10, p. 19), as amended,

are hereby further amended by striking out "June 30, 1947" wherever appearing and in each instance inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1948."

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 49) against adoption of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of May 1, 1947, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be passed over.

PARTICIPATION OF ARMY AND NAVY PERSONNEL IN OLYMPIC GAMES

The bill (H. R. 2276) to authorize the Secretary of War to pay certain expenses incident to training, attendance, and participation of personnel of the Army of the United States in the seventh winter sports Olympic games and the fourteenth Olympic games and for future Olympic games was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like to know how much this bill will cost the Government.

Mr. GURNEY. There is an authorization of $125,000 for the two services.

Mr. LANGER. I object to consideration of the bill at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. LANGER subsequently said: Mr. President, after conferring with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], I wish to withdraw my objection to House bill 2276, Calendar No. 330.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I have conferred with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], who has now very kindly withdrawn his objection. I hope, therefore, that it may be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy are hereby authorized to direct the training and attendance of personnel of the Army of the United States and of the naval service, respectively, as participants in the seventh winter sports Olympic games and the fourteenth Olympic games and future Olympic games: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War is further authorized to direct the training and attendance of animals of the Army of the United States for such games: *Provided further*, That the expenses in amounts not to exceed $75,000 for the Army and $50,000 for the Navy, incident to the training, attendance, and participation in the seventh winter sports Olympic games and the fourteenth Olympic games, including the use of such supplies, material, and equipment as in the opinion of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, respectively, may be necessary, may be charged to the appropriations for the support of the Army and appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service, respectively, for the fiscal year 1948 and 1949: *And provided further*, That applicable allowances which are or may be fixed by law or regulations for participation in other military activities shall not be exceeded.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to pay certain expenses incident to training, attendance, and participation of personnel of the Army of the United States and of the naval service, respectively, in the seventh winter sports Olympic games and the fourteenth Olympic games and for future Olympic games."

MANAGEMENT AND OPERATION OF NAVAL PLANTATIONS OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1358) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the management and operation of naval plantations, outside the continental United States," approved June 28, 1944, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Armed Services was, in section 1, on page 1, line 3, after the word "That", to strike out "section 2 of."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 1, after line 6, to insert:

SECTION 1. Hereafter the appropriations for the subsistence of Army and Navy personnel, respectively, shall be available for any and all expenditures necessary in the management, operation, maintenance, and improvement of any plantation or farm, on land subject to Army or Navy jurisdiction outside of the continental United States, for the purpose of furnishing fresh fruits and vegetables to the armed forces of the United States: *Provided*, That equipment, material, and supplies required therein may be purchased without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, and other laws applicable to purchases by governmental agencies: *Provided further*, That only American nationals, employees of the United States, shall be entitled to benefits under the civil-service laws and other laws of the United States relating to the employment, work, compensation, rights, benefits, or obligations of civilian employees of the United States: *Provided further*, That surplus production over the amount furnished, or sold to the armed forces of the United States and to civilians serving with the armed forces may only be sold outside the continental limits of the United States: *And provided further*, That no land shall be acquired under this authorization.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendments were, in section 2, on page 2, line 25, after the word "end", to insert "the Secretary of War, with respect to Army affairs, and"; on page 3, line 1, after the word "Navy", to insert "with respect to Navy affairs"; at the beginning of line 7, to strike out "naval or" and insert "Army, Navy, or"; in line 8, after the words "determination of", to insert "the Secretary of War, in regard to Army matters, and"; and in line 10, after "Navy", to insert "in regard to Navy matters."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MILITARY LEAVE OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES OR OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (H. R. 1845) to amend existing laws relating to military leave of certain employees of the United States or of the District of Columbia so as to equalize rights to leave of absence and reemployment for such employees who are members of the Enlisted or Officers' Reserve Corps, the National Guard or the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLOTHING ALLOWANCE OF CERTAIN ENLISTED MEN OF THE MARINE CORPS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1375) to further amend section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, so as to provide for the clothing allowance of enlisted men of the Marine Corps and Marine Corps Reserve, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment, on page 1, line 8, after the words "men of the" to insert "Army."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to further amend section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, so as to provide for the clothing allowance of enlisted men of the Army, Marine Corps, and Marine Corps Reserve."

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO THE PANAMA CANAL

The bill (H. R. 3629) to authorize the transfer to the Panama Canal of property which is surplus to the needs of the War Department or Navy Department was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO LOUISIANA POWER & LIGHT CO.

The bill (H. R. 2248) to authorize the Secretary of War to grant an easement and to convey to the Louisiana Power & Light Co. a tract of land comprising a portion of Camp Livingston in the State of Louisiana was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ATTENDANCE OF MARINE BAND AT NATIONAL ENCAMPMENT OF GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC

The bill (H. R. 3124) to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the Eighty-first National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held in Cleveland, Ohio, August 10 to 14, 1947, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MAJ. RALPH M. ROWLEY AND FIRST LT. IRVING E. SHEFFEL

The bill (S. 179) for the relief of Maj. Ralph M. Rowley and First Lt. Irving E. Sheffel was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Ralph M. Rowley, major, Signal Corps, United States Army, and Irving E. Sheffel, first lieutenant, Finance

Department, United States Army, are hereby relieved of liability for all charges now entered or which may be entered against them, or either of them, as a result of the theft of 429,257 lire ($4,292.57) of Army funds by a person unknown, near Ruvo, Italy, on November 3, 1943, while the said Ralph M. Rowley was acting as class A agent officer for the said Irving E. Sheffel.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Ralph M. Rowley, an amount equal to the total amount deducted from his pay in partial settlement of any such charges: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

REV. JOHN C. YOUNG

The bill (S. 880) for the relief of Rev. John C. Young was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Reverend John C. Young, of Montgomery, W. Va., the sum of $3,500, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries and loss of earnings sustained by him as a result of having been shot by a member of the military police force of the Army of the United States, in Montgomery, W. Va., on August 11, 1945: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

COL. WILLIAM J. KENNARD

The bill (S. 957) for the relief of Col. William J. Kennard was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Col. William J. Kennard, of Washington, D. C., the sum of $950, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for the difference between (1) the amount he was actually allowed as compensation for the value of the personal property which he lost as a result of the invasion of the Philippine Islands by the Japanese in December 1941, and (2) the amount which should have been paid to the said Col. William J. Kennard as compensation for the value of such property: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

PATENT IN FEE TO JAMES BLACK DOG

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 402) to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to James Black Dog a patent in fee to certain land, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with an amendment, on page 1, line 3, after the word "That," to insert "upon application in writing", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, upon application in writing, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to James Black Dog, a Fort Peck Indian allottee, a patent in fee to the northeast quarter of section 34, township 30 north, of range 53 east, Montana principal meridian, containing 160 acres.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PATENT IN FEE TO GROWING FOUR TIMES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 608) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Growing Four Times, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with an amendment, on page 1, line 3, after the word "That," to insert "upon application in writing", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, upon application in writing, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Growing Four Times, of Frazier, Mont., a patent in fee to the following-described allotted lands situated in the State of Montana: The northeast quarter of the southeast quarter, and the southeast quarter of the southeast quarter, of section 5, township 26 north, range 45 east, Montana principal meridian.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CAPITAL GRANTS FOR CERTAIN LOW-RENT HOUSING AND SLUM-CLEARANCE PROJECTS

The bill (S. 1361) to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 so as to permit capital grants for low-rent housing and slum-clearance projects where construction costs exceed present cost limitations upon condition that local housing agencies pay the difference between cost limitations and the actual construction costs was announced as next in order.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, this is a bill to which the Committee on Banking and Currency unanimously agreed. Roughly, this is the situation:

There have been 100 housing projects approved by the FHA. The money has been earmarked and is available. Money has already been spent on most of them. I think a typical example is a project in Milwaukee, Wis., to provide 242 housing units. The FHA has already spent $375,000 in condemnation proceedings in acquiring the property. However, there is a limitation in the present housing act, to the effect that if the unit costs more than $5,000 the Federal Government cannot grant any loans.

This bill merely provides that if the local municipality wants to put up the difference between $5,000 and the current cost of the housing it may do so and get the Federal money. In other words, this will in no way cost the Federal Government anything. It will merely allow the local municipality to proceed with the project if and when it decides to put up the money.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which has been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with amendments, on page 2, line 1, after the word "grants", to insert "loans, or annual contributions"; and at the beginning of line 11, to insert "loans, or annual contributions", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted etc., That section 15 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(6) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (5) of this section, or of any other section of this act, the Authority is authorized to make capital grants, loans, or annual contributions for low-rent-housing or slum-clearance projects, in the full amount of any sums previously allocated pursuant to this act, to any public housing agency, at the request of such agency, upon condition that such agency will pay, or cause to be paid by the State or political subdivision, the difference between the cost limitations prescribed in subsection (5) of this section and the actual cost of construction per family dwelling unit or per room during the period of building construction. The receipt of capital grants, loans, or annual contributions by any public-housing agency pursuant to this subsection shall in no way prejudice or impair the rights or privileges of such agency to participate fully in other low-rent housing or slum-clearance projects under this act or any other law. Nothing in this subsection shall prejudice the right of those public housing agencies which can, by reason of lesser need, or would prefer to delay the starting of their proposed building operations until labor and material costs stabilize at levels consistent with the cost limitations prescribed in subsection (5) of this section."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 so as to permit loans, capital grants, or annual contributions for low-rent-housing and slum-clearance projects where construction costs exceed present cost limitations upon condition that local housing agencies pay the difference between cost limitations and the actual construction costs."

INCREASE IN EQUIPMENT MAINTENANCE OF RURAL CARRIERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 203) to increase the equipment maintenance of rural carriers 2 cents per mile per day traveled by each rural carrier for a period of 2 years, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Civil Service with an amendment, on page 1, line 4, to strike

out "2 cents" and insert in lieu thereof "1 cent," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That each carrier in the rural mail delivery service shall be paid for equipment maintenance a sum equal to 1 cent per mile per day for each mile or major fraction of a mile scheduled in addition to the 6 cents per mile per day for each mile or major fraction of a mile scheduled as now provided by law. Payments for the additional equipment maintenance as provided herein shall be at the same periods and in the same manner as payments for regular compensation to rural carriers.

SEC. 2. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 3. This act shall take effect on the first of the month following the date of its enactment and shall terminate 36 months from the beginning date or such earlier date as the Congress may by concurrent resolution prescribe.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, may we have a brief explanation of the bill?

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, the bill, as originally introduced, calls for an increase of 2 cents a mile for rural mail carriers. They have had but one increase since 1934. In 1943 there was a 1-cent increase, which brought the mileage up to 6 cents a mile. This bill would increase the mileage to 7 cents a mile and would cost approximately $2,200,000.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. BALL. Is this for the use of the car, or is it total compensation?

Mr. BALDWIN. It is only for the maintenance of the automobile. There are approximately 32,000 rural mail carriers in the United States and their average pay is approximately $2,900 a year. They have been receiving far less than is required to maintain their automobiles. In fact, we had testimony before the committee that it cost on an average about 12 cents a mile for a rural mail carrier to maintain his automobile. The bill would give him 7 cents a mile, which is a little more than half of that estimate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to increase the equipment maintenance of rural carriers 1 cent per mile per day traveled by each rural carrier for a period of 3 years, and for other purposes."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the calendar.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ARMY DISBURSING OFFICERS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 1514, Calendar No. 254.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 1514) for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I shall make a brief explanation of the bill. As stated, it is for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States. While in the service they have been charged with certain funds which have been lost. The funds have been carefully checked. They are small amounts, ranging from $37 and $43 up to one item of $500. The action is recommended by the Department as necessary to get these matters cleared up in order that the books of the Government may be straightened out sometime, somehow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN OFFICERS EMPLOYED IN THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 1032, Calendar No. 224, for the relief of certain officers and employeees of the Foreign Service of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1032), for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, certain officers in the Foreign Service lost their money, property, and so forth, and this bill provides compensation for the losses which have been sustained. The matter has been thoroughly checked by Government authorities.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, this bill was objected to by some Senator on the last call of the calendar. Has the Senator from Wisconsin discussed the situation with the objecting Senator, so that the objection has been removed?

Mr. WILEY. I do not know who objected, but I was informed that because I was not present there was some objection made because the bill itself did not indicate its nature. Since I have explained the bill it would seem that there could be no material objection, because it was reported unanimously.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I shall object to further consideration of any bill which has been objected to unless the Senator who objected at the call of the calendar is present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

LEGISLATION AFFECTING TIDELANDS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, last year the Congress of the United States passed some tidelands legislation relative to the quitclaiming of tidelands to the coastal States. Today the Supreme Court of the United States handed down its decision, which, as I read it, is adverse to the State of California. I wish to call the matter to the attention of the Senate and to have printed in the body of the RECORD, following my remarks, the Supreme Court's decision in the matter, together with the dissenting opinions of Mr. Justice Reed and Mr. Justice Frankfurter. I invite the attention of each and every Member of the Senate to the fact that this decision is not only adverse to possession by the State of California, but, as I read it, Mr. President, it adversely affects title to the tidelands of every other coastal State in the Union, including the Thirteen Original States.

I believe that Members of the Senate who were here at the time the quitclaim legislation was under consideration remember that some of us who were in favor of the legislation at that time raised the point that if there was a decision adverse to California, in our opinion it would adversely affect the interests of every other coastal State in the Union.

Because of the great importance of this issue and because of the widespread interest which I believe there will be in all the States in the Union, I ask that the decisions be printed at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the decisions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES—NO. 12, ORIGINAL—OCTOBER TERM, 1946—UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, PLAINTIFF, V. STATE OF CALIFORNIA—JUNE 23, 1947

Mr. Justice Black delivered the opinion of the Court.

The United States by its Attorney General and Solicitor General brought this suit against the State of California invoking our original jurisdiction under article III, section 2, of the Constitution, which provides that "In all cases * * * in which a State shall be a party, the Supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction." The complaint alleges that the United States "is the owner in fee simple of, or possessed of paramount rights in and powers over, the lands, minerals, and other things of value underlying the Pacific Ocean, lying seaward of the ordinary low-water mark on the coast of California and outside of the inland waters of the State, extending seaward three nautical miles and bounded on the north and south, respectively, by the northern and southern boundaries of the State of California." It is further alleged that California, acting pursuant to State statutes, but without authority from the United States, has negotiated and executed numerous leases with persons and corporations purporting to authorize them to enter upon the described ocean area to take petroleum, gas, and other mineral deposits, and that the lessees have done so, paying to California large sums of money in rents and royalties for the petroleum products taken. The prayer is for a decree declaring the rights of the United States in the area as against California and enjoining California and all persons claiming under it from continuing to trespass upon the area in violation of the rights of the United States.

California has filed an answer to the complaint. It admits that persons holding leases from California, or those claiming under it, have been extracting petroleum products from the land under the 3-mile ocean belt

immediately adjacent to California. The basis of California's asserted ownership is that a belt extending three English miles from low-water mark lies within the original boundaries of the State, California Constitution, article XII (1849);[1] that the Original Thirteen States acquired from the Crown of England title to all lands within their boundaries under navigable waters, including a 3-mile belt in adjacent seas; and that since California was admitted as a State on an equal footing with the original States, California at that time became vested with title to all such lands. The answer further sets up several affirmative defenses. Among these are that California should be adjudged to have title under a doctrine of prescription; because of an alleged long existing congressional policy of acquiesence in California's asserted ownership; because of estoppel or laches; and, finally, by application of the rule of res judicata.[2]

After California's answer was filed, the United States moved for judgment as prayed for in the complaint on the ground that the purported defenses were not sufficient in law. The legal issues thus raised have been exhaustively presented by counsel for the parties, both by brief and oral argument. Neither has suggested any necessity for the introduction of evidence, and we perceive no such necessity at this stage of the case. It is now ripe for determination of the basic legal issues presented by the motion. But before reaching the merits of these issues, we must first consider questions raised in California's brief and oral argument concerning the Government's right to an adjudication of its claim in this proceeding.

First. It is contended that the pleadings present no case or controversy under Article III, section 2, of the Constitution. The contention rests in the first place on an argument that there is no case or controversy in a legal sense, but only a difference of opinion between Federal and State officials. It is true that there is a difference of opinion between Federal and State officers. But there is far more than that. The point of difference is as to who owns, or has paramount rights in and power over, several thousand square miles of land under the ocean off the coast of California. The difference involves the conflicting claims of Federal and State officials as to which government, State or Federal, has a superior right to take or authorize the taking of the vast quantities of oil and gas underneath that land, much of which has already been, and more of which is about to be, taken by or under authority of the State. Such concrete conflicts as these constitute a controversy in the classic legal sense, and are the very kind of differences which can only be settled by agreement, arbitration, force, or judicial action. The case principally relied upon by California, *United States* v. *West Virginia* (295 U. S. 463), does not support its contention. For here there is a claim by the United States, admitted by California, that California has invaded the title or paramount right asserted by the United States to a large area of land and that California has converted to its own use oil which was extracted from that land (cf. *United States* v. *West Virginia*, supra, 471). This alone would sufficiently establish the kind of concrete, actual conflict of which we have jurisdiction under article III. The justiciability of this controversy rests therefore on conflicting claims of alleged invasions of interests in property and on conflicting claims of governmental powers to authorize its use (*United States* v. *Texas* (143 U. S. 621, 646, 648); *United States* v. *Minnesota* (270 U. S. 181, 194); *Nebraska v. Wyoming* (325 U. S. 589, 608)).

Nor can we sustain that phase of the State's contention as to the absence of a case or controversy resting on the argument that it is impossible to identify the subject matter of the suit so as to render a proper decree. The land claimed by the Government, it is said, has not been sufficiently described in the complaint since the only shoreward boundary of some segments of the marginal belt is the line between that belt and the State's inland waters. And the Government includes in the term "inland waters" ports, harbors, bays, rivers, and lakes. Pointing out the numerous difficulties in fixing the point where these inland waters end and the marginal sea begins, the State argues that the pleadings are therefore wholly devoid of a basis for a definite decree, the kind of decree essential to disposition of a case like this. Therefore, California concludes, all that is prayed for is an abstract declaration of rights concerning an unidentified 3-mile belt, which could only be used as a basis for subsequent actions in which specific relief could be granted as to particular localities.

We may assume that location of the exact coastal line will involve many complexities and difficulties. But that does not make this any the less a justiciable controversy. Certainly demarcation of the boundary is not an impossibility. Despite difficulties this Court has previously adjudicated controversies concerning submerged land boundaries. (See *New Jersey* v. *Delaware* (291 U. S. 361, 295 U. S. 694); *Borax Ltd. v. Los Angeles* (296 U. S. 10, 21–27); *Oklahoma* v. *Texas* (256 U. S. 70, 602).) And there is no reason why, after determining in general who owns the 3-mile belt here involved, the Court might not later, if necessary, have more detailed hearings in order to determine with greater definiteness particular segments of the boundary. (*Oklahoma* v. *Texas* (258 U. S. 574, 582).) Such practice is commonplace in actions similar to this which are in the nature of equitable proceedings. (See *e. g. Oklahoma* v. *Texas* (256 U. S. 608–609; 260 U. S. 606, 625, 261 U. S. 340).) California's contention concerning the indefiniteness of the claim presents no insuperable obstacle to the exercise of the highly important jurisdiction conferred on us by article III of the Constitution.

Second. It is contended that we should dismiss this action on the ground that the Attorney General has not been granted power either to file or to maintain it. It is not denied that Congress has given a very broad authority to the Attorney General to institute and conduct litigation in order to establish and safeguard Government rights and properties.[3] The argument is that Congress has for a long period of years acted in such a way as to manifest a clear policy to the effect that the States, not the Federal Government, have legal title to the land under the 3-mile belt. Although Congress has not expressly declared such a policy, we are asked to imply it from certain conduct of Congress and other governmental agencies charged with responsibilities concerning the national domain. And, in effect, we are urged to infer that Congress has by implication amended its long-existing statutes which grant the Attorney General broad powers to institute and maintain court proceedings in order to safeguard national interests.

An act passed by Congress and signed by the President could, of course, limit the power previously granted the Attorney General to prosecute claims for the Government. For article IV, section 3, clause 2 of the Constitution vests in Congress "Power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the Territory or other property belonging to the United States." We have said that the constitutional power of Congress in this respect is without limitation. *United States* v. *San Francisco* (310 U. S. 16, 29–30). Thus neither the courts nor the executive agencies could proceed contrary to an act of Congress in this congressional area of national power.

But no act of Congress has amended the statutes which impose on the Attorney General the authority and the duty to protect the Government's interests through the courts. See *In re Cooper* (143 U. S. 472, 502–503). That Congress twice failed to grant the Attorney General specific authority to file suit against California,[4] is not a sufficient basis upon which to rest a restriction of the Attorney General's statutory authority. And no more can we reach such a conclusion because both Houses of Congress passed a joint resolution quitclaiming to the adjacent States a 3-mile belt of all land situated under the ocean beyond the low-water mark, except those which the Government had previously acquired by purchase, condemnation, or donation.[5] This joint resolution was vetoed by the President.[6] His veto was sustained.[7] Plainly, the resolution does not represent an exercise of the constitutional power of Congress to dispose of public property under article IV, section 3, clause 2.

Neither the matter to which we have specifically referred, nor any others relied on by California, afford support for a holding that Congress has either explicitly or by implication stripped the Attorney General of his statutorily granted power to invoke our jurisdiction in this Federal-State controversy. This brings us to the merits of the case.

Third. The crucial question on the merits is not merely who owns the bare legal title

---

[1] The Government complaint claims an area extending 3 nautical miles from shore; the California boundary purports to extend 3 English miles. One nautical mile equals 1.15 English miles, so that there is a difference of .45 of an English mile between the boundary of the area claimed by the Government, and the boundary of California. See California Constitution article XXI, sec. 1 (1879).

[2] The claim of res judicata rests on the following contention: The United States sued in ejectment for certain lands situated in San Francisco Bay. The defendant held the lands under a grant from California. This court decided that the State grant was valid because the land under the bay had passed to the State upon its admission to the Union. *United States* v. *Mission Rock Co.* (189 U. S. 391). There may be other reasons why the judgment in that case does not bar this litigation; but it is a sufficient reason that this case involves land under the open sea, and not land under the inland waters of San Francisco Bay.

[3] 5 U. S. C., secs. 291, 309; *United States* v. *San Jacinto Tin Co.* (125 U. S. 273, 279, 284); *Kern River Co.* v. *United States* (257 U. S. 147, 154–55); *Sanitary District* v. *United States* (266 U. S. 405, 425–426); see also *In re Debs* (158 U. S. 564, 584); *United States* v. *Oregon* (295 U. S. 1, 24); *United States* v. *Wyoming* (323 U. S. 669, 331 U. S. —).

[4] S. J. Res. 208, 75th Cong., 1st sess. (1938); S. J. Res. 83 and 92, 76th Cong., 1st sess. (1939). S. J. Res. 208 passed the Senate, 81 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 9326 (1938), was favorably reported by the House Judiciary Committee, H. Rept. 2378, 75th Cong., 3d sess. (1938), but was never acted on in the House. Hearings were held on S. J. Res. 83 and 92 before the Senate Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, but no further action was taken. Hearings before the Senate Committee on Public Lands and Surveys on S. J. Res. 83 and 92, 76th Cong., 1st sess. (1939). In both hearings objections to the resolutions were repeatedly made on the ground that passage of the resolutions was unnecessary since the Attorney General already had statutory authority to institute the proceedings. See Hearings Before the House Committee on the Judiciary on S. Res. 208, 75th Cong., 3d sess., 42–45, 59–61 (1938); Hearings on S. J. Res. 83 and 92, supra, 27–30.

[5] H. J. Res. 225, 79th Cong., 2d sess. (1946); 92 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 9452, 19316 (1946).

[6] 92 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 10660 (1946).

[7] 92 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 10745 (1946).

to the lands under the marginal sea. The United States here asserts rights in two capacities transcending those of a mere property owner. In one capacity it asserts the right and responsibility to exercise whatever power and dominion are necessary to protect this country against dangers to the security and tranquillity of its people incident to the fact that the United States is located immediately adjacent to the ocean. The Government also appears in its capacity as a member of the family of nations. In that capacity it is responsible for conducting United States relations with other nations. It asserts that proper exercise of these constitutional responsibilities requires that it have power, unencumbered by State commitments, always to determine what agreements will be made concerning the control and use of the marginal sea and the land under it. (See *McCulloch* v. *Maryland* (4 Wheat. 316, 403–408); *United States* v. *Minnesota* (270 U. S. 181, 194).) In the light of the foregoing, our question is whether the State or the Federal Government has the paramount right and power to determine in the first instance when, how, and by what agencies, foreign or domestic, the oil and other resources of the soil of the marginal sea, known or hereafter discovered, may be exploited.

California claims that it owns the resources of the soil under the 3-mile marginal belt as an incident to those elements of sovereignty which it exercises in that water area. The State points out that its original constitution, adopted in 1849 before that State was admitted to the Union, included within the State's boundary the water area extending three English miles from the shore (California Constitution (1849) art. XII, sec. 1); that the enabling act which admitted California to the Union ratified the territorial boundary thus defined; and that California was admitted "on an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatever" (9 Stat. 452). With these premises admitted, California contends that its ownership follows from the rule originally announced in *Pollard's Lessee* v. *Hagan* (3 How. 212); see also *Martin* v. *Waddell* (16 Pet. 367, 410). In the Pollard case it was held, in effect, that the original States owned in trust for their people the navigable tidewaters between high and low water mark within each State's boundaries, and the soil under them, as an inseparable attribute of State sovereignty. Consequently, it was decided that Alabama, because admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the other States, had thereby become the owner of the tidelands within its boundaries. Thus the title of Alabama's tidelands grantee was sustained as valid against that of a claimant holding under a United States grant made subsequent to Alabama's admission as a State.

The Government does not deny that under the Pollard rule, as explained in later cases,[8] California has a qualified ownership[9] of lands under inland navigable water such as rivers, harbors, and even tidelands down to the low-water mark. It does question the validity of the rationale in the Pollard case that ownership of such water areas, any more than ownership of uplands, is a necessary incident of the State sovereignty contemplated by the "equal footing" clause. (Cf. *United States* v. *Oregon* (295 U. S. 1, 14).) For this reason, among others, it argues that the Pollard rule should not be extended so as to apply to lands under the ocean. It stresses that the Thirteen Original Colonies did not own the marginal belt; that the Federal Government did not seriously assert its increasingly greater rights in this area until after the formation of the Union; that it has not bestowed any of these rights upon the States, but has retained them as appurtenances of national sovereignty; and the Government insists that no previous case in this Court has involved or decided conflicting claims of a State and the Federal Government to the 3-mile belt in a way which requires our extension of the Pollard inland-water rule to the ocean area.

It would unduly prolong our opinion to discuss in detail the multitude of references to which the able briefs of the parties have cited us with reference to the evolution of powers over marginal seas exercised by adjacent countries. From all the wealth of material supplied, however, we cannot say that the Thirteen Original Colonies separately acquired ownership to the 3-mile belt or the soil under it,[10] even if they did acquire elements of the sovereignty of the English Crown by their revolution against it (cf. *United States* v. *Curtiss-Wright Export Corp.* (299 U. S. 304, 316)).

At the time this country won its independence from England there was no settled international custom or understanding among nations that each nation owned a 3-mile water belt along its borders. Some countries, notably England, Spain, and Portugal, had, from time to time, made sweeping claims to a right of dominion over wide expanses of ocean. And controversies had arisen among nations about rights to fish in prescribed areas.[11] But when this Nation was formed, the idea of a 3-mile belt over which a littoral nation could exercise rights of ownership was but a nebulous suggestion.[12]

Neither the English charters granted to this Nation's settlers,[13] nor the treaty of peace with England,[14] nor any other document to which we have been referred, showed a purpose to set apart a 3-mile ocean belt for colonial or State ownership.[15] Those who settled this country were interested in lands upon which to live, and waters upon which to fish and sail. There is no substantial support in history for the idea that they wanted or claimed a right to block off the ocean's bottom for private ownership and use in the extraction of its wealth.

It did happen that shortly after we became a Nation, our statesmen became interested in establishing national dominion over a definite marginal zone to protect our neutrality.[16] Largely as a result of their efforts, the idea of a definite 3-mile belt in which an adjacent nation can, if it chooses, exercise broad, if not complete, dominion has apparently at last been generally accepted throughout the world,[17] although as late as 1876 there was still considerable doubt in England about its scope and even its existence. (See *The Queen* v. *Keyn* (L. R. 2, Exch. Div. 63).) That the political agencies of this Nation both claim and exercise broad dominion and control over our 3-mile marginal belt is now a settled fact (*Cunard Steamship Co.* v. *Mellon* (262 U. S. 100, 122–124)).[18] And

[8] See e. g., *Manchester* v. *Massachusetts* (139 U. S. 240); *Louisiana* v. *Mississippi* (202 U. S. 1); *The Abby Dodge* (223 U. S. 166). See also *United States* v. *Mission Rock Co.* (198 U. S. 391); *Borax, Ltd.* v. *Los Angeles* (296 U. S. 10). Although the Pollard case has thus been generally approved many times, the case of *Shively* v. *Bowlby* (152 U. S. 1, 47–48, 58) held, contrary to implications of the Pollard opinion, that the United States could lawfully dispose of tidelands while holding a future State's land "in trust" as a territory.

[9] See *United States* v. *Commodore Park* (324 U. S. 386, 390, 391); *Scranton* v. *Wheeler* (179 U. S. 141, 159, 160, 163); *Stockton* v. *Baltimore & N. Y. R. Co.* (32 F. 9, 20); see also *United States* v. *Chandler-Dunbar Co.* (229 U. S. 53).

[10] A representative collection of official documents and scholarship on the subject is Crocker, The Extent of the Marginal Sea (1919). See also I Azuni, Maritime Law of Europe (published 1806) ch. II; Fulton, Sovereignty of the Sea (1911); Masterson, Jurisdiction in Marginal Seas (1929); Jessup, The Law of Territorial Waters and Maritime Jurisdiction (1927); Fraser, The Extent and Delimitation of Territorial Waters, 11 Corn. L. Q. 455 (1926); Ireland, Marginal Seas Around the States, 2 La. L. Rev. 252, 436 (1940); Comment, Conflicting State and Federal Claims of Title in Submerged Lands of the Continental Shelf, 56 Yale L. J. 356 (1947).

[11] See, e. g., Fulton, op. cit. supra, 3–19, 144–145; Jessup, op. cit. supra, 4.

[12] Fulton, op. cit. supra, 21, says in fact that "mainly through the action and practice of the United States of America and Great Britain since the end of the eighteenth century, the distance of three miles from shore was more or less formally adopted by most maritime states as * * * more definitely fixing the limits of their jurisdiction and rights for various purposes, and, in particular, for exclusive fishery."

[13] Collected in Thorpe, American Charters, Constitutions, and Organic Laws (1919).

[14] Treaty of 1783, 8 Stat. 80.

[15] The Continental Congress did, for example, authorize capture of neutral and even American ships carrying British goods, "if found within 3 leagues (about 9 miles) of the coasts." (Journ. of Cong. 185, 186, 187 (1781).) Cf. Declaration of Panama of 1939, 1 Dept. of State Bull. 321 (1939), claiming the right of the American Republics to be free from a hostile act in a zone 300 miles from the American coasts.

[16] Secretary of State Jefferson in a note to the British Minister in 1793 pointed to the nebulous character of a nation's assertions of territorial rights in the marginal belt, and put forward the first official American claim for a 3-mile zone which has since won general international acceptance. Reprinted in H. Ex. Doc. No. 324, 42d Cong., 2d sess. (1872), 553–554. See also Secretary Jefferson's note to the French Minister, Genet, reprinted American State Papers, I Foreign Relations (1833), 183, 384; act of June 5, 1794, 1 Stat. 381; 1 Kent, Commentaries, 14th ed., 33–40.

[17] See Jessup, op. cit. supra, 66; Research in International Law, 23 A. J. I. L. 249, 250 (Spec. Supp. 1929).

[18] See also *Church* v. *Hubbard* (2 Cranch 187, 234). Congressional assertion of a territorial zone in the sea appears in statutes regulating seals, fishing, pollution of waters, etc. 36 Stat. 325, 328; 43 Stat. 604, 605; 37 Stat. 499, 501. Under the National Prohibition Act territory including "a marginal belt of the sea extending from low-water mark outward a marine league, or three geographical miles" constituting "the territorial waters of the United States" was regulated. 41 Stat. 305. Reprinted in Research in International Law, supra, 250. Anti-smuggling treaties in which foreign nations agreed to permit the United States to pursue smugglers beyond the 3-mile limit contained express stipulations that generally the 3-mile limit constitutes "the proper limits of territorial waters." See e. g., 43 Stat. 1761 (pt. 2). There are innumerable executive declarations to the world of our national claims to the 3-mile belt, and more recently to the whole continental shelf. For references to diplomatic correspondence making these assertions. (See 1 Moore, International Law Digest (1906), 705, 706, 707; 1 Wharton, Digest of International Law (1886), 100. See also Hughes, Recent Questions and Negotiations, 18 A. J. I. L. 229 (1924)). The latest and broadest claim is President Truman's recent proclamation that the United States "regards the natural resources of the subsoil and sea bed of the continental shelf beneath the high seas but contiguous to the coasts of the United States as appertaining to the United States, subject to its jurisdiction and control." (Exec. Proc. 2667, September 28, 1945, 10 F. R. 12303.)

this assertion of national dominion over the 3-mile belt is binding upon this Court. (See *Jones* v. *United States* (137 U. S. 202, 212–21'); *In re Cooper* (143 U. S. 472, 502–503).)

Not only has acquisition, as it were, of the 3-mile belt, been accomplished by the National Government, but protection and control of it has been and is a function of national external sovereignty. (See *Jones* v. *United States* (137 U. S. 202); *In re Cooper* (143 U. S. 472, 502).) The belief that local interests are so predominant as constitutionally to require state dominion over lands under its land-locked navigable waters finds some argument for its support. But such can hardly be said in favor of state control over any part of the ocean or the ocean's bottom. This country, throughout its existence, has stood for freedom of the seas, a principle whose breach has precipitated wars among nations. The country's adoption of the 3-mile belt is by no means incompatible with its traditional insistence upon freedom of the sea, at least so long as the National Government's power to exercise control consistently with whatever international undertakings or commitments it may see fit to assume in the national interest is unencumbered. (See *Hines* v. *Davidowitz* (312 U. S. 52, 62–64); *McCulloch* v. *Maryland*, supra.) The 3-mile rule is but a recognition of the necessity that a government next to the sea must be able to protect itself from dangers incident to its location. It must have powers of dominion and regulation in the interests of its revenues, its health, and the security of its people from wars waged on or too near its coasts. And insofar as the nation asserts its rights under international law, whatever of value may be discovered in the seas next to its shores and within its protective belt will most naturally be appropriated for its use. But whatever any nation does in the open sea which detracts from its common usefulness to nations, or which another nation may charge detracts from it,[19] is a question for consideration among nations as such, and not their separate governmental units. What this Government does, or even what the States do, anywhere in the ocean is a subject upon which the Nation may enter into and assume treaty or similar international obligations. (See *United States* v. *Belmont* (301 U. S. 324, 331–332).) The very oil about which the State and Nation here contend might well become the subject of international dispute and settlement.

The ocean, even its 3-mile belt, is thus of vital consequence to the Nation in its desire to engage in commerce and to live in peace with the world; it also becomes of crucial importance should it ever again become impossible to preserve that peace. And as peace and world commerce are the paramount responsibilities of the Nation, rather than an individual State, so, if wars come, they must be fought by the Nation. (See *Chy Lung* v. *Freeman* (92 U. S. 275, 279).) The State is not equipped in our constitutional system with the powers or the facilities for exercising the responsibilities which would be concomitant with the dominion it seeks. Conceding that the State has been authorized to exercise local police power functions in the part of the marginal belt within its declared boundaries,[20] these do not detract from the Federal Government's paramount rights in and power over this area. Consequently, we are not persuaded to transplant the Pollard rule of ownership as an incident of State sovereignty in relation to inland waters out into the soil beneath the ocean, so much more a matter of national concern. If this rationale of the Pollard case is a valid basis for a conclusion that paramount rights run to the States in inland waters to the shoreward of the low water mark, the same rationale leads to the conclusion that national interests responsibilities, and therefore national rights are paramount in waters lying to the seaward in the 3-mile belt. (*Cf. United States* v. *Curtiss-Wright Corp.* (299 U. S. 304, 316); *United States* v. *Causby* (328 U. S. 256).)

As previously stated this Court has followed and reasserted the basic doctrine of the Pollard case many times. And in doing so it has used language strong enough to indicate that the Court then believed that States not only owned tidelands and soil under navigable inland waters, but also owned soils under all navigable waters within their territorial jurisdiction, whether inland or not. All of these statements were, however, merely paraphrases or offshoots of the Pollard inland water rule, and were used, not as enunciation of a new ocean rule, but in explanation of the old inland water principle. Notwithstanding the fact that none of these cases either involved or decided the State-Federal conflict presented here, we are urged to say that the language used and repeated in those cases forecloses the Government from the right to have this Court decide that question now that it is squarely presented for the first time.

There are three such cases whose language probably lend more weight to California's argument than any others. The first is *Manchester* v. *Massachusetts* (139 U. S. 240). That case involved only the power of Massachusetts to regulate fishing. Moreover, the illegal fishing charged was in Buzzards Bay, found to be within Massachusetts territory, and no question whatever was raised or decided as to title or paramount rights in the open sea. And the Court specifically laid to one side any question as to the rights of the Federal Government to regulate fishing there. The second case, *Louisiana* v. *Mississippi* (202 U. S. 1, 52), uses language about "the sway of the riparian states" over "maritime belts." That was a case involving the boundary between Louisiana and Mississippi. It did not involve any dispute between the Federal and State governments. And the Court there specifically laid aside questions concerning "the breadth of the maritime belt or the extent of the sway of the riparian states" (Id. at 52). The third case is *The Abby Dodge* (223 U. S. 166). That was an action against a ship landing sponges at a Florida port in violation of an act of Congress (34 Stat. 313), which made it unlawful to "land" sponges taken under certain conditions from the waters of the Gulf of Mexico. This Court construed the statute's prohibition as applying only to sponges outside the State's "territorial limits" in the Gulf. It thus narrowed the scope of the statute because of a belief that the United States was without power to regulate the Florida traffic in sponges obtained from within Florida's territorial limits, presumably the 3-mile belt. But the opinion in that case was concerned with the State's power to regulate and conserve within its territorial waters, not with its exercise of the right to use and deplete resources which might be of national and international importance. And there was no argument there, nor did this Court decide whether the Federal Government owned or had paramount rights in the soil under the Gulf waters. That this question remained undecided is evidenced by *Skiriotes* v. *Florida* (313 U. S. 69, 75), where we had occasion to speak of Florida's power over sponge fishing in its territorial waters. Through Mr. Chief Justice Hughes, we said: "It is also clear that Florida has an interest in the proper maintenance of the sponge fishery and that the [State] statute so far as applied to conduct within the territorial waters of Florida, in the absence of conflicting Federal legislation, is within the police power of the State."

None of the foregoing cases, nor others which we have decided, are sufficient to require us to extend the Pollard inland water rule so as to declare that California owns or has paramount rights in or power over the 3-mile belt under the ocean. The question of who owned the bed of the sea only became of great potential importance at the beginning of this century when oil was discovered there.[21] As a consequence of this discovery, California passed an act in 1921 authorizing the granting of permits to California residents to prospect for oil and gas on blocks of land off its coast under the ocean (Cal. Stats. 1921, c. 303). This State statute, and others which followed it, together with the leasing practices under them, have precipitated this extremely important controversy, and pointedly raised this State-Federal conflict for the first time. Now that the question is here, we decide for the reasons we have stated that California is not the owner of the 3-mile marginal belt along its coast, and that the Federal Government rather than the State has paramount rights in and power over that belt, an incident to which is full dominion over the resources of the soil under that water area, including oil.

Fourth. Nor can we agree with California that the Federal Government's paramount rights have been lost by reason of the conduct of its agents. The State sets up such a defense, arguing that by this conduct the Government is barred from enforcing its rights by reason of principles similar to laches, estoppel, adverse possession. It would serve no useful purpose to recite the incidents in detail upon which the State relies for these defenses. Some of them are undoubtedly consistent with a belief on the part of some Government agents at the time that California owned all or at least a part of the 3-mile belt. This belief was indicated in the substantial number of instances in which the Government acquired title from the States to lands located in the belt; some decisions of the Department of the Interior have denied applications for Federal oil and gas leases in the California coastal belt on the ground that California owned the lands. Outside of court decisions following the Pollard rule, the foregoing are the types of conduct most nearly indicative of waiver upon which the State relies to show that the Government has lost its paramount rights in the belt. Assuming that Government agents could by conduct, short of a congressional surrender of title or interest, preclude the Government from asserting its legal rights, we cannot say it has done so here.

As a matter of fact, the record plainly demonstrates that until the California oil issue began to be pressed in the thirties, neither the States nor the Government had reason to focus attention on the question of which of them owned or had paramount rights in or power over the 3-mile belt. And even assuming that Government agencies have been negligent in failing to recognize or assert the claims of the Government at an earlier date, the great interests of the Government in this ocean area are not to be forfeited as a result. The Government, which holds its interests here as elsewhere in trust for all the people, is not to be deprived of those interests by the ordinary court rules designed particularly for private disputes over individually owned pieces of property; and officers who have no authority at all to dispose of Government property cannot by their conduct cause the Government to lose its valuable rights by

[19] See *Lord* v. *Steamship Co.* (102 U. S. 541, 544).

[20] See *Utah Power & Light Co.* v. *United States* (243 U. S. 389, 404); *cf. The Abbey Dodge* (223 U. S. 166) with *Skiriotes* v. *Florida* (313 U. S. 69, 74–75).

[21] Bull, No. 321, Dept. of the Interior, Geological Survey.

their acquiescence, laches, or failure to act.[22]

We have not overlooked California's argument, buttressed by earnest briefs on behalf of other States, that improvements have been made along and near the shores at great expense to public and private agencies. And we note the Government's suggestion that the aggregate value of all these improvements are small in comparison with the tremendous value of the entire 3-mile belt here in controversy. But however this may be, we are faced with the issue as to whether State or Nation has paramount rights in and power over this ocean belt, and that great national question is not dependent upon what expenses may have been incurred upon mistaken assumptions. Furthermore, we cannot know how many of these improvements are within and how many without the boundary of the marginal sea which can later be accurately defined. But beyond all this we cannot and do not assume that Congress, which has constitutional control over Government property, will execute its powers in such way as to bring about injustices to States, their subdivisions, or persons acting pursuant to their permission. See *United States* v. *Texas* (162 U. S. 1, 89, 90); *Lee Wilson & Co.* v. *United States* (245 U. S. 24, 32).

We hold that the United States is entitled to the relief prayed for. The parties, or either of them, may, before September 15, 1947, submit the form of decree to carry this opinion into effect, failing which the Court will prepare and enter an appropriate decree at the next term of Court.

It is so ordered.

Mr. Justice Jackson took no part in the consideration or decision of this case.

DISSENT OF MR. JUSTICE REED

In my view the controversy brought before this Court by the complaint of the United States against California seeks a judgment between State and Nation as to the ownership of the land underlying the Pacific Ocean, seaward of the ordinary low-water mark, on the coast of California and within the 3-mile limit. The ownership of that land carries with it, it seems to me, the ownership of any minerals or other valuables in the soil, as well as the right to extract them.

The determination as to the ownership of the land in controversy turns for me on the fact as to ownership in the Original Thirteen States of similar lands prior to the formation of the Union. If the original States owned the bed of the sea, adjacent to their coasts, to the 3-mile limit, then I think California has the same title or ownership to the lands adjacent to her coast. The original States were sovereignties in their own right, possessed of so much of the land underneath the adjacent seas as was generally recognized to be under their jurisdiction. The scope of their jurisdiction and the boundaries of their lands were coterminous. Any part of that territory which had not passed from their ownership by existing valid grants were and remained public lands of the respective States. California, as is customary, was admitted into the Union "on an equal footing with the original States in all respects whatever" (9 Stat. 452). By section 3 of the Act of Admission, the public lands within its borders were reserved for disposition by the United State. "Public lands" was there used in its usual sense of lands subject to sale under general laws. As was the rule, title to lands under navigable waters vested in California as it had done in all other States (*Pollard* v. *Hagan* (3 How. 212); *Barney* v. *Keokuk* (94 U. S. 324, 338); *Shively* v. *Bowlby* (152 U. S. 1, 49); *Mann* v. *Tacoma Land Co.* (153 U. S. 273, 284); *Borax Consolidated, Ltd.* v. *Los Angeles* (296 U. S. 10, 17)).

The authorities cited in the Court's opinion lead me to the conclusion that the original States owned the lands under the seas to the 3-mile limit. There, of course, as is shown by the citations, variations in the claims of sovereignty, jurisdiction, or ownership among the nations of the world. As early as 1793, Jefferson, as Secretary of State, in a communication to the British Minister said that the territorial protection of the United States would be extended "three geographical miles" and added:

"This distance can admit of no opposition, as it is recognized by treaties between some of the powers with whom we are connected in commerce and navigation, and is as little, or less, than is claimed by any of them on their own coasts." (H. Ex. Doc. No. 324, 42d Cong., 2d sess., pp. 553–554.)

If the original States did claim, as I think they did, sovereignty and ownership to the 3-mile limit, California has the same rights in the lands bordering its littoral.

This ownership in California would not interfere in any way with the needs or rights of the United States in war or peace. The power of the United States is plenary over these undersea lands precisely as it is over every river, farm, mine, and factory of the Nation. While no square ruling of this Court has determined the ownership of those marginal lands, to me the tone of the decisions dealing with similar problems indicates that, without discussion, State ownership has been assumed (*Pollard* v. *Hagan, supra; Louisiana* v. *Mississippi* (202 U. S. 1, 52); *The Abby Dodge* (223 U. S. 166); *New Jersey* v. *Delaware* (291 U. S. 361; 295 U. S. 694)).

DISSENT OF MR. JUSTICE FRANKFURTER

By this original bill, the United States prayed for a decree enjoining all persons, including those asserting a claim derived from the State of California from trespassing upon the disputed area. An injunction against trespassers normally presupposes property rights. The Court, however, grants the prayer but does not do so by finding that the United States has proprietary interests in the area. To be sure it denies such proprietary rights in California. But even if we assume an absence of ownership or possessory interest on the part of California, that does not establish a proprietary interest in the United States. It is significant that the Court does not adopt the Government's elaborate argument, based on dubious and tenuous writings of publicists, that this part of the open sea belongs, in a proprietary sense, to the United States. (See Schwarzenberger, Inductive Approach to International Law, 60 Harv. L. Rev. 539, 559.) Instead, the Court finds trespass against the United States on the basis of what it calls the national dominion by the United States over this area.

To speak of dominion carries precisely those overtones in the law which relate to property and not to political authority. Dominion, from the Roman concept dominium, was concerned with property and ownership, as against imperium, which related to political sovereignty. One may choose to say, for example, that the United States has national dominion over navigable streams. But the power to regulate commerce over these streams, and its continued exercise, do not change the imperium of the United States into dominium over the land below the waters. Of course, the United States has paramount rights in the sea belt of California—the rights that are implied by the power to regulate interstate and foreign commerce, the power of condemnation, the treaty-making power, the war power. We have not now before us the validity of the exercise of any of these paramount rights. Rights of ownership are here asserted—and rights of ownership are something else. Ownership implies acquisition in the various ways in which land is acquired—by conquest, by discovery and claim, by cession, by prescription, by purchase, by condemnation. When and how did the United States acquire this land?

The fact that these oil deposits in the open sea may be vital to the national security, and important elements in the conduct of our foreign affairs, is no more relevant than is the existence of uranium deposits, wherever they may be, in determining questions of trespass to the land of which they form a part. This is not a situation where an exercise of national power is actively and presently interfered with. In such a case the inherent power of a Federal court of equity may be invoked to prevent or remove the obstruction. (*In re Debs* (158 U. S. 564); *Sanitary District* v. *United States* (266 U. S. 405).) Neither the bill nor the opinion sustaining it suggests that there is interference by California or the alleged trespassers with any authority which the Government presently seeks to exercise. It is beside the point to say that "if wars come, they must be fought by the Nation." Nor is it relevant that "The very oil about which the State and Nation here contend might well become the subject of international dispute and settlement." It is common knowledge that uranium has become "the subject of international dispute" with a view to settlement. Compare *Missouri* v. *Holland* (252 U. S. 416).

To declare that the Government has "national dominion" is merely a way of saying that vis-a-vis all other nations the government is the sovereign. If that is what the court's decree means, it needs no pronouncement by this Court to confer or declare such sovereignty. If it means more than that, it implies that the Government has some proprietary interest. That has not been remotely established except by sliding from absence of ownership by California to ownership by the United States.

Let us assume for the present that ownership by California cannot be proven. On a fair analysis of all the evidence bearing on ownership, then this area is, I believe, to be deemed unclaimed land, and the determination to claim it on the part of the United States is a political decision not for this Court. The Constitution places vast authority for the conduct of foreign relations in the independent hands of the President. (See *United States* v. *Curtiss-Wright Corp.* (299 U. S. 304).) It is noteworthy that the Court does not treat the President's proclamation in regard to the disputed area as an assertion of ownership. If California is found to have no title, and this area is regarded as unclaimed land, I have no doubt that the President and the Congress between them could make it part of the national domain and thereby bring it under article IV, section 3, of the Constitution. The disposition of the area, the rights to be created in it, the rights heretofore claimed in it through usage that might be respected though it fall short of prescription, all raise appropriate questions of policy, questions of accommodation, for the determination of which Congress and not this Court is the appropriate agency.

Today this Court has decided that a new application even in the old field of torts should not be made by adjudication, where Congress has refrained from acting. (*United States* v. *Standard Oil Co.* (330 U. S. —).) Considerations of judicial self-restraint would seem to me far more compelling where there are obviously at stake claims that involve so many far reaching, complicated, historic interests, the proper adjustments of which are not readily resolved by the materials and methods to which this Court is confined.

This is a summary statement of views which it would serve no purpose to elaborate. I think that the bill should be dismissed without prejudice.

[22] *United States* v. *San Francisco* (310 U. S. 16, 31–32); *Utah* v. *United States* (284 U. S. 534, 545, 546); *Lee Wilson & Co.* v. *United States* (245 U. S. 24, 32); *Utah Power & Light Co.* v. *United States* (243 U. S. 389, 409). See also *Sec'y of State for India* v. *Chelikani Rama Rao, L. R.* (43 Indian App, 192, 204 (1916)).

CONTROL OF POSSESSION, ETC., OF PISTOLS AND OTHER DANGEROUS WEAPONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House bill 493, which is not on the call today. Upon two previous occasions when the calendar was called I objected to the consideration of the bill, which applies solely to the District of Columbia, and provides generally that police officers shall have the right to search and arrest a person suspected of carrying a concealed weapon as if for a felony. I propose to offer an amendment if the bill is considered.

I wish to say that I have explained to the two Senators concerned—the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK]—and there is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 493) to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia," approved July 8, 1932 (sec. 22, 3204 D. C. Code, 1940 edition).

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I now offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That section 4 of the act entitled "An act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia," approved July 8, 1932 (sec. 22, 3204 D. C. Code, 1940 ed.), is amended by adding at the end of such section a new sentence as follows: "Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by a fine of not less than $750 and not more than $2,000 or by imprisonment for not less than 1 year and not more than 3 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, at the last call of the calendar, objection was voiced by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] to the consideration at that time of Senate bill 1421, which is number 281 on today's calendar. The Senator from California has advised me that he acted in the name and on behalf of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL]. Both Senators have advised me that they have no objection to the bill. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that we recur to Senate bill 1421, Calendar No. 281; and I request its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1421) to provide for the appointment of one additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce, and for other purposes.

Mr. BALL. Mr President, I objected to the consideration of this bill at the first call of the calendar because I was under the impression that there already were two assistant secretaries in the Department of Commerce. Upon inquiry, I find there is only one Assistant Secretary, who devotes his full time to the Civil Aeronautics Administration work, and that the Department needs an additional Assistant Secretary to supervise the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce and its various field offices. I have been assured by Mr. Foster, the Under Secretary, that the enactment of the bill will not result in any increase in appropriations. Therefore, I have no objection to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1421) to provide for the appointment of one additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there shall be in the Department of Commerce one additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Secretary of Commerce may assign to his Assistant Secretaries such duties, including the direction of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, as he shall prescribe, or may be required by law. The Assistant Secretaries of Commerce shall be without numerical distinction of rank and shall have salaries of $10,000 per annum.

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FORTY-SEVEN SESSION OF PENNSYLVANIA STATE LEGISLATURE

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, reference has been made on this floor to the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in a manner which reflects a desire to cast discredit upon the Republican majority in that body and to belittle the legislation enacted in the session which has just come to a close.

I have before me an article appearing in the June 18 edition of the Pittsburgh Press, giving a round-up of the 1947 legislative session. This summary sets forth the accomplishments of the general assembly and also lists those proposals which its members failed to enact into law.

Mr. President, I invite the attention of my colleagues to this article, so that they may be in a position to judge whether the session of the Pennsylvania Legislature just closed contributed to the well-being and progress of my State of Pennsylvania and its 10,000,000 citizens. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have this article from the Pittsburgh Press printed in the RECORD and made a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MANY NEW LAWS ON STATE BOOKS AS ASSEMBLY ENDS LONG SESSION—QUITE A FEW OTHERS REJECTED BY LEGISLATORS; 80 PERCENT OF PITTSBURGH PACKAGE PASSED

HARRISBURG, June 18.—When Pennsylvania's lawmakers adjourned their 22-week session here last night they had put a lot of new laws on the State books.

They had turned down many others.

They took their time about it, chalking up most of their progress in the adjournment rush of the final week.

Legislation designed to benefit Pittsburgh, though it faced many obstacles, fared well. Eight of the 10 points of the Pittsburgh package bill became law.

WHAT LEGISLATURE DID IN SESSION

This is what the 1947 legislature did:

PITTSBURGH PACKAGE

Enacted a country-wide smoke control law.

Created the Pittsburgh parking authority.

Authorized the county commissioners to build and operate garbage disposal plants.

Set up a separate city department of parks and recreation.

Created a county transit commission to study and regulate traffic and parking.

Relieved the city from payment of incidental damages in connection with the construction of through highways, such as the Penn-Lincoln Parkway.

Authorized the county planning commission to pass on public improvement projects in townships within the county.

Authorized the city to tax anything not now taxed by the State.

NEW TAXES

Increased tax on beer from one-half cent to 1 cent a bottle.

Put a tax of 1 cent a bottle on soft drinks; one-half cent an ounce on flavoring syrups.

Increased the cigarette tax from 2 cents to 4 cents a pack.

Wiped out most corporations' privilege of writing off trade losses in the form of reduced taxes.

Postponed until 1949 the manufacturers' exemption from payment of the 5-mill capital stock tax.

EDUCATION

Subsidies to local districts increased $48,000,000 to an all-time high of nearly 200 millions in the current 2-year period.

Minimum teachers' salaries in Pittsburgh increased to $2,175, with a range upward to $4,000. Elsewhere in the State the range is $1,950 to $3,400.

Pittsburgh School Board authorized to levy a per capita tax of from $1 to $5 on those over 21, a personal property tax of from 1 to 4 mills and a mercantile tax of one-half mill on wholesalers and 1 mill on retailers.

A State authority voted to erect school buildings and rent them to local districts.

A tax equalization board authorized to adjust real estate tax rates.

Freshman college centers continued for students unable to get into crowded colleges and universities.

LABOR

Strikes banned by employees of State and local governments, including school teachers, and by workers in essential public utilities.

Unemployment compensation to strikers eliminated.

Jobless pay period for jobless workers increased from 20 to 24 weeks.

Picketing made illegal except by employees of a struck plant.

Maximum work week for women and minors extended from 44 to 48 hours and from 5 to 6 days.

Women permitted to work night shifts and guaranteed equal pay for the same work done by men.

Labor unions required to file financial reports.

Jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts outlawed.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Judges given pay increases ranging from 17 to 20 percent. Most county employees increased 10 percent across the board.

Municipalities permitted to tax anything not taxed by the State.

Municipalities authorized to operate and regulate parking lots.

Cities authorized to ban smoking in stores.

School set up for training officials in good government.

Councils, boards, and other governmental agencies barred from adopting ordinances or transacting business at closed sessions.

HIGHWAYS

Two-hundred-and-fifty-million-dollar road construction and repair program set up.

Three-million-dollar increase to 20 millions in State subsidies to municipalities for roads authorized.

Set up $225,000 for roadside rests.

Highway department authorized to set speed limits below 50 miles per hour on dangerous stretches.

HOUSING

Insurance companies given the right to buy, build, and rent homes, apartments, commercial and industrial buildings.

Cities under 30,000 population, boroughs, and first-class townships permitted to establish housing authorities. (Larger municipalities already have this right.)

State housing board given virtual veto power over Federal subsidies to local districts.

VETERANS

Took first step for payment of a bonus in 1950 with ceiling of $500, based on $15 a month for overseas service and $10 for domestic duty.

INCIDENTAL

Free fishing licenses provided for those totally blind and those who have lost one limb.

Extended to January 1, 1949, the deadline by which State and local personal property taxes must be paid.

CONSUMER PROTECTION

Tightened laws against short-weight sales of coal, vegetables, and fruit.

Enacted a law with teeth to ban "gyp" auto financing.

Barber shops placed under immediate supervision of licensed barbers at all times.

Heavy penalties provided for ticket scalpers.

Misrepresentation of policies by insurance companies outlawed.

Fees for selling margarine reduced to $2 a year.

PUBLIC HEALTH

Set up $89,000,000 for building mental hospitals and other welfare institutions.

Increased 40 percent to $12,262,000 subsidies to general hospitals and provided another million for training nurses.

Provide ! $7,000,000 for treatment of diseases among children examined under the school health program.

CONSERVATION

Provided $10,000,000 for long-range flood control, building of dams, reforestation, and recreation.

Provided $1,090,000 to seal abandoned mines to prevent drainage of acids into streams used as water sources by municipalities.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Youths required to give proof of age before they can buy liquor or beer in bars.

COMMERCE AND BUSINESS

Advertising campaign expanded to sell Pennsylvania as a desirable place to establish business, to live, and in which to spend vacations.

Made permanent taxes for employers whose labor turn-over is low.

ELECTIONS

Moved Republican Party from second to first place on the ballot.

Ratified proposed amendment to the United States Constitution to limit future Presidents to two terms.

Changed the date of the primary from June to September.

EXPENSE ACCOUNTS

The legislators voted themselves expense accounts and clerical-hire allowances of $2,400 for their 2-year terms.

WHAT LEGISLATURE REFUSED TO DO

Here are some of the things the legislature failed to do:

Refused to remove restrictions on margarine, prohibited presale coloring, required monthly reports from grocers of purchases, and compelled restaurants which serve it to say so on their menus.

Refused to require bakers to fortify bread with vitamins.

Refused to pass fair-employment-practices legislation in spite of pleas from Governor Duff.

Refused to make the State responsible for the upkeep of bridges on State highways in cities.

REFUSED APPEAL

Refused to authorize municipalities to complain to the public utilities commission in cases involving mass transportation.

Refused to pass the boxcar-truck bill to increase the weight of semitrailers from 45,000 to 62,000 pounds.

Refused to authorize municipalities to decide whether they want to permit playing of hockey between 2 and 6 p. m. on Sundays.

Refused to put controls on under-the-counter sales of new and used cars at inflated prices.

NO CLOSED-SHOP BAN

Refused to ban the closed shop or to enact a series of bills which labor leaders declared were "punitive and restrictive."

Refused to appropriate $10,000,000 to consolidate schools and thus remove the little red school house from the Pennsylvania scene.

Refused to approve the "Allegheny County Package" to transfer millions of dollars in local taxes to the State.

Refused to recodify the State's liquor laws to permit appeals to the superior court by either the licensee or the State. This would have ended the differences among counties as to whether clubs are or are not included in the quota law limiting permits to 1 for each 1,000 population in any community.

REAPPORTIONING OUT

Refused to reapportion the members of the legislature, although such a move is long overdue.

Refused to outlaw the Ku Klux Klan on the ground that present laws have that effect.

Refused to require lobbyists to register with the legislature.

Refused to require members of the assembly to disclose the sources of their incomes.

Refused to permit parimutuel horse-race betting.

Refused to create a separate State department of mental health.

Refused to pass a bill to control rents on the ground that Congress is doing that.

Refused to increase the salary of the Governor and his cabinet and the five members of the public utility commission. (Governor Duff probably would have vetoed such a bill anyway.)

SUSPENSION OF ANNUAL ASSESSMENT WORK ON MINING CLAIMS IN TERRITORY OF ALASKA

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2369) providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the Territory of Alaska, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CORDON, and Mr. HATCH conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States withdrawing the nomination of Eugene S. Hunton, to be postmaster at Hartford, Ark., which was ordered to lie on the table.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Francisco Corneiro, of the Virgin Islands, to be district attorney for the District Court of the Virgin Islands, vice James A. Bough, resigned.

By Mr. WHITE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Earl O. Heaton and Lawrence W. Swanson, to be commander and lieutenant commander, respectively, in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

CONFIRMATION OF CERTAIN NOMINATIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, as in executive session, the Senate proceed to consider, on the Executive Calendar, the nomination of Hon. Jed Johnson, of Oklahoma, to be judge of the United States Customs Court, and the nomination of Otto Schoen, of Missouri, to be United States marshal. The other nominations on the calendar are objected to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, the nominations will be stated.

UNITED STATES CUSTOMS COURT

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hon. Jed Johnson, of Oklahoma, to be judge of the United States Customs Court.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Otto Schoen, of Missouri, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified forthwith of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 564) to provide for the performance of the duties of the office of President, in case of the removal, resignation, or inability both of the President and Vice President.

RECESS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, so far as I know, that concludes the business which is to come before the Senate today. Therefore I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 24, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 23 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

UNITED STATES CUSTOMS COURT

Hon. Jed Johnson to be judge of the United States Customs Court.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Otto Schoen to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Missouri.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate June 23 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

POSTMASTER

Eugene S. Hunton to be postmaster at Hartford, in the State of Arkansas.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 23, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Donald C. Beatty, D. D., chaplain, Veterans' Administration, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we pause in this hour to acknowledge Thy claim on our loyalty and our service. Beyond all lesser claims, we know that Thou dost call us to serve Thee. We therefore pray "Thy Kingdom come" both in our hearts and minds and in this our beloved country.

Grant that, in carrying out the responsibilities of our daily lives, we may have the consciousness that we are, in our place and time, advancing Thy will for us and for mankind.

Grant to us such a measure of Thy spirit of good that it will enliven our imaginations, animate our purposes, and sanctify all our doings.

Not only for ourselves, our Father, do we pray: For every child of Thine—the afflicted in body or in spirit, the distressed, the homesick, and the homeless—we would remember them and serve them as for Thee.

Free us, we pray, from needless anxiety and groundless fears; strengthen our purposes of good; and, ever and always, give us Thy peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 20, 1947, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On June 20, 1947:

H. R. 620. An act for the relief of Blanche E. Broad.

On June 21, 1947:

H. R. 765. An act for the relief of Elwood L. Keeler;

H. R. 925. An act for the relief of Therese R. Cohen;

H. R. 1412. An act to grant to the Arthur Alexander Post, No. 68, the American Legion, of Belzoni, Miss., all of the reversionary interest reserved to the United States in lands conveyed to said post pursuant to act of Congress approved June 29, 1938;

H. R. 1874. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 1482. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Gilda Cowan, a minor.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3737. An act to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. CAIN, Mr. FLANDERS, and Mr. MCGRATH to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3611. An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. CAIN, Mr. FLANDERS, and Mr. MCGRATH to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Justice.
2. Department of the Navy.
3. National Archives (General Schedule No. 6).
4. Office of Temporary Controls.

ILLINOIS AND MICHIGAN CANAL

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1628) relinquishing to the State of Illinois certain right, title, or interest of the United States of America, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 2, after "Grundy", insert "Du Page."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FLOOD CONTROL, REPUBLICAN VALLEY, NEBR.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, tragedy has once more struck in the Republican Valley in southwest Nebraska. It was 12 years ago this summer that a flood took the lives of 112 of our citizens. At that time there was high water on the main stem on Medicine Creek and on all the tributaries.

Yesterday at 5:30 in the morning a wall of water came down Medicine Creek, flooding the city of Cambridge. The water and debris reached the second-story windows of many of the houses. All communications are cut off. The main line of the Burlington Railroad is out again. The first reports indicate that 50 or more people were missing. The latest information shows that there are 10 known dead and 4 yet unaccounted for.

A program of flood control and water utilization has been authorized for this territory. Construction was not reached before the war. The work of the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation in the Republican Valley is just now getting started.

I wish to urge, with all the force at my command, that the Congress, the President, the Army engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Bureau of the Budget recognize that an emergency exists, that temporary help be extended, and that steps be taken to speed up all of the work that has been planned. What has happened at the stricken and sorrowing city of Cambridge can happen at a number of points on the Republican River. I repeat what I have said before, that from the standpoint of river development the Republican River Basin is the most neglected spot in America.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TWYMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the

RECORD in two instances and include an editorial.

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain references and quotations from outside sources.

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article written by him entitled "A Realistic Farm Policy."

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks and include a radio broadcast delivered by me over WOL last Sunday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I said over the radio on station WOL yesterday afternoon:

Today, as every American who has the present and future greatness of his country at heart is proudly aware, marks the third anniversary of the enactment into law of the GI bill of rights.

Three years ago, in obedience to the will of the American people, expressed overwhelmingly through their elected Representatives in the Congress, the President of the United States signed a daring new charter in human rights.

As an American, I rejoice in this free expression of the heart and mind and conscience of a free people.

As one of the sponsors at the request of the American Legion of the GI bill of rights, and as chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, House of Representatives, Eightieth Congress, I rejoice in the work of the Seventy-eighth Congress that produced this historic achievement.

I rejoice in the work of succeeding Congresses that has further widened and liberalized the opportunities for good citizenship embodied in the original act.

In a very real sense the enactment of the GI bill marked the coming of age of the American people.

Long before the shooting war ended it had become apparent to thoughtful Americans, both in and out of Congress, that the gigantic world conflict that was to put 16,000,000 of our finest young men into uniform might conceivably lead to national postwar tragedy if the postwar needs of those millions of young fighting men were minimized or ignored altogether.

Before our eyes was the picture of the aftermath of World War I. Thirty years ago the readjustment of veterans to useful and self-reliant citizenship was regarded by most Americans in terms so narrow that readjustment became little more than a medical program for the hospital treatment and care of those wounded in battle.

Thirty years ago restoration of lost opportunities for peacetime citizenship was left largely to the veterans themselves.

If a veteran had to give up his ambitions for a useful professional career because of lack of educational opportunities, that was regarded pretty generally as his own affair.

If he failed to acquire working skills because of time and opportunity torn out of his life by war, he was free to take the unskilled job that nobody else wanted, or perhaps find no job at all.

If he wanted to establish a home for his family, or go into business for himself, or get started on his own farm, it was, generally speaking, no direct concern of his Government or his fellow citizens.

Thirty years ago Americans accepted postwar stagnation and ruin for many of its veterans as a natural calamity, to be accepted passively as part of the normal and ugly price of war.

The enactment of the GI bill blasted that outworn concept of veterans' readjustment to smithereens.

Just 3 years ago today the citizens of America, through their Congress, proclaimed by law that after war ends the right to normal peacetime opportunities, retarded by war, can and must be reestablished for our millions of fellow citizens who fought and won the war for all.

It is this theory and this practice that underlies the GI bill. It underlies every other piece of legislative justice for our citizen veterans placed on the statute books of the Nation by the Congress.

Three years of accelerated progress under the GI bill have justified beyond all doubts the creative thinking and the coordinated action that produced the law.

The number of our fellow citizens who are veterans of World War II now tops 14,000,000.

Today more than half of our two and a quarter million college students are veterans. They are getting their education at Government expense with the active help of the Veterans' Administration, which carries out the mandate of the laws enacted for veterans by Congress.

This vast educational and training program adds strength to the very bone and marrow of America. By enriching the productive capacity of a whole generation of Americans, we are enriching the living strength of our country.

By the 1st of May, more than three-quarters of a million loans had been approved for guaranty by the Veterans' Administration, in accordance with the provisions of the GI bill of rights. These loans have provided sorely needed opportunities to hundreds of thousands of our fellow citizens to get decent housing for their families, or to make a bold new start in businesses or on farms of their own.

This, then, is the meaning of the GI bill. If veterans are to grow and share in the productive life of this Nation, they must be given the opportunities to equip themselves with the skills and the training needed to earn jobs, to hold jobs, and to produce jobs in a prosperous and unified America.

All of our citizens, including all our fellow citizens who are veterans, must pay for this program. But in spreading the costs we are, by the same token, spreading the gains. Every family has at least one relative who may benefit from this far-reaching legislation. For all citizens, including our fellow citizens who are veterans, will profit from such Nation-wide gains throughout the rest of our lives.

Let us rejoice in the GI bill of rights. Let us rejoice in the America that produced it. Let us especially rejoice in the magnificent work being done by veterans under its provisions.

LOBBYISTS

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, there is a law on the statute books requiring the registration of lobbyists, and the reporting of their salaries and expenses. I understand more than 800 such persons have registered under this law. Last week during the discussion of the President's veto message on labor some 800 lobbyists were reported to have come to Washington in an automobile veto caravan. They came here for the purpose of influencing the President to veto the Labor Act and to exert their influence on Members of Congress to sustain such veto.

Who paid their expenses? Have they registered as lobbyists?

There have been reports that labor organizations have spent more than $1,000,000 in lobbying against the labor act and for sustaining the veto. Have those expenses been reported as lobbying costs?

Phil Murray, president of the CIO, was interviewed on a radio program Friday night called Meet the Press. In that radio interview Mr. Murray said that he had talked to various Members of Congress about the act. Mr. Murray was asked if he thought that would come under the head of lobbying. He replied that he did not believe so. Many Members had called him asking about the act, he replied. Is that lobbying and is Mr. Murray registered as a lobbyist?

According to the press the President, on Friday, invited 13 Members of the Senate to luncheon. It is reported that he spoke to the Senators about his labor bill veto. Was that lobbying?

Mr. Speaker, I would like to know just who is a lobbyist and who is lobbying whom.

THE TRUTH ABOUT SOIL CONSERVATION APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1948

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The New Dealers are living up to form in their sending out of false propaganda about appropriations for the 1948 Soil Conservation Service. Since most of the New Dealers, the majority of the ones present, voted to liquidate the sheep business in America on June 16, 1947—an industry like all livestock enterprises that is associated with soil conservation—they are in a rather embarrassing position and on thin ice when it comes to talking about soil conservation. These New Dealers voted to destroy the sheep breeders' soil-conservation program. Livestock production is soil conservation. During the past 5 years one-third of the sheep industry of the United States has been liquidated. Now the New Dealers are after the other two-thirds. If Texas sheepmen, with nearly 20 percent of the sheep of the Nation, are to be liquidated, if Oklahoma sheepmen are to be liquidated, if Missouri sheepmen are to be liquidated, and Minnesota and New Mexico sheepmen are to be liquidated, and Tennessee sheepmen are to be liquidated, by the administration, it will not do them any good to try to send out fake and false propaganda about the appropriation for Soil Conservation Service to the sheepmen of America. The sheepmen of America are carrying on a soil-conservation program of their own. The

sheepmen do not want the New Dealers interfering with their Soil Conservation Service either, as they have voted to do. If and when the sheep are liquidated, still bigger and better appropriations will be demanded from the United States Treasury in the name of soil conservation.

What are the facts about the appropriations for the Soil Conservation Service? The following is from page 256 of the hearings:

Appropriations

1938	$22,175,000
1939	21,462,349
1940	21,462,349
1941	16,705,750
1942	23,516,775
1943	20,510,812
Supplemental (overtime)	1,473,720
1944	19,511,855
Overtime pay	3,016,948
1945: $28,340,000, less overtime, $3,964,700	24,375,300
1946	33,211,800
1947	39,300,000
1948: Plus pending increase due to 1946 Pay Act, $4,000,000	38,437,000

What does this official list show?

First. That the $38,437,000 for 1948 is a larger appropriation than was made for any year except 1947. The appropriation for research under the Soil Conservation was cut from $1,423,000 in 1947 to $673,000 for 1948. The reason given was than many old districts had already had the benefits of this research, and the $673,000 is sufficient for the new districts. It was also claimed that much of this research work was being carried on by the States.

Second. That in 1947 the $4,000,000 was used under the Pay Act which provided a total of $43,300,000 used. This would make some $5,000,000 less money available in 1948 than in 1947.

Third. The appropriation for 1948 was $5,000,000 more than for 1946.

Many agencies of the Federal Government are receiving appropriations in the name of soil conservation. What are these agencies?

First. The Federal appropriations to experimental stations where funds are used for soil experiments and tests. This appropriation was not reduced.

Second. The Extension Service. The extension service with its soil specialists have for 30 years carried on soil conservation. This appropriation was not reduced.

Third. Forestry Service. In some of the sandy areas, tree planting is one of the first requirements for soil conservation. The farm forestry project is kept and retained in full. This appropriation was not reduced.

Fourth. The TVA has distributed free fertilizer. This has been given away mostly in the South. A few pounds to one farmer; a carload to another, free.

Fifth. The Soil Conservation Service appropriations. You will note that the 1948 appropriations for the Soil Conservation Service of $38,437,000 is $16,000,000, or 74 percent more than the 1943 appriations; the 1948 Soil Conservation Service appropriation is $15,591,000, or 72 percent more than the 1944 appropriation; the 1948 appropriation of $38,437,000 for soil conservation was $10,097,000, or 35 percent more than 1945; the 1948 Soil Conservation Service appropriation of $38,437,000 was $5,226,000, or 18 percent more than for 1946; the 1948 appropriation was $853,000, or 2 percent less than for 1947, when the pending Pay Act appropriation is not considered. When and if this $4,000,000 is considered it would show the 1948 appropriation at the most to be only 12 percent below the 1947 appropriation.

There were parts of the Agricultural appropriation that I did not wish to subscribe to. It would have been easy to vote to recommit this bill. What position would these agencies have been in on July 1, 1947? Did you ever think that one out? Did you wish to see the whole agricultural appropriation stymied and be in the mess the Maritime Commission finds itself in today in regard to funds? Wouldn't the bill have gone right back to the same committee?

It may be temporarily good politics to send out false and fake propaganda about soil conservation. After erecting more and more severe trade barriers than any administration in the history of the country, they are at the end of their rope in trying to maintain that they are for reciprocity and a good-neighbor policy. The American sheepmen have found out that the present administration is not interested in their soil-conservation program.

I repeat, as a member of the Legislative Agricultural Committee, I would have changed the set-up of the appropriations in the Agricultural Appropriation Committee, but that is no justification for the fake and false propaganda.

These appropriations must be considered in the light of results accomplished. The Soil Conservation Service is handicapped by a lack of available equipment needed to carry on the projects. Many witnesses before the Legislative Agricultural Committee advocated that the Soil Conservation Service become a part of Extension Work. The Soil Conservation Service with thirty-eight million in 1948 and Extension with but twenty-four million for general extension, home economics work, and boys' and girls' club work does not appear to many to be the correct relationship as to funds. The great percentage of the people are anxious for more and more 4-H Club work. Authorization has already been made for additional funds for boys' and girls' club work. Something over $50,000,000 is in the agricultural appropriation for research. The Appropriation Committee made a new appropriation for marketing research of some $9,000,000. In the light of the above facts it is difficult to see how the Soil Conservation Service can complain when their appropriation was kept nearly intact in comparison to some agencies that were very materially reduced.

The fact that the administration has allowed milk to sell below the floor guaranteed by law would indicate that they do not care to use the funds available to follow out the law even in this respect. Every 10 cents per hundredweight that Wisconsin milk sells below the Steagall lawful support price means a $15,000,000 annual loss on the fifteen billions of milk produced in the State. An announced support price for milk and action in supporting this announced price in keeping with the law is surely a most important influence on the agricultural economy of our State where over half the farm income is from the dairy business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Bristol Courier entitled "Truman Versus Truman" showing the difference between the veto of the Case bill and the veto of the labor bill; and in another instance to include an editorial entitled "GOP Promises Are Kept."

Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include three editorials.

PROVIDING REVENUE FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3737) to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. DIRKSEN, BATES of Massachusetts, O'HARA, MCMILLAN of South Carolina, and SMITH of Virginia.

BOARD OF EDUCATION, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3611) to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. DIRKSEN, BATES of Massachusetts, O'HARA, MCMILLAN of South Carolina, and SMITH of Virginia.

METROPOLITAN POLICE FORCE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1997) to provide seniority benefits for certain officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia who are veterans of World War II and lost opportunity for promotion by reason of their service in the armed forces of the United States, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, strike out all after line 2 over to and including line 8 on page 2 and insert

"That (a) any officer or member of the Metropolitan Police force or of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, who served in the armed forces of the United States during the period beginning May 1, 1940, and ending December 31, 1946, and (1) whose name appeared during such service (as a result of a regular or reopened competitive examination for promotion) on any civil-service register with respect to such force or department for promotion to a higher rank or grade, or (2) whose name appeared on such a register as a result of a reopened examination taken subsequent to his release, shall, for the purpose of determining his seniority rights and service in such rank or grade, be held to have been promoted to such rank or grade as of the earliest date on which an eligible standing lower on the same promotion register received a promotion either permanently or temporarily to such rank or grade."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CRAVENS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Fort Smith Times-Record of June 18, 1947, with reference to proposed tax legislation.

Mr. KENNEDY asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Hon. John Adkinson, city manager of the city of Cambridge, Mass.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a magazine article.

Mr. DEANE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Sunday Star.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I was very much surprised to listen to the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] trying to create a smoke screen in relation to lobbying. Does my friend fail to distinguish between lobbying and the right of petition? The right of petition is one of the four cornerstones of personal liberty, and under no condition should it ever be undertaken to take it from any person or group of our people. There have been large paid advertisements in the newspapers from the Manufacturers' Association. I consider it their constitutional right of petition. I do not agree with them in their positions, but I do not attack them for doing what they did do. When we do not attack them, I do not think labor should be attacked for doing the same thing.

I notice a watchdog committee is going to be appointed. I never heard of a watchdog committee in the constitutional history of our country. A watchdog on whom? A watchdog on what? It is rather amusing and an amazing situation that after this so-called perfect bill is passed, so far as proponents of the antilabor bill are concerned, the bitter proponents of it then decide to create a watchdog committee. For what purpose? A watchdog over whom? The American people would be interested to see that in the future.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

THE FOREIGN SITUATION

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand an Associated Press item appearing in a Washington paper, which says that a mysterious movement of thousands of food parcels to the United States from the deluded people of the Mediterranean area, themselves hungry, has been in progress for months, with the shipments apparently destined for supposedly starving American relatives and friends. These people, the article continues, must be the victims of an unfriendly ideology whose followers are spreading propaganda on the bad state of affairs in America.

In other words, Moscow, by press, radio and otherwise, is telling the people of the Balkan and Mediterranean countries that our Government has fallen, that we are in a state of chaos and revolution and that our people are starving.

For this and other compelling reasons, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I believe that next to the program for aid to Greece and Turkey to check the spread of communism, the bill involving our cultural program, which includes a provision for the continuation of our official radio broadcast the Voice of America, is the most important measure that has come to the floor of the House this session.

I am amazed at the parliamentary routine that the House leadership has adopted, perhaps unintentionally, with respect to this important measure. It is being handled by a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which I am not a member and other members of the full committee are not primarily charged with responsibility for the bill. It has been considered by fits and starts on the floor since the time when the memory of man runneth not to the contrary, it might be said with little exaggeration. It will be set down for consideration on a day and proceedings will begin. Several times, with debate well under way, I have been called to my office for a few moments and on my return to the floor, to my amazement, I find that our subcommittee has been forced to fold its tents, so to speak, and slip silently away, and some other committee is on the floor, pressing some bill of comparatively minor significance.

On other days, coming to the floor to attend proceedings on bills set down on the calendar for the day, I find that the cultural program bill has been slipped in for another hour's consideration between, perhaps, a District bill and a minor appropriation bill. Finally, on Friday last, when we had the last attempt at consideration, certain Members of the body resorted to a filibuster insisting on one quorum call after another for the purpose of delay.

When we adjourned on Friday last, it was with the understanding, I thought, that the bill would be taken up again today, but I see no mention of it on the whip notice.

By taking small bites every 4 or 5 days, we have swallowed this cow all but the tail. I do hope that this most important measure will be called up today and disposed of finally.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. BANTA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the superintendent of schools.

Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech by Arthur Bevin, Chief of the Flood Control Service.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

THE LABOR BILL VETO

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the long and belabored explanation of the President telling why he vetoed the labor bill just simply is not worth reading. It is especially laughable when we think of the speech he made at Princeton University the other day when a doctor's degree was conferred upon him and he made the statement that he had not read the bill; then 2 days later he presented this Congress with a 5,500-word reason why he could not approve it. In effect, it was saying: "I need votes."

His veto message contained more inconsistencies, more contradictions, and more erroneous and misleading statements than anything I have ever heard.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HOUSE REPORT 209

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 40, authorizing the Committee on Un-American Activities to have printed for its use additional copies of

House Report 209, Eightieth Congress, first session, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, as amended, the Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, be, and is hereby authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 25,000 additional copies of House Report 209, Eightieth Congress, first session, entitled "The Communist Party of the United States as an Agent of a Foreign Power."

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS BY COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I call up House Concurrent Resolution 39, authorizing the Committee on Un-American Activities to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearing held on February 6, 1947, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, as amended, the Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 3,000 additional copies of the hearing held before said committee on February 6, 1947, pursuant to Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "3" and insert "2."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE HEARINGS ON RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 186, authorizing the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings held before said committee during the current session relative to reciprocal trade agreements, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 1,000 additional copies of the hearings held before said committee during the current session relative to reciprocal trade agreements.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRAHAM HISTORY OF JUDICIARY COMMITTEE MADE A HOUSE DOCUMENT

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 241, providing for the printing, as a House document, the History of the Committee on the Judiciary, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the "History of the Committee on the Judiciary," prepared by the Honorable LOUIS E. GRAHAM, be printed as a House document.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF CERTAIN HOUSE REPORTS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 35, providing for the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 541, Seventy-ninth Congress; House Report No. 1205, Seventy-ninth Congress; and House Report No. 2729, Seventy-ninth Congress, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be printed 1,500 additional copies of House Report No. 541, Seventy-ninth Congress, entitled "The Postwar Foreign Economic Policy of the United States," of which 500 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the House; 1,500 additional copies of House Report No. 1205, Seventy-ninth Congress, entitled "Economic Reconstruction in Europe," of which 500 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the House; and 5,000 additional copies of House Report No. 2729, Seventy-ninth Congress, entitled "Final Report Reconversion Experience and Current Economic Problems," of which 500 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 4,500 copies shall be for the use of the House.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ERECTION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA OF A MEMORIAL TO THE MARINE CORPS DEAD

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I call up Senate Joint Resolution 113, authorizing the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to the Marine Corps dead of all wars, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to grant authority to the Marine Corps League, Inc., to erect a memorial on public grounds in the District of Columbia in honor and in commemoration of the men of the United States Marine Corps who have given their lives to their country.

SEC. 2. The design and the site of such memorial shall be approved by the National Commission of Fine Arts, and the United States shall be put to no expense in or by the erection thereof.

SEC. 3. The authority conferred pursuant to this joint resolution shall lapse unless (1) the erection of such memorial is commenced within 5 years from the date of passage of this joint resolution, and (2) prior to its commencement funds are certified available in an amount sufficient, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior, to insure completion of the memorial.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LECOMPTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution of the City Council of the City of Ottumwa, Iowa.

Mr. TABER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the Chairman of the Maritime Commission to Mr. TABER, dated June 9, Mr. TABER's reply thereto dated June 17, and a letter dated June 20, 1947, from the Comptroller General to Mr. TABER.

THE MARITIME COMMISSION

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I have been accused of many things this year by the bureaucrats who object to every effort to bring about business management in Government, but an all-time high was reached last Friday when the Chairman of the Maritime Commission accused the Comptroller General and me jointly of being responsible for closing up the offices of the Commission because we refused to enter into a conspiracy to violate the law. Lindsay Warren's and my shoulders are broad enough to stand up under such a charge.

The truth of the matter is that the Maritime Commission knew on July 1, 1946, just how much money they had to spend for administrative expenses this year. They did not keep books on it or they would have known then just how to adjust their personnel to stay within the limitation. They knew on the 15th of April this year that they had made such a mess of their bookkeeping and budgeting that they were in the red to the tune of $331,552 and had to do something to get in the clear. Instead of taking action which would have enable them to live within their budget, they attempted to persuade the Comptroller to permit them to violate the law in their accounts and wanted me to agree to it. Lindsay Warren and I have been around just a little too long to fall for that kind of business. This performance is typical of the way the Commission has run its business for a number of years as described in the report on the independent offices appropriation bill last week. Their string has played out; the Commission has had to close up and they say I am to blame.

They did not have the grace to come before the Appropriations Committee with a budget estimate in the usual way.

I have today inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the correspondence which sets forth all the facts.

EXTENDING RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 252, Rept. No. 639), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3916) to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and to extend the succession and certain lending powers and functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

THE LEGISLATURE OF PENNSYLVANIA KILLS COMMUNISTIC FEPC

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, while we are talking of sending the Voice of America to Moscow, I come this morning to call your attention to the "voice of Moscow" as it is sent to America through the Communist Daily Worker, which this morning attacks the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania for its refusal to pass the crazy FEPC Act.

You will remember that they put that crazy measure on the ballot in California last fall and the people voted on it. It lost by a clear majority in every single county in California. They have tried to ram it through the legislatures of various other States and failed.

The committee on labor of the Legislature of Pennsylvania turned it down 17 to 8, then they tried to have the committee discharged. The legislature sustained the committee by an overwhelming majority.

They absolutely failed to bunko the people of Pennsylvania, or at least the legislature of that great State, into passing one of the most vicious pieces of Communist legislation ever proposed.

Remember this FEPC proposal is the chief plank in the Communist platform.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I am glad the gentleman recognizes the fact that in Pennsylvania we have a good, sound, sensible Republican administration.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that Republicans can get right when they try. I hope other intelligent Republicans throughout the country join with the intelligent Democrats in defeating this communistic measure every time it comes up.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

RUSSIAN OIL SHIPMENTS

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I had hoped to be able today to report to the Congress that action had been taken by the Office of International Trade to curtail the present record shipments of oil and other petroleum products from west coast ports to Russia. I regret I cannot make such a report, although I have been informed that studies are now being made relative to this disturbing situation and that some type of action will be taken soon.

For fear that the lethargy displayed by the Office of International Trade may have disastrous results to America, I call upon President Truman to take immediate action, under the powers that he possesses, to stop these shipments immediately. If the President or the Office of International Trade fail to act on this vital matter before tomorrow noon, I propose to introduce a concurrent resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

When I addressed the House last Friday I stated that, as chairman of an armed services subcommittee responsible for stockpiling of strategic materials, I would conduct hearings to ascertain why oil was being permitted to leave this country in the face of the obvious shortage which confronts us.

Saturday morning representatives of the Office of International Trade of the Department of Commerce, which administers our Export Control Act, appeared before my subcommittee and testified extensively as to the oil shortage and the shipments I have referred to. It was then that the committee was advised that the matter was under study and that action would probably be taken soon. It was my hope that action would be taken over the week-end. This morning I was again informed that the matter is still under study.

Mr. Speaker, I have knowledge that distributors of gasoline and oil in the State of Michigan have been advised by their suppliers that deliveries of gasoline and oil would be greatly curtailed during the months of July and August. We know that because of the shortage of gasoline the Army aviation training program has to be curtailed, as has the movement of our naval vessels. The situation is becoming so acute that there is a possibility of gasoline rationing and of a lack of fuel oil to heat homes in the Middle West next winter.

I am not at all satisfied, Mr. Speaker, with the replies given to me by representatives of the Office of International Trade and their promise that action will be taken soon. This is a matter that demands immediate attention. The people of the Nation are greatly disturbed. They want to know why we are permitting oil to be shipped in large quantities to a nation that is refusing to cooperate with us and which, we know, is now holding naval maneuvers in the Pacific Ocean and the Bering Sea. The people do not want this Government to repeat the stupid mistake that was made prior to Pearl Harbor when we shipped oil and scrap metal to Japan.

Mr. Speaker, I refuse to permit American oil to be shipped to Russia or any other country when this Nation faces a shortage of that same product. I recognize the political implications involved in what I am demanding this country to do. I recognize the technical difficulties that always arise when controls are placed on a product such as petroleum. I recognize that there are various gasolines with various octanes and I am fully aware of the fact that the by-products of petroleum must also be considered. However, for once in our lives, let this country lock the door before the horse is stolen.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include editorial comment.

OIL EXPLORATION

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, while I share in the apprehension of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] about the oil reserves in this country, I, too, believe that we should carefully review the shipments of oil now going to Russia. If they are as reported they should be stopped or greatly restricted. I call the attention of the House to the fact that this morning the Committee on Public Lands reported out a resolution which furthers the obtaining of oil from shale as well as from agricultural products in this country. It was brought out in the hearing that there is enough oil in the shale of the United States to last us some 2,000 years at the present rate of using oil. So, I hope when this resolution comes before the House the Members will join in its passage in order to assist in the experimental work not only on shale and agricultural products, but other sources from which we may obtain oil.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman not think that we ought to stop the exportation of gasoline to Russia right away?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It ought to be carefully reviewed by the proper committee. I am interested, however, that shale and agriculture products be utilized. We have from time to time surplus agriculture products. If these are used to produce alcohol it can be blended with gasoline and thus solve our problem of surpluses on the farm.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

MARITIME EMPLOYMENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 342)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the House of Representatives of the United States:

In accordance with the obligations of the Government of the United States of America as a member of the International Labor Organization, I transmit herewith the authentic texts of nine conventions and four recommendations with respect to maritime employment which were adopted at the Twenty-eighth (Maritime) Session of the International Labor Conference at Seattle, Wash., June 6 to 29, 1946.

The constitution of the International Labor Organization provides in article 19 thereof that each member is obligated within a year after the closing of a session of the conference to bring each convention or recommendation adopted at such session before the authority or authorities within whose competence the matter lies, for the enactment of legislation or other action. In the case of a convention, the member is obligated, upon obtaining the consent of the authority or authorities within whose competence the matter lies, to report the formal ratification and to take the necessary action to bring the provisions of such convention into effect. The member is obligated, in the case of a recommendation, to report the action taken. It is required under article 35 of the constitution of the International Labor Organization that, subject to certain exceptions, members will apply conventions which they have ratified to their colonies, protectorates, and possessions which are not self-governing. In the case of a federal government, the power of which to enter into conventions on labor matters is subject to limitations, article 19 provides also that a convention to which such limitations apply may be treated as a recommendation.

It is indicated by established practice that submission to the legislative body is essential to the full observance of the obligations of membership. Under the present constitution of the Organization, no further action is required "if on a recommendation no legislative or other action is taken to make a recommendation effective, or if the draft convention fails to obtain the consent of the authority or authorities within whose competence the matter lies."

Accordingly I am also transmitting the authentic texts of the conventions and recommendations adopted at the twenty-eighth session of the International Labor Conference to the Senate of the United States of America with a view to receiving the advice and consent of that body to ratification of certain of those conventions and to obtaining legislative action by that body concurrently with the House of Representatives to give effect to certain of those conventions and recommendations.

I ask that you consider legislative implementation of certain of those conventions and recommendations in the light of the comments contained in the report of the Secretary of State and the communications of the Secretary of Labor, the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Commerce, the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, the Federal Security Administrator, and the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, copies of which are attached.

(Enclosures: (1) Authentic text of conventions and recommendations; (2) report of Secretary of State; (3) message to the Senate; (4) from Secretary of Labor; (5) from Acting Secretary of the Treasury; (6) from the Attorney General; (7) from Secretary of Commerce; (8) from Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission; (9) from the Federal Security Administrator; (10) from Assistant Secretary of Agriculture; (11) memorandum from Shipping Division, Department of State.)

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 23, 1947.*

CARRY-OVERS TO REORGANIZED RAILROADS

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3861) to allow to a successor railroad corporation the benefits of certain carry-overs of a predecessor corporation for the purposes of certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object because I consider this to be a very important bill—in fact, much too important to be considered by unanimous consent—and to give the gentleman from Ohio an opportunity to explain the bill.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to do so and do the best I can by way of an explanation of this bill. Its purpose is to equalize the taxation of reorganized railroads by removing an existing discrimination against certain railroads. This discrimination arises out of the fact that under the laws of some States railroads emerging from bankruptcy or receivership are not able to use their old charters in effecting their reorganization. This causes them to be treated for Federal tax purposes as a different taxpayer from the old company and results in their being denied the benefit of the carry-over provisions. A bill similar to this one passed the House 2 years ago and went to the Senate. It was included as a rider to the tax-adjustment bill of 1945. The Senate eliminated the provision without prejudice on the ground that it was not germane to that bill and also in order that certain questions might be cleared up in public hearings. The Committee on Ways and Means had rather complete hearings on the matter this year and came to an agreement.

Here is what the bill involves——

Mr. FORAND. Did the gentleman say that the committee had complete hearings?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I thought we had.

Mr. FORAND. I think they were very brief hearings, and they were in executive session, if the gentleman will recall.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. The hearings have been published and are available to the House. I believe the gentleman would agree with me that practically everybody who could have been interested in this matter was present. The Treasury was there, and our experts employed by the Committee on Ways and Means were there. The committee was in executive session, and we had a rather full membership present. Nothing would have been accomplished—nothing much, at least, could have been accomplished by any further hearings. Does not the gentleman think so?

Mr. FORAND. The fact still remains that at the first executive session following the hearings certain parts of the bill were ordered to be rewritten.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. FORAND. Those parts were rewritten and last week—I believe it was last Wednesday or Thursday—in executive session the committee decided to report out this bill. When I asked for information the gentleman will recall that nobody could actually explain the bill. The author could not explain the bill and the gentlemen from the legislative counsel could not explain it without the help of the Treasury.

Frankly I feel this way about it—when I smell smoke I look for fire.

The railroad lobby has been extremely busy during this session, and within the last 3 or 4 days this is the third relief bill for railroads that has come to us. Were it not for the fact that I realize that the majority could very well bring this bill up under suspension of the rules or in pursuance of a rule from the Committee on Rules and pass the bill over my objection, I definitely would fight to the end on it.

If I understand the bill properly, and I hope I do, it means that railroad corporations coming out of receivership and reorganizing under a new charter will definitely have the same tax benefit that the predecessor corporation would have. Is that correct?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Yes. If the gentleman will permit me to explain it, I think the gentleman would agree with me. I want to compliment the gentleman on his assiduity in insisting on this matter being brought out clearly. I think it has been done. If there is any disagreement between the gentleman and myself, it is only on the question of

whether or not we have had enough explanation. I think we have, and I think the other members of the committee thought we had. The Treasury had a representative there. He was a very capable man, and as the gentleman knows, he is one of the most capable in the country. He said that the Treasury had had some objection at one time, but new language had been put in the bill and the representative of the Treasury himself helped write the new language. I think in all fairness the matter now is just about as good as it can be made. As far as any railroad lobby is concerned, I know nothing of that. I do not represent any of the railroads and none of the railroads interested in this legislation are in my district. So I have no interest whatever in it. I am sure the gentleman has no personal interest in it either. All these reorganized railroads must clear through the courts. Many are in court now. They must pass the scrutiny of the judge and of the examiners. They must pass the scrutiny of the Interstate Commerce Commission. All railroad reorganizations must be and have been approved by both of these agencies.

Mr. FORAND. Will the gentleman deny that under the reorganization of these railroads the liabilities are all wiped away and the stock is purchased at a very small number of cents on the dollar?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. No. When the railroads go into receivership in these cases, the bondholders become the owners of the property. The equity of the stockholders is generally wiped out. This bill will apply to a number of small railroads. I think all of them are small railroads that have gone into receivership. Some may be a little larger, of course, than others. They were forced into receivership during the depression. Most of them have been in receivership ever since. There were 33 of them. One was liquidated and that made 32. Out of the 32 there were 18 that have terminated the receivership or bankruptcy. Eight of them came out with their old charter. The other 10 have come out also, but these 10 came out under a cloud as compared with the 8. The eight came out with their old charter. The 10 did not because in those States they could not come out with their old charter because the State law would not permit them to do so. They should have the same tax consideration as the others since there is no difference between a railroad reorganization under the old charter and a reorganization under a new charter. It is simply that in the latter case the new company technically becomes a different corporate entity. If you do not pass this legislation, 10 railroads will be at a disadvantage over the rest. I am sure the gentleman does not want that.

Mr. FORAND. But after all, two wrongs do not make a right. It is my contention that when a railroad comes out of receivership they should not have any tax relief that would have accrued to the predecessor corporation.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Well, here were eight railroads that came out under their own charter which got this tax relief. Ten came out but they were forced to take another charter. They are not a different company. It is the same management, the same roadbed and equipment, and the same employees. The Treasury figures this way, and I think properly: It is better to have these 10 railroads running on their own feet, so to speak, than to have them in receivership and under the cloud of a court.

Mr. FORAND. The gentleman will admit that many of these railroads could have come out of receivership but they preferred to remain in that status.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Well, I do not know. I have heard that stated. Of course by staying in bankruptcy or receivership these roads do not run the risk of losing the carry-over benefits as they do by coming out. This bill corrects that situation.

Mr. FORAND. It was so testified at our hearings.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. But that is not at issue here, because the Treasury would know about that. The Treasury has not raised that question. I am fairly convinced, from the hearings and from all I know about it and from the way these experts handled it, that it would be for the best interests of the country if these railroads could be brought out. None of them are very strong. They want to get out and walk on their own feet. I think the Treasury is doing them a favor by giving them that consideration. The Treasury does not give them a dollar. All it gives them is permission to carry forward the same as the other railroads. The gentleman surely would not be in favor of having these railroads come out crippled and with an additional burden put on them over and above that which is put on other railroads.

Mr. FORAND. I do not want any additional burden put on them, but I do not want to give them any extra benefits. In fact, as I see this, it is an extra benefit for a new corporation. Most of the stockholders are new stockholders. They do not assume the responsibility of the predecessor railroad and yet they want the tax benefit that would have accrued to the predecessor railroad.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. My experience has taught me this: There are many people who think that when a railroad goes through receivership that somebody profits a lot. Of course, many a little stockholder will lose his hundred dollars, but many a large stockholder will lose a hundred thousand dollars. But when they come out they come out under the sanction of the court. There are not enough assets to pay off the stockholders and the bondholders, and the bondholders have first priority. Their rights are established by the bankruptcy or receivership proceedings and by thus perfecting their equitable title they in effect become the legal owners. The Treasury recognizes this. The judge and his assistants and his commissioners have taken the testimony. The Interstate Commerce Commission must first approve it. When these railroads come out they ought to be permitted to come out with the same rights and the same privileges as any other railroad. They ought not be loaded down. I sympathize with the gentleman in his procedure. I think the gentleman is to be complimented, but I do not think he need have any fears in this case.

Mr. FORAND. Is there any date within which these corporations who are now seeking this relief must avail themselves of this law?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Yes, at the end of this year. The relief under this law will terminate January 1, 1948.

Mr. FORAND. And after that they are all out?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Yes; they are all out.

Mr. FORAND. Those who do not take advantage of it?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. That is right. They are out.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORAND. I yield.

Mr. DOUGHTON. This is purely a tax matter, is it not?

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Absolutely.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The Treasury had an expert there, who is always alert as to tax matters. This matter was fully discussed. If he could have found any objection or any criticism from the standpoint of the Treasury, I am satisfied he would have found it. I became satisfied there was nothing unfair about it as far as the tax matter is concerned. I do agree with the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND], and he is to be complimented on his position, but after this is cleared through our committee, and cleared through the Treasury Department, which is always alert as to tax matters, I feel there is no reasonable ground for objection to this bill.

Mr. FORAND. I still feel that the railroad lobby has been extremely busy to the point where this is their third bill within 3 days to come before the Congress. It seems to me we should be on the alert.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORAND. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. I wish someone to give me assurance that there is no possibility that this legislation may be used as a device to escape the payment of legitimate taxes.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I think we may rely upon the Treasury Department as to that. The Treasury insisted in drafting this bill in its present form. This additional burden has been placed on the railroads by reason of an old Supreme Court decision. The decision was not in a railroad-company case, it was on an entirely different kind of operation, but it was to the effect that where a company reorganized under a different charter, and changed its name they were held to be a new company.

As a lawyer I am glad to think that whenever these railroad companies or any other companies go through the process of bankruptcy, receivership, they cannot come out unless they have the sanction of the judicial courts and of the Interstate Commerce Commission, which is a quasi-judicial tribunal. This bill does not affect any other company or corporation of any kind in any way at any time.

Mr. DINGELL. The gentleman offers me the assurance and to the House also, that it is not possible to use this as a device to get away from paying legiti-

mate taxes—through the device of reorganization.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Most emphatically not; I may say to the gentleman that should such a thing develop I would join with him in amending the law.

In order that the Members may be as fully informed as possible about the provisions and purpose of this bill, I extend the report of the Committee on Ways and Means, which studied the bill:

CARRY-OVERS TO REORGANIZED RAILROADS

Mr. JENKINS, from the Committee on Ways and Means, submitted the following report:

The Committee on Ways and Means, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3861) to allow a successor railroad corporation the benefits of certain carry-overs of a predecessor corporation for the purposes of certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code, having had the same under consideration, report it back to the House without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

GENERAL STATEMENT

Under existing law, if a railroad corporation is reorganized in a receivership proceeding or in a proceeding under section 77 of the National Bankruptcy Act, as amended, and the reorganization is effected through the organization of a new corporation, any carry-overs of net operating losses or unused excess profits credits of the old corporation cannot be used by the new corporation. The reorganized corporation is regarded as a different taxpayer from the old corporation. Consequently, railroads coming out of receivership or bankruptcy proceedings are treated differently, depending upon whether they can be reorganized under the same charter or under a new charter. The bill removes this discrimination by allowing to railroad corporations, which have acquired, prior to January 1, 1948, property of other railroad corporations in receivership proceedings or proceedings under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act, the net-operating-loss carry-over and the unused excess-profits-credit carry-over of the railroad corporations from which such property was acquired in such proceedings. The bill applies only where the property for tax purposes has the same basis in the hands of the new corporation as it had in the hands of the old corporation, and the relief is limited to railroad corporations as defined in section 77m of the National Bankruptcy Act.

The relief is retroactively applied to extend the benefits to railroads which have already completed their reorganization. A safeguard is written in the bill which is intended to prevent the railroad reorganized in the receivership or bankruptcy proceedings under a new charter, from getting any greater tax relief than it would have been entitled to, if it had reorganized under its old charter.

It is necessary to give the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, authority to prescribe regulations to determine the manner and the extent in which such carry-overs will be applied. It is intended that the regulations will not be arbitrary but fair and reasonable in their application.

Hearings were held by your committee on May 26, 1947, at which time representatives of the railroads and the Treasury Department were heard.

According to testimony given your committee at the hearings, 33 class I railroads have been involved in bankruptcy or receivership proceedings since the last depression. Of these roads, 18 have been reorganized and 1 has been liquidated. Fourteen are still in the process of reorganization. Of the 18 railroads whose reorganization has been completed, 8 were able to resume operations under their old charters and hence have no problem regarding the use of the carry-over and carry-back provisions. This is also the case as regards the 14 roads still in bankruptcy or receivership. Of the 10 reorganized railroads which were compelled to use new charters in effectuating their reorganization, only 7 have any direct financial interest in this legislation. These are: Akron, Canton & Youngstown Railroad Co., Chicago & Eastern Illinois Railroad Co., Gulf, Mobile & Ohio Railroad Co., Minnesota & St. Louis Railway Co., Minneapolis, St. Paul & Saulte Ste. Marie Railroad Co., Spokane International Railroad, and Wabash Railroad Co. The total amount of potential tax liability involved is $7,500,000, which represents the additional taxes which these seven railroads otherwise will have to pay merely on account of being compelled under State law to use a new charter on reorganization. The major part of this amount, however, has not been paid into the Treasury and therefore will not necessitate a tax refund. So far as the foregoing seven railroads are concerned, only carry-overs are involved.

The Treasury has no objection to this legislation and your committee is of the opinion that it should be promptly enacted into law. It is believed that the enactment of this legislation will tend to remove one of the impediments holding railroads in receivership.

DETAILED DISCUSSION OF THE TECHNICAL PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

The bill applies to railroad corporations (as defined in sec. 77m of the National Bankruptcy Act, as amended) which have acquired, prior to January 1, 1948, property of other such railroad corporations in a receivership proceeding or in a proceeding under section 77 of the National Bankruptcy Act, as amended, where the basis of the property so acquired is determined under section 113 (a) (20) of the Internal Revenue Code. The corporation which has thus acquired property is referred to as the successor corporation and the corporation from which the property was so acquired is referred to as the predecessor corporation.

In the case of a successor corporation, section 1 provides for the treatment of the net operating losses and unused excess profits credits of the predecessor corporation as carry-overs to the successor corporation for the purposes of the determination under the Internal Revenue Code of the "net operating loss carry-over" from any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1938, and the "excess profits credit carry-over" and the "unusued excess profits credit carry-over" from any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1939, in each case under the law applicable to such taxable year. Thus, the method of computation of the carry-overs as well as the years for which such carry-overs are available (except as provided in subsections (b) and (c) of sec. 1) and the computation of the net operating loss deduction and the unused excess profits credit adjustment (called the excess profits credit carry-over for taxable years beginning in 1940) are governed by the provisions of the applicable law under the Internal Revenue Code.

In general, the successor corporation will not be allowed a carry-over to a taxable year, or a carry-over from a taxable year, which would not be allowed to the predecessor corporation under the Internal Revenue Code if the predecessor corporation had been made use of under the receivership proceedings or the proceedings under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act instead of the successor corporation. Thus, except as provided in subsections (b) and (c) of section 1, carry-overs will be allowed, as provided under the code, only to the two immediately succeeding taxable years, and carry-overs will not be created from any year if the otherwise applicable provisions of the Internal Revenue Code provide no carry-over from such year. The provisions of subsection (a) of section 1 to the effect that there shall be carried over to the successor corporation the net operating losses and unused excess profits credits of the predecessor corporation from the second taxable year preceding its taxable year in which the acquisition occurred is applicable as to such second preceding year only if subsection (c) of section 1 is applicable.

The carry-overs provided for under subsection (a) of section 1 are to be allowed only in the manner and to the extent provided in regulations prescribed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, as necessary to apply such net operating losses and unused excess profits credits as carry-overs so far as possible as if the predecessor corporation had been made use of in such proceedings instead of the successor corporation. Because of the probable variation in the circumstances presented in each case, it is believed that the rules for the determination of the carry-overs to the successor corporation may best be promulgated in regulations of the Commissioner, giving reasonable and proper effect to the general policy set forth in the bill.

It is not contemplated that where the predecessor corporation has continued in existence after the acquisition that such carry-overs will be denied to the predecessor; rather it is contemplated that in such a case carry-overs shall be available to the successor only to the extent not used by the predecessor, as determined in the regulations with respect to such carry-overs. In any case, the net operating losses and unused excess-profits credits of the predecessor corporation shall not be carry-overs to any taxable year of the successor corporation prior to the taxable year of the successor corporation in which the acquisition occurred.

Subsection (b) of section 1 provides a rule applicable to every case where the taxable year of the successor corporation in which the acquisition occurred and the taxable year of the predecessor corporation in which the acquisition occurred overlap in whole or in part. This rule is designed to clarify the application of subsections (a) and (c) of section 1 in determining the immediately succeeding taxable years to which there may be a carry-over. Under the rule the taxable year of the successor in which the acquisition occurred is the first taxable year succeeding the taxable year of the predecessor in which the acquisition occurred, and subsequent taxable years of the successor follow in order. Any such succeeding taxable year may, of course, also be an "intervening" taxable year for the purposes of the application of sections 122 and 710 (c) of the code.

Subsection (c) of section 1 prescribes a rule for the application of section 1 to cases in which the period, beginning on the first day of the taxable year of the predecessor corporation in which the acquisition occurred and ending on the last day of the taxable year of the successor corporation in which the acquisition occurred, is not more than 12 months. In such a case, subsection (c) of section 1 provides that the number of taxable years to which such net operating loss or unused excess profits credit is a carry-over shall be three instead of two. This rule is directed to situations in which, in effect, the period in which fall the taxable years (of predecessor and of successor) in which the acquisition occurred would have been but one taxable year of the predecessor corporation if the predecessor corporation had been made use of in the proceeding instead of the successor corporation. In such a case, under existing law, the taxable year of the predecessor in which the acquisition occurred and the taxable year of the successor in which the acquisition occurred are, of course, separate taxable years of two distinct taxpayers, and each

would be counted as a taxable year. Accordingly, if it were not for the provisions of subsection (c), the successor would not obtain the benefits of the carry-overs to the extent contemplated by the bill.

The operation of this provision is illustrated by the following example: A predecessor corporation made its returns on the calendar-year basis. The acquisition occurred on August 31, 1940, and the corporation was dissolved on the same date; accordingly, it made a return for the short taxable year ending August 31, 1940. Its successor corporation was organized on July 1, 1940, and made its return for its first taxable year for the short taxable year ending on December 31, 1940; thereafter it made its returns on the calendar-year basis. The predecessor corporation sustained a net operating loss in 1939, which was a carry-over to the predecessor corporation for its taxable year beginning January 1, 1940, and ending August 31, 1940, and (to the extent it remained unused in whole or in part) to the taxable year of the successor corporation beginning July 1, 1940, and ending December 31, 1940 (under the provisions of subsections (a) and (b) of section 1). By reason of the provisions of subsection (c) of section 1 there may also be a carry-over to the taxable year of the successor corporation beginning January 1, 1941 (the third succeeding taxable year). In any case, the amount to be carried over to such succeeding taxable years of the successor corporation is to be determined under regulations prescribed so as to allow the amount of any such carry-overs to be determined as nearly as possible in the same manner as prescribed in the code. It is contemplated that in such a case, the carry-over, if any, to the third succeeding taxable year will be computed by making adjustments for each of the two intervening taxable years immediately prior to such third taxable year.

In the application of subsection (c) of section 1 to the carry-over of any unused excess-profits credit, it is contemplated that the regulations will prescribe such adjustments as are necessary in the case of carry-overs from taxable years of less than 12 months in which the acquisition occurred in order that such carry-overs shall, as nearly as possible, be the same in amount as if the predecessor corporation had been made use of in such proceeding instead of the successor corporation. In order to prevent too great a portion of an unused excess-profits credit carry-over being absorbed in intervening taxable years of less than 12 months by reason of the annualization of excess-profits net income for such a short year under section 711 (a) (3), it is also contemplated that the regulations will prescribe a method of adjusting the adjusted excess-profits net income for such intervening years for the purposes of carry-overs to succeeding taxable years under section 710 (c) of the code.

Section 2 of the bill is a provision limiting the effect of the provisions of section 1 of the bill.

Subsection (a) of section 2 provides for a comparison of the aggregate of the income and excess-profits taxes of the successor corporation for any taxable year, determined without regard to any carry-overs permitted by this bill, with the aggregate of the income and excess-profits taxes that would have been imposed on the predecessor corporation for such taxable year if the predecessor corporation had been made use of in the proceeding instead of the successor corporation. Where for any taxable year the successor's aggregate so determined without regard to the carry-overs permitted by the bill is less than the aggregate of the predecessor for such year, each tax, so determined, making up the successor's aggregate for such year shall constitute its tax for such year.

Subsection (b) of section 2 provides that where the successor's aggregate, though not less than the aggregate of the predecessor, would be reduced to a lesser amount than the predecessor's aggregate by an application of section 1 of the bill, the successor's taxes for that year, notwithstanding the provisions of section 1, shall be the taxes that would have been imposed on the predecessor corporation; that is, the same as the taxes that make up the predecessor's aggregate. The comparisons required by section 2 must be made for those taxable years of the successor corporation to which there is a carry-over from the predecessor. Thereafter the comparisons need not be made.

For the purposes of both subsections (a) and (b) of section 2, the taxes that would have been imposed on the predecessor had it been made use of in the proceeding instead of the successor (that is, the taxes that make up the predecessor's aggregate) are to be determined under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Section 2 of the bill is operative only to limit the net tax reduction that would otherwise result from an application of the provisions of section 1 of the bill, and any carry-overs permitted by section 1 are to be considered as having been used for the year to which section 2 applies to the extent that they would have been used had section 2 not been applicable.

Section 2 may be illustrated by the following examples in which it is assumed that the corporations made their returns on the calendar-year basis:

Example 1. As of the beginning of January 1, 1942, the successor corporation acquired all the properties of the predecessor corporation, the predecessor corporation being dissolved immediately thereafter. The successor corporation was a new corporation, having no capital, no income, and no deductions prior to this acquisition. For 1942, under section 1 of this bill, the successor was allowed a net operating loss carry-over and an unused excess profits credit carry-over from its predecessor. There were no other carry-overs or carry-backs. The taxes of the successor for 1942 computed without regard to the carry-overs provided by this bill were as follows:

Excess profits tax	$1,800,000
Normal tax	1,920,000
Surtax	1,280,000
Aggregate of taxes	5,000,000

Assume that if the predecessor corporation had been used in place of the successor in the proceeding, its deductions and its excess-profits credit would be less than that of the successor. The taxes that would have been imposed upon the predecessor for 1942, computed with its carry-overs, had it been used in place of the successor were as follows:

Excess profits tax	$2,250,000
Normal tax	1,920,000
Surtax	1,280,000
Aggregate of taxes	5,450,000

Since the aggregate of the taxes imposed on the successor without regard to this bill ($5,000,000) is less than the aggregate that would have been imposed on the predecessor if it had been used in place of the successor ($5,450,000), the successor has received full benefit from the proceeding and is not entitled to any tax reduction for such taxable year by the application of this bill.

Example 2. In this example, involving the same corporations for the same taxable year, there is no net operating loss carry-over from the predecessor corporation but there is an unused excess-profits credit carry-over, and the excess-profits credit of the predecessor if it had been used in place of the successor is more than such credit in example 1. The taxes of the successor corporation, computed without regard to any carry-overs, are the same as in example 1. The taxes that would have been imposed on the predecessor for 1942 in this example were as follows:

Excess-profits tax	$900,000
Normal tax	2,160,000
Surtax	1,440,000
Aggregate of taxes	4,500,000

Section 2 (a) of the bill, illustrated in example 1, does not apply since the aggregate of the taxes imposed on the successor without regard to the bill ($5,000,000) is not less than the aggregate that would have been imposed on the predecessor had it been used in place of the successor in the proceeding ($4,500,000). However, the taxes of the successor computed with the carry-overs for 1942 provided by section 1 of the bill were as follows:

Excess-profits tax	0
Normal tax	$2,400,000
Surtax	1,600,000
Aggregate of taxes	4,000,000

The aggregate of the taxes of the successor computed with the carry-overs provided by section 1 of this bill ($4,000,000) is less than the aggregate of the taxes that would have been imposed on the predecessor if it had been used in the proceeding in place of the successor ($4,500,000). Subsection (b) of section 2 provides that in such a case, where subsection (a) of section 2 does not apply, the taxes of the successor corporation shall be the taxes that would have been imposed on the predecessor corporation if it had been so used in place of the predecessor. Accordingly, the taxes of the successor corporation for such taxable year are as follows:

Excess-profits tax	$900,000
Normal tax	2,160,000
Surtax	1,440,000

Of course, if in this example the aggregate of the taxes of the successor computed with the carry-overs provided by section 1 of the bill were not less than the aggregate of the taxes that would have been imposed on the predecessor if it had been used in the proceedings in place of the successor, the taxes of the successor would be its taxes computed with the carry-overs provided by section 1.

Section 3 of the bill provides that where there are two or more predecessor corporations or two or more successor corporations the provisions of sections 1 and 2 of the bill shall be applied only to such extent and subject to such conditions, limitations, and exceptions as the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, may by regulations prescribe. This provision is necessary because of the problems presented where more than one railroad corporation is involved in the proceeding and under the order of the court a combination into a single successor corporation is effected or a single corporation is split into two or more corporations. Thus, in some cases one or more of such predecessor corporations may have filed consolidated returns with another of the predecessor corporations whereas there may be additional corporations involved which were not so consolidated. In view of the probable variation in the circumstances presented in each case and in view of the Commissioner's experience with many similar types of situations, for example, those arising where corporations file consolidated returns, it is desirable that the Commissioner apply the statute to these cases under regulations prescribed by him with the approval of the Secretary, giving reasonable and proper effect to the general policy set forth in the bill.

Section 4 of the bill extends, for not more than 1 year after the date of the enactment of the bill, the period of limitation as to all years affected by the bill if the refund or credit of any overpayment to the

extent resulting from the application of the bill is prevented on the date of its enactment or within 1 year from such date, except where refund or credit is prevented by section 3761 of the Internal Revenue Code relating to compromises. In such cases where section 4 extends the period of limitation, the overpayment shall be refunded or credited if claim therefor is filed within 1 year from the date of enactment of the bill. The overpayment is to be credited or refunded in the manner provided in the Internal Revenue Code. However, no interest is to be allowed or paid on any overpayment or deficiency resulting from the application of the bill. If an overpayment allowed under this bill (for example, in an amount of excess profits tax) results in a deficiency in a related tax (for example, in an amount of income tax) which deficiency, however, would be barred by the statute of limitations such deficiency may be assessed and collected as provided in section 3807 of the Internal Revenue Code.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I realize I cannot stop the passage of this legislation. It can be brought up by other means, either under a rule or under suspension of the rules. For this reason I withdraw my objection, but I shall vote against the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) if a railroad corporation (as defined in section 77m of the National Bankruptcy Act, as amended) (hereinafter referred to as successor corporation) has acquired, prior to January 1, 1948, property from another such railroad corporation (hereinafter referred to as predecessor corporation) in a receivership proceeding, or in a proceeding under section 77 of the National Bankruptcy Act, as amended, and if the basis of the property so acquired is determined under section 113 (a) (20) of the Internal Revenue Code, then, for the purposes of the determination under the Internal Revenue Code of—

(1) the "net operating loss carry-over" from any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1938, under the law applicable to such taxable year; and

(2) the "excess profits credit carry-over" or the "unused excess profits credit carry-over" from any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1939, under the law applicable to such taxable year,

the net operating losses and the unused excess profits credits of such predecessor corporation for the taxable year in which the acquisition occurred and for the two preceding taxable years shall be carry-overs to such successor corporation in the manner and to the extent provided in regulations prescribed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, as necessary to apply such net operating losses and unused excess profits credits as carry-overs so far as possible as if the predecessor corporation had been made use of in such proceeding instead of the successor corporation.

(b) For the purposes of this section, the taxable year of the successor corporation in which the acquisition occurred shall be considered as a taxable year succeeding the taxable year of the predecessor corporation in which the acquisition occurred.

(c) For the purposes of this section, if the period, beginning on the first day of the taxable year of the predecessor corporation in which the acquisition occurred and ending on the last day of the taxable year of the successor corporation in which the acquisition occurred, is not more than 12 months, the number of taxable years to which such net operating loss or unused excess profits credit is a carry-over shall be three instead of two, and such regulations shall prescribe (as nearly as possible in the same manner as provided in section 122 (b) (2) and section 710 (c) (3) (B) of such code) the amount to be carried over to the last of such succeeding years.

SEC. 2. (a) In the case of any taxable year of the successor corporation, if—

(1) the aggregate for such taxable year of the taxes of the successor corporation imposed by chapter 1 and subchapter E of chapter 2 of the Internal Revenue Code, computed without regard to this act,

is less than the amount of—

(2) the aggregate of such taxes (determined under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary) that would have been imposed on the predecessor corporation for such taxable year if the predecessor corporation had been made use of in such proceeding instead of the successor corporation,

then the taxes of the successor corporation for such taxable year shall be the taxes computed without regard to this act.

(b) In the case of any taxable year to which subsection (a) of this section is not applicable, if—

(1) the aggregate for such taxable year of the taxes of the successor corporation imposed by chapter 1 and subchapter E of chapter 2 of the Internal Revenue Code, computed without regard to this section,

is less than the amount of—

(2) the aggregate of such taxes (determined under regulations prescribed by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary) that would have been imposed on the predecessor corporation for such taxable year if the predecessor corporation had been made use of in such proceeding instead of the successor corporation,

then the taxes of the successor corporation for such taxable year shall be the taxes so determined under regulations as the taxes that would have been imposed on the predecessor corporation for such taxable year.

SEC. 3. Where there are two or more predecessor corporations or two or more successor corporations, the provisions of sections 1 and 2 of this act shall be applied only to such extent and subject to such conditions, limitations, and exceptions as the Commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary, may by regulations prescribe.

SEC. 4. If the allowance of a credit or refund of an overpayment of tax resulting from the application of this act is prevented, on the date of the enactment of this act or within 1 year from such date, by the operation of any law or rule of law other than this section and other than section 3761 of the Internal Revenue Code, such overpayment shall be refunded or credited in the manner provided in the Internal Revenue Code if claim therefor is filed within 1 year from the date of the enactment of this act. No interest shall be allowed or paid on any overpayment or deficiency resulting from the application of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include with my remarks the committee report so that every bit of information we have may be in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

NURSERIES AND NURSERY SCHOOLS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 751) to continue a system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of school-age and under-school-age children in the District of Columbia through June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act to authorize and direct the Board of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia to establish and operate in the public schools and other suitable locations a system of nurseries and nursery schools for day care of school-age and under-school-age children, and for other purposes," approved July 16, 1946 (Public Law 514, 79th Cong.), is amended by striking out the date "June 30, 1947" and inserting in lieu thereof the date "June 30, 1948."

SEC. 2. Such section is further amended by striking out "or who are so handicapped that they cannot otherwise provide for the day care of their children"; and by adding at the end of such section the following new sentence: "Appropriations made under the authority contained in section 4 of this act shall be available for the maintenance and operation of such of the buildings and grounds (as may be designated and approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia under the provisions of this section) in and on which such nurseries and nursery schools may be established, maintained, and operated."

SEC. 3. Section 4 of such act is amended by striking out "$500,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$150,000."

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, this bill from the Committee on the District of Columbia, deals with day-care centers for children. The day-care centers were established in 1942, during the war. This bill has been under consideration by a subcommittee. The subcommittee did not report the bill unanimously. I take the floor at this time to speak to the membership about some phases of the situation and follow their judgment in the matter.

As I said, day-care centers were established in 1942 for the purpose not to take care of children but to provide a place where working mothers could take their children while they were participating in the war effort. Congress has, from year to year, reenacted the bill and extended it.

The question presents itself: Shall the Congress continue to authorize day-care centers in the District of Columbia and for how long, and to what extent?

I think the membership will be interested in the fact that the Commissioners who now have the authority and responsibility over these centers while, personally they think it would be nice to continue these day-care centers, are asking themselves whether the District can afford them. In other words the war is over and, like a prudent man, we must ask ouselves not whether we want this

but whether we can afford child-day centers.

In the Seventy-ninth Congress this activity was transferred to the Public Welfare Department which now has control of the care of children. They report it cost about $11.50 a week for a 5-day week, almost $60 a month, for the care of these children. The parents pay an average of $3.60 a week for this service for their children. It is governed by what the parents can afford to pay. They take in the children of mothers who are working and of families that earn up to $5,000 a year. The average age of the children in these centers is from 2 to 11 years of age.

The operation since the Public Welfare people have taken it over seems to have been very good. The Congress appropriated last year $250,000. The bill passed by the other body recently provides for $151,000. The welfare group say they cannot operate the 13 centers, but can operate perhaps seven or eight centers with that amount of money.

There is now a waiting list of children that want to come into these centers. The working mothers need such a center. I do not think many of them could work without having it.

The question is, of course, how far shall the District go with this type of work. Some cities have similar projects. For instance, New York, Chicago, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Denver. I understand Baltimore does not have it. There are only about seven or eight large cities that have a complete child-care service. Some places have a limited service.

I may say that the full District Committee took some action asking that the subcommittee study the quesion more in detail and bring back a report and recommendation as to whether the District should take over the care of these school-age children in a large program or shrink the program. The committee will undertake this study very soon. Of course, the question is how far you want to extend it. Do you want to extend it to children between 2 and 5 or between 2 and 11, as they have it now. Some of the Members feel that perhaps it should be a part of the Community Chest fund operation or perhaps part of the preschool activity.

Those are some of the things I wanted to present to the Members of Congress relative to this program. How far do you want to go, bearing in mind the cost, bearing in mind the present condition of the District of Columbia budget, and bearing in mind that the war is now over, that the purposes for which the centers were established to take care of these children has been fulfilled. This involved not so much the children as permitting the mothers to work during the war effort. About 300 families with 500 children now receive this service.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

The question is on the resolution.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REGULATION OF FUNERAL DIRECTORS AND EMBALMERS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill, H. R. 2173, to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended, and I ask unanimous consent that this bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended, is hereby amended by adding paragraph 44A.

"PAR. 44A. (a) On and after 90 days from the enactment of this paragraph, no person shall, in the District of Columbia, carry on the business or profession, or discharge any of the duties, of an undertaker or embalmer, unless there has been issued to him by the Comissioners of the District of Columbia or their designated agent a license therefor in full force and effect. Such license shall entitle the holder thereof to perform the duties of an undertaker or embalmer, or both. The fee for such license shall be $20 per annum, which shall be paid to the Collector of Taxes of the District of Columbia. Such license shall be issued at the time and in the manner provided in paragraph No. 5 of this section.

"(b) An applicant for a license shall submit proof satisfactory to the Commissioners or their designated agent, on such forms as the Commissioners may prescribe, that he is not less than 21 years of age, a citizen of the United States, of good moral character; that he is a graduate of a recognized high school or educational equivalent; that he is a graduate of a school or college of embalming, whose course of instruction is not less than 9 months, comprising not less than 840 hours of study, and that he has had not less than 2 years' practical experience in the business or profession. Such applicant shall be examined theoretically and practically in anatomy, embalming, embalming fluids, sanitation, disinfection, the care and preparation of dead human bodies for burial and the shipment of same, laws and regulations pertaining to communicable diseases, and such other subjects as the Commissioners or their designated agent deem appropriate and proper: *Provided, however,* That at the time of the enactment of this act every person registered as an undertaker with the Health Department of the District of Columbia and actually engaged in the business or profession of undertaker or embalmer of a fixed place or establishment equipped as a funeral home and who desires to continue in such business or profession shall be entitled to a license therefor without examination upon application therefor and upon furnishing proof satisfactory to the Commissioners or their designated agent that he was so registered and so engaged in such business; that he is not less than 21 years of age; a citizen of the United States, of good moral character, and that he is a graduate of a school or college of embalming whose course of instruction is not less than 9 months of study, comprising not less than 840 hours of study, or that he has had actual experience equivalent thereto; and upon payment of a license fee hereinbefore provided.

"An examination of applicants for a license shall be held not less frequently than once each year at such time and place as the Commissioners or their designated agent shall determine; notice of such examination shall be given at least 30 days prior to the date set therefor.

"(c) The Commissioners are hereby authorized:

"(1) To refuse to issue or renew or to suspend or revoke a license for fraud or misrepresentation in the application therefor, or for misconduct during an examination therefor, or for any act or practice considered detrimental to the public health, welfare, and safety, including the act of removing a dead human body without the prior consent of a person who, under the law, is authorized to give such consent, or for violation of the laws and regulations of the District of Columbia relating to the removal or burial or disposal of dead human bodies or the provisions of this paragraph or of the rules and regulations hereinafter authorized to be promulgated, or for conviction of a felony as shown by a certified copy of the record of the court of conviction, or for such other cause as the Commissioners may consider advisable.

"(2) To appoint a committee of seven persons of good moral character, six of whom shall have been actually and continuously engaged in the business or profession of undertaker or embalmer in the District of Columbia for at least 5 years next preceding their appointment and the health officer of the District of Columbia, or a member of the personnel of the health department designated by said health officer, who shall serve ex officio as a member of said committee, to conduct the examination of applicants for a license hereinbefore provided; the appointment of each such person shall be for a period of 1 year unless sooner terminated by the Commissioners for cause; such appointees shall serve without compensation for their services as such.

"(3) To issue licenses without examination to persons licensed by other Territories and States under such terms and conditions as they may deem appropriate.

"(4) To prescribe the terms, conditions, and license fee, not to exceed $10 per annum, under which apprenticeship shall be served.

"(5) To employ, and provide for necessary travel, in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, such additional employees as may be necessary and to make such expenditures as may be necessary for the proper enforcement of the provisions of this paragraph and the rules and regulations promulgated by authority thereof. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the District of Columbia not otherwise appropriated, funds to carry out the provisions of this act.

"(6) To promulgate and enforce, and from time to time to alter, such rules and regulations, not inconsistent with the provisions of this paragraph, as they deem necessary, for the proper execution and enforcement of the provisions of this paragraph.

"(d) The provisions of paragraph No. 1 of this section relative to the assignment or transfer of a license and the provisions of paragraph No. 7 of this section relative to the definition of the word 'person' shall not apply to licenses issued under the provisions of this paragraph. The word 'person' as used in this paragraph shall be construed to mean a natural person only, and licenses issued under the provisions of this paragraph shall not be assignable or transferable."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 2, strike out the words "carry on the business or profession, or."

Page 3, line 9, strike out the words "the business or profession of" and insert in lieu thereof "discharging the duties of an."

Page 3, line 10, insert after the word "home" the words "in the District of Columbia."

Page 3, line 11, strike out the words "in such business or profession" and insert in lieu thereof "to discharge such duties."

Page 3, line 15, strike out the words "engaged in such business" and insert in lieu thereof "discharging such duties."

Page 4, line 20, strike the word "seven" and insert "five."

Page 4, line 21, after the comma, insert the words "not more than."

Page 4, line 21, strike the word "six" and insert in lieu thereof the word "two."

Page 4, line 22, strike out the words "the business or profession of" and insert in lieu thereof "discharging the duties of an."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER], chairman of the committee handling this bill, will want to be heard in explanation of it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Briefly, Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for certain regulations and qualifications of undertakers. Under the present law in the District of Columbia, all anyone who engages in the business or profession of undertaking or embalming has to do is register his name with the Health Department, but without any proof that he is qualified to conduct such business or profession to get a permit. The bill sets up minimum standards for the licensing of those engaged in undertaking and embalming, and creates a committee of five persons to be selected by the Commissioners, two of whom shall be reputable undertakers or embalmers, and the Health Officer of the District of Columbia, or a member of the personnel designated by him, shall be a member of said committee.

I might say to the Members of the House that 48 States now have some regulations for the qualifications of those individuals who want to become undertakers and embalm bodies and conduct funerals. The District of Columbia has no regulations. We held extensive hearings before the Senate held hearings, and we also had some joint hearings. There was one objection from one undertaker in the city, and I think that the amendments that have been presented will remove that objection. He has indicated no objections to me since the bill was reported. It came out of the full Committee on the District of Columbia by unanimous vote. It seems to me that the District of Columbia ought to establish as soon as possible some qualifications for individuals who want to engage in this important business. It has the support of all the other undertakers, with one exception.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. As I understand, this legislation would require a license fee of $20 a year to be paid to the Collector of Taxes of the District of Columbia by those who handle bodies and work for the undertakers and embalmers of the District of Columbia.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. On page 5, line 13, there is a $10 fee for apprentices. the $20 is for the undertaker who is established in business. I think the gentleman is right.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it the gentleman's interpretation of this language that the $20 applies to the owner of the undertaking establishment and not to the employees and apprentices in that business?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think it applies to the owner, the individual actually engaged in the practice of undertaking. As to the apprentice, the man who is learning the business, $10 applies to him.

Mr. HARRIS. An apprentice, working for an embalming establishment, in my opinion, is a man who is just working there as a hired hand, doing odd jobs, and he is the man you are going to require a $10 license from?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I do not so interpret it.

Mr. HARRIS. I mean, the man who actually assists the undertaker.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think the chauffeur or hearse driver is not an apprentice, certainly not under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. HARRIS. Information has come to me that there are some 82 undertaking establishments operating in the District of Columbia and that there are some 410 employees in this business in the District of Columbia; that is, employees working for them, and some 300 of them would be qualified and required to pay $20 a year to continue to work. We have had a lot of talk in the last few years, I would say, on the gentleman's side of the House, as to how much money a person should be required to pay into a union in order to work. Now, here is what you are doing in the District of Columbia to people who are employed in the business of embalming. They are going to be required to pay $20 a year?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Let me call the gentleman's attention to the language on page 2, line 3, "The duties of an undertaker or embalmer." I think that very definitely circumscribes who will pay the ten or twenty dollars. I would say to the gentleman that the other 48 States require the payment of some fees or dues for licensing operations in the profession of embalming.

Mr. HARRIS. What are the fees paid in the other States.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. They are all the way from $5 to $50, the testimony shows. The average is around $20 or $25.

Mr. HARRIS. That is for people who work for the embalming establishment?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. No; the undertaker or embalmer. The embalmer is the man who works with the bodies. The undertaker may be the man who supervises the funeral, a funeral director, or he may embalm bodies and conduct funerals.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

As I understand it, the owner of the embalming business is required to pay a fee in some of the States.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. He is generally an embalmer. In Washington they are all embalmers.

Mr. HARRIS. That is it. The man who makes $1,500 or $2,000 has to pay the same fee in Washington as the man who owns the establishment and probably makes thousands of dollars in connection with his business.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The undertaker and the embalmer in Washington, D. C., are practically the same individual. I do not think you will find much difference. You do have your apprentice individuals, who pay a smaller fee for learning the business.

The merit of the bill, as I see it, is that it sets up some qualifications for the individual who is going to enter into the important job of undertaking We had testimony before our committee that the best individual one undertaker had in Washington, D. C., was a bus boy in a hamburger shop. He took him out of there, with no training and no experience whatsoever, and now he is an undertaker. We had further information before our committee that when individuals die in the District that often, within a couple of hours, four or five undertakers or embalmers are out there trying to snatch the body.

Mr. HARRIS. This bill does not correct that situation?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes; indeed, it does.

Mr. HARRIS. On page 3 I notice this language:

At the time of the enactment of this act every person registered as an undertaker with the Health Department of the District of Columbia and actually engaged in discharging the duties of an undertaker or embalmer at a fixed place or establishment equipped as a funeral home in the District of Columbia and who desires to continue to discharge such duties shall be entitled to a license—

And so forth.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Sure; but it will stop him doing that work in the future. Pass this bill, and in the future he will not be in the body-snatching business. He will be under the regulation of this Board, and the regulations will make that an improper act.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. What is the purpose of the fee? Is it to bring enough money into the treasury of the District of Columbia to administer the law? I assume that is it.

Mr. HARRIS. It is not clear to me. I assume the gentleman from Nebraska can tell the gentleman from Michigan its purpose.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The individuals appointed on this Board will not be salaried persons. We change this to make it five individuals, only two of whom shall be undertakers. They receive no salary so there is no cost other

than expenses. This should be sufficient to carry it.

Mr. DONDERO. That is the purpose of the question, to find out whether it is simply to get money enough to carry the law.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The Commissioners seem to think it would be sufficient to carry it; yes.

Mr. HARRIS. In the bill they submitted they set the fee at $20, I believe.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS. Would it not take something like $12,000 or $15,000 a year to administer this act?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. No, I think not, because no one receives any salary under this act. The Board is not a salaried Board.

Mr. HARRIS. Why charge them any license fees if it does not cost them anything?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. There are some examinations and some expenses. I question whether the expenses will be over $2,000 a year in the matter of issuing licenses and giving examinations.

Mr. HARRIS. Does this provide reciprocity with other States?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It sets up reciprocity provisions, which we do not have at the present time.

Mr. HARRIS. You do not have any regulations at present?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is right; there is no reciprocity now because there are no regulations.

Mr. HARRIS. But if this bill were to pass, you would have a reciprocity provision in it?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. It would be possible to set up reciprocity with other States. It is thought the standards are high enough here to meet their requirements.

Mr. HARRIS. Anyone coming from another State would be required to stand an examination given by a board established under this act before he would be permitted to practice embalming in the District of Columbia?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. If he met the qualifications set up in this bill he could either take the examination or get a license by reciprocity. That is true of any other profession, I might say.

Mr. HARRIS. The qualification, of course, is that he must be 21 years of age, a resident of the District and have as much as 2 years of training in some college. Is that correct?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. He must be a graduate of a recognized high school or have its educational equivalent. That is, he must be a graduate of a school or college and enrolled in an embalming course with instruction of not less than 9 months comprising no less than 840 hours of study, and that he has had not less than 2 years' practical experience in the business or profession. He must be of good moral character and qualify for reciprocity or take an examination as is now done in other States.

Mr. HARRIS. It seems to me the objection could be made to this legislation that it sets up a provision in the District of Columbia whereby those who are here now may continue in their business by payment of annual dues and restricting anyone else to the discretion of the Commission.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes. A grandfather clause protects those now in the business.

Mr. HARRIS. But if someone else happens to come in and wants to practice embalming he has to go through all of these requirements as set out in the bill before he will be permitted to work in the District, in addition to paying $20 a year.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think it is necessary that he have a knowledge of anatomy, embalming, embalming fluids, sanitation, disinfectants, and so forth. That is what the bill requires as a minimum requirement.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NEW SCHOOL BUILDING AT MOCLIPS, GRAYS HARBOR COUNTY, WASH.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2545) to provide funds for cooperation with the school board of the Moclips-Aloha District for the construction and equipment of a new school building in the town of Moclips, Grays Harbor County, Wash., to be available to both Indian and non-Indian children, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, after "for" insert "expenditure under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior for."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MINING CLAIMS IN ALASKA

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2369) providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the Territory of Alaska, with Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WELCH, CRAWFORD, and SOMERS.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS—FIRE DEPARTMENT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 3433) to amend the act entitled "An act to classify the officers and members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1906, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of the act entitled "An act to classify the officers and members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1906, as amended (D. C. Code, 1940 ed., sec. 4–404), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. That the Fire Department of the District of Columbia shall be composed of and operated upon a two-platoon system and the personnel thereof shall consist of one chief engineer; such number of deputy chief engineers (all of whom shall have had at least 5 years' experience in some regularly organized municipal fire department) and battalion chief engineers as said Commissioners may deem necessary from time to time within the appropriations made by Congress; one fire marshal; such number of deputy fire marshals, inspectors, and clerks as said Commissioners may deem necessary from time to time within the appropriations made by Congress; such number of captains, lieutenants, and sergeants as said Commissioners may deem necessary from time to time within the appropriations made by Congress; one superintendent of machinery; and such number of assistant superintendents of machinery; pilots, marine engineers, assistant marine engineers, marine firemen, privates of class 6, privates of class 5, privates of class 4, privates of class 3, privates of class 2, privates of class 1, hostlers, and laborers as said Commissioners may deem necessary from time to time within the appropriations made by Congress: *Provided*, That the chief engineer of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia shall have the right to call for and obtain the services of any veterinary surgeon employed by said District who at the time shall not be engaged in a more emergent veterinary service for said District: *Provided further*, That the police surgeons of said District are required to attend, without charge, the members of the Fire Department of said District, and examine all applicants for appointment to, promotion in, and retirement from, said Fire Department."

SEC. 2 (a) The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and directed to (1) establish a workweek of not more than 70 hours for officers and members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia on night-platoon duty and of not more than 50 hours for such officers and members on day-platoon duty, and (2) require that the hours of work in each such workweek be performed within a period of five of any seven consecutive days. The 2 days off duty in each 7-day period to which each officer and member of the Fire Department is entitled under this subsection shall be in addition to his annual leave and sick leave allowed by law.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a), whenever the Commissioners declare that an emergency exists of such a character as to necessitate the continuous service of all officers and members of the Fire Department, it shall be the duty of the chief engineer of the Fire Department to suspend and discontinue the granting of such 2 days off in 7 during the continuation of such emergency.

SEC. 3. This act shall take effect on July 1, 1948.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA EMERGENCY RENT ACT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 3131) to extend for

the period of 1 year the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 (b) of the act entitled "An act to regulate rents in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 2, 1941, as amended (D. C. Code, 1940 ed., sec. 45–1601), is hereby amended by striking out "1947" and inserting in lieu thereof "1948."

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of page 1, line 7, after the word "thereof", insert "March 31, 1948."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 3864) to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act with respect to contribution rates after termination of military service and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 (c) (4) of the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(iv) Contribution rates after termination of military service: When the Board finds that the continuity of an employer's employment experience has been interrupted solely by reason of one or more of the owners, officers, managers, partners, or majority stockholders of such employer's employing enterprise having served in the armed forces of the United States of America or any of its allies during a time of war, such employer's employment experience shall be deemed to have been continuous throughout the period that such individual or individuals so served in such armed forces, including the period up to the time it again resumes the status of an employer liable for contributions under this act, provided it resumes such status within 2 years from the date of discharge of such individual or individuals or from the date of the termination of such war, whichever date is the earlier. For the purposes of this paragraph (iv), in determining an employer's contribution rate his average annual pay roll shall be the average of his last three annual pay rolls."

SEC. 2. Section 3 (a) (9) (b) of the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) The term 'average annual pay roll', except for the purposes of paragraph (4) (iv) of this subsection, means the average of the annual pay rolls of any employer for the three consecutive 12-month periods ending 90 days prior to the computation date;".

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this act shall be effective with respect to employment on or after July 1, 1943. The amount of any contributions or interest thereon paid to the Board by any employer in excess of the amount such employer would have been required to pay if the amendments made by this act had been in effect on and after July 1, 1943, shall, for the purposes of section 4 (i) of the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, be considered to have been erroneously collected. Notwithstanding the period of limitation prescribed in such section 4 (i), the employing unit which paid such excess amount of contributions or interest thereon may make application under such section 4 (i) within 1 year after the date of the enactment of this act for an adjustment or a refund thereof.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RAILROAD SIDING, FRANKLIN STREET NE.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 3744) to authorize the construction of a railroad siding in the vicinity of Franklin Street NE., District of Columbia, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, subject to sections 2 and 3, the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. is hereby authorized to construct in the District of Columbia a single siding which shall start at a point on such company's Metropolitan branch track approximately 367 feet north of the center line of Franklin Street, NE. and shall run from such point in a southerly direction (a) across the southeast corner of parcel 132/71, (b) under the viaduct in Franklin Street, (c) into parcel 132/85, and (d) along the east line of parcel 132/85.

SEC. 2. The siding authorized to be constructed by the first section shall pass under the viaduct in Franklin Street in accordance with plans approved in advance of such construction by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 3. Congress reserves the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, that concludes the business on the District of Columbia Calendar.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DEVITT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent.

Mr. FLETCHER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. SNYDER (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), indefinitely, on account of death in the family.

To Mr. MORGAN (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), for 1 week, on account of death in the family.

To Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, from June 23 to June 28, inclusive, on account of official business.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] may have until midnight tonight to file a committee report from the Committee on Armed Services on the so-called officers' and personnel bill, H. R. 3820.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMANENT RATE OF POSTAGE ON FIRST-CLASS MAIL MATTER

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 221, to provide for permanent rates of postage on mail matter of the first class, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the rate of postage on all mail matter of the first class (except postal cards and private mailing or post cards) shall be 3 cents for each ounce or fraction thereof: *Provided*, That drop letters shall be charged at the rate of 1 cent for each ounce or fraction thereof when mailed for local delivery at post offices where free delivery by carrier is not established and when they are not collected or delivered by rural or star-route carriers. The rate of postage on postal cards (including the cost of manufacture) and private mailing or post cards (conforming to the conditions prescribed by the act entitled "An act to amend the postal laws relating to use of postal cards," approved May 19, 1898 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 39, sec. 281), shall be 1 cent each.

SEC. 2. The increases in the rates of postage on mail matter of the fourth class, and the increases in the registry fees for registered mail, fees for obtaining receipts for registered mail, and fees for delivery of registered, insured, and collect-on-delivery mail to addressee only, or to addressee or order, prescribed by title IV of the Revenue Act of 1943 (58 Stat. 69, 70), as amended by the act of September 17, 1944 (58 Stat. 732), entitled "An act to fix the fees for domestic insured and collect-on-delivery mail, special-delivery service, and for other purposes," and by the act of August 14, 1946 (Public Law 730, 79th Cong., 2d sess.), entitled "An act to fix the rate of postage on domestic air mail, and for other purposes," shall continue in full force and effect.

SEC. 3. This act shall take effect on July 1, 1947.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is (a) to make permanent the present 3-cent rate for local and nonlocal first-class mail, which rate expires June 30, 1947, and (b) to retain in full force and effect all other postage rates which are now in effect, but which would also expire on the same date. Unless renewed by legislation, the letter rate will revert to 2 cents on July 1, 1947, thereby reducing the Department's revenue by about $189,000,000.

The resolution further provides for the extension of certain existing increases in fourth-class mail and registered mail. These items amount to $16,260,000. Considering the critical financial situation of the Post Office Department and the fact that the present cost of handling first-class local and nonlocal mail exceeds 2 cents, and considering further that the first-class nonlocal 3-cent rate has been in existence since 1932 and the 3-cent local rate since 1933, the committe recommends a permanent change to be made in the first-class rate. It also recommends the extension of the existing increases in fourth-class and registered mail above mentioned, amounting to $16,260,000, making a total of $205,000,000 that the Department would lose if these rates are permitted to lapse.

It is imperative, therefore, that this resolution be adopted promptly so that there may be no question about these rates remaining in effect after July 1, 1947.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, a member of the House Committee on Rules.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Your committee has reported a bill which is rather comprehensive in its terms and for which I compliment the committee. It undertakes to save for the Government some of the half billion dollars in subsidies that are now being paid out, resulting in a loss to the Post Office Department. I am wondering whether the gentleman is going to be successful in getting that bill before the House as a part of the economy program of his party, so that we can save the Government this half billion dollars this year.

Mr. REES. Our committee did spend a great deal of time and energy in consideration of this legislation. I want to pay tribute to the members of our committee on both sides of the aisle who worked diligently, and spent their time and effort in bringing to this House what I believe to be a reasonable and sensible bill dealing with this problem.

That bill is pending before the Committee on Rules, of which the distinguished gentleman from Virginia is a member. I appreciate very much his interest in and his support of this legislation. In the meantime there are only a few days remaining. So it becomes necessary for our committee to recommend for passage this resolution that is before us today. However, it is not the intention of the chairman of the committee to withdraw the bill pending before the Rules Committee. I expect to appear before the gentleman's committee within the next day or two asking for a rule to bring that legislation before the House.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. REES. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I wonder if the gentleman knows why we cannot get a hearing before the Rules Committee on that bill.

Mr. REES. I do not know. It has not been refused but the time is getting very short.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I understand this bill relates to the catalogs of mail-order houses. Why in the world anybody should want the Government to subsidize those mail-order houses and send this advertising matter through the mails free is not understandable to me. I wonder why the gentleman is not able to get a hearing before the Rules Committee.

Mr. REES. I am in accord with the gentleman's viewpoint. The President in his budget address of January 10, of course, said he was going to ask the Post Office Department to submit legislation that would raise $300,000,000 to wipe out the deficit in the postal service. The Post Office Department finally came up with recommendations of schedules of increases that would raise approximately $176,000,000 and the House committee, after spending more than 2 months taking testimony, finally submitted a bill to raise about $110,000,000.

I believe the gentleman well knows that there are some Members who are reluctant to go along with us. We hope, however, that we may be able to get a rule, and I trust we may be able to get a bill before the House. Then let the membership of the House decide the question.

At this particular time, however, we are faced with the necessity of extending the 3-cent rate promptly; otherwise we lose revenue amounting to approximately $205,000,000.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma, a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. RIZLEY. Can the gentleman tell us what the deficiency was during the current fiscal year in the operations of the Post Office Department under the present administration?

Mr. REES. During the year 1946?

Mr. RIZLEY. Yes.

Mr. REES. In 1946, of course, it did not amount to as much as $300,000,000. To be fair about it, the principal reason for this deficit is because this Congress—rightly so—saw fit to raise the salaries of workers in the postal service. That is the reason for the large deficit.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIZLEY. In order to make up that deficiency as soon as possible the administration made some recommendations that the present postal rates be increased. Is that correct?

Mr. REES. The Post Office Department recommended an increase in second-, third-, and fourth-class mail rates. The recommendations made in the matter of the second-class rates would have raised something like $33,000,000. The committee came back with a raise of about $9,000,000. The same is true with reference to third-class rates. The Post Office recommended $32,500,000 for third-class matter. We did not raise it quite as much as they recommended. For fourth-class mail the Post Office recommended increased rates to raise an additional $50,000,000. The committee bill would raise a little less, I am informed. As a matter of fact, fourth-class mail, under the law, is supposed to pay its way.

Mr. RIZLEY. Notwithstanding the fact that this deficiency has been coming about the Department took no steps to increase the rates; but, then, I believe they cannot.

Mr. REES. The Post Office Department cannot increase the second and third class rates.

Mr. RIZLEY. When previously had they recommended that any increase be made?

Mr. REES. In March of this year.

Mr. RIZLEY. But over the years when we had a Democratic Congress was there any recommendation made to increase the rates or do away with the subsidies?

Mr. REES. I was not a member of the Post Office Committee at that time. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] was a member of the committee and took a deep interest in these problems. I will yield to him.

Mr. MASON. The Post Office Department did recommend a year ago, and a year and a half ago, that the rates be raised. The House has already passed a raise in rates but it has always been stymied in the Senate.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. The 3-cent letter-mail rate which this bill seeks to continue was inaugurated way back in 1934, when there was raised $100,000,000 to clear up a deficit the Post Office Department had incurred.

I told the membership at the time—and you will find it in the RECORD—that if you kept up your spending the 3-cent rate would never be reduced. We were assured loudly and lustily by the Democratic administration that it was only temporary, that their sole purpose was to use it to balance the postal budget. It has continued through the years, long after the $100,000,000 was cleared up, and in the last few years it has been used to take care of the spending of the Democratic administration. The Democrats are still short $150,000,000 in the Post Office Department. It seems to me if there was ever anything unbusinesslike, it was the statements as to the purpose for which this increased postage rate was to be used. It was just a camouflage for the American people.

Mr. REES. I appreciate the gentleman's observation. Even so, there has been an increase in the cost in the Post Office Department, due to increased salaries and wages.

Mr. RICH. Yes; but the same administration passed all these laws to spend money.

Mr. REES. We increased the salaries of all those people.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman is not trying to defend the laws that were passed to spend this money, is he?

Mr. REES. Of course, I am not defending any unnecessary spending. Of course, this administration has spent a tremendous amount of money that should have been saved.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee, ranking minority member of my committee, who has given a great amount of study to this problem.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Is it not true that except for the increase in the salaries of postal employees in 1945 and 1946, there would not be any deficit today? The deficit for the current fiscal year is about $300,000,000.

Mr. REES. Yes; I think the gentleman has stated the situation correctly.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. The increase in salaries, which was voted by Members on both sides of this House, almost unanimously, amounts to $351,000,000.

Mr. REES. The statements of the gentleman is correct.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to clarify the situation a little further for the RECORD. The President, in his budget message, called attention to a deficit for this year, in second-, third-, and fourth-class mail matter, and stated he was requesting the Post Office Department to submit rates to wipe out the deficit. The Department came up with recommendations for increases they say would raise approximately $176,000,000 of that amount.

Our committee, after 2 months of hearings and study of the problem, submitted H. R. 3519 that includes the proposal we have here today, and would, in addition thereto, increase revenues approximately $110,000,000. In other words, the bill would raise a little more than one-third of the anticipated deficit.

There has been so much misunderstanding with regard to the postal increase bill that I do not want to endanger the emergency provisions contained in this resolution.

The postal bill has not only been misunderstood, but the recommendations of our committee have been subjected to misinterpretations of various kinds. The principal question involved is whether those who use the mail, the big volume for business purposes, should pay a share of the increased cost of the postal service they use, or whether the entire deficit shall be charged to the Federal Treasury.

I believe, when given an opportunity to have this legislation presented, the Members of this House will agree the provisions are fair and reasonable, and that the recommendations of our committee should be approved.

It has been suggested, among other things, that we wait until an investigation of the Post Office Department has been concluded. Certainly there will be a survey and investigation to determine where economies may be made and waste eliminated. We want to know, also, whether there are places where the Department may be made more efficient. We expect to press that matter as promptly and vigorously as can be done. To that, let me say it will take several months. By that time the deficit will have mounted to several hundred million dollars that will be charged to the Federal Treasury.

The bill has been criticized because of increase in rate on fourth-class matter (books, catalogs, and parcel post). I call your attention to the fact that under the present law this class of mail is expected to pay its own way. I have today, addressed a letter to the acting Postmaster General, directing his attention to this matter.

I think it is fair to call attention to the fact too that rates in postal service on some classes of mail have not been changed since 1879, and other classes since 1932. I believe it is the duty of Congress to at least look them over. Certainly no member of our committee, and no one in this House want to provide rates that will penalize or injure anyone using the postal service.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to enter into any political controversy about this thing or raise any political question. I just want to talk a little sound financial business about it. We have had this bill reported from the Committee on Post Offices and Civil Service for a month or more with an application for a rule from the Rules Committee so that the House might have the question before it and determine the matter. It is inconceivable to me, if we have any idea at all about common sense, that we should sit here and refuse the House the opportunity to decide the question whether we are going to continue to subsidize mail-order-house catalogs, commercial advertisements, and other similar mail at the present huge expense to the taxpayers. That just does not make sense to me.

I was in hopes, and I am sure the gentleman from Pennsylvania who is seeking to interrupt me has been in hopes, that we were going to get some economy in this Congress, that we were going to save some of this money that has been needlessly expended. I cannot think of any more useless and unjustifiable expenditure on the part of the Government than to subsidize mail-order-house catalogs and other advertising matter.

Let us get down to business here and see if we cannot save some of this money. I do not want to talk politics about this but I cannot help it because you gentlemen on the left have been maintaining that you are going to give us economy in Government, you are going to give us a business administration. There is just not any business in spending two or three hundred million dollars a year to subsidize a lot of mail-order catalogs, magazines, and commercial advertising.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

In my opinion, the Congress ought to recognize that fact and it ought to bring a bill in here doing that very thing. But let me say and repeat what I was saying awhile ago, if you raise this $300,000,000 in postal rates then you will pass a lot of laws because the Post Office Department says every time you do that that they want the money from the Congress because you will raise a lot of wages, and I am against that. I think we ought to stop here some time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman's party is in power, the gentleman is for economy and you do not have to pass any more laws. I hope that the gentleman from Pennsylvania will cooperate with me in the Rules Committee to at least obtain a hearing for these gentlemen on the Post Office Committee who have worked so hard on the bill, so that it may be submitted to the House. If we are wrong, that is another thing. The House does not have to pass it. But why cannot the House consider a bill that its own committee has worked so hard on, and is calculated to save $165,000,000?

Mr. RICH. You can count on my help. I shall be with you.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I know the gentleman will.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. I am in agreement with the gentleman from Virginia in his views. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee conducted hearings for over a month on this legislation. We worked faithfully on this bill and we have prepared a good bill. It is nonpartisan, it is nonpolitical, and will give us about $110,000,000 in additional postal revenues. But since the bill was reported, we find certain influences which are preventing a rule being granted on the bill. We find the book lobby, the magazine and other interests fighting to keep us from getting a rule. I sincerely hope that the gentleman from Virginia, with the help of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, will assist us in getting a rule.

I will say to the gentleman from Virginia that our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], the author of this bill, has been most active in sponsoring this legislation.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES. The thing resolves itself into whether or not you are going to let these people who use the mail for commercial purposes pay at least a part of their own way or whether you are going to charge it to the taxpayers of this country?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am in favor of them paying their own way.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. When the special committee investigators find out a number of facts with reference to the business management of the Postal Department, it will be able to make some recommendations that will save a lot of money as an economic matter. I have great faith in what the committee can bring forth.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. But it will not save this money that you are giving

to the mail order houses and the other advertisers through the deficit they are creating. They are not paying as much in postal rates as it costs the Government to send the stuff through the mails, and there is no excuse for that sort of business.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of the enactment of the resolution sponsored by the gentleman from Kansas, [Mr. REES], the chairman of our committee. This resolution has the unanimous approval of our committee. It is absolutely essential legislation at this time. If this resolution is not adopted prior to July 1, the Post Office Department will suffer a loss of revenue of around $200,000,000 per year. I hope that after the resolution is adopted that then the Committee on Rules will give us a rule on the omnibus bill providing an increase in various postal rates.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Speaker, I am not in favor of subsidizing mail-order house catalogs or large magazine units, but I do think it should be pointed out here that the omnibus bill which has been discussed, also covers schoolbooks and certain library books, and that if this omnibus bill does come forward I trust that it will eliminate those essential library and schoolbooks and services which are included in the omnibus bill and deal separately with your large mail-order catalog houses and your other magazine publishers. These concerns which operate for profit should certainly be dealt with on a different basis than those schools and institutions which are being operated as nonprofit organizations, in an attempt to render only service.

Mr. ALMOND. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Speaker, as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service has pointed out, the joint resolution now before the House is absolutely necessary in order to keep in full force and effect the rates on first-class mail, otherwise they will expire on June 30th of this year and revert to the old rate. If that should happen, the deficit of the Post Office Department will greatly increase.

I want to say in response to some of the remarks made by my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia, that the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service under the able leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] has for many weeks conducted exhaustive, full, and painstaking hearings on the subject of the deficit in the Post Office Department. We find that the estimated deficit will approximate $287,000,000 at the end of this fiscal year. To my amazement, as a new Member of that committee, it has been called to my attention that for the last 100 years in the history of the Post Office Department, both under Republican and Democratic Administrations, in only 17 years out of those 100 has that department failed to show a deficit. In other words, it has shown a deficit for 83 years out of the last 100 years.

I should like to see the bill which is pending before the Committee on Rules reported out for action by the House, because there are some industries, some businesses, which are being subsidized by the Federal Government. I think the Congress should do something about it. As the chairman has pointed out, the Post Office recommended certain increases in rates in all classes of the postal service. If we could have seen our way clear to adopt the proposals of the Post Office Department, they would have raised approximately $176,000,000 to offset in part the $287,000,000 deficit. The bill we have worked on studiously and earnestly would increase the rates by about $110,000,000.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALMOND. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. As I understand, this measure will make permanent the present 3-cent rate on first-class mail?

Mr. ALMOND. That is the purpose and desire, as I understand it.

Mr. SPRINGER. I also understand that that is made necessary by reason of the very large deficit which has resulted throughout many years during the last 100 years?

Mr. ALMOND. The gentleman is correct.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 110. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 24, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

825. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 16, 1946, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Ipswich River, Plum Island Sound, and Fox Creek, Mass., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

826. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting changes in the deficiency estimates of appropriation for the fiscal years 1944 and 1945 for the Navy Department and Naval Establishment (H. Doc. No. 341); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 40. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Un-American Activities to have printed for its use additional copies of House Report 209, Eightieth Congress, first session; without amendment (Rept. No. 633). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 39. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Un-American Activities to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearing held on February 6, 1947; with an amendment (Rept. No. 634). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 186. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings held before said committee during the current session relative to reciprocal trade agreements; without amendment (Rept. No. 635). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 241. Resolution providing for the printing, as a House document, the "History of the Committee on the Judiciary"; without amendment (Rept. No. 636). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 35. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 541, Seventy-ninth Congress; House Report No. 1205, Seventy-ninth Congress; and House Report No. 2729, Seventy-ninth Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 637). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BISHOP: Committee on House Administration. Senate Joint Resolution 113. Joint resolution authorizing the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to the Marine Corps dead of all wars; without amendment (Rept. No. 638). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 252. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 3916, a bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and to extend the succession and certain lending powers and functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 639). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHORT: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 3830. A bill to provide for the promotion and elimination of officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 640). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BULWINKLE:

H. R. 3934. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to venereal-

disease rapid-treatment centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEVENSON:

H. R. 3935. A bill to provide for the carrying of mail on star routes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 3936. A bill to authorize the United States Park Police to make arrests within Federal reservations in the environs of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 3937. A bill for the relief of William C. Reese; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 3938. A bill for the relief of Flury & Crouch, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

664. By Mr. HARDIE SCOTT: Petition of the Ukrainian-American Women's Citizen Association, of Philadelphia, Pa., urging passage of H. R. 2910, a bill to authorize the United States during an emergency period to undertake its fair share in the resettlement of displaced persons in Germany, Austria, and Italy, including relatives of citizens of members of our armed forces, by permitting their admission into the United States in a number equivalent to a part of the total quota numbers unused during the war years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

665. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to favoring and urging passage of necessary enabling legislation providing for universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

666. Also, petition of Sol Pelish and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opposition to any legislative measures for the suppression of the Communist Party; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

667. Also, petition of Charles H. Nutting, Daytona Beach, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

668. Also, petition of Mrs. Carrie L. McManus, Townsend Club No. 1, Sarasota, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

669. Also, petition of Miss Ellen K. DeVries, New Port Richey, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

670. Also, petition of Mrs. L. H. Anglemyer, Orlando, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

671. Also, petition of Mrs. A. C. Starke, Sanford, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 24, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, when we become satisfied with ourselves, hold ever before us Thy demands for perfection.

Lest we become content with a good batting average, let us see the absolutes of honesty, of love, and of obedience to Thy will Thou dost require of us.

Seeing them, may we strive after them by Thy help.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, June 23, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on June 23, 1947, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 824) for the relief of Marion O. Cassady.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2173. An act to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended;

H. R. 3131. An act to extend for the period of 1 year the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended;

H. R. 3433. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to classify the officers and members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1906, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3744. An act to authorize the construction of a railroad siding in the vicinity of Franklin Street NE., District of Columbia;

H. R. 3861. An act to allow to a successor railroad corporation the benefits of certain carry-overs of a predecessor corporation for the purposes of certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 3864. An act to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act with respect to contribution rates after termination of military service; and

H. J. Res. 221. Joint resolution to provide for permanent rates of postage on mail matter of the first class, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 35. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 541, Seventy-ninth Congress; House Report No. 1205, Seventy-ninth Congress; and House Report No. 2729, Seventy-ninth Congress;

H. Con. Res. 39. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Un-American Activities to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearing held on February 6, 1947; and

H. Con. Res. 40. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Un-American Activities to have printed for its use additional copies of House Report 209, Eightieth Congress, first session.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 751. An act to continue a system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of school-age and under-school-age children in the District of Columbia through June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 113. Joint resolution authorizing the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to the Marine Corps dead of all wars.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, if I may make a very brief statement with respect to the program for today, it is anticipated that there will be taken up, first, the joint resolution terminating certain war and emergency statutory provisions, in charge of the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. That is to be followed by the naval appropriation bill. There is a desire that the Senate then consider one or two treaties which have been reported and are on the calendar. There were some other matters suggested, but they are controversial, and I feel that if these two legislative matters and the one executive matter to which I have referred are disposed of it will be sufficient for the day.

MEETING OF COMMITTEE DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may meet this afternoon at 2 o'clock.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PERMISSION TO HOLD HEARINGS

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the last of the great appropriation bills has been passed by the House. I refer to the independent offices appropriation bill. I am chairman of a Subcommittee on Appropriations which is in charge of that bill. We started hearings this morning. It will be necessary to work during all the available time this week in order to get out the bill, and I doubt if it can be done by June 30.

Therefore, I ask permission of the Senate that the Appropriations Subcommittee having charge of the independent offices appropriation bill may meet every afternoon this week, if necessary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED PROVISIONS APPLICABLE TO APPROPRIATIONS FOR NAVY DEPARTMENT (S. DOC. NO. 64)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed provisions applicable to appropriations for the Navy Department, in the form of amendments to the budget for the fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator of the Office of Temporary Controls, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Twentieth Report of the Office of Price Administration, covering the period ended December 31, 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Corporation covering its operations from the period of its organization on February 2, 1932, to September 30, 1946, inclusive (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIAL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate petitions and a memorial, which were referred, as indicated:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, favoring the enactment of legislation to prevent disposal of war surplus goods; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

(See joint resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. WILEY on June 23, 1947, p. 7539, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A petition of sundry citizens of the State of Florida, praying for the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan, to provide old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Salem Square Congregational Church, of Worcester, Mass., protesting against the enactment of legislation providing Federal aid to education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Letters in the nature of petitions from Florence Gluesing, of Woodside, Long Island, N. Y., and H. E. Larson, of Los Angeles, Calif., praying that the Senate sustain the President's veto of the Taft-Hartley labor relations bill; ordered to lie on the table.

A letter in the nature of a memorial, from M. Harrision, of New York, N. Y., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to provide compulsory military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LODGE (for Mr. BRICKER), from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

S. 164. A bill for the establishment of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; without amendment (Rept. No. 344).

By Mr. BALL, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 3311. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 343).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 186. A bill for the relief of Santiago Naveran; without amendment (Rept. No. 345);

S. 187. A bill for the relief of Antonio Arguinzonis; without amendment (Rept. No. 346);

S. 189. A bill for the relief of Simon Fermin Ibarra; without amendment (Rept. No. 347);

S. 190. A bill for the relief of Pedro Ugalde; without amendment (Rept. No. 348);

S. 298. A bill for the relief of certain Basque aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 349);

S. 489. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, to preserve the nationality of naturalized veterans, their wives, minor children, and dependent parents; without amendment (Rept. No. 350);

S. 518. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the nationality of citizens who were unable to return to the United States prior to October 14, 1946; with an amendment (Rept. No. 352);

S. 558. A bill for the relief of the alien Michael Soldo; without amendment (Rept. No. 351);

H. R. 1866. A bill for the relief of Paul Goodman; without amendment (Rept. No. 353); and

H. R. 3398. A bill to extend the period of validity of the act to facilitate the admission into the United States of the alien fiancées or fiancés of members of the armed forces of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 354).

BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. HAWKES introduced a bill (S. 1497) to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the Director of the Census to collect and publish statistics of cottonseed and cottonseed products, and for other purposes," approved August 7, 1916, which was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Civil Service, and appears under a separate heading.

COLLECTION AND PUBLICATION OF STATISTICS OF FATS AND OILS

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill relating to the collection and publication of statistics of fats and oils, and I request that an explanatory statement by me may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanatory statement presented by the Senator from New Jersey will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1497) to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the Director of the Census to collect and publish statistics of cottonseed and cottonseed products, and for other purposes," approved August 7, 1916, introduced by Mr. HAWKES, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. HAWKES is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ALBERT W. HAWKES, OF NEW JERSEY, TO ACCOMPANY INTRODUCTION OF HAWKES BILL ON CENSUS OF FATS AND OILS

Mr. President, I am today introducing a bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the Director of the Census to collect and publish statistics of cottonseed and cottonseed products, and for other purposes," approved August 7, 1916.

My bill would broaden the law and extend coverage to include all fats and oils.

According to the Bureau of the Census, the entire cost of all the animal and vegetable fats and oils statistics now being compiled and published by the Bureau of the Census is about $56,000 per year.

The present annual value of fats and oils produced and processed in this country is estimated to be approximately $3,000,000,000.

In a letter dated May 21, 1947, to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Civil Service, Acting Secretary of Commerce William C. Foster stated:

"During the war these reports to the Bureau of the Census were made compulsory under War Food Administration Order 42, and were released on a monthly and quarterly basis. Since the termination of this order they have been continued on a voluntary basis as a result of their importance to industry, but there is some question as to how long this service could be maintained without specific authority and funds."

Mr. Foster also stated:

"In the fast-moving field of fats and oils, this current information is highly necessary for stable market conditions. The monthly reports are awaited with great interest by the trade as a guide in their buying and selling operations. As this country moves from a period of shortage to one of surplus these reports will be of increasing importance."

A similar bill, H. R. 3895, was introduced in the House of Representatives on June 18, 1947, by Congressman HESS, Republican, of Ohio.

I doubt if anyone would question the wisdom of spending the small amount of money that has been estimated to be involved in the interest of furnishing facts for those who use and process oils and fats, so as to avoid the high costs that come from speculation in the dark.

This speculation in the dark has caused processors and users of these products to pay exorbitant prices when, if they knew the facts, it might not have been necessary.

Exorbitant prices for raw materials lead to high costs for finished products and mulct the public consumer. This condition is what every right-thinking American is trying to avoid.

PRINTING OF REPORT CONCERNING CONVERSION OF TWO COST-PLUS-A-FIXED-FEE CONTRACTS AND DISPOSAL OF A SHIPYARD (S. DOC. NO. 65)

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document a report concerning the conversion of two cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts between the Maritime Commission and the California Shipbuilding Corp. to a fix-price basis, transmitted to the Senate by the Comptroller General of the United States on June 11, 1947.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS TO THE DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, ETC., APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, under rule 40 of the Rules of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent to file three notices in writing of my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI to submit emergency amendments to H. R. 3311, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, two of them authorizing the OIC program, and the third appropriating funds

for the salaries of law clerks and secretaries of judges.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the notices will be printed in the RECORD, and the proposed amendments will be received and printed for the information of the Senate.

Mr. BALL. In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 3311) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: Page 3, line 1, after "1946;", insert the following: "acquisition, production and free distribution of informational materials for use in connection with the operation, independently or through individuals, including aliens, or public or private agencies (foreign or domestic), and without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, of an information program outside of the continental United States, including the purchase of radio time (except that funds herein appropriated shall not be used to purchase more than 75 percent of the effective daily broadcasting time from any person or corporation holding an international shortwave broadcasting license from the Federal Communications Commission without the consent of such licensee), and the purchase, rental, construction, improvement, maintenance, and operation of facilities for radio transmission and reception; purchase and presentation of various objects of a cultural nature suitable for presentation (through diplomatic and consular offices) to foreign governments, schools, or other cultural or patriotic organizations, the purchase, rental, distribution, and operation of motion-picture projection equipment and supplies, including rentals of halls, hire of motion-picture projector operators, and all other necessary services by contract or otherwise without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes; not to exceed $5,000 for entertainment."

Mr. BALL. In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 3311) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: Page 3, line 16, after "(19 U. S. C. 1354)" and before the period, insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 665), the Department of State is authorized, in making contracts for the use of international short-wave radio stations and facilities, to agree on behalf of the United States to indemnify the owners and operators of said radio stations and facilities from such funds as may be hereafter appropriated for the purpose, against loss or damage on account of injury to persons or property arising from such use of said radio stations and facilities."

Mr. BALL. In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of the rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 3311) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: Page 71, after line 12, insert the following:

"Miscellaneous salaries: For salaries of all officials and employees of the Federal judiciary, not otherwise specifically provided for, $1,800,000: *Provided*, That the compensation of secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges (exclusive of any additional compensation under the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 and any other acts of similar purport subsequently enacted) shall be fixed by the Director of the Administrative Office without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, except that the salary of a secretary shall conform with that of the main (CAF-4), senior (CAF-5), or principal (CAF-6) clerical grade, or assistant (CAF-7), or associate (CAF-8) administrative grade, as the appointing judge shall determine, and the salary of a law clerk shall conform with that of the junior (P-1), assistant (P-2), associate (P-3), full (P-4), or senior (P-5) professional grade, as the appointing judge shall determine, subject to review by the judicial council of the circuit, if requested by the Director, such determination by the judge otherwise to be final: *Provided further*, That (exclusive of any additional compensation under the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 and any other acts of similar purport subsequently enacted) the aggregate salaries paid to secretaries and law clerks appointed by one judge shall not exceed $6,500 per annum, except in the case of the senior circuit judge of each circuit and senior district judge of each district having five or more district judges, in which case the aggregate salaries shall not exceed $7,500.

Mr. BALL also submitted three amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 3311, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendments referred to, see the foregoing notices.)

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 2173. An act to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended: to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3131. An act to extend for the period of 1 year the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3433. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to classify the officers and members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1906, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3744. An act to authorize the construction of a railroad siding in the vicinity of Franklin Street NE., District of Columbia; and to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3864. An act to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act with respect to contribution rates after termination of military service; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3861. An act to allow to a successor railroad corporation the benefits of certain carry-overs of a predecessor corporation for the purposes of certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Finance.

H. J. Res. 221. Joint resolution to provide for permanent rates of postage on mail matter of the first class, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Civil Service.

CITATIONS BY B'NAI B'RITH TO SECRETARY OF STATE GEORGE C. MARSHALL, ASSOCIATE JUSTICE ROBERT H. JACKSON, AND SECRETARY OF WAR ROBERT P. PATTERSON

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD addresses by Secretary of State Marshall, Associate Justice Jackson, and Secretary of War Patterson, on the occasion of the award of citations to them, together with an address by Attorney General Clark, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE—VIEWS OF IDAHO STATE EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD statements by Col. S. D. Hayes, director of the Idaho State Employment Service, and Mr. A. J. Tillman, assistant director of the Idaho State Employment Service, and presently acting director, which appear in the Appendix.]

UNNECESSARY OPERATIONS—ARTICLE BY ALBERT DEUTSCH

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a condensation of an article entitled "Unnecessary Operations," by Albert Deutsch, published in the Woman's Home Companion, which appears in the Appendix.]

IT DID HAPPEN—ARTICLE BY THOMAS L. STOKES

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "It Did Happen," by Thomas L. Stokes, appearing in the Atlanta Constitution, the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, and other papers, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER FLOOD—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD various articles and editorials relating to the Mississippi flood, which appear in the Appendix.]

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY PROJECT—EDITORIAL FROM WINNIPEG TRIBUNE

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Dream That May Come True," published in the Winnipeg, Manitoba, Tribune of June 19, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 564) to provide for the performance of the duties of the office of President, in case of the removal, resignation, or inability both of the President and Vice President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). The pending business before the Senate is Senate bill 564, the Presidential succession measure. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Wisconsin.

TERMINATION OF CERTAIN EMERGENCY AND WAR POWERS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 346, Senate Joint Resolution 123, declaring that in interpreting certain acts of Congress, joint resolutions, and proclamations World War II, the limited emergency, and the unlimited emergency shall be construed as terminated and peace established.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Reserving the right to object, it is understood the pending business will be resumed after the joint resolution in charge of the Senator from Wisconsin shall have been disposed of?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is understood by the occupant of the chair at the present moment.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 123) declaring that in interpreting certain acts of Congress, joint resolutions, and proclamations World War II, the limited emergency, and the unlimited emergency shall be construed as terminated and peace established, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert:

That the following statutory provisions are hereby repealed:

Act of June 10, 1942 (56 Stat. 351);

Section 207, title II, act of September 21, 1944 (58 Stat. 736);

Act of March 5, 1940 (50 Stat. 45), as amended;

Section 609, act of July 1, 1944 (58 Stat. 714, ch. 373);

Act of October 1, 1942 (56 Stat. 763, ch. 573);

Sections 2, 3, and 4, act of July 8, 1942 (56 Stat. 649);

Act of April 16, 1943 (57 Stat. 65), as amended;

Act of September 29, 1942 (56 Stat. 760);

Section 61 (b) of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as added by the act of June 26, 1944 (58 Stat. 359, ch. 279);

Section 21 of the act of February 16, 1914 (38 Stat. 289);

Act of January 15, 1942 (56 Stat. 5, ch. 3);

Act of June 3, 1941 (55 Stat. 238, ch. 162), as amended;

The provision in the act of June 11, 1940, making appropriations for the Navy Department for the fiscal year 1941, under the heading "Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, pay, subsistence, and transportation of naval personnel," prohibiting the payment of active-duty pay and allowances to retired officers except during the war or national emergency (54 Stat. 265, 275);

The provision in the act of February 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 68), under the heading "Marine Corps—Pay of officers, active list," relating to the availability of funds for the payment of active-duty pay to retired officers;

Section 2 of the act of February 15, 1879 (20 Stat. 295);

Act of May 29, 1945 (59 Stat. 226, ch. 137);

The provisions under the headings "Bureau of Engineering" and "Bureau of Construction and Repair," in the act of June 11, 1940 (54 Stat. 293), authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to exceed the statutory limit on repair and alterations to vessels commissioned or converted to meet the existing emergency;

Act of November 29, 1940 (54 Stat. 1219, ch. 923), as extended by the act of May 15, 1945 (59 Stat. 168, ch. 127);

The proviso of the act of February 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 63), that no officer of the Navy or Marine Corps who has been or hereafter may be adjudged fitted shall be involuntarily retired prior to 6 months subsequent to the termination of the existing national emergency;

Act of December 2, 1944 (58 Stat. 793);

Act of February 21, 1942 (56 Stat. 97, ch. 107);

Act of April 9, 1943 (57 Stat. 61, ch. 40);

The proviso of the act of June 26, 1940 (54 Stat. 599), under the heading "Council of National Defense," that until such time as the President shall declare the present emergency at an end the head of any department or independent establishment of the Government, notwithstanding the provisions of existing law, may employ, with the approval of the President, any person of outstanding experience and ability at a compensation of $1 per annum;

The provision of the act of July 2, 1942 (56 Stat. 548), as amended, which permits the Secretary of the Interior, or any official to whom he may delegate such authority, to appoint, without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, skilled and unskilled laborers, mechanics, and other persons engaged in a recognized trade or craft, including foremen of such groups;

Act of December 22, 1942 (56 Stat. 1070, ch. 801);

The provisions under the heading "Department of Agriculture, Surplus Marketing Administration," and "Department of the Interior, Government in the Territories," contained in the act of December 23, 1941 (55 Stat. 855, 856–857);

Section 8 of the act of June 9, 1943 (57 Stat. 126);

Section 301 of the act of September 9, 1940 (54 Stat. 884), as amended;

The provision in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act of 1942, under the heading "Selective Service System," relating to the presentation of quarterly reports to the Postmaster General (56 Stat. 101);

Act of July 9, 1943 (57 Stat. 390, ch. 209);

Section 5 of the act of June 28, 1944 (58 Stat. 394);

Section 2883 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code, added by the act of January 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 17);

Section 2883 (d) and (e) of the Internal Revenue Code, added by the act of March 27, 1942 (56 Stat. 187);

Act of December 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 817, ch. 609);

The provision in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1945, under the heading "Water conservation and utilization projects," relating to the use of the services or labor of prisoners of war, enemy aliens, and American-born Japanese (58 Stat. 463, 491);

Section 6 (b) of the act of March 11, 1941 (55 Stat. 33), as amended;

Act of December 17, 1941 (55 Stat. 808, ch. 588), as amended;

Section 606 (h) of the Communications Act of 1934, added by the act of December 29, 1942 (56 Stat. 1096);

Act of April 29, 1942 (56 Stat. 265, ch. 266);

Act of May 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 216, ch. 201), as amended;

Act of June 11, 1940 (54 Stat. 306, ch. 327), as amended;

Act of June 29, 1940 (54 Stat. 689, ch. 447), as amended;

Act of October 10, 1940 (54 Stat. 1092, ch. 838), as amended;

Act of May 2, 1941 (55 Stat. 148), as amended;

Act of June 14, 1941 (55 Stat. 591, ch. 297), as amended;

Section 3 (i) of the act of March 24, 1943 (57 Stat. 45, 51);

The proviso of subsection (h) of section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, added by the act of June 17, 1943 (57 Stat. 158);

Section 1 of the act of April 24, 1944 (58 Stat. 216), except that any suspension of the statute of limitations heretofore provided for in an agreement entered into under the authority of such section shall continue in effect for the period provided in such agreement, but in no case longer than 2 years after the date of the approval of this resolution;

Act of April 11, 1942 (56 Stat. 217);

Section 3 of the act of July 11, 1941 (55 Stat. 585);

Act of November 23, 1942 (56 Stat. 1020), as amended;

Act of October 29, 1942 (56 Stat. 1012);

Section 303 of the act of December 18, 1941 (55 Stat. 840);

Section 12 of the act of June 11, 1942 (56 Stat. 357), except that outstanding certificates issued thereunder shall continue in effect for a period of 6 months from the date of the approval of this joint resolution unless sooner revoked;

Act of July 12, 1943 (57 Stat. 520);

Act of June 5, 1942 (56 Stat. 323, ch. 346);

Act of January 2, 1942 (55 Stat. 881, ch. 646);

Act of December 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 1080, ch. 812);

Act of July 8, 1943 (57 Stat. 390, ch. 200);

The provisions of the act of November 19, 1941 (55 Stat. 765), as amended, relating to the availability for expenditure of funds appropriated pursuant to said act, as amended.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the termination date or termination period heretofore provided therefor by law, the following statutory provisions are repealed effective upon the date hereinafter specified, or upon the expiration of the period hereinafter specified, and shall remain in full force and effect until such date or until the expiration of such period. Such statutory provisions are hereby amended accordingly:

a. Repeal effective July 1, 1948:

Act of July 8, 1941 (55 Stat. 579, ch. 278), and the Act of June 22, 1943 (57 Stat. 161, ch. 137);

Section 2 of the act of November 17, 1941 (55 Stat. 764);

Act of March 13, 1942 (56 Stat. 171);

Act of June 27, 1942 (56 Stat. 461, ch. 455);

Act of July 1, 1943 (57 Stat. 371), and the act of May 14, 1942 (56 Stat. 278), as amended;

Act of September 22, 1941 (55 Stat. 728, ch. 414), as amended;

The provision in the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, under the heading "Federal Works Agency, Public Buildings Administration," relating to the authority of the Commissioner of Public Buildings to designate employees as special policemen (56 Stat. 990, 1000);

Act of July 29, 1941 (55 Stat. 606, ch. 326).

b. Repeal effective 6 months after the date of this joint resolution:

Act of January 27, 1942 (56 Stat. 19, ch. 21), as amended);

Act of December 17, 1942 (56 Stat. 1056);

Section 610 (c) of the act of July 1, 1944 (58 Stat. 682, 714);

Act of October 10, 1942 (56 Stat. 780, ch. 588);

Act of June 28, 1944 (58 Stat. 463, ch. 297);

Act of July 9, 1943 (57 Stat. 391, ch. 213), as amended.

c. Repeal effective 1 year after the date of this joint resolution:

Section 1 of the act of July 20, 1942 (56 Stat. 662);

Section 605 (c) of the act of July 1, 1944 (58 Stat. 682, 713).

SEC. 3. In the interpretation of the following statutory provisions, the date when this joint resolution becomes effective shall be deemed to be the date of the termination of any state of war heretofore declared by the Congress and of the national emergencies proclaimed by the President on September 8, 1939, and on May 27, 1941:

Act of July 1, 1941 (55 Stat. 498, as amended;

Act of February 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 9, ch. 15);

Section 86 of the act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 204);

Act of July 2, 1917 (40 Stat. 241), as amended;

Section 16 of the act of June 10, 1920 (41 Stat. 1072);

Act of February 26, 1925 (43 Stat. 984, ch. 340);

Act of April 12, 1926 (44 Stat. 241);

Act of May 29, 1926 (44 Stat. 677, ch. 424);

Section 20 of the act of May 18, 1933 (48 Stat. 68);

The provision of the act of May 15, 1936 (49 Stat. 1292), which authorizes the United States to control and operate the Little Rock Municipal Airport without rental or other charge in time of national emergency;

Act of May 27, 1939 (49 Stat. 1387);

Provisions authorizing the assumption of possession and control of the areas specified in the following statutes or parts of statutes: Section 3 of the act of June 21, 1938 (52 Stat. 834); act of June 20, 1936 (49 Stat. 1557, ch. 636); act of August 19, 1937 (50 Stat. 696, ch. 697); section 4 of the act of February 28, 1933 (47 Stat. 1368);

Section 5 (m) of the act of May 18, 1933 (48 Stat. 62);

Act of December 26, 1941 (55 Stat. 863, ch. 633);

Act of January 26, 1942 (56 Stat. 19);

Section 120 of the act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 213, 214);

Provision of Naval Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1917 (act of August 29, 1916, 39 Stat. 602), under the heading "Lighthouse Service," authorizing the President to transfer vessels, equipment, stations, and personnel of the Lighthouse Service (now Coast Guard under Reorganization Plan No. II) to the jurisdiction of the Navy or War Department;

Section 16 of the act of May 22, 1917 (40 Stat. 87);

Provision of chapter XVIII of the act of July 9, 1918 (40 Stat. 892), as amended by the act of November 21, 1941 (55 Stat. 781, ch. 499), extending the time for examination of accounts of Army disbursing officers;

Section 69 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended by section 7 of the act of June 15, 1933 (48 Stat. 156);

The provision authorizing the extension of enlistments in the Regular Army or the Enlisted Reserve Corps, in force at the outbreak of war or entered into during its continuation, for 6 months after its termination, contained in the act of March 15, 1940 (54 Stat. 53, ch. 61);

Act of May 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 213);

Section 2 of the act of December 13, 1941 (55 Stat. 799, ch. 571);

Chapter II, articles 2 (d), 48, 58, 59, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 104, and 119 of the act of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 759, ch. 227);

Paragraph 3 of section 127a as added to the act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 166), by section 51 of the act of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 759, ch. 227);

Revised Statutes, 1166;

The fourth proviso of section 18 of the act of February 2, 1901 (31 Stat. 748, ch. 192);

Provision of the act of July 9, 1918 (40 Stat. 861), making appropriations for the Army for the fiscal year 1919, under the heading "Barracks and Quarters," authorizing the Secretary of War to rent or lease buildings in the District of Columbia necessary for military purposes;

Section 111 of the act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 211), as amended;

Section 363 of title III of the act of July 1, 1944 (58 Stat. 682, ch. 373);

Act of December 26, 1941 (55 Stat. 862, ch. 629), as amended by the act of December 23, 1944 (ch. 720, 58 Stat. 923);

Act of February 20, 1942 (56 Stat. 94);

Provision of Naval Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1917 (act of August 29, 1916, 39 Stat. 581), under heading "Officers for Engineering Duty Only," authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to recall to active duty enlisted men on furlough without pay to complete the enlistment period;

Act of August 18, 1941 (55 Stat. 629);

Section 2 of the act of December 13, 1941 (55 Stat. 799, ch. 570);

Revised Statutes, 1420, as amended by section 2 of the act of January 20, 1944 (58 Stat. 4, ch. 2);

Provision of the act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 614), which authorizes Marine Corps training camps for the instruction of citizens to be in existence for a period longer than 6 weeks in each fiscal year in time of actual or threatened war;

Revised Statutes, 1624, article 4, paragraphs 6, 7, 12–20, and article 5;

Act of March 22, 1943 (57 Stat. 41);

Revised Statutes, 1462–1464;

Provision of the Naval Appropriation Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917 (act of August 29, 1916, 39 Stat. 591), under the heading "Fleet Naval Reserve," authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to call retired enlisted men into active service;

Provisions contained in the act of July 1, 1918 (40 Stat. 717), as amended (14 U. S. C. 164, 165), which authorize commissioned or warrant officers on the retired list to be ordered to active duty and to be temporarily advanced on the retired list, so far as such provisions pertain to personnel of the Coast Guard;

Act of April 8, 1946 (Public Law 337, 79th Cong.);

Section 4 (c) of the act of August 10, 1946 (Public Law 720, 79th Cong.);

Revised Statutes, 1436;

First proviso of section 18 of the act of May 22, 1917 (40 Stat. 84, 89);

Act of October 6, 1917 (40 Stat. 393, ch. 93), as amended;

Section 11 (c) of the act of June 23, 1938 (52 Stat. 948);

Section 10 of the act of June 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 394);

Section 18 of the act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 604, 79th Cong.);

Provisions of the act of March 4, 1917 (39 Stat. 1192–1193); the act of May 13, 1942 (56 Stat. 277, ch. 304); sections 3 and 4 of the act of July 9, 1942 (56 Stat. 656); the act of June 17, 1943 (57 Stat. 156, ch. 128); the act of June 26, 1943 (57 Stat. 209); and the act of May 31, 1944 (58 Stat. 265, ch. 218), which authorize the President or the Secretary of the Navy to acquire, through construction or conversion, ships, landing craft, and other vessels;

Section 10 of the act of May 14, 1930 (46 Stat. 329, 332);

Act of May 29, 1930 (46 Stat. 479, ch. 350);

Section 7 of the act of April 26, 1898 (30 Stat. 365);

Act of March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143–148, ch. 166), as amended;

Sections 3 and 12 of the act of February 21, 1946 (Public Law 305, 79th Cong.);

Section 1 of the act of July 20, 1942 (56 Stat. 662, ch. 508), as amended;

Act of December 17, 1942 (56 Stat. 1056, ch. 763);

Act of March 17, 1916 (39 Stat. 36, ch. 46);

Act of April 11, 1898 (30 Stat. 737);

Act of March 3, 1925 (43 Stat. 1109, 1110);

Section 1 of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 724, ch. 516);

Section 4 of the act of July 7, 1943 (57 Stat. 388);

Act of May 18, 1946 (Public Law 385, 79th Cong.);

Section 2 of the act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 697, 79th Cong.);

Section 4 (b) of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 712, 714);

Act of December 17, 1942 (56 Stat. 1052);

Section 3 of the act of June 27, 1944 (58 Stat. 387, ch. 287);

Act of December 23, 1944 (58 Stat. 926, ch. 726);

Act of March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143, ch. 166), as amended;

Section 1 of the act of December 7, 1945 (59 Stat. 603, 604);

Act of December 10, 1942 (56 Stat. 1045);

Act of December 26, 1941 (55 Stat. 858), as amended, except that the Commissioners of the District of Columbia may continue to exercise the authority under sections 7 and 9 of such act, as amended, until not later than June 30, 1948, and the provisions of sections 11 and 12 of such act, as amended, shall continue to apply to cases in which the authority under sections 7 and 9 is exercised;

Proviso of section 303 (c) of the act of October 14, 1944, as added by the act of February 18, 1946 (Public Law 301, 79th Cong.);

Sections 119 and 156 of the act of October 21, 1942 (56 Stat. 814, 852–856);

Section 500 (a) of the act of July 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 291, ch. 268), as amended;

Section 201 of the act of August 10, 1946 (Public Law 719, 79th Cong.);

Act of July 31, 1945 (59 Stat. 511, ch. 338);

Section 6 of the act of February 4, 1887 (24 Stat. 379), as amended;

Provision of the act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 619, 645), which empowers the President in time of war to take control of transportation systems;

Subsection (15) of section 402 of the act of February 28, 1920 (41 Stat. 477 (15));

Section 420 of the act of May 16, 1942 (56 Stat. 298);

Act of July 30, 1941 (55 Stat. 610);

Section 606 of the act of June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1104), as amended;

Section 4 of the act of July 15, 1918 (40 Stat. 901), as amended;

Sections 302 (h) and 712 (d) of the act of June 29, 1936 (49 Stat. 1993 and 2010);

Sections 1 (d) and 3 (a) of the act of August 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 1254 and 1255);

Section 2 of the act of October 22, 1914 (38 Stat. 765, ch. 334); act of May 10, 1943 (57 Stat. 82);

Section 1 (b) and subsections 2 (a), 2 (b), and 2 (c) of the act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 660, 79th Cong.);

Section 1 of the act of January 28, 1915 (38 Stat. 800–801);

Provision of Naval Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1917 (act of August 29, 1916, 39 Stat. 600), under heading "Coast Guard," subjecting personnel of the Coast Guard operating as part of the Navy to the laws governing the Navy;

Section 1 of title II of the act of June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. 220);

Provision of Naval Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1917 (act of August 29, 1916, 39 Stat. 601), under heading "Coast Guard," authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to man any Coast Guard station or maintain any house of refuge as a Coast Guard station;

Title II of the act of February 19, 1941 (55 Stat. 11), as amended;

Act of December 16, 1941 (55 Stat. 807, ch. 586);

Provisions appearing under the heading "Limitations upon prosecutions," relating to crimes committed 2 years before arraignment, except for desertion committed in time of war, of the act of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 794);

Act of July 1, 1944 (58 Stat. 677, ch. 368);

Section 1 of the act of October 9, 1940 (54 Stat. 1061, ch. 788);

Section 2 of the act of June 19, 1912 (37 Stat. 138);

Provision of Naval Appropriation Act for the year 1918 (act of March 4, 1917, 39 Stat. 1192), authorizing the President to suspend provisions of the 8-hour law to contracts with the United States;

Section 6 of the act of March 3, 1931, as added by the act of August 30, 1935 (49 Stat. 1013, ch. 825);

Provision of Naval Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1917 (act of August 29, 1916, 39 Stat. 558), under heading "Pay, miscellaneous," for the admission for treatment of interned persons and prisoners of war, under the jurisdiction of the Navy Department, to the Government Hospital for the Insane;

Section 604 of the act of July 1, 1944 (58 Stat. 712, ch. 373);

Section 400 (b) of the act of June 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 288), as amended;

Act of July 11, 1946 (Public Law 499, 79th Cong.);

Act of July 9, 1942 (56 Stat. 654);

Act of June 19, 1936 (49 Stat. 1535).

SEC. 4. The first sentence of section 3805 of the Internal Revenue Code, as added by section 507 (a) of the act of October 21, 1942 (56 Stat. 798, 963), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"In the case of any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1940, no Federal income tax return of, or payment of any Federal income tax by, any corporation organized under the China Trade Act, 1922 (42 Stat. 849, U. S. C., title 15, ch. 4), shall become due until January 1, 1948."

SEC. 5. Nothing herein contained shall be held to exempt from prosecution or to relieve from punishment any offense heretofore committed in violation of any act.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the purpose of the joint resolution is to repeal or otherwise terminate operations under certain war and emergency statutory provisions which are no longer needed for the proper functioning of various agencies and departments of the Government.

In recognition of the interest of all its standing committees in this subject, the Senate, on January 8, 1947, adopted Senate Resolution 35, which directed each standing committee to make a full and complete study of all existing temporary and permanent emergency and wartime legislation within its jurisdiction, and to transmit its recommendations to the Committee on the Judiciary for review and correlation.

The Committee on the Judiciary has had the problem of terminating war and emergency statutes under continuing study for a considerable period of time. In the course of its study the committee caused to be compiled a list of all provisions of Federal statutes affected by the termination of hostilities, the war, or emergency, and that list has been printed as Senate Document No. 5.

Thereafter the Attorney General correlated and presented the views of the interested agencies of the executive branch of the Government on the statutes set forth in Senate Document No. 5. The report and recommendations of the Attorney General have been received, and are printed as Senate Document No. 42, and then were carefully considered by the committee.

In the prolonged and detailed study made of the various provisions, the committee considered the recommendations contained in Senate Document No. 42 and the recommendations in the reports of the standing committees. The committee has also had numerous consultations and conferences with representatives of the Government agencies, and has given careful consideration to the views of interested private agencies and persons. A public hearing, in which full opportunity to testify was afforded all interested persons, was also held on June 10, 1947.

On the basis of all the information developed as a result of the foregoing procedure, the committee has concluded that while it is necessary to continue in effect some of the war and emergency statutory provisions, a large number of such provisions should now be repealed or operations thereunder terminated. Senate Joint Resolution 123, as introduced on June 5, 1947, was prepared only for the purpose of establishing a basis upon which the committee might found its final conclusions.

The committee recommends that the termination of war and emergency statutory provisions should be made in positive terms. Accordingly, the joint resolution in the amended form reported out by the committee provides specifically for the repeal or other termination of the provisions of law granting war or emergency powers which should be terminated at this time. In this form the joint resolution leaves no doubt as to its exact operation.

Section 1 of the joint resolution would accomplish the immediate repeal of 60 statutory provisions, which include the bulk of all the temporary statutes enacted since the beginning of World War II.

Section 2 amends 16 additional statutory provisions so as to effect their repeal at a fixed time in the future, which will permit a necessary period for conversion to peacetime operations. The termination provisions in these statutes would no longer be related to a war or emergency, but the statutes would be amended so that they would expire on the dates provided in the resolution.

Section 3 of the joint resolution, which lists 108 statutory provisions, provides that in the interpretation of these provisions the time when the joint resolution becomes effective shall be deemed to be the date of the termination of any state of war heretofore declared by the Congress and of the national emergencies proclaimed by the President on September 8, 1939, and on May 27, 1941. Nearly all the provisions affected by this section are permanent legislation. Most of them are effective only during the periods of war or emergency. A few provide that the statutory authority shall continue for a specified period after the termination of war or an emergency. The section will have the effect of terminating immediately operations under the statutory provisions which are in effect only during a period of war or emergency. Authority under provisions which by their terms remain in effect for a specified period after the termination of the war or emergency will terminate at the end of that specified period. The permanent statutes affected by the section will remain as permanent legislation for use again upon the occurrence of the contingency provided for by their terms.

Section 5 provides that nothing contained in the resolution shall be held to exempt from prosecution or to relieve from punishment any offense committed in violation of any act.

Senate Document No. 5, prepared by this committee in the course of its study of the problem of terminating war controls, listed 542 temporary and emergency and wartime provisions of law. The committee has found that 44 of these have already or expired or been repealed or similarly affected, many on March 31, 1947, others upon the President's proclamation of the cessation of hostilities. Seventy provisions will expire on a definite date already fixed by Congress in the terms of the provisions themselves. Seventy-one are not war measures in the sense in which that term is usually interpreted, but relate to agricultural programs of the United States, provide rights for veterans, or pertain to other similar matters. Another group of statutory provisions set out in Senate Document No. 5 consists of those which relate to matters upon which legislation is now pending before the Congress. Nearly all of these pertain to the organization of the armed services. The committee felt that it would be inappropriate to repeal or otherwise terminate these provisions and thus interfere with the deliberations of the other standing committees of the Senate in matters pending before them.

SUMMARY

Briefly, the joint resolution has the effect of repealing immediately 60 statutory provisions, of effecting the repeal within 1 year of 16 additional statutory provisions, and of terminating operations under 108 further statutory provisions so far as those operations depend upon the existence of war heretofore declared by the Congress or the emergencies proclaimed by the President on September 8, 1939, and May 27, 1941.

Of the war and emergency statutes not affected by the resolution, a large number will terminate at some definite time in the future by reason of provisions already contained in them. Another group are not affected by the resolution because they are presently the subject of deliberations of standing committees of the Senate other than the Judiciary Committee.

CONCLUSION

The committee has decided that all aspects of the problem of termination of war and emergency statutes have been thoroughly examined, and that the extensive investigations, conferences, hearings, and deliberations have provided a basis for intelligent legislative action. The need for this action is urgent in that the amended Senate Joint Resolution 123 will do a great deal toward returning the machinery and operations of the Government from a war and emergency status to a permanent peacetime basis.

For the foregoing reasons, the Committee on the Judiciary reports Senate Joint Resolution 123, as amended, by unanimous consent, and urges that it be adopted.

Mr. President, there is on the desk of each Senator the report of the committee, which contains the bill and the substance of the statement I have already given to the Senate. I want to say, briefly, that it will be remembered that in January the program was developed, and a general resolution was adopted whereby there was referred to the various committees the question of determining what in their judgment should be done in relation to statutes or laws that had special application to the jurisdiction possessed by those committees. The committees functioned and reported, in accordance with the resolution, to the Committee on the Judiciary. The Committee on the Judiciary then proceeded to screen all the information it received from the committees; it proceeded to screen the information it had received from the executive departments of the

Government; and it then proceeded to hold conferences. There was a general agreement reached between the departments and the committee, so there is practically no controversial element in the joint resolution.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILEY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Am I correct in understanding that we are now discussing the control bill that concerns the continuance of control over manila hemp and other imported fibers?

Mr. WILEY. No; that is order No. 347 on the calendar, Senate bill 1461, a bill to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act. We are not discussing that. It is unaffected by the proposed legislation. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] should take up that bill immediately following action on the pending bill. I am informed the Senator from Kentucky is now on his way to the Senate Chamber.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Then those articles are the subject of another bill that is now before the Committee on the Judiciary, or which the Judiciary Committee has reported; is that not true?

Mr. WILEY. That is correct. That relates to the Second War Powers Act, title III.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. LODGE. Is it planned to take up Senate bill 1461 this morning?

Mr. WILEY. I hope that will be done. At least, if I have anything to say about it, we will consider it, for the reason that it is necessary that action on the part of both Houses of Congress and the President be had by the 30th of the month; otherwise there would be a hiatus respecting these matters that might be very detrimental to the functioning of our economy.

Mr. LODGE. So far as the Senator from Wisconsin knows, then, Calendar No. 347, Senate bill 1461, will be considered immediately following the disposition of the bill that is now being discussed?

Mr. WILEY. That is my understanding.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. Yes; I am happy to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In furtherance of what my colleague from Massachusetts has just said, I understand that the report on Calendar 347, which is Senate bill 1461, has not yet been printed and is not available, and, therefore, since one of our substantial Massachusetts businesses, employing over 1,000 persons, is vitally interested in the matter, I hope the matter may not come before us until there has been an opportunity at least to see it in printed form.

Mr. WILEY. In reply to that suggestion, I may say that I hope the Senator will not insist that that be done. The bill and the report have been submitted, but the Printing Office has been so swamped that apparently we may not get them promptly. The only question at issue, however, between the Senator and the committee would be the question of so-called control of cordage, and that matter can be discussed very openly and freely; and, whatever the judgment of the Senate is, that matter could even be removed from the bill. But we must get action on the Second War Powers Act.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. LODGE. May I understand that the able Senator from Wisconsin would be willing to accept an amendment, even if the bil' is not printed?

Mr. WILEY. The bill is printed, but the report is not printed.

Mr. LODGE. I wanted to inquire whether the Senator from Wisconsin might be willing to accept an amendment to the bill, even if the bill were not printed?

Mr. WILEY. The Senator from Massachusetts is not now talking about the bill that I am discussing. He is referring to order 347, Senate bill 1461, which is a bill to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act?

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. WILEY. That bill is not under consideration at this time; and, of course, I would not have authority to accept an amendment, anyway. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is in charge of that bill, and it involves only four or five items of the Second War Powers Act, one of which relates to cordage. The bill has just now been laid on my desk, and it can be brought up for consideration.

Mr. LODGE. I know that the Senator from Wisconsin is very influential insofar as that bill is concerned.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts. This is the first time the word "influential" has been used in connection with me, and I appreciate it.

Mr. LODGE. Well, I mean it.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I suggest that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH] make a statement in connection with the bill at this time, and that the Senate proceed to a conclusion upon it.

Mr. MCGRATH. Mr. President, addressing myself to Senate Joint Resolution 123, which is now before the Senate, I may say that the bill has been worked over very laboriously by the Committee on the Judiciary in complete cooperation with the Department of Justice. The measure deals with extremely complicated matters, because what is attempted to be done by it is to wipe off the statute books a great many of the acts that were placed upon them during the war period.

The purpose of the bill, as drawn, is to place the country largely back on a peacetime basis with respect to many of the functions that have been heretofore exercised on a wartime or emergency basis. The general purpose of the bill requires very little explanation, but if we were to begin to explain it in detail the Senate would perhaps be kept in session longer than the session concluded on Saturday.

Mr. President, I might say that there are over 500 different enactments that have had to be considered in the drafting of the joint resolution now before us. All these various enactments have been considered by the agencies of Government they affect. They have been analyzed by the experts in the Department of Justice who were familiar with the original enactments and their operations.

I am authorized to say on behalf of those who have been representing the administration, that the joint resolution in its present form is desirable. Should the measure not pass in its present form we will soon have to face the task of dealing with these acts one by one, and it is greatly to be feared that such an approach to the problem would result in endless confusion in the administrative branches of Government.

Therefore, Mr. President, without going into further details, for the matters involved are set forth adequately in the report, I should like to join with the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], in urging the passage of the joint resolution, with the assurance to the Members of the Senate on this side of the aisle, if they should need any assurance, and to all the Members of the Senate, that the measure we are asking the Senate to pass has been thoroughly studied, and we believe it to be the most orderly way possible to largely return the Government to a peacetime basis. Therefore, I hope the joint resolution will be passed.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I urge the adoption of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the committee to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert other language in lieu thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 123) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution to terminate certain emergency and war powers."

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 564) to provide for the performance of the duties of the office of President, in case of the removal, resignation, or inability both of the President and Vice President.

NAVY DEPARTMENT AND NAVAL SERVICE APPROPRIATIONS, 1948

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to lay aside the unfinished business, Senate bill 564, and that the Senate proceed to consider the Navy Department and naval service appropriation bill, fiscal year 1948.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to ask the Senator from Massachusetts if that request has been cleared with the Senator from Nebraska

[Mr. WHERRY], who has a standing request that the unfinished business have first consideration.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Massachusetts replies in the affirmative.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts that the unfinished business be laid aside and that the Senate proceed to consider the naval appropriation bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3493) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, this being an appropriation bill, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hatch	Murray
Baldwin	Hawkes	Myers
Ball	Hayden	O'Conor
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Brewster	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Hoey	Overton
Bridges	Holland	Pepper
Brooks	Ives	Reed
Buck	Jenner	Revercomb
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Wyo.
Byrd	Kem	Russell
Cain	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Capehart	Knowland	Smith
Capper	Langer	Sparkman
Chavez	Lodge	Stewart
Connally	Lucas	Taft
Cooper	McCarran	Taylor
Cordon	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McClellan	Thye
Downey	McFarland	Tobey
Dworshak	McGrath	Tydings
Eastland	McKellar	Umstead
Ecton	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ellender	Magnuson	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Wherry
Flanders	Martin	White
Fulbright	Maybank	Wiley
George	Millikin	Williams
Green	Moore	Wilson
Gurney	Morse	Young

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is absent because of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LODGE in the chair). Ninety-three Senator have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to make a very brief statement. To the best of my knowledge, this is a unanimous committee report. A summary of what the committee has recommended is on page 7 of the report. The committee believes that what it has recommended for the Navy will provide a well-balanced fighting navy, adequately manned. In dollars and cents, the committee has increased the net appropriation over what the House recommended by $15,500,000. In expenditures in the fiscal year 1948, it has reduced the House action by approximately $30,000,000. The bill would permit an increase in enlisted personnel to 395,000 men, with 43,000 officers, as compared with 355,000 men and 41,000 officers, as provided by the House.

In a nutshell, that is what the committee recommends for the action of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Naval Establishment—Office of the Secretary—Miscellaneous expenses," on page 3, line 16, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$14,500,000" and insert "$16,700,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Research, Navy," on page 4, line 6, after the word "Research", to strike out "$34,400,000" and insert "$34,000,000"; and in line 9, after the word "Laboratory", to insert a comma and "and the Special Devices Center."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Island governments," on page 5, line 10, after the word "areas", to strike out "$2,500,000" and insert "$3,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Naval Personnel—Training, education, and welfare, Navy," on page 6, line 12, after the word "For", to insert "expenses necessary for the."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, line 22, after the word "libraries", to insert "and expenses incident thereto."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 11, after "(34 U. S. C. 821)", to strike out "$12,000,000" and insert "$15,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, line 13, after the word "Navy", to strike out "$26,850,000" and insert "$29,850,000, to be accounted for as one fund."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Miscellaneous expenses, Bureau of Naval Personnel," on page 7, line 18, after the word "tags", to strike out "$300,000" and insert "$700,000."

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Naval Reserve," on page 8, line 5, after the word "activities", to strike out "$100,000,000" and insert "$99,700,000."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in connection with the Naval Reserve I notice that the Senate committee has cut the amount recommended by the House to the extent of approximately $300,000, as is well known by the Senator from Massachusetts, who himself has been very active in the matter of the Naval Reserve. I wonder if it was the consensus of the committee and the Navy Department that the amount recommended will be adequate to establish Naval Reserve units in the various districts of the United States. The Navy has been very active in this connection. In my own State and in the State of Massachusetts several communities have active Naval Reserve units. They are not Naval Reserve units such as we had prior to World War II, which existed largely only on paper. These are active, going concerns. The men take pride in their commissions, and they undergo training every year. The Navy has generously placed at their disposal many ships. I am wondering if it is the consensus of opinion that the amount recommended will cover not only the existing activities, but also possible future activities in the coming year.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would reply to my colleague from Washington that the House gave the Naval Reserve the full amount requested in the budget. The Senate cut it by $300,000, but increased by $450,000 the amount to go into purchasing Naval Reserve items. That was entirely agreeable to the Navy. They can put the money into the other item and they probably could not put it into the first item.

Mr. MAGNUSON. So, what the Navy itself probably contemplates and plans for the coming fiscal year is what it thinks will do the job?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 8, line 5.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Naval Academy," on page 8, line 13, after the word "models", to strike out the colon and the following proviso: *"Provided*, That no part of any appropriation in this act shall be available for the pay or allowances of any enlisted man of the Navy or Marine Corps assigned to duty at the Naval Academy, if such assignment will increase the total number so assigned above 1,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Ships—Maintenance, Bureau of Ships," on page 9, line 10, after the word "vessels", to insert "leasing of laying-up facilities and docks"; on page 10, line 19, after the word "expeditions," to strike out "$300,000,000" and insert "$322,000,000"; and in line 23, after the word "Fund", to insert "and/or the Clothing and Small Stores Fund."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, to my mind, this is the most important item in the naval appropriation bill. As the Senator from Massachusetts well knows, when the President suggested that the various bureaus of the Navy cut and economize after the war, the Bureau of Ships probably did the best job of any of the Navy Department bureaus.

It is my understanding that the House gave them an over-all cut of approximately 17 percent of their budget estimate. In effect, that means to the Bureau of Ships an even greater cut, because they were diligent in cutting ahead of time, and cutting down to the rock

bottom of their budget estimates. Of course, as the Senator well knows, the maintenance of the fleet, both active and inactive, is the most important item in naval appropriations, and one of the largest items. It affects employment in all the navy yards, in Massachusetts, in my own State, in California, at Philadelphia, Norfolk, New York, Mare Island, San Diego, Terminal Island, Hunters Point, and Bremerton.

The Navy had set an over-all figure, again a rock-bottom estimate, in order to maintain the fleet which Congress itself had given a mandate to the Navy to maintain, and there was a rock bottom of approximately 90,000 civilian employees scattered about through the various navy yards. The House cut that amount approximately $72,000,000——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It was $74,000,000.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That would seriously curtail the Navy's figure of 90,000 civilian mechanics and employees in the various navy yards, to a great extent. I believe the ceiling was 9,000 in a Navy yard. That would cut it down to approximately 8,200. Of course it is false economy—and I am sure the Senator from Massachusetts agrees with me—to postpone repairs to a ship. It means that next year it will be necessary to make more repairs, because both the active fleet and the inactive fleet must be maintained. I am wondering whether or not, from the hearings and from the testimony of the very able head of the Bureau of Ships, Admiral Mills, who cut his budget almost to the extreme when he might have asked for more, the committee learned whether the restoration of $22,000,000, as it affects the navy yard in Boston as well as the navy yard in my State, will seriously curtail the so-called employment ceilings in those navy yards.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I will first say to my colleague that when I said $74,000,000 was cut by the House I should have said $66,000,000. The action of the Senate restored approximately $22,000,000. Admiral Mills, who was one of the best witnesses who appeared before the subcommittee, stated that the restoration will permit the maintenance of the active fleet and will result in a standard of maintenance which, while it is not all that is desired, will be sufficient. Furthermore, it will permit the overhauling of some of the inactive ships and permit procurement of electronic material. While this cannot go on indefinitely, it is enough for this year, and will take care of the active fleet and make possible some work on the inactive fleet, and allow the procurement of some new electronic material that is necessary.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In other words, Admiral Mills was of the opinion that the restoration of $22,000,000 would be sufficient, over and above the House cut, to keep up repairs to the so-called active fleet?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And that also they would be able to do some work on what we term the inactive fleet?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. What would this do to the 90,000 personnel ceiling that was set?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It would mean, I believe, some reduction, but not very much. That subject was not gone into in detail. There will be some reduction, of course.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In other words, the committee left it open so that the Bureau of Ships itself could lay off men; that is, an over-all layoff, rather than in a specific yard?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I understood Admiral Mills' testimony, the yards that will be kept going will keep the ordinary number of employees. Their basic employees will be continued and their basic work will be continued.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Was there any testimony at all to the effect that some of the so-called wartime yards might be closed?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The whole bill provides for the Navy in such a way that the essential shore establishments for a well-balanced battle fleet will be maintained, and naturally the Navy will continue to close down those shore establishments which were essential for war purposes only. That question was not gone into in detail, because it was left to the Navy to keep those shore stations which were essential for a well-balanced fleet in the Pacific and in the Atlantic.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In other words, the Bureau of Ships was given a margin within which they could vary, as the circumstances required, as between the various Navy yards?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Was there any testimony at all regarding the so-called east and west coast yards, as to the complement of the fleet that now lies in the Atlantic as against the complement of the fleet in the Pacific?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Admiral Nimitz in his prepared testimony told the number of carriers and the size of the battle fleet in the Pacific as opposed to the Atlantic Fleet. If my memory is correct, he said there were more ships in the Pacific than in the Atlantic, but I am not certain of that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If it is not confidential, was there any testimony at all as to the size of the Atlantic Fleet as compared with the size of the Pacific Fleet for the coming year?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am informed that it is broken down about 50–50 at the present time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I appreciate the fact that the Senator did not go into this matter in detail, because it is a matter of operations rather than ship maintenance, and it is a difficult thing to separate them, but the Nation's naval strength, the greatest combined naval strength in the world, is now divided equally between the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. With a little balance in favor of the Pacific Fleet. If the Senator will read the table at the bottom of page 3 of the report he will see the number of ships that will be in active service as a result of the Senate's action.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Is there a great variance from the complement of the fleet as of a year ago? In other words, are more ships being moved to the Atlantic than were normally moved in the period beginning with World War II?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That movement has not yet started, but I believe it will be in that direction.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In an easterly direction, through the canal?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Illinois, if the Senator from Washington has concluded.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I had one more question I wanted to ask, but the Senator from Illinois may go ahead.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me ask the able Senator from Massachusetts just two or three questions in order that I may clear up some misinformation in my own mind. I have not had an opportunity to read the report of the committee. Can the Senator tell me how much the House of Representatives cut in actual money below what was requested in the budget of the President of the United States?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The House cut the budget estimates by $378,000,000, resulting in a reduction in expenditures for the fiscal year 1948 of approximately $374,000,000.

The Senate restored $177,000,000 of the cut, making a net cut in appropriations for 1948 of $201,000,000. But the Senate rescinded appropriations of 1946 and 1947 in the amount of $161,000,000, making a net increase in appropriations of $15,500,000, but a net reduction in total expenditures for 1948 of $30,000,000.

Mr. LUCAS. Do I correctly understand that there is only a $30,000,000 difference between what the President estimated in his budget and what the Senate Appropriations Committee finally agreed upon?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No; what it amounts to is that the Senate committee's action is to cut the President's budget by $200,000,000.

What the committee has done is to cut the appropriations submitted by the President by $200,000,000, and to cut the expenditures for the fiscal year 1948 by $400,000,000; but it has increased, net, the appropriations made by the House by $15,500,000, but has reduced the expenditures recommended by the House for the fiscal year 1948 by $30,000,000, making a net reduction in appropriations of $200,000,000, but a net reduction in expenditures of $400,000,000.

Mr. LUCAS. I think I understand the statement the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts has made.

Now let me inquire briefly just where these cuts will take place in the Navy. Probably the Senator from Massachusetts has already told the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to answer that question a little obliquely.

Mr. LUCAS. Certainly.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The President's message, in dollars and cents, permitted a Navy of 400,000 men and 45,000 officers. The House cut the number of men, on the basis of an average throughout the year, to 355,000 men and 42,000 officers.

The Senate committee's action has restored the number of men to 395,000, and the officers to 43,000. In other words, by the Senate committee's action, we have restored sufficient men in uniform to operate the same number of ships that the President recommended. The cuts we have made may be stated as follows: We have cut some in rescinding contracts for the newest of equipment; we have cut some in maintenance; and we have rescinded some of the project orders and contract orders for new ships and for the maintenance of some of the ships that are in the inactive fleet.

But, as I told the Senator from Washington, Admiral Mills appeared before us, and we have restored enough money to maintain adequately the active fighting fleet.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me ask this further question: Is the report by the Appropriations Committee a unanimous report?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is.

Mr. LUCAS. I know that the Senator from Massachusetts is as much interested in an adequate national defense in these uncertain times as is any other Member of the Senate, and so I should like to know whether he feels that what the committee has recommended is adequate to meet the needs of the Navy during the fiscal year 1948.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do believe so. Furthermore, I believe that the Navy itself, although it would like to have more money, will get along and is satisfied with what we have provided.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator from Massachusetts believe that as a result of these cuts we shall in any way be impairing the efficiency or the adequacy of the Navy in this crucial period of world history?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In answer to that question I say, No; I do not. I think what we have done by our action is to postpone, if you will, by a little, providing the latest type of radar, boring all the guns, providing all the reserves of ammunition and the reserves of materials for building new ships or maintaining ships, but we have not affected the fighting forces. We have permitted the Navy to have what it calls well-rounded battle task forces.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me ask one further question, please. First, I wish to say to my able friend, the Senator from Massachusetts, that in my humble judgment there is nothing more important at the present time, in view of the critical conditions which now exist in the world, than for us to have an up-to-date, adequate, efficient United States Navy. As a result of the unanimous report of the Appropriations Committee upon this vital item in connection with the President's budget, I assume that the Senate conferees, of which the able Senator from Massachusetts probably will be chairman, will do everything within their power to keep this item where it has been fixed by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I say to my able colleague from Illinois that there is no one who feels any stronger along the lines he has so ably stated than I do.

Mr. LUCAS. I know of the record of the Senator from Massachusetts on this question. My only desire in interrogating him along this line is to see that when the conferees meet nothing will be done to disturb what seems to me to be a fair and honest verdict by our Appropriations Committee with respect to this cut. The Senator from Massachusetts has told me that in his judgment nothing has been done that will impair the efficiency or adequacy of the Navy in this unusual hour of uncertainty in world affairs. I simply plead with the Senator and all other Senators who will be members of the conference committee to stick by their guns, because I feel that it is necessary to do so. I have a sort of intuitive judgment in this matter. I do not know anything about the facts; I have not studied the facts; I admit that I have not read the report but I have a feeling that we cannot do too much to stand by the Navy and the Army at this particular time.

I dislike to go against their judgment, although I know there are a great number of Senators who feel that the Army and Navy come here and ask for many things they do not deserve; and that may be true; there may be something in that. But I would rather have just a little too much at this particular time than not have quite enough. I think it is very important, as I view it, to do everything possible to get what the Appropriations Committee has recommended.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think our committee has done just what the Senator has suggested.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. First of all, what was the House percentage over-all cut of the Navy budget, as compared with the budget request?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In appropriations, about 11¼ percent; in money to be spent in 1948 it was $374,000,000.

Mr. MAGNUSON. What was the Senate committee cut, percentagewise?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. We restored $177,000,000 of a cut of $378,000,000, leaving the net cut in appropriations $201,000,000.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Which would be, as I calculate mentally, around 5 or 6 percent, would it not?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Between 5 and 6 percent.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The ship-maintenance appropriation was cut in the House 17.5 percent?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It was cut a net amount of $66,000,000.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Which means 17.5 percent, as I recall the figures.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would have to figure that out.

Mr. MAGNUSON. This is the point: Whereas the over-all cut in the Navy, in the House Appropriations Committee, was 11 percent, the Bureau of Ships appropriations was cut 5 or 6 percent more than the over-all cut, and, to my mind, of course, that is the most important item in the Navy budget. The restoration of the twenty-two million, as compared with the 5 or 6 percent cut, which now exists over the budget estimates, is how much in regard to the Bureau of Ships?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Without trying to figure the percentage, what we have done is to put back personnel to operate the active fleet and cut away a little bit of the maintenance, also rescinding appropriations of 1946 and 1947 on contract orders and project orders.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I see in the committee report that the budget message calls for 850 combat ships. The House action reduced that to 765 combat ships. This refers to the active fleet. The Senate committee restoration, according to the committee report, is to have 850 combat ships, which is what the budget calls for. How does the committee justify a complete restoration of the active fleet to 850, and still cut the maintenance of that active fleet a certain percentage over the budget estimate?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Because the Navy, in figuring its maintenance and figuring its restorations, and so on, had figured to the topmost degree of efficiency, figuring on painting right down to the keel, installing the newest type of radar equipment, and so on. We felt it was much more important to restore the personnel who will operate a well-manned, fighting fleet, than to paint down to the keel, and install the newest type of radar.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Let those things go for a time?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In other words, the cut in ship maintenance will not seriously handicap the maintenance of the 850 ships which the President asked for. It might postpone some of the extras?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct, and that was gone into very carefully by the committee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Did Admiral Mills testify at all as to what the cut would be in the navy yard appropriation due to the Senate committee action?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. He definitely did not. What he wants to do, as I said, is to keep the navy yards, which they expect to maintain with their skilled employees, with all the help necessary to maintain those yards, to distribute the work so that those yards will be maintained, and not build up some at the expense of others.

Mr. MAGNUSON. For the purpose of the RECORD again, and I appreciate this is general and not exact, the Senator's best estimate is that if the new ships appropriation is cut, let us say, 5 or 6 percent, that would react in time to a cut of 5 or 6 percent from the present over-all manpower total, in Boston, Philadelphia, Bremerton, and the like?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I understand not. If a yard is to be given up, of course, that yard will be put on a caretaker basis, and it will affect those yards, but the employees in the yards which are to be maintained, which the Navy expects to maintain, will not be affected to the same extent.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Was there any testimony as to which yards would be maintained and which might be put on a caretaker basis?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There was not.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is reasonable to assume, is it not, from the general testimony, that the so-called old-established yards would probably be definitely maintained if the amount were sufficient to maintain them adequately?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would assume so, but I cannot speak authoritatively on that, because that question was not gone into.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Is there any amount placed in the bill at all for new ship construction?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There is, but I cannot tell the Senator just how much without going into the records.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Is that for combat ships?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I so understand.

Mr. MAGNUSON How much did the Senate committee restore as to research?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The research figure submitted by the budget was left untouched by the House. The Senate committee again took the same action it did in regard to the reserve. It cut a few hundred thousand dollars of the amount for research, and put it into the item for administrative assistants, so that all research could be properly tabulated, and so on.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In other words, a very small amount?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It was $400,000 out of an appropriation of $34,000,000.

Mr. MAGNUSON. What did the Senate committee do in regard to the Bureau of Aeronautics, compared with the House action?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator look at the top of page 4 of the report? That shows the total operable fleet, with aircraft, operable within personnel limitations. In other words, the Senate committee action restores almost the full number of ships the budget called for, though not quite.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Seventy-eight million, I see on page 11 of the report. Is that correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The budget estimate for the Bureau of Aviation of the Navy was $529,500,000. The House cut it to $474,000,000, and the Senate restored $28,890,000, making a budget of $502,890,000, or a rough cut of just under $27,000,000.

Mr. MAGNUSON. To sum this up, in other words, the over-all Senate action on naval appropriations would allow the United States Navy—and it is gaged by personnel; that is the yardstick—some 395,000 men and 42,000 officers, as compared to the budget request and the President's request of 500,000 men and about 43,000 officers, generally speaking?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. We have to make this distinction. The President in his budget made request for 46,000 officers and 425,000 enlisted men, but the money requested in submitting the budget was only enough to take care of 45,000 officers and 400,000 men. What the Senate has done is to permit 395,000 men, instead of 400,000, and 42,000 officers, instead of 45,000 officers.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Does the Senator recall the congressional mandate as to the number of men in the fleet? Was it 500,000 men?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If my memory is correct, it was 425,000 men.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Four hundred and twenty-five thousand men?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is according to my memory.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It was approximately 500,000 over-all?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. A little under.

Mr. MAGNUSON. So that, under the Senator's able direction, in view of the drastic House cuts, the over-all strength of the Navy, if it is cut—and it may not be cut; the efficiency can still well go on, despite some cuts—is practically what Congress mandated to the Navy Department as to the size of the so-called active fleet?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Almost, but not quite.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Just one more question, and I will be through. I do not want to delay the Senator, but this, to me, is a very important matter. Under "General provisions," section 103 is again placed in the bill, and that is the result, is it not, I will ask the Senator from Massachusetts, of a practice of long standing on the part of the Navy Department and Congress?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is in the same form as it has been since 1915.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator. I compliment the Senator from Massachusetts on the very efficient and fine job he has done on the naval appropriations. I think the RECORD should show that I served with the Senator, and I have been with him many times on matters affecting the welfare of the Navy, and when the welfare of the country as it pertains to the Navy has been at stake and at issue. I will say that his judgment on the matter has always been wise and farsighted. As the Senator from Illinois well said, I know the Senator from Massachusetts agrees that this is most important; in other words, it is our first line of defense, and although the Navy had a great many friends during the war, I am glad to see that the Navy also has some friends in peacetime. We do not want to relapse into the days of the twenties, when we practically scuttled the Navy. I think this bill is very adequate, and I hope the Senator, as the Senator from Illinois says, will stick to his guns in the conference.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. MYERS. Did I understand the Senator to say that in the maintenance item the Senate has further reduced the House cuts?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No.

Mr. MYERS. What has been done in the maintenance item, with regard to the House cuts?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senate committee has restored $22,000,000 of a $66,000,000 cut from the appropriation for maintenance of the Bureau of Ships. Also the Senate committee recommends the rescission of a certain number of contract orders and project orders for 1946 and 1947, on which very little work is being done, as we are informed by the Navy, amounting to $161,000,000. Those contracts and those project orders have been rescinded.

Mr. MYERS. The Senator from Washington, addressing a question to the Senator from Massachusetts, I believe, inquired whether the Navy Department had given any indication as to which yards might be used as standby yards.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. They did not, to our committee, in any way, and I deliberately did not ask them that question, because I did not want to get into any questions, saying this yard should be opened, or that yard should be closed. The Navy, as I understand it, and as Admiral Mills and Admiral Nimitz told the committee, expects to keep the shore establishment that will permit them to operate balanced task forces in both the Pacific and the Atlantic. I did not go into the questions in any way, except that the established yards will not, as I understand, be put down below the fundamental number of employees which they have had over a period of years.

Mr. MYERS. I surmise, then, from that statement, that the committee has no intention of going into that question.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not think the committee ought to go into that question.

Mr. MYERS. Could the Senator inform me what effect the bill might have on the naval aircraft factory in Philadelphia?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I can only say this—and I did not bring it up—the question of antisubmarine patrol was left uncertain between the Army and the Navy, when the budget was submitted, and we have put in $78,000,000 to build antisubmarine aircraft patrol over the next 3 years. That is a contract authorization that does not include any money in the fiscal year 1948, but permits the planning, and we shall have to appropriate for it in 1949 and 1950. But we do that because the antisubmarine work has been definitely established as a part of the Navy function.

Mr. MYERS. I understand there has been an over-all personnel at that aircraft factory of approximately 6,000 people. Does the Senator have any idea as to whether or not the bill may require a reduction in that staff or in that force?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No. There, again, I would say to my colleague from Pennsylvania, we did not go into that matter. I do not think it was the intention of the committee to go into this aircraft factory or that aircraft factory, or the navy yard; we left that entirely to the Navy.

Mr. MYERS. I think this is the one real aircraft factory that the Navy has. Would the Senator be able to indicate, as the result of this bill, whether or not they could maintain the same level that they have had in the past, in the years before the war and in the years during the war? Would they be able to maintain their same personnel level of employment?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I could not answer that question in detail. What we

did was to put back enough personnel so that they could operate the same number of aircraft that the budget provided, which they requested, and to allow enough oil, to allow enough materials, and to allow enough ground crews to operate those planes safely.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. O'CONOR. May I inquire further from the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts regarding long-range antisubmarine patrol service? The Senator has very kindly made observations with regard to it, and I would appreciate it very much if he could elaborate somewhat on it, because of the importance of that subject.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The only elaboration I can make is that we have done what the Navy requested. As I understand it, when the budget was submitted—this is perhaps repeating what I have already said—there was a difference of opinion as to whether the antisubmarine production should be in the hands of the Army aircraft or in the hands of the Navy. That question has since been decided that it is a Navy function, so we put in $78,000,000 of contract authorization, which is all that was asked for; but none of this will be spent in 1948, but it will be spent in 1949 and 1950, on providing the so-called "turtles."

Mr. O'CONOR. I am very grateful to the Senator, but I would like to ask whether he believes that, in view of the great importance of this particular phase of the subject, that there is guaranteed adequate provision for antisubmarine patrol service, even without the appropriation at this time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. We have a letter here from the Secretary of the Navy to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], chairman of the committee, which would indicate that the $78,000,000 was eliminated by the Bureau of the Budget. We put it back. The Secretary goes on to say that no new funds are needed to be provided in 1948. He also says that additional contract authority will be necessary ultimately in the amount of $170,000,000, but only $78,000,000 is requested at this time, and that is all the committee placed in the bill.

Mr. O'CONOR. May I ask whether or not there was any change in the figures submitted by the Navy in that particular respect?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am informed not.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from Massachusetts. I may say that I would like to echo the sentiments expressed by other Senators in commending very heartily the splendid work of the Senator from Massachusetts on this very important subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Ordnance—Ordnance and ordnance stores, Navy," on page 11, line 3, after the word "For" where it occurs the first time, to insert "necessary expenses of"; and in line 15, after "(Public Law 604)", to strike out "$180,000,000" and insert "$192,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Supplies and Accounts—Pay and subsistence of naval personnel," on page 13, line 5, after the word "stopped", to strike out the colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That no appropriation contained in this act shall be available for the pay, allowances, or other expenses of any enlisted man or civil employee performing service in the residence or quarters of an officer or officers on shore as a cook, waiter, or other work of a character performed by a household servant, but nothing herein shall be construed as preventing the voluntary employment in any such capacity of a retired enlisted man or a transferred member of the Fleet Reserve without additional expense to the Government, nor the sale of meals to officers by general messes on shore as regulated by detailed instructions from the Navy Department; total, pay, and allowances"; and in line 17, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "$1,153,000,000" and insert "$1,219,777,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 20, after the word "law", to strike out "$47,000,000" and insert "$53,981,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 22, after the word "personnel", to strike out "$1,200,000,000" and insert $1,273,758,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 6, after the word "Fund", to insert "and/or the Naval Stock Fund."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Transportation and recruiting of naval personnel," on page 15, line 10, after the word "appropriation", to strike out "$34,000,000" and insert "$36,631,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts," on page 15, line 24, after the word "yards", to insert a semicolon and "losses sustained by disbursing officers of the Navy receiving counterfeit currency and counterfeit military payment certificates; and amounts necessary to adjust deficiencies in the accounts of disbursing officers of the Navy resulting from transactions authorized by Public Law 554, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved December 23, 1944"; on page 16, line 5, before the word "In", to strike out "$150,000,000" and insert "$155,000,000"; and in line 10, after the word "Fund", to insert "and/or the Clothing and Small Stores Fund."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Transportation of things," on page 16, line 14, after the word "Guard", to strike out "$50,000,000" and insert "$58,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Fuel, Navy," on page 16, line 20, after the word "facilities", to strike out "$50,000,000" and insert "$55,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Yards and Docks—Maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks," on page 17, line 16, after the word "Docks", to insert "maintenance, repair, and operation of passenger-carrying vehicles for the Navy Department; rental of passenger-carrying vehicles"; in line 20, after "(Public Law 604)", to strike out "$126,000,000" and insert "$128,650,000"; on page 18, line 6, after the word "housing", to strike out "$3,450,000" and insert "$3,800,000"; and in line 7, after the words "in all", to strike out "$129,450,000" and insert "$132,450,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Aeronautics—Aviation, Navy," on page 18, line 19, after the word "plants", to insert a comma and "and for the employment of group IV–b personnel in the Bureau of Aeronautics necessary for the purposes of this item of appropriation"; on page 19, line 8, after "(Public Law 604)", to strike out "$291,000,000" and insert "$319,890,000"; in line 10, after the words "in all", to strike out "$474,000,000" and insert "$502,890,000"; and in line 21, after the word "of", to strike out "$170,000,000" and insert "$248,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Marine Corps—Pay, Marine Corps," on page 20, at the beginning of line 1, to strike out "$26,400,000" and insert "$28,384,000"; in the same line, after the word "including", to strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "$3,316,000"; in line 7, after the word "allowance", to strike out "$3,500,000" and insert "$3,728,000"; in line 8, after the word "allowance", to strike out "$5,100,000" and insert "$5,470,000"; and in the same line, after the words "in all", to strike out "$35,000,000" and insert "$37,582,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 6, after the word "troops", to strike out "$1,342,000" and insert "$1,448,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 7, after the words "In all", to strike out "$189,128,000" and insert "$191,816,000"; and in line 10, after the word "fund", to insert "and shall be available for amounts necessary to adjust deficiencies in the accounts of disbursing officers of the Marine Corps resulting from transactions authorized by the act of December 23, 1944."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Pay of civil force, Marine Corps," on page 21, line 19, after "Marine Corps", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,175,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 22, after "Marine Corps", to strike out "$900,000" and insert "$1,050,000"; and in the same line, after the words "in all", to strike out "$1,900,000" and insert "$2,225,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Shipbuilding—Ordnance for new construction," on page 25, line 9, after the word "plants", to insert "and group IV–b personnel in the Bureau of Ordnance necessary for the purpose of this appropriation."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Navy Department—Salaries," on page 26, line 8, after the figures "$7,000", to strike out "$3,600,000" and insert "$4,471,100."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 9, after "Office of Naval Research", to strike out "$764,000" and insert "$1,244,100."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 11, after the word "boards", to strike out "$17,500" and insert "$22,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 12, after the word "Library", to strike out "$50,000" and insert "$57,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 13, after "Office of Judge Advocate General", to strike out "$300,000" and insert "$348,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 14, after "Office of Chief of Naval Operations", to strike out "$1,400,000" and insert "$1,575,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 16, after "Board of Inspection and Survey", to strike out "$35,000" and insert "$37,400."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 17, after "Office of Director of Naval Communications", to strike out "$1,625,000" and insert "$2,454,300."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 19, after "Office of Naval Intelligence", to strike out "$900,000" and insert "$1,182,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 20, after "Bureau of Naval Personnel", to strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "$3,897,700."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 21, after "Hydrographic Office", to strike out "$1,800,000" and insert "$2,200,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 23, after the word "work", to strike out "$400,000" and insert "$433,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 24, after "Bureau of Ships", to strike out "$5,450,000" and insert "$6,950,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I note on page 26 that again for the Bureau of Ships the committee has added some $1,500,000 for salaries. Is that because of the fact that the research and planning was transferred into that office?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator repeat his question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I see that the Bureau of Ships has been granted also an increase in salaries.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That was done at the request of Admiral Mills. The money that was given to him for the Bureau of Maintenance would not be adequately administered unless we increased the number of supervisors and administrators, and the purpose was to increase this amount in order that he could efficiently spend the money we gave him.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is a very important item for the Bureau of Ships, and I do hope that that increase will also be sustained in conference, because this planning means so much.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 25, after "Bureau of Ordnance", to strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "$3,710,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 1, after "Bureau of Supplies and Accounts", to strike out "$4,300,000" and insert "$4,710,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 3, after "Bureau of Medicine and Surgery", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,284,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 5, after "Bureau of Yards and Docks", to strike out "$2,000,000" and insert "$2,574,600."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 6, after "Bureau of Aeronautics", to strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "$2,400,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 7, after "Navy Department", to strike out "$32,660,100" and insert "$39,569,300."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Contingent expenses," on page 27, line 19, after the word "offices", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,060,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Printing and binding," on page 28, line 4, after the word "Office", to strike out "$2,750,000" and insert "$3,050,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Contingent and miscellaneous expenses, Hydrographic Office," on page 28, line 13, after the word "charts", to strike out "$900,000" and insert "$1,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Contingent and miscellaneous expenses, Naval Observatory," on page 29, line 3, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$48,000" and insert "$50,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "General provisions," in section 106, on page 34, line 18, after the word "appropriations", to insert a semicolon and "payment of rewards, as authorized by law, for information leading to the discovery of missing naval property or the recovery thereof."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, after line 2, to strike out:

SEC. 109. During the fiscal year 1948 the Secretary is authorized to procure intermittent services in accordance with section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 600), but at rates for individuals not in excess of $50 per day.

And in lieu thereof to insert the following:

SEC. 109. Appropriations in this act shall be available for the payment of employment at the seat of government or elsewhere of temporary (not in excess of one year) or intermittent services in accordance with section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 600), but at rates for individuals not in excess of $50 per day.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, in the amendment on page 35, I offer an amendment to strike out in lines 12 and 13 the words "but at rates for individuals not in excess of $50 per day." If this amendment to the amendment is adopted it will result in reducing the amount to approximately $38.50 a day, and would be in line with the Appropriations Committee's action on other bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts has offered an amendment to the committee amendment on page 35, in lines 12 and 13, to strike out the words "but at rates for individuals not in excess of $50 per day." The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, line 3, after the word "expenses", to strike out "(including the pay, allowance, and subsistence of naval and Marine Corps personnel)"; in line 6, after the word "equipment", to insert "except vessels"; and in line 16, after the word "paid", to insert "and the Navy Department is authorized to apportion, obligate, and expend funds from the several appropriations involved in advance of the reimbursement thereto: *Provided*, That reimbursement shall not be made for pay and allowances and subsistence of naval and Marine Corps personnel within the numbers appropriated for."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, after line 8, to insert:

SEC. 114. The Secretary may transfer not to exceed 5 percent of any of the foregoing appropriations to any other appropriation or appropriations made by this act, but no such appropriation shall be increased more than 5 percent as a result of such transfer: *Provided*, That a quarterly statement of any such transfers shall be transmitted to the chairmen of the Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives and of the Senate.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. With respect to the new section 114, of course, it is common practice to allow flexibility, but I

will ask the Senator from Massachusetts whether that was the percentage the Navy itself asked for?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The answer is "Yes." That section was left out of the 1948 appropriation bill by the House. It was in the 1947 appropriation bill and was in previous appropriation bills. The provision will allow a transfer from one appropriation to another of not exceeding 5 percent, but not to exceed 5 percent of the amount of the appropriation to which it was transferred.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But the percentage was what the Navy itself suggested?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is a wise provision, and I am glad to see it back in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 37, after line 16, to insert:

TITLE II—REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 201. Amounts made available to the Navy Department from appropriations are hereby reduced in the sums hereinafter set forth, such sums to be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury immediately upon the approval of this act:

NAVAL ESTABLISHMENT

Office of the Secretary: "Miscellaneous expenses, Navy, 1946," $2,000,000.

Bureau of Naval Personnel:

"Instruction, Navy, 1946," $325,000;

"Welfare and recreation, Navy, 1946," $1,250,000;

"Naval Reserve, 1946," $12,000,000;

"Naval Reserve, 1947," $12,000,000.

Bureau of Ships:

"Maintenance, Bureau of Ships, 1946," $105,000,000;

"Maintenance, Bureau of Ships, 1947," $20,000,000;

Bureau of Ordnance:

"Ordnance and ordnance stores, Navy, 1946," $30,000,000;

"Ordnance and ordnance stores, Navy, 1947," $7,000,000.

Bureau of Supplies and Accounts:

"Pay and subsistence of naval personnel, 1946," $50,000,000;

"Transportation and recruiting of naval personnel, 1946," $10,000,000;

"Maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, 1946," $6,000,000;

"Maintenance, Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, 1947," $10,000,000;

"Transportation of things, Navy, 1946," $25,000,000;

"Fuel, Navy, 1946," $10,000,000.

Bureau of Medicine and Surgery: "Medical Department, Navy, 1946," $2,000,000.

Bureau of Yards and Docks:

"Maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks, 1946," $3,000,000;

"Maintenance, Bureau of Yards and Docks, 1947," $3,000,000.

Bureau of Aeronautics:

"Aviation, Navy, 1946," $65,000,000;

"Aviation, Navy, 1947," $10,000,000.

Marine Corps: "General Expenses, Marine Corps, 1946," $20,000,000.

In all, $403,575,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, after line 16, to insert:

No person shall be held liable for an overobligation of any above-listed appropriation when such overobligation occurs as a result of the approval of this act. Such overobligations shall be reduced in such a manner and at such a rate as to assure no overexpenditure.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, line 22, to change the section number from 114 to 202.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments.

The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 3493) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. OVERTON, and Mr. GREEN conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of the Senate proceedings.)

TEXT OF FINAL ARTICLES REVISION CONVENTION—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As in executive session, the Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting Executive EE, Eightieth Congress, first session, an authentic text of the Final Articles Revision Convention, 1946 (No. 80), adopted at the Twenty-ninth Session of the International Labor Conference at Montreal on October 9, 1946. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the convention, and the communication and convention will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; and, without objection, the communication from the President will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The communication from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith an authentic text of the Final Articles Revision Convention, 1946 (No. 80), adopted at the Twenty-ninth Session of the International Labor Conference at Montreal on October 9, 1946. In my opinion this convention is essential to bring the language of previously adopted conventions into conformity with present conditions and specifically to recognize the present relationship of the International Labor Organization to the United Nations under article 57 of the Charter of the United Nations.

This convention was adopted unanimously by the Conference. On the part of the United States delegation, affirmative votes were cast by the two Government delegates, by the delegate representing employers, and by the delegate representing workers.

The purpose of the convention is to make verbal changes in the texts of conventions adopted at the previous 28 sessions and to assign responsibility to the Director General of the International Labor Office for certain of the chancery functions for which previously the Secretary General of the League of Nations was responsible.

The effect of this convention is described in more detail in the report of the Secretary of State, enclosed herewith, and in a communication from the Secretary of Labor, a copy of which is enclosed.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 24, 1947.*

(Enclosures: (1) Authentic text of Convention No. 80; (2) report of the Secretary of State; (3) from the Secretary of Labor.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. VANDENBERG, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

James Bruce, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Argentina.

William J. Sebald, of the District of Columbia, and sundry other persons for appointment as foreign service officers in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

PROTOCOL AMENDING THE AGREEMENTS, CONVENTIONS, AND PROTOCOLS ON NARCOTIC DRUGS

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senate to take up the Narcotics Protocol which has been on the Executive Calendar for sometime. It is totally without controversy of any nature, and I am sure that its approval will be nothing more than a formality. I shall be glad to make a statement in connection with it.

I ask unanimous consent that, as in executive session, the Narcotics Protocol, Executive N, Eightieth Congress, first session, be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan?

There being no objection, as in executive session, the Senate, as in committee of the whole, proceeded to consider the Protocol, Executive N (80th Cong., 1st sess.), a protocol amending the agreements, conventions, and protocols on narcotic drugs, opened for signature at Lake Success on December 11, 1946, and signed on behalf of the United States of America on that date, which was read the second time, as follows:

PROTOCOL AMENDING THE AGREEMENTS, CONVENTIONS AND PROTOCOLS ON NARCOTIC DRUGS CONCLUDED AT THE HAGUE ON 23 JANUARY 1912, AT GENEVA ON 11 FEBRUARY 1925 AND 19 FEBRUARY 1925, AND 13 JULY 1931, AT BANGKOK ON 27 NOVEMBER 1931 AND AT GENEVA ON 26 JUNE 1936

The States Parties to the present Protocol, considering that under the international Agreements, Conventions and Protocols relating to narcotic drugs which were concluded on 23 January 1912, 11 February 1925,

19 February 1925, 13 July 1931, 27 November 1931 and 26 June 1936, the League of Nations was invested with certain duties and functions for whose continued performance it is necessary to make provision in consequency of the dissolution of the League, and considering that it is expedient that these duties and functions should be performed henceforth by the United Nations and the World Health Organization or its Interim Commission, have agreed upon the following provisions:

ARTICLE I

The States Parties to the present Protocol undertake that as between themselves they will, each in respect of the instruments to which it is a party, and in accordance with the provisions of the present Protocol, attribute full legal force and effect to, and duly apply the amendments to those instruments which are set forth in the Annex to the present Protocol.

ARTICLE II

1. It is agreed that, during the period preceding the entry into force of the Protocol in respect of the International Convention relating to Dangerous Drugs of 19 February 1925, and in respect of the International Convention for limiting the Manufacture and regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs of 13 July 1931, the Permanent Central Board and the Supervisory Body as at present constituted shall continue to perform their functions. Vacancies in the membership of the Permanent Central Board may during this period be filled by the Economic and Social Council.

2. The Secretary-General of the United Nations is authorized to perform at once the duties hitherto discharged by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations in connection with the Agreements, Conventions and Protocols mentioned in the Annex to the present Protocol.

3. States which are Parties to any of the instruments which are to be amended by the present Protocol are invited to apply the amended texts of those instruments so soon as the amendments are in force even if they have not yet been able to become Parties to the present Protocol.

4. Should the amendments to the Convention relating to Dangerous Drugs of 19 February 1925, or the amendments to the Convention for limiting the Manufacture and regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs of 13 July 1931, come into force before the World Health Organization is in a position to assume its functions under these Conventions, the functions conferred on that Organization by the amendments shall, provisionally, be performed by its Interim Commission.

ARTICLE III

The functions conferred upon the Netherlands Government under articles 21 and 25 of the International Opium Convention signed at The Hague on 23 January 1912, and entrusted to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations with the consent of the Netherlands Government, by a resolution of the League of Nations Assembly dated 15 December 1920, shall hence forward be exercised by the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

ARTICLE IV

As soon as possible after this Protocol has been opened for signature, the Secretary-General shall prepare texts of the Agreements, Conventions and Protocols revised in accordance with the present Protocol and shall send copies for their information to the Government of every Member of the United Nations and every nonmember State to which this Protocol has been communicated by the Secretary-General.

ARTICLE V

The present Protocol shall be opened for signature or acceptance by any of the States Parties to the Agreements, Conventions and Protocols on narcotic drugs on 23 January 1912, 11 February 1925, 19 February 1925, 13 July 1931, 27 November 1931 and June 1936, to which the Secretary-General of the United Nations has communicated a copy of the present Protocol.

ARTICLE VI

States may become Parties to the present Protocol by

(*a*) signature without reservation as to approval,

(*b*) signature subject to approval followed by acceptance or

(*c*) acceptance.

Acceptance shall be effected by the deposit of a formal instrument with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

ARTICLE VII

1. The present Protocol shall come into force in respect of each Party on the date upon which it has been signed on behalf of that Party without reservation as to approval, or upon which an instrument of acceptance has been deposited.

2. The amendments set forth in the Annex to the present Protocol shall come into force in respect of each Agreement, Convention and Protocol when a majority of the Parties thereto have become Parties to the present Protocol.

ARTICLE VIII

In accordance with Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations, the Secretary-General of the United Nations will register and publish the amendments made in each instrument by the present Protocol on the dates of the entry into force of these amendments.

ARTICLE IX

The present Protocol, of which the Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish texts are equally authentic, shall be deposited in the archives of the United Nations Secretariat. The Agreements, Conventions and Protocols to be amended in accordance with the Annex being in the English and French languages only, the English and French texts of the Annex shall equally be the authentic texts and the Chinese, Russian and Spanish texts will be translations. A certified copy of the Protocol, including the Annex, shall be sent by the Secretary-General to each of the States Parties to the Agreements, Conventions and Protocols on narcotic drugs of 23 January 1912, 11 February 1925, 19 February 1925, 13 July 1931, 27 November 1931 and 26 June 1936, as well as to all Members of the United Nations and nonmember States mentioned in Article IV.

IN FAITH WHEREOF the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed the present Protocol on behalf of their respective Governments on the dates appearing opposite their respective signatures.

DONE at Lake Success, New York, this eleventh day of December one thousand nine hundred and forty-six.

ANNEX TO THE PROTOCOL AMENDING THE AGREEMENTS, CONVENTIONS AND PROTOCOLS ON NARCOTIC DRUGS CONCLUDED AT THE HAGUE ON 23 JANUARY 1912, AT GENEVA, ON 11 FEBRUARY 1925 AND 19 FEBRUARY 1925, AND 13 JULY 1931, AT BANGKOK ON 27 NOVEMBER 1931 AND AT GENEVA ON 26 JUNE 1936

1. AGREEMENT CONCERNING THE MANUFACTURE OF, INTERNAL TRADE IN, AND USE OF PREPARED OPIUM, WITH PROTOCOL AND FINAL ACT, SIGNED AT GENEVA ON 11 FEBRUARY 1925

In articles 10, 13, 14 and 15 of the Agreement, "the Secretary-General of the United Nations" shall be substituted for "the Secretary-General of the League of Nations" and "the Secretariat of the United Nations" shall be substituted for "the Secretariat of the League of Nations".

In articles 3 and 4 of the Protocol, "the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations" shall be substituted for "the Council of the League of Nations".

2. INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION RELATING TO DANGEROUS DRUGS, WITH PROTOCOL, SIGNED AT GENEVA ON 19 FEBRUARY 1925

For Article 8, the following article shall be substituted:

"In the event of the World Health Organization, on the advice of an expert committee appointed by it, finding that any preparation containing any of the narcotic drugs referred to in the present chapter cannot give rise to the drug habit on account of the medicaments with which the said drugs are compounded and which in practice preclude the recovery of the said drugs, the World Health Organization shall communicate this finding to the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. The Council will communicate the finding to the Contracting Parties, and thereupon the provisions of the present Convention will not be applicable to the preparation concerned."

For article 10, the following article shall be substituted:

"In the event of the World Health Organization, on the advice of an expert committee appointed by it, finding that any narcotic drug to which the present Convention does not apply is liable to similar abuse and productive of similar ill-effects as the substances to which this chapter of the Convention applies, the World Health Organization shall inform the Economic and Social Council accordingly and recommend that the provisions of the present Convention shall be applied to such drug.

"The Economic and Social Council shall communicate the said recommendation to the Contracting Parties. Any Contracting Party which is prepared to accept the recommendation shall notify the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who will inform the other Contracting Parties.

"The provisions of the present Convention shall thereupon apply to the substance in question as between the Contracting Parties who have accepted the recommendation referred to above."

In the third paragraph of article 19, "the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations" shall be substituted for "the Council of the League of Nations."

The fourth paragraph of article 19 shall be deleted.

In articles 20, 24, 27, 30, 32 and 38 (paragraph 1), "the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations" shall be substituted for "the Council of the League of Nations" and "the Secretary-General of the United Nations" shall be substituted for "the Secretary-General of the League of Nations," wherever these words occur.

In article 32, "the International Court of Justice" shall be substituted for "the Permanent Court of International Justice."

Article 34 shall read as follows:

"The present Convention is subject to ratification. As from 1 January 1947, the instruments of ratification shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who shall notify their receipt to all the Members of the United Nations and the nonmember States to which the Secretary-General has communicated a copy of the Convention."

Article 35 shall read as follows:

"After the 30th day of September 1925, the present Convention may be acceded to by any State represented at the Conference at which this Convention was drawn up and which has not signed the Convention, by any Member of the United Nations, or by any nonmember State mentioned in article 34.

"Accessions shall be effected by an instrument communicated to the Secretary-General of the United Nations to be deposited in the archives of the Secretariat of the United Nations. The Secretary-General shall at once notify such deposit to all the

Members of the United Nations signatories of the Convention and to the signatory non-member States mentioned in article 34 as well as to the adherent States."

Article 37 shall read as follows:

"A special record shall be kept by the Secretary-General of the United Nations showing which States have signed, ratified, acceded to or denounced the present Convention. This record shall be open to the Contracting Parties and shall be published from time to time as may be directed."

The second paragraph of article 38 shall read as follows:

"The Secretary-General of the United Nations shall notify the receipt of any such denunciations to all the Members of the United Nations and to the States mentioned in article 34."

3. INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR LIMITING THE MANUFACTURE AND REGULATING THE DISTRIBUTION OF NARCOTIC DRUGS, WITH PROTOCOL OF SIGNATURE, SIGNED AT GENEVA ON 13 JULY 1931

In article 5, paragraph 1, the words "to all the Members of the League of Nations and to the nonmember States mentioned in article 27" shall be replaced by the words "to all the Members of the United Nations and to the nonmember States mentioned in article 28".

For the first sub-paragraph of paragraph 6 of article 5, the following sub-paragraph shall be substituted:

"The estimates will be examined by a Supervisory Body consisting of four members. The World Health Organization shall appoint two members and the Commission on Narcotic Drugs of the Economic and Social Council and the Permanent Central Board shall each appoint one member.

"The Secretariat of the Supervisory Body shall be provided by the Secretary-General of the United Nations who will ensure close collaboration with the Permanent Central Board."

In article 5, paragraph 7, the words "December 15th in each year" shall be substituted for the words "November 1st in each year", and the words "through the intermediary of the Secretary-General of the United Nations to all the Members of the United Nations and non-member States referred to in article 28" shall be substituted for the words "through the intermediary of the Secretary-General, to all the Members of the League of Nations and non-member States referred to in article 27".

For paragraphs 2, 3, 4 and 5 of article 11, the following paragraphs shall be substituted:

"2. Any High Contracting Party permitting trade in or manufacture for trade of any such product to be commenced shall immediately send a notification to that effect to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who shall advise the other High Contracting Parties and the World Health Organization.

"3. The World Health Organization, acting on the advice of the expert committee appointed by it, will thereupon decide whether the product in question is capable of producing addiction (and is in consequence assimilable to the drugs mentioned in sub-group (*a*) of Group I), or whether it is convertible into such a drug (and is in consequence assimilable to the drugs mentioned in sub-group (*b*) of Group I or in Group II).

"4. In the event of the World Health Organization, on the advice of the expert committee appointed by it, deciding that the product is not itself a drug capable of producing addiction but is convertible into such a drug, the question whether the drug in question shall fall under sub-group (*b*) of Group I or under Group II shall be referred for decision to a body of three experts competent to deal with the scientific and technical aspects of the matter, of whom one member shall be selected by the Government concerned, one by the Commission on Narcotic Drugs of the Economic and Social Council, and the third by the two members so selected.

"5. Any decision arrived at in accordance with the two preceding paragraphs shall be notified to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who will communicate it to all States Members of the United Nations and the non-member States mentioned in article 28."

In paragraphs 6 and 7 of article 11, "the Secretary-General of the United Nations" shall be substituted for "the Secretary-General".

In articles 14, 20, 21, 23, 26, 31, 32 and 33, "the Secretary-General of the United Nations" shall be substituted for "the Secretary-General of the League of Nations".

In article 21 for the words "by the Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium and Other Dangerous Drugs" shall be substituted the words "by the Commission on Narcotic Drugs of the Economic and Social Council".

For the second paragraph of article 25, the following paragraph shall be substituted:

"In case there is no such agreement in force between the Parties, the dispute shall be referred to arbitration or judicial settlement. In the absence of agreement on the choice of another tribunal, the dispute shall, at the request of any one of the Parties, be referred to the International Court of Justice, if all the Parties to the dispute are Parties to the Statute, and, if any of the Parties to the dispute is not a Party to the Statute, to an arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with the Hague Convention of 18 October 1907 for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes."

For the last paragraph of article 26, the following paragraph shall be substituted:

"The Secretary-General shall communicate to all Members of the United Nations or non-member States mentioned in article 28 all declarations and notices received in virtue of the present article."

Article 28 shall read as follows:

"The present Convention is subject to ratification. As from 1 January 1947, the instruments of ratification shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who shall notify their receipt to all the Members of the United Nations and to the non-member States to which the Secretary-General has communicated a copy of the Convention."

Article 29 shall read as follows:

"The present Convention may be acceded to on behalf of any Member of the United Nations or any non-member State mentioned in article 28. The instruments of accession shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who shall notify their receipt to all the Members of the Unite Nations and to the non-member States mentioned in article 28."

In the first paragraph of article 32, the last sentence shall read as follows:

"Each denunciation shall operate only as regards the High Contracting Party on whose behalf it has been deposited."

The second paragraph of article 32 shall read as follows:

"The Secretary-General shall notify all the Members of the United Nations and non-member States mentioned in article 28 of any denunciation received."

In the third paragraph of article 32, the words "High Contracting Parties" shall replace the words "Members of the League and non-member States bound by the present Convention".

In article 33, the words "High Contracting Party" and "High Contracting Parties" shall replace the words "Member of the League of Nations or non-member State bound by this Convention" and Members of the League of Nations or non-member States bound by this Convention".

4. AGREEMENT FOR THE CONTROL OF OPIUM-SMOKING IN THE FAR EAST, WITH FINAL ACT, SIGNED AT BANGKOK ON 27 NOVEMBER 1931

In articles V and VII, "the Secretary-General of the United Nations" shall be substituted for "the Secretary-General of the League of Nations".

5. INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF ILLICIT TRAFFIC IN DANGEROUS DRUGS, SIGNED AT GENEVA ON 26 JUNE 1936

In articles 16, 18, 21, 23 and 24, "the Secretary-General of the United Nations" shall be substituted for "the Secretary-General of the League of Nations".

For article 17, second paragraph, the following paragraph shall be substituted:

"In case there is no such agreement between the Parties, the dispute shall be referred to arbitration or judicial settlement. In the absence of agreement on the choice of another tribunal, the dispute shall, at the request of any one of the Parties, be referred to the International Court of Justice, if all the Parties to the dispute are Parties to the Statute, and, if any of the Parties to the dispute is not a Party to the Statute, to an arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with the Hague Convention of 18 October 1907 for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes."

Paragraph 4 of article 18 shall read as follows:

"The Secretary-General shall communicate to all the Members of the United Nations and to the non-member States mentioned in article 20 all declarations and notices received in virtue of this article."

Article 20 shall read as follows:

"The present Convention is subject to ratification. As from 1 January 1947, the instruments of ratification shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who shall notify their receipt to all the Members of the United Nations and the non-member States to which the Secretary-General has communicated a copy of the Convention."

Paragraph 1 of article 21 shall read as follows:

"The present Convention shall be open to accession on behalf of any Member of the United Nations or non-member State mentioned in article 20."

In paragraph 1 of article 24, the words "High Contracting Party" shall be substituted for the words "Member of the League or non-member State".

The second paragraph of article 24 shall read as follows:

"The Secretary-General shall notify all the Members of the United Nations and non-Member States mentioned in article 20 of any denunciations received."

In paragraph 3 of article 24, the words "High Contracting Parties" shall replace the words "Members of the League or non-member States bound by the present Convention".

Article 25 shall read as follows:

"Request for the revision of the present Convention may be made at any time by any High Contracting Party by means of a notice addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations. Such notice shall be communicated by the Secretary-General to the other High Contracting Parties, and, if endorsed by not less than one-third of them, the High Contracting Parties agree to meet for the purpose of revising the Convention."

For Afghanistan:
A. Hosayn Aziz
Dec. 11, 1946

For Argentina:
José Arce
Diciembre 11, 1946

For Australia (subject to the approval of the Government of Australia):
Norman J. O. Makin
December 11, 1946

For the Kingdom of Belgium:
G. Kaeckenbeeck
11 décembre 1946
For Bolivia:
E. Sanjinés
14 de Diciembre de 1946
For Brazil:
P. Leão Velloso
17 décembre 1946
For the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic:
K. Kiselev [1]
11 December 1946
For Canada:
Paul Martin
11 Dec. 1946
For Chile.
F. Nieto del Rio
11 Dec. 1946
For China:
P. C. Chang
11 December 1946
For Colombia:
Alfonso Lopez
December 11, 1946
For Costa Rica:
F. de P. Gutierrez
Dec. 11, 1946
For Cuba (sujeto a la aprobación por el Senado de la Republica): [2]
Guillermo Belt
Diciembre 12, 1946
For Czechoslovakia:
V. Clementis
11 XII. 1946
For Denmark:
Gustav Rasmussen
11 décembre 1946
For the Dominican Republic:
Emilio Garcia Godoy
11 December 1946
For Ecuador:
Sujeta a aprobación [3]
F. Illescas
Dec. 14, 1946
For Egypt:
A. Sanhoury
11 December 1946
For El Salvador:

For Ethiopia:

For France:
Alexandre Parodi
11 décembre 1946
For Greece:
V. Dendramis
December 11, 1946
For Guatemala:
Jorge Garcia Granados
13 de Diciembre de 1946
For Haiti (*ad referendum*):
Hérard C. L. Roy
14 décembre 1946
For Honduras:
Tiburcio Carias, Jr.
December 11, 1946
For Iceland:

For India:
M. C. Chagla
11th Dec. 1946
For Iran:
Nasrollah Entezam
11 décembre 1946
For Iraq:
A. Bakr
December 12, 1946
For Lebanon:
C. Chamoun
13 décembre 1946
For Liberia:
C. Agayomi Cassell
11 December 1946
For the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg:
Pierre Elvinger
December 11th, 1946
For Mexico:
Luis Padilla Nervo
Dec. 11, 1946
For the Kingdom of the Netherlands:
E. N. van Kleffens
December 11, 1946
For New Zealand:
C. A. Berendsen
11th December 1946
For Nicaragua sujeta a aprobación [3]
G. Sevilla-Sacasa
13 December 1946
For the Kingdom of Norway:
Finn Moe
December 11th, 1946
For Panama:
R. J. Alfaro
Diciembre 15, 1946
For Paraguay (*ad referendum*):
César Romeo Acosta
December 14, 1946
For Peru:

For the Philippine Republic:
Carlos P. Romulo
December 11, 1946
For Poland:
Dr. S. Tubiasz
Dec. 11, 1946
For Saudi Arabia:
Faisal [4]
11 December 1946
For Sweden:

For Syria:
F. Khouri
11/12/1946
For Turkey (only in respect of Conventions to which Turkey is a Party):
Muzaffer Goker
11 décembre 1946
For the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic (subject to approval): [5]
L. Medved
11 December 1946
For the Union of South Africa:
H. T. Andrews
15 December 1946
For the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (subject to approval):
N. Novikov
11/XII—1946
For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:
Hartley Shawcross
11. XII. 46
For the United States of America (subject to approval):
Warren R. Austin
December 11, 1946
For Uruguay (*ad referendum*):
José A. Mora
14, Diciembre, 1946
For Venezuela (*ad referendum*):
E. Stolk
11 décembre 1946
For Yugoslavia:
Stanoje Simic
11 décembre 1946

Certified true copy.
For the Secretary-General:
A. H. FELLER
Acting Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Legal Department

[1] Kuzma V. Kiselev, 11 December 1946 (translation by the Secretariat of the United Nations).

[2] Subject to approval by the Senate of the Republic (translation by the Secretariat of the United Nations).

[3] Subject to approval (translation by the Secretariat of the United Nations).

[4] Amir Faisal al Saud, 11 December 1946 (translation by the Secretariat of the United Nations).

[5] Subject to approval. L. I. Medved, 11 December 1946 (translation by the Secretariat of the United Nations).

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, this protocol has the unanimous recommendation of the Committee on Foreign Relations. It is nothing more, in essence, than the transfer of the Permanent Central Opium Board of the League of Nations to the jurisdiction of the United Nations. Probably no work that was undertaken under the old League of Nations was more effective or successful in all aspects than its control of the international narcotics trade. The pending protocol is nothing more than a transfer of the American obligation to the old Narcotics International Control to the new United Nations authority, which substitutes for the League of Nations authority in this respect.

The protocol involves absolutely no new obligations whatever. It is calculated to increase slightly the American share of expense, because the proration of expense under the United Nations is somewhat different from that of the old League of Nations. In any event the sum involved is relatively small—as I understand, $2,000,000 or $3,000,000.

The record of successful work in curtailing international narcotics traffic has been amazing in its effectiveness, and I am sure that we all wish the effort to continue without interruption.

Mr. President, I think that is a complete statement of the case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The protocol is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the protocol will be reported to the Senate.

The protocol was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution of ratification will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive N, Eightieth Congress, first session, a protocol amending the agreements, conventions, and protocols on narcotic drugs, opened for signature at Lake Success on December 11, 1946, and signed on behalf of the United States of America on that date.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification. [Putting the question.] Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution of ratification is agreed to, and the protocol is ratified.

NOMINATION OF EDWIN C. WILSON TO BE CHIEF OF THE AMERICAN MISSION FOR AID TO TURKEY

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, as in executive session, I am sure the Senate will be very happy to confirm the nomination of Ambassador Edwin C. Wilson, who is now representing us in Turkey, to be the Chief of the American Mission for Aid to Turkey. This nomination has the unanimous and enthusiastic support of the entire membership of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I report the nomination, and ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan? The Chair hears none.

The nomination will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edwin C. Wilson to be Chief of the American Mission for Aid to Turkey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

INFORMATION PROGRAM OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, the Senate Appropriations Committee will soon, no doubt—perhaps today or tomorrow—be reporting the appropriation bill for the State Department. We shall then know the outlook for the Department's various programs to combat deliberately lying propaganda arising against us in some parts of the world, combating this propaganda with the truth about the United States in factual, objective, unimpassioned, accurate information.

So much has been written and spoken about the Voice of America broadcasts and about the other programs of the State Department's information work that I think many of our people are confused. In this atmosphere I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to one of the finest articles I have seen on this subject. It was written not by an ivory-tower thinker but by a newspaperman, an outstanding Pennsylvania newspaperman, the new editor of the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, Mr. Andrew Bernhard, who knows something about our information program because he was recently in Europe, where he could see not only how these programs work out but, most important of all, the need for them.

Mr. Bernhard was managing editor of the Post-Gazette when he went to Europe this year to cover the Big Four Conference of Foreign Ministers. I was so impressed by one of his early stories cabled back on March 11 that I read a few portions of it to the Senate at that time. He cautioned us not to become too excited about the extremes of optimism and pessimism which would be emanating from that Conference via the news stories from Moscow, inasmuch as the sessions were closed meetings and many reporters would periodically be going overboard on "inside dope" stories.

On his way back from Moscow, Mr. Bernhard cabled a story from Paris which was one of the best jobs I had seen of the strategic importance of food in the problems of achieving peace and restoring Europe.

Back in Pittsburgh now, and promoted to editor of the paper, Mr. Bernhard has written a story on the State Department's information program to which I call the attention of the Appropriations Committee now considering this program. His first paragraph keynotes the theme, and is as follows:

To anyone who has been in Moscow recently, the uproar here at home over the appropriation of $31,000,000 to continue the State Department's information program abroad is incomprehensible.

Yet the subcommittee—and probably by now the full committee—has cut that amount at least in half.

His story goes on to tell how Russians, particularly, can read nothing that their Government does not want them to read in the way of books, periodicals, newspapers, and magazines, and that the impression the Russian citizen gets of the rest of the world is precisely the impression the Russian Government wants him to get. He tells of the unremitting, violent propaganda campaign in Russia directed against the United States. He tells what we are doing about it in the magazine America, in the Voice of America radio program, and by other methods, and he gives an excellent description of what there is about the Voice of America which seems to appeal so much to the Russian listener. I think that paragraph is very incisive. Mr. Bernhard says:

It seemed to me that if they (the scripts for the program) had a fault it lay in their dullness, their adherence to straight fact and their avoidance of the color, drama and liveliness with which American domestic radio seeks to add appeal to its programs. But after awhile I came to see that it was precisely because of this flat, unemotional, objective treatment of the news that the program developed appeal among the Russians. Their emotions, nerves, eyes, and ears are continually so harried, shouted at and alarmed that they welcome a program without stridency, that appeals to logic rather than prejudice.

I commend to the Senate and especially to those members of the Appropriations Committee who have the State Department's information program presently under consideration, Mr. Bernhard's article. I now ask that it be printed in the RECORD in its entirety at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VISITOR TO MOSCOW STRESSES NEED OF UNITED STATES INFORMATION PROGRAM—AMERICANS "OVER THERE" MAY DISAGREE ON SOME THINGS BUT THEY ALL BACK PLAN, POST-GAZETTE EDITOR REPORTS

(By Andrew Bernhard)

To anyone who has been in Moscow recently, the uproar here at home over the appropriation of $31,000,000 to continue the State Department's information program abroad is incomprehensible.

Americans stationed in Moscow, for their Government or on private business, disagree on many things. But during the Conference of Foreign Ministers, I found none who objected to the information program.

Here at home one gets the idea that the radio program called the Voice of America is the whole issue involved. It isn't, though it may well be the most important as far as Russia is concerned.

CENSORSHIP IN RUSSIA

Most Americans know that no Russian can read anything his Government does not wish him to read. No foreign books, periodicals, newspapers, or magazines can be sent into Russia without permission of the Russian Government. So the impression the Russian citizen gets of the rest of the world is precisely the impression the Russian Government wants him to get.

For more than a year the Kremlin, through all avenues of communication, has carried on an unremitting, violent propaganda campaign to convince the Russian people that the western powers, headed by a predatory, greedy United States, are conspiring to attack Russia.

The United States is pictured as a nation in the grip of blood-thirsty monopolists, who hunt down minorities like wild beasts, who exploit the resources and people of the country and who are trying to stir up war to prevent their victims from finding out what a paradise the workers of Soviet Russia live in.

TOUGH PUBLIC-RELATIONS JOB

Unless we Americans wish to brush all that off and leave the masters in the Kremlin a clear field in their perversions of the truth, we are confronted with a job of public relations, and about the toughest job of public relations in history.

Through an arrangement with the Russian Government the United States sends to Russia 50,000 copies monthly of a slick-paper magazine called America, printed in the Russian language.

America is a combination of text and pictures presenting to the Russian reader a completely factual account of American life.

Americans in Moscow say that it is so popular with Russians that its circulation easily could be increased tenfold overnight if the Kremlin would permit it.

Considering that most Russians are aware that their government frowns on people with too great an interest in foreign affairs, that is a tribute alike to the curiosity of the Russians and to the effectiveness of America.

The magazine is part of the State Department's information program which apparently would be dropped if the people who wish to be known as the watchdogs of the United States Treasury have their way and are able to kill the appropriation for the program.

VALUE IS UNDETERMINED

The Voice of America radio program is a little harder to assay as to value, just as it is always hard to determine the number of listeners for any radio program.

A firm advertising a product over the radio in the United States judges the value of its program, finally, less by its so-called rating than by its results. If sales pick up it has proof the program is doing its job.

By that judgment the Voice of America must be doing its job. It was started without the advantage of a single word of publicity in the Russian press or on the Russian radio.

Obviously, the Russians were not going to publicize a program which might expose the falsity of their propaganda drive.

Ilya Ehrenbourg, most famous living Russian writer, attacked the Voice of America program for two or three columns in the Russian press recently. That would seem to prove that the program is hitting where it hurts, that the Russians finally decided it could no longer be ignored.

I read the Voice of America program scripts pretty regularly while in Russia. It seemed to me that if they had a fault it lay in their dullness, their adherence to straight fact and their avoidance of the color, drama, and liveliness with which American domestic radio seeks to add appeal to its programs.

SECRET OF ITS APPEAL

But after a while I came to see that it was precisely because of this flat, unemotional, objective treatment of the news that the program developed appeal among the Russians. Their emotions, nerves, eyes, and ears are continually so harried, shouted at and alarmed that they welcomed a program without stridency, that appealed to logic rather than prejudice.

Word got around, from one man to another, that at such and such a time and on such and such a wave length, the Americans were telling about America. And as Russian curiosity about America is as insatiable as American curiosity about Russia, the word circulated fast.

Of course there immediately occurs to an American the question of how many short wave sets there are in Russia. I was told that while figures were impossible to obtain, the proportion of short wave sets is far higher

there than in the United States, since the Russian radio, because of the vast distances it must cover, has developed short wave to much greater relative degree than is true in this country.

And radio sets are owned largely by professional people, engineers, scientists, managers, those best able to influence others.

Finally, both Secretary of State Marshall and Ambassador Smith have testified to the value of the State Department information program and to the Voice of America broadcast. Both of them are clearly aware of the American taxpayers' burden and are not men who wish to throw money out of the window.

Their testimony should carry considerably more weight than the prejudices of Congressman JOHN TABER, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee.

Thirty-one million dollars is a lot of money, but viewed as an advertising appropriation to build good will for us in the world it does not look so formidable.

Compared with what the Russians probably are spending it must be peanuts.

FLOOD CONTROL, RECLAMATION, SOIL CONSERVATION, RURAL ELECTRIFICATION, AND EDUCATION

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, near the close of its recent session, the Minnesota State Legislature adopted a concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to appropriate funds for a flood-control project in Clearwater and Pennington Counties, Minn. Contract plans for this vital project have been completed and approved by the Office of the Chief of Engineers of the War Department. Although the project was authorized by the Seventy-ninth Congress, work cannot proceed without appropriation of necessary funds.

Earlier in the session, a concurrent resolution was adopted by the Minnesota Legislature to memorialize Congress to authorize sufficient appropriations to make possible a flood-control project in Aitkin County, Minn.

Recognizing the merit of these concurrent resolutions passed by the Minnesota Legislature, I wish to take this opportunity to make known my views concerning such worthy projects as are mentioned in them, and also to state my convictions concerning other provisions in the appropriations acts.

I fully recognize the need for economy. I appreciate that this Congress has taken steps to bring about economy in the appropriations acts and by study of Government departments and bureaus to the end that greater efficiency may be achieved with resulting reductions in expenditures. The people are demanding a cut in the cost of Government, and that must be accomplished.

However, I do not believe that it would be an economy to reduce our appropriations to the extent that worthwhile flood-control projects are made impossible. Floods bring not only devastation of property but destruction of much tillable land as a result of erosion.

A reduction in the appropriation that would deny proper reclamation projects would be no economy. Such reduction would only deny our people opportunities. Such reduction or denial of appropriations would not permit the United States to expand into what amounts to a new frontier.

A reduction in the appropriations that would prevent a proper soil-conservation program would be no economy. Such reduction would only deny future generations fertile acres to till. In the relatively few generations of life in the United States, 282,000,000 acres of fertile land have already been depleted of top soil, and we are in the process of destroying a good many million more acres. It is time that we, the people, think of the future generations in preserving the fertility of our land, and this can be brought about only by proper provisions for a program of conservation.

There would be no economy, nor would there be a sound program for the welfare and safety of the people in the rural areas of the United States, were we to deny an adequate and proper appropriation for rural electrification. This is nothing more than a book transaction on the part of the United States. The appropriation is made available as a loan to an association for the construction of the line and service to the people, and they in turn pay it back on a monthly installment basis with interest. In the history of rural electrification the payments have been forthcoming and oftentimes far in advance of their due date. As a result of this program there have been expanded production on the farm and increased safety by the elimination of the hazardous lamp and lantern about the farm. No project has been more worthy than the REA.

There would be no economy in failing to make adequate provision for research in agriculture and forestry. Only by such research can we help lay the foundations for a soundly developed rural life and a prosperous farm industry. Only by such research can we find the means of protecting our priceless forest resources and the better use of forest products. These programs will mean a better life for the future, and we must provide for them now.

While I am speaking at this time of appropriations for these worthy objectives, they are not the only important needs I have in mind. One of the most vital of all is the obligation of the American people to provide proper educational facilities for our youth. They are the men and women of tomorrow. We are living in a mechanical age, highly scientific in every respect; and in order that we may keep strong and progressive this Nation of ours, youth must be trained and educated to meet the demands of this new scientific age.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolutions of the Minnesota Legislature, to which I have referred and in which I concur, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to speed action in appropriating funds for the improvement of Red Lake River and tributaries in Clearwater, Red Lake, and Pennington Counties, Minn.

Whereas unprecedented flood conditions along the Red River of the North and tributaries are at this very time inundating thousands of acres of farm land, flooding cities and disrupting sewerage, water supply and other public utilities, and removing from crop production, hay, pasture and feed for livestock, hundreds of farms within the area; and

Whereas the United States Corps of Engineers, War Department, have completed plans and have approved, in its report to Congress contained in House Document No. 345, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, on Red Lake River and tributaries including Clearwater River, dated October 25, 1943, a plan of flood control for these streams; and

Whereas local affected interests have already subscribed to all of the conditions for participation in the project set forth in said report; and

Whereas the actual commencement of construction awaits action by the Congress to appropriate the necessary funds: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Minnesota (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress is respectfully urged to appropriate immediately the necessary funds to enable the United States Corps of Engineers to undertake the flood-control project outlined and recorded in House Document No. 345, Seventy-eighth Congress, first session, hereinbefore referred to, so as to prevent the recurrence of the disastrous floods which at present are devastating agriculture, municipalities, and industries within the area; be it further

Resolved, That a duly authenticated copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the presiding officers of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to each of the Senators and Representatives of the State of Minnesota in the Congress of the United States.

LAWRENCE M. HALL,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
C. ELMER ANDERSON,
President of the Senate.

Adopted by the house of representatives the 23d day of April 1947.

G. H. LEAHY,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

Adopted by the senate the 23d day of April 1947.

H. Y. TORREY,
Secretary of the Senate.

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to appropriate funds for the Mississippi flood control in Aitkin County

Whereas the Mississippi River makes a sharp bend in Aitkin County, which is 23½ miles around, and only 6 miles across from one point in the river to the other; and

Whereas the Mississippi River at this point overflows its banks at regular intervals, flooding the area encompassed in the river basin, causing great damage to the farmers owning this land; and

Whereas the lands flooded by the Mississippi River in Aitkin County are rich agricultural lands and these lands are kept out of production due to the high water; and

Whereas the Corps of Engineers of the War Department has examined and made a preliminary survey of the locality in Aitkin County for flood control and allied purposes and its report is now in the office of the Chief of Engineers, Washington, D. C.; and

Whereas the Corps of Engineers has recommended that a canal be constructed across the 6-mile strip to channel the Mississippi River away from the lowlands in Aitkin County; and

Whereas it is to the benefit of the farmers of Aitkin County and the public generally that these floods be controlled and prevented from damaging property: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Legislature of the State of Minnesota memorialize the Congress of the United States to appropriate funds for the Mississippi flood control in Aitkin County; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be instructed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Minnesota.

LAWRENCE M. HALL,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
C. ELMER ANDERSON,
President of the Senate.

Adopted by the house of representatives the 15th day of April 1947.

G. H. LEAHY,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

Adopted by the senate the 23d day of April 1947.

H. Y. TORREY,
Secretary of the Senate.

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 564) to provide for the performance of the duties of the office of President, in case of the removal, resignation, or inability both of the President and Vice President.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we have agreed to vote next Friday at 2 o'clock on what is known as the Presidential succession bill. The time between 12 and 2 o'clock is very short, and probably all proponents and opponents of the bill will want to speak.

The bill provides that—

If, by reason of death, resignation, removal from office, inability, or failure to qualify, there is no President pro tempore to act as President under subsection (b), then the officer of the United States who is highest on the following list, and who is not under disability to discharge the powers and duties of the office of President shall act as President: Secretary of State, Secretary of the Treasury, Secretary of War, Attorney General, Postmaster General, Secretary of the Navy, Secretary of the Interior, Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary of Commerce, Secretary of Labor.

That is the end of the amendment, Mr. President; that is all it affects.

The amendment the committee has reported would have been fine until the atomic age came over the horizon, because during our previous life as a Nation no one could conceive that so many people in our official life could die at one time or in an interval of 4 years. In other words, we had not lifted our mental visors to what happened at Hiroshima. But Hiroshima ushered in a new age.

It is well known that the bomb which was dropped at Hiroshima was only a baby bomb, and that if an atomic bomb were to drop on Washington, everyone of us, including the President pro tempore, the entire Senate, and the entire House of Representatives, would go out of business, would check into life on another sphere.

I do not make these statements because of fear, but because history is rife with illustrations of the need for establishing an orderly succession. We remember Rome in the age of the Triumvirate. What we must do now, if we are to establish a sound law of succession, is to make sure that it is adequate in this atomic age.

So I have prepared a very brief amendment which I ask to have printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 6, line 6, before the period, insert a comma and the following: "the highest ranking of those military or naval officers of the United States who are on active duty, are not under disability to discharge the powers and duties of the office of President, and are eligible to the office of President under the Constitution."

On page 6, line 14, after the word "individual", insert the following: "(other than a military or naval officer)."

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, this amendment to Senate bill 564 is predicated on the assumption that all the civilians already contemplated for succession will have been annihilated. Let me say that had the atomic bomb been dropped on Tokyo, the Japanese Emperor and all his family and all the Japanese Diet and all the other leading men and women of Japan would have been wiped out.

By my amendment I propose to insert the following in Senate bill 564:

The highest ranking of those military or naval officers of the United States who are on active duty, are not under disability to discharge the powers and duties of the office of President, and are eligible to the office of President under the Constitution.

Mr. President, I never was more serious in my life than I am at this moment. I would be the last person in the world to say that this Nation should be turned over to the military; but this amendment only assumes that the President and Vice President and the Cabinet are no longer living, and that could only occur in time of war.

Today I am arguing briefly for the old American principle that we are a government of law, rather than simply a government of men. So, if we establish a rule of succession, it should be one which will guarantee that others will not be striving for supremacy, and that we shall not repeat the history of Rome. Under my amendment, the highest-ranking officer, whoever he might be, would automatically become the Commander in Chief and acting President of the United States.

I say again that these things may never happen; but, as we all remember, Billy Mitchell, that great American, tried to tell the brass hats in his age what would happen; and even when he demonstrated that an airplane could sink a battleship, still they would not believe it.

Certainly we cannot close our eyes to the lessons of Hiroshima and the meaning of this atomic age. In other words, in a future war the victor would be the nation which could first disorganize its opponent, and the way to do that would be to destroy its governmental machinery. A nation thus attacked would be taken over. Of course, we hope that no such thing will ever happen. I say that this succession bill would have been all right until a few years ago, but today it is out of date, it is as dead as dead can be, because it does not meet the situation which can develop overnight.

Mr. President, my reason for providing in the amendment that the highest ranking of our military or naval officers shall be next in succession is that all of us know that the military or naval officers take their rank in accordance with the date of their appointment. That provides a very easy way of arriving at the decision of who would be in command of this country, and who then would have to go to work and take on the job of synchronizing the remaining resources of the United States, material, human, and spiritual. It is a matter which we cannot ignore. I trust that between now and Friday, when this measure comes before the Senate, my colleagues will give thought to my amendment. I am seriously concerned about it.

Mr. President, as I look around the Senate Chamber now and think of the tempest in the teapot of yesterday, I am reminded of Kipling's words, "The tumult and the shouting dies." Let me paraphrase that by saying—

The tumult and the shouting dies,
The fearists and the false depart;
Hope shines bright in the Nation's eyes,
Love surges in the Nation's heart.

United, strong, we face the dawn;
We shun all fear, and march ahead
Forthrightly. We, the Nation's spawn,
Are true through all. We scorn the Red.

The checks and balances we have,
The faith the centuries have wrought,
Come to us by the word of God.
This is the truth the people sought.

The doubters and the leftists cease
Their yapping and their spurious fears.
The people rise and gain release.
Restored, we have the golden years.

Mr. President, I am especially concerned to have my dear friend the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] give consideration to this amendment to his bill, because, although his bill is all right as far as it goes, nevertheless I think it ignores the implications of the atomic age. Although I expect to listen quietly on Friday to the Senators who will speak on the bill, I trust that my amendment will be accepted and taken to conference, at least, and there, if necessary, rewritten, in order to be more adequate to meet the challenges of these days.

I know that some people may feel that by my amendment I have created fear, but I say that nothing of the kind should occur. I believe there are occasions when we must face the realities. A few years ago anyone who read some of the Buck Rogers stories would have said those things could never happen.

Yet, Mr. President, the escapades of Buck Rogers are here in reality. If Senators have been reading recent newspaper articles, they will have seen that planes are now being built which will travel up to 2,000 miles an hour, and we are contracting for them. Even now this continent is only 4 hours away from Europe, and that traveling relatively slow. So I say that in this shrunken world, where time and space exist no longer, it is obvious that we must be prepared for an

emergency government, with the speed and adequacy necessary in this atomic age. Every preparation against a war emergency makes that emergency less likely to happen. But one thing is true above all others; there must be order in our law, so that whatever happens the succession provided will be adequate to the emergency.

THE STEEL INDUSTRY

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the United States is confronted with the greatest demand on its industrial capacity that has ever been faced by any industrial nation. We are operating at a full-employment level in our domestic economy, and now must prepare to meet heavy requirements from foreign countries. Whole nations have had their heavy industries destroyed, and generally the industrial establishment of the nations of the world has deteriorated over the war years.

The role of the United States in the rehabilitation of these war-stricken nations is limited by the capacity of the industries of our country to meet the needs of a full-employment economy at home and the rebuilding of shattered foreign industrial economies. In these remarks I wish to offer some observations on the adequacy of the capacity of the steel industry, of an industry so basic that without its contribution neither of these objectives can be attained.

At a recent meeting of the American Iron and Steel Institute, certain leaders of the industry expressed their attitudes respecting the current and future demand for the products of the steel industry. Their views may be summarized as follows. While the steel industry, working at capacity, is not able to meet the present domestic demand for steel, the industry believes there is no case for an increase over the present capacity of 90,000,000 tons. Yet, small independent businesses are closing and many others are curtailing production due to lack of steel.

The demand is abnormal—it cannot last, they declare. One steel company president put forth the argument that per capita consumption over the period of 1920–40 should be the guide in judging the need for steel capacity. Implicit in this presentation is the assumption that conditions of depression are a part of the industry's concept of normalcy. Some leaders of the industry even anticipate the beginning of a depression in late 1947 and consequently a lessening of the demand for steel.

These views should occasion no surprise, coming from the representative of a monopolistic industry with its long history of policies of high prices and profits and low volume of production. The restrictive policy of the steel industry with its emphasis on steel scarcity has been an important factor in lessening industrial activity and thereby bringing on and perpetuating depressions.

All the objective analyses that I know of, including Department of Labor studies, memoranda of leading economists, and testimony at various committee hearings by users of steel and so forth, show clearly that the demand for steel is an expanding one. Instead of the present capacity of 90,000,000 tons, we shall need 100,000,000 tons per year or more in the very near future for domestic use and for our foreign-trade obligations. If the industry fails to expand, or if it contracts to 80,000,000 tons, as has been suggested by some steel producers, we shall be at least ten to twenty thousand tons short of what our economy needs to work at high levels. This, according to the record of unemployment in the 1920's and 1930's, means that industrial production and recovery would be held back and as many as 20 percent of the necessary job opportunities would not be available. Ten to twelve million people out of a total of around 60,000,000 would be idle.

If the leaders in the steel industry can take this prospect of mass unemployment without being greatly concerned, the public and the Congress of the United States cannot. A Nation that adopted the Employment Act of 1946 as an instrument of national policy will not again accept depression conditions as a basis for industrial policy or decisions of the steel industry.

Steel is so important that an advanced industrial society cannot operate at capacity with chronic shortages of steel products.

For the first time in our peacetime history our economy has been straining to operate at full capacity. The one great obstacle to this achievement has been a shortage of steel products. While the steel industry is operating at capacity, many steel-consuming industries are not. The recent numerous shutdowns of the automobile industry because of steel shortages with the falling off in car production and employment are known to everyone.

Only recently publicity was given to an imminent shortage of several thousand box cars because steel is not available with which to make them. I need not tell you the disastrous effects of this one shortage on all farming areas, particularly the region west of the Mississippi River. This one shortage effectively cuts down our ample food supply and curtails our ability to feed other nations. It also affects employment. Thousands of men would have gainful employment in the manufacture of these box cars, others in their servicing, and still others in moving the crops into the cars for shipment. Thus the shortage of this great basic commodity—steel—has accumulative effect and progressively lowers industrial activity.

The effect of the steel shortage is being felt in another vitally important segment of our domestic economy—the oil industry. Oil well casing, line pipe, compressors, and other production and distributive tools of the industry are so scarce that many independent producers are being forced to shut down at a time when increased production of oil must be achieved to meet our national and international requirements. For example, it has been estimated by government and industry experts in this field that if pipe mill output from United States steel mills continues at about the present rate, it would require 5 years to produce the pipe necessary to supply prospective oil and natural gas pipe-line construction in the United States and abroad.

If, however, existing mills could be operated at capacity, turning out only large diameter pipe, it is estimated that they should be able to supply the required tonnage in from 3 to 3½ years, or by the summer of 1950. It should be borne in mind that these figures apply to large diameter pipe only and do not include supply-requirement figures on pipe under 12 inches in diameter, which is universally required for the drilling of wells by the great majority of oil producers. Hence, it is clear that unless the current shortage of steel and steel products is rapidly overcome through expanded mill capacity and increased production, the impact upon the domestic oil industry will be felt not only in continued shortages of petroleum products within the United States but also in the weakening of our ability to maintain our position of preeminence in the highly competitive international field.

I wish to cite one other effect of the shortage of steel on the development of industries in my own section of the country, the West. Recently the president of the Geneva Steel Corp. of Utah, a subsidiary of the United States Steel Corp., addressing a group of businessmen in Boise, Idaho, had the following to offer concerning the effect of steel shortages on the industries of the intermountain States, and I quote his remarks:

> For the near future, the continuing steel shortage not only in the western market but in steel markets generally will act as a definite deterrent to the establishment of fabricating plants in the intermountain area. The steel shortage would not only affect the ability of a company to obtain steel for the erection of a plant and the acquisition of equipment; it would also seriously impede the company's ability to obtain steel stocks for use in its fabricating operations.

The Iron Age, traditional spokesman for the steel industry had this to say about the effect of the steel corporations' pronouncement on the development of western industry:

> Some of the overenthusiastic boosters for the industrialization of this area were saddened a little by a portion of a speech delivered by Walter Mathesius, president of the Geneva Steel Co., before a business group in Boise, Idaho.

Mr. President, the announcement by the steel corporation that they are unwilling to take steps to insure the development of the West amply confirms the fears of those of us who declared our opposition to the sale of the Geneva steel plant to this great monopoly. Here is a self-admission by the leading member of the steel industry that they are unprepared and unwilling to carry out the expansion in the basic steel industry of the West which will insure the industrial development of the Intermountain States.

Full employment and the development of regional industry are not compatible

with the policy of restriction of production. This policy carries the seeds of another depression in the future, as it has in the past.

The leaders in the steel industry may be right in their fears that a let-down from the present high level of demand may soon be upon us, and that we have shown ourselves poorly prepared to prevent it. All the more reason for taking steps now to make sure that the subsequent restoration of full employment following any recession is as speedy as possible and that shortages in raw material production and capacity do not delay that recovery.

It is not sufficient for leaders of industry to say that uncertainty of future demand makes expansion unwise. That is tantamount to an abdication of the basic function of industrial leaders in our free competitive enterprise system. If industrial leaders are unable or unwilling to take risks involved in expanding the productive facilities required by a growing population whose living standards are bound to continue to rise, some other assurances for maintaining an expanding economy must be devised.

Mr. President, I have the following positive program to suggest as a basis for discussion of the ways and means of obtaining the expansion of our steel capacity necessary to the maintenance of a full-employment economy, the development of our underindustrialized areas, and our proper participation in the rehabilitation of western European nations.

In the first place, our knowledge of the extent and character of our steel shortages is insufficient. We know that the industry is not able to supply current demands. We know the present capacity of the industry will be insufficient to meet demand for years to come. But the nature of this demand by type of products and by areas of the country's need is a matter of guesswork. The facts are simply not available. I recommend that a resolution, with an adequate appropriation, be adopted requiring the appropriate division in the Department of Commerce or a section of the Council of Economic Advisers to make a continuing study of steel supply and demand by the different basic products of the industry. This knowledge, it must be emphasized, may well be the key to the maintenance of full employment at home, to our assumption of leadership in rehabilitating stricken foreign countries, and in preserving the peace of the world.

In the second place, once the nature and extent of the steel shortage has been ascertained, a policy for the further expansion of the industry must be set forth. I suggest that the facts on steel shortages be considered by the President, who can then transmit his recommendations to the Congress for appropriate action.

In the third place, I wish to point out the alternatives available to the Congress and the President in effecting the needed expansion of steel production. I favor the expansion of the industry by private enterprise based on the principles of a free competitive economy. Under these conditions I urge expansion by the present members of the industry. I certainly think adequate precaution should be taken to guard against a monopolistic situation in any geographic area such as exists in the West at the present time. In the event unaided private capital is unequal to the expansion, or unwilling to make it, I suggest the use by private industrialists of public funds from a Government lending agency on such terms and conditions as would insure the most rapid development of the needed additional capacity. I would consider here long-time loans at low rates of interest. It may be necessary to add the provision in this plan that the lending agency would suspend interest payments when for any prolonged period of time the industry's operating rate fell below a certain level of plant capacity.

As a last alternative, if the others fail, is the one followed during the war in most of our great war-plant construction. Here I refer to the use of public funds and construction of a Government-owned plant to be leased for private operation. I trust this third method will not prove to be necessary but as I conceive the problem there can be little doubt that steel capacity is inadequate to meet the twin needs of a full employment economy and American obligations to a war-stricken world.

It will not be difficult to convince a country which almost doubled its manufacturing plant capacity in a period of five war years that it could now make an expansion in the capacity of this great industry so necessary for the objectives which I have outlined. We need more steel capacity and production to sustain full employment of our people. We must get that needed production.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a memorandum on the estimates of steel required for full employment in the United States, together with a critical examination of certain figures presented on that topic by Mr. Wilfred Sykes, president of the Inland Steel Co. of Chicago. This memorandum has been prepared at my suggestion by an outstanding Government economist, Dr. Louis H. Bean, Special Assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture.

I ask that his letter of transmittal be included with the memorandum.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, June 17, 1947.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: This is in response to your letter of June 2 in which you request my appraisal of the data contained in the recent speeches by Mr. Walter S. Tower, president, American Iron and Steel Institute, and Mr. Wilfred Sykes, president, Inland Steel Company before the American Iron and Steel Institute, particularly as they relate to my recent memorandum to you on steel requirements for full employment. You also requested comment on the relation of steel production to agricultural welfare. I have attempted to deal with both of these questions in the attached memorandum.

With regard to the farmers' interest in steel production sufficient to maintain full employment, the memorandum points out briefly that the volume of industrial goods and services available to farmers for use in their production and in their homes depends on the general level of industrial production and, therefore, also on steel, inasmuch as steel is basic to our entire industrial structure. Farm income and its purchasing power rises and falls with industrial production and employment. In prosperity years, farm purchasing power is basically limited by the level of employment and industrial production. Using steel as a symbol of industrial activity, this interdependence between agriculture and industry is summarized in the fact that a shortage of one ton of steel below the volume required for full employment means $250 to $300 in farm purchasing power at present prices.

With regard to Mr. Sykes' estimates of steel required for full employment, the present memorandum points out the following:

Mr. Sykes assumes that there is a constant, not a rising, per capita demand for steel in the United States, that the maximum per capita demand attained 18 years ago in 1929 is the best we can look forward to in the future, that on the basis of expected population growth, the 1929 per capita domestic consumption, with allowance for moderate exports, would mean a total demand of 76,000,000 tons in 1950 and 78,000,000 tons in 1955, and that in view of this prospect the present capacity of steel, which has been reduced from 95,000,000 in 1945 to 91,000,000 as present, should probably be reduced further to a "real economic capacity" of around 80,000,000.

In contrast with these assumptions and estimates, the actual record of production for domestic use and for export shows that there have been a succession of peak levels with a marked rising trend; that the peak reached in 1902 of 422 pounds per capita was exceeded by 614 pounds in 1906, then by 632 in 1910, by 735 in 1912, by 886 in 1920 (skipping the war years), by 899 in 1923, by 922 in 1926, by 1,038 in 1929, and by 1,243 in 1941. This persistent trend points to a prosperity requirement of nearly 1,400 pounds for 1950, instead of 1,100 as estimated by Mr. Sykes.

The failure to recognize this persistent upward trend in per capita demand leads to Mr. Sykes estimating steel requirements for 1950 at only 76,000,000 tons and for 1955 at only 78,000,000 tons, instead of 100,000,000 tons or more as suggested by the analysis in my memorandum. Past experience suggests that steel production of seventy-six to seventy-eight million tons would mean keeping the industrial production level in the early 1950's down to a point where only 80 percent of the necessary job opportunities would be available, and this would mean unemployment of 10,000,000 or more. On the basis of $250 of farm income for every ton of steel short of the volume required for full employment, this could mean a shortage in farm income of at least $5,000,000,000 annually.

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS H. BEAN,
Office of the Secretary.

MEMORANDUM TO SENATOR MURRAY ON THE SYKES ESTIMATES OF STEEL REQUIRED FOR FULL EMPLOYMENT

This memorandum is in response to the following letter of June 2 in which you request my appraisal of the data on future steel requirements contained in the recent addresses presented by Messrs. Sykes and Tower before the American Iron and Steel Institute:

"DEAR MR. BEAN: The press has recently carried reference to papers presented at the general meeting of the American Iron and Steel Institute. I noted particularly the references to a paper on the future of the steel industry by Mr. Wilfred Sykes, president, Inland Steel Co., of Chicago, and also a paper by Mr. Tower, president of the American Iron and Steel Institute. The

data cited in those papers, as representing future steel requirements, appeared to be at variance with the analysis contained in the memorandum which you were good enough to prepare for me under date of May 9, on steel requirements for full employment.

"Will you be good enough to review these statements and let me have your appraisal of the statistical information contained in them insofar as they bear on the conclusions in your memorandum?

"I would also appreciate it if you could include in your memorandum such comments as your studies in agricultural-industrial relations warrant that have a bearing on farmers' interest in adequate steel capacity?"

The answer to your second question I believe can be given in relatively brief form and I would like, therefore, to deal with it before taking up the comparison of Mr. Sykes' data and projections with those I presented to you.

A. DEPENDENCE OF FARM INCOME ON STEEL PRODUCTION

As producers of food and industrial raw materials for the rest of the Nation, farmers must have a high level of industrial employment and purchasing power to secure an adequate return for their labor. As consumers of industrial goods and services for production and for use in their farm homes, they are interested in their proper share of a constantly rising volume of industrial output. And, as citizens desiring world peace, they are interested in promoting a high level of world trade in agricultural and industrial products. For these reasons, the welfare of farmers is directly involved in our ability to maintain full employment, and for the same reasons they are directly involved if there is any question as to the adequacy of supplies of the major industrial products, such as iron and steel, for maintaining full employment and national purchasing power.

Farmers thus have the same interests in adequate steel capacity for full employment as do other groups. Farmers as producers and consumers constitute a large part of the American economy. And any limitation to the national level of production of goods and services, due to the inadequate supply of iron and steel and their products, is automatically a limitation on farm machinery, equipment, automobiles, tractors, and other industrial goods and services farmers require for maintenance of their output. It is also a limitation on the goods and services generally available for the farmers' standard of living for which they exchange their annual output. Obviously, the greater the volume of industrial production and of steel in the United States, the greater the farm income, and the greater the volume of industrial goods available to farmers for purchases for use in their production and in their homes. At the present time, every ton of steel short of the tonnage required for full employment means about $250 less in farm purchasing power.

This dependence of farm purchasing power on industrial production and, therefore, on steel production, is illustrated in the 20-year record of the purchasing power of farm cash income and production of steel ingots and castings, shown in chart I. After World War I, both agriculture and industry, the latter represented here by steel production, were caught in a major deflation and depression. The subsequent rise in industrial production made it possible for the purchasing power of farm income to rise to higher levels. As the production of steel rose to 63,000,000 tons in 1929 compared with 47,000,000 tons in 1920, the purchasing power of farm income rose to $15,000,000,000 (at 1946 prices) compared with 12.5 billions in 1920. Between 1929 and 1932, agriculture and industry were both caught in the greatest depression in our history. They went down together in depression and rose together in response to recovery efforts. The rise in purchasing power of farm income from 1932 to 1937, from about $10,000,000,000 to about 13.5 billions, was limited by the rise in industrial production. Both the production of steel and the purchasing power of farm income failed in 1936 and 1937 to reach their predepression peak of 1929.

This over-all relationship between farm income and industrial activity at full employment levels, as represented by steel, may be summarized by pointing out that in the prosperity years 1920, 1923, 1928, and 1929 farm income amounted to $260 to $300 (at present prices) for every ton of steel produced. In 1940 and 1941, it amounted to $230. And for 1947 it is likely to be over $300. It is probably not stretching the fact of interdependence between farm and factory too much to say that for every ton of steel below the volume required for full employment, farmers now have a stake of at least $250 to $300.

Farm income and steel production

Year	Purchasing power of farm cash income [1]	Production of steel ingots and castings	Purchasing power of farm income per ton
	Billion dollars	*Million tons*	*Dollars*
1920	14,114	47.2	300
1923	14,155	50.3	281
1926	15,334	54.1	284
1929	16,704	63.2	266
1936	15,093	53.5	282
1937	15,201	56.6	269
1940	15,388	67.0	229
1941	19,163	82.8	231
1947 (estimated)	27,000	85.0	318

[1] At 1947 prices paid by farmers, taken as 225 percent of 1910–14.

B. COMMENTS ON MR. TOWER'S ADDRESS

Of the two papers delivered before the general meeting of the American Iron and Steel Institute on May 22, referred to in your letter, only the paper by Mr. Sykes contains data directly related to the data in my memorandum. Mr. Tower's paper, therefore, needs only brief comment.

At one point, he refers to the current concern over the adequacy of steel production to sustain full employment. He cites and casts doubt on the conclusions reached in the studies of the United States Department of Labor that, by 1950, the maintenance of full employment will require considerably more steel than is being produced at present. In contrasting the situation in 1919 and 1920 with the present, he says that "it was not until 1929 that steel production rose high enough to exceed the figure of war-created capacity." He hints at an impending depression by pointing out (a) that in 1919 "enthusiastic estimates were freely circulated as to building to be done, automobiles to be made, and exports to be shipped," and (b) that in 1920 "steel was riding high on a wave of optimism when you met in May of 1920. Steel is riding high as you meet here today. I hope that the similarities may not hold beyond this point."

There is nothing in this speech that deals specifically or quantitatively with the magnitude of the domestic or foreign outlet for iron and steel for the immediate future or for the long-run.

C. COMMENTS ON MR. SYKES' ESTIMATES OF STEEL REQUIRED FOR FULL EMPLOYMENT

Unfortunately, Mr. Sykes' estimates of steel required for full employment in 1950, like the projections suggested by the data in my memorandum, do not have the benefit of a survey of the domestic and foreign markets for iron and steel for 1950 and beyond. Consequently, the differences between his estimates and those I supplied to you, which I shall point out presently, turn out to be merely differences in the art of examining and analyzing the historical record of steel production and of inferring from the trend of that record the volume of steel that is most likely to be needed to maintain full employment in 1950 and subsequent years.

To emphasize the fact that the differences are merely statistical, it may be added that two elements of uncertainty in the need for steel consumption and capacity, about which there generally are differences of opinion, Mr. Sykes dismisses as relatively unimportant. In my memorandum I raised the question as to the trend in competition from plastics and light metals as possibly affecting the upward trend in steel requirements. Mr. Sykes dismisses this as immaterial. With regard to light metals, he says:

"The light metals and their alloys will not make inroads on the steel industry. They will create their own fields, and their production will continue to increase."

I also referred to the current discussions in the steel industry with regard to technological developments that might yield greater production of iron and steel without plant expansion. On this point, Mr. Sykes:

"Improvements in the technology of iron and steelmaking will continue, but that they will be of such a radical nature as to make obsolete any of our major installations is not likely to occur within the next few decades."

Mr. Sykes estimates that the annual peak demand in total ingot tons is not likely to exceed 80,000,000 tons before 1955. The peak in per capita demand that might occur in the immediate future is estimated at 1,061.5 pounds for 1950, and 1,059.0 pounds for 1955. These estimates are obtained by taking the 1929 maximum domestic demand of 978 pounds and adding 83.5 pounds for export demand for 1950 and 81.0 pounds for 1955. On the basis of the expected population in 1950 (143,896,000), and in 1955 (148,186,000), Mr. Sykes estimates the maximum consumption of steel ingots at 76,373,000 for 1950, and 78,464,000 for 1955. These represent respectively 83.7 percent and 85.9 percent of the present capacity of 91,241,250 tons.

Mr. Sykes adds:

"While the present rate of operation exceeds the above indicated maximum demand per capita, it is a condition which I feel is temporary. For normal peacetime purposes a peak domestic demand of about 1,000 pounds per capita can be anticipated which would add about 2 percent to the above totals.

"If we project this reasoning to the year 1975 with an anticipated population of about 163,000,000, we arrive at a maximum demand of about 90,000,000 ingot tons, allowing 10 percent for export. This is so far in the future that any such speculation is of doubtful value except to establish the general order of magnitude.

"It will be seen from this analysis that our present productive capacity would seem to be ample for our future needs for many years to come. However, I do not believe it is excessive because included in our present nominal capacity there is undoubtedly a great amount of equipment which is not economical and which probably should be discarded. It is my estimate, and I want to emphasize that it is only an estimate, that our probable real economic capacity in this country is somewhere around 80,000,000 ingot tons per year, which balances up pretty closely with the anticipated, or possible, demands within the next 5 or 10 years. These figures would seem to indicate that no expansion in ingot capacity is required in the near future although, of course, there may be additional plants built either to replace existing uneconomical units or to satisfy some special needs."

From the same records, I conclude that the per capita requirements for domestic and foreign demand for 1950 are more likely to

be close to 1,400 pounds, or a total of around 100,000,000 tons, instead of 1,100 pounds per capita, and a total of less than 80,000,000.

This conclusion, that the demand for steel is not likely to exceed 80,000,000 tons before 1955, that 11,000,000 tons of present capacity of 91 millions probably should be discarded, is due (a) to the fact that Mr. Sykes reads the steel-production record in terms of selected averages covering prosperity and depression years instead of in terms of the experience in years of full employment, and (b) to the fact that he assumes the maximum consumption attained nearly two decades ago in 1929, will not be exceeded in the future.

The per capita consumption during the 30 years prior to the last war (1911-40), Mr. Sykes says, remained fairly constant and he supports this statement with the facts (a) that "* * * the average per capita domestic demand for steel, based on ingots produced from 1911 to 1920, was 666 pounds, and from 1921 to 1940 it was 668 pounds," and (b) that "In the 10 years from 1921 to 1930, when we had a period of considerable expansion and rehabilitation following the First World War, the per capita domestic demand averaged 770 pounds. In the decade from 1931 to 1940, when we went through a period of unprecedented depression during much of which business practically stagnated, the average per capita demand dropped to 576 pounds. This is, however, a cyclical variation."

After presenting the yearly record of domestic demand per capita from 1920 to 1940 inclusive, Mr. Sykes adds:

"It should be noted also that the greatest per capita demand occurred in the decade immediately following the First World War, when the average reached 770 pounds with a peak of 978 pounds per capita in 1929, whereas in the second decade of this period the average dropped to 576 pounds with a peak per capita demand of 838 pounds in 1940, which was influenced by prewar preparations."

The significant features in Mr. Sykes' examination of the record thus are:

1. His conclusion that per capita consumption has remained fairly constant.

2. His assumption that the 1929 peak is apparently the best that can be anticipated, and

3. His comment that the peak in the 1931-40 decade, namely, that of 1940, was influenced by prewar preparations.

With regard to point 1, it should be noted that Mr. Sykes deals with averages covering years of prosperity and depression. Since he is projecting steel demand for maximum or full employment conditions, his analysis should deal with the full employment experiences. Had he done so he would have observed that in the prosperous year of 1920 domestic demand per capita amounted to 752 pounds; in the succeeding prosperous year, 1923, 847 pounds; in the next prosperous year, 1926, 874 pounds; and in 1929, 978 pounds. For prosperity years, this record actually shows a rising trend in domestic per capita consumption, and, therefore, it would be reasonable to expect the 1929 peak to be surpassed, just as every other peak prior to 1929 has been surpassed, unless one is of the belief that the steel industry has at last attained maturity and entered a period of stability or decline after reaching the 1929 peak.

With regard to the 1940 consumption of 838 pounds, it should be noted that while it may have been influenced by war preparations, it was even more seriously influenced by the prevalence of unemployment in the United States which had the effect of curtailing domestic demand. Had we had full employment in 1940, steel production would have been at least 10,000,000 tons greater than it was. Consequently, the failure of the 1940 consumption to equal or exceed the 1929 figure is no evidence of a down-turn in the rising trend of demand in full employment years indicated by the long-time record up to 1929.

In order that you may see quite clearly the differences between the Sykes' estimates and those that may be derived from my presentation, I attach hereto three of the four charts included in my previous memorandum showing (1) United States production of steel ingots and castings, 1900 to 1947, with a rising trend for prosperity years, (2) the rising volume of production required to sustain full employment, and (3) the production of steel ingots and castings and unemployment, 1920–1947. There is also included a fourth chart on a per capita basis which shows clearly the rising trend in maximum production from 1900 to date. In each case, I have had added the Sykes' estimates, or their equivalent.

In chart I, you will note the long-time trend of steel production for peacetime prosperity years is upward and that a projection of the trend from 1906 to 1929 indicates a total well over 100,000,000 tons for 1950 and 1955. Mr. Sykes' estimates of 76,000,000 and 78,000,000 tons are thus at least 20,000,000 tons short of the volume suggested by the trend for 1950, and for 1955 the indicated difference or shortage is even greater.

In chart II, which shows production on a per capita basis, you will note that the amount of steel required per job to sustain full employment has followed an upward trend up to 1941, rising from a half ton in 1900 to over 1 ton in the 1920's and to 1.7 tons in 1941. A projection of this trend points to 1.8 tons per employed person in 1950 and nearly 2 tons in 1955. The Sykes' estimates, 76,000,000 tons for 1950 and 78,000,000 for 1955, are equivalent to about 1.25 tons per job, assuming 60,000,000 jobs to be filled in 1950 and 62,000,000 in 1955. If in these years we should need 1.8 to 2 tons per job and have only 1.25 tons to go around, substantial unemployment would be found to prevail.

In chart III you will note the amount of unemployment that is implied in the Sykes' estimates. The chart shows that on the basis of past experience, we would need well over 100,000,000 tons of steel if unemployment is to be kept to only 3 to 5 percent of the labor force. Mr. Sykes' estimate of 76,000,000 tons of steel for 1950 would be in line with the experience of 1939, when 16 percent of the labor force was unemployed, and his estimate of 78,000,000 tons for 1955 would be more nearly in line with the experience of 1933 to 1935, when unemployment amounted to 20 percent or more.

Finally, in chart IV you will note that there has been a rising—not, as Mr. Sykes claims, a constant—trend in the per capita demand for steel for domestic use and for export. The upward trend is unmistakable if you follow the successive record of peak demand from 1900 to date. By 1900 the United States produced a maximum of 300 pounds of steel per capita. The next maximum, in 1902, was 422 pounds; the next, in 1906, was 614 pounds; the next, in 1910, was 632 pounds. Another maximum, 735 pounds, was reached in 1912; then, skipping the war years, a still greater maximum was reached in 1920, 886 pounds, and this was exceeded in 1923 with 899 pounds; in 1926 with 922 pounds, and in 1929 with 1,038 pounds, and in 1941 with 1,243 pounds. A projection of this trend to 1950 points to about 1,400 pounds per person instead of Mr. Sykes' estimate of 1,000 pounds for domestic demand plus 10 percent additional for exports, or 22 percent below the trend.

This is the basic difficulty I find in Mr. Sykes' presentation of the record, that he, as well as many others, fail to differentiate between the rising trend of demand in prosperous years and the much lower demand experienced in depression years. The question you are interested in is the amount of steel that is likely to be required to sustain full employment, now that we have it, or to restore and sustain full employment in case unemployment should develop in the near future. Mr. Sykes' method of estimating, as well as the estimates of those who are fearful that we may some day experience a depression like that of the 1930's, tend to confuse the simple issue of what is likely to be required in the way of steel production and capacity for full employment. My reading of the record suggests that Mr. Sykes' estimates, if used as a guide for the steel industry, would make it impossible to sustain the present level of full employment and would perpetuate a large volume of unemployment, once it were allowed to develop.

TAX REDUCTION

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, when the recent tax reduction bill came over from the House of Representatives and was referred to the Finance Committee of the Senate, I appeared before the committee, and offered for its consideration some three or four amendments which I announced I intended to propose to the measure. Two of those amendments I offered and very earnestly pressed on the floor of the Senate. They were rejected, but at the time of their rejection, particularly with respect to one, some assurances were given that it was the intention of the leadership, I think on both sides of the aisle, that the proposed amendment would be considered in a general tax revision bill which it was said would be taken up at the next session of Congress; in fact, that soon the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives was to begin to hold hearings on such a tax revision bill.

The two amendments I offered at that time, to which I wish to make reference now, were, first, one which was appropriate and proper to a tax reduction bill, an amendment to raise personal exemptions. I thought, and still believe, that that is the best approach, or the essential first step, in any tax reduction we should make, whether at this session of Congress or the next, or the next.

The other amendment in which I was very much interested, and which I sponsored, was one to remove the discrimination which now exists, in the collection of Federal income taxes, between married citizens of noncommunity property States, and those residing in community property States. That is the amendment to which I referred which it was thought—and it was said, by the leaders in this body—properly belonged in a tax revision bill, and not in a tax reduction bill.

Mr. President, I intend to continue to press for this legislative tax reform. Following the time the Senate rejected these amendments, and after the tax bill had reached the President, I conferred with the President of the United States about these two proposals. I made no recommendation with respect to whether he should or should not veto the tax bill, because I thought that addressed itself to his judgment and wisdom, after the Congress had acted, but I did urge the President that, in the event he concluded to veto the tax bill, he give consideration to these two amendments I had proposed during the pendency of the tax bill in this body, first, that any tax reduction should include the raising of personal exemp-

tions, in order to give relief to that large group and mass of our citizens who are in the low-income brackets, and who are the wage earners of this Nation.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. I was just thinking, as the Senator was speaking—and it has been mentioned before on the floor, of course—that it cannot be too often emphasized that when we sought to raise taxes the first thing we did was to decrease the personal exemptions. Is not that correct?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is correct; and that brought on to the tax rolls this large number of our citizens in the small-income brackets, and actually, by doing so, we taxed away from them some of the real necessities of life, based upon American standards of living. But we did that in a war emergency, when we all had to make sacrifices to support the Government and to raise revenue to fight an all-out world war.

Mr. TAYLOR. Part of the purpose was actually to keep people from consuming goods we needed in the war effort, was it not?

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is true; but now, in returning to a peacetime economy, we are trying to make the necessary economic adjustment, to get back to a peacetime basis. The wisdom of reducing taxes at all at this time, or next year, may be debatable; but, if we are to reduce taxes, I am anxious that we take the first step toward reduction of taxes by raising personal exemptions.

Mr. President, on the other issue, I have since appeared before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, now holding hearings preparatory to writing and introducing for the next session of Congress, as I understand, a general tax-revision bill. I appeared before that committee and urged that a provision be incorporated in the bill that would place all States of the Nation, irrespective of whether community-property States or not, on the same footing, so that the Federal income taxes would be collected from all citizens alike, and that husband and wife in the non-community-property States, for the purpose of Federal income taxes, would be permitted to split their incomes and to make separate returns thereon, just as they do in community-property States.

I would like at this point in the RECORD, and as a part of my remarks, to incorporate the statement that I made before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives on June 20, 1947.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). Is there objection to the request?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHN L. M'CLELLAN BEFORE THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON JUNE 20, 1947

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the courtesy you have extended me to appear before you today to discuss a provision which I propose shall be incorporated in the tax revision bill for 1948, on which measure you are now holding hearings.

Before discussing my proposal I wish to commend this committee for its foresight and wisdom used in undertaking to draft and initiate legislation for a general revision of our tax structure. Each revision is badly needed.

It was, doubtless, inevitable that with an unanticipated and unprecedented rapid rise in the cost of government and a correspondingly rapid increase in taxes that the burden imposed on the taxpayers would be accompanied to some degree by injustices and discriminations. Such has resulted and a good many inequities now exist under present law.

Mr. Chairman, I make no pretense at being an expert on tax legislation, but the gross inequity which I seek to have corrected is so patent and flagrant that the wisdom of a Solomon is not required to discover it nor is a trained technical knowledge required to explain it.

By adoption of the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution some 34 years ago, the power was granted to the Federal Government to raise revenues by levying a tax on the income of its citizens. Pursuant thereto, the Congress has from time to time enacted revenue laws levying such taxes at varying rates with prescribed exemptions and limitations. Generally, the rate of tax has constantly increased with each new revenue measure until at present we have the highest income-tax rate in the history of the Nation—a rate that imposes a tax obligation that is indeed burdensome to most of our citizens—so burdensome that a large majority feels that the rate should be reduced, as evidenced by the vote recently recorded in both the House and Senate on H. R. 1 at this session of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I agree that tax reduction is highly desirable although there is a sharp difference of opinion with respect to whether, under present economic and fiscal conditions, it is wise or expedient to enact such a measure at present. However that may be, Mr. Chairman, there is one thing upon which we can and should all agree and that is that preceding any general tax-reduction legislation, or at least simultaneously with such tax-reduction legislation, revisions and adjustments should be made that will eliminate the existing inequities and discriminations of present laws and provide for the collection of income taxes from American citizens on an equal basis in ratio to their income irrespective of the State of their domicile or the laws of the State in which they may reside.

Under existing law, the construction placed thereon and regulations promulgated by the Internal Revenue Bureau, married couples—husbands and wives—of 10 States of this Nation, States having community-property laws, enjoy a favored status resulting in their paying considerable less Federal income tax on their earnings and income than that paid by husbands and wives in the other 38 States of the Union that do not have community-property laws.

In the 10 favored States, husbands and wives, although their entire income may be earned by the husband, are permitted to split this income 50–50, each filing a tax return for one-half and thus reducing the amount of tax collected from the husband's earnings from that which he would have paid had he reported his full income, as husbands are required to do in the non-community-property States.

Last year, Mr. Chairman, 1946, according to the best estimates of the Treasury Department, husbands and wives in 9 community-property States—and there are 10 now—paid between $175,000,000 and $180,000,000 less Federal income taxes than did the same number of husbands and wives with the same incomes in non-community-property States. It is also estimated, Mr. Chairman, by the Internal Revenue Bureau authorities that on the basis of the present rate of taxation, if this favored status, or the same income-splitting privilege, should be accorded to husbands and wives residing in non-community-property States—if the incomes of husbands and wives in all States of the Union were taxed alike by the Federal Government, there would be a loss of revenue to the Treasury of approximately $800,000,000. If tax reduction is now in order, then an equalization that does justice to all married citizens alike that will cost some $800,000,000 annually recommends itself with an appeal for justice that cannot, should not, be denied by an honest Government and by fair, sincere, and conscientious Representatives of the people in Congress.

In my State, Arkansas, husbands and wives last year paid out of their incomes, usually earned by the husband, some $5,000,000 more in Federal income taxes than was paid by the same corresponding number of husbands and wives in the same category in the surrounding community-property States bordering Arkansas—Oklahoma, Texas, and Louisiana.

Mr. Chairman, there are 25 members of your committee. Only three of your number are representatives from community-property States. Twenty-two of you represent States whose citizens are discriminated against, just as are those of my State. Each of you can ascertain by an estimate from the Internal Revenue Bureau how much more Federal income taxes husbands and wives are paying in your State than are the same comparative number with like incomes paying in community-property States. If you will check on this, you will probably be surprised. The penalty inflicted on your citizens because you do not have the community-property system in your State is probably greater than you have realized. You will find it sufficient to engage your interest and to convince you that this travesty upon justice should be removed—and removed now. There can be no excuse for longer delay.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I ask to have printed in my remarks a table prepared for me by the Treasury Department showing the differences both in amount and percentage of taxes paid by husbands and wives on given incomes in community-property States and those who reside in States that do not have community-property laws.

Combined net income before personal exemption	Tax payable		Amount and per cent greater tax in non-community-property State	
	Community-property State [1]	Non-community-property State [2]	Amount	Per cent
$1,000				
$1,200	$38.00	$38.00		
$1,500	95.00	95.00		
$2,000	190.00	190.00		
$2,500	285.00	285.00		
$3,000	380.00	380.00		
$4,000	570.00	589.00	$19.00	3.33
$5,000	760.00	798.00	38.00	5.00
$6,000	969.00	1,045.00	76.00	7.84
$7,000	1,179.00	1,292.00	114.00	9.68
$8,000	1,387.00	1,577.00	190.00	13.70
$9,000	1,596.00	1,862.00	266.00	16.67
$10,000	1,843.00	2,185.00	342.00	18.56
$15,000	3,154.00	4,047.00	893.00	28.31
$25,000	6,460.00	9,082.00	2,622.00	40.59
$50,000	18,724.50	24,795.00	6,070.50	32.42
$100,000	50,274.00	63,127.50	12,853.50	25.57
$150,000	86,953.50	105,383.50	18,430.00	21.20
$200,000	127,081.50	148,124.00	21,042.50	16.56
$250,000	169,337.50	191,339.50	22,002.00	12.99
$500,000	383,543.50	407,464.50	23,921.00	6.24
$750,000	599,068.50	623,589.50	23,921.00	3.99
$1,000,000	815,793.50	839,714.50	23,921.00	2.93
$2,000,000	1,680,293.50	1,704,214.50	23,921.00	1.42
$5,000,000	4,273,793.50	4,275,000.00	1,206.50	.03

[1] Income divided evenly between husband and wife.
[2] Entire income reported by husband on joint return.

It ranges, Mr. Chairman, from $19 or 3.33 percent on a gross income of $4,000 to $2,622 or 40.59 percent on a gross income of $25,000. By way of further illustration, Mr. Chairman, since you reside in a non-community-property State, you have to pay $655.50 more Federal income tax on your salary of $12,500 per year as a Member of Congress than is paid by each of the three members of your committee from the States of California, Washington, and Texas on their salaries as members of Congress. Why this difference, Mr. Chairman? By what process of reasoning, by what standard of fairness and equity, can such discrimination be justified? What quality of statesmanship could possibly motivate this Congress in the enactment of a tax adjustment and revision bill that would perpetuate rather than would remove and eliminate such a monstrosity in our tax structure?

Are you from the non-community-property States willing to take the responsibility for continuing a tax system that requires your citizens to bear a larger share of the cost of this Government on the basis of their income and ability to pay than you will require of citizens of like income and ability to pay in the 10 non-community-property States? I am not, and I shall not be a party to perpetuating this indefensible imposition upon the citizenship of Arkansas which I represent.

Mr. Chairman, I have no quarrel with the community-property States. Most of them inherited their property-tax system. It is their right to keep it. I would not infringe upon that right. I do not want to disturb them in the full enjoyment of the benefits and advantages that it affords. I only ask that Federal income taxes be collected from the citizenship of the other 38 States at the same rate and on the same basis as they are collected from the citizens of the 10 community-property States. An honest Government cannot justify the broad and indefensible discrimination that now obtains.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I propose and earnestly urge that this committee, having the initial responsibility for doing justice and initiating equitable tax legislation, incorporate in the tax revision bill now under consideration the text of S. 1453 which I recently introduced in the Senate. A bill granting to married persons living in non-community-property States who file joint returns the same income-tax treatment as if they lived in community-property States.

Mr. Chairman, I earnestly urge that the text of the bill which I have introduced in the Senate, or similar provisions to those contained therein, be incorporated in the tax-revision bill which you are now considering. Mr. Chairman, I plead with you, the members of this committee, and with all Members of Congress for righteous and equitable treatment, for simple justice to all American citizens alike.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, there appears in the United States News of June 27, 1947, under the title "Tax Cuts That Mr. Truman Favors," the following two paragraphs:

President Truman is getting set to advocate a tax reduction in 1948 centering on a raise in exemptions that will remove millions of taxpayers from the rolls and bar much of a tax saving to the middle- and upper-income groups which have borne the brunt of prewar and wartime tax increases.

The second paragraph reads as follows:

The White House also will favor a tax-law change affecting 1948 income that will permit husbands and wives in all States to divide income equally for tax purposes. This privilege now is reserved for taxpayers in the nine community-property States.

Mr. President, I hope that these are the views of the President. This is not authentic; it only appears in the magazine that I have referred to; but I trust that that information is correct and is based upon fact, and that the President is thinking along those lines. It is encouraging and gratifying to me to know that he is, and I hope to see that made the tax program for the next year.

Mr. President, there also appears in the issue of the United States News to which I have referred an article entitled "New Support for Tax Splitting; Treasury Study of Plan That Would Give Relief to 5,000,000 Families." I ask that this article be incorporated in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW SUPPORT FOR TAX SPLITTING—TREASURY STUDY OF PLAN THAT WOULD GIVE RELIEF TO 5,000,000 FAMILIES—MOVE TO PLACE ALL COUPLES ON SAME BASIS AS THOSE IN COMMUNITY-PROPERTY STATES

Tax cutting, now that Congress has upheld President Truman's veto of the 1947 tax bill, goes over until 1948. Emphasis then, as in the 1947 Congress, will be on relief for individual taxpayers. As a starter on the 1948 program, Congress is leaning toward a plan to provide relief for about 5,000,000 of the Nation's taxpaying families.

That plan simply would permit husbands and wives to split the family income equally for tax purposes. This privilege, offering big tax savings to couples in middle and upper income groups, now is enjoyed only by residents of nine community-property States—Washington, California, Texas, Oklahoma, Arizona, New Mexico, Nevada, Idaho, and Louisiana. A tenth, Oregon, recently passed a community-property law, and married couples in that State are expected hereafter to qualify for the income-splitting privilege.

SUPPORT FOR PLAN

The proposal to extend the same privilege to all States is catching on in Congress and elsewhere, much as the Ruml pay-as-you-go plan caught on in 1942. Since Stanley S. Surrey, the Treasury's Tax Legislative Counsel, disclosed a year ago that the Treasury was working on an income-splitting idea, it has been endorsed in principle by eight State legislatures. Twenty-two bills proposing such a system have been introduced in the current session of Congress. The plan has been promised top billing for 1948 by the Senate Finance Committee. And now, in a new staff study on family taxes, the Treasury offers broad hints that it, too, likes the idea.

What the Treasury is after is to eliminate inequities under present tax laws applying to family incomes. The study just filed with the House Ways and Means Committee points to these areas that need attention.

Where a taxpayer lives often makes a difference in how much tax he pays on his income. If he lives in a community-property State, he can split his salary with his wife, get himself into a lower tax bracket, and thereby save money on his taxes. However, if he lives in one of the other States, his salary is taxable to him alone.

Where his money comes from may be another factor. People with investment income sometimes can divide that income among members of the family through gifts of income-producing property, through family partnerships, family trusts, and other devices. Except in community-property States, where income splitting is automatic, this privilege is denied to salaried people.

How investments are divided among members of the family might determine the amount of a family's tax. The Treasury points out that, because of family relationships and the nature of their investments, some families living on investment income cannot make use of tax-saving devices such as partnerships and trusts, while others effect big savings through such devices.

Income splitting, as the Treasury study shows, would help to eliminate all of these forms of tax discrimination.

Residence in community-property States no longer would offer any tax advantage, because married couples in all States would be on the same tax basis.

Salaried people would get, by law, about the same income-splitting privilege that people with investment income now get through family trusts, partnerships and other tax-saving devices.

All families with investment income would be put on more nearly the same footing, so far as taxes are concerned. In many cases, the incentive to divide income-producing property through trusts, gifts and partnerships would disappear.

EFFECT ON FAMILY TAXES OF DIVIDED-INCOME PLAN

In nine community-property States, husbands and wives are permitted to split the family income for Federal income tax purposes. The tax saving resulting from that privilege, for married couples at various income levels, is shown in the table below:

Net income	Tax in 9 community-property States	Tax in 39 other States	Difference	
			Amount	Percent
$5,000	$760	$798	$38	4.8
$10,000	1,843	2,185	342	15.7
$15,000	3,154	4,047	893	22.1
$25,000	6,460	9,082	2,622	28.9
$50,000	18,725	24,795	6,071	24.5
$100,000	50,274	63,128	12,854	20.4
$500,000	383,544	407,465	23,921	5.9
$1,000,000	815,794	839,715	23,921	2.8

Tax differences between families living in community property States and those living in other States, as those differences exist under present laws, are shown in the accompanying table.

At $5,000 of net income, a taxpayer in a community-property State splits his income with his wife, and each reports $2,500 in a separate tax return. The couple's tax amounts to $760. In any of the 39 other States, the same income, taxable in a lump, bears a tax of $798. The difference is $38, or 4.8 percent.

At $10,000, the tax in a community-property State is $1,843. In other States it is $2,185. Here the difference is $342, or 13.7 percent.

At $15,000, the advantage of income splitting is greater still. In a community-property State, the tax is $3,154, against $4,047 in one of the other States. This is a difference of $893, or 22.1 percent.

At $25,000, the difference reaches a peak of 28.9 percent. In a community-property State, a couple with this income pays a tax of $6,460, against $9,082 in another State.

At $50,000, the gap begins to narrow again. The tax in a community-property State is $18,725, compared with $24,795 in one of the other States. The difference at this level is 24.5 percent.

At $100,000, a couple in a community-property State pays $50,274. Elsewhere, the tax is $63,128, a difference of 20.4 percent.

At $500,000, the advantage in community-property States is only 5.9 percent. This percentage drop is explained by the fact that

surtax rates stop increasing past $200,000. In nine States, couples at this income level pay $383,544. In other States they pay $407,465.

At $1,000,000, the difference is only 2.8 percent. In a community-property State, a couple with this net income pays $815,794, as compared to $839,715 in other States.

These same savings are offered to married couples in all States by the proposal to give Nation-wide effect to the community-property privilege. These savings are greatest in the upper middle groups—from $10,000 to $100,000. Couples with net incomes below $3,300 get no benefit, because they already are in the lowest surtax brackets. Above $5,000,000 savings disappear again, as effective rates there are up to the ceiling of 85.5 percent.

Other plans for dealing with tax inequities among family taxpayers are suggested by the Treasury, but with less emphasis than is given the income-splitting proposal.

Mandatory joint returns are suggested as one means of removing the tax advantage of couples living in community-property States. This system, proposed by the Treasury and voted down in Congress in 1942, is the opposite of the plan to extend income splitting to all States. By requiring joint returns the community-property advantage in taxation would be eliminated. This plan, at about the 1946 level of national income payments, would add $542,000,000 to the tax bills of 1,400,000 couples that now split their incomes. At the same level of income payments, the extension of income splitting to all States would save $744,000,000 for 4,900,000 married taxpayers. Those figures would be higher at the current increased level of income payments.

The Treasury is not likely to make any serious effort to get mandatory joint returns considered by Congress in 1948. As shown by the 1942 debate, community-property States would oppose such a plan on the ground that it would strike at the rights guaranteed to wives under the laws of those States.

A management and control plan is a second alternative suggested by the Treasury. Under this proposal, automatic splitting of income in community-property States would be eliminated. A husband's salary would be taxable to him alone. On income from property, the tax would fall on the husband if he exercised management and control over the property, and on the wife if she had control of the property. This plan would add about $82,000,000 to the taxes of 600,000 married couples in community-property States, assuming about the 1946 level of income payments. Objections in Congress to this idea are likely to be about the same as those raised against mandatory joint returns.

Higher tax rates for single persons and for married couples filing separate returns are involved in the Treasury's third alternative. The idea here is to take the profit out of filing separate returns instead of joint returns. The weakness of this plan, as the Treasury suggests, is that it would put a relatively much heavier burden on single persons than does present law. It would mean added taxes, totaling about $1,000,000,000 a year, divided among 1,400,000 married couples and 7,200,000 single persons.

All the alternative plans, thus, could be expected to run into trouble in Congress. That leaves the proposal to extend income splitting to all States as the one plan that is likely to be taken seriously as a means of wiping out the tax advantages that are now held by families in the community-property States.

A broader tax program than this, however, is to be expected in 1948. Congress will want to provide some tax relief for all of the 46,000,000 income tax payers. Income splitting would benefit only about 5,000,000 families. It offers no relief to low-income families or to single persons. This plan, therefore, would have little chance in Congress except as part of a comprehensive program of tax relief.

Higher exemptions and allowances for dependents may be the administration's proposal for giving relief to low-income taxpayers. Raising exemptions from $500 to $600 would drop about 4,700,000 low-income taxpayers from the rolls.

A percentage cut for all taxpayers, similar to the plan blocked for this year by a veto, is likely to have support from Republican tax leaders again in 1948.

This situation promises another conflict in 1948 over the way to go about cutting taxes. But whatever the broader portion of the program turns out to be, income splitting appears to have a good chance of becoming a part of it. It is the only plan for individual tax relief that is gaining strength both in the administration and in Congress' Republican leadership.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, in conclusion, I want to say that I feel very keenly about both of these proposals. I believe there is real justice, real merit in each, and I believe it is the duty of the Congress to enact legislation that will include both of these proposals. I shall present them and insist on their enactment on every occasion and at every opportunity until they are enacted into law.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the unanimous-consent agreement to vote upon the succession bill will not become operative until Friday; in order to accommodate several Senators who, for good reasons, have to be absent tomorrow and a part of the next day, and to accommodate several of the very important committees that are writing appropriations today—I think five of them are working—if there is no further business to come before the Senate I shall move to recess.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ECTON in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I surmise it is probably the intention of the Senator from Nebraska to move to recess until Thursday?

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. HATCH. I wonder if the Senator has any plans for Thursday's business.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. The unfinished business then will be the succession bill. The distinguished minority leader and the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] preferred that the amendments be taken up on that day, and we have so arranged.

Mr. HATCH. On Thursday?

Mr. WHERRY. On Thursday, so that that will be the unfinished business for Thursday afternoon, as late as we want to sit. The vote will be had on the bill, and all amendments and motions in connection therewith, at 2 o'clock Friday afternoon.

Mr. HATCH. That would give ample time for full discussion of the succession bill?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; it would, in the opinion of the minority leader. I am satisfied of the correctness of the statement made by the minority leader that that will afford ample time. Not only that matter, but one other matter should be taken up, and that is the extension of title III of the Second War Powers Act on which action must be taken by June 30. I think that would require only 2 or 3 minutes, and it is the intention to dispose of that Thursday afternoon at the beginning of the session.

Mr. HATCH. It is not the intention, then, to take up the State, Justice, and Commerce appropriation bill?

Mr. WHERRY. It would have to lie over until Thursday. An appropriation bill would have the right of way, of course.

Mr. HATCH. There are certain of the provisions of that bill which I expect will provoke considerable discussion, and there should be full time for discussion. I am sure the Senator from Nebraska would bear both of those things in mind.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes. I thank the Senator for making the suggestions. I assure him the arrangements are being made in order to accommodate the minority leader, really, and certain other colleagues who wanted to be away.

Mr. HATCH. Yes; I understand. I was not endeavoring to be critical at all. I just wanted to get the information.

RECESS TO THURSDAY

Mr. WHERRY. If there is nothing else to come before the Senate this afternoon, I now move that the Senate recess until Thursday at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess to Thursday, June 26, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 24 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Alton Adolor Lessard, of Maine, to be United States attorney for the district of Maine, vice Hon. John D. Clifford, Jr., resigned.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

Harry M. Brennan to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 42, with headquarters at Louisville, Ky. (Reappointment.)

William J. Storen to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 16, with headquarters at Charleston, S. C. (Reappointment.)

Abe D. Waldauer to be collector of customs for collection district No. 43, with headquarters at Memphis, Tenn. (Reappointment.)

BUREAU OF ORDNANCE, NAVY DEPARTMENT

Rear Adm. Albert G. Noble, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance in the Department of the Navy, for a term of 4 years.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate June 24 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

AMERICAN MISSION FOR AID TO TURKEY

Edwin C. Wilson to be chief of the American Mission for Aid to Turkey.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 24, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou lowly Nazarene, in humility of soul we bow at Thine altar. Here we would pause and find in Thee needed strength and courage; here we seek to be directed in honesty of purpose and integrity of motive, for we would look forward as men look toward the morning.

Bless all States: may their union be strong, not for selfishness or aggression or self-aggrandizement, but a light of living hope whose rays fall upon the troubled waters of every shore line. Grant that we may never violate the sacred trust which has been placed upon us by a liberty-loving people. Do Thou inspire us to cultivate those high qualities which are requisite to give character, proper strength, dignity, and worth. Be Thou our remedy for that which is wrong, our guide toward that which is right, and our help in those emergencies for which human strength is vain.

In the name of our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 381. An act for the relief of Allen T. Feamster, Jr.;

H. R. 407. An act for the relief of Claude R. Hall and Florence V. Hall;

H. R. 493. An act to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia," approved July 8, 1932 (sec. 22, 3204 D. C. Code, 1940 ed.);

H. R. 577. An act to preserve historic graveyards in abandoned military posts;

H. R. 617. An act for the relief of James Harry Martin;

H. R. 1067. An act for the relief of S. C. Spradling and R. T. Morris;

H. R. 1144. An act for the relief of Samuel W. Davis, Jr.; Mrs. Samuel W. Davis, Jr.; and Betty Jane Davis;

H. R. 1318. An act for the relief of Mrs. Fuku Kurokawa Thurn;

H. R. 1362. An act to permit certain naval personnel to count all active service rendered under temporary appointment as warrant or commissioned officers in the United States Navy and the United States Naval Reserve, or in the United States Marine Corps and the United States Marine Corps Reserve, for purposes of promotion to commissioned warrant officer in the United States Navy or the United States Marine Corps, respectively;

H. R. 1376. An act to amend the acts of October 14, 1942 (56 Stat. 786), as amended, and November 28, 1943 (57 Stat. 593), as amended, so as to authorize transportation of dependents and household effects of personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard to overseas bases;

H. R. 1514. An act for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1807. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the county of Pittsburg, Okla., a perpetual easement for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a public highway over a portion of the United States naval ammunition depot, McAlester, Okla.;

H. R. 1845. An act to amend existing laws relating to military leave of certain employees of the United States or of the District of Columbia so as to equalize rights to leave of absence and reemployment for such employees who are members of the Enlisted or Officers' Reserve Corps, the National Guard, or the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2248. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to grant an easement and to convey to the Louisiana Power & Light Co. a tract of land comprising a portion of Camp Livingston in the State of Louisiana;

H. R. 2339. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the designation of Army mail clerks and assistant Army mail clerks," approved August 21, 1941 (55 Stat. 656), and for other purposes;

H. R. 2411. An act to authorize patenting of certain lands to Public Hospital District No. 2, Clallam County, Wash., for hospital purposes;

H. R. 2654. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to grant to the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore, State of Maryland, a permanent easement for the purpose of installing, maintaining, and servicing a subterranean water main in, on, and across the land of the United States Coast Guard station called Lazaretto depot, Baltimore, Md.;

H. R. 2655. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant to the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore, State of Maryland, a permanent easement for the purpose of installing, maintaining, and servicing two subterranean water mains in, on, and across the land of Fort McHenry National Monument and Historic Shrine, Md.;

H. R. 2915. An act for the relief of Mrs. Frederick Faber Wesche (formerly Ann Maureen Bell);

H. R. 3124. An act to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the Eighty-first National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held in Cleveland, Ohio, August 10 to 14, 1947;

H. R. 3372. An act authorizing certain agreements with respect to rights in helium-bearing gas lands in the Navajo Indian Reservation, N. Mex., and for other purposes;

H. R. 3629. An act to authorize the transfer to the Panama Canal of property which is surplus to the needs of the War Department or Navy Department;

H. J. Res. 92. Joint resolution authorizing the presentation of the Distinguished Flying Cross to Rear Adm. Charles E. Rosendahl, United States Navy;

H. J. Res. 96. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue posthumously to the late Roy Stanley Geiger, lieutenant general, United States Marine Corps, a commission as general, United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 167. Joint resolution to recognize uncompensated services rendered the Nation under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1358. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the management and operation of naval plantations outside the continental United States," approved June 28, 1944;

H. R. 1371. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to appoint, for supply duty only, officers of the line of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1375. An act to further amend section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, so as to provide for the clothing allowance of enlisted men of the Marine Corps and Marine Corps Reserve;

H. R. 1742. An act for the relief of Mary Lomas;

H. R. 2276. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to pay certain expenses incident to training, attendance, and participation of personnel of the Army of the United States in the seventh winter sports Olympic games and the fourteenth Olympic games and for future Olympic games; and

H. R. 3769. An act to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to qualifications of part-time referees in bankruptcy.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 175. An act to provide for the furnishing of quarters at Brunswick, Ga., for the United States District Court for the Southern District of Georgia;

S. 179. An act for the relief of Maj. Ralph M. Rowley and First Lt. Irving E. Sheffel;

S. 203. An act to increase the equipment maintenance of rural carriers 1 cent per mile per day traveled by each rural carrier for a period of 3 years, and for other purposes;

S. 258. An act for the relief of Troy Charles Davis, Jr.;

S. 292. An act for the relief of Samuel Augenblisk;

S. 305. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hilda Margaret McGrew;

S. 402. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to James Black Dog a patent in fee to certain land;

S. 490. An act to provide for the extension and application of the provisions of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to certain officers and employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service in the Department of Justice;

S. 608. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Growing Four Times;

S. 682. An act to regulate the interstate transportation of black bass and other game fish, and for other purposes;

S. 706. An act for the relief of William D. McCormick;

S. 880. An act for the relief of Rev. John C. Young;

S. 957. An act for the relief of Col. William J. Kennard;

S. 1100. An act for the relief of Frankie Stalnaker;

S. 1231. An act authorizing and directing the Commissioner of Public Buildings to determine the fair market value of the Fidelity Building in Kansas City, Mo., to receive bids for the purchase thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 1361. An act to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 so as to permit loans, capital grants, or annual contributions for low-rent housing and slum-clearance projects where construction costs exceed present cost limitations upon condition that local housing agencies pay the difference between cost limitations and the actual construction costs;

S. 1421. An act to provide for the appointment of one additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 135. Joint resolution to extend the succession, lending powers, and the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3791. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill and requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BALL, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. TYDINGS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate having proceeded to reconsider the bill (H. R. 3020) an act to prescribe fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management in their relations with one another which affect commerce, to protect the rights of individual workers in their relations with labor organizations whose activities affect commerce, to recognize the paramount public interest in labor disputes affecting commerce that endanger the public health, safety, or welfare, and for other purposes; returned by the President of the United States with his objections, to the House, in which it originated, and passed by the House on reconsideration of the same, it was—

Resolved, That the said bill pass, two-thirds of the Senate having voted in the affirmative.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 2369) entitled "An act providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the Territory of Alaska," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CORDON, and Mr. HATCH to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS, 1947

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3791) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 3, line 22, after "1948", insert ": *Provided further*, That the amount obligated and expended shall be based on an annual appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 of not to exceed $18,000,000."

Page 5, strike out all after line 22 over to and including line 8 on page 6.

Page 6, after line 23, insert:

"Control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest: For an additional amount, fiscal year 1947, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to control and eradicate foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest as authorized by the act of February 28, 1947 (Public Law 8), and the act of May 29, 1884, as amended (7 U. S. C. 391; 21 U. S. C. 111-122), including expenses in accordance with section 2 of said Public Law 8, $1,500,000, to remain available until June 30, 1948."

Page 9, line 3, strike out "$5,977,000" and insert "$6,097,000."

Page 9, line 5, after "$5,972,000", insert "'Post-office inspectors, salaries', $10,000."

Page 9, line 5, after "$5,972,000", insert "'Post-office inspectors, travel and miscellaneous expenses', $10,000."

Page 9, line 5, after "$5,972,000", insert "'Transportation of equipment and supplies', $50,000."

Page 9, line 5, after "$5,972,000", insert "'Operating force for public buildings', $50,000."

Page 10, line 11, strike out "June 30, 1948" and insert "expended."

Page 10, after line 11, insert:

"The funds provided in the preceding paragraph shall be available to an amount not exceeding $250,000 to take all action necessary to prevent erosion at Anaheim Bay, Surfside, Calif."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is my understanding that only four Senate amendments are involved. One eliminating the House provision for sugar rationing; one adding $1,500,000 for the prosecution of the foot-and-mouth disease eradication campaign in Mexico; some urgent provisions for the Postal Service; and the diversion of a quarter of a million dollars from the $12,000,000 allowed for flood control for some emergency work in California.

As to the elimination of the money for sugar rationing, it is my understanding this was done by the Senate in response to the recommendation of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Of course, money must be provided for the vigorous prosecution of the campaign against the foot-and-mouth disease, although I think, from evidence adduced from the hearings in both the House and the Senate, we were paying a very high price for some of the stock we were buying for purposes of destruction in the extermination of the disease.

The provision for the Postal Service is routine and urgent, and should be agreed to.

The only item on which there is occasion for question is the diversion of the quarter of a million dollars from the $12,000,000 allowed for emergency flood control at this critical time. Regardless of whether the purpose of the diversion is an emergency or not, the amendment, instead of earmarking money already provided for emergency flood control, should have provided for an additional appropriation.

However, I am assured by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], that as the session advances and it becomes evident that additional funds are necessary for this purpose, an opportunity will be afforded to secure a supplementary appropriation for emergency flood control and repair.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. What is the amount diverted from the emergency flood-control authorization or appropriation?

Mr. CANNON. We had an authorization of $15,000,000 for flood control. The bill has just been signed by the President. The House, out of the $15,000,000 authorization, appropriated $12,000,000. This amendment is a proposition by the Senate to take $250,000 of the $12,000,000 proposed for emergency flood control for use on a river and harbor project on the Pacific coast.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. It is not a river and harbor project. Will the gentleman understand that there is only $250,000 to put that sand quickly into a very extreme emergency. The changing of a jetty changed the beach so that in less than a year the beach is washing out houses which a year ago were 150 feet away from the beach. By putting this in, the work of the engineers then continues for permanent correction. I agree with everything the gentleman from Missouri has said except by calling it a river and harbor project it gives a wrong impression. It is an urgent emergency.

Mr. CANNON. It has been my understanding that this is one of many similar emergency projects on the Atlantic Coast as well as the Pacific Coast none of which was provided for in the original bill.

The $12,000,000 appropriation is for a pressing emergency. A tide of water is rolling down our rivers engulfing towns and devastating farm lands. The situation demands immediate and urgent attention, and the $12,000,000 is a minimum amount. The gentleman's amendment should have provided for an additional $250,000 and not for a reduction in the already inadequate amount provided for the established flood-control program.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Was that provision requiring the expenditure during the current year eliminated in the Senate?

Mr. CANNON. It was. There is now no time limit on the expenditure.

Under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, and upon the assurance of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] that further funds for flood control will be provided if and when needed, I shall not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]?

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask some questions about this proposition.

First, does this mean the end of sugar rationing entirely?

Mr. TABER. Not immediately. As I understand it, sugar rationing as to industrial users will continue for a while. However, my opinion is that it will not last very long because with the end of some of these other things, the demand for sugar has gone down.

There were close to a million tons in different parts of the world that became available to the United States, and we are more and more getting to the situation where the Government will need to get rid of sugar instead of trying to ration it.

Mr. RANKIN. What I am interested in is getting rid of the rationing of sugar and stopping the harassing of individuals and small enterprises which have to use sugar. I am just wondering

if this bill will terminate sugar rationing entirely.

Mr. TABER. Only insofar as householders are concerned, not insofar as industrial users are concerned. We have not the authority in the Appropriations Committee to terminate it.

Mr. RANKIN. As far as I am concerned I should like to see the burden lifted from the shoulders of these small enterprises that have to use sugar.

Mr. TABER. I think that would be in the public interest.

Mr. RANKIN. When may we expect a step in that direction?

Mr. TABER. We have before us a budget estimate of $5,000,000 to continue the process of sugar rationing during the next fiscal year. We have been told that no such amount would be needed, but we have not had hearings upon it because we have been told by the Department that they were not prepared to give us an accurate statement of just exactly what the situation was. We expect to hold those hearings in the next few days.

Mr. RANKIN. Further reserving the right to object, I again state to the gentleman that I hope this sugar rationing can be taken off entirely at the earliest date.

Mr. TABER. That is my hope.

Mr. RANKIN. I also wish to ask the gentleman a question about this project the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] referred to. Is that money taken out of flood-control funds or is this a special appropriation?

Mr. TABER. It is taken out of the $12,000,000, but it is only $250,000.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Does the gentleman understand that this is not a regular appropriation?

Mr. RANKIN. I understand that.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. This is made with the understanding that it will be replaced when needed.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from California that I am in favor of developing our internal resources and sending less money to be poured into the sinkholes of Europe.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to ask the gentleman about this million and a half for the foot-and-mouth-disease campaign in Mexico. It is my understanding that this does not represent the amount of the supplemental budget estimate but that this million and a half dollars is to be provided in order that the program can be carried along until the committee has an opportunity to investigate certain phases that have come to its attention.

Mr. TABER. The situation is that this million and a half applies toward the estimate that was submitted by the budget of $65,000,000. It is not my intention to bring the matter up on the floor until some people representing our committee and the Committee on Agriculture have had an opportunity to go down there and look the thing over to see what is going on, then come back here and report to us.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. But this fund will permit the program to be carried along until that investigation is made.

Mr. TABER. There is a small quantity of cattle that have been herded together that were infected and needed to be slaughtered and buried immediately before the rainy season hit that area of Mexico; and the Senate felt after this hearing that it was not safe not to provide the funds.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think that is correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of all legislative business and after any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for one-half hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may have permission to sit during general debate in the House this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

ADEQUATE RELIEF FOR THE ELDERLY CITIZENS OF OUR COUNTRY

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, there are over 10,000,000 elderly people in the United States, many of them in need of the necessities of life, food, clothing, medicine, and shelter. Our Nation, with abundant resources, has been niggardly in providing proper relief for our elderly citizens.

There are a number of bills pending in the Congress for this purpose, but thus far no action has been taken thereon. On the opening day of the Congress I introduced H. R. 16, which has for its purpose giving of proper consideration for these old folks. The bill is pending before the Ways and Means Committee. I appeared before the committee on June 16 urging that this or some bill providing help for these old folks be reported out before we adjourn. My statement, together with the names of our colleagues who are sponsoring this legislation, appears in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on page A3001. As I have set forth in the statement, we have sent abroad for relief and asistance in foreign countries over $21,000,000,000 since the war ended, and justice demands that while spending billions abroad we make adequate provision for our own citizens here at home. It would seem that our old folks must move to foreign countries to share in old-age benefits from Uncle Sam's Treasury.

As a last resort I have filed today on the Speaker's desk a petition to take H. R. 16 from the committee and place it on the floor for action. This should be done before the Congress adjourns, and I hope all of you who favor adequate relief for the elderly citizens of our country will sign this petition.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KEARNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include two letters.

Mr. MATHEWS, asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper item.

Mr. OWENS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Chicago Herald-American.

Mr. SEELY-BROWN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. WEICHEL (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject President Truman's Tax Policy and include an article by David Lawrence on the same subject.

Mr. ELLIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MACKINNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter and an editorial from a Louisiana newspaper.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. WHITTINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Commercial Appeal, entitled "False Economy's Tragic Blight."

Mr. FOLGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article opposing

universal military training entitled "Is It an Iron Curtain?"

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. TWYMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

PROMOTION AND ELIMINATION OF OFFICERS OF THE ARMY, NAVY, AND MARINE CORPS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 253, Rept. No. 641), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3830) to provide for the promotion and elimination of officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 89]

Bennett, Mich.	Gathings	Lyle
Bland	Gavin	McGarvey
Boykin	Gearhart	Macy
Brophy	Gifford	Mansfield, Tex.
Buckley	Granger	Marcantonio
Byrne, N. Y.	Gross	Morgan
Celler	Hall,	Morrison
Chapman	Edwin Arthur	Nodar
Chenoweth	Hartley	Pfeifer
Chiperfield	Heffernan	Powell
Clark	Hill	Reed, N. Y.
Clements	Hinshaw	Robertson
Clippinger	Hope	Sabath
Cole, N. Y.	Jenison	Shafer
Coudert	Jennings	Short
Dawson, Ill.	Jensen	Smith, Ohio
Dawson, Utah	Kearns	Snyder
Delaney	Keefe	Stratton
Dolliver	Kelley	Thomas, N. J.
Domengeaux	Kerr	Towe
Eaton	Kilburn	Vail
Fuller	Klein	Vincent
Gallagher	Lea	West
Gary	Lusk	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 359 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

INFORMATIONAL SERVICE, STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3342) to enable the Government of the United States more effectively to carry on its foreign relations by means of promotion of the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills between the people of the United States and other countries, and by means of public dissemination abroad of information about the United States, its people, and its policies.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3342, with Mr. JENKINS of Ohio in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on Friday, the Clerk had completed the reading of the bill and the committee amendment on pages 20 and 21, sections 905 through 909. The pending question is on the committee amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that a correcting amendment on page 16 be included in the legislation, as follows:

Page 16, line 2, after "study", insert a period and strike out "; and act."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MUNDT to the committee amendment on page 21: At the end of the bill add a new section to be numbered section 910 and read as follows:

"REGULATORY PROVISIONS TO APPLY TO ALL INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION ACTIVITIES AND EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGES OF STATE DEPARTMENT

"SEC. 910. All provisions in this act regulating the administration of international information activities and educational exchanges provided herein, shall apply to all such international activities under jurisdiction of the Department of State."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is simply to bring into one office all of the operating activities of the State Department dealing in any way with student exchanges or the exchange of specialists or information, or any other individuals or material. The members of the Committee know that at the present time there are various items of legislation which permit different functions to be carried out. Under various types of substantive legislation we have laws dealing with Latin-American interchanges handled by one office of the State Department; we have authority under an appropriation act for certain exchanges in many areas, and so forth. We feel it would be a further safeguard to this type of legislation if all of the interchange and information activities in which the State Department is engaged are handled under the requirements, directives, safeguards, and regulations of this act.

In other words, to have all of the operating personnel screened by the FBI, to have the preclusion against aliens applying to all activities, and to have the same restrictions and restraints which govern the activities in Europe and in Asia also apply to South America, it is important to add this amendment, which also eliminates such blank-check authority as that granted by the Appropriations Committee in providing funds for broadcasting and educational exchange and information activities by the State Department without bringing them under the intelligent control of Congress as provided for in H. R. 3342 as now amended.

This is an additional safeguarding amendment which brings all these State Department activities into the purview of one office from which the Congress will get regular detailed reports on each activity, all of them to come under the supervision of the Advisory Bipartisan Board provided by the Dirksen amendment to H. R. 3342.

I have nothing further to add on this amendment. I feel it is one that no one could oppose, and I ask for its adoption.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota, a State Department amendment, perhaps does have the intention of uniting these activities under one department, if that can be done. I rise, though, at this time to call your attention to an article appearing in last Sunday's New York Times relative to the number of students now in the United States and the difficulties our GI's are having in getting into colleges. The article, in part, says this:

Colleges and universities throughout the United States expect a greater number of students on their campuses next fall than ever before in their history. Advance reports indicate that the current record-breaking student body of 2,000,000 will be substantially increased when classes reopen in September.

Despite the tremendous increase that has taken place in the last 2 years, many educators predict that the pressures on their campuses from students seeking admittance will grow worse before they get any better. They believe that the peak enrollment may not come until 1949 or 1950. Then the total student body is expected to be in the neighborhood of 3,000,000 or just about double what it was before Pearl Harbor.

For the most part the colleges have completed their registration for the 1947–48 terms. Many, indeed, are already receiving requests for 1948. They report that never in their experience have they received so many applications. In some colleges the ratio of applications to available space has run 10 or 15 to 1. For example, Cornell University received close to 15,000 applications for admission as freshmen—and could accommodate at a maximum 1,300.

Students who have not yet been admitted to a college or university can expect to experience difficulty in getting accepted at this late date. Though some of the smaller institutions, particularly in the Midwest, have a few vacancies, these are expected soon to be filled.

This unprecedented development which started almost immediately after the war ended, is owing in part to the influx of veterans, and in part to the backlog of high-school graduates seeking admittance.

It is estimated that about 250,000 men and women qualified for college and eager to enter were turned away during the past academic year.

To sum up, the Times survey indicates that 33 State universities will admit out-of-State students this fall on a limited and selective

basis, 11 will not admit them at all, while 3 will accept them on nearly equal terms with students of their own State.

I was hoping that the committee in considering this bill would make it a straight broadcasting bill. That is all the information that has gone out to the country. The State Department, through all of their channels of information, has sent this out, and Secretary Marshall, appearing before the committee, said, "We must broadcast information to the world about America." With that I agree, and I think the majority of the Members of this Congress agree that we must sell America through radio, and I think that is what we should do. But it must be apparent to the Members of Congress that the State Department by this amendment desires to build up a huge permanent organization. The committee rejected an amendment which provides for a 2-year extension of the act. The State Department did not want that, so it was turned down. At the proper time I am going to offer a motion, unless offered by the minority, to recommit this bill and ask that the Foreign Affairs Committee bring back a bill for broadcast purposes only. I believe in that 100 percent, but I do not believe that we ought to build up a huge department to bring more students into the United States, when all of our universities are crowded to the gills with students of our own who want to go to school. The GI's who have been discharged from the Army are looking forward to educational opportunities. There are now over 17,000 foreign students in the United States. Why should we deny our GI's the right to go to school? Why should we crowd them out because we want to bring in others from foreign lands to go to school? A gentleman from the State Department testifying before another committee said they would like to bring in 10,000 to study medicine. I submit to you that every medical school in the United States is crowded. They talk about bringing them into our schools of higher learning to take postgraduate courses. They are also crowded. Just try to get into a postgraduate school. Under this bill the State Department proposes to bring into the United States a whole new group of students for study in our already crowded institutions. I say that if we have the room for them, they are welcome, but as long as our GI's are going to school, they should be taken care of first. As the New York Times states, 250,000 have been turned away, and that by 1950, the peak enrollment, there will be 3,000,000 seeking an education.

I ask that you turn down this amendment and recommit the bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, because we sincerely believe that we have the most of everything that is good for the world—both material, educational, and religious advantages—this bill, I assume, is brought in to tell all the world all about our superiority in the hope that by following our ways, our methods, they may likewise share in the good things which we have.

On the first day that this bill was up for debate the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] called attention to the fact that our armed forces had sold America to the world, that our conduct in the past had been such that there was no nation and very few people in any nation who do not realize that this is the very best country in the whole world for the common man. He pointed out very eloquently and very persuasively, that there was no need for us to advertise or sell America, because a majority of the people or at least large numbers of people in every nation wanted to come here, and they knew why they want to come here and that is proof enough of the soundness of our system of government and of its value. They want to share the advantages that we possess.

Then another feature of the bill, as I understand it, is that we want to learn something from the rest of the world. I would be the last to think that we could not learn something from other people, but I am wondering whether or not, with the situation as it is, we are going to be permitted to learn even if this bill goes through and whether knowledge gained will be of value.

I have had no opportnity to read this amendment. I only heard what the gentleman from South Dakota said about it, that it was, as I got his statement, an effort to bring all the activities within the State Department. Unless I am mistaken, the State Department has something to do with the reciprocal trade activities. It has somet'ng to ' o with almost every activity of our Nation as it relates to the action of other nations. If that be so, what is the value, what do we gain by sending teachers abroad, by having them come here, if we follow a course which is not practicable, which will undo what it is here proposed or more accurately make the proposed action futile?

This bill, as I understand it, is to stop communism from spreading throughout the world, yet while we are spending our money to, by words, stop communism abroad—while we are spending our money in sending our words and our pictures and our songs and our plays to convince the Communists and the Russians that they must stop at a certain point in the Old World. While we say that we fear the spread of communism, and while we are told day after day that if we do not stop Russia at the Turkish border or somewhere in eastern Germany they are coming over here, we at the same time, I assume, with the sanction of this same State Department, are shipping the very things, the basic necessities for the preparation and the carrying on of war to Russia which she may wage against us. My reference is to the situation called to your attention so ably and so effectively by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] last week. The idea of spending $34,000,000 to tell the Russians or anyone else, in this instance the Russians, primarily and principally, that they must stop at a certain point over there, and then at the same time shipping them oil and gasoline, without which no war can be carried on, to enable them to prepare for war—to spread communism. Is it not silly? Is it not absurd? The State Department has its share in that.

If the State Department wants to stop communism, if there is danger of Russia attacking us, while we know as we do know, or at least we have been told, that there is a threatened shortage of oil in this country, fuel oil, if you please, while we know that our factories, upon which we must depend for the production of munitions of war to defend ourselves, cannot operate if there is a shortage of oil, we appropriate millions of dollars to send words across, and at the same time the same State Department apparently does not disapprove, at least, of the shipment of munitions of war to our potential enemy. Stop communism with words—give Russia oil to spread communism?

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, first, I want to comment on the statements just made that the pending amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota is a State Department amendment. On the contrary, it is an amendment worked out here by which the Congress can better control the State Department.

Second, may I ask the Members, please, when they have a moment of time, to turn to pages A3071 to A3073 in the Appendix of the RECORD, because they contain a factual discussion one by one by one of most of the charges that have been made regarding this bill—that it will let down the bars against immigration, that it will crowd some GI's out of college, that it will open our schools to Communists and agitators, that it will treat foreign students better than veterans are treated, or give them $10 a day while they are studying here, and so on. The facts are given there in answer to those arguments. Obviously, we cannot take the time now to discuss them one by one here on the floor. But if the Members will examine those pages in the Appendix of the RECORD they can get the facts on which to base their judgment.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this section and on all amendments and on the bill itself close in 30 minutes, the time to be equally divided among those Members desiring to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I move that debate on this section and all amendments and on the bill itself close in 30 minutes, the time to be divided equally amongst Members standing.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I want to put in the RECORD our interpretation of section 906 as part of the legislative history of this bill.

Section 906 was written for a very specific purpose. If this bill were to supplant or take over the work being done abroad in educational and other lines by private American agencies, I would op-

pose it. The schools, the colleges, the hospitals, the agricultural experiment stations, the small industrial demonstration centers that have been set up by American private organizations, churches, and so forth, all over the world, have done for decades and are doing now an invaluable piece of work. It must be said emphatically that it is not intended under this bill to have Government agencies supplant those private agencies or take over those functions. Rather the authorization is only to supplement them, to assist and facilitate their work.

I want to give a specific illustration. The selection, the placement, and the supervision of exchange students and professors under this program has been handled by the so-called Institute of International Education, a private organization of prominent educators and citizens set up by the Carnegie Foundation under the guidance of Nicholas Murray Butler after World War I. Dr. Stephen Duggan, a great scholar and educator, has been the head of it for years. When this student exchange program was first started the Government asked the Institute to be the administrative agency in examining and selecting students assigning them to appropriate colleges or universities, supervising their studies, serving as counselor to them. It has done a remarkable job. There has been no criticism from any source.

Recently the United States Office of Education perhaps because of the almost universal tendency of Government agencies to build empires, has been trying to muscle in and take over the job done heretofore by the Institute. The Office and its friends have tried to pressure the State Department into assigning to it the management of students and professors from abroad, and ours when they go abroad.

The committee believes strongly that Government agencies should not take over functions that belong primarily to educators, that private agencies can and usually will do a far better job than Government bureaus in these fields—with less politics, fear, or favor.

So we wrote section 906 as an amendment, providing that wherever the Secretary can use private agencies in carrying out the provisions of this act, he shall use private agencies insofar as practicable.

To make more clear and specific what we meant, we wrote into the committee report language as follows:

> The committee believes that if a private agency can perform an activity as well or better than a Government agency, and at no greater expense, the Secretary of State should avail himself of those private services.

It is the job of the Department of State to establish general policies and to handle the expenditure of funds; wherever there is a private agency, whether educational organization, or news service, or broadcasting system, or library association, or what not, which can carry out an authorized function as well as and as cheaply as a Government bureau could do it, then the Government shall use and assist and facilitate and supplement the private agencies, but not directly manage them or the functions.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] has expired.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACKINNON] is recognized for 2 minutes.

SUPPORT OUR FOREIGN POLICY BY A PROGRAM OF COOPERATION

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, the Mundt bill, in its present form, represents the collective judgment of this House. With the safeguards of the Dirksen amendment, the changes made by the Keefe amendment, and the other improvements the House has made in the bill, I submit that we should give this program a fair try. Who knows but that the seed of knowledge planted by this education program may some day produce a democratic chieftain on the continents of Europe and Asia who will undo all the harm now being done by totalitarian communism. At this time, when we still have troops overseas, when the treaties of peace have not been agreed upon, when communism is undertaking a world-wide infiltrating offensive, and when the battle of ideas is at its height in Europe and Asia, I submit that we cannot hazard that backward step toward isolation which we would take by defeating this bill. As a nation we need all the ammunition we can muster in our peacetime offensive to support other peoples who believe in freedom.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. OWENS] for 2 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, last week I mentioned that the persons who were sponsoring this bill had seen fit to castigate those who were honestly opposing it, by styling them "isolationists." The word was again mentioned a moment ago by the preceding speaker. I class it properly with the word "interventionist." The gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] took the well after I made that comparison last week and stated that synonyms of isolationism were "insecurity," "impracticability," and "unrealism." Those were his home-made definitions. I went to the dictionary here—Webster's Unabridged International—to see what it really meant and it defines the word "isolate" as follows:

> To separate from all foreign substances; to make pure; to attain a free state.

The word "intervention," according to the dictionary, means "interference of a state in the affairs of another state for the purpose of compelling it to do or forbear doing certain acts or of maintaining of altering the actual condition of its domestic affairs irrespective of its will."

That is the reason I stated that if I had to choose between being called an interventionist or an isolationist I would choose the latter. Intervening is exactly what is being done by one bill after another which is being placed before this House with respect to foreign relations. We of Congress are becoming interventionists.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OWENS. I yield.

Mr. ELLIS. The gentleman from Illinois might supply the answer to my question. In Saturday's paper I noticed 61 Northwestern University professors and instructors have written letters of endorsement of Henry Wallace. I would like to know whether they are the export or the import type.

Mr. OWENS. Evidently they must be of the import type. It appears they are going to import a few more to add to the number.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a few words from the Farewell address of the first President of our country, which might aid the committee in its work.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. OWENS. The excerpt from the Farewell Address that I wish to insert is as follows:

> In the execution of such a plan nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others should be excluded, and that in place of them just and amicable feelings toward all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges toward another an habitual hatred or an habitual fondness is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur.
>
> Hence frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation prompted by ill will and resentment sometimes impels to war the government contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject. At other times it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty, of nations has been the victim.
>
> So, likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter without adequate inducement or justification. It leads also to concessions to the favorite nation of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions by unnecessarily parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted, or deluded citizens (who devote themselves to the favorite nation) facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country without odium, sometimes even with popularity, gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.
>
> As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence

or awe the public councils. Such an attachment of a small or weak toward a great and powerful nation dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter. Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence (I conjure you to believe me, fellow citizens) the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake, since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike of another cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots who may resist the intrigues of the favorite are liable to become suspected and odious, while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interests.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I just want to reiterate what I said a few moments ago, that this bill does provide for bringing in foreign students. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] placed in the Appendix some fiction and facts relative to the bill. He states that about 500 foreign students might come in. I submit to you that if 250,000 American students are to be denied admission to the universities this year, that these 500 foreign students are just that too many

I would like to call attention to the fact that General Marshall in all of his releases has said he hoped to have a broadcasting bill, so that we could broadcast to foreign countries. I am in favor of that, I think that should be done. I think it is fair to say, too, that even if this body sees fit to pass the bill the other body will not pass the Mundt bill, absolutely will not pass it, will not even consider it.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. No; I will not yield to the gentleman.

They do need some authorization. The other body placed money in the appropriation bill for broadcasting, something this House has not endorsed; it was stricken out on a point of order. I think the House ought to take action to make the broadcasting program possible all over the world. By recommitting the bill and bringing out merely a broadcasting bill it will serve that purpose.

The pending bill is loosely drawn. It is a bill that covers too wide a field for the State Department. Sixteen amendments have been accepted. It is permanent legislation that Congress has no way of supervising even though they bring in reports. It is a continuing program, not for 2 years but for many years in the future.

I say again to the membership that I am favorable to Secretary Marshall's broadcasting program, but it should not be hooked up with anything else. This bill provides for Cook tours paid at public expense. We should authorize the program so that appropriations can be made to take care of just broadcasting programs, but we should not extend the authorization over the entire field of education. The other body will only consider a broadcast program. Why pass this bill now? I feel in view of the action by the Senate this bill is untimely.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, in view of some disparaging comments made by Mr. Benton relative to Members of the House I could not support any movement he advocates. The spirit of ridicule in which he recently referred to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the chairman of this subcommittee, comes with very poor grace. His present attitude would warrant any Member's refusing to go along with it at the present time.

The exchange of students may be a very well worth-while project in the future if the students who come in and the students who go out are properly screened and when there is sufficient room in our presently overcrowded schools and universities to take care of such a program.

One of my acquaintances who is in a position to know tells me that the most popular reading matter in all Soviet Russia is the Sears-Roebuck and the Montgomery Ward catalogs. They see the magazine America but it does not carry too much weight. He further said that if there were a radio in every Russian home we could broadcast 24 hours a day, and no matter what material we might send over that it would not do much good. They are sold on America—and almost to a man and woman—they would gladly come to this country if they could. If the leaders of Russia and the Russian-dominated countries say "jump," they will jump. If they say "jump on America," they will jump on America, and all our broadcasts will not stop it.

Mr. Benton's attitude toward military training and the military budget, urging that $200,000,000 be taken away from the military and given to this program, shows he is not traveling along the same highway that the leaders of this Government are now traveling.

As long as the present staff is in control of these programs I cannot support them. If Mr. Marshall will really clean house, and as General Washington said: "Put only Americans on guard," I could then support a reasonable program to combat false statements made about us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK].

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair cannot recognize the gentleman for that purpose, for there is an amendment pending.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BUCK. When will it be in order for me to offer my amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. After the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota has been disposed of, but by that time all time for debate will have expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we now dispose of my amendment. It certainly is not my desire to deprive any Member of offering any amendment.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. BUCK. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK], while he cannot offer his amendment now may speak to his amendment which will be offered after time for general debate has expired.

Mr. BUCK. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, my amendment simply calls for an appraisal of the effectiveness of the program. It has been presented to the committee and has been accepted. I understand there is no objection to it. There is not, therefore, any reason to debate it. It is to add to section 909 the following words:

Inclusive of appraisals and measurements, where feasible, as to the effectiveness of the several programs in each country where conducted.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I simply want to say in confirmation of what the gentleman from New York has said that he has taken this amendment up with our committee and we give him our unanimous support.

Mr. BUCK. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, as you all know, I am against this program, and for one reason. I believe this expenditure is a waste of taxpayers' money; we are throwing this money down a rat hole. I do not believe we will accomplish anything with the expenditure of this money any more than we have already accomplished with the expenditure of over $400,000,000,000 in our war effort, over $12,000,000,000 in Europe since VJ-day, and the shedding of the blood of 300,000 American soldiers on European soil. If that has not done the job, certainly this will not do it for us.

As Herbert Hoover pointed out, to spend money foolishly in Europe is to do irreparable harm to our economy. This is another blank check.

The Truman administration is now going through the motions of showing concern about the cost of the Truman doctrine—the doctrine of pouring out the resources of the United States to support every reactionary government in the world from the bloody dictator Peron in Argentine to the bloody dictator Inönü in Turkey.

Yesterday morning the New York Times had a four-column headline which reads, "Truman creates three committees to survey our capacity to aid

world." Apparently even Mr. Truman is beginning to understand the fact that the great majority of the people of the United States are thoroughly opposed to the administration program of bolstering dictatorship abroad by bankrupting democracy at home.

But Mr. Truman has once again underestimated the intelligence of the people of the United States if he thinks that they can be fooled by this proposed window dressing. He has appointed not one committee but three committees to study the effects of this disastrous program on the American economy. And who heads these three committees? One is headed by the President's Secretary of the Interior. One is headed by the President's Council of Economic Advisers. One is headed by the President's Secretary of Commerce. These are the very persons on whose advice the President is presumably already relying.

Is there anyone who thinks that committees under such direction—two members of the President's own Cabinet and the head of the President's Council of Economic Advisers—will bring in any reports which go to the root of the President's program of bankruptcy?

Even as window dressing, this latest gesture of the administration is an insult to the intelligence of the people of this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KERSTEN].

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in firm support of this bill. This morning at 7:30 over the radio one of our leading commentators, Mr. George E. Reedy, said the following:

> Had it not been for the patience and firmness of Representative KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota, the measure would have died. As it was, it survived several attempts at mayhem and murder by only the slimmest of margins.

Mr. Chairman, America can no longer be defended by a policy of isolation. Years ago when we were in our infancy, decades ago, the policy of isolation was a defense; but today when America is the greatest country in the world, it cannot bring upon itself an age of isolation, for by doing that we withdraw from the rest of the world. If we make ourselves dumb, if we silence the intelligence of this country and we rely only upon this country as it is, we cannot expect that the rest of the world will not be taken over by forces that are inimical to ours.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. Does the gentleman feel it might be wise to wait until we have an invoice of American resources from a committee which has been appointed to make that study before we further commit ourselves? The gentleman from Wisconsin, I dare say, has no more idea than I or any other Member of this House as to what the resources of America constitutes at this moment, and he does not know whether we can afford $31,000,000 or 31 cents. I maintain that we should have an invoice of our resources before we commit ourselves to any further program overseas.

I am willing to admit that the world needs the voice and ideals of God, but it appears a little silly to entrust that mission to certain members of the State Department. Christian missionaries have been pursuing this program for years. Surely, they are better equipped to do a successful job than certain personnel of the State Department. To talk God and Christianity to atheistic nations, as well as to people who do not accept Jesus Christ as the Son of God but scoff at our ideals, is, in my opinion, tantamount to casting pearls before swine.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. In response to that I would say that the best commodity we can deliver abroad is the idea of the fundamental concept of our Government; that is, that the individual and the person comes first before the state, and that the rights that the individual or the person gets are not from the state but from his God. That is the American idea, the American philosophy, and that is what the world needs today.

Further, in response to the gentleman, I am not willing to regard the rest of the peoples of the world as "swine." The rest of the peoples of the world are human beings endowed with inalienable rights just as we in America. We so stated in our Declaration of Independence: "All men"—not just citizens of the United States—"are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator"—not by the State—"with certain inalienable rights." These flaming words were true in 1776; they are still true in 1947. They are true in America, in France, in Italy, in Greece, in Poland. They are true everywhere and at all times. They are true because they are based upon the fundamental nature of man.

Thank God that the Government of the United States is based upon the true nature of man. That man and the family come first. That the state is the servant not the master of the people. That human rights which come from God are not to be uprooted and destroyed by a ruthless state power. The deadly threat to the security of the United States today is that political philosophy that regards man as merely a highly developed animal; that regards the state as the source of all political power; the philosophy that is based on "scientific materialism"; the philosophy that proclaims atheism. That is the contest in the world today, the true answer as to the nature of man. It is a contest of ideas—the most fateful kind of a contest.

Shall the Voice of America be silent in this hour? Shall the oppressed people of the world be unaware that in America human liberty still prevails? Shall we hide our light under a bushel? Shall not our best defense be in a reawakening of hope in human breasts the world over? Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln did not disdain to base their greatest thoughts on the spiritual nature of man. Let the Voice of America be heard; the voice of a nation that recognizes the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI].

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the House to this fact: What assurances have we that the "Commies" will not control this broadcasting? In 1943 I warned this House what was happening with OWI and OSS. Today 50 percent of the State Department are former OWI and OSS members, and the old members and employees of the State Department today are worried that they are being shoved out of their jobs by the "Commies," as the "Commies" now have civil-service status and are eligible as preference workers in the State Department.

I also want to call this to the attention of the House: We were selling Russia to Europe in 1943 instead of America. Forgetting that Russia's neighbors have known her for centuries better than we do and are today reaping harvest from our folly, by Russia obstructing all our work, are we going to repeat the past?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, early in the debate I said that I was not sold on everything in this bill. The debate has now continued throughout several days. Much heat has been generated and some light. Amendments have been offered so that the bill before us today is entirely different than the bill as it came from the committee. Fourteen vital amendments have been adopted. I just noticed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday that the gentleman from South Dakota, the chairman of the subcommittee has printed those amendments. They are lengthy and technical. I have not had time to study them all.

There is much good in the bill. However it can, and should be improved. Within a few minutes we will be called upon to vote. There will be two votes: First, a motion to recommit, which means to kill the bill lock, stock and barrel; second, a motion to pass the bill, that is, if the motion to recommit is defeated. If the bill is voted down that is the end of it. If the bill passes the House that is not the end of it. It then goes to the Senate where it will be thoroughly considered and these amendments digested. Then if the bill passes the Senate with additional perfecting amendments, it will come back to the House in its revised form. There will be a vote on the conference report on the amendments and that will be the vote that counts, the final vote.

For the sake of the good that is in this bill, I am not going to vote to kill it today. I shall therefore vote against the motion to recommit and for the passage of bill, thus sending it on its way. I reserve the right to speak and vote against the conference report if it comes back to the House in a way that I do not like. This bill has within it the germ of peace and better world understanding. The country wants both.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I am offering an amendment to this bill that is

intended to protect the rights of employment of veterans as provided in the Veterans' Preference Act. The membership of the House, I believe, is familiar with this act as it applies to veterans employed in civil service. I want to make sure their rights are protected under this bill so that when men and women are employed the terms of the preference act will be respected.

I believe, too, that since those employed under this act, if enacted into law, will have a great deal to do with transactions with foreign countries, the Government will do well to see to it that veterans are employed where their services can be utilized. There are a good many veterans who have a pretty broad understanding of our problems with foreign countries and their services will thereby be extremely valuable.

I hope my amendment will be approved.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to call attention to the fact that civil-service employment is not given the protection to which I think it is entitled under this bill. I call your attention for example to the language on page 14 of the bill where it is specifically stated that those administering the legislation can employ people without regard to the civil-service and classification laws, on a temporary basis. Further provision is made that aliens may be employed within the United States. Such aliens, will, of course, be limited to services related to translation and narration. The thing to which I want to specifically direct the attention of the committee is that civil-service laws and rules and regulations thereunder must also be respected in the administration of this legislation.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Will not the gentleman have the amendment read? It is at the Clerk's desk.

Mr. REES. I want to have the amendment read, but first I want to ask a question of the gentleman from South Dakota. About how many people does the chairman contemplate will be employed under the terms of this legislation if enacted into law?

Mr. MUNDT. The entire legislation?

Mr. REES. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. There are now 1,800 people. I presume it will depend entirely on how much money is appropriated. The other body has indicated a willingness to appropriate $12,000,000 to the program, which would give us an employment of 300 to 500 people.

Mr. REES. This, as I understand it, would make a total employment under the present bill, if enacted into law, of about 2,300 people. One of the things that disturbs me with respect to this whole problem is that the subcommittee deems it necessary to pass this legislation in order that our people may be on more friendly relations with the people of Europe who have so recently been our allies in a world war. It is indeed a strange situation we face when such legislation is requested in order that these people may have a more friendly attitude toward us. People who for the most part are those to whom we provided implements and munitions of war, together with supplies of various kinds and who have been provided with materials of all kinds, including food and clothing, since hostilities ceased.

It is estimated that we have spent between twelve and twenty billion dollars in property and money for these people and yet, as I say, it seems passing strange that in order to have a better understanding with people we have helped so much it is claimed that it is necessary for us to provide the legislation requested in this bill.

Certainly, I am in favor of exchange of ideas and knowledge with other countries. We are doing that now, and rightly so. We have far more foreign students in our schools and universities than we have in foreign countries. We have always been liberal in that respect. We are right now. Even with crowded conditions there are 17,000 students in our colleges and universities. While about 3,000 Americans are in schools abroad. Foreigners are allowed to travel in America anywhere they please on visitors' visas, but not so with respect to Americans in certain countries of Europe.

Mr. Chairman, I am one of those who wants to be fair and friendly with the people of other countries, but I cannot understand the necessity of this proposed legislation in order to do so. If I thought the further expenditure of $35,000,000 provided under this bill and the employment of 2,300 people in the State Department to carry on the programs outlined herein, would bring peace and understanding, of course, we would all support it. Give us a simple, constructive program with a policy that is reasonable and definite and I will gladly support it.

Let me say again, I just do not believe we need all this legislation, with all of its ramifications and implications in order to bring about an understanding between our countries of the world, who have so recently been our allies, and to whom we are now furnishing huge quantities of equipment, oil, machinery, food, and other things to rehabilitate and help them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, down through the ages, particularly since the birth of the Redeemer, progressive mankind has been constantly fighting toward the development of an idea of government with a recognition of the omnipotence of God and centered around the dignity and the personality of the individual. It evidenced itself in parliamentary form in Great Britain, and later under a constitutional government in our own country.

Among the famous utterances of American history which will always ring in the minds and hearts and ears of Americans and men and women everywhere seeking the dignity of the individual are the immortal words of Patrick Henry, "Give me liberty or give me death." Only a few weeks ago, in another country, Hungary, under the control of the Communist Army, another man paraphrased that and took the same position when he said, "Give me liberty or give me death."

Mr. RANKIN. It probably meant death for him.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Sulyok, leader of the Freedom Party, one of the political parties of Hungary, made a dramatic speech within the last few weeks. It was a speech for the dignity of man, for liberty, a speech that he probably knew when he made it meant death, as the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] interposed a moment ago, and I agree with him. Down through the ages there have been individuals who were wedded to the idea of liberty, Patrick Henry in the days preceding the Revolution, and this brave man of our day.

Mr. Chairman, as I see it, this legislation is necessary in the national interest of our country. It is also a powerful voice to the minds of individuals like this brave man in other lands, who will receive the benefit of these broadcasts that will go out of our country as a result of the passage of this bill, sending to him and his kind the message of hope.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON].

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, the pros and cons of the Voice of America have been debated at great length. There were times during the debate when it appeared that Gabriel's horn would probably drown out the last whisper of the Voice before it was finally passed. In the very near future, as has been stated, there will be a vote to recommit this measure. In considering that vote to recommit, I should like to call to the attention of the committee at this time that the principle involved in his bill represents the considered opinion of the entire Committee on Foreign Affairs, a standing committee of the House of Representatives.

It might well be argued that the integrity of that entire committee is at stake here on the question of whether or not this legislation is repudiated by the membership. The Senate action has been discussed here briefly. It has been said that the Senate intends to take no action on this measure when it reaches that body. The truth of the matter is that the Senate originally indicated such an action, but several days later indicated its willingness to agree to the sum of $6,000,000. Several days ago, after further study of the principles involved in the bill, the Senate indicated a willingness to increase that amount to $12,000,000. The Senate has very definitely taken action in the appointment of a subcommittee of Senators HATCH and SMITH to investigate the bill at length and in detail.

So far as recommitting this bill is concerned with instructions to report back a measure which encompasses only the broadcasting features of the bill, I personally believe that such action would sound the death knell of the information program.

The libraries and information bureaus abroad are to me one of the most important features of the bill. There are one-

hundred-odd such bureaus servicing thousands of inquiries every week of the year. That, to me, is a most important feature.

To some, the student-exchange program is the most important; to others, the broadcasting feature is preeminent.

Mr. Chairman, I trust that the House will consider well its vote before it recommits not only a bill but a principle which has the almost unanimous approval of the committee, the press, the radio, and the veterans' organizations of America.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee handling this legislation be given my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, for any program to succeed there are three essential requirements: The first is a sound workable plan; second, adequate funds; and, third, proper personnel to carry it out.

It has been apparent all during this debate that the major difficulty most Members have with respect to this bill is the question of the personnel. I understand fully that apprehension. I can say frankly that when our committee first approached this problem I was strongly disposed against it because of some of the personnel I had seen here and in Europe and Asia operating the war-information programs which preceded this one. To be perfectly blunt, it was not in those years the Voice of America. It was mostly the voice of the left wing of the administration in power. I could not support that. I wanted a true voice of America, all of America.

Mr. Chairman, if I did not know of the great changes in policy and in personnel, both at higher and lower levels, that have taken place in the last 6 months or more, if we had not in this bill established more careful definitions of the functions of the office in the future, and stricter controls of its activities and, above all, of its personnel, I would still be against it. But as I studied the whole problem in relation to our present world situation during days of hearings and discussions, on the record and off the record, I became increasingly convinced of two paramount facts. First, that the need for this information and education program today is infinitely greater than we have realized; and, second, that the agency has been enormously improved. Its personnel has been drastically combed and culled out. That process is still going on. Whatever it or its predecessors did in the past, it is doing a good job now and there is no reason to doubt that it will do an increasingly good job in the future.

I do not care how good a product may be. It must be well presented, and repeatedly, or it will not be widely accepted. Who knows that better than Americans?

The finest product the world has ever known was the life and teachings of Jesus Christ. But His message would never have gotten across, no matter how perfect His life and His teachings and His deeds, if it had not been for the greatest educational program and propaganda campaign—in the right sense of the term—which ever existed. He Himself set it in motion when He sent out His disciples—trained personnel—to tell a story. It was a matchless story, almost unbelievable good news—but it had to be told. It still has to be told.

The Apostle Paul was the world's greatest and most effective spreader of ideas. To be sure, he had the most explosive ideas that the world has ever known. Communism is like a tin soldier out of the dime store compared to the explosive ideas which Jesus Christ let loose in the world. It is because of the way in which they were spread by the disciples and by St. Paul and the missionaries who have followed in His train that it can be truthfully said that "all the armies that ever marched, and all the navies that ever were built, and all the parliaments that ever sat, and all the kings that ever reigned, put together, have not affected the life of man upon this earth as powerfully as has that one solitary life."

Mr. Chairman, I believe with all my heart that in the Constitution of the United States and the system of government our fathers established here, we have incomparably the best set of political ideas that were ever put together in one place in the world's history. I think they are the hope of the world. The future of our Nation and of the world depends upon the spread of those ideas—everywhere. The ideas are the world's best, but they are not enough; we must present them. That, in my judgment, is the only way we can ultimately turn back the tide of totalitarianism and tyranny which is sweeping over the earth.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE] for 2 minutes.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, if this legislation is not passed by the House, our failure will have repercussions far beyond the details of the bill which are under attack. It will be interpreted abroad as further evidence of isolationism. In a world in which blitzkreig by infiltration, subterfuge, blackmail, and political pressure has been substituted for blitzkreig by direct military assault, we shall have decided to conduct an unworthy retreat. That this will seriously handicap our Government in the prosecution of an effective foreign policy is beyond doubt, as the testimony of General Marshall, General Eisenhower, Gen. Bedell Smith, and others forcefully states.

But if we fail to pass this measure, our failure will carry still other implications which are not pleasant to contemplate. It will be, on our part, a most unbecoming and damaging gesture. Our country has been populated in large part by people from Europe. These people brought with them many things, including European culture. Over the years, Americans have journeyed to Europe in order to maintain contact with European culture, and Europeans have come here to create and enhance American culture. Now we are asked to show the world that we have a culture. We are asked to extend our culture to Europe, to a Europe in which the chaos and destruction of war have perpetrated cultural ravages also. We proclaim that we reject the crass materialism of Marxism. We say that we do not believe in the communistic doctrine of economic determinism. We vehemently protest that we believe with Abraham Lincoln that the individual is the complex heart of society. We state that our faith is based on the dignity of the individual—that we believe in the human soul. And yet there are some of us who would restrict our exports to the purely material things of life. There are some who would entitle our detractors to say that while we have produced a nation of military might and industrial power we have engendered no culture commensurate with these material achievements; that we are a cultural and spiritual desert. There are those who would furnish the enemies of freedom with the basis for saying that we worship the dollar rather than the immortal soul of man. Are we such pagans that we have already forgotten the spiritual values which enabled Americans to fight World War II to a successful conclusion? Are we such shallow cynics that we believe that men will give their lives for material things? Have we forgotten our American heritage to such an extent that we dare not proclaim our own settled conviction that our free system under God is one for which we are prepared to put forth a great sustaining effort in peace as well as war?

It is now our turn to provide culture for others. Aristotle said that education is an adornment in prosperity and a refuge in adversity. Let us help to provide that refuge. Let us spread the beneficent contagion of our education, of our culture, of our concept of human society to the remote recesses of this planet where the forces of darkness and despotism have enslaved millions of people. Let us enlarge our conceptions to the circle of our duties. A world contracted by science must be united by freedom if peace is to prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS].

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] for 4 minutes.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, we have now come to the end of a long, interesting, and informative discussion of what I honestly consider to be one of the most important decisions this Congress has been called upon to make during the Eightieth Congress. For some reason or other it has been tremendously difficult to get across to the membership the true and honest facts which are involved in this decision.

I want to read, for example, a telegram which just came to me this morning from Mr. Louis E. Starr, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, who has been worried because somebody misquoted the position of the Veterans of Foreign Wars during the sustained debate on H. R. 3342. Here is his telegram:

Strongly urge favorable consideration of H. R. 3342 as pending in House. Essential to a constructive approach of our postwar relations with other countries that we utilize all media of information and cultural exchange. Reciprocal teacher-student exchange important as informational broadcasts. We cannot fight ideas with our money but we can with our ideas and our American way of life.

LOUIS E. STARR,
Commander in Chief,
Veterans of Foreign Wars of U. S. A.

That was sent up with a personal messenger, along with a note which I have been asked to be read:

Much has been said on the floor of the House that the teacher-student exchange provisions would cause infiltration of communistic ideologies into our country.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States has been in the foreground in the fight against communism in this country. Yet, as indicative of our appraisal of the situation, the VFW at its Forty-seventh National Encampment held in Boston endorsed the principle of the Mundt bill. Following is the national resolution:

"RESOLUTION 531

"INFORMATION AND STUDENT EXCHANGE WITH U. S. S. R.

"Be it resolved by the Forty-seventh National Encampment, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, assembled in Boston, Mass., September 2–7, 1946, That (1) the Veterans of Foreign Wars attempt through the State Department to arrange for and defray the expenses of exchange students and exchange athletic teams to be selected from among the members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and veterans of the Red Army; and (2) the Veterans of Foreign Wars through the State Department endeavor to make available to the Russian people American radio programs, both news and entertainment, American motion pictures, and American press services published in Russian."

Mr. Chairman, the contents of this note from the VFW should make crystal clear the attitude of that great veterans' organization on this important legislation.

Repeatedly, for some reason or other, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] and others, have said that the Secretary of State is not concerned about the student exchange features of the Mundt bill. I presume the Secretary of State writing in a letter over his own signature should be writing the thing in which he believes. I want to quote to you what General Marshall said:

I am unreservedly in favor of the exchange of students, professors, and books. These methods, in the long run, may be far more important for the interchange of information than broadcasting. * * * I do not believe that a bill limited to broadcasting would give this Government the opportunities it must have to explain itself to the rest of the world.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I am sorry; I cannot yield.

I submit in closing, Mr. Chairman, that some Members of the House seem inclined to swallow a camel but strain at a gnat. We have voted to the same men who are to carry out this program $11,000,000,000 in this Congress to give us defense establishments. We have voted $12,000,000,000 to give foreign aid abroad.

We are now down to what the other body of Congress indicates may be only $12,000,000 to fight the battle of peace. Mr. Chairman, are Members really not interested in getting this battle for peace conclusively won? This suggested sum of eleven or twelve millions to win the peace is a most niggardly sum compared with the eleven billions we have voted for security in this uneasy world and the twelve billions authorized to supply creature needs abroad.

What are you going to tell your people back home when they ask you what the Eightieth Congress did to help win the peace? Are you going to say: "I voted $12,000,000,000 for aid abroad. I voted $11,000,000,000 to give us a defense establishment, troops, ships, and guns, but I could not trust these same administrators with eleven, or twelve, or twenty million dollars to fight the battle of peace." If that is the basis of our argument then we are derelict in our duty indeed in not coming down into the well of the House and moving to impeach the Secretary of State if we do not have confidence enough in him to give him the $11,000,000 he says he needs to build the temple of peace we all want to see constructed.

Mr. Chairman, I submit as a matter of cold candor that we should either impeach the Secretary of State or else equip him with the tools he needs to accomplish the results we all desire. As for me, I prefer to provide him with the tools for which he pleads and to set up a program for him to operate which can make it possible for peace to succeed.

Preparedness alone and preparedness plus international alliances and organizations alone have been tried as devices for maintaining the peace almost since the beginning of civilization. What has been the result? The result has been one recurring war after another, each conflict being bloodier and more destructive than the one preceding it. We offer you in H. R. 3342 an approach to peace which the world has never tried. We offer you the machinery and the methods by which America can help create those wide areas of human understanding, good will, and international respect and confidence which are essential if peace is to endure. We offer it to you at a price which is actually less than one-fourth the cost of one modern battleship. We offer it in the form of legislation carrying adequate safeguards for its successful operation and providing for congressional controls which will make this peace-serving program the joint effort of our legislative and executive branches of government. We offer it to you at a juncture of history when the horrors of war have never been more appalling and when the essentiality of an enduring peace has never been of such importance.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the House, I urge your support of H. R. 3342 with all the force at my command. Winning the peace is fully as important as winning the war. I trust that by your votes on this legislation you will support and approve a program set up to secure the peace and devised to create a climate in which the causes of war can be eliminated and the blessings of peace can be preserved.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

All time for debate on the pending amendment and on the bill has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUCK: Page 21 line 13, strike out the period and add the following: "Inclusive of appraisals and measurements, where feasible, as to the effectiveness of the several programs in each country where conducted."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES: Page 21, after line 9, insert the following:

"SEC. 909. No provision of this act shall be construed to modify or to repeal the provisions of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944;"

And on line 11, renumber section 909 to read "SEC. 910."

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will be authorized to correct the section numbers so they will conform.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment as amended.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JENKINS of Ohio, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3342) to enable the Government of the United States more effectively to carry on its foreign relations by means of promotion of the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills between the people of the United States and other countries, and by means of public dissemination abroad of information about the United States, its people, and its policies, pursuant to House Resolution 224, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. RANKIN and Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Oklahoma rise?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am opposed to the bill, Mr. Speaker, in its present form.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the bill H. R. 3324 be recommitted to the Committee on Foreign Affairs with instructions to report it back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment: "Strike out section 201, on pages 3 and 4."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MASON) there were—ayes 172, noes 52.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 273, nays 97, answered "present" 1, not voting 58, as follows:

[Roll No. 90]

YEAS—273

Abernethy	Celler	Goff
Albert	Chadwick	Goodwin
Allen, Calif.	Chelf	Gordon
Allen, La.	Clason	Gore
Almond	Coffin	Gorski
Andersen, H. Carl	Cole, Kans.	Granger
	Colmer	Grant, Ala.
Andresen, August H.	Combs	Grant, Ind.
	Cooley	Gregory
Andrews, Ala.	Cooper	Griffiths
Andrews, N. Y.	Corbett	Gwinn, N. Y.
Angell	Cotton	Hagen
Arends	Courtney	Hale
Auchincloss	Cox	Hall,
Bakewell	Cravens	Leonard W.
Barden	Crosser	Halleck
Bates, Ky.	Davis, Ga.	Hand
Bates, Mass.	Davis, Tenn.	Hardy
Battle	Davis, Wis.	Harless, Ariz.
Beall	Dawson, Ill.	Harris
Beckworth	Dawson, Utah	Harrison
Bell	Deane	Hart
Bennett, Mo.	Devitt	Havenner
Bland	Dingell	Hays
Blatnik	Dirksen	Hébert
Bloom	Donohue	Hedrick
Boggs, La.	Dorn	Hendricks
Bolton	Doughton	Herter
Bonner	Douglas	Heselton
Bradley	Durham	Hess
Bramblett	Eaton	Hobbs
Brooks	Eberharter	Holmes
Brown, Ga	Ellsworth	Hope
Bryson	Elsaesser	Horan
Buchanan	Engel, Mich.	Howell
Buck	Engle, Calif.	Huber
Bulwinkle	Evins	Jackson, Calif.
Burke	Fallon	Jackson, Wash.
Burleson	Feighan	Jarman
Busbey	Fellows	Javits
Byrne, N. Y.	Fernandez	Jenkins, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.	Flannagan	Johnson, Calif.
Camp	Fletcher	Johnson, Ind.
Canfield	Fogarty	Johnson, Tex.
Cannon	Folger	Jones, Ala.
Carroll	Foote	Jones, N. C.
Carson	Forand	Jones, Wash.
Case, N. J.	Fulton	Jonkman
Case, S. Dak.	Gamble	Judd
Karsten, Mo.	Miller, Conn.	Rohrbough
Kean	Mills	Rooney
Kearney	Mitchell	Ross
Keating	Monroney	Sadlak
Kee	Morris	Sadowski
Kefauver	Morton	Sasscer
Kennedy	Muhlenberg	Scoblick
Kersten, Wis.	Mundt	Scott, Hardie
Kilday	Murdock	Seely-Brown
King	Murray, Tenn.	Sheppard
Kirwan	Nixon	Sikes
Kunkel	Norblad	Simpson, Ill.
Landis	Norrell	Smathers
Lane	Norton	Smith, Maine
Lanham	O'Brien	Smith, Va.
Larcade	O'Konski	Somers
Latham	O'Toole	Spence
Lea	Pace	Stanley
LeCompte	Patman	Stevenson
LeFevre	Patterson	Stigler
Lewis	Peden	Sundstrom
Lodge	Peterson	Taylor
Love	Philbin	Teague
Lucas	Pickett	Thomas, Tex.
Lyle	Plumley	Thomason
Lynch	Poage	Tollefson
McCormack	Potts	Trimble
McDonough	Poulson	Vorys
McDowell	Preston	Wadsworth
McMahon	Price, Fla.	Walter
McMillan, S. C.	Price, Ill.	Welch
McMillen, Ill.	Priest	West
MacKinnon	Rabin	Wheeler
Madden	Rains	Whittington
Mahon	Ramey	Wigglesworth
Manasco	Rayburn	Williams
Mansfield, Mont.	Rayfiel	Wilson, Ind.
	Richards	Wilson, Tex.
Marcantonio	Richlman	Winstead
Meade, Ky.	Riley	Wolverton
Meade Md.	Rivers	Worley
Merrow	Rockwell	Zimmerman
Michener	Rogers, Fla.	
Miller, Calif.	Rogers, Mass.	

NAYS—97

Allen, Ill.	Graham	Reeves
Anderson, Calif.	Gross	Rich
Arnold	Gwynne, Iowa	Rizley
Banta	Harness, Ind.	Robsion
Barrett	Hoeven	Russell
Bender	Hoffman	St. George
Bishop	Hull	Sanborn
Blackney	Jenkins, Ohio	Sarbacher
Boggs, Del.	Jennings	Schwabe, Mo.
Brehm	Johnson, Ill.	Schwabe, Okla.
Brophy	Johnson, Okla.	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Brown, Ohio	Knutson	
Buffett	Lemke	Scrivner
Butler	McConnell	Shafer
Church	McCowen	Simpson, Pa.
Clevenger	McGregor	Smith, Kans.
Cole, Mo.	Maloney	Smith, Wis.
Crawford	Martin, Iowa	Springer
Crow	Mason	Stefan
Cunningham	Mathews	Stockman
Curtis	Meyer	Taber
Dague	Miller, Md.	Talle
D'Ewart	Miller, Nebr.	Tibbott
Dondero	Murray, Wis.	Twyman
Elliott	O'Hara	Van Zandt
Ellis	Owens	Vursell
Elston	Passman	Weichel
Fenton	Phillips, Calif.	Whitten
Gavin	Phillips, Tenn.	Wolcott
Gearhart	Ploeser	Wood
Gillette	Rankin	Woodruff
Gillie	Reed, Ill.	Youngblood
Gossett	Rees	

ANSWERED PRESENT—1

Lesinski

NOT VOTING—58

Bennett, Mich.	Gifford	Macy
Boykin	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Mansfield, Tex.
Buckley		Morgan
Chapman	Hartley	Morrison
Chenoweth	Heffernan	Nodar
Chiperfield	Hill	Pfeifer
Clark	Hinshaw	Powell
Clements	Holifield	Redden
Clippinger	Jenison	Reed, N. Y.
Cole, N. Y.	Jensen	Robertson
Coudert	Jones, Ohio	Sabath
Delaney	Kearns	Short
Dolliver	Keefe	Smith, Ohio
Domengeaux	Kelley	Snyder
Drewry	Keogh	Stratton
Fisher	Kerr	Thomas, N. J.
Fuller	Kilburn	Towe
Gallagher	Klein	Vail
Gary	Lusk	Vinson
Gathings	McGarvey	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Jenison against.

Mr. Thomas of New Jersey for, with Mr. Clippinger against.

Mr. Towe for, with Mr. Dolliver against.

Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Bennett of Michigan against.

Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. McGarvey against.

Mr. Chapman for, with Mr. Kearns against.

Mr. Klein for, with Mr. Gallagher against.

Mr. Gary for, with Mr. Reed of New York against.

Mr. Delaney for, with Mr. Vail against.

Mr. Morgan for, with Mr. Smith of Ohio against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Jones of Ohio with Mr. Gathings.
Mr. Nodar with Mr. Pfeifer.
Mr. Jensen with Mr. Morrison.
Mr. Macy with Mr. Clements.
Mr. Hartley with Mr. Domengeaux.
Mr. Short with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Holifield.
Mr. Chiperfield with Mr. Kelley.
Mr. Cole of New York with Mrs. Lusk.
Mr. Chenoweth with Mr. Redden.
Mr. Hill with Mr. Sabath.
Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall with Mr. Vinson.
Mr. Keefe with Mr. Heffernan.
Mr. Snyder with Mr. Clark.
Mr. Robertson with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Hinshaw with Mr. Boykin.
Mr. Fuller with Mr. Fisher.
Mr. Gifford with Mr. Drewry.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that the House has finally passed the State Department's information program bill which, I hope, will enable the United States to continue to broadcast to the world so that the lies and half-truths which have been disseminated about us can be met and overcome.

In our committee hearings and during the course of debate, we received much evidence of the type of propaganda which has been broadcast against us and which can only be met by letting all the world know the truth concerning the ideals for which this country stands. We have been accused of being imperialistic; of launching a race in armaments; of secretly running the Turkish Army; of making a colony of the Philippines, and that the American policy in Germany aims to bring about "an imperialist peace based on the enslavement of nations."

These are some of the many false statements which have been brought to our committee's attention and this was the type of information which the peoples of Europe and Asia got as they listened to radio broadcasts emanating from abroad. It is a picture, with variations, which has been broadcast about America over a period of many months. The purpose, obviously, is to arouse suspicions as to this country's motives and create fears as to its aims.

The United States cannot afford to be complacent about this anti-American propaganda campaign. Nor can it afford to sit back and assume that the untruths, half-truths, and exaggerations will do no harm just because we know they are so wide of the mark. The

United States has spent billions in relief for foreign countries. We have approved appropriations for Greece, Turkey, and for the relief of needy European countries. It is in defiance of all logic and common sense to appropriate that money and at the same time cut out the small appropriations needed to present to the world a true picture of America.

Such an information program is needed not merely to combat the vicious anti-American propaganda with which so many ears are being assailed in so many countries of the world. It is even more needed to hold up to the world an undistorted mirror of American events, American thought, American policies.

To some slight extent this essential task is being done by private agencies and individuals, but there is a vast area which private enterprise cannot and does not reach in this battle for men's minds. It is at this point that the Government must step in and do the job that so badly needs being done, a job which, incidentally, the State Department, despite its critics, has done extremely well.

The House has today, by its vote of 273 to 97, indicated its strong approval for this needed and necessary program to present to the world a true picture of America, and carry on the interchange of students and technicians so that a better feeling can be created and the truth given to other nations about us and our way of life.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill H. R. 3342.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

THEY PUT THE PRESIDENT IN A HOLE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the President, left to himself, would never voluntarily have gotten into the mess where he now finds himself. His left-wing advisers have gotten him into a dilemma.

In his veto message of the labor bill he stated that when one "understands the real meaning of its various parts the result is startling"; that, as a whole, it is in "conflict with important principles of our democratic system." He states that it "contains seeds of discord which would plague this Nation for years to come."

The President has taken an oath to faithfully execute the laws of the land. The measure which he vetoed is today the law of the land.

The President has no choice. He must hold steadfast to the oath which he has taken or face impeachment.

He has no right to disregard the expressed will of the people. He is face to face with a situation where, having expressed an opinion that the law is detrimental to the welfare of the Nation, he must nevertheless enforce it.

No doubt, the truth is that he had no adequate knowledge of the law when he submitted his veto message.

We cannot assume that he was not telling the truth when he stated on Tuesday that he had never read the bill and, that being true, it is not only possible but highly probable that he did not know what was in the bill when he submitted his veto message on the following Friday.

Let us now assume that he will forget the advice, reject the conclusions, of his left-wing advisers; give the legislation adequate study and when, after such study, he learns, as he will, that it is remedial and beneficial in its nature, give positive instructions to the National Labor Relations Board and his Department of Justice to see that it is correctly interpreted and adequately enforced.

The President of the United States should admit his mistake, see to it that the subordinates in his administration comply with the will of the people as expressed so overwhelmingly in the adoption of this legislation.

The issue is clearly drawn and it is: Shall the will of the people, expressed in the constitutional way, prevail or are minority political pressure groups to rule this country? The people are watching.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs may be permitted to sit during general debate in the House all of this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a newspaper article and in the other a newspaper editorial.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address delivered by His Excellency, the Ambassador from Egypt. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $177.50, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. OWENS asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks previously made in the committee on the bill H. R. 3342 and include excerpts from Washington's Farewell Address.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BENDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in seven instances and to include seven different articles.

Mr. KEFAUVER (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials.

Mr. SPENCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he will make in the debate on the extension of RFC and include a letter from John D. Goodloe, Chairman of the Board.

Mr. LEA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two subjects, in one to include an editorial and in the other a decision of the Supreme Court.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD, but has been informed by the Public Printer that the extension will exceed two pages of the Record and will cost $355. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] may have permission to extend these remarks notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a report on the subject of immigration.

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include four editorials on the subject of the wool bill and one editorial on the subject of the tax bill.

Mr. SMATHERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a poem.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] may be excused today on account of business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the New York Times.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained on the roll call just had on the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1947. Had I been present I would have voted "aye."

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, due to the fact that I was detained unavoidably, I arrived on the floor 3 minutes after the conclusion of the roll call on H. R. 3342, the so-called Voice of America bill. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

NATIONAL DEFENSE ACT

Mr. ANDREWS of New York submitted a conference report and statement on the bill H. R. 3303, an act to stimulate voluntary enlistments in the Regular Military Establishment of the United States.

WAR POWERS ACT

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 3647.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

BANKRUPTCY ACT

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H. R. 3769, an act to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to qualifications of part-time referees in bankruptcy, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Line 7, after "and", insert "retired."

Line 7, strike out "men" and insert "personnel."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION ACT

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 252 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3916) to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and to extend the succession and certain lending powers and functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I shall later yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]. I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides 2 hours of general debate and waives points of order against H. R. 3916, a bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and to extend the succession and certain lending powers and functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

There is only one reason for waiver of points of order in this resolution, and that arises in connection with the Ramseyer rule.

The Banking and Currency Committee's report on the bill complies with the Ramseyer rule so far as is practical. Sections of the existing RFC law which are altered by this bill appear in the left column of the report. Changes in these sections, proposed in this bill, appear in the column on the right side of the same page. This arrangement complies with the intent of the Ramseyer rule. To comply with the letter of the rule, however, the whole law setting up RFC would have to be included in the report.

In general, this bill extends the life of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for 2 years, but eliminates many of the agency's emergency wartime powers and functions. At present, RFC and its subsidiaries have lending authority of about $18,000,000,000. This bill reduces that authority to $2,000,000,000, and provides for the orderly liquidation of outstanding loans in excess of $2,000,000,000. Other functions which RFC carried on in competition with private lending agencies, have also been eliminated in this bill. I will leave further explanation of the bill to the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, who have had the measure under consideration for some time.

This bill has the support of both parties, so I think this resolution will meet little opposition.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Will the gentleman tell me whether the bill will permit the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to lend to properly organized irrigation districts where they desire to get a loan to promote irrigation?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. It will permit them to do so.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this rule has, I think, the unanimous approval of both the Rules Committee and the Committee on Banking and Currency. As far as I know, there is no objection to the rule and no opposition to the bill, which continues the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under limited conditions for a period of 2 years. So I hope the rule will be adopted and the bill will be passed.

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak to the House just a few minutes this morning on a question that I think is going to give us serious trouble in the field of labor. I am afraid the impression has gone out to the country that the Taft-Hartley bill is going to stop all strikes and cure all the evils the country has suffered from labor union abuses in late years. The most vital thing to the American people is the continuous operation of its utilities and vital industries. That bill, in the compromise form in which it was finally adopted, does not take care of that situation.

We are confronted in the next 10 days with a Nation-wide coal strike; in fact, negotiations for a new contract have already broken off. You know the policy of the United Mine Workers—no contract, no work. There is a very slim prospect that a new contract will be arrived at before the time the contract expires.

If this happens, you are going to have a repetition of the thing that brought about the seizure of the coal mines and their operation by the Government, and there is every indication that it is going to happen. All that can be done under the Taft-Hartley bill is that the Government may seek an injunction and have an investigation made covering a period of 60 days, after which there must be an election to determine whether the workers are willing to accept the final offer of the employer. That will consume a further 15 days, and at the end of 5 days thereafter that injunction must be dissolved. So that at the end of 80 days from the time the strike begins all Government opportunity to stop a strike in the coal industry is at an end, as far as existing law is concerned, because the seizure provision of the Connally-Smith Act and all other provisions of that act will expire on the 1st of July.

It seems to me before Congress adjourns we ought to do something to give the President some power in that situation in case we are confronted when Congress is not in session with that kind of national disaster.

I am, therefore, introducing today a bill to extend the seizure provisions of the Connally-Smith Act for a period of 1 year longer so that if that calamity occurs, the President will at least have some power of seizure and operation of the mines so that we will not be confronted with another cessation of the mining of coal right on the verge of winter.

It seems to me, and I am very serious about it and very much disturbed about it, that we ought to do something so as to be able to avoid that sort of national catastrophe.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Does not the gentleman feel that the bill provides for a renewal of the injunction after 80 days if in the opinion of the Attorney General and the President that is necessary?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No, sir; it very directly does not.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am very glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MACKINNON. What you are proposing in substance is that the President be given stricter powers with respect to coal miners than he wanted with respect

to any other laboring people in the country—is not that the essence of it?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I did not take the floor to get into a controversy about the President's views. The views of the President and mine happen to differ, but I respect his views. I think he acted in good faith upon such advice as he had, but I think that he had bad advice, if you want my opinion.

We are confronted now with a condition that has nothing to do with politics, but does have to do with the safety of the American people. It is not confined to coal mines. It refers to any vital industry, and it does extend the power of the President to seize in case of such a calamity for a period of 1 year from the expiration of the act.

Mr. MACKINNON. I was interested in that, if the gentleman will yield further, because I was wondering whether you were construing the President's veto message to evidence a desire for stricter laws with respect to coal miners and weaker laws for other workers.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. No, sir; I was not reading anything into the President's message or into the President's mind. I was not referring to that.

The bill which I propose is not confined to the coal-mining industry. I mentioned that particular industry, however, because we are confronted with an emergency in that industry at this time and it is upon the Congress at this time.

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. OWENS].

Mr. OWENS. The gentleman knows that the committee was not desirous of having the Government seize control. When I say the committee, I mean the Committee on Education and Labor. Will the gentleman say what portion of the bill says that the Attorney General cannot go in a second time for an injunction?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not think that is the question involved. I think we only have such powers of going in for an injunction as the bill grants, and when the bill says that you may do such-and-such and does not say that you must not do something else, I believe we only have the power that the bill grants. I do not think that after this injunctive procedure is exhausted you have the right to start all over again and do it again. I wish it did. If it did, I do not think it would be necessary to extend the provisions of the Smith-Connally Act.

Mr. OWENS. I may say to the gentleman that it was never intended to stop. It was intended that he could go in two or three times if necessary for the safety and health of the Nation.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not put that construction on the bill.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MACKINNON. I agree with the gentleman that the language does not permit repetitious injunctions. I do not feel that one can place such construction on the language in the law; otherwise, the 60-day limitation would have been useless.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Yes; I agree with your construction of the language of the bill.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. FOLGER. I wish to state that I voted against overriding the President's veto. I have received telegrams and letters both commending my course and in criticism of it. To those who commended me, I made the reply that I did vote against it, but that since it is now the law of the land it is the duty of every citizen in this country to give that law a fair trial to work.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I think that is a very fine position to take.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusettts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], calls to the attention of the House and of the country the inadequacy of the bill which became law yesterday by both branches of the Congress passing it over the veto of the President. I think the gentleman's position is confirmed by the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Education of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY], if he is quoted correctly in the press today. I have before me a copy of the Washington News which says:

"New bill's coauthor doubts it can halt a Lewis walk-out."

And he goes on to explain why he doubts that it can halt a coal strike if Mr. Lewis decides there shall be one in the near future.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. MACKINNON. Do you now advocate that we pass a law to make it possible for the Government to halt a strike by an injunction?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Do I advocate that?

Mr. MACKINNON. Yes.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Well, I certainly join with the gentleman from Virginia in his suggestion that the present powers be extended for one year, that is that some authority exist temporarily at least to meet an emergency, if one arises, and in protection of the public interest. Now, of course, the gentleman voted to override the President's veto and I have a few observations to make.

We find this bill—this omnibus labor bill—becoming a law yesterday, and immediately the American people are made acquainted with the fact that it is inadequate to meet a situation of primary concern to the entire country. Coal is the life of a nation. Coal is the life of a people. No nation can get along without coal. Its industrial life is definitely connected with coal, and the best order and the decent living and the sanitary conditions of every individual is connected with the production of coal. It is a matter of primary importance that the American public this winter not be disturbed by the harmful results of another stoppage of coal production. It is an amazing situation and the people of the country can now realize it. We who had followed the legislation knew it. The very proponents of the bill—the partisan proponents—were aware of the situation, and for some reason or other they ducked the issue in relation to coal. I am wondering whether it is because John L. Lewis is one of the outstanding Republicans of the country.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREHM].

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, not a single member of the House Committee on Labor was so naive as to believe that the bill recently passed would settle or solve strikes dealing with national health, safety, or welfare; we never claimed that at all. In fact I have stated on several occasions that it would not. However, we had only two alternatives from which to choose: (1) to try mediation and conciliation for a period of 60 days during which we hoped tempers would cool and some equitable solution of the problem might be arrived at; and, (2) compulsory arbitration. The President very vehemently said he objected to compulsory arbitration, and so do many of us who know that it is a forerunner of conditions which we are trying to avoid.

Now, I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts or any other Member present to give us any alternative to the cooling-off period during which we might try to settle differences, other than compulsory arbitration? Surely we should not be condemned for trying to solve the problem of strikes which tend to destroy our economy. That is all the bill attempted to do in this respect.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BREHM. I yield.

Mr. MACKINNON. The answer proposed by the gentleman from Massachusetts very obviously is a continuation of Government operation which denies both the miners and the owners any freedom and subjects both groups to complete dictation by the President. It seems very odd to me that the same people who a short time ago fought a mild labor bill on the grounds that it was too drastic now complain that it is not strong enough with respect to the coal miners. The gentleman from Virginia, however, is not of that group that opposed any changes in our labor laws.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3916) to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and to extend the succession and certain lending powers and functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the con-

sideration of the bill H. R. 3916, with Mr. HARNESS of Indiana in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the bill which we have under consideration, H. R. 3916, extends the life of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for 2 years. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation was set up in 1932 to make available credits which were not at that time available from banks or other financing institutions. Frequently we have extended its powers so that at the present time it has authority to make loans of somewhere between fourteen and eighteen billion dollars. It might seem rather peculiar to some that I say "somewhere between fourteen and eighteen billion dollars." That there is some uncertainty as to its authority is not the fault of anyone, but is due to the fact that the Congress on several occasions has authorized certain unspecified amounts for specific purposes, then has authorized the money to be raised for these purposes through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and has authorized the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to issue its bonds, notes, and debentures in sufficient amounts to make available enough money to do the job. So if there is any uncertainty in respect to the authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation it is as much the fault of the Congress as anyone else. That is purely academic, however, because in this bill we rewrite the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act. You will find in this bill all of the authority which RFC will have from the date of its enactment and you will find that authority almost wholly contained in section 4 of title I. The functions and powers which are not authorized under section 4, generally speaking, are not continued.

As I have said, the RFC can now make loans up to somewhere over $14,000,000,000, but if this bill is enacted the new business of RFC is restricted to $2,000,000,000. So, for the purposes of administering section 4, we give them $2,000,000,000.

At present RFC has outstanding about $9,000,000,000. Generally speaking, the effect of this bill is to compel a liquidation of outstanding loans and commitments so that eventually when the liquidation of the outstanding commitments and loans is completed, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation will be operating as a $2,000,000,000 Corporation instead of a possible $18,000,000,000 Corporation.

We in the committee take particular pride in the job which we have done in respect to this bill. I might say that the compilation of Reconstruction Finance Corporation acts as published contains something over 260 pages, and we have boiled those 260 pages down into a 21-page bill, virtually into a 15-page bill, because title II starting on page 15 and running through page 21, contains matters that do not affect the future operating power of the Corporation materially.

Up to the present time the RFC has had the authority to invest in preferred stock of banks. They no longer will have that authority.

Up to the present time the RFC has had authority to buy the obligations of the Federal Government and buy the notes, bonds, and debentures of any other agency of the Government. They no longer will have that authority.

RFC has had the authority to buy the direct obligations of States, counties, and municipalities for local government purposes. They will no longer have that authority, but will continue to have the authority to invest in or make loans to what are called proprietary functions of the States, counties, and municipalities.

Now, proprietary functions of the States, counties, and municipalities are functions which are not directly essential to the preservation of the governments. Examples of such functions are harbor authorities, highway authorities, airport authorities, bridge authorities, drainage districts, irrigation districts, housing authorities, and all other authorities and functions which do not have primarily to do with the functioning of the governments. That is distinguished from the building of city halls, State houses, institutions, office buildings, and so forth, incident to the maintenance of the government itself.

In respect to the latter, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation cannot make a loan. In respect to the proprietary functions they can buy the obligations of and make loans to local authorities in that field.

We continue the authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make available $25,000,000 for disaster loans.

We lay down some general policies. We have said in section 4 that the Corporation may aid in financing agriculture, commerce, and industry, may help in maintaining the economic stability of the country, and may assist in promoting maximum employment and production, but it must function within the limitations we have provided. The limitations are found in section 4, and there are three of them. They may purchase the obligations of and make loans to any business enterprise organized or operating under the laws of any State or the United States, and they may participate in the making of such loans. They may make loans to financial institutions and may participate in the making of loans by financial institutions. As I have said before, they may acquire the obligations of municipalities, political subdivisions or States, public agencies and instrumentalities of one or more States and municipalities, and public corporations, boards, and commissions for their proprietary functions.

They may also make loans to railroads, but if the Corporation makes a loan to a railroad it must be with the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission. It may make loans to air carriers and for the development of aviation, but when a loan is made for that purpose it must have the approval of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. Are they permitted to issue partial or total financial guarantees to the banks for credits extended by the banks?

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman means a blanket participation?

Mr. PLOESER. Yes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. No, they are not allowed to continue the practice of indulging in blanket participation. The practice of blanket participation has grown up through the last 2 years, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has about $400,000,000 of blanket participations. Briefly, that is the practice where a bank is given a line of credit for, we will say, $100,000. If that bank makes up to $100,000 of loans, all of those loans may be blanketed under the RFC guaranty. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation never sees the loan. It is an additional guaranty, which we did not think was necessary. The practice has grown from nothing to about $400,000,000, almost two-fifths of the outstanding loans of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, over a 2-year period.

I might say also because of the controversy which I know has been suggested to some of you that under the language of the bill the Reconstruction Finance Corporation will no longer provide a secondary market for real-estate paper, including the purchase of loans made by financial institutions under the provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. At the present time there are about $60,000,000 of such loans and commitments held by Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

We provide that in the giving of financial assistance by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to these different activities they shall not participate, they shall not make the loan, they shall not give financial assistance, unless the financia' assistance applied for is not otherwise available on reasonable terms.

We also provide that the obligation purchased shall be of sound value or shall be so secured as reasonably to assure retirement or repayment.

We provide that financial assistance may be made either directly by the RFC or participated in with other financial institutions.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. KUNKEL. Will the gentleman call attention to section 208 a and b on page 20 which deals with the question of the RFC and small businesses? It is a matter of great interest to many Members of the House.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes. It will be recalled that some 2 months ago the House passed a bill which continued the authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to buy from the War Assets Administrator for the account of small business. That bill was an interim bill which continued that authority to June 30, 1947, when the Reconstruction Finance Corporation will expire unless we extend it under the provisions of this bill.

Under that bill the Reconstruction Finance Corporation could buy any

quantity of war assets and store them against a future demand by small business.

Under the language of section 208 of this bill we have continued the authority of the RFC to buy from the War Assets Administration for the account of any small business but provide that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation must have on file a request from a small business for the property before the purchase can be made. In other words, the market for the commodity is created before the Reconstruction Finance Corporation may buy from the War Assets Administration. This authority should be continued; otherwise, there are many small businesses which may find it difficult to secure needed materials to stay in business.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I would like to ask the gentleman from Michigan the same question I asked the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] when he was discussing the bill under the rule. In the gentleman's opinion, will this permit an irrigation district where they have organized under the laws of the State to borrow money from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in order to promote an irrigation district?

Mr. WOLCOTT. There is no question about it. I can answer very definitely that they will have that authority if the irrigation district is organized under the laws of the State. I understand in your case the irrigation district is set up as a subsidiary of the State or the county, and if they are so created under State law, the irrigation district will be exercising a proprietary function and will very obviously come within the terms of the bill which authorizes the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to loan to them or purchase their obligations.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. They would have to meet the sound economic standards that might be set up by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation?

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is correct. They must meet the other standards.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. About a year ago the Comptroller General before our Committee on Expenditures made some criticism about the bookkeeping and accounting methods of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. In a conversation with the Comptroller General, Mr. Warren, this morning, he very definitely stated that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation had corrected its methods of bookkeeping and accounting and had adhered strictly to the recommendations of the Comptroller General. I merely want to say that in support of the statement of the gentleman from Michigan that the RFC is doing a good job.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am glad that the gentleman has made that contribution. I take this opportunity to say that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has been most cooperative in helping the committee set up this bill.

I have never seen an agency of the Government show quite such wholehearted cooperation with a congressional committee as there was between the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the House Committee on Banking and Currency.

I do not know if I have made it clear, but I want to make it clear now, that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation will not be authorized to make real-estate loans secured by mortgages, deeds of trust, or other instruments conveying or constituting a lien upon real estate or any interest therein. In other words, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is taken out of the real-estate market as such under the belief that to make available money for that and the other purposes, authority for which is repealed by this bill, would only accelerate the velocity of credit and thereby create further inflation. The tendency now, we believe, should be to contract Government credit facilities, not to expand them further. Because of the inflationary condition of the country at the present time, this appears to be sound policy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself one additional minute.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. On page 6 of the bill as originally introduced by the gentleman there existed subsection (6).

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman is speaking of H. R. 3898 now?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. That is correct.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I have just covered that.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I am sorry. I was not present.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I said we had deleted that. RFC would no longer provide a secondary market for real-estate loans guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. So that by the deletion, as I understand it, veterans cannot go to the RFC now and obtain an additional $6,000 loan?

Mr. WOLCOTT. This has no relation whatsoever to what the veteran can do. The veteran can still get the benefits of the GI bill in respect to home loans.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Up to $4,000.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes. The financial institution from which the veteran secures a loan can still have the loan guaranteed up to 50 percent not exceeding $4,000.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. But under H. R. 3898, before the deletion of this section, the veteran could go to the RFC and obtain a $6,000 mortgage?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No. He could obtain a guaranty up to $4,000. For example, he could go to his bank and get an $8,000 mortgage, $4,000 of which would be guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration. The Veterans' Administration guaranteed 50 percent of the loan up to $4,000.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. And then he could go to the RFC and get an additional $6,000.

Mr. WOLCOTT. When the RFC bought this paper, they bought it without recourse, so that it would be 100 percent guaranteed by our Government. All they did was to take over the obligation of the financial institution. It does not affect the veteran at all.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Well, I disagree with the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] has again expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, if corporations, like individuals, are entitled to the gratitude of the people by reason of their services, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is richly entitled to the gratitude of the American people. It was organized in 1932 under the Hoover administration. I think its activities have illustrated the fundamental differences between the Democratic and Republican Parties. I do not say this in any partisan spirit. The primary objectives of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation were to bail out the railroads, insurance companies, and banks. It did that. It probably saved them. Everybody at that time was wallowing in the heavy seas of the depression, the big fellow and the little fellow. The little fellow needed just as much help as the big fellow but he did not get it until the next administration. It has always been a principle of the Republican Party that if the great banking institutions, the great railroads, and insurance companies could be made prosperous and successful the national economy would be stimulated and the small businessman and the wage earners could take care of themselves. Then you remember came the very nadir of the depression in the banking holiday. It took courage and vision to close the banks of America. Mr. Roosevelt did that. If he had not I do not know what would have happened to the economy of the Nation. The banks were closed. The worthless paper was written off. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation made loans to about 5,000 banks. The banking holiday was declared over, the banks were reopened, and a short time thereafter, by act of Congress, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation was set up. From that day to this there have been few bank failures of any magnitude. The confidence of the people in their banking institutions was reestablished.

So when you consider whether the charter of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation should be renewed I think the Members of Congress should take into consideration the splendid services it has rendered to the American people. As it exists now there is a conglomerate mass of legislation granting it the powers it needed to meet certain emergencies. Those acts are all repealed by this pending bill, and with clarity this bill defines the powers that may be exercised and the duties of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The pending bill reduces its available assets for lending from what they now are, as our distinguished chairman says, fourteen to eighteen billions to $2,000,-

000,000; but the main thing is it keeps this organization functioning.

I do not believe we should continue to give help to the individual and private business when it is not absolutely necessary. If an emergency takes place we can enlarge the powers and functions of the Corporation to meet the needs.

I hope and trust that the bill will be passed. I realize there are some differences of opinion as to whether the Corporation ought to be entrusted with certain powers that have been taken away from it by this bill. One of the questions is whether or not it should furnish a secondary market for GI loans. That has been considered by the directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and been considered in the committee. the directors of the Corporation seem to be in doubt as to whether the Corporation should be delegated this authority.

I wish to say another thing, John D. Goodloe is now Chairman of the Board. For many years he has been the able Chief Counsel for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. He is a man of vision, of fine administrative ability; and I am sure he will administer the affairs of this Corporation with the same ability and fidelity he has demonstrated through the years.

I am not going to discuss the technical aspects of the powers that still reside in the Corporation. Many of them will be useful, many of them will assist the business interests of the United States. The Corporation is still empowered to make loans to small business. It is empowered to make loans to political subdivisions, not to purchase the direct obligations of the political subdivision which pledged the faith and credit of those subdivisions, the direct obligations of the county or the city because they should not need the support of an agency of this kind. There should be a ready market for those obligations, but revenue bonds issued on the proprietary capacity of the political subdivisions which otherwise could not find a ready market may be purchased by the RFC, which will help in financing many of the improvements that are necessary for the happiness and welfare of the people. One of those improvements I am hopeful they may be able to help is the interceptor sewers and disposal plants that may be necessary to clean up some of our polluted rivers. There are many other improvements of that character for which there might be no ready market for securities merely pledging revenues.

Mr. Chairman, whatever may be the differences about some of the provisions of this law, I hope the House will pass the act and continue the functions fo this great Corporation for two more years. If it is not needed at that time it can be done away with. If emergency should arise we can put it into operation again. In my opinion, it would be ill-advised to abolish it at this time.

Mr. Chairman, as a part of my remarks I include the following letter from the Honorable John D. Goodloe, Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which details some of the useful activities and great services of that great Corporation in a period in one of the greatest depressions our Nation has experienced:

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION,
Washington, June 21, 1947.

Hon. BRENT SPENCE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPENCE: This is in response to your telephone request for a brief statement in summary form of the assistance RFC rendered in the banking crisis in the early 1930's. I hope the following information, which is cumulative as of April 30, 1947—in other words, covers the entire period since 1932—will be sufficient for your purposes.

Loans have been authorized to 4,919 going banks, principally in 1932 and 1933, in the amount of $1,334,880,161 to enable the banks to meet the demands of their depositors that grew out of fears for the safety of their money because of the depression. Of this, $1,138,251,619 was disbursed, and 98.1 percent of the amount disbursed has been repaid.

Loans aggregating $1,422,805,381 have been authorized for distribution to depositors in 2,780 closed banks, or banks in process of liquidation. Of this amount, $1,060,157,541 has been disbursed, and 99.5 percent of that has been repaid.

In addition to the bank loans, and pursuant to authority given it to make loans to State funds created to insure deposits of public moneys in banks, the Corporation disbursed $13,064,631 to the Board of Deposits of the State of Wisconsin to make funds available to several hundred local governments whose money was tied up in closed or restricted banks. This has all been repaid.

Loans aggregating $178,989,560 were authorized to 1,183 building and loan associations and receivers of building and loan associations to make funds available to shareholders and depositors and to enable receivers to make distributions to depositors and other creditors of the associations without causing extensive foreclosures of homes. Of this $140,158,068 was disbursed, all of which has been repaid.

Loans aggregating $600,096 were made to credit unions, all of which have been repaid.

To strengthen the capital structure of the banks of the country the RFC was authorized by act of Congress approved March 9, 1933, to subscribe for or make loans on the preferred stock, exempt from double liability, of National and State banks and trust companies on the request of the Secretary of the Treasury with the approval of the President. In the case of any State bank which is not permitted by the laws of its State to issue preferred stock exempt from double indemnity, the Corporation is authorized to purchase its capital notes or debentures.

Under this authority, the Corporation has authorized the purchase of capital in 6,382 National and State banks in the amount of $1,346,211,670. Of this, $1,170,565,312 was disbursed to 6,161 banks and over 80 percent has been retired. The Corporation still has $167,571,573 invested in the capital of 1,134 National and State banks. In addition, the Corporation purchased $176,500,000 of preferred stock of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, $2,500,000 of which was retired and $174,000,000 sold to the United States Treasury.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely yours,

JOHN D. GOODLOE,
Chairman.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT].

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, the RFC was created in 1932 when private credit facilities of the country were close to temporary paralysis. Its operations served to bridge the gap caused by that paralysis and to help restore private credit agencies to normal operation. In that emergency period the RFC served a critical and useful economic function.

However, in the final analysis the true test of whether or not that experiment in Government credit was successful will be determined by the ability of Congress to eliminate this instrument of state capitalism at the appropriate time.

It is my conviction that the appropriate time for the withdrawal of the RFC from the lending field has arrived. Bank deposits and currency outstanding in America as of April 30, 1947, approximated $165,000,000,000. This is not far from the highest amount of cash and credit available in our history. This cash and credit should furnish an adequate reservoir of capital for all justifiable private credit purposes.

If that is so active, continuation of the RFC will almost certainly result in Government competition with private credit facilities for the loaning of funds.

The impression has been created that this bill represents a rigid contraction of RFC lending and investment activities. Compared with the unlimited grants of power given the RFC during the war that statement is correct. Compared with the prewar peacetime operation of the RFC the statement seems somewhat overdrawn.

On December 31, 1933, the year end following the crisis in industry and finance, the RFC had loans outstanding of $1,719,602,000. This bill provides the RFC with $2,000,000,000 of loaning power or more than the RFC was using at the end of 1933, when we were still in the valley of depression.

So it is perhaps significant that 14 years after the paralysis period the RFC is being continued on a basis which provides loans and advances up to $2,000,000,000.

Furthermore, as a matter of record, the loans and advances of the RFC on March 31, 1947, only amounted to $1,716,000,000. On this basis the RFC continues its operations with lending power substantially in excess of that in use as of the end of the first quarter of 1947.

The rise in the number of employees of this Bureau affords a side view of the scope of its activities. On June 30 1939, the RFC had 4,090 employees. On April 30, 1947, it had 7,892 employees. For an agency supposedly diminishing, as we get further and further away from the credit paralysis of 1933, this is a strange contradiction in employment totals.

Some members of the committee were satisfied that the hearings gave us adequate information on the operation of this public-credit colossus. I did not share in that conclusion. The committee heard only one witness, the present Chairman of the RFC Board.

The importance of a comprehensive understanding of the activities of the RFC by the House was pointed out by the Comptroller General in House Document No. 316, Eightieth Congress, first session:

The desirability of financing the activities of RFC through borrowings has not been questioned in this report, but it should be

pointed out that the Congress could improve its control over the enterprise through the requirement that its capital be supplied through appropriation rather than through borrowings

As a factual matter, the Congress will be by adoption of this bill in the position of authorizing, without specific appropriation or further congressional action, Federal lending and investment up to $2,000,000,000, based upon hearings during which only one man was heard and that was the Government official heading the agency. Letters from Jesse Jones and Herbert Hoover were read into the hearings, and this was the only other evidence the committee obtained.

Perhaps the committee had adequate information to give carte blanche approval to the operations of the RFC, but to me that approval consisted quite largely as an act of faith.

The Comptroller General in a letter to the RFC Board of Directors in June 1946, after 8 months of examination of RFC records, declared:

Nor do these records afford an adequate basis for a satisfactory report of the discharge of important operating and fiscal responsibilities assumed by the companies or a satisfactory report of the discharge of the aggregate responsibility of the top management for any period.

On July 31, 1946, in House Document No. 674, the Comptroller General, reporting to Congress on the audit of the RFC then in progress by his Office, listed the following specific failures in the accounting functions of the RFC:

First. The Company does not control its $7,000,000,000 investment in property.

Second. The Company does not control its $800,000,000 investment in inventories of Defense Supplies Corporation, Metals Reserve Company, and U. S. Commercial Company.

Third. The Company does not control its cash receipts.

Fourth. The Company does not control rentals earned on its properties.

Fifth. The Company does not control certain important liabilities.

Sixth. The Company does not control recoveries due it on plant extensions built for utility companies.

Seventh. The Company does not control its surplus property disposal activities.

Eighth. The Company has no control over the activities of its affiliate, U. S. Commercial Company.

I have inquired of the Comptroller General to find out whether in the ensuing period he has had any occasion to revise these findings, and I quote from his letter to me on June 4, 1947:

The views of the General Accounting Office concerning accounting of the RFC and other matters, as expressed in House Document No. 674 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, remain unchanged.

To agree to the active continuation of the RFC now the House must subscribe to the belief that private credit in the United States cannot operate without a public credit crutch at a time when American business is in the biggest boom in its history. I am unable to accept that conclusion. Further, it appears somewhat strange that we should be, in official oratory, at least, opposing the nationalization of credit in foreign lands while continuing to countenance its growth in this country.

To pass this measure in its present form the House must subscribe to the belief that politically selected money lenders, using other people's savings, can loan money with more wisdom and competence than private individuals and groups using their own funds. It must subscribe to the belief that the Government has a right to use arbitrarily assessed tax funds for risk capital purposes in private enterprise.

To continue the RFC the House must subscribe to the belief that either an emergency exists in the field of private credit or that the private credit facilities of the Nation are so defective or so puny that an instrument of state capitalism must permanently both umpire and play in the contest of supplying credit to private enterprise. I cannot agree to this conclusion.

In its present lending to business firms, the RFC is doing one of three things (1) making loans that private credit institutions find economically unsound; (2) competing unfairly with private capital; or (3) making political loans.

This is not a healthy situation even though there may be a great number of private banks in this country who currently welcome the credit crutch facilities made available by the RFC.

In the competitive enterprise system there should be enough competition among the banks to see that every reasonably sound loan is made. If present laws prevent such loans from being made for one reason or another, such as capital requirements of small-town banks, then changes should be made in our banking laws to permit private credit to become mobile enough to supply such needs.

When the RFC makes loans that private institutions will not make, it imposes a judgment that overrules the competitive operation of the natural economic laws. It interferes with the operation of financial institutions whose progress and profits depend upon their ability and willingness to make every reasonably sound loan.

Mr. Chairman, theoretically the House has four alternatives before it on the RFC.

One is to do as the other body did, extend it for 1 year without change. That procedure seems utterly indefensible in a Congress pledged to get the Government out of business, to eliminate unnecessary bureaus and to bring about economy in Government.

A second alternative is to abolish the RFC entirely. I am not inclined to favor that course. However, there is a significant body of opinion in this country that believes that to be the sound procedure, based upon the fact that the RFC was set up to tide us over an emergency and the emergency is over. Rather than the continuance provided in this bill, I believe the RFC should be liquidated.

A third alternative is the one selected by the House Banking and Currency Committee. It is to continue this agency more or less indefinitely, although the stated period of the bill is 2 years, and leave it possessed with tremendous powers although shorn of the utterly fantastic wartime grants of power.

A fourth alternative is to preserve the RFC as a skeleton organization, as an instrument of public credit that could be reactivated in the event of another emergency. This was the course that I had hoped the committee would take in its action on this bill.

By retaining this agency on a stand-by basis the House would be preserving its utility in the case of another emergency.

In this way the potential usefulness of the RFC could be continued, but the evils which it brings into the normal operation of our private credit facilities would be ended.

In closing I want to point out to the House that this bill continues in the hands of the RFC, a politically controlled credit agency, vast powers to influence the course of economic affairs in this Nation.

For some time we have been in the throes of inflation, yet the RFC with continued power can add fuel to inflation by financing enterprises which are unsound credit risks.

While the bill provides that the RFC will not provide financial assistance unless financial assistance is not otherwise available on reasonable terms, this provision is open to many interpretations. For example, in its current operations the RFC loans money at 4 percent. This interest rate alone has operated as an inflationary factor in the economy. It has undoubtedly encouraged the establishment of businesses that would not otherwise come into being at the height of a war-created boom.

It seems probable that the lending operations of the RFC have helped to accentuate the length and intensity of the present business boom. As a consequence, the bust—when it comes—will be of greater proportions than without the peacetime operations of the RFC in the field of private credit.

If that conjecture proves correct, then the peacetime RFC will have gone a long way toward nullifying its emergency usefulness.

If the Congress means business when it orates about "eliminations of unnecessary bureaus" the RFC is a good place to start. The creeping socialization that this agency is facilitating has no place in a nation that owes its greatness to a genuine system of private operated enterprise.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER].

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, within the provisions of H. R. 3916, a bill to amend the RFC Act as amended, is a most important provision which affects our entire national economy and in particular, small business, which comprises 95 percent of all of our free competitive enterprise. The important part of this bill is found on page 20, line 18, under section 208, which restores to RFC the powers which were granted that agency under Executive Order 9665 to purchase surplus property for resale to small business. Were these normal times, such provision would probably not be necessary, but, unfortunately, these are not normal times — monopoly tendencies

have been accentuated during the war—small business in competition with big business has been denied access to many of the vital raw materials or finished products necessary for its healthy, economic life.

For the information of this Congress, on March 11, 1947, Comptroller General Warren ruled that the RFC was without authority to use funds for exercising its statutory priority to obtain surplus property on behalf of small business. Based on this ruling, the RFC stopped as of the morning of March 12, accepting new applications or processing pending applications, of which there were 25,000 pending and several hundred new applications filed weekly. This activity of the RFC has been highly successful and very satisfactory to small business. The RFC has consummated over 45,000 transactions this year alone involving a total of $108,000,000 acquisition costs, and what we mean by this year is from January 1 until the cut-off date of March 12, which in itself indicates the tremendous help small business received by having this priority.

In practice, the exercise of this priority by RFC is without cost to the Government because small business either pays cash for the property or obtains a loan for that purpose. It is significant to note that the loans to small business in this connection run less than 1 percent.

Since the statutory priority of RFC has not expired, the result of the Comptroller General's ruling is to defeat the intent of Congress on behalf of small business in surplus-property acquisition in competition with big business.

The basis of the Comptroller General's ruling is that the corporate charter of the Smaller War Plants Corporation expired on December 31, 1946, and no funds can be used for carrying out any of the functions formerly possessed by SWPC. However, in early 1946, the functions of SWPC were transferred to the RFC and the Department of Commerce and for this reason, the corporate charter of the SWPC was permitted to expire. It was generally believed, and the Attorney General has so specifically ruled, that the power so transferred may still be exercised.

No sooner had the Comptroller General issued his ruling than this all-important matter affecting small business was brought to my attention and I immediately introduced into this Congress, H. R. 2535, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, passed out of that committee favorably; went to the Rules Committee, passed out of the Rules Committee and came to the floor of this House, where it was passed unanimously. This bill then went to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee and was passed out of that committee unanimously; it was given Order No. 60 on the Senate Calendar. Unanimous consent was asked to bring this bill up for immediate consideration because of the serious impact upon small business. There was objection to the unanimous-consent rule by one lone Senator, which automatically put the bill back in its original position on the Senate Calendar.

Telegrams, letters, and 'phone calls, far too numerous to elaborate upon were received by the Committee on Small Business of the House of Repreesntatives, seeking aid to small business in having this priority reestablished for small business by this Congress.

H. R. 2535 was recommitted to the Committee on Banking and Currency in the Senate, where it again met with objection by the same Senator and was defeated in committee by a vote of 7 to 2.

The Administrator of War Assets has stated that he recommends the priorities for the groups selected by Congress to be continued until at least December 31 of this year. Small business, as explicitly stated in the Surplus Property Act, was one of the groups which Congress recognized needed specific assistance. Yet, due to the circumstances which I have just related, this is the only group selected by Congress for special assistance which is being deprived of the rights which Congress intended it should receive.

There is another factor in the situation which I feel also should be brought to the attention of this Congress. One of the primary objectives of the act was to assist the returning veteran to establish himself in business. Under the O'Mahoney-Manasco amendment of last year veterans were given the priority on surplus property, second only to Government agencies. This, however, is a one-time priority, and after the veteran has exercised it, he is no longer eligible for assistance under the veterans' priority. This is logical, as he has then become a small businessman. Consequently, in denying to small business the priority rights intended them by Congress, we are also denying assistance to the veteran who has established himself as a small businessman.

The sudden halting of the small business priority came as a shock to many small businessmen. In fact, RFC still holds approximately 18,000 unfilled applications, to say nothing of those who have been turned away since that date. According to the latest figures of War Assets, there will be approximately $18,000,000,000 of surplus property yet to be disposed of. This is many times the total surplus from the First World War and contains a fair percentage of raw materials, finished products or real property highly suitable to small business. By depriving small business of this priority position on this stupendous inventory still available, we are jeopardizing their competitive position in industry and definitely depriving them of the assistance that Congress has always intended they should receive.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I desire to state that each member of the House Committee on Banking and Currency is very proud of our able chairman. He has been very patient, has shown a lot of diplomacy, and has heard everybody who wanted to be heard for the bill and against the bill. I think we have a good bill, with one exception, and I shall call attention to this later.

The bill as reported by the committee is the result of weeks of careful study of the financial structure of the RFC, its outstanding obligations and commitments, and RFC's policy in every field of lending in which it is now authorized to operate. The bill that has been drafted on the basis of these hearings is soundly conceived and is calculated to meet legitimate credit needs of those businesses in this country which are presently unable to obtain credit from normal, private financial channels and provides a framework which can promptly be implemented by the Congress as circumstances may require.

The bill does not extend RFC with all its existing powers. Many powers which appear in the present RFC laws are the result of numerous statutes passed by the Congress over the past 15 years to meet particular emergency situations. Many of these, of course, are no longer needed and are repealed in the bill.

There is one provision of the present law that is repealed which I think ought to be restored, and that is the provision which authorizes the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to buy the GI loans. I expect to support an amendment to restore this provision when it is offered.

There is retained, however, a broad base which Congress can quickly expand to meet any emergency that may arise in the future. Powers retained to meet the credit required by deserving borrowers appear to be adequate to satisfy immediate need. What is of equal importance is the fact that the bill preserves as a corporate entity a Government organization, which, during the most trying times of this country's history, has had 15 years' experience in dealing with emergencies of the most serious character in peacetime depression and war.

At the risk of repeating much that many of you have heard in the past, and especially in recent weeks, I think it appropriate to review briefly some of the major achievements of the RFC during the period of its existence. Those achievements in each and every instance had some direct relationship to the preservation of the private enterprise system in America as we know it, and, in my opinion, cannot be repeated too many times. Its influence is reflected in the high standard of living enjoyed in America today, and to the credit of the people who directed the operations of the RFC, there has never been an attempt to dramatize its accomplishments in the press, radio, or other popular avenues of publicity. The RFC needs no such build-up. It is solid, substantial, and dedicated to the preservation of equal opportunity for all in the business and industrial life of this great country. I, for one, am at a complete loss in my efforts to understand the basis for any opposition to its continuance. Let us review for a moment some of the many major accomplishments of this great organization, all of which have contributed to the healthy growth of the private enterprise system in this country.

In 1933, by action of the RFC, the tottering banking structure of the United States was saved, and public confidence restored. Millions of depositors were saved from loss. Millions of dollars of people's money invested in real estate, homes, farms, and business property were

saved by RFC's purchase of mortgages during the grim days of the depression. Unfortunate people who were the victims of floods, storms, cyclones, earthquakes, and other disasters were provided the funds for a new start. The railroad transportation system, upon which this country so vitally depends, was preserved. Hundreds of businesses were saved from bankruptcy, and many others would have been forced out of business had not the RFC moved with speed and intelligence.

The prompt and effective action by the RFC during the years of the thirties, without question, enabled the United States to successfully meet the severe tests occasioned by the outbreak of war in 1941.

It was plain early in 1940 that the United States was faced with a struggle which could result either in the preservation of the American principle of free opportunity and individual liberty, or the acceptance of a totalitarian doctrine bent upon forcing its will upon all mankind.

It was at this desperate time that the Congress of the United States determined that the agency of the Government best qualified to prepare us for the severe trials ahead was the RFC. Consequently, broad powers were provided the corporation, perhaps broader than ever before granted to an agency of this Government. These powers have never been abused, and the results speak for themselves. As a member of the Banking and Currency Committee for many years, and as one who has intimately participated in the discussions preceding the granting of these powers, I am proud, at the moment when this important bill is being considered, to state that the RFC has achieved an enviable record in serving the public good.

We are all, at this moment, concerned with the troubled situation existing in every part of the world which vitally affects our way of living. We certainly would be blind to the effects these developments would have on the economy of the United States if we permitted the one agency of the Government which, by experience and ability, is equipped to meet such circumstances, to end its useful service to this country. For this reason, if for no other, it is my conviction that the RFC should be extended for a period of at least 2 years.

But there are other more immediate reasons why RFC's life should be extended. No business enterprise in this country can survive if denied adequate credit to meet its legitimate needs. We hear on every hand that the banks are in better condition than ever before in our history. But the banks, for some reason which I am unable fully to understand, simply are not making the loans necessary for the survival of many small business enterprises. They are denied the opportunity to engage in gainful occupation for lack of adequate credit from private banking channels, and the demand for that credit is now greater than ever before. The RFC in 1946 made five times the number of loans made in 1945 and eight times the number in 1944, representing over 33 percent of all loans made to business enterprises since RFC's inception.

Thousands of these loans were made to returning veterans which enabled them to reestablish old businesses and establish new ones. I can cite an example in my own State of Georgia which, I am sure, is typical of situations existing all over the United States. Approximately 100 veterans organized a corporation for the production of certain housing materials. Each purchased $1,000 worth of common stock in their corporation and individually sought to borrow about $2,000 more, guaranteed under the GI bill of rights. Application to private banks for the additional funds was denied, and, having exhausted all possibilities of aid from private sources, the RFC made the loans directly. The manufacturing plant is now in production and employs approximately 160 veterans and the concern is producing housing materials urgently needed at this time, and at a profit.

I am sure that the small banks appreciate the service that RFC renders in the field of small business. Because of the rules governing loans by banks, they are frequently unable to make loans which they might otherwise be perfectly willing to make. RFC makes it possible for these businesses to establish themselves on a sound financial basis, and they eventually become the best customers of private banking institutions. The small bankers recognize this. They also know that RFC in its participation program enables the small bank to earn a reasonable profit on its loans which, except for the RFC, would be absorbed by the larger city banks.

The action which the Congress is about to take on H. R. 3916, which would extend the life of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, is one of the most important decisions to be made in the present session. Failure to approve this bill would, in my judgment, result in far-reaching, disastrous consequences to our national economy.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I am definitely and heartily in favor of the enactment of this bill. First, I would like to compliment our chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], on the very splendid job that he did in going over the entire authorization and lending authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and carefully rewriting the act so as to bring its duties and its functions within the purview of what the present situation demands in Government financing.

The bill, as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] so ably told you, simply continues the RFC for another 2 years, in clearly defined language. The Congress has, at various times since the establishment of the agency back in the depression days, added new duties and new authorizations to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Like so many legislative acts, many of those powers have been allowed to gather dust on the statute books until no man living knew where the lending authority of the RFC began or where it left off. It was a job that required careful and painstaking reorganization of the legislation.

ONLY ONE DEFEAT

I believe, except in one instance, it represents one of the finest pieces of legislation that has been brought to the floor of this House.

We greatly reduce the lending authority and the borrowing authority of the RFC, cutting it down to what I believe is adequate postwar size. It will be limited to $2,000,000,000 of new business with the passage of this act.

In considering the Reconstruction Finance Corporation you have learned of some of the more spectacular lending activities as—witness the time when it saved the large railroads, the insurance companies, and the banks. This erroneously left the impression that it was an agency functioning only to help big business.

NINETY PERCENT WERE SMALL LOANS

Nothing could be further from the truth, because 90 percent of all the loans that have been made by this agency since it started have been small business loans. Ninety percent of the loans have been made not to salvage or to insure invested capital, but made with the idea of creating employment; with the idea of keeping alive the industrial production of this country, both little and big, to furnish jobs for American workmen so that they could produce, not only for their industry but for the health and welfare of the Nation as well. You know the jobs RFC did during the depression. Perhaps one of the few sources of investment capital that were open not only for private business but for our States and municipalities as well, was the RFC through those troubled times.

Dormitories were built across this land of ours. State schools, municipal, farm drainage, and other improvements were put in because the RFC made available this credit at an interest rate that the communities and the public bodies of this Nation could afford to pay.

I doubt if there has been any agency of Government that has operated since 1933 that can show a performance record of over $500,000,000 clear profit to the United States Government as a result of its peacetime activities. We heaped dozens and dozens of disagreeable jobs on the RFC during the depression and we heaped dozens of disagreeable jobs on the RFC during the war.

They furnished the personnel, the trained organization, the know-how, to administer these agencies in a most creditable manner. I doubt if there is any agency in the Government today whose relationships have been as pleasant, who have stayed so closely within the authority granted to them by the Congress of the United States as the RFC; and yet the result of their peacetime operations has been over $500,000,000 profit to Uncle Sam.

NOW POSTWAR PROBLEMS

Now we are looking at the postwar situation. Already there are rumors going across the country that a recession is apt to set in; and far back from Washington you find on the main streets of America coming signs of a tightening of

the normal credit facilities of the Nation.

No one knows, of course, what is going to happen, whether we will have a recession, whether the disturbed foreign situation or other events over which neither the Congress nor business have any control, will result in a great stringency of credit; and I think we would be very, very careless of the Nation's welfare if we, at this time, should fail to continue the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

AIDS SMALL BANKS

I am constrained to disagree with my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BUFFETT], when he says that this is a socialization of credit. This credit that the RFC extends through banks to the free-enterprise system is the very core of free enterprise. You cannot have free enterprise if you deny the necessary long-term and intermediate-term credit to the smaller businesses of this Nation.

I disagree with him also that a bunch of bureaucrats are sitting in Washington saying who gets the credit and who does not get the credit. The record of loans made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shows that the credit originates with the smaller banks of this country. These small financial enterprises ask the RFC if it will join with them and furnish additional participation credit facilities for making the loans these small, individual, privately owned or company-owned credit enterprises throughout the 49 States wish to make.

The RFC originates no loans. All the loans it makes are requests that come for the most part to it from small banks.

Before the RFC was established, these small banks, limited under our national banking acts and under the Federal Reserve restrictions, could lend only a certain small percentage of their capital—I believe not more than 20 percent—to any one borrower.

They would have to get the necessary additional financial credit by going with their hat in their hand to Wall Street banks begging and pleading in order to get the necessary credit to make the wheels of industry turn in their own locality.

It was Government regulations that prevented them from lending more than a certain percentage of their capital to these small businesses. Yet, because financial power was concentrated in a few great banks of this country, they could say to the small banks, "Give us almost all of your profit on the deal or we will not underwrite the loan; we will not participate in the loan."

That is why I say it is so necessary at this time when no man knows what the financial situation will be that we are going into, to have this added financial assistance that the smaller lending enterprises of our Nation, the smaller banks, can go to and ask participation as partners in helping to build their home-town free enterprise in their local communities.

To show you the necessity for these loans in the postwar period, $450,000,000 worth of new loans have been originated in participation with small banks and small lending enterprises during 1946, and all this was done without one single word of criticism that the RFC was competing with any lending institutions. I think that is a record you can be very proud of.

DEMANDS EXPANDING ECONOMY

Mr. Chairman, prosperity and full employment depend on an expanding economy and not a contracting economy. If you want to make jobs for the people who have the talents to work, you can do no better than to make this necessary finance for these small enterprises available to the little man who wants to establish his own business, who wants to buy machinery, who wants to buy equipment, who wants to put out a product that America is willing to buy.

Without access to this long-term financing, free enterprise suffers. Everybody says that today the banks are bulging with money. You go to any bank examiner and see whether the Federal Reserve likes to see a 3- or 4-year note for $500,000 in a bank's portfolio. Ask any country banker and he will tell you that note will get them into more trouble, no matter how good the loan is, with the bank examiners than anything they might have in their portfolios.

INTERMEDIATE CREDIT NEEDED

There is a drought, there is a scarcity, there is a shortage of this intermediate time financing. There is no place that the little businessman can go to in the investment market, either in Wall Street or in any of the great financial centers, and get adequate financing for his little business.

If you take away the prospect and chance for the little, small bank to originate this loan, without a chance for the RFC to participate in that, you will be doing a very dangerous thing for the economy of this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, does the RFC have good business judgment? Is it capable of making money? I remember a small bit of legislation that I helped to get into a bill to insure against war damage. This insurance was being sought throughout the country during the war. The RFC by operating with only two or three assistants reinsured these insurance policies against bomb and other war damage and made a little over $250,000,000 out of that one project. Does that sound like an agency we would like to abolish, an agency we would like to throw away at this time as a financial uncertainty? I hardly think so.

DAMAGES GI LAW

Mr. Chairman, I want to speak about one small point of difference between the members of the committee that we had. I refer to cutting out from this bill what was known last year as the Brown amendment, put in by my distinguished friend from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] at the request of the Veterans' Administration. It permitted the RFC to furnish a secondary market for insured loans that the Veterans' Bureau make to the veterans to buy their homes.

The committee did not take enough time in considering this proposal. Surely we did not have enough testimony to show us the right way to do it.

By arbitrarily denying this secondary market for GI home loans I believe we are going to do the Government a disservice, and I know definitely that we are going to do the veterans who want to get a home a disservice.

In permitting the RFC to buy the GI loans, we offered the RFC a chance to buy them from any person who has originally made the loan. There can be no shifting or bickering of paper back and forth. The RFC under the Brown amendment could only buy from the original maker of the loan. They could only buy them at par. In other words, they could get back from the RFC the money that they themselves had lent the GI. The man who sells the loan then is allowed to service that loan, collect the interest, and so forth, for the RFC on the standard going rate, the lowest minimum rate that is available or allowable in the insurance practice. That is one-half of 1 percent. That is all he gets for servicing these small loans.

I think we would be making a very great mistake to restrict this bill to eliminate that type of paper from purchase by the RFC.

We can take in thousands of different kinds of commercial paper and business loans under this bill, and yet you are going to say to the country at large that we ourselves, the Congress, do not have enough faith in the integrity of these GI loans to make them eligible for purchase by the RFC.

If the veterans across the Nation in our 48 States are going to get ample credit for their homes, as this Congress has promised them they will get under the GI bill of rights, then we should provide this secondary market for these loans in the RFC.

It will make this veterans' housing program work far better. Without this authority, I am afraid that approval by the Veterans' Bureau of the GI's housing loan will merely be a "hunting license," and in spite of all the guaranties the Congress has made for his house, he will be unable to get it financed.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOLGER].

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, I feel that it is really an imposition in consuming any time on my part to make any statement concerning this bill which the Committee on Banking and Currency has brought to the House. But I could not refrain from doing so in remembrance of the full testimony and all the evidence that was presented to our committee on the subject. It was really, I must say, a surprise to me to find that over the great period of years since the time this institution of Government was

organized in 1932 up to the present time that such a magnificent showing has been made as was made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. We remember the many difficult situations in the last 5 or 6 years that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation encountered in respect to the extreme needs that were brought on by the war situation. They never failed. They operated in other fields and finally came out with a legitimately shown profit, notwithstanding some of the losses that they had to take because they were asked to step into the breach in the way of subsidizing needed materials and the production of needed materials in the war, whether it was profitable or not, and with all that it has been a grand showing that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has made even in its financial operations.

It would be impossible for any one to recount the great benefits that this has been to the business of the United States since the year 1932. It has been large. It has been tremendous. Taken all together, I do not know of any institution of Government that has rendered a greater service and a larger service than the Reconstruction Finance Corporation rendered.

I bring to your attention, nevertheless, in the lending field the testimony of one witness before us whose name I do not recall, and I would not care to say if I remembered it; it is immaterial. He was somewhat skeptical. He did not know what the committee was going to do, and it seemed that he was a little of the opinion that we should discontinue the life of this corporation. I asked him a question as to what percent of the loans over the period had been made by private banking institutions and what by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. His answer was that 98 percent of all the loans had been made by private banking institutions. I then asked him why he was uneasy about the situation. He said he was not, because it had been fairly and honestly and well operated to the benefit of the economy of the whole country. The bankers themselves were definitely included. He was just afraid of the broad powers they already have under the act as it originally obtained.

The committee felt that now we are in what we conceive to be, though we do not know how long it will remain, an easy place as to financing the necessary industry of our country, including agriculture and other activities of our economy, we would do well to limit the scope and the breadth of the operations of the institution; but we do not know how long this situation will obtain. We hope it will continue indefinitely, but the expectation we could not reasonably have, and certainly we could not kill an organization that has been as helpful as this one has. We feel that it should not be laid back upon the shelf as a dead body but should be continued as a living thing. Then if we find in a year or 2 years—and that is the limit of the extension of the life of the Corporation—that broader powers are needed, if some deplorable situation arises when we must enlarge its powers and its scope of operations, we can safely and well do so. In the meantime, however, it is best for the industry and the economy of this country that it be retained just as we have retained it for the 2-year period, under the limitations that have been prescribed, which I think, speaking personally, are sufficient, and which at the same time are not at all too broad, but will be helpful to everybody, including the banks, small business, and every other part of our economy. We should continue this Corporation's life as a living thing as is done under the terms of this bill.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this bill, and express the hope that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation will use its new powers to help in the solution of America's No. 1 domestic problem, housing.

Everything possible should and must be done to help overcome the housing shortage which is undermining the morale and health of millions of veterans and their families and of other citizens. The RFC should use its powers to help bring down the costs of new housing by extending the necessary financing to new companies which have developed good industrial housing which they are ready to produce if they can get the necessary monetary backing and who cannot raise the money through private channels. Industrial housing is standardization and preassembly manufacture of parts of a house by production-line methods to be assembled at the site. Industrial housing could bring a new chapter in construction methods in the United States and could do much to provide homes for millions of people at prices that they can afford to pay by reducing labor, material, and production costs. Labor costs can be reduced because the number of man hours that go into a house assembled from parts produced by machine processes, is less than by traditional manual methods. Material costs can be reduced because direct purchases by industrial house manufacturers from material manufacturers eliminate many of the intermediate distribution and middle-man costs. Production costs can be reduced because of the efficiency of industrial engineering techniques.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

RFC HAS AN IMPRESSIVE RECORD

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, when I think of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation I think of a good friend of mine known to many of you, Harvey C. Couch, of Arkansas. In 1932 President Hoover summoned that brilliant business man to Washington to help lay the foundations of this great financial institution. I know how he neglected his private business to work with others in establishing the early policies of the RFC, that enabled the agency to lend $2,000,000,000 to the banks of America, 99 percent of which has been repaid.

I also think of John D. Goodloe, the present Chairman of the Board, an able administrator. He was only a law student when I first met him, and I have taken pride in his progress. I think the entire committee was impressed by the statement Chairman Goodloe made in reviewing the activities of the RFC during his service as chairman.

REVISIONS ARE IN ORDER

The gentleman from Michigan has done an excellent job in guiding our thinking as he explored this problem individually, pointing the way to a simplified statute that would clearly chart the future activities.

Now, the Congress owes it to the people to define clearly just what function this agency is to serve in the future. The bill is clear and concise and I hope it will be supported.

Some of its functions are still necessary. For example, through disaster loans, 30 States suffering at times from floods, earthquakes, and tornadoes have participated in RFC benefits, a magnificent service, and one that should continue.

RFC USED FOR WIDE VARIETY OF SERVICES

Impartial observers will agree that RFC, during the 15 years since its organization, has demonstrated its ability to discharge numerous responsibilities which Congress assigned to it.

Let me mention briefly a few of the other things which we have been able to accomplish through the agency of this Corporation. It buttressed our weakened banking system in 1933 by putting approximately $1,200,000,000 of fresh capital in over 6,000 banks, and stood prepared to help the rest. This helped immeasurably in the restoration of confidence, despite the failure of more than 6,000 banks in the preceding year or so. Approximately 85 percent of this total investment has been repaid.

It also made loans to building and loan associations, credit unions, insurance companies, and agricultural credit institutions.

The RFC made loans to and invested in the securities of railroads owning more than two-thirds of the entire railroad mileage of the country, to the extent of about $1,000,000,000. This financial assistance saved many of our large systems from receivership and helped them prepare for the great burdens which they assumed during the war. Only a small portion of these loans remains unpaid.

It has aided municipalities and local public agencies in financing the construction and improvement of essential public projects. With this assistance, local communities have been able to build bridges, waterworks, and other projects essential to the welfare of their citizens. Practically all of these projects have been financially successful. More than $100,000,000 has been loaned to help in the reorganization of drainage and irrigation districts. This assistance has been of vital importance to many of our farm areas.

During the period of national defense and throughout the war, responsibilities of the most diverse nature were assigned to the RFC because of its record for doing the job expeditiously and in a businesslike manner.

It is also worth mentioning that the peacetime functions of the RFC have

been carried on without any drain on the Treasury. In fact, they have yielded a net profit to the Government of more than $500,000,000 after payment of all operating expenses, interest on the money borrowed, and an adequate reserve against losses.

This is a record of restored confidence, and the prompt performance of difficult assignments in times of emergency. I do not anticipate a depression within the next year or two, and I hope that we will never face another one, but none of us can read the future and it is well to bear in mind that the RFC with its vast experience, its trained organization and its flexible procedures, can be of incalculable value to the Nation should an unforeseen emergency develop. An organization of this caliber cannot be built overnight.

In addition to the desirability of continuing the RFC for emergency purposes, there is a continuing need for such an agency to meet the credit needs of business enterprises, particularly small business, including veterans. The economic health and welfare of this Nation depends mainly on the strength and stability of its small business enterprises. It is well known that the legitimate credit needs of small business cannot be entirely met by our private-banking institutions. And the RFC is authorized to make business loans only when credit is not otherwise available on reasonable terms. In other words, the Corporation is not engaged in competition with banks.

Many of the Corporation's loans, particularly to banks and railroads, have been large and spectacular, but the great majority of all business loans have been made to small business enterprises. I am told that of the 39,000 business loans which the Corporation has made since 1932, 90 percent have been in amounts under $100,000. The continuing need for this type of financial assistance is demonstrated by the fact that during 1946 the RFC made 12,247 loans to business enterprises, involving over one-half billion dollars, and it should be remembered that these loans were made only to applicants who could not obtain credit from private sources.

Perhaps of equal significance with its lending functions is the number of requests the Corporation has received from small business for various types of assistance, involving technical, managerial, and accounting problems. RFC officials advised us that in 1946 the Agency handled 260,000 requests for assistance, of which about 50 percent pertained to matters other than loans. After receiving such preliminary assistance the loan applicant frequently finds he does not need a loan, or that he does not need a loan as large as he anticipated, or for as long a time as he originally believed necessary. In many cases he finds that his needs can actually be met by his local bank. By handling many of its business loans through participation with banks the RFC has not only assisted small businessmen throughout the country but has also been a great help to the smaller banks in meeting the legitimate credit needs of their community.

Some practices of RFC I do not approve of but the agency was under a mandate from Congress to follow them. I refer, for example, to loans to the REA and to farm-tenant loans. These should be direct Treasury loans and I hope this improvement will be authorized by the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me there is every reason for prompt and unanimous approval of the main features of this bill. I agree, however, that it is rather disquieting news that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], brings us of General Bradley's disappointment in our failure to provide for the continued RFC financing of veterans' loans. I hope under the 5-minute rule that we will go very carefully into the merits of the amendments to be offered in that respect.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

TITLE I—AMENDMENT TO RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION ACT

SECTION 1. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1. There is hereby created a body corporate with the name 'Reconstruction Finance Corporation' (herein called the Corporation), with a capital stock of $325,000,000 subscribed by the United States of America. Its principal office shall be located in the District of Columbia, but there may be established agencies or branch offices in any city or cities of the United States under rules and regulations prescribed by the board of directors. This act may be cited as the 'Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act'.

"SEC. 2. The management of the Corporation shall be vested in a board of directors consisting of five persons appointed by the President of the United States by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Of the five members of the board, not more than three shall be members of any one political party and not more than one shall be appointed from any one Federal Reserve district. Each director shall devote his time principally to the business of the Corporation. The terms of the directors shall be 2 years but they may continue in office until their successors are appointed and qualified. Whenever a vacancy shall occur other than by expiration of term the person appointed to fill such vacancy shall hold office for the unexpired portion of the term of the director whose place he is selected to fill. The directors, except the chairman, shall receive salaries at the rate of $12,500 per annum each. The chairman of the board of directors shall receive a salary at the rate of $15,000 per annum.

"SEC. 3. (a) The Corporation shall have succession through June 30, 1949, unless it is sooner dissolved by an act of Congress. It shall have power to adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal; to make contracts; to lease or purchase such real estate as may be necessary for the transaction of its business; to sue and be sued, to complain and to defend, in any court of competent jurisdiction, State or Federal: *Provided*, That the Corporation shall be entitled to and granted the same immunities and exemptions from the payment of costs, charges, and fees as are granted to the United States pursuant to the provisions of law codified in sections 543, 548, 555, 557, 578, and 578a of title 28 of the United States Code, 1940 edition; to select, employ, and fix the compensation of such officers, employees, attorneys, and agents as shall be necessary for the transaction of the business of the Corporation, in accordance with laws applicable to the Corporation, as in effect on June 30, 1947, and as thereafter amended; and to prescribe, amend, and repeal, by its board of directors, bylaws, rules, and regulations governing the manner in which its general business may be conducted. Except as may be otherwise provided in this act, the board of directors of the Corporation shall determine the necessity for and the character and amount of its obligations and expenditures under this act and the manner in which they shall be budgeted, incurred, allowed, paid, and accounted for, without regard to the provisions of any other laws governing the expenditure of public funds and such determinations shall be final and conclusive upon all other officers of the Government. The Corporation shall be entitled to the free use of the United States mails in the same manner as the executive departments of the Government.

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the right to recover compensation granted by the act approved September 7, 1916, as amended (5 U. S. C., sec. 751), shall be in lieu of, and shall be construed to abrogate, any and all other rights and remedies which any person, except for this provision, might on account of injury or death of an employee, assert against the Corporation or any of its subsidiaries.

"SEC. 4. (a) To aid in financing agriculture commerce, and industry, to help in maintaining the economic stability of the country and to assist in promoting maximum employment and production, the Corporation, within the limitations hereinafter provided, is authorized—

"(1) To purchase the obligations of and to make loans to any business enterprise organized or operating under the laws of any State or the United States: *Provided*, That the purchase of obligations (including equipment trust certificates) of, or the making of loans to railroads or air carriers engaged in interstate commerce or receivers or trustees thereof, shall be with the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission or the Civil Aeronautics Board, respectively: *Provided further*, That in the case of railroads or air carriers not in receivership or trusteeship, the Commission or the Board, as the case may be, in connection with its approval of such purchases or loans, shall also certify that such railroad or air carrier, on the basis of present and prospective earnings, may be expected to meet its fixed charges without a reduction thereof through judicial reorganization except that such certificates shall not be required in the case of loans or purchases made for the acquisition of equipment or for maintenance.

"(2) To make loans to any financial institution organized under the laws of any State or of the United States.

"(3) In order to aid in financing projects authorized under Federal, State, or municipal law, to purchase the securities and obligations of, or make loans to, (A) municipalities and political subdivisions of States, (B) public agencies and instrumentalities of one or more States, municipalities, and political subdivisions of States, and (C) public corporations, boards, and commissions: *Provided*, That no such purchase or loan shall be made for payment of ordinary governmental or nonproject operating expenses as distinguished from purchases and loans to aid in financing specific public projects.

"(4) To make such loans, in an aggregate amount not to exceed $25,000,000 outstanding at any one time, as it may determine to be necessary or appropriate because of floods or other catastrophes.

"(b) No financial assistance shall be extended pursuant to paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a) of this section, unless the financial assistance applied for is not otherwise available on reasonable terms. All securities and obligations purchased and all loans made under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a) of this section shall be of such sound value or so secured as reasonably to assure retirement or repayment and

such loans may be made either directly or in cooperation with banks or other lending institutions through agreements to participate or by the purchase of participations, or otherwise.

"(c) The total amount of investments, loans, purchases, and commitments made pursuant to this section 4 shall not exceed $2,000,000,000 outstanding at any one time.

"(d) No fee or commission shall be paid by any applicant for financial assistance under the provisions of this act in connection with any such application, and any agreement to pay or payment of any such fee or commission shall be unlawful.

"(e) No director, officer, attorney, agent, or employee of the Corporation in any manner, directly or indirectly, shall participate in the deliberation upon or the determination of any question affecting his personal interests, or the interests of any corporation, partnership, or association in which he is directly or indirectly interested.

"(f) The powers granted to the Corporation by this section shall terminate at the close of business on June 30, 1949, but the termination of such powers shall not be construed (1) to prohibit disbursement of funds on purchases of securities and obligations, on loans, or on commitments or agreements to make such purchases or loans, made under this act prior to the close of business on such date, or (2) to affect the validity or performance of any other agreement made or entered into pursuant to law.

"(g) As used in this act, the term 'State' includes the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

"SEC. 5. Section 5202 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the words 'War Finance Corporation Act' and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act.'

"SEC. 6. The Federal Reserve banks are authorized and directed to act as custodians and fiscal agents for the Corporation in the general performance of its powers conferred by this act and the Corporation may reimburse such Federal Reserve banks for such services in such manner as may be agreed upon.

"SEC. 7. The Corporation may issue to the Secretary of the Treasury its notes, debentures, bonds, or other such obligations in an amount outstanding at any one time sufficient to enable the Corporation to carry out its functions under this act or any other provision of law, such obligations to mature not more than 5 years from their respective dates of issue, to be redeemable at the option of the Corporation before maturity in such manner as may be stipulated in such obligations. Such obligations may mature subsequent to the period of succession of the Corporation. Each such obligation shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of the obligation of the Corporation. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to purchase any obligations of the Corporation to be issued hereunder, and for such purpose the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, are extended to include any purchases of the Corporation's obligations hereunder.

"SEC. 8. The Corporation, including its franchise, capital, reserves and surplus, and its income, shall be exempt from all taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States, by any Territory, dependency, or possession thereof, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority, except that any real property of the Corporation shall be subject to special assessments for local improvements and shall be subject to State, Territorial, county, municipal, or local taxation to the same extent according to its value as other real property is taxed: *Provided*, That the special assessment and taxation of real property as authorized herein shall not include the taxation as real property of possessory interests, pipe lines, power lines, or machinery or equipment owned by the Corporation regardless of their nature, use, or manner of attachment or affixation to the land, building, or other structure upon or in which the same may be located. The exemptions provided for in the preceding sentence with respect to taxation (which shall, for all purposes, be deemed to include sales, use, storage, and purchase taxes) shall be construed to be applicable not only with respect to the Corporation but also with respect to any other public corporation which is now or which may be hereafter wholly financed and wholly managed by the Corporation. Such exemptions shall also be construed to be applicable to loans made, and personal property owned by the Corporation or such other corporations, but such exemptions shall not be construed to be applicable in any State to any buildings which are considered by the laws of such State to be personal property for taxation purposes. Notwithstanding any other provision of law or any privilege or consent to tax expressly or impliedly granted thereby, the shares of preferred stock of national banking associations, and the shares of preferred stock, capital notes, and debentures of State banks and trust companies, acquired prior to July 1, 1947, by the Corporation, and the dividends or interest derived therefrom by the Corporation, shall not, so long as the Corporation shall continue to own the same, be subject to any taxation by the United States, by any Territory, dependency, or possession thereof, or the District of Columbia, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority, whether now, heretofore, or hereafter imposed, levied, or assessed, and whether for a past, present, or future taxing period.

"SEC. 9. In the event of termination of the powers granted to the Corporation by section 4 of this act prior to the expiration of its succession as provided in section 3, the board of directors shall, except as otherwise herein specifically authorized, proceed to liquidate its assets and wind up its affairs. It may with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury deposit with the Treasurer of the United States as a special fund any money belonging to the Corporation or from time to time received by it in the course of liquidation, for the payment of its outstanding obligations, which fund may be drawn upon or paid out for no other purpose. Any balance remaining after the liquidation of all the Corporation's assets and after provision has been made for payment of all legal obligations shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts. Thereupon the Corporation shall be dissolved and its capital stock shall be canceled and retired.

"SEC. 10. If at the expiration of the succession of the Corporation, its board of directors shall not have completed the liquidation of its assets and the winding up of its affairs, the duty of completing such liquidation and winding up of its affairs shall be transferred to the Secretary of the Treasury, who for such purpose shall succeed to all the powers and duties of the board of directors under this act. In such event he may assign to any officer or officers of the United States in the Treasury Department the exercise and performance, under his general supervision and direction, of any such powers and duties. When the Secretary of the Treasury shall find that such liquidation will no longer be advantageous to the United States and that all of the Corporation's legal obligations have been provided for, he shall retire any capital stock then outstanding, pay into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts the unused balance of the moneys belonging to the Corporation, and make a final report to the Congress. Thereupon the Corporation shall be deemed to be dissolved.

"SEC. 11. (a) Whoever makes any statement knowing it to be false, or whoever willfully overvalues any security, for the purpose of obtaining for himself or for any applicant any loan, or extension thereof by removal, deferment of action or otherwise, or the acceptance, release, or substitution of security therefor, or for the purpose of influencing in any way the action of the Corporation, or for the purpose of obtaining money, property, or anything of value, under this act, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both.

"(b) Whoever (1) falsely makes, forges, or counterfeits any note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or coupon, in imitation of or purporting to be a note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or coupon, issued by the Corporation; or (2) passes, utters, or publishes, or attempts to pass, utter or publish, any false, forged or counterfeited note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or coupon, purporting to have been issued by the Corporation, knowing the same to be false, forged, or counterfeited; or (3) falsely alters any note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or coupon, issued or purporting to have been issued by the Corporation; or (4) passes, utters, or publishes, or attempts to pass, utter, or publish, as true any falsely altered or spurious note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or coupon, issued or purporting to have been issued by the Corporation, knowing the same to be falsely altered or spurious, or any person who willfully violates any other provision of this act, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000, by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

"(c) Whoever, being connected in any capacity with the Corporation, (1) embezzles, abstracts, purloins, or willfully misapplies any moneys, funds, securities, or other things of value, whether belonging to it or pledged or otherwise entrusted to it; or (2) with intent to defraud the Corporation or any other body politic or corporate, or any individual, or to deceive any officer, auditor, or examiner of the Corporation, makes any false entry in any book, report, or statement of or to the Corporation, or, without being duly authorized, draws any order or issues, puts forth, or assigns any note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or draft, bill of exchange, mortgage, judgment, or decree thereof; or (3) with intent to defraud participates, shares, receives directly or indirectly any money, profit, property, or benefit through any transaction, loan, commission, contract, or any other act of the Corporation; or (4) gives any unauthorized information concerning any future action or plan of the Corporation which might affect the value of securities, or having such knowledge, invests or speculates, directly or indirectly, in the securities or property of any company, bank, or corporation receiving loans or other assistance from the Corporation, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

"(d) No individual, association, partnership, or corporation shall use the words 'Reconstruction Finance Corporation' or a combination of these three words, as the name or a part thereof under which he or it shall do business. Every individual, partnership, association, or corporation violating this prohibition shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not exceeding $1,000 or imprisonment not exceeding 1 year, or both.

"(e) The provisions of sections 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, and 117 of the Criminal Code of the United States (U. S. C., title 18, ch. 5, secs. 202 to 207, inclusive), insofar as applicable, are extended to apply to contracts or agreements with the Corporation under

this act, which for the purposes hereof shall be held to include loans, advances, discounts, and rediscounts; extensions and renewals thereof; and acceptances, releases, and substitutions of security therefor.

"SEC. 12. The Corporation is authorized to exercise the functions, powers, duties, and authority transferred to the Corporation by Public Law 109, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved June 30, 1945, but only with respect to programs, projects, or commitments outstanding on June 30, 1947.

"SEC. 13. If any provision of this act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this act, and the applicability of such provision to other person or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby."

TITLE II—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 201. No provision of this act shall be construed so as to prevent the Corporation from disbursing funds on purchases, of securities and obligations, on loans made, or on commitments or agreements to make such purchases or loans, and liabilities incurred, pursuant to law prior to the effective date of this act.

SEC. 202. The succession of United States Commercial Company, a corporation created by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation pursuant to section 5d (3) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is hereby extended through June 30, 1948.

SEC. 203. All assets and liabilities of every kind and nature, together with all documents, books of account, and records, of the RFC Mortgage Company, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Maryland, all the capital stock of which is owned and held by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, shall be transferred to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. With respect to the assets, liabilities, and records transferred, "Reconstruction Finance Corporation" for all purposes is hereby substituted for "The RFC Mortgage Company", and no suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against such corporation shall abate by reason of the enactment of this act, but the court, on motion or supplemental petition filed at any time within 12 months after the date of such enactment, showing a necessity for the survival of such suit, action, or other proceeding to obtain a determination of the questions involved, may allow the same to be maintained by or against the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

SEC. 204. The Federal Loan Agency, created by Reorganization Plan Numbered 1 pursuant to the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1939, approved April 3, 1939, is hereby abolished, and all its property and records are hereby transferred to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

SEC. 205. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to transfer as soon as practicable after the effective date of this act, to the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to receive, all of the stock of the Federal home-loan banks held by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cancel notes of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and sums due and unpaid upon or in connection with such notes at the time of such cancellation, in an amount equal to the par value of the stock so transferred.

SEC. 206. The following acts and portions of acts are hereby repealed:

(a) Sections 1, 201, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, and 211 of the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932, approved July 21, 1932 (47 Stat. 709), as amended;

(b) Section 304 of the act approved March 9, 1933 (48 Stat. 1), as amended;

(c) Sections 27, 32, 36, 37, and 38 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, approved May 12, 1933 (48 Stat. 41), as amended;

(d) Sections 5 and 19 (c) and the last two sentences of section 8 (b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, approved May 12, 1933 (48 Stat. 33), as amended;

(e) The act approved June 10, 1933 (48 Stat. 119), as amended;

(f) The last sentence of section 4 (b) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, approved June 13, 1933 (48 Stat. 129), as amended;

(g) Sections 301 and 302 of the National Industrial Recovery Act, approved June 16, 1933 (48 Stat. 195), as amended;

(h) Section 84 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933, approved June 16, 1933 (48 Stat. 257), as amended;

(i) The act approved January 20, 1934 (48 Stat. 318);

(j) The fourth paragraph of the Emergency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1935, approved June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1056), and section 202 of the Public Works Administration Extension Act of 1937, approved June 29, 1937 (50 Stat. 357);

(k) Sections 10, 13, 14, 15, and 16 of the act approved June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1105), as amended;

(l) So much of sections 4 and 602 of the National Housing Act, approved June 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 1247), as amended, as relates to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation;

(m) The first section and sections 2, 3, 9, 11, and 13 of the act approved January 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 1), as amended;

(n) The act approved August 24, 1935 (49 Stat., ch. 646, p. 796);

(o) The act approved March 20, 1936 (49 Stat. 1185);

(p) The act approved April 10, 1936 (49 Stat., ch. 168, p. 1191);

(q) The first section of the act approved January 26, 1937 (50 Stat. 5), as amended;

(r) The act approved February 11, 1937 (50 Stat. 19), as amended;

(s) So much of section 32 (b) of the Farm Credit Act of 1937, approved August 19, 1937 (50 Stat. 703), as relates to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and so much of section 33 (b) of the said act as relates to the payment of the expenses of corporations formed by the consolidation of two or more regional agricultural credit corporations;

(t) So much of the act approved June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1193), as relates to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation;

(u) Section 12 of the Federal Highway Act of 1940, approved September 5, 1940 (54 Stat. 867);

(v) Section 5 of the act approved June 10, 1941 (55 Stat. 250);

(w) The act approved October 23, 1941 (55 Stat., ch. 454, p. 744);

(x) The act approved March 27, 1942 (56 Stat., ch. 198, p. 174);

(y) The act approved June 5, 1942 (56 Stat., ch. 352, p. 326); and

(z) Sections 1 and 2 of Public Law 656, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 7, 1946.

SEC. 207. The liquidation of the affairs of the Smaller War Plants Corporation administered by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation pursuant to Executive Order 9665 shall be carried out by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, notwithstanding the provisions of the last paragraph of section 5 of the First War Powers Act, 1941. The Smaller War Plants Corporation is hereby abolished.

SEC. 208. (a) The Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall have the power to purchase any surplus property for resale, subject to regulations of the War Assets Administrator or his successor, to small business when, in its judgment, such disposition is required to preserve and strengthen the competitive position of small business. The purchase of surplus property under this section shall be given priority under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, immediately following transfers to Government agencies under section 12 of such act, as amended, and disposals to veterans under section 16 of such act, as amended. The provisions of section 12 (c) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, shall be applicable to purchases made under this section. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall not purchase any surplus property pursuant to this section unless a small business had previously made application to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for such property. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall not purchase any real property for resale to small business pursuant to this section in any case where any person from whom the property had been acquired by a Government agency, gives notice in writing to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation that he intends to exercise his rights under section 23 of the Surplus Property Act, as amended.

(b) The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is further authorized for the purpose of carrying out the objectives of this section to arrange for sales of surplus property to small business concerns on credit or time basis.

(c) For the purposes of this section the terms "persons," "surplus property," and "Government agency" have the same meaning as is assigned to such terms by section 3 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended.

SEC. 209. During the period between June 30, 1947, and the date of enactment of legislation making funds available for administrative expenses for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, the Corporation is authorized to incur, and pay out of its general funds, administrative expenses in accordance with laws in effect on June 30, 1947, such obligations and expenditures to be charged against funds when made available for administrative expenses for the fiscal year 1948.

SEC. 210. This act shall take effect as of midnight June 30, 1947.

Mr. SPENCE (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and be open to amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROWN of Georgia: Page 6, after line 7, insert the following new paragraph:

"(5) To provide for original mortgagees a market for home loans guaranteed or insured under the provisions of title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, or under the provisions of the National Housing Act, as amended, by the purchase, administration, and disposition of such loans directly, or through national banks, acting as agents or as trustees."

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I was hopeful that our fine chairman would accept this amendment.

I introduced this amendment last year and it became law. In my home county, with a population of some 25,000 people, there are two $50,000 banks. They make loans to veterans, but they can only loan a certain amount of money, and the same situation exists in many rural areas

in the United States. If they had some place to sell these GI loans, then they could serve many more veterans. We do not have any market or any other lending agencies to make or buy these loans. The amendment I offered was to create a secondary market in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Under the present law, the RFC is only authorized to purchase these loans and not compelled to do so. There are many veterans who cannot be served through the small banks and obtain the money that Congress provided in the GI bill of rights unless we have a market for these small banks to sell the loans. The American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and practically all of the veterans' organizations have endorsed this amendment. The termination of the authority of the RFC to purchase veterans' loans in order to enable veterans to continue to purchase homes in many localities would be disastrous because in many of these localities there is no agency to purchase such loans. Only $40,000,000 has been expended by the RFC in purchasing such loans, and the veterans have received some $4,000,000,000 in the purchasing of homes.

It is true that in the large cities of this country there are other lending agencies which can purchase the loans from the banks, but in the small communities there is nobody to serve the community and serve the veterans but the small banks. There are no other lending agencies.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. Denver is a city of some 400,000 population. I have a telegram from the Denver Association of Home Builders, which represents those builders who are building about 90 percent of the home construction in the Denver area. They say the amendment which the gentleman has offered is vitally essential to enable the veterans to purchase homes under the existing program. So even in a city where they have larger banks and larger agencies that can purchase this paper, they say this is vitally necessary to a continuation of their home building program.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Would the gentleman like to have inserted under extension of remarks some telegrams I have received from a dozen communities and cities and American Legion organizations asking that this amendment be agreed to?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I would be glad to have the lady put those in.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman think this is adding something to the bill rather than detracting from it?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Well, I know that a great many soldiers cannot be accommodated. It was suggested in the Rules Committee that the Federal Reserve System might accommodate them, but they do not have the authority to buy the loans, and loans can only be put up as collateral with them, which does not relieve the small banks and place them in position to make further loans to veterans on account of the small capital stock.

The Federal Reserve would have to obtain authority to purchase these loans just as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation must have authority to do the same thing. There would be no loss to the RFC because they can turn down any and all loans they desire. They do not pay any premium for the GI loans. They would be in position to accommodate the bank that is not able to make so many loans and carry out the intention of Congress. The refusal to allow the RFC to purchase these loans is completely inconsistent with the intention of Congress as laid down in the GI bill of rights.

Now, let us be frank and tell the veterans that as long as the GI bill of rights is on the statute books we mean to serve them by these loans, and without this amendment it is impossible to do it in many communities of the United States. If you desire to amend the GI bill of rights, do that in another bill. We want to give the same treatment to all the veterans. This amendment simply gives authority to the RFC so that we can have a market to sell the loans in localities of this country where the banks cannot afford to loan more money on account of small capital stock and must get rid of some of the loans in order to accommodate more veterans. It is a great injustice to a great majority of our veterans. We must treat them all alike wherever they are located. That was the intention of the Congress in providing a way for veterans to have homes. Many communities certainly cannot serve them unless this amendment is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] has expired.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MACKINNON as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. BROWN of Georgia: Page 6, after line 7, and before line 8, insert a new subparagraph to read as follows:

"(5) To provide for original mortgagees a market for home loans guaranteed or insured under the provisions of Title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, by the purchase, administration, and disposition of such loans directly, or through national banks, acting as agents or as trustees."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

AUTHORITY TO PURCHASE GI LOANS SHOULD BE CONTINUED IN RFC

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is in substantially the same form as the existing provision of the law upon which we are presently operating.

The difference between my amendment and that offered by the gentleman from Georgia is that his amendment also includes authority to purchase mortgages issued under the National Housing Act. The NHA provision refers primarily to mortgages issued under title 2 and title 6 of the National Housing Act. That phase of the amendment would be an additional power over that which was granted by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia at the last session. The form of my amendment as now offered as a substitute is substantially the same as the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia at the last session of Congress.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACKINNON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The amendment offered is the amendment that was in the bill introduced by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]. We considered that bill in the committee. I just followed his language, and added the additional language which was not there in the Wolcott amendment. In effect I copied the other amendment.

Mr. MACKINNON. That is absolutely right. Upon investigating and studying that amendment I was of the opinion that there was a strong possibility that it would throw the RFC into financing general housing construction that I am sure the Congress did not wish to give them at this time as we have other agencies for that purpose.

This amendment I am offering is limited to loans on veterans' homes authorized under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

Various claims will be made about this particular amendment. The thought will be expressed that possibly if we are going to continue this it ought to be done as an amendment to the GI bill of rights. If you want to do it that way I have no objection; but we are not doing it that way and if we cut this off in this bill today we are in effect amending the GI bill of rights so as to make it inoperative, and completely so, in a great many instances where the GI is a necessitous borrower. I want to drive that home. The most necessitous GI borrowers are the principal ones who will be unable to secure their credit if this provision is not adopted. Unless there is some secondary line of credit where such 100-percent loans can be disposed of, the provisions of the GI bill are not going to be implemented and we are going to deny to the most necessitous individuals in the GI group the benefits that we have promised them in the GI bill of rights. I do not think there can be any argument about that particular proposition. I am as much opposed as any person to loose credit, but if we are going to implement the GI bill of rights in any particular its promised benefits should be made equally available to all. To make the loan guaranty effective we must adopt this amendment, because the minute this bill becomes law there will be no place that a GI can go to get the benefits that have been held out to him. I appreciate the difficulties of offering an amendment on the floor when it is opposed by the committee, but I submit that the justification for the continuation of this power is so great in view of the promises that have been made in the GI bill that we should leave no stone unturned to see that those promises are

fulfilled. I thank you for your consideration and in closing I wish to point out that the veterans' organizations are strongly supporting this amendment. In support of that statement, I include a telegram from the American Legion:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 24, 1947.*

Hon. GEORGE MACKINNON,
House of Representatives:

The American Legion strongly objects to termination of authority of RFC to purchase veterans' loans as contemplated by H. R. 3916. Continuation of this authority necessary to enable veterans to continue to purchase homes. Request your cooperation in securing amendment of H. R. 3916.

JOHN THOMAS TAYLOR,
Legislative Representative,
American Legion.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes and that the majority close the debate.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the Home Builders Association of Massachusetts, together with a representative of the American Legion, visited me this morning and expressed great concern that this would in effect nullify provisions under the GI bill of rights. I have copies of telegrams that came in to the American Legion, and will read a list of companies making loans to veterans in the various States who have expressed themselves as indicating that the extension of the authority of the RFC to purchase loans granted by the Veterans' Administration under the GI bill of rights is essential. This list is as follows:

J. C. McGee, president, Reid McGee & Co., Jackson, Miss.

W. Walter Williams, Seattle, Wash.

Joseph N. Gorson, president, Fidelity Bond & Mortgage Co., Philadelphia, Pa.

R. C. Houser, Miami, Fla.

A. H. Cadwallader, Jr., Corpus Christi, Tex.

Mortgage Investment Corp., San Antonio, Tex.

Lyle H. Plant, T. J. Bettes Co., San Antonio, Tex.

B. B. Bass, vice president, American Trust Co., Oklahoma City, Okla.

Albert Mager, Mager Mortgage Co., Oklahoma City, Okla.

H. B. Moffitt, Oklahoma City, Okla.

W. R. Johnston, Oklahoma City, Okla.

Richard Gill, president, Richard Gill Co., San Antonio, Tex.

James R. Rouse, regional vice president, Mortgage Bankers Association, Baltimore, Md.

Hill Mortgage Corp., Buffalo, N. Y.

Hubert R. Haeussler, regional vice president, Mortgage Bankers Association of America, Detroit, Mich.

Aksel Nielsen, the Title Guaranty Co., Denver, Colo.

Richard Cadwallader, national vice commander of American Legion and chairman of the national housing committee, Baton Rouge, La.

Fred M. Fuecker, department adjutant of the American Legion of Washington, Seattle, Wash.

Hayward S. Cleveland, Legionnaire, Port Washington, N. Y.

Arthur L. Marcus, Legionnaire, Greendale, Wis.

A. Clark Murdock, Legionnaire, Omaha, Nebr.

J. D. Sawyer, Legionnaire, Middletown, Ohio.

Dick Vail, Legionnaire, Fresno, Calif.

J. E. Owens, president, Carolina Housing and Mortgage Corp., Hickory, N. C.

The State of Massachusetts is tremendously interested in this matter. I see the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is going to speak on it. It seems to me this is really making inoperative loans under the GI bill of rights.

I hope the amendment will be adopted and some provision made to make the loan provisions of the GI bill of rights operative.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is endorsed by those who I think know more about the GI housing program and in whom the Congress has more confidence than any one throughout the country.

It is endorsed by the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars and by General Bradley. The original amendment was put in at General Bradley's request last year. It also has the endorsement of the National Mortgage Association, which includes almost all of your large insurance companies, and every phase of our national economy dealing with this type of mortgage. It is also endorsed by the Home Builders Association.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to read one paragraph, if I may, from General Bradley's letter, which is too long to read in its entirety in this short period of time:

The Veterans' Administration is aware that the saturation point has been reached by many lenders for long-term mortgage commitments and there are indications that many other lenders will reach that stage. Several conferences with lender groups have demonstrated that the continuation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation purchase program is not only desirable but essential if veterans' needs for financing the purchase of homes are to be met.

We gave a solemn pledge to the veterans of this country that we would insure their loans by 100 percent. By this action today in shirking this authority we are running out on that pledge. Now, if the Congress wants to violate the pledge, let us do it directly, not indirectly.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Is it not a fact that while the RFC has only purchased about $60,000,000 worth of these mortgages out of a total of $4,000,000,000 of mortgages involved, nevertheless it does serve to give confidence to the banks that have put out these mortgages to know that the RFC and the lending power of the RFC are behind them?

Mr. MONRONEY. The gentleman is quite right. If we do not extend this lending power we are saying to all the lending institutions that the RFC has no confidence in our own paper which we are insuring in the Veterans' Administration. There is additional liability involved because the loans are insured 100 percent of value. When we furnished a market through RFC we are able to keep from any danger that the price in the market place might decline to 85 or 90 percent of their true value. I am sorry indeed that the committee did not have the time to adequately go into this matter. If they had had testimony in the hearings, I am certain that the bill would have contained this very provision.

I do ask that the committee vote for either amendment. Either amendment is just as good. The adoption of either will make sure that the veteran desiring a home will not be denied the right to adequate financing, no matter in what part of the Nation he resides. Without this amendment, many sections of the country, in fact probably in all sections, the pledge of Congress to this home financing will be nullified.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, this activity has increased from nothing to the point now where there is something less than $60,000,000 outstanding. This is what the RFC is doing in this respect, and I think that it believes that we could cut off the program here now, but it is very doubtful whether we can cut this program off a year or a year and a half from now.

I will also read from General Bradley's letter to me a very significant statement:

The amount of mortgages purchased to date is small as compared with the amount anticipated. I am advised informally that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation at present is making purchase commitments at the rate of $1,500,000 per day and the total commitments at present are approximately $62,877,387.

Now, the total power of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to loan is $2,000,000,000 under this program. Very shortly you would have exactly the same situation in reference to this loan that you have with the blanket participation. That activity grew from nothing to about $450,000,000 in a year and a half's time. In less than 2 years' time over 50 percent of your loaning power would be in these loans. The banks have money now to make this credit available, and if these GI loans under present conditions are not good risks for the banks, then I doubt whether the Federal Government should go into them through the back door of the RFC, but should amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act.

What happens? The Veterans' Administration guarantees a loan up to 50 percent of its value not to exceed $4,000. The loan is not made to the veteran by the Veterans' Administration. It is made to the veteran by a bank, and the bank goes to the Veterans' Administration and gets 50 percent of that loan guaranteed up to $4,000. What happens on an $8,000 house? Default is made by the veteran. The Veterans' Administration immediately comes in and pays the bank $4,000.

The bank now liquidates that indebtedness through foreclosure of the $8,000 loan to get its $4,000 out, paying back what is left over the $4,000 to the Veterans' Administration. Now, that is reduced proportionately. All you are doing here is to make it possible for somebody to get half of 1 percent for servicing this paper. The GI is not involved at all in this transaction. These banks can rediscount this paper at the Federal Reserve banks. They can rediscount this paper with the home loan banks. We set up 12 of them with a capitalization of $150,000,000. They are functioning as going concerns for the very purpose of discounting this paper, and if the banks cannot sell this paper to the RFC, they can rediscount it at the home loan banks and the Federal Reserve banks. You will have a lion by the tail inside of a year that you cannot get rid of. We have to meet it head on sometime, and we should meet it before it gets out of control.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MACKINNON) there were—ayes 35, noes 47.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BROWN of Georgia) there were—ayes 38, noes 52.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. It is not given to many Members of the House to preside over the House or Committee at any time. I think the attention of the Committee should be called to the fact that the present occupant of the chair has a birthday today, and I am sure will receive the unanimous felicitations of the Members of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HARNESS of Indiana, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3916) to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and to extend the succession and certain lending powers and functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 252, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from New York opposed to the bill?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. In its present form I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MARCANTONIO moves to recommit the bill (H. R. 3916) to the Committee on Banking and Currency, with the recommendation it report the bill back forthwith with the following amendment: On page 6, after line 7, insert the following subsection:

"(5) To provide for original mortgagees a market for home loans guaranteed or insured under the provisions of title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, by the purchase, administration, and disposition of such loans directly, or through national banks, acting as agents or as trustees."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO) there were—ayes 37, noes 71.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant-at-Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 154, nays 192, not voting 83, as follows:

[Roll No. 91]

YEAS—154

Abernethy	Fogarty	Miller, Calif.
Albert	Folger	Miller, Md.
Allen, La.	Forand	Mills
Almond	Gordon	Monroney
Andrews, Ala.	Gore	Morris
Barden	Gorski	Murdock
Bates, Ky.	Gossett	Murray, Tenn.
Battle	Granger	Norton
Beckworth	Gregory	O'Brien
Blatnik	Hardy	O'Toole
Bloom	Harless, Ariz.	Pace
Boggs, La.	Harris	Passman
Bonner	Hart	Patman
Brooks	Havenner	Peden
Brown, Ga.	Hays	Peterson
Bryson	Hedrick	Philbin
Bulwinkle	Hobbs	Pickett
Burleson	Holifield	Poage
Byrne, N. Y.	Huber	Preston
Carroll	Hull	Price, Fla.
Celler	Jackson, Wash.	Price, Ill.
Chelf	Javits	Priest
Colmer	Johnson, Okla.	Rains
Combs	Johnson, Tex.	Rankin
Cooley	Jones, Ala.	Rayburn
Cooper	Jones, N. C.	Redden
Corbett	Judd	Riley
Courtney	Karsten, Mo.	Rivers
Cox	Keating	Rogers, Fla.
Cravens	Kee	Rogers, Mass.
Crosser	Kefauver	Sadowski
Davis, Ga.	Kennedy	Sasscer
Davis, Tenn.	Kilday	Scott, Hardie
Dawson, Utah	King	Sheppard
Deane	Kirwan	Sikes
Devitt	Lane	Smathers
Donohue	Larcade	Smith, Va.
Dorn	Lesinski	Somers
Doughton	Lucas	Spence
Douglas	Lyle	Stanley
Drewry	Lynch	Stigler
Durham	McCormack	Thomas, Tex.
Eberharter	McMillan, S. C.	Thomason
Elliott	MacKinnon	Trimble
Engle, Calif.	Madden	Walter
Evins	Mahon	Wheeler
Fallon	Mansfield, Mont.	Whitten
Feighan	Marcantonio	Whittington
Fisher	Meade, Md.	Williams
Flannagan		Wilson, Tex.
Winstead	Wood	Zimmerman
Wolverton	Worley	

NAYS—192

Allen, Calif.	Gavin	Muhlenberg
Allen, Ill.	Gearhart	Mundt
Andersen, H. Carl	Gillette	Murray, Wis.
	Gillie	Norblad
Anderson, Calif.	Goff	O'Hara
Andresen, August H.	Goodwin	O'Konski
	Graham	Owens
Andrews, N. Y.	Grant, Ind.	Patterson
Angell	Griffiths	Phillips, Tenn.
Arnold	Gross	Ploeser
Auchincloss	Gwinn, N. Y.	Plumley
Bakewell	Gwynne, Iowa	Potts
Banta	Hagen	Poulson
Barrett	Hale	Ramey
Bates, Mass.	Hall, Leonard W.	Reed, Ill.
Beall	Hand	Rees
Bell	Harness, Ind.	Reeves
Bender	Herter	Rich
Bennett, Mo.	Heselton	Riehlman
Bishop	Hinshaw	Rizley
Blackney	Hoeven	Rockwell
Boggs, Del.	Hoffman	Rohrbough
Bolton	Holmes	Ross
Bradley	Hope	Russell
Bramblett	Horan	Sadlak
Brehm	Jackson, Calif.	St. George
Brophy	Jenkins, Ohio	Sanborn
Brown, Ohio	Jenkins, Pa.	Sarbacher
Buck	Jennings	Schwabe, Mo.
Buffett	Johnson, Ill.	Schwabe, Okla.
Burke	Johnson, Ind.	Scoblick
Busbey	Jones, Ohio	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Butler	Jones, Wash.	Seely-Brown
Byrnes, Wis.	Jonkman	Shafer
Canfield	Kean	Short
Cannon	Kearney	Simpson, Ill.
Carson	Kersten, Wis.	Simpson, Pa.
Case, N. J.	Knutson	Smith, Kans.
Case, S. Dak.	Kunkel	Smith, Maine
Chadwick	Landis	Smith, Wis.
Church	Latham	Springer
Clason	Lea	Stefan
Clevenger	LeCompte	Stevenson
Coffin	LeFevre	Stockman
Cole, Mo.	Lewis	Sundstrom
Cotton	Lodge	Taber
Crawford	Love	Talle
Crow	McConnell	Taylor
Cunningham	McCowen	Thomas, N. J.
Curtis	McDonough	Tibbott
Dague	McDowell	Tollefson
Davis, Wis.	McGregor	Twyman
D'Ewart	McMahon	Van Zandt
Dirksen	McMillen, Ill.	Vorys
Dondero	Maloney	Vursell
Ellis	Martin, Iowa	Wadsworth
Ellsworth	Mathews	Welchel
Elsaesser	Meade, Ky.	West
Elston	Merrow	Wigglesworth
Engel, Mich.	Meyer	Wilson, Ind.
Fellows	Michener	Wolcott
Fenton	Miller, Conn.	Woodruff
Fletcher	Miller, Nebr.	Youngblood
Foote	Mitchell	
Fulton	Morton	
Gamble		

NOT VOTING—83

Arends	Grant, Ala.	Manasco
Bennett, Mich.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Mansfield, Tex.
Bland		Mason
Boykin	Halleck	Morgan
Buchanan	Harrison	Morrison
Buckley	Hartley	Nixon
Camp	Hébert	Nodar
Chapman	Heffernan	Norrell
Chenoweth	Hendricks	Pfeifer
Chiperfield	Hess	Phillips, Calif.
Clark	Hill	Powell
Clements	Howell	Rabin
Clippinger	Jarman	Rayfiel
Cole, Kans.	Jenison	Reed, N. Y.
Cole, N. Y.	Jensen	Richards
Coudert	Johnson, Calif.	Robertson
Dawson, Ill.	Kearns	Robsion
Delaney	Keefe	Rooney
Dingell	Kelley	Sabath
Dolliver	Keogh	Scrivner
Domengeaux	Kerr	Smith, Ohio
Eaton	Kilburn	Snyder
Fernandez	Klein	Stratton
Fuller	Lanham	Teague
Gallagher	Lemke	Towe
Gary	Lusk	Vail
Gathings	McGarvey	Vinson
Gifford	Macy	Welch

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Rooney for, with Mr. Towe against.
Mr. Buchanan for, with Mr. Hartley against.
Mr. Kelley for, with Mr. Stratton against.
Mr. Gathings for, with Mr. Coudert against.
Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Nodar against.
Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Reed of New York against.
Mr. Lusk for, with Mr. Clippinger against.
Mr. Morgan for, with Mr. Eaton against.
Mr. Klein for, with Mr. Dolliver against.
Mr. Clements for, with Mr. Fuller against.
Mr. Chapman for, with Mr. Halleck against.
Mr. Pfeifer for, with Mr. Gifford against.
Mr. Gary for, with Mr. Kilburn against.
Mr. Buckley for, with Mr. McGarvey against.
Mr. Heffernan for, with Mr. Macy against.
Mr. Delaney for, with Mr. Howell against.
Mr. Dingell for, with Mr. Vail against.
Mr. Domengeaux for, with Mr. Kearns against.
Mr. Richards for, with Mr. Arends against.
Mr. Manasco for, with Mr. Jenison against.
Mr. Teague for, with Mr. Hess against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Bennett of Michigan with Mr. Camp.
Mr. Cole of Kansas with Mr. Fernandez.
Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall with Mr. Clark.
Mr. Hill with Mr. Grant of Alabama.
Mr. Jensen with Mr. Rabin.
Mr. Keefe with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Robsion with Mr. Hébert.
Mr. Phillips of California with Mr. Jarman.
Mr. Welch with Mr. Hendricks.
Mr. Mason with Mr. Rayfiel.
Mr. Lemke with Mr. Norrell.
Mr. Nixon with Mr. Lanham.
Mr. Chiperfield with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Johnson of California with Mr. Sabath.
Mr. Chenoweth with Mr. Vinson.
Mr. Snyder with Mr. Kerr.
Mr. Smith of Ohio with Mr. Bland.
Mr. Robertson with Mr. Boykin.
Mr. Cole of New York with Mr. Mansfield of Texas.

Mr. FOLGER, Mr. EBERHARTER, Mr. CORBETT, Mr. DEVITT, Mr. HARDIE SCOTT, and Mr. WOLVERTON changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. FULTON and Mr. D'EWART changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 335, nays 4, not voting 90, as follows:

[Roll No. 92]

YEAS—335

Abernethy	Battle	Burke
Albert	Beall	Burleson
Allen, Calif.	Bender	Busbey
Allen, Ill.	Bennett, Mo.	Butler
Allen, La.	Bishop	Byrne, N. Y.
Almond	Blackney	Canfield
Andersen, H. Carl	Blatnik	Cannon
	Bloom	Carroll
Anderson, Calif.	Boggs, Del.	Carson
Andresen, August H.	Boggs, La.	Case, N. J.
	Bolton	Case, S. Dak.
Andrews, Ala.	Bonner	Celler
Andrews, N. Y.	Bradley	Chadwick
Angell	Bramblett	Chelf
Arnold	Brehm	Church
Auchincloss	Brooks	Clason
Bakewell	Brophy	Clevenger
Banta	Brown, Ga.	Coffin
Barden	Brown, Ohio	Cole, Mo.
Barrett	Bryson	Colmer
Bates, Ky.	Buck	Combs
Bates, Mass.	Bulwinkle	Cooley
Cooper	Jenkins, Pa.	Poage
Corbett	Jennings	Potts
Cotton	Johnson, Ill.	Poulson
Courtney	Johnson, Ind.	Preston
Cox	Johnson, Okla.	Price, Fla.
Cravens	Johnson, Tex.	Price, Ill.
Crawford	Jones, Ala.	Priest
Crosser	Jones, N. C.	Rains
Crow	Jones, Ohio	Ramey
Cunningham	Jones, Wash.	Rankin
Curtis	Jonkman	Rayburn
Dague	Judd	Redden
Davis, Ga.	Karsten, Mo.	Reed, Ill.
Davis, Wis.	Kearney	Rees
Dawson, Utah	Keating	Reeves
Deane	Kee	Rich
Devitt	Kefauver	Richards
D'Ewart	Kennedy	Riehlman
Dirksen	Kersten, Wis.	Riley
Dondero	Kilday	Rivers
Donohue	King	Rockwell
Dorn	Kirwan	Rogers, Fla.
Doughton	Kunkel	Rogers, Mass.
Douglas	Landis	Rohrbough
Drewry	Lane	Ross
Durham	Larcade	Russell
Eberharter	Latham	Sadlak
Elliott	Lea	Sadowski
Ellis	LeCompte	St. George
Ellsworth	LeFevre	Sanborn
Elsaesser	Lemke	Sarbacher
Elston	Lesinski	Sasscer
Engel, Mich.	Lewis	Schwabe, Okla.
Engle, Calif.	Lodge	Scoblick
Evins	Love	Scott, Hardie
Feighan	Lucas	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Fellows	Lyle	
Fenton	Lynch	Seely-Brown
Fisher	McConnell	Shafer
Flannagan	McCormack	Sheppard
Fletcher	McCowen	Short
Fogarty	McDonough	Sikes
Folger	McDowell	Simpson, Ill.
Foote	McGregor	Simpson, Pa.
Forand	McMahon	Smathers
Fulton	McMillan, S. C.	Smith, Kans.
Gamble	McMillen, Ill.	Smith, Maine
Gavin	MacKinnon	Smith, Va.
Gearhart	Madden	Smith, Wis.
Gillette	Mahon	Somers
Gillie	Maloney	Spence
Goff	Mansfield, Mont.	Springer
Goodwin		Stanley
Gordon	Martin, Iowa	Stefan
Gore	Mathews	Stevenson
Gorski	Meade, Ky.	Stigler
Gossett	Meade, Md.	Stockman
Graham	Merrow	Sundstrom
Granger	Meyer	Taber
Grant, Ind.	Michener	Talle
Gregory	Miller, Calif.	Taylor
Griffiths	Miller, Conn.	Teague
Gross	Miller, Md.	Thomas, Tex.
Gwinn, N. Y.	Miller, Nebr.	Thomason
Gwynne, Iowa	Mills	Tibbott
Hale	Mitchell	Tollefson
Hall, Leonard W.	Monroney	Trimble
	Morris	Twyman
Hand	Morton	Van Zandt
Hardy	Muhlenberg	Vorys
Harness, Ind.	Mundt	Vursell
Harris	Murdock	Wadsworth
Hart	Murray, Tenn.	Walter
Havenner	Murray, Wis.	Weichel
Hays	Norblad	West
Hébert	Norton	Wheeler
Hedrick	O'Brien	Whitten
Herter	O'Hara	Whittington
Heselton	O'Konski	Wigglesworth
Hinshaw	O'Toole	Williams
Hobbs	Owens	Wilson, Ind.
Hoeven	Pace	Wilson, Tex.
Hoffman	Passman	Winstead
Holifield	Patman	Wolcott
Holmes	Patterson	Wolverton
Horan	Peden	Wood
Huber	Peterson	Woodruff
Hull	Philbin	Werley
Jackson, Calif.	Phillips, Tenn.	Youngblood
Jackson, Wash.	Pickett	Zimmerman
Javits	Ploeser	
Jenkins, Ohio	Plumley	

NAYS—4

Buffett	Marcantonio	Schwabe, Mo.
Kean		

NOT VOTING—90

Arends	Buckley	Clements
Beckworth	Byrnes, Wis.	Clippinger
Bell	Camp	Cole, Kans.
Bennett, Mich.	Chapman	Cole, N. Y.
Bland	Chenoweth	Coudert
Boykin	Chiperfield	Davis, Tenn.
Buchanan	Clark	Dawson, Ill.
Delaney	Hope	Nodar
Dingell	Howell	Norrell
Dolliver	Jarman	Pfeifer
Domengeaux	Jenison	Phillips, Calif.
Eaton	Jensen	Powell
Fallon	Johnson, Calif.	Rabin
Fernandez	Kearns	Rayfiel
Fuller	Keefe	Reed, N. Y.
Gallagher	Kelley	Rizley
Gary	Keogh	Robertson
Gathings	Kerr	Robsion
Gifford	Kilburn	Rooney
Grant, Ala.	Klein	Sabath
Hagen	Knutson	Scrivner
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Lanham	Smith, Ohio
	Lusk	Snyder
Halleck	McGarvey	Stratton
Harless, Ariz.	Macy	Thomas, N. J.
Harrison	Manasco	Towe
Hartley	Mansfield, Tex.	Vail
Heffernan	Mason	Vinson
Hendricks	Morgan	Welch
Hess	Morrison	
Hill	Nixon	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin with Mr. Beckworth.
Mr. Knutson with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.
Mr. Rizley with Mr. Fallon.
Mr. Scrivner with Mr. Harless of Arizona.
Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Harrison.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table for immediate consideration the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 135) to extend the succession, lending powers, and the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That (a) the first sentence of section 4 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is hereby further amended by striking out "June 30, 1947" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1948"; and the first sentence of section 14 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is hereby further amended by striking out "July 1, 1947" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1948"; and (b) section 5d of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended; the act approved January 26, 1937 (50 Stat., ch. 6, p. 5), as amended; and the act approved February 11, 1937 (50 Stat., ch. 10, p. 19), as amended, are hereby further amended by striking out "June 30, 1947" wherever appearing and in each instance inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1948."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the provisions of the bill H. R. 3916 as passed by the House.

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The bill H. R. 3916 was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. REEVES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include extraneous matter. In connection with one of them, I have submitted the material to the Public Printer and have been informed that it will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $266.25, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extensions may be made.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore granted, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on tomorrow, Calendar Wednesday, be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks, and I ask that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LANDIS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. KING] may address the House for 30 minutes on Thursday next after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURDOCK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to the gentleman from California [Mr. NIXON], for June 24, 25, and 26, to testify in contempt trial of Leon Josephson in New York City.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

AUTOMOBILES FOR VETERANS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the hour is late but the hour approaches for the termination of the right of certain amputees and paraplegic cases to apply for automobiles. The present law expires on the 30th of June. I am going to take up the time of the House for 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill was not endorsed entirely by the great air-fight surgeon and rehabilitation doctor, General Rusk, now medical director of the New York Times, last year, but he heartily endorses it this year and wants the inclusion of arm amputees as well as leg amputees.

The bill, H. R. 3583, introduced by the able and distinguished Member of Congress from New Jersey, Judge MATHEWS, a veteran of World War I, proposes to remove inequalities in existing law, Public Law 663, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 8, 1946.

Mr. Speaker, I remember during the war the rapidity with which we passed all legislation providing for the sending of jeeps abroad and all sorts of conveyances and munitions of war for these men to use in protecting our country. The men went out to their deaths; if they did not die many were disabled. Today, all this bill asks for is that those who lost their arms and legs, those who were blinded, and those who have lost the use of their limbs can be given transportation in order that they may rehabilitate themselves. That is a very small thing to ask, Mr. Speaker. It is very little to do for these men to give them a chance to go back to work in order that they may be employed in gainful occupations. They cannot go back and forth on the streetcars. They cannot go to and from their classes in busses.

In a way, the automobiles are a sort of prosthetic appliance and were so considered when the bill passed Congress in the last session. It went through, as the Speaker knows, as a rider to the deficiency appropriation bill. It was accepted by the House and became law. That law expires on the 30th of June.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MATHEWS] in his bill asks that the amputees and paraplegic cases of World War I be included because that was discriminatory at the time and that the arm amputees and the blind be included.

Mr. Speaker, it was very discriminatory to leave out the double-arm amputees who have great difficulty in traveling in busses, streetcars, and railroad trains. They have had many falls as a result. They, too, need the transportation. Then, Mr. Speaker, the blind also need transportation. The traffic is tremendously heavy now. The traffic in the subways is very heavy. A man was leading two blind men the other day in the New York subway. The man who was leading them did not have too good vision himself. They were on the platform and walked off the platform, and all three men fell onto the tracks below and narrowly missed the live rail. Surely these groups need cars for transportation as a mean of rehabilitation.

General Bradley said that there was nothing we should not do to rehabilitate the disabled. This is something that can be done and done at once.

Mr. Speaker, this is real rehabilitation for the veterans. We have done nothing in this session of the Congress for the disabled veterans. No one in the United States wants to economize on the disabled. The time is growing short. It is time we did something for the disabled veterans. We have done things in the past but there are many inequalities to be adjusted. The veterans need their legislation this year and not next year. Are we too busy to care for these disabled this year; must we tell them to come back next year? The legislation is needed today. During the war, if we had not sent supplies over in a year or 6 months or 9 months or even 3 months, it would have been too late. It is the same with this legislation. Next year is too late, the next session of Congress is too late. If the time were not extended in filing claims under the present law it is apparent to all that an injustice will be done, because a considerable number of World War II amputees will not be discharged before July 1, 1947. There are some 200 alone at the Walter Reed Hospital, some who will not be discharged. The law requires they must be entitled to compensation to receive a car; they must be discharged before their claim can be filed and eligibility determined.

H. R. 3583 makes the legislation permanent, and permits application for benefits within 3 years from the effective date of the act or from the date of discharge, whichever is later. There are certain inequalities in the present law for the group supposed to be covered. There are certain technicalities that would be overcome in this law. Even for those who can now get a car, the existing law permits only $1,600 for the cost of the car, and such an amount cannot be applied to the price of a car costing in excess of $1,600. This bill would allow a man to pay an extra amount himself for a car in excess of $1,600. The veterans themselves have asked for this provision, as there are certain types of cars easy for them to drive that they cannot purchase for $1,600. There is a provision which I understand the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MATHEWS] is willing to remove. That is the allowance of $300 for freight and for insurance. That will save some $3,000,000 if it is removed from the bill.

Under the provisions of the new bill, any man who has lost the use of one or both feet, or one or both hands, or is blind will get the benefits of the bill. It applies to veterans of all wars. The veterans of the first war felt they were discriminated against. Certainly they should be taken care of today. It has been considered that this is a prosthetic appliance. That is the reason that the men who asked for the original legislation have asked for it. As you know, only limited provisions of the bill were finally accepted by the Congress.

I would like to state regarding the cost of the bill that under this measure for the total number of veterans, the total cost over a period of 3 years to take in 12,400 veterans would be a little over $23,000,000, if all applied. If the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MATHEWS] is willing to strike out the provision for $300 for freight and insurance, which would amount to $3,000,000, that would make the cost $20,000,000. Already the Treasury Department has unexpended some five or six million dollars for expenditure for automobiles under the present bill. So the total amount to be expended over the next 3 years would be approximately $4,000,000 a year, a mere bagatelle when it gives back to the men their power of mobility; gives back to the men a chance to get out into the world again; a chance to perform their duties as other normal men.

Three paraplegics from Maguire Hospital came up here twice regarding the legislation. I called General Bradley the second time they came. I made an engagement for those men to see him. They could not have come if they had not had their automobiles. He told me this morning he was tremendously interested in their problems.

Mr. Speaker, as to the paraplegia cases I saw in hospitals in 1944 in Europe I was told they would never be out of bed again, yet today as a result of medical skill this man from the Maguire Hospital, and others like him are not only out of bed but they are doing very important work. As a result of their automobiles they can go about and engage in business. This young paraplegia victim, a very intelligent man, will be able to become a clergyman. As a result of his car he can go to his classes, he can go to his church in his automobile, he can even preach from his automobile.

It is a real rehabilitation measure.

Today there came here a man who had lost both arms at the shoulder. He was able to come to the Capitol today, Mr. Speaker, because he could drive his car.

Such a small sum is involved, Mr. Speaker, and I repeat economy should not be made at the expense of the disabled veterans.

I believe the entire membership will want the passage of this bill and want it passed immediately.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 175. An act to provide for the furnishing of quarters at Brunswick, Ga., for the United States District Court for the southern district of Georgia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 179. An act for the relief of Maj. Ralph M. Rowley and First Lt. Irving E. Sheffel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 203. An act to increase the equipment maintenance of rural carriers 1 cent per mile per day traveled by each rural carrier for a period of 3 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 258. An act for the relief of Troy Charles Davis, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 292. An act for the relief of Samuel Augenblick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 305. An act for the relief of Mrs. Hilda Margaret McGrew; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 402. An act to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to James Black Dog a patent in fee to certain land; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 490. An act to provide for the extension and application of the provisions of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to certain officers and employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service in the Department of Justice; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 608. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Growing Four Times; to the Committee on Public Lands.

S. 682. An act to regulate the interstate transportation of black bass and other game fish, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 706. An act for the relief of William D. McCormick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 880. An act for the relief of Rev. John C. Young; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 957. An act for the relief of Col. William J. Kennard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1100. An act for the relief of Frankie Stalnaker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1361. An act to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 so as to permit loans, capital grants, or annual contributions for low-rent-housing and slum-clearance projects where construction costs exceed present cost limitations upon condition that local housing agencies pay the difference between cost limitations and the actual construction costs; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 381. An act for the relief of Allen T. Feamster, Jr.;

H. R. 407. An act for the relief of Claude R. Hall and Florence V. Hall;

H. R. 493. An act to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia," approved July 8, 1932 (sec. 22, 3204 D. C. Code, 1940 ed.);

H. R. 577. An act to preserve historic graveyards in abandoned military posts;

H. R. 617. An act for the relief of James Harry Martin;

H. R. 1067. An act for the relief of S. C. Spradling and R. T. Morris;

H. R. 1144. An act for the relief of Samuel W. Davis, Jr., Mrs. Samuel W. Davis, Jr., and Betty Jane Davis;

H. R. 1318. An act for the relief of Mrs. Fuku Kurokawa Thurn;

H. R. 1362. An act to permit certain naval personnel to count all active service rendered under temporary appointment as warrant or commissioned officer in the United States Navy and the United States Marine Corps, and the United States Naval Reserve and the United States Marine Corps Reserve, for purposes of promotion to commissioned warrant officer in the United States Navy or the United States Marine Corps, respectively;

H. R. 1376. An act to amend the acts of October 14, 1942 (56 Stat. 786), as amended, and November 28, 1943 (57 Stat. 593), as amended, so as to authorize transportation of dependents and household effects of personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard to overseas bases;

H. R. 1514. An act for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1628. An act relinquishing to the State of Illinois certain right, title, or interest of the United States of America, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1807. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the county of Pittsburg, Okla., a perpetual easement for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a public highway over a portion of the United States naval ammunition depot, McAlester, Okla.

H. R. 1845. An act to amend existing laws relating to military leave of certain employees of the United States or of the District of Columbia so as to equalize rights to leave of absence and reemployment for such employees who are members of the Enlisted or Officers' Reserve Corps, the National Guard, or the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes.

H. R. 1997. An act to provide seniority benefits for certain officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia who are veterans of World War II and lost opportunity for promotion by reason of their service in the armed forces of the United States.

H. R. 2248. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to grant an easement and to convey to the Louisiana Power & Light Co. a tract of land comprising a portion of Camp Livingston in the State of Louisiana.

H. R. 2339. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the designation of Army mail clerks and assistant Army mail clerks," approved August 21, 1941 (55 Stat. 656), and for other purposes;

H. R. 2411. An act to authorize patenting of certain lands to Public Hospital District No. 2, Clallam County, Wash., for hospital purposes;

H. R. 2545. An act to provide funds for cooperation with the school board of the Moclips-Aloha district for the construction and equipment of a new school building in the town of Moclips, Grays Harbor County, Wash., to be available to both Indian and non-Indian children;

H. R. 2654. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to grant to the mayor and City Council of Baltimore, State of Maryland, a permanent easement for the purpose of installing, maintaining, and servicing a subterranean water main in, on, and across the land of the United States Coast Guard station called Lazaretto depot, Baltimore, Md.;

H. R. 2655. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant to the mayor and City Council of Baltimore, State of Maryland, a permanent easement for the purpose of installing, maintaining, and servicing two subterranean water mains in, on, and across the land of Fort McHenry National Monument and Historic Shrine, Md.;

H. R. 2915. An act for the relief of Mrs. Frederick Faber Wesche (formerly Ann Maureen Bell);

H. R. 3124. An act to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the eighty-first national encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held in Cleveland, Ohio, August 10 to 14, 1947;

H. R. 3372. An act authorizing certain agreements with respect to rights in helium-bearing gas lands in the Navajo Indian Reservation, N. Mex., and for other purposes;

H. R. 3629. An act to authorize the transfer to the Panama Canal of property which is surplus to the needs of the War Department or Navy Department;

H. J. Res. 92. Joint resolution authorizing the presentation of the Distinguished Flying

Cross to Rear Adm. Charles E. Rosendahl, United States Navy;

H. J. Res. 96. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue posthumously to the late Roy Stanley Geiger, lieutenant general, United States Marine Corps, a commission as general, United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 167. Joint resolution to recognize uncompensated services rendered the Nation under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 751. An act to continue a system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of school-age and under-school-age children in the District of Columbia through June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 113. Joint resolution authorizing the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to the Marine Corps dead of all wars.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on June 20, 1947, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3203. An act relative to maximum rents on housing accommodations; to repeal certain provisions of Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 25, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

827. A letter from the Administrator, Office of Price Administration, transmitting the Twentieth Report of the Office of Price Administration, covering the period ended December 31, 1946 (H. Doc. No. 343); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

828. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the effective operation and expansion of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

829. A letter from the Chairman, Acting Secretary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting a report covering its operation for the period from the organization of the Corporation on February 2, 1932, to September 30, 1946, inclusive; to the Committee on Banking ond Currency.

830. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of $400,000,000 for assistance to Greece and Turkey (H. Doc. No. 344); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

831. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of $162,160,600, a contract authorization, and a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an appropriation for the Post Office Department (H. Doc. No. 345); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

832. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of $100,000 for the Federal Security Agency (H. Doc. No. 346); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

833. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of $400,000 for the judiciary (H. Doc. No. 347); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

834. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of $13,900,000 for the Department of Commerce (H. Doc. No. 348); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

835. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Navy Department to pay claims for death or personal injury to residents of Guam, in the amount of $794,761.28 (H. Doc. No. 349); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

836. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting records of judgments rendered against the Government by United States district courts, as submitted by the Department of Justice through the Treasury Department, and which require an appropriation of $13,684.32 (H. Doc. No. 360); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

837. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Navy Department to pay claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death, in the sum of $55,418.56 (H. Doc. No. 350); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

838. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting record of a judgment rendered against the Government by the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, submitted by the Department of Justice through the Treasury Department, and which requires an appropriation of $2,899.49, together with an indefinite appropriation to pay interest (H. Doc. No. 361); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

839. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the War Department to pay claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death, in the sum of $15,405.48 (H. Doc. No. 351); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

840. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for payment of judgments rendered against the Government by United States district courts amounting to $44,496.30, together with an indefinite appropriation to pay interest (H. Doc. No. 352); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

841. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Public Roads Administration to pay claims for damage to roads and highways of States or their subdivisions, in the sum of $336,034.58 (H. Doc. No. 353); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

842. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed provision relating to judgments rendered against the Government by the Court of Claims (H. Doc. No. 358); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

843. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting records of judgments rendered against the Government by the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts in special cases submitted by the Department of Justice through the Treasury Department, and which require an appropriation of $47,825.27 (H. Doc. No. 359); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

844. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the War Department to pay claims on account of damage arising out of personal injury and damage to privately owned property occasioned by Army personnel in a foreign country, in the amount of $29,944 (H. Doc. No. 354); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

845. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation under the War Department for payment of certain claims allowed by the General Accounting Office amounting to $5,568.70 (H. Doc. No. 355); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

846. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates of appropriation amounting to $51,447,842.71 to cover claims allowed by the General Accounting Office and for services of the several departments and independent offices (H. Doc. No. 356); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

847. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a schedule of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims which has been submitted by the Treasury Department and requires an appropriation for payment, amounting to $382,494.38 (H. Doc. No. 362); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

848. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates of appropriation submitted by the several executive departments and independent offices to pay claims for damages to or losses of privately owned property, in the sum of $383.18 (H. Doc. No. 357); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. H. R. 3830. A bill to provide for the promotion and elimination of officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 641). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LEA: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 3855. A bill to provide for the appointment of one additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 642). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 669. A bill to provide a method of paying subrogation claims arising out of insurance payments for damages sustained as the result of explosions at Port Chicago, Calif., on June 17, 1944; with an amendment (Rept. No. 643). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HULL: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 1180. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the admission of Wisconsin into the Union as a State; without amendment (Rept. No. 644). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BRADLEY: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 3672. A bill to create an Academic Advisory Board for the United States Merchant Marine Academy; without amendment (Rept. No. 646). Re-

ferred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3566. A bill to amend subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 647). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 175. A bill to confer upon the Governor of Alaska the power to pardon and remit fines and forfeitures for offenses against the laws of the Territory of Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 668). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 187. A bill to amend Public Law 304, Seventy-seventh Congress; with an amendment (Rept. No. 669). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 205. A bill to amend the act approved May 7, 1934, granting citizenship to the Metlakahtla Indians of Alaska; with an amendment (Rept. No. 670). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 734. A bill to amend the act of February 12, 1925, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 671). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 1337. A bill authorizing a per capita payment of $100 each to the members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation; with an amendment (Rept. No. 672). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 1554. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act providing for the transfer of the duties authorized and authority conferred by law upon the board of road commissioners in the Territory of Alaska to the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1932; without amendment (Rept. No. 673). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 1609. A bill to authorize the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska to provide for the exercise of zoning power in town sites on the public lands of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 674). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 2161. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce synthetic liquid fuels from coal, oil shales, agricultural and forestry products, and other substances, in order to aid the prosecution of the war, to conserve and increase the oil resources of the Nation, and for other purposes," approved April 5, 1944 (58 Stat. 190); with an amendment (Rept. No. 675). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 2361. A bill to clarify the legal status of certain lands described in a treaty between the United States and the Delaware Indians, dated October 3, 1818; with an amendment (Rept. No. 676). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 2484. A bill to authorize the payment of certain sums to jobbers in connection with their logging of timber for the Menominee Indians on the Menominee Reservation during the logging season 1934–35, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 677). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 2996. A bill to authorize an appropriation for public-school facilities at Owyhee, Nev.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 678). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 3153. A bill to provide for the sale or other disposal of certain submarginal lands located within the boundaries of Indian reservations in the State of Montana; with an amendment (Rept. No. 679). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 3175. A bill to add certain public and other lands to the Shasta National Forest, Calif.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 680). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 3343. A bill to amend the Alaska game law; without amendment (Rept. No. 681). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 3266. A bill to authorize the issuance of certain public improvement bonds by the Territory of Hawaii; without amendment (Rept. No. 682). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 3376. A bill to ratify and confirm Act 10 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1947, extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under chapter 118, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945; without amendment (Rept. No. 683). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 3679. A bill to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the city and county of Honolulu, a municipal corporation, to issue sewer bonds; with an amendment (Rept. No. 684). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. S. 723. An act to authorize the preparation of preliminary plans and estimates of cost for an additional office building for the use of the United States Senate; without amendment (Rept. No. 685). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. S. 980. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to define the area of the United States Capitol Grounds, to regulate the use thereof, and for other purposes," approved July 31, 1946; without amendment (Rept. No. 686). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 3623. A bill to provide that members of the Communist Party shall be ineligible for veterans' benefits, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 687). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPRINGER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3647. A bill to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act; with an amendment (Rept. No. 688). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 629. A bill for the relief of A. E. McCartney and O. A. Foster; with amendments (Rept. No. 648). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 642. A bill for the relief of Frank F. Miles; with an amendment (Rept. No. 649). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1296. A bill for the relief of Cohen, Goldman & Co., Inc.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 650). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1498. A bill for the relief of Hempstead Warehouse Corp.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 651). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1502. A bill for the relief of Herman Trahn; with an amendment (Rept. No. 652). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1535. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Ralph Stanfield, a minor; with an amendment (Rept. No. 653). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1670. A bill for the relief of Pittsburgh DuBois Co.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 654). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPRINGER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1726. A bill for the relief of Elsie L. Rosenow; with an amendment (Rept. No. 655). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2062. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Carrie M. Lee; with an amendment (Rept. No. 656). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2390. A bill for the relief of Elmer A. Norris; with an amendment (Rept. No. 657). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2507. A bill for the relief of the firm of Barrett & Hilp; without amendment (Rept. No. 658). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2550. A bill for the relief of Mack Gene Odom, a minor; with an amendment (Rept. No. 659). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 53. An act conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Harold Turcean; without amendment (Rept. No. 660). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. S. 394. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Raymond Wesley Doyle; without amendment (Rept. No. 661). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. S. 395. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Richard Jay Doyle; without amendment (Rept. No. 662). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. S. 396. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Thurlow Grey Doyle; without amendment (Rept. No. 663). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. S. 397. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Lawrence Stanley Doyle; without amendment (Rept. No. 664). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. S. 399. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Gladys May Doyle; without amendment (Rept. No. 665). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 2885. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to

Becker Little Light; with an amendment (Rept. No. 666). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 2886. A bill authorizing the sale, under supervision, of land of Richard Little Light; without amendment (Rept. No. 667). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 3939. A bill to provide for the granting to certain officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the benefits of promotions for which they were selected during the war but were prevented from receiving by virtue of being absent in a status of missing, missing in action, interned in a neutral country, captured by an enemy, beleaguered, or besieged, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 3940. A bill to amend the act approved April 12, 1945 (59 Stat. 50), to authorize Commodity Credit Corporation, as an agency of the United States, to sell peanuts owned or controlled by it, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. R. 3941. A bill to provide special priorities for the disposal of surplus agricultural real property to veterans who intend to live on farms and to engage in farming as their principal occupation, to eliminate the priorities of State and local governments and tenants of former owners with respect to such property, to reduce from 90 to 30 days the priority period within which former owners of surplus real property may exercise their priorities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 3942. A bill to extend for 1 year premium price payments with respect to copper, lead, and zinc; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 3943. A bill to require laundries in the District of Columbia to provide bond for the loss of customers' property; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 3944. A bill to create an Independent Air Safety Board; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 3945. A bill to repeal Public Law No. 101 of the Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MACKINNON:

H. R. 3946. A bill to authorize the immediate payment in cash of bonds issued under the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PLOESER:

H. R. 3947. A bill to amend the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROSS:

H. R. 3948. A bill to incorporate the Gold Star Society of American War Widows and Orphans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BISHOP:

H. R. 3949. A bill to amend section 14 of the Flood Control Act of 1946 so as to provide for the removal of obstructions, ice, drift, and debris; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 3950. A bill to reduce individual income tax payments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 3951. A bill to terminate certain tax provisions before the end of World War II; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 3952. A bill to amend section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FELLOWS (by request):

H. R. 3953. A bill to amend the immigration laws relating to stowaways; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 3954. A bill to approve Act No. 74 of the Session Laws of 1947 of the Territory of Hawaii, entitled "An act relating to revenue bonds of the Territory of Hawaii," and Act No. 95 of the Session Laws of 1947 of the Territory of Hawaii, entitled "An act relating to Territorial and county public improvements and the financing thereof by the issuance of revenue bonds," to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 3955. A bill to make inapplicable section 2139 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the traffic in intoxicating liquors in the Indian country, to certain nonreservation lands of the Chippewa Tribe of Indians in the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 3956. A bill to prohibit Members of Congress from serving the United States in any other capacity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEWIS (by request):

H. R. 3957. A bill to amend Revised Statutes 4898 (U. S. C., title 35, sec. 47) to add certain requirements as to the recording of subsequent purchases and mortgages affecting patents and patent applications; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3958. A bill to extend temporarily the time for filing applications for patents and for taking action in the United States Patent Office with respect thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 3959. A bill to extend the life of certain provisions of the War Labor Disputes Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HUBER:

H. R. 3960. A bill to provide for the free importation of scrap or refuse synthetic rubber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 3961. A bill to provide increases in the rates of pension payable to Spanish-American War and Civil War veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. J. Res. 222. Joint resolution terminating consumer credit controls; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. Con. Res. 54. Concurrent resolution to provide for the use of Schick General Hospital at Clinton, Iowa, for the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BUCK:

H. Res. 254. Resolution directing the Secretary of State to transmit forthwith to the Committee on the Judiciary certain documents, records, and memoranda relating to one Serge Rubinstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. Res. 255. Resolution directing the Attorney General to transmit forthwith to the Committee on the Judiciary certain documents, records, and memoranda relating to one Serge Rubinstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EATON:

H. Res. 256. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to conduct studies and investigations of all matters coming within the jurisdiction of that committee and providing for participation by members of other standing committees of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to halt all disposal of war surplus goods; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 3962. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Beghini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 3963. A bill for the relief of William J. Burns; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 3964. A bill for the relief of Thomas D. Sherrard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN:

H. R. 3965. A bill for the relief of John H. Schmitt and Mrs. Mildred Schmitt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 3966. A bill to authorize and direct the District Court for the Southern District of Florida to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Bessie Irene Edgar without regard to previous settlements with other tort feasors and lapse of time; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POTTS:

H. R. 3967. A bill for the relief of Samuel Ezratty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 3968. A bill for the relief of Olive Irene Milloglav; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

672. By Mr. HULL: Memorial of the Wisconsin Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States to halt all disposal of war surplus goods; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

673. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Branch 918, Workmen's Circle, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of a national health insurance bill, such as the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

674. Also, petition of Mrs. Charles Richman and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

675. Also, petition of Miss Matilda Oberd, Sarasota Townsend Club, No. 1, Sarasota, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

676. Also, petition of Joseph B. Dye, St. Petersburg, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of H. R. 16, the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

677. Also, petition of the Arizona-U. S. A. Cancer Cure Society, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting appropriations for cancer cure; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 25, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed Lord, as we ponder the depths and the heights of Thy love, magnify Thyself in us; help us to serious thought, to spiritual thought, thus renewing the freshness and the joy and the hope of life. When we accept it with its challenge and its obligations, O let our days be full of wholesome endeavor and faithful service, making them fruitful in our land and the whole busy world. Ever keep in our thought that the secret of unity, contentment, and progress is the fear of the Lord, and that happy is that people whose God is the Lord. Father of mercy, forgive our sins and blot them out, not only in Thy book of remembrance but out of our hearts and minds, and bring us at last through joy and through sorrow to Thine own blessed immortality.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3493. An act making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill and requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. OVERTON, and Mr. GREEN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 123. Joint resolution to terminate certain emergency and war powers.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

JUNE 25, 1947.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: From the Governor of the State of Washington, I have received the certificate of election in due form of law of Hon. RUSSELL V. MACK as a Representative-elect to the Eightieth Congress from the Third Congressional District of that State, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Hon. Fred Norman.

Very truly yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. MACK appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

CONTINUING TEMPORARY AUTHORITY OF THE MARITIME COMMISSION UNTIL MARCH 1, 1948

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3911) to continue temporary authority of the Maritime Commission until March 1, 1948.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the paragraph under the head "United States Maritime Commission" in title I of the Third Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1946 (Public Law 521, 79th Cong., approved July 23, 1946), as amended by section 2 of Public Law 6, Eightieth Congress, approved February 26, 1947, and section 1 of said Public Law 6, Eightieth Congress, and the first two sentences of section 11 (a) and section 14 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 (Public Law 321, 79th Cong., approved March 8, 1946), are amended by striking out the dates "July 1, 1947" and "December 31, 1947" wherever either appear therein and inserting in lieu thereof the date "March 1, 1948."

SEC. 2. That section 5 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(d) Where an operator is engaged both in the foreign trade and in the domestic trade (coastwise or intercoastal), additional charter hire determined with reference to voyage profits of the chartered vessels, under regulations promulgated by the Maritime Commission, shall be computed, accounted for, and paid separately on such foreign trade and shall be computed, accounted for, and paid separately on such domestic trade covering all voyages commencing subsequent to June 30, 1947."

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WEICHEL: On page 2, line 15, after the words "domestic trade", insert a comma.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may sit during the session of the House today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. STEVENSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, one on the subject of soil conservation and the other on the Farmers Home Administration.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter he received from the Secretary of War and his reply thereto.

Mr. COTTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Nashua Telegraph of Nashua, N. H.

AID TO EUROPEAN COUNTRIES

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, doubtless the Russian sympathizers in America will be pleased to read in the newspapers that the Russian Government has about been persuaded to sit down around the table with France and England in a cooperative spirit to see how much money, material, equipment, and food it will take to relieve the needs of these and other European countries to be furnished by the United States under what is now known as the Marshall plan.

Mr. Speaker, you will remember a few weeks ago Secretary of State Marshall in a speech made a statement in substance that unless the European nations got together, including Russia, and decided how much help they needed from the United States and how much they were willing to help themselves, the United States in the future would help only the nations that were friendly to our form of government and who would try to help themselves in reestablishing a government subject to the will of the people.

Mr. Speaker, we thought at the time this statement was made that Russia should be excluded. After 2 years of her attempt to scuttle every peace and economic move in the interest of the European countries and after her constant opposition to every proposal by the United States Government, we should have learned our lesson by this time and should not have left the door open for Russia to come in on any future give-away policy of the United States. It appears that the Russian leaders who have no conscience can be greatly benefited by joining for a few weeks with France and England in parceling out how many billions of dollars and materials those countries are willing to accept, particularly Russia. It appears that Russia intends to come in. Why not? She got billions during the war, and she hopes to get more billions at the expense of the United States, which she hopes will wreck our own economy making our Nation an easy prey to her ideology of government—communism.

Mr. Speaker, while we are sending $400,000,000 to Greece and Turkey and have vowed to stop communism within the Russian border, yet it appears we are willing to continue to help finance the Russian Government if her leaders will only be so cooperative and kind enough to sit in on the conference and let us know how much they want.

Mr. Speaker, it would have been far better for the United States, in my judgment, to have not left the doors ajar for the entrance of Russia.

It is my judgment that before we ask the nations of the world to let us know how much more they need that we would have first adopted the Hoover, Baruch, Vandenberg plan making a study of our ability to further help European nations before we hold out the hope that all they have to do is to add up the amounts in the billions of dollars in help they and other nations need. President Truman said:

> It must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.

Of course, this was aimed at Russia. Now we invite her in to accept our help. In a later speech he declared that "the United States would limit its economic aid to nations which do not seek to impose their will on others." Has Russia quit seeking to impose her will on others? Is the President riding two horses at the same time going in different directions?

Mr. Speaker, since these utterances were made Russia's imperialistic career has gone unchanged. Our Government has recently issued a strong protest against the Communist coup in Hungary and against the suppression of the last remnants of the Communist opposition in Bulgaria.

Yet, in the face of all this, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch says:

> Secretary Marshall has announced an American-financed plan for the recovery of Europe with Russia included as a recipient of the funds.

The Post goes on to say:

> It is confusing to hear Russia arraigned one day as an aggressor and to see her included the next day with democratic nations as one of the beneficiaries of American loans which may total some $24,000,000,000.

This in the face of Russia denouncing our loans to Europe as "dollar imperialism" and an attempt to enmesh Europe in the web of American finance capitalism.

If we are going to try to help build up a democracy in western Europe in opposition to Communist imperialism, why, in the name of heaven, do we invite Russia to sit in with other nations who are willing to work with us and thereby giving to her vast aid in American dollars pulled out of the pockets of the overburdened taxpayers of America?

Mr. Speaker, it does appear that this administration has practiced the policy of wasting the finances of this country by appeasing Russia until we cannot break with her long-practiced tradition.

TERMINAL-LEAVE BONDS

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to announce that the Subcommittee on Pay and Administration of the Armed Services Committee will begin hearings on the cashing of terminal-leave bonds on Thursday of this week. I know this will be of interest to many Members of Congress.

I would like at this time to invite any Member of Congress who introduced a bill on this subject to appear before the subcommittee this Thursday, if he so desires, to give the committee the benefit of his views. Of necessity, any such statement must be short.

Should a Member desire to file a statement upon the bill for the record, naturally he may do so.

The terminal-leave bonds, or technically the armed forces leave bonds, are part of the national debt. We propose to reduce that debt by cashing these bonds and, at the same time, save the Government interest charges.

The total value of the armed forces leave bonds outstanding as of June 13, 1947, was approximately $1,820,000,000. There were about 8,500,000 bonds outstanding.

It is estimated that within a year about 12,000,000 bonds, with a total value of about $2,500,000,000, would be outstanding if the pending legislation to permit cashing is not enacted. That amount of bonds, at 2½-percent interest, would cost the Government $62,500,000 a year in interest alone.

Our subcommittee intends to act expeditiously. I have made this announcement of public hearings so that Members of Congress, and others, may make arrangements to be heard.

FIGHT FOR HOUSING DAY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, representatives of a veritable who's who of nationally distinguished civic, religious, fraternal, and veterans' associations are here today in the interests of housing on Fight for Housing Day.

It is announced that we are to have an investigation of building-construction labor this summer to see if it is the cause of the national housing shortage. No exception can be taken to such an investigation, but it is a fraction of the job, for builders who sell shoddy houses, material suppliers who continue to control housing markets, and municipalities with antiquated handicraft, cost-boosting municipal building codes are also causes of the national housing shortage. The House will, I am sure, not consciously look for a scapegoat or engage in partiality. An even-handed investigation of the national housing shortage by a select committee appointed by the Speaker, as called for by House Resolution 247, introduced by me June 16, 1947, is absolutely essential in the national interest. Such an investigation, together with immediate action on the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill, introduced in the House as H. R. 2523, will show that we are really tackling the housing shortage. It is my earnest hope that we will be trying in the next 6 months to find out what it takes to get homes built, and that we will not permit ourselves to be diverted from that task by looking for someone to blame for the national housing emergency.

The organizations participating in Fight for Housing Day are the following:

American Association of Social Workers.
American Association of University Women.
American Council on Education.
American Council on Race Relations.
American Federation of Labor.
American Federation of Women's Clubs.
American Home Economics Association.
American Public Health Association.
American Public Welfare Association.
American Veterans' Committee.
American Veterans of World War II.
Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees.
Congress of Industrial Organizations.
Consumers Clearing House.
Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches of the United States of America.
Family Service Association of America.
Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.
Jewish Welfare Board.
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.
National Association of Consumers.
National Association of Housing Officials.
National Association of Rural Housing.
National Board of the Young Women's Christian Associations.
National Catholic Welfare Council.
National Conference of Catholic Charities.
National Congress of Parents and Teachers.
National Council of Catholic Men.
National Council of Catholic Women.
National Council of Housing Associations.
National Council of Jewish Women.
National Council of Negro Women.
National Farmers Union.
National Federation of Settlements.
National Institute of Municipal Law Officers.
National League of Women Voters.
National Public Housing Conference.
National Urban League.
National Women's Trade Union League.
Southern Conference for Human Welfare.
United States Conference of Mayors.
Veterans of Foreign Wars.

HOUSING SHORTAGE

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and especially to his statement that the investigation regarding racketeering and monopoly in building construction should be carried on in an impartial

manner. He probably read the same press notice that I saw the other morning which mentioned that the subcommittee, composed of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. OWENS], and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUCAS], were going to investigate union racketeering in building construction. When we prepared the report of the subcommittee with reference to the investigation there was no such reference contained therein. It was stated that the investigation would be with respect to monopoly and racketeering in building construction, without differentiating between business and labor unions. We intend to make an impartial investigation covering every phase of such activity and to uncover such monopoly whether it is in business, labor, or in certain improper codes of municipalities. Something has to be done to remedy the situation which now exists concerning the construction of homes and other buildings throughout the Nation. I sincerely hope that this investigation will be helpful and that it will bring forth the fact that the construction can be accomplished without the passing of drastic legislation which will result in Federal control of such construction.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MALONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. D'EWART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Mark Sullivan in today's Tribune.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

STRIKE IN COAL FIELDS

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, the strike news from the coal fields today is very distressing and from the morning papers there is every indication that the strikes are spreading in an alarming degree. A general strike at this time would be the greatest disaster that could happen to our country.

We have now had time to appraise the President's veto message. No message from any President has ever received such universal disapproval. As I read the message again, I find sufficient grounds to come to the conclusion that it constitutes an indirect invitation to all labor to go on strike. The President alone will have to bear this responsibility.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. DEVITT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

GENERAL STATE OF CONFUSION

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I become so confused nowadays over what is happening. I just do not know how the general public feel about many things that happen daily. When I think of the destruction of 20,000,000 bushels of potatoes by pouring kerosene on them, the terrible destruction of food by instruction of the Department of Agriculture—remember this Department of Government once killed the pigs, plowed down the cotton, and burned the wheat—and then when I think about importing 4,000,000 bushels of potatoes from Canada when Great Britain has a potato famine. I just do not see where there is any sense in things of that kind. Why did not Canada give her potatoes to her mother country? We did not need to buy them at high prices.

Then, I read in this morning's paper about food packages from Greece coming into this country. There are 100,000 to 160,000 packages of food representing such delicacies as figs, olives, grapes, and raisins. That is food for the Greeks. Now, why should the Greeks send food here to America? I cannot understand that, when we are requested by the President to give $300,000,000 to feed the Greeks.

There are so many things that just do not make sense—things that somebody ought to find out and see what the trouble is. I have tried to find out but I cannot.

The Congress overwhelmingly passes a labor law for the good of labor, for the general public, and for management. The President sends a scathing rebuke to Congress with a veto, saying there is not a good thing in the bill, or at least he mentioned none.

Congress passed a tax bill. The President vetoed it, saying he wants to apply the taxes on the great national debt his party built up for this Nation. Why does not the President try in some manner to cut down his awful spending? Oh, such spending—no economy in government. No wonder we are confused.

The remedy: elect a Republican President next year to work with the Republican Congress. Then it will be cooperation—until then I see nothing but confusion.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include an editorial in each by Stewart Riley, publisher of the Bedford Daily Times-Mail.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, news reports indicate that General Bradley, Veterans' Administrator, advised a Senate appropriations subcommittee yesterday that he will have to reduce his personnel by 15,000 under the appropriation bill reported by the House Appropriations Committee and passed by the House.

Mr. Speaker, I have been hammering away to prevent the slash in the appropriation for the Veterans' Administration. I have pointed out on this floor how severely the all-important hospital program would be affected.

Last week when the appropriation bill involving the Veterans' Administration was before the House I offered an amendment to increase it by $100,000,000 and my amendment was voted down and I was astounded to see members of the Appropriations Committee of the House in both parties take the floor in opposition to it. Those who opposed my move at that time contended that the Veterans' Administration had been given all the money it had asked for. I cannot understand how they can reconcile that position with General Bradley's statement which I understand he gave before the Senate committee. The House conferees can still rectify this matter and I appeal to them to place back in this bill an appropriation sufficient for General Bradley and General Hawley to carry on effectively and efficiently the work of the Veterans' Administration.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper item.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include certain articles.

Mr. HART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement.

Mr. PRICE of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a speech by Gen. George C. Kenny at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology on the unification of the armed forces.

Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address made by Mr. Michael W. Straus, United States Commissioner of Reclamation, and an address by Dr. Charles A. Lory, former president of the Colorado A. and M. College.

LET'S DEVELOP AMERICA'S INTERNAL RESOURCES, AND STRENGTHEN OUR NATIONAL DEFENSE BY THE IMMEDIATE CONSTRUCTION OF THE TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE INLAND WATERWAY

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House

for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and to include excerpts from the hearings by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and from the report of the Board of Army Engineers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that Congress is going somewhat wild in curtailing our internal improvements while pouring American money into the coffers of Europe.

If there ever was a time when we needed to concentrate on the development of our internal resources, that time is now.

One thing I am going to insist on in the coming appropriation bill is funds with which the Army engineers may proceed with the construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway.

The Mississippi River, the greatest inland waterway on earth, is virtually a dead stream, because, while traffic can go down it with ease and rapidity, it cannot return, except at terrific expense.

Our atomic bomb plant at Oak Ridge, Tenn., is bottled up. In order to bring the raw materials for this plant by water you have to go upstream 1,131 miles to reach a point that could be reached by moving up on this slack water route only 481 mles.

This project is vitally necessary to the national defense, as well as to the navigation of the Mississippi, the Ohio, the Missouri, the Tennessee, and all their tributaries.

We must get the work started on it as quickly as possible.

It is already authorized by law. All we have to do now is to make the necessary appropriation. We cannot afford to postpone this proposition.

Every year's delay will add to our transportation costs, if not to the cost of construction, and at the same time weaken our national defense by failing to provide this short water route between the Gulf of Mexico and our atomic energy plant at Oak Ridge—the greatest defense plant the world has ever known.

Those of you who want to spend the American people's money to feed and clothe every lazy lout from Tokyo to Timbuktu and to finance regimes that are now plotting the overthrow of this Government may do so, but I, for one, will insist on the development of our own internal resources; and this, the greatest project of its kind ever proposed, should be the first on the list.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

GENERAL EISENHOWER

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I have read with considerable personal regret that General Eisenhower is to leave his post as Chief of Staff to become president of Columbia University. I recall a few words which General Eisenhower spoke to the Committee on Appropriations at the conclusion of the War Department hearings this year which were said off the record. I have thought of them many times and I think they should be in the record somewhere as a part of the written record on which history may judge the character of General Eisenhower in his service to the Government. I recall that he said something like this:

"We have presented to you our request for the funds that we think we need. This is the best judgment of the War Department at this time, but I want to say to you that the War Department recognizes the constitutional responsibilities of the Congress. When we have completed the presentations and the Congress has made its deliberate judgment on the portion of the national income that can be devoted to the mission of the Army, the War Department will live with the decision that the Congress has made; there will be no recriminations and no complaints. If I hear of anyone acting or speaking to the contrary there will be another in his place when it comes to my attention. I believe in the American system."

To me that was one of the finest expressions I have heard from any representative of any branch of Government appearing before the Appropriations Committee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

UNITED STATES HOME NEEDS VERSUS FOREIGN RELIEF

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the thought suggested by the gentleman from Mississippi that if we are to help other nations we here at home must preserve our own economy, keep a firm foundation under our own industries, agriculture, and economic structure, when now advanced in the Halls of Congress does not meet quite as much criticism as it did in days gone by, days when anybody venturing to speak for America first and in the interests of American national interests was branded by the Reds and by some New Dealers as a seditionist, if not as a traitor. Yes, times have changed and today it is all right to give the Communists a kick and to, if not too loudly, say something about the necessity of keeping our Nation strong and ready.

Today in the gallery, from my own district, sit substantial citizens who are down here protesting the cut in the agriculture bill. They say that the farm lands up there and the farmers need that appropriation to preserve the fertility of the soil, and they want to know why I should not go all out for increased appropriations. I tried to explain to them that there just was not money enough to go around, but I did not get it across. They do not like any cut—anything other than an increase in the appropriation. They think I ought to vote for it, and maybe I should. Another group sits with them, and we all had lunch together this noon, which wants money for the Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill. When I told them that yesterday, for example, we put through legislation to spend some $34,000,000 to sing songs, and make speeches, show works of art to exchange pupils and teachers with foreign nations I just did not get anywhere. They wanted less of that, more for the home folks. Unless something is done those friends of mine may vote against me next time because I do not vote for the things they want, and I do not like that. I am wondering if some of you gentlemen are going to get into the same situation—that is, find yourselves without an office and without a salary if you do not quit giving everything away to somebody across the seas while failing to take care of the home folks. Now, help me out by limiting the grants of money for people in other countries until we have taken care of the essential needs of ours.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 40 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address recently made by Dr. Joseph F. Thorning.

PROMOTION AND ELIMINATION OF OFFICERS OF THE ARMY, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 253.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3830) to provide for the promotion and elimination of officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of the time to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 253 makes in order, under an open rule, consideration of H. R. 3830, introduced by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] and reported by the Committee on the Armed Services. This bill, H. R. 3830, provides for the promotion and elimination of officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes.

I do not expect to take the time of the House to discuss this measure in detail, because, very frankly, it is a complicated bill. If I may speak facetiously, I have been told this morning it is the longest "Short" bill on record, inasmuch as it was introduced by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has every reason to feel happy and facetious, because only this morning, after hearings for 3 days, the committee of which the gentleman is a member, and of which I am a member, without hearing any witnesses, unanimously adopted this resolution.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Massachusetts for calling that committee report to the attention of the House and for the splendid support he gave my bill, H. R. 775, this morning. I express the hope that the same unanimous support may be given the measure when it comes to the floor of the House.

Returning to the discussion of H. R. 3830, very simply this bill sets up a method whereby officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps may be reduced in rank to fit the permanent peacetime organization of our armed services and to fix a method whereby promotions shall be made in the future. The rule which has been granted, I may add, was by a unanimous vote. It provides for 4 hours of general debate. It was the opinion of the Rules Committee, and of members of the Armed Services Committee which appeared before the Rules Committee, that the 4 hours' time granted under the rule will not be required for the consideration of this legislation. However, in order that there be no shutting off of debate, in order that any Member of the House may have a full opportunity to ask any questions relative to this bill he sees fit, because, as I said before, it is a complicated measure, the Rules Committee believed that 4 hours' general debate should be permitted, but expresses the fervent hope it will not be necessary to take the entire 4 hours.

I hope that this resolution will be adopted and that the bill will be passed.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time on this side. As the gentleman from Ohio has said, the rule provides for 4 hours' general debate, but it was the opinion of the Committee on Rules that probably that amount of time would not be needed. It is a very comprehensive and incomprehensible bill, and we hope that the Armed Services Committee will explain its contents fully to the House, and to that end I yield back the balance of my time so that the rule may be adopted.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STIMULATE ENLISTMENTS IN MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3303) to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military Establishment of the United States, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3303) to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military Establishment of the United States, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following:

"That effective July 1, 1947, the Secretary of War is authorized, notwithstanding the provisions of the last paragraph of section 127a of this Act, to accept original enlistments in the Regular Army from among qualified male persons not less than seventeen years of age for periods of two, three, four, five, or six years, and to accept reenlistments for periods of three, four, five, or six years: *Provided*, That persons of the first three enlisted grades may be reenlisted for unspecified periods of time on a career basis under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe: *Provided further*, That anyone who serves three or more years of an enlistment for an unspecified period of time may submit to the Secretary of War his resignation and such resignation shall be accepted by the Secretary of War and such person shall be discharged from his enlistment within three months of the submission of such resignation. Except if such person, other than an enlisted member of a Regular Army Puerto Rican unit submits his resignation while stationed overseas or after embarking for an overseas station, the Secretary of War shall not be required to accept such resignation until a total of two years of overseas service shall have been completed in the current overseas assignment, and in the case of anyone who has completed any course of instruction pursuant to paragraph 13 of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended (10 U. S. C. 535), or pursuant to section 2 of the act of April 3, 1939 (53 Stat. 556), as amended (10 U. S. C. 298a), the Secretary of War shall not be required to accept such resignation until two years subsequent to the completion of such course. The Secretary of War may refuse to accept any such resignation in time of war or national emergency declared by the President or Congress, or while the person concerned is absent without leave or serving a sentence of court martial. The Secretary of War may refuse to accept a resignation for a period not to exceed six months following the submission thereof if the enlisted person is under investigation or in default with respect to public property or public funds: *Provided further*, That no person under the age of eighteen years shall be enlisted without the written consent of his parents or guardian, and the Secretary of War shall, upon the application of the parents or guardian of any such person enlisted without their written consent, discharge such person from the military service with pay and with the form of discharge certificate to which the service of such person, after enlistment, shall entitle him: *Provided further*, That nothing contained in this act shall be construed to deprive any person of any right to reenlistment in the Regular Army under any other provision of law. No person who is serving under an enlistment contracted on or after June 1, 1945, shall be entitled, before the expiration of the period of such enlistment, to enlist for an enlistment period which will expire before the expiration of the enlistment period for which he is so serving: *Provided further*, That any enlisted person discharged from the Regular Army who upon such discharge is recommended for reenlistment shall be permitted to reenlist with the rank held by him at the time of his discharge if he reenlists within a period to be specified by the Secretary of War but not to exceed three months from the date of such discharge: *And provided further*, That any enlisted person discharged from the Regular Army by reason of acceptance of his resignation shall not be entitled upon subsequent reenlistment to the rank, rating, or grade held at the time of discharge.

"SEC. 2. Any person who enlists or reenlists in the Regular Military Establishment on or after June 1, 1945, in the seventh grade, upon the completion of recruit training, but not later than four months subsequent to the date of enlistment, shall, unless sooner promoted, be promoted to the sixth grade, provided he meets such qualifications as may be prescribed in regulations promulgated by the Secretary of War: *Provided*, That no back pay or allowance shall accrue to any person by reason of enactment of this section.

"SEC. 3. Section 2 of the National Defense Act, as amended (10 U. S. C. 4, 602), is further amended by deleting the last sentence thereof.

"SEC. 4. Paragraph 4 of section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 is hereby amended by substituting a colon for the period at the end of such paragraph and by adding immediately after such colon the following: '*Provided further*, That in addition to such enlistment allowance, any person enlisting for an unspecified period of time shall be paid the sum of $50 upon the completion of each year of service of such reenlistment, and any person who resigns or is discharged from such enlistment for an unspecified period of time shall not thereafter be entitled to any additional enlistment or reenlistment allowance based on any period served in such enlistment for an unspecified period of time.'

"SEC. 5. Effective July 1, 1947, sections 653 and 653a of title 10, United States Code, are repealed and all other laws and parts of laws insofar as they are inconsistent with or in conflict with the provisions of this Act are likewise repealed.

"SEC. 6. Subsection 1 (b) of the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 (38 U. S. C., Supp. V., 691a) is amended by striking out the word 'and' at the end of subsection (7) thereof, inserting a semicolon in lieu of the period after subsection (8) thereof, and adding the following 'and (9) any person entering upon active service, or enlisting, on or after the first day of the first month after

the approval of the Act adding this subsection.'

"SEC. 7. Sections 57 and 58 of the National Defense Act, as amended, are further amended by striking out the words 'eighteen' therefrom and substituting therefor the words 'seventeen' in each of the said sections."

And the Senate agree to the same.

W. G. ANDREWS,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
DEWEY SHORT,
CARL VINSON,
P. H. DREWRY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CHAN GURNEY,
STYLES BRIDGES,
E. V. ROBERTSON,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3303) to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military Establishment of the United States, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to the amendment, namely:

The Senate amendment was to strike out all of the House bill after the enacting clause and to insert thereafter the provisions of the Senate bill. The managers on the part of the House receded from disagreement to the Senate amendment, with an amendment whereby section 3 of the bill as passed by the House and stricken by the Senate was reinstated. In accepting the Senate amendment, the managers on the part of the House thereby concurred also in the addition of a new section to the bill whereby mustering-out payments are denied to persons entering upon active service, or enlisting, on or after the first day of the first month after the enactment of the bill.

WALTER G. ANDREWS,
DEWEY SHORT,
LESLIE ARENDS,
CARL VINSON,
PATRICK DREWRY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the legislative appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas reserved all points of order on the bill.

PROMOTION AND ELIMINATION OF OFFICERS OF THE ARMY, NAVY, AND MARINE CORPS

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3830) to provide for the promotion and elimination of officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3830, with Mr. GRAHAM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 47 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, at the beginning I wish to express my genuine and sincere appreciation to each and every member of our subcommittee and also to the members of the full Committee on Armed Services of the House for their full and earnest cooperation in the preparation and the reporting of this very long, difficult, and involved measure.

At first it seemed an almost impossible task because the subject is just about as interesting as a table of logarithms or a page out of a trigonometry textbook. It required only a week's or a month's time to find out what one of my professors of philosophy once said: That a philosopher or a scientist is one who makes the obvious seem obscure.

After 10 long weeks of hearings on this complicated measure, I confess that even members of the subcommittee who have studied it most diligently in long and exhaustive hearings and after many executive sessions and even after private discussions with representatives of the War and Navy Departments may not have the final answer to the solution of this pressing problem. On the whole, however, I think we have done a very good job, and for the first time, perhaps, in our history we have brought the Army and the Navy together so that they are in fundamental agreement, not only the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy but our high-ranking officers in both arms of the services.

Mr. Chairman, Subcommittee No. 1 on Personnel of the Committee on Armed Services has been working since the 1st of April on the Army and Navy promotion bills, which are now together in H. R. 3830.

The hearings have been well attended, and we have been through one of the most difficult, complicated subjects I have had to work on since coming to Congress. It was only a week ago last Monday that we completed our work on these bills. H. R. 3830 now represents our view as to an equitable and economical promotion system for the Army, Navy, Marine Corps and Air Corps—a system that will offer careers satisfactory enough to attract capable men and to hold such men now in service. The bill was unanimously reported by our full committee last Friday.

The Navy promotion system is contained in the first four titles of H. R. 3830. The Army promotion system is in title 5. Both systems are predicated upon the principle of promotion by selection, although they differ considerably in applying the principle.

When we began studying the bills, we were inclined to integrate the two promotion systems. Early in the hearings, however, we became aware of the fact that it is too early to effect such a radical departure, even though I think I represent the view of the subcommittee in saying that within the next 5 to 10 years the systems can be reconciled to a much greater extent than they can be now.

The Navy plan in titles 1 through 4 of H. R. 3830 is not an innovation for the Navy. It effects certain refinements in the Navy selection system which has been in effect since 1916—over 30 years. The reason the Navy resubmits the program to Congress at this time is to permit an immediate return to the Navy system of permanent promotion by selection, with provision for temporary ranks during the period required for the transition from the present wartime system. The Navy makes certain changes required by the recent integration of Reserve officers to the Regular Navy and Marine Corps and incorporates various improvements in the selection system based on wartime experience. The new Navy promotion law is the product of more than 2 years' intensive study by various boards of officers in the Navy Department.

The Army promotion system, contained in title 5 of H. R. 3830, is, on the other hand, a real novelty for the Army. It represents over 8 months' study by a special War Department board, including a thorough analysis of the Navy system. The result is that, for the first time, supported by strong recommendations of General Eisenhower, the Army is to have promotion by selection in the lower Army grades. Selection has always been used by the Army for promotion to grades above colonel. But always in the past, in the lower grades, seniority alone controlled Army promotions. The subcommittee was strongly in favor of this change.

Let me say here that beyond using the same word—selection—the Army and Navy promotion systems, as outlined in this bill, correspond very little at the present time in governing promotions up to and including the grades of lieutenant colonel and commander. Actually, the Army selection system as proposed in title 5 of this bill is, in the lower grades, an elimination system, so that all qualified officers will be selected up and only the unqualified will go out, rather than selecting only the best qualified officers up, as is the case in the Navy system, to fill a limited number of vacancies. There are excellent reasons for this difference in approach by the services, only one of which I will mention at this time—that is, that the introduction of selection into the Army is so novel an undertaking, with such far-reaching effects on the careers of tens of thousand of officers who have grown up under a seniority system in use throughout the Army's history, the Army of necessity must enter into this undertaking with caution. As a result, and because of other basic differences between the services at the present time, the Army selection, in grades below colonel, will operate initially as a method by which to force out incompetent officers. On the other hand, the Navy system, beginning in the grade of lieutenant commander, will force out about one of every five officers in each grade when

the system stabilizes, in order to preserve the required distribution of officers and to maintain the proper age levels in each grade.

It is important to keep in mind that both services, in many respects, are still under wartime conditions, especially in regard to personnel requirements. Take the Navy promotion system, for example. Title 1 sets up the permanent promotion plant for Navy line officers and for the Marines. Title 2 does the same thing, using the Navy running-mate system, for the Navy staff corps. But title 3 deals with temporary promotions, which will have to be continued in the Navy for a considerable time to come. By applying Regular Navy officer percentage to the temporary strength of the Navy, these promotions will be continued on a closely defined basis until they are no longer needed. Under the terms of the bill they will pass out of the picture not later than 10 years hence.

In the Army a comparable situation exists. Section 515 of title 5 of the Army bill continues Army temporary promotions so long as they are necessary in that service. Bear in mind that Army Regular officer strength will reach only about 37,500 officers this year; nevertheless, the Army officer active duty strength will be well over 100,000. In the Navy not more than 27,000 Regulars are represented in its more than 40,000 officers.

So you can see that what is being done by these bills is to provide a permanent career plan for those in the Regular Army and Regular Navy while at the same time providing for the carrying along of many thousands of temporary officers for some years ahead. One result of this situation is that it is premature for any of us to say that the programs contained in H. R. 3830 will finally answer the promotional needs of the services. Some 5 or 10 years hence we will know better what, in detail, those needs will be. For the present, however, the programs offer needed stability to the Regulars; they permit personnel planning in both services to proceed efficiently; and they provide a means by which to meet the temporary officer requirements of all the services.

Various important changes in old promotion law are effected by this legislation. I will summarize them, then explain those changes the committee made in the programs as proposed by the services. I will take the Navy program first—titles 1 through 4 of H. R. 3830.

First. Navy permanent promotions are reintroduced. They have been discontinued since 1942. The committee quickly recognized the urgent need of this, in order to provide some incentive for Regular Navy officers to remain in service and to offer some inducement to capable men to make the service a career. This is one of the main reasons why this legislation is before the Congress at this time.

The Navy plan brings officers to flag rank at an earlier age than heretofore. By normal promotion, a Navy officer may now reach admiral rank at about age 53, and outstanding officers can reach admiral grade still earlier. Under previous law, they could reach this rank as old as 60. This is a great improvement, in the view of the committee. The last war certainly demonstrated the need for vigor and comparative youth in positions of responsibility in the services.

Also, the Navy plan, for the first time, introduces selection in admiral grade—that is, from now on an admiral must justify himself after a certain length of time, instead of being guaranteed retention in grade until he reaches retirement age or resigns or dies in office. This should have a stimulating effect in the Navy's highest ranks.

Grade distributions—that is, the numbers of officers in each grade—were increased to some extent in lieutenant commander, commander, and captain grades, while the numbers in ensign and lieutenant grades were reduced. There are two reasons for this: First, under old law the forced elimination of officers has been too severe in the higher grades to insure a reasonably attractive career; second, modern war has become so complex that additional officers are needed now in higher grades to perform the many highly technical, professional duties which formerly did not exist. After extensive consideration of this departure, the committee agreed as to its desirability.

Another novelty in the Navy program is the so-called accelerated promotion plan which permits the Navy, for the first time, to promote especially well qualified officers in advance of the average officer. This has been impossible in the past because, under the Navy system, every man ranking above the promoted officer was, under the law, considered as having failed of selection. This had most serious effects upon the officers passed over by the selection board. It jeopardized their entire Navy careers, because, if they failed once again for selection to the same grade, they had to be forced out of the Navy. The natural result was that such promotions simply were not made. Now such promotions become possible by the accelerated promotion device, which permits a Navy selection board to select an outstanding man without having to pass over every officer above him.

A new promotion zone plan is contained in the Navy program. This is a complicated process, but the general idea is to prevent a great amount of forced elimination of officers one year, practically none the next, maybe 50-percent elimination the next, and so on, as has been the rule in the past. By averaging the vacancies to occur over a 5-year period, and by applying to that average the average number of officers who will come up for promotion during that period, the Navy can insure that all officers will have comparatively equal opportunity for promotion over the years. This should be a substantial improvement over the old system. The Navy is proud of the idea and the committee thinks it has reason to be.

Another innovation is the introduction of limited duty officers into the Navy officer corps. These officers are to come from enlisted and warrant officer ranks only. This program gives the Navy enlisted man an opportunity to advance to officer grade as a member of a restricted group. He can rise as high as commander and is given a protected career along the way. Even though this group cannot be as large as some of us might have preferred, because it must be restricted to the specialized jobs such technicians can perform, the committee was pleased that this proposal was made and that Navy enlisted men are to have a reasonable opportunity to advance into the officer corps.

These are the main differences proposed by the Navy plan.

Now, as to the Army plan, contained in title 5, the big item is the introduction of promotion by selection in the lower Army grades, beginning in the grade of lieutenant, the same rank as that in which the Navy begins selection.

Promotions on a basis of seniority alone are dispensed with by this system. In the future, an Army officer will have to qualify for promotion—that is, he must be selected for promotion by the majority of a board of officers—before he can advance to captain and above. Provision is made for promotion without regard to existing vacancies after specified periods of service in grade—this being a marked difference from the Navy system required by the fact that the Army functions as a nucleus or cadre in peacetime for the enormous wartime Army, whereas the Navy remains, in peace or war, largely an operational force.

The Army plan sets up various promotion lists rather than using the Navy running-mate idea. The result is about the same; that is, it is so designed as to give comparative promotion opportunity to officers regardless of the branch they may be serving in. Also, the Army bill had to have a separate promotion list for the Air Corps in anticipation of the creation of a separate Department of Air, as contemplated under the merger bill. The committee went over this aspect of the plan very carefully and agreed that it is workable and, at least for the present, a necessary Army procedure.

The Army also plans, for the first time, to stop appointing officers in each of the several branches, excepting the Air Corps, the several Corps of the Medical Department and chaplains. Army officers in the future are to be appointed in the Regular Army rather than in the Infantry, for example. This particular phase of the Army plan was taken under special study by the committee because of the Corps of Engineers and Judge Advocate General Department problems associated therewith. Brigadier General Dahlquist, the Army representative charged with this legislation for the War Department, was called upon several times to justify this procedure. After full consideration in public hearings and executive session, the subcommittee concluded that the Army is sound in its contention that branch appointments, with the exceptions mentioned, should be discontinued. Continuation of branch appointments, while providing protection for the branches and insuring continuation of the traditions of the various

branches and corps, nevertheless is subject to the greater disadvantage of imposing upon the Army too rigid a structure which cannot be readily responsive to changing military needs.

This innovation in the Army bill does not abolish Army branches. It merely stops commissioning officers in the various branches, thereby permitting the Secretary of War to transfer officers with greater facility from one branch to another as military needs dictate. This had to be done on a grandiose scale during the war.

Another change is that the Army will now appoint chiefs of branches from among those officers who are already generals, rather than following the old system of requiring that branch chiefs hold rank of the office only temporarily. This was approved by the committee, but with certain modifications I will discuss later.

The Army plan will result in the promotion of all but the unfit officers to and including the grade of lieutenant colonel thereafter, only best-qualified officers will be promoted to fill vacancies, comparable in this respect to the Navy plan. The committee anticipates that this plan will be modified when the Army gains experience in the application of selection in the lower grades, and that before too many years have gone by forced elimination in lower Army grades will have to be imposed. This is now possible—but not required—in the Army plan. For the present, however, there is little question that the Army's venture into selection is too radical a departure to attempt the immediate adoption of a system identical with that of the Navy. In this connection the Navy testified that its present system could not have been adopted by the Navy itself when it was first applied in 1916. Such a system has to develop gradually. No doubt the Army plan will evolve similarly, as modified by needs peculiar to the Army.

A further Army novelty is the ranking of Army brigadier generals with rear admirals of the lower half and major generals with rear admirals of the upper half. Heretofore, in the absence of one-star grade in the Navy, rank discrepancies occurred which the subcommittee agreed are undesirable. The Army bill requires that date of rank in the one- and two-star ranks will determine the relative rank; not the one or two stars worn on the officers' shoulders. This avoids the rear-admiral versus brigadier-general problem which has existed formerly. We not only agreed with the proposal, but required its extension to Marine brigadier generals and major generals.

At this point I may say that the only alternative to the plan of ranking brigadiers with rear admirals is the permanent reestablishment of the rank of commodore in the Navy, which is vigorously opposed by Secretary Forrestal, Admiral Nimitz, and others in policy-making positions in the Navy Department. The subcommittee determined this point after a great deal of discussion. Since the Army entered no opposition to the removal of commodores from the Navy rank structure, and since the relative rank of brigadier generals and rear admirals has been adjusted, the subcommittee could see no justifiable reason for imposing commodores on the Navy. A decision to this effect was reached unanimously, with all members of the subcommittee present.

One further point on both bills before going into the committee amendments: I am glad to say that neither of the plans contained in H. R. 3830 will involve additional expense to the Government after enactment until the services reach their authorized strengths some 10 or 15 years hence. At that time some additional cost will occur. But this will decrease rapidly until, comparatively soon thereafter, the Navy system will function with a saving to the Government. The Army system, over a 30-year span, might cost three-tenths of 1 percent more than the present system. The committee found this an especially attractive feature of both plans, particularly in view of the promotional improvements that the bill will effect.

Now, as to our amendments to the original proposals: Our most important changes were in flag and general ranks in the Army, Navy, Air Corps, and Marine Corps. As the promotion programs came to us originally, they were based on the idea of keeping five-star rank in peacetime. Together, the bills authorized 24 four-star officers, 79 three-star officers, 406 two-star officers, and 237 brigadier generals. These are combined figures—for the Army—including the Air Corps—the Navy, and the Marine Corps. Separately, the original bills authorized 15 full generals for the Army, plus the Chief of Staff; 46 lieutenant generals, 142 major generals, and 203 brigadier generals. For the Navy 8 full admirals, plus the Chief of Naval Operations; 29 vice admirals, and 253 rear admirals. For the Marine Corps 1 full general, 4 lieutenant generals, 11 major generals, and 34 brigadier generals.

We considered this question of top rank as exceedingly important. We held consultations with the Secretaries of War and Navy and with the professional heads of all the services before we reached any final decisions.

Our unanimous conclusion was that five-star rank is properly a wartime rank and should not become a continuing peacetime rank. We also agreed that in peacetime the services should not have as many high-ranking officers as they had asked for, although, in reducing those now holding high rank, an appropriate period for readjustment should be provided. The result was that we chose July 1, 1948, as the date on which four stars will become the top peacetime rank in all the services, and numerical ceilings, effective on that date, were imposed on the three- and four-star officers the services can have. If all five-star officers are not off active duty by then, they will be charged against the four-star allotments of the services.

As amended, the bill now provides that effective July 1 of next year, the Army cannot have more than 4 four-star generals, as contrasted with the 15, including the Air Forces, the Army bill would have authorized originally. One of these 4 must be the Chief of Staff of the Army who was excluded from the 15 originally requested. In the Navy, there will be 4 four-star admirals authorized as of July 1, 1948, instead of the originally requested 8 plus the Chief of Naval Operations and Commandant of the Marine Corps. These 4 in the Navy will be the Chief of Naval Operations, the Commander in Chief of the Atlantic Fleet, the Commander in Chief of the Pacific Fleet and the Commandant of the Marine Corps.

You will note that we did not specify all four of the Army four-star officers—only the Chief of Staff of the Army. We left the other three unspecified because at least two of them will have to be occupational chiefs in Europe and Japan. We considered it inadvisable to specify them in the law for the reason that these positions will terminate when the Army's occupational duties are completed. However, there is little doubt that the Army's four-star generals will be the Chief of Staff, the commanding generals of our occupational forces in Japan and Europe, and the commanding general of all Army forces in the United States.

For the Air Forces, we authorized three four-star generals instead of the six originally planned for. Only the commanding general of the Air Corps is designated in the bill. But there is little doubt that one of the other two will be the commanding general of the Strategic Air Forces. The remaining one can be such officer as the commanding general of the Matériel Command, or the commanding general of the Air Defense Command, as the Air Forces may determine.

Also on four-star rank, we amended the bill to require that in the future any officer, whether from the Army, Navy, Air Corps, or the Marine Corps, who becomes Chief of Staff to the President—the position now held by Admiral Leahy—will have four-star rank while he holds that position. We also provided a supplemental allowance for the chiefs of the four services in recognition of their added obligations as compared with other four-star officers.

As to three-star ranks, we authorized the Army, less the Air Corps, to have 23 in place of the 46, including the Air Forces, the bill would have authorized originally. The Navy was also authorized 23 in place of the 29 requested. The marines got 2 instead of 4, and the Air Corps was given 14 rather than the 17 it would otherwise have had. This makes a total of 62 three-star officers as compared with 79 the bills would have authorized as introduced.

Within the three-star limits we required that the services' representatives to the United Nations hold three-star rank and, because of the duties of this assignment, we gave such officers additional allowances while they so serve.

At this point we also instructed the services to allot the same rank for comparable branch chief positions, although these positions were not specified in the bill for the reason that they relate to the organization of the departments rather than to promotions. We have been advised by Admiral Sprague and by General Dahlquist, who are charged with this legislation for the departments,

that the Army and Navy are now in full agreement on the rank for these respective positions. This is an important point. The lack of uniformity of rank in branch chief positions between the services has produced a great deal of unnecessary and unhealthful friction in the past.

On two-star ranks, our decision was to impose numerical ceilings only on permanent promotions and to permit temporary promotions to these ranks to continue so long as temporary promotions remain necessary in both services. This was necessary because all services are still much larger than their permanent officer strengths. To have imposed numerical ceilings on these ranks, proportionate to the services' regular officer strengths, would have produced an impossible situation. In the Army, for instance, the Regular strength, as stated earlier in these remarks, is only 37,500 officers; yet, the total officer strength of the Army, including temporary officers, is well over 100,000—almost four times the Regular strength.

A similar situation exists in the Navy, Air Corps, and Marine Corps.

As a result, the ceilings imposed on two- and one-star ranks apply only to permanent appointments in these grades. The temporary strengths in these grades will, in the Army, be about 450, and, in the Navy, about 260 rear admirals. These figures will automatically decrease as the Army and Navy reduce in strength over the years ahead.

For permanent promotions, we specified that the Army, including the Air Corps, could have not more than 134 major generals, excluding those temporarily in higher grades. This includes 2 for the Army Dental Corps, 1 Army chaplain, and 8 for the Medical Corps. Of the 179 Army brigadier generals authorized, 2 will be Dental Corps, 1 Veterinary Corps, 1 chaplain, and 8 Medical Corps. The Air Forces will have a proportionate share of the Army allotment in these grades. Present plans are that the Air Corps will have 58 major generals and 75 brigadiers. The Marine Corps will have 10 major generals and 23 brigadiers.

The Navy was authorized 181 rear admirals, and we required that 143 of these be line rear admirals and 38 staff corps rear admirals. Those in the Staff Corps will be made up of 15 in the Medical Corps, 13 in the Supply Corps, 4 in the Civil Engineer Corps, 4 in the Dental Corps, and 2 in the Chaplain Corps. The Navy, of course, will have no one-star rank, although those who are now commodores will retain the rank so long as the grade is needed, subject to the termination of the wartime temporary law under which commodores are appointed.

These ceilings on top rank were arrived at after exceedingly thorough study of lists of the billets the services planned for general and admiral grades. I may say that the committee was reluctant to require these reductions when many of the officers who will be affected so recently gave us the leadership that won the last war. But a large proportion of the lower ranking officers have already been reduced in rank, and the committee agreed that what has been necessary in their instance must apply comparably to those who served in the topmost grades.

Without getting into as much detail, I will summarize now the other amendments we made in both bills.

We required that the three- and four-star officers be confirmed by the Senate—a definite departure from previous law and not originally contained in either promotion plan.

We placed a limit on the Army's authority to keep brigadier generals and major generals on duty until retirement age after completion of the required service, the limit being 10 brigadiers and 10 major generals who may be so retained. The limit was imposed to insure a constant turn-over in top rank so as to keep youth at the top and to give lower-ranking officers reasonable opportunity to reach general officer grade.

The Army program was amended to permit generals and lieutenant generals to retire in those grades, without extra pay, when so authorized by the President. This was in the Navy proposal; it was extended to the Army to bring the services together on this point. This does not involve increased pay for these officers; it is honorary only; it gives these officers the right to the title and rank of general and lieutenant general, as the case may be, on the retired list, if they have once attained the grade on active duty.

The Army's allowance of Medical Department generals was reduced from three-fourths of 1 percent of the strength of the Medical Department officer corps to one-half of 1 percent, to conform to the Navy percentage. This works out to give the Medical Department precisely the number of generals that was specified for the various corps of the Medical Department.

We required that Army branch chiefs be confirmed by the Senate and we required that only the President can effect their removal. The Army had proposed that these positions no longer require Senate confirmation, and branch chiefs could be removed at the pleasure of the Secretary of War. To provide reasonable security for these positions, and at the same time not so protect them as to make branch chiefs completely independent, we intruded the Senate and President into the process. It was unanimously agreed by the subcommittee that this will provide adequate protection for such branches as the Corps of Army Engineers—which was foremost in our minds at the time—and for the Judge Advocate General's Department.

Next, we amended the Navy bill to withdraw from the Navy its authority to retire officers in the next higher grade when they have received a commendation from the head of an executive department. We felt justified in this, for two reasons: First, the Navy Department itself opposed this provision when it first became law in 1925; and second, its extension to the Army would involve entirely too many officers. The Navy Department is reasonably content with our action on this point. Of course, this will not be retroactive. Officers already so retired will retain the status they now have under this provision of law.

Another amendment was to limit to the Army's World War I hump of lieutenant colonels the Army authority to retire lieutenant colonels as colonels after 28 years of service, when no vacancies are available for their promotion to the grade of colonel. The Army does not object to this very strongly; and we felt that this problem could best be handled in this way rather than extend the authority to the Navy.

Another change of some consequence was an amendment providing that, excepting disability retirements, the retirement pay of colonels, captains in the Navy, admirals and generals will not be a flat 75 percent of active-duty pay. The exact amount will be computed on the officer's length of service, up to 75 percent, as is done in lower grades. This has some collateral results. Other legislation is pending which would give 75 percent retirement to Army generals, and a law passed by the last Congress gave the same to admirals. Also, in the original Army promotion bill age retirements were a flat 75 percent of active-duty pay. Our position is that there is no logical basis for computing retirement pay of high ranking officers on a basis different from that of officers in lower grades. Normally, this amendment will not affect many officers, since most generals and admirals will receive the maximum 75 percent in any event; but those whose length of service would not entitle them to the 75 percent should not, in our opinion, be given it.

There were some thirty-odd amendments, Mr. Chairman, but I do not want to go into them unless it is necessary since they are comparatively minor in scope.

This completes my general statement on this important legislation, which will have far-reaching effects on the more than 175,000 officers in the services. The legislation is urgent. The Regular officers of the Army and Navy must have some assurance as to what the future holds for them or the services will lose a high proportion of their most capable men, and the morale of those who remain will be impaired. Also, do not forget what I mentioned before—that all the services are still on a war footing in many respects insofar as personnel needs are concerned. As a result, in the absence of this or other legislation, when the war is officially ended, the services would have to release the thousands of temporary officers who must be retained for some years to come. Our national defense would be dangerously weakened and our armed services demoralized. Quick passage of this bill is essential to our national security.

I yield now to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I wish first to congratulate the gentleman on the comprehensive, intelligent, and clear statement he has made. I think I understood the gentleman to say that promotions up to the grade of captain and even higher could be made without regard to vacancies.

Mr. SHORT. In the Army, up to the grade of lieutenant colonel.

Mr. EBERHARTER. What becomes of the tables of organization if promotions can be made when there are no vacancies? I wish the gentleman would explain that to me.

Mr. SHORT. The Army anticipates finding no difficulty in having vacancies for many years to come. I may say that under the Navy proposals there is a greater forced attrition than there is under the Army title, and we could not make the Army bill identical with the Navy bill because it is the first time the Army has ever had selection. It will require a number of years; they realize it and they are going to have many headaches in working this plan out successfully.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman indicates that there are many vacancies in different grades, and promotions can be made to them.

Mr. SHORT. Yes; because the Army anticipates having not more than 37,500 regular commissions although their authorized strength is 50,000; and the Navy has only 27,000. I may say to the gentleman that the Regular commissions in the Navy are 40,000, based on authorized strength.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the Army has a great many extracurricular activities, such as the National Guard and the Reserve Corps which produce these vacancies.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. The gentleman stated, I believe, that a change was made affecting those who had received certain medals or commendations who under the present law can retire at 75 percent; that the change did not affect those who had already retired, that it affected those who are qualified for retirement but have not retired; their authorization would be reduced. Is that right?

Mr. SHORT. No; under the present law men who had received commendations by an executive department could be retired at one grade higher than that which they held but at no increase in pay. Our committee eliminated that provision because the Navy itself had opposed it when it was originally adopted in 1925. They offered a bill as late as 1943 wanting to get rid of it. The Army never had it.

Mr. WHITTEN. I do not mean to differ with the gentleman, but I wonder if those people who are already qualified under that provision of the present law should not be protected under the new law.

Mr. SHORT. They are protected. I tried to make it clear that the law is not retroactive. The officers already so retired will retain the status they are entitled to under the provisions of the law.

Mr. WHITTEN. But those who could retire under that provision would be affected adversely.

Mr. SHORT. Yes; they would be. We are going to stop it because we think it should never have been instituted in the beginning.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I wish to compliment the gentleman on the very excellent statement he has made and to ask him what the ultimate cost will be to the taxpayers?

Mr. SHORT. Very little, if any. In fact, there will be no increase in cost until we reach stabilized conditions after the transition period 10 years hence. There may be some slight increase then to the Navy, but thereafter it will rapidly decrease until there will actually be a saving; and, as far as the Army is concerned, the increase, if any, will be about thirty-three one-hundredths of 1 percent; and we feel that the advantages greatly outweigh that.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN. I also would like to compliment the gentleman from Missouri on his wonderful statement here today and the work of his committee in trying to iron out this situation. I speak in behalf of some of the GI's in the last war. We feel like seniority and all that should be taken care of and we appreciate what you have done here. Is it not a fact that under the old system it would be absolutely impossible to utilize the services of a young man similar to Napoleon Bonaparte who reached the height of his efficiency as lieutenant colonel at 27 years? It would be impossible to utilize a man that young?

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman is eminently correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself two additional minutes.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Would the gentleman tell me whether this is correct: Under the new promotion plan for those in the grades below general officer, does the seniority system maintain except that those officers who are not qualified are eliminated? Is that what it amounts to?

Mr. SHORT. No. Officers in both the Army and Navy will be elevated or chosen by a selection board set up by each department. If they fail twice of selection by the board, and a different board in each instance, then they go out. They either go up or out.

Mr. ALBERT. Is any provision made to guarantee that officers other than those who are graduates of service schools will be on the selection board?

Mr. SHORT. I am glad the gentleman asks that question because I consider one of the best features of the bill the assurance to our people in the future that a vast majority of the officers in both the Army and Navy will not be graduates of either West Point or Annapolis.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KILDAY. It is a fact that at the present time, out of 137,000 officers on duty in the Army, only 8,000 are graduates of West Point?

Mr. SHORT. That is true.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. DREWRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to say that on this occasion I find myself in the same boat with the genial gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT]. We are traveling in the same direction and trying to reach the same objective. I have traveled with him on former occasions and can report that it is always a pleasure to be in his company. Necessarily my approach to the discussion of this bill will be similar to his. I will try however to give a brief but comprehensive analysis of the main features of the bill. I wish to compliment the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] for the hard-working energy and close application he gave to the study of this complicated subject. His report to the full committee is a model of correct analytical statement, concise, clear, and well-expressed. I, personally, am much indebted to him for his fair and impartial guidance in the work of the subcommittee.

In my opinion it is impossible to pass a perfect general promotion bill. It is practically impossible to get a bill which will meet with the approval of every officer in the armed services, yet the Armed Services Committee has tried to do that very thing in this bill, providing for the promotion and elimination of officers in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes. It contains 303 pages. It has taken several months for the committee, working rather steadily and continuously, to draft the bill. It was not drafted until it had been studied by the officers of the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps, as well as by the enlisted men of said services and the National Guard, and then further opportunity was given to everybody who wished to be heard. It has the approval of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy and was reported unanimously by the Committee on Armed Services. It is, of course, physically impossible, in the time given over to the discussion of this bill, to go into every phase of it, and I do not know that a discussion of any phase of it would do more than be an expression of opinion. Due to the many changes that arose out of the war, it was very important, in fact, essential, that some kind of legislation should be passed that would relieve the minds of the men in the services and definitely fix their permanent status. This bill is the answer of the committee to the request for permanent legislation. If there should be any injustices in the bill or any changes become necessary, such changes can very readily be adjusted by amendment of this basic law.

At the present time the promotion of officers is controlled by temporary appointments under wartime regulations as the provisions of the permanent law were

suspended in 1942 in order to meet the changing conditions due to the war. This bill stabilizes such temporary promotions and gives permanent status. It is not entirely rigid in its application for it was recognized that there should be some flexibility to prevent unfairness to some officers who served brilliantly during the war in their temporary assignments, and in addition there must be some flexibility to meet conditions that may arise in the future. The committee believes that it is a fair, orderly, and economical system creating a promotional flow in the service that will hold qualified officers in the service and attract many young men who wish to make their service in the Army or Navy their life work.

The bill applies equally to the Army and the Navy and the Marine Corps. Hearings were had separately with reference to the Army and the Navy, and then the final conclusion to draft it into one bill with an attempt, as far as was possible, to have a similarity in the procurement, distribution, and promotion of men of both services. This is, of course, not the first promotion bill to come before Congress, but it is the most comprehensive bill that has been proposed. So far as the Navy is concerned, acts were passed in 1916, 1917, 1926, 1934, 1935, 1938, and 1940 on the various divisions of the Navy, and in the approach to the drafting of this over-all act a careful examination was made of all existing law, and there was a historical study of previous laws in order to determine which principles of those laws were sound and would fit the Navy as of today. As said by Commander Martineau in the hearings on the bill:

> Actually this bill does not by any means represent any revolutionary step. It is merely a part of the evolutionary process whereby we have built up through the years what we consider to be an effective Navy promotion system. This is simply another step along the way, a refinement of the principles that have developed really since 1916.

I quote this to show the very serious and comprehensive investigation that was made by the Navy authorities in the drafting of this bill; and it being the idea of the committee as well as of the services not to have anything that would be radical. I think the same approach was made by the Army and a special War Department Board was created for the purpose.

This Board found a similar condition as to former promotion laws. The present promotion law was enacted in 1920. It was amended in 1935 and in 1940. This proposed legislation was the result of many months of intensive research and study, with attention to former laws and a redrafting to meet conditions which existed during the war and still exist. The legislation for the Army promotional system contained in this bill has the approval of the General Staff and all the ranking officers of the various arms of the service. It was fully studied and discussed.

The principle of selection governs the promotion of all officers in the Army and Navy. However, the application of the principle necessarily varies in certain particulars. The Navy has followed the principle of selection for more than 30 years. So this bill returns the Navy to that system of permanent promotion by selection but makes some provision for temporary ranks required by the transition from wartime conditions. Certain other changes in the selection system are believed to be improvements based upon the experience acquired during the years of war.

The Army will also have promotion by selection, but the application of the principle is not the same as in the Navy. Instead of following the Navy system of selecting only the best-qualified officers up, the Army system will select up all qualified officers and eliminate the unqualified. The result in the end will be the same.

The Army Regular officer strength will be about 37,500 officers this year but the active-duty officer strength will be over 100,000. This is due to the necessity for continuing temporary promotions as long as the said officers are necessary in the service. A similar condition exists in the Navy but not to as great an extent, as 27,000 Regulars are represented in its more than 40,000 officers. This bill, therefore, provides a permanent career plan for those in the Regular Army and Navy, and also provides for carrying along the temporary officers.

There are some changes in both Army and Navy in the existing promotion law. For instance admiral rank could be reached as old as 60. Now a naval officer may reach admiral rank at 53. This step will give younger men an opportunity for service in high rank. Also the principle of selection is applied to the admiral grade instead of being retained until he reaches retirement age, or resigns, or dies in office. Again provision is made for increasing the number of officers in the grades of lieutenant commander, commander, and captain, while the number in the grades of ensign and lieutenant were decreased. It was found that additional numbers were needed in the higher grades to fill positions requiring more highly technical duties. These are some of the changes that improve the existing system in the Navy.

The greatest change in the Army system was promotion by selection in the lower grades beginning in the grade of lieutenant. Promotions on a basis of seniority alone are discarded. Again, the Army plan has various promotion lists, so that officers have their promotion opportunity without reference to the branch in which they are serving. Army officers will be appointed in the Regular Army rather than in a certain arm of the service. This will permit the Secretary of War to transfer officers as military needs require. Also, only the best-qualified officers, after the grade of lieutenant colonel will be promoted to fill vacancies.

Before leaving the subject, it should be noted that the subcommittee thought that there should be no five-star rank in peacetime, and that it should be considered a wartime rank.

The committee at the same time reduced the number of officers of star rank below the proposals contained in the bills as introduced. The number of said grades was reached after a detailed study of the billets the services planned for general and admiral grades.

The above, I believe, is a fairly full exposition of the purposes and details of the proposed legislation. It has been most carefully and studiously studied and planned. As far as I know it meets with the approval of all the services of our Military Establishment. After all, they are the persons more directly concerned. The plan is equitable and it is economical. After the plan is put into operation, if it be found that changes are desirable they can easily be made by the Congress.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, this bill, H. R. 3830, is a tremendous piece of work. I compliment the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], chairman of the committee, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], chairman of the subcommittee, upon the production of this bill.

I have spent three evenings trying to read this, and I am free to say that even at the end of three evenings, and with some previous experience, I have relatively little knowledge of what the bill contains. I understand that the subcommittee took some 10 weeks in its preparation. It is a bill of tremendous importance to the people of this Nation, for not only does it affect the future of their armed services, but it affects, as the gentleman from Missouri has said, some 175,000 or 180,000 commissioned officers of those services.

An immense amount of experience has gone into this bill. The Navy has had some 30 years of experience with selection and it has tried to embody that in the bill. The Navy has had various schemes during all of that time. When I first started in the service, the only way promotion was achieved was by death, old age, retirement, or by the selection out of a very few people. That proved to be very poor practice, and shortly thereafter the system was changed so that in 1916 we brought in this selection system for officers of the Navy, applying it at that time only from the grade of lieutenant commander up.

The scheme as used at that time was kept for a few years, then gradually we modified it so as to extend it down to and including officers of the grade of lieutenant, junior grade, in the Navy.

Accompanying any system of promotion you will find a system of retirement, and that, Mr. Chairman, is one of the most important things which can affect any service; how to get the boys out so as to make room for others then down at the bottom. If you do not do that, in a short time your service becomes top-heavy with old men, and believe me, they do get old, because they will not move until they are put out.

There was a time some years ago when an officer when he became a rear admiral was from 62 to 63½ years old, and a captain got into his grade usually around 60 or a little above. That was in effect even at the time of what we called a "plucking board," then modifications came along and they began to retire people in connection with a selection

system for age in grade. That seemed to be a very desirable thing for a while. If a captain became 56 years of age he was retired, and so on down the line. But it was not adaptable to our system because the boys have a latitude of 4 years in entering the Naval Academy, so you soon came to the point where officers in the service were being retired for age without ever having had a chance of promotion.

The American people do not like that sort of thing and so they gradually changed the law until it was required that an officer should be passed over twice in his grade and should have attained a certain amount of commissioned service.

Under this new proposal, it will be amplified again so that you will have service-in-grade in combination with total commissioned service and also that of being passed over.

Mr. Chairman, the Navy schemes have been well tried out. There is no perfect bill for promotion or retirement. It steps on too many people's toes. You cannot possibly make everybody an admiral or everybody a general and so we cannot get a perfect scheme, but it looks to me as if this one is about as fair as anything we can develop at the present time.

The proposed bill does several things. First, it provides for forced retirement in the flag grades, which is a very necessary feature. The gentleman from Missouri mentioned in that connection that we were getting rid of the deadwood. I do not agree with the gentleman from Missouri in that respect. We have very little deadwood in the flag grades at the present time. We are getting rid of a number of officers in the flag grades so as to make it possible for the younger men to come up to be promoted without having to wait all their lives for such an occasion to take place. It is a most desirable provision, and I certainly hope it will be retained.

Second, this bill contains a provision for selection down to the grade of junior lieutenant, which is in accordance with the present system.

Third, it provides for the discharge of lieutenants and lieutenants, junior grade, if they fail to live up to the needs of the service or prove themselves unsuitable for the naval service.

I have had many complaints about the idea of taking a lieutenant or a junior lieutenant and putting him out on the cold, cold world with only up to 2 years' pay. I cannot see any reason why the Government should feel it is necessary to support a reasonably young man all of his life just because he had a commission in the Navy and was unable to make good insofar as the naval service is concerned. I think that is an excellent provision.

Fourth, this bill continues the temporary officer set-up, as I understand it, until the line has reached 95 percent of its permanent strength or until January 1, 1957, whichever is the first. I believe that is correct, is it not, may I ask the gentleman from Missouri, that the bill continues the temporary set-up until January 1, 1957?

Mr. SHORT. That is correct.

Mr. BRADLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, it also applies selection to the Army. Naturally, I cannot speak very much for the Army, but I do know that no system which provides for promotion just because you live long enough, and because you wear shoes, is of any value to the military service.

I appreciate that the whole arrangement will be far from perfect for the Army at the present time. The Army has not had the experience, but I feel confident that the Army will work out a good system after a little experience.

There are some details about this proposed law which I do not believe are advisable. I realize that we cannot all think the same way, and I have no intention of trying to write legislation of this complexity on the floor of the House.

However, I hope to comment on a few sections as they are brought up in the belief that such comment should be made a part of the record so that they may be available for the use of hearings which may be held in another legislative body on this set-up.

I assume the gentleman from Missouri will soon be asking unanimous consent to consider large portions of the bill as read for the purpose of amendment, and to that I shall not object, but I hope the gentleman from Missouri will go along with me if I find it necessary to ask for a little more time at some particular points due to the committee considering such large sections of the bill at one time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DREWRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, this has been a most difficult bill to prepare. It happens not to be my first experience with personnel legislation for the armed services, for during the 8 years of my service as a member of the Committee on Military Affairs I had to do with personnel problems. In all personnel matters the issues are very complex.

This bill has been very carefully balanced. Should it be upset in any one of its portions it would throw the other portions of the bill out of balance. I want to call attention particularly to the fact that it covers the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps. This is the first time we have ever been able to consider a promotion bill for the three services together. In the past a Navy promotion bill would go to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and an Army bill to the Committee on Military Affairs. There would be different features in each bill and there would be a constant attempt on the part of one to catch up with the other. In this instance we have attempted to take all of the services and fix comparable ranks on comparable bases just as much as it was possible to do so. In other words, a man holding the rank of lieutenant—senior grade—in the Navy would to all intents and purposes be on a footing with a captain in the Army, and so on through the comparable grades.

I want to emphasize the fact that we have had to approach the two services from a different viewpoint. At the present time nobody knows what the strength of the Army is to be. Until a few days ago we still had permanent law fixing the strength of the Army at 286,000. That ceiling was suspended only during the war, and again suspended during the recruitment period. The other day we completed work on a conference report which repeals that ceiling, but what the ceiling will be no one knows, because we have never reached that point. So the only permanent figure that we have for the Army is the authorized commissioned strength.

Permanent legislation now fixes the regular Army officer strength at 50,000. That is an increase over the 16,000 in the Regular Army at the time the expansion of the Army began immediately prior to the war. On the other hand, in the Navy we have permanent legislation enacted in the last Congress which fixes the permanent peacetime strength of the Navy at 500,000 and provides the percentage basis on which officers shall be assigned. It is 7 percent for the line of the Navy. Therefore, there is an authorized strength of 35,000 Regular Navy officers. So in approaching this bill we could approach it as it affected the Navy from the standpoint of its over-all strength and the percentage of the officers in the various grades as compared to enlisted men. But when it came to the Army, not knowing what their permanent enlisted strength is going to be, we had to approach it on a percentage distribution of the officer strength.

Comment was made with reference to starting for the first time in the Army the selective promotion system. This is true. Beginning with the promotion to captain hereafter selections boards will be used by the Army in promotions. There is a distinction. It is a modified Navy plan, and it is designed to give the Army some experience with selection before it can hope to equal what the Navy after more than 30 years of experience has accomplished. The Navy started the selection system in 1916.

Under the provisions of this bill the Secretary of War has two alternatives: He can either have selection up or out, or he can have selection of the best fitted, such as the Navy now has, and in that manner there would be forced attrition.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania, or some other Member, asked with reference to promoting men to grades regardless of vacancies. The Army is not on the same basis as the Navy on billets so-called in the various ranks. The Navy is an operational force, whereas the Army serves as a cadre to be expanded rapidly in time of war in order to provide an adequate Army. So this bill provides for overflowing the grades of the officers in the Army. There is plenty of work for them to do. They will serve in the high schools and colleges of the country as instructors to ROTC units; they will serve with the National Guard and Organized Reserve organizations and things of that kind. In addition, modern warfare experimentation and development will require a great many officers.

It should be stressed also that nobody got all he wanted in this bill. The Army and the Navy definitely did not get all

they asked for. As a matter of fact, they got a rather small portion of what they asked for in the higher grades of generals.

The committee took the position that the highest grades authorized in time of war were probably not necessary in time of peace. The five-star admiral rank and five-star general rank, which now adheres to the persons of those holding them, will expire with their person. They will hold that rank when they go off active duty into retirement. Thereafter there will be but four 4-star generals in the Army; there will be three 4-star admirals in the Navy, with one 4-star general as Commandant of the Marine Corps; there will be three 4-star generals for the Army Air Forces. In the other ranks below there has been a comparable reduction in those ranks.

The bill provides for a percentage distribution of officers. I know there has been some talk on the floor and some mail received and some ill-considered editorials in the papers with reference to promotion in the various ranks. The information is available here with reference to those matters, and members of the committee are in a position, I think, to satisfy you on them.

As time has gone on during the weeks we have been considering this bill, and we have been in session practically daily, many different groups have come forward asking special consideration for their group. I doubt if there has been any single group in the Army, with one exception, that has not asked for some special consideration. The group that has not asked special consideration is the fighting man, the man who does the fighting, the fellow who carries the gun in the infantry into the front lines. There has not been any pressure for him. He is the only one who has not been represented before the committee. We have treated them all alike and have rejected many of the special considerations which they asked. That applies to the branches which have come in with requests for special promotion lists and things of that kind.

The bill provides that the chiefs of these services shall come from the general officers of the line. When it came to the committee that was the extent of the provision. In other words, they would be designated by the Secretary of War and would serve at his pleasure. The committee saw fit to provide that they be nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate for a term normally of 4 years while they served in the position of chief of a branch.

I know many of you have received letters about this situation as it existed in the original bill, but I believe that in the bill as we have reported it we have given adequate safeguards with reference to those chiefs of branches. I do not know whether there are those here who care to ask questions about that. The committee is prepared to answer them.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment before I close on the necessity for prompt action on this legislation. We have, of course, about 137,000 officers in the Army, something less than that in the Navy. I do not have the figure at the moment. But unless the Regular Army man knows where he stands, now that we have increased his strength, from 16,000 to 50,000, unless he knows what length of career he is going to have and what he may anticipate with reference to promotion, you are not going to keep your good men. You will keep the man who cannot do as well on the outside or the man who cannot get a job on the outside.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. DREWRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, the man who is desired by private industry, who is receiving attractive offers at all times from private industry, is not going to stay as a professional in your service unless he knows where he is. I therefore hope there will be prompt action both here and in the other body on this legislation.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. I think the gentleman has made a very fine statement and we appreciate it. I would like to ask the gentleman if it is the belief of the committee that the chief of a special service should be selected from the line officers? Should the Judge Advocate General of the United States Army be selected from the infantry or should he be a specialist in the field of law?

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, this bill provides that all of these chiefs shall be chosen from the generals of the line. There is an additional provision following that with reference to the appointment of chiefs of branches. There has never been a law requiring the Judge Advocate General to be a member of the Judge Advocate Corps, there has never been a law requiring the Chief of Engineers to be a member of the engineering corps, and so on. It has always been possible for the President to nominate any man he saw fit in the Army to head these branches. That power is continued here. Within the entire history of the permanent law as it now exists and as carried forward in this legislation, on four occasions the Army has failed to choose the branch chief from that branch. At the present time General Larkin is serving as quartermaster general of the Army. He is an engineering officer. But he came from the European Theater where his primary function was provision for the Army in the front lines, and he has had wide experience in that. General Lowry, recently retired as Chief of Army Finance, was a Coast Artillery officer who went to that position from the position of budget officer of the War Department. General DeWitt some years ago was appointed Quartermaster General, and General Baker, at one time was also appointed Quartermaster General. But the law is not changed in that respect. So, there is no greater danger, in my mind, of an engineer being appointed to head the law department of the Army, or a lawyer appointed to head the engineering department of the Army, than there has been in the past. Of course, he must now come from generals of the line. Heretofore he has generally come from colonels or lieutenant colonels of the branch. That was necessarily true, because those branches could not have generals. When they became colonels their careers were finished, unless they were chosen by the President to serve as branch chiefs or assistant chiefs, when they would be nominated and confirmed for rank of major general or brigadier general, to hold the rank while occupying the position. So, while the branch chiefs will now come from generals of the line, members of the branches may now become generals of the line, something that they have not enjoyed in the past.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. What is the rank given to the chiefs of the branches?

Mr. KILDAY. That is another instance in which we attempted to standardize the organization of the Army and the Navy. It is required by this bill that they be the equivalent of two-star officers; a major general in the Army or a rear admiral in the Navy, and that comparable positions shall hold comparable grades.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Is it not true that our committee strove hard through the hearings to equalize the burdens and the opportunities between the two services as much as was humanly possible?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes, and I think we have done a good job in getting the Army and the Navy together. I know that the large groups of Army and Navy men that worked with us on this matter will always have kindly feelings toward each other and be able to approach each other more easily, because they worked together as a common team.

Mr. SHORT. Not only the Army and the Navy worked together, but the Marine Corps.

Mr. KILDAY. We had all of them with us, and I might say we had them for weeks on end, and at one time I thought we would never finish with it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman I ask for these few minutes to bring out a point or two of my observations from the past in this type of legislation. At the outset I want to express my commendation of the Committee on Armed Services and especially the Subcommittee on Personnel for the progress that they have made in the matter of promotion legislation. I speak with some experience in that field, because I served on this subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs for 8 years. I had my first baptism of fire in 1939 in opposing the Woodring bill and writing the dissenting opinion, or helping to write that opinion with now Senator SPARKMAN to kill off the Woodring bill and

bring in the promotion bill of 1939. That bill which developed in 1939 in place of the Woodring bill was not a perfect bill by any means. It was only calculated to correct as many inequities as possible in the World War hump without doing injustice to the individual officers who had struggled under that hump from the time of World War I.

The bill now before the House is a long step forward in looking to a fair and equitable solution of the promotion problem. In the 1939 consideration of the promotion bill I had a long discussion with the Chief of Staff and his Assistant Chief of Staff G–1 (personnel) regarding a promotion-by-selection provision in the law. At that time it was explained to me that the paper records of the Army were not adequate to maintain a promotion-by-selection system; in other words, the ratings were too irregular and not uniform and complete enough to allow them to go to a promotion-by-selection plan at that time. With that background you can understand why I have taken particular interest in studying the new personnel reports and cards that they have devised for making a promotion-by-selection law workable. The rating given to the individual officer by the various senior officers must be carefully done and rather uniformly done in order to carry out a promotion-by-selection system adequately and fairly. I have studied the new personnel report forms in the Army papers within recent weeks and I am very pleased with the work done by the War Department, of which I am speaking particularly, in building up a better and more workable personnel rating. Through the years ahead I believe it will be possible for the War Department to administer this bill much more fairly than we could under the old rating plan.

There is one subject we tried to cover in our committee report in 1939 a little more fully than you have here, perhaps, in some respects, and that is the matter of elimination of officers. This matter may come up for further consideration in other legislation but that part of the system provided in this bill for the elimination of the unfit is a good start. The success of this bill you are now considering in achieving the elimination of the unfit or unqualified officer personnel will be dependent upon the will or the desire of the War Department officials to eliminate the unfit or the unqualified. I only wish it were possible to include in this legislation some provision requiring them to eliminate a small percentage. My observations between World War I and World War II were that the War Department and the high Army officers did not proceed to eliminate a lot of deadwood that might have been eliminated to the betterment of the service. I will watch their administration of this law with great interest to see whether or not they have improved in that direction.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Was not that failure, a failure which I witnessed myself down through the years, due in large part to the legislation we passed in 1920, which created what was known as the class B Board in the Army? That board would slate a certain number of unqualified officers for retirement on a percentage basis with respect to their salaries. Then we also put in that law a provision to the effect that the officer who had been class B'd could appeal to a board of inquiry, and it was up there that he was sustained.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I agree with the gentleman. I know the gentleman from New York knows what he is talking about, because while I was a lieutenant in the Army the gentleman from New York was chairman of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs and had a very real part in drafting the reorganization legislation following World War I. He rendered outstanding and distinguished service to our Nation. I saw the laws we are here talking about in actual operation, and I know that that appeal provision placing too much emphasis on the individual, forgetting and taking the emphasis completely off the good of the Nation and the adequacy of our national defense, and very nearly disrupted the whole system. The Army and War Department officials worked under a great handicap.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Under that law, the final order which would place an unfit man on the retired list was made by the President of the United States. If the man was turned down by the B Board, and even the court of inquiry, well, a grave and reverend Senator would reach the President of the United States and ask him not to issue the order, and he often succeeded in persuading him.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Yes, and the number eliminated through the machinery set up by law was so tiny that it left the matter of housecleaning the deadwood out of the Army a standing joke for the world to behold. That was the weakest single point in our entire national defense structure between World War I and World War II. I am speaking now about the Army part of it; not the Navy.

I wish it were possible for us to consider requiring the elimination of a percentage of deadwood as a minimum, but I shall not offer it in connection with this bill. I will withhold any such amendment to this bill and observe developments. I know from talks I have had with the General Staff and the War Department that they are very anxious to remedy that defect now. I sincerely hope the Army and War Department leaders will find it possible to kick out the drones and the deadwood in the years to come. This is the weakest point in Army personnel legislation. The one charged with inefficiency and incompetency has had the upper hand. The result has been that all too few of them have been eliminated and we have carried a sizeable load of deadwood. Not a large percentage of officers are drones, but even a relatively small number of them make up a very great burden on our national defense. It is imperative that the drones be eliminated if our Nation is to be adequately protected in this war-torn world.

Referring to another point about this bill, I am glad that you have limited to the World War I hump the automatic promotion on retirement, from lieutenant colonel to colonel, for those who have served more than 28 years. That is a wise provision. That was put in the promotion law of 1939 only to take care of the hump and was not intended as permanent legislation.

We were faced with a terrific problem between World War I and World War II because the officer personnel was so nearly of the same age and so nearly of the same length of military experience. They were all right as lieutenants. I was one of them, and I know. It is fine to have a lot of lieutenants, but 20 years later when I became a member of the Committee on Military Affairs I woke up to the fact that the same young lieutenants of 1917–20 were then of an age when they should have been made majors and lieutenant colonels; and although we did not have enough places to use that many majors and lieutenant colonels, in fairness to the individual officers, they should have been given promotion to those ranks by that time.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman recognizes, however, that under the pending bill we do accelerate promotion.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Yes, indeed.

Mr. SHORT. It has been too slow in the past, but now we make it possible for men of the younger age to reach the rank of admiral and flag grade or general rank.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. In fact, you have done such a good job on that that it is hard for me to adequately express my approval and admiration for the work that you have done.

The promotion provisions that you are now outlining in this bill should be very successful in keeping the Army young, alert, efficient, and effective, and, believe me, we are going into an era now when they must be kept young, alert, efficient, and effective.

Mr. SHORT. It should not be forgotten that we are going to have competition hereafter even between the admirals, and they are going to work to keep their rank.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Yes, indeed. I want to commend you especially for the limitations that you have placed on the grades of general and admiral rank, placing them in real competition to hold their own. That competition is not going to hurt the armed services a bit. It will be a wholesome thing, and it will keep our national defense much more alert.

Mr. SHORT. May I ask the gentleman just one other question. I do so because he has served many years not only in the Army, but in our Committee on Military Affairs. I think he is competent to speak on it. The gentleman realizes that having dealt so long and so hard with the problem of promotion it is exceedingly difficult, if not well nigh impossible, to write any formula that will do exact justice to everybody. When you help Joe, you are likely to hurt John.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I agree very strongly with the gentleman on that.

Mr. SHORT. There are some inescapable inequities in any general formula, and no general formula can possibly take care of them.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I agree with the gentleman very strongly. Again I commend the Committee on Armed Services and the Subcommittee on Personnel especially, for the outstanding work you have done on the proposed legislation now under consideration.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON].

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I recognize that the committee has brought forth a bill which represents a tremendous amount of study and undoubtedly it is an improvement over existing law in many respects. However, I wish to call attention to a particular part of the bill which I believe may lead to trouble in the future. I hope it will not. It has been brought out by questions which have been asked of speakers on the floor in debate already.

I refer to the question of appointments of the chiefs of branches from the general officers holding office in the grade prescribed by law for such officers and which is set forth in section 513 of this bill. In the past, these chiefs of branches, 13 in number, have been appointed more or less rigorously from the particular branches which they were to head. In my home district, we have two particular branches which are peculiarly indigenous to my district in peacetime. That is the branch which has to do with ordnance and the branch which has to do with the Army engineers.

I believe that the records that have been made by these two branches in the past have indicated the success with which the appointments of Chiefs of Branches for Ordnance and for Engineers have been made. I am sorry to see any change made which would permit a major general of the line to go in as either Chief of Engineers or Chief of Ordnance on the basis that he has had duty similar to that required by the assignment he may fill. I think it should be left as it is today, that the Chief of Engineers should, insofar as possible, be selected from the Corps of Engineers and that the Chief of Ordnance should be selected from the Ordnance Department. The requirement that the person appointed must be a major general would open up selection from the entire Army other than the special branches which are excluded, such as the Medical Corps, Dental Corps, and Chaplains. It seems to me it is quite possible that some major general with a distinguished career in other departments, who is on active duty but for whom there is no particular berth, may desire to become the chief of a branch and he can by showing that he has been in a duty similar to either the Engineers or Ordnance, be in position almost to demand appointment to the position of chief of the branch which may be vacant. I would prefer to follow the present system under which the President is entitled to nominate from officers down to the rank of colonel of engineers the Chief of Engineers, and the Chief of Ordnance likewise. Hereafter, if this bill becomes law, he will have to appoint a major general unless he is going to say there is no major general in the Army capable of holding the job. The result will be in normal peacetime operations rather serious, I believe, in some situations involving the engineers, which have largely to do with rivers and harbors and flood-control work on which hundreds of millions of dollars will be expended each year. One would expect in peacetime that the Chief of Engineers would be very familiar with one of those two types of service. He might come from having served as division engineer at the city of New York, the city of Chicago, or New Orleans, or Boston. Under the system followed in the past, such an officer is likely to be a colonel, and even though he may have had the 28 years' experience now required to become Chief of Ordnance, nevertheless he will be barred because he does not hold the rank of major general and cannot therefore be considered for the position. For that reason, therefore, I feel, and so expressed myself in the committee, as being in favor of permitting these two branches at least to be considered separately like the Medical Corps, the Dental Corps, the Veterinary Corps, and the Chaplains Corps.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for three additional minutes.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. I wish to point out and call the gentleman's attention to paragraph (e) on page 27 beginning in line 8, requiring that chiefs of branches and assistants shall be officers who have demonstrated by actual and extended duty in such Army branch or service or in similar duty that he is qualified for such assignment; and, further, whereas the original Army bill contained a provision that these chiefs should be appointed by the Secretary of War and removed by the Secretary of War, our subcommittee reinstated appointment by the President and confirmation by the Senate and that they could be removed only by the President. So we did safeguard it.

Mr. CLASON. I think the subcommittee strengthened the bill greatly by that change. Until that change was made the President and the Senate apparently had no control over such appointments.

There is another department or branch which I feel is very much composed of specialists, and that is the Judge Advocate General's department to which reference has been made. While I have not had the close contact with officers of the Judge Advocate General's department that I have had with Ordnance and Engineers, nevertheless, it is hard for me to believe that it is possible to consider that service as other than a specialized service. Generals in the Army testified that in war time more than 90 percent of the work done by the Judge Advocate General's department has to do with legal questions and that in peace time more than two thirds of the work has to do with legal questions. It seems to me therefore that when you have a service or a branch which is as specialized as the Judge Advocate General's department, and so testified by high ranking officers in the department, that the only fair thing is to set that apart like the Medical Corps as a separate branch.

Certainly if we had relatives in the Army and they were subject to criminal process or court martial, we would feel we would want them to be treated with the highest regard. The only way we can safeguard them is by making the Judge Advocate General's department a department where lawyers shall be appointed who are capable of handling the work, and not unqualified, as has happened during the war, due to the scarcity of lawyers with commissions, where the defense had to be oftentimes conducted by an officer, willing and able undoubtedly but not qualified to conduct a criminal case.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. In the hearings on the Judge Advocate's bill, every single witness suggested a change in the setup and the particular thing they stressed was to have independent officers free from the line command. Is that not so?

Mr. CLASON. That is true as to every witness other than witnesses from the War Department. In other words, the American Bar Association, every one of the various other bar associations, all of the veterans organizations, and every witness who appeared independently of the War Department insisted that the Judge Advocate General's department should be a separate service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, it hardly seems necessary for me to discuss the details of this bill, which have been so fully outlined by the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT]; the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DREWRY]; and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY]. It may not be out of the way for me, however, to make some observations, first, in a general way, then, specifically, having to do with certain provisions of this bill as they were brought about through cooperation between the membership of the Subcommittee on Personnel.

I call attention of the committee and the House to the fact that about 6 months ago, when the reorganization bill became effective, the so-called Armed Services Committee was formed. It consisted of approximately one-half former members of the Naval Affairs Committee and the other half former members of the Military Affairs Committee. The process of integration was not an easy one. But the

committee set about its business. It was as a result of unanimous action of the full Committee on Armed Services that the committee was set up into functional subcommittees, and, as a matter of record, the membership of each subcommittee represented one-half of those from the former Naval Affairs Committee and one-half from the former Military Affairs Committee. At the same time the chairmanships on the majority side of these subcommittees were awarded on the basis of one-half from each of the former service committees, and, similarly speaking, insofar as we were able to accomplish it, the ranking minority members of each subcommittee were chosen in the same way.

Subcommittee No. 1 on Personnel, of which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] is chairman, represents a membership, and obviously for good reason, of the more mature, older members of the committee on both sides of the aisle. In dealing with the important questions of personnel that, of course, is most important.

I would like to say something about the deliberations that went on in arriving at the unanimous opinion of 12 members of this subcommittee—10 members under the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DREWRY]—the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] and myself acting ex officio. The deliberations went on for approximately 3 months. There were some considerations resolved and reconciliations made that had to do most importantly with the high command of the Army, on the ground and in the air; the Navy and the Marine Corps.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to say something about a gentleman who is not here today.

I speak of the gentleman from Georgia, the Honorable CARL VINSON, former chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, during the war and for many years before, an outstanding legislator, naval-wise and otherwise who, as ranking minority member on this committee, from my viewpoint, has probably contributed more than any other single member of the committee or of the House to the successful consolidation of the Armed Services Committee. In particular, referring to the divisions in this bill involving high rank and the decrease in high rank and the unilateral treatment given to branches of the services across the board, he has revealed one of the finest spirits of cooperation legislatively of any Representative with whom I have ever had knowledge. There is a reduction in high rank. The five-star rank goes out. There is a reduction of four stars, and there is equalized treatment for the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps.

So, at this point I wish to compliment the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], who is unavoidably absent because of illness in his family, and to say to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], and to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DREWRY], and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] that in my entire legislative experience I have never seen more consistent consideration, investigation, and successful effort culminate in the unanimous opinion of 12 men, and thereafter report of 33 members of the Armed Services Committee, in an important bill such as this.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered as having been read, and that amendments may be in order to each title and section in chronological order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to title I?

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is long and quite technical and involved, and I do not intend to discuss it, because I have not the familiarity that I should have to discuss it properly. However, I want to discuss a problem which I think besets the military forces from stem to stern, and that is adequate consideration for those in the service who are willing and able to become technically proficient in any specialized line of the service.

I might speak, for example, of those who are engaged in the study and advancement of the art of electronics either in the Navy or the Army, the Air Corps or the Marine Corps. That is a study which cannot be made and completed and fully utilized in a 4-year tour of duty. It is almost a life study. If the Navy and the Army and the Marine Corps are to have within the service the benefit of the best training and the best type of experience to solve these technical problems in the modern art of warfare, they must not only permit these men to continue in their chosen lines of work over a period of years, but they must likewise give them the opportunity for promotion that they do not now share with those who are so-called line officers. Apparently the Army and the Navy and also the Marine Corps believe that unless a man is qualified to lead troops or ships in battle that he is not qualified for high rank. That, of course, is a mistake. It is important that we have a sufficient number of generals qualified to lead troops in battle, but we have got to have men who are qualified to consider the technical problems of the services and to advance the art of the services to the point where the field forces can be technically proficient.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman from California knows that we have made a provision in the pending bill whereby enlisted men in the Navy can rise to the rank of commander as well as warrant officer; perhaps a better opportunity than they ever had before, with some guaranty of security to protect them. We have also provided that highly technically trained men doing scientific work in certain fields are given a chance to become officers.

Mr. HINSHAW. Let me just tell you something. These highly technically proficient gentlemen not only should be given a chance to become officers, they would not even work for your Navy or your Army if they were not officers to start with. They have had better educations and better experience for the most part than anybody who ever graduated from the Naval or Military Academies.

Mr. SHORT. They are officers under the provisions of this bill, and they are given greater protection than officers in the line.

Mr. HINSHAW. I hope they are given ample opportunity to practice their professions, but do not think you can class them as worthy enlisted or warrant personnel.

On yesterday I had occasion to address the Institute of Navigation at its third annual meeting here in Washington, and I discovered, among other things, that the Navy Department, for example, is abandoning its efforts to provide for qualified aerial navigators in the Navy. That is a ridiculous situation, because if any group in the Navy—and it applies to the Army also—should become highly proficient in aerial navigation it should be in those services. They went out and gathered in a lot of young men during this war and trained them to be navigators. Today there is not an aerial navigator left in the naval air service. Just why that should be I do not know, except that the brass hats at the top have decreed that these men should become grounded in all aspects of the naval profession. Hence they are being assigned to sea duty now to work on cruisers, battleships, and so forth, instead of being permitted to continue their work as aerial navigators.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Does the gentleman think an officer of the Navy who is to navigate a ship or an airplane should not be qualified to navigate both?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes, I do; but I do not think the navigation of an airplane has a great deal to do with the navigation of a ship. The navigator of an airplane does what is known as pressure pattern flying. It has nothing to do with sailing a ship, it has nothing to do with a submarine, it has nothing to do with anything on the surface at all. Yet the business of pressure pattern flying and the meteorology that is required for it, the technical knowledge of the electronics that are concerned in it, and a great many other factors, should be preserved in qualified personnel in the Naval Air Forces. For the Navy Department or any department of the Government to say that a man trained in aviation and who becomes proficient in the arts and sciences related to aviation should have to serve on a battleship or submarine in order to obtain experience

to qualify him for rank is the most cockeyed, asinine thing I have ever heard of. Specialists must be encouraged or good men will refuse to specialize. I should like to leave that with the Committee. I hope the brass hats in both services will read my remarks.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in this case I address myself particularly to that part of the bill on page 47 covered by lines 9 to 14, which is the part referred to by the gentleman from Missouri in regard to the relative ranks of brigadier general and rear admiral.

This provision is included in several sections of the act and it is a most remarkable one. The condition which it purports to correct has a long history running back at least to 1917 and probably further.

I have no argument with the desirability of the purposes of the provision. My argument is with the method set forth, in which we are setting out by legislative process to demonstrate that one of the most fundamental algebraic axioms is in error, in which we are trying to out-Einstein Dr. Einstein himself, for in his most exuberant moments he merely sought to prove that something unknown and unbelievable to us could be brought within the comprehension of the human mind, whereas we are endeavoring to demonstrate that things equal to the same thing are not equal to each other, for specifically we are saying, in effect, that the grades of brigadier general and major general are both equal to rear admiral, yet are not the same thing insofar as rank is concerned.

Let us look at this picture in a simple way. There is only one grade of rear admiral recognized by our laws. There are two pay scales in that grade, which for pay purposes is divided into an upper and a lower half. There is only one commission issued for the whole grade. The act of advancing in pay from the lower to the upper half is merely an administrative one accomplished by a letter from proper authority saying, in effect, that the officer under consideration is now in the upper half of the grade and is entitled to the higher pay scale. If we were to consider that the pay scale in any way affects rank or grade we should have ten different ranks in a captain's grade and ten different ranks in a commander's grade.

Quite to the contrary of this situation, the law recognizes two distinct grades or ranks in brigadier generals and major generals. This same situation prevails in nearly all nations and no one that I know of claims for an instant that these two grades are equal. Separate commissions are issued for these two grades.

In this country we are badly afflicted with the idea of keeping up with the Joneses and sometimes also with what might be called a dog-in-the-manger attitude among ourselves. Both of these ideas seem prevalent in current legislation. It seems that the Navy cannot use commodores in its service for certain well-founded reasons concerning the international situation. This fact has been recognized for many years. Therefore, a captain in the Navy is promoted directly to the grade of rear admiral.

It seems that the Army insists on keeping brigadier generals for reasons which it vindicates very satisfactorily, so its colonels are advanced to brigadier generals and its brigadier generals to major generals.

Now, naturally, when a Navy captain is commissioned a rear admiral he takes precedence over all brigadier generals regardless of the date of commission, and that is not pleasing to the generals concerned.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY. I yield, but I hope the gentleman will give me more time.

Mr. SHORT. In all fairness to the gentleman, would he think it should be pleasing to the general?

Mr. BRADLEY. I see no connection whatever with what the general wants. I consider that rank is the question involved.

Mr. SHORT. A captain in the Navy corresponds to a colonel in the Army.

Mr. BRADLEY. That is correct.

Mr. SHORT. When a colonel advances to brigadier general, perhaps at an earlier date than the captain is promoted to rear admiral, still you insist that the rear admiral, even if he receives a rating of the lower half, should take precedence and priority over the brigadier general. I think it is a rank injustice.

Mr. BRADLEY. I think that is the wrong way to look at the situation.

Mr. SHORT. We were willing to correct that, I might say to the gentleman, if the Navy had been willing to reinstate the position of commodore.

Mr. BRADLEY. I see no reason for the Navy adopting the rank of commodore when they have no use for it in the world today.

Mr. SHORT. The Navy wants to eat its cake and have it at the same time.

Mr. BRADLEY. I hope the gentleman will allow me more time because I am going to run short.

To keep up with the Joneses something must be done about this situation. Of course, the Army might drop the grade of brigadier general, but they do not want that solution.

As a consequence, they work out the rather amazing situation we have in this bill—that a brigadier general is equal in rank to the lower half of the rear admirals, while a major general is equal to the upper half of rear admirals, but that the grades of brigadier general and major general are not equal to each other.

It is for that reason that I say we are trying to legislate new principles into mathematics for we are legislatively saying here that things equal to the same thing are not equal to each other.

Now, let us look at the difficulties into which this strange quirk can get us, and into which it will get us. No foreign nation is going to recognize this mental aberation of ours. To foreigners a rear admiral and a major general are of equal grades and a brigadier general is one grade lower. Let us then suppose that we have a rather senior brigadier general ashore in one of our ports and that we have a rear admiral of the lower half in the same port in his flagship. By this legislation, the brigadier general will be senior to the rear admiral. Then, in comes a foreign warship with a rear admiral on board. The foreigner, let us say, has a date of commission more recent than our own rear admiral and so is junior to him in accordance with international custom. The foreign rear admiral, however, is senior to our brigadier general ashore by any principle which can be applied, for I do not believe that this Nation will attempt to negotiate with other states in an effort to change the generally accepted rules of military seniority—and I do not believe it could succeed in changing these rules even if it did attempt to do so.

Now, we have a pretty situation like this: The American brigadier general is senior to the American rear admiral. The American rear admiral is senior to the foreign rear admiral. The foreign rear admiral is senior to the American brigadier general. Round and round and round she goes—just a pinwheel to which there is no answer while we have such a law on our statute books.

And this situation, Mr. Chairman, can and will be duplicated in many lands under many circumstances to our embarrassment and our chagrin. No one outside the United States will understand this peculiar arrangement. Our diplomats will be in difficulties time after time, and, I predict, will soon be begging for a return to international custom.

Mr. Chairman, I am speaking for neither the Army nor the Navy, but only in an effort to show what a difficult and peculiar situation this measure would usher in. I hope that some change to bring this into conformity with common custom throughout the world will be accomplished before this bill becomes a law.

Mr. Chairman, I have a few questions that I would like to ask in view of the fact that we have gone over this bill so rapidly.

I would like to go to page 7 and ask the gentleman from Missouri when this limitation in regard to the number of rear admirals, that is, 150, becomes effective.

Mr. SHORT. We have provided almost a year or a little more than a year, I think it is, until July 1, 1948, for these schedules to go into effect.

Mr. BRADLEY. I believe that to be the case.

Mr. SHORT. We give about a year.

Mr. BRADLEY. The bill is so large that I was unable to ascertain that definitely.

One more question. Will the gentleman from Missouri tell me how this number of 150 was arrived at? This is not merely a useless question, because we are now engaged in writing a bill for the Coast Guard. We have tried to give them the same advantages given to the Navy; so we want to apply the same yardstick.

Mr. SHORT. The number of rear admirals as well as the number of major generals and brigadier generals was arrived at on a percentage basis depending upon the authorized strength of the different services.

Mr. BRADLEY. That is the original number, as I understand it, but how was this 150 arrived at which is obviously

fewer than the number that would be allowed at three-quarters of 1 percent of the total number of officers?

Mr. SHORT. We are not taking three-quarters of 1 percent as the factor, we are taking one-half of 1 percent for both the Army and the Navy. We equalize them.

Mr. BRADLEY. This provision, then, is one-half of 1 percent for permanent legislation?

Mr. SHORT. Yes, for both branches of the service.

Mr. BRADLEY. That is the point I wanted cleared up.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY. I yield.

Mr. KILDAY. I simply wanted to add that we required the departments to submit to us a list of the posts and billets to which they intended to assign these star officers. We went over the list of billets and assignments and where we thought they were not sufficiently important to have a two star man in command we cut him out. We went over it with a great deal of care and consultation with the departments, and where we found a rear admiral commanding an atoll in the Pacific we just eliminated him. We went through it very realistically, evaluated the assignment, and applied the percentage basis also.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY. I think the members of the committee did a very good job. I am not criticizing the arrangements at all, except the fact that throughout all the world there is international recognition of rank. You cannot change it by any law in this one country. We have tried this at other times, like our neutrality law, and our changes simply blow up as they do not gain international recognition. These customs have been established many centuries. If you want to make two grades of rear admirals, all right; somewhat like the British did at one time when they had rear admirals of the blue and rear admirals of the red; but to my mind it is a very foolish thing. It seems to me to be a mental aberration to say that one-half of a grade is equal to a certain thing and the other half of the same grade is equal to another thing, but that the two things are not equal to each other.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I take this time because the gentleman from California in general debate said he had some remarks to make which he hoped would be considered in the other body. I, too, wish to make a few remarks which I hope may be given some consideration in the other body.

I told you a while ago that nobody got everything he asked for in this bill, that the Navy asked for a good many things that they did not get, the Army asked for a good many things we did not give them, and the Marine Corps asked for a good many things we did not give them. Some, of course, are not satisfied, and this is the first evidence now in the consideration of the bill, but I anticipate additional procedure in the other body, hence my remarks now.

In the Army you have one-star, two-star, three-star, four-star, and, for the time being, five-star generals. In the Navy you have two-star, three-star, four-star, and five-star admirals. There is no one-star officer in the Navy comparable to the brigadier general in the Army. There formerly was a rank of great distinction, a rank held by Admiral Dewey, the rank of commodore, which carried one star, but which was abolished about 50 years ago by the Navy. They went to the system of having rear admirals as their first flag rank. It is one of those situations where we insisted that we were going to put the Army and the Navy in comparable position as to comparable ranks. In a place like Honolulu where the Army and the Navy work together, in the past—and in the future, unless this provision is carried—a brigadier general, who has been a brigadier general for several years, serving on the same post with a naval captain, who has been there the whole time, outranks the naval captain, but when the naval captain is promoted to the next higher rank, that of read admiral, he immediately outranks the brigadier general, notwithstanding the general's longer service. We have tried to wipe out inequalities of that kind for they are the things that act as irritants between the Army and the Navy. Our attempt is to eliminate irritants as far as possible. To me it is a very small thing. It seems to me that a man of sufficient stature to serve as admiral in the Navy or general in the Army should not object to the system we have provided here, simply that among themselves they will rank in accordance with the date on which they receive their stars, whether it is one star or two stars; that is, among themselves, they rank from the date of reaching flag or rank. I see no objection to it, but I do see a great deal of objection to the present system under which a naval officer jumps many numbers of Army officers when he first enters flag rank.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I wish to ask the gentleman what provision has been or will be made in the law that will take care of these situations in which our officers found themselves during the war when they were assigned to serve on foreign posts with officers of foreign countries. I believe, particularly in the case of the British Government, they assign a rank to the position rather than assign a man of a given rank to serve in that position and invariably they assign a rank to the position which outranks the officers of ours so assigned.

Mr. KILDAY. On this thing of competing with foreign rank, I have a system which I think would work. We can authorize our flag officers to carry two pockets full of stars. Whenever they are assigned to a station with a foreign officer who always outranks him, he may be authorized to pin on enough stars to outrank the other man.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is the finest suggestion I have heard in a long time.

Mr. KILDAY. You will find in dealing with foreign nations that they will always find a man who outranks whoever you have. I do not care what you call our generals and admirals, they will outrank them. So I think ours had better carry a pocketful of stars to be attached for outranking purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to title II?

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Is an amendment pending?

Mr. BRADLEY. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Is an amendment pending?

The CHAIRMAN. This is a pro forma amendment. The gentleman moved to strike out the last word.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. It is my understanding that the bill was to be considered read and there was to be only the offering of amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a pro forma amendment.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, on page 56, line 21, we find that in the case of a chief of bureau when his term expires "that such a rear admiral serving as a chief of bureau shall upon termination of his tenure as chief of bureau be carried in excess until the next natural vacancy occurs in the grade of rear admiral in the corps concerned."

I should like to ask the gentleman from Missouri exactly what is meant by that? What happens if this officer who is kept in the grade of rear admiral after having left the position of chief of a bureau is not selected by the next selection board? We have here an entirely new provision. We have a provision that, if an officer completes his tour of duty as a chief of a bureau, instead of reverting to his original grade he is to be retained in that grade of rear admiral until the time of the next selection board. I do not know how long that would be, possibly 6 months, possibly 2 years; but anyway he is there. What happens to him if he is not selected by the next board?

Mr. SHORT. It is my understanding the admiral comes up for selection at the end of his period of service of 4 years in grade.

Mr. BRADLEY. I think the gentleman misunderstands me. This provision pertains to those officers who have been selected and who have served as chief of a staff bureau. Under present law when a chief of a bureau's term expires he has two things he can do; one, he can drop back to his original grade and continue on active duty; the other is he may retire while in office, keeping his present grade and 75 percent of the pay of the upper half. But here we have a new provision.

Mr. SHORT. What page?

Mr. BRADLEY. Page 56, lines 17 to 21. It is entirely new in naval law, as far as I know.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Is the gentleman referring to the clause "in excess"?

Mr. BRADLEY. No; I am referring to exactly what this provision says, that upon completion of his term as chief of a bureau he shall retain his grade until the time of the next selection board. What I want to know is what happens to him if he is not selected? Does he go back to his original grade?

Mr. SHORT. He stays in that grade.

Mr. BRADLEY. Then you have set up the Secretary of the Navy as a separate selection board to fill your staff flag grades, because the officer has lost his commission as chief of a bureau. It says "that such a rear admiral serving as a chief of bureau shall upon termination of his tenure as chief of the bureau be carried in excess until the next natural vacancy occurs in the grade of rear admiral in the corps concerned."

Mr. SHORT. That is true, just what it says.

Mr. BRADLEY. When that vacancy occurs, does he get it?

Mr. SHORT. Yes.

Mr. BRADLEY. Then you have bypassed the Selection Board.

Mr. SHORT. He continues until that vacancy occurs.

Mr. BRADLEY. Then you have completely bypassed the Selection Board, because it had nothing to do with his selection or appointment as chief of bureau. That is what I am driving at. You have set the Secretary of the Navy up as a selection board for that purpose.

Mr. SHORT. Of course, the men who have been chiefs of bureau naturally have certain outstanding ability.

Mr. BRADLEY. I am not questioning that for a moment.

Mr. SHORT. Or they would never be made chief.

Mr. BRADLEY. I am not questioning that for a moment; but you have a selection law and you are bypassing it completely, if that is the case.

Perhaps it would be well for me to state specifically my thoughts at this point so any uncertainties may be cleared up before this legislation is passed by both Houses. Under present law, as I understand it, a chief of bureau may be appointed from any grade above lieutenant commander. Upon confirmation by the Senate the officer nominated as chief of bureau attains the rank of rear admiral in the upper half. If this were not the case, then there could be no need of such officer being carried "in excess" after completing his tour of chief of bureau, as he would already have his "number" or place in the list of rear admirals of the corps concerned.

It would seem to me, therefore, from the proviso I have quoted that the intent of the act is merely to allow an ex-chief of bureau to retain his rank of rear admiral until the next natural vacancy. If then selected for that rank, he would attain it permanently. If not selected for that rank, he would automatically revert to his permanent rank in the corps. If the belief of the gentleman from Missouri is correct, as I understand him, in that this officer would automatically fill the vacancy for which he was waiting, then it seems to me that the purpose of the selection board for staff corps of the Navy will be largely defeated, and, in some instances, such, for example, as in the Civil Engineers Corps and the Chaplain Corps, the whole process of selection by selection boards would come to naught, as the natural flow from the position of chief of bureau would supply enough rear admirals to fill their quotas entirely.

I believe this provision should be clarified to an extent that such possible misunderstandings will be eliminated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, I have been lenient with the gentleman from California, but it is utter folly to try to hold open hearings on this sort of a bill on this floor, and that is all the gentleman has been doing. I will not object at this time, but I shall have to hereafter. We have already granted half a dozen additional extensions.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY. By the method under which this bill is being read, and the way we are going through it, we are not giving the members opportunity to make the comments they desire. If I had appreciated the problem which has arisen I would have objected to the bill being considered in this hasty manner. I feel that each Member of the House has a definite right to be heard.

On page 72, lines 9 to 11, I find a peculiar provision. Would somebody explain that to me? Would the gentleman from Missouri explain to me why a medical corps officer is given 1 year advantage over all others?

Mr. SHORT. Because a medical officer spends one more year in training than a lawyer or chaplain. It takes at least 4 years in the medical university after 4 years in college, after finishing high school, for the ordinary medical officer to graduate, and that is the reason we make that allowance of 4 years. We allow the dentists 3 years and the veterinarian 2 years. Of course, the veterinarian does not apply to the Navy.

Mr. BRADLEY. I thank the gentleman. I think we are entitled to that information. That we are entitled to have it spread on the RECORD.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The gentleman from his long service in the Navy and his close contact with this matter I am sure will realize the difficulty that both services are under today in maintaining their medical complement.

Mr. BRADLEY. May I say to the gentleman that I realize it thoroughly, and I do not want to cause any difficulties in the bill.

I have said that I would offer no amendments, but I do think I am entitled to answers to some questions which arise when a bill like this is thrown at us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Are there any amendments to title II?

Are there any amendments to title III?

Are there any amendments to title IV?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTEN:

On page 204, line 22, strike out the word "hereafter."

Page 204, line 24, after the word "may", strike out the words "have been" and insert in lieu thereof the words "hereafter be."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I have made a study of this bill, and certainly I think the gentlemen on both sides of the aisle have done well a painstaking job in its preparation. The bill is very comprehensive and is the result of real study by the committee. Certainly, I do not put myself in a position of being more able than the members of this committee in passing judgment on it, nor could I improve on it, generally speaking.

My attention has been called, however, to section 412 wherein the committee has made an attempt to equalize the retirement pay of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps. It seems that under the law passed in 1925 the Navy and Marine Corps are authorized to and have permitted certain of its personnel to retire with greater retirement pay when they have received commendation of the Secretary of the Navy for meritorious action in combat. Section 412 of this bill attempts to strike out that inequality between the services. I think it is a wholesome action to place the personnel of all services on an equal basis so far as retirement is concerned. The committee, however, recognizing that certain naval and Marine Corps personnel had already retired under the present law saw fit not to make this provision retroactive insofar as those who have already retired are concerned. My amendment attempts to keep section 412 of this bill from being retroactive as to those now in active service but who have brought themselves within the provision of the act of 1925, in that they hold these commendations. In other words, if this provision—section 412 of the bill—is not amended, it means that certain of those in the Navy and Marine Corps, now on active duty, by retiring before this law gets onto the statute books, can get more retirement pay by quitting, even though the Navy and Marine Corps need them and the men want to stay on, than they can if they stay on and serve 4, 6, or 8 years longer. I think my amendment is in line with what the committee intended, and I hope the committee will see fit to accept it.

Mr. SHORT. I wish to congratulate the gentleman from Mississippi for catching a very significant point. I think his amendment is fair and really does carry out what the committee had in mind. Therefore, it is acceptable to the committee.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MITCHELL: Page 204, line 23, strike out "officers of the Navy, Marine Corps" and insert in lieu thereof "officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard"; and on page 205, strike out lines 6 and 7 and insert in lieu thereof: "hereafter granted because of any such commendation: *Provided*, That any officer of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard below the grade of rear admiral or major general who may have been awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor, the Distinguished Service Cross, the Navy Cross, or the Silver Star Medal shall, upon retirement, be placed upon the retired list with the next higher rank or grade than that in which he would otherwise be retired under laws and regulations existing at the time of such retirement, but shall not be granted any increase in pay because of such commendation or such higher rank of grade: *And provided further*, That such officers who have heretofore been or will hereafter be accorded."

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to recognize those who distinguished themselves in actual combat with the enemy when our country was at war. The decorations that are mentioned in my amendment are awarded only to those who distinguished themselves by extraordinary heroism in actual conflict with the enemy. This amendment will not place any additional burden upon the taxpayer, as such advance in rank upon retirement is simply honorary. For instance, a captain in the Army would retire with the rank of major, or a colonel in the Marine Corps would retire as a brigadier general, as the case may be. They still would draw the retired pay of captain or colonel, but would have been accorded the honor of holding the next higher rank on the retired list. Such an honor is little enough recognition for the sacrifices and devotion to country and duty that they must necessarily have given to have been awarded such combat commendation.

I am certain my colleagues on both sides of the House will support this amendment and thereby prove that our memories are not too short lived.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MITCHELL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. This is exactly what has been done with the Regular Navy officers, is it not? The gentleman wants to make this apply to all officers whether they are Regular officers or Reserve officers?

Mr. MITCHELL. All officers who can qualify under the requirements of those four commendations, yes.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MITCHELL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I think my colleague from Indiana has made a very excellent statement and has made a good case. I shall be glad to support his amendment.

Mr. MITCHELL. I thank my colleague.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MITCHELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I hold the same view with regard to the gentleman's amendment. Let me ask him this question, to be sure: These four decorations the gentleman has referred to and which are mentioned in the gentleman's amendment are those given for valor or extraordinary heroism in combat only?

Mr. MITCHELL. Yes.

Mr. KEATING. The only effect of this amendment is that a captain in the Navy, let us say, who had received one of these decorations, when he came to retire would retire with the title of rear admiral but not with the pay of a rear admiral?

Mr. MITCHELL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think the adoption of the amendment one way or another is highly important and I am somewhat embarrassed to speak on it. I recognize the position of many present Representatives in this Congress, new Members, who served with the armed services in this war, in combat, frontline service, and gave valorous service. I speak as a recipient of one of these decorations in World War I. I have never believed that anyone so rewarded should receive any recognition beyond that, for it is my opinion that for every one who receives a Congressional Medal of Honor, a Distinguished Service Cross, a Silver Star, or what not, there are 10 or 20 more who rightfully should receive them.

Any action in the adoption of this amendment is highly preferential to one of many who rendered equally valorous service.

I ask that the amendment be voted down.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. I think perhaps there is much truth in what the gentleman says, but would not the same thing be true of the award of the medal itself?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. That may be true.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. The gentleman would certainly not suggest that we should stop the award of the medal; would he?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. No; I would not, but let it be on no other basis.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KEAN. I would say as a recipient of two of these medals that I agree thoroughly with what the gentleman from New York has said.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MITCHELL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SHORT) there were—ayes 34, noes 47.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, on page 206 of the bill, lines 7 to 10, we find the provision which allows three four-star admirals for the Navy. We listened to a statement some time ago which might lead you to believe that is the same condition which has prevailed for some time. Mr. Chairman, this is not the same condition. There has never been a time that I can recall since 1916 that the Navy has not had four four-star admirals. These have been assigned as commander in chief of the Atlantic, commander in chief of the Pacific, chief of operations, and commander in chief, Asiatic. That assignment has been changed from time to time and indicates the need of flexibility in this measure, but there is no such flexibility here.

In this particular measure, we find one of these four-star grades taken away from the line of the Navy where it has been for more than 30 years and given to the Marine Corps. Now, I have no objection whatever to the Marine Corps having such a grade, but I see no reason why one such position should be taken away from the Navy. I cannot see why the Navy with some 40,000 officers does not need as much rank now as when it had only about ten or twelve thousand officers. But now we are taking one of these four-star officers away from the Navy—actually reducing the number in this rank below prewar figures.

The fact of the matter is, as I see it, that the Navy should have a minimum of five four-star officers, one for Chief of Operations, one for the Atlantic, one for the Pacific, and two that they could send wherever they are needed, probably one to European and one to Asiatic waters. I cannot see any objection to that idea.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY. I yield gladly to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I may say that this matter has been the subject of conferences on the part of Mr. Vinson, myself, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy, and the professional heads of all three services. I want to recall to the gentleman's attention that the Navy has approximately 400,000 men in the service and the Army 1,000,000. The Army is limited in this bill to four four-star generals, with 1,000,000 men; the Navy, including the Marine Corps, four four-star admirals, with only 500,000 men. The committee has agreed to equalize the services and this amendment has the complete approval of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], and the full membership of the personnel subcommittee; and, finally, of the departments themselves.

Mr. BRADLEY. I am glad to have the gentleman give this information. That does not, however, in any way prevent a Member of the House from expressing his own personal opinion, which I am doing now and which I want to see in the RECORD.

One more thing as we go along. I notice that nothing in this legislation

preserves the rank held by our battle commanders during the war in either the Army or the Navy. It is not to be expected that these battle commanders will be given any of these particular posts assigned in the bill. Therefore, all of your battle commanders, the top officers who went out and fought and won the war will stand to be put back in grade on July 1, 1948, if some provision is not passed before that time to assist them.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY. Gladly.

Mr. SHORT. I, of course, appreciate the gentleman's views. As I stated in my original remarks, the committee was very reluctant to reduce the rank of these heroes who contributed so much to winning the war; but the officers of lower grade, the captains, have already taken a reduction. General Dahlquist, who was the War Department's representative in this regard, was a major general and commanded a combat division in Europe, a Texas division. He has already been reduced, after a most excellent record, to brigadier general. He was willing to take his reduction in rank.

I want to repeat what I said earlier this afternoon, if a colonel is reduced to major and a major is reduced to captain, how is it going to hurt to reduce a lieutenant general to a major general, or a vice admiral to an admiral? We feel that the reduction should be all across the board and all down the line.

Mr. BRADLEY. I hope the gentleman will give me some more time.

Mr. SHORT. We certainly will have no objection to the gentleman's asking for more time.

Mr. BRADLEY. I thank the gentleman for his comments; I thank him sincerely. I am merely trying to do what has been done down through the entire history of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY. The same thing has been done right down through the history of the United States from the beginning of our existence as a Nation. It has been done in almost every other country ir the world. The men who have commanded in battle and won the wars have been given some reward.

I am advised informally that there will probably be no objection in many quarters to passing legislation designed to permit these top battle commanders to keep their rank, and so prevent their going on the retired list at a reduced rank for a few weeks or a few months.

I merely want to make this a matter of record so it can be seen that we have not missed the point as we have gone by.

I do not believe the American people are going to see their top battle commanders reduced in grade for a matter of a few months or days before they retire.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not true that many of the commanders on the ships were Reserve officers?

Mr. BRADLEY. That is correct.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. They will be reduced, I suppose, to the rank even of second lieutenant in the Navy.

Mr. BRADLEY. I may say to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that Reserve officers commanded small ships and transports. I do not believe any Reserve officer commanded any of the larger combat ships.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BRADLEY. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman from California feel that the Navy has had a chance to tell its story? I do not feel that before the Expenditures Committee the Navy perhaps has been allowed to speak. I feel that the Navy itself is gagged.

Mr. BRADLEY. I have no feeling that the Navy has been gagged in any way by the Armed Services Committee. I feel they gave them a full hearing. There are differences of opinion, however, as I am showing right now by my comments.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. I am glad to hear my colleague from California make that remark because we really gave the Navy more time than we gave the Army. In fact, I am beginning to suspect that the Navy told us one thing in the committee but has been telling something different on the outside.

Mr. BRADLEY. May I say to the gentleman from Missouri that they do not have to tell me anything about the Navy. I have served in the Navy long enough to know what conditions are and what I think would be right.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The gentleman from California has served many years in the Navy. The Navy had its full share of time before the committee. The gentleman knows that they are for this bill wholeheartedly and they are not in any way backtracking on anything they said in the hearings in my opinion.

Mr. BRADLEY. I appreciate the gentleman's statement. I rather doubt that there is as complete approval as he indicates. As I have said repeatedly, however, I am speaking my own opinions to get them in the RECORD because this is what I believe. I believe every Member of the House should do likewise when he feels such to be advisable.

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLASON: On page 224, line 24, after the comma following the word "corps", insert the words "in the Judge Advocate General Corps"; and on page 225, line 2, after the last comma, insert the words "Judge Advocate General Corps"; and at the end of line 6, add the words "general officers, Judge Advocate General Corps, Regular Army."

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to secure for the Judge Advocate General's Corps recognition the same as the Medical Corps, the Dental Corps, the Veterinary Corps, the Chaplains' Corps and other corps which are considered separate from the Regular Army. The reason I have offered this amendment is because I happen to be a member of a subcommittee which this day reported to the full committee a bill which has to do with the Judge Advocate General's Department. The majority of the committee who were present favored the setting up of the Judge Advocate General's Department as a separate branch of the service.

The reason for that is that the testimony has clearly shown that in wartime more than 90 percent of the business of the Judge Advocate General's Department has to do with legal matters. Line officers are not needed in this Department in any way, shape or manner; therefore, it seems unfortunate that this Department should be mixed up with line officers or officers who have to do with the actual handling of troops or of supplies for the Army. It is purely a legal proposition, just as the Medical Corps has to do with medical matters. There is a little administration in the Medical Corps, similarly in the Judge Advocate General's Department. As I see it, we have had a lot of courts martial. We have had considerable talk by veterans' organizations setting forth that during the course of the war these courts martial were not in all cases properly handled. By setting up the Judge Advocate General's branch as a separate corps I think that we will be meeting the feelings of the leaders of the various veterans' organizations and the various bar associations throughout the country, including the American Bar Association. As a matter of fact, not a single person appeared as a witness, outside of the War Department, either in connection with the Judge Advocate's Department bill or this promotion bill, who favored placing the Judge Advocate General's Department in the Regular Army. Each and every one of these witnesses, outside of the War Department, favored the setting up of the Judge Advocate General's Department as a separate branch. In view of the fact that it has to be solely with legal matters, it is not expected that these officers shall take part in drills or in the handling of troops or have any connection with fighting except under most extraordinary circumstances. It seems to me, therefore, that we ought to follow the viewpoint of the veterans who believe they are entitled to have lawyers in the Judge Advocate General's Department looking out for the enlisted men who are in trouble, also to follow the viewpoint of the bar associations all over the country.

Mr. Chairman, these people testified that they have been working for days

and for months in an attempt to improve the Judge Advocate General's department. To throw aside their views as expressed in countless resolutions and in several documents many pages long which have been submitted to the committee would be an unfortunate act on the part of the House here this afternoon. By setting up the Judge Advocate General's department as a separate branch like the Medical Corps, I cannot see how anyone having to do with the fighting branch of the Army is in any way affected adversely. Certainly if we are going to run the department as it should be, they could not be expected to be assigned to the Judge Advocate General's department.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. Did the report of the committee of the Secretary of War that studied the question of military justice and revision of the Articles of War recommend that the Judge Advocate branch be a separate branch in line with the Medical Corps and the others?

Mr. CLASON. They have taken a position on this promotion bill which wipes out the Judge Advocate General's department as a separate service, but every person who has been connected with the Army in the past and who is now a veteran, and every leading lawyer in the country, as near as I can find out, favors it as a separate branch.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe the gentleman from Massachusetts is quite right in his understanding of the work being done by the Armed Services Committee on the so-called military justice bill. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON] is a member of the subcommittee; the chairman of which is the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON]. I think it is tacitly agreed, at least by myself and also the leadership on the committee, that if and when the War Department-Justice bill is completed and referred by our committee to the House and acted upon, and if it sets up a separate JAG department, the promotion bill as finally acted upon in the Senate will be changed accordingly. This is no time to bring the matter up from the subcommittee, which has not been approved by the full committee on the floor of the House, and expect the House to alter a bill upon which the full committee has not finally acted.

I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts I am wholly in sympathy with everything that has been done in the subcommittee insofar as reforming the procedure of military justice and what he said about the Judge Advocate's department. If and when the military-justice bill reaches the floor and is acted upon favorably by the House and the Senate, there is a proper way and a very easy way to bring about a correction, but this is definitely not the time to attempt to do it, and the motion should be defeated.

Mr. CLASON. In view of the statement made by my very able chairman, for whom I have the very highest respect, and if the membership is willing, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

Mr. GOFF. I object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have on the Clerk's desk an amendment providing for the creation of a separate promotion list for the Judge Advocate General's department, but if I may have the time to inquire of the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, perhaps I shall not offer it.

Mr. Chairman, in continuation of the colloquy we just had on the last amendment presented before it was voted on, the gentleman stated that the committee had in mind amending the promotion bill that we have before the House today as soon as the report of the subcommittee studying military justice had submittted its report to the main committee; is that correct?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The military justice bill has not been reported by the subcommittee to the full committee of the Armed Services as yet, and therefore, has not been reported to the House. It is presumed that some day the military-justice bill will be acted upon by the House. It is quite apparent that the promotion bill will not be acted upon by the Senate for quite a while, but in any event the Army military-justice bill can be written amending the promotion bill, if necessary, or the promotion bill in the Senate, or when it is agreed upon in conference, can be further amended accepting such amendments as may be necessary on the basis of the Army military court martial.

Mr. GOFF. Does the gentleman expect the military-justice bill to be reported out this session?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I am informed that they have agreed upon a bill today. I might say they have been working on it for 4 months, and I am heartily in sympathy with everything that has been done, and so is a large majority of the membership of the House. The gentleman might direct his question to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], who is the ranking minority Member of that committee.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, that subcommittee was in session this morning and did complete the bill, and we will be able to report it to the full committee at its next meeting which I expect will be next Tuesday, if not before. I do not know, of course, what action the full committee may take on it. The subcommittee has written the bill and completed its work.

Mr. GOFF. Then I take it that the promotion bill will be acted upon this session by the Senate.

Mr. KILDAY. I would not attempt to predict what action the other body might take, due to recent experience. If both of these bills go through, the last to go through could certainly amend the one that went through ahead of it.

Mr. GOFF. Mr. Chairman, under these circumstances I shall not offer my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title V? If not, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. GRAHAM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3830) to provide for the promotion and elimination of officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 253, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Comittee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARINE CORPS

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1371) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to appoint, for supply duty only, officers of the line of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, lines 3 and 4, after "permanent", insert "or temporary."

Page 2, line 8, after "permanent", insert "or temporary."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OLYMPIC GAMES

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2276) to authorize the Secretary of War to pay certain expenses incident to training, attendance, and participation of personnel of the Army of the United States in the seventh winter sports Olympic games and the fourteenth Olympic games and for future Olympic games, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That the Secretary of War and

the Secretary of the Navy are hereby authorized to direct the training and attendance of personnel of the Army of the United States and of the naval service, respectively, as participants in the seventh winter sports Olympic games and the fourteenth Olympic games and future Olympic games: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War is further authorized to direct the training and attendance of animals of the Army of the United States for such games: *Provided further*, That the expenses in amounts not to exceed $75,000 for the Army and $50,000 for the Navy, incident to the training, attendance, and participation in the seventh winter sports Olympic games and the fourteenth Olympic games, including the use of such supplies, material, and equipment as in the opinion of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, respectively, may be necessary, may be charged to the appropriations for the support of the Army and appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service, respectively, for the fiscal years 1948 and 1949: *And provided further*, That applicable allowances which are or may be fixed by law or regulations for participation in other military activities shall not be exceeded."

Amend the title so as to read as follows: "An act to authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to pay certain expenses incident to training, attendance, and participation of personnel of the Army of the United States and of the naval service, respectively, in the seventh winter sports Olympic games and the fourteenth Olympic games and for future Olympic games."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NAVAL PLANTATIONS

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1358) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the management and operation of naval plantations, outside the continental United States," approved June 28, 1944, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "section 2 of."

Page 1, after line 6, insert:

"SEC. 1. Hereafter the appropriations for the subsistence of Army and Navy personnel, respectively, shall be available for any and all expenditures necessary in the management, operation, maintenance, and improvement of any plantation or farm, on land subject to Army or Navy jurisdiction outside of the continental United States, for the purpose of furnishing fresh fruits and vegetables to the armed forces of the United States: *Provided*, That equipment, material, and supplies required therein may be purchased without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, and other laws applicable to purchases by governmental agencies: *Provided further*, That only American nationals, employees of the United States, shall be entitled to benefits under the civil-service laws and other laws of the United States relating to the employment, work, compensation, rights, benefits, or obligations of civilian employees of the United States: *Provided further*, That surplus production over the amount furnished, or sold to the armed forces of the United States and to civilians serving with the armed forces may only be sold outside the continental limits of the United States: *And provided further*, That no land shall be acquired under this authorization."

Page 2, line 3, after "end", insert "the Secretary of War, with respect to Army affairs, and."

Page 2, line 3, after "Navy", insert ", with respect to Navy affairs."

Page 2, line 8, strike out "naval or" and insert "Army, Navy, or."

Page 2, line 9, after "of", insert "the Secretary of War, in regard to Army matters, and."

Page 2, line 10, after "Navy", insert ", in regard to Navy matters."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLOTHING ALLOWANCE—MARINE CORPS

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1375) to further amend section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, so as to provide for the clothing allowance of enlisted men of the Marine Corps and Marine Corps Reserve, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 8, after "the", where it occurs the first time, insert "Army."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to further amend section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, so as to provide for the clothing allowance of enlisted men of the Army, Marine Corps, and Marine Corps Reserve."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AN INTERSTATE PROGRAM FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE COLUMBIA RIVER

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, today, in the city of Walla Walla, Wash., a hearing is being held by the Columbia Basin Inter-Agency Committee to consider arguments concerning a proposal from the Secretary of the Interior to impose a 10-year moratorium on the construction of any new dams on the lower reaches of the Columbia and Snake Rivers.

This proposal, made at the behest of certain interests in the Northwest and objected to violently by certain other interests, constitutes a major crisis in the long series of events which have marked the steady but uncoordinated development of that region of our Nation comprising the drainage area of the Columbia River system. The decision on that proposal, whether it be affirmed, or rejected, or modified, may well be the key to the future unity or embittered separation of the forces concerned with developing the resources of the Columbia region.

It is for that reason that I have chosen this date to introduce into this Eightieth Congress a bill to create a Columbia Interstate Commission, a corporation under which the chosen representatives of the four Pacific Northwest States and the Federal Government would enter into a compact to undertake the planning, promotion, and operation of the orderly, progressive development of the Columbia River region.

I consider this to be the logical time for the residents of the Pacific Northwest States to unite on a firm basis by joining their representative State governments and their native private enterprise with the several agencies of the Federal Government and to assume command of their own destiny. I earnestly ask that the Members of this Congress and all parties concerned give full consideration and study to this proposal before coming to any judgment upon it and that they move toward its enactment prior to the adoption of such a far-reaching decision as the proposed 10-year moratorium on new lower Columbia construction.

NOT AN AUTHORITY

The purpose of creating the Columbia Interstate Commission is to provide a vehicle for the orderly development of the tremendous resources with which this region has been blessed, to give voice to the residents of the Pacific Northwest States in determining the policies directing that development, to protect and extend the benefits of that development to the growth of the true native private enterprise in that area, and to guarantee to the Federal Government an orderly program for the liquidation of the tremendous investments it has made and is being asked to make in the Northwest.

This is not a "valley authority" bill. It does not contemplate the setting up of an autocratic government agency empowered to plan and regulate the economic life of the entire region. It does not present a blueprint for full-scale development.

The bill does recognize the need for a statutorily recognized interstate agency, responsible to the will of the people residing in the Columbia River region and empowered to develop a program and policy consistent with the needs and desires of the people themselves. It attempts to locate the necessary authority involved as closely to the people of that area as is constitutionally possible.

INTERSTATE PROBLEM

The Columbia River is both an interstate and an international stream. With its 73 tributaries, it drains large areas of western Montana, Wyoming, nearly all of Idaho, part of British Columbia, and well over 50 percent of both Oregon and Washington.

Those familiar with the potentialities and characteristics of this river realize that any construction, regulation, or other action taken at any point along its course has a definite and related effect upon the entire waterway. For that reason, no one State nor any portion of any State can be allowed to exercise an arbitrary control over its flow. In addition, the water-storage and watershed-protection features in the higher levels are

necessary components of the power, flood-control, and navigation systems in the broad reaches below.

This problem has long been recognized. The Governors of the States affected, several years ago, saw fit to get together and discuss their mutual problems and their mutual benefits in the Columbia. This present bill is designed to give them a practical share in the solution of those problems and the determination of the policies to be followed regarding development of their several States.

A second move in the proper direction was the formation of all Federal agencies concerned with resources development into the Columbia Basin Inter-Agency Committee. While this move tended to achieve a coordination of effort between the existing Federal agencies, it has been notably and severely lacking in that it retained absolute policy control in the hands of those agencies and did not allow practical participation in policy-making on the part of the residents of the region affected.

The effect of the CIC bill would be to bridge the gap left by those two moves.

NEED MORE LOCAL CONTROL

During the past year or so, there has been a tendency on the part of those who fear the dangers of a collectivized valley authority for the Columbia region to protest that they favor entrusting the development of the river to "existing agencies."

But what are these "existing agencies" that they should be so jealously protected in their position?

Do they represent the people who live in the Columbia region?

Are they responsible to the residents of the Columbia drainage area?

I should like to remind those who speak in dread of collectivization that for 119 years the Federal jurisdiction over the rivers of this Nation has increased—and the "existing agencies" are the arms of that jurisdiction.

As the courts now interpret the commerce clause in the Federal Constitution, our central Government has final authority over a river system from the ocean to the upper end of the last brook in any watershed. That clause simply provides: "To regulate commerce with foreign nations, among the several States and with the Indian tribes."

We, today, find ourselves engulfed in Federal jurisdiction—yet those who claim to fear that very condition most are today its paradoxical defenders.

I believe that we should pause and review what has been done. We should take stock lest the juggernaut of our own creation crush valuable units of local and State government which we should cherish and protect.

I do not by any means oppose the proper part the Federal Government must play in any river development. There are provinces of authority which must be reserved to the Federal jurisdiction. What I here advocate is the additional playing of the full part of the peoples of the States themselves in this picture, for ours is still a Union of States.

PROTECTS PRIVATE INDUSTRY

The CIC bill provides for the utilization of every Federal agency in the development of reclamation, navigation, flood control, pollution control and all of the other benefits which flow from our intelligent development of the Columbia. I have also tried to take full advantage of the existing agencies within the States, as, for instance, the Columbia Basin Commission in the State of Washington which for years has served as a model for intelligent State participation in natural-resource development.

The bill calls for creation of a Federal Corporation, with headquarters located in the region and properly respecting the existence and rights of the States themselves. It also provides for making the benefits of resource-development available to private industry and the protection of existing private industry in the region.

The CIC would consist of a five-man Commission, appointed by the President, four of whose members would be nominated by the governors of the States of Washington, Idaho, Oregon, and Montana. The fifth member would be appointed at large. In addition, there would be an advisory council of 33, including the governors of the four States, plus the directors of conservation and development of those four States and the State of Wyoming. The Columbia system drains only a small portion of Wyoming, hence its representation is reduced.

The remaining members of the Advisory Council would be six additional members from each of the four States. The suggestion is that Oregon, Idaho, and Montana, should form Columbia Basin commissions, on a nonpartisan basis, similar to that already existing in Washington, and that the members of these commissions would be the representatives on the Advisory Council.

This Advisory Council would have basic control over the determination of policies and programs to be presented to Congress for approval, the payment of debts and of moneys in lieu of taxes to State and local governments, the priority relationship of projects and the like.

SELF-SUPPORTING

It is contemplated that all projects to be undertaken by the CIC will be self-liquidating. The commission would act as an independent corporation under the Federal Administration and would be required to reimburse the United States Treasury for every loan or appropriation made to it by the Federal Government.

There are two major stages in the development of a river system. The first is the planning and construction of the physical properties. This is the stage of decision, of which today's meeting at Walla Walla in the State of Washington is a vital part. The second is the stage of operation which begins after the projects are built. In the case of the Columbia, we have already entered upon some phases of the second stage while still in the midst of the first.

During both of these stages, however, it is tremendously important that the united or conflicting interests of the people living in the affected area be given just consideration. During the first stage, major sacrifices must be made by some persons in order to clear the way for a new project. In the second stage, continued watch must be maintained that the original purposes of the development are achieved, that the Federal investment is reimbursed to the Treasury and that the project is not subjected to controls or manipulation contrary to the best interests of the people.

FISHERIES RIGHTS

As an example, the fundamental reason for the proposed moratorium on new dam construction being considered today at Walla Walla is the demand on the part of the fishing industry that it be given sufficient time to rehabilitate the multimillion dollar salmon spawning grounds to new downstream locations. The interests of the fishing industry certainly are valid and it has a right to its proper measure of protection. On the other hand, if the majority of the people of the region are determined to have other features of their one great natural resource, the Columbia, developed, there must be provision made that both ends, if at all possible, can be achieved.

This is a perfect example, in my estimation, of the kind of Solomon's justice which must be exercised in determining the progress of a river program. The capitalized value of the Columbia fishing industry amounts to more than $100,000,000 and accounts for an annual operation of from seven to ten million dollars, not to mention the number of persons dependent on it for their livelihood. While those who desire the early completion of navigation and power improvements on the lower Columbia and Snake Rivers have much in their favor, this investment in the fishing industry constitutes a value which should not lightly be discarded.

We have made strides of progress in this line. Through cooperation of many agencies and with private efforts, much has been learned and much accomplished in the perfection of fish ladders, transplantation of spawning grounds, clearing of downstream beds, pollution control, and other measures.

But we have not yet solved the question of how long navigation must wait for adequate solution of these problems.

Who are better qualified to make such an all-important decision—the appointed officials of the Federal administrative agencies at the Nation's Capital or the duly-designated representatives of the people who live in the Columbia region?

CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW

There is another important purpose in the creation of a Columbia Interstate Commission. Today, there are some 17 different Government agencies concerned with the development of the Columbia River. Each of these must represent itself separately before the Congress of the United States. Many of them appear before several different committees of the Houses of Congress.

Passage of this bill would make it possible for the Members of Congress to review the entire question of Columbia River development through one legislative committee, thereby gaining a full and accurate picture of the work done, the policies followed, the financial operations, and the relationship of this inte-

grated activity to the entire governmental structure.

This improvement would be noted also in the representation before Congress by the several private associations which maintain interests in resource development.

Our experiences in this present session have amply demonstrated the amount of misinformation about the various phases of developmental activity which have been injected into the hearings of the several legislative committees by many of these private organizations, each guarding its own interest and often attempting to sabotage others.

ATOMIC ENERGY

A prime example of this experience is one of the arguments used by the representatives of the fishing industry in calling for the 10-year moratorium. Using a number of scientific articles written for popular consumption in national magazines as the basis of their contention, the fisheries people have stated that after 10 years it would be senseless to build any further dams across the Columbia for the purpose of generating electric power "because everybody knows that before the 10-year period is over, atomic energy will be producing electricity more cheaply than either steam or hydroelectric plants."

Because of the far-reaching implications of this argument, I took the trouble last week to ask the highest authority on the subject in this country, the members of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, whether there was any possibility of having the feasibility or pay-out ability or other values of the proposed hydroelectric projects on the Columbia River diminished or nullified by reason of progress in the development of electric power through atomic energy.

The answer I received from the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission was as follows:

UNITED STATES
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., June 19, 1947.

House of Representatives,
Hon. WALT HORAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HORAN: Your letter of June 11 has been received and studied by the members of the Atomic Energy Commission. The questions which you have raised about the time required for the development of atomic power to the point where it is a major competitor with other sources of electrical power are difficult to answer in detail.

We have no doubt that the long-range future of atomic power is bright but believe the process will in general be one of gradually supplementing rather than replacing other means of generating electrical power.

It is very likely that the first commercial installations for atomic power will be in locations with inadequate access to coal and economical water power.

As to the particular question you put, while it is not prudent to make firm predictions about the rate of development in an industry which is so new, we believe it unlikely that atomic power presents any serious question of rendering obsolete Columbia River power within the predictable future.

Sincerely yours,
DAVID E. LILIENTHAL,
Chairman.

In addition to the statements contained in the above letter, I am advised on responsible authority which I believe to be competent, that it is extremely doubtful, in the light of present knowledge, whether the production of electric energy through the application of atomic power will be made feasible and economical enough to compete with Columbia hydropower within the next 25 years.

Indeed, one of the most important men concerned with the study and application of atomic energy has stated that atomically generated electric power probably never will become feasibly anything more than a supplement to present methods of generation. In spite of this, irresponsible persons even in the northwest have been not above using such specious arguments before the committees of Congress to further their ends in frustration of the common good.

Clearly, then, there is a need for the establishment of a responsible agency to sift through the maze of such conflicting statements and present an official, authoritative case for orderly Northwest development to the Senators and Representatives of the Nation here in Washington.

INTERIM PROPOSALS

In summing up all these considerations, I am today asking the Congress and the people of the United States to look upon this proposal as a restatement of the proper relationship of an American Government and its people as applied to the development of river resources in general and to the Columbia River region in particular.

Pending consideration of this bill, I am hereby asking the Columbia Basin Inter-Agency Committee, in its meeting at Walla Walla, to study the following proposals:

First. First priority should be given to continued progress and early completion of those phases of Columbia-region development which have already been started, including installation of additional generators at Grand Coulee Dam, construction of the Columbia Basin irrigation project, Hungry Horse Dam, McNary Dam, the upstream developments in Idaho and Montana, and the Detroit project in Oregon.

Second. Every facility at the disposal of the Federal and State governments of the States concerned and every effort of private enterprise should be directed toward the relocation of the salmon spawning grounds, the improvement of downstream fishways, and such other measures as will best protect the fishing industry from the effects of future dam construction.

Third. Such proceedings as may be necessary should be instituted through the Office of Indian Affairs to make reasonable and just settlement with the Indians replacing the terms of the treaties regarding fishing rights, whereby those treaties no longer would constitute a bar to future river development.

Fourth. The proposed moratorium on construction of new dams across the Columbia below its confluence with the Okanogan River and on the Snake below its juncture with the Salmon should be placed in effect for a period of not more than 2 years from this date, pending action on the part of the Congress on the proposed creation of a Columbia Interstate Commission, and, after the expiration of that time, if such Commission has been created and is in operation, it should become the responsibility of the Commission, subject to the approval of the Congress, to determine whether the moratorium should be prolonged or lifted. If the Congress has failed to create the CIC, the Inter-Agency Committee shall present to the Congress all information obtained as a result of its surveys and hearings and the decision shall be left with the Congress.

It is my belief that these proposals constitute the best possible compromise in the interests of the general public of the Pacific Northwest.

PROFIT BY EXPERIENCE

This Nation of ours is a Union of States. Each of those States is composed of people—people who have vital interests in every proposal and every decision that is made regarding the area in which they live. I consider it to be in the American tradition that those people resident in an area retain the maximum degree of control over the policies and government of their native region.

Our National Government, now at the urging of this Congress going through the painful process of decentralization to local controls after a hectic few years of rigid, centralized, and bureaucratic administration, can well profit by fully recognizing the existence of States as such and by working with them as partners in interstate compacts such as the CIC.

During the recent war the people of the Northwest experienced the benefits of a working partnership on the part of private industry, the local and State authorities, and the Federal Government when they banded together all of their electrical generation and distribution facilities into the Northwest power pool. This partnership successfully carried the tremendous loads of the war effort in the Pacific Northwest and at the same time demonstrated that private industry and Government can work side by side, provided the proper ground rules are laid down and the rightful interests of each are safeguarded.

It was the war that served to point out the crucial role the Columbia River could play in the destiny of all of us. It was the war that showed us how to work together to our mutual benefit without the loss of those traditional concepts which make up the American way of doing things.

Let us now strive to accept those lessons in time of peace and utilize them as the basis for a means of cooperation among friends and neighbors that will glorify the progress of our future years.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, I advocate greater support and a better public understanding of the fine work which is being done by our United States Maritime Commission. This body is often

accused of too strenuous agitation in behalf of merchant marine development, and I fear that for that reason its recommendations are often discounted. My observance, however, is that it is a highly skilled and competent agency, which did an excellent war job under tremendous difficulties, and is now in the process of perfecting a compact and efficient postwar organization. It is actually the only Government spokesman for our merchant marine, and is the only available advocate for it in high places. In my humble opinion, the importance of the merchant marine, and our maritime future as a Nation warrants a Cabinet post for this subject alone.

A part of my congressional district lies in the great port of Baltimore, which is now the second largest in volume of foreign commerce handled. Observing the expanding operations of that international harbor, and noting the dependency of a city of a million people on the activities of its port, has given me a new appreciation of the vital importance of a healthy and prosperous American merchant marine to the future of our national economy; in fact, its national significance perhaps is even greater than its local and area importance.

I wish time would permit me to fully outline the facilities and advantages of the port of Baltimore, for, I feel that it stands out as a great symbol of our national dependency on shipping and on merchant marine stability and progress. In addition to the volume of business handled, it is one of the world's leading ship construction and repair centers, and many of the vast fleet of ships which annually visit Baltimore take advantage of this modern equipment, and the efficiency and economy with which it is operated. Besides 10 private shipbuilding and repair plants there is the United States Coast Guard yard at Curtis Bay, where extensive and efficient repair work and construction of small craft has been a major endeavor for many years.

This great shipbuilding and repair industry at Baltimore, as well as in our other ports, is threatened with extinction unless our country embarks at once on an aggressive program of merchant-marine development. Unless and until our Government clarifies its merchant-marine program, it is likely that by next year there will be no merchant shipbuilding. Men with experience and skills will be diverted into other activities, and when we have need for them in another emergency there may not even be a nucleus around which a shipbuilding program could be built.

A port means a great deal to the economy and industry of the city and surrounding area; and by the same standards the American merchant marine means a great deal to America.

The world has seen many changes, and the most consistent have been in trade and warfare. In peace as well as war, the outstanding nation in every age has been the one with the biggest and most effective battle and commercial fleet. From the early Greek legends, we know that the Cretans lost the sea lanes in a great naval disaster in about 1400 B. C., and from that time down through the ages, through the Phoenicians, the Carthagenians, the Romans, Persians, Greeks, and through the history of Venice, Turkey, Portugal, Spain, the Dutch, and the French—as each of these nations lost its foothold in the sea lanes, it lost its place in the sun. Through no aggressive steps on our part, we now occupy that place in the sun, and with that comes many responsibilities we might heretofore have ignored or at best quibbled over. An adequate merchant-marine fleet is one of these responsibilities, if we are to safeguard and keep sound this Nation of ours, and fulfill our obligations toward keeping world peace.

We have found it necessary to advance foreign loans. This is one step in our pursuit for world peace; our Army and Navy constitute another factor; and our merchant marine fleet—which in peace or war cannot be separated from our Navy—not only helps to supply and advance our own economy, but ties in with the general over-all picture of our foreign policy.

We must not, in justice to our own economy and world peace, permit our merchant marine to deteriorate and disintegrate as it did after the First World War, while we are indirectly subsidizing with our money through these foreign loans, the construction and operation of our competitors' merchant ships, most of which are completely subsidized.

We must have a stable program and stick to it, and, not as we have been doing in the past, treat our merchant marine as a favorite son during emergencies and as a step-child in between. At the beginning of the First World War shipbuilding was at such a low ebb that the vast bulk of our men and munitions had to be transported in foreign ships. That emergency produced a spurt of activity, followed by a negative interest, which dwindled to such an extent as to make us trail our competitors in shipping. In spite of our tremendous output and unequaled record attained during the last war, the immediate outlook for shipbuilding in this country is at present more ominous than at any time since before the outbreak of World War I.

These uncertainties and constant changes of policies have had their effects upon the industry, and, to my mind, it is vital that the Congress adopt a sound, coordinated, long-range ship-building program. If the policy is stabilized, fluctuation in the industry would be eliminated; technical staffs, vital to the development of marine architecture and marine engineering, would be preserved; and the employment level of merchant seamen would become more stable. Stabilized employment is important to those many merchantmen who follow the seas as a livelihood, and continued, uninterrupted movement of ships is necessary to the over-all industry in this highly competitive field.

America's leadership on the seas, achieved during the recent war, is rapidly disappearing. Our merchant marine of 56,000,000 tons at the end of the recent war is now down to about thirty million, and decreasing fast. A report, which reached me not long ago, showed that only 64 new ships are under construction in this country, with 14 of them destined for foreign owners. At the same time, Great Britain was building 454 new ships, Holland 91, Italy 87, and Sweden 66, which, as above stated, are being indirectly subsidized with our foreign loans.

The United States still leads the merchant-marine parade with about 30,000,000 gross tons of shipping now in service, compared with the 8,000,000 gross tons we had in 1939. But I am informed that over half of the more than 3,000 ships in our fleet are due to be laid up with 2 years, at the present rate of decline. Also, the percentage of American goods carried on American ships is rapidly declining. I believe our ships now carry about 75 percent of United States exports and about 70 percent of our imports, but at the way things are going now the prospect is that we will be carrying well below the 50 percent of exports and imports within the next couple of years.

I am afraid that United States shipping concerns see little hope of holding their own against lower-cost merchant fleets of other nations, either in freight or passenger carriage, without substantial Government aid. Operating costs are often 100 percent or more above those of the ships of other nations. The costs of building and operating American ships have tripled, in many cases, which those of foreign fleets have become perceptibly less.

I know we do not like the word "subsidy" in this country, but I see no other course for us to pursue than to give such Federal aid in both construction and operation that will at least let us come within striking distance of foreign competition. It is a form of national insurance, in that it would protect our own national economy and security, as well as world peace; and it must be considered as such rather than the hand-out which the word always seems to imply to Americans.

In the black picture which faces American shipyards today, one of the most encouraging signs is the appointment by the President of the Advisory Committee for it indicates at least the awakening of a national recognition of the importance of this subject to America's welfare.

I was impressed by the statement submitted on May 21st last to this Advisory Committee by Mr. Frazier A. Bailey, the new president of the National Federation of American Shipping, which represents about 90 percent of deep-water American passenger and cargo lines. His views reflect the opinions of practical men, and I am inclined to go along with his recommendation that our construction differential be frozen at the present legal maximum of 50 percent, and that it be extended to American ships in both foreign and domestic trades. The latter extension seems to me to be vital because of the requirements of national security in making available military and naval auxiliaries, as well as the preservation of the Nation's shipbuilding facilities, organizations and craftsmen.

It seems to me high time that the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 should be clarified and strengthened.

Congress should give attention to the statement of June 1, 1947, by the National Foreign Trade Council, which pointed out that over a 9-year period total subsidies paid to shipping lines was less than the Government outlay in support of such items as coffee and butter during one recent year. This organization showed conclusively that a sound merchant marine is a necessity in the promotion of foreign trade as it is to the national defense; and in giving its support to Government merchant marine subsidies effectively disposed of the theory that foreign-flag lines ought to be allowed to carry more American goods in order to permit their countries to earn more dollars to spend in this country. In denying the contention that present shipping rates are too high, the council also showed that the rates of one American line increased only 60 percent from January 1, 1926, to December 31, 1946, while operating costs had risen 213 percent. Such statements should not be interpreted as depreciation of the value of foreign shipping to our ports and to our foreign trade. These foreign-owned and operated ships are welcome visitors to our shores, and play a substantial part in furthering our maritime activity. However, they do indicate very clearly the main point at issue: That we must have a self-sufficient and independent merchant marine of our own if we are to be adequately protected in respect to our national defense and world trade. Opportunity is knocking at our door, but the raps are getting fainter. This is the zero hour for the American merchant marine. Never before has our opportunity been so great to prevent a catastrophy and to assure an adequate merchant marine future, in which American ships will have their just share of world-wide commerce, and maintain their rightful and dominant position on the trade routes of the seas.

H. R. 3647

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order tomorrow to take up for consideration the bill (H. R. 3647) with 1 hour of general debate and the bill to be then read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

INTERNATIONAL REFUGEE ORGANIZATION

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 225, which makes in order House Joint Resolution 207, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 207, providing for membership and participation by the United States in the International Refugee Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] and now yield myself such time as may be necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I find myself in an anomalous position on this question in asking the House to approve a rule on a bill about which I am quite doubtful. I discussed the provisions of this measure at some length with the chairman of the subcommittee which reported it, our good friend and colleague [Mr. VORYS] and apparently I did not understand at the time I discussed it with him just what the bill did.

However, yesterday and this morning I made further inquiry into the bill and the report of the committee and I have made some other investigations.

Briefly, this resolution makes in order House Resolution 207, reported by the Foreign Affairs Committee. House Resolution 207 authorizes the United States to join a new international organization, which is to take the place of UNRRA when that wholly discredited organization dies on June 30, 1947.

House Resolution 207 authorizes the appropriation of $73,500,000 as the United States contribution, toward the operation of this new world organization, and it is intended to cover those countries where there are some 1,000,000 displaced persons; namely, in Austria, Germany, and Italy.

As I understand the report of the committee the same organization, the same set-up that is now administering the funds appropriated to UNRRA will take over and administer this with the exception that the United States will appoint a director.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I am very happy to yield to my distinguished friend from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. If the gentleman will read the report and the hearings, the gentleman will find that UNRRA is not going to run this. UNRRA goes out of existence in 5 days, unwept, unhonored, and unsung. While some of the UNRRA personnel will have to be used in these camps, the direction of this is not coming from UNRRA.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. The gentleman did not correct a thing I said. In fact, I stated precisely what the gentleman said, that the old UNRRA personnel now in the countries where these funds are to be expended will be used by the new organization to administer the funds requested here. The exception, as I just said, is that a new director will be named.

Here we are considering another authorization for $73,500,000 for the purpose of feeding the displaced persons in these several countries.

In the War Department budget for 1947 there is an item of $725,000,000 for the purpose of feeding those people within the zones we occupy, that is, Austria, Germany, Korea, Italy, and Japan.

A break-down of those figures as I got them from the Appropriations Committee is as follows: The amount allocated for the feeding of the people in Germany, and that includes the displaced persons in our zone, is $308,814,760. There is another item of $5,274,129 to feed the people in occupied Austria.

There is about $210,000,000-plus in that budget request to pay the personnel in administering these funds. The rest of the $725,000,000, of course, is allocated to Japan and Korea, but we are not interested in that in this debate.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Yes; I shall be very glad to yield.

Mr. VORYS. I think the gentleman will find that no provision of any kind is made in any of the War Department appropriations for the care and feeding of displaced persons at all after July 1st.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. That is what the gentleman told me the other day, so I took the matter up with the chairman of the Appropriations Committee who I see on the floor, and who informed me—and I was so informed also by the clerk who gave me these figures—that this money was allocated for the purpose of feeding all people who may need food in our occupied territory; and, obviously, that includes that group of displaced persons.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 25 contains a discussion of this subject in the other body during which Senator VANDENBERG made the statement that if this international relief organization was not authorized the Army would take over the program.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. If I remember correctly, when the bill was before the House authorizing $350,000,000 for relief we were assured that because of the complete break-down and failure of UNRRA from now on we were going to take over this relief load ourselves.

We were asked to appropriate $350,000,000 to take care of those people outside of the occupied zones and we were told that the War Department would take care of those within the zones. That is why I have brought out these figures represented in the budget request of the War Department to feed those people in the occupied zones. Of course, from our experience with UNRRA I would be reluctant to join any other world organization to which we contribute the greater part of the money; but the immediate assurance I seek here is that by authorizing this $73,500,000 we would get a like credit from the budget request of the War Department.

Mr. VORYS. I can give no such assurance as my information is that in the budget which was filed and which is the basis for appropriation, this item of $73,500,000 was included for the care of these displaced persons and the supervision of the camps and that no amount for that purpose is included in the military budget.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I refer the gentleman to the RECORD of March 25, page 2485. On that page Senator VANDENBERG makes this statement:

> The International Refugee Organization will take over the responsibilities of the Army of the United States, heretofore and presently exercised; the responsibility of UNRRA, presently expiring; and the responsibilities of the Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees. It will present a united, organized control of the displaced-persons problem in Germany, Austria, and Italy.

The question I would like to ask is this: We are concluding treaties with Austria and with Italy. Do we now proceed to take over the displaced persons problem in Austria and Italy after the treaties are signed with those countries?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. If we adopt this resolution presented by the Committee on Foreign Affairs it would authorize this world organization to do that. There is no limitation placed upon our participation in this world organization except we may withdraw by giving 1 year's notice. I am not too much concerned about that. I would like to see the Army get out from under this tremendous load of feeding these different people. However, I am concerned about the duplication and the tremendous amount of money being asked for this purpose. The ink has no more than dried on bills we have already passed, authorizing $400,000,000 in aid to Greece and Turkey, $350,000,000 to feed the peoples of Europe who have been taken care of partially by UNRRA, and $725,000,000 in the War Department budget, to say nothing of the tremendous sums we make available to the world through the International Bank and the Export-Import Bank. Now comes this proposal for an added $73,500,000. I must say to my colleagues there has to be a halt somewhere along the line. We all wish to contribute to the limit of our ability to relieve starvation and suffering. But I wonder if we are not going about this this in a wrong way.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. ELLIS. I would like to know if the gentleman has any information on the contributions made by other member nations to this fund?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Under this proposal?

Mr. ELLIS. Yes.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. If the gentleman will get the report and the hearings, he will find that. I cannot remember the number of countries that have already indicated their desire to participate in this. It is my recollection that the United States will contribute something around 79 percent of the fund. The gentleman from Ohio can correct me if I am wrong about that.

Mr VORYS. The United States contributes 39.89 percent for administrative expenses and 45.75 percent for operational expenses. If you care to look at the hearings, you will find on page 69 the budget and the contributions.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. That would be a total contribution in percentage of the United States of about how much?

Mr. VORYS. Seventy-three million five hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. The total fund is about how much?

Mr. VORYS. One hundred and sixty million dollars. If all of the countries do not come in, of course, our contribution would be proportionately larger. The largest it would be, however, would be about 55 percent. In no case would our contribution be increased. At present there are 19 countries that have signed the charter of the IRO. Six of them have come in without reservation. The rest, as with the United States, are subject to reservations. In our case the reservation, of course, is approval by the Congress.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BUCK. If we contribute 55 percent of the cost, will we have 55 percent of the control as to how the money is expended?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I will have to refer that question to my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. I will be glad to discuss the merits of this measure on the rule, if it is desired, although we had hoped to go into the details a little more fully in the Committee of the Whole. But the organization starts when it has 15 members and 75 percent of the budget subscribed. It will then have an executive committee consisting of nine. We would presumably be one of the nine. We would be one of the members, and it will have a director general who might or might not be an American. This is not a case, I take it, where we are seeking control and responsibility. It is a case where we now have control and responsibility of two-thirds of these people, 600,000 of them, in our zone, and we would be very happy to share control and responsibility with the rest of the world because this is not merely an American problem; it is an international problem, and I know of no one in the United States who is seeking to have us control the destiny of this organization or pay for all of its costs.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I am very appreciative of the cooperation of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I just felt that I ought to suggest that I am advised by soldiers from across the sea that they are drifting into our zone in these refugee camps in droves just because they do not have to work there. In the British and the French zones, where they have these camps, they have to work. We make it more attractive to them by maintaining them in idleness. I do not know; maybe this international management would be better than our own, unless it degenerated into the same kind of international racketeering UNRRA was.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I said a few minutes ago that we should seek some assurance from the Committee on Appropriations that this fund is not going to be duplicated in the deficiency appropriation bill which involves $750,000,000 for the War Department, to take care of the same people in the same areas. Would the gentleman care to comment on that?

Mr. TABER. We have not finished our hearings. We have not had any hearings on this International Refugee Organization. We have not had complete hearings on the War Department bill and we have not had complete hearings on the $350,000,000 deal, and no hearings at all on the $400,000,000 for Greece. How I could give any assurance to anybody without complete hearings, is beyond me.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, may I say to the gentleman that I hope that the Committee on Appropriations will give that assurance, because our committee has been given the assurance that there will be no duplication While our committee does not handle appropriations any more than the Committee on Rules does, I am certainly counting on the Committee on Appropriations to make sure, with the assurances already given us by the administration, that there will be no duplication.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I am quite sure the gentleman feels that way. I am glad to know that he is as much interested in that as I am.

Mr. VORYS. I certainly am.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. Does the gentleman know whether this is considered an emergency measure or not?

Mr. VORYS. Could I answer that question?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. UNRRA, as I say, goes out of existence on June 30. This organization which was set up last December 15 was contemplated to take over where UNRRA left off. UNRRA and the Army have been doing this job. I am informed that there are no appropriations available for the care of these people in the Army budget of July 1. There are no other provisions. Therefore there is a very difficult and embarrassing hiatus which will come along in 5 days from now, and we have seen the result of that in the papers in the past few days where the preparatory commission of IRO, which was not originally intended to be an operating organization, in order to bridge the gap and have some funds to keep these camps going and to take care of these people in the interim, is trying

to borrow $1,000,000 from the United Nations.

Mr. BREHM. My purpose in asking this question was that if it is not an emergecy, then I feel we should wait until the committee which has been appointed to study the situation comes in and reports to us just what our own economic situation is in America. If we have—and no doubt we have—previously committed ourselves, then of course, the only thing we can do is to go through with it. I have voted for each resolution and each appropriation requested for relief and rehabilitation purposes in devastated countries, and want to continue so to do, providing that such action does not jeopardize our own American economy. But I still maintain that we are obligating ourselves, committing ourselves, going forward with this program, and there is not a Member of this House at the present time who can tell us whether or not we can afford the program financially. Let us leave all the ideals out, because I am in sympathy with the ideals.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I prefer to let the gentleman debate that when we get into the committee.

Mr. BREHM. That was the reason for my question.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I want to make just another observation or two and then relinquish the floor.

I am advised that it cost us $130,000,000 last year to carry on this program. This bill reduces that amount substantially, because it calls for $73,500,000. That may be accounted for because many of the displaced persons who were taken care of last year will no longer be in those zones. They may have been rehabilitated or gone somewhere else.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. We went in great detail into the question of reducing this expenditure to find why it could be reduced under IRO and could not be reduced under the United States Army. The reasons are fully disclosed in the record, and they are as follows: The IRO is an international organization that will operate on European standards. The estimate of the cost of management personnel alone, for example, by European standards is $6,000,000 a year less than it would be according to the salaries we pay.

As was testified to us by General Hilldring, who was the State Department official concerned, a former general of the Army who had this thing in tow for years, we could not possibly run an operation on the austerity basis that an international organization can run it. He gave us another example, shoes. He said the United States Army shoes cost not less than twice as much for each of these refugees and DP's as this international organization will pay for them. Therefore, the difference in cost, which is extremely material, about 50 percent less, is accounted for by the fact that they will run the kind of a show that ought to be run on an austerity basis for these camps, which we could not possibly do. This accounts for the difference in cost of about $50,000,000 a year.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. That is another reason why, perhaps, the legislation is desirable. I am terribly disturbed about the tremendous drain upon our economy through these authorizations and appropriations. Out in the Midwest the newspapers are carrying stories today that on July 1 petroleum products and gasoline will be rationed, due in no small part to the fact that we have been shipping so much of our petroleum products out of the country. How much longer are we going to squander our wealth and resources without making some kind of an appraisal as to how far we can go? I think we ought to scrutinize every single one of these authorization bills with the greatest of care. I have all the confidence in the world in my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, who assures me that by adopting this measure this country will save money. If we can do that without impairing the effectiveness of international relief, then, of course, it is a proper thing to do. If it is going to be an additional authorization, I think we should not pass it. I do hope you will adopt this rule and place the bill before the House for full debate.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think it makes any of us happy to have to indulge in these large expenditures and this drain upon our Treasury and upon our taxpayers, but I do not think we can just look at this one particular item or this one particular bill. We have to look frankly at the world situation.

At the time the war ended there were 10,000,000 displaced persons in these camps in Europe. Fortunately, this number has now been reduced to about 1,000,000. Those people have been harassed, abused, and starved to the point where they are pitiable objects of human charity. Nobody in this country could turn his back upon the appeals those people make to the Christian charity of civilized people.

The only question that is presented to us today, it seems to me, is whether we are going to let these people starve to death. They have no place to go. They cannot go back to the countries from which they came. That has not been our policy. We have spent many hundreds of millions of dollars. By doing so we have kept thousands of these poor outcasts from actual starvation.

My friend from Indiana has one fear about this bill, that it will be duplicated in the appropriation for the War Department. I am surprised he does not know the gentleman from New York, JOHN TABER, better than that. If the Committee on Appropriations ever duplicates this fund, it will be a great surprise to me. I have absolute faith that they are not going to spend any more money than they have to. This is just one of those necessities growing out of the war, to try to alleviate the chaos of Europe in order that we may not get in a worse fix over there than we are now.

It seems to me to be an expenditure that we just have to make, and one that we ought to make, and one that has every appeal to the charitable instincts of the American people.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I find, on page 11 in the report of the committee, a statement by General Hilldring, who is now Assistant Secretary of State and was formerly a general in the War Department, in which he says:

> I wish to emphasize our contribution to IRO would be in lieu of and make unnecessary those expenditures which would otherwise be made by the War Department or other agencies of our Government for displaced-persons operations which are the responsibility of the Government of the United States.

Obviously, when they made up their budget of $725,000,000 and sent it here to the Committee on Appropriations, they did not know if the Congress was going to authorize this $73,500,000 and they covered it with the War Department so that they would have the money in case. I want to emphasize that fact and I want the Committee on Appropriations to know that if we do authorize this $73,500,000 they should look the budget over very carefully.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I know the gentleman from Indiana has the same confidence in the Committee on Appropriations as I have heretofore expressed. They are not going to appropriate or recommend the appropriation of any money that is not necessary.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I wonder if the gentleman has had any concern about the immigration of these people to the United States?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is expressly taken care of in the language of the bill. If the gentleman will read the bill he will find that it has no effect whatsoever on our immigration laws and it authorizes the immigration of no one into this country.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. If the gentleman will yield further at that point, I do not know whether he has read the constitution of the Refugee Organization.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I have read the bill, and the bill is what is going to govern us in this instance.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Yes, but the constitution provides for the immigration to other countries.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. That is not our Constitution.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. But it is in their constitution.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. In response to the question that naturally might be raised as to what might be the effect of this bill on immigration, in the constitution of IRO they do three things for the displaced persons, that is, for these refugees. They take care of their support

and their repatriation, that is, sending them home where they can be sent home for resettlement or in other countries. Many countries are accepting them. However, if you will look at the first page of the bill you will find set forth in the shortest way that this can be stated the Revercomb amendment which was put into this bill in another body and is adopted in this legislation. The language is as follows:

Provided, however, That this authority is granted and the approval of the Congress of the acceptance of membership of the United States in the International Refugee Organization is given upon condition and with the reservation that no agreement shall be concluded on behalf of the United States and no action shall be taken by any officer, agency, or any other person and acceptance of the constitution of the Organization by or on behalf of the Government of the United States shall not constitute or authorize action (1) whereby any person shall be admitted to or settled or resettled in the United States or any of its Territories or possessions without prior approval thereof by the Congress, and this joint resolution shall not be construed as such prior approval, or (2) which will have the effect of abrogating, suspending, modifying, adding to, or superseding any of the immigration laws or any other laws of the United States.

You cannot say that any more plainly than that.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. If the gentleman will permit me to ask the gentleman from Ohio a question, if he has read the constitution set up by the organization it does provide for the immigration to other countries.

Mr. VORYS. Certainly. I just said that.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think the bill takes care of it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield further to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think the bill takes care of it, it is true, but the constitution provides for it.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution is here as an aftermath of the war. We join with other nations in taking care of the displaced persons in the American zone in Europe. There are some 1,000,000 that have no place to go. They are the direct responsibility of the victorious nations. They must be fed. The problem is to find a home for them and make them self-supporting just as soon as possible.

I, like many Members of Congress, have been greatly displeased at the operation and results of UNRRA. It is not a pretty picture and one we would like to forget.

It is to be hoped that this activity of caring for the displaced persons will go forward with efficiency and that there will be no duplication in the work now being carried on by the Army.

The Congress will without doubt be called upon for several years to make appropriations for this type of work. This is not the last effort in assisting these people.

I also hope that a survey can be made of our resources in order to determine just how much assistance can be given all over the world by the United States. I have been of the opinion for some time that we are now overextending ourselves, and that it will result in a serious dislocation of our own economy if long continued. There is a definite limit as to what we can do. This refugee problem is but a small segment of the entire picture.

As this resolution is passed and the work starts, I hope there will be careful supervision and reports of the results to the Congress. If it develops that there are abuses, as in UNRRA, the next Congress will be very reluctant to continue the program under a joint arrangement with 20 other nations. I do feel that inasmuch as we must furnish most of the funds, that we should exercise more authority and have the responsibility of seeing that the program is operated in an efficient manner. This may be hard to do with so many conflicting ideas from 20 other nations.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I do not yield further. I think there should be no misunderstanding on the question of immigration. It has nothing in the world to do with this bill, and the bill expressly says so. It does not make any difference what the constitution of the United Nations says or the constitution of any other country or organization in Europe says. The only way people can come into this country is through a modification or change of the law of our country by an act of Congress. This bill expressly excludes that subject from its provisions and there is simply no question about that and everybody is agreed upon it.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution to its adoption or rejection.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY—SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 125

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight tonight to file a report on Senate Joint Resolution 125.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING REVENUE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 3737) to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS' SALARY ACT OF 1947

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 3611) to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

MEMBERSHIP AND PARTICIPATION BY UNITED STATES IN THE INTERNATIONAL REFUGEE ORGANIZATION

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 207, providing for membership and participation by the United States in the International Refugee Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 207 with Mr. BREHM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] is recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], for 30 minutes.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, this matter has been rather well explained through the questioning during the consideration of the rule; but let me just summarize what this legislation provides.

The bill under consideration provides for our joining an international organization for the care, repatriation, and resettlement of displaced persons called the International Refugee Organization, which was formed on December 15, 1946, and goes into effect when 15 nations have joined without reservation and when 75 percent of the budget has been subscribed. It was contemplated that the United States would have joined a long time ago and that was the reason why no arrangement was made for taking care of these people further in the military budgets. A companion bill to this one passed the Senate unanimously on March 25. This bill required some rewriting to provide for the interim period between July 1, when UNRRA winds up, and when appropriations for the care and supervision of these camps under the Army winds up; these interim provisions take up the latter part of this legislation, which is a very short resolution.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. GOSSETT. Is there anything in this bill that will preclude this organization from circumventing directly or indirectly the immigration laws of the country?

Mr. VORYS. I am sorry the gentleman was not here when I read section 1. If the gentleman will look at page 1, line 9, continuing to line 16 on page 2, the gentleman will find the most thoroughgoing elimination of any possibility that this organization or our joining it could make any change whatsoever in our immigration laws.

As the gentleman knows, there is a bill before his committee which has to do with proposed immigration of these DP's.

This bill very carefully and explicitly has nothing to do with that and provides that our joining this organization shall not change in any respect our immigration laws.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. GOSSETT. Is the language cited by the gentleman in substance the Revercomb amendment to the Senate bill?

Mr. VORYS. It is exactly the Revercomb amendment.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Is Russia a part of this organization?

Mr. VORYS. Russia has been invited to join and has not joined, nor have any of the so-called satellite countries. While, of course, no one can read the future, it is not expected that Russia will join. Russia has its own solution for the DP's problem.

Mr. DONDERO. One more question. Does this relieve the army of occupation of some of the burdens they are now carrying?

Mr. VORYS. Yes; it does. If you will read what General Hilldring said, who handled this for the Army, and what Secretary Petersen had to say on it, it is a relief which they devoutly hope will come soon. They say this is not a military problem, it is a civilian problem, and they ought to be out of it. They further say this is not just an American problem but an international problem and an international organization should have responsibility and control.

Mr. DONDERO. With that in mind, might this resolution then save this country some money?

Mr. VORYS. This resolution will save $58,500,000 over what it cost us for this purpose during the current year. The gentleman will find on page 33 of the hearings the estimated cost if we do not go into IRO, which will be over $20,000,000 more than if we do go in.

Mr. DONDERO. It is for that reason I look with favor upon this resolution.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Is it correct that this does not include but excludes people of Germanic origin, whether they come from any other country into Germany or are in Germany?

Mr. VORYS. This excludes the so-called ethnic Germans. There has been criticism of that exclusion and the gentleman will find in the hearings on page 51 a statement from the Refugee's Defense Committee, an organization which feels they should not be excluded. Let me remind the gentleman, however, that IRO is an international organization, and as the Refugee's Defense Committee pointed out in their statement, it is not within the power of the Congress of the United States to amend the constitution of an international organization.

Our representative at the first meeting of IRO will be the Hon. Lewis Douglas, our Ambassador to Britain, who many will remember when he was a Member of this House and who can be depended upon to represent this country wisely and well. He can propose an amendment to include ethnic Germans, but when it is considered there are millions of those people, that they are in there among their own countrymen in Germany, it seems to me it is asking a good bit for the rest of the world to take on that burden in addition to this million of the DP's the Germans brought in as slaves and as political prisoners, from other countries.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. These ethnic Germans we are now speaking of fall exclusively on the shoulders of the United States Army so far as their support now is concerned?

Mr. VORYS. No; they fall upon Germany. They may be a part of our general burden in our zone.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I was interested in the definition of "persons of German ethnic origin" and in checking the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I find this definition of persons of German ethnic origin:

1. Pertaining to the Gentiles, or to nations not converted to Christianity; heathen; pagan—opposed to Jewish and Christian.

2. Relating to community of physical and mental traits in races, or designating groups of races of mankind discriminated on the basis of common customs and characters.

I think they should have said ex-enemy Germans. Who can say whether a man is a Christian or not?

Mr. VORYS. I do not know whether the gentleman is reading from the charter of the IRO or not, but the charter does set forth in full a definition.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. But ethnic Germans are excluded?

Mr. VORYS. They are excluded from IRO.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I read to the gentleman the definition taken from Webster's Dictionary on what an ethnic German is.

Mr. VORYS. I am advised from a reading of the provisions of the charter on page 68 of the hearings which explains what ethnic German means in this connection that no such definition as you read is included.

Let me remind you all what this is all about. When our armies overran Europe in 1945 there were about 8,000,000 of these slaves and political prisoners in concentration camps and in slave camps. They were then called displaced persons, or DP's. They were the victims of Hitler's fiendish cruelty. With my colleagues the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS], whom I see here today, I was on a congressional committee requested by General Eisenhower to go and see the concentration camps as they were opened up. I brought here today a couple of photographs of what those camps looked like when we got there. These people at Buchenwold, Nordhausen, and Dachau had been the victims of the most diabolical and fiendish cruelty that was ever practiced on this planet. Those who were left were on our hands. It shocked me over 2 years ago to find that American soldiers were still holding these people in the concentration camps because they were so infected with typhus and other diseases that they would not let them out, fearing they would contaminate the surrounding Germans and our own troops. It is a shock to me to think that any of these people are still left in these camps, but such is the fact. However, 7,000,000 out of the 8,000,000 have already been repatriated or returned to their homes, and the problem here is what to do with what is called the hard core of unrepatriables, those who cannot go home for obvious reasons, because to go home means to go to slavery or death.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself three additional minutes.

Let me call your attention to page 2 of the report and see how this remaining group is made up. In camps there are 278,868 Poles. They cannot go home. Jewish, 193,332. They cannot go home. Balts, 180,838. Yugoslavs, 34,494. Soviets, 13,800. You can see that practically all of these people do not dare go home. They are scattered in about 700 camps ranging from a few hundred up to 16,000.

The purpose of this organization, as mentioned before, is to take care of them where they are; to repatriate such as can be repatriated, and to resettle as many as possible. Resettlement is going on at a rate which is estimated to reach 150,000 or better this year, so that this problem will dwindle, and it is hoped that it will only last for 2 or 3 years. No one knows how long it will last. If there are changes in the political situation there, maybe many of these people can go home, but at the present time they are a charge on us. We have got two-thirds of them on the American taxpayers, and it seems to me that it would be wise for us to move back and let other nations share in this responsibility. We do not desire to control the destinies of these people. We are perfectly willing to have a proper international organization take over.

Now, the question was raised as to whether this is going to be an UNRRA show. As I have stated, we have definite assurance that it will not be. As is pointed out in the report, we have assurances from General Marshall, and we know from the appointment of a man like Lew Douglas that it will not be run on an UNRRA basis if he has anything to say about it.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. I would like to ask the gentleman just what voice or what vote do we have in this international organization.

Mr. VORYS. We just get one vote.

Mr. O'HARA. How many votes are there in the organization?

Mr. VORYS. There are 19 who have joined as we have, 13 subject to reservations. For instance, our reservation is that Congress must act. Six have joined and paid in their shares. It is fully set forth here. We only get one vote. But this is not, as I said earlier, a case where I think America is seeking control or domination of the organization. It is an international matter, where we have got

a little too much control and responsibility right now and we would be very happy to share the control and responsibility with others.

May I say this: We have the most profound and definite assurance as to the type of person who will be chosen to head this organization. You can find the assurance in writing from General Marshall in the hearings, page 43, but, in addition, we have other assurances. Of course, any discussion of who would head an organization that we have not as yet joined would not only be premature, but embarrassing and impertinent, so no such discussion can be entered into. But, we have the profoundest assurance that the leadership in this organization is going to be businesslike and realistic.

Let me say just one last word. I have discussed the financial aspects showing how we can save money by going into this. But let us not forget this that this million of men, women, and children—and there are children being born in these camps—are suffering in body and in spirit because, through no fault of their own, they cannot get to the place that is dearest to us all—home, and while we discuss this as an economic problem, as we should, let us bear in mind also that we are dealing with some human beings who have suffered greatly.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I just want to inquire if our share of contribution in this organization is based upon our share of contribution in UNRRA.

Mr. VORYS. No. Our share in this is 39.89 percent for administrative and 45.75 percent for operating. You cannot proportion that to anything except that they got around the table and they got up what they thought would be a fair proportion for each prospective member, and the gentleman will find that in the hearings on page 69.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Will the personnel that have been in UNRRA be turned over to this new organization and be employed by the new organization?

Mr. VORYS. We discuss that in our report. I think I can best answer it by reading this sentence:

> We believe, however, from the assurances we have received, and the character of our representation in the IRO that the leadership and direction of IRO will not contain any UNRRA personnel, and that the only UNRRA people who will come into IRO will be certain operating personnel on the working level, who have proven their competence under trying circumstances.

We must remember two things: One, UNRRA is going out unwept, unhonored, and unsung as far as Congress is concerned. Two, the only people on earth who have experience in directing these camps are some UNRRA people, and there are some good ones. You will find in the report the letter from General Marshall which shows the way in which they are processing the ones that will be taken over, but UNRRA's personnel will not furnish the leadership.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. They have gone over with practically double the salaries of the last 5 months.

Mr. VORYS. I do not know about that.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT].

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote for this bill with the Revercomb amendment in it, because I think that problem has to be dealt with. To keep the RECORD straight, however, I want to say that my good friend who has just left the floor has been misinformed to a great extent and has allowed his enthusiasm to run away with him. He intimates that 800,000 refugees or displaced persons now in the some 300 American camps, were there at the time he went over and surveyed the horrors and the tragedies of the concentration camps. That is not true. Probably less than 30 percent of those now in the DP camps were displaced persons at the time the shooting ended. Many of them have voluntarily displaced themselves since that time. They came into the American zone and have just stayed. True, it is a problem, and they are on our hands, but they are not the persecuted, oppressed people that some would have you believe them to be.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] states that they are nonrepatriable. That, too, is a great exaggeration. Gen. Lowell W. Rooks, currently head of UNRRA, made the statement the other day that of the 7,000,000 persons repatriated by the Allied forces following the war there was no one single authenticated case on record where any of them had been liquidated or persecuted. Most of these people just refuse to go home. Many of them could find useful occupations, they could serve with credit and helpfulness to the devastated areas from whence they came, if they would. Most of those remaining in these camps are human wreckage, many are bums and criminals.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. There are 242,669 that have jobs outside the camps now. If these people can get jobs in hostile Germany, it seems to me they show a good bit of ingenuity, but they are hanging onto their DP status because they want to get out of Germany.

Mr. GOSSETT. Those are very minor jobs. As a matter of fact, we won the war, and we can settle those people in Germany if we want to.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman does not mean to say that all the people who went back to these other countries were not persecuted and killed, because if the gentleman wants specific cases I can give him specific cases of hundreds of people who went back to their own countries and when they got back there were liquidated right away.

Mr. GOSSETT. I was quoting what General Rooks said as reproduced in the Christian Science Monitor on the 4th day of this month. None of the witnesses appearing before our committee now having hearings on the so-called Stratton bill—and I have asked several of them that question—have produced any cases. There are persons being liquidated in areas of Europe, it is true, but they are not necessarily the people who went from these DP camps back home.

Mr. BLOOM. But they were displaced persons back in their own countries.

Mr. GOSSETT. No; they were people who had lived there for generations, many of them.

There is another angle of this thing I want to call to the attention of the House before passing on. I say the first thing the IRO ought to do is close up those camps and send those back home who will go. As for those who will not go, let them stand in the soup lines, if necessary, with others whom it may be necessary to feed. To be a displaced person in the American zone is to be in a preferred status, and we have more or less invited it. Why treat these folks better than others. They are not a particular problem of ours. That is why I am willing for the UN to deal with the matter. I am not willing, however, for them to dump these undesirables into our lap or to settle them in this country. I will support this bill in reliance upon the good faith enforcement of the Revercomb amendment.

Another misstatement that is generally made is that these people are in concentration camps and that we maintain confines. That is not true at all. We have not done that in a long while. They are free to go and come as they will. Incidentally, many of them are making pretty good money on black-market operations out of American goods which we furnish them. That sort of thing ought to be looked into.

Now, about the personnel in this IRO. You have one very objectionable gentleman up there now who is working as an American in the refugee organization. I have a long record here, part of which was compiled by the FBI, which indicates that this man is a notorious Communist. I might not be able to praise his communism, but I do know that he came here in 1940 under the Spanish quota. He worked for the State Department for a while. He was fired down there. His name is Gustavo Duran. He is now a social-affairs officer in the social department of the Refugee Division of the United Nations. He is at present serving in that capacity at an annual salary of $7,500 a year. If he is the Duran I think him to be, he would be hanged in Spain. Even if he be some other Duran, why place a recent Spanish immigrant in such a position of authority? This is a time when none but Americans should be on guard. While I assume this Gustavo Duran is still employed in the Refugee Division of United Nations, and I further assume he would be so employed by the IRO when set up.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. I would like to be enlightened if I am wrong. The only IRO

personnel on this planet at the present time that there could possibly be would be those connected with the IRO preparatory commission in Geneva. I know of no other IRO organization in the world, because the thing has not started yet and cannot get started officially because not enough people have joined and, frankly, many nations are waiting to see what we do.

Mr. GOSSETT. But this is the nucleus of what we are hoping will grow into the IRO. This man is the social officer in the social department of the Refugee Division of the United Nations. Now, I say that he has no business there, and if those are the sort of folks who are going to run this thing then it is going to be a pipe line for Communists to come into this country as well as a lot of other people that we do not want.

Mr. VORYS. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. GOSSETT. I want to caution those of you who have worked so diligently on this thing that you look into the sort of folks who are going to run it. Further, do not be misled by a lot of propaganda about the people who are now in the displaced-person camps.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, it seems quite well agreed here today that the United States should accept membership in the International Refugee Organization. I want to sum up, so that we are quite clear, why we on the committee came to that conclusion and why I believe the House should come to that conclusion.

First and foremost, the refugee and DP camps in the occupied areas of Germany, Austria, and Italy today are being operated under the United States flag and under the command of United States Army personnel. If all of you could have sat with us and heard how the Army considers that job burdensome and interfering with its primary responsibilities, and with great justice, you would be more sympathetic to this way out for the Army and for the United States itself.

Second, we cannot possibly conduct an operation in a way that Europeans conduct an operation. They conduct it on the basis of a cost which we just cannot begin to duplicate. We questioned the witnesses very closely on that score and came to two conclusions. First, that it is actually costing us $130,000,000 a year to take care of the DP camps under our direct jurisdiction in which two-thirds of the DP's are now located. Under the IRO plan which we have here it will cost us $73,500,000, which is a very material saving of well in excess of $50,000,000. Not satisfied with that comparison, we insisted that the Army construct a budget based on the very same austerity basis which the IRO will use in the administration of these camps. The construction of that budget is found in the record of the committee hearings on page 33. On that very same austerity basis the Army said they could not possibly run the operation for less than $94,000,000 a year. So, no matter what basis you take it on, there is a very material saving financially to the United States. That is point two.

Finally, we transfer our responsibility here to an international organization with which we now deal at arms' length. That is a very important consideration, especially as it bears on the issue of immigration, which, as it did in the other body, has come under considerable discussion and consideration in the House here.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. I am curious as to what authority the organization has. Suppose by a majority vote they agree to move some of these people from Germany to France. Do they have any authority to do so without the consent of France, for example?

Mr. JAVITS. No; it does not. It depends upon the national processes of each of the countries involved. The International Refugee Organization will be compelled to deal at arm's length with us and with every other country concerned, although that country may be a member of the organization; and that brings me to the point of immigration. I do not think I need impress upon the House my deep interest in this whole question of resettling the refugees and DP's by immigration into various countries. I want to assure the House that there is no moral basis arising out of this legislation which will give any better or different claim to whatever efforts are being made to get the United States to take some of these refugees and DP's under our immigration laws. No different, or stronger, or better moral basis is being created by this legislation whatsoever. On the contrary, the organization of the International Refugee Organization will divest our Army of responsibility for the refugees and DP's and relieve us of the pressure which would come from the Army's desire otherwise to divest itself of this jurisdiction. The passage of this legislation clears the atmosphere for an opportunity to debate the immigration issue directly between the various people who have different ideas on the subject. We in the United States will deal, then, at arm's length with an international organization which will have the whole matter in charge.

I think that every argument that can be made regarding this matter is covered in the committee hearings. The committee went into it very thoroughly and very exhaustively, taking an initial responsibility as if it had not been heard by the Senate at all. The committee came to the unanimous conclusion that membership in the International Refugee Organization was the best way to handle the situation.

I hope the House will pass the bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Has the gentleman investigated the thousands of packages being sent to this country from Greece supposedly for the starving Americans?

Mr. JAVITS. There are two explanations. I have a great many people of Greek extraction in my district. I find that one explanation is the feeling of gratitude in Greece and their desire to send some delicacies over here in friendly reciprocity. That bounteous feeling apparently has been traded on by some organizations having their bases both in Greece and the United States, stirring the people up to send these packages over, carriage charges collect. As a result it becomes a money-making scheme. The thing is being investigated very much more thoroughly, but from what we now know that is what it looks like; it looks like some activity perpetrated upon these already poor and desperate people of Greece.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I have already introduced two resolutions to take care of the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present. This is too important legislation to be considered when so few Members are on the floor.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BREHM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 207, providing for membership and participation by the United States in the International Refugee Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a communication by Vicente Villamin.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes today following the other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, for 2 days, on account of business.

The SPEAKER. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDOWELL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

MOVEMENT OF FOOD PARCELS TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, on Monday last, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COURTNEY], a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, arose on this floor and said, and I quote:

Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand an Associated Press item appearing in a Washington paper, which says that a mysterious movement of thousands of food parcels to the United States from the deluded people of the Mediterranean area, themselves hungry, has been in progress for months, with the shipments apparently designed for supposedly starving American relatives and friends. These people, the article continues, must be the victims of an unfriendly ideology whose followers are spreading propaganda on the bad state of affairs in America.

Mr. Speaker, I still quote the gentleman from Tennessee. He said:

In other words, Moscow, by press, radio, and otherwise, is telling the people of the Balkan and Mediterranean countries that our Government has fallen, that we are in a state of chaos and revolution and that our people are starving.

It is quite apparent, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from Tennessee, who is known to be one of the most astute members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, is puzzled at the idea of the starving people of the Balkan countries actually shipping food to their kinfolk and friends here in America, and perhaps today I can unravel the mystery. Those things which I am about to say, Mr. Speaker, should be construed as a message to all of the Americans of Slavish descent, and to all the Canadian people of Slavish descent, and to all the Slavs in either the United States or the Dominion of Canada.

For the past 18 months there has been considerable action amongst American and Canadian Slavs, particularly those citizens of either country who were born in Slavish countries and who during their years on this continent have acquired a modest stake, and are either at or are approaching the period of their retirement. The action amongst these people, I have discovered, is by agents and representatives of the various Slavish countries now behind the ominous Russian iron curtain. It is now known that a great effort, for many, many months, has been made to convince those who have some money, that things are now good back in Europe and every appeal is made to the very human desire of every person to see the hills and streams of his native land before he dies.

I have discovered that many Slavs, particularly Croats and Serbs, have already shipped back to Yugoslavia, usually accompanied by their wife and what children they can induce to go along, in the belief that they were going back to a peaceful, settled land where there was a minimum of political troubles, and sufficient food, and the other necessities of life, to keep every person contented. This idea has been drummed into these people in Canada and the United States to such an extent that several boat loads of them have already disappeared behind the iron curtain, and it is my fear that they have disappeared forever.

The gentleman from Tennessee is much puzzled that packages of food should be arriving from Balkan countries supposedly for starving Americans, and expresses the belief that some person is supplying the people of the Balkans with misinformation about the United States, where we still have plenty to eat, plenty to wear, and almost every other thing that humans desire these days. Let me inform the gentleman from Tennessee, Congressman COURTNEY, and let me inform the Slavish people of the United States and Canada what is actually going on, and may I preface this remark by saying that although I represent a district in western Pennsylvania, and as everybody knows there are hundreds of thousands of citizens of Slavish descent in western Pennsylvania, there are so few of them in my own district that no check has ever been made to determine their numbers, thus there is no politics in what I say; but there is a sincere desire to save thousands of the good Slavish citizens of North America from the horrible, bloody disillusion that awaits them if they make the mistake of leaving these shores.

I should be specific and say that my message today is directed principally to former citizens of Yugoslavia, Serbs, Croats, and Albanians, to Bulgars, to Latvians, to Czechs, Slovenes, Russians, and Poles, and to the non-Slavic countries—Rumania, Hungary, and Greece. Those packages of food coming back here are all a part of a dastardly lie on the part of the Communist dictators in Moscow who are teaching the illiterate people in the Balkans that the American Government has fallen and the American people are in chaos and that food has become a desperate necessity here in America. Let me tell the Congress something, and the Slavs of the United States and Canada. There is a movement of Slavs out of Canada to Yugoslavia. Every inducement is made by Communist agents to accelerate this movement. The Communists have several objectives—one is to immediately steal what money these people have taken with them, and another is to prove to the people back home, by the arrival of many American Slavs, that conditions here are so awful that they were glad to escape. A third reason is to get the children both in the United States and Canada, and who are citizens of both countries, who are now between, say, 9 and 15 years old, into cleverly organized Communist schools in Russia, that they may come back here in a few years as American citizens and Canadian citizens, and a fourth reason, and an all-important reason for this attempted mass exodus of Slavs, is to give the Communist agents who arranged this the opportunity to get into their possession as many American and Canadian passports as possible. The now-famous Gerhart Eisler case demonstrates what can be done in America with such documents as these.

Let me read you a wire received from the steamship *Radnik*, which very recently arrived at the port of Split on the Dalmatian coast, which is a part of Yugoslavia:

The first day after leaving Montreal the Communist commissar of the ship informed all passengers that they must deliver their money into his hands. This money, he said, would be returned to them on their arrival in Yugoslavia. The commissar told these people that the reason for collecting their money was because of their sleeping arrangements there might be burglaries aboard.

The disillusioned Slavs aboard the *Radnik* made such a strenuous objection to this mass theft that the commissar and other Communist agents aboard the ship made a forced search of their baggage. This resulted in arguments, quarrels, and fights and resulted in the death of one of the men named Jakov Drobnic, a Slovene from Toronto who was buried before the ship got out of the St. Lawrence River, at Father Point, Quebec. This man's wife and two children are now in Yugoslavia and a son is living in Noranda, Canada. They were robbed before they even left the sound of traffic on the Canadian shore.

On an earlier voyage, the *Radnik* took a load of passengers from Vancouver in British Colombia. It picked up some more at San Pedro, Calif., picked up some more at Marseilles, France, and they all disappeared behind the hammer and the sickle on the Dalmatian coast. No Congressman, nor the State Department, nor anybody else, can get these American and Canadian citizens back to the safety of America, as the Communist dictator, Josip Broz, known to the world as Tito, insists they every person born in Yugoslavia is always a citizen of that country, and recognizes no demands for them.

Mr. Speaker, may I reveal something else that should be interesting, not only to the Slavs of the New World but to all citizens of all decent countries all over the world. Here is the story of what happens when Red fascism overcomes a free country. Yugoslavia, like all other lands, is a land of homes and families, otherwise it would not be a country but merely a desert of wandering folk much like the Sahara, but for generations and centuries the hills of Albania, Croatia, and Serbia have been populated with homes and all the things that make for a country. Here is what happened in Yugoslavia—Tito, after years of training in Moscow, and after General Mihailovich was sold out by the British and American Governments, became the dictator of Yugoslavia. He made only a few laws, and, taken separately, those laws appear not to be too bad, but collectively they have destroyed the home life and the family life of this country, and are rapidly creating a generation of children whose only paternity is the State, which means Tito. For instance, Mr. Speaker, Tito said that the penalty for the oldest and most common crime in the world—adultery—would be death, and in subsequent months people were executed in various parts of Yugoslavia charged with adultery. He also declared that all children are born legal—that there is no such thing as illegitimate, and that every mother was by law required to be responsible for a child. He removed from men any responsibility for fatherhood at all. Then a third edict was that divorce is merely a matter of routine. A divorce could be granted on any cause whatsoever—merely the desire. With the awful penalty of death hanging over the heads of young people

of Yugoslavia, hundreds of thousands of marriages occurred, and subsequently hundreds of thousands of divorces occurred, until within a period of 3 years hundreds of thousands of girls had been married numerous times, had children by various fathers, and these children now are wards of the State. Do not you see what has happened in Yugoslavia? This country of peasants, whose mainstay was the home and the fireside, and who were intensely religious—religion has gone, all knowledge of home life is gone, and a new and dangerous generation is rapidly being created there.

Can you imagine the results of such laws—laws that affect birth and death and everything else that is fundamental to human being? By the time the young people of Yugoslavia reach the age where they desire a more settled and a more sedate life, they discover that is not to be. The girls have been married many times and have many children. The only thing to turn to, either for the men or the women and children, is to the state; thus, these ruthless antireligious Communists destroy civilization in one generation.

The number of Members of the House and the Senate who bear Slavic names or who have Slav blood in their veins is a daily living testimony to the great things the Slavish people have brought to America. The history of the United States, beginning with the very battlefields of the Revolution, contains the names of Poles and Czechs and other Slavs—many of them—who risked their lives, and many died in their wild desire for freedom—freedom for America, if they could not have it in their own country.

Mr. Speaker, many American Slavs are being urged to visit Canada and then urged to get aboard these ships and sail without proper passports or visas. Even their visiting papers are eagerly sought after by the agents of the Comintern.

These things that I have related here, dismal as they are, I believe to be true, as I have checked the source of my information in many ways and in many directions. This information has come to me through my work on the House Committee on Un-American Activities. For the safety of those who furnished the information I will not reveal their names, but one day I will, and it will be seen that the people who told me these things and placed the proof in my hands are as familiar with the countries named here as I am with my own beloved Pennsylvania.

I hope the Slavs of America will read these remarks and ponder about their future.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order heretofore entered, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 3 minutes.

MOVEMENT OF FOOD PARCELS TO THE UNITED STATES

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced two similar resolutions; one requests information of the Secretary of State and the other requests information of the Secretary of the Treasury.

The resolution is as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be requested to furnish the House of Representatives full information in his possession relative to reports published in the New York Times and other newspapers that thousands of packages containing 100,000 to 160,000 pounds of food, mostly meat, have been shipped during the past 6 to 12 months from Greece and the Mediterranean area to the United States for supposedly starving Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a second similar resolution asking that the Secretary of the Treasury submit to the House the same information, as the Commissioner of the Bureau of Customs has much information in the matter.

This is a serious situation and should not be permitted to go unnoticed or unexplained by the Government departments. With the billions of dollars and commodities of all kinds being sent to Europe by this country, something is very definitely wrong to have a situation of this kind exist. The United States Department of Agriculture undoubtedly brought the matter out into the light when the Bureau of Animal Industry apparently traced an outbreak of hoof-and-mouth disease to 1,539 cases of foodstuffs which arrived here on the S. S. *Examiner* last November. Mark Ethridge, United States representative of the United Nations' Balkan Commission, said the shipment of food parcels from Greece to the United States "sounds like a first-class racket." The Greek Government officials have cabled the Greek consular officials in the United States for full details of the shipments. I hope very much that the Members of the House will cooperate in securing the adoption of my resolutions.

Mr. Speaker, this strange situation should be immediately and very thoroughly investigated. We are sending supplies to the starving people of Greece and other countries in the Mediterranean area, and certainly they should not be sending back supplies to us. Whether this is out of the kindness of their hearts or just a racket, nobody seems to know.

Reference has been made to the outbreak of the hoof-and-mouth disease, which has been traced to 1,539 cases of foodstuffs which arrived on the steamship *Examiner* last November. Something is radically wrong if we are sending food to the starving people of Europe, and they, in turn, because they think we are starving, send it back to us. This situation should be investigated completely before we go very much further with what we are doing. The situation shows an inadequate information department or an inadequate intelligence department.

Mr. Speaker, I also take this time to say to the House that the amputees and the disabled veterans cannot understand why they are getting no legislation during this session of the Congress when millions and millions of dollars are being sent to foreign countries. The disabled veterans have no feeling against the people of foreign countries, but they do have a feeling against sending money over there, and when they ask for help they are told it is time to economize. Economy should not be at the expense of the disabled. It is high time that the money going to these other countries be used for the disabled if they are to be cared for. The disabled are extremely tender-hearted and generous, and every country has had examples of their great generosity. But our disabled need help.

I refer to one piece of legislation having to do with the amputees and the blind, which expires on the 30th of June. Many of them are in hospitals and cannot take advantage of the legislation. For many, it is their only means of transportation. If this legislation expires, it means that their ability to get around will be lost. It means loss of a chance for a job or a chance for school or college. Can you picture a man without legs, a man without arms, and you see him in an automobile; you do not know whether he has any legs or not, you do not realize whether he has arms or not; but if you see him get out of that car, you will realize what it has meant to that man, who has given half of himself, to have a means of transportation in order that he may live a fairly normal life, in order that he may be able to get work. No one would want to deny him this opportunity. This is a rehabilitation measure. Some of the doctors who opposed the measure last year, when the boys had taken it up with me, are for it this year. They have made a further study of the matter, and they believe that it is a real rehabilitation for these men. The gentleman from New Jersey, Judge MATHEWS, introduced a much better piece of legislation than the one last year.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleading with the House to pass his bill, H. R. 3583, which was reported out of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and is now before the Rules Committee. I plead that this legislation be passed before the time expires, preferably tomorrow. Pass the bill before it is too late.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. J. Res. 123. Joint resolution to terminate certain emergency and war powers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 3769. An act to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to qualifications of part-time referees in bankruptcy; and

H. R. 3791. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 26, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from

the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

849. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 3121 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

850. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting an amendment to a draft of a proposed bill which was submitted on April 22, 1947, entitled "A bill to authorize certain expenditures from the appropriation of St. Elizabeths Hospital, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

851. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of $100,000, for the Department of the Interior, to remain available until expended (H. Doc. No. 363); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KEAN: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 3810. A bill to amend section 522 of the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to clarify the procedure in ascertaining the value of foreign currency for customs purposes where there are dual or multiple exchange rates, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 689). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 3961. A bill to provide increases in the rates of pension payable to Spanish-American War and Civil War veterans and their dependents; without amendment (Rept. No. 690). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 1113. A bill to provide for removal of restrictions on property of Indians who serve in the armed forces; with an amendment (Rept. No. 691). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COLE of New York: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 1938. A bill to authorize the appropriation, for expenditure by the International Children's Fund of the United Nations Organization, of certain amounts received from services of conscientious objectors; with an amendment (Rept. No. 692). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 3395. A bill to add certain lands to the Modoc National Forest, Calif.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 693). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 3614. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Brainerd War Dead National Memorial; with an amendment (Rept. No. 694). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CARSON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 2956. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act approved June 21, 1938, as amended; with an amendment (Rept. No. 695). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. H. R. 2225. A bill authorizing the transfer to the United States Section, International Boundary and Water Commission, by the War Assets Administration of a portion of Fort McIntosh at Laredo, Tex., and certain personal property in connection therewith, without exchange of funds or reimbursement; without amendment (Rept. No. 696). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 1426. A bill to extend veterans-preference benefits to widowed mothers of certain ex-servicemen; with amendments (Rept. No. 697). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. House Joint Resolution 156. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the launching of the U. S. S. *Constitution*; without amendment (Rept. No. 698). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 3759. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 701). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLACKNEY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 3501. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946, approved August 9, 1946 (Public Law 704, 79th Cong., 2d sess., 60 Stat. 963), and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 702). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLACKNEY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 3851. A bill to provide additional inducements to physicians and surgeons to make a career of the United States military, naval, and public health services, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 703). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. H. R. 775. A bill for the establishment of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; without amendment (Rept. No. 704). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. Senate Joint Resolution 125. Joint resolution to strengthen the common defense and to meet industrial needs for tin by providing for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry; without amendment (Rept. No. 705). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 3969. A bill to establish a Columbia Interstate Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 3970. A bill to establish standards for education in the Constitution and American history for the District of Columbia, to provide for obtaining factual information by the Congress of teaching methods in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 3971. A bill to amend section 2455 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to increase the size of isolated or disconnected tracts or parcels of the public domain which may be sold, and for other purposes: to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 3972. A bill to transfer certain functions and personnel to the Secretary of Commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 3973. A bill relating to the compensation of commissioners for the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MACKINNON:

H. R. 3974. A bill to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to acquire home loans guaranteed or insured under the provisions of title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 3975. A bill to authorize the appointment as officers in the Regular Establishments of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of enlisted men who served as officers under combat conditions; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SEELY-BROWN:

H. R. 3976. A bill to raise the minimum wage standards of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STIGLER:

H. R. 3977. A bill to direct the Civil Service Commission to confer a competitive classified civil-service status upon certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 3978. A bill to provide for the temporary advancement in rank and increase in salary of lieutenants in the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia serving as supervisors of certain squads; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 3979. A bill to promote the national security by providing for a Secretary of National Security; for a National Military Establishment; for a Department of the Army, a Department of the Navy, and a Department of the Air Forces; and for the coordination of the activities of the National Military Establishment with other departments and agencies of the Government concerned with the national security (short title: National Security Act of 1947); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 3980. A bill to enable debtor railroad corporations expeditiously to effectuate reorganizations of their financial structures; to alter or modify their financial securities; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H. R. 3981. A bill providing for the sale of the Trask Homes housing project in Tillamook, Oreg.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 257. A resolution requesting the Secretary of the Treasury to furnish the House of Representatives full information relative to food and meat being shipped from Greece and the Mediterranean area to the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. Res. 258. A resolution requesting the Secretary of State to furnish the House of Representatives full information relative to food and meat being shipped from Greece and the Mediterranean area to the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. Res. 259. A resolution providing expenses for conducting the investigations and surveys authorized by House Resolution 211 of the Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 3982. A bill to provide for the readmission to citizenship of Hua-Chuen Mei; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of Missouri:

H. R. 3983. A bill for the relief of Northwest Missouri Fair Association, of Bethany, Harrison County, Mo.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H. R. 3984. A bill for the relief of George Hampton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 3985. A bill for the relief of James R. Frazer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

678. By Mr. DONDERO: Petition of sundry citizens of Royal Oak, Mich., petitioning Congress to prevent the cutting down of the trees in the Olympic Forest by individuals or corporations for commercial uses and urging adverse action on Senate bill 711, House bills 2750 and 2751, and House Joint Resolution 84; to the Committee on Public Lands.

679. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution by Auxiliaries of the United Spanish War Veterans of Wisconsin, protesting entrance of 250,000 displaced persons into our country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

680. By the SPEAKER: Petition of 200 members of St. Lukes' Archconfraternity, Gary, Ind., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for investigation of conditions in Yugoslavia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

681. Also, petition of A. M. Corbett and sundry other citizens of West Palm Beach, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, House bill 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

682. Also, petition of T. S. Kinney and sundry other citizens of Orlando, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, House bill 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

683. Also, petition of Miss Anna L. Stark and sundry other citizens of Sarasota, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, House bill 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

684. Also, petition of members of Loyalty Council No. 55, a subordinate council, representatives of the Daughters of America, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opposition to House bills 35, 36, 37, 38, 464, 466, 1249, 1250, and 1251; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 26, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we are beginning to understand at last that the things that are wrong with our world are the sum total of all the things that are wrong with us as individuals. Thou hast made us after Thine image, and our hearts can find no rest until they rest in Thee.

We are too Christian really to enjoy sinning and too fond of sinning really to enjoy Christianity. Most of us know perfectly well what we ought to do; our trouble is that we do not want to do it. Thy help is our only hope. Make us want to do what is right, and give us the ability to do it.

In the name of Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of Tuesday, June 24, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on June 25, 1947, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 317. An act for the relief of Robert B. Jones;

S. 361. An act for the relief of Alva R. Moore;

S. 425. An act for the relief of Col. Frank R. Loyd;

S. 470. An act for the relief of John H. Gradwell;

S. 514. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Sylvia De Cicco;

S. 561. An act for the relief of Robert C. Birkes;

S. 597. An act to provide for the protection of forests against destructive insects and diseases, and for other purposes; and

S. 614. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for a permanent Census Office," approved March 6, 1902, as amended (the collection and publication of statistical information by the Bureau of the Census).

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 135) to extend the succession, lending powers, and the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3303) to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military Establishment of the United States.

The message further announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 1358. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the management and operation of naval plantations outside the continental United States," approved June 28, 1944;

H. R. 1371. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to appoint, for supply duty only, officers of the line of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1375. An act to further amend section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, so as to provide for the clothing allowance of enlisted men of the Marine Corps and Marine Corps Reserve;

H. R. 2276. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to pay certain expenses incident to training, attendance, and participation of personnel of the Army of the United States in the seventh winter sports Olympic games and the fourteenth Olympic games and for future Olympic games; and

H. R. 3791. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3342. An act to enable the Government of the United States more effectively to carry on its foreign relations by means of promotion of the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills between the people of the United States and other countries, and by means of public dissemination abroad of information about the United States, its people, and its policies;

H. R. 3830. An act to provide for the promotion and elimination of officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3911. An act to continue temporary authority of the Maritime Commission until March 1, 1948.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 381. An act for the relief of Allen T. Feamster, Jr.;

H. R. 407. An act for the relief of Claude R. Hall and Florence V. Hall;

H. R. 493. An act to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia," approved July 8, 1932 (sec. 22, 3204 D. C. Code, 1940 ed.);

H. R. 577. An act to preserve historic graveyards in abandoned military posts;

H. R. 617. An act for the relief of James Harry Martin;

H. R. 1067. An act for the relief of S. C. Spradling and R. T. Morris;

H. R. 1144. An act for the relief of Samuel W. Davis, Jr.; Mrs. Samuel W. Davis, Jr.; and Betty Jane Davis;

H. R. 1318. An act for the relief of Mrs. Fuku Kurokawa Thurn;

H. R. 1358. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the management and operation of naval plantations outside the continental United States," approved June 28, 1944;

H. R. 1362. An act to permit certain naval personnel to count all active service rendered under temporary appointment as warrant or commissioned officers in the United States Navy and the United States Naval Reserve, or in the United States Marine Corps and the United States Marine Corps Reserve, for purposes of promotion to commissioned warrant officer in the United States Navy, or the United States Marine Corps, respectively;

H. R. 1371. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to appoint, for supply duty only, officers of the line of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1375. An act to further amend section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, so as to provide for the clothing allowance of enlisted men of the Army, Marine Corps, and Marine Corps Reserve;

H. R. 1376. An act to amend the acts of October 14, 1942 (56 Stat. 786), as amended, and November 28, 1943 (57 Stat. 593), as

amended, so as to authorize transportation of dependents and household effects of personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard to oversea bases;

H. R. 1514. An act for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1628. An act relinquishing to the State of Illinois certain right, title, or interest of the United States of America, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1807. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the county of Pittsburg, Okla., a perpetual easement for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a public highway over a portion of the United States naval ammunition depot, McAlester, Okla.;

H. R. 1845. An act to amend existing laws relating to military leave of certain employees of the United States or of the District of Columbia so as to equalize rights to leave of absence and reemployment for such employees who are members of the Enlisted or Officers' Reserve Corps, the National Guard, or the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1997. An act to provide seniority benefits for certain officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia who are veterans of World War II and lost opportunity for promotion by reason of their service in the armed forces of the United States;

H. R. 2248. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to grant an easement and to convey to the Louisiana Power & Light Co. a tract of land comprising a portion of Camp Livingston in the State of Louisiana;

H. R. 2276. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to pay certain expenses incident to training, attendance, and participation of personnel of the Army of the United States and of the naval service, respectively, in the Seventh Winter Sports Olympic Games and the Fourteenth Olympic Games and for future Olympic games;

H. R. 2339. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the designation of Army mail clerks and assistant Army mail clerks," approved August 21, 1941 (55 Stat. 656), and for other purposes;

H. R. 2411. An act to authorize patenting of certain lands to Public Hospital District No. 2, Clallam County, Wash., for hospital purposes;

H. R. 2545. An act to provide funds for cooperation with the school board of the Moclips-Aloha district for the construction and equipment of a new school building in the town of Moclips, Grays Harbor County, Wash., to be available to both Indian and non-Indian children;

H. R. 2654. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to grant to the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore, State of Maryland, a permanent easement for the purpose of installing, maintaining, and servicing a subterranean water main in, on, and across the land of the United States Coast Guard station called Lazaretto depot, Baltimore, Md.;

H. R. 2655. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant to the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore, State of Maryland, a permanent easement for the purpose of installing, maintaining, and servicing two subterranean water mains in, on, and across the land of Fort McHenry National Monument and Historic Shrine, Md.;

H. R. 2915. An act for the relief of Mrs. Frederick Faber Wesche (formerly Ann Maureen Bell);

H. R. 3124. An act to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the Eighty-first National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held in Cleveland, Ohio, August 10 to 14, 1947;

H. R. 3372. An act authorizing certain agreements with respect to rights in helium-bearing gas lands in the Navajo Indian Reservation, N. Mex., and for other purposes;

H. R. 3629. An act to authorize the transfer to the Panama Canal of property which is surplus to the needs of the War Department or Navy Department;

H. R. 3769. An act to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to qualifications of part-time referees in bankruptcy;

H. R. 3791. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 92. Joint resolution authorizing the presentation of the Distinguished Flying Cross to Rear Adm. Charles E. Rosendahl, United States Navy;

H. J. Res. 96. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue posthumously to the late Roy Stanley Geiger, lieutenant general, United States Marine Corps, a commission as general, United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 167. Joint resolution to recognize uncompensated services rendered the Nation under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate tomorrow and Monday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the request is granted.

MEETING OF COMMITTEE DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I am doing now what I have failed to do thus far, and I believe one of the subcommittees of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is still standing in suspense because I have forgotten to do this.

The Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which is now in the process of holding a hearing on Senate bill 545, asks the consent of the Senate to continue the hearing during the rest of today, or so much thereof as may be necessary for that purpose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

REVISED ESTIMATE OF APROPRIATION FOR VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION (S. Doc. No. 66)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a revised estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 involving an increase of $2,088,000 for the Veterans' Administration in the form of an amendment to his submission of May 15, 1947, to the House of Representatives contained in House Document 252 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

GENERAL PROVISIONS OF GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS AND CREDIT AGENCIES (S. Doc. No. 67)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an amendment to the language of the "General provisions" of the Government corporations and credit agencies budget for the fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 3121 of the Internal Revenue Code (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

DONATIONS BY NAVY DEPARTMENT TO NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, a list of institutions and organizations, all nonprofit and eligible, which have requested donations from the Navy Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXPENDITURES FROM APPROPRIATION OF ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

A letter from the Acting Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, recommending an amendment to draft of a bill to authorize certain expenditures from the appropriation of St. Elizabeths Hospital, and for other purposes, submitted to the Senate on April 22, 1947 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the President pro tempore and referred as indicated:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Joint Resolution 21

"Whereas the present system of financing the cost of administration of State unemployment-compensation and employment-service operations by grants from the Federal Government under the provisions of the Social Security Act, the Wagner-Peyser Act, and the Unemployment Tax Act is defective in the following respects:

"1. Congress and the responsible Federal agencies have failed to make available to the State of Illinois and the other States sufficient funds to permit proper administration, adequate planning and staffing, and the rendering of the services to the employers and workers of the respective States to which they are entitled by reason of the provisions of their unemployment-compensation laws;

"2. It has permitted the Federal Government to collect from the employers of this State Federal unemployment taxes at the rate of three-tenths of 1 percent of their pay rolls, amounting to approximately $98,000,000, to be used for administration of this State's Unemployment Compensation Act, while granting for such purposes only the sum of approximately $28,000,000, thus diverting for other purposes the sum of $70,000,000;

"3. It permits the determination of the amount necessary for efficient operation of State unemployment-compensation laws and the granting of funds for that purpose by a Federal agency which has no obligation or responsibility for the administration of such State laws;

"4. By permitting a Federal agency to grant or withhold funds, such agency is enabled to interfere in matters of administration which should be the sole province of the State.

"5. It burdens the employers of this State and other States with the obligation of duplicate reporting to the State and Federal Government, and in some cases with double taxation; and

"Whereas the State of Illinois is fully capable and desirous of administering its employment security program without aid or interference by the Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-fifth General Assembly of the* State of Illinois (*the senate concurring herein*), That the Congress of the United States be respectfully requested to enact legislation to exempt employers from the payment of the Federal three-tenths-of-1-per-

cent unemployment tax and to permit each State to collect such tax, in addition to contributions now collected by it, and to use such sums to finance its employment security program without Federal restriction; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the secretary of state to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, the chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate of the United States, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate of the United States, and each Member of the Congress elected from the State of Illinois.

"Adopted by the house, June 11, 1947.

"Concurred in by the senate, June 18, 1947."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Public Lands:

"House Resolution 45

"Resolution commending the United States Forest Service for the manner in which it has activated and maintained the Apalachicola National Forest in Liberty County, Fla.

"Whereas the United States Forest Service in 1933 activated the Apalachicola National Forest in Liberty County, Fla., and since said date has enlarged and maintained said forest and it is now one of the largest and outstanding national forests in the United States of America; and

"Whereas the soil contained within Apalachicola National Forest is especially suited to the production and growth of long-leaf yellow pine trees; and

"Whereas the timber resources of the United States are becoming extinct except within the national forest, and it is of paramount interest and concern to the people of the United States that the production and growth of timber should be carried on; and

"Whereas it is the sense of the House of Representatives of the State of Florida that the continued growth and production of long-leaf yellow-pine timber should not be interfered with but should be encouraged in every way possible: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Florida:

"SECTION 1. That the House of Representatives of the State of Florida commends the United States Forest Service for the manner in which it has activated and maintained the Apalachicola National Forest in Liberty County, Fla., and for its splendid record in the conduct of said forest and in the production of timber and the distribution of the proceeds of the sale of said timber to Liberty County, Fla.

"SEC. 2. That it is the desire of this House of Representatives that no action of any kind be taken by the United States Forest Service or any branch of the United States Government that would tend to reduce the size of said forest, the production of timber therein, or the distribution of the proceeds received from the sale of said timber to Liberty County, Fla., and that said forest be maintained at its present size.

"SEC. 3. That a certified copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Honorable CLAUDE PEPPER and the Honorable SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, United States Senators from Florida; to the Honorable BOB SIKES, Member of the House of Representatives of the United States from the Third Congressional District of Florida; and to the Clerk of the Senate of the United States; and to the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States; and to the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States of America."

A petition signed by sundry citizens of the State of Florida, praying for the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan to provide old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

PROTEST AGAINST LIQUOR ADVERTISING

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, over the past weeks I have received in my office 600 petitions in favor of Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes.

These petitions contain over 16,000 signatures. I should like to have a list of the communities, cities, and villages represented in the petitions incorporated in the RECORD with my remarks.

There being no objection the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PETITIONS RE CAPPER BILL (S. 265), WITH 16,346 SIGNATURES AFFIXED, RECEIVED FROM NEW YORK STATE CITIES AND VILLAGES

Adams, Akron, Alabama, Albany, Albertson, Albion, Alden, Alexander, Alfred, Allegany, Alplaus, Altamont, Alton, Ames, Amityville, Amsterdam, Andover, Anglica, Apalachin, Arcade, Argyle, Armonk, Ashville, Atlanta, Attica, Auburn, Aurora, Averill Park, Avoca, Avon, Babylon, Baldwin, Baldwinsville, Ballston Spa, Barnerville, Barneveld, Barton, Bason, Batavia, Bath, Bayport, Beaver Dams, Belfast, Bellerose, Belmont, Bergen, Berkshire, Barne, Bethel, Binghamton, Black River, Bloomingburg, Bloomingdale, Blossvale, Bombay, Boonville, Boston, Breesport, Brewerton, Brightwaters, Broadalbin, Brockport, Bronxville, Brookfield, Brooklyn, Brushton, Buffalo, Burdett, Caledonia, Cambridge, Camden, Canajoharie, Canastota, Candor, Caneadea, Canisteo, Carthage, Cassadaga, Castle Creek, Catskill, Cazenovia, Central Bridge, Ceres, Champlain, Chapin, Chautauqua, Chenango Forks, Cherry Creek, Cherry Valley, Chili, Chittenango, Churchville, Cicero, Clarence, Clarendon, Clarksville, Clay, Clayville, Cleverdale, Clyde, Clymer, Cobleskill, Coeymans, Cohocton, Cohoes, Collins, Collins Center, Commack, Comstock, Conewango Valley, Cooksburg, Cooperstown, Copenhagen, Corfu, Corinth, Corning, Cornwall, Cortland, Coxsackie, Crown Point, Crown Point Center, Cuba, Dale, Dalton, Dansville, Dayton, Delanson, Delhi, Delmar, Depauville, De Peyster, Deposit, De Ruyter, De Witt, Dewittville, Dickinson Center, Dresden, Dryden, Dundee, Eagle Bridge, Earlville, East Amherst, East Aurora, East Bloomfield, East Moriches, East Northport, Eastport, East Rockaway, East Syracuse, East Williston, Eaton, Edwards, Elma, Elmira, Elnora, Endicott, Endwell, Erieville, Erin Esperance, Etna, Fairport, Falconer, Farmingdale, Fayetteville, Ferndale, Fernwood, Fillmore, Fishers, Flushing, Fonda, Forestville, Fort Edward, Fort Hunter, Fort Plain, Frankfort, Franklin, Franklin Depot, Franklin Square, Franklinville, Fredonia, Freedom, Freeport, Freeville, Frewsburg, Friendship, Fulton, Fultonville, Gainesville, Galway, Gasport, Geneseo, Georgetown, Germantown, Gerry, Glen Aubrey, Glenfield, Glens Falls, Gloversville, Gouverneur, Gowanda, Grahamsville, Granville, Great Neck, Greene, Greenlawn, Greenport, Greenville, Greenwich, Guilderland Center, Hagaman, Hamburg, Hamilton, Hamlin, Hannacroix, Hannibal, Harrisville, Hartwick, Hauppauge, Hemlock, Hempstead, Herkimer, Hermon, Heuvelton, Higgins Bay, Highland, Hilton, Himrod, Hoffmans, Hollis, Holcomb, Holland, Holley, Holmes, Homer, Honeoye Falls, Hoosick Falls, Hornell, Horseheads, Houghton, Howes Cave, Hudson, Hudson Falls, Hume, Hurley, Hurleyville, Hyde Park, Ilion, Interlaken, Ionia, Ira, Ithaca, Jamaica, Jamesport, Jamestown, Jay, Jeffersonville, Johnsburg, Johnsonburg, Johnson City, Johnstown, Jordan, Kauneonga Lake, Keeseville, Kendall, Kenmore, Keuka Park, Kingston, Kirkville, Knapp Creek, Lacona, La Fargeville.

Lake Luzerne, Lakemont, Lakewood, Lancaster, Lebanon, Leon, Leonardsville, Le Roy, Liberty, Lima, Limestone, Lisbon, Lisle, Little Falls, Little Valley, Liverpool, Livingston, Livingston Manor, Livonia, Lockport, Long Eddy, Long Island City, Loon Lake, Lowman, Lowville, Ludlowville, Lynbrook, Lyons, Machias, Madrid, Maine, Malone, Manchester, Mannsville, Manorville, Marilla, Marlboro, Martinsburg, Martville, Massena, Mayfield, Mayville, Medusa, Merrickville, Mexico, Middlefield, Middle Grove, Middleport, Middletown, Milton, Mineola, Minetto, Minoa, Mohawk, Moira, Montgomery, Monticello, Mooers, Moravia, Moriah, Morristown, Mount Morris, Mount Vernon, Myers, Nanticoke, Nanuet, Naples, Nedrow, Newark Valley, New Berlin, Newburgh, Newfane, New Hartford, New Hyde Park, Newport, New Suffolk, New York, Niagara Falls, Nile, North Bangor, North Chili, North Cohocton, North Granville, North Pitcher, Northport, North Rose, North Tonawanda, Norton Hill, Norwich, Nunda, Nyack, Oakfield, Ogdensburg, Olean, Oneida, Oneonta, Oramel, Orient, Oriskany Falls, Orweli, Ossining, Oswego, Otego, Otto, Owego, Painted Post, Palatine Bridge, Panama, Patchogue, Pavilion, Pearl River, Peekskill, Penfield, Penn Yan, Perry, Perrysburg, Peru, Philmont, Phoenix, Plattekill, Port Byron, Porterville, Port Henry, Port Jervis, Portville, Potsdam, Poughkeepsie, Prattsville, Preston Hollow, Pulaski, Pultneyville, Randolph, Ransomville, Ravena, Red Creek, Rensselaer, Rexford, Rhinebeck, Richburg, Richford, Richland, Richmondville, Ripley, Riverhead, Rochester, Rockland, Rockville Centre, Rose, Rosendale, Round Lake, Rouses Point, Rush, Rushford, Russell, St. Johnsville, Salamanca, Salt Point, Sandusky, Saranac Lake, Saratoga Springs, Savannah, Sayville, Schenectady, Schenevus, Schuylerville, Scio, Scottsville, Selkirk, Sharon Springs, Sherburne, Sherman, Shortesville, Silver Creek, Silver Springs, Sinclairville, Skaneateles, Sloansville, Smiths Basin, Smithtown, Smyrna, Snyder, Sodus, Sodus Point, Southampton, South Dayton, South Lansing, South Otselic, South Westerlo, Sparrow Bush, Speculator, Spencerport, Speonk, Spragueville, Sprakers, Springfield Center, Spring Valley, Springwater, Stafford, Stanfordville, Stanley, Staten Island, Stillwater, Stockton, Straits Corners, Sundown, Swain, Swan Lake, Syracuse, Tarrytown, Ticonderoga, Tioga Center, Tomkins Cove, Tompkins Corners, Tonawanda, Troy, Trumansburg, Truthville, Unadilla, Union Grove, Union Springs, Utica, Vails Gate, Valley Stream, Varysburg, Vermontville, Vernon Center, Vestal, Victor, Voorheesville, Walden, Wallace, Wallkill, Walton, Wantagh, Warnerville, Warsaw, Warwick, Washingtonville, Waterford, Water Mill, Waterport, Watervliet, Watkins Glen, Waverly, Wayland, Wayne, Webster, Weedsport, Wells Bridge, Wellsburg, Wellsville, Westdale, West Falls, Westfield, Westhampton, Weston Mills, Westport, West Winfield, Whitehall, White Lake, White Plains, Whitney Point, Williamson, Wilmington, Wilson, Windsor, Wolcott, Woodhull, Woodmere, Woodville, Worcester, Wyoming, Yorkshire, Youngstown.

College Point, Middle Village, Solvay, Fairview, Richmond Hill, Woodhaven, Port Dickinson, Pine Bluff, Laramie, Bosler, Cheyenne, Eggertsville, Williamsville, New Hackensack, Port Richmond, Scotia, Menands, East Bethany, Ellenville, Queens Village, Synden, St. Albans, West Granville, Maspeth, Tottenville, Frankport, Astoria, Bayside, Woodside, Forest Hills, Jackson Heights, Sprokers, Elmhurst, Rutherford, Southampton, Sterling, West Barre, Langnoit, Oceanside, Gilbertsville, South New Berlin, Mount Upton, Centerport, Nichols, Troupsburg, Circleville, Fair Oaks, Palmyra, Marion, East Palmyra, Upper Nyack, South Nyack.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 3251. A bill to amend the act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 603), as amended, so as to authorize naval retiring boards to consider the cases of certain officers, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 356).

By Mr. BALDWIN, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 364. A bill to expedite the disposition of Government surplus airports, airport facilities, and equipment and to assure their disposition in such manner as will best encourage and foster the development of civilian aviation and preserve for national defense purposes a strong, efficient, and properly maintained Nation-wide system of public airports, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 359).

By Mr. MAYBANK, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 3394. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the evacuation and return of the remains of certain persons who died and are buried outside the continental limits of the United States," approved May 16, 1946, in order to provide for the shipment of the remains of World War II dead to the homeland of the deceased or of next of kin, to provide for the disposition of group and mass burials, to provide for the burial of unknown American World War II dead in United States military cemeteries to be established overseas, to authorize the Secretary of War to acquire land overseas and to establish United States military cemeteries thereon, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 358).

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on Armed Services:

H. R. 3484. A bill to transfer the Remount Service from the War Department to the Department of Agriculture; without amendment (Rept. No. 357).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 136. A bill for the relief of Ioannis Stephanes; without amendment (Rept. No. 360); and

S. 409. A bill for the relief of Milan Jandrich; with an amendment (Rept. No. 361).

By Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 1087. A bill to amend section 502 (a) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944; without amendment (Rept. No. 362);

S. 1249. A bill authorizing additional research and investigation into problems and methods relating to the eradication of cattle grubs, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 363); and

H. R. 195. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell certain lands in Alaska to the city of Sitka, Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 364).

By Mr. AIKEN:

From the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 1326. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act; with an amendment (Rept. No. 378).

From the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

S. 1350. A bill to authorize relief of the Chief Disbursing Officer, Division of Disbursement, Treasury Department, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 379).

By Mr. REVERCOMB, from the Committee on Public Works:

H. R. 1610. A bill to amend the act of June 14, 1938, so as to authorize the Cairo Bridge Commission to issue its refunding bonds for the purpose of refunding the outstanding bonds issued by the commission to pay the cost of a certain toll bridge at or near Cairo, Ill.; without amendment (Rept. No. 365); and

H. R. 3072. A bill to authorize the preparation of preliminary plans and estimates of cost of for the erection of an addition or extension to the House Office Buildings and the remodeling of the fifth floor of the Old House Office Building; without amendment (Rept. No. 366).

By Mr. O'CONOR, from the Committee on Civil Service:

S. 1180. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of commemorative stamps in honor of Gold Star mothers; without amendment (Rept. No. 367).

By Mr. BUCK, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 612. A bill to amend section 35 of chapter III of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia," as amended, so as to permit certain additional investments; with amendments (Rept. No. 371);

H. R. 1633. A bill to amend section 16 of chapter V of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia"; without amendment (Rept. No. 368);

H. R. 1634. A bill to amend section 1, and provisions (6), (7), and (8) of section 3, and provision (3) of section 4 of chapter V of the act of June 19, 1934, entitled "An act to regulate the business of life insurance in the District of Columbia," and to add sections 5a, 5b, and 5c thereto; without amendment (Rept. No. 369); and

H. R. 1893. A bill to authorize the sale of the bed of E Street SW., between Twelfth and Thirteenth Streets, in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 370).

By Mr. KEM, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 8. A bill to provide for the incorporation, regulation, merger, consolidation, and dissolution of certain business corporations in the District of Columbia; with an amendment (Rept. No. 372);

S. 1442. A bill to amend sections 235 and 327 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 374);

H. R. 494. A bill to reorganize the system of parole of prisoners convicted in the District of Columbia; with amendments (Rept. No. 373);

H. R. 3235. A bill to amend the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia, with respect to abandonment of condemnation proceedings; without amendment (Rept. No. 375); and

H. R. 3515. A bill to make it unlawful in the District of Columbia to corruptly influence participants or officials in contests of skill, speed, strength, or endurance, and to provide a penalty therefor; without amendment (Rept. No. 376).

By Mr. McGRATH, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 1402. A bill to authorize the parishes and congregations of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the District of Columbia to establish bylaws governing the election of their vestrymen; without amendment (Rept. No. 380);

S. 1462. A bill to authorize the official reporters of the municipal court for the District of Columbia to collect fees for transcripts, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 381);

H. R. 2470. A bill to authorize the establishment of a band in the Metropolitan Police force; without amendment (Rept. No. 382);

H. R. 3547. A bill to authorize funds for ceremonies in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 383); and

S. J. Res. 129. Joint resolution to provide for the appropriate commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the seat of the Federal Government in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 384).

By Mr. ECTON, from the Committee on Public Lands:

S. 714. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Claude E. Milliken; with amendments (Rept. No. 385); and

S. 1317. A bill to give to members of the Crow Tribe the power to manage and assume charge of their restricted lands, for their own use or for lease purposes, while such lands remain under trust patents; without amendment (Rept. No. 386).

By Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Public Lands:

S. 1419. A bill to enable the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to authorize the city and county of Honolulu, a municipal corporation, to issue sewer bonds; without amendment (Rept. No. 387); and

S. 1420. A bill to authorize the issuance of certain public-improvement bonds by the Territory of Hawaii; without amendment (Rept. No. 388).

By Mr. BREWSTER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 1038. A bill to amend the Federal Airport Act; with amendments (Rept. No. 389).

By Mr. BROOKS, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

H. J. Res. 170. Joint resolution authorizing the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to Andrew W. Mellon; with amendments;

S. Con. Res. 6. Concurrent resolution to include all general appropriation bills in one consolidated general appropriation bill; with an amendment (Rept. No. 391);

S. Con. Res. 11. Concurrent resolution creating a joint committee to investigate certain matters affecting agriculture; with amendments;

S. Con. Res. 18. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of proceedings at the unveiling of the statue of William E. Borah; without amendment;

S. Res. 123. Resolution requiring each committee of the Senate to report semiannually certain information concerning its employees and expenditure of funds; without amendment;

S. Res. 127. Resolution prohibiting, under certain conditions, the printing in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of matter offered as a part of the remarks of a Senator; without amendment; and

S. Res. 128. Resolution to pay a gratuity to Carolyn Crum Orbello; without amendment.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on June 24, 1947, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill and joint resolution:

S. 751. An act to continue a system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of school-age and under-school-age children in the District of Columbia through June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 113. Joint resolution authorizing the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to the Marine Corps dead of all wars.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and withdrawing the nominations of sundry postmasters, which nominations were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on Civil Service:

Sundry postmasters.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming:

S. 1498. A bill to provide support for wool, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MAYBANK:

S. 1499. A bill providing for the conveyance to the State of South Carolina, or any political subdivision thereof, of that portion of the Fort Moultrie Military Reservation determined to be surplus to the needs of the War Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 1500. A bill for the relief of Lt. Richard Park, United States Naval Reserve; and

S. 1501. A bill for the relief of W. Irving Lincoln; to the Committee on the Judiciary;

S. 1502. A bill to authorize the contribution to the International Children's Emergency Fund of the United Nations of an amount equal to the moneys received by the Selective Service System for the services of persons assigned to work of national importance under civilian direction pursuant to section 5 (g) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 1503. A bill for the relief of Charles L. Bishop; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1504. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the confirmation of the title to the Saline lands in Jackson County, State of Illinois, to D. H. Brush, and others," approved March 2, 1861; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 1505. A bill authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in Boise, Idaho, to the Boise Chamber of Commerce; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1506. A bill for the relief of Max Albrecht Blank; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 1507. A bill authorizing the sale of undisposed of lots in Michel Addition to the town of Polson, Mont.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. McCARRAN (for himself and Mr. WILEY):

S. 1508. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to express the intent of the Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance," approved March 9, 1945 (59 Stat. 33); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

S. 1509. A bill to raise the minimum wage standards of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 1510. A bill to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1511. A bill to provide additional inducements to physicians, surgeons, and dentists to make a career of the United States military, naval, and public health services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 1512. A bill to improve accounting within the Federal Security Administration, to authorize intra-agency transfers and consolidations of appropriations by the Federal Security Administrator, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 1513. A bill to authorize the appointment of Sidney F. Mashbir as a colonel, Adjutant General's Department, United States Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1514 (by request). A bill to amend the act of Congress entitled "An act to accord free entry to bona fide gifts from members of the armed forces of the United States on duty abroad," approved December 5, 1942; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. AIKEN (for himself, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and Mr. FULBRIGHT):

S. 1515. A bill to make surplus property available for the alleviation of damage caused by flood or other catastrophe; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. J. Res. 137. Joint resolution for the relief of certain creditors of the Norwood Pulp & Machinery Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. VANDENBERG, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original joint resolution (S. J. Res. 138) to provide for returns of Italian property in the United States, and for other purposes, which was ordered to be placed on the calendar, and appears under a separate heading.)

RESTRICTIONS ON TRAVEL BY AMERICAN AND FOREIGN CITIZENS

Mr. BREWSTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the resolution (S. Res. 111) relative to modifying restrictions on travel by American and foreign citizens, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSION OF CERTAIN POWERS OF THE PRESIDENT UNDER SECOND WAR POWERS ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. ELLENDER submitted an amendment and Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the bill (S. 1461) to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

CLAIRE M. PHILLIPS—AMENDMENT

Mr. MORSE submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1295) for the relief of Mrs. Claire M. Phillips, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

INVESTIGATION OF OPERATIONS OF POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. BALDWIN (for himself, Mr. BUCK, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. THYE, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. ECTON, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. O'DANIEL, Mr. UMSTEAD, and Mr. O'CONOR) submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 20), which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Senate Committee on Civil Service and the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittees thereof, are hereby authorized and directed to make a joint study and investigation of the operations of the Post Office Department with particular reference to (1) the efficiency of the operations of the Department, (2) the existing postal rates and the extent to which each of the various types of services (including the carriage of different classes of mail) rendered by the Department is self-supporting, and (3) the necessity or desirability of changing the methods of conducting the operations of the Department and of increasing or adjusting postal rates in order to provide more economical methods of executing its functions and to eliminate the deficit resulting from operations of the Department.

SEC. 2. The committees shall report to their respective Houses, as soon as practicable during the present Congress, the results of the joint study and investigation together with such recommendations for necessary legislation, or for changes in methods of operation of the Post Office Department, as they deem advisable.

SEC. 3. (a) To carry out the purposes of this resolution, the committees are authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eightieth Congress; to hold such hearings; to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents; to administer such oaths; to take such testimony; to procure such printing and binding; and to make such expenditures as they deem advisable. The cost of stenographic service to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

(b) In conducting the joint study and investigation, the committees are empowered to appoint and to fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and clerical and stenographic assistants as they deem necessary and advisable, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for comparable duties.

(c) The expenses incurred under this resolution in conducting the joint study and investigation shall not exceed $150,000, and shall be paid upon vouchers approved by the chairmen of the respective committees, or by any member, duly authorized by the respective chairmen. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of disbursements so made.

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO REPORTING OF MEASURES BY COMMITTEES

Mr. GURNEY (for himself, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. AIKEN) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 133), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That paragraph (3) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended to read as follows:

"(3) Each standing committee is authorized to fix the number of its members (but not less than one-third of its entire membership) who shall constitute a quorum thereof for the transaction of such business as may be considered by any such committee. No measure or recommendation shall be reported

from any such committee unless a majority of the members of such committee are actually present or have given proxies to a member or members of such committee.

"SEC. 2. After the date of adoption of this resolution, section 133 (d) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 shall not be effective with respect to the reporting of any measure or recommendation by any standing committee of the Senate."

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 3342. An act to enable the Government of the United States more effectively to carry on its foreign relations by means of promotion of the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills between the people of the United States and other countries, and by means of public dissemination abroad of information about the United States, its people, and its policies; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H. R. 3830. An act to provide for the promotion and elimination of officers of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3911. An act to continue temporary authority of the Maritime Commission until March 1, 1948; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT OF 1947—LETTER BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter on the Labor-Management Relations Act, addressed by him to the workers of Wisconsin and working men and women of America, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY HON. BERNARD M. BARUCH BEFORE INDUSTRIAL COLLEGE OF THE ARMED FORCES

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Bernard M. Baruch before the Industrial College of the Armed Forces on June 26, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

LABOR LEGISLATION—ADDRESS BY JOE A. WILSON

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on labor legislation by Joe A. Wilson, general representative of the International Printing Pressmen and Assistants' Union of North America, at the Southwest Conference of Printing Pressmen and Assistants, at Galveston, Tex., June 16, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRICE REDUCTION WITH INCREASED WAGES—STATEMENT BY FOWLER McCORMICK

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement regarding reduction in prices with increases in wages, by Fowler McCormick, chairman of the board of the International Harvester Co., before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, on June 26, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE INTERSTATE OIL COMPACT—ADDRESS BY HIRAM M. DOW

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered recently by Mr. Hiram M. Dow, one of New Mexico's leading lawyers, before the Producers' and Royalty Owners' Association, at Amarillo, Tex., on the subject of the interstate oil compact and the work of the Interstate Oil Compact Commission, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONSERVATION FARMING—ESSAY BY JULIAN STOUTAMYER

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an essay entitled "Conservation Farming," written by Julian Stoutamyer, of the elementary school of Front Royal, Va., which appears in the Appendix.]

LABOR LEGISLATION—TELEGRAPHIC COMMENT

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two telegrams urging the sustaining of the President's veto of the labor bill, one from the Joint Council of Teamsters, No. 37, Phil Brady, president; the other from M. E. Steele; which appear in the Appendix.]

THE PALESTINE SITUATION—LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT FROM BILLY ROSE

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter to President Truman from Billy Rose dealing with the Palestine situation, published in the Washington Times-Herald of June 25, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMUNIST INFILTRATION IN COUNTRIES SOUTH OF THE RIO GRANDE—LETTER FROM SAMUEL E. GIUDICI

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by Samuel E. Giudici, of Lima, Peru, regarding plans for preventive measures taken by the American Legion against Communist infiltration in the countries south of the Rio Grande, and resolutions pertaining thereto, which appear in the Appendix.]

NO LOAFERS, THEY—EDITORIAL FROM THE WILMINGTON (DEL.) JOURNAL-EVERY EVENING

[Mr. WILLIAMS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "No Loafers, They," published in the Wilmington (Del.) Journal-Every Evening of June 20, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PRESIDENT'S VETO OF THE LABOR BILL—ARTICLE FROM NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Truman and His 'Team' Stand Up to Congress," published in the New York Times of June 22, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT OF 1947—EDITORIAL FROM ARKANSAS DEMOCRAT

[Mr. McCLELLAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Labor Reform Bill Becomes Law," published in the Arkansas Democrat of June 24, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

TO THE BOARDS OF DIRECTORS OF AMERICAN BUSINESS — EDITORIAL FROM FORTUNE MAGAZINE

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "To the Boards of Directors of American Business," published in the June 1947 issue of Fortune magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS (H. DOC. NO. 365)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and with the accompanying report referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 7728.)

EXTENSION OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 135) to extend the succession, lending powers, and the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

TITLE I—AMENDMENT TO RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION ACT

SECTION 1. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. There is hereby created a body corporate with the name 'Reconstruction Finance Corporation' (herein called the Corporation), with a capital stock of $325,000,000 subscribed by the United States of America. Its principal office shall be located in the District of Columbia, but there may be established agencies or branch offices in any city or cities of the United States under rules and regulations prescribed by the board of directors. This act may be cited as the 'Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act.'

"SEC. 2. The management of the Corporation shall be vested in a board of directors consisting of five persons appointed by the President of the United States by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Of the five members of the board, not more than three shall be members of any one political party and not more than one shall be appointed from any one Federal Reserve district. Each director shall devote his time principally to the business of the Corporation. The terms of the directors shall be 2 years but they may continue in office until their successors are appointed and qualified. Whenever a vacancy shall occur other than by expiration of term the person appointed to fill such vacancy shall hold office for the unexpired portion of the term of the director whose place he is selected to fill. The directors, except the chairman, shall receive salaries at the rate of $12,500 per annum each. The chairman of the board of directors shall receive a salary at the rate of $15,000 per annum.

"SEC. 3. (a) The Corporation shall have succession through June 30, 1949, unless it is sooner dissolved by an act of Congress. It shall have power to adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal; to make contracts; to lease or purchase such real estate as may be necessary for the transaction of its business; to sue and be sued, to complain and to defend, in any court of competent jurisdiction, State or Federal: *Provided*, That the Corporation shall be entitled to and granted the same immunities and exemptions from the payment of costs, charges, and fees as are granted to the United States pursuant to the provisions of law codified in sections 543, 548, 555, 557, 578, and 578a of title 28 of the United States Code, 1940 edition; to select, employ, and fix the compensation of such officers, employees, attorneys, and agents as shall be necessary for the transaction of the business of the Corporation, in accordance with laws, applicable to the Corporation, as in effect on June 30, 1947, and as thereafter amended; and to prescribe, amend, and repeal, by its board of directors, bylaws, rules, and regulations governing the manner in which its general business may be conducted. Except as may be otherwise provided in this act, the board of directors of the Corporation shall determine the necessity for and the character and amount of its obligations and expenditures under this act and the manner in which they shall be budgeted, incurred, allowed, paid, and accounted for, without regard to the

provisions of any other laws governing the expenditure of public funds and such determinations shall be final and conclusive upon all other officers of the Government. The Corporation shall be entitled to the free use of the United States mails in the same manner as the executive departments of the Government.

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the right to recover compensation granted by the act approved September 7, 1916, as amended (5 U. S. C., sec. 751), shall be in lieu of, and shall be construed to abrogate, any and all other rights and remedies which any person, except for this provision, might, on account of injury or death of an employee, assert against the Corporation or any of its subsidiaries.

"SEC. 4. (a) To aid in financing agriculture, commerce, and industry, to help in maintaining the economic stability of the country and to assist in promoting maximum employment and production, the Corporation, within the limitations hereinafter provided, is authorized—

"(1) To purchase the obligations of and to make loans to any business enterprise organized or operating under the laws of any State or the United States: *Provided*, That the purchase of obligations (including equipment trust certificates) of, or the making of loans to railroads or air carriers engaged in interstate commerce or receivers or trustees thereof, shall be with the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission or the Civil Aeronautics Board, respectively: *Provided further*, That in the case of railroads or air carriers not in receivership or trusteeship, the Commission or the Board, as the case may be, in connection with its approval of such purchases or loans, shall also certify that such railroad or air carrier, on the basis of present and prospective earnings, may be expected to meet its fixed charges without a reduction thereof through judicial reorganization except that such certificates shall not be required in the case of loans or purchases made for the acquisition of equipment or for maintenance.

"(2) To make loans to any financial institution organized under the laws of any State or of the United States.

"(3) In order to aid in financing projects authorized under Federal, State, or municipal law, to purchase the securities and obligations of, or make loans to, (A) municipalities and political subdivisions of States, (B) public agencies and instrumentalities of one or more States, municipalities, and political subdivisions of States, and (C) public corporations, boards, and commissions: *Provided*, That no such purchase or loan shall be made for payment of ordinary governmental or nonproject operating expenses as distinguished from purchases and loans to aid in financing specific public projects.

"(4) To make such loans, in an aggregate amount not to exceed $25,000,000 outstanding at any one time, as it may determine to be necessary or appropriate because of floods or other catastrophes.

"(b) No financial assistance shall be extended pursuant to paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a) of this section, unless the financial assistance applied for is not otherwise available on reasonable terms. All securities and obligations purchased and all loans made under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a) of this section shall be of such sound value or so secured as reasonably to assure retirement or repayment and such loans may be made either directly or in cooperation with banks or other lending institutions through agreements to participate or by the purchase of participations, or otherwise.

"(c) The total amount of investments, loans, purchases, and commitments made pursuant to this section 4 shall not exceed $2,000,000,000 outstanding at any one time.

"(d) No fee or commission shall be paid by any applicant for financial assistance under the provisions of this act in connection with any such application, and any agreement to pay or payment of any such fee or commission shall be unlawful.

"(e) No director, officer, attorney, agent, or employee of the Corporation in any manner, directly or indirectly, shall participate in the deliberation upon or the determination of any question affecting his personal interests, or the interests of any corporation, partnership, or association in which he is directly or indirectly interested.

"(f) The powers granted to the Corporation by this section shall terminate at the close of business on June 30, 1949, but the termination of such powers shall not be construed (1) to prohibit disbursement of funds on purchases of securities and obligations, on loans, or on commitments or agreements to make such purchases or loans, made under this act prior to the close of business on such date, or (2) to affect the validity or performance of any other agreement made or entered into pursuant to law.

"(g) As used in this act, the term 'State' includes the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

"SEC. 5. Section 5202 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the words 'War Finance Corporation Act' and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act'.

"SEC. 6. The Federal Reserve banks are authorized and directed to act as custodians and fiscal agents for the Corporation in the general performance of its powers conferred by this act and the Corporation may reimburse such Federal Reserve banks for such services in such manner as may be agreed upon.

"SEC. 7. The Corporation may issue to the Secretary of the Treasury its notes, debentures, bonds, or other such obligations in an amount outstanding at any one time sufficient to enable the Corporation to carry out its functions under this act or any other provision of law, such obligations to mature not more than 5 years from their respective dates of issue, to be redeemable at the option of the Corporation before maturity in such manner as may be stipulated in such obligations. Such obligations may mature subsequent to the period of succession of the Corporation. Each such obligation shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of the obligation of the Corporation. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to purchase any obligations of the Corporation to be issued hereunder, and for such purpose the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, are extended to include any purchases of the Corporation's obligations hereunder.

"SEC. 8. The Corporation, including its franchise, capital, reserves and surplus, and its income shall be exempt from all taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States, by any Territory, dependency, or possession thereof, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority, except that any real property of the Corporation shall be subject to special assessments for local improvements and shall be subject to State, Territorial, county, municipal, or local taxation to the same extent according to its value as other real property is taxed: *Provided*, That the special assessment and taxation of real property as authorized herein shall not include the taxation as real property of possessory interests, pipe lines, power lines, or machinery or equipment owned by the Corporation regardless of their nature, use, or manner of attachment or affixation to the land, building, or other structure upon or in which the same may be located. The exemptions provided for in the preceding sentence with respect to taxation (which shall, for all purposes, be deemed to include sales, use, storage, and purchase taxes) shall be construed to be applicable not only with respect to the Corporation but also with respect to any other public corporation which is now or which may be hereafter wholly financed and wholly managed by the Corporation. Such exemptions shall also be construed to be applicable to loans made, and personal property owned by the Corporation or such other corporations, but such exemptions shall not be construed to be applicable in any State to any buildings which are considered by the laws of such State to be personal property for taxation purposes. Notwithstanding any other provision of law or any privilege or consent to tax expressly or impliedly granted thereby, the shares of preferred stock of national banking associations, and the shares of preferred stock, capital notes, and debentures of State banks and trust companies, acquired prior to July 1, 1947, by the Corporation, and the dividends or interest derived therefrom by the Corporation, shall not, so long as the Corporation shall continue to own the same, be subject to any taxation by the United States, by any Territory, dependency or possession thereof, or the District of Columbia, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority, whether now, heretofore, or hereafter imposed, levied or assessed, and whether for a past, present, or future taxing period.

"SEC. 9. In the event of termination of the powers granted to the Corporation by section 4 of this act prior to the expiration of its succession as provided in section 3, the board of directors shall, except as otherwise herein specifically authorized, proceed to liquidate its assets and wind up its affairs. It may with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury deposit with the Treasurer of the United States as a special fund any money belonging to the Corporation or from time to time received by it in the course of liquidation, for the payment of its outstanding obligations, which fund may be drawn upon or paid out for no other purpose. Any balance remaining after the liquidation of all the Corporation's assets and after provision has been made for payment of all legal obligations shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts. Thereupon the Corporation shall be dissolved and its capital stock shall be canceled and retired.

"SEC. 10. If at the expiration of the succession of the Corporation, its board of directors shall not have completed the liquidation of its assets and the winding up of its affairs, the duty of completing such liquidation and winding up of its affairs shall be transferred to the Secretary of the Treasury, who for such purpose shall succeed to all the powers and duties of the board of directors under this act. In such event he may assign to any officer or officers of the United States in the Treasury Department the exercise and performance, under his general supervision and direction, of any such powers and duties. When the Secretary of the Treasury shall find that such liquidation will no longer be advantageous to the United States and that all of the Corporation's legal obligations have been provided for, he shall retire any capital stock then outstanding, pay into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts the unused balance of the moneys belonging to the Corporation, and make a final report to the Congress. Thereupon the Corporation shall be deemed to be dissolved.

"SEC. 11. (a) Whoever makes any statement knowing it to be false, or whoever willfully overvalues any security, for the purpose of obtaining for himself or for any applicant

any loan, or extension thereof by removal, deferment of action or otherwise, or the acceptance, release, or substitution of security therefor, or for the purpose of influencing in any way the action of the Corporation, or for the purpose of obtaining money, property, or anything of value, under this act, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both.

"(b) Whoever (1) falsely makes, forges, or counterfeits any note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or coupon, in imitation of or purporting to be a note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or coupon, issued by the Corporation; or (2) passes, utters, or publishes, or attempts to pass, utter, or publish, any false, forged, or counterfeited note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or coupon, purporting to have been issued by the Corporation, knowing the same to be false, forged, or counterfeited; or (3) falsely alters any note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or coupon, issued or purporting to have been issued by the Corporation; or (4) passes, utters, or publishes, or attempts to pass, utter, or publish, as true any falsely altered or spurious note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or coupon, issued or purporting to have been issued by the Corporation, knowing the same to be falsely altered or spurious, or any person who willfully violates any other provision of this act, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000, by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

"(c) Whoever, being connected in any capacity with the Corporation, (1) embezzles, abstracts, purloins, or willfully misapplies any moneys, funds, securities, or other things of value, whether belonging to it or pledged or otherwise entrusted to it; or (2) with intent to defraud the Corporation or any other body politic or corporate, or any individual, or to deceive any officer, auditor, or examiner of the Corporation, makes any false entry in any book, report, or statement of or to the Corporation, or, without being duly authorized, draws any order or issues, puts forth, or assigns any note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or draft, bill of exchange, mortgage, judgment, or decree thereof; or (3) with intent to defraud participates, shares, receives directly or indirectly any money, profit, property, or benefit through any transaction, loan, commission, contract, or any other act of the Corporation; or (4) gives any unauthorized information concerning any future action or plan of the corporation which might affect the value of securities, or having such knowledge, invests or speculates, directly or indirectly, in the securities or property of any company, bank, or corporation receiving loans or other assistance from the Corporation, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

"(d) No individual, association, partnership, or corporation shall use the words 'Reconstruction Finance Corporation' or a combination of these three words, as the name or a part thereof under which he or it shall do business. Every individual, partnership, association, or corporation violating this prohibition shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not exceeding $1,000 or imprisonment not exceeding 1 year, or both.

"(e) The provisions of sections 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, and 117 of the Criminal Code of the United States (U. S. C., title 18, ch. 5, secs. 202 to 207, inclusive), insofar as applicable, are extended to apply to contracts or agreements with the Corporation under this act, which for the purposes hereof shall be held to include loans, advances, discounts, and rediscounts; extensions and renewals thereof; and acceptances, releases, and substitutions of security therefor.

"SEC. 12. The Corporation is authorized to exercise the functions, powers, duties, and authority transferred to the Corporation by Public Law 109, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved June 30, 1945, but only with respect to programs, projects, or commitments outstanding on June 30, 1947.

"SEC. 13. If any provision of this act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this act, and the applicability of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby."

TITLE II—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 201. No provision of this act shall be construed so as to prevent the Corporation from disbursing funds on purchases, of securities and obligations, on loans made, or on commitments or agreements to make such purchases or loans, and liabilities incurred, pursuant to law prior to the effective date of this act.

SEC. 202. The succession of United States Commercial Company, a corporation created by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation pursuant to section 5d (3) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is hereby extended through June 30, 1948.

SEC. 203. All assets and liabilities of every kind and nature, together with all documents, books of account, and records, of The RFC Mortgage Company, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Maryland, all the capital stock of which is owned and held by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, shall be transferred to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. With respect to the assets, liabilities, and records transferred, "Reconstruction Finance Corporation" for all purposes is hereby substituted for "The RFC Mortgage Company," and no suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against such corporation shall abate by reason of the enactment of this act, but the court, on motion or supplemental petition filed at any time within 12 months after the date of such enactment, showing a necessity for the survival of such suit, action, or other proceeding to obtain a determination of the questions involved, may allow the same to be maintained by or against the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

SEC. 204. The Federal Loan Agency, created by Reorganization Plan No. 1 pursuant to the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1939, approved April 3, 1939, is hereby abolished, and all its property and records are hereby transferred to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

SEC. 205. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to transfer as soon as practicable after the effective date of this act, to the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to receive, all of the stock of the Federal home-loan banks held by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cancel notes of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and sums due and unpaid upon or in connection with such notes at the time of such cancellation, in an amount equal to the par value of the stock so transferred.

SEC. 206. The following acts and portions of acts are hereby repealed:

(a) Sections 1, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, and 211 of the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932, approved July 21, 1932 (47 Stat. 709), as amended;

(b) Section 304 of the act approved March 9, 1933 (48 Stat. 1), as amended;

(c) Sections 27, 32, 36, 37, and 38 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, approved May 12, 1933 (48 Stat. 41), as amended;

(d) Sections 5 and 19 (c) and the last two sentences of section 8 (b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, approved May 12, 1933 (48 Stat. 33), as amended;

(e) The act approved June 10, 1933 (48 Stat. 119), as amended;

(f) The last sentence of section 4 (b) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, approved June 13, 1933 (48 Stat. 129), as amended;

(g) Sections 301 and 302 of the National Industrial Recovery Act, approved June 16, 1933 (48 Stat. 195), as amended;

(h) Section 84 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933, approved June 16, 1933 (48 Stat. 257), as amended;

(i) The act approved January 20, 1934 (48 Stat. 318);

(j) The fourth paragraph of the Emergency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1935, approved June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1056), and section 202 of the Public Works Administration Extension Act of 1937, approved June 29, 1937 (50 Stat. 357);

(k) Sections 10, 13, 14, 15, and 16 of the act approved June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1105), as amended;

(l) So much of sections 4 and 602 of the National Housing Act, approved June 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 1247), as amended, as relates to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation;

(m) The first section and sections 2, 3, 9, 11, and 13 of the act approved January 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 1), as amended;

(n) The act approved August 24, 1935 (49 Stat., ch. 646, p. 796);

(o) The act approved March 20, 1936 (49 Stat. 1185);

(p) The act approved April 10, 1936 (49 Stat., ch. 168, p. 1191);

(q) The first section of the act approved January 26, 1937 (50 Stat. 5), as amended;

(r) The act approved February 11, 1937 (50 Stat. 19), as amended;

(s) So much of section 32 (b) of the Farm Credit Act of 1937, approved August 19, 1937 (50 Stat. 703), as relates to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and so much of section 33 (b) of the said act as relates to the payment of the expenses of corporations formed by the consolidation of two or more regional agricultural credit corporations;

(t) So much of the act approved June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1193), as relates to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation;

(u) Section 12 of the Federal Highway Act of 1940, approved September 5, 1940 (54 Stat. 867);

(v) Section 5 of the act approved June 10, 1941 (55 Stat. 250);

(w) The act approved October 23, 1941 (55 Stat., ch. 454, p. 744);

(x) The act approved March 27, 1942 (56 Stat., ch. 198, p. 174);

(y) The act approved June 5, 1942 (56 Stat., ch. 352, p. 326); and

(z) Sections 1 and 2 of Public Law 656, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 7, 1946.

SEC. 207. The liquidation of the affairs of the Smaller War Plants Corporation administered by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation pursuant to Executive Order 9665 shall be carried out by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, notwithstanding the provisions of the last paragraph of section 5 of the First War Powers Act, 1941. The Smaller War Plants Corporation is hereby abolished.

SEC. 208. (a) The Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall have the power to purchase any surplus property for resale, subject to regulations of the War Assets Administrator or his successor, to small business when, in its judgment, such disposition is required to preserve and strengthen the competitive position of small business. The purchase of surplus property under this section shall be given priority under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, immediately following transfers to Government agencies under section 12 of such act, as amended, and disposals to veterans under section 16 of such act, as amended. The provisions of section 12 (c) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, shall be applicable to purchases made under this section. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall not purchase any surplus property pursuant to this section

unless a small business had previously made application to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for such property. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall not purchase any real property for resale to small business pursuant to this section in any case where any person from whom the property had been acquired by a Government agency, gives notice in writing to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation that he intends to exercise his rights under section 23 of the Surplus Property Act, as amended.

(b) The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is further authorized for the purpose of carrying out the objectives of this section to arrange for sales of surplus property to small business concerns on credit or time basis.

(c) For the purposes of this section the terms "persons," "surplus property," and "Government agency" have the same meaning as is assigned to such terms by section 3 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended.

SEC. 209. During the period between June 30, 1947, and the date of enactment of legislation making funds available for administrative expenses for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, the Corporation is authorized to incur, and pay out of its general funds, administrative expenses in accordance with laws in effect on June 30, 1947, such obligations and expenditures to be charged against funds when made available for administrative expenses for the fiscal year 1948.

SEC. 210. This act shall take effect as of midnight June 30, 1947.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. BUCK, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. MAYBANK, and Mr. TAYLOR conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY subsequently said: Mr. President, I have been advised by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] that in view of other engagements he will not be able to act as conferee on the legislation involving the extension of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that he be excused and that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] be appointed in his place.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the change is made.

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 564) to provide for the performance of the duties of the office of President, in case of the removal, resignation, or inability both of the President and Vice President.

Mr. WHERRY. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is the Presidential succession bill.

Mr. WHERRY. In order for that business to be displaced there must be unanimous consent or a motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. Matters transacted by unanimous consent do not affect the status of the bill to which the Senator from Nebraska refers.

PERMANENT BUILDING FOR THE AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I ask unanimous consent to report favorably from the Committee on Foreign Relations House Joint Resolution 193, to grant authority for the erection of a permanent building for the American National Red Cross, District of Columbia Chapter, Washington, D. C., and I submit a report (No. 355) thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the report will be received.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, if the House joint resolution shall be enacted, title to the building and the property will remain in the Government of the United States. No expense is involved. The upkeep of the building will be a charge against the Red Cross.

There is great anxiety to complete certain details prior to July 1. The joint resolution has unanimously passed the House of Representatives, it has the approval of all the appropriate authorities of the District of Columbia, and I take the liberty of asking unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside for the consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Reserving the right to object, I should be glad indeed to comply with the suggestion of the distinguished Senator from Michigan, with the understanding that no controversy will be provoked in the consideration of the measure. If there is, I think the Senator will agree with me we should proceed with the regular order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator is quite correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the senior Senator from Michigan?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 193) to grant authority for the erection of a permanent building for the American National Red Cross, District of Columbia Chapter, Washington, D. C., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RETURN OF ITALIAN PROPERTY IN THE UNITED STATES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I ask unanimous consent to report in lieu of Senate Joint Resolution 133 an original joint resolution to provide for return of Italian property in the United States, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 390) thereon.

There being no objection, the report was received, and the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 138) to provide for return of Italian property in the United States, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT OF 1947

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, a few days ago, on the occasion of the final debate on the Taft-Hartley labor bill, I expressed faith in the National Labor Relations Board, in the membership of the Board, and in the Board's willingness to cooperate in the administration of the new act. I felt sure, and I feel sure at this time, that there will be no question as to their desires and as to their activity in connection with that administration. I am sure that they will be 100 percent in their effort to carry it out, and to carry out the intent of the Congress in its passage.

In this connection I wish to read, because I think it should appear in the RECORD, a statement of the Board, which is very brief, indicating their desire in the matter. It reads as follows:

> Yesterday the Taft-Hartley bill was proposed legislation. Today it is the Labor-Management Relations Act, the law of the land. The people's representatives having spoken, the debate is over so far as this Board is concerned.
>
> The Congress has not only decided the policy issues, but has entrusted the effectuation of much of the new policy to the National Labor Relations Board. All who accept that trust must do so with single-minded purpose to carry out the congressional intent. Effective June 24, 1947, this Board will prepare to give the new act the fairest and most efficient administration that lies within its power.

Mr. President, that is the statement. The same night on which this statement was issued, the Chairman of the Board, Mr. Paul M. Herzog, appeared on a radio program and pledged again not only his own cooperation, but the cooperation of all the members of the Board. At that time Mr. Herzog not only made this pledge in behalf of himself and of the Board, but he also indicated his willingness to cooperate fully with the joint congressional committee which is to be appointed under the provisions of the act, to aid in carrying it out, to aid in the study of all labor relations in this country, and to ascertain not only what changes in administrative techniques may be needed in the way of implementing the new act, but also what changes may be needed in the act itself following a period of experience with its administration.

Mr. President, to me that is a fine beginning for the new act. I am sorry that there are those in this country who seem to want to take issue with it immediately, and perhaps to try to circumvent its operation.

Personally, I believe the new act can be made to work successfully. I believe we can remove whatever defects it contains. I believe that those defects need not interfere with its operation in the year 1947, and I believe that, with a proper attitude of cooperation between labor and management, out of this act we can build in this country the kind of management-labor relationship which is so essential, and which, unfortunately, has been lacking up to the present time.

CANCELLATION OF STOCK OF FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. For what purpose, may I ask the distinguished Senator?

Mr. CAPEHART. I desire to ask unanimous consent to take up Senate bill 1070, Calendar No. 305.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall be glad to comply with the request of the distinguished Senator from Indiana, if the bill will provoke no controversy. If there should be prolonged debate upon the bill, I should like to have the regular order.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider Senate bill 1070, Calendar No. 305.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1070) to provide for the cancellation of the capital stock of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the refund of moneys received for such stock, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BUTLER. May we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I want to yield to the able Senator from Michigan for an amendment to the bill. He was the original author of the bill, and I should like to hear from him.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I think this is a perfectly sound measure, down to section 6, on page 5. At that point I very violently disagree with the bill. Down to that point, the bill proposes to retire the Federal investment in the capital structure of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, under certain safeguards. Down to that point, I think the situation is precisely as it ought to be. But, when section 6 is reached, it is proposed for the first time to classify the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation among the other general corporations of the Government, and submit it to the jurisdiction of the Bureau of the Budget. Fundamentally, I think that is a grave error—just as grave an error as it would be to submit the Federal Reserve banking system to the jurisdiction of the Bureau of the Budget.

Furthermore, after the preceding sections of the bill have taken effect, there will cease to be a penny of Government investment in the FDIC; there will cease to be a penny of revenue involved in the operation of the FDIC; there will cease to be any capital stock; the FDIC will become a private trust, operated under public authority. I submit that the FDIC will cease to be a Government corporation, in any sense of the word, comparable with the other Government corporations, which I agree ought to be brought under the Bureau of the Budget.

The FDIC is audited by the General Accounting Office and the Comptroller General. On the board of the FDIC sits the Comptroller of the Currency. In my view, the FDIC is the most important single factor in the maintenance of public confidence in the fiscal system of the Government of the United States, and under no circumstances should its independence, its complete, total, and utter independence, be handicapped or mortgaged by any sort of political interference; and the Bureau of the Budget is a political institution.

I submit that the experience of the country under the FDIC for the past 12 years indicates the complete necessity for the maintenance of its independence, so that it in turn may maintain without impairment the complete public confidence which America today has in its banking institutions; and I submit that when the first step has been taken toward subordinating the FDIC's independence to political administrative control, the first step has been taken in tearing down the basis of the most essential source of public confidence in our public fiscal affairs. I submit to the able Senator from Indiana that, in the spirit of the remainder of the bill, section 6 should be deleted, and the independence of this institution should be completely preserved. I shall move to strike section 6 from the bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, as author of the bill, I accept the amendment.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, was this matter submitted to the committee, or is this now a motion being made for the first time on the floor?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I appeared before the committee in connection with the remainder of the bill, at which time this particular proposition had not been proposed; therefore I had no opportunity to testify in respect to it. But it is the united opinion of the Treasury Department, of the Bureau of the Budget itself, and of the FDIC, and particularly of Mr. Crowley, expressed in a very moving message received from him a few days ago, that the independence of the FDIC must not be mortgaged in any such fashion.

Mr. HATCH. The proposition was not first acted upon by the committee?

Mr. VANDENBERG. No, it was not.

Mr. CONNALLY. If this was not considered by the committee, on whose responsibility is it being offered?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The committee considered it.

Mr. CONNALLY. As I understood the Senator, he stated that when he appeared before the committee, this matter was not before it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It was not a part of the bill at the time I testified.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, if I may answer the inquiry of the able Senator from Texas, this was not in the bill which I originally offered. It was later put in the bill by the committee. In my opinion, the section should not be a part of the bill. I am perfectly willing to have it withdrawn, and to agree to the amendment offered by the able Senator from Michigan, because I am in hearty accord that the section should not be in the bill.

I may say further that the Chairman of the FDIC is opposed to its being in the bill. I do not know who was the author of the suggestion that the section be placed in the bill, but certainly the opinion was not unanimous that it be put in the bill. I do not believe it is a controversial subject, so far as the committee is concerned.

Mr. President, may we have a vote on the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1070) to provide for the cancellation of the capital stock of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the refund of moneys received for such stock, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with amendments.

The first amendment of the committee was, in section 1, line 3, to strike out:

That the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is directed to repay to the Secretary of the Treasury, to be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, and to each of the Federal Reserve banks the amount received, respectively, from the Secretary or from such bank for the capital stock of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; and all stock and subscriptions for stock of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation shall be canceled upon the enactment of this act.

And insert:

That the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is directed to retire its capital stock by paying the amount received therefor (whether received from the Secretary of the Treasury or the Federal Reserve banks) to the Secretary of the Treasury as hereinafter provided, to be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. As soon as practicable after the enactment of this act, the Corporation shall pay to the Secretary so much of its capital and surplus as is in excess of $1,000,000,000. The balance of the amount to be paid to the Secretary shall be paid in units of $10,000,000 except that the last unit to be paid may be less than $10,000,000. Each unit shall be paid as soon as it may be paid without reducing the capital and surplus of the Corporation below $1,000,000,000. As each payment is made a corresponding amount of the capital stock of the Corporation shall be retired and canceled and the receipt or certificate therefor shall be surrendered or endorsed to show such cancellation. The stock subscribed by the various Federal Reserve banks shall be retired and canceled, pro rata, before the stock subscribed by the Secretary is retired and canceled.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to strike out all of section 3, as follows:

SEC. 3. Section 12B (h) (1) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 264 (h) (1)), is amended by striking out the first sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"The assessment rate shall be one-twelfth of 1 percent per annum until such time as the surplus of the Corporation on the 1st day of January or July of any year may equal or exceed $1,000,000,000; and thereafter no further assessments shall be made, except that if on the 1st day of January or July of any year the surplus of the Corporation does not exceed $990,000,000, the Corporation is authorized to make an assessment for the 6-month period beginning on such date at a rate not in excess of one twenty-fourth of 1 percent per annum. The Corporation may, with respect to any period for which assessments are not required to be made, waive such of the reports required by this

paragraph (h) as the Corporation may deem advisable."

And insert a new section 3, as follows:

SEC. 3. Section 12B (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 264 (b)), is amended by striking out "$10,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$12,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to strike out all of section 4, as follows:

SEC. 4. The first sentence of section 12B (o) (1) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 264 (o) (1)), is amended to read as follows:

"The Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding its notes, debentures, bonds, or other such obligations, in a par amount aggregating not more than three times the sum of (A) the amount of the capital stock of the Corporation outstanding on January 1, 1947, and (B) the amount received by the Corporation in payment of the assessments upon insured banks for the year 1936."

And to insert a new section 4, as follows:

SEC. 4. Section 12B (o) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 264 (o)), is amended to read as follows:

"(o) The Corporation is authorized to borrow from the Treasury, and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to loan to the Corporation on such terms as may be fixed by the Corporation and the Secretary, such funds as in the judgment of the Board of Directors of the Corporation are from time to time required for insurance purposes, not exceeding in the aggregate $3,000,000,000. For such purpose the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds of the sale of any securities hereafter issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, are extended to include such loans. Any such loan shall be used by the Corporation solely in carrying out its functions with respect to such insurance. All loans and repayments under this section shall be treated as public-debt transactions of the United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to insert a new section 5, as follows:

SEC. 5. Subsections (b) and (c) of section 5e of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 15, secs. 606a (b) and (c)), are hereby repealed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to insert a new section 6, as follows:

SEC. 6. The Government Corporation Control Act is amended by—

(a) inserting in section 101 after "Panama Railroad Company" a semicolon and "Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation";

(b) inserting at the end of section 102 the following new sentence: "The budget program of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, however, shall not be required to contain estimates of (1) amounts to be used to pay insurance claims or to purchase, or make loans on, assets of insured banks, (2) expenses in connection with receiverships for banks becoming insolvent after the preparation of such budget program, or (3) borrowings for the purposes specified in (1) and (2).";" and

(c) striking out of section 201 the following: ", and (4) Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation."

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, this is the amendment which I ask be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment inserting a new section 6 in the bill.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Indiana whether or not the rates or the charges for auditing the various banks have been changed in the bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. They have not been changed in the bill. The rates in the bill remain as they were formerly.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1070) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is directed to retire its capital stock by paying the amount received therefor (whether received from the Secretary of the Treasury or the Federal Reserve banks) to the Secretary of the Treasury as hereinafter provided, to be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. As soon as practicable after the enactment of this act, the Corporation shall pay to the Secretary so much of its capital and surplus as is in excess of $1,000,000,000. The balance of the amount to be paid to the Secretary shall be paid in units of $10,000,000 except that the last unit to be paid may be less than $10,000,000. Each unit shall be paid as soon as it may be paid without reducing the capital and surplus of the Corporation below $1,000,000,000. As each payment is made a corresponding amount of the capital stock of the Corporation shall be retired and canceled and the receipt or certificate therefor shall be surrendered or endorsed to show such cancellation. The stock subscribed by the various Federal Reserve banks shall be retired and canceled, pro rata, before the stock subscribed by the Secretary is retired and canceled.

SEC. 2. Section 12B (d) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 264 (d)), is hereby repealed.

SEC. 3. Section 12B (b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 264 (b)), is amended by striking out "$10,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$12,500."

SEC. 4. Section 12B (o) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 264 (o)), is amended to read as follows:

"(o) The Corporation is authorized to borrow from the Treasury, and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to loan to the Corporation on such terms as may be fixed by the Corporation and the Secretary, such funds as in the judgment of the Board of Directors of the Corporation are from time to time required for insurance purposes, not exceeding in the aggregate $3,000,000,000. For such purpose the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds of the sale of any securities hereafter issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, are extended to include such loans. Any such loan shall be used by the Corporation solely in carrying out its functions with respect to such insurance. All loans and repayments under this section shall be treated as public-debt transactions of the United States."

SEC. 5. Subsections (b) and (c) of section 5e of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 15, secs. 606a (b) and (c)), are hereby repealed.

SUPPORT FOR WOOL—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 68)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 814, entitled "The Wool Act of 1947."

This bill contains features which would have an adverse effect on our international relations and which are not necessary for the support of our domestic wool growers.

As originally passed by the Senate, the bill directed the Commodity Credit Corporation to continue until the end of 1948 to support prices to domestic producers of wool at not less than 1946 levels. It further authorized the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell wool held by it at market prices. I have no objection to these provisions.

As passed by the House, the bill carried an amendment intended to increase the tariff on wool through the imposition of import fees. This was done to provide a means of increasing the domestic market price for wool to approximately the support price, thus shifting the cost of the support from the Treasury to the consumers of wool products. The prices of these products are already high.

The conferees of the two Houses agreed upon a measure closely following the House bill, but empowering me to impose import quotas as well as import fees.

The enactment of a law providing for additional barriers to the importation of wool at the very moment when this Government is taking the leading part in a United Nations Conference at Geneva called for the purpose of reducing trade barriers and of drafting a charter for an International Trade Organization, in an effort to restore the world to economic peace, would be a tragic mistake. It would be a blow to our leadership in world affairs. It would be interpreted around the world as a first step on that same road to economic isolationism down which we and other countries traveled after the First World War with such disastrous consequences.

I cannot approve such an action.

The wool growers of this country are entitled to receive support. There is still ample time for this Congress to pass wool legislation consistent with our international responsibilities and the interests of our economy as a whole. I urge that the Congress do so promptly.

A bill based on the general principles and policy of the original Senate bill would be acceptable to me, although I would prefer a more permanent wool program, as suggested in my memorandum which was made public on March 12, 1946.

For these reasons I am returning S. 814 without my approval.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 26, 1947.*

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the veto message of the President together with the bill be printed and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the veto message together with the bill will be printed and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The Chair hears no objection.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be permitted to meet at 2:30 o'clock this afternoon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIEN FIANCÉES OR FIANCÉS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 3398, order No. 358, to extend the period of validity of the act to facilitate the admission into the United States of the alien fiancées or fiancés of members of the armed forces of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill H. R. 3398, an act to extend the period of validity of the act to facilitate the admission into the United States of the alien fiancées or fiancés of members of the armed forces of the United States, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STRIKES FOLLOWING THE PASSAGE OF LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, something ugly has developed since the new labor bill became law last Monday, something in violation of the American spirit of majority rule. In my own State of Pennsylvania and in other States some 200,000 men have marched out of the coal mines.

They have laid down their tools and have declared they will not work because they do not like the law.

Elsewhere, in some sections of the labor movement, there have been threats against the Congress and against the Government by men who think themselves bigger than our laws and our Constitution. These leaders see themselves as an invisible government within the Government. They have grown defiant and arrogant by reason of the immunities thrown about them by a one-sided labor law.

This is not the American way. I hope the rank and file of labor will not permit itself to be led down this blind alley by these blind so-called labor leaders. Such defiance of the law could set back the cause of labor 50 years. If continued, such conduct will arouse resentment in the minds of millions of American citizens, hurting not only the real leaders of labor, but also the fine Americans who constitute its rank and file. I hope that they will act as sane citizens, and obey the law. I would remind these people of the American tradition of accepting the decision of the majority.

Mr. President, I would remind them also that for more than a decade when the New Deal was riding high, there were millions of Americans who were unalterably opposed to its philosophy. But since that party was then in power, because it reflected the expressed will of the majority of Americans, the verdict was accepted in the true American spirit. We did not stage a sit-down strike against our country; we worked for a change through the orderly processes prescribed by the Constitution. That was sound citizenship.

Last Monday, the great majority of the American people spoke through their elected Representatives. This verdict should be accepted in the same spirit.

There have been threats to dig in and organize a last-ditch fight to defy and obstruct the operation of this law. The kind of labor leaders who talk that language are unscrupulous men. They cannot speak for the rank and file of loyal Americans. Defiance of the law is not the way of our people.

I regret that the labor union whose stronghold is in my State—and to which I have been so close—has elected to flout the law with a walk-out. It is significant that there have not been such walk-outs by other unions. But they have been widespread by this union.

Mr. President, that kind of development does not mean spontaneous action by the workers. It means one thing, and one shameful thing only: In this union, of all the unions of the Nation, the leadership elected to lead its people off the job and into defiance of the law and the will of the majority. This so-called spontaneous walk-out has obviously been inspired and carefully planned. This is what I mean by "invisible government."

The labor bill was no partisan bill. Nearly 50 percent of the Democrats in the Senate joined the Republican majority to override the President's veto by a 2½-to-1 margin. At the other end of the Capitol, some 60 percent of the Democrats helped to override the veto by 4 to 1. There is no doubt that Congress acted in accord with the wishes of the majority of our population.

In view of this impressive vote, and of the desire for labor legislation by the country as a whole, it is simply good citizenship and the duty of all to accept the new law and to give it a fair trial. I know that with such an opportunity this law can substantially benefit every element of labor and management except the unscrupulous labor leader who seeks to boost himself to labor dictatorship by riding the shoulders of the men who work, sweat, and pay dues.

But let me say now, if the process of trial and error should show that one or more provisions of the law will not operate as desired, even under proper conditions, then I shall vote for a change. I am sure that all of Congress feels as I do, and will act to correct the law wherever it may fail. In the meantime, it is the duty of all Members of Congress—those who have supported this law and those who have opposed it—to remind their people back home that this is the law of the land passed overwhelmingly—and that it must be given an honest opportunity to prove itself.

I would feel much better if I were certain it would get such a chance. Unfortunately, there are those in the labor movement who will set booby-traps in its path. There are those in the Administration who, for political purposes, will go all out to discredit it. The law cannot get a fair chance if the National Labor Relations Board sets out to sabotage it and make it fail.

All of Congress and much of the country know that some members and employees of the National Labor Relations Board, the very men who are to administer the law, declared their opposition to it long before it was passed. They worked to poison the President's mind against it. All Congress and much of the Nation know that the Secretary of Labor opposed this measure privately and publicly. We know that two Assistant Secretaries of Labor have been out on the stump for months, rabble rousing against this legislation.

They did not see it in final form—they did not give it a chance. These people just flatly declared the bill unworkable. They roused labor against it, and they indicated how they intend to treat it when they get their hands on it.

Mr. President, they are not the proper people to administer this law. It seems to me that the President's first move should be to remove them and to replace them with people whose minds are not turned against the law. Impartial, middle-of-the-road men should be brought in to give the law a fair start in life. Such action is necessary as confirmation of the President's recent statement that he intends to enforce the law.

This is an important law. The future of labor relations for years to come hangs upon its administration.

It depends also upon getting to the workingman the truth about the provisions of the law and upon dispelling the malicious untruths which have been spread by enemies of the legislation. Whether we are to go on to greater production and to greater harmony between management and labor depends upon these two things.

Mr. President, this is serious business. The people were not fooling when they told their elected representatives they wanted legislation to correct the glaring abuses which had grown out of the Labor Relations Act. The Congress was not fooling when it passed this law overwhelmingly—not once, but twice.

We must not and will not permit sabotage by those who think themselves greater than the Nation's laws, whether those people occupy positions within the Federal Government or whether they are labor racketeers.

Mr. President, if these men want to defy the law, it is time our people knew it. If any invisible empire has been set up within our country to sabotage the

legislation demanded by the people, it is time this fact was brought to light.

But I cannot believe that these things will continue. In my mind there can be only one test of good citizenship, and that is to obey the law, and give it a fair and honest opportunity to work. I am convinced that the rank and file of labor and the sound leaders among them will see to it that common sense and true Americanism prevail.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, we have just listened to the very able speech delivered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN]. As one of those who opposed the Taft-Hartley bill, I wish to repeat now what I said last Saturday, namely, that once the bill became the law of the United States, I could always be found among those insisting that, until changed, the bill should be enforced in its entirety.

I said on Saturday, and I repeat now, that we cannot have government by law in this country unless we, as the representatives of the people, take the position that the laws shall be enforced. I also said that of course we are not going to change human nature by merely putting a law on the statute books which a large minority of our people consider to be unjust and in violation of their rights and freedoms.

I am not at all surprised—although I do not condone any of it—at the reaction which today has occurred among the rank and file of American workers. I wish to say that the reaction in opposition to this bad law is not limited to the level of the labor leaders. I think it is perfectly clear that bitter resentment is felt throughout the rank and file of American labor. I think the situation calls for a tremendous amount of patience and understanding on the part of all.

I think that as time passes—next week, 2 weeks from now, or a month from now—things are bound to settle down. I think the leaders of labor and the workers of this country are going to recognize the soundness of the basic principle which I think was set out in the speech of the Senator from Pennsylvania, namely, that after all, in this system of government of ours we must express our opposition to laws legally. I think there is plenty of good legal procedure for such an expression of opposition to this law. Let it be tested in the courts—not on the picket lines. I think there will be plenty of opportunity to point out to the proponents of this legislation that they did make a grievous mistake last Saturday when they put on the statute books a law which is going to prove to be grossly unjust to the legitimate rights of labor, and in the long run will prove to be unworkable, as the President said in his veto message.

Nevertheless, we, as lawmakers, must back up the President in the statesmanlike statement he made after his veto was overridden, namely, that it is the obligation of all of us to see that the law is administered fairly, efficiently, and as effectively as possible. It is going to have to be changed in many respects in order to prevent grave abuses and injustices.

As to the coal miners' walkouts, I regret them; but here, again, let us keep our heads as we now proceed to go into what I think it is perfectly obvious is going to be another coal crisis in America. If we take time to investigate the situation, I think we shall find that for some weeks past it has been very difficult for the representatives of the workers to carry on good-faith collective bargaining in the coal industry, for a number of reasons, one important reason being that in that important industry there have been a number of operators who have taken the position, "We are going to wait until we see what the Congress does with the Taft-Hartley bill before we agree to anything."

Mr. President, they now have that bill as the law of the land. Question is being raised as to whether it is at all applicable to the coal situation. Lawyers in this country today are very much in dispute as to whether in passing the Taft-Hartley bill the Congress passed a law which will have any effect on the coal situation, as some of us forewarned about in the speeches we made prior to the overriding of the President's veto on last Saturday. Mr. Lewis has never used the National Labor Relations Board at any time. He does not have a single local that has ever been certified by the National Labor Relations Board.

There is another angle to this coal situation that I think we need to examine, that is, whether we in Congress have, after all, been fair to the coal miners of America, or whether we have all too frequently shown a resentment toward a leader, rather than an appreciation of the working problems of the coal miners of America. Not only must we recognize that today, as I said once before on the floor of the Senate, the production of coal is vitally basic to the stabilization of our economy here at home, but we must not ignore the fact that the production of coal in the United States and in the Ruhr and in England and in other places in the world is basic to the peace. We are not going to help international relations any, we are not going to help the cause of peace any if we proceed to take an emotional attitude concerning the workers' problems in the coal fields of this country. If there ever was a time when the coal problems in America should be faced in a spirit of calm reflection and determination to try to work out an arrangement in the weeks ahead which will result in fair and just treatment to the coal workers of America, that time is now.

I, for one, wish to say in closing that I do not think the American people have ever been sufficiently fair to the coal workers of America. Our whole industrial system depends upon what those workers bring out of the bowels of the earth. Every wheel that is turning in America today is dependent, insofar as its future turning is concerned, upon the black gold that our miners will bring out of the earth at such tremendous personal risks to themselves in the months ahead. We, the public, owe them more consideration than we have yet given them. We owe it to them to give them fair wages, decent working conditions, and the safety protections necessary to protect their limbs and lives. They are entitled to Federal safety legislation. We should give such legislative protection to them. Mr. President, we must give them the protections to which they are entitled from an industry which for too long has been more interested in antilabor legislation than in industrial peace.

I say that if our entire economy is dependent upon coal and the work of the coal miners then we had better proceed to see to it that now, this time, the miners get a fair and square deal. We the public, the users of coal, should stop asking the coal workers of America to subsidize the rest of us by working under conditions which none of us would work under without objections too. In fact I wish the critics of the coal miners would just have to work for about a month in the coal mines of America; they would soon stop talking about passing Taft-Hartley bills. Rather they would wake up to the fact that get-tough attitudes will not settle our coal problems.

We shall settle the coal problems of America when, but not until, we, the people, insist that the coal workers get a fair and square deal. They have never yet had it in the history of the country; they do not have it now. They will not work without a contract. Coal cannot be mined with force of arms. Negotiations, not threats, are needed in the coal industry. Union-busting techniques will not produce coal.

REPORT ON AIR POWER—ARTICLE IN NEWSWEEK

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to an important article, as I believe, which is published in Newsweek magazine of June 30, appearing on the newsstands today. The article is entitled "Report on Air Power," and the subheading is "Weakened wings: How much Washington has let the Air Force wane, and how Russia works to be stronger in men, planes, and ideas."

I submit, Mr. President, that in view of the delicate situation abroad and our current international policy, the implications of this sober, fact-filled article must be carefully pondered by all of us.

It tells us that the United States has fallen behind Russia in numbers of combat planes. It declares that we are lagging in research. It asserts that our marvelous aircraft-production facilities, which achieved a miracle of wartime production, are being allowed to disintegrate.

I am particularly interested in the emphatic warnings contained in this article, because they buttress the statements which leading representatives of the Nation's aircraft industry presented to a Senate committee just a few weeks ago. These representatives included Mr. Robert Gross, president of Lockheed Aircraft Corp., and Mr. Harry Woodhead, president of Consolidated Vultee Aircraft Corp., spokesmen for the California industry, which produced almost one-third of all the airframes turned out during the war.

In their appearance before the Senate committee, the leaders of the aircraft industry did not petition for any particular appropriation for the Army and Navy air forces. Each of them emphasized, instead, the need for a consistent continuous long-term air policy. They contended that prompt adoption of a sound national air policy was absolutely imperative to prevent a further dangerous deterioration of our air power, and to avoid the threatened disintegration of our aircraft-manufacturing industry.

Mr. President, the facts contained in Newsweek's authoritative report on air power substantiates the contentions of the leaders of the aircraft industry. Certainly this article emphatically supports the need for prompt action to establish a national air policy for America that will assure we obtain and preserve American leadership in the air.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT ON AIR POWER—WEAKENED WINGS: HOW MUCH WASHINGTON HAS LET THE AIR FORCE WANE

(Army Air Forces requests for appropriations for the coming year barely squeaked through the Congressional filter this month after severe reductions had been made both by the War Department and the Bureau of the Budget. Making all due allowances for exaggerations designed to impress reluctant Congressmen, it is a fact that air-force leaders are genuinely worried over the threatening decline in this country's air power. Checking and weighing their warnings and arguments, Newsweek's Washington Bureau sends the following summary report of the present and prospective facts about American air strength.)

American military airpower is on its way to becoming a myth. Two years ago it was incomparably the greatest in the world. Today, in the language of the Compton Commission report, it is a "hollow shell." In the foreseeable tomorrow, if present trends continue, it will be in danger of being hopelessly outclassed.

Paradoxically, this relative disarmament in the air is taking place at a time when lack of confidence in long-range security is inspiring demands in many high quarters for American superarmament. While pursuing a foreign policy dependent upon American military weight in world councils, the Government is in fact whittling down that weight to a level that many Army officers, at least, find alarming.

The Compton Commission, which four weeks ago reported to President Truman on universal military training, said this country needed a mobile striking force consisting mainly of air power and capable of operating around the globe and in both arctic and tropical regions. Such a force does not now exist and is not in prospect.

Responsible military sources have compared the needs and the current realities in the following terms:

The air force in being must be large enough to cope with the initial emergency of another war. Since it is understood that in such an emergency the United States might well be the first and primary target, this force must be larger than any ever maintained in peacetime before.

The fact is that in numbers of combat airplanes, the United States has fallen behind Russia. Russia is believed to have a combat air force today larger than the American and British air fleets combined.

It has to be possible, industrially speaking, to expand swiftly in case of emergency. In the two previous wars, the American period of grace was measured in months and years. In the future, it may be limited to weeks and days and, indeed, may not exist at all.

The fact is that production facilities, so prodigiously expanded during the recent war, are being allowed to disintegrate.

American planes must be technically superior to those of any other potential enemy. Such superiority will depend on successful research and development over a period of years.

The fact is that in research—the real key to all future air strength—the United States is lagging.

AIR POWER IN BEING

The Army still has nearly 25,000 planes of all types and the Navy 15,000. These are huge air fleets. But they are not the actual dimensions of present American air power. Many of these ships are obsolete or obsolescent. Large numbers are stored in pools, shops, and other forms of storage. With passage of time, these planes are largely in the process of becoming useless.

At the present time, the Army Air Forces says that its immediately usable front-line combat air fleet consists of 1,500 aircraft. The Navy's total in the same category is given as 1,400. Both are far below the estimated minimum strengths the services want. The AAF plan for its immediate postwar air force called for 70 groups, including roughly 50 groups of combat craft and 20 of supporting carriers, weather, mapping, and reconnaissance ships. This would call for a total of about 4,000 planes. Budget cuts forced reduction of this plan to 55 operational groups and 15 skeletonized groups.

In actual practice, the Army's 55 groups are not up to strength, and most of them are classified as having low combat efficiency. They are equivalent, it is said, to about 30 wartime air groups.

If a sudden emergency were to arise today, the United States could probably call on its reserves of trained men and stored planes and hold its own against an attack. But the passage of a few years will change this picture radically.

RUSSIAN STRENGTH

Russian active combat-plane strength is believed to be about 14,000. Even though kept operational, many of these planes may be of relatively low combat efficiency.

The Russians have no important naval air force. Neither do they as yet have any long-range strategic bombing force, although the big plane seen in the air over the May Day parade was taken as a sign that the Russians are hard at work in this field as well. That plane, incidentally, was not a "captured" American B–29, as reported at the time, but is now believed to be a new type of Russian bomber better than the B–29 although not so effective as the B–36 now in production in this country.

The Russians captured 75 of Germany's best twin-jet fighters and a number of others and, more important, captured the principal centers of German jet development and production. One guess is that they now have between 300 and 500 front-line jet fighter planes.

MANPOWER

In personnel, the plan is not quite so far behind. Against a projected total of 401,000 men, the AAF now has 380,000. But the program for training reserve pilots and other specialists is far in arrears. It was planned to have an air force of 44,000 pilots, for example, with 48,000 in reserve. The latter were to be kept "fresh" at 130 special bases. Actually, only 70 bases were activated and 22,500 reserve pilots were trained. Economy then forced elimination of all but 41 training centers where just under 10,000 reserve pilots are now being handled. An additional 19,000 reservists who have applied are out in the cold. The picture as to pilots holds generally true as to bombardiers, navigators, engineers, and other flight-crew personnel.

Fliers trained in the recent war will, with age, lose their effectiveness. The AAF wanted to plan a training program for new cadets that would turn out 4,000 new graduates every year. The current program is limited to 1,500 a year.

Naval aviation is suffering from similar headaches, although it is considerably better off than the AAF because more of the Navy was retained intact and the Navy Bureau of Aeronautics has fared better in budget matters than the Army has.

RESEARCH

After VE-day AAF experts in Germany made the sobering discovery that American aviation science was just about 10 years behind in certain vital fields. This was due in part to the fact that when war came the American high command decided to concentrate on production rather than research. The Germans, on the other hand, were far ahead on jet and supersonic plane design and missiles like the V–1 and V–2 when the war ended. The American victory was acknowledgedly a "close squeeze," and the AAF now urgently wants to close the research gap.

Much of Germany's research set-up was concentrated in the east, out of bomber range, and hence fell into the hands of the Russians. Many German specialists are now working in Russia, involuntarily perhaps, but under excellent conditions. Considerable information and some experts fell to the Americans, but Germans have been brought to this country only over the opposition of many American scientists and with technical status as prisoners of war.

The actual extent of Russia's research program is not known. There is enough information to suggest that the Russians are expending prodigious effort in this field, as in the field of atomic energy, but the progress of the work can only be surmised. If it has not already lost research leadership, the United States may be in danger of doing so and consequently must put forth its maximum effort.

The United States is not exactly inactive in the matter of new aircraft development. The new Aircraft Yearbook for 1947 lists no fewer than 37 types of jet planes being developed here. One of these, the P–80R, set a new speed record last week. But the overall program, in the AAF's opinion, is too weak.[1] This is a matter strictly of money.

After VE-day the AAF drafted a plan calling for $272,000,000 to be spent on research annually. In 1946 it received $200,000,000, in 1947, $110,000,000. For fiscal year 1948 it asked for $347,000,000, but this has been pared down, by the War Department and Budget Bureau, to $123,000,000 and there is no certainty of how much of this it will get from Congress.

Taken together with the general decline of aeronautical research under industrial auspices, this adds up to dangerous future weakness.

PRODUCTION

In the decade after the First World War the American aircraft industry withered away to a total of only three producers. As late as 1939 the industry still ranked forty-fourth in dollar value of product. From this it rose, in a few years, to mammoth proportions. In 1944 the American

[1] In March Maj. Gen. Curtis LeMay, head of AAF development programs, told a House appropriations subcommittee: "The United States is far behind * * * particularly in the sciences and techniques associated with guided missiles. * * * We definitely are a year or more behind in some phases of jet power-plant development."

plane industry turned out 96,000 aircraft, or about one every 5 minutes.[2]

The problem of cushioning the industry against the inevitable stoppage and of keeping facilities working on a minimum security basis was taken up by the governmental Air Coordinating Committee in 1945. Its report recommended annual military plane production at the rate of 3,000 to 5,700 a year, with employment for 206,500 to 315,000 workers. The lower and upper levels in these figures were to be determined by world security conditions. While these conditions would seem now to suggest the need for a level as far up as possible, the fact is that in 1946 the industry manufactured a total of 1,330 military planes and 467 transports. It was employing 180,000 workers, a total that was dropping off every month.

The result is bright red ink in the books of the aircraft companies. Seven of the 12 leading air-frame manufacturers showed operating losses in 1946 despite heavy tax carry-backs allowed by the Government. Their combined deficit ran to more than $8,000,000. Hearings held in Washington last month abounded with dire prophecies of mergers and bankruptcies in the industry unless something drastic were done.

The paradox is that the industry is still turning out perhaps the best combat and transport planes in the world. The trouble is that orders are insufficient to make the operation pay, John C. Lee, of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce aviation committee, caustically summed it up in a speech this month when he declared that the aircraft companies are building better and better planes in smaller and smaller quantities at greater and greater financial loss.

SIGNIFICANCE

The argument for economy, in military as well as other budgets, is not always merely myopic. During the war the Government, and especially the armed services, acquired the habit of being prodigal in the use of the country's wealth and resources. Those habits may take some breaking. There is always some evidence to support the view that money is spent wastefully and that a great deal can be achieved by husbanding resources and increasing efficiency rather than by bludgeoning through by sheer size and weight.

While these arguments have to be considered, it is also necessary to give all due weight to the views of responsible men charged with no small part of the Nation's security. The main implications of their argument come down to this:

If armed force is to remain the principal ingredient of world influence, then the United States is bound to lose some of its international weight if the air-power situation is as black as the AAF believes it is. If the threat of another war should become real 5 years hence, the United States would be at a serious disadvantage and may not be given the chance to put its industrial genius to work at another miracle.

If this is true, and another war should come and its main weapon is still air power, then the United States might well lose the war.

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 564) to provide for the performance of the duties of the office of President, in case of the removal, resignation, or inability both of the President and Vice President.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska whether or not it is intended to continue discussion on the Presidential succession bill for the rest of the day.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; I am not sure what the Senate will do when I yield the floor, but if I have an opportunity I should like to present my argument in favor of Senate bill 564. It is the unfinished business, and it is our intention to continue with its consideration. A vote on the measure is to be had tomorrow at 2 o'clock.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator know about how long he will require?

Mr. WHERRY. If there is no interruption, I believe I can conclude my presentation within an hour.

Mr. ELLENDER. My reason for asking is that I was wondering whether or not an effort would be made this afternoon to take up Senate bill 1461. That is the bill to extend the power of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act.

Mr. WHERRY. My understanding is that there will be considerable controversy over that bill. Its consideration would require unanimous consent. For the information of the Senator, at least for the day, I should be inclined to object to its consideration, or to the consideration of any other measure with respect to which there is controversy. I feel that we should proceed with consideration of the Presidential succession bill. We have been very lenient. Inasmuch as we have unanimous consent to vote at 2 o'clock tomorrow, I feel that the proponents and opponents should have ample time for discussion.

Mr. ELLENDER. Then, so far as the Senator is concerned, if a request were made for the consideration of Senate bill 1461, he would object?

Mr. WHERRY. If there is controversy over it, and I believe there is.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand there is.

Mr. WHERRY. If a controversial situation arises, I certainly would ask for the regular order, even though unanimous consent had been granted for the consideration of Senate bill 1461. I am inclined to feel that it should not be brought up until after 2 o'clock Friday.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to Senate bill 1461, and ask that it lie on the table and be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska has been rather patient in setting aside the pending business, the Presidential succession bill, for the consideration of so-called urgent or must legislation. Inasmuch as there has been a unanimous consent agreement to vote upon the succession bill, and all motions and amendments relating thereto, at 2 o'clock tomorrow afternoon, I feel that unless measures are of the "must" variety, I shall be forced to object to any further unanimous consent request, because it is my opinion that the proponents and opponents of the bill feel that there should be ample time and opportunity to debate its provisions.

Of course, if the Senate feels that some measure which comes along should have priority, it will be perfectly agreeable to me to take it up, but I should not like to have it said at 2 o'clock Friday afternoon, when, under the unanimous consent agreement, the Senate is to vote, that ample time was not given to a discussion of the provisions of Senate bill 564.

With that idea in mind, Mr. President, I should like to present the provisions of the bill, and debate them upon the floor of the Senate. If the debate runs out, it will be perfectly agreeable to me that other measures be taken up, but unless ample opportunity is given for all to take part in the debate, I feel that unanimous consent requests should not be granted until after tomorrow afternoon at 2 o'clock.

Senate bill 564, which was introduced February 11, 1947, was reported out of the Committee on Rules and Administration March 28, 1947, with amendments. It deals solely with the question of Presidential succession.

The bill does two things: First, it places the Speaker of the House of Representatives or the President pro tempore of the Senate, in the order named, ahead of the Secretary of State in the line of succession.

Second, it adds to the list of Cabinet Officers eligible to succeed the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Labor, who, under the present law, are not included, their positions having been created since the date of enactment of the existing statute which was enacted in 1886.

Out of the 32 Presidents of the United States, 7 have died in office. They are as follows: William Henry Harrison, Zachary Taylor, Abraham Lincoln, James A. Garfield, William McKinley, Warren G. Harding, and Franklin D. Roosevelt.

During our entire history, no Vice President, while acting as President of the United States, has died in office, and, thus, there has never been a succession under either of the succession laws. By that I mean the law passed in 1792 and the law passed in 1886. However, each and every time we are without a Vice President, legislation along the line of the pending bill becomes of deep concern.

Under the existing law, succession descends through the President's Cabinet to and including the Office of Secretary of the Interior, all members of his Administration. Under the bill, succession would be down through the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate, both of whom are elective officers, and closer to the people, followed by Members of the Cabinet, including the 3 offices created subsequent to the enactment of the present law, namely, Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary of Commerce, and Secretary of Labor.

The deaths of approximately one-fifth of our Presidents has brought Vice Presidents into the office of President, which means that approximately one-fifth of the time we have had no Vice President to succeed to the Presidency of the United States.

Succession legislation has been inaugurated in periods such as that we are experiencing now, when there was no

[2] In the last year of the war Russia produced 40,000 planes. Additional facilities captured from Germany are estimated to have a potential capacity of 60,000 planes a year.

Vice President to succeed to the Presidency, and it is at such a time that the question of succession becomes of deep concern. It is that condition in which we find ourselves today.

VIEWS OF THE PRESIDENT

President Truman, realizing the seriousness of this situation, recommended to the Congress, in a special message dated June 19, 1945, the enactment of new legislation covering the subject of succession. I desire to read the message, which was sent to the Congress on June 19, 1945. The President stated in the message:

To the Congress of the United States:

I think that this is an appropriate time for the Congress to reexamine the question of the Presidential succession.

The question is of great importance now because there will be no elected Vice President for almost 4 years.

The existing statute governing the succession to the office of President was enacted in 1886. Under it, in the event of the death of the elected President and Vice President, members of the Cabinet successively fill the office.

Each of the Cabinet members is appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. In effect, therefore, by reason of the tragic death of the late President, it now lies within my power to nominate the person who would be my immediate successor in the event of my own death or inability to act.

I do not believe that in a democracy this power should rest with the Chief Executive.

Insofar as possible, the office of the President should be filled by an elective officer. There is no officer in our system of government, besides the President and Vice President, who has been elected by all the voters of the country.

The Speaker of the House of Representatives, who is elected in his own district, is also elected to be the presiding officer of the House by a vote of all the Representatives of all the people of the country. As a result, I believe that the Speaker is the official in the Federal Government, whose selection next to that of the President and Vice President, can be most accurately said to stem from the people themselves.

Under the law of 1792, the President pro tempore of the Senate followed the Vice President in the order of succession.

The President pro tempore is elected as a Senator by his State and then as presiding officer by the Senate. But the Members of the Senate are not as closely tied in by the elective process to the people as are the Members of the House of Representatives. A completely new House is elected every 2 years, and always at the same time as the President and Vice President. Usually it is in agreement politically with the Chief Executive. Only one-third of the Senate, however, is elected with the President and Vice President. The Senate might, therefore, have a majority hostile to the policies of the President, and might conceivably fill the Presidential office with one not in sympathy with the will of the majority of the people.

Some of the events in the impeachment proceedings of President Johnson suggested the possibility of a hostile Congress in the future seeking to oust a Vice President who had become President, in order to have the President pro tempore of the Senate become the President. This was one of the considerations, among several others, which led to the change in 1886.

No matter who succeeds to the Presidency after the death of the elected President and Vice President, it is my opinion he should not serve longer than until the next congressional election or until a special election called for the purpose of electing a new President and Vice President. This period the Congress should fix. The individuals elected at such general or special election should then serve only to fill the unexpired term of the deceased President and Vice President. In this way there would be no interference with the normal 4-year interval of general national elections.

I recommend, therefore, that the Congress enact legislation placing the Speaker of the House of Representatives first in order of succession in case of the removal, death, resignation, or inability to act of the President and Vice President. Of course, the Speaker should resign as a Representative in the Congress as well as Speaker of the House before he assumes the office of President.

If there is no qualified Speaker, or if the Speaker fails to qualify, then I recommend that the succession pass to the President pro tempore of the Senate, who should hold office until a duly qualified Speaker is elected.

If there be neither Speaker nor President pro tempore qualified to succeed on the creation of the vacancy, then the succession might pass to the members of the Cabinet as now provided, until a duly qualified Speaker is elected.

If the Congress decides that a special election should be held, then I recommend that it provide for such election to be held as soon after the death or disqualification of the President and Vice President as practicable. The method and procedure for holding such special election should be provided now by law, so that the election can be held as expeditiously as possible should the contingency arise.

In the interest of orderly, democratic government, I urge the Congress to give its early consideration to this most important subject.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 19, 1945.*

It was on June 19, 1945, that the special message came from President Truman, recommending in principle provisions almost identical with those of the bill I am now discussing. No action was taken, so again, on January 21, 1946—please get the date, nearly 8 months later—President Truman, in his message on the State of the Union, as appears at page 21 of House Document No. 385, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, specifically referred to succession legislation, and asked for its early consideration. He listed such legislation as tenth on the list of 21 specific proposals which he urged upon the Congress for early consideration. The tenth item on this list reads:

(10) Legislation making provision for succession to the Presidency in the event of the death or incapacity or disqualification of the President and Vice President—as recommended by me on June 19, 1945.

I hold in my hand the 21 proposals listed by the President in his message on the State of the Union. They include the creation of fact-finding boards for the prevention of stoppages of work in Nation-wide industries, they provide legislation to supplement the unemployment insurance benefits; they provide legislation for the domestic use and control of atomic energy. But No. 10 of the 21 proposals is to provide the very legislation known as Senate bill 564, the provisions of which are in accord with the statement and the recommendations made by the President.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the 21 proposals, taken from the President's message on the State of the Union of January 21, 1946, be incorporated at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the proposals were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGISLATION HERETOFORE RECOMMENDED AND STILL PENDING

To attain some of these objectives and to meet the other needs of the United States in the reconversion and postwar period, I have from time to time made various recommendations to the Congress.

In making these recommendations I have indicated the reasons why I deemed them essential for progress at home and abroad. A few—a very few—of these recommendations have been enacted into law by the Congress. Most of them have not. I here reiterate some of them, and discuss others later in this message. I urge upon the Congress early consideration of them. Some are more urgent than others, but all are necessary.

1. Legislation to authorize the President to create fact-finding boards for the prevention of stoppages of work in Nation-wide industries after collective bargaining and conciliation and voluntary arbitration have failed—as recommended by me on December 3, 1945.

2. Enactment of a satisfactory full-employment bill, such as the Senate bill now in conference between the Senate and the House—as recommended by me on September 6, 1945.

3. Legislation to supplement the unemployment-insurance benefits for unemployed workers now provided by the different States—as recommended by me on May 28, 1945.

4. Adoption of a permanent Fair Employment Practice Act—as recommended by me on September 6, 1945.

5. Legislation substantially raising the amount of minimum wages now provided by law—as recommended by me on September 6, 1945.

6. Legislation providing for a comprehensive program for scientific research—as recommended by me on September 6, 1945.

7. Legislation enacting a health and medical care program—as recommended by me on November 19, 1945.

8. Legislation adopting the program of universal training—as recommended by me on October 23, 1945.

9. Legislation providing an adequate salary scale for all Government employees in all branches of the Government—as recommended by me on September 6, 1945.

10. Legislation making provision for succession to the Presidency in the event of the death or incapacity or disqualification of the President and Vice President—as recommended by me on June 19, 1945.

11. Legislation for the unification of the armed services—as recommended by me on December 19, 1945.

12. Legislation for the domestic use and control of atomic energy—as recommended by me on October 3, 1945.

13. Retention of the United States Employment Service in the Federal Government for a period at least up to June 30, 1947—as recommended by me on September 6, 1945.

14. Legislation to increase unemployment allowances for veterans in line with increases for civilians—as recommended by me on September 6, 1945.

15. Social security coverage for veterans for their period of military service—as recommended by me on September 6, 1945.

16. Extension of crop insurance—as recommended by me on September 6, 1945.

17. Legislation permitting the sale of ships by the Maritime Commission at home and abroad—as recommended by me on September 6, 1945. I further recommend that this

legislation include adequate authority for chartering vessels both here and abroad.

18. Legislation to take care of the stock piling of materials in which the United States is naturally deficient—as recommended by me on September 6, 1945.

19. Enactment of Federal airport legislation—as recommended by me on September 6, 1945.

20. Legislation repealing the Johnson Act on foreign loans—as recommended by me on September 6, 1945.

21. Legislation for the development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River Basin—as recommended by me on October 3, 1945.

Finally, on February 5, 1947, no action having been taken by Congress on the recommendations of the President of June 1945, or in the message on the state of the Union in 1946, we find that the President again called to the attention of Congress the necessity for action, in a strongly worded letter covering the urgency of the situation. I quote his letter verbatim:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, February 5, 1947.

Hon. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
President of the Senate Pro Tempore,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On June 19, 1945, I sent a message to the Congress of the United States suggesting that the Congress should give its consideration to the question of the Presidential succession.

In that message, it was pointed out that under the existing statute governing the succession to the office of President, members of the Cabinet successively fill the office in the event of the death of the elected President and Vice President. It was further pointed out that, in effect, the present law gives to me the power to nominate my immediate successor in the event of my own death or inability to act.

I said then, and I repeat now, that in a democracy, this power should not rest with the Chief Executive. I believe that, insofar as possible, the office of the President should be filled by an elective officer.

In the message of June 19, 1945, I recommended that the Congress enact legislation placing the Speaker of the House of Representatives first in order of succession, and if there were no Speaker, or if he failed to qualify, that the President pro tempore of the Senate should act until a duly qualified Speaker was elected.

A bill (H. R. 3587) providing for this succession was introduced in the House of Representatives and was passed by the House on June 29, 1945. It failed, however, to pass the Senate.

The same need for a revision of the law of succession that existed when I sent the message to the Congress on June 19, 1945, still exists today.

I see no reason to change or amend the suggestion which I previously made to the Congress, but if the Congress is not disposed to pass the type of bill previously passed by the House, then I recommend that some other plan of succession be devised so that the office of the President would be filled by an officer who holds his position as a result of the expression of the will of the voters of this country.

It is my belief that the present line of succession as provided by the existing statute, which was enacted in 1886, is not in accord with our basic concept of government by elected representatives of the people.

I again urge the Congress to give its attention to this subject.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

ACTION OF THE SEVENTY-NINTH CONGRESS

To carry out the recommendations of the President's message of June 19, 1945—as pointed out by the President in his letter of February 5, 1947, written after the Eightieth Congress had convened, and after it had been in operation for more than a month—Representative Hatton W. Sumners, of Texas, then chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, introduced in the Seventy-ninth Congress a bill—H. R. 3587.

The Sumners bill was reported to the House on June 27, 1945, came up for consideration, and was passed by the House of Representatives on June 29, 1945.

For the purposes of the RECORD, so the Senate may have the complete record before it, I ask unanimous consent that the so-called Sumners bill, H. R. 3587, together with the very brief report upon it, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill, together with the report, were ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows.

[Union Calendar No. 241—79th Cong., 1st sess.—H. R. 3587—Report No. 829—In the House of Representatives—June 25, 1945—Mr. Sumners of Texas introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary; June 27, 1945, committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed]

A bill to provide for the performance of the duties of the office of President in case of the removal, resignation, or inability both of the President and Vice President

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) (f) if, by reason of death, resignation, removal from office, inability, or failure to qualify, there is neither a President nor Vice President to discharge the powers and duties of the office of President, then the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall, upon his resignation as Speaker and as Representative in Congress, act as President until the disability be removed, or a President shall be elected.

(2) The same rule shall apply in the case of the death, resignation, removal from office, or inability of an individual acting as President under this subsection.

(3) An individual acting as President under this subsection shall continue to act until a President shall be elected in the manner prescribed in subsection (f), or, if no President shall be so elected, then until the expiration of the then current Presidential term, except that—

(A) if his discharge of the powers and duties of the office is founded in whole or in part on the failure of both the President-elect and the Vice-President-elect to qualify, then he shall act only until a President or Vice President qualifies; and

(B) if his discharge of the powers and duties of the office is founded in whole or in part on the inability of the President, Vice President, or individual acting under this subsection, then he shall act only until the removal of the disability of one of such individuals.

(b) If, at the time when under subsection (a) a Speaker is to begin the discharge of the powers and duties of the office of President, there is no Speaker, or the Speaker fails to qualify as Acting President, then the President pro tempore of the Senate shall, upon his resignation as President pro tempore and as Senator, discharge the powers and duties of the office of President until a President shall be elected in the manner prescribed in subsection (f) or, if no President shall be so elected, then until the expiration of the then current Presidential term, but not after a qualified and prior entitled individual is able to act.

(c) (1) If, by reason of death, resignation, removal from office, inability, or failure to qualify, there is no President pro tempore to discharge the powers and duties of the office of President under subsection (b), then the officer of the United States who is highest on the following list, and who is not under disability to discharge the powers and duties of the office of President, shall discharge such powers and duties: Secretary of State, Secretary of the Treasury, Secretary of War, Attorney General, Postmaster General, Secretary of the Navy, Secretary of the Interior, Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary of Commerce, Secretary of Labor.

(2) An individual discharging the powers and duties of President under this subsection shall continue so to do until a President shall be elected or until a Speaker is qualified in the manner prescribed in subsection (f) or, if no President shall be so elected, then until the expiration of the then current Presidential term, but not after a Speaker of the House is qualified and prior-entitled individual is able to serve, except that the removal of the disability of an individual higher on the list contained in paragraph (1) or the ability to qualify on the part of an individual higher on such list shall not terminate his service.

(3) The taking of the oath of office by an individual specified in the list in paragraph (1) shall be held to constitute his resignation from the office by virtue of the holding of which he qualifies to serve as President.

(d) Subsection (a), (b), and (c) shall apply only to such officers as are eligible to the office of President under the Constitution. Subsection (c) shall apply only to officers appointed, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, prior to the time of the death, resignation, removal from office, inability, or failure to qualify, of the President pro tempore, and only to officers not under impeachment by the House of Representatives at the time the powers and duties of the office of President devolve upon them.

(e) During the period that any individual serves as President under this act, his compensation shall be at the rate then provided by law in the case of the President.

(f) (1) If the event by reason of which the Speaker is required by subsection (a) to act as President shall have occurred more than 90 days immediately preceding the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November in the year in which the next regular election of Representatives to the Congress is to be held but in which there is to be held no regular quadrennial election of a President and Vice President, the Secretary of State shall forthwith cause a notification of such event to be made to the executive of every State, and shall specify in such notification that electors of a President and Vice President to fill the unexpired terms shall be appointed in the several States on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November in the year in which the next regular election of Representatives to the Congress is to be held. Electors appointed pursuant to such notification shall be appointed in the same manner as is provided by law for the appointment of electors for a regular quadrennial election of a President and Vice President, and shall meet and give their votes on the first Monday after the second Wednesday in December following their appointment, at such place in each State as the legislature of such State shall direct. Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, all provisions of law relating to the choosing of a President and Vice President at a regular quadrennial election shall apply with respect to the choosing of a President and Vice President to fill the unexpired term as provided in this subsection; and the terms of the President and Vice President so chosen shall begin on the 20th day of January immediately following their election.

(f) Sections 1 and 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the performance of the duties of the office of President in case of the removal, death, resignation, or inability both of the President and Vice President," approved January 19, 1886 (24 Stat. 1; U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 3, secs. 21 and 22), are repealed.

[79th Cong., 1st sess.—House of Representatives—Report No. 829]

QUESTION OF THE PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

(June 27, 1945, committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed)

Mr. BRYSON, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted the following report to accompany H. R. 3587.

The Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3587) to provide for the performance of the duties of the office of President in case of the removal, resignation, or inability both of the President and Vice President, after consideration, report the same favorably to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

"GENERAL STATEMENT

"On June 19, 1945, the President of the United States addressed a message to the Congress making recommendations for legislation with respect to succession to the Presidency in case of the removal, death, resignation, or inability to act of the President and Vice President. The message reads as follows:

"'MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TRANSMITTING REQUEST FOR LEGISLATION DEALING WITH THE QUESTION OF THE PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

"'*To the Congress of the United States:*

"'I think that this is an appropriate time for the Congress to reexamine the question of the Presidential succession.

"'The question is of great importance now because there will be no elected Vice President for almost 4 years.

"'The existing statute governing the succession to the office of President was enacted in 1886. Under it, in the event of the death of the elected President and Vice President, members of the Cabinet successively fill the office.

"'Each of these Cabinet members is appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate. In effect, therefore, by reason of the tragic death of the late President, it now lies within my power to nominate the person who would be my immediate successor in the event of my own death or inability to act.

"'I do not believe that in a democracy this power should rest with the Chief Executive.

"'Insofar as possible, the office of the President should be filled by an elective officer. There is no officer in our system of government, besides the President and Vice President, who has been elected by all the voters of the country.

"'The Speaker of the House of Representatives, who is elected in his own district, is also elected to be the presiding officer of the House by a vote of all the Representatives of all the people of the country. As a result, I believe that the Speaker is the official in the Federal Government whose selection, next to that of the President and Vice President, can be most accurately said to stem from the people themselves.

"'Under the law of 1792 the President pro tempore of the Senate followed the Vice President in the order of succession.

"'The President pro tempore is elected as a Senator by his State and then as presiding officer of the Senate. But the Members of the Senate are not as closely tied in by the elective process to the people as are the Members of the House of Representatives. A completely new House is elected every 2 years, and always at the same time as the President and Vice President. Usually it is in agreement politically with the Chief Executive. Only one-third of the Senate, however, is elected with the President and Vice President. The Senate might, therefore, have a majority hostile to the policies of the President and might conceivably fill the Presidential office with one not in sympathy with the will of the majority of the people.

"'Some of the events in the impeachment proceedings of President Johnson suggested the possibility of a hostile Congress in the future seeking to oust a Vice President who had become President, in order to have the President pro tempore of the Senate become the President. This was one of the considerations, among several others, which led to the change in 1886.

"'No matter who succeeds to the Presidency after the death of the elected President and Vice President, it is my opinion he should not serve any longer than until the next congressional election or until a special election called for the purpose of electing a new President and Vice President. This period the Congress should fix. The individuals elected at such general or special election should then serve only to fill the unexpired term of the deceased President and Vice President. In this way there would be no interference with the normal 4-year interval of general national elections.

"'I recommend, therefore, that the Congress enact legislation placing the Speaker of the House of Representatives first in order of succession in case of the removal, death, resignation, or inability to act of the President and Vice President. Of course, the Speaker should resign as a Representative in the Congress as well as Speaker of the House before he assumes the office of President.

"'If there is no qualified Speaker, or if the Speaker fails to qualify, then I recommend that the succession pass to the President pro tempore of the Senate, who should hold office until a duly qualified Speaker is elected.

"'If there be neither Speaker nor President pro tempore qualified to succeed on the creation of the vacancy, then the succession might pass to the members of the Cabinet as now provided, until a duly qualified Speaker is elected.

"'If the Congress decides that a special election should be held, then I recommend that it provide for such election to be held as soon after the death or disqualification of the President and Vice President as practicable. The method and procedure for holding such special election should be provided now by law, so that the election can be held as expeditiously as possible should the contingency arise.

"'In the interest of orderly, democratic government, I urge the Congress to give its early consideration to this most important subject.

"'HARRY S. TRUMAN.

"'THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 19, 1945.*'

"H. R. 3587, introduced by Mr. Sumners of Texas, is designed to carry into effect the recommendations of the President.

"ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

"The bill provides in subsection (a) that in the event there is neither a President nor a Vice President to discharge the powers and duties of the office of President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall, upon his resignation as Speaker and as Representative in Congress, act as President until the disability be removed, or a President shall be elected. The Speaker, upon succeeding to the Presidency, would continue to act until the expiration of the unexpired current Presidential term or until a President is elected at a special election pursuant to the provisions of subsection (f). It is provided, however, that if the occasion for the succession of the Speaker to be Acting President is the failure of the President-elect and Vice-President-elect to qualify, or to the inability of the President or Vice President, the Acting President shall continue as such only until the President or Vice President qualifies or until the removal of the disability.

"In the event there is no Speaker or the Speaker fails to qualify as Acting President, it is provided in subsection (b) that the President pro tempore of the Senate shall, upon his resignation as such and as Senator, discharge the powers and duties of the office of President until the President is elected pursuant to subsection (f) or until the expiration of the current Presidential term, but in no case after a qualified and prior-entitled individual is able to act. Thus the President pro tempore of the Senate would not continue to serve after a duly qualified Speaker is available to serve as Acting President. For this reason subsection (b) describes the function of the President pro tempore in relation to the Presidency as simply the discharge of the powers and duties of the office of President.

"In the event there is no President pro tempore of the Senate to serve pursuant to subsection (b), it is provided in subsection (c) that the powers and duties of the office of President shall be discharged by the officer of the United States who is highest on the following list and who is not under disability: Secretary of State, Secretary of the Treasury, Secretary of War, Attorney General, Postmaster General, Secretary of the Navy, Secretary of the Interior, Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary of Commerce, Secretary of Labor. As in the case of the President pro tempore, a member of the Cabinet thus discharging the powers and duties of President is to serve until the expiration of the current Presidential term, or until a special election is held pursuant to subsection (f), but in no event after a qualified Speaker of the House is able to serve.

"Provision for special election is contained in subsection (f). It is therein provided that if the event by reason of which the Speaker is required to act as President occurs more than 90 days immediately preceding the regular congressional election in November, in a year in which there is no regular Presidential election, a special election is to be held on the Tuesday after the first Monday in November in the year of the next regular congressional election. This provision for an election at the usual time for congressional elections would apply in the event of a vacancy occuring in the period between the beginning of a Presidential term and 90 days prior to the next regular November congressional election. Should a vacancy occur during the second biennium of a Presidential term, no special election is provided. If a vacancy should occur less than 90 days prior to a regular congressional election in November, there is likewise no provision for a special election, in the view that there would be inadequate time to hold such election in conjunction with the next regular congressional election, and hence the individual succeeding to the Presidency would continue to serve until the next regular Presidential election.

"The procedure to be followed in relation to a special election is to conform to the procedure for regular Presidential elections. The term of the President and Vice President chosen at a special election is to begin on the 20th of January immediately following their election and is to end with the close of the unexpired term for which the special election was held.

"CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE BILL

"The Constitution provides in article II, section 1:

"'In case of the removal of the President from office, or of his death, resignation, or inability to discharge the powers and duties of the said office, the same shall devolve on the Vice President, and the Congress may by law provide for the case of removal, death,

resignation, or inability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring what officer shall then act as President, and such officer shall act accordingly, until the disability be removed, or a President shall be elected.'

"In designating the Speaker as the 'officer [who] shall then act as President' in the contingencies described in the Constitution, the bill resembles the original statute governing succession to the Presidency. That statute, enacted by the Second Congress on March 1, 1792, provided that in the contingencies stated 'the President of the Senate or, if there is none, then the Speaker of the House of Representatives for the time being, shall act as President until the disability is removed or a President is elected.' This statute remained in force almost a century until 1886, when the present law was enacted. The act of 1792 thus represents a construction by an early Congress, whose views of the Constitution have been long regarded as authoritative, of the provision empowering Congress to designate the officer who shall act as President. The act of 1792 reflects also a long-continued acquiescence in the construction of the Constitution under which the Speaker and the President pro tempore of the Senate are deemed to be officers within the meaning of article II. Their resignation as a condition of serving as President is required by the provision in article I, section 6, that no person holding any office under the United States shall be a member of either House during his continuance in office.

"The provision of the bill for a special election is founded upon the provision of article II, section 1, that the officer acting as President shall so act 'until the disability be removed, or a President shall be elected.' It is quite clear that this constitutional clause was intended to authorize a special Presidential election. The original proposal in the Constitutional Convention was that the designated successor should act 'until the time of electing a President shall arrive.' This wording was changed to the present form on motion of Madison on the ground that the original proposal 'would prevent a supply of the vacancy by an intermediate election of the President.' While the Constitution is not explicit on the question whether a special election may be for the unexpired term rather than for a full 4-year term, it does not provide that the term of each incumbent shall be 4 years, but that the President shall hold his office 'during the term of 4 years.' This language appears to have reference to a fixed quadrennial term, permitting the filling of an unexpired portion thereof by election. The tradition of special elections for unexpired terms of other officers also supports the provision of the bill in this regard.

"CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

"The bill repeals sections 1 and 2 of the act of January 19, 1886 (24 Stat. 1; U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 3, secs. 21 and 22):

" 'SEC. 21. In case of removal, death, resignation, or inability of both the President and Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of State, or if there be none, or in case of his removal, death, resignation, or inability, then the Secretary of the Treasury, or if there be none, or in case of his removal, death, resignation, or inability, then the Secretary of War, or if there be none, or in case of his removal, death, resignation, or inability, then the Attorney General, or if there be none, or in case of his removal, death, resignation, or inability, then the Postmaster General, or if there be none, or in case of his removal, death, resignation, or inability, then the Secretary of the Navy, or if there be none, or in case of his removal, death, resignation, or inability, then the Secretary of the Interior, shall act as President until the disability of the President or Vice President is removed or a President shall be elected: *Provided*, That whenever the powers and duties of the office of President of the United States shall devolve upon any of the persons named herein, if Congress be not then in session, or if it would not meet in accordance with law within 20 days thereafter, it shall be the duty of the person upon whom said powers and duties shall devolve to issue a proclamation convening Congress in extraordinary session, giving 20 days' notice of the time of meeting.

" 'SEC. 22. Section 21 of this title shall only be held to describe and apply to such officers as shall have been appointed by the advice and consent of the Senate to the offices therein named, and such as are eligible to the office of President under the Constitution, and not under impeachment by the House of Representatives of the United States at the time the powers and duties of the office shall devolve upon them respectively.' "

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it will be noted that the President's message recommended a change in the act of 1886, which would in effect place the succession essentially where it was under the act of 1792, which was the first law on the subject, except that it reverses the order of succession as between the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate.

In other words, under the act of 1792, the President pro tempore of the Senate was first in order of succession.

H. R. 3587, known as the Sumners bill, which I have just asked to have inserted in the RECORD, carried into effect the recommendation of the President. The bill reported out by the House committee is substantially the same as S. 564, which was introduced by me in February of this year, and which was reported to the Senate by the Committee on Rules and Administration, Report No. 80, Calendar No. 79, except that H. R. 3587 provided for a special election, whereas S. 564 does not so provide.

When H. R. 3587 was considered by the House of Representatives, the requirement that the Speaker of the House of Representatives resign as Speaker and as a Member of the House was deleted. In other words, the House sent a bill to the Senate which provided that the Speaker of the House could not only act as President, but he also could act as the Speaker. This deletion was, I believe, the result of a misunderstanding. The debates on the floor of the House indicate that the Members of the House of Representatives were of the opinion that a later provision in the bill covered the question of resignation.

At this point, I should like to call attention to the colloquy engaged in on June 29, 1945, by Mr. LEWIS, as found on page 7134 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that day. Mr. LEWIS, chairman of a House judiciary subcommittee, said:

Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Amendment offered by Mr. LEWIS: Amend by striking out the words in lines 7 and 8 on page 1 as follows: 'Upon his resignation as Speaker and as Representative in Congress,' and insert in lieu thereof the following: 'as hereinafter provided.' "

The provision "hereinafter provided" in the Sumners bill referred only to the Cabinet officers, and it is my opinion that when they adopted the amendment the House felt they provided that not only Cabinet officers but the President pro tempore and the Speaker of the House would be required to resign. I think that is borne out by the further statement:

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, the language of this amendment, I believe, helps to correct a little of the criticism which the gentleman from New York made about this situation when he said we would have an anomalous situation of a Speaker having to resign before becoming President. The language which would take care of that situation is already in the bill provided we strike out the words that this amendment would strike out in lines 7 and 8. The language that covers this is found on page 4, lines 3 to 6, inclusive, and reads as follows:

"The taking of the oath of office by an individual specified in the list in paragraph (1) shall be held to constitute his resignation from the office by virtue of the holding of which he qualifies to serve as President."

So it is my opinion that it was the intention of the House when it adopted the amendment that it was to apply to the Speaker and the President pro tempore with just the same force as it applied to the Cabinet officers.

The later provision in the bill, to which I referred, provided that under certain circumstances, if a person succeeded as Acting President, the taking of the oath of office would constitute his resignation from the office by virtue of the holding of which he qualified to act as President.

However, the provision in question related only to Cabinet officers in the line of succession. Furthermore the House did not strike from the bill the provision specifically requiring that the President pro tempore of the Senate should resign as President pro tempore and as a Member of the Senate. Certainly, if the arguments used on the floor of the House of Representatives were sound, the specific provision insofar as the President pro tempore was concerned should also have been deleted.

There can be no question that the Speaker and President pro tempore should resign, in view of the provision in article I, section 6, clause 2 of the Constitution, that no person holding any office under the United States shall be a Member of either House during his continuance in office. The provision is:

No Senator or Representative shall, during the time for which he was elected, be appointed to any civil office under the authority of the United States which shall have been created or the emoluments whereof shall have been increased during such time; and no person holding any office under the United States shall be a Member of either House during his continuance in office.

Thus, I feel safe in saying that the provisions of S. 564 are substantially the same as those previously approved by the House of Representatives, and substantially carry into effect the recommendations of the President of the United States.

The bill as originally introduced by me is an exact duplicate of H. R. 3587, the Sumners bill, which passed the House in the Seventy-ninth Congress, and is that portion of S. 564 which is lined through. If Senators want to examine the Sumners bill they will find it in the language lined through in the Senate committee bill.

I quote from the report:

The amendment offered as a substitute differs from S. 564 as introduced in the Senate in the following respects:

1. S. 564 originally provided that in cases where the President pro tempore shall act as President, he should so act upon his resignation from the office of President pro tempore and as Senator; however, it did not require the resignation of the Speaker in cases where he is to act.

The amendment provides that the Speaker shall also resign both as Speaker and as Representative in Congress before acting as President.

Certainly there is no need for argument on that amendment, because if we are to insist upon the President pro tempore resigning when he becomes Acting President, we should require the same thing of the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

2. S. 564 provided that in cases where the President pro tempore acts as President he shall not continue to act after a Speaker becomes able to act.

Under the amendment, when a President pro tempore acts as President he will continue to act until the expiration of the then current Presidential term, unless in the meantime a President or Vice President qualifies.

To make it perfectly clear, in the substitute amendment, when once the President pro tempore qualifies, he cannot be supplanted by the Speaker of the House, even though he becomes qualified. The President pro tempore can be displaced only by the President or the Vice President. Certainly no further argument is needed to show that that is just and fair.

3. The original bill provided that where a Speaker is acting as President and becomes disabled, and a new Speaker then acts as President in his place, the new Speaker would continue so to act only until the first Speaker recovered from his disability.

Under the amendment, the new Speaker would continue to act as President notwithstanding the recovery of the first Speaker.

That is, he is not to be supplanted by anyone other than the President or the Vice President of the United States, and should not be, in view of the fact that he resigns and qualifies to fill the unexpired term of President of the United States.

4. The original bill as introduced provided with reference to Cabinet officers that where a Cabinet officer is acting as President by reason of there being no Speaker or President pro tempore and a Speaker subsequently qualifies, then the Cabinet officer is displaced by the Speaker.

The amendment, in the nature of a substitute, provides that the Cabinet officer shall be displaced either by a Speaker or a President pro tempore of the Senate in that order upon their qualifying.

5. Under S. 564 as originally introduced, a Speaker, acting as President, would, with certain exceptions, act "until a President shall be elected in the manner prescribed by law, and until the expiration of the then current Presidential term."

The amendment provides that he shall, with certain exceptions, act only until the expiration of the then current Presidential term, thus simplifying the language and avoiding the possibility of a particular Speaker continuing to act beyond the then current Presidential term.

6. A corresponding change is made to cover the case of a Cabinet member acting as President.

7. A number of minor changes in language have been made for purposes of consistency and clarification. For example, the original bill as introduced provided that the Speaker would "act as President," but that the President pro tempore and Cabinet members would "discharge the powers and duties of the office of President." Wherever the latter phraseology appears in the original bill, the amendment substitutes the word "act" throughout.

That gives the difference between the bill originally introduced in the Senate, Senate bill 564, and the substitute amendment which is now before us for consideration.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

Under the provisions of the bill, when, by reason of death, resignation, removal from office, inability, or failure to qualify, there is neither a President nor a Vice President to discharge the powers and duties of the office of President, the following order of succession shall prevail.

First, the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall, upon his resignation as Speaker and as Representative in Congress, act as President. Attention is invited to the fact, in connection with the provision for the succession of a Speaker, that the Speaker of the House of Representatives, if there is one, will always be first on the list in the order of succession. It is only when there is no Speaker of the House of Representatives, or when the Speaker cannot or does not qualify, that the order of succession devolves upon the President pro tempore of the Senate, or any other officer of the United States.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Suppose a Speaker were under 35 years of age. Would we not then have a President who was not of the required age, and therefore could not hold the office?

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. I will say to my distinguished colleague that in that event the Speaker no doubt would not resign. Therefore the office would pass to the next person in succession, who would be the President pro tempore of the Senate.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator stated that in his opinion the Speaker would not resign. I have the highest regard and respect for the opinion of the Senator from Nebraska, but what does the bill provide?

Mr. WHERRY. The bill provides that when a Speaker qualifies, and there is no disability, he succeeds——

Mr. HATCH. Where are the words?

Mr. WHERRY. On page 6, line 18:

Subsection (a), (b), and (d) shall apply only to such officers as are eligible to the office of President under the Constitution.

Mr. HATCH. That would apply also in case the Speaker of the House were not a Member of the House.

Mr. WHERRY. That is a question which I shall answer later in my argument. To answer quickly the question which the Senator from New Mexico asked, if the Speaker could not qualify, or were under a disability, no doubt he would not resign. If he were under 35 years of age he would know before resigning that he could not qualify, and therefore he would not resign as Speaker. He would continue in that office. But if for some reason he should resign and not qualify, until a new Speaker were elected the succession would be in the person of the President pro tempore of the Senate. If the Speaker then qualified, he would take over. But in the event he did not qualify, or did not meet the constitutional provisions, the office would pass on to the Secretary of State, and the same qualifications would apply—whatever the qualifications are for holding the office.

Mr. HATCH. I have several questions in my mind about the bill, but I anticipate that the Senator is going to discuss them. I shall reserve further questions until the Senator shall have finished, and see if they are not answered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have made a diligent review of the question of succession, and I have presented it to the full committee. Most of the questions which have been asked here were asked before the committee. I am satisfied that if Senators will hear me through, most of the questions which they may raise will be answered. At least they will be answered as I think they should be answered. However, I wish my distinguished colleagues to know that I am glad to yield to them for any question.

Second, if at the time a Speaker would, under the proposed law, begin the discharge of the powers and duties of the office of President, there were no Speaker, or the Speaker failed to qualify as acting President, then the President pro tempore of the Senate would, upon his resignation as President pro tempore and as Senator, act as President.

When the Speaker of the House of Representatives or the President pro tempore of the Senate qualifies, such person will continue to act until the expiration of the current Presidential term, except that if his discharge of the powers and duties of the office is founded in whole or in part on the failure of both the President-elect or the Vice President-elect to qualify, then he shall act only until a President or Vice President qualifies; and if his discharge of the powers and duties of the office is founded in whole or in part on the inability of the President or Vice President, then he shall act only until the removal of the disability of one of such individuals.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. I do not know whether the Senator will discuss the word "disability" in his remarks, but that word has given me considerable trouble.

Mr. WHERRY. I am going to discuss it all through the debate, but I should like the Senator to know that the bill deals with inability just as the succession law now deals with inability. We are providing only for succession legislation, and whatever question is in the mind of the distinguished Senator now relative to what the disability might be in the legislation has been in the minds

of Senators and House Members who have considered this matter for 164 years.

Mr. HATCH. That is in my mind, but I do not think the present law is at all satisfactory, even though it has existed for many years. I think there is a grave defect in it which ought to be corrected, and I hope the Senater will discuss it.

Mr. WHERRY. May I digress from my presentation to answer briefly the question which has been raised by the distinguished Senator, which, of course, all of us agree is one of the most difficult questions with which we have to deal in any succession law. The question whether a President is unable to perform the functions and duties of his office due to a mental or physical condition is, as I have said, not germane t. the bill, because we are speaking only about succession as provided for in Senate bill 554. But it is an important question, because the Constitution provides what might happen under the wording of the Constitution. The bill deals with the subject of the line of succession, but not with the procedure for determining when succession shall take place. Under both the act of 1792 and the act of 1886, the same question would have been involved, just as the Senator is asking it now. It will be remembered that the act of 1886 is the present law, which prescribes no specific procedure for determining inability of the President to act. There was a great deal of debate on it. No doubt the Senator has read it. There are reams of arguments advanced in defining what disability is. Nevertheless, it is not provided for in either of the acts. It seems sufficient to say that in the entire period of approximately 164 years of the existence of this country, the issue has never officially been presented for settlement.

Mr. HATCH. It has never been officially presented, but it has been presented to the people of the country and, to my mind, in a most disgraceful way.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall mention that later, and I want to do it as kindly as I can. It did come up for consideration. In only two instances did it rise to the point of discussion. I say this with deepest respect for the ones who might have been laboring under a disability.

The first was the case of James A. Garfield, who survived between 2 and 3 months after being shot by an assassin. During that period he was unable fully to perform the duties of the office of President. However, the issue was never officially raised, because, finally, he passed on, and the situation was clarified.

The second case was that of former President Woodrow Wilson. It will be remembered by the Senator from New Mexico and other Senators that a committee of Senators was selected, but not formally appointed, to call upon President Wilson after affliction came upon him in 1920. History records reveal that the President was in bed, propped up, and he joked with the Senators present. So the report of the committee was that there was nothing to report and, further, "The President seems to be mentally capable," and so forth.

Thus, again, the question was not officially presented for decision. In the case of Garfield, as I mentioned a moment ago, he died before the issue became acute. In the case of Wilson, his term of office expired prior to such time.

Those are the only two cases during the existence of our country relative to disability which the records of history reveal.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator has made a great study of this question. If the committee which called upon President Wilson had found the contrary, what would have been the procedure?

Mr. WHERRY. That issue must be settled sometime.

Mr. HATCH. If the Senator will further yield, that emphasizes one of the objections I have to a bill of this nature. I think this entire subject—and there is no more important subject before the country—should be carefully studied and a complete and comprehensive bill passed which would take care of all these matters, instead of merely providing the line of succession.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I appreciate very deeply the words of the distinguished Senator. He is a student of history, and he knows that a committee was appointed as long ago as 1856 which went into the debates and the arguments of the Constitutional Convention. They followed the history of succession. The report is elaborate. I spent many nights at home reading through the report of the Judiciary Committee appointed in 1856. When the report was finally made, four recommendations were included, but it will be found that there is an absence of anything relative to disability.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator is entirely correct in what he has said, but I am not one of those who subscribe to the philosophy that if a thing never has been done it never can be done. I think the very evidence the Senator has given us illustrates the necessity for a complete overhaul of the entire plan of succession, defining "disability" and how it is to be determined, even including the Electoral College. I think that ought to be looked into also.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall have something to say about that also. That very statement has been made time and time again on the floor and in committee hearings. I think I have handled this bill as well as it can be handled until some superbody gets together to bring in suggestions. With the exception of disability, the subject has been overhauled from A to Z and back again, and I am satisfied that if a committee were appointed now to do the very thing which the Senator has asked be done, it would probably result in their throwing up their hands and saying that it is not only difficult to say when there is a disability, but report that it is impossible to formulate a plan by which we can accomplish the very arduous task of compelling the one who is holding the office to forego the office and declare it vacant and put someone else in in his stead. As I said a moment ago, in all the history of the United States such disability has occurred only twice, and, as I pointed out, the subject was elaborately discussed by the Judiciary Committee in 1856. Yet in 1886, when Senator Hoar debated this matter for days on the floor of the Senate, with his colleagues and also in the committee, the matter of disability was thoroughly discussed.

I should like to suggest to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico that in the amendment which now is offered as a substitute, it is required that the Speaker of the House of Representatives or the President pro tempore of the Senate must resign. I say to the Senator that even though the accession to the Presidency is a duty and an honor, nevertheless, as I shall point out later, to my mind one of the safeguards and one of the ways of determining disability is to provide that the Speaker or the President pro tempore, whichever comes first, shall determine whether the disability is only temporary or whether it is permanent, and whether, under those conditions, he would like to risk his seat in the Senate or in the House of Representatives by resigning and then ascending to the position of Acting President of the United States. I think that is one way to solve the problem.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MALONE in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Suppose it is not a question of disability, but is a matter of a vacancy on account of death. Is it the spirit of the amendment that it will be the duty of the Speaker to resign, or will that be an option?

Mr. WHERRY. It will be an option on the part of the Speaker or the President pro tempore; it will not be mandatory. The same situation will apply in the case of disability.

Of course, as I have already stated, the question of disability has not yet arisen. As I said earlier in my remarks, seven Presidents have died and seven vice presidents have succeeded to that office, but we have had no difficulty in regard to succession. However, when there is a vacancy in the office of Vice President, as is the case at the present time, the question becomes acute. That is what is in my mind.

I think the President was most sincere in stating to the Members of the Congress that now is the time—at least during his period of service as President—to make provision, so that in the future a succession law will take care of any such situation.

In regard to the matter of having the office go to the Secretary of State, as provided in the present law, the Act of 1886, the President felt that because of the fact that the Speaker of the House of Representatives is elected from his own district every 2 years, and, in addition, is elected by the Members of the House of Representatives, he is the official who is closest to the people of the United States. It is solely upon that premise that I believe that the Speaker of the House should come ahead of the President pro tempore of the Senate.

Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from New Mexico for raising the question of disability. It is a deep question. Even though we proceed to enact this legislation, such action on our part would in no way hinder or deter the making of a complete study of the very subject to which the distinguished Senator from New Mexico has referred. In fact, if that is the will of the Senate, I should be glad to join in moving for the creation of a joint committee, composed of members of both the House of Representatives and the Senate, to do exactly what the Senator from New Mexico has suggested. However, I suggest that before that study would be completed, the emergency now confronting us would be over, in my opinion; and then the subject would be dropped, just as was done in 1886. The result would be that in 1956 nothing would come from the study of the joint committee.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HATCH. I say to the Senator that what he has just stated about the emergency being over and the study being dropped, is what has prompted me to take the very strong view which I now have taken, namely, that the time to act is while the emergency still exists—right now. I think we can get the study and the report, and thereupon we shall be able to enact the necessary over-all legislation.

But if we let the emergency pass, as the Senator from Nebraska has said, inasmuch as we are all inclined to put off and procrastinate, I am satisfied that the Senator from Nebraska is exactly right in saying that nothing will be done after the emergency has passed, if the study has not been made by that time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall be glad to have support from both sides of the aisle in connection with the passage of the proposed legislation before July 26, so as to take care of the situation as I see it. I should also be glad to join with the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, who has made such a forceful argument to us, in respect to a joint resolution calling for the making of a study such as the one he has mentioned; and certainly that could be done before 1949.

I say frankly that, based upon the precedents, if such a joint committee were to take as much time as previous joint committees have taken, the Congress would not receive its recommendations in sufficient time to permit of the enactment of legislation on the subject before January 20, 1949, in my opinion.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me once more?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HATCH. I regret that the forceful argument to which the Senator from Nebraska has referred did not make clear to him what I have in mind.

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, yes; it did.

Mr. HATCH. What I have in mind is simply that if Congress now enacts such legislation, the Congress then will be saying, "It is all taken care of; the emergency is over," and we shall continue on this new basis in the future. Then the study will not be made, and we shall wind up by finding ourselves in exactly the position we now are in.

Mr. WHERRY. I say to the distinguished Senator that I understand his position very clearly. He is a forceful debater. He raised the question of disability; but, in fact, the question of disability is not raised by the succession legislation now before us.

If it is the desire of the Senator from New Mexico to have a joint committee study the question of succession as it applies to disability—and I regard that as a big question—that will be perfectly agreeable to me. But the question of disability has not been raised by the pending bill, as I have previously stated; and it is my thought that if before July 26 we can carry out the suggestions of the President of the United States in respect to this emergency legislation we shall have accomplished much, as I shall point out later in my remarks, because the law has been changed by various measures, including the lame-duck amendment; since 1886 there have been various changes in respect to the question of how we shall provide by statute what is proposed in the pending measure. But the disability matter, as described by the Senator from New Mexico, could be studied. If and when a vacancy should occur, so that determination of the question would have to be made, I should be glad to give that matter definite study.

The emergency now confronting us does not involve that matter. The present emergency calls for having the Congress provide for a succession down the line, as the President suggested, in the event that something of that sort should occur between now and January 20, 1949.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HATCH. I thank the Senator for yielding, and I do not wish to take up too much of his time; but I do not wish to be limited to the question of disability.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course not.

Mr. HATCH. My thought is that the study should necessarily include all the troublesome and vexatious problems, including that of the line of succession itself.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course.

Mr. HATCH. Frankly, I am not satisfied with the proposal as to the line of succession, as contained in this measure. I am not even satisfied as to its constitutionality; and in that respect I think there are grave and serious questions which should receive the most profound study and consideration that we can give to them. I say that the time to do that is now that the emergency exists; for if we pass the measure now before us without making such a study, probably another 100 years will pass before the Congress again will become acutely aware of the necessity of the enactment of the legislation to which I have referred; and of course at that time those of us who are now in Congress will not be here.

Mr. WHERRY. But at least we shall have passed this bill, and then 100 years from now something else can be done.

I say to the Senator that if he has any doubt in regard to the constitutionality of this measure, let him attempt by legislation to define disability and the vacating of the office, and that will be an act upon which the question of constitutionality will hinge. It is for that reason that I say to the Senator that the disability feature is not a part of the legislative proposal presented in this amendment.

In other words, Mr. President, when either the Speaker of the House of Representatives or the President pro tempore of the Senate once qualifies to act as President, he can be displaced only by the President or Vice President. That is the statement I had just concluded when the distinguished Senator from New Mexico raised the question of disability.

Third, if by reason of death, resignation, removal from office, inability, or failure to qualify, there is no President pro tempore to act as President, then the officer of the United States who is highest on the following list, and who is not under disability to discharge the powers and duties of the office of President, shall act as President: The Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, the Attorney General, the Postmaster General, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Labor.

I point out here that the positions of Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary of Commerce, and Secretary of Labor were created subsequent to enactment of the act of 1886.

Any of the persons named in that list, when acting as President, would continue so to do until the expiration of the then current Presidential term, but not after a qualified and prior-entitled individual was able to act, namely, the President, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, or the President pro tempore of the Senate. By that I mean that if the Secretary of State has become qualified and has taken the oath to act as President, he can be displaced only by the President, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, or the President pro tempore, provided that they, in order, become qualified to act as President of the United States.

The removal of the disability of an individual higher on the list of Cabinet officers, or the ability to qualify on the part of an individual higher on such list, shall not, however, terminate his service. By that, I mean that if the Secretary of the Treasury qualifies because the Secretary of State had a disability, and if subsequently there was a removal of the disability, if the Secretary of State thereupon wish to qualify, under this measure he would not supplant the Secretary of the Treasury, once the Secretary of the Treasury became qualified and became the Acting President.

The taking of the oath of office by one of the persons named in the list of Cabinet officers would be held to constitute his resignation from the Cabinet office, by virtue of the holding of which he qualified to act as President.

Persons in the line of succession would have to be eligible to hold the office of President under the Constitution and Cabinet officers on the list would have had to be appointed by and with the

advice and consent of the Senate prior to the time of the death, resignation, removal from office, inability, or failure to qualify, of the President pro tempore, and must not have been under impeachment by the House of Representatives at the time when the powers and duties of the office of President devolved upon them. During the period when any person acts as President, his compensation is to be at the rate then provided by law in the case of the President.

That, briefly, Mr. President, is a statement of the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as compared to the original Sumners bill and also as compared to the original Senate bill 564, which was in reality the Sumners bill, but was amended by me and was adopted by the committee after we made a study of this situation.

Now I should like to make a brief statement regarding the historical background upon which I base the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Both the original succession act of 1792, and the act of 1886, which is the present law, were enacted in the light of the provisions of article II, section 1, paragraph 5, of the Constitution, which reads as follows:

> In case of the removal of the President from office, or of his death, resignation, or inability to discharge the powers and duties of the said office, the same shall devolve on the Vice President, and the Congress may by law provide for the case of removal, death, resignation or inability, both of the President and Vice President—

I should like to emphasize that—

> declaring what officer shall then act as President, and such officer shall act accordingly, until the disability be removed, or a President shall be elected.

The act of 1792 enacted in the Second Congress, provided that the Vice President pro tempore—President pro tempore of the Senate—was the first in order of succession, and the Speaker of the House, second.

At that time, there was some discussion as to making Cabinet members the first successors, beginning with the Secretary of State, who at the time was Thomas Jefferson. However, this move was blocked by Alexander Hamilton, then Secretary of the Treasury, who was bitterly opposed to Jefferson and his policies. Hamilton's recommendations prevailed, and the act of 1792, which was in effect for almost a century, placed the President pro tempore of the Senate as first in the line of succession, followed by the Speaker.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HATCH. From what the Senator has said, I think he will agree that the true historical explanation of the reasons for passing the act were connected with the personal animosities which then existed.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct; it grew out of the animosities existing between two men. But for that, I think the Senator will agree with me, the succession would then have proceeded through the Speaker to the President pro tempore. The personal animosities to which the distinguished Senator refers brought about the act of 1792, placing the President pro tempore ahead of the Speaker. That act was in vogue and in full force until 1886, at which time the act itself was changed.

Mr. HATCH. If the Senator will yield, the law was on the books, but it was never invoked and never came into play during that period.

Mr. WHERRY. I stand corrected. I said "in vogue," not "invoked." I mean that there was no change in the statute from 1792 until 1886, and during that long period the succession was first to the President pro tempore and then to the Speaker. As I stated before, it resulted solely from the differences between the two statesmen, Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton.

Mr. HATCH. If my recollection does not play me false, that subject was discussed in the speech of the late Senator Hoar mentioned by the Senator a while ago, was it not?

Mr. WHERRY. That is true; and also in 1886, because, in the hearings conducted by both of the committees, the question always came up as to who should be in the line of succession.

Mr. HATCH. I mean that at that time the same historical background was given as that which the Senator has given today.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Following the death of President Taylor July 9, 1850, and the succession of Millard Fillmore, the question of succession legislation again came into prominence.

I now mention the committee that studied the matter; and we are now speaking about the committee that was appointed to study all the angles the Senator from New Mexico would have liked to study again. In 1856 the Judiciary Committee of the Senate made a careful inquiry into the subject of succession to the Presidency. Their report—and it is an interesting report, as Senators will find if they will read it—dated August 5, 1856, indicates that they considered all possible eligible persons in this connection, not only the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives but also Members of the Senate in the order of their seniority, Cabinet members, and members of the Supreme Court.

After considering the matter the committee recommended that the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, in that order, succeed to the Presidency, followed by the Chief Justice and other Justices of the Supreme Court. That was their recommendation, and they certainly considered volumes of evidence—reams of it.

In accordance with their recommendation, a bill was submitted to the Senate carrying the recommendations into effect. However, the legislation was never approved. The emergency was over, finally, and, just as I stated a moment ago, when these emergencies end and a new President or Senator or Vice President is elected, then the legislation is allowed to drop until an acute situation or an emergency again arises.

The fact remains that the Judiciary Committee, in its report, recognized the desirability of continuing, as first in the order of succession, the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Throughout the subsequent years, from time to time, especially when a Vice President was called upon to take over the duties of the Presidency, bills were introduced in the Congress to provide for amendments or revisions of the act of 1792. But it was not until the death of President Garfield that the matter was forcibly brought to the attention of the country and the Congress, and a new succession law enacted.

In 1886, the Congress passed the present law, which provides for the succession of the Secretary of State, Secretary of the Treasury, and other members of the Cabinet in the order of their rank as the Cabinet existed at that time.

As I said a moment ago, at that time there was no Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary of Commerce, or Secretary of Labor. Those three Cabinet officers have now been added to the list I proposed in the substitute amendment.

The reasons for the enactment of the act of 1886, the present law, as stated by Senator Hoar on the floor of the Senate, in the debates December 15, 1885, Forty-ninth Congress, first session, and I want to give a synopsis of those arguments, were as follows:

First. Because, from time to time, there was no officer in being who could succeed to the Presidency. I should like to restate that because, unless the legislation has been carefully studied, it is possible to overlook this very important point. From time to time, there was no officer in being who could succeed to the Presidency. That is why the law was changed in 1886. The Senator was then referring to situations between sessions of the Congress when no President pro tempore or Speaker of the House of Representatives was in being under the then existing organizational rules of the Senate and the House.

Second. That it was awkward and repugnant to one's sense of propriety for the President of the United States to sit in the chair of the Senate, and preside over and listen to discussions in regard to his own nominations, voting upon them himself, as an equal in the Senate, and presiding over and listening to the severe criticism of executive policy, which Senator Hoar stated in times of high party antagonism must be always heard in the Senate—and ought always to be heard in the Senate, may I suggest.

This criticism was aimed at the situation which existed under the act of 1792, which had no provision requiring the President pro tempore of the Senate or the Speaker of the House to resign upon assuming the office of Acting President.

I should like to point out again to the Senate that at that time this situation was regarded as it is now, as it was regarded in 1886, or as we view it now. The act of 1886 changed that particular feature, and it has been changed once again. So it makes the measure which has been offered in line, I think, with all the constitutional barriers that have been previously erected.

CONCLUSION

Today we are again confronted with a situation in which the United States has a President but no Vice President. Indeed, if anything, the situation is more critical in that the duties—I think the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] will agree with me on this point—imposed upon not only the President of the United States, but the Secretary of State, require both officials to do extensive traveling within and without the United States. Under the present succession law the Secretary of State would first succeed to the Presidency, in the event of the death of the President.

Proof of the importance of this matter was forcibly before the country when from March 2, 1947, to March 6, 1947, President Truman was away from Washington, yes and he was outside the United States—he was on a visit to Mexico. We are not condemning that, but I simply want to give the Senate the facts, to show that the President was outside the United States for 4 days. But another important point is that at that very time, namely, on March 5, Secretary Marshall left Washington for Moscow, and remained away from the United States until April 26, 1947.

Such things occur by reason of the increased duties that have been forced upon the shoulders of the President and also upon the Secretary of State. I have given one instance in which both were outside the United States for nearly 5 days. If anything had happened to the President of the United States, the country would have been in an acute situation, insofar as the succession was concerned.

It seems to me that we should face the facts and enact into law a bill which takes into consideration modern conditions and the changes which have taken place in the Constitution of the United States and in the organizational set-up of the Senate and House since 1886.

Senator Hoar's argument as to the periods of time during which there would be no Speaker of the House of Representatives or President pro tempore of the Senate has been answered by the adoption of the so-called lame duck amendment to the Constitution, which changed the terms of office of Members of the House and Senate so that they run from January 3d, for a period of 2 years in a case of a Member of the House of Representatives, 6 years in the case of a Senator.

Previous to the adoption of the 20th amendment, there were periods from 12 o'clock March 4th of each odd year to the succeeding December, in the absence of special session, when there was no Speaker of the House of Representatives.

In addition, under the rules of the Senate, which existed prior to 1901, the President pro tempore of the Senate was only appointed when the Vice President was absent from the Senate. Since that time, the rule has been changed and the President pro tempore is elected to hold office at the pleasure of the Senate, and until his successor is elected.

Thus, in the absence of death, there would never be a period of time when there would be no Speaker of the House of Representatives or President pro tempore of the Senate, except for the period between the date of convening of the new Congress and date of election of its officers.

Of course, that still happens. Congress assembles at noon on the 3d day of January, and from the time the senatorial term of the President pro tempore expires at that time and before he is reelected by the Members of the Senate and takes his oath of office there is no President pro tempore, and the argument of Senator Hoar would apply for that brief space of time. But there is no difficulty now respecting that issue, and if for any reason there should be a delay in the election of a new President pro tempore of the Senate, the Secretary of the State could step into the breach, if there were no Speaker of the House, and serve as Acting President 3 or 4 days, until a President pro tempore was elected.

Since 1886 a change has occurred. That change came about by reason of the adoption of the lame duck amendment, by reason of which there is no time when there is a vacancy, unless on the death of a Speaker of the House or a President pro tempore of the Senate, except that intervening time between the time the term of a Representative expires in the House and a Speaker is elected, or the time in the Senate between the time of convening at 12 o'clock noon and when a President pro tempore of the Senate is elected.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. O'CONOR. First I wish to say that I think the Senator from Nebraska is making one of the finest contributions I have heard on this very important subject. I have attempted to read up on it extensively. I have never heard the subject more thoroughly discussed than it has been today.

There is one question which has arisen, and to which I am sure the Senator has given thought, and on which he may be able to add enlightenment to those of us who want to do what is best for the country, as does the Senator from Nebraska.

Has the Senator taken into consideration the following situation: The new Congress convened on January 3 of this year. The individual who was elected to be Speaker of the House has been elected for only 2 years. If he should succeed to the Presidency, and if he were required to serve out the remaining time in the Presidency, he would actually be serving a period of time at the end of the 2 years for which he was not an elected officer.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have that point covered in my presentation, and I shall come to it in a short while.

Mr. O'CONOR. I do not want to anticipate what the Senator is to say.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall cover it later in my remarks. I should like to say to the Senator from Maryland that the bill provides that when the Speaker of the House once qualifies as acting President, he does so for the remainder of the unexpired term for which the President was elected.

Mr. O'CONOR. Conceivably that may be for 3 years, or some other period of time.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; whatever the period of time may be. When the individual who is elected Speaker of the House is elected to the Congress, he is an officer elected from his own district. During all the time there has been a House of Representatives no one has been elected Speaker of the House who was not a Member of Congress. All during the time there has been a Senate of of the United States no one has been President pro tempore who was not a Member of the United States Senate.

The bill provides that if the Speaker qualifies as acting President, he immediately becomes the acting President, and continues to be the acting President for the unexpired term of the President, that is, for the remainder of the time the President would have served had he lived.

It should also be remembered that the moment he qualifies and becomes Acting President he resigns as an officer of the House of Representatives. He must do so in order to meet the constitutional requirement that no one can hold two offices in the Government. No one can act as President and also be the Speaker of the House at the same time.

I wish to say, at this point, that no one is closer to the people than the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and that therefore he is the logical individual to place in line of succession after the Vice President. That is the point President Truman strongly emphasized in his message. I certainly think the President made one of the finest statements I ever heard when he said that the democratic processes would not be met if he were to nominate a Secretary of State, who might belong to his party, which might be the minority party, who would then be next in line, after the President's death, for the Presidency. The same would be true with respect to the Republican Party, if it were the minority party and a similar situation should exist. If the Secretary of State were next in line of succession, the people would be denied, in an emergency, an acting President who was so close to the people as is the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Not only is the Speaker elected from his own congressional district, but the House composed of 435 Members, each of whom comes directly to the House by vote of his constituents, in turn elects one of the Members to be Speaker of the House.

Another point I wish to emphasize is that the Speaker of the House serves for a long period of time before he is elected to that position. I cannot conceive of a Member who has not served a long apprenticeship in the House being elected Speaker. The individual who becomes Speaker is well qualified with respect to appropriations. He has much knowledge of general legislative matters. The same is true with respect to the Senate. A Senator who is elected President pro tempore has served a long period of apprenticeship. I think that by virtue of his long period of apprenticeship, no officer is better qualified than the Speaker of the House, from the stand-

point of length of service and experience, to become Acting President. I thank the Senator for his observations.

Mr. O'CONOR. I thank the Senator for his very clear exposition of the question.

Mr. WHERRY. One further point which I wish to call to the attention of the Senator from Maryland is that the same situation would apply to a Senator. It applies not only to a Speaker, but also to a Senator. A Senator may have served 5 years, or 3 years, before becoming Acting President and serving for an additional length of time. The same thing would apply to the Secretary of State, if he were appointed by the President, and the President died. Under the present law the Secretary of State would succeed to the Presidency. He would fill out the unexpired term.

Mr. O'CONOR. I readily understand that, and the Senator is undoubtedly correct. The only reason the question occurred to me was that with a Member of the House of Representatives elected for only 2 years, there was greater likelihood that he might serve a period for which he was not elected.

Mr. WHERRY. The same thing might be true of a Senator. Suppose he had served 5 years of his 6-year term, and then became President pro tempore of the Senate. If the President should die and if there were no Vice President and the Speaker could not qualify, the President pro tempore of the Senate would succeed to the Presidency. If the President should die within the first year for which he was elected, and the Vice President should die, the Senator would serve as Acting President for 3 or 3½ years, or whatever the unexpired term of the President might be. But he would serve only for that period. I think the point which the Senator raises is a good point; but I wish to make it clear that it applies not only to the President pro tempore, but to others. When a Secretary of State is appointed, if he serves faithfully, we assume that he will continue to serve during the administration in which he was appointed. So in reality the same point could be made with respect to the Secretary of State or the Secretary of the Treasury.

The twentieth amendment of the Constitution changed the terms of office of Members of the House and Senate. This is what makes the pending measure important, because we are now in a different situation from that of 1886, at the time Senator Hoar was able to present formidable arguments, which the Senate accepted, in passing the legislation relating to Presidential succession now on the statute books. The twentieth amendment to the Constitution provides:

SECTION 1. The terms of the President and Vice President shall end at noon on the 20th day of January, and the terms of Senators and Representatives at noon on the 3d day of January, of the years in which such terms would have ended if this article had not been ratified; and the terms of their successors shall then begin.

SEC. 2. The Congress shall assemble at least once in every year, and such meeting shall begin at noon on the 3d day of January, unless they shall by law appoint a different day.

SEC. 3. If, at the time fixed for the beginning of the term of the President, the President-elect shall have died, the Vice-President-elect shall become President. If a President shall not have been chosen before the time fixed for the beginning of his term, or if the President-elect shall have failed to qualify, then the Vice-President-elect shall act as President until a President shall have qualified; and the Congress may by law provide for the case wherein neither a President-elect nor a Vice-President-elect shall have qualified, declaring who shall then act as President, or the manner in which one who is to act shall be selected, and such person shall act accordingly until a President or Vice President shall have qualified.

That is exactly what is done in this amendment. We have followed the provisions of the twentieth amendment, the so-called lame-duck amendment.

SEC. 4. The Congress may by law provide for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the House of Representatives may choose a President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them—

That has reference when there is not a majority situation in the electoral college, and the election of a President devolves upon the House of Representatives—

and for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the Senate may choose a Vice President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them.

In case of the death of any of the persons from whom the Senate may choose a Vice President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them, we have the right to say who shall succeed to that office.

SEC. 5. Sections 1 and 2 shall take effect on the 15th day of October following the ratification of this article.

SEC. 6. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Perhaps the question which I was about to ask the Senator from Nebraska has been answered. Assume, for instance, that the Speaker of the House did not possess the constitutional qualifications to become President. Does the bill take care of that situation?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska has answered that question. The bill does take care of the situation. As the Senator pointed out a while ago, there is language in the bill, which the Senator read to me, and which I had not read up to that time, which provides, in substance, that only persons eligible under the Constitution may act as President. In other words, a Speaker of the House must possess the constitutional qualifications in order to act as President before he is eligible to succeed to that office. I think that is the provision of the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. It is found on page 6, line 18.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Following up that question, assume that neither the Speaker of the House nor the President pro tempore met the qualifications laid down in the Constitution for eligibility to the office of President of the United States. What would happen, under the terms of the bill?

Mr. WHERRY. The Secretary of State would be next in line of succession. If he were not qualified, or if his nomination had not been confirmed when he was appointed, or if any qualification were lacking, the next in line would be the Secretary of the Treasury, and so on through the list of Cabinet officers. Those provisions are found in the second part of the bill.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate the Senator's questions. They are very pertinent. I am satisfied that they are answered by the various provisions of the bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I have not heard all of the Senator's address on this question. I am wondering how this bill compares with the Succession Act of 1792. As I understand, it was somewhat similar to the bill before us. It remained the law for a considerable period of time, and I am wondering whether or not the Senator has made a comparison with that act, and whether he can tell me briefly what the difference is.

Mr. WHERRY. I can tell the Senator in one or two sentences. The main difference is that the Succession Act of 1792 provided that the President pro tempore should succeed to the office of President, and that the next in line should be the Speaker of the House, followed by the Cabinet officers.

Mr. LUCAS. That is practically the only difference. In other words, with that difference, we are moving back to where we were in 1792, when the first Succession Act was passed by Congress.

Mr. WHERRY. I think that is the only difference. I think there was a provision for a special election, but the law was never invoked, so there is no precedent on that score.

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand, it was that provision which later caused some of the long debates in Congress.

Mr. WHERRY. In 1856 a subcommittee was appointed by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. That subcommittee made an exhaustive research into the question of succession. It considered all the questions involved, and among them the question of disability, which has been raised by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH]. I have made a long argument which answers all those questions. As I see it, the main reason why the succession act of 1792 provided first for the succession to the Presidency by the President pro tempore and then by the Speaker of the House was the fact that there were differences between Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton.

I believe that one of the finest statements that has ever been made, and one of the best arguments that has ever been advanced for the bill, has been made by President Truman, the head of the Democratic Party.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not happen to agree with the position of the President.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not wish to inject politics into this question. I have the highest regard for my friend from Illinois; but I wish to avoid the consideration of politics. On both sides of the aisle there are distinguished statesmen who have taken a great interest in succession legislation. I admit that if death should overtake our President at this time, or if he should become disabled, if the bill were on the statute books the next in line of succession would be the Speaker of the House, who happens to be Mr. MARTIN, a Republican. But let me say to the distinguished Senator that if he will follow the history of the proposals to change the law, he will find that the political considerations are about evenly balanced. We are passing long-range legislation. Even at the very next session the tables may be turned. I am satisfied that if the Senator will follow the history of the debates on this question he will see that in instance after instance the emergency finally terminated, and then nothing further was done until a new situation arose, such as that we face today, with no Vice President. I am sure that if the Senator will examine the history of the question impartially he will not press the political argument, because it has no place in this debate.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to disabuse the Senator's mind of the impression that I am injecting politics into the argument, because apparently it involves no political considerations. Strange as it may seem, the Senator from Nebraska is quoting a Democratic President in his speech. He is all for President Truman.

Mr. WHERRY. So far as this particular piece of legislation is concerned, that is true. I will say further to the Senator that I shall always be with the President when he is right, and I shall certainly be against him when he is wrong.

Mr. LUCAS. That is a wonderful spirit. That spirit always has characterized the Senator from Nebraska. However, to show that there is no politics in this question, the Senator is an ardent Republican—one of the best—and he is for the President of the United States, who is a Democrat. I am an ardent Democrat, and I am against the President of the United States in his position on this bill, so there cannot be any politics.

Mr. WHERRY. That is interparty politics, which is the worst kind.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator knows more about interparty politics than does the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I am gratified to hear the Senator from Nebraska speak so highly of the President of the United States and of the message from which he quoted as convincing and overwhelming proof of the desire for this type of legislation. I am delighted to see that the Senator from Nebraska is such an ardent admirer of the President. But that does not convince me of the soundness of the position which the President took. The President takes as his main reason, in effect, the tragic death of the late President, and the desirability of nominating the person who would be the President's immediate successor in the event of his death or inability to act.

I have a high regard, of course, for this reasoning of the President; but is it not true, as a matter of fact, that in both of our political conventions, when we have nominated our choice for the Presidency, that man usually dominates the convention and makes his own choice of Vice President?

Mr. WHERRY. I am not as apt in politics as were the Democrats in Chicago. I really cannot answer that question. I should certainly think that the man who was nominated for the Presidency would have something to say about who should run with him on the ticket. I do not know anything about that kind of convention politics. I have not been in one in which my judgment was invited. I would say to the Senator that I certainly would think that the President would have something to say as to who his running mate should be.

Mr. HATCH. While the Senator is making this rather extreme concession, will he not further agree that no man could be nominated for the Vice Presidency if the one nominated for the Presidency opposed him?

Mr. WHERRY. I am sorry, but I was disturbed for a moment and did not get all of the Senator's question.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator would not go the full length with me?

Mr. WHERRY. I will say that I will go the full length with the Senator every time he is right, and when he is wrong I will go to the full extent the other way.

Mr. HATCH. Then this debate should end, because I am right.

Mr. WHERRY. We shall get above this political proposition, and I think we should. I think the Senator from New Mexico has a brilliant legal mind. I have been with him on the Committee on the Judiciary, and when he started in with his questions, which were basically constitutional and legal, I deeply appreciated them, because I feel that this is a big subject. I am sorry that we can take only this afternoon and tomorrow until 2 o'clock to debate this matter, because I have reluctantly given way time and time again, and I am just as sure as I could be sure of anything that this Presidential succession is emergency legislation. I am satisfied that the President has suggested a piece of legislation that is sound; and I want to reassure the Senator that while he has as good a right to differ with the President as I have, this is one time when I think the President has recommended legislation which Congress ought to pass. I would say that whether Mr. MARTIN were Speaker of the House, or Mr. RAYBURN, for whom I have a high regard.

Mr. HATCH. If the Senator will further yield, I do want to continue this discussion along the lines of the question I have asked, because it is an extremely important and practical matter. When I said I was right, I meant that what little experience I have had and what I have read convinces me that both political parties, when they nominate their choice for the Presidency, are moved largely in their choice of a Vice-Presidential candidate by what the nominee for the Presidency says. They certainly would not nominate a man for Vice President who was opposed by the nominee for President. Therefore, it means simply this, that the nominee for President does name his own immediate successor; and the argument of the President of the United States in his message falls completely flat, although I know how earnest and sincere he is.

Mr. WHERRY. I disagree with my distinguished friend. What I think the President meant was that he had a right to nominate to be Secretary of State the man who would succeed him. The Secretary of State is appointed; he is not elected. The fact that the Secretary of State belongs to the same party contradicts the very idea and principle which the President has suggested to the Senate, that is, that the Speaker of the House, being elected by the people, even though he come from a different party, is the man who is closer to the people, and, therefore, should be the President. That is what the President means, I take it.

Perhaps I did not get the Senator's point correctly, but it seems to me that if I correctly understand what the President is talking about, it is that in reference to the nomination of one to succeed him he feels he is a nonpartisan. He said it was in order to carry out the democratic policies and processes. The one closest to the people of the United States, as I stated before, is the Speaker of the House, and not an appointed Secretary, who belongs to the same party, which might become the minority party, and therefore he is not as close to the people, regardless of his qualifications or his ability, as would be the Speaker who is elected each 2 years, and then, in turn, elected Speaker by the House of Representatives.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield further to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HATCH. I will say that the point which the Senator is now discussing is set forth in another paragraph of the President's message, in which he says that the man who acts as President should be one who has been elected by the people; but it was another reason which he mentioned with which I disagree, because, as a matter of practical politics, a President does actually choose the Vice President, and thereby does nominate his immediate successor.

Mr. WHERRY. I will let the Senator go ahead and have his Presidential nominee select whom he wants for Vice President, provided the Senator will support this legislation, so that in the event the Vice President dies and the President wants a successor, he will come from the Speakership of the House, under the theory, as the President pointed out, that the Speaker is the elected officer closest to the people, and therefore is to be preferred over the Secretary of State or some other Cabinet officer.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator asked if I would support the legislation. I cannot support it, for the reasons which have been thus far discussed. There is a far more grave reason that would forever preclude my supporting the legislation.

Mr. WHERRY. And what is that, may I ask the Senator?

Mr. HATCH. The constitutional provision.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall come to that in just a moment.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. Is it not true that in the last two Republican conventions, which are the only two of which I have any personal knowledge from having attended them, while the Vice-Presidential nominee may have had the approval of the man who had been nominated for President, he was in neither case directly selected by the man chosen to head the ticket? In the case of the 1940 convention and in the case of the 1944 convention, after the nomination was made for the Presidential office, there was considerable discussion as to who should be the Vice-Presidential candidate, and it was a matter of the free and open choice of the convention. Of course, the choice had the approval of the Presidential nominee, but it fell far short of a deliberate and direct designation by the Presidential nominee as to who should have second place on the ticket. I think it is highly probable, I say in all deference to my learned and distinguished friend from New Mexico, that that might not always have been true in the Republican Party, but it certainly was true, to my personal knowledge, in the last two Republican conventions.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator therefore will agree that neither of those Vice Presidents was selected over the opposition of the Presidential nominee?

Mr. BALDWIN. I think that is true, but I think it is entirely different from the Democratic National Convention, where it is certainly a pretty generally accepted fact that the man who was President at the time and was renominated had the biggest voice as to who should run with him on the ticket. The fact that he was in the Presidential office might very well distinguish the two cases. I am not critical of the situation. However, I think that my learned friend's argument falls short of effectiveness, because what he says about the designation of the Vice-Presidential nominee by the Presidential nominee does not always hold true, so that the Presidential nominee does not in effect select who might ultimately turn out to be his successor, if the election is successful.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HATCH. I think the Senator from Connecticut has correctly outlined the situation. However, if he has ever attended a Democratic convention he knows it is a pretty free and open affair, in a way. However, the point I make is that whether there is an outright designation or not, it still remains true of both of the parties, I think, that the nominee for President has the moving voice in the selection of the nominee for Vice President, and I think that should be true.

Mr. BALDWIN. I agree with the Senator. I think it is a vital factor, and I think it should be. However, there is just one intervening fact between the nomination and the actual election relative to the selection of the nominee for the Vice-Presidential office. The people in the meantime have a chance to pass upon the whole matter.

The argument advanced for the pending bill is that the Speaker of the House has stood before the electorate and has, in turn, been chosen by a majority of the other 434 Members of the House of Representatives, who themselves also stood for election, in this case fairly recently.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I simply wish to observe to the Senator from Nebraska that he has been very generous in yielding, and I think we are getting a little away from his discussion, so I shall not interrupt him further along these lines. I am very hopeful that he will soon get to a discussion of the constitutional features, because I am very much concerned about them.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Connecticut for his observation, Mr. President. Let me say that for the life of me, I cannot understand what the matter of selection of the Vice President by the Presidential candidate or by anyone else has anything to do with the matter of succession. Of course, I am glad to have the benefit of the Senator's observations.

I was present at both the Republican Conventions which the distinguished Senator from Connecticut attended, and there was much interest in the selection of the Vice President in each case, and there were some very close votes in that connection. So I think those who did make that selection gave the matter every consideration. But I wish to point out that we are now considering the matter of succession, not the nomination of a Vice President at a party convention.

It is my opinion that the succession should occur in the manner provided in the amendment, namely, that in the event of the death of the President and Vice President, the order of succession should be, first, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, for the very reason given so forcibly by the Senator from Connecticut, namely, that the Speaker of the House is first elected as a Representative in Congress from his district every two years, upon the issues that are involved, and the segment of the people who vote for that candidate, vote for him because of the platform upon which he stands, and his character, and his ability to carry out his promises. When that candidate becomes a Member of the House of Representatives, representing that district, and thereafter, while a Member of the House, is nominated to be Speaker of the House, if he is elected, he is elected by the votes of a majority of the 434 other Members of the House of Representatives, on both sides of the aisle, Republican and Democratic as well; it is they who select their Speaker.

So I join not only in the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, but also in the able words of the President of the United States: That the Speaker of the House of Representatives is the elected officer of the Government closest to the people. I say "elected;" and for that reason, and only for that reason, I place the Speaker of the House of Representatives ahead of the President pro tempore of the Senate, in the matter of succession.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I do not wish to prolong the discussion of this matter, and let me say that it may well be that the able Senator from Nebraska has covered this particular point. Nevertheless, let me ask whether it is not a historical and traditional fact that, really, the first President of the United States was the President of the Constitutional Convention; and, as I recall, he came from Delaware.

Mr. WHERRY. Once again I thank the Senator for his observation.

Mr. President, I wish to conclude my discussion of this point with as much force as I possibly can. I say that the only reason why we provide that the succession shall go first to the Speaker of the House of Representatives is because he serves an apprenticeship in the House before he is elected Speaker of the House. We find that all the Speakers who have come up from long years of service are men in whom the House of Representatives has confidence, and are men who are prepared to handle all types of legislation. In view of that fact, and the further fact that they are more closely riveted, I believe, to the principles at the grass roots than is any other elected official of the Government, in short, that the Speaker of the House, as the President has pointed out, is closer to the people—I believe that the succession should go first to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to point out what I think is the fallacy of the Senator's argument on that point. The Senator has been stressing it with a great deal of energy all afternoon. Under our system of government we elect a President for a period of 4 years. From the beginning the people have said that they would like to have the President exercise his theories or philosophies of government uninterrupted for that period of time.

Through the present bill, the Senator from Nebraska is trying to introduce a new theory, one very much like that of the English system. In other words, the other day the President vetoed the labor bill, but his veto was overridden both in the House of Representatives and in the Senate, by an overwhelming majority. If that situation had occurred under the British system, the President would have called for a vote of confidence and no doubt there would have been a new President under those conditions.

But under our theory, whether right or wrong, we have proceeded for a century and a half under the principle that once the people elect a President of the United States for a term of 4 years, the political theories and philosophies of that particular person are to apply for 4 years.

However, under this amendment, that situation would be reversed in the event there was a Democratic President and a Republican Congress—the situation which exists at the present time. If something should happen to the President of the United States, after the amendment were enacted into law, overnight a new political party would come into power before the 4 years expired. This should not happen under our present system of free government.

I contend that today of all times in the history of our country, is a time when, in view of the present situation in the world, those who now are in power should continue in power for the period for which they were elected by the people in 1940. That is my answer to the Senator's argument.

Senators can talk about the Speaker of the House of Representatives as being close to the people, and I agree with that point of view. I also point out, likewise, that the President pro tempore of the Senate is close to the people. But that does not meet or fit in with the long-standing governmental theory under which the American people have been operating from the very beginning of our Government. No amendment which the Senator could propose would convince me that we should make a change in the middle of the 4-year period, by adopting an amendment of this kind. I do not believe that is what the people intended to have done, and I do not believe they now intend to have it done. I do not believe they ever expected that a Republican Congress would take over in the middle of the term of a Democratic President; and, likewise, I do not believe that they expected that the reverse would ever occur.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me, to permit me to ask a question following the remarks of the learned Senator from Illinois?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. I should like to ask if it is not highly improbable that during the 2 years immediately following the election of a President, there would be a President of one political party and a House of Representatives controlled by a majority of another political party. I do not recall an instance of that sort in all the history of the United States. Under our system, that is highly improbable, if not well-nigh impossible.

That means that if the President and the Vice President were to die or become incapacitated during that 2-year period, and if the Speaker of the House of Representatives were then to become President, the chances would be 999 out of 1,000 that he would be of the same political party as the President and Vice President who had died or had become incapacitated.

Mr. President, assuming that the President and Vice President do die or do become incapacitated in the second 2-year period of the Presidential term under an unusual situation such as those obtaining at the present time, when the President is of one political party and the majority of the Congress of another. In the present Congress we have such a situation and one which has not often developed in our history, although it did develop last November. It seems to me that the election last November demonstrated to everyone who has considered the matter that the policies being followed by the administration—that is to say, the President and the Vice President in this particular case—did not meet with the approval of the people. For that reason, the control in Congress was given to a party in opposition to the administration in power. That election was the latest opportunity the people had had to express their opinion in regard to the policies being followed by the administration then in the White House.

Why is there anything wrong with the proposition that if the control of the newly elected Congress should be of a different political complexion than the administration in the White House, the Speaker of the House would then be reflecting more nearly the point of view and opinion of the electorate by and large, than would a President or Vice President, whose administration had been repudiated at the most recent election?

Mr. LUCAS. If I may answer, Mr. President, the argument of the Senator from Connecticut makes no impression upon me whatever, because if the theory laid down by the able Senator from Connecticut is to be followed, a constitutional amendment should be presented providing that when either Republicans or Democrats take over both branches of Congress, it then becomes necessary to have either a Republican or Democratic President in order to carry out the policies of the Congress of the United States at such time.

Mr. BALDWIN. If I may interrupt there, just a moment, Mr. President, it is perfectly apparent, in what has happened in the last 2 weeks, that the administration in the White House and the majority of the Congress more recently elected can be in complete disagreement.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator may draw any conclusions from that situation he desires. Two weeks is a very short time, I will say to my able friend, in which to draw on his imagination or in which to draw any conclusion as to what may or may not happen, but I reiterate, with all the emphasis at my command, that so long as we continue to follow the Constitution of the United States, given to us by the founding fathers, directing that nominees should be elected President for the term of 4 years, the Congress, in my judgment, should not disturb the right of the party in power, whether it be Democratic or Republican, to continue with their theories and their philosophies during the said 4 years; because the people spoke. The people spoke in 1944, right or wrong, and whatever may be said about the congressional election last fall, the people again spoke, but not upon a number of theories and a number of laws and a number of policies, and things that are being done, by the present Congress of the United States.

Of course, the pending matter was not discussed at any time in the 1946 election. I say, with all due deference to my good friend, if the situation were not as it is in both Houses of Congress, the pending bill would not be here today.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from Illinois for his contribution. I say emphatically that there is no fallacy in the argument I have presented here in behalf of the succession going to the Speaker of the House. As the distinguished Senator from Connecticut has so ably pointed out, the situation in the first 2 years would be, in 999 times out of 1,000, I think, as the Senator has described it.

Mr. HATCH. No; not that many; that is not the history of the country.

Mr. WHERRY. I could not quote figures that would be too excessive. At any rate, I do not recall an instance in the country's history when it has happened differently. But I will say there is no fallacy in the argument, because if the people in the third year, or in the second year, have elected a Congress, either Democratic or Republican, then it is because the people have renounced the policies of the platform on which the President and the Vice President were elected; and, because Representatives are closer to the people, they should have a President who more nearly represents what the people, at the election and just prior thereto, indicated they wanted. There is no fallacy in that. Whether it be a Democratic or Republican administration make no difference. Such things are about even all the way through. The pending legislation must be viewed on a long-range basis. Of course, it is possible to hurl a charge that it is politics, now, but just as soon as the emergency is over—and I will leave it to the distinguished Senator—we shall forget it; we shall not change it; and then it will go on and on, and nothing will be done about it. The next time perhaps the situation will be reversed. But certainly no one can dispute the fact that the Speaker of the House of Representatives is closer to the people than is any other elective officer. I believe we could get an agreement on that. Whether he has the ability some other person has is another question; but his long service of apprenticeship, the fact that he is elected every 2 years, the fact that he is elected by the entire membership of the Congress, ought to be convincing evidence that there is no other elected officer that is closer to the people. Certainly he is closer than an appointed officer, than the Secretary of State, or the Secretary of the Treasury, or whoever might be named.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I will yield to the minority leader.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Speaker of the House may be closer to the Members of the House than any other officer in the Government, but he cannot be any closer to the people, because he represents only one district, just as any other Representative does.

Mr. WHERRY. I have covered that.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator covered that?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know whether the Senator covered it correctly or not. I was called out of the Chamber at the time the Senator covered it. I may uncover it when I come to my remarks. Has the Senator discussed, or has anybody argued, whether the pending bill solves this problem: The Constitution of the United States requires the President of the United States to be native born and 35 years of age. The Constitution does not require the Speaker of the House either to be native born or 35 years of age. The Constitution does not even require him to be a Member of the House.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will yield, it is unnecessary to go into that argument. On page 6, line 18, in the first subsection, it is provided that he must be qualified to be President of the United States.

Mr. BARKLEY. In other words, if the Speaker of the House is not 35, and is not native born, then the bill is a nullity so far as he is concerned?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; the office then passes on to the next in line, the President pro tempore.

Mr. BARKLEY. The President pro tempore can come into the Senate at the age of 30, and he does not have to be native born. He is required to be 30 years of age. It is provided in the bill that he must be qualified. So, if the House should elect an unqualified Speaker, and if the Senate should elect an unqualified President pro tempore, neither of them could become President?

Mr. WHERRY. It would then go to the Secretary of State. This is exactly correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Then the succession would finally pass to the Secretary of State, as the third in line?

Mr. WHERRY. The situation described by the minority leader would never happen.

Mr. BARKLEY. Perhaps that is so; but, under the Constitution, it could happen?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; it could happen temporarily, only, because it would take but a very few minutes for the House to elect a new Speaker if the Speaker did not qualify or if he resigned. The Senate could do the same thing with the President pro tempore; or, if he did not qualify, then the Secretary of State could continue to act as President until the President pro tempore qualified.

Mr. BARKLEY. During those few minutes, when the House would have to discharge its Speaker and reelect one, who would be President?

Mr. WHERRY. The Secretary of State.

Mr. BARKLEY. He could be President, then, for a few minutes, and then the House would unhorse him?

Mr. WHERRY. He would serve only for the emergency. The bill provides that there shall be no time when there will not be an officer eligible to become President of the United States, and we are having difficulty now with that very provision.

The bill provides that whenever a Speaker becomes qualified, he is the first in the line of succession. If he cannot qualify according to the terms of the Constitution, the people would not want him as President of the United States, even though he were a Member of the House of Representatives.

Mr. BARKLEY. They absolutely would not. I would not want him as President, anyhow.

Mr. WHERRY. If he were unable to qualify, then the next in line would be the President pro tempore. I cannot conceive of either a Speaker or a President pro tempore serving in that office who would not qualify as President of the United States. But if he did not qualify, then the Secretary of State would be called upon to serve during the emergency, or until either the Speaker or the President pro tempore could qualify to act as President of the United States.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I would like to ask a question, as a matter of interest. As I understand, under the Constitution there are certain age requirements and residence requirements for both Senators and Members of the House of Representatives. Is there any law whatever that makes provision for any requirements as to the qualifications of the Secretary of State, who is an appointee of the President?

Mr. WHERRY. None whatever.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I will answer the question: none whatever.

Mr. HATCH. I did not want to answer that question.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will pardon me, I wanted to answer the question asked by the Senator from Connecticut, and I would like to say, with all the force that is in me, that there is none whatever. I want to thank the Senator for bringing that to my attention. One more thing, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Cabinet officers are not elected by the people; they are appointed. How anyone can say that there is a defect in the line of succession suggested in the bill, I just cannot understand, because the Speaker is closer to the people today than any other official.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. The Speaker is closer to the people, he is elected by the people, he is an elective officer, and the Secretary of State is not an elective officer. He is appointed, and he does not have any different qualifications than has the Speaker.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator, to ask one other question?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; I am always glad to yield to the minority leader.

Mr. BARKLEY. In the event the President-elect and the Vice-President-elect should both die, after they have been elected by the electoral college, and before assuming the duties of office, in January, what would happen? There is no law that authorizes the reassembling of the electoral college. They are like the salmon, to which I referred the other day; they spawn, and they die. The electoral college elects a President, and then it dies, and nobody has power to reconvene it. If both the President-elect and the Vice-President-elect should die, what would happen?

Mr. WHERRY. The provision in the bill, which I think answers the question, will be found on page 4, beginning with line 19, that, in the event a President fails to qualify, or a Vice President fails to qualify, then the succession goes to the Speaker. It goes to the Speaker, then to the President pro tempore, then to the Secretary of State.

Mr. BARKLEY. Suppose the Congress has expired.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Congress had expired, and if there were no Speaker, and if it should happen that there were no President pro tempore of the Senate, then under the provisions of the bill the Secretary of State would become the acting President until such disability or disqualification was removed.

Mr. BARKLEY. The bill provides that the position of acting President shall finally come to the Secretary of State, but it makes it just as hard as possible for the Secretary of State to become acting President. Everyone else has to die before the succession comes to him.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Kentucky raises technical points which may never arise. The bill provides for protection against every emergency that can be conceived of so that organized civil government shall continue.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not asking these questions facetiously. I am asking them because I believe there are many gaps in the whole situation which, fortunately, we have never had to bridge, but which ought to be considered, so that all the holes and all the gaps to a legitimate succession to the Presidency may be closed, either before an individual takes his office or after he takes his office, and it seems to me that instead of bringing before the Senate a bill which contains piecemeal legislation, the whole question ought to be gone into and investigated by the committees of the Senate in order that we may fill every gap that may conceivably exist in respect to an emergency or exigency such as exist at present.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have the highest regard for the Minority Leader, and I believe I have several times this afternoon answered the points raised by him. I agree that there is no perfect piece of legislation. I suppose there may be some gaps which are not provided for by the pending bill. I want the distinguished Senator to know, however, that the bill does not represent piecemeal legislation. To begin with, the bill contains the legislation recommended by the President of the United States.

Mr. BARKLEY. I may say at that point that I was opposed to the proposal when the Democrats were in power. I was opposed to it when the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] was Speaker

of the House, and when the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] was President pro tempore of the Senate. I was opposed to the proposal then just as I am opposed to it now. So no one can accuse me of having any political bias in regard to it.

Mr. WHERRY. I have not accused the distinguished minority leader of anything.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator is getting ready to. [Laughter.]

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I see the Senator from Vermont is in his seat. I know what he wants to propose. I have a matter which I am anxious to speak of, but I would rather the Senator from Vermont were allowed to proceed now. I can take up my matter later.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Vermont, providing the legislation he wishes to propose is not controversial. I have been very lenient, I will say, in connection with my presentation respecting the succession bill. I want to accommodate every Senator. I deeply appreciate the questions that have been asked respecting the succession bill, of which I have made a considerable study. If in any respects the legislation can be improved, we shall be very glad to attempt to do so. I am satisfied that the legislation has been carefully analyzed and studied. We have carefully analyzed the exhaustive study and work done by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary in 1856; we have carefully analyzed the work of the committee in 1886. Our research men and our counsel and the committee members have carefully analyzed the changes that have resulted from the adoption of the lame-duck amendment, which changes completely the status of the office of the Speaker and President pro tempore during the years for which they are elected.

I think the bill provides a complete answer to the question as to what line of succession is needed in order to continue an orderly Government, with a possible definition of disability. The matter of disability was not contained in the provisions of the law of 1792, was not contained in the law of 1886. Until someone can satisfactorily define what a disability is, and draft provisions to compel a person having a disability to vacate an office to which he is elected, even though he thinks he is not suffering from any disability, I think a constitutional question will exist, one which has not been solved. But I am satisfied that aside from the question of disability, the matter is handled fairly well in the bill before us, that is, that a Speaker does not have to resign, or that a President pro tempore does not have to resign, if he feels in his own mind that the disability is only temporary. I think that making the decision optional with the Speaker and the President pro tempore practically solves the question of disability.

As I said before, never in the history of the country have we had to make a decision of that kind. The matter of disability is not a part of this particular legislation in connection with Presidential succession. I agree, however, with the distinguished Senator from New Mexico that it is a perplexing problem.

I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Vermont with the understanding that the matter which he proposes to bring up will not be controversial and consume any considerable length of time.

SUPPORT FOR WOOL

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I ask unanimous consent to report Senate bill 1498, to provide support for wool, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the report is received.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, this new bill, ordered by the committee to be favorably reported, provides for support for wool at the 1946 support price. It gives the Commodity Credit Corporation authority to dispose of the accumulated wool stocks, amounting to some 450,000,000 pounds, at less than parity, if it is found necessary to do so.

The President's veto message on the wool bill was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The committee met at 2:30 by permission of the Senate. It was decided it would be futile to attempt to pass the legislation over the President's veto. Therefore, no action was taken on the veto. Instead the committee voted unanimously to report favorably Senate bill 1498, introduced by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON].

The bill contains just two provisions. It puts a support price on wool equal to the 1946 support price, until December 31, 1948, and permits the Commodity Credit Corporation to dispose of the stocks on hand at whatever price they have to sell them for in order to get rid of them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). The bill will be reported by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1498) to provide support for wool, and for other purposes.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Senate bill 1498 is a bill to provide support for wool. The President today vetoed the wool bill, which was the result of the conference between certain members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and certain members of the House Committee on Agriculture, and agreed to by both the House and the Senate recently. The new bill, S. 1498, is the same as the conference report with one exception, that is, that section 4 of the conference report bill has been omitted from Senate bill 1498. The new bill accepts the House amendment to the support price provision of the Senate bill. The Senate bill carried a support price of not less than the price paid in 1946. The House amended that by striking out the words "not less than" and merely inserting the price of 1946.

The only other provision in which there is any change from the original Senate bill, which was amended slightly by the House, is in section 3 of Senate bill 1498. The original Senate bill provided that:

> The Commodity Credit Corporation may, without regard to restrictions imposed upon it by any law, dispose of any wool produced prior to January 1, 1949, at prices which will permit such wool to be sold in competition with imported wool. The disposition of any accumulated stock under the provisions of this section, however, shall be made at such rate and in such manner as will avoid disruption of the domestic market.

That was in the original Senate bill 814. Section 3 of the new bill is the House amendment, which reads:

> The Commodity Credit Corporation may, until December 31, 1948, dispose of wool owned by it without regard to any restrictions imposed upon it by law.

Those are the only differences between the new bill and the original Senate bill 814.

Section 4 has been omitted. It was because of that section, Mr. President, that the President of the United States said, in his veto message, he was forced to veto the bill. That was a provision giving the President the option to impose import fees or quotas on the importation of wool.

I do not think there is any need for me to say anything more. I hope the Senate will accept the bill, as some such bill is most urgently required. The shearing of the 1947 wool clip is already 80 percent completed. Most of the wool is lying sacked in warehouses all over the country. In many instances the small producer has been forced to sell his clip at some 10 to 15 cents below the price he would receive under this measure. It is an urgent measure, and I again remind the Senate that wool is a critical material. That was brought home to me forcibly this morning when I was sitting as a member of the subcommittee considering the War Department appropriation bill, and we heard the representatives of the National Guard crying for new uniforms. They said they needed 300,000 woolen uniforms for the troops. I could not help thinking that if our domestic wool producers were put out of business, as they might well be unless we have some legislation to keep them in business, the result, in case of war, might be disastrous.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the Senator from Wyoming have discussed this bill with me. I shall not object to its consideration at this time. However, I should like to point out that there are several factors concerning the bill which I believe do not make for the best type of legislation.

As the Senator from Wyoming has stated, the bill does three things. First, it sets the price of domestic wool at the minimum of the prices obtained in the year 1946. Second, it permits the Com-

modity Credit Corporation to buy wool at this price until December 31, 1948——

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. The Senator from Massachusetts said "at the minimum of the prices obtained in the year 1946." It is at the 1946 prices.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is what I intended to say.

Second, it permits the Commodity Credit Corporation to buy wool until December 31, 1948, at the 1946 prices. Third, it permits the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell the wool it has on hand at less than it cost the Commodity Credit Corporation.

I respectfully point out that the bill in effect does three things. First, it puts and keeps the Government in the domestic wool market. In reality, it makes the Goverment the sole buyer of the domestic wool crop unless the price exceeds the price of 1946. Secondly, it is the only commodity, I believe, which the Government buys at a price greater than parity. That is a new formula for Government purchases of commodities. Third, I wish to point out that it puts the cost of clothing, so far as wool is concerned, at a high price, and will maintain it there.

It is fair to say that the prices of wool today are high. It is fair to say that the price of wool is substantially above the 1946 levels. But this bill means that that price will be obtained until December 1948 and that if the prices fall off at all, the Government must stay in the wool market and become the purchaser of wool which is produced domestically. It will then sell such wool at a loss in order to compete with the foreign market.

For these reasons we who come from Massachusetts, where the wool trade is to a large extent concentrated, and where there are large textile mills, certainly do not like this bill. But the Senate has debated it in full in the past. We have stated our objections. The bill is substantially the bill which the Senate originally passed. That bill was amended in the House to include the tariff provision, and with the tariff provision the bill has now been vetoed.

For these reasons I shall not object to unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill. However, I still say that if I had my way the bill would not become law in its present form.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. There is one thing which I should like to mention in connection with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. He referred to the high prices of wool clothing. I wonder if the Senator realizes how little wool there is in a suit of clothes. Take, for example, a three-piece suit of clothes of the finest wool, heavy weight, winter clothing. At the outside, the total weight of wool in that suit is 2½ pounds. If the support price were doubled and the manufacturers had to pay double the price they pay today, it could not increase the price of the Senator's suit more than $1.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, there is nothing in the bill but what has been considered and overwhelmingly approved by the Senate earlier in the session. For that reason I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to point out that when we pass this bill it is not so much a question of the cost of this particular piece of legislation as it is a question of establishing the precedent of guaranteeing to one group of farmers for 2 years the highest prices which they received for their commodities during wartime. We now have on the statute books laws guaranteeing prices on certain basic commodities, according to a parity formula. This proposal exceeds that. Other groups of farmers now under the parity formula have just as much right to ask the Government to guarantee 125 or 150 percent of parity as do the wool producers.

Also, at least one-third of our agriculture is not under any support program at all, but is on a free market. To me it is not fair to pick out one small group of farmers and try to enact legislation to take care of them at the expense of the rest of the country.

During recent years much has been said on both sides of the aisle about returning to a free-enterprise system. If we pass this bill, we shall be entirely eliminating all the wool buyers of the country and placing the purchase of wool entirely in the hands of the Government, as was pointed out by the Senator from Massachusetts. Therefore, at this time I object to unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HATCH. Do I correctly understand that objection was made?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator from Delaware registered an objection.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I was hopeful that no objection would be made. I wish now to express my thanks to the Senator from Vermont and other members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for the sympathy with which they have treated this subject, and the promptness with which they have acted. I trust that the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] will make a motion at the earliest possible moment to take up this bill and dispose of it.

Mr. AIKEN. I can assure the Senator from New Mexico that I would make such a motion, but I do not care to impose upon the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and ask him to yield for that purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to comply with the Senator's request.

Mr. AIKEN. The small wool growers of the West will have to continue to be at the mercy of the speculators.

The Government has supported other commodities at higher-than-parity prices. All during the war it supported poultry at higher-than-parity prices. It has supported dairy products at higher-than-parity prices. It has supported other commodities. We are not singling out wool.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is willing to yield to me at this time for the purpose of making a motion to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1498.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not wish to be in the position of holding up the wool growers of western Nebraska. I think I have been as lenient as anyone could be with my time. I have yielded time and again for more than 10 days. I have permitted other legislation to displace the unfinished business.

We have a unanimous-consent agreement to vote tomorrow afternoon at 2 o'clock. I feel that Members of the Senate ought to be able to read my speech in the RECORD. I am convinced that we should enact the pending legislation. I do not wish to be placed in the position tomorrow afternoon at 2 o'clock of having Senators say, "We have not had ample time to discuss this question." I am perfectly agreeable to permitting the Senate to do what it wishes to do, but I do not want Members of the Senate to be under any misapprehension when the vote comes tomorrow. I do not want the impression to be gained that I have in any way delayed consideration of the succession bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I suggest that if the motion is made now, in all probability it will be agreed to. There seems to be a disposition on the part of all Senators except the Senator who objected to allow the bill to be considered. I hope the Senator from Nebraska will yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield for a question?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me for a question?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I understand, the only question pending is a unanimous-consent request for the present consideration of the bill. My question is this: If the wool bill is taken up by unanimous consent, will those of us who do not like it have an opportunity to vote "no" on the passage of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. AIKEN obtained the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if I have the floor, before yielding to the Senator from Delaware I wish to say that when it comes to a matter of saving money, the United States Government has probably $170,000,000 tied up in 460,000,000 pounds of wool. That wool could be released and made available for use if we could only pass this bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have no objection whatever to the Senate considering the bill. However, I do not want it done under a unanimous-consent agreement for a vote on the passage of the bill. If the Senate wishes to consider the bill at this time, I am not planning to delay its passage, if the Senator will make a motion to bring the bill before the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. There is a unanimous-consent request to take up this particular bill. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Vermont if it involves final passage of the bill this afternoon?

Mr. AIKEN. It does.

Mr. WHERRY. Then am I correct in thinking it would require a quorum call before unanimous consent is made?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that a quorum call will be required if final passage of the bill is intended this afternoon.

Mr. AIKEN. Then, Mr. President, I move that the pending business be temporarily laid aside and the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate bill 1498.

Mr. BARKLEY. It seems to me that the ruling of the Chair is a little different from what it should have been. If unanimous consent is given for consideration of the bill by unanimous consent it does not thereafter require a roll call to pass it, or even a quorum call, unless some Senator makes the point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] incorporated in his unanimous-consent request a declaration of intention to pass the bill today.

Mr. BARKLEY. It was a mere declaration of intention, but it was not a part of the unanimous-consent request, as I understand it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood that it was a part of the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. BARKLEY. That would be fixing a definite time for a vote, which would require a quorum call, unless it were waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont, as the Chair understands, can withdraw the unanimous-consent request in the form in which he entered it.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, inasmuch as the unanimous-consent request was not granted, anyway, I subsequently made the motion that the pending business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1498. I do not know of any protracted speeches which are to be made for or against the bill. It seems to me that we can get a vote on it so that those who want to keep their record of opposition clear would have a chance to make that record in a very short time.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it seems to me that we might vote on it without any further discussion, and it can probably be passed, as it was passed before, without much delay.

A parliamentary inquiry. If it is done by way of motion, will it or will it not set aside, not temporarily, but set aside, the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would set aside the pending business until 12 o'clock tomorrow. But there is nothing to prevent the pending business, which then would be set aside, from being taken up again this afternoon.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, as I understand the parliamentary situation, the motion made by the Senator from Vermont would only displace the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the Chair's understanding.

Mr. WHERRY. And when it is concluded the Senate will return to the pending business.

Mr. BARKLEY. Why can we not vote on it now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands the motion of the Senator from Vermont to be that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1498.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1498) to provide support for wool, and for other purposes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, there is one statement which I should like to correct, and that is the statement of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] in relation to the support price enjoyed by poultry farmers. I should like to call to his attention the fact that poultry farmers do not enjoy a support price at all on broilers. The support price on other poultry is the lowest of any support price on any of the basic commodities. In the western States farmers enjoy some support price on their fowls, but in the East there is no support price on poultry, or turkeys, nor has it ever been requested. Wool is the only agricultural product to my knowledge which has ever had a support price so far in excess of parity level. In other words, we are asked to establish a precedent if we pass the wool bill.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield for a question on that point?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Is not this an aftermath of the war condition.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is true.

Mr. THYE. It is a situation brought about by the war?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is true but the same situation exists as to other agricultural products.

Mr. THYE. It is a situation brought about by the fact that the waters around Great Britain were blocked because of the war, and the wool coming from Australia had to come to the United States. Then, because there was need for a high inventory of wool, Great Britain as well as the United States built a large inventory. With the ending of the war we commenced to market that wool. Great Britain's high inventory came to the United States just a few cents under our own domestic wool price, with the result that the Commodity Credit Corporation's holding of domestic wool was left on the shelf, and the imported wool took the market day by day, month by month. We must either pass legislation like this or we shall have a situation in which we have 460,000,000 pounds of wool going on the market at the level at which it is today, and as the market becomes depressed because of that huge volume, the Federal Government will be holding indefinitely the wool which the Commodity Credit Corporation now has.

So I say again to the Senator that it is an aftermath of the war, and we might as well pass the legislation now. We do not want to break every man in the sheep business. Unless we want to break them we should pass this legislation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. He has said that the situation is an aftermath of the war. But the war was a world-wide affair and all of the farmers in the United States participated in it. I cannot understand why he should suggest that we select one group of farmers and propose to extend to them for two more years wartime prices for their crop, when we are not supporting this other group of farmers either at parity or at cost of production. Under this bill we would be supporting the price of wool at the highest price in the history of the wool industry.

Mr. THYE. If the Senator will yield for another question——

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The Senator will admit that the price is not an unjust or unfair price because it happens to be parity. We find ourselves, after the ending of the war, with a situation which the war brought about, when we had to have a high inventory of wool on tap. Because of the condition in which Great Britain found itself at the conclusion of the war, with approximately 2,000,000,000 pounds of wool on hand, it placed that wool on our market, which compelled our producers to go to the Commodity Credit Corporation, and the Commodity Credit Corporation had to buy the wool and maintain parity for the wool producer. That is why the Commodity Credit Corporation has the 460,000,000 pounds of wool today.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator is perfectly right. The reason that we have 460,000,000 pounds of wool is because the Commodity Credit Corporation was buying wool at an artificially high price, and as the Senator pointed out also, Australia was putting wool on this market at just a few cents below the price which was fixed, and as a result most of the woolen mills in the country, instead of using American wool, were using British wool, which we were buying at 1 or 2 cents below the high price established. The result is that we have 400,000,000 or 500,000,000 pounds of wool, or enough to last us almost a year, and we are still using British wools, to a large extent. To cor-

rect this situation, as I see it, it is proposed that we continue for 18 months in the same direction, hoping that something will happen in the meantime whereby we can correct a situation which was brought about by the same piece of legislation which it is now proposed we extend.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. The Senator has stated that there is a stock pile of approximately 1 year's consumption in the United States. The consumption in the United States this year is around 1,000,000,000 pounds, and it was approximately that last year. Of that 1,000,000,000 pounds, 800,000,000 pounds is being shipped in from foreign countries.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But a large proportion of that which is included in consumption is reexported.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. No; that is the consumption in this country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] quoted the figures from the Department of Agriculture last week when we discussed the bill. At that time I placed in the RECORD figures showing that we were importing and consuming foreign wool at inflated prices while our own wool was backing up in storage. That condition is economically unsound.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. The consumption of domestic wool and imported wool in the United States had for many years not been below 600,000,000 pounds. We ourselves were producing 450,000,000 pounds before the war, but owing to the conditions which exist and which this bill is designed to remedy, the wool-producing industry in this country dropped from 450,000,000 pounds to approximately 300,000,000 pounds. This bill is designed to try to bring about the figure which prevailed in prewar days.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does the Senator from Wyoming feel that we can offer a reasonable explanation to the other farmers as to why we cannot guarantee to them a price similar to that?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am ready to yield the floor in a few minutes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Delaware asked a question as to what explanation could be given to the other farmers of the United States. The explanation is entirely simple. With respect to no other agricultural product have we the situation which exists with respect to wool. The British Government has established a state monopoly for the sale of British-produced wool in the United States, and unless this bill is passed we shall be condemning the individual wool producers of the United States to competition with the British state monopoly, a selling monopoly that exists with respect to no other agricultural commodity. It is a complete justification for the action which we ask.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I want to ask the Senator from Wyoming this question. When the President vetoed the legislation which was sent to him recently, did he not veto the instrument by which we might prevent the situation which the Senator is discussing?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. When the President vetoed the bill he said that if it were in the form in which it had been introduced by my colleague, he would have signed it. So we hope the Senator will permit the Senate to proceed on that basis.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I have no intention of blocking the consideration of the bill at this time. I shall vote against the bill because I think it would have a highly undesirable effect, for it does establish a precedent of taking care of one group of farmers at wartime prices for their product, while at the same time other groups of farmers would be operating in a free market.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I shall not delay the Senate for more than 2 minutes further. I merely wish to say that I oppose this bill and shall vote against it for the reasons I have already stated, and for the additional reason that I believe it will result, as the Senator from Delaware has pointed out, in a very substantial cost to the Government. How many millions of dollars it will cost the Government no one can say at the present time, because no one knows what will be the price of wool in the next year and a half. But presumably the 460,000,000-plus pounds of domestic wool which is in the hands of the Government will have to be sold, and a substantial amount will have to be sold at a loss.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. GREEN] and myself, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In line 4, it is proposed to strike out "December 31, 1948", and insert "June 30, 1948."

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, it seems to me that this bill, which again is hurriedly brought before us, is at best a matter of extreme controversy between two forces that are materially affected by it, namely, the producers of wool, on the one hand, and the manufacturers who use wool, on the other hand. I come from a section of the country where the product of the wool growers is used in manufacturing. We are advised by our folks that this support legislation is unnecessary and undesirable. The Senator from Massachusetts has expressed his opinion regarding his constituents, and I may say that ours are similarly situated.

It seems to me that since we are dealing with something that is of an emergency nature, we would be dealing quite fairly if we were to pass support legislation which would take care of the wool growers until June 30, 1948. The Congress will be in session again beginning in January 1948, and it will then have ample time to look into the supply situation, the price situation, the views of the growers, and the views of the manufacturers.

So it seems to me that it would be only a fair compromise of an issue which is highly controversial, to say the least, for us to set the date of termination of this support price measure as of June 30, 1948, instead of December 31, 1948. Therefore, I have offered the amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to say, briefly, that I am fearful that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH] and his colleague [Mr. GREEN] have not read the bill. The amendment will not in the slightest degree affect the price at which the manufacturers of Rhode Island may purchase wool, because one of the principal portions of this measure is to be found in section 3, reading as follows:

> The Commodity Credit Corporation may, until December 31, 1948, dispose of wool owned by it without regard to any restriction imposed upon it by law.

The effect of that provision is that the Commodity Credit Corporation may sell this wool competitively with foreign wool, so that the price of the foreign wool will govern the price at which the Commodity Credit Corporation disposes of the domestic wool, and the manufacturers of New England will not be injured in that respect at all.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to point out to the Senator the statement he made just a few minutes ago about the English trading corporation. I most respectfully disagree with what the Senator has just said; and I do so for the following reason, and I should like to ask the Senator whether there is merit in it: If the domestic price of wool is held up to the 1946 value, and if one foreign corporation controlled by the English authorities is trading with us, obviously they will keep their price higher than they would if there were a free market, and if the domestic supply sold at a lower price.

We do not want to take a floor away from the domestic producers of wool. We in New England believe that certainly they should have a floor, but we do not believe that it should be so high that the prices of foreign products, as well as our own products, will be kept at an artificial level.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I say to the Senator from Massachusetts that there cannot be a free market as long as the British selling monopoly exists, so that portion of the Senator's argument is out.

With respect to the second portion of his argument, as I see it, let me say that the British selling monopoly will reduce its price in order to take whatever portion of the domestic market it can take; and under this bill the Commodity Credit Corporation will proceed to meet the reduction of the British selling monopoly, with the effect, in my judgment, that the manufacturers will receive a much better price than the one they are entitled to.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to oppose the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island. Its effect would be to give the Texas sheep growers the support price for 1948, but to deny it to the Montana sheep growers, because the Texas sheep growers would get their sheep sheared in time to get the wool to market before June 30, which is the date proposed by the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island, but the Montana and Wyoming and the

other Rocky Mountain wool growers, who do not finish shearing until June, would be denied the support price which the amendment would grant to growers in the more southern States. Therefore, I shall oppose the amendment.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I oppose the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island. It seems to me that the entire question of the support program must be reviewed in 1948. The Steagall amendments, which provide parity for not only one commodity but many agricultural commodities, expire in 1948, so at that time that question must be reviewed. The Commodity Credit Corporation will expire in 1948, and at that time the entire question of the renewal of that Corporation, as well as the period of time during which its life shall be extended, must be examined and studied, and at that time we must reestablish it, if there is to be such legislation after the year 1948.

For that reason, it seems to me inconsistent to establish the date of termination of this particular support price as of June 30, when all the other support prices of the agricultural program are now established under different dates.

In view of the question which the able junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] raised once before about the support price on wool, let me say that there are support prices on many agricultural commodities. The Senator has in mind the more recent potato-support price, but in the near future he will hear much about the peanut-support price, and it concerns the Eastern States.

So I suggest that the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Rhode Island would be somewhat inconsistent with the entire agricultural program as now provided by the Steagall amendments.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to say this about the amendment, that in the pending bill it is proposed to confer upon the Commodity Credit Corporation power to carry out the supporting of this product during all the next year. I should like to call attention to the fact that the Commodity Credit Corporation ceases to exist on June 30, 1948. I wonder what position we would be in with these conflicting dates.

Mr. THYE. It was extended to December 31.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think that should be checked. I understood it was possibly June 30. Anyway, I considered what position we would be in if we were to extend this law until December, and, at the same time, the Commodity Credit Corporation ceases to exist on June 30. Could the Senator from Vermont answer that question?

Mr. THYE. If the Senator would care to have me answer that question, relative to the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Senate has passed the bill, and the House Banking Committee has reported it favorably today, so that there is no question that the bill will be passed, extending the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation until December 31, to comply with the provisions of the Steagall amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The truth of the matter is, we are conferring upon an agency which does not exist power to carry out the proposed law; is not that correct?

Mr. THYE. It would be hardly conceivable for me, as a Member of the Senate, that the Congress, having passed a measure under which the producer geared himself to the high production he attained in order to meet the war demands upon him, would fail to make possible a continuance of the provision of the Steagall amendment, that would assure Congress carrying out that which Congress undertook in previous acts.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not suggesting that we would fail to do it, but I am merely suggesting that legislation is being proposed before that has been done. We have the cart before the horse.

Mr. AIKEN. The reason the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation was extended 1 year instead of 2 was that, under the law passed by Congress last year, the Commodity Credit Corporation is required to write and take out a Federal charter before July 1, 1948, and therefore it was impossible to extend it for more than 1 year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still open for amendment. If there be no amendment, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, before the so-called wool legislation was taken up I was engaged in a discussion of the succession bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to suggest to the Senator from Nebraska that, because of the action that has just been taken, there is no pending business, and it is suggested to the Chair that the Senator from Nebraska should move to consider the succession bill.

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now resume the consideration of Senate bill 564, the succession bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 564) to provide for the performance of the duties of the office of President, in case of the removal, resignation, or inability both of the President and Vice President.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, prior to the consideration of the so-called wool bill, the minority leader propounded to me a question. During my attempt to answer the question, the Senator made a statement that I was about to accuse him of something, I am not sure what. I should like to say, as genially as possible, that I was not accusing the minority leader of anything, and that I protest the fact that he feels that he can read my mind. I was about to complete the answer to the question. I am sorry the Senator is not on the floor.

As I recall the Senator's question, it was this: If a President-elect and a Vice President-elect died, how would the Congress be convened? How would a Speaker and a President pro tempore be obtained to fill the office of President? I should like to point out to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky that, having considered the changes in the Constitution since 1886, eliminating those hurdles, I have in my prepared speech the answer to his question. But, because the Senator asked it at this point, I should like to answer, briefly.

Section 2 of the twentieth amendment to the Constitution provides:

> The Congress shall assemble at least once in every year, and such meeting shall begin at noon on the 3d of January, unless they shall by law appoint a different day.

So that Congress now assembles on the 3d day of January. The Senate would be in session. Another thing that I want to state as a premise, before answering the Senator's question, is that a President would be serving as of January 3; because the Senator's query runs only to what would happen if a President elect and a Vice President elect should die before qualifying, before taking office, but after their election.

A President performs the duties of the Presidency until when? Until January 20. So that, in the intervening time from January 3, when the Congress is assembled, the Senate, by rule of the Senate, under the twentieth amendment, on January 3, would become organized, and a President pro tempore would be elected. The President pro tempore would be qualified. I mean he would be elected, and, as far as the necessary organization is concerned, he would be available to succeed, in the event that the Speaker of the House of Representatives were not qualified.

The same thing would be true relative to a Speaker of the House of Representatives. The House is assembled. The Speaker would be elected. The President-elect and the Vice President-elect do not take office until the 20th of January. So that, available in the line of succession would be the Speaker of the House of Representatives. I regret that the minority leader is not present, because it is impossible to imagine a situation that would not be covered by the pending legislation. The succession would be provided for in any emergency.

It is not merely a question of whether it is the present Speaker, or whether it is a Democrat or a Republican. The situation requires a long range view, with provisions to meet any emergency—the emergency that now exists, and the emergency that might exist within another year or two, under situations that may not be exactly similar, so far as parties are concerned.

Let me restate for the benefit of the distinguished minority leader, who is not present, that a President will hold over until January 20, that the Congress, under the twentieth amendment, as laid down in the Constitution, convenes on January 3. A Speaker would be elected in the organization of Congress, likewise a President pro tempore. In the event

that either the Speaker or the President pro tempore could not qualify during that intervening period, then the succession would go to the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State holds over until his successor is appointed, so there is no gap, there is no hurdle to be crossed, that has not been covered by the proposed amendment, which provides for succession through the Speaker, the President pro tempore, and then on to the Cabinet officers.

Mr. President, I think that I have given the complete answer to the queries that have been directed to me, relative to the succession. I should like to call attention to the changes in the rules of the Senate, that bolster the case and bolster the amendment that I have offered. As to the change in the rules of the Senate, I have before me a memorandum from the Parliamentarian, which reads as follows:

TENURE OF PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

From the First Congress until March 12, 1890, in the various absences of the Vice President, the Senate on each occasion chose a President pro tempore, who in each instance held the office only until the Vice President returned and resumed the chair.

Because of the law providing for the succession to the office of the President of the United States, which was in force prior to 1886, it was important that there be an incumbent of the office of President pro tempore during the sine die adjournments of the Senate. In order to permit the Senate to choose a President pro tempore whose tenure of office would extend beyond the final adjournment, it was the practice of the incumbent Vice President, shortly before such an adjournment, to vacate the chair and absent himself from the Senate for the remainder of the session. The Senate would then proceed to choose a President pro tempore. With only four exceptions, which occurred in the early Congresses, the tenure of the President pro tempore thus chosen was not terminated by the adjournment of the session, but continued into the next session until the Vice President resumed the chair, or until the Senate chose another for the office.

At the short, or final, session of a Congress, which expired on March 4 of the odd years, the Senate would choose a hold-over Senator, due to the fact that the expiration of the term of a Senator automatically terminated his tenure as President pro tempore, even though he had been reelected to the Senate for the ensuing term. Where there was a vacancy in the office of Vice President, the President pro tempore continued to hold his office until the Senate elected a successor, or until his term of office as Senator expires.

On March 12, 1890, the Senate adopted the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That it is competent for the Senate to elect a President pro tempore, who shall hold the office during the pleasure of the Senate and until another is elected, and shall execute the duties thereof during all future absences of the Vice President until the Senate otherwise order."

Since the above date the President pro tempore has held the office continuously during the pleasure of the Senate, irrespective of absences of the Vice President. As above stated, however, if his term as Senator expired his tenure as President pro tempore was simultaneously terminated. This situation prevailed on several occasions since 1890, with the result that there would be a vacancy in the office from March 4, following the adjournment of a Congress, until the Senate would fill the vacancy in the session which convened in the following December, unless a special session of the Congress, or the Senate only, was called by the President. A vacancy might also arise during a sine die adjournment by reason of the death of the President pro tempore or of his resignation as a Senator.

On February 6, 1933, the twentieth, or so-called lame-duck amendment, became a part of the Constitution of the United States. This amendment provided that the terms of Senators and Representatives should begin on January 3 instead of March 4, and that the regular sessions of Congress should also begin at that hour. Under this amendment, therefore, except in the case of the death of the President pro tempore during an adjournment, or of his resignation as a Senator, there can normally be only a brief period of time that a vacancy will exist in this office, and that would occur when the term of the President pro tempore as a Senator expired, inasmuch as it is reasonable to assume that the Senate very shortly after it convened would proceed to fill the vacancy.

That is the statement of the Parliamentarian, which verifies the statement I made to the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from New Mexico relative to this particular situation, that the twentieth amendment, the "lame duck" amendment, provides that a Representative is elected and serves until the 3d day of January at noon, at which time his term of office expires. The same is true with respect to the President pro tem. It is only in the time intervening, after the convening of Congress, during which the Senate and the House organize, that we are without the services of a Speaker or a President pro tem.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Prior to the adoption of the twentieth amendment, the terms of all Members of the House of Representatives expired on March 4 of the odd years. There would therefore be a vacancy in the office of Speaker until the next Congress met (ordinarily in the following December) and election of that official was had by the House. This situation obtained in the House every 2 years. Where the Speaker died, or the office for any other reason was vacated, during a sine die adjournment or recess other than the short session ending on March 4, the vacancy would continue until a Speaker was elected at the next session.

Since the adoption of the twentieth amendment, however, a vacancy in the office of Speaker occurring by expiration of a Congress is analogous to that of the termination of the office of President pro tempore by reason of the expiration of his term as Senator, and usually would be of very short duration, inasmuch as the Representatives-elect, after the roll call of States and the ascertainment that a quorum is present, can immediately proceed to the election of a Speaker. This is done prior to the administration of the oath to the Members-elect.

So the situation which arose in January in the Senate over the question of confirming the Senator from Mississippi, Mr. Bilbo, would not arise in the House. My statement to the minority leader that the House would be without the services of a Speaker for only a few minutes is not an exaggerated one. The credentials of the Members are presented to the proper officer of the House, and if there is any question respecting the credentials of any Member he stands aside until after the oaths of the others are taken. Immediately thereafter the House is organized. So a new Speaker would be chosen within a very short time.

Thus, the first point of contention raised by the proponents of the Succession Law of 1886 is eliminated.

The second point of contention made by Senator Hoar, as the proponent of the act of 1886, which is the present law, that the President pro tempore of the Senate should not continue as the President pro tempore of the Senate and act as President of the United States at the same time, which argument would be equally applicable to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, is covered in the bill I propose by the provision requiring the Speaker of the House of Representatives or the President pro tempore of the Senate to resign prior to entering upon the duties of President.

I am in accord with the views of those Members of Congress who heretofore took the position that it was awkward and repugnant to one's sense of propriety for the President of the United States to sit in the chair of the Senate and preside over, and listen to discussions in regard to his own nominations, and so forth.

I likewise agree with those Members of Congress who heretofore have taken the position that in view of the constitutional provision against a Member of either House of the Congress holding any other Federal office, it is improper for the Speaker of the House of Representatives or the President pro tempore of the Senate to continue in such office and assume the office of the Presidency. It was for this reason that I inserted in the proposed bill a specific provision requiring the resignation of the Speaker of the House of Representatives or the President pro tempore of the Senate, as the case may be, prior to assuming the office of the Presidency.

The argument has been presented that it is unfair to require of the Speaker of the House of Representatives or the President pro tempore of the Senate that they resign at the time of assuming the office of acting President, particularly in those cases where the reason for taking over the office is the disability of a President.

This argument, in my mind, has little merit. In the first place, when any officer of the United States, particularly an elective one, is called upon during an emergency to act as President, there should be no hesitation or doubt on his part as to his duty.

The honor of being President of the United States, even for a temporary period, is sufficient, but, in addition, there is the duty that everyone holds to serve his country in time of emergency wherever he is called to serve.

In the second place, once this legislation is enacted into law every Speaker and President pro tempore will know that it is a part of the responsibilities of the office he has assumed or will assume that he may be called upon in time of emergency, even for a temporary period, to act as President, and that in order to qualify it will be necessary for him to resign. He is put on notice.

However, if there be a man who is Speaker of the House of Representatives or President pro tempore of the Senate who, for his own reasons, does not see fit to accept the Presidency, it is his privilege under the bill to decline to qualify, in which event the succession will descend next in order to the Secretary of State

and so on through the Cabinet, as provided for in the bill.

As I said a few hours ago on the floor of the Senate in answer to a question by the Senator from New Mexico relative to what has been provided with respect to disability, it seems to me this is the answer, because if one is called upon to resign as Speaker and resign as a Representative, or if one is called upon to resign as President pro tempore and also as a Senator, that individual is going to be very careful to know whether or not the disability is only of a temporary nature before he resigns his office. I think that is the answer to the question of disability, which has not been defined and is really not a part of this succession legislation.

The question as to who shall succeed to the Presidency of the United States where there is no President or Vice President qualified to act, has been a long-controverted one. This is the question raised by the minority leader, which I have already answered. There never has been any unanimity of opinion in any Congress where it has been discussed. I believe that the President of the United States in his message was right in recommending that the Speaker of the House of Representatives be the first in line of succession.

I have given my reasons more than half a dozen times this afternoon on that point.

The Speaker of the House of Representatives is the officer of the Government closest to the people of the United States upon whom might properly fall the duties of President. While it is true that the Speaker of the House of Representatives is not elected by the people, the Members of the House of Representatives are elected by the people every 2 years and in turn elect their Speaker.

Thus, he is the ranking officer of the Government who holds his office more nearly as a result of the wishes of the people than any other.

He is elected to the House. He is elected by the people of his own district. The House of Representatives, composed of 435 Members from both parties, elects a Speaker each 2 years. So the Speaker is elected by those who stand for election in the congressional districts throughout the United States of America. That is a total answer to those who raise their voice against this legislation, who say that we should provide a succession down through the Secretary of State and the Cabinet officers, who are appointive officers, who are not elected by the people—in fact who may be appointed by the head of a minority party in power, appointments which would not properly reflect the sentiments and the voice of the people in a succeeding legislature a majority of whose Members might be composed of Representatives of another party. If a President should die in the first or the second year of his term, as was pointed out by the Senator from Illinois, why should the people of the United States, during the second or the third or the fourth year, when there might be a complete change of opinion and when the House was controlled by the opposing party—why should the people of the United States be bound by having an acting President who is not of the party then in control? Instead of waiting up to 4 years it would be necessary to wait only 2 years to put into the Presidency an individual who properly and rightly reflects the opinions of the people, and that is done through having the succession come through the Speaker.

Likewise, I think the President pro tempore of the Senate is the next in line of properly eligible Government officers who for the same reasons should be selected to serve if there is no Speaker of the House of Representatives to take over. In the event there is no Speaker of the House of Representatives or President pro tempore of the Senate, then, I believe, by force of necessity only, succession should devolve upon the members of the Cabinet in the order of their precedence, commencing with the Secretary of State.

There is no reason in the world why I should object to our present President pro tempore serving as President. I am speaking now of the office. The President pro tempore is not as close to the people as is the Speaker of the House of Representatives. A Senator is elected for a term of 6 years. During that time a Member of the House must be elected three times. So I certainly need go no further than to say that a Member of the House is closer to the people than is a United States Senator.

Another point which I have made, and which I wish to emphasize, is that a Member of the House is elected. In many cases Senators are appointed, and do not stand for election. They might not properly reflect the viewpoint of the constituencies from which they come, as compared with Representatives from the same States.

Not a single hurdle can be mentioned that we have not passed over in considering the question of the line of succession. I invite any Senator who has any different opinion, or any suggestion he wishes to make, to rise now upon the floor of the Senate and tell what is wrong with the succession bill as it has been presented. Why should not the officer closest to the people be designated to represent the people of the country? That is why I agree with the President of the United States. As I stated earlier, I have not agreed with the President on many occasions. But I have the courage to support the President when I think he is right; and I have the courage to oppose him when I think he is wrong. In this case I believe he is right, and I intend to support him. I hope every Democratic Senator will feel the same way and that Republican Senators will come to the same conclusion .

Actually this is not a political question. Attempts have been made to drag in politics, but I am looking at the question from the long-range viewpoint. The succession law has not been changed since 1886, and it ought to be changed. The twentieth amendment changed the rules of the Senate and of the House of Representatives. A change in the succession law is in order. It is long past due.

Mr. President, this is not piecemeal legislation. This presentation is an analysis of the work done by the Senate Judiciary Committee in 1856. It is an analysis of all the debates. It is a complete analysis of the twentieth amendment, and it is a complete analysis by the Parliamentarian and by our research counsel of the rules of the Senate and of the House of Representatives.

The bill before us is not piecemeal legislation. It contains every provision that can properly be written into a succession law. The only question which is not covered is the question of disability, and such a provision cannot be written until someone is smart enough to clear the constitutional hurdle. Why should that question hold up the proper line of succession? The question of disability has never arisen in 160 years, and possibly never will.

It has been argued that the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate are not officers eligible to succeed to the Presidency. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] wanted to know about the constitutional argument. Here it is.

This argument is largely based on the so-called Blount case, wherein it was alleged by Blount that the Senate of the United States did not have jurisdiction to act as a court of impeachment for the reason that he was not a Senator of the United States at the time of the trial, and for the further reason, that the alleged violations—if committed—were committed at the time he was a Senator and not a civil officer.

The Senate found—and rightly so—in sustaining his demurrer, that the plea was sufficient in law to sustain the demurrer but the Senate made no specific determination as to which of the grounds raised by Senator Blount were controlling.

They did not settle anything so far as concerns the definition of an officer under the succession bill. So why go further with that argument?

I say that there was no determination by the decision in the Blount case of the constitutional question as to who is or who is not an officer.

Other considerations entered into the then Senate arriving at its decision—particularly that there is specific provision in the Constitution for each House of the Congress to discipline its own Members, so far as impeachment is concerned.

Regardless of the grounds upon which the Senate decided this case, the important fact remains that the Senate did not make a finding as to whether or not Blount was an officer for the purposes under which we are now considering the succession bill.

In opposition to the theory that a Member of Congress is not an officer within the meaning of the Constitution, I invite the attention of the Senate to the case of *Lamar* v. *United States* (reported in 241 U. S. 102). The decision was handed down on May 1, 1916, 32 years after the present law, sponsored by Senator Hoar, was enacted.

This decision holds that a Member of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States is an officer acting under the authority of the

United States within the meaning of the United States Criminal Code.

I quote from the Court's argument:

Guided by these rules, when the relation of Members of the House of Representatives to the Government of the United States are borne in mind, and the nature and character of their duties and responsibilities are considered, we are clearly of the opinion that such Members are embraced by the comprehensive terms of the statute. If, however, considered from the face of the statute alone, the question was susceptible of obscurity or doubt—which we think is not the case—all ground for doubt would be removed by the following considerations:

(a) Because prior to and at the time of the original enactment in question the common understanding that a Member of the House of Representatives was a legislative officer of the United States was clearly expressed in the ordinary, as well as legal, dictionaries. See Webster, verbo "office"; Century Dictionary verbo "officer"; 2 Bouvier's Law Dictionary, 1897 edition 540, verbo "legislative officers"; Black's Law Dictionary, second edition, page 710, verbo "legislative officer."

A Member of the House or Senate is a legislative officer.

(b) Because at or before the same period in the Senate of the United States, after considering the ruling in the Blount case, it was concluded that a Member of Congress was a civil officer of the United States within the purview of the law requiring the taking of an oath of office. (CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE, 38th Cong., 1st sess., pt. 1, pp. 320–331.)

That was the record we had prior to the time when we had the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

(c) Because also in various general statutes of the United States at the time of the enactment in question a Member of Congress was assumed to be a civil officer of the United States, Revised Statutes, sections 1786, 2010, and subdivision 14 of section 563.

(d) Because that conclusion is the necessary result of prior decisions of this court, and harmonizes with the settled conception of the position of members of state legislative bodies as expressed in many State decisions.

So there is not a shadow of doubt that from the Lamar case until now, a Member of the House of Representatives or a United States Senator has been considered a legislative officer. There has not been a contrary decision since that time.

It seems to me that this decision removes any doubt as to the question of whether a Member is an officer of the United States.

It might be urged that an interim election would be the solution to this vexing problem. I know that there are those who believe in a special election. However, when one takes into consideration the primary and other laws of the States relating to the election of Presidents, and the fact that it would be necessary to amend the laws or constitutions of the 48 States, in addition to enacting a Federal law, it is a lengthy process and one fraught with difficulties.

Furthermore, to throw the United States into the turmoil of an election when such a catastrophe as the death or inability to act of both a President and Vice President occurs would not only in my judgment be unwise, but might lead to such chaotic conditions as almost to be tantamount to a revolution. That could happen, because of the total state of confusion which a special election, coming right after a regular election, might cause among the people.

Certainly, at such a time, there should be an orderly, smooth-working, quick-acting remedy for the situation, to the end that the United States would not be without an acting President, who, once qualified, would continue to act without the necessity of going to the country for election.

Under the terms of the bill the Speaker of the House of Representatives is next in line of succession. If the Speaker does not qualify, the President pro tempore is next in line. If he does not qualify, the Secretary of State is next, followed by other Cabinet officers. What could be smoother than that kind of succession? What could be suggested that would accomplish the purpose better than that kind of succession? What could be better calculated to inspire confidence among the people? A special election would inject all kinds of chaotic conditions throughout the country, especially if it were held at a time when there might be a national emergency.

Everything that the acting President would do would have to be in the light of the pending interim election.

Another phase of this matter is the fact that the Constitution of the United States provides for terms of four years for President. I have heard that statement over and over again. I have heard it at least a dozen times this afternoon.

The question would quickly arise as to whether an interim election for an interim period is constitutional, or whether the elected President, elected at an interim election, should serve for 4 years. If the latter situation obtained—and certainly a President elected at an interim election would contend that the tenure of his office was for 4 years—this would throw the Presidential elections completely off of the schedule which has existed since the beginning of the country.

So those who are advocating an election for a term of 4 years are running head-on into a constitutional question which would throw the country into a total state of confusion. I feel that the one who succeeds should only fill out the unexpired term, and that when that term has been completed we should proceed with the general election now provided by law.

Mr. President, the constitutional questions which are involved in legislation of this kind have not only been argued since time immemorial, but will continue to be argued in the future indefinitely.

I do not believe that we can ever get a unanimity of opinion on all of the questions which will arise in a consideration of this matter. That fact has been in evidence this afternoon. To put this question off for further study would be only hypocrisy. It would simply prolong the disagreements and arguments of 160 years, and would accomplish no good purpose.

If that is the route we want to follow we should take our time and do it long after the emergency has developed. I mean the fact that we have now no Vice President, and will continue in that state until January 20, 1949.

So the matter before us requires action now, as we are faced with a fact and not a theory; namely, that we have a Vice President serving as President, and the question, Suppose anything should happen to him?—and God knows we hope it will not—should be settled. He has recognized the urgency of the situation and has frankly recommended that immediate legislation be enacted. We cannot, by putting it off and procrastinating, solve this question of succession. I say that it should be done now. But no matter when it is done, the party which is opposing it, I suppose, from a political angle, will say, "Wait until we get into power." We cannot select an opportune time but what that argument will be advanced.

I am looking at this matter in a long-range way. We have to step over the immediate hurdle. If we do, there is no place in this bill where one can find fault with the succession. If there is, I should like to have some Senator now point it out to me. This is not piecemeal legislation, as I said before. It is legislation which has been prepared with a great deal of thought, not only in 1947 but in years gone by. The matter demands immediate attention. The President has recommended that immediate legislation be enacted. That is all that is asked for. I join with the President in that request. So I say, with all the force that is within me, that each and every one of us should consider this legislation overnight, and when we vote tomorrow at 2 o'clock let us vote unanimously to carry out the recommendation of the President of the United States.

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. President, the action Congress takes on the agricultural appropriation bill can have a very definite bearing upon the future prosperity of our Nation.

Since I became a Member of the United States Senate a few months ago I have diligently devoted my time to work in my office, attending committees, studying legislation, becoming acquainted with my colleagues and the procedure of the Senate, attending meetings of the Senate, listening to debate, and voting. However, when I consider what the agricultural appropriation bill, as it passed the House, proposes to do to a farm program which, after many years of thought, effort, time and money, has come to be a well established and essential part of our national economy, I feel that I must protest such action. My father was a farmer all of his life. I grew up on a tobacco farm. With the exception of 1 year, I worked on the farm until past my twenty-first birthday. By my own experience I have first-hand knowledge of the hardships and problems of farm life. With my own hands I have helped to wring from soil that was none too willing

enough of the fruits of the earth to sustain life on a decent scale. I am proud that I learned the hard way. My interest in agriculture is deep-seated and sincere, not because it is based upon some theory or hearsay but upon my own experience.

Another reason for my opposition to the drastic cuts in the appropriations for agriculture is the fact that I was a Member of the House when most of the legislation upon which the farm program now rests was being formulated and passed. From my own experience I knew how badly it was needed. In much of it, it was my privilege to take an active part. I was a member of the subcommittee on appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, and for some years had the opportunity to keep check on the success of a farm program which has meant so much to the entire country.

It seems to me that our own experiences have demonstrated beyond controversy that in any recession or depression following a period of inflation, agriculture suffers first and most severely. It has been proven, in my judgment, that we cannot hope to enjoy in this country any sound or stable economy unless agriculture is prosperous. These considerations are so important that they must be considered when we come to deal with a bill that proposes under present conditions to slash approximately $341,000,000 from appropriations for agriculture.

When I returned home from military service in 1919, after an absence in the service of approximately 23 months, there was an appearance of general prosperity. We soon learned how inflationary and false it was. In the deflation of 1920, agriculture was the first business activity of any size which felt the blow. How quickly and how hard it hit bottom needs no recital here. When prices in other lines fell to unprofitable levels, producers withheld goods from the market and curtailed production. The farmer could not follow a similar method. He was struggling to meet pressing demands, frequently involving loss of his property. He had to have money. His only recourse was to produce more of cash crops. The more he produced the lower prices went. Millions lost all of their property and other millions saved something by borrowing heavily on long and hard terms. At that time there was no farm program, not even a policy of assisting important surplus farm commodities in finding foreign markets where they were badly needed. There was no medium through which the farmers could, by voluntary cooperation on any reasonable basis, bring production in line with consumption.

Agriculture continued to suffer. By 1929 the situation had become so desperate that a special session of Congress was called to relieve the farmer. It did relieve him of about all that he had left. Congress passed a tariff act so high as to eliminate foreign trade from the picture at the very time when many surplus cash crops needed to find a foreign market. It is painful to recall what followed. Only by frank admission of an unevenly balanced economy, with the odds against it, can we understand how agriculture in this land could have suffered the distress; bankruptcy, and ruin that fell to its lot between 1929 and the time the recovery program began. This was bad for the farmers, driving them in many sections almost to the point of desperation. Its effect did not stop there. No thoughtful person can doubt that the distress of agriculture through so many years exerted direct influence upon the awful day in 1933 when it became necessary to close the doors of every banking institution in America.

We do not wish to travel that road again. We should profit now by these experiences and do everything that is reasonable to keep a broad and well-considered agricultural program on a sound basis. For more than 25 years we have sought to obtain equality for agriculture. Any action to weaken the existing program and organization strikes at the heart of the farm and national economy. The party in control of the Government from 1929 to 1933 is now again in control of Congress. I feel bound to warn it against carrying its economy drive to the point where it endangers the security of agriculture and, if pursued, will ultimately undermine the prosperity and general welfare of the Nation.

Again we are in another era after a war. Again we have inflation, the end of which is not in sight. Again we are without assurance of dependable foreign markets. Certainly there is sufficient similarity between general conditions that confront us now and the bitter experiences through which we passed after World War I to require that we exercise the greatest of care in the consideration of any proposal that would hurt an agricultural program that has proven its worth and dependability. It would be foolish to throw away our lifeboats just because our ship is at the moment strong.

Mr. President, time does not permit me to discuss all the items which have been reduced in the agricultural appropriation bill. I do wish to call attention to a few.

AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM—TRIPLE A

The act creating the triple A was passed when I was a Member of Congress. It was my privilege to have the opportunity of participating to some extent in the preparation of this legislation, and especially the tobacco-control program, and I voted for its passage. I believed in the triple A program then, and believe in it more strongly now after having seen it in operation during the intervening years. This program for 1947 is already under way. The pending bill would cut appropriations for this year about one-half. The bill proposes to cut out the program altogether in 1948. Since farmers plant by the season, it has been customary for Congress to appropriate funds available around July 1, to cover practices under a program actually put into effect the preceding fall. At the same time, Congress has set limits within which the next year's program could be developed. That is how the bill now before Congress covers appropriations for payments to farmers under the 1947 agricultural conservation program, which has been under way for almost one-half of the program year. Some practices have been under way since last August. The Department of Agriculture was told by the Congress last June to proceed to develop a program which would cost $300,000,000. Congress did not say "up to" $300,000,000; Congress said $300,000,000. On the basis of that language, farmers and the Department of Agriculture started the program machinery moving. In my State the practices for which farmers could earn payments in 1947 were approved last September. Allocation of funds was made in December, and to date about 180,000 farm operators have completed farm plans for carrying out conservation practices on their farms.

The bill now before the Senate Appropriations Committee, as it came from the House, proposes to appropriate only $165,000,000 to take care of the $300,000,000 program authorized by Congress. It would drastically reduce both the payments already promised and the machinery for administering the law. The State offices and the county and community-farmer committees would be unable to function properly. The county-farmer committees would be able to serve only 12 days a year and the community committees only 1 day a year. These committees operate as leaders, and it is largely through their leadership that the farmers of the country have increased agricultural production to record levels. Today the use of agricultural products is one of our most important means of trying to build world peace. The proposed reduction not only would break faith with the farmers who relied upon the promises of the Government, but it would have the effect of tearing down the splendid organizations which have been built in the country among the farmers themselves.

This is a matter of tremendous importance to the farmers of North Carolina because of its possible effect upon the tobacco-control program which has been so eminently successful. Anything which would adversely affect that program would seriously injure North Carolina's tobacco growers. In this connection, I wish to quote what the Secretary of Agriculture has said:

> The House recognized the need for the committees in administering 3-year tobacco-marketing quotas, which are now in effect. It allowed special funds for this purpose. The funds represent the approximate cost of administering the marketing quotas for the 1947 crop, if the State and county offices in the tobacco areas could continue operating about normally. If these offices are cut down so that the work on quotas cannot be handled on a part-time basis along with the conservation program, the cost of administering the quotas will go up. If the committee system is abolished, as the bill provides, special offices will have to be set up to handle the tobacco-marketing quotas that will be in effect on the 1948 crop, and this will raise the cost. Furthermore, some special means would have to be set up to take the place of the committee system in establishing acreage allotments for marketing quotas.

Mr. President, if the majority party wants to discontinue this program which helps farmers conserve and build up the present and future fertility of the soil, the only fair and reasonable thing to do is to fulfill existing promises and contracts of the Government and give the

farmers sufficient notice. It simply is not fair to change the rules in the middle of the game.

It is difficult for me to understand the action taken on the agricultural conservation program. This program is not based upon paying a farmer not to do something. On the contrary, it has offered encouragement, assistance, and help to the farmer who wished to improve his soil, diversify his crops, and prevent his land from washing away. North Carolina has a large number of small farms. This program has been of far-reaching effect. It has added to the value of farm lands. It has increased productivity. It has been the heart of a great program which has been enforced by the farmers themselves. It would be a tragedy to destroy it. The entire $300,000,000 should be appropriated for this program, and it should be continued in the future.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

The Soil Conservation Service is too well known to require detailed discussion here. In the few years of its existence it has pointed the way toward the elimination of soil erosion and the conservation of the fertility of the soil and of water resources. It has contributed to better methods of farming. Its original projects demonstrated the value of the program. Perhaps the greatest enemy of agriculture throughout the ages has been the washing away of the soil. This, it is said, is more responsible than any other thing for the present poverty in China. In North Carolina some of the richest counties of the eighties and nineties became impoverished by soil erosion. Where rivers run red with the soil from the hills, erosion is doing its work. This service is and has been for many years headed by an eminent North Carolinian, Dr. H. H. Bennett. He has literally given his life to the cause of the conservation of the soil. He has made a permanent contribution to the welfare and prosperity not only of farmers but of the entire Nation.

In North Carolina today there are 22 soil conservation districts which include 83 percent of all of the farms in the State. The Soil Conservation Service supplies technical advice and information to assist the farmers in carrying out plans designed for the prevention of erosion and the plans designed for the conservation of the soil. The Soil Conservation Service also cooperates with the State experiment station in matters of research, looking toward the solution of practical farm problems. In these days when floods threaten to destroy, and frequently do destroy, land, property, and human life, it is well to remember that sound soil conservation practices such as strip-cropping, pasture coverage, tree planting, and the planting of grasses and legumes are practical methods of assisting in the control of water flow, the prevention of soil erosion, and the prevention of floods.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

When I became a member of the House Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, early in 1935, it was at first difficult for me to understand the necessity for many types of agricultural research being carried on by the Department of Agriculture. The necessity of this work was soon apparent, and from my studies and observations I became an ardent advocate of agricultural research. Private industry has learned that research pays large dividends. So has agriculture. As I look back upon my efforts to serve the agricultural interests of my State and country, I get much personal satisfaction from the fact that I was able to render some assistance beginning in 1935, in obtaining funds for the tobacco research program at the Oxford Tobacco Experiment Station in North Carolina. Millions of dollars have been saved the tobacco farmers of North Carolina by the experiments conducted at the station. A wilt-resisting type of tobacco, known as Oxford 26, has been developed at the Oxford Experiment Station, after years of experimentation. It has been estimated that in 1946, alone, about $50,000,000 worth of the Oxford 26 variety was produced on land that could not have made a tobacco crop if that particular variety had not been developed.

I recall another small item which, at the request of Hon. GRAHAM H. BARDEN, of North Carolina, and myself, was inserted in the agricultural appropriation bill in 1936 or 1937, in the sum of $10,000, for the purpose of conducting research in connection with cucumbers. In spite of the small amount of funds I am told that the results of the investigations which were begun with that $10,000 practically revolutionized the pickle industry in the United States and brought tremendous benefits to the producers of cucumbers, as well as to the manufacturers of pickles. These two items illustrate the tremendous benefits resulting from agricultural research.

The work of the Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering, the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, and the other divisions of the Agricultural Research Administration have done and are still doing splendid work in the field of many kinds of agricultural research. Every day that passes reminds us more acutely of the necessity of appropriating funds for carrying out the purposes and objectives of the Research and Marketing Act of 1946, known as the Hope-Flannagar bill. I understand that only one-half of the amount authorized by that bill has been provided in the pending appropriation bill. With surpluses already piling up in many farm commodities, this program of research and marketing cannot get underway on a broad basis too soon.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

In my days on the farm, there was no such thing, generally speaking, as rural electrification. My own attitude toward this program is one of great appreciation. I voted for it when I was a member of the House some years ago, and eagerly looked forward to the carrying out of the program. I have seen what it can do for rural people. In 1935 when the REA program got underway, the North Carolina power lines reached only 3 farms out of every 100. Fewer than 10,000 farms had electricity. Since then, I have watched the lines extend themselves until now they reach 50 out of every 100 North Carolina farms. There are 35 REA financed rural electric systems in my State. They now have plans for installing many more miles of power lines. I assume that the situation in my State is typical of other States. Farmers want electricity. They want to enjoy its comforts and benefits. They have confidence in the REA and, furthermore, they pay for the program. It should not be reduced because the amount requested in the budget was $20,000,000 less than was necessary to meet existing applications. The loans are not gifts. This money contributes vastly to rural welfare and it is paid back to the National Treasury with interest. About a billion dollars of Federal funds is already involved in the rural-electrification program. The records show that the investment to date has been sound. It is administered by the farmers themselves through cooperative organizations. It has the expert advice of the REA. To reduce the administrative appropriation would not only delay the progress of the program but it would endanger the investment the Government has already made. About one-half of rural America now has the blessings of electric light and power. The program should go on until those blessings are extended to the other one-half of our rural people, and the full amount recommended by the Budget Bureau should be appropriated; and even this amount will be inadequate to finance existing applications.

FOREST SERVICE

In my opinion, the Forest Service is one of the most efficient divisions of the Department of Agriculture. America's timber resources are declining. We are paying scarcity prices for lumber. National forests are managed for permanent production. They can help us in meeting our present needs and serve us in emergencies in the future. National forests afford watershed protection which aids in flood control. Floods and streams full of red mud the year round in North Carolina indicate the need for watershed protection. This is true of many States in the Nation. Nearly 60 percent of the total area of North Carolina is wood and forest land. Many industrial plants in the State depend directly or indirectly on the forest for raw materials, and our woods-products industries are second only to textiles as a source of employment in manufacturing. Many hydroelectric power developments and most of the municipal water supply systems in the State are dependent on forest watersheds.

The three national forests in North Carolina are looked upon with great pride by the people of our State.

The bill as reported has eliminated all funds for wildlife management. When most of the States are devoting more and more thought and attention to the utilization of wildlife resources, it appears to be eminently unwise for the Government to go in the opposite direction and eliminate its essential services in this connection.

I also wish to call attention to the Forest Products Laboratory located at

Madison, Wis. Its work is national in its effect and is of extreme importance to the entire Nation, especially to States like North Carolina, where there are so many industries that depend on forest products and where so many farmers sell forest products.

The Southeastern Forest Experiment Station, located in North Carolina, has done a great work in the field of better forest management.

The entire program of the Forest Service is so interwoven with the whole agricultural program that if it is seriously crippled anywhere its disastrous effect will be far reaching.

FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

I now desire to call attention to an item in the bill which, to me, has been one of the outstanding achievements of the past few years in agriculture. It has helped those who could not have otherwise helped themselves. The Farmers Home Administration, previously the Farm Security Administration, and before that known as the Farm Tenant Purchase Program, has during the past 10 years to some extent offered solution to one of the greatest problems of American agriculture through the years; namely, the tenant problem. Government loans, first authorized in 1937 by the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, for the purpose of enabling tenants to buy farms, is entirely eliminated by the House action. In eliminating funds to carry out this provision of the Farmers Home Administration Act, the House invalidates section 505b of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, which opened opportunities to qualified veterans. The Farmers Home Administration Act of 1946 further extended opportunities to veterans by giving them preference for the loans. Not only this, but severe reductions have been made in funds to provide farm operating loans and, unless restored, will deprive many farmers in my State and throughout the Nation of their only source of credit for purchasing and successfully operating farms. I understand that the House committee report and statements made on the floor indicate that no fault is found with the program or with its administration.

From the beginning, tenant purchase loans have been on a sound basis. The value has been determined by appraisers and by the local committees which pass upon the eligibility of each applicant. Only farmers and veterans who cannot borrow elsewhere on reasonable terms are eligible, and this is true of the operating loans also. In North Carolina, 2,727 families have bought farms with direct Government loans. Almost 30 percent—797 families—have already repaid their loans in full. This means that the families have become home owners and taxpayers. The Government has given them an opportunity, of which they have taken full advantage.

The national loss to the Government on tenant-purchase loans has been negligible. Since it began 10 years ago, the net loss on loans totaling more than $282,000,000 has been only $50,830, or about one-fiftieth of 1 percent. The continued need for this program is shown by the fact that in the Nation there were 92,000 applications on file at the end of December 1946. Sixteen applications were on hand for every loan that could be made from funds available. At present there are about 41,000 unfilled applications for veterans alone. Time will not permit me to further discuss the reduction in funds for operating and subsistence loans except to say that 57 percent of the adjustment loans during the first 7 months of the fiscal year were made to veterans. The demand and need for these loans is still widespread and urgent. The full amount recommended by the budget should be appropriated for the Farmers Home Administration. The money helps people who cannot otherwise help themselves and, furthermore, it is paid back to the Government with interest.

SCHOOL LUNCHES

My discussion has, up to this point, been devoted to items which are either repaid to the Government or else make a substantial and continuing contribution to the physical assets of our country, increase the wealth, add to the farmers' income, and in many ways contribute to the soundness of the national economy. I feel that I would be derelict in my duty if I did not now call attention to the school-lunch program which, in the main, deals with the health and education of children. Even in times of prosperity, it is a well-known fact that the health of children is not always solved by higher incomes. Under the program heretofore in force, school children of the country have been assisted in getting at least one good, nutritious meal each day. The effectiveness of the program has been reflected in the health of the children and their progress in school, and it has the interested support of most of the organizations throughout the country which deeply concern themselves with the well-being, health, and education of the school children of the Nation. The House bill proposes to reduce the amount available for this purpose from seventy-five million to forty-five million, ten million of which is earmarked for nonfood assistance, leaving available for food assistance $35,000,000. Furthermore, the language now in the appropriation bill would make it impossible for more than about 21 States and the District of Columbia to take advantage of its benefits. The full amount should be restored, and the language changed so as to permit full participation in its benefits. There can be no reasonable excuse at this time for cutting down an item which so vitally affects the citizens of tomorrow.

CONCLUSION

There are many other items in the agricultural appropriation bill which I should like to discuss and in which I am vitally interested, such as adequate funds for the Solicitor's Office and the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, the services of which agencies are essential to the effective administration of the farm program.

I subscribe to the doctrine that economy should be practiced by the Federal Government and that unnecessary expenses should be eliminated. I have voted for many reductions and expect to vote for others. However, I cannot subscribe to a course which will seriously cripple and may well destroy the efforts of a generation in building a sound, helpful, and sensible agricultural program. The agricultural conservation program, triple A, the Soil Conservation Service, the REA, the Farmers Home Administration, Forestry Service, Research and Experimentation all are a part of what we have come to call our farm program in this country. The proof of its effectiveness is seen on every hand. Improved methods of farming, betterment of the soil, cooperation of the farmers, increase in taxable values, preservation of the soil, results flowing from scientific research, all point to the success of the program. Furthermore, the fact that the farmers of America were able during 5 years of war to produce more with less labor and with less machinery than had ever been produced before is the greatest testimonial which can possibly be offered as to the effectiveness of the program to which I have referred. I was a farmer when we had no real farm program. I know by experience and observation what these things have meant to the rural people of North Carolina and to the Nation. It would be a tragedy to this generation and an utter disregard for the generations to come for this program to be destroyed.

The effectiveness and success of a farm program depend in a substantial degree upon the type, character and ability of the people who enforce it. There are many patriotic people in the Department of Agriculture who regard their jobs not just as a way to make a living but as an opportunity to serve agriculture and the Nation. The cuts made in the pending bill are so drastic as not only to eliminate such unnecessary personnel as there may be in the Department, but also many able men who have been and are devoting their lives toward making worthwhile contributions to the effectiveness of the farm program.

I make bold to assert that the Nation cannot long operate without a prosperous agriculture. The bill in its present form strikes at the heart of agriculture and this, in turn, will constitute a body blow to our entire national economy. I, therefore, urge the Senate Appropriations Committee and the Members of the Senate with all the earnestness I possess, to amend the agricultural appropriation bill so as to maintain the policies, programs, and services authorized by law; to carry out the agreements made with the farmers of America; to maintain the integrity of Congress; and to serve the best interest of our Nation.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF CERTAIN HOUSE REPORTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 35, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be printed 1,500 additional copies of House Report No. 541, Seventy-ninth Congress, entitled "The Postwar Foreign Economic Policy of the United States," of which 500 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the House; 1,500 additional copies of House Report No. 1205, Seventy-ninth Congress, entitled "Eco-

nomic Reconstruction in Europe," of which 500 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 1,000 copies shall be for the use of the House; and 5,000 additional copies of House Report No. 2729, Seventy-ninth Congress, entitled "Final Report Reconversion Experience and Current Economic Problems," of which 500 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 4,500 copies shall be for the use of the House.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the concurrent resolution.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 39, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, as amended, the Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 2,000 additional copies of the hearing held before said committee on February 6, 1947, pursuant to Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the concurrent resolution.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HOUSE REPORT 209, RELATING TO UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 40, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, as amended, the Committee on Un-American Activities, House of Representatives, be, and is hereby authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 25,000 additional copies of House Report 209, Eightieth Congress, first session, entitled "The Communist Party of the United States as an Agent of a Foreign Power."

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the concurrent resolution.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I send to the desk a telegram relating to the necessity for appropriations for combating the foot-and-mouth disease. I ask that the telegram be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Appropriations, as follows:

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *June 25, 1947.*

Hon. CARL A. HATCH,
Senate Office Building:

Following wire addressed Chairman Senate and House Appropriation Committee:

"Following full day session with Mexican delegates and Department of Agriculture officials our national advisory committee views with alarm delay in action on foot-and-mouth disease appropriation bill and information which indicates that further delay may continue pending committee investigation of Mexican situation. We believe $65,000,000 appropriation must be acted upon before this session of Congress adjourns and that sufficient deficiency appropriation as might be recommended by Department of Agriculture must be provided to serve in interim. Any relaxation of this program will be disastrous to entire campaign in Mexico and in turn disastrous to entire economy of this Nation. Million and one-half appropriation approved yesterday adequate only until June 30."

NEW MEXICO CATTLE GROWERS' ASSOCIATION,
GEORGE A. GODFREY, *President.*
HORACE H. HENNING, *Secretary.*
ALBERT K. MITCHELL.

EXPENDITURE OF ADDITIONAL FUNDS BY COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration I ask unanimous consent to report favorably without amendment Senate Resolution 130, and ask for its immediate consideration. The resolution was previously unanimously approved by the Appropriations Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 130), submitted by Mr. BRIDGES on June 12, 1947, and favorably reported by the Committee on Appropriations, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eightieth Congress, $10,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes, specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946.

EMPLOYMENT OF TEMPORARY ASSISTANTS, ETC., BY COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably, without additional amendment, Senate Resolution 129, and I request its present consideration. The resolution was previously unanimously approved by the Appropriations Committee, with an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 129) submitted by Mr. BRIDGES on June 18, 1947.

The amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 1, line 10, after the word "exceed," to strike out "$25,000" and insert "$50,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HATCH. How large an appropriation of additional funds is involved in the two resolutions?

Mr. BROOKS. One is for $10,000 and the other is for $50,000.

Mr. HATCH. Which is the resolution providing for $50,000?

Mr. BROOKS. The resolution providing for $50,000 is to make an investigation of the very subject concerning which the Senator just asked to have a telegram printed in the RECORD. The purpose is to make a survey of the hoof-and-mouth disease in the United States.

Mr. HATCH. I have no objection to the resolution. I do think it is proper for the Senate to be advised when these requests are made as to how much money is involved, and what is the purpose of the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the Committee on Appropriations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

VOLUNTARY ENLISTMENTS IN THE REGULAR MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I submit the conference report on House bill 3303, to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military Establishment, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3303) to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military Establishment of the United States, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following: "That effective July 1, 1947, the Secretary of War is authorized, notwithstanding the provisions of the last paragraph of section 127a of this Act, to accept original enlistments in the Regular Army from among qualified male persons not less than seventeen years of age for periods of two, three, four, five, or six years, and to accept reenlistments for periods of three, four, five, or six years: *Provided*, That persons of the first three enlisted grades may be reenlisted for unspecified periods of time on a career basis under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe: *Provided further*, That anyone who serves three or more years of an enlistment for an unspecified period of time many submit to the Secretary of War his resignation and such resignation shall be accepted by the Secretary of War and such person shall be discharged from his enlistment within three months of the submission of such resignation. Except if such person, other than an enlisted member of a Regular Army Puerto Rican unit submits his resignation while stationed overseas or after embarking for an overseas station, the Secretary of War shall not be required to accept such resignation until a total of two years of overseas

service shall have been completed in the current overseas assignment, and in the case of anyone who has completed any course of instruction pursuant to paragraph 13 of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended (10 U. S. C. 535), or pursuant to section 3 of the Act of April 3, 1939 (53 Stat. 556), as amended (10 U. S. C. 298a), the Secretary of War shall not be required to accept such resignation until two years subsequent to the completion of such course. The Secretary of War may refuse to accept any such resignation in time of war or national emergency declared by the President or Congress, or while the person concerned is absent without leave or serving a sentence of court martial. The Secretary of War may refuse to accept a resignation for a period not to exceed six months following the submission thereof if the enlisted person is under investigation or in default with respect to public property or public funds: *Provided further*, That no person under the age of eighteen years shall be enlisted without the written consent of his parents or guardian, and the Secretary of War shall, upon the application of the parents or guardian of any such person enlisted without their written consent, discharge such person from the military service with pay and with the form of discharge certificate to which the service of such person, after enlistment, shall entitle him: *Provided further*, That nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to deprive any person of any right to reenlistment in the Regular Army under any other provision of law. No person who is serving under an enlistment contracted on or after June 1, 1945, shall be entitled, before the expiration of the period of such enlistment, to enlist for an enlistment period which will expire before the expiration of the enlistment period for which he is so serving: *Provided further*, That any enlisted person discharged from the Regular Army who upon such discharge is recommended for reenlistment shall be permitted to reenlist with the rank held by him at the time of his discharge if he reenlists within a period to be specified by the Secretary of War but not to exceed three months from the date of such discharge: *And provided further*, That any enlisted person discharged from the Regular Army by reason of acceptance of his resignation shall not be entitled upon subsequent reenlistment to the rank, rating, or grade held at the time of discharge.

SEC. 2. Any person who enlists or reenlists in the Regular Military Establishment on or after June 1, 1945, in the seventh grade, upon the completion of recruit training, but not later than four months subsequent to the date of enlistment, shall, unless sooner promoted, be promoted to the sixth grade, provided he meets such qualifications as may be prescribed in regulations promulgated by the Secretary of War: *Provided*, That no back pay or allowance shall accrue to any person by reason of enactment of this section.

"SEC. 3. Section 2 of the National Defense Act, as amended (10 U. S. C. 4, 602), is further amended by deleting the last sentence thereof.

"SEC. 4. Paragraph 4 of section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 is hereby amended by substituting a colon for the period at the end of such paragraph and by adding immediately after such colon the following: '*Provided further*, That in addition to such enlistment allowance, any person enlisting for an unspecified period of time shall be paid the sum of $50 upon the completion of each year of service of such reenlistment, and any person who resigns or is discharged from such enlistment for an unspecified period of time shall not thereafter be entitled to any additional enlistment or reenlistment allowance based on any period served in such enlistment for an unspecified period of time."

"SEC. 5. Effective July 1, 1947, sections 653 and 653a of title 10, United States Code, are repealed and all other laws and parts of laws insofar as they are inconsistent with or in conflict with the provisions of this Act are likewise repealed.

"SEC. 6. Subsection 1 (b) of the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 (38 U. S. C., Supp. V, 691a) is amended by striking out the word "and" at the end of subsection (7) thereof, inserting a semicolon in lieu of the period after subsection (8) thereof, and adding the following: "and (9) any person entering upon active service, or enlisting, on or after the first day of the first month after the approval of the Act adding this subsection."

"SEC. 7. Sections 57 and 58 of the National Defense Act, as amended, are further amended by striking out the words "eighteen" therefrom and substituting therefor the words "seventeen" in each of the said sections."

And the Senate agree to the same.

CHAN GURNEY,
STYLES BRIDGES,
E. V. ROBERTSON,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

W. G. ANDREWS,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
DEWEY SHORT,
CARL VINSON,
P. H. DREWRY,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

CONSTRUCTION OF BUILDINGS BY CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINSTRATION

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on page 10 of the committee report on the appropriation bill, House bill 3311, which will probably be taken up tomorrow, or soon thereafter, there is certain language with reference to the curtailment of the construction of buildings at airports. It seems to me the language was unhappily selected with regard to construction of buildings at airports. For myself I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the RECORD my views with reference to the construction of buildings at airports.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE REPORT ON H. R. 3311

It is felt that the recommendations of the Senate Appropriations Committee on H. R. 3311 wherein suggestion is made that the Civil Aeronautics Administration should not proceed with the construction of administration buildings on airports during fiscal year 1948 is unduly restrictive and limits the authority of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics to exercise discretion in administering the Federal Airport Act.

The Civil Aeronautics Administration proposes a balanced program whereby each specific project is evaluated on the basis of needs and in comparison from a priority standpoint with other airport development projects.

The figures contained in the committee report concerning buildings are misleading. The $25,200,000 quoted represents total costs of buildings in a contemplated 1948 budget of $65,000,000. Actually the Federal money represented in the proposed building construction is approximately $12,500,000 of the $65,000,000. With the 1948 appropriation reduced to $32,500,000 from the $65,000,000 it is likely that the portion of the funds to be expended on buildings will also be reduced 50 percent or $6,500,000.

The Civil Aeronautics Administration proposes to construct buildings only at those points where they are urgently needed due to the special conditions applicable to the specific airports. At some places scheduled air lines are using inferior airports where airports with better runways are available but which have no facilities for handling passengers, mail, and cargo, and it would be in the interest of safety to provide administration buildings in order that scheduled air-carrier operations could be transferred to the already existing new airport. There are other cases where existing buildings are improperly located and do not permit utilization of an existing airport, and where buildings should be torn down and replaced in order to provide more clearance for operations, particularly for instrument landings.

At some localities there are several existing airports but nearly all traffic is trying to crowd into one airport because no facilities such as administration buildings exist at the second airport, and it would be in the interest of safety to encourage segregation of flight activities and distribution of various types of traffic between the several landing areas.

An analysis of the list of projects and a little inquiry into the details of each of the projects listed in Senate Document 14 leads me to believe that the CAA proposes to expend its airport funds wisely, that it has given most careful consideration to the various projects of high priority and selected for development those for the fiscal year 1948 which are most urgently needed. I have known Mr. Wright, the Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, for several years and have found him to be one of the most able administrators and public servants in whom I have the utmost confidence and trust for the carrying out of such a program. I do not believe that he will expend Government money on buildings which are not urgently needed for the furtherance of civil aviation.

I further believe that he will carry out in the highest degree and in the most efficient manner the intent of the Federal Airport Act as passed on May 13, 1946.

In view of these conditions I feel that the CAA's airport program should not in any way be governed by the recommendations in the Senate Appropriations Committee report relative to construction of buildings.

The $25,200,000 figure quoted in the Senate committee report represents total cost for buildings in the contemplated 1948 program, both sponsor and Federal funds. In comparing the amount needed for buildings with the total amount of the appropriation, it should be stated that $12,500,000, approximately, of Federal funds would go toward administration buildings if we had a total appropriation of $65,000,000, that is to say, about 20 percent of the total program involves buildings. With a $32,500,000 appropriation, it is logical to suppose that from five to seven million dollars might be needed for buildings.

In some instances a provision of an administration building is vitally necessary at the present time. Seattle-Tacoma (Bow Lake) is a good example. Unless an administration building is provided there the air lines will probably continue to use Boeing Field in Seattle. There is no comparison, from a safety standpoint, between the runway at Boeing and the much better landing area at Bow Lake. Indirectly, therefore, the provision of an administration building at Bow Lake will increase the safety and probably the regularity of air-line service into the Seattle-Tacoma area. In the Northeast,

Worcester, Mass., provides a fair example of another aspect of this question. The city of Worcester has proceeded without Federal aid to construct an airport. They, like many other cities, are anxious to receive Federal assistance in finishing the job. Construction of an administration building is one of the items that still remains to be done.

I have examined the program for the State of Minnesota and I find that, although buildings were provided for at Duluth, Bemidji, and Alexandria, these are relatively low-priority projects. I do not see, therefore, how we could show Senator BALL that his State would be affected seriously. So far as Senator BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, is concerned, there are no buildings proposed in the 1948 program for his State.

The Senator from Illinois might be concerned with the administration building proposed at Quincy. The Third Region has pointed out that the Quincy airport was built under the DLA program. Three paved runways were provided, each 150' by 5,400'. It was not possible to spend any money for administration buildings or other necessary facilities under the DLA program. The Third Region has therefore requested that Federal funds be allocated now for construction of the first unit of an administration building, paving additional apron, providing adequate access roads, and furnishing utilities to the building area. This is a certificated air-line stop but service has not been inaugurated due to the lack of adequate facilities.

The Senators from Michigan might be interested in Saginaw and Battle Creek. At Saginaw-Bay City, the situation is similar to that at Quincy, Ill. This is a DLA airport and funds are needed now to convert certain military buildings to civil use and to provide the first unit of a permanent administration building. This is a scheduled stop on PCA and is also used by several interstate carriers. At Battle Creek the prewar administration building and certain other facilities are deemed inadequate. They should be rehabilitated or replaced now.

The Senators from Nebraska might be interested in Omaha and North Platte, Nebr. The fifth region has included in Senate Document No. 14 a $400,000 administration building. They do not, however, mention it in their justification. At North Platte the fifth region proposes development of a new building area to permit adequate clearance between runways and buildings so that an instrument-landing system can be installed. Included in the project is a terminal building.

The Senators from Massachusetts might be interested in the project at Worcester, Mass. There is no adequate administration building on the airport at the present time. We have set up $100,000 for this purpose.

The Senators from Tennessee might be interested in Memphis, Tenn. The second region says, "A new administration building is sorely needed at this station in order to accommodate the passengers from 52 scheduled flights daily, provided by 5 major air lines." At Nashville, Tenn., the region has this to say: "Berry Field is now served by two air lines with 52 scheduled flights daily. This field needs relief from the passenger-handling standpoint, which can be accomplished by the construction of an administration building. The existing building is entirely inadequate to accommodate present-day air travel."

The Senators from Maryland could be interested in the administration building proposed for Cumberland, Md. A temporary frame building, which is grossly inadequate, serves as an administration building at the present time. This is a class 5 airport and TWA has applied to the Board for permission to operate there. If TWA is granted permission to operate, a permanent ad building will be needed. A similar situation exists at Salisbury, Md. There is no administration building there at the present time. Chesapeake Airways are now operating interstate schedules there and have filed a preliminary application with the Board for interstate operation. Several other air lines have expressed the desire to operate from Salisbury. The Senators from Arizona might be interested in the building proposed for Tucson (Municipal No. 2). This project includes construction of a medium-sized administration building suitable for handling the air-line traffic which will use this airport in the near future. Davis Monthan, which is being used by the air lines at present, is to be a strictly military field and the air lines will move over to Municipal No. 2. At Nogales, an administration building is needed to handle air traffic from Mexico, in addition to local use. Adequate customs and health inspection services are not available at the present time for this port of entry. American Airlines, Arizona Airways and LAMSA, a Mexican air line, operate into this field now. There are several other airports with similar problems in the State of Arizona. It is only necessary to run down the list shown in Senate Document No. 14. Phoenix, I believe, is the only one that does not contain an administration building as part of the project.

FLOODS ON THE UPPER MISSISSIPPI AND MISSOURI RIVERS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago I presented to the Senate a graphic picture of the disastrous floods then raging on the upper Mississippi-Missouri Rivers. Then it was apparent to all observers that this was a flood of more than usual proportions. But subsequent events have produced more floods so that today we face one of the major flood disasters of all time, and the end is not yet in sight, for the waters are now spilling over in the tributaries of the Missouri and deluging the vast fertile lands along the main river.

The flood toll has reached an estimated $200,000,000 and laid waste 3,800,000 acres of land in these United States this year.

Mr. President, this spells ruin to many thousands of families directly in the flood's path. Its ultimate effects go far beyond that, however, creating consequences of Nationwide and international import.

The Congress of the United States cannot afford any longer to brush these floods aside by passage of a bill to provide some money with which the Army Engineers can rebuild broken levees and dikes. This is not a flood whose debris can be mopped up as the tired housewife sweeps out the mud and filth left in her parlor when the waters recede. No; this is a flood caused by our neglect, by our refusal to plan so as to use the God-given rains for the benefit of mankind, by our shortsighted and selfishly induced continuance of a completely discredited piecemeal approach to flood control which not only fails to prevent floods, but which competent engineers say actually increases them.

Why do I say that the present floods are not local in their effects? Because, Mr. President, these floods have drowned out the 1947 corn crop.

From Davenport to the Missouri—

Reports the Washington Post this morning—

through the center of the greatest grain-growing belt in the world, corn is drowned out. The situation isn't confined to Iowa. This writer has just finished driving 1,300 miles through the best growing sections. He has yet to see one field of corn of average development.

The poorest corn crop in 20 years is predicted.

Corn shortage means that meat will be scarce and prices will skyrocket. Yet how much higher they can go since the Republican leadership of the Congress removed price controls last year, without becoming strictly a luxury item found only on the menus of our rich citizens, I do not know.

The corn shortage calls into question any plans we might develop for the export of foodstuffs and wheat to famine-stricken foreign countries. Hence, our international policy is directly affected by the wasteful, but wholly preventable floods of the Missouri-Mississippi Basin.

And do not think for one moment that the people in the farming area now under water are not looking toward Congress for an explanation of its conduct in ignoring the plight over the years of the vast grain-growing lands of this Nation. The Post reporter sampled public opinion on his trip.

In a small roadside feed store yesterday—

He says—

I heard a pious old Iowa farmer blame this year's wild weather upon interference with nature in the use of the atom bomb. Another disagreed. He blamed it on the Republican Congress.

Mr. President, I have before the Senate a measure dealing with the present flood emergency, which I introduced on June 12, and which was referred for action to the Committee on Public Works. That measure calls for a field investigation of these floods now, and for the formulation of plans which will prevent such floods ever occurring again. Moreover, it requires that a program be developed now for the rehabilitation of the areas inundated and for the relief of the victims of these floods.

This is an emergency, Mr. President, one which will not wait upon the pleasure of a small body of men in the United States Congress. If we do not act now, the suffering of a large section of our fellow citizens will become unendurable. If we do not investigate the flood conditions now, gain a first-hand knowledge or their extent and character, and ascertain their causes, then the tendency will be to put off any investigation until next year's floods rage once more.

The press of the Nation is aware of these conditions. They, too, have called upon the Congress for action now. This is not a partisan issue. Both Republican and Democratic newspapers urge action. I have previously submitted for the RECORD items of news and editorial comment which fully substantiate these assertions. I now ask permission to insert in the RECORD additional materials. One is an editorial appearing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch for June 17, 1947, quoting the Missouri Farmer, titled "After the Floods Come."

Another is a news story from the Washington Daily News of June 24, 1947, titled "Flood Toll: $200,000,000 and 3,800,000 Acres."

The third is an editorial appearing in the New York Daily News for June 16, 1947, titled "Rivers on the Rampage."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of June 17, 1947]

AFTER THE FLOODS COME

New Missouri floods are "a monument to years of tinkering by Army engineers," farm paper says; they deal with floods only after these occur, as Chinese have done for ages; urges TVA-type plan to prevent high water, aid conservation, and help public power.

[From the Missouri Farmer]

"This year's flood, which has forced hundreds of farm families to move; which has destroyed their crops, fences, and other property; which has interrupted rail, bus, and truck transportation as well as other communications; which has washed away and damaged scores of bridges and miles of roads, is a monument to the years of tinkering on the part of the Army engineers.

"For nearly a hundred years the Army engineers have been building levees that melt away year after year before the floods like lumps of sugar. They have been building dams to hold back the water.

"Lately they have choked up the Missouri River with dikes, reducing the carrying capacity of the stream, until when a rainy spell comes along the water has no place to go except out over the land.

"DAMS, LEVEES, AND DIKES

"In other words, the engineers have been dealing with effects instead of the causes of floods. They have been attempting to deal with the waters after they have swept down into the lowlands, dealing with them by building dams, levees, and dikes, the same kinds of measures used by the Chinese more than a thousand years ago.

"There is not a small farm boy in this State who does not know that the recurring floods begin when the rain falls upon the uplands. The rainfall gathers into little rivulets, then rushes down into the branches and creeks, then into the larger streams, carrying away the rich top soil upon which future generations must depend for food.

"Why cannot the Army engineers see this? Why cannot Congressmen see it? Why cannot all the people see it? Why do we keep on appropriating enormous sums for these ineffectual measures—keep on dealing with effects rather than working on the causes of floods?

"ATTACK ON ALL FRONTS

"The TVA has solved this flood problem by attacking it upon all fronts, by the extensive use of fertilizers and other soil-conservation practices, then by building dams. Unlike the dams proposed by the Army engineers under the Pick-Sloan plan, these TVA dams do more than just control floods * * * they generate power for cities and farms to take the drudgery off the backs of mankind and to comfort the people by lighting up their homes and keeping them warm.

"Why do not the people of Missouri, and the whole Missouri River Basin, which takes in several States, learn from this outstanding example which has met with universal approval throughout the Tennessee Valley, and which has attracted the favorable notice of people all over the world?"

[From the Washington Daily News of June 24, 1947]

FLOOD TOLL: $200,000,000 AND 3,800,000 ACRES

The fourth, and most disastrous, flood crest in a month moved relentlessly down the Missouri River Valley today, ruining all hope of a 1947 crop in the inundated areas.

The new flood was expected to drown almost 300,000 fertile acres. This would give the Nation a total loss to floods this year of 3,800,000 acres with an immediate monetary loss of almost $200,000,000 in crops, equipment, and personal possessions.

Estimates do not take into account the amount of topsoil ripped away, ruining the land forever. The floods have driven 20,000 persons from their homes in 4 weeks.

The new swell of high water was expected to reach St. Joseph, Mo., today, shoving the United States Engineers' surface markers to a height of 21.5 feet. Flood stage is considered 17 feet at St. Joseph.

As it juggernauted down river, the flood ruined some of the finest corn and wheat farm land in America. About 400 miles of bottom land was expected to be overrun in the section where Missouri, Kansas, and Nebraska join.

The weather was clear and residents hoped it would hold long enough to permit the river to discharge the overload of water it received from torrential rains last week.

Engineers predicted the river would go over the top of the levee protecting the St. Joseph Municipal Airport. They said the dike probably would collapse under the strain, permitting millions of gallons of water to overspread the field.

At Boonville, Mo., engineers and city officials were attempting to keep the municipal waterworks intake pit from collapsing. The engineers said that if the foundation walls collapsed, the intake would be buried, shutting off the town's water supply.

The crest was moving through the valley like a long, low wave. The river was falling above and below the rise.

At Nebraska City, Nebr., 70 miles above St. Joseph, the surface level fell two-tenths of a foot. At Kansas City, 45 miles downstream, the river dropped slowly to 19.2 feet from the crest to 19.4 feet hit by the previous flood, which was still moving down the river in advance of the new rise.

Verne Alexander, regional river engineer for the Kansas City weather bureau, said the new flood would "beat anything we've had so far this month and clean out the valley for this year as far as crops are concerned."

The Platte River was leveling off at Agency, Mo., where only the housetops showed above the surface.

Rescue workers still sought five persons at Cambridge, Nebr., where eight persons died in a flash flood Sunday. The waters of Medicine Creek and the Republican River had receded today, leaving the streets and houses full of silt.

The week end flash floods in Iowa and Nebraska were pouring their burden of water into the larger rivers today. Alexander said the Missouri would rise to 6 feet above flood stage at Kansas City tomorrow.

[Fom the New York Daily News of June 16, 1947]

RIVERS ON THE RAMPAGE

The latest of the old familiar Mississippi-flood news stories broke last week with all the conventional details—thousands of people chased out of their homes to higher territory, 1,000,000-odd acres under water, crop and property damage mounting into millions of dollars, levees torn out by the dozen.

These were no record-breaking floods, at that; just run-of-the-mill results of some rather heavy rains.

A good part of the flooding originated in the upper Mississippi River itself, above St. Louis. What we'd like to recall to the customers is that another considerable part was contributed by the Mississippi's biggest and most rambunctious tributary, the Missouri.

This, too, happens frequently.

The Mississippi's biggest feeder from the east, the Ohio, did not in this case contribute to the floods. But it often does.

And still another Mississippi tributary, the Tennessee, sometime ago got over its old habit of pouring excess water at will into the United States biggest river. This is because the Tennessee Valley Authority, better known as TVA, sometime ago roped and hog-tied the Tennessee all the way back to its beginnings.

In addition to tying efficient flood-control knots in the Tennessee, the TVA has brought cheaper electric power—meaning rising standards of living—to its large southern region of operations, and has sharply slowed down the soil erosion which not long ago was gutting the area.

TVA, too, is so prosperous a Government enterprise that the House voted last week to require the Authority to pay back to the Government $348,000,000, or the major part of its original cost, in the next 40 years.

The moral of all this seems plain to us. It is that we need at least two more agencies like the TVA. We need an MVA—Missouri Valley Authority—and an OVA, or Ohio Valley Authority.

Of the two, the NVA would seem to be the more urgently needed, because the Missouri River system is so much bigger than the Ohio complex of rivers.

The Missouri itself is 2,470 miles long. With its feeders—the Yellowstone, Big Horn, Cheyenne, Platte, etc.—it drains about one-sixth of the Nation's land area.

THE WILD MISSOURI

In three recent flood years, 1942–44, inclusive, the Missouri dealt $150,000,000 worth of flood damage. You can repair most flood damage; but you can't restore the 550,000,000 tons of valuable soil, sand, silt, etc., that the Missouri washes away every year, for the Mississippi to carry in large part to the Gulf of Mexico.

An MVA, with as much luck and successful management as the TVA has had, should be able to do a good job on the Missouri River system.

Of course, the TVA is a Socialist device, as would be an MVA and an OVA. Most of the Socialist philosophy, in our estimation is crackpot stuff, and is now proving itself so before Americans' interested eyes in Russia and Great Britain.

But it seems impossible that the Socialist philosophy can be 100 percent cockeyed. Further, we have in TVA one working example of the success of a big interstate Government agency to promote flood control, soil conservation, reclamation, and power production.

"SOCIALISM"—SO WHAT

As to these things being socialistic, our feeling is: So what? If they work, why worry about their correct economic label? What matters is that TVA is working, and that proper variations on TVA ought to bring the Missouri and Ohio River systems under control.

MVA and OVA are in a coma in Congress at this time. We hope it won't be long before they come to life again.

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 564) to provide for the performance of the duties of the office of President, in case of the removal, resignation, or inability both of the President and Vice President.

TEMPORARY CONTINUANCE OF AUTHORITY OF THE MARITIME COMMISSION UNTIL MARCH 1, 1948

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3911.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3911) to continue temporary authority of the Maritime Commission until March 1, 1948.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the bill is designed to extend authority of the Maritime Commission in the operation of tankers and other vessels until March 1, 1948. When VJ-day came we had some 5,000 vessels of one type or another operated by our Maritime Commission. That number has been reduced until in the middle of June of this year the Maritime Commission was operating 332 vessels. Of that number 258—I believe that is the correct figure—were tankers, carrying petroleum not only from this country to ports of the world, but from ports of the world to other ports of the world, and in some cases bringing petroleum into this country. These tanker operations and the passenger- and dry-cargo operations which are now going on must cease and terminate by the 30th of June unless we pass this extending legislation. I think it is imperatively necessary that we do so. The legislation is approved by the President. The Secretary of State appeared before the Merchant Marine Committee of the House in behalf of the legislation. Mr. Clayton also urged upon the House committee its passage. It was unanimously reported by the House committee and was unanimously passed by the House itself. I hope it may have similar treatment here.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I should like to make an inquiry of the Senator from Maine.

I understand that the employees of the Maritime Commission are on a 5-day payless furlough during the whole of this week, beginning on Monday last. Would the passage of this extension bill have any effect upon the payment of those employees?

Mr. WHITE. No direct effect, but it would assure the continued operation by the Maritime Commission of our fleet, and I think would indirectly make a substantial contribution to the employees in the matter of their pay and otherwise.

Mr. GEORGE. I am advised that the employees have been asked to work on a voluntary basis, and that they have been at work part of the time. As the Senator knows, it is not a large organization.

Mr. WHITE. That is quite true.

Mr. GEORGE. They have been working part time on a voluntary basis. They have the impression—or at least they have given me the impression—that if they are not paid out of the appropriation for the fiscal year 1947, which will expire July 1, they will not be paid at all for those 5 days.

Mr. WHITE. That matter has not been brought to my attention. The proposed legislation does not specifically deal with it, but it seems to me that the indirect effects of the legislation must be to give better assurance to the employees.

Mr. GEORGE. I had the impression that possibly the payment of those employees was contingent upon the extension of the work which the Senator is now asking to have extended until March of next year.

Mr. WHITE. I hope it will insure prompt payment of those who have worked during the lean period.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, as I understand, one of the purposes of the bill is to make available tankers to bring petroleum products to this country. We in New England are tremendously interested. I was advised by the Governor of Connecticut that unless this service with the tankers is continued there may be a fuel shortage in our part of the country.

Mr. WHITE. There is very real danger of it. The tankers which are involved constitute about one-fourth of the entire world tonnage of tankers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendments to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 3911) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RECESS

Mr. WHITE. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, June 27, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 26 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Carl Birkeland, of Illinois.
Lyle C. Himmel, of South Dakota.
Ralph H. Hunt, of Massachusetts.
Gerald G. Jones, of South Dakota.
Foster H. Kreis, of Minnesota.
Joseph E. Maldonado, of Arizona.
John H. Marvin, of Florida.
John H. E. McAndrews, of Minnesota.
Harold D. Pease, of California.
Henry T. Unverzagt, of Virginia.
Stephen B. Vaughan, of New Jersey.
Harold C. Wood, of Massachusetts.

John H. Madonne, of Texas, now a Foreign Service officer of class 2 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 3 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

Russell M. Brooks, of Oregon.
U. Alexis Johnson, of California.
Robert P. Joyce, of California.

T. Eliot Weil, of New York, now a Foreign Service officer of class 4 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

Charles C. Gidney, Jr., of Texas, now a Foreign Service officer of class 5 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

W. A. Ayres, of Kansas, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for a term of 7 years from September 26, 1947.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 6th day of June 1947:

Ralph H. Blaylock, a citizen of Mississippi.
Michael M. Spark, a citizen of New York.

WITHDRAWALS

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate June 26 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

POSTMASTERS

The nominations sent to the Senate on various dates during the present session of the Congress of persons listed below to be postmasters at the offices indicated with their respective names:

ALABAMA

Fred W. McLaurine, Fitzpatrick.
Mrs. Alma Coaker, Fruitdale.
Otis L. Headrick, Pyriton.
Thomas S. Edwards, Remlap.
Robert Thomas Coffman, Veto.
Mrs. Margaret C. Phillips, Wellington.

ARKANSAS

Luther P. Gentry, Mayflower.

CONNECTICUT

Vincent P. Kelley, Lebanon.
Mrs. Lillian M. Cooper, Middle Haddam.

COLORADO

George J. Peterson, San Acacio.

GEORGIA

George T. Love, Jr., Morganton.

ILLINOIS

Irwin C. Stoltz, Bellmont.
Charles H. Lawler, Cortland.
Mrs. Pauline M. Hutchison, Shirley.

INDIANA

Mrs. Hazel Runner, Cross Plains.
Harold E. Collings, Kingsbury.
Miss Zula G. McBride, Mays.
Lee V. Johnson, New Goshen.
Mrs. Ruth M. Slevin, Nineveh.
Charles E. Rodenberg, Pershing.
Mrs. Mabel E. Deel, Rockfield.
William C. Bunner, Springport.

IOWA

Jasper H. Frogge, Numa.

KANSAS

Mrs. Nellie C. Lucas, Dearing.
Ira B. Armstrong, Hiattville.

KENTUCKY

Claud E. Taylor, Balkan.
William O. Hopper, Willisburg.

LOUISIANA

Miss Rosa M. Owens, Frierson.
Mrs. Ruth C. Barentine, Longville.
Mrs. Pearl H. Campbell, Pine Prairie.
Mrs. Emma H. Andermann, Saint James.

MARYLAND

Mrs. Grace H. Hudson, Bishop.
Miss Cornelia W. Hickman, Point of Rocks.

MICHIGAN

Hiram M. Terry, Leonard.
Mrs. Fern A. Pierce, Oakley.
Carmo A. Nichols, Sagola.

MINNESOTA

Melvin R. Henrickson, Guthrie.

MISSISSIPPI

Albert L. Mills, Kossuth.
David L. Rodgers, Randolph.

MISSOURI

Paris M. Hill, Glenwood.
Floyd J. Strain, Louisburg.
Mr. Stella Siebert, Pilot Knob.

NEBRASKA

Irvin C. Conkel, Burr.
L. Wayne Spainhourd, Thurston.

NEW MEXICO

Mrs. Clyda Morrow, House.
O. K. Sanders, Willard.

NEW YORK

Mrs. Rebecca E. Traynor, Breesport.
Mrs. Bessie A. Benjamin, Speonk.

NORTH CAROLINA

Robert White, Bunn.
Mrs. Esther H. Bullock, Delco.
Mrs. Myrtle B. Smith, Hays.
Mrs. Bettie V. Wall, Pee Dee.
Samuel L. Sanderlin, Shawboro.

NORTH DAKOTA

Mrs. Alice C. Kelly, Rogers.

OHIO

Mrs. Minerva S. Gray, Baybridge.
Miss Esther Swerlein, Dola.
Mrs. Nonnie B. Irwin, Goshen.
S. Albert Culbertson, New Athens.
Mrs. Marie L. Ruff, Thurman.
Mrs. Alice Marguerite Corder, Trinway.

OKLAHOMA

Mrs. Florence S. Campbell, Castle.
Mrs. Hettie O. Russell, Loco.

PENNSYLVANIA

Mrs. Ida L. German, Andreas.
Roy R. Miller, Berrysburg.
Miss Thelma B. Kelley, Brier Hill.
Mrs. Adeline Lobb, Brisbin.
Mrs. Margaret E. Dell, Broad Top.
George E. Myers, Cowansville.
Mrs. Elizabeth Claycomb, Imler.
William G. Phillips, Joffre.
Miss Ellen E. Malmberg, Kinzua.
Mrs. Gertrude M. Brown, Leckrone.
Lewis W. Cordell, Marion.
Mrs. Evalyn S. Gates, Mattawana.
Miles W. Miller, New Berlin.
Mrs. Florence D. Porter, Spring Creek.

PUERTO RICO

Miss Blanca Rosa Gomez, Las Marias.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Loyd H. Johnson, Gramling.
Howard H. Kemp, Jr., Pineville.

TENNESSEE

Mrs. Hazel S. Wheaton, Allardt.
Mrs. Myrtle Mae Atkinson, Grimsley.
Albert Keathley, New River.
Dorsie G. Bailey, Reagan.
Mrs. Eliza Cooper, Rickman.

TEXAS

Clovis W. Cummings, Ivanhoe.
Louis G. Harrell, Knott.

UTAH

Mrs. Grace E. Stokes, Cleveland.

VIRGINIA

Mrs. Lila M. Critcher, Beach.
Charles Clagett Wells, Matoaca.
Mrs. Mamie B. Keesee, Sycamore.

WASHINGTON

Harry S. Burlingham, Redondo.
Raymond D. Spurrell, Willapa.

WEST VIRGINIA

Miss Martha Jane Perry, Anjean.
Mrs. Cora B. Dearth, Bens Run.
Charles A. Cabell, Carbon.
Harry F. Jackson, Clothier.
Mrs. Lillian M. Brown, Dunlow.
Miss Doris R. Hood, Folsom.
Herbert G. Goddard, Laurel Creek.
W. Leslie Warden, Stanaford.
Mrs. Laura H. Coleman, Victor.

WISCONSIN

Mrs. Carolyn Stoxen, Bassett.
Mrs. Estelle H. Beck, Rolling Prairie.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 26, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. William Kailer Dunn, assistant pastor, St. Edward's Catholic Church, Baltimore, Md., offered the following prayer:

Almighty Father, the Members of this House are gathering to legislate for the welfare of their fellow men during anxious days in our national life. The supreme law given us by Thy Divine Son was one of love: "This is My commandment, that you love one another as I have loved you." Grant that this principle may guide the deliberations today. Help these lawmakers to see in every American citizen one of Thy creatures, watched over by Thee with a care and solicitude that numbers even the hairs of the head.

Into the hands of these Congressmen Thou hast delegated some of Thy care for precious human beings. May nothing selfish or evil prompt their decisions. Let them see the face of Thy Son reflected in the countenance of each employer and employee in this land. Let them receive from this House the same respect as would be given to Jesus Himself, for He once said:

As long as you did it to one of these, my least brethren, you did it to Me.

Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On June 23, 1947:

H. R. 1221. An act for the relief of Eva Bilobran; and

H. R. 3792. An act to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes.

On June 25, 1947:

H. R. 468. An act to amend section 115 of the Internal Revenue Code in respect of distributions by personal holding companies;

H. R. 1624. An act to authorize payment of allowances to three inspectors of the Metropolitan Police force for the use of their privately owned motor vehicles, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2368. An act to amend paragraph 8 of part VII, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to authorize an appropriation of $3,000,000 as a revolving fund in lieu of $1,500,000 now authorized, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2872. An act to amend further section 4 of the Public Debt Act of 1941, as amended and clarify its application, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3143. An act to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Paonia Federal reclamation project, Colorado;

H. R. 360. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Francis Eugene Hardin, a minor;

H. R. 651. An act for the relief of the estate of Rubert W. Alexander;

H. R. 888. An act for the relief of certain owners of land who suffered loss by fire in Lake Landing Township, Hyde County, N. C.;

H. R. 1065. An act for the relief of the estate of Thomas Gambacorto;

H. R. 1237. An act to regulate the marketing of economic poisons and devices, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2207. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands within the Shiloh National Military Park, Tenn., and for other purposes;

H. R. 2353. An act to authorize the patenting of certain public lands to the State of Montana or to the Board of County Commissioners of Hill County, Mont., for public-park purposes;

H. R. 2852. An act to provide for the addition of certain surplus Government lands to the Otter Creek recreational demonstration area, in the State of Kentucky;

H. R. 3151. An act to grant a certain water right and a certain parcel of land in Clark County, Nev., to the city of Las Vegas, Nev.;

H. R. 3197. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Mancos Water Conservancy District increasing the reimbursable construction cost obligation of the district to the United States for construction of the Mancos project and extending the repayment period;

H. J. Res. 188. Joint resolution authorizing the erection on public grounds in the city of Washington, D. C., of a memorial to the dead of the First Infantry Division, United States forces, World War II; and

H. J. Res. 210. Joint resolution to extend the time for the release, free of estate and gift tax, of certain powers, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 616. An act to authorize the creation of a game refuge in the Francis Marion National Forest in the State of South Carolina.

STRENGTHENING THE COMMON DEFENSE

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 260, Rept. No. 706), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 125) to strengthen the common defense and to meet industrial needs for tin by providing for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry, and all points of order against said joint resolution are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amend-

ments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXPORTATION OF CERTAIN COMMODITIES

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 261, Rept. No. 707), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3049) to continue in effect section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), as amended, relating to the exportation of certain commodities. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

PENSIONS TO SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR AND CIVIL WAR VETERANS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 262, Rept. No. 708), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 3961) to provide increases in the rates of pension payable to Spanish-American War and Civil War veterans and their dependents, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the bill shall be considered as having been read. No amendment shall be in order to the said bill. At the conclusion of the general debate, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

AMENDING SECTION 522 OF THE TARIFF ACT OF 1930

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3810) to amend section 522 of the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to clarify the procedure in ascertaining the value of foreign currency for customs purposes where there are dual or multiple exchange rates, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 522 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 31, sec. 372) is hereby amended by striking out in subdivision (b) the phrase "in subdivision (c)" and inserting in lieu thereof "in subdivisions (c) and (d)", by striking out the period at the end of the last sentence of subdivision (c) and adding "or from the last ascertainable transactions and quotations outside the United States in or for foreign exchange payable in United States currency or other currency", and by adding the following new subdivision;

"(d) Dual or multiple exchange rates: When there are on any day dual or multiple exchange rates, either in the New York market for exchange payable in the currency of a particular foreign country, or in that foreign country for exchange payable in the currency of the United States, or otherwise between the United States and that foreign country, the Federal Reserve Bank of New York may in its discretion ascertain or calculate, and certify to the Secretary of the Treasury, all or any of such rates for noon of such day and shall so ascertain or calculate and certify any other of such rates which the Secretary of the Treasury shall request. For the purpose set forth in subdivision (b), if more than one of such rates are so certified, the Secretary of the Treasury shall select from the rates certified, or shall otherwise determine, a single rate of conversion of each such currency for that day. The rate so selected or determined for the currency of a particular foreign country shall be as nearly representative as is practicable of the rate of exchange, or the combination of such rates, used most generally in effecting the transfer of payment for commodities exported from that foreign country to the United States or in converting into the currency of such foreign country such payment made in United States dollars or in the currency of any other country. The rate so selected or determined shall not be lower than the lowest, nor higher than the highest, rate certified for the currency of such foreign country for such date, and may differ from any rate certified or actually used in any transaction. If the date of exportation falls upon a Sunday or holiday, then the rate so selected or determined for the last preceding business day shall be used. If the proclaimed value referred to in subdivision (b) varies by 5 percent or more from any one of the dual or multiple rates certified for the same currency, the proclaimed value shall be disregarded, unless such proclaimed value varies by less than 5 percent from the rate selected or determined. In the latter case, conversion shall be made at the proclaimed value.

"(e) Exercise of authority through subordinates: The Secretary of the Treasury may exercise any authority or function conferred on him by this section through such employees of the Department of the Treasury as he shall designate."

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury, or such employees of the Department of the Treasury as he may designate for the purpose, may exercise the authority and functions vested in him by subdivision (d) of section 522 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by this act, in all cases where the Federal Reserve Bank of New York has heretofore certified or hereafter certifies more than one rate of exchange for the same currency for any date prior to the enactment of this act and no decision has been heretofore made by the Secretary of the Treasury or the Commissioner of Customs with respect to the value which should be used for conversion on liquidation.

SEC. 3. The selection or determination of a single rate pursuant to subdivision (d) of section 522 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by this Act, shall not be construed as a rule coming within the provisions of sections 2, 3, or 4 of the Administrative Procedure Act, Public Law 404, approved June 11, 1946.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include certain questions addressed to the Treasury Department and the reply from the General Counsel's office.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 3810 has the unanimous approval of the Ways and Means Committee and is strongly recommended by the Treasury Department.

For the past few years, due to unstable exchange rates, importers of merchandise have found it impossible to determine their costs.

Many of the countries of the world have set up systems of dual or multiple exchange rates, and both the United States Government and the importer have been at sea as to exactly what rates should be charged for customs purposes.

This situation has not only made it difficult for businessmen to close out transactions but has discouraged many of them from importing goods, since they could not be sure of their costs.

Many thousands of cases are awaiting settlement and more are piling up each day.

H. R. 3810 will provide a method by which our businessmen can reach a prompt settlement of their customs obligations with the Government.

The bill, in short, provides that where there are dual or multiple exchange rates, the Federal Reserve Bank of New York shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury what these rates are, and that if more than one of such rates are certified, the Secretary of the Treasury shall select from the rates certified a single rate of conversion of each such currency for customs purposes on that day.

The rate cannot be higher than the highest nor lower than the lowest certified to him by the bank.

This rate shall be as nearly representative as is practicable of the rate of exchange or the combination of such rates used most generally in effecting the transfer of payment for commodities exported from that foreign country to the United States.

It is contemplated that the rate used will be a commercially realistic rate.

These ratio-fixing functions will be performed by monetary and economic experts of the Treasury outside the customs service.

The first part of the bill gives authority to the Federal Reserve Bank of New York to determine rates from transactions in foreign exchange payable in United States currency outside the United States.

This is needed because there are occasions when foreign nations demand payments for goods in their own countries and there is no quotation for that currency on that day in the United States.

The third section exempts these determinations from sections 2, 3, and 4 of the Administrative Procedure Act. Under these sections rules issued by Government agencies, with a few exceptions, must be published in the Federal Register and there must be a delay of at least 30 days between publication of the rule and its effective date.

It is possible that a determination of rates by the Treasury Department under this bill might be considered rule-making withing the meaning of the Administrative Procedure Act, though this would not be within the spirit of the requirements of the act.

Compliance with the rule-making provisions of the act would entail a great amount of work, expense, and delay without any substantial benefit to the public.

Application of the Administrative Procedure Act requirements to all these rates would partially defeat the purpose of the bill by delaying the availability of the rates and would also create an unwarranted additional expense to the Government.

No diminution in the protection of interested persons is foreseen since the right to judicial review is available to them under section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930. If the Secretary of the Treasury abuses his discretion or does not abide by the formula set out for him by Congress, the importer may protest the action of the Collector of Customs in applying the disputed rate and thereby obtain review by the United States Customs Court.

This bill should have the support of all those who import merchandise, for when it becomes law both the Government and the importer will know where they stand.

The need for prompt passage of this legislation is apparent.

I include as a portion of these remarks certain questions addressed to the Treasury Department and the reply from the general counsel's office:

1. Do the provisions of this bill permit the Secretary of the Treasury or an employee, such as the Commissioner of Customs, by selecting a certain rate of exchange, to alter the basis of ad valorem duties to a marked degree?

It is neither the effect nor the intent of the bill H. R. 3810 to permit the Secretary of the Treasury or an employee, such as the Commissioner of Customs, by selecting a certain rate of exchange, to alter the basis of ad valorem duties, any more than the determination and certification of a single rate for the currency of a foreign country by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York may now be said to alter the basis of ad valorem duties under the present section 522 of the Tariff Act of 1930. It is not the intent of the bill to have the Commissioner of Customs select or determine the rate to be used where multiple rates exist and are certified. On the contrary, the intent, as spelled out by the Treasury Department in submitting the bill to the Congress, is to have the determination or selection of the rate to be used performed in the Treasury Department by monetary and economic experts outside the Customs Service, and those experts will consult with representatives of other interested agencies of the Government. Furthermore, the effect and the intent of the bill is to establish a standard under which the rate determined or selected for the currency of a particular foreign country shall be as nearly representative as is practicable of the rate of exchange, or the combination of such rates, used most generally in effecting the transfer of payment for commodities exported from that foreign country to the United States or in converting into the currency of such foreign country such payment made in United States dollars or in the currency of any other country. The single rate to be used cannot be higher than the highest, nor lower than the lowest, rate certified by the Federal Reserve Bank. It is thus contemplated by the bill that the rate used will be a commercially realistic rate, so far as such rate exists or can be determined from rates used in connection with the preponderance of imports to the United States from the foreign country during the period for which a rate is required. Under the mandatory provisions of the bill the standard must be applied so that the single rate applicable for the purposes of assessing ad valorem duties will be that rate which most closely corresponds to the value in our own money of the commodities imported from the foreign country, thus adhering as closely as may be to the basis for ad valorem duties established by the tariff act schedules.

2. Do the provisions of H. R. 3810 extend backward so as to permit a rate of exchange to be set for prewar years which could not have been set at that time, on the basis of which importations made a long time ago would be appraised on a markedly different basis than possible at the time of importation?

In applying the retroactive provisions of the bill to the determination or selection of a single rate for the currencies of foreign countries for which currencies more than one rate existed before the recent war, the bill imposes the same standards to assure the selection or determination of a single rate which shall represent as nearly as is practicable the rate or combination of rates used most generally in effecting the transfer of payment for commodities as the standard applicable to future cases. It is thus equally required under the bill as to currencies for which dual or multiple rates existed in the prewar period that the rate selected or determined be a commercially realistic rate, so far as practicable, as of the period for which the rate is applicable. Thus, duties on importations made in prewar years would be assessed on the basis of commercial and currency exchange conditions existing at the time of shipment of the goods, just as future importations would be handled under the bill on the basis of conditions in existence for the date for which the selections or determinations are to be made. For each country a single rate for the date of shipment, past or future, would be determined.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include editorials and other material.

ECONOMIC AID TO EUROPE

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, on the eve of the Big Three Conference in Paris, Moscow has informed us through Pravda that the conditions which the United States will place on our economic aid to Europe under the so-called Marshall plan will determine its failure or success. Pravda asserted that if such conditions were copied after the Greek-Turkish sample the proposal would fail.

The United States will not permit Moscow to dictate the conditions under which we extend aid to western Europe. I hope the conditions not only will be copied after the Greek-Turkish sample but will be even more stringent. If it requires $25,000,000,000 over the next 4 or 5 years to stabilize the economies of the war-devastated countries and to win the peace, it will be far cheaper in the end than fighting another war. It will be money invested for the security of our country.

The spending of American money must at least accomplish the following purposes:

First. The economic rehabilitation of war-devastated countries to stop them from becoming Communistic.

Second. Prevent the spread of communism which has been taking place by puppet governments directed from Moscow, by infiltration, by external pressures, and by other methods.

Third. Halt aggression by the Soviet Union and check the march of totalitarian Russia toward world domination.

I shall not vote to spend American money abroad under the Marshall plan or any other plan unless conditions are laid down to accomplish the purposes I have set forth.

SHOWING OF FILMS DEPICTING PRESENT LIVING CONDITIONS IN GERMANY

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD. Mr. Speaker, it is the request of some of my constituents that I extend an invitation to the first showing of a color film depicting the present living conditions in Germany.

These pictures will be shown at 4 o'clock this afternoon, June 26, on the fifth floor of the National Archives Building, Eighth and Pennsylvania Avenue, NW.

These pictures were taken by professional photographers under the direction of Mr. O. R. Hauser, the national president of the American Relief for Germany. Mr. Hauser has just returned from Europe after making a survey of economic and social conditions, and will be present at the showing of the film to answer questions and to give his views on this subject.

You and any of your friends interested in the subject treated in this moving picture, are cordially invited to attend.

Mr. Speaker, discussing the legislation providing for membership and participation by the United States in the International Refugee Organization, I wish to point out that the Constitution of the International Refugee Organization excludes certain German people from receiving relief.

In my opinion, such a provision is highly discriminatory, and one which does not fulfill the obligations of the United States to aid the war-ravaged countries of Europe. Many German people were the victims of Nazi aggression to the same extent that the people of France, Greece and other countries were ravaged by Hitler. It has been declared by responsible leaders of the United States that a destitute and prostrate country is ripe for the influx of Communism. If this is true, then refusal to aid Germany is an open invitation to convert that country to a way of life not compatible with our system of free enterprise.

The time may come, if it is not already close at hand, when we, the people, might welcome gladly a vanquished foe as an ally in an effort to stamp out and crush the venemous attacks of subversive elements upon the governmental structure of this Nation.

America has always stood for fair play. Our social conscience is highly sensitive. We should not, and we cannot, back down from this heritage now. Brutally kicking one when down and helpless is not my idea of fair play. Feeding one dog in a kennel and kicking away another is no way to promote peace in the kennel. Similarly, feeding one group and starving another is no way to promote international peace. It is my interpretation, that part II, section 4, of the Constitution of the International Refugee Organization, does exactly that.

An amendment to House Joint Resolution 139, which will preclude the United States from participating in the International Refugee Organization unless aid is also extended to Germany, must be introduced. I wish to state that I will support such an amendment.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GRANT of Indiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two short editorials.

Mr. MACY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some remarks he made at New York Tuesday evening.

Mr. SPRINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech he made today.

EXPORTATION OF OIL

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a House concurrent resolution providing that it is the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States, exercising the powers granted to him under section 6 (a) of the act of July 2, 1940—Fifty-four Statutes, page 714—as amended, immediately issue a proclamation prohibiting the exportation of all petroleum and petroleum products from the continental limits of the United States or its possessions.

Mr. Speaker, the House should take immediate action on this resolution. Members are well aware of the fact that we have an oil shortage in America. It is so critical that the Standard Oil Co. has announced it will ration its gasoline supplies this summer in the Midwest. Secretary of the Navy Forrestal, yesterday, warned that the United States is "almost a have-not Nation in oil." We are likely to not have enough oil to heat our homes this fall.

We continue to ship petroleum and petroleum supplies to Russia and other countries in spite of this emergency.

While the Office of International Trade in the Department of Commerce has announced it will reinstate export licensing on petroleum products June 30, tankers are being loaded at west coast points for oil shipments abroad in the meantime.

The people of America are greatly disturbed, and I believe that the Congress should act now. Before the day is over, I am going to ask unanimous consent to take up my resolution, which follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)—

Whereas there is at present an oil shortage in the United States; and

Whereas, because of this shortage, the armed services have been forced to curtail aviation operations; and

Whereas the armed forces may be forced to curtail many other naval and military operations; and

Whereas the possibility of gasoline rationing is now pending; and

Whereas certain large shipments of petroleum products are now being loaded for shipment to Russia and other countries; and

Whereas the armed forces of the United States are entitled to the petroleum production of this country in preference to all other nations; and

Whereas under section 6 (a) of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), as amended, the President is authorized to prohibit or curtail the exportation of any articles, materials, or supplies whenever the President determines that it is necessary in the interests of national defense: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States exercising the powers granted to him under section 6 (a) of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), as amended, immediately issue a proclamation prohibiting the exportation of all petroleum or petroleum products from the continental limits of the United States or its possessions.

SYNTHETIC RUBBER

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I think the people of this country who use rubber products, and that includes every automobile driver in the United States, should be concerned about two propositions. One is that too many members of the rubber industry of this country take the position that they are no longer interested in using synthetic rubber. In that manner they take the position that the synthetic rubber industry in this country should be permitted to die and go out of business. Second, this attitude on the part of those short-sighted manufacturers is due to the fact that, since the Government dropped the control of rubber as its main purchaser, raw rubber prices have dropped from 25 cents per pound to 14 cents a pound, and as usual, too many of our so-called long-headed business men take the position that when a product reaches a low price we should then become dependent upon some foreign country for our supplies. In my opinion, it would be a tragedy and poor business and poor defense for us to close the synthetic rubber industry of this country and have it go out of business, and again depend upon other countries for our rubber.

Mr. SHAFER. If the gentleman will yield, my subcommittee is going to start hearings on that next week.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to take this time to congratulate the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] and other leaders and Members on the Democratic side of the House for the persistent manner in which they have insisted upon the payment of terminal-leave bonds. Their persistence has produced results.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that most Members of the House were pleased yesterday when the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BLACKNEY] announced that the Subcommittee on Pay and Administration of the Committee on Armed Services was beginning hearings on the matter of the cash payment of terminal-leave bonds. This offers an opportunity not only to discharge an obligation to our former enlisted men, but also to reduce the national debt and to save the Government money in the form of interest on these bonds. On the opening day of this session of Congress the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] introduced a bill making provision for the cash payment of terminal-leave bonds held by veterans who served as enlisted men during World War II. I am pleased to state that I was the third Member of the House to sign the discharge petition to bring this measure out of committee. I join my friend from California in insisting that this bill be brought to the floor and passed so that these bonds may be cashed before the end of this session of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, our veterans who served as enlisted men in World War II are entitled to this legislation. Terminal leave for officers was paid in cash. Why should not enlisted men also have their terminal leave paid in money rather than in bonds? Many of our enlisted men served in the war at a base pay of $21 per month. The pay of private was not raised to $50 per month until after the war had already started. When the war was over, the Congress saw fit to raise the pay of enlisted men 50 percent. Everybody was in favor of this legislation, but why are

those who faced the enemy not also entitled to consideration? I, for one, am going to insist that they be given equal consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I desire also to say a word about pending legislation for our Spanish-American War veterans and our veterans of World War I. Today we find that the veterans of the Spanish-American War and the Philippine Insurrection are receiving pensions entirely inadequate in this age of rising prices. Let us hope that this session of Congress will see fit to adopt H. R. 3516 or H. R. 3961 and increase these pensions. These Spanish-American War veterans are fast becoming the senior veterans of our armed forces. Most of our Civil War veterans have passed on. As a veteran of World War II, I think I join all my comrades in the hope that these great patriots whom we all respect and admire so much will receive this little assistance from our Government.

Our World War I veterans are certainly entitled to improved legislation in the field of disability and dependency benefits. I hope, therefore, the House will see fit to call up and pass H. R. 26, which was designed for this purpose. There is a dire need for such legislation. The time to act is now.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, I address myself to what appears to me to be the bewildering policy of the Government in the purchase of food for foreign relief.

Apparently it is the American policy to export foods that are high-priced because of domestic shortage in preference to foods that are low-priced because of domestic surplus.

Some time ago, I wrote the Secretary of Agriculture suggesting the purchase of second- and third-grade poultry. For many reasons, one would think the Department would welcome this suggestion. During the war, under Government pressure, poultry production was enormously expanded. Today, however, the poultry market is depressed. One of the principal factors in this condition is the enormous supply of second- and third-grade poultry now in storages.

Such poultry is entirely fit for human consumption and under normal conditions has a ready domestic market. But at the present time the farmers' inability to dispose of this surplus is seriously affecting the market in all grades of poultry.

Since it is palatable food which can be purchased cheaply to the great relief of a depressed market, I was confident the Department of Agriculture would give serious consideration to my proposal, but on May 1, the Under Secretary of Agriculture wrote me that large supplies of poultry could not be purchased because of the great shortage of refrigerated boats and refrigerated facilities at docks and at inland points of consumption.

I immediately wrote the Under Secretary directing his attention to the prodigious surplus of canned poultry which acts as a depressant upon the entire poultry market. I told him of one farmer's cooperative in my district which has on hand 250,000 cases of canned chicken and turkey which it cannot sell. During the war, this cooperative was encouraged by the Government to can every pound of chicken and turkey available. It increased its canning facilities about four times its original capacity. The domestic market for canned poultry disappeared overnight as soon as fresh-dressed poultry became available. As a result, poultry canners have a large inventory of canned chicken and turkey, and also a tremendous supply of undergrade poultry which ordinarily would be used for canning.

On May 22 the Under Secretary wrote me:

> There has been no interest shown on the part of foreign nations in either canned or frozen poultry.

He spoke, however, of the interest of foreign nations in frozen beef.

Mr. Speaker, everybody knows that American beef supply is not sufficient to meet domestic demands. The resulting high prices for beef contributes substantially to the existing high cost of living. Some days ago meat packers claimed that the recent sharp advance in the price of beef was caused by foreign purchases.

I cannot understand why it is that there is refrigeration for the export of beef, but none for the export of poultry.

I cannot understand why beef, the supply of which is so short, should be exported in refrigerated boats when canned poultry, the supply of which is so large, should not be purchased in quantity for foreign relief.

Our aid to the hungry abroad should not require us to keep them in style. We should not hand out a menu for a-la-carte orders, regardless of the supply in our own larder.

Mr. Speaker, I represent the second largest apple-producing area in the country. In 1946 Virginia's apple production was 13,680,000 bushels, most of which was grown in my district. As a complement to this great agricultural industry, there has grown up a large manufacturing industry which cans apple byproducts. Canned apple byproducts are sold on the domestic market and their manufacture furnishes employment to many thousand men and women. This spring there was a surplus of canned apples and apple sauce, both of which are wholesome and cheap foods. I was not able to interest Government authorities in the purchase of any of this surplus for foreign relief. Neither does the Department appear to be interested in the purchase of green beans, potatoes, or fruit juices, of which large supplies are held by farmer organizations.

Earlier this month I wrote Under Secretary Dodd that the policy of the Department was not understood by the food purchasers, and if good reason existed for the failure to buy surplus foods, it should be explained to the American farmer. I have received no answer to this request for explanation.

The policy of purchasing foods in which a domestic shortage exists, to the exclusion of surplus products, hits the American people four blows with one swing of the club. It increases the cost to the taxpayer; it reduces the amount of food to the needy; it decreases the supply and increases the price of food to the consumer; it does nothing to solve the problem of the farmer in disposing of his surplus stock.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

TERMINAL-LEAVE BONDS

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, this morning I appeared before the Armed Services Committee and made a statement in support of my bill H. R. 219, an amendment to the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to permit cash settlement for terminal-leave pay authorized by that act. At this time I want to present to the House the substance of my testimony before that committee.

Several bills of a similar nature have been introduced and are now pending before the Armed Services Committee. Indeed, a number of them, including my own, were introduced on the first day of the Eightieth Congress. Of course, I would be very happy to have my own bill enacted into law, but my primary purpose is to urge favorable action on this important matter regardless of whose name appears as the author of the bill.

I am extremely anxious that the veterans who served as enlisted men in our armed forces have the privilege of turning their terminal leave bonds into cash at their option and that those who have not yet applied for their terminal leave pay may have the opportunity to decide whether their pay will be in cash or in bonds.

The Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 was introduced and passed the House in a form which would have authorized cash payment. However, as you know, another body would not agree to cash payment and the House conferees had to compromise on that point. In its present form the act still discriminates against the enlisted men of the armed forces since it does not entrust them with the cash in payment for unused leave. Officers, on the other hand, received cash payment for accrued leave upon the termination of their active tours of duty. Enlisted men must wait 5 years until their nonnegotiable bonds mature before they may realize cash payment for the time they served their country.

The continuation of this act in its present form is just a continuation, to a smaller degree of course, of the discrim-

ination against enlisted men which existed before the measure was enacted. Before its enactment, the officers received terminal leave pay in cash; the enlisted men received nothing. Now, the officers receive their terminal leave pay in cash at the termination of their service, but the enlisted men must wait 5 years for theirs.

The enlisted men have borne the brunt of the war. They have endured more and they have suffered more. They have paid the heaviest price. In many instances they served their country at a greater sacrifice than did the officers. It is inconceivable that the mere fact of rank should entitle an officer to this monetary privilege beyond the advantage which he already enjoys with respect to his salary. This is grossly unjust, and I trust that we shall not hesitate to make a readjustment by passing one of these proposed amendments to the Armed Forces Leave Act.

Many of our veterans are trying to build homes and establish businesses and they need every penny they can scrape together at this time. It is high time that we give them the opportunity to cash their terminal leave bonds.

To illustrate, I quote from a letter I recently received from a veteran who, like many other veterans throughout the country, was trying to build a home:

I am in a spot and really need $150. I have my leave bond but it will not do me any good. I will even tell you why. My house will be finished in just a few weeks and if I have not the $150 for the closing fees such as taxes and insurance the house will have to go to someone else. So please try to get me a special permit to cash my bond. Please, if you ever do anything for our sake.

Mr. Speaker, I have received many letters of a similar nature and I am sure that every member of the House has received letters of the same type. In the face of rising living costs, our veterans, many of them, must have some ready cash or, as in the case of the veteran whose letter I have just quoted, must run the risk of losing their homes, or their businesses, in which they already have invested much money.

One of the finest benefits the Congress has accorded the veterans of World War II is the educational program under the GI bill of rights. The Veterans' Administration informed me this morning that under that program, 1,692,042 veterans, both men and women, are in school and 612,583 are engaged in on-the-job training. The full-time students are having a pretty difficult time stretching their subsistence allowance to cover the present cost of living, particularly those students who have families. I know that thousands of our GI students would welcome the opportunity to cash their terminal leave bonds. And in many cases, I am sure, it would save them from the necessity of dropping out of school.

Another great host of veterans who deserve our eternal gratitude and every consideration a grateful American people can give them are the 231,476 disabled veterans who are preparing themselves for lives of usefulness under the vocational rehabilitation program. Many of these men have families and dependents and should have the opportunity to cash their terminal leave bonds at this time.

I can think of no reasonable justification for further delay in this important matter.

Even the most economy-minded members should give serious thought to this amendment, for it affords an opportunity to reduce the national debt. This point is clearly pointed out by the Greenville (S. C.) News in a recent editorial, in which it is stated that—

These bonds are now a part of the national debt, and payment of them will reduce the debt by that much. There is apparently general agreement on the principle of applying a surplus to debt reduction; and even by Mr. Truman's budget a surplus of a billion or so is expected in the coming fiscal year.

How can either Congress or the administration, therefore, object to using this surplus to pay on that part of the debt which is represented by such holders of these terminal leave bonds as may desire to receive cash now instead of waiting 5 years for the bonds to mature.

Will the President still contend that it is inflationary to pay these bonds now; and if so, how will such a claim stack up with the argument that the way to get the country on a sounder financial and economic basis is to make all possible speed in paying off the debt?

Many letters, petitions, and resolutions have been received by me and other Members of the House in support of the proposal under consideration.

On April 7, 1947, I received a copy of the following concurrent resolution adopted by the South Carolina General Assembly:

Whereas the National Congress of the United States of America by legislation duly passed, issued to enlisted men of World War II terminal pay nontransferable bonds for their services as rendered; and

Whereas these veterans in the United States could more acceptably use such pay in the readjustment periods in so many ways; and

Whereas there is now pending in the National Congress a number of bills to make immediate cash payment of these terminal-pay bonds to the veterans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the General Assembly of South Carolina hereby requests the National Congress of the United States to give as early attention as is practicable to the payment of the terminal-pay bonds heretofore issued to veterans of World War II; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Members of the National Congress from South Carolina urging immediate attention and assistance with this pending legislation; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution also be sent to the President of the Senate of the United States and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the legislative committee of the American Legion and to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, all in Washington, D. C.

I commend the attitude of our Republican friends, constituting, as they do, the majority in both Houses of Congress, for their announced willingness to cooperate in amending the law so as to provide for cash payment of the veterans' bonds.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLATNIK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include editorials.

Mr. DEANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

H. R. 1639

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to file minority views on the bill H. R. 1639.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

RENT-CONTROL BILL

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, it is, indeed, the job of this Congress to promote the general welfare of the American people, as has been so beautifully expressed in this morning's prayer.

The rent bill—the so-called rent bill, which cannot control rents—was not written in such a way that it will promote the welfare of 15,000,000 renting families in America.

I want to inform the Members of the House that in my district, which is a good cross section of what you are going to find in renting districts throughout the country, already dozens and dozens and dozens of letters are coming in that would break your heart about old people who have nowhere to go to get any more money and who have already been informed that on July 1 their rent will be raised—not the 10 percent that we heard about here, not the 15 percent, but anywhere from 40 to 75 to 100 percent. The phony rent-control bill passed by Congress, which is rent control in name only, will cause hardship and misery from one end of the country to the other.

I hope the President vetoes this phony rent-control bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD with reference to cashing terminal-leave bonds.

IDENTIFICATION CARDS FOR MEMBERS AND OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 251 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows.

Resolved, That the Committee on House Administration is hereby authorized and directed to make available, as soon as practicable after the start of each new Congress,

to every Member of the House of Representatives, Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, Doorkeeper, Postmaster, Chaplain, Parliamentarian, an identification card of a size suitable for carrying in a billfold. Such identification card shall contain a photographic likeness of the Member or named officer and such information as may be deemed appropriate for the purpose of identifying such Member or named officer.

SEC. 2. The cards furnished to Members of the House of Representatives and named officers pursuant to section 1 are to be furnished solely for their convenience, and nothing in this resolution shall be held to place a duty upon any Member of the House of Representatives or named officer to carry or to use any such card.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAVING GASOLINE BY THE TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE RIVER SLACK-WATER ROUTE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] I desire to say that next week when the civil functions bill comes before the House I shall offer an amendment which will, if adopted, in the future save untold millions of dollars worth of gasoline. That is an amendment providing for a slack-water route up the Tombigbee to the Tennessee River and a downstream route to Cairo, Ill.

Let me show you what that means. I have a photograph on my wall of a 14,000-ton barge coming down the Ohio River from Pittsburgh, Pa. That barge returning from Mobile, Ala., to Paducah, Ky., would save more than $22,000 worth of gasoline. Returning to Cairo, Ill., it would save more than $20,000. I have a photograph of a barge coming down from Michigan loaded with automobiles. That barge returning from Mobile to Cairo, Ill., by this short water route would save more than $20,000 in fuel alone at the present price. So if you want to save gasoline vote for my amendment next week to begin construction immediately on the Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TRANSMITTING REPORT FROM THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL (H. DOC. NO. 365)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

On March 8, 1946, I sent to the Congress a report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems describing the operations of the Council during the preceding 6 months in coordinating the foreign financial activities of the Government.

On January 13, 1947, I sent to the Congress a National Advisory Council Report on Participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development to October 31, 1946.

I have now received from the National Advisory Council a report covering its operations from February 28, 1946, to March 31, 1947, and describing, in accordance with section 4 (b)(5) of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, the participation of the United States in the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank from October 31, 1946, to March 31, 1947.

The report is attached hereto.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 26, 1947.*

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

WELCOME TO GENERAL EISENHOWER AS PRESIDENT OF COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome to the Twenty-first Congressional District of New York General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower who has accepted the presidency of Columbia University, which is in the district I have the honor to represent.

The people of the district are very happy over this appointment. They consider it a great honor and privilege that the victor in the Battle of Europe should come into our district to head one of the greatest institutions of learning in the world. We will try to make him comfortable in the twenty-first, and we will try to make him very happy. The general's view of the Hudson River and the Palisades which is truly magnificent as seen from our district will, we believe, make him feel that New York can be very beautiful, homelike, and a real rest from the labors of war while he undertakes the arts of peace.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of June 25, entitled "Columbia's New President."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The editorial referred to follows:

COLUMBIA'S NEW PRESIDENT

The gain for this community in having General Eisenhower as one of its citizens, standing in a position of eminence and influence, is so great that one is tempted to ignore any issue of special fitness for his new responsibilities. He has demonstrated the highest talents as a leader of men. His sure sense of executive direction was felt hour by hour in the most critical days of the late war. His rank as first citizen needs neither citations nor medals to affirm it.

It is therefore in a spirit of warm appreciation that New Yorkers will cheer the general's decision to accept the presidency of Columbia University. In every activity whereby that great institution can influence the culture and welfare of the city there will be complete confidence in the general's understanding and good sense. Similarly, in all the manifold contacts which the head of Columbia inescapably has with the life of the town, there will be the finest example of patriotism and the truest words of courage. The gains that are certain to accrue to the city are very great, indeed.

The task which confronted the trustees of Columbia was obviously a difficult one. The very eminence of Dr. Butler through so many years made the search for his successor an uphill undertaking. Fortunately for the well-being of the university as a seat of learning, it possessed in Dr. Fackenthal an able and accomplished aide who has bridged the gap with distinction and upon whom General Eisenhower can lean with every confidence. It is good to know that the trustees understand the importance of Dr. Fackenthal's services.

There will inevitably be regrets that the trustees were unable to find a scholar of the first rank qualified for the post. Plainly, in turning to General Eisenhower, they elected to subordinate the question of learning, of the skills in education, to the more practical issues of administration and, in a broad sense, leadership. It can be argued that the present era of confusion calls for just the stalwart virtues which the general exemplifies in excelsis. No doubt such considerations weighed heavily in the minds of the trustees. The regrets will remain.

These are, however, problems domestic to Columbia. A powerful hand is undoubtedly needed in this old institution, full of entrenchments and rivalries. There can be no question of the strength of General Ike. It will be interesting to all the experts to watch his assumption of an educational high command. Whatever the problems raised on Morningside Heights, the gain to the community by his presence is certain and beyond price. He will have the finest of the city's welcomes when he arrives next year.

EXTENDING CERTAIN POWERS OF THE PRESIDENT UNDER TITLE 3 OF THE SECOND WAR POWERS ACT

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the unanimous consent secured on yesterday by the leadership I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3647, to extend certain powers of the President under title 3 of the Second War Powers Act.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3647, extending certain powers of the President under title 3 of the Second War Powers Act, with Mr. COLE of Missouri in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, under unanimous consent granted yesterday there is 1 hour for general debate, 30 minutes of that time to be controlled by this side and 30 minutes by the other side, if it is so desired. The bill will then be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. Any germane amendments will be in order at that time.

We want to expedite consideration of this bill as much as possible for the reason that these war powers cease on

Monday next, the 30th of June; therefore it is essential, if there is to be any extension at all, that we act at once. I am informed the Senate is taking this matter up today. It is hoped that the two bills, the House and Senate bills, will be in a position where they can go to informal conference this evening, so that we may pass some type of legislation promptly.

I may say further that this bill has been handled by Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary. Extensive hearings have been held over a period of weeks and months. The last bill was introduced on May 28 and has the approval of all of the agencies of Government asking for continuation of these powers. It has the unanimous approval of the Committee on the Judiciary.

I do not expect to take all of the time unless the House wants to discuss the matter further.

I now yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER], chairman of the subcommittee that conducted all of the hearings and who is familiar with the bill in every detail. He has done a laborious and a grand job. He is entitled to the thanks of the House and the country.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, as will be recalled, in March we presented a measure for the extension of the Second War Powers Act and by approval of the committee and by the House this act was extended until June 30, 1947, which is next Monday, when all of these powers will be eliminated unless action is taken promptly. The distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], has stated that fact, and that is the reason we are hurried in order to get some action, if any action is necessary. I presume all of the Members have read the bill which is now before the committee.

Mr. Chairman, starting with the different articles which are embraced in the bill and upon which, and over which, some control is continued, I will start at that point and will go through these various sections of the bill. If anyone has any questions they desire to ask as we go through these various sections I will be very happy to answer the questions if I can.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I would like to ask the gentleman a question or two about the elimination on page 3 of manila or abaca fiber and cordage and agave fiber cordage. I have read the report and on page 3 there is a statement that while the representatives of the Department of Commerce wish to continue the control over this very strategic material, and it is a very short material, in short supply, many of the manufacturers do not wish to continue control. I have in my own district one of the largest manufacturers of cordage and manila rope in America, or in the world, for that matter, and they have written me urging the continuance of these controls. I would like to have the gentleman explain, if possible, just what the testimony was before the committee, because I am unable to get a printed copy of the hearings.

Mr. SPRINGER. I am very happy that the gentleman asks that question, and if he will wait until I explain the first subdivision, which relates to tin and tin products, which immediately precedes that to which he refers, then I will give him the testimony and what the hearings disclose on the question of fiber and cordage.

Under No. 1, tin and tin products were in the bill which was extended to June 30. We had very extensive hearings on that question. After we had completed the hearings, may I say to the members of the committee, the heads of the departments interested, and those interested in the production of tin and the handling of that particular commodity met and agreed that tin and tin products should be continued in this extension, and they wrote the amendment which is now included in italics in the bill. The provision with reference to tin and tin products reads as follows:

Tin and tin products, except for the purpose of exercising import control of tin ores and tin concentrates—

That is the amendment that was universally agreed upon by the processors and producers and by the department heads in our own Government.

If there are no other questions on that matter, we will go to the next section, which is No. 2, and which relates to hard fibers. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio that we heard quite a lot of testimony on this question of fibers and cordage. Mr. Dobbs, from the Department of Agriculture testified at great length on that question.

The evidence disclosed this, that the present production of fiber, binder twine, baler twine and cordage has been practically completed; that is, as you know, produced during the winter months preparatory to the harvest and baling season during the summer. The evidence disclosed that the binder twine and the baler twine which is to be used during the present harvest season and the present year has already been produced, and that if hard fibers and cordage was continued under control it could and would relate only to the production of this commodity this coming winter for use next summer in the harvesting and baling season. For that particular reason the subcommittee came to the unanimous conclusion that it was unnecessary to continue that control with respect to that particular item.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I am informed that there is now a world shortage of these fibers, and that that shortage will continue for at least 5 years, and that in order to protect the proper production of the twine and rope that is manufactured in this country, and which is very necessary to industry as well as to agriculture, that these controls should be continued so that it would be beneficial. I wonder what the testimony from the witnesses has been on that subject?

Mr. SPRINGER. The testimony, answering that part of the question submitted, which was presented to the subcommittee indicated that there was no present shortage. There is ample baler twine and binder twine and cordage at the moment.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I ask one other question and I will conclude? I understand that the bill in the other body does contain and carry this particular item.

Mr. SPRINGER. I think perhaps the gentleman is correct in that respect. The Senate bill contains that particular provision, I have been advised.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If the Senate, which is acting today, as I am advised, should enact a bill with this clause in the measure, the matter would go to conference, and the Committee of Conference would have another opportunity, that is, the Members of the House and the Senate on that committee, at least, to give further consideration to the question as to whether or not this fiber should be included.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is entirely correct. That would be the procedure which would be followed.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And if the gentleman is on that committee, may I express the hope that they will review their action on this matter and give it full attention and every consideration.

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota, a member of the committee.

Mr. DEVITT. May I ask the gentleman this question? Is it not true that the evidence disclosed that an agent for a trade association of cordage manufacturers appeared before the committee, and he said that he represented all of the cordage people in the country with the exception of a factory in Ohio—the Hoeven Co.? When he spoke for all of the industry in this country, with this one exception, he gave as the opinion of the industry that there was going to be an ample supply of this hard fiber, and he recommended to the committee that the controls be taken off.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is entirely correct. In addition to his testimony, we had the testimony of the departments of Government. While they made no recommendation, they indicated that there is an ample supply for this particular season. They also admitted that the twine for harvesting and for baling purposes has already been produced and is now available for use.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to my very good friend.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I presume that if this bill goes to conference and that item is one of the matters of difference between the House and the Senate full consideration will be given to any testimony the Senate may have taken as well as any testimony the House has taken?

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is entirely correct. If and when this bill goes to conference, everything will be taken into consideration by the conferees, and a fair and equitable determination of the question will be made.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I have full confidence in the makeup of the subcommittee.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Did the representatives of the cordage industry appear before you in connection with manila, abaca, and rope, and were they not unanimous as to terminating these controls on manila fiber?

Mr. SPRINGER. They were unanimous in their opinion upon that question.

Mr. STEFAN. The committee was also unanimous as to the termination of controls on manila fiber?

Mr. SPRINGER. The committee was unanimous and made a unanimous report terminating the controls on the fiber and cordage.

Mr. STEFAN. Is the gentleman familiar with the Senate bill on that subject? Is that also carried out in the Senate bill?

Mr. SPRINGER. As I recall, it is in the exact language provided in subparagraph (2) on page 3 of the bill now before this committee, except in the Senate measure hard fiber and cordage is retained—while in the House measure it was stricken.

Mr. STEFAN. So there is unanimity as far as the elimination of controls on cordage and fiber is concerned?

Mr. SPRINGER. With that exception, it is.

Mr. STEFAN. That is on the part of the House and also on the part of the Senate?

Mr. SPRINGER. With the variance I have indicated, you are correct.

Mr. STEFAN. The Senate bill is the same as you have it in your bill?

Mr. SPRINGER. It is stricken from our bill, and the Senate bill contains it.

Mr. MICHENER. As a matter of fact, the Senate bill, which it is taking up today, contains the controls on this particular item, and this bill eliminates them.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is entirely correct, may I say to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. MICHENER. Is it not a fact that Mr. Dodd, of the Department of Agriculture, appeared because he was asked to appear in connection with this matter, when the bill was up in March, and then he appeared again just recently. On this occasion he said he did not see the necessity for the continuance, but it was a matter of policy for the Congress to determine and he did not want to recommend a matter of policy.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman from Michigan is entirely correct. That was the statement of Mr. Dodd, who testified before the subcommittee who heard the evidence on this question.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SHAFER. I have been assured by the gentleman and the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary that under this bill the Export Control Act, which operates under the Defense Act of July 2, 1940, is fully protected, and that the controls under that act will be extended under your bill.

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes. May I ask the gentleman if he will defer that question for a few moments until I reach that section of the bill. Then I will explain it, and if the gentleman has any questions at that time I shall be glad to answer them.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It seems to me we face this practical situation, that at the moment there is no shortage of these fibers and cordage. That is number one. That is very fundamental. Second, the Philippines in particular, where the fine quality is produced, are now coming back into production to supply the world with its requirements.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is right. The evidence disclosed that fact to us at the hearing before the subcommittee.

Mr. CRAWFORD. We have here the Government agencies saying there is no longer any necessity for Government controls and the Government's interfering with business operations. It seems to me the only conclusion we can come to is to strike out the language in lines 14 and 15 which the committee has struck out. I think the committee acted wisely in that respect.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say to the gentleman from Michigan that at the very outset of the hearings the statement was made by the chairman of the full Committee on the Judiciary and by myself as chairman of Subcommittee No. 4 that unless these departments showed by a preponderance of the evidence that the controls were absolutely necessary to be continued they were going to be discontinued and decontrolled.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Our party is on record with the public of this country that we will remove these controls when they are no longer necessary.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION. As I understand the committee report and the testimony I heard on the subject, this is the season of the year when there is the greatest demand for cord and cordage, and there will not be such a demand until next year, when the crop season comes on.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is entirely correct in that statement.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to my friend from Michigan, Mr. SHAFER.

Mr. SHAFER. As was stated by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD], the Republican Party is on record to discontinue the controls as quickly as possible. But what are you going to do in a case where we are furnishing millions of dollars to the nations of the world to bid up our products and at the same time we pass an act that will not control the shipments of exports out of the country at the prices that they will pay with our money? For instance, as Russia is doing today—paying a premium of 37 cents a barrel for our oil and, as a result, oil is going out of the country in great cargoes unless we extend export controls.

Mr. SPRINGER. If the gentleman will defer that matter until I come to that section, which is section 6, I will explain that fully, and I think we are going to satisfy him and the committee on that question insofar as this measure is concerned.

Mr. SHAFER. I make my observation in order to make my position clear—that I am for the discontinuance of controls, but I am convinced, on the basis of testimony that we have heard in the House Committee on Armed Services, that many of these controls or some of these controls must be continued, whether we like it or not.

Mr. SPRINGER. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MICHENER. There is a difference between extending all controls as some would do and spelling out the controls that are necessary to continuance. Rather than continue all controls and continue the old laws without modification, our committee cooperating with the departments has spelled out those controls which are necessary now. The matter to which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] is referring, namely, export controls, will be covered by this bill as spelled out therein, rather than providing a blanket control giving the President or anyone else the right to use all controls if, when, and where they may think advisable.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point? If that is true, why exclude petroleum and petroleum products?

Mr. SPRINGER. I will explain that in a minute. May I say that I am going to offer an amendment later to take care of any further exporting of petroleum or petroleum products—which I hope will be unanimously adopted by the committee.

Antimony is continued. As you know, that commodity is used for the construction of batteries, ball bearings, and in the making of bells and articles of that kind. This control is essential because that is a very critical product.

Cinchona bark, quinine, and quinidine, as I understand, have been eliminated from the Senate bill but we have continued them with an amendment. If the Members will look at the bill on page 3, regarding cinchona bark, quinine, and quinidine, the bill provides "that controls shall not apply to any of said materials now held or hereafter acquired by other than Government agencies." That means simply that the stock pile which the Government has acquired and which it now has on hand may be allocated but it does not apply to the general pub-

lic or the businessmen of the country going into the open market and making purchases. There is no allocation insofar as their purchases are concerned because it was shown conclusively to the subcommittee that such control was not necessary.

Under item 4 on page 3 provision is made with relation to controls for exports which are required to expand or maintain the production in foreign countries of materials critically needed in the United States of America.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HERTER. Is it not true that the essential difference between the bill introduced by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] continuing general export controls and the bill which is now under consideration is that under the Second War Powers Act they were not export controls as such which were under consideration, but rather the allocation from our domestic production for particular needs in the foreign field in order to stimulate production for our own domestic needs?

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. HERTER. So that you are handling only the export controls insofar as they deal with the limited field, whereas the bill introduced by the gentleman from Michigan, which I believe has been granted a rule and which will come before us shortly, has to do with over-all protection of the price structure and so on in connection with general export controls.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is entirely correct on that question. Now, hurrying on to the import provisions of materials on page 4, relating to fats and oils, and that includes oil-bearing materials, fatty acids, butter, soap, and soap powder, but excluding petroleum and pertoleum products, we have also stricken "rice and rice products," for the purpose of exercising import control. That paragraph relates only to import control. Then, you will observe, the section proceeds a little further with reference to nitrogenous fertilizer material, and we are continuing that commodity for the purpose of exercising import control and establishing priority in production and delivery for export.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I wish to know why butter was included under control for export? What was the reason given for that, if any?

Mr. SPRINGER. That relates only to import controls. You have cheese, fats, and other commodities related to the same matter, and this particular section to which the gentleman now refers relates only to import controls. It has nothing whatever to do with export controls.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to my friend.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. In view of the tremendous volume of cheese that is being imported into the country it seems to me there should be some control over that so that the American market on this product would not be destroyed. I can say to the gentleman that of the volume of cheese that is coming into the United States from Italy and from Argentina, much is not up to the standard of the American-produced cheese; and it would help to put cheese in here; to limit the amount of cheese that could be imported into the country would be very helpful in protecting the economy of the producers in the United States.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is entirely correct on that issue as I understand it, and as it was understood from the evidence which was adduced before the subcommittee.

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of California. Will the gentleman tell me if there would be objection to excluding copra and coconut oil from the category of fats and oils? I understand there is an abundant supply now from the Philippines and it would be a boon to them to be able to dispose of their crop due to the fact that they have no storage facilities, and it would also be somewhat of a boon to Pacific Ocean shipping because that is one of the large bulk cargoes that would be brought back to this country.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say to the gentleman that the departments of the Government did not request that such matter be carried into this bill further than it has been continued in the pending measure.

In the hearing a peculiar situation was disclosed on this matter of copra. Our vessels leave this country with cargoes for the Philippines and elsewhere, from which points they could bring copra back into thi country for crushing and processing, yet they are not permitted to bring back cargoes of coconuts for crushing purposes. That is the particular reason the subcommittee came to the conclusion that there was no need of any specific mention of that matter in this particular measure at this particular time.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to my colleague from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. In the part of the bill which has to do with export controls——

Mr. SPRINGER. I am coming to that in just a moment.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Let me ask a question or two. I think the gentleman can answer them very easily.

That is existing law right now but it expires on June 30.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is entirely right.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Powers under the existing War Powers Act expire on June 30.

Mr. SPRINGER. June 30, 1947, next Monday night at midnight.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. This merely extends existing law as it affects export controls.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Has the gentleman any suggestion as to how we might strengthen that law to prevent the abuses that have come to our attention in the last few days with respect to the shipment of petroleum and other products out of the country?

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say to the gentleman I am just coming to that now under subdivision 6 on page 4. It relates to exports and it uses the word "materials." "Materials" is a rather broad word and we excepted from this particular provision food and food products, rice and rice products, manila (abaca) fiber, and cordage, and agave fiber and cordage, and fertilizer materials. May I say that in order to strengthen this bill and to preserve the petroleum and petroleum products from the danger that now exists in this country, I intend to offer an amendment at the end of line 12 on page 4 which will "include petroleum and petroleum products" which are sought to be exported. That will make it absolutely positive that petroleum and petroleum products are included in those items, under that section of this measure. May I say further, that particular section of this measure provides that before exporting any such commodity, that need must be certified to by the Secretary of State that it is absolutely necessary for this commodity to be exported. That is not all. This measure requires an additional certification by the Secretary of Commerce showing that the export of this commodity "will not be detrimental to the domestic economy of the United States of America." I think that reaches the point which the gentleman from Indiana has mentioned. We have tried to preserve our petroleum and its products for use by our own people.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. I hope the gentleman offers his amendment because I want to support it.

Mr. SPRINGER. I intend to offer that amendment as soon as the bill is read for amendments.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. It is necessary that something be done immediately because under existing law they are permitting these things to be shipped out and we must take strong steps to stop it.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is correct. My amendment will be offered and I am confident that the amendment will entirely clarify and entirely protect that situation.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. In reference to the amendment the gentleman states he intends to offer, I call his attention to line 4, page 4, beginning with the words "but excluding petroleum and petroleum products."

Mr. SPRINGER. That is on imports. That relates to import control, solely.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I thought it related to exports. In other words, am I

assured that the amendment the gentleman proposes to offer will prevent the export of petroleum products from the United States under present circumstances?

Mr. SPRINGER. It will do that if the Secretary of State makes his certification and if the Secretary of Commerce makes his certification in accordance with the existing facts. May I say in this connection I have just received a newspaper from one of the very large cities in my district, Richmond, Ind., in which it is stated:

Oil company cuts summer gasoline for 12 States, including Indiana—

Those 12 States are cut down to the amount which they received during the war. That is all of this commodity that is to be delivered to them. This article states further—

including Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, North and South Dakota, Kansas, Nebraska, Oklahoma—

And my own State of Indiana.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman advise the committee if he finds any inconsistency as between the pending resolution and the Shafer resolution which provides for control over exports?

Mr. SPRINGER. The Shafer resolution is an over-all coverage. This resolution relates to certain products that were controlled under the Second War Powers Act.

Mr. COX. Would the adoption of the gentleman's resolution make necessary some amendment to the Shafer resolution?

Mr. SPRINGER. With the amendment which I propose to offer relating to petroleum and petroleum products, I think it reaches the very point which the gentleman from Michigan desires to reach.

Mr. SHAFER. I am interested further than that. I am interested in the control of all exports where they are not in surplus in this country. That is what my bill calls for. It gives authority to place a control on anything that is in short supply in this country.

Mr. SPRINGER. If the gentleman will defer that matter, of course, that will come up when his bill is presented. I hope not to confuse it with this pending measure.

Mr. SHAFER. I think it has been confused right along and that is the reason I make this statement.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. A gentleman whom I consider an authority on agriculture is very fearful of this bill relative to shipping out of this country products that are short in agriculture. Does the gentleman think agriculture is sufficiently protected or is there danger to agriculture in this bill?

Mr. SPRINGER. Where food and food products are excluded I think agriculture is entirely protected; at least, that is the intention of the Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee and that is the intention of the full Judiciary Committee in presenting this bill to the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, when the question of continuance of controls was first considered by the Judiciary Committee, a policy was adopted under which all controls were to be eliminated immediately unless a strong case for the continuance of controls was made at that time. The subcommittee headed by the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER] made a very careful study of the entire question and reached the conclusion that there was no need for continuance of the controls except as to the items mentioned in this bill.

Furthermore, the committee reached the unanimous conclusion that even the controls provided for in this bill should not be continued beyond January 31 on the theory that if the need existed for the continuance of controls, Congress would be in session again in January and we could meet whatever situation existed.

Now, as to the controls of rope, manila—abaca—fiber and cordage, and agave fiber and cordage, in addition to the reasons given by the gentleman from Indiana there is one thing more that caused the committee to strike out the control as to those items, and that was the easing of the shipping situation. so that today there are bottoms sufficient to bring in any amount available.

Mr. Chairman, there is no disagreement on any of the provisions in this bill and there are no requests for time on this side. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McGARVEY].

Mr. McGARVEY. Mr. Chairman, about a month ago President Truman held a conference with his New Deal economic advisers. At that time his entire Cabinet was present, together with others of his official family, with the exception of Mr. Marriner S. Eccles, who controls the vastly important credit regulations of this Nation.

After the conference the President asked the manufacturers and retailers of the Nation to reduce prices in order to avoid a serious depression. This, we were informed, was the advice of the best economic brains of the administration. However, Mr. Eccles did not attend the conference, and, strangely enough, an announcement appeared shortly thereafter to the effect that the subsidy on sugar beets had been lifted to a record all-time high of $14.50 a ton.

In this connection, I wish to refer to several events leading to the appointment of Mr. Eccles as Assistant Secretary of the Treasury. In 1934, when this appointment was made, you will recall that William H. Woodin, then Secretary of the Treasury, had formerly been a director of the American Beet Sugar Co.—now American Crystal Sugar Co.—the company that bailed the Eccles family out of their Amalgamated Sugar Co. after years of operating losses. It was in 1934 that Congress passed the Jones-Costigan Sugar Act with its beet-sugar subsidy, providing enormous profits to the sugar producers.

I would also call your attention to the testimony of Mr. Eccles before the Senate Banking Committee on May 26, 1947. At that time he urged the regulation of bank-holding-company expansion to block a blow "at the heart of our traditional system of competitive banking." When Mr. Eccles was president of the First Security Corp. of Ogden, he had with him as officers and directors the following: M. A. Browning, vice president; E. G. Bennett, vice president; G. S. Eccles, treasurer; Joseph Scowcroft, director; S. S. Eccles, director. These men, with the exception of Mr. Marriner Eccles, are still officers and directors of the First Security Corp. of Ogden, and they are also directors of the Amalgamated Sugar Co., of which Mr. Eccles is still chairman of the board. Mr. G. S. Eccles is now chairman of the executive committee and president of the First Security Corp. of Ogden, and Mr. G. S. Eccles, S. S. Eccles, and W. L. Eccles are directors. He apparently sees no harm in a holding company operating a system of banks in which he must still have an interest. For the record it might be noted that the First Security Corp. of Ogden, with consolidated resources of excess of $300,000,000, owns the majority of all stock of the following banks: First Security Bank of Idaho, Boise, Idaho—21 branches; First Security Bank of Utah, Ogden, Utah—8 branches; First National Bank of Salt Lake City—2 branches; First Security Trust Co., Salt Lake City, Utah; First Security Bank, Rock Springs, Wyo.; First Security Building & Loan Association, Pocatello, Idaho.

This is the man who continues a credit policy contrary to all natural laws of supply and demand, thrift, and sound finance. This is the man who opposes the termination of credit control. He asked the Senate Banking Committee to recommend legislation continuing controls until July 31, 1948. Is he again trying to stifle production?

He now opposes the end of Regulation W which would permit the public to purchase automobiles, refrigerators, electric irons, cooking ranges, floor coverings, and other items which could not be had during the war. As you all know, under Regulation W the purchaser is required to pay one-third down and the balance within 15 months. The continuation of this control would have the effect of drying up consumer demand with the resulting curtailment of production.

This power-hungry Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board has even been reaching out to eliminate the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in order to acquire control of its functions. As usual, his excuse is that he wishes to prevent inflation. If he would prevent inflation why was the Government permitted to buy wheat at any old price when they could have bought all they wanted at $2, a price which is still much too high for that commodity.

In conclusion, I would like to say that the activities of the Federal Reserve Board and, more particularly, the activi-

ties of its Chairman, could well be investigated by this Congress. We are all interested in lowering today's high prices. I am sure that an inquiry of the type just mentioned would provide some interesting and conclusive results.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the Armed Services Subcommittee No. 3, which is responsible for stock piling of strategic materials, I take this time to make my position clear relative to this legislation.

President Truman, on March 20 this year, sent a message to Congress requesting legislation to extend export controls from the present expiration date—June 30—for 1 year. Because this authority to control exports was originally contained in the National Defense Act of July 20, 1940, this message was sent to the Armed Services Committee.

In order to bring this issue before Congress, I, as chairman of the subcommittee to which the message was referred by the Speaker, introduced H. R. 3049. Extensive hearings were held and H. R. 3049 was subsequently reported unanimously by the full committee. I then appeared before the Rules Committee, about 2 weeks ago, to bring the issue before the House. Following my appearance before the Rules Committee, I learned that someone from the Judiciary Committee had requested a delay in granting the rule, stating that that committee would have an over-all bill which would include the extension of export controls. The Rules Committee, I understand, held up a rule on H. R. 3049 as the result.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration has been brought up under a unanimous-consent request, and I am unable to find where it in any way takes care of the provisions of H. R. 3049, as I have been told that it would.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHAFER. I gladly yield to my good and able friend the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. Does not the gentleman from Michigan believe that with the amendments I have stated, and which I propose to offer to section 6 on page 4 of the bill, the situation will be taken care of?

Mr. SHAFER. No. It takes care of it as far as my interest in the exportation of petroleum products is concerned, but not in regard to many other products which I am convinced must be controlled.

Mr. Chairman, there is a misunderstanding regarding this bill and H. R. 3049. Each bill is necessary. Now, in order to clarify the situation, permit me to say that this bill, reported by the Judiciary Committee, relates to authorities under the Second War Powers Act, and H. R. 3049, reported by the Armed Services Committee, as to export controls is authorized by section 6 of the National Defense Act of July 2, 1940. As I see it, the two must be considered separately.

The Judiciary Committee bill permits export controls on certain specific items and, as the Second War Powers Act is written, permits a complete embargo on a few specified items, such as tin, antimony, fats, and oils—and now petroleum.

The Second War Powers Act does not provide for any system of licensing. On the other hand, the Export Control Act, H. R. 3049, is a bill to authorize the extension of export controls as contained in section 6 of the National Defense Act of July 2, 1940. This permits controls to be exercised on any item deemed to be essential in the national interest. These controls are based upon an allocation system from this country of those items considered to be in short supply.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, the Judiciary Committee bill, now before us, only permits an outright embargo on a few specified items, whereas the export control bill, H. R. 3049, will permit the continuation of existing controls on those items now under control under a licensing system. It covers a great deal more than the Judiciary Committee bill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to further Government controls any more than any other Member of this House, but we who dislike controls have been forced into the position of extending them. And so long as this Congress continues to vote millions of dollars to foreign nations to be used to bid up the prices of our own products, controls will be necessary.

The bill under debate and H. R. 3049 must both be enacted. I cannot see how the two can be combined into one. I shall support this bill and will bring in H. R. 3049 as soon as the leadership permits. The Judiciary bill, in my opinion, does not do all that is necessary.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, I have no requests for time on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

FINDINGS OF FACT AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. (a) Certain materials and facilities continue in short supply at home and abroad as a result of the war. The continued exercise of certain limited emergency powers is required to complete the orderly reconversion of the domestic economy from a wartime to a peacetime basis, protect the health, safety, and welfare of the American people, and to support the foreign policy of the United States.

(b) It is the general policy of the United States to continue emergency wartime controls of materials only to the minimum extent necessary (1) to protect the domestic economy from the injury which would result from adverse distribution of materials which continue in short world supply; (2) to promote production in the United States by assisting in the expansion and maintenance of production in foreign countries of materials critically needed in the United States; and (3) to aid in carrying out the foreign policy of the United States.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time for the purpose of clearing up the language on page 4, line 3.

What I would like to know is whether that language is not ambiguous or if something is the matter with it or else I cannot read the English language. I take it from the report that what that means is that under this bill the President will have the power to control fats and oil imports and then so far as fertilizer is concerned he is going to control both imports and exports. Is that correct?

Mr. SPRINGER. That is correct.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The irony of it is that here we have a bill back in our laps where the President says he does not want the power to control one commodity, which happens to be wool, and yet at this same hour we are going to give him powers of control over many other imports.

Mr. SPRINGER. With reference to the nitrogenous fertilizer materials, we get a large portion of those materials from Canada. Consequently, it is necessary to have some control on imports so we can get that commodity here in our country for use. On the other hand, after it has been processed some of these fertilizers are sent to foreign countries so those people can produce some of their food so that we will not be called upon to furnish all the food that is necessary for the people over there. That is the purpose of that particular provision of the bill. I think it is very wholesome, and it is essential that the provision remain in the bill.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The last sentence reads, "Thus the considerable burden now shouldered by the United States in feeding foreign populations would be gradually alleviated."

I think the time has come in this country when somebody had better check up and find out whom we are feeding and who is feeding us. The chances are that in pounds, bushels, and tons, the world is feeding us just as much as we are feeding them. I think the time has come when we ought not to be telling the world that we can feed them when we will not be able to do so.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to my colleague the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. Do I understand the situation to be that upon the enactment of this bill there will not be continued any longer any controls on exports of fats and oils, including oil-bearing materials?

Mr. SPRINGER. That is right. That particular section—section 5, on page 4—relates to imports.

Mr. PACE. And no controls will be continued on that?

Mr. SPRINGER. Whatever controls exist at the moment, if any, would still exist, but this relates only to import controls.

Mr. PACE. Whatever exists, exists on the authority of the act which you are now amending.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. PACE. Therefore, if this is the substitute for the existing authority, there will not be any authority to control the exports of fats and oils.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. With reference to cheese, I wish to advise the committee that so much cheese is coming here from Italy and Argentina and other countries that our markets are being glutted because of these imports. I wonder if there is some way that the gentleman can propose an amendment to this bill so that there may be a limitation on the imports of cheese? This cheese should be used in Italy, where they need it, rather than to export it to the United States while we are sending other food over there.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I realize the situation, but I can say to my distinguished colleague from Minnesota that if a bill like the wool bill that passes this House by a large majority is vetoed by the President, even after the Secretary of Agriculture has sent the bill up here, I would not care to introduce a bill which I could expect to be passed and signed by the President. So I will leave the cheese out of this situation.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am taking this time to secure a little more information from the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the legislation. I heard the colloquy between him and my colleague from Georgia with reference to export controls. I wish to ask the gentleman from Indiana if there is any provision in the bill for the continuance of export controls when it comes to wheat, flour, grains, cereals, or fats and oils?

Mr. SPRINGER. Does the gentleman desire to know whether or not in my opinion they come under import controls or export controls?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Export controls.

Mr. SPRINGER. Under section 5 fats and oils are brought under the import control provision, and nitrogenous fertilizer material for the purpose of exercising both export and import controls.

Under section 6 the gentleman will observe that the export control relates to materials and as I indicated just a little while ago, I intend to introduce an amendment to make it positive that petroleum and petroleum products will also be embraced under the export controls. Under that provision the Secretary of State must certify that it is absolutely needed abroad. Even that is not sufficient but the Secretary of Commerce must also certify that the exportation of the particular commodity will not in any way be detrimental to the domestic economy of the United States of America.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. What about the other commodities?

Mr. SPRINGER. If I may proceed a little further, we differ in this measure from the Senate amendment in that the Senate bill seeks to set up a new board, another agency. They provide for the appointment of a Director at a cost of $15,000 a year. That means, of course, the setting up of a large agency the cost of which no one can foresee. We, by this bill, seek to put the responsibility on these two heads of departments, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Commerce and require that they must certify as to those commodities provided in this bill.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman has not fully answered my question on export controls over grain, flour, and other commodities that are now under export control. The reason I asked my question is that the price level in this country has risen tremendously on certain foods; and we must recognize that as long as the Congress of the United States has a policy which appropriates hundreds of millions of dollars to people in other countries to be used in the purchase of food commodities from the United States we are going to have an increased price level in this country. We are sympathetic to the idea of lending aid to the distressed people in other countries but there has been considerable complaint about the high prices of food in this country, particularly meat and bread, corn and other commodities. The people ought to be told that as long as our country furnishes the dollar exchange to the countries which never expect to pay one penny back to us that some controls must be continued—and I do not like controls—as long as we provide the money, tax the people for the money and then give it away and give away our food commodities. It unavoidably brings higher prices in this country.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say that title 3 of the Second War Powers Act, which is section 1501 (a) relates to allocations and priorities, that is all. There are certain items which we are excluding and eliminating from the provisions of controls under that particular section in this bill.

This bill is not as broad as that introduced by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for four additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. By the terms of the gentleman's bill it is very broad and all-inclusive, it is a blank check, in other words, to the President. In this pending bill we seek to eliminate controls under the allocation and priority provisions of section 3 of the Second War Powers Act. There is that broad difference between his version and the version of the bill now before us.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Then the gentleman is of the opinion that the power to issue export licenses for the export of certain products is still covered either in his bill or in the bill of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER]?

Mr. SPRINGER. I think it is. That is my interpretation of the measure, and that concurs with the view of the committee.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I understand the licenses are going to be issued the same as they have been on the export of wheat; is that right?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is my understanding now.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. I am advised that there is a third bill, one coming from the Armed Services Committee, on this question, or is that the bill to which the gentleman from Michigan referred?

Mr. SPRINGER. That is the bill to which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] referred. It is a bill that came out of the Armed Services Committee. There is another bill coming over from the Senate, as I understand it, which is somewhat at variance with the bill now before the committee.

Mr. PACE. How does it happen so many committees have jurisdiction over this legislation?

Mr. SPRINGER. I cannot understand that. The bill we now have was submitted to the Judiciary Committee and the Judiciary Committee had jurisdiction over it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It is under the new reorganization act that the conflict has occurred, which may be worthy of investigation.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. The Reorganization Act had nothing to do with it. In the last Congress the Congress gave to the Judiciary Committee jurisdiction over war powers acts. The Shafer bill originates with an act of 1940, before we were in the war, permitting the President to place export controls on strategic materials, national defense materials, so that the President at that time might say which country got military supplies from this country. The Shafer bill would continue that policy enlarged so that the President of the United States would be the czar as to if, when, where, and how exports were carried out.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his contribution to this discussion. It is good to have it clear here. Let me point out again that the food situation as well as the petroleum and oil situation in the United States is becoming serious. In providing money for other countries to buy these products in the United States we should exercise a great degree of caution to see that all of these vital materials are not pulled out of the country to the detriment of the American people. If we do not take action, then we may have that serious inflation in the United States which will cause disaster to everyone.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I address myself to the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Judiciary to ascertain if it is a fact that rice and rice products are deleted and stricken from the terms of this bill?

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is correct. Rice and rice products are excluded from the provisions of the bill.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat intrigued by the statement just made by the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, who again called attention to the fact that it is high time that we began to take some inventory of the resources of this country in order to see whether we can afford the actual drain upon the physical resources of this Nation.

I wonder if the Members of Congress have in mind the fact that you will have provided authorization for appropriations for relief and for expenditures for people alleged to be suffering from hunger well over $1,500,000,000, $775,000,000 of that to be expended by the Army in occupied areas during the next fiscal year, $400,000,000 for Greek-Turkish aid in fiscal 1948 and most of the balance to be expended during the present calendar year. I have been listening to the testimony before the deficiency subcommittee in which the requests for appropriations are being considered, and I think it is high time that the Members of Congress and the people of America are aroused to the seriousness of the threat to our own economy that is involved in this picture.

Now, am I talking wildly when I make that statement? The testimony before the committee shows that the State Department and the President of the United States are so concerned, as are the other departments of Government, that a Presidential investigating committee has just been appointed. For what purpose? To make a survey of the resources of the United States for the purpose of determining whether or not we can continue to fulfill these commitments. And, yet, in the face of that critical situation, recognized by the President and his advisers, we continue to march merrily on and on and on, as though the resources of these United States were utterly unlimited. Then we pick up the paper and see one Secretary saying that we are a have-not nation as to oil; that we are a have-not nation as to minerals, as to copper, as to tin, and a hundred other items. Yet we propose to assume burdens which amount to 70 to 80 percent of the total cost of looking after and caring for the unfortunate peoples of the world. The great heart of America goes out to these people who are suffering, and yet we have finally reached the point now where the administration is forced to come to the consideration of the simple question, How far can we go and maintain our own economy?

So I want to issue a warning and I want to issue a challenge to this Congress and to the people of America who so lightly and blithely and apparently with so little concern can urge the Congress to continue this program of foreign spending, spending, and spending, when we may wake up when this report comes in and find that we have so depleted our own economy that we will be in danger of a violent collapse.

It is worth giving some thought to, my friends.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to obtain information from the gentleman from Indiana in charge of this bill. I turn to page 4, and my first question is under original paragraph (6), as amended, paragraph (5). Does this paragraph reading "fats and oils for the purpose of exercising import control" confine it to fats and oils that are required for import?

Mr. SPRINGER. To the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi I may say that the provision relates to import controls; fats and oils and materials which are included there. Rice and rice products were stricken out.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I understand that. My question is that fats and oils, for the purpose of exercising import control are included in this section.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is precisely correct.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Now then, what is the meaning of this language? "and nitrogenous fertilizer materials for the purposes of exercising import control and of establishing priority in production and delivery for export." All that is confined to import materials, what is the meaning of the language about establishing priority for export?

Mr. SPRINGER. As the gentleman will note, after "control" in line 7 there is a comma, and then we start with this new provision with regard to nitrogenous fertilizer materials. That relates largely to nitrogen, for the purpose of exercising import control. We get most of that nitrogen from Canada.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes; that is perfectly clear, if the paragraph stopped there.

Mr. SPRINGER. Then it goes further and says, "for the purpose of establishing priority in production and delivery for export." As the gentleman knows, there is some fertilizer produced in this country now being exported to foreign countries so they can produce and take care of themselves. That export control as reported is to cover that situation. The evidence was clear and conclusive upon that need.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In other words, that export control is continued for imports in production for export?

Mr. SPRINGER. That control is continued.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. What is the meaning of the following section, "Materials (except food and food products, and fertilizer materials) required for export"? When you except them in the following section from the export provision, is there not a contradiction?

Mr. SPRINGER. No. The gentleman will understand that in paragraph 5 as renumbered on page 4, "for delivery for export," that relates to the fertilizer when completed. When we get down to the next paragraph, it relates solely to export, and it provides that the fertilizer materials are excepted. But they are covered, in our opinion, in the preceding section.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. They are excepted in paragraph 6, unless imported for production for export as provided in paragraph 5.

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes. That is correct.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If I understand the language, fertilizer materials would be excepted from any export control under that paragraph 6.

Mr. SPRINGER. It was the thought of the subcommittee and it was the thought of those who had discussed that question that since it was handled in the previous section, that is, it related to import control and establishing priority in production and for delivery for export, that such language took care of the situation as far as fertilizer is concerned, and there was no necessity of carrying it on in the next section, which relates entirely to export.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes, but they except fertilizer materials from export. As I understand, there is no control over domestic fertilizer, but only on fertilizer imported to be used in production for export.

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes, under that section. That I think is taken care of in the preceding section.

The Clerk read as follows:

TEMPORARY RETENTION OF CERTAIN EMERGENCY POWERS

SEC. 2. To effectuate the policies set forth in section 1 hereof, title XV, section 1501, of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, approved March 27, 1942, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1501. (a) Except as otherwise provided by statute enacted during the first session of the Eightieth Congress and except as otherwise provided by subsection (b) of this section, titles I, II, III, IV, V, VII, and XIV of this act and the amendments to existing law made by such titles shall remain in force only until March 31, 1947. After the amendments made by any such title cease to be in force, any provisions of law amended thereby (except subsection (a) of section 2 of the act entitled 'An act to expedite national defense, and for other purposes,' approved June 28, 1940, as amended by the act of May 31, 1941) shall be in full force and effect as though this act had not been enacted.

"(b) Title III of this act and the amendments to existing law made by such title shall remain in force only until June 30, 1948, for the exercise of the powers, authority, and discretion thereby conferred on the President, but limited to the following materials, and to facilities suitable for the manufacture of such materials:

"(1) Tin and tin products;

"(2) Manila (abaca) fiber and cordage, and agave fiber and cordage;

"(3) Antimony;

"(4) Cinchona bark, quinine, and quinidine;

"(5) Such materials for export which are required to expand or maintain the production in foreign countries of materials critically needed in the United States, for the purpose of establishing priority in production and delivery for export, and such materials which are necessary for manufacture and delivery of the materials required for such export;

"(6) Fats and oils (including oil-bearing materials, fatty acids, butter, soap, and soap

powder, but excluding petroleum and petroleum products) and rice and rice products, for the purpose of exercising import control, and nitrogenous fertilizer materials for the purposes of exercising import control and of establishing priority in production and delivery for export;

"(7) Materials (except food and food products, and fertilizer materials) required for export, but only upon certification by the Secretary of State that the prompt export of such materials is of high public importance and essential to successful carrying out of the foreign policy of the United States, for the purpose of establishing priority in production and delivery for export, and such materials as may be necessary for the manufacture and delivery of the materials required for such export: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the extension to June 30, 1948, made by this subsection, the two Houses of Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may designate an earlier time for the termination of any power, authority, or discretion under such title III: *Provided further*, That nothing in this subsection (b) shall be construed to continue beyond March 31, 1947, any authority under paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 2 of the act entitled 'An act to expedite national defense and for other purposes,' approved June 28, 1940, as amended, to negotiate contracts with or without advertising or competitive bidding: *Provided further*, That nothing contained herein shall affect the authority conferred by Public Law 24, Eightieth Congress, approved March 29, 1947, or the Sugar Control Extension Act of 1947.

"(c) The functions exercised under title III of this act and the amendments to existing law made by such title, shall be excluded from the operation of the Administrative Procedure Act, except as to the requirements of section 3 of that act."

Mr. WALTER (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that the bill be open to amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 7, strike out "June 30" and insert "January 31."

Page 3, line 11, after "products," insert "except for the purpose of exercising import control of tin ores and tin concentrates."

Page 3, line 14, strike out lines 14 and 15.

Page 3, line 16, strike out "(3)" and insert "(2)."

Page 3, line 17, strike out "(4)" and insert "(3)."

Page 3, line 18, insert "*Provided*, That controls shall not apply to any of said materials now held or hereafter acquired by other than Government agencies."

Page 3, line 21, strike out "5" and insert "4."

Page 4, line 6, strike out "6" and insert "5."

Page 4, line 5, after the word "products" strike out "and rice and rice products."

Page 4, line 10, strike out "7" and insert "6."

Page 4, line 11, after the word "products" insert "rice and rice products, manila (abaca) fiber and cordage, and agave fiber and cordage."

Page 4, line 20, after the word "export" insert "*Provided*, That no such certification by the Secretary of State shall be effective unless and until the Secretary of Commerce shall certify that the proposed action will not be detrimental to the domestic economy of the United States."

Page 5, line 1, strike out "June 30" and insert "January 31."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPRINGER: In line 10, page 4, after the word "Materials" insert a comma; and in line 12, page 4, after the parenthesis at the end of the line insert a comma and add "including petroleum and petroleum products."

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I explained this amendment when we were engaged in general debate. The amendment is offered at this point in order to be certain that there is export control continued over petroleum and petroleum products.

As the Members well know, throughout the country there is a very great shortage of oil and gasoline. Just recently we learned that we are exporting at the rate of approximately 1,000,000 barrels of oil and gasoline per month to Russia from this country, and that at this very moment they are threatening to ration gasoline in this country.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. Is there anything in existing law that would enable the Government to prevent the exportation of oil by those companies who want to make greater profits by exporting this oil?

Mr. SPRINGER. I think there is perhaps nothing that would absolutely reach that, but by writing it into this particular bill by way of an amendment I feel confident that we will be able to control that situation by giving export controls to the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Commerce.

May I say, Mr. Chairman, in that connection that under this export control which is provided in this section of the bill it must be certified by the Secretary of State to the effect that it is of high public importance and essential for the carrying out of the foreign policy of the United States. That must be so certified by the Secretary of State. That is not all. After the Secretary of State makes that certification, then it is necessary for the Secretary of Commerce to also certify that the exportation of this particular commodity which they are seeking to export will not in any way be detrimental to the domestic policy of the United States of America. That is about as far as we could go in protecting that particular feature. The responsibility will then rest upon the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Commerce.

But I feel confident, Mr. Chairman, that they will protect the exportation of oil and gasoline far different from that which has been carried on in the past.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. MICHENER. As a matter of fact, the Secretary of Commerce could not do other than so certify, if there was any type of rationing of gasoline in this country. That would affect the domestic economy.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is precisely correct.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Indiana yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I have been a member of the Committee on Insular Affairs since I have been a Member of the House of Representatives. At the present time I am a member of the Philippine Commission and I try to keep informed on problems concerning the Philippine Islands.

I desire at this time to compliment the chairman and his committee for having stricken lines 14 and 15 from the bill and sincerely hope that should the bill go to conference they will insist on the bill as amended.

Mr. SPRINGER. I wish to thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I favor the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana.

I would like to inform the House that the concern over the shipment of oil to Russia is a matter that has aroused the Nation. They are paying a premium on the oil that they are purchasing.

I am confident that this amendment will prevent the wasting of our natural resources. It will require a certification by the Secretary of State that exports of petroleum and petroleum products will not be detrimental to the domestic economy of the United States.

We are being informed that gasoline may be so short in the near future that we may have to ration it in some States. It is ridiculous, yes, almost criminal that we should permit exports of gasoline and oil to foreign sources who may use them to wage war on us, and at the same time deplete our own supply so that rationing may be necessary.

We must protect our natural resources. We must be alert to our future and especially when our resources are being sought by nations that talk peace and prepare for war.

I urge adoption of this amendment as a proper and expedient precaution to our own safety. Russia not only wants all of our gasoline and oil but all she can get from the Middle East. The gentleman from Indiana is to be complimented for his amendment. It should be adopted.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. Can the gentleman from California inform us as to the companies that are shipping this oil to Russia?

Mr. McDONOUGH. The information I have, and which I believe is authentic is that there are many companies in the United States shipping oil to Russia.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I appreciate the gentleman's explanation in response to my question with respect to nitrogenous fertilizer material. As I understand, paragraph 6 on page 4, renumbered paragraph five old section applies:

To nitrogenous fertilizer materials for the purpose of exercising import control and of establishing priority in production and delivery for export.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. As I understood the gentleman he said that language in that section applied to nitrogenous fertilizer materials that are imported but which are to be used in the production for export.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is entirely correct; that is the way we considered it, and that is our interpretation of that provision in the bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And then paragraph 6, old paragraph 7, exempts from export fertilizer materials produced in the United States for export.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is correct.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In order to make those two sections conform I ask the gentleman if it would not be in order to insert the word "nitrogenous" in line 12 before the word "fertilizer" thus making the two sections agree? Would there be any objection? I do not see that there could be.

Mr. SPRINGER. There would be no objection on the part of the Committee if that word were inserted as indicated by the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I will offer such an amendment.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask that my amendment be voted on.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON: Page 4, line 12, insert the word "nitrogenous" before the word "fertilizer."

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, may I say that the committee has no objection to that amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, some weeks ago the President sent a message to the Speaker of the House of Representatives on the question of export controls. That message on export controls was referred to the Committee on Armed Services by the Parliamentarian of the House.

Subcommittee 3 of the Armed Services Committee, which is concerned in the mobilization of war industries, the stock piling of strategic materials, and so forth, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER], conducted extensive hearings on the question of the extension of the Export Control Act. Some 2 or 3 weeks ago the subcommittee reported by unanimous vote to the full committee, and the full committee reported favorably a bill, H. R. 3049, by unanimous vote, to the House. Application was made to the Rules Committee. At that time no rule was granted, nor so far as I know was the rule denied, but since that time I am given to understand the Committee on Rules has seen fit to grant a rule on the bill from the Armed Services Committee, H. R. 3049. It may be that the action of the committee on the bill from the Judiciary Committee today will obviate necessity for the consideration of H. R. 3049 which comes from the Armed Services Committee on at least a portion of the subject.

My point in taking the floor at this time is to ask the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], what portion of his bill extends export control as such under the provisions of the act of July 2, 1940?

Mr. MICHENER. The chairman of the Judiciary Committee does not have before him the law to which the gentleman from New York refers.

The act of July 2, 1940, as I recall, was an act affecting national defense materials only, which was passed before we entered the war.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. That is correct.

Mr. MICHENER. The purpose of the bill at that time was to make it possible for the President of the United States to designate to which countries strategic materials should be sent.

In other words we were told we were not going to get into the war, that we were not in the war, but that we would enact a law giving the President the right, in his discretion, to send strategic materials to such countries as he, the President, might select.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. All right. Let me ask the gentleman another question. I assume the gentleman has read the provisions of the bill, H. R. 3049, reported unanimously by the Armed Services Committee?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I am informed that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] has been in consultation with Senator COOPER, who is the head of the subcommittee on this subject in the Senate. I believe it is a correct statement to say that the provisions of 3049, the Armed Services Committee bill, on this subject are included in the Senate bill which will be acted upon today. In other words, it is acceptable to the Armed Services Committee of the House and would be were our bill to pass. I ask the gentleman from Michigan, is he informed upon these provisions in the proposed Senate bill?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes. I may say that the Committee on the Judiciary has cooperated with the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, of which Mr. COOPER is a member. Mr. COOPER is a member of that committee and has had charge of this matter. The members of the Judiciary Committee had an extended conference last night with Mr. COOPER and I think there is a general understanding that we want to accomplish the same things.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. The real trouble is that in the Senate bill instead of permitting the President to administer as is the case under existing law, they set up an administrator with a salary of $15,000 with the right to employ such help in numbers as he may see fit to administer the law. We are very much opposed to that. The Shafer bill would simply give the President all the right which he has to allocate or designate the materials to be exported. In other words, it is a question of whether or not you give the President a blank check to do as he may see fit or to spell it out in the bill as in the House bill.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I asked the gentleman a question. I did not ask him for a statement of views as to the provisions.

Mr. MICHENER. I thought I was answering the gentleman's question.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Are the provisions in the Senate bill comparable to the provisions of the bill H. R. 3049?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Is it the intention of the conferees from this committee, when they go to conference with the Senate, to accept the Senate provisions or not?

Mr. MICHENER. It would not be my purpose to accept anything in the Senate bill that gave the President a blank check to use his discretion in all cases without limitation.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I do not care what you think. I want to know whether or not you will accept the provisions. The answer is "No."

Mr MICHENER. The language as written?

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. I would not want to pass on that, because if I had written the language I would have made it shorter. I would simply say that the President shall have such authority as he heretofore had, and stop there. That is all.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER], if he has any observations to make.

Mr. SHAFER. The gentleman from Michigan apparently inferred in his remarks that I am standing behind the Senate bill to establish a new administrator.

Mr. MICHENER. No; I did not intend that.

Mr. SHAFER. I did not want my position misinterpreted.

Mr. MICHENER. No. I do not think the gentleman from Michigan is in favor

of this administrator, but, in my judgment, the gentleman from Michigan now speaking thinks his bill could be written in much less language by saying that the President shall have all the power he has had since 1940 to allocate as he may see fit. I may be wrong about that.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. The gentleman from Michigan would like to be assured whether the provisions in his bill, whether it is his bill, or a bill of the Senate, or anyone else's bill, will be finally agreed to.

Mr. SHAFER. All I would like to have, Mr. Chairman, is the assurance that controls can be placed on any items in short supply in this country. That is all I ask, and that is what my bill provides. There are only 415 items now being controlled under this act. There were 3,200, as I explained before.

This organization that administers the act, the Department of International Trade, has done a good job in decontrolling all items that have been in surplus supply. All I ask is the assurance that the OTI just will not be abolished on the 30th day of this month. If it is, the Committee on the Judiciary of the House can take the responsibility for the increase in the prices of those articles that will be shipped out of here and no control had over them.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman and I do not differ a lot, but I want to call his attention to the fact that these 3,200 items that have been removed have been removed largely because of legislation enacted by the Congress, which is just along the lines of this bill. This bill is carrying on the first Decontrol War Powers Act which this House passed, which came from our committee, and which was responsible for the decontrol of practically all of those items. But I do not want to revive the law enacted in 1940 without any limitation, without any reference to anything that has happened from the time the original authority was given, up to now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. I am glad to have this colloquy in my time.

Mr. SHAFER. May I ask the gentleman one more question? Did the Judiciary Committee hear Mr. Blaisdell and Mr. McIntyre and others of the Office of International Trade? Did they appear before his committee?

Mr. SPRINGER. They did not.

Mr. SHAFER. I did not think so.

Mr. SPRINGER. We notified everyone who was interested in the legislation to appear, and specific invitations were issued to the departments of Government interested. But those gentlemen did not appear and they did not testify.

Mr. SHAFER. It appears very much, Mr. Chairman, that we must have two different bills on this matter, as I have contended, because if those gentlemen did not appear before the Judiciary Committee they should have appeared before this bill was brought before us.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. After those other men were notified.

Mr. MICHENER. The departments were notified. Amplifying what my colleague from Michigan has said, as I recall, according to the report, hearings were held on the Shafer bill back in April. We were holding hearings at that time, too, on this matter, and we held hearings up to the 28th day of May. The gentlemen to whom he referred appeared before his committee weeks and weeks ago. Now, we introduced this bill at the request of the very people he is talking about and on the 28th day of May, and then we held additional hearings. They sent up their experts and the people who advocated what is in this bill. The Shafer bill was introduced on June 3.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

THE RESOURCES OF OUR COUNTRY MUST BE PROTECTED

Mr. Chairman, I am particularly interested in the legislation before us that deals with the question of export controls, especially as it applies to petroleum and petroleum products. I am generally in favor of a minimum amount of control by the Federal Government, but I do think that in dealing with such an important problem, it is well for us to take notice of some of the things that are going on with regard to exportation of oils and other materials to other countries.

I direct your attention to a serious situation with respect to oil. We are exporting oil to foreign countries where it is sold at premium prices. We are informed that our country exported more than a million gallons of gas and oil to Russia during the last month at a premium price of 39 cents per barrel. We also shipped large supplies to other countries.

The Secretary of the Navy told a committee of this Congress recently that our country is becoming a "have not" Nation with respect to our gas and oil supplies. Big oil companies have just published statements to the effect that they are going to ration gasoline for a while because the demand is greater than the capacity of our refineries.

It appears we are depleting our oil and gas resources in favor of the countries of Europe, some of whom have vast supplies of their own. It seems to me that, while we are willing to divide with foreign nations, it would be well that we find out where our supplies are going and whether our resources can stand the exports of such materials that are being purchased at premium prices from funds, a great extent of which are loaned by this country.

Our Government in recent months has given or loaned, in one way or another, either through the Army, the State Department, or otherwise, approximately one and one-half billion dollars to other nations so they may buy products and materials from this country. This money, of course, comes from the Federal Treasury. I do not want to be misunderstood. I am in favor of doing as much as we can within reason to rehabilitate people of other countries who are in need, but I believe there are at least two things that ought to be considered: First, we should know what products are going out of this country, where they are going, and for what use. We should also be informed with respect to our own resources, so it may be determined whether our reserves and supplies are sufficient to take care of the demands without injury to the Nation's stability.

In view of the situation I have just outlined, the American people are entitled to be informed with respect to this condition, especially considering that the funds for the purchase of these supplies are in the most part being furnished by the American taxpayer.

After all, we want to help people who are in need, but, at the same time, we must protect our own interests. Let us take a little inventory as we go along. It is time, I think, for the American people to stop, look, and investigate.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, during the war it was necessary to delegate a great deal of authority to the executive department. I think the Committee on the Judiciary has been doing a good job in trying to write off some of the controls that were delegated during the war. They will remember that the gentleman now addressing the House introduced resolutions to end some of these controls that may have been necessary during the war. I still have a resolution before the Judiciary Committee and I understand that some attention is being given to it. I hope that we can go along with the other body, as they have passed a bill that takes off these controls that are in effect because of the war.

There is one control, however, that I wish the Committee on the Judiciary or the Committee on Public Works, to which the several resolutions were referred, would deal with. It relates to the power of the Executive to freeze a part of the appropriation bills as passed by this Congress. Let us go over that again.

At the present time the Chief Executive claims to have the authority under the War Powers Act to nullify any part of the appropriations that this Congress might pass. You do not think so? Well, he did it last year the day after Congress adjourned on an appropriation bill that the Congress passed relative to public works. Public works includes irrigation projects, post offices, flood control, and similar projects. Now, he did that the day after Congress adjourned last year. It must be remembered that when that public works appropriation bill was before him, he had 10 or a dozen Members of Congress down when he signed the bill, and he handed a pen to each one that had been interested in the bill and said that this was a great step forward. The Congress adjourned on August 3 of last year, but in a letter dated August 2 he froze most of the work for Public Works. That freeze order included appropriations for reclamation and flood control. Last week this Congress appro-

priated $12,000,000 to take care of emergency flood control work. It might not have been necessary had work proceeded under the appropriation as passed by the Congress last year.

I submit to my colleagues that the Chief Executive should not have the authority under the Second War Powers Act to nullify a portion of an appropriation bill that might be passed by this Congress. He still has that authority. I hope the proper committee, whether it be the Committee on the Judiciary or the Committee on Public Works, will take the steps necessary to see that this authority is eliminated, because it has never been held by any President heretofore and it has never been so exercised.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska that on the 24th of this month the Senate passed Senate Joint Resolution 123, which I understand eliminates 142 specific laws which were closely related to the conduct of the war. It may be that the very act to which the gentleman refers is incorporated among those contained in that bill. I am not certain. That bill has just been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. I understand we are going to start checking on these laws immediately, and the matter will soon be before the House.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I am glad to know that. I know that the Committee on the Judiciary, of which the gentleman is a member, and whose chairman is the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], will go into that problem carefully. I hope you will explore it thoroughly, and if you do find that the President still retains the authority under the Second War Powers Act to freeze appropriations passed by this Congress, that you will take appropriate action to annul such authority.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin: On page 5, after subsection (c), insert a new subsection to read as follows:

"(d) The President shall have power to control both imports and exports of wheat, flour, corn, oats, and barley."

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the adoption of this amendment will clear up this matter so we will know in time what is in this bill and what in time is not in the bill. I have heard two answers. One is that wheat exports were to be controlled and the other was that they were not going to be controlled. If you adopt this amendment it will clear up that situation. At least we will know then whether or not wheat is included.

I repeat what our distinguished colleague from Minnesota said, and may I say there is not a Member of this House that is closer to the food situation and has been for the last 20 years than the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN]. If there is any reason in the world to extend any powers to President Truman at this time in connection with agricultural products, it surely is so far as wheat is concerned. Wheat is the staff of life. It is hard for me to get up here today in my present frame of mind, as I mentioned before, when they will not even have controls over a little thing like wool, and try to give the President power to control the export of wheat. There is no reason for me to be wrong too. I do not think there is a Member of this House who wants to assume the responsibility of letting these exports of wheat go all over the world and not have any control over them. Wheat prices have settled down. The price is not very much above the support price at the present time. I should like to have any Member here tell me what the price of wheat is going to be in 30 days in view of what we are facing so far as the United States oat and corn crop is concerned in 1947. Do you deliberately wish to raise the cost of living at this time?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I feel that the gentleman's amendment should be adopted, unless it is cleared up by the committee that these commodities are included, because so long as we furnish money to foreign countries to buy these commodities, and they do not expect to repay the money, they will bid up the price and take the commodities out of the United States. As the gentleman has so well said, when it comes to producing feed crops this year, we may have to use a lot of this wheat in lieu of corn to take care of our livestock and produce dairy products, pork, and poultry products for the people.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I hope the committee takes the right attitude and accepts this amendment. There is nothing personal in it as far as I am concerned. Very few bushels of wheat are produced in my district, but I do know we have 140,000,000 people in the United States, and I know that bread is the staff of life. I know that as a Member of Congress I do not want to sit here and leave the President powerless and let wheat from this country go all over the world and have the price of wheat $2.50, $3, or $4 a bushel, which is what they are selling the Argentine wheat for at the present time. So I hope the committee will accept this amendment.

Mr. SHAFER. Will your amendment take care of oil?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. It only takes care of wheat and grain.

Mr. SHAFER. That is what I wanted to know.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] relates to the import and export controls on wheat, oats, corn, and other farm commodities.

We are dealing in this bill with the controls on allocations, the controls on priorities that are set forth in title III of the Second War Powers Act.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin is broad in its terms and proposes certain provisions which I do not think come within the provisions of this bill. This bill relates to certain items which have been continued under control by the extension of the Second War Powers Act. The export control which the gentleman from Wisconsin suggests by his amendment is all-embracing and does not relate to the allocation or the priority but gives both import and export controls on certain commodities not relating to allocations at all.

Mr. Chairman, the committee cannot accept the gentleman's amendment, and I ask the Committee to vote it down.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I am taking this time to try to clarify what seems to me to be a rather confused situation, both regarding this bill and the general export control bill which was reported out of the Committee on Armed Services and on which a rule was granted this morning.

I hope the chairman of the committee or the chairman of the subcommittee will check me on these facts if my understanding is incorrect.

Export controls were first put on in this country a year and a half prior to the time that we went to war. That was done by the act of July 2, 1940, long before the Second War Powers Act was ever thought of.

The bill which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] has introduced and which will be before us shortly, deals with the continuation of the Presidential powers that were given at that time. Those Presidential powers were intended to protect this country from having drained out of its domestic economy all sorts of things which would include grain, flour, tractors, and all types of things for which we have a great domestic need and for which competitive bidding, if they were in short supply, would drive the domestic prices up to such a point as to destroy our entire economy. That is the bill which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER] has introduced and which will come before us later.

The bill from the Committee on the Judiciary, as it has been reported, is a bill which has a much more limited application, and with that limited application the amendment just offered does not really take care of the situation which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] had in mind. The intent of the Second War Powers Act was never to control exports but to control domestic priorities with respect to exports so that the Government in certain exceptional cases could require manufacturers in this country to send certain types of machinery or goods abroad because of the valuable returns that we get for doing that.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is entirely correct.

The amendment proposed by the gentleman from Wisconsin relates to the general Export Control Act while we are dealing here in the Second War Powers Act with title III which relates to allocations and priorities and is not all-inclusive as is proposed by the gentleman from Wisconsin in his amendment.

Mr. HERTER. Will the gentleman agree that we have to have a combination of both bills? At the present time,

as I understand it, the Senate has approved a bill which is now a combination of the two things. If we pass both bills, they would then be considered in conference as a single matter even though there was a division of jurisdiction in the matter as it was handled here in the House.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say to the distinguished gentleman that I understand the Senate is considering that bill at this particular time and it has not yet been voted out; at least, that is the information I received this morning.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I would like to ask the gentleman whether there would be any objection—I recognize the gentleman as a great parliamentarian—to the gentleman from Michigan offering a new title to this bill which would include his amendment?

Mr. HERTER. After all, I am not the Parliamentarian of the House, but we are dealing with two entirely different laws which were put on the statute books at different times. While there is an overlapping to a limited degree, they have been under separate jurisdictions and before different committees of the House.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HERTER. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Then we have the gentleman's assurance that the bill of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER], for which a rule has already been granted, will come in subject to amendment and that in that bill we can take care of the wheat and feed situation.

Mr. HERTER. I may say to the gentleman that if that bill comes before the House in its present form, it already takes care of the situation the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that, if the two bills deal with different subjects, then parliamentarily they cannot get married in the House. A point of order would lie. If both bills are included in a bill that comes from the Senate, they would be married, and they would be before the conference.

Mr. HERTER. The gentleman is a great parliamentarian and knows much more about the rules governing such things than I; but I believe it is extremely important that the general export control powers be maintained because we are likely to get ourselves into a very serious situation on many commodities that we cannot now foresee which may become scarce.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to direct a question to a member of the Judiciary Committee. Is there anything in the bill that continues Government control over freight cars used for the transportation of gas, oil, and petroleum products. Is there anything in this bill that continues this authority in the executive branch of the Government?

Mr. SPRINGER. As the gentleman knows, title 3 of the Second War Powers Act relates to priorities and allocations. That is what we are dealing with here. We are not dealing with the broad general subject such as the Export Control Act, or anything of that character. The question here deals with allocations. Under title 6 on page 4 of the bill the gentleman will note that the word "materials" is used in connection with export controls. That is a very broad word.

Mr. RIZLEY. The matter of which I speak has no relation whatever to export controls, it is related to control of freight cars or control of cars that were built for the Government and put into use in the petroleum industry for domestic use.

The Government controlled the use of these cars by leasing them to various and sundry companies. They were used to transport butane and other liquefied gases. The Government has controlled these cars but they have been declared surplus and control will end on June 30. Allocations were attempted to be made by ODT under the War Powers Act. What I am seeking to find out is whether control over those cars is continued in this bill.

Mr. SPRINGER. There is nothing specific on that subject in this bill. The Office of Defense Transportation and the War Manpower Commission jointly had something to do with that subject—perhaps more recently the Office of Defense Transportation has that problem; but this bill relates only to allocations and priorities and contains nothing regarding the matter to which my good friend has referred.

Mr. RIZLEY. The point I am trying to make is that these cars did come under allocations and priorities and I want to know whether the law granting such control of these cars is extended by this act.

Mr. SPRINGER. The question of continuation is set forth in sections 4, 5, and 6 in the new provisions of the bill; and those powers are all that are being continued by this bill.

Mr. RIZLEY. The gentleman means, then, that this power is not continued or extended to anything except those things which are specifically mentioned in, and sent out, and described in this bill.

Mr. SPRINGER. And which could be included by interpretation; but there is no specific reference to the matter which the gentleman from Oklahoma has mentioned.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. COLE of Missouri, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3647) to extend certain powers of the President under title 3 of the Second War Powers Act, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any of the amendments? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the bill just passed may have five legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 3993) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 717), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. COOPER reserved all points of order.

MARY LOMAS

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1742) for the relief of Mary Lomas, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 5, strike out "54" and insert "56."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concerred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Carrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 13) entitled "Joint resolution to extend the succession, lending powers, and the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation," requests a conference with the House on

the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BUCK, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. MAYBANK, and Mr. SPARKMAN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from a magazine.

INTERNATIONAL REFUGEE ORGANIZATION

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 207, providing for membership and participation by the United States in the International Refugee Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 207, with Mr. BREHM in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GORDON].

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote for the passage of House Joint Resolution 207 as reported unanimously by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I believe the conditions that are written in this joint resolution are adequate, and recommends a fair distribution of responsibilities in solving the gigantic problem for the care of displaced persons for their repatriation or resettlement.

The International Refugee Organization is the method recommended by the General Assembly of the United Nations for the solution of the displaced persons problem.

If the United States does not become a member of the International Refugee Organization, that organization will not come into being. Thus, the question of United States participation is really identical with the question of whether the International Refugee Organization should exist at all. If there is no International Refugee Organization, the United States will have to assume, for an indefinite period, all costs and responsibilities connected with the care and assistance to the eventual disposition of the over 600,000 displaced persons in American-occupied zones. This eventuality would prove disadvantageous to the United States on financial, practical, and political grounds.

The cost to the United States last year of taking care of our share of the displaced persons was about $130,000,000. Our share of the International Refugee Organization budget for the first year would be only $73,500,000. A saving of $56,500,000 would thus be effected.

The resettlement of the displaced persons in our zones will not be financed by the respective countries which will receive them, but by the International Refugee Organization or—if it does not come into being—by the United States. In the former case, the United States would contribute 45.75 percent of the developing costs of resettling all of the estimated 800,000 displaced persons to be resettled. In the latter case, we would pay 100 percent of the resettlement costs of between 500,000 and 600,000.

The participation of 15 or more countries in the International Refugee Organization will create a collective stimulus toward solution of the problem as quickly as possible through resettlement. Toward that end the resettlement problem will be in the forefront of discussion on a world-wide basis.

But if the United States has not supported the international solution of the problem through an International Refugee Organization, we would have to play a lone hand in arranging with other countries for the resettlement of our displaced persons. This would doubtless take considerably longer, thus prolonging our subsidization of the care and maintenance costs well beyond the 3- to 5-year goal of the International Refugee Organization.

This organization would consolidate and greatly simplify the processes through which relief and resettlement are to be effected. Therefore, the per capita costs would be at a minimum.

Without this organization, the United States would have to deal separately with a multiplicity of countries, private agencies, missions, and individuals. Real economy through consolidation would be almost impossible. Per capita costs would thus be much higher both for care and resettlement.

The orderly disposition of the displaced persons problem is, for financial, political, and humanitarian reasons, essential to its success. The formulation of just, uniform, and recognized standards concerning displaced-persons care, assistance, eligibility, nationality determination, documentation, international travel, resettlement, and legal and political protection, is of prime importance not only to the displaced persons themselves, but to the countries of the world. Obviously a forum of interested nations can fulfill these objectives far more completely, quickly, and satisfactorily than can any one country acting unilaterally. Efficient solution of such matters will directly or indirectly benefit every country involved, and especially those—such as the United States—which are importantly involved in the displaced-persons problem. The international scope of the refugee problem was officially recognized by the first meeting of the General Assembly of the UN in January 1946. Failure to achieve such results will bring chaos to the world-refugee problem, and ultimate repercussions of a far-reaching nature.

Politically, the United States cannot afford to avoid international participation in one of the great world problems emerging from the war. Even if we had not a single displaced person in our zones, the moral and political obligation to accept international responsibility toward the succor of more than a million anti-Fascist refugees would be inescapable.

House Joint Resolution 207 authorizes United States membership and participation in the work of the International Refugee Organization, a temporary organization within the framework of the United Nations, which was formed December 15, 1946, to deal with the problem of war refugees and displaced persons who are being cared for at present by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration and the occupying armies. The United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, however, will terminate on June 30, 1947, throwing the entire burden and expense of this problem on the United States Army and other occupying armies unless the International Refugee Organization takes over.

Our joining this United Nations organization is an act of international cooperation that will save money for the United States, will carry out our agreed share in the support, repatriation and resettlement of these victims of war and its aftermath, without change in our immigration laws or policies, and will terminate existing responsibilities for the displaced persons in the United States occupied zones.

During the war Hitler had more than 10,000,000 people from the countries he occupied in concentration camps or at slave labor. It is estimated that on VE-day there were over 8,000,000 of these war victims. They were the survivors of the diabolically ingenious system of torture, terror, and starvation by which the Nazis suppressed the occupied countries and got their work done. Since VE-day over 7,000,000 of them have been repatriated, returned to their homes, or resettled, placed in other lands. Others have come to the camps as refugees from postwar Soviet terror and persecution. There remained on December 31, 1946, slightly more than 1,000,000 displaced persons in Germany, Austria, and Italy, as follows:

In camp:	
Polish	278,863
Jewish	193,332
Baltic	180,838
Yugoslav	39,494
Soviet	13,800
Western European	2,400
Others	86,003
Total	794,735
Out of camp	242,669
Grand total	1,037,404

These displaced persons, men, women, and children, in about 700 camps, numbering from a few hundred up to 16,000, are what has been called the hard core of unrepatriables.

Many of them do not dare return home because of well-justified fear of persecution. Although the occupied countries must contribute to their support, basic care and maintenance must be continued for them and arrangements must be made for their eventual repatriation or resettlement.

Up to now responsibility for this essentially civilian problem has been divided between the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, the Inter-Governmental Committee on Refugees, the American, British, and French Armies—a wasteful, expensive, confusing, unsatisfactory system. Two-thirds of the displaced persons are under the American flag, a charge on the American taxpayers.

Our failure to join the International Refugee Organization would be tantamount to a rejection of the idea of international effort as the ideal medium for the solution of humanity's problems. Thus, the underlying unity of all world organizations, and particularly of the United Nations, would be seriously prejudiced by our stand.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the joint resolution we now have under consideration is a companion measure to Senate Joint Resolution 77, with the same title and purpose, unanimously passed by the Senate on March 25, 1947. It had been reported to the Senate on March 11, 1947, with the unanimous approval of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. With no change in the text, except as to the amount of our contribution, the resolution was introduced in the House as House Joint Resolution 207 and referred to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. After hearings, conducted by a subcommittee of which I was a member, and after earnest consideration by the full committee, the measure was reported out with the committee's unanimous approval.

There are three important provisions in the measure. First, it authorizes the acceptance by the United States of membership in the International Refugee Organization, the first organization set up by the United Nations to take care of an international problem. Second, it authorizes the President to designate the United States representatives and alternates who will attend the sessions of the Organization. Third, it authorizes the appropriation annually of such sums as may be necessary for the payment of its administrative expenses.

It is quite natural that the Members of the House should want to know, not only the reasons for the establishment of the International Refugee Organization, but also why it is either necessary or advisable for the United States to become a member of or to contribute to the costs of carrying out its purposes and the expenses of its administration.

No doubt our situation in respect to displaced persons in Europe is known to many Members of the House. There may be others, however, who have had no opportunity nor occasion to look into the matter and who therefore desire further information. It is my hope that in the short time allotted to me I may be able to give a reasonably clear explanation of the purposes of the proposed legislation and the reasons for its enactment.

When the United States and its allies took over Germany after defeating the German army, over 8,000,000 people from countries conquered and looted by Hitler were found in concentration camps or engaged in enforced or slave labor. These were called "displaced persons." Most of these were the helpless victims of aggression held in bondage by a brutal taskmaster. Freed by the allied armies, their disposition immediately became a serious problem—a problem not yet completely solved.

From VE-day down to the present, however, approximately 7,000,000 of these people have either been repatriated, that is, returned to their former homes in the respective countries from which they were removed, or have been resettled in other countries. Pending repatriation or resettlement, all displaced persons, including women and children, had to be fed, clothed, and sheltered at great expense by UNRRA, the intergovernment Committee on Refugees, and the Army. Of this expense, the United States bore its full share.

Today, of the 1,000,000 persons remaining unrepatriated and unresettled, there are 600,000 in the United States camps, under the American flag, who, with the passing of UNRRA and unless the task is taken over by some other agency, must be housed, clothed, and fed by our Government alone, at an annual cost of $130,000,000.

Of the 600,000 now being cared for in American camps, there are practically none who can be repatriated. For a reason that no one can well question, they refuse to return or to be returned to their former homes. They are certain that should they return they will be welcomed by death or by the chains of slavery.

Among the persons who thus fear repatriation and who must be resettled are 278,868 from Poland, 180,838 from the Baltic countries, 39,404 from Yugoslavia, 13,800 from the Soviet Union, 2,400 from various sections of western Europe, and 86,000 from other parts of the world. There are also 193,332 persons of the Jewish race who cannot be repatriated and for whom must be found places for resettlement.

The process of resettling these people has been and is now going on as rapidly as possible. I am advised that prospects are brightening every day for acceptance of large numbers of displaced persons by other countries. A large number have already been resettled in various European countries, such as Belgium and Norway, and several South American countries have already agreed to accept quite a number of them as immigrants and prospective citizens.

We had evidence before our committee showing that within the past 3 months there were resettled in Brazil 5,000 persons, in Chile 8,000, in Colombia 400, in Peru 5,000, and in Venezuela 15,000. Within the same time, 50,000 displaced persons were resettled in Belgium. As I have stated, from now on, the job will be one of resettlement only—a task involving the negotiation of agreements with various nations whereunder the persons will be permitted to enter those countries—a fixed number in each case—and there find a haven and establish their homes. To accomplish this in the shortest possible time will be the task of the new Organization:

It must be understood that the Organization we are discussing today is an instrumentality of the United Nations. In December last, the United Nations, anticipating the liquidation of UNRRA and recognizing the international character of the problem of displaced persons, undertook the establishment of an Organization to take over the task of caring for and resettling them, such Organization to take charge immediately after UNRRA closed up. A constitution for IRO—International Refugee Organization—was approved by the General Assembly on December 15, 1946, and participation of the nations of the world invited.

Under the constitution the signatures of 15 states were required to bring the Organization into existence. Up to this date 19 states have signed, and the allocated contributions of such signatory states total more than the 75 percent of the budget required by the constitution as a condition precedent to the Organization's establishment. The United States signed the constitution, subject, however, to the approval of the Congress. Therefore, to make the membership and participation of the United States effective, it is necessary to pass the legislation now under consideration.

Incidentally, it may be stated that neither Russia nor any of her satellites or puppet states have joined this organization. Their adherence is not anticipated. It is, however, expected that quite a number of other nations will join following the passage by Congress of the pending legislation. Other nations have been awaiting the action of the United States.

Immediate action on this legislation is extremely important. UNRRA goes out of existence within the next few days—June 30, 1947. There is no other organization either ready, willing, or authorized to take over. UNRRA has had the direction and management of the displaced persons camps. So far as I recall, no one has yet told us just what will happen when UNRRA steps out. Perhaps the Army will step in and do the whole of a job on which it was doing a part. I am not advised. But I do know that the job is one for this proposed international organization—a facility working under and with the United Nations.

May I, in conclusion emphasize the fact that, by joining with the IRO to solve the problem of displaced persons, we will save the difference between the annual cost of doing the job alone, which we will be forced to do, and our annual contribution to the Organization. The cost to the United States of taking care of displaced persons during the past year of 1947 was $130,000,000, including the sums paid out by our Army and our contribution through UNRRA. Our annual contribution to IRO will be $73,500,000. Therefore, our membership in the IRO, if we join under the authorization of this legislation, will save to the United States the difference between $130,000,000 and $73,500,000—a net saving of $56,500,000 for the first year. Our saving for ensuing years, and until the work of the Organization is completed, will be in the same proportion, but determined by the number of persons who may be resettled each year. It is believed, and earnestly hoped, that the Organization will have completed its task within the next 3 years.

The pending legislation is desirable from every standpoint The problem of displaced persons is certainly one of international concern. There is certainly no valid reason why the United States should alone be responsible for its solution or should alone carry the heavy burden it imposes. The International Refugee Organization will relieve us of a great part of the burden and much

of the responsibility. Our membership in the Organization imposes no obligation other than the payment of our annual contribution, and this, as has been shown, is for the first year, $56,500,000 less than we have heretofore been contributing for the same purpose.

From time to time I have been asked whether or not this legislation would in any way change or modify our immigration laws. Some inquirers have expressed the fear that in some manner the resolution might open the door for admission of a number of refugees or displaced persons into the United States, regardless of our immigration regulations.

Such fears are entirely groundless and unwarranted. The Committee on Foreign Affairs saw to it that an amendment, written in the bill before its passage by the Senate, was incorporated in the measure we are now considering. That amendment clearly and expressly provides against any modification or abrogation of our immigration laws by this resolution and specifically inhibits the admittance into the country, or settlement or resettlement herein, of any person or persons without prior approval of Congress. The amendment further provides that the resolution shall not be construed as such prior approval. This safeguard is certainly ample and its language certainly cannot be misinterpreted.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEE. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Assuming that we do not find places for these people, how long will we be expected to carry the load?

Mr. KEE. We will be expected to carry the load, if we fail to go into this Organization, just as long as a single displaced person remains in the American camps.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Is it not a fact that if this Organization is organized and we join it we can retire on 1 year's notice, whereas today we have the obligation on our own hands?

Mr. KEE. That is true. It is further true that it is anticipated by this Organization, a new organization that will take over this work, that they will certainly find a place for the resettlement of all of these people within 3 years. They are already resettling them very rapidly. Belgium recently took 50,000 persons and Brazil has taken 5,000. Peru has accepted 5,000 and Venezuela 15,000. Other countries are rapidly taking them. If we place this burden where it belongs, these people will be resettled and the $130,000,000 cost to us annually will be reduced to $73,500,000.

The need for prompt action on this legislation in imperative, and I want to express the earnest hope that the proposal may receive the unanimous approval of the membership of this body.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Foreign Affairs should be commended for reporting favorably on this humanitarian legislation (H. J. Res. 207). This resolution provides for membership and participation by the United States in the International Refugee Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor.

There are today over a million displaced and homeless persons in the war-stricken countries of Europe. Some of these unfortunate people cannot go back to their former homes on account of hostile governments now in control which will imprison or execute them on account of former views and independent thought. The great majority of these displaced and unfortunate war victims are without any opportunities to establish a homeland or secure work or earn a livelihood. By adopting this resolution, the United States will share with other countries its just and pro rata responsibility on caring for these helpless people. In considering this resolution, we must look upon our country as the world's leading Nation, willing to shoulder its responsibility to humanity. These homeless people have been harassed, abused, and starved to the point where they are pitiful objects for human charity. No sensible person could turn his back upon the appeals for aid those people make to the Christian and civilized nations of the world.

I have received numerous requests from individuals and organization in the industrial Calumet Region of Indiana, asking that our great country do its share to finish the burdensome responsibility which has been thrown upon democratic nations by reason of the recent World War. I hope and trust that this resolution passes as reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the joint resolution for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President is hereby authorized to accept membership for the United States in the International Refugee Organization (hereinafter referred to as the "Organization"), the constitution of which was approved in New York on December 15, 1946, by the General Assembly of the United Nations, and deposited in the archives of the United Nations: *Provided, however*, That this authority is granted and the approval of the Congress of the acceptance of membership of the United States in the International Refugee Organization is given upon condition and with the reservation that no agreement shall be concluded on behalf of the United States and no action shall be taken by any officer, agency, or any other person and acceptance of the constitution of the Organization by or on behalf of the Government of the United States shall not constitute or authorize action (1) whereby any person shall be admitted to or settled or resettled in the United States or any of its Territories or possessions without prior approval thereof by the Congress, and this joint resolution shall not be construed as such prior approval, or (2) which will have the effect of abrogating, suspending, modifying, adding to, or superseding any of the immigration laws or any other laws of the United States.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] some questions. I think it is probably brought out clearly in the joint resolution and was brought out rather clearly on the floor yesterday that this resolution does not change our immigration laws.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman is correct. The section which has just been read, which is known as the Revercomb amendment, inserted in the companion Senate bill by Senator REVERCOMB, makes that as clear as human language can do it.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. This joint resolution refers to the constitution of the IRO. Is there anything in that constitution that might bind the United States Government in any way to take any part of the refugees or displaced persons in the American zone in Europe or any other place in Europe?

Mr. VORYS. There is not. The Revercomb amendment was the result of a long study and consideration of legal opinions in the Senate, and it positively eliminates any such possibility. Of course, the purpose of the IRO is to do three things: To support these people, and repatriate them or send them home, if possible, and third, to resettle them, that is, find a new home for them, and new homes are being found for thousands of them. That is the way these camps will finally be eliminated. But no country is forced to accept any and by the terms of the constitution and to make assurance doubly sure, we have put in the Revercomb amendment which is absolutely airtight on that.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Following the question I asked the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE] a moment ago, assuming that the United Nations do not find a place for all of these people to settle, how long will we be expected in the United States to carry this financial burden?

Mr. VORYS. Of course, that is anybody's guess. The hope is that within 2 or 3 years, at the outside 5 years, this problem will have been eliminated. I can give you my own suggestion, and that is that when these camps have been reduced to the point where all of those who can be resettled or repatriated have been resettled or repatriated and when the economy of Germany has again been built up, then those who need merely custodial care, that is, the lame, the halt, and the blind, will be supported by the German people under international supervision, however, to make sure that the Germans do not do with them what they did with the displaced persons during the war. Certainly, that is unofficial, but that is my hope as to the way the thing could end up in 2 or 3 years. Of course, we can retire or withdraw at any time on a year's notice, and if this gets too burdensome we will bow out.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. KEE. The international supervision, of course, would be the supervision of the IRO, the organization that we are setting up.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. But we are not, that is, the Government of the United States is not in any way bound by

anything written in that constitution. Is that correct?

Mr. KEE. We are not bound by anything written in that constitution as compared with the act we are considering here.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. May I ask one further question of the gentleman from Ohio?

We have pending in the Congress a bill to bring some 400,000 so-called displaced persons into the United States as immigrants for permanent residence. I doubt that bill passes, but is there anything in this House Joint Resolution 207 or in the constitution involved in it which will warrant anybody saying that Congress is bound on moral grounds, having passed this resolution, to take a number of immigrants?

Mr. VORYS. There is not only no moral commitment in this legislation—there is not only no moral commitment on our entering into this organization which would require us to change our immigration laws, but in my judgment we will have tremendous moral pressures brought on us, if we fail to do anything for the support of these people where they are now, to take care of them since we refused to go into this international organization to take care of them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I simply want to get that in the record because if this so-called refugee bill ever gets to the floor I do not want to hear it said in this House that having gone into this we are morally obligated to take the next step and let down our immigration barriers.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MATHEWS. Since it has been figured here that we are to pay 39.8 percent of the administration budget and 45.7 percent of the operating budget, which is almost half, those percentages must have been based on something. Why will it not be reasonable to argue that we should take that percentage of displaced persons?

Mr. BLOOM. Oh, no.

Mr. MATHEWS. I am asking why.

Mr. VORYS. Obviously, the big financial load is put on the nation that is best able to bear the load.

Mr. MATHEWS. Yes.

Mr. VORYS. On the other hand, the resettlement obligation is being put most heavily on those nations which cannot contribute financially, but which do need manpower. That is the way the thing is operating at the present time. We are putting up the lion's share of the money, and those nations which do not have the money but which do need manpower and have the places to resettle the people take the lion's share of the resettlement.

Mr. MATHEWS. Have we the gentleman's assurance on that?

Mr. VORYS. Yes; that is what is going on right now.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I am glad the gentleman from Ohio has made that statement because we now have a solemn commitment from the Foreign Affairs Committee that while the United States is putting up the bulk of the finances we are going to expect other nations to take the load of receiving these people. I desire to say in conclusion that I am fearful, after all, that this resolution will prove to be unwise. We all sympathize with people in distress, and I think our Nation has made most ample provision for them, but it seems to me that we ought to take stock and see how much further this Nation can go in such matters first. The resources of this Nation are not unlimited. The committee cannot give us any estimate of how long we may be expected to keep up this vast expenditure. They say it might last up to 5 years. How long can we keep it up? We need more information on this whole problem, it seems to me. We now know that UNRRA was badly handled, almost a failure. Nations took advantage of us. The substance which we sent over there was misused in a great many cases and probably in few cases was it made known to the recipients that the United States was putting up the great bulk of it. It seems that this new organization—IRO—is now to step in where UNRRA left off. What assurances do we have that it will not be handled in the same manner as UNRRA was? Mr. Chairman, in view of the many uncertainties and risks involved in this new venture, I approach it with grave concern. We have been giving these people food, clothing, medical care, and everything else they needed for more than 2 years now while they sit down and do nothing. After the Civil War our people returned to farms run-down and destroyed, homes laid waste in many cases, farm tools rusted and gone, but they still had brave hearts, great souls, and indomitable wills and they went to work and triumphed over the most terrible aftermath of war ever experienced by any people. One-armed men tied their sleeves to a plowhandle and, undaunted by privations, hardships, and even lack of the actual necessities of life, faced the future with a courage and determination never equaled in history. They received not 1 cent from the Federal Government or any other source. They helped themselves.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I am becoming fed up with the gyrations and hoop-jumping to which this Congress is being continuously subjected.

It was only a couple of months ago when we were asked to provide, and did provide, some $350,000,000 for relief purposes in numerous parts of the world. UNRRA was about to end. UNRRA had been a failure. Loud were the assurances that this time the administration and the expenditures would be in the exclusive control of the United States. The cumbersomeness and the unworkability of UNRRA's international control would not be continued. Harry S. Truman wrote to the Congress, and I quote:

> I recommend that this relief assistance be given directly rather than through an international organization and that our contribution be administered under United States control.

The committee, on page 3 of its report, said:

> The relief contemplated in this joint resolution is in no sense a continuation of UNRRA. Although of the utmost urgency, it is believed that the problem can best be handled by direct relief rather than through the cumbersome mechanism of an international agency.

Then the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], in the debate, said:

> It is a different proposition, is it not, than UNRRA? UNRRA was an international proposition. This is a proposition where the Government of the United States controls every penny it has appropriated for this purpose and it cannot go to any other purpose.

Carrying on the desirability of United States control, the distinguished minority leader, Mr. RAYBURN, remarked:

> Every dollar of this money is in the hands of the President of the United States. Is this not correct?

And Mr. EATON replied:

> Yes.

Then the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM]:

> In this bill we provide the rules and regulations they must conform to and the President of the United States has full control. A gentleman referred to UNRRA but that has nothing to do with this. This is a different kind of administration. It is a unilateral administration. If they do not conform to the rules and regulations laid down by the United States Government, then we can automatically without any notice at all shut them off from any further relief.

The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS], speaking of UNRRA, carried on with:

> As a matter of fact, we have contributed 72 percent of that entire fund for world relief to this date. In addition to that, we have turned our funds over to an international organization and, in some cases, we have been disappointed with the methods of distribution and the results.

Today, Mr. Chairman, 2 months later, we turn a handspring. We are asked to contribute annually for an undetermined number of future years $73,000,000 to the same type of international organization which was condemned so lustily 7 or 8 weeks ago. We contribute some 40 percent of the administrative cost and from 45 to 50 percent of the operating cost. And, Mr. Chairman, unbelievable as it is, we get one vote out of nine as to how that money is to be spent. We even lack assurance that the chief of the organization will be an American. Yesterday the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], the chairman of the subcommittee, told us, and I quote:

> This is not a case, I take it, where we are seeking control and responsibility. It is a case where we now have control and responsibility for two-thirds of these people—600,000 of them in our zone—and we would be very happy to share control and respon-

sibility with the rest of the world because this is not merely an American problem. It is an international problem and I know of no one in the United States who is seeking to have us control the destiny of this organization and pay for all of its costs.

Mr. Chairman, I have never considered it good business to give others the responsibility for spending my money, particularly when those others outvote me eight to one. I would prefer, under these circumstances, to keep the responsibility myself. It might cost me a bit more but eight other people would not be telling me what to do.

Mr. Chairman, the administration and the Committee on Foreign Affairs was wrong either on the $350,000,000 relief measure or on this measure. I can no longer take one argument one day and the opposite argument the next day. I shall therefore vote against this bill. I favor our handling our problems with our own people and I hope some day that the administration and the committee will make up their minds as to whether it is best to spend our money ourselves or let it be spent for us by an international organization.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York says there is some inconsistency between this bill and the action taken on the relief bill. In the first place, the reason that relief was continued unilaterally was because it was hoped that relief was tapering off this year and that this would be the wind-up job and that there was no reason for continuing a big international organization. On the other hand, in this matter of the displaced persons, which has been a military question of taking care of some people found in our zones, for one thing in order to preserve order, it was felt that it was time to start up an international organization to carry out this international responsibility, and therefore the IRO was formed for that purpose. The gentleman, I am sure, has cited nothing in connection with the relief measure which would warrant anyone expecting that the refugees were to be supported out of the $350,000,000 relief bill. Let me remind the House that Germany is excluded from the relief bill, that this Congress wrote in the countries that were to receive the relief, and Germany was not one of them. Germany has 850,774 out of the 1,037,404 DP's, so that four-fifths of the DP's are in Germany, which does not get a dime of the relief money and, as we explained yesterday, none of the military appropriations generally for supporting Germany go to the DP's.

Mr. Chairman, there are others who sometimes blow hot and blow cold. When the Greek-Turkish bill was up for consideration there was great criticism that we were bypassing the United Nations. Now when we have an opportunity to enter a Union Nations organization in which neither Soviet Russia nor its satellites are members, some of those same critics claim that we ought to bypass this United Nations organization and go it alone, even though it will cost more. It will cost more if we stay out. I feel we should not bypass this new United Nations organization but should go in and turn over the major responsibility for this international problem to an international organization instead of carrying two-thirds of it on the backs of the American taxpayers.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HAND. In reference to the question of cost, I call the gentleman's attention to the report, page 4, indicating that the amount of money spent last year by the Army for this purpose was $115,000,000. Do I understand it is contended all that money will be saved, and that, as a matter of fact, this participation will cost us less than the program has been costing us in the past?

Mr. VORYS. Yes. Our total participation cost $130,000,000 last year, including our share of UNRRA, our contribution to the Interdepartmental Committee on Refugees, and our Army appropriation. The Army estimates that if we do not go into this they cannot get along with less than $94,000,000. So we save on any basis $58,000,000 over what it is costing for the current year and $20,000,000 over what it would cost us next year if we go it alone.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I was quite impressed with the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK]. I, too, am beginning to wonder just what further gyrations will be expected of this House. I wonder where this course is leading us and when the end of the road will finally come.

Over a period of several years we have had first one thing, then another. First we had Bretton Woods, which was the patent medicine that would solve all the ills of the future. Some of us were slightly dubious because of the fact that we seemed to be putting up good, honest American money, whereas other participants were putting up cigarette coupons and what have you. That did not seem to work. Although we were led to believe that would take the place of loans to various nations, as were made after the First World War, it was not long after that until we were called upon to make a loan to Britain of some 4 billion dollars. One of the great talking points that I am sure sold that loan to some Members of the House and to many people of the country was the argument made on this floor that it would bolster up Britain to be a great bulwark against communism. The patent medicine in that bottle leaked out apparently. Soon we were in here voting some $400,000,000 as a loan to Greece and Turkey. We also had UNRRA, a scheme which on its face should have indicated a little caution.

If anyone has ever doubted the wisdom of turning his own property over to some one else to handle he should read Shakespeare's King Lear and ponder on it a bit. Anyone who would have opposed UNRRA when it was created would have been a great old reactionary, without sympathy for the downtrodden and fallen people of the world. Now you all admit that did not work and you are in here with this.

I wonder how far we are going to go, I wonder just what progress we are making.

Those of you who have lived in small towns, I know, must recall the old medicine shows that came around every summer. They had imposing names. They sold medicine in an imposing-looking bottle with a very fancy label attached. Now, that medicine was supposed to cure all the ills of mankind, and always, as the people were standing there and spending their money, there would be an old-fashioned country doctor, an old reactionary, who sort of advised the people against patent medicine as a remedy for everything. Usually his words went unheeded. The strange thing about it was that the next year another show came around carrying a different name, a different label on the bottle, but the same old medicine being sold to the same people, and if you had investigated the whole thing you would have found beneath the label the same old ingredients. Even the cast in the show was the same but under different names, wearing different costumes and selling newer and better patent medicine.

I was impressed by the speech made here today by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]. Let us realize that we are trustees for the people who will live after us. We have limited resources in this country, as we are beginning to find out. I am anxious that we do our full duty to all the people of the world, but I submit we should be a little practical. Let us find out how far we can go. Let us find out what they are doing to cooperate with us, and let us find out what results we have had for the money we have spent all over the world.

I simply urge a little caution in these matters.

Mr. PEDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I realize that it is not a very popular thing to get up and speak against a measure which probably has a humanitarian purpose. I do happen, however, to be particularly familiar with the situation under consideration today. I was a legal officer in the army of occupation for over a year. One of my duties was that of dealing with displaced persons, and I said to myself that if the time ever came when I would be one who had something to do with the determination of a policy with which it was handled, that I would at least speak my voice, and that is what I want to do today.

I think all of us agree that we are going to do what we can to help people that need help, but I say to you Members that a majority of these people right now do not need help. They have been helped for 2 years. I know you will say, "Well, these people have been persecuted." True, they have been persecuted, but they have not gone back to work in 2 years and the majority of them that will remain will not go back to work in another 10 years. I love my

country, and my country comes first. I voted for $400,000,000 for the Greek-Turkish loan. I voted for $350,000,000 to help the relief program, but I cannot vote for this bill. It may be that I am a little bit prejudiced in one respect. I happen to have been the victim of one of these individuals whereby they put a gun in my back. The fact that I had on an American uniform at that time did not cut any weight.

We have got to stop, as the gentleman who just preceded me said, and look at this thing and see where the end is. Can we forever spend money in Europe and forget our own country? We have got to stop and think. Only this week we passed a bill providing for some eleven to sixteen or maybe thirty million dollars for a program in Europe. Here is another bill which provides for $73,000,000 more. We all admit that there must be an end to it somewhere. Where is the end? I say that we should stop now and do, as the gentleman said, look to the end, at least, as to what it is going to cost us for a few years before we go blindly into these matters.

One other point. This is a question I would like to ask of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS]. How many of these displaced persons are Jewish?

Mr. VORYS. One hundred and ninety-three thousand three hundred and thirty-two out of one million thirty-seven thousand four hundred and four.

Mr. PEDEN. Is it not a fact that the Jewish displaced persons will not go anywhere except to Palestine?

Mr. BLOOM. Oh, no; I will answer that.

Mr. VORYS. No; I think that is not a fact.

Mr. PEDEN. Is it not a fact that the majority of them request that?

Mr. VORYS. A lot of them want to go there, but they are going other places. Further, in the IRO constitution it is provided that if they do not go, not merely Jews but any displaced persons, if they will not work or if they do not go where a place is picked out for them, they are put out of the IRO camps.

Mr. PEDEN. In conclusion I wish to say merely this. I do not intend to try to influence you or to prejudice your minds simply because I did deal with them, but I think this and I believe it sincerely: If in each one of these seats today sat a soldier who served in the occupation army who had dealt with this problem, I doubt very seriously if this bill would pass. Those people have gone home that were there against their will.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PEDEN. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. In the camps are 278,868 Poles. Does the gentleman think those people can go home in safety? Or does he think that the 180,838 Balts can go home to the Baltic States, now under Russian control, with safety? Of course they cannot.

Mr. PEDEN. I answer that question by saying merely that the theory on which this is based is that we are to take care of these people because they cannot go home. Is the United States Government to care for those who do not agree with the ideas current in Russia or other countries for as long a time as they do not want to go home? These people are living in a camp, they are not working. They are relying solely upon the food that is furnished them by UNRRA now, which is paid for 75 percent by the American people. Now we are asked to continue to pay and pay and pay, and they sit there and eat without work.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, in answer to the gentleman who has just spoken, may I say that this is not only a question of taking care of the erring few refugees that we might not want to take care of, because there are 1,037,404 people in all to be provided for as displaced persons. The great bulk of these people are law-abiding, God-fearing people that were against dictatorships in the countries where they came from. They were against the German dictatorship and they were also against all dictatorships.

I do not believe the gentleman means that just because some one of them put a gun in his back one day when he was in uniform, he then thinks that the whole group is like that, and therefore he will not try to prevent starvation among 1,037,404 people. So that is not the real reason for his general opposition. That might have been the reason that he first felt that he would look into the question, but I hope and believe it is not the reason he is against feeding these people.

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to my good friend the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. GWINN of New York. What evidence have we that these people are the kind of people the gentleman says they are, that they are not in sympathy with communism or socialism or any part of it, when the rest of the countries they came from are given over largely to socialism or communism?

Mr. FULTON. May I answer the gentleman from New York, whose judgment I respect, by saying they were thrown out of their own countries by just such forces, and by quoting some figures of their willingness to work where they are. There are 242,669 of these people, almost 25 percent, that are trying to work and have jobs in countries that have been depleted by the war. They are working as much as they can right where they are. In addition, other European countries are willing to take them in, so they must be pretty good people. Also because the South American countries are saying, "Send us shiploads of them," and three South American countries have already made commitments.

Mr. GWINN of New York. The evidence is certainly in conflict on this point. I think we are greatly in the dark as to just what the facts are.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Over in the other body they had 558,000 in these camps, yesterday there were 600,000, as mentioned in our committee, and today there are 1,400,000. Just what is the exact number of these displaced persons?

Mr. FULTON. In 700 DP camps there are 794,735. Out of camp there are 242,669. That answers the gentleman's question in exact figures, I believe.

Out of 10,000,000 displaced persons before VE-day, all but 1,037,000 have been returned or relocated. There were 8,000,000 on VE-day so there has been a pretty good job of replacing them and putting them where they could fit into communities.

May I ask the able gentleman from Louisiana, who said that if we on the Committee on Foreign Affairs take the position that this bill should go through, then it was to be assumed to be a binding commitment on our committee in respect to the Stratton bill.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I did not say that. I simply asked your own committee if that was going to be your position. I did that because I want your committee to commit itself on the record as to what its position is going to be. I did not want anybody to say that we were binding ourselves by passing this bill to open the doors and break down the immigration barriers.

Mr. FULTON. On the other hand, there was the inference from your previous question that we were then committed against the Stratton bill. May I answer the gentleman by saying that the Stratton bill covers immigration into this country, while this bill is for feeding the displaced people and taking care of them where they are. The two bills do not cross in the least, and as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee I can say I know of no commitment.

This bill for the IRO does not amend the immigration laws. Therefore, the two are separate and there is no commitment either way. There is no commitment by the Committee on Foreign Affairs on the Stratton bill and there is no commitment by the Committee on the Judiciary, which has the Stratton bill under consideration, on the IRO bill. The two are different means of approaching the same problem of the same people.

May I close by saying it would be interesting, I believe, to look at article 11, subsection 3 of the International Refugee Organization charter. That article refers to headquarters and other offices. Subsection 3 says "All offices and representation shall be established only with the consent of the government in authority in the place of establishment."

Therefore, may I add that when the IRO comes to put these administrators into our zone in Germany or Austria, or in Italy, they have to put people there who are satisfactory, and subject to the consent of the government in authority, which is ourselves. So we do have a negative control over who will be there and who will manage these camps, although we would not exercise that control for day-to-day administrative purposes.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section do now close.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. SCRIVNER and Mr. RANKIN objected.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section close in 10 minutes.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were ayes 59, noes 28.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and thirty Members are present, a quorum.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this bill; and I might say to you, in advance, that I am opposed to pouring $6,000,000,000 a year of American money into the coffers or the sink holes of Europe.

Did you know that they are now reaping their third crop in Europe since the war closed? Yet they are calling on us to feed the people of Europe, and just as long as we continue to do so the demands will continue to pour in.

You are dealing with an organization here that the American people have never had a chance to vote on. Now, let me give you a little history; I think it might do our Republican friends some good to hear this. We went to bat on this international proposition in 1920 when we tried to abandon the policy laid down by Washington and Jefferson of "peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations, entangling alliances with none." We put in our platform, we Democrats, the League of Nations Charter with article X included. That became the issue in the campaign, and when the election was over it took the State line of Mississippi to stop the Republican landslide. Of course, I supported Mr. Cox, our Democratic nominee.

When I came to Congress that year the Republicans had 169 majority in this House and 23 majority in the Senate. They got off on some will-o'-the-wisp about the antilynching bill and the Ku Klux Klan, high tariffs, and things like that, and almost destroyed themselves in the election of 1922.

But, on this issue of Americanism, or nationalism, when our candidate was on the other side, the American people spoke with a thunderous voice.

Now, you are not going to get any of this money back. The countries of Europe that owed us repudiated their debts after the last war, and with the exception of Finland they have not paid a dime in about 20 years, and they never will pay it.

Do you think the American taxpayers are inexhaustible? Do you think the patience of the American people is inexhaustible? Mr. Bullitt, former Ambassador to Russia, testified before our committee that 60 percent of the members of the Communist Party in this country are immigrants.

These people hanging around in these camps, many of them, are not trying to get work and would not work if they had a chance to do so. There is plenty of work for everybody in Europe who wants to work today. Yet we come along with one bill after another to drag us into this maelstrom of internationalism.

Professor Adler, of the University of Chicago, and other Red professors throughout the country know what they are talking about when they say, "We must abolish the United States." What they want to do is to get rid of the United States and subordinate us to some kind of international Sanhedrin, if you please, or Tower of Babel to collapse amidst a confusion of tongues, with all the wreck and ruin that it will bring to the American people.

I say it is about time we looked out for our own people. Why not use some of this money to pay these terminal leave bonds that we have given our ex-servicemen? Oh, you have paid all the officers; the brass hats have been taken care of. But how about the rank and file? Why not pay these terminal leave bonds? We have a tremendous load to take care of the disabled soldiers and their dependents in this country. It is about time that the Congress of the United States got its feet on the ground, on American ground, on American soil, and stopped trying to drag us into a world government that will mean the end of the greatness of this powerful Nation, built by our forefathers who came here to get away from this stuff that they are carrying on in Europe today.

I am not going to support it, and I am not going to support any bill to pour $6,000,000,000 a year of the American taxpayers' money into the sinkholes of Europe, either. It is about time that the Congress woke up to the fact that it is our duty to look after the American people. If these people in Europe are not willing to work to make their own living, it is about time they be put on their own and given to understand that we are not going to continue to feed and clothe them out of the pockets of the overburdened taxpayers of America.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the question was asked just a moment ago as to how much more this is going to cost. Before I give you some more sad news, may I state that a friend of mine of long standing, more than 30 years, who served with me for 20 years before he went over to Europe this last time, has just returned from quite a long stay in Germany, and his comments verify exactly, and more, the statements that were made here by an earlier speaker, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. PEDEN].

What and where is the end? I do not know. In a few days you will be asked to vote approvingly on a deficiency appropriation for $750,000,000 for aid and relief in foreign countries, occupied areas, Korea, Japan, and Germany, a little more than half, as my recollection goes, going to Germany to feed the people, to buy food for them, to buy seeds, to buy farm machinery, and all that. We asked the same question then of those gentlemen, one of whom had just flown over from Germany to testify before the committee: "How long is this going to go on?" They did not know. At the best, 2 or 3 years, possibly longer.

This appeal as to relieving displaced persons and the refugees, of course, pulls at the heartstrings of any person that has just a little bit of the milk of human kindness in his soul. May I inquire from the chairman of the committee what his definition is of a war refugee, now that this war is almost 2 years old.

Mr. VORYS. The definition is found at some length in the hearings. A displaced person——

Mr. SCRIVNER. I asked first about a war refugee. What is the gentleman's conception of a war refugee? Do not worry about the hearings. Let the gentleman tell me what he thinks himself.

Mr. VORYS. I cannot tell the gentleman in short language. I ask him to read the hearings, page 66. The definition covers almost a page, and then those who are not included, the exclusions, cover most of the next page. It is very carefully drawn to hold the restrictions down.

Mr. SCRIVNER. What about the displaced persons?

Mr. VORYS. That definition is on the same page. It runs from page 66 to page 67.

Mr. SCRIVNER. If I recall one of the statements made here earlier, some of these displaced persons are being fed from the German food raised in Germany. It seems more than anomalously strange that if the German food is going to feed the displaced persons, and then we in turn are sending food and seed to feed the Germans, it all comes out of our pocket anyway.

Mr. VORYS. The food that is requisitioned from the Germans is potatoes and vegetables and things they grow.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Among the items which we are being requested to appropriate $750,000,000 for are seed potatoes.

Mr. VORYS. Yes; but we are not shipping potatoes over there, and the amount is rather small.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I do not know.

Mr. VORYS. Can the gentleman figure any better way to work this thing?

Mr. SCRIVNER. Let me ask one more question: I think someone said some of these displaced persons had been in those camps for as long as 5 years. How many of them have been in those camps as few as 60 days?

Mr. VORYS. Fifteen percent have come in since 1945, when they were first registered.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That does not tie in with the information that has recently been given me by a man whose word I would take whether it was or was not on oath, and that is that day by day there are more and more of these persons who have been there for less than 60 days. They cannot possibly in my conception be considered war refugees at

this late stage of the game. What has happened to those persons who were given 3 months' supplies of rations in order to have them leave these camps and go back either to their homeland or some other place?

Mr. VORYS. That is what happened to the 7,000,000 who have gone home.

Mr. SCRIVNER. How many of them are there who through circumstances that were perhaps beyond their control lost that supply of food and then came back into the camps: in other words, were repeaters?

Mr. VORYS. I know of no repeaters.

Mr. SCRIVNER. All right, but you talk to some of these men who have returned from Europe who had something to do with part of that job. They will tell you that there were a lot of repeaters. How they got back they do not know because their time was so taken up that they could not find out.

As far as your remedy which you hold out is concerned, there is very little hope that we can be through in perhaps 5 years. So far as I can see, this is not a permanent solution of the situation. Unless a better plan than this can be devised, I do not see how we as Members of Congress and the American taxpayers should be asked to do as they say a woman has to do—to pay and pay and pay.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. The President shall designate from time to time a representative of the United States and not to exceed two alternates to attend a specified session or specified sessions of the general council of the Organization. Whenever the United States is elected to membership on the executive committee, the President shall designate from time to time, either from among the aforesaid representative and alternates or otherwise, a representative of the United States and not to exceed one alternate to attend sessions of the executive committee. Such representative or representatives shall each be entitled to receive compensation at a rate not to exceed $12,000 per annum, and any such alternate shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate not to exceed $10,000 per annum, for such period or periods as the President may specify, except that no Member of the Senate or House of Representatives or officer of the United States who is designated as such a representative shall be entitled to receive such compensation.

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to the Department of State—

(a) such sums, not to exceed $73,325,000 for the fiscal year beginning June 30, 1947, as may be necessary for the payment of United States contributions to the Organization (consisting of supplies, services, or funds and all necessary expenses related thereto) as determined in accordance with article 10 of the constitution of the Organization; and

(b) such sums, not to exceed $175,000 for the fiscal year beginning June 30, 1947, as may be necessary for the payment of—

(1) salaries of the representative or representatives and alternates provided for in section 2 hereof, and appropriate staff, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; and

(2) such other expenses as the Secretary of State deems necessary to participation by the United States in the activities of the Organization: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 7 of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, and regulations thereunder, applicable to expenses incurred pursuant to that act shall be applicable to any expenses incurred pursuant to this paragraph (b) (2).

SEC. 4. (a) Sums from the appropriations made pursuant to paragraph (a) of section 3 may be transferred to any department, agency, or independent establishment of the Government to carry out the purposes of such paragraph, and such sums shall be available for obligation and expenditure in accordance with the laws governing obligations and expenditures of the department, agency, independent establishment, or organizational unit thereof concerned, and without regard to sections 3709 and 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 41, sec. 5, and title 31, sec. 529).

(b) Upon request of the Organization, any department, agency, or independent establishment of the Government (upon receipt of advancements or reimbursements for the cost and necessary expenses) may furnish supplies, or if advancements are made may procure and furnish supplies, and may furnish or procure and furnish services, to the Organization: *Provided*, That such additional civilian employees in the United States as may be required by any such department, agency, or independent establishment for the procurement or furnishing of supplies or services under this subsection, and for the services of whom such department, agency, or independent establishment is compensated by advancements or reimbursements made by the Organization, shall not be counted as civilian employees within the meaning of section 607 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended by section 14 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946. When reimbursement is made it shall be credited, at the option of the department, agency, or independent establishment concerned, either to the appropriation, fund, or account utilized in incurring the obligation, or to an appropriate appropriation fund, or account which is current at the time of such reimbursement.

SEC. 5. During the interim period, if any, between July 1, 1947, and the coming into force of the constitution of the Organization, the Secretary of State is authorized from appropriations made pursuant to paragraph (a) of section 3, to make advance contributions to the Preparatory Commission for the International Refugee Organization, established pursuant to an agreement dated December 15, 1946, between the governments signatory to the constitution of the Organization, at a rate of not to exceed one-twelfth per month of the United States contribution to the Organization contemplated by paragraph (a) of section 3 hereof. Such advance contributions to the said Preparatory Commission shall be deducted from the said contribution to the Organization for the first fiscal year as provided in paragraph 6 of the said agreement. The provisions of paragraphs (a) and (b) of section 4 of this joint resolution shall be applicable, respectively, to such advance contributions and to the procurement and furnishing of supplies and services to the said Preparatory Commission.

Mr. VORYS (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and be open to amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, under this bill the International Refugee Organization will take over the responsibilities of the Army and UNRRA as of July 1, 1947. The purpose is to present a united, organized control of displaced persons which comes as an aftermath of war. It is my understanding that some 20 nations have agreed either in full or in part to the constitution which sets up the provisions for caring for these displaced persons.

I have been rather critical of the past operations of UNRRA, as have many other Members of the Congress. It was not satisfactory, partly because it was administered in connection with 40 other nations, and there seemed to be a divided responsibility and authority. The activities of UNRRA, which are soon ending, is something that many of us would like to forget.

I do feel that it is the responsibilty of the United States and the victorious nations to take the lead in helping to get the displaced persons either back to the country from which they came or into some productive work in some country which would put them in a position to take care of themselves. There are some reports which indicate that many refugees are flowing into the American zone from the Russian and English area of administration because they received better food and treatment in the American area. Russia seems to have her own peculiar way of handling displaced persons. They presumably go into slave labor all over Russia and work for the state. In the American zone they apparently do not have to work and are better treated than in either of the other two zones of occupation.

The money asked for in this bill amounts to $73,500,000 and is our share of the IRO operations. In looking over the list of nations who are participating I note that most of them have borrowed money from the United States and it can well be assumed that all of the expense in the end will be borne by this country. It is questionable if any money lent to the participating nations will ever be repaid to the United States.

The administration of the IRO must be carefully supervised in order that there will be no duplication with the work carried on by the Army. I feel that we ought to get rid of the old UNRRA employees. There ought to be an American supervisor who will put some good business practices and common sense into the direction of this organization. If this country had not entered into an agreement under the United Nations plan, I am convinced that we could operate the displaced persons camps more efficiently by ourselves. As the matter now stands, we bring in 20 or more nations and they help to form the policies under which the agency is directed and our money is expended. Personally I do not like that part of the program.

I am also convinced that every effort should be made to see that these individuals are properly located so that they can take care of themselves and not become a continuing responsibility and wards of the IRO. Reports coming from these displaced-person camps indicate that these people are a disillusioned, displeased, unhappy, communistic lot and that they are taking the attitude that that the United States must continue giving them care and attention indefinitely. I do feel it is our responsibility

for a short time, but certainly there should and must be an end to this type of charity at an early date.

There is no question but many of these folks, including women and children, are in grave need of help and attention from the United States and all nations who are interested in their care. It is a part of the price we must pay for war. We cannot blind ourselves to the terrific human suffering, hunger, misery, and despair because these people now have no place to call home. It is a difficult problem but if properly handled should be solved and the IRO should be able to go out of existence within 2 years. There is no question but what many countries could take and will be glad to have some of the Poles, Yugoslavs, Balts, and the Jewish refugees in these camps. I understand there are some 700 camps ranging in size from a few hundred refugees to 15,000 or more.

Mr. Chairman, I am also hopeful that within a reasonably short time, the proper committees will make a survey of the resources of this country. I think it is very imperative that we determine at an early date just how much and how long the United States can continue to pour out the resources of this Nation in loans, grants, and gifts all over the world. I am certain that there is a limit to what this Nation can continue to give and remain in a strong economic position at home. We must remain strong, otherwise we will find ourselves in the same gutter, struggling with the economic problems that the rest of the world now finds itself.

Mr. Chairman, I expect to support the the IRO and our participation in an effort to get these displaced persons relocated. I do so with my fingers crossed because I am fearful we may find some of the same poor administration that was experienced in UNRRA. Nevertheless, there is a job to do and it is our duty as the strongest Nation on earth to participate in helping to restore these unfortunate people. If the organization fails to give a good account of its activities during the year, it would be impossible for me to give it support next year. I shall watch, as the Congress should, its activities in the months that lie ahead.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I doubt if there is any Member in the House who does not know of my extreme conservatism when it comes to pouring out American money to help distressed people.

On this particular bill I conscientiously feel that our Nation is more morally obligated to come to the aid of these people in these displaced areas than any other people in the world. I think we are more morally obligated to come to their aid than we are to come to the aid of the German people who 2 or 3 years ago were slaughtering our boys. I feel that we are more morally obligated to come to the aid of these people than we are to come to the aid of the Italian people who were our enemies or to any other people throughout the world. We are more morally obligated because these people were our friends, they were our true allies, through thick and thin.

Another reason why we are morally obligated to take care of these people above all others is because they are our responsibility. They are homeless today and they are nationless today because of acts of the leaders of the Government of the United States of America among the three great powers of the world. They were robbed of their governments, they were robbed of their countries, they were robbed of their homes, they were robbed of their lands by secret agreements at Yalta, Potsdam, and Tehran in which our Government participated. The fac that these people are displaced is not of their own wish, is not of their own making. They are displaced and homeless because of the action of the Big Three at the big secret conferences at Yalta, Potsdam, and Tehran.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Did not Hitler have a little something to do with their being displaced?

Mr. O'KONSKI. Yes; Hitler did too, and, of course, they hate Hitler and they hate communism. And that is another reason why they are displaced people today. They have just as much hatred against communism as they have against Hitlerism. That is one reason they are in the sad condition they are at the present time.

The statement was made a while ago that these people are simply staying in these camps awaiting an opportunity to come to the United States. I know that is not true. I wish I had with me here a letter I received from a constituent today telling where he had signed the necessary affidavits to get one of his Esthonian relatives to the United States of America. He had made the necessary application. Today I received a letter he wrote me. He said he had heard from his nephew over in his area and that the answer from the nephew was "I do not want to come to the United States; I want to go back to Estonia. I want to go back there and shoot up the damned Communists."

If those people in the displaced areas want to go anywhere, they want to go back to their respective countries; they want to go back to those countries, and they want to wrest their countries from Communist domination and Communist control; that in the inevitable struggle that lies ahead between communism and democracy those million displaced people today are our first line of defense, they are our best friends, they will be our most faithful and loyal allies and servants.

We cannot let those people down because they are our moral responsibility, more so than any other people throughout the world.

I might mention that these displaced people today are getting more meager rations than the people of Germany at the present time. Did you know that under our Army of Occupation that is the case? Is that reasonable? Why should we take better care of the Germans than we do of the displaced people who are there because of no act of their own, no wish of their own, but are there because we had a part in putting them there by taking away their governments, by taking away their lands and giving them something they did not want?

Mr. Chairman, these people are our moral responsibility. I think we should take care of them. As far as I am concerned, I would vote for this bill before I would vote for any other aid program for any other people anywhere else in the world because I think these people are more entitled to our help and because these people are our moral responsibility.

I hope I have made my position clear.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we cannot arrive at an agreement on a limitation of debate. I see five Members on their feet. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill close in 25 minutes, the last 3 to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MATHEWS].

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I want to agree to some extent with the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI]. We do have a duty to do something about these people. We insisted, whether it was a compulsory insistence or not, in getting into this war; we assisted in devastating those countries over there and we must accept our share of the responsibility. The problem is to what extent should we go and what methods should we employ.

I recall very distinctly a year or so ago, when this UNESCO thing came up on the floor for consideration, I stood up and said I could not vote for it because in the organizational charter which accompanied the bill it provided a council of UNESCO consisting of 15 people, 14 of whom were not citizens of the United States but were representatives of foreign countries, who decided on the budget of that Organization and were bound to appropriate the amount of money that they decided upon. This particular bill does not have that feature in it. This makes a definite and direct appropriation, but, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUCK] pointed out, you still have an 8-to-1 vote against you in this as you have a 14-to-1 vote against you in UNESCO.

I am a little bit puzzled by some of the statements that have been made on the floor. In the first place, I do not see either in the report or in the hearings or in the bill a copy of the constitution of the Organization that we are authorizing, if we pass the bill, the President will make us a member of. I do not know what it provides.

Mr. VORYS. The whole thing is on page 55 and following.

Mr. MATHEWS. I thank the gentleman. I will read it after a while. I could not find it.

If we can save money by the passage of this resolution and perform the duty which we have to perform, I am very much in favor of it. The difficulty, however, is that at the bottom of page 3 of the report is the following:

According to State Department estimates the refugee and displaced-person program will have cost the United States approximately $130,000,000 during the current fiscal year. This includes our share of UNRRA expenditures for this purpose, our contribution to the Inter-Governmental Committee on Refugees, and $115,931,000 spent by the United States Army for displaced persons. By participating in the International Refugee Organization program the United States Government would thus save about $58,500,000 over the present fiscal year's cost.

That is fine. But what is the picture as presented? In 2 years we got rid of 7,000,000 of these persons, according to a statement made here on the floor, by either sending them back to their own countries or to some other country. We are told, however, it will take 4 years more to get rid of the 1,000,000 remaining. That is puzzling. I think we ought to know something about what is proposed to do with this money and how the program is to be worked out. I do not know, and I have not yet found out from reading the report. Perhaps I will find it out later.

But what are we going to do in a way of an over-all plan to get rid of this problem and get rid of it permanently and in the very shortest space of time with the least expense? There is an old saying, "What is everybody's business is nobody's business." It seems in this United Nations organization, in this over-all United Nations program, what is everybody's business is the business of the United States of America to carry out. I do not think that the burden is being properly distributed, and I do not think we are getting the results we want to get by turning matters over to organizations the control of which are not within the United States of America but the majority of the money for which is contributed by the United States of America.

I shall probably vote for this bill, but I will do so with a great deal of regret. I hope when next year comes around we will have a clearer picture. Perhaps the reason for the whole thing is that we are all too far away from this problem. We get reports of various kinds. We do not know which report to rely on, which makes it very difficult.

Utilizing the information given me by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], I find on page 61 of the hearings, in article 10, finance, section 1 of the constitution of the International Refugee Organization, practically the same provisions that are in the constitution of UNESCO. The amount of the budget, gotten up by the Director General, "shall be allocated to the members in proportions for each heading to be determined from time to time by a two-thirds majority vote of the members of the General Council present and voting."

On page 58, article 6, the General Council, section 1, provides that this General Council is made up of one representative from each member. The United States of America has one vote. So two-thirds of a council made up of the representatives of governments other than the United States, and not this Congress, determines the amount of the money the taxpayers of this Nation shall pay. I did not believe this was in accordance with our own Constitution with regard to UNESCO. I still do not believe it is any more in accordance with that Constitution in the case of an international refugee organization. And, Mr. Chairman, we find from page 3 of the report that for the coming year the United States pays 39.89 percent of the administrative budget, or well over one-third, and 45.75 percent of the operating budget, or almost one-half, together with an additional $2,300,000 for large-scale resettlement operations and $175,000 for the cost of our representation in the International Refugee Organization. And 16 nations have joined up to date. Together they will only have to pay two-thirds of the administrative budget and one-half of the operating budget.

It seems to me right down dishonest to argue that we do not have to pay the share allocated to us if this Congress does not want to appropriate the money, after we have agreed to pay whatever the General Council fixes.

It is costing us plenty to get into these side shows of the United Nations. And we have no control over how the money is spent.

Where are we going to stop, Mr. Chairman, not only in making direct appropriations to foreign countries, but in pledging the credit of the United States for unknown amounts of future expenditures to be determined by foreign countries?

And this is part of our foreign policy.

I only hope that the Foreign Affairs Committee is right when it contends we will not spend as much if we pass this resolution as if we do not. It is so refreshing compared to the other legislation this committee has been successful in getting passed by this House. No wonder the President vetoed the tax-reduction bill. That, obviously, is also part of the Truman doctrine.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN].

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Chairman, on the basis of the facts I find it very difficult to support this bill. As a practical matter, it looks as if we may have to support it in order to save some money. If we do not vote the $73,000,000 they say the Army will spend $128,000,000. Now, if that is our choice, we are in a rotten spot there. On the facts this is a very bad showing.

We have over a million persons on relief in Europe. Compared to our own country that is a good showing assuming that the flotsam and jetsam are in that million—and we must assume that, Members of the House. Let us compare it with our own situation. I just called the Library of Congress and found that we have 910,000 general industrial workers unemployed on unemployment compensation; the kind that do not want to work. We have 828,397 veterans unemployed. We have 450,000 private charity cases and public assistance cases, that is State assistance. That is nearly 2,000,000 people of our own. We know the kind they are. We must know what kind they are in Europe.

The disturbing thing about it is that we Americans and, I fear, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, have reached the point of view that we must be responsible for the sins and the wars of other people; that we have got to do something about the fact that communism leaves them in this bad situation and that the wars of their false gods and dictators left this group in a bad situation, so we have got to come to their rescue.

Members of the House, one of the best speeches made recently was made by one of our southern colleagues, who said that "We did not spend 5 cents redeeming the devastated people of the South after the Civil War." They redeemed themselves. They tied their empty shirt sleeves to the plow handles and worked it out themselves. That is what men and women have to do when they commit sins or follow false gods anywhere in the world. Let us quit fooling ourselves.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWINN of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. Purely from the point of view of our servicemen over there in the occupied areas, does the gentleman not think that that group of a million people that might be starving to death in that area would add a lot to the unrest unless we tried to help feed them and take care of them partially, because the other part of the burden is on the Germans? Does the gentleman not think it would help our servicemen to get this thing through?

Mr. GWINN of New York. I gather from the servicemen who are coming back that is not a help; that it is a discouragement that we can be such saps as not to learn the truth about the people; that we are weeping today when they are no different than the people of any other country in the world who do not want to work and who are filthy and diseased, and for whom there is not much help that can be given.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, every argument, appealing both to the mind and to the heart, favors this legislation.

An appropriation of $73,500,000 is authorized as this country's allocated share of the expenses of operation of the International Refugee Organization for the fiscal year beginning July 1. During this past year, our share of UNRRA expenditures, together with the amount expended by our occupying forces for the care of displaced persons, has amounted to $130,000,000, so that the authorization in this bill represents a saving over the expenditures of the past year of $58,500,000.

Certainly we cannot abandon the task which we have undertaken to help care for these unfortunate people, most of whom cannot or dare not return to the country of their origin. This is clearly an international problem, to be met by the combined and cooperative effort of all those nations whose interests are so closely linked with ours, as envisioned by the terms of this bill.

There are those, both in and out of Congress, who say: "Why don't we go back home and wash our hands of this distasteful task? These people are no concern or direct responsibility of ours. Let them return to their homes or shift for themselves the best they can." Although I realize that those who advance this thesis do so in the sincere belief that such course is in the best interests of this country, I cannot share the view that this callous disregard for physical and mental suffering and this un-Samaritan approach will do anything but injury to the long-term interests of the very nation which the exponents of this theory seek to serve.

Nearly two-thirds of this hard core of a million unrepatriables is now under the American flag. To allow them, or, in fact, the remaining one-third to be dispersed to wander about as lost souls without a country and without hope, many to perish of starvation and exposure, solely because our country does not act in this emergency, is unthinkable, not alone in terms of humanitarianism, but definitely also, in the enlightened self-interest of ourselves and of the preservation as a world force of those ideals and principles in which we believe, and the overthrow of which is threatened by the ideologies of those countries which have held themselves aloof from participation in this Organization. We all know that subversion thrives amid want and suffering. To invite that result would be the product of unfavorable action on this measure.

If the United States should not participate, the Organization would be doomed to failure. As a result, the only alternative to the chaos resulting from total abandonment by us of any participation in caring for these displaced persons, refugees and persecutees would be some plan whereby various organizations of diverse nationalities, together with different governments acting separately in an uncoordinated fashion, represented in our case by the War, and probably State Department, would try to do this job. The result would be not only extravagance, but inefficiency, waste, duplication, and confusion.

There is another definite, tangible, long-term advantage in committing the responsibility for the care of these displaced unfortunates to an international organization of which we are a member. We must not lose sight of the ultimate goal, which is a permanent solution of the problem, by a resettlement in other countries of those who cannot return to their native lands. Although the bill expressly provides that no agreement can be made and no action taken under its terms whereby any person shall be admitted to the United States without prior approval by Congress, or which will in any way abrogate, modify, or supersede our immigration laws, and although it is important in our consideration of this measure that we do not confuse it with the controversial legislation to provide for the active participation by this country in the solution of the displaced-persons question, yet it cannot be gainsaid that we are, and should be, vitally interested in this world problem.

Several of the smaller nations which have already signified their willingness, indeed, desire, to receive their fair share are already members of the Organization. Apart from the justifiable criticism which would be directed at us were we to shirk our responsibility for participation in IRO, in my judgment it would be short-sighted indeed to attempt to isolate ourselves from the joint effort, involving as it necessarily will, not alone the day-to-day care of these unfortunates and the alleviation of human want and misery, but also the very much broader question of what eventually is to be done in the matter of finding permanent homes for them.

Whether we favor or oppose permitting a limited number to be admitted to this country, or whether or not we have yet made up our minds on this admittedly controversial issue, we must all recognize the global character of a problem of such magnitude and, it seems to me, should unanimously agree that we should at least be represented at the council table where discussions are held and decisions made of such transcendent importance to all nations.

The immutable stand which our Government has taken against involuntary repatriation has my wholehearted support. The alternative is slavery or death for a million souls. If I appraise correctly the consciences of the American people when they know the naked truth they would expect us, as their chosen representatives, to prevent the hideous results flowing from our failure to participate in this humanitarian undertaking.

The defeat of this legislation would be a signal to the world that this great and prosperous country, so richly endowed with the good things of life, no longer entertains any concern for the plight of the suffering, the homeless, and the oppressed. That is not, in my judgment, the American spirit or the American tradition. We must not let it happen.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. The gentleman is a highly competent lawyer. The gentleman has read this bill. Does the gentleman feel that it is made adequately clear in this bill that this represents no commitment of any kind or character, legal or moral, with respect to the immigration policy of the United States?

Mr. KEATING. I think there is no question but that it is entirely separate and apart from the problem we are here considering, except that I feel we should be at the table where this other question is considered internationally.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, as most of you people know, I opposed UNRRA when it was set up and I voted against every appropriation for UNRRA. I am opposed to this bill for the same reason, because the same principle is involved in this bill as was involved in UNRRA, in my estimation. At that time I said, "I do not want to duck our responsibility for handing out relief but if we hand it out we should hand it out under an American organization and see that it goes to the proper place."

You know the history of UNRRA. A lot of you men voted for UNRRA with your fingers crossed. We have heard today that you are going to vote for this bill with your fingers crossed. You have not learned from the mess that UNRRA made that this Organization is going to take over and carry on. Temporary, it says. Let me tell you something. Whenever we turn over to an international organization our affairs and place in the hands of an international board of directors our responsibility and our job I think we are not voting American.

In 1934 this Congress voted for the reciprocal trade agreements. They placed in the hands of the President the power to raise or lower the tariff. They resigned that power to the President. The President delegated it to the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State delegated it to some people in his group, and they are now in Geneva for the purpose of delegating the power that belongs to this Congress to an ITO, as that is called, an International Trade Organization. That is how great oaks from little acorns grow.

I am opposed to this bill because it proposes to set up and become a part of this International Refugee Organization. Let us do out own refugee work. Let us provide our own money through an American organization. Let us take our share of these refugees here and let us screen them as the Stratton bill proposes. Let us screen them according to our own laws.

I am accused, maybe, of being inconsistent because I am for that bill and I am opposed to this bill. That bill is a voluntary organization, that bill is voluntary on our part. This bill says we will become a part of an organization over which we will have no control whatever afterward.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. OWENS].

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I should like to clear up one point with respect to this bill. At page 68 of the hearings, in the definitions, it mentions "Persons who will not be the concern of the Organization." The definition includes war criminals, quislings, and traitors, persons who assisted the enemy in time of war, ordinary criminals, and so forth. Then the definition includes these words:

> Persons of German ethnic origin, whether German nationals or members of German minorities in other countries, who:
>
> (a) have been or may be transferred to Germany from other countries.

There is a (b) also in that which says, "have been during the Second World War evacuated from Germany to other countries." Under the Stratton bill, H. R. 2910, while it does not clearly show that those persons cannot emigrate to this country as displaced persons, the statement given by Mr. Stratton when he testified would indicate that they cannot. It is my understanding also that they are not being included in the care which is given to the German people. If they are not being included in this bill, they are really displaced persons because they are people who have lived, for instance, 100, 200, and 300 years in some of the nations adjoining Germany and were sent from those countries into Germany during the war There they now are with no one to take care of them.

I would like to have the chairman explain, if he would, just what is the situation regarding these innocent people.

Mr. VORYS. There is no question but what these ethnic Germans who have been moved out of Sudetenland and out of Silesia are unfortunate. On the other hand, they are in Germany among people of their own race who speak their language and who are not their enemies. They are the recipients of part of this $700,000,000 which goes to support Germany. It would seem unnecessary to extend the IRO and to increase the burden of the American taxpayer by including the millions of these persons in IRO. If, however, IRO desires to change its constitution that can be done by a proposal from our American representative. We cannot, of course, change the constitution of the IRO on the floor of Congress.

Mr. OWENS. I would like to have that point urged for this reason. It is my understanding, from reading the hearings, that there is no statement which would safeguard those people in the hearings nor in the report nor in the bill. From reports that I have had from people who have come from Germany they state that these people are not being accepted by the German people, and they are not being treated by us as German people, nor as displaced persons, although they are really displaced persons.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OWENS. I yield.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I am glad the gentleman brought that out because, as the gentleman stated, there are many innocent people who are being discriminated against by the language of the IRO constitution. Does not the gentleman think that the IRO constitution instead of using the phrase "people of ethnic German origin" might use the phrase "ex-enemy Germans" and would that not be better so as to take care of these innocent people?

Mr. OWENS. I do not think they have to do that because in this statement of definitions they have included everybody of the type you have mentioned that would be adverse to our country during the war. For that reason, they should have left those words out completely. I believe those people should be helped, and that is the one thing that makes me hesitate with respect to this bill, just that one point.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my time may be given to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Mississippi for yielding me this time. I made the request of him to do that because I want to speak a word about this bill and what it means to this country.

Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], in the statement that he made. But I am also interested in the things that we are doing internationally; I do not want to wreck America for Europe, Asia, or Africa—but I am afraid you are more for those hemispheres than for America and our people.

The President just this afternoon sent back to the Senate the veto message on the wool bill. He is just trying to pull the wool over the eyes of the American people and he is doing it to perfection. He objects to the wool bill because of the fact that we want to let the people who use the wool pay the expense and prices to American wool growers and he says he wants the farmers in the West to receive the right prices for the wool, and he is going to take the money out of the Treasury of the United States in the form of subsidies in order to do it. One hundred to one hundred and fifty millions of dollars in subsidies to wool growers. Where will you get the money to pay these subsidies? I want a tariff to protect the prices in this country for all commodities. I am more interested in America than foreign countries and I want everybody to know that.

If you people want to let the President of the United States pull the wool over the eyes of the American people any longer, it is about time that you wake up. I am afraid that the bill you are passing here today is doing just that very thing. Do you not know it is time that the American people looked to their own future? Do you not know that the American people are clamoring now for something stable in order that we might take care of the people of this country without wrecking our own country. Do you not know that the Treasury of the United States now has a debt of $257,000,000,000? Where will you get the money to pay that debt? You cannot do it and follow the President in his spending spree.

The President of the United States wants to go into the Treasury deeper and deeper in order that we might go further and further into debt. If we do not stabilize the country, how are we going to be able to take care of all the people of all the world if you do not look after the American people? Do you not think it is about time that we did that? We must have a sound economy if we want a sound Treasury and good government.

Read the President's veto message. It will be published, no doubt, in the RECORD of the Senate today. You are not even going to get a chance to vote to override the veto. The Senate has already sent the bill back to committee and they are not going to vote on it. What has happened? The Senate is now bringing out a bill and you are going to be asked to pass that. Giving the wool growers the highest prices they received for wool in 27 years and having the Government buy all the wool at those prices and then sell it at any price they can get for it in competition with foreign wool even to the extent of permitting the State Department to reduce the tariff now on wool. Oh, such procedure is dangerous to our stability; such shortsightedness on the part of the President is pathetic to American security.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I understand the Senate has already passed the bill.

Mr. RICH. They have already passed the bill similar to the bill the Senate passed before giving the growers the highest price in 27 years for wool, and they are going to ask the House of Representatives to swallow it—paying one hundred and fifty millions in subsidies.

You want to wake up pretty soon because there will be nothing left in this country if we continue joining these international organizations and sending our substance abroad, if we continue trying to see how fast we can give away everything we have got in this country to the detriment of our own people.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I want to congratulate the gentleman on his remarks and I want to call to the attention of the membership the fact that the committee tells us that our share of this is going to be 38 percent. With the other countries of the world busted and our having to lend them money to pay their share, in the final analysis we are going to pay 100 percent right down the line and the American taxpayer is paying the bill. We are not saving the taxpayer anything.

Mr. RICH. It looks to me like we have got a bunch of sleepy Congressmen. We ought to tell the American people what is happening to them, but the majority of the Congressmen do not realize it. They are just about asleep at the switch. It is time that they woke up. Before we are broke, before we are wrecked, before we are unable to finance ourselves, and are completely busted. Oh, wake up, Congress, before it is too late.

Mr. GAVIN. I want to compliment the gentleman on a very fine statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

The gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I do not think I am a sleepy Congressman although I am thoroughly in favor of this bill.

It was my privilege in 1945 to go to Europe on an official trip and study the displaced persons problem. At that time there were 9,000,000 displaced persons wandering across the face of Europe in the American and British zones. We asked General Lee how many there were and he said that on the other side of Germany and through the Balkans he estimated that the total number of all DP's in Europe to be about 30,000,000.

Today we have about 1,000,000 left. Do you not realize that we cannot just get up and wash our hands of them and say, "Let these poor people stew in their own juice. They made their own bed." Before we got into the war, Germany ran over them, robbed them, raped them, killed them, displaced them, did everything inhuman in the world to them. Then we came along in our drive against the German powers and overran them and they were displaced and moved hither and yon all through Europe. We also destroyed the productive capacity of all of Western Europe.

When I came back in the summer of 1945 I told my people, especially the businessmen in my district: "You can sit here, you men, and say it is none of our business to meddle in the affairs of Europe, it is none of our business to take care of these starving and ignorant people, but I say to you if you would go over and look at the problem, if you would study the problem, if you would analyze the problem, you would understand, as I think I understand, that we must be interested in the plight of these poor people. As a pure matter of Americanism, it is our business to help take care of these people. To do this job is what I call enlightened selfishness. It may cost some money. I can think of a great many criticisms of this plan, but considering the over-all picture it seems to me there is only one way that we can get a stabilized western Europe which we must have in order to have a stabilized world, and that is through trying to feed and help these poor homeless starving people until they can get on their feet.

We cannot handle this alone. We are in the United Nations. Whether we want to be in or not, we are in there and we are the only power that has the capacity and the wealth to make a real substantial contribution to this problem. I say, therefore, that the thing to do for our own self-interest as a pure matter of good American policy, as an antidote to trouble in the future, as a step to getting into a more peaceful world, as a step toward world peace, is to take care of these people at this time. As I say, we cannot do this alone. We have joined the other nations of the world to try to bring about some stability, some peace, and some happiness in this world, and I believe that this is one of the means to that end, one of the best steps and a humanitarian step leading toward the peace of the world. America can and must furnish the leadership to help these starving people till they can help themselves. This bill should be passed overwhelmingly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS], chairman of the subcommittee, is recognized for 4 minutes to close the debate.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who so desire may have the privilege of extending their remarks at this point in the RECORD on this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, when I heard my good friend from Nebraska say that he proposed to vote for this bill, but with his fingers crossed, it occurred to me that that was almost my feeling at this moment in regard to the measure. Yes, I shall vote for it, too, but I have some reservations in mind and I owe it to myself, if not to others, to state those reservations.

I, too, like so many others am somewhat worried about the vast sums that we are expending to try to bind up the wounds of war. While I am anxious to do this act of mercy, I do hope that it will gain us good will instead of the scorn and contempt which other efforts in the past have yielded our generosity.

I, too, am concerned about any possible connection between this bill and one which may follow it concerning relief for and settlement of displaced persons from the distressed lands of Europe. We have been assured that there is no connection between this bill and the other proposal. We are told that by voting this bill we do not make any commitments—legal, moral, or otherwise—for the second proposal which will be before us soon. I want it distinctly understood that my vote in favor of the present bill is not to be construed as favoring any subsequent legislation that would open our doors to any displaced persons in Europe.

I feel that we must do our uttermost to furnish relief to the victims of war and that we ought to join other nations in this organized way to do it most effectively. It is because I am unwilling to disregard our immigration laws and opposed to throwing our doors open to these displaced persons, that I feel we must pass this bill and give aid most effectively abroad.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BREHM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 207, providing for membership and participation by the United States in the International Refugee Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor, pursuant to House Resolution 225, he reported the same back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BUCK) there were—ayes 124, noes 43.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk Senate Joint Resolution 77, providing for membership and participation by the United States in the International Refugee Organization, and authorizing an appropriation therefor, and its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President is hereby authorized to accept membership for the United States in the International Refugee Organization (hereinafter referred to as the "Organization"), the constitution of which was approved in New York on December 15, 1946, by the General Assembly of the United Nations, and deposited in the archives of the United Nations: *Provided, however*, That this authority is granted and the approval of the Congress of the acceptance of membership of the United States in the International Refugee Organization is given upon condition and with the reservation that no agreement shall be concluded on behalf of the United States and no action shall be taken by any officer, agency, or any other person and acceptance of the constitution of the Organization by or on behalf of the Government of the United States, shall not constitute or authorize action (1) whereby any person shall be admitted to or settled or resettled in the United States or any of its Territories or possessions without prior approval thereof by the Congress, and this joint resolution shall not be construed as such prior approval, or (2) which will have the effect of abrogating, suspending, modifying, adding to, or superseding any of the immigration laws or any other laws of the United States.

SEC. 2. The President shall designate from time to time a representative of the United States and not to exceed two alternates to attend a specified session or specified sessions of the general council of the Organization. Whenever the United States is elected to membership on the executive committee, the President shall designate from time to time, either from among the aforesaid representative and alternates or otherwise, a representative of the United States and not to exceed one alternate to attend sessions of the executive committee. Such representative or representatives shall each be entitled to receive compensation at a rate not to exceed $12,000 per annum for such period or periods as the President may specify, except that no member of the Senate or House of Representatives or officer of the United States who is designated as such a representative shall be entitled to receive such compensation.

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State such sums not to exceed $75,000,000 for the fiscal

year beginning June 30, 1947, as may be necessary—

(a) for the payment of United States contributions to the Organization (consisting of supplies, services, or funds and all necessary expenses related thereto) as determined in accordance with article 10 of the constitution of the Organization; and

(b) for additional expenses incident to participation by the United States in the activities of the Organization, including: (1) salaries of the representative or representatives and alternates provided for in section 2 hereof, and appropriate staff, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; (2) travel expenses without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as amended, the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, as amended, and section 10 of the act of March 3, 1933, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 5, sec. 73b), and, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe, travel expenses of families and transportation of effects of United States representatives and other personnel in going to and returning from their post of duty; (3) allowances for living quarters, including heat, fuel, and light, as authorized by the act approved June 26, 1930 (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 5, sec. 118a), and similar allowances for persons temporarily stationed abroad; (4) cost-of-living allowances under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe, including allowances to persons temporarily stationed abroad; (5) services as authorized by section 15 of Public Law 600, Seventy-ninth Congress; (6) official entertainment; (7) local transportation; and (8) printing and binding without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 44, sec. 111) or section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 41, sec. 5).

SEC. 4. (a) Sums from the appropriations made pursuant to paragraph (a) of section 3 may be transferred to any department, agency, or independent establishment of the Government to carry out the purposes of such paragraph, and such sums shall be available for obligation and expenditure in accordance with the laws governing obligations and expenditures of the department, agency, independent establishment, or organizational unit thereof concerned, and without regard to sections 3709 and 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 41, sec. 5, and title 31, sec. 529).

(b) Upon request of the Organization, any department, agency, or independent establishment of the Government (upon receipt of advancements or reimbursements for the cost and necessary expenses) may furnish supplies, or if advancements are made may procure and furnish supplies, and may furnish or procure and furnish services, to the Organization. When reimbursement is made it shall be credited, at the option of the department, agency, or independent establishment concerned, either to the appropriation, fund, or account utilized in incurring the obligation, or to an appropriate appropriation, fund, or account which is current at the time of such reimbursement.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I offer as an amendment the provisions of House Joint Resolution 207 as just passed by the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VORYS: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That the President is hereby authorized to accept membership for the United States in the International Refugee Organization (hereinafter referred to as the 'Organization'), the constitution of which was approved in New York on December 15, 1946, by the General Assembly of the United Nations, and deposited in the archives of the United Nations: *Provided, however,* That this authority is granted and the approval of the Congress of the acceptance of membership of the United States in the International Refugee Organization is given upon condition and with the reservation that no agreement shall be concluded on behalf of the United States and no action shall be taken by any officer, agency, or any other person and acceptance of the constitution of the Organization by or on behalf of the Government of the United States shall not constitute or authorize action (1) whereby any person shall be admitted to or settled or resettled in the United States or any of its Territories or possessions without prior approval thereof by the Congress, and this joint resolution shall not be construed as such prior approval, or (2) which will have the effect of abrogating, suspending, modifying, adding to, or superseding any of the immigration laws or any other laws of the United States.

"SEC. 2. The President shall designate from time to time a representative of the United States and not to exceed two alternates to attend a specified session or specified sessions of the general council of the Organization. Whenever the United States is elected to membership on the executive committee, the President shall designate from time to time, either from among the aforesaid representative and alternates or otherwise, a representative of the United States and not to exceed one alternate to attend sessions of the executive committee. Such representative or representatives shall each be entitled to receive compensation at a rate not to exceed $12,000 per annum, and any such alternate shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate not to exceed $10,000 per annum, for such period or periods as the President may specify, except that no Member of the Senate or House of Representatives or officer of the United States who is designated as such a representative shall be entitled to receive such compensation.

"SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to the Department of State—

"(a) such sums, not to exceed $73,325,000 for the fiscal year beginning June 30, 1947, as may be necessary for the payment of United States contributions to the Organization (consisting of supplies, services, or funds and all necessary expenses related thereto) as determined in accordance with article 10 of the constitution of the Organization; and

"(b) such sums, not to exceed $175,000 for the fiscal year beginning June 30, 1947, as may be necessary for the payment of—

"(1) salaries of the representative or representatives and alternates provided for in section 2 hereof, and appropriate staff, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; and

"(2) such other expenses as the Secretary of State deems necessary to participation by the United States in the activities of the Organization: *Provided,* That the provisions of section 7 of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, and regulations thereunder, applicable to expenses incurred pursuant to that act shall be applicable to any expenses incurred pursuant to this paragraph (b) (2).

"SEC. 4. (a) Sums from the appropriations made pursuant to paragraph (a) of section 3 may be transferred to any department, agency, or independent establishment of the Government to carry out the purposes of such paragraph, and such sums shall be available for obligation and expenditure in accordance with the laws governing obligations and expenditures of the department, agency, independent establishment, or organizational unit thereof concerned, and without regard to sections 3709 and 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 41, sec. 5, and title 31, sec. 529).

"(b) Upon request of the Organization, any department, agency, or independent establishment of the Government (upon receipt of advancements or reimbursements for the cost and necessary expenses) may furnish supplies, or if advancements are made may procure and furnish supplies, and may furnish or procure and furnish services, to the Organization: *Provided,* That such additional civilian employees in the United States as may be required by any such department, agency, or independent establishment for the procurement or furnishing of supplies or services under this subsection, and for the services of whom such department, agency, or independent establishment is compensated by advancements or reimbursements made by the Organization, shall not be counted as civilian employees within the meaning of section 607 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended by section 14 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946. When reimbursement is made it shall be credited, at the option of the department, agency, or independent establishment concerned, either to the appropriation, fund, or account utilized in incurring the obligation, or to an appropriate appropriation fund, or account which is current at the time of such reimbursement.

"SEC. 5. During the interim period, if any, between July 1, 1947, and the coming into force of the constitution of the Organization, the Secretary of State is authorized from appropriations made pursuant to paragraph (a) of section 3, to make advance contributions to the Preparatory Commission for the International Refugee Organization, established pursuant to an agreement dated December 15, 1946, between the governments signatory to the constitution of the Organization, at a rate of not to exceed one-twelfth per month of the United States contribution to the Organization contemplated by paragraph (a) of section 3 hereof. Such advance contributions to the said Preparatory Commission shall be deducted from the said contribution to the Organization for the first fiscal year as provided in paragraph 6 of the said agreement. The provisions of paragraphs (a) and (b) of section 4 of this joint resolution shall be applicable, respectively, to such advance contributions and to the procurement and furnishing of supplies and services to the said Preparatory Commission."

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF SUCCESSION, LENDING POWERS, AND FUNCTIONS OF THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate Joint Resolution 135, to extend the succession, lending powers, and the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, with House amendment thereto and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WOLCOTT, GAMBLE, KUNKEL, TALLE, SPENCE, BROWN of Georgia, and PATMAN.

Mr. SUNDSTROM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees may have until midnight tonight to file a report on Senate Joint Resolution 135.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. NORTON asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement he made before the Appropriations Committee on the Clark-Hill Dam.

Mr. HAVENNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter and a newspaper article.

COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 775) for the establishment of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right, and I shall not object, this resolution was introduced by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and was unanimously reported by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. It is a resolution from which very beneficial results may develop, although so far as the Congress itself doing any reorganizing of executive departments of Government is concerned there has never been a successful bill passed in the entire history of our country. A number of commissions have been appointed in the past by the Congress upon recommendation of previous Presidents, but none of the recommendations ever made by those commissions were enacted into law so far as I can ascertain as far as the Congress itself was concerned.

Back several years ago the present system of permitting the executive branch to make the organization subject to disapproval—I think the first step was approval of the Congress, and now disapproval within 60 days—was put into operation, and there have been to a limited extent some reorganizations put through under the existing law. The Members on both sides of the committee feel that it is worth taking another chance. We have confidence in the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]. I do not know whether he will be a member of the committee or not. Of course, it is not within my prerogative to express other than the hope that he will be, because his personality and his dynamic influence causes me, as a member of the committee, to feel that such a commission with him on it might accomplish more than any other commission heretofore appointed by the Congress.

Bearing upon the history of reorganization in this country a very comprehensive letter was sent to the chairman of the committee by our former colleague, Hon. Lindsay Warren. It is a very interesting letter, one that I think ought to be incorporated in the RECORD for the information of the Members and for the guidance of the members of this Commission when this resolution passes and the members of the Commission are appointed.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Comptroller General of the United States to the chairman of our committee be included at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. The letter reads as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, May 21, 1947.

Hon. CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Further reference is made to a letter of March 19, 1947, from the clerk of your committee, requesting a report on H. R. 775, Eightieth Congress, entitled "A bill for the establishment of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government."

The bill declares that it is the policy of Congress to promote economy, efficiency, and improved service in the transaction of business in the executive branch of the Government by (1) limiting expenditures to the lowest amount consistent with efficient performance; (2) eliminating duplication and overlapping of services, activities and functions; (3) consolidating services, activities and functions of a similar nature; (4) abolishing services, activities and functions not necessary to the efficient conduct of Government; and (5) defining and limiting executive functions, services and activities. A bipartisan commission of public and private representatives, chosen by the President and the presiding officers of the House and the Senate, would be established to study and investigate the present organization and methods of operation of all departments, bureaus, agencies, boards commissions, offices, independent establishments, and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Government. The commission would determine what changes are necessary to effectuate the policies enumerated and report its findings and recommendations to the Congress within 10 days after the Eighty-first Congress is convened, after which it would cease to exist.

The purpose for and need of such legislation is discussed by Senator LODGE—who has introduced an identical bill, S. 164, in the Senate—at pages 267 and 268 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 13, 1947, and at pages 1580 to 1583 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 3, 1947. Apparently, it is contemplated that the studies and reports to be made by specialists and Members of Congress will form the basis of a reorganization which then could be brought about by the enactment of appropriate legislation.

I have a keen interest in matters pertaining to reorganization of the executive branch of the Government, not only because of my duties as Comptroller General, but, also, because as a member of the Select Committee on Government Organization of the Seventy-sixth Congress I lived with the subject for 3 years and, in fact, was in charge of that part of the original bill which was enacted as the Reorganization Act of 1939. That interest impels me to bring to the attention of your committee the observation that the history of reorganization attempts in the past has shown clearly the ineffectiveness of any legislation which provides merely for investigation and report, without vesting authority in someone to take decisive action placing in operation the changes found necessary.

A summary history of reorganization proposals is to be found in Senate Report No. 638, Seventy-ninth Congress. As early as 1798 a congressional committee was appointed to investigate possible changes in the distribution of appropriations for the executive departments, and in 1822 a select committee was established to consider reduction of governmental expenditures. In 1828 a committee appointed to determine retrenchments that could be made "with safety to the public interests" commented on its difficulty in getting department heads to agree to retrenchment. In more recent years President Theodore Roosevelt noted (seventh annual message) that two commissions appointed by him had investigated the reorganization of the scientific work of the Government and had studied the conduct of the executive force, and he urged (eighth annual message) passage of a bill to authorize a redistribution of the regular bureaus and an amalgamation of independent bureaus and commissions under the jurisdiction of appropriate departments. But he did so without success.

In 1911, at the request of President Taft, the Congress appropriated funds to enable him to undertake a study of the administrative organization. The Taft Commission on Economy and Efficiency (1910–13) recommended the adoption of a national budget system and the abolition of certain services and the consolidation of others. The Commission's recommendations were approved and submitted to Congress. But no action was taken. President Wilson was given limited authority in 1918 under the Overman Act (40 Stat. 556) "to coordinate or consolidate executive bureaus, agencies, and offices * * * in the interest of economy and the more efficient concentration of the Government," but the changes he made thereunder were permanently effective only to the extent that they were carried over in a legislative reorganization of the War Department by the National Defense Act in 1920.

Prior to the passage of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 (42 Stat. 20), which equipped the President with an effective arm of budgetary control by creating the Bureau of the Budget, the Congress had created a very exceptional and able Joint Committee on Reorganization to survey the administrative services and to make recommendations for the coordination of Government functions and their economical conduct. (See the act of Dec. 29, 1920 (41 Stat. 1083), as amended (42 Stats. 3 and 1562)). Two of the ablest Members of that Congress were members of the committee—Senator Wadsworth, now Representative Wadsworth of New York, was a member, and the late Carl Mapes, of Michigan, was the House chairman. To that committee there was submitted a reorganization plan that had been worked out by President Harding and his cabinet in 1922. However, at hearings held in 1924, the departments affected vigorously opposed the Harding Plan and, although a bill to make effective the committee's recommendations was reported out, all efforts to obtain consideration of it were unsuccessful.

It should be noted that on account of the futile efforts of that committee Mr. Wadsworth, who had become a Member of the House, and the late Representative Mapes both voted to give the President the right

to reorganize in the Reorganization Act of 1939.

Thereafter, despite repeated requests of Presidents Coolidge and Hoover, little or nothing was done until the Economy Act of 1932 (47 Stat. 413) was approved. Until then, Congress itself had assumed the substantial burden of reorganization efforts. But the futility and ineffectiveness of that procedure had become increasingly evident, and in the Economy Act a new policy was adopted of vesting in the Executive both the duty of initiating reorganizations and the power to make them operative.

Thus, under the Economy Act the President was authorized to transfer or consolidate agencies and functions by Executive order, subject to disapproval and invalidation by resolution of either House of Congress. However, the section authorizing invalidation in such manner was considered to be unconstitutional by Attorney General Mitchell (37 Op. Atty. Gen. 56), on the ground that there was no authority whereby either House acting alone could take legislative action; and a series of Executive orders issued by President Hoover late in 1932 regrouping and transferring 58 agencies was set aside by a resolution of the House of Representatives, on the theory that any reorganization should be accomplished by the incoming President. Later amendments of the Economy Act (47 Stat. 1517, 48 Stat. 16) substituted for the objectionable section a provision that Executive orders issued under authority of the act would be effective 60 days after their submission to Congress and added a provision authorizing the President to abolish the whole or any part of an executive agency, including any or all of its statutory functions.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt, shortly after his inauguration, created a special committee to assist him in developing plans for an administrative reorganization and, although urgent problems presented by emergency activities prevented comprehensive action, a number of transfers and consolidations were accomplished under the new plan, including the consolidation of theretofore scattered activities in the Procurement Division, the National Park Service, the Division of Disbursement, etc. In 1936 he appointed a committee to investigate the executive branch and the problems of administrative management, and requested both Houses of Congress to create corresponding special committees. The President's Committee on Administrative Management submitted a report on January 8, 1937, recommending widespread changes.

The new policy was continued under the Reorganization Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 561), which authorized the President to make reorganizations, including the abolition of agency functions, to take effect 60 days after the transmittal of plans therefor to the Congress, unless by concurrent resolution congressional disapproval had been expressed. Under that act, five reorganization plans were put into effect. Following its termination, the President was given authority, under the First War Powers Act, 1941 (55 Stat. 838), to make such redistribution of functions among the executive agencies as deemed necessary in the prosecution of the war. However, since the authority and the steps taken pursuant to it extend only until 6 months after the termination of the war, further legislation was enacted in the Reorganization Act of 1945 (59 Stat. 613), containing provisions similar to those of the 1939 act. The President submitted three reorganization plans under the 1945 act, one of which was rejected by the Congress and two of which went into effect. Two additional plans were submitted on May 1, 1947, described as Reorganization Plans Nos. 1 and 2 of 1947. (See H. Doc. Nos. 230 and 231, 80th Cong.)

Thus, it is evident that every President from Theodore Roosevelt to the present has urged a reorganization of the executive branch of the Government; and innumerable commissions have been appointed, Presidential and congressional committees have investigated, reports have been made and complete programs of reorganization have been formulated and submitted for general consideration. But, except for reorganizations brought about through the delegation of power to make them operative, the net result has been that the executive branch has continued to grow in all directions and to become more and more complex without much being done to improve the efficiency, or reduce the cost, of its functioning.

I originally made the following observation in connection with provisions which delegated such authority to the President in the Reorganization Act of 1939, during the debate of that legislation on the floor of the House of Representatives, and I reiterated it at hearings before the House and Senate committees on the measure which became the Reorganization Act of 1945:

"The House committee knew that it could consider this matter from now until doomsday with all of its varied ramifications, and that we would inevitably come back to the proposition presented to you in the bill now under consideration. We know from past experience, indeed from sad experience, here in this body, that the Congress will never of its own accord and of its own initiative reorganize the Government of the Nation. Time after time it has been tried, and time after time it has met with failure."

That conclusion is not mine alone. It has been expressed in one form or another by countless others, including Presidents Hoover, Roosevelt, and Truman. President Truman's letter of May 24, 1945, to the Congress, contained the following statement:

"Experience has demonstrated that if substantial progress is to be made in these regards, it must be done through action initiated or taken by the President. The results achieved under the Economy Act (1932), as amended, the Reorganization Act of 1939, and title I of the First War Powers Act, 1941, testify to the value of Presidential initiative in this field."

President Roosevelt, in a letter of March 29, 1938, reproduced at page 4487 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 31, 1938, stated:

"There are two methods of effecting a business-like reorganization. It can be done by complex and detailed legislation by the Congress going into every one of the hundreds of bureaus in the executive departments and other agencies.

"Or it can be done by giving to the President as Chief Executive authority to make certain adjustments and reorganizations by Executive order, subject to overriding of these Executive orders by the Congress itself.

"I would have been wholly willing to go along with the first method, but attempts at detailed reorganization by the Congress itself have failed many times in the past, and every responsible Member of the Senate or the House is in agreement that detailed reorganization by the Congress is a practicable impossibility."

The then Secretary of Commerce, Herbert Hoover, addressing the thirteenth annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, on May 21, 1925, commented as follows:

"Nor will we ever attain reorganization until Congress will give actual authority to the President or some board, if you will, or a committee of its own members to do it. It is of no purpose to investigate again and report. We have had years of investigation and every investigation has resulted in some recommended action. Congressional committees have for many sessions and even so late as the last session reported out important recommendations. What is needed is the actual delegation of authority to act."

The underlying factors compelling such a conclusion are manifest from the history of attempts to reorganize the executive branch. Perhaps the two most important factors are the gigantic proportions of the bureaucracy involved and the strong vested interests inherent in its existing structure. There is little need to illustrate the first. The magnitude of the executive branch of the Government has become well known to everyone in recent years, even though the almost infinite complexity of its countless activities may not be as apparent to the average citizen as it is to the Members of Congress who annually appropriate the funds required to vitalize its myriad operations. Not only is it futile to suppose that it would be feasible for the Congress to undertake the incredibly difficult task of completing the painstaking research, careful planning, and comprehensive analysis of administrative problems and of administrative implications of proposed changes involved, but it well may be that the Congress, which recently has streamlined its own legislative processes, would prefer to concentrate its efforts on issues of principle which are determined by judgment rather than by expert knowledge of detail or routine.

The second factor has been a real bugaboo of reorganization plans in the past. Only to the extent that the pressure resulting from vested interests have been effectively avoided or countered have reorganization programs met with any measure of success. Senator, later Secretary, Byrnes, speaking on the floor of the Senate in favor of the reorganization bill that became law in 1939, illustrated the opposition to change which always has resulted from such vested interests as follows (quoting from p. 2498 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 28, 1938):

"I have yet to talk with reference to reorganization to one man in the Government service who did not make this answer: 'Of course it should be done. I know it should be done, but'—and then, when he joins the great old order of 'butters' you will find that he says, 'but do not touch my department.' He is in favor of the reorganization, 'but do not touch my department; do not touch my bureau; do not touch my division.' If there is the slightest chance that it will be touched you have a strenuously active man, you have an efficient man, opposing it, for when we talk about the lobbyists who come to Washington and go before the departments, we must remember that the man in the department has the advantage of seeing all those lobbyists and he adopts the most improved method. He is the best of all of them. He profits by experience. As a result, we determined that there was no way to accomplish reorganization except to give to the President the power."

If the lessons and gains of past experience are to be capitalized, if future programs to reorganize the executive branch are to be built from the foundation of successful efforts in the past, it is imperative that such programs provide a practicable means by which decisive action can be taken to accomplish necessary changes. The Reorganization Act of 1945 provides such a means, and under it reorganization plans may be submitted to the Congress by the President until April 1, 1948. In this connection it should be noted that subsequent to enactment of the Reorganization Act of 1945, there was approved the Congressional Reorganization Act of 1946 under which the Committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments have the duty of "studying the operation of Government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency" and of "evaluating the effects of laws enacted to reorganize the legislative and executive branches of the Government." It well may be that in discharging such duties the said committees will obtain much valuable information and data which, if made available to the President, would be of great assistance to him in formulating reorganization plans. Also, it may be that over a period of time much

valuable information will be furnished to the Congress by his office under the provisions of section 206 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 which could be made available to the President.

As the head and manager of the executive branch, the President has the initial responsibility for good management, including that for the efficient and economical distribution of the work to be performed by it. I am convinced that the power to reorganize should be in him and that it will serve no useful purpose to investigate and report again in the expectation that this will insure reorganization changes being made. That method has been proved to be unworkable.

In view of the past history of the subject of Government reorganization, I would regard the passage of H. R. 775 as a waste of public funds.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

There is no question but what some good might come out of this Commission, and it is our sincere hope, I will say for the members of the committee, that some good will come out of it. There is no opposition from this side, and I just wanted to make these few remarks to show that the efforts of the past have been negligible, so far as congressional action is concerned, with reference to reorganization matters, and I hope that when this Commission recommends congressional action, when the report is made—which, by the way, will not be until the next Congress meets—that some good will come out of the efforts and recommendations of the Commission that will be appointed as a result of this resolution.

Now, I want to say that it is the confidence we have—and I say that sincerely—in the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], more than any other offsetting history of congressional action, that prompted me—and I am sure I speak for the other Democratic members—in unanimously voting this resolution out of committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Be it enacted etc.—

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to promote economy, efficiency, and improved service in the transaction of the public business in the departments, bureaus, agencies, boards, commissions, offices, independent establishments, and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Government by—

(1) limiting expenditures to the lowest amount consistent with the efficient performance of essential services, activities, and functions;

(2) eliminating duplication and overlapping of services, activities, and functions;

(3) consolidating services, activities, and functions of a similar nature;

(4) abolishing services, activities, and functions not necessary to the efficient conduct of Government; and

(5) defining and limiting executive functions, services, and activities.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out the policy set forth in section 1 of this act, there is hereby established a bipartisan commission to be known as the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government (in this act referred to as the "Commission").

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) Number and appointment: The Commission shall be composed of 12 members as follows:

(1) Four appointed by the President of the United States, 2 from the executive branch of the Government and 2 from private life;

(2) Four appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, 2 from the Senate and 2 from private life; and

(3) Four appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, two from the House of Representatives and two from private life.

(b) Political affiliation: Of each class of two members mentioned in subsection (a), not more than one member shall be from each of the two major political parties.

(c) Vacancies: Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

QUORUM

SEC. 5. Seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. (a) Members of Congress: Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) Members from the executive branch: The members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall each receive the compensation which he would receive if he were not a member of the Commission, plus such additional compensation, if any (notwithstanding section 6 of the Act of May 10, 1916, as amended; 39 Stat. 582; 5 U. S. C. 58), as is necessary to make his aggregate salary $12,500; and they shall be reimbursed for travel subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) Members from private life: The members from private life shall each receive $50 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, in accordance with the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

EXPIRATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 9. Ninety days after the submission to the Congress of the report provided for in section 10 (b), the Commission shall cease to exist.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 10. (a) Investigation: The Commission shall study and investigate the present organization and methods of operation of all departments, bureaus, agencies, boards, commissions, offices, independent establishments, and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Government, to determine what changes therein are necessary in their opinion to accomplish the purposes set forth in section 1 of this act.

(b) Report: Within 10 days after the Eighty-first Congress is convened and organized, the Commission shall make a report of its findings and recommendations to the Congress.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 11. (a) Hearings and sessions: The Commission, or any member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as the Commission or such member may deem advisable. Any member of the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission or before such member.

(b) Obtaining official data: The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this act; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the chairman or vice chairman.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement on the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill for fiscal 1948.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STRATTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement concerning the location of the Oregon Atomic Laboratory in Du Page County, Ill.

Mr. HAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. ROBSION asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain excerpts and documents.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and in each to include an editorial.

Mr. BUSBEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter addressed to Hon. William Benton, Assistant Secretary of State.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on tomorrow to consider the legislative appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

MAINTENANCE OF A DOMESTIC TIN-SMELTING INDUSTRY

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 125) to strengthen the common defense and to meet industrial needs for tin by providing for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That (a) tin is a highly strategic and critical material of which insufficient ore reserves exist in the United States and of which an adequate supply is vital to the Nation's industrial, military, and naval requirements for the common defense.

(b) Tin is now and for the immediate future will remain in supply short of the requirements of this country's industrial, military, and naval needs.

(c) It is necessary in the public interest and to promote the common defense that Congress make a thorough study and investigation regarding the advisability of the maintenance on a permanent basis of a domestic tin-smelting industry and to study the availability of supplies of tin adequate to meet the industrial, military, and naval requirements of the Nation in time of national emergency.

SEC. 2. The powers, functions, duties, and authority of the United States heretofore exercised by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation (1) to buy, sell, and transport tin, and tin ore and concentrates; (2) to improve, develop, maintain, and operate by lease or otherwise the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex.; (3) to finance research in tin smelting and processing; and (4) to do all other things necessary to the accomplishment of the foregoing shall continue in effect until June 30, 1949, or until such earlier time as the Congress shall otherwise provide, and shall be exercised and performed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation while that Corporation has succession, and thereafter by such officer, agency, or instrumentality of the United States as the President may designate.

SEC. 3. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation or the officer, agency, or instrumentality of the United States subsequently designated by the President shall render a full report to Congress on all its activities under this joint resolution not later than December 31, 1947, and at the end of each 6 months thereafter.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

House Resolution 260 was laid on the table

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. KING] is recognized for 30 minutes.

NEWSPRINT CONCERNS DEFY COURTS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of this House to a situation which is of vital importance to every newspaper and every newspaper reader in this country.

There have been, I am sure, several thousand definitions of our constitutional freedom of the press, but the man in the street finds freedom of the press for him—is his ability to purchase and read the newspaper of his choice.

Today that choice is becoming extremely limited. Due to a shortage of newsprint, and a "grey market" operation in some of the newsprint which is available, the smaller publishers and the publishers without the backing of "big money" find themselves confronted with a life and death struggle to keep their newspapers going.

This country is almost entirely dependent upon its newsprint supply from foreign countries. We produce in the United States less than 20 percent of the newsprint consumed. Most of the remainder comes from Canada.

This dependence upon other countries, and this lack of newsprint, is, in itself, alarming enough, but now we are confronted by the spectacle of Americans who change flags almost as often as they change clothes, who are openly defying the United States Government, and by their very defiance are supporting the contention of our Department of Justice that something is rotten in the newsprint industry.

Just a few days ago in New York City in a Federal court we had the spectacle of an American corporation dodging behind international boundaries in a refusal to come openly before the American people to explain their cartel manipulations.

The Department of Justice has for a long time been investigating the newsprint manipulations of the huge International Paper Co., and at last has presented the matter to a Federal grand jury

When subpenas were issued, however, for the records of International's subsidiary companies—the Canadian Paper Co. and the Paper Sales Co.—the American corporation refused to produce the records of those two companies, declaring they were Canadian corporations and beyond the investigative jurisdiction of American authorities.

At a hearing in Federal court on this contention the International Newsprint Co. admitted that it owns in its entirety the common stock of the Canadian Paper Co., and that the Canadian Paper Co., in turn, owns the entire common stock of the Paper Sales Co., yet the parent company, this American concern, the sole owner, had the audacity to contend that it had no control over the records of its Canadian firms. And this despite the fact that the boards are interlocking; the officers are, in many cases, identical; that the firms all share offices in the United States; that they have the same telephone lines; that the American firm makes deals in the name of the Canadian firms without even consulting them; that the American firm stands good on bank loans to the Canadian firms.

The United States Government contends that the three are one and the same company, and that the American firm, owning them all, is perfectly able to produce records and is subject to the laws of the United States.

Yet, a former United States Attorney General, acting as attorney for the companies, declared the three were not related, and that no court in this country has power to force a production of the Canadian records—unless it has a special act of Congress.

I say that no act of Congress should be necessary; that the case is clearly one of a cartel which is dodging its responsibilities to its native country by a series of incorporations in Canada. But I say, too, that if this is to be the pattern of international cartel and monopoly to exist in the United States—then it is time that the Congress act—and act fast.

I am proposing no legislation at this time, but I am serving warning upon these newsprint corporations—that if they openly defy the authority of the United States—if they choose to hide behind the flag of Canada or any other country—and if they are setting a pattern of defiance of our laws—then this Congress can act, and can be tough about it.

There can be no stronger proof of shady shenanigans within the Canadian newsprint trust than the fact that these companies are fighting so hard to avoid producing their records. If they have nothing to hide, nothing to fear—then why do they go to great lengths to refuse information to the grand jury?

We know, and I believe every Congressman knows—that there is a well-established "gray market" in newsprint in this country. The price set by the industry is actually about $90 a ton, but we have records in our own House committee investigating this situation that sales have been made at $180 a ton. Furthermore, I am informed of instances where the price has been $230 a ton, $270 a ton, and even $300 a ton.

That newsprint, in part at least, is coming from Canada. The small publisher cannot pay such prices, even if he would. That newsprint is being diverted somewhere, somehow, from legitimate channels, and the legitimate publisher is penalized.

What this situation can lead to should be clear to anyone. The bigger the publisher, the longer he can afford to stay in business. But the little press, the labor press, the religious press, the liberal press, cannot long continue in business, and the freedom of the individual newspaper reader to the newspaper of his choice, is rapidly becoming a lost freedom.

I address myself to this subject to put the newsprint industry on warning that the Congress will not forever remain quiet while the laws of the United States are flaunted by international corporations. If these American companies with foreign subsidiaries, want to remain in business—if they want to have the protection of the flag and laws of the United States of America—it is time they were stood up and were counted as Americans who, in turn, are ready to defend the freedom of the press.

I hope that before this session adjourns, our able House committee now investigating the newsprint situation, will turn its attention to this particular phase of defiance by American firms. I am sure, from what I know of the hearings this committee has already held, that every effort is being made to encourage an expanded United States newsprint industry which will one day give us independence of foreign sources. I have hope that before this House adjourns, our committee will bring us a report so that all our people back home may know just what a crisis is faced today by their small publishers.

If it be nationalistic to demand that Americans behave as Americans, and not dodge behind foreign corporations to circumvent the laws of their native country, then that kind of nationalism I can and do endorse.

To those newsprint companies of this country who are now flag-dodging in an effort to thwart an investigation by our Department of Justice, I say, "If it is congressional action you are asking for, it is congressional action you will get, but you will not like it; you will not like it."

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I should like to compliment the gentleman on bringing this matter to the attention of the House. The newsprint situation in California is really very, very critical. I hope that something can be done about it so that our newspapers can get a sufficient amount of newsprint.

Mr. KING. I thank the gentleman from California.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] is recognized for 1 hour.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR RECLAMATION PROJECTS

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago the Interior Department appropriation bill came before the House. At that time various Representatives in the House from the 12 Western States spoke on the floor relative to certain items in the bill. The bill went to the Senate, was discussed in subcommittee; it has been passed by the Senate, and will go either today or tomorrow, possibly within the next few hours, into conference between the two Houses. It is the desire, therefore, of some of us who live in the Western States to say now what we think of the changes in the bill that have been made in the other body. For that reason I have reserved this time.

I call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that when the bill was earlier before us and comments were made upon it it was not always, and in fact, it was rather rare, that the comments upon the bill had to do with the amounts of money. There were involved matters of principle, of policy, and in many instances of the wording of the bill. If the Congress is to write a new reclamation policy for the United States, that is the right of the Congress, but the Westerners who spoke at that time expressed the hope that any changes in policy might be written with the understanding that they were changes, and discussed fully. We did not want changes put in by the committee, perhaps not realizing the extent of the action, in themselves to represent policy changes. There were changes in wording which had a more far-reaching effect than perhaps any Member of Congress realized at the time.

The bill is before us again. I hold in my hand the bill (H. R. 3123), the appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior, in the Senate print. There are many items that justify comment, but to save time I shall only comment upon a few of them, thus permitting some of the other Members of Congress, whom I see here, to comment upon those in which they are more personally interested.

On page 15, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], will be interested to observe that the item for the education of Indians has been increased from the $8,000,000, when it left the House, to $11,500,000. I submit to the Congress that this is a matter for careful consideration by the Congress at some future time. But until that moment arrives it is necessary fully to finance the schools.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman will recall that during the consideration of this bill in the House an amendment was considered to provide the increase which has been provided now by the other body. There were two amendments, I think, which were made—one to increase the $8,000,000 to $10,000,000 and from $10,000,000 to $11,500,000. The vote on the $10,000,000 was very close. In fact, I think many Members felt that standing alone, it would probably have carried. I call attention to it because obviously a great many Members of the House, when this item was debated at some length, felt that the larger provision should be made for education programs of the Indian Service. I sincerely hope that the memory of the extended debate at the time will be borne in mind by the conferees.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I concur in the statement of the gentleman and also in his hope.

Turning to page 37, the general investigation item which had been, as I recall, something like $5,000,000 in previous bills, or perhaps in the Budget request, and had been reduced to $125,000 in the House bill has been increased by the Senate to $2,000,000. An attempt was made to increase it in the House by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. STOCKMAN]. I hope that in the consideration by the conference committee adequate money will be left. I think the amount put in by the Senate is probably the correct amount to make the necessary investigations and to keep from stopping work or causing any interruption in the program.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HOLMES. This is a very important item in relation to the Interior Department Appropriation bill because it contains within it the program that the Bureau of Reclamation of the Interior Department carries for investigations and feasibility reports for planning irrigation projects in the West. I think it is one of the most important items we have in the bill.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. In other words, the gentleman feels it might be an economy rather than an expense.

Mr. HOLMES. That is correct.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. That is, that the preliminary work being done by the Bureau might save money in the subsequent construction work.

On page 44, there is an item for the Central Valley project, but in order to save time I will leave comment upon that item to those Members from California whom I see on the floor, the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] and the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I would like to say just a word about the Central Valley project and point out certain facts which I think many Members, who do not live in the West, are unaware of.

In the first place, the money which goes into these projects is paid back dollar for dollar, so that ultimately the United States is merely lending money, and the water users and power users who get the benefits pay the money back.

In the second place, with particular reference to the Central Valley project, I noticed the item that the gentleman refers to is for some transmission lines. I want to point out to the Members that the Central Valley water project was first approved by the Legislature of the State of California. Thereafter, pursuant to our Constitution, a referendum was held on this piece of legislation and the people, at a formal election, I think in 1932, approved the project. The project which was approved is substantially identical with the one the Reclamation Bureau is now developing and was a program for an integrated power system. That is what the transmission lines are developing. Many Members seem to think that we in the Central Valley are trying to develop a pattern different than is found elsewhere in the United States with reference to the development of power in conjunction with this water project. The pattern that we are trying to develop in California is exactly the same as has been developed in the Northwest, in Washington, and in other reclamation projects throughout the country. We want a separate integrated system of power development so that we can handle that power to the best advantage, for the consumer, and so that there may be the most recovery to the taxpayers from the sale of this power.

These are some of the things that very few Members know about and I wish to

thank the gentleman from California for permitting me to put them in the RECORD.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I thank the gentleman and I call attention to the fact that the increase in the Senate in the entire appropriation for the Central Valley project, for all expenditures on all the facilities, was approximately only $3,000,000. The gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] has just handed me an analysis of the changes made in the other body, in the appropriations for Central Valley projects, and I will include the table at this point in my remarks:

Comparison of House and Senate appropriation bill, fiscal year 1948, Central Valley project, California

	Appropriation bill		Senate action, increase (+) or decrease (−)
	As passed by House	As passed by Senate	
Joint facilities	$690,000	$690,000	0
Irrigation facilities	5,134,980	5,622,028	+$487,048
Power facilities:			
Shasta power plant	427,800	427,800	0
Keswick Dam	100,740	100,740	0
Keswick power plant	218,040	218,040	0
Transmission lines:			
Shasta to Delta, via Oroville and Sacramento, 230-kilovolt	256,680	256,680	0
West side lines Shasta to Delta, 230-kilovolt, to a point opposite and connecting with Shasta substation	0	2,160,000	+2,160,000
Keswick tap line, 230-kilovolt	0	160,000	+160,000
Sacramento to Antelope, 115-kilovolt	0	170,000	+170,000
Contra Costa Canal extension, 69-kilovolt	71,760	118,000	+46,240
Substations:			
Antelope	0	45,000	+45,000
Contra Costa	0	48,000	+48,000
Total	6,900,000	10,016,288	+3,116,288

The table shows a total increase in the other body of only $3,116,288.

That leads me to the next comment which I think is important and must be kept in mind, Mr. Speaker, when the bill comes back to this House. It is that the Senate actually did not make new money available to the amount which would appear as an increase of $54,000,000. We had a most difficult experience in this House trying to get accurate figures on the balances remaining in the fund on July 1. Some $29,000,000 or less of the money put in by the Senate was not additional money to that voted by the House, but, as I understand the report, and I have read it very carefully, was merely to bring the funds on hand on July 1 to the point where the House thought they would be, when we actually passed the bill.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HOLMES. An examination of the major items involved in the Senate print shows conclusively that there was a clarification of the confusion between unobligated and unspent balances as they appeared in the House appropriations. With the clarification which the gentleman has so ably outlined it shows definitely that the other body has clarified this unobligated versus unspent balance controversy and there is in the Senate print a very accurate break-down of the contemplated moneys necessary for the continuing of these major projects. I am speaking particularly in reference to the Columbia Basin and the Bonneville Power Administration in the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I thank the gentleman. It is very hard not to have confusion when a committee is given three different sets of figures at three different times. When I appeared before the Senate subcommittee I said that the most constructive job that subcommittee could do would be to determine the accuracy of the amounts left over as of July 1.

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield.

Mr. NIXON. Commenting on the point which the gentleman has made about the figures which have been considered in the House and in the Senate by the Appropriations Committee, I think it is well to note that, in the figures which were recommended by the House Appropriations Committee for reclamation projects, $68,000,000 had been recommended and approved by this House. That together with the amount of $85,000,000, which was the carryover which the House Appropriations Committee found to be existing from the figures which were submitted by the Bureau of Reclamation would have made a total program of $153,000,000 for the next year, which, of course, is from all accounts, a considerable program.

The Senate Appropriations Committee has recommended a total program for reclamation projects of $160,000,000, which is an increase of only $7,000,000 in the program actually recommended for reclamation projects. This is due to the fact that, when the Bureau of Reclamation presented its figures for the carryover from the preceding year, the Senate found that instead of $85,000,000 being available for that purpose there was only $56,000,000.

The gentleman from California has suggested that there were three different sets of figures involved, and I think on that point it is well to bear in mind that when the Bureau of the Budget and the Bureau of Reclamation presented their figures before the Senate Appropriations Committee they declared that the figure of $85,000,000 which the House committee had assumed would be available for the next year from the previous year was incorrect, and that only $44,000,000 was available. The Senate found that $56,000,000 was actually available. I believe therefore it is well for us to bear in mind that when the House Appropriations Committee recommended the expenditure of $68,000,000 in new money for the next year they were actually approving a program of $153,000,000, which compares quite favorably with the program of $160,000,000 which the Senate has recommended be approved;

The reason in great part of the confusion over these appropriations has been due to the bookkeeping of the Bureau of Reclamation and to the figures which have been presented. I feel that all the Members of this body could well read the report of the Senate Appropriations Committee on that very point, because it brings forth the confusion which the gentleman has described.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I thank the gentleman for those comments because they are pertinent.

It must be borne in mind, Mr. Speaker, that much of the money about which we are talking is reimbursable money, and a great deal of it with interest.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I am very much interested in this Interior appropriation bill, perhaps from a little different angle than some of the rest of the Members. There are two projects on the Republican River, which is a tributary of the Missouri River, in which I am interested, the Frenchman-Cambridge project and the Bostwick project. There is no power involved in either one of them, but there is a great element of flood control. On last Sunday morning there was a flood at Cambridge, Nebr., taking the lives of 14 people, possibly 15. Six or seven miles above Cambridge, the Bureau of Reclamation is to build a dam, which has been authorized by both the Bureau and by the Army engineers. It will be 65 percent flood control, and it would have done much to prevent this catastrophe.

In 1935 this area in southwest Nebraska had a flood loss involving 112 lives, but because part of our storage is for irrigation these items are under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation. They are essentially flood-control items and they would do much to relieve the stress from the highest water in many, many years which is now pouring down there.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. May I ask the gentleman if that item is in the Interior bill or in the civil-functions bill of the War Department?

Mr. CURTIS. It is in the Interior bill.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. It would be under the project "Appropriation for the Missoui River Basin"?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Which comes on page 45.

Mr. CURTIS. There are two major dams and reservoirs in the Frenchman-Cambridge project. One of them has already been started. The dam on Medicine Creek, which would have prevented this loss of life, has not yet been started. I sincerely hope that the schedule can be moved up so that it may be started immediately. It is a question of saving lives and millions of dollars of property in my district, and I cannot consent to a

reduction in the amount the Senate fixed for the Missouri River Basin.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. That amount left the House as $9,786,600 and has been returned as $18,535,000. That item, I take it, is the one to which the gentleman is referring?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes. Not all of that was an increase. Part of that comes in in the dispute over how much money is actually available and unexpended. I cannot tell you how much is an actual raise over the amount the House thought it was appropriating.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. There is another item in that same Missouri Basin over-all project, in western South Dakota, which is in much the same position that the gentleman has mentioned in Nebraska. I refer to the item for the Grand River unit, commonly known as the Shade Hill Dam. There again you have a combination of flood control and irrigation reservoir. The House earmarked $300,000 for that. The Senate concurred in that but did not increase it specifically, I feel, in accordance with the general increase it allowed individual items. There the Federal Government itself in one flood lost over $500,000 worth of property in addition to some loss of lives and dispossession of families. It is a relatively small project. The whole dam could be built for less than $2,000,000. The loss of the Government in a single flood has proximated 25 percent of the total cost of construction.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I want to turn to page 46, where there is a small item, but one which is very important to those of us who live in the far West. It has to do with the Colorado River Dam and the Boulder Canyon project in which the Senate have very properly done something that many of us called to the committee's attention; that is, put in a small amount of money, only $33,300, for the reimbursement of the Boulder City school district for the instruction of children attending the schools in that area. Where you have an area completely owned by the Government and without school taxes, this becomes, to us in the West, a very serious problem.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Nevada.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am very pleased that the gentleman from California has brought up that item. We in southern Nevada feel where the students who attend the schools are from the Boulder Dam reservation, that the Federal Government has an obligation to meet a part of the cost of the schools there, in that all of the property that is on that reservation is on Government land. There is not the taxable wealth to obtain funds to maintain the schools.

When the House acted on this discrimination against the West's appropriation bill they did so unjustly. For instance, the Budget request for the funds available for construction of Davis Dam, was reduced from $18,000,000 to $6,200,000. I mentioned at that time that this was a short-sighted measure of economy, because it would necessitate the slowing up of construction of that great dam from 4 to 5 years in its completion. Davis Dam was a result of a treaty obligation between the United States and Mexico, and is designed to produce substantial blocks of power for the Southwest. What the House in effect was doing by cutting this measure so drastically was to go against the law of the land, for the treaty was a firm basis for law, just as much as any act of this Congress.

When Congress a year ago appropriated for the current fiscal year $7,500,000 it did so knowing full well that that sum would only start the project. Congress knew at that time that more money would have to be forthcoming to enable the project to be completed. There is no unobligated balance to be carried over into the fiscal year of 1948, and yet the House allowed only $6,200,000 to carry out the needs for fiscal year 1948. Fortunately, the Senate looked at this matter in a little more farsighted manner. They have recommended that the amount be increased by $7,300,000 to provide a total appropriation of $13,500,000. They have also recommended that the Commissioner of Reclamation be authorized to enter into contracts in an amount not in excess of $4,500,000. This contract authorization will assure Davis Dam of not being further hamstrung by a lack of funds. Their action is to be commended.

I wish to address myself to the Boulder-Hoover Dam. The House finally allowed $400,000 for the Boulder Canyon project. The 1948 estimate was in the amount of $800,000. The Senate committee has recommended, and the Senate passed, providing for an increase of $75,575 to provide a total appropriation of $475,575 which together with the unobligated balance of $497,713 will provide a total of $973,288 for the fiscal year of 1948. The House cut, as I mentioned on April 24, was particularly untimely since all of the expenditures for these activities at Boulder-Hoover Dam are reimbursable under the Boulder Canyon Act of 1928 and the subsequent adjustment act of 1940.

I am particularly happy to note in the Senate report that the committee specifically allowed money to complete designs and specifications and award a contract for a high school and appurtenant facilities at Boulder City. I made mention on April 24 that Boulder City is a Government town. The land and most of the buildings are owned as I stated before by the United States Government and are nontaxable by the State of Nevada. The Government has an obligation to take care of the educational facilities and the education of the children at that community. When the House committee stated in their report that "they were opposed to the Government providing educational facilities at this project, it being of the opinion that assessments levied against the beneficiaries should provide funds for such facilities as is the practice in other American communities," they showed a lack of understanding of the situation. Again, the Senate fortunately included this feature in their report and cooperative action by the House on this amendment, in conference, will assure that area of maintaining their high educational standards.

I should like to take just a moment more of the valued time of this body to explain one other feature of the Interior Department appropriation bill, which, I believe, should be included by the House in view of the Senate's action. The House specifically eliminated cooperative or noncooperative ground-water activities from this bill, contrary to budget estimates. The Senate has stricken from the bill the prohibition against use of funds for cooperative or noncooperative ground-water activities. This is as it should be. The Legislature of the State of Nevada has provided $40,000 for continuing the cooperative ground-water program in my State. This program has been under way for a year. The House's action would completely eliminate appropriation for ground-water activity. This is most important for development of our latent resources in the West.

Westerners are for economy cuts just as easterners or midwesterners or southerners might be, but we are opposed to cuts which are unjustified. One thought occurs to me that may be of significance. The West is the new section of our great Nation. Only by promoting new plans will our country continue to grow. I implore you, gentleman, to not cut appropriations where the result of the money spent will be the harnessing of streams, the development of new areas, and the expansion of our resources.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I am very glad the gentleman brought up the point of the Davis Dam because the comments on it usually refer to power only, much of which will be made available to the district represented so well by the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. RUSSELL]; however, it is also a water-conservation measure affecting the waters of a very unpredictable river, the Colorado, and is a part of an obligation the United States assumed in signing the treaty between the United States and Mexico.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I appreciate the fine interest that the gentleman from California is taking in this matter, and it is very revealing to bring these facts to our attention. It seems our problem here is one of convincing some of those who live east of the Mississippi of the vast importance of water development, hydroelectric power, irrigation, and reclamation west of the Mississippi River. I am speaking of those on both sides of

the aisle in this House. There is the great surge of population to the Western States; the problem that we have already agreed upon in the Mexican Water Treaty to deliver out of one of our great water systems more than a million and a half acre-feet of water to Mexico, which we all agreed on, but nevertheless it is water that we expected to use, and it is taken out of our system. The existing problem now between Arizona and California is how much water may be taken out of the Colorado River, and the question whether it will serve a larger population in California than in Arizona. The whole picture is of an economic nature and of such vast proportions that it is just as important to those of both parties who live east of the Mississippi River as it is to those who live west of the Mississippi River. It is a great national question, and I still think that the restorations that were made by the Senate, although greater than the amounts that passed the House, are not sufficient in every detail to meet our requirements for the next fiscal year.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HOLMES. The restoration by the Senate helped our program immensely in the West, as we all agree, but I do want to call attention of the Members of the House who are a bit cautious about these restorations that even the restorations made by the Senate were not full budget estimates, and that the Senate still was using what they considered a program of economy in working out these restorations. That is the point that I think the gentleman from California brings to the attention of the House, that these restorations are carefully thought out. On the other hand, they are not being made without intelligent recognition of the problem.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I thank both gentlemen for their comments.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, there is a problem at the present time before the Public Works Committee on the disposition of power at the bus bar for dams built by the Army engineers and those built by the Department of the Interior, which is going to have a vital effect on the development of our future hydroelectric power. It is vital for the reason that although there is some argument, and I think a virtuous argument, to the effect that the Department of the Interior may be asking for more than they can spend in a fiscal year, there is some reason why we should consider how much of that money was funded and not spent the previous year in anticipation of what may be spent for the ensuing year. Nevertheless, the whole thing should be looked at more as a matter of economy, and of national importance, than for the economy of the Western States who might be thought to be arguing for greater sums of money for the development of reclamation, irrigation, and hydroelectric power.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I thank the gentleman very much.

Now, there are a few little items on page 47, and then, again, on page 48, which have little to do with the amount of money, but have to do with the wording of the bill. I called attention, when the bill was previously before the House, to the fact that the wording under the Boulder Canyon project extension of the All-American Canal into the Coachella Valley, as it came to this floor, made it impossible to spend the money, and I call attention now to the fact that the necessary changes, which in a separate legislative bill passed the subcommittee, the committee, and this House unanimously, subsequently passing the subcommittee and the committee and the Senate unanimously, have now been included in the wording of the appropriation bill which comes back to us from the other body, so that the money for the continuation of the canal and the extension of the laterals can now be spent. Construction can be continued, and the saving to the United States, or to the taxpayers' pocketbooks, if you wish, is in the neighborhood of $8,000,000.

On the following page there has been a slight change in the amount of money for the construction of the straightening of the Colorado River, the river-front work, and the levee system, in which both the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] and I are interested, which allows $63,300 more than the House allowed but some $437,000 less than the Budget thought necessary for this year. In speaking to the House before, I said we would be well satisfied to continue the work with the amount appropriated, whatever it was; and had the project advanced to the point where we could use more money, we would have no hesitation in coming to the Congress next year. It is not desirable to put money into funds which will not be spent in one fiscal year.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. The gentleman will recall that when this bill was on the floor of the House there was some dissatisfaction with the treatment of the force account item.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I was just about to come to that. That is the next item. I thank the gentleman for reminding me of it, because I should like the gentleman to know that in the bill the three lines to which we objected have been stricken out. While he and I might think that that was enough, just striking them out and putting nothing in their place, the other body has put in a statement which I will now read:

> No part of any construction appropriation for the Bureau of Reclamation contained in this act shall be available for construction work by force account or on a hired labor basis, except for management and operation, maintenance and repairs, engineering and supervision, routine minor construction work, or in the case of emergencies local in character, so declared by the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation.

I think that covers the cases which affect the gentleman's district and mine, where it would be absolutely impossible to make repairs to lines, ditches, banks, or river beds, unless they could be made under force account. While making it necessary for the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation to declare them emergencies, nevertheless this does give us that recourse, and I am satisfied with it, and I am quite sure that the conference committee will allow it to remain in the bill.

Mr. HORAN. I think it is quite important to point out that while some of those so-called force accounts might appear to be subject to contract letting, quite often they are a diversion from the maintenance and operation of a reclamation project or construction project.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROBSION. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION. I should like to commend the gentleman for his always earnest activity in behalf of the people of the West. I share that interest. I feel that in rehabilitating other countries we should not forget that we have neglected our own West and other parts of our country during the war.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. May I say to the gentleman from Kentucky that the desire of those of us from the West has never been to come into the Congress of the United States and say we are in favor of economy provided it does not apply to our areas, nor that we want unlimited amounts of money. We have tried to come before the House, and before the committees, fairly and say, "This is the amount of money which can reasonably be spent in 1 year for a constructive purpose," and in most cases it has been reimbursable money. I, for one, think we should separate those parts of the appropriations which have to do with reimbursable funds from those parts which have to do with the outright expenditure of money.

There are other items in the bill which, as I said at the start, I would like to speak about, but in order to save time I have refrained from speaking about them, leaving them to the Representatives from those areas who are more closely interested in them.

I feel that the desire of all of us is to support the subcommittee, to support the Committee on Appropriations, and to attempt to help the conference committee work out a final appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior which will permit the economy of the West to be developed and will not at any time result either in the destruction of the work already started, nor the destruction of the hopes of a very important part of the United States, economically and politically.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] has just handed me another excellent table, for which I thank him, analyzing all the changes made in the House bill while it was in the other body. It is instructive and helpful. I will include it in my remarks at this point.

Comparison of House and Senate appropriation bills, fiscal year 1948

Appropriation title	As passed by House	As passed by Senate	Senate action, increase (+) or decrease (−)
Reclamation fund, special fund:			
Salaries and expenses [1]	$3,000,000	$3,260,000	+$260,000
General investigations [1]	125,000	2,000,000	+1,875,000
Construction:			
Gila project, Arizona	[2] 1,000,000	[3]	[3]
Davis Dam project, Arizona-Nevada	[2] 6,200,000	[3]	[3]
Central Valley project, California	[2] 6,900,000	[3]	[3]
Kings River project, California	[2] 100,000	[3]	[3]
Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado	[2] 6,815,000	[3]	[3]
Pine River project, Colorado	175,000		−175,000
Boise project, Idaho, Payette division	897,000	897,000	0
Boise project, Idaho, Anderson Ranch	3,874,000	3,874,000	0
Lewiston Orchards project, Idaho	500,000	500,000	0
Palisades project, Idaho	876,000	930,750	+54,750
Hungry Horse project, Montana	[2] 1,550,000	[3]	[3]
Carlsbad project, New Mexico	21,000	21,000	0
Rio Grande project, New Mexico-Texas	755,000	755,000	0
Deschutes project, Oregon	1,626,000	1,626,000	0
Klamath project, Oregon-California	1,800,000	1,800,000	0
Ogden River project, Utah	30,000	30,000	0
Provo River project, Utah	1,000,000	[5] 1,000,000	0
Columbia Basin project, Washington	[2] 11,435,000	[3]	[3]
Shoshone project, Wyoming, Power Division	443,000	443,000	0
Total construction	45,997,000	11,876,750	−120,250
Operation and maintenance: [1]			
Parker Dam power project, Arizona-California	(700,000)	(2,140,000)	+(1,440,000)
Yuma project, Arizona-California	130,000	130,000	0
Power revenues	(32,000)	(32,000)	0
Central Valley project, California	(800,000)	(800,000)	0
Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado	(130,000)	(130,000)	0
Boise project, Idaho	185,000	185,000	0
Minidoka project, Idaho	75,000	75,000	0
Power revenues	(196,000)	(196,000)	0
North Platte project, Nebraska	(136,000)	(136,000)	0
Rio Grande project, New Mexico-Texas	(220,000)	(220,000)	0
Deschutes project, Oregon	50,000	50,000	0
Owyhee project, Oregon	260,000	260,000	0
Klamath project, Oregon-California	200,000	200,000	0
Columbia Basin project, Washington	(1,300,000)	(1,326,000)	+($26,000)
Yakima project, Washington	300,000	300,000	0
Power revenues	(25,000)	(25,000)	0
Reclamation fund, special fund—Continued			
Operation and maintenance—Continued			
Kendrick project, Wyoming	($200,000)	($200,000)	0
Riverton project, Wyoming	89,000	89,000	0
Power revenues	(48,300)	(48,300)	0
Shoshone project, Wyoming	50,000	50,000	0
Power revenues	(79,400)	(79,400)	0
Total operation and maintenance	1,339,000	1,339,000	0
Power revenues ( )	(3,866,700)	(5,332,700)	+($1,466,000)
Total reclamation fund	50,461,000	18,475,750	+2,014,750
General fund—construction:			
Gila project, Arizona	[3]	1,600,000	+600,000
Davis Dam project, Arizona-Nevada	[3]	[6] 13,500,000	+7,300,000
Central Valley project, California	[3]	10,016,288	+3,116,288
Kings River project, California	[3]	100,000	0
Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado	[3]	10,471,908	+3,656,908
Hungry Horse project, Montana	[3]	3,285,353	+1,735,353
Columbia Basin project, Washington	[3]	20,354,000	+8,919,000
Total construction		59,327,549	+25,327,549
Operation and maintenance: All-American Canal	[4]	[4]	[4]
Total general fund		59,327,549	+25,327,549
General account:			
Fort Peck project, Montana	1,250,000	1,575,058	+325,058
Missouri River Basin	9,786,600	18,535,000	+8,748,400
Colorado River Dam fund:			
Boulder Canyon project, operation and maintenance	1,500,000	1,533,300	+33,300
Boulder Canyon project, construction	400,000	475,575	+75,575
All-American Canal	3,245,000	3,245,000	0
Colorado River development fund [1]	250,000	500,000	+250,000
Colorado River front work and levee system	1,000,000	1,063,300	+63,300
Motion pictures			
Total general account	17,431,600	26,927,233	+9,495,633
Grand total, all funds	67,892,600	[6] 104,730,532	+36,837,932
Total power revenues	(3,866,700)	(5,332,700)	(+1,466,000)

[1] Fiscal year appropriation.

[2] Appropriation requested from general fund.

[3] House allowance made from reclamation fund—H. R. 3123.

[4] Included in All-American Canal, construction.

[5] Senate allowance made from general fund.

[6] In addition, the Senate bill contains contract authorization as follows: Provo River, $430,000; Davis Dam, $4,500,000.

		General fund, construction
Reclamation fund (construction):		
As passed by House	$45,997,000	0
As passed by Senate	11,876,750	$59,327,549
Decrease	34,120,250	59,327,549
Transferred to: General fund	34,000,000	34,000,000
Net decrease	120,250	
Net increase		25,327,549

Mr. BRADLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY. May I say to the gentleman from California that while reclamation is not a matter of such vital importance to my district as it is to many sections of California, yet water, in general, is of the utmost importance for agriculture, industry, and to sustain the ever-increasing population of southern California. It may be difficult for many from the Eastern States to realize that the populations of certain sections of California have doubled during the last 6 or 7 years. Quite likely it will come as a surprise to learn that we must obtain most of our water from locations some hundreds of miles distant from the great centers of population, and that every one of these reclamation projects, through the construction of dams and through the conservation of water, is of great benefit to us. Without ample water much of California would cease to qualify among the garden spots of the world. It would cease to supply a great part of the fruit and vegetables used in the whole United States.

The gentleman may rest assured that he has the wholehearted support of the Eighteenth District of California in his efforts to obtain more ample funds for the reclamation projects of the West.

MAYOR JAMES M. CURLEY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, today a former Member of this House, the mayor of Boston, was sentenced to serve from 6 to 18 months by a judge of the United States district court. The jury was out 2 days before it arrived at its verdict, and went home over 1 night. The case had gone up to the circuit court, where the verdict was sustained by a 2 to 1 decision.

It is not my purpose to discuss the facts of the case, but to make some pointed comments on the disposition of the case today. Mayor Curley was very ill and medical evidence was submitted. A motion for clemency was denied, and then a motion was made that execution of sentence be suspended long enough to permit Mayor Curley, for a reasonable period of time, to return to Boston to perform certain official duties affecting State and municipal business. That motion also was denied. Having in mind the poor physical condition of Mayor Curley, the action of Judge Proctor in denying clemency is amazing to me. His action in denying above all that the execution of sentence be suspended long enough to permit Mayor Curley to attend to important matters affecting State and municipal business is indefensible. It is impossible for me to understand and appreciate the judicial mind which would deny the mayor of any city, particularly a city of the size and importance of Boston, a reasonable period of time as was requested.

So far as I am concerned, to say that the action is cold is expressing myself mildly. I say this as one who strongly believes in an independent judiciary and

who believes in the appointment of judges for life during good behavior.

I ran for my first public office 30 years ago on a platform against the election of judges in a district which on a popular vote would probably have favored the election of judges by at least 5 to 1. It seems rather difficult for me to appreciate the failure to allow the motion for clemency because of his poor health. But, to deny the suspension of execution of sentence for a reasonable period of time until he could go back to his city and transact certain business of concern to the people is absolutely indefensible. This is a matter which appeals to my conscience and I am expressing myself in a restrained manner. I repeat, it is difficult for me to understand the action of any judge in denying any man under such circumstances a reasonable period of suspension of execution of sentence in order to perform important public duties.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any Member, particularly those from the 15 Western States, may be permitted to extend their remarks in connection with my time on the subject on which I addressed the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CANFIELD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. GATHINGS (at the request of Mr. CRAVENS), for the remainder of the week, on account of official business.

To Mr. KEARNEY (at the request of Mr. CANFIELD), for 10 days, on account of official business.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule referred as follows:

S. 616. An act to authorize the creation of a game refuge in the Francis Marion National Forest in the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1358. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the management and operation of naval plantations, outside the continental United States," approved June 28, 1944.

H. R. 1371. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to appoint, for supply duty only, officers of the line of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes.

H. R. 1375. An act to further amend section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, so as to provide for the clothing allowance of enlisted men of the Army, Marine Corps, and Marine Corps Reserve; and

H. R. 2276. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to pay certain expenses incident to training, attendance, and participation of personnel of the Army of the United States and of the naval service, respectively, in the seventh winter sports Olympic games and the fourteenth Olympic games and for future Olympic games.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 27, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

852. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to transfer certain transmission lines, substations, appurtenances, and equipment in connection with the sale and disposition of electric energy generated at the Fort Peck project, Montana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

853. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 in the amount of $1,336,000 for the Post Office Department (H. Doc. No. 364); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

854. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a list of institutions and organizations which have requested donations from the Navy Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

855. A letter from the Administrator, National Housing Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Andrew A. Koleser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

856. A letter from the Administrator, National Housing Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of William G. Nelson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

857. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act of Congress entitled "An act to accord free entry to bona fide gifts from members of the armed forces of the United States on duty abroad," approved December 5, 1942; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 260. Resolution providing for the consideration of S. J. Res. 125, joint resolution to strengthen the common defense and to meet industrial needs for tin by providing for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry; without amendment (Rept. No. 706). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 261. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 3049, a bill to continue in effect section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), as amended, relating to the exportation of certain commodities; without amendment (Rept. No. 707). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 262. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 3951, a bill to provide increases in the rates of pension payable to Spanish-American War and Civil War veterans and their dependents; without amendment (Rept. No. 708). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CORBETT: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 251. Resolution to provide that Members of the House of Representatives and officers shall, for their convenience, be furnished with identification cards; without amendment (Rept. No. 709). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 3152. A bill to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act; with an amendment (Rept. No. 710). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REED of New York: Committee on Ways and Means. S. 1072. An act to extend until July 1, 1949, the period during which income from agricultural labor and nursing services may be disregarded by the States in making old-age assistance payments without prejudicing their rights to grants-in-aid under the Social Security Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 713). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. House Concurrent Resolution 54. Concurrent resolution to provide for the use of Schick General Hospital at Clinton, Iowa, for the Veterans' Administration; without amendment (Rept. No. 714). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 816. An act to repeal the Post Roads Act of 1866, as amended, and for other purposes, without amendment (Rept. No. 715). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Committee on Foreign Affairs. S. 1005. An act to amend the act of June 28, 1935, entitled "An act to authorize participation by the United States in the Interparliamentary Union"; without amendment (Rept. No. 716). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 3993. A bill making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 717). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2313. A bill to amend the act of May 19, 1926 (44 Stat. 565), as amended by the acts of May 14, 1935 (49 Stat. 218), and of October 1, 1942 (56 Stat. 763), providing for the detail of United States military and naval missions to foreign governments; without amendment (Rept. No. 718). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. S. 350. An act to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States until June 30, 1948; without amendment (Rept. No. 719). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 650. A bill for the relief of Ruston Jamsetji Patell; without amendment (Rept. No. 711). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 928. A bill for the relief of Riyoko Patell; with an amendment (Rept. No. 712). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HOPE: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 2511. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to quitclaim 2 acres of land near Muirkirk, Md., to the Queens Chapel Methodist Church; without amendment (Rept. No. 720). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 3986. A bill to provide for a Naval Marine Museum on Treasure Island; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 3987. A bill to amend section 51 of the Internal Revenue Code to equalize Federal income taxes upon married persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRICE of Florida:

H. R. 3988. A bill relating to the sale of Paxon Field, Duval County, Fla.; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 3989. A bill to amend section 51 of the Internal Revenue Code to equalize Federal income taxes upon married persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MUNDT:

H. R. 3990. A bill to provide for water-pollution-control activities in the Public Health Service of the Federal Security Agency and in the Federal Works Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SUNDSTROM:

H. R. 3991. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the Rahway River and its tributaries, New Jersey, for flood control, for run-off and water-flow retardation, and for soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 3992. A bill to provide special pensions for certain persons awarded medals for extraordinary heroism in combat; to the Committee on Veterans' affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana:

H. R. 3993. A bill making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MEADE of Maryland:

H. R. 3994. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 so as to require the insurance, registration, and instruction in the use of safety devices, of passengers transported in interstate air transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 3995. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery at Juneau, Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 3996. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery at Honolulu, T. H.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GEARHART:

H. R. 3997. A bill to exclude certain vendors of newspapers or magazines from certain provisions of the Social Security Act and Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 3998. A bill to provide for regulation of certain insurance rates in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MICHENER (by request):

H. R. 3999. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to adjudicate certain claims resulting from evacuation of certain persons of Japanese ancestry under military orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. J. Res. 223. Joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the Caribbean Commission and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. J. Res. 224. Joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. Con. Res. 55. Concurrent resolution to include all general appropriation bills in one consolidated general appropriation bill; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. Con. Res. 56. Concurrent resolution to prohibit exports of petroleum and petroleum supplies outside the continental limits of the United States or its possessions; to the Committee on Armed Services.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, commending the United States Forest Service for the manner in which it has activated and maintained the Apalachicola National Forest in Liberty County, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to exempt employers from the payment of the Federal three-tenths of 1 percent unemployment tax and to permit each State to collect such tax, in addition to contributions now collected by it, and to use such sums to finance its employment security program without Federal restriction; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H. R. 4000. A bill for the relief of John K. Jackson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RICHARDS:

H. R. 4001. A bill for the relief of W. Avery Hollis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

685. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Salem Square Congregational Church petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opposing passage of a Federal aid bill to education, including the support of parochial schools in America; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

686. Also, petition of Miss Clementine Lenta, and sundry other citizens of Duluth, Minn., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of House bill 2910; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

687. Also, petition of Mrs. S. L. Apgar, and sundry other citizens of Clearwater, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, House bill 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

688. Also, petition of Mrs. Margaret Gurtler, and sundry other citizens, Jacksonville, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, House bill 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

689. Also, petition of various citizens of the Fifth Congressional District, State of Washington, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of House bill 2716; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JUNE 27, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Teach us, O Lord, the disciplines of patience, for we find that to wait is often harder than to work.

When we wait upon Thee, we shall not be ashamed, but shall renew our strength.

May we be willing to stop our feverish activities and listen to what Thou hast to say, that our prayers shall not be the sending of night letters, but conversations with God.

This we ask in Jesus' name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 26, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on June 26, 1947, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 882. An act for the relief of A. A. Pelletier and P. C. Silk; and

S. 1230. An act to amend section 2 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 125) to strengthen the common defense and to meet industrial needs for tin by providing for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry.

The message also announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 77) providing for membership and participation by the United States in the International Refugee Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor, with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had insisted upon its amendment to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 135) to extend the succession, lending powers, and the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and

that Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. GAMBLE, Mr. KUNKEL, Mr. TALLE, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BROWN of Georgia, and Mr. PATMAN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1742) for the relief of Mary Lomas.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3493) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. PLUMLEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana, Mr. PLOESER, Mr. SCRIVNER, Mr. SHEPPARD, Mr. THOMAS of Texas, and Mr. HENDRICKS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 775. An act for the establishment of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government;

H. R. 3810. An act to amend section 522 of the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to clarify the procedure in ascertaining the value of foreign currency for customs purposes where there are dual or multiple exchange rates, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3647. An act to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 1742. An act for the relief of Mary Lomas;

H. R. 3398. An act to extend the period of validity of the act to facilitate the admission into the United States of the alien fiancées or fiancés of members of the armed forces of the United States;

H. R. 3911. An act to continue temporary authority of the Maritime Commission until March 1, 1948; and

H. J. Res. 193. Joint resolution to grant authority for the erection of a permanent building for the American National Red Cross, District of Columbia Chapter, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS DURING SENATE SESSIONS

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Senate Committee on Public Lands be allowed to hold hearings on a pending matter during the sessions of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

MEETING OF COMMITTEE DURING SESSION OF THE SENATE

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce or a subcommittee thereof may sit during the session of the Senate this afternoon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate during the remainder of the afternoon and on Saturday of this week.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate tomorrow, should there be a legislative session, and on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday of next week, for the purpose of visiting the foot-and-mouth-disease-infested area of Mexico on an official trip.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate to and including Tuesday, July 1.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 564) to provide for the performance of the duties of the office of President, in case of the removal, resignation, or inability both of the President and Vice President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement under which the Senate is operating, the Senate will vote at 2 o'clock on S. 564, and in the meantime the time will be equally divided between the proponents and opponents of the measure, to be controlled by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. Will the Senator from Kentucky or the Senator from Nebraska indicate whom he wishes recognized?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the time is so limited I shall necessarily have to omit much of the argument I had intended to make in opposition to the pending measure. But in the beginning I wish to say that there are four distince points upon which I oppose the bill.

The first point is that the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate are not "officers," in the sense in which the term "officer" is employed in the Constitution.

Second. If an officer named to act as President resigns his office, he becomes ineligible, under the wording of the Constitution, to act as President.

Third. It would violate the separation of powers theory for a member of the legislative branch to act as President.

Fourth. The Presidency is a national office, whereas Members of Congress are normally more or less special pleaders for certain segments of the Nation.

Mr. President, I think that in the time at my disposal I shall discuss only one constitutional feature of the bill. That provision of the bill which, in my opinion, renders the entire measure in violation of the Constitution was inserted in the hope that it would make it constitutional, but that provision which would require either the Speaker of the House of Representatives or the President pro tempore of the Senate to resign his office before acting as President has rendered the entire bill of no effect, absolutely null and void, and in complete violation of the Constitution of the United States.

I think that what I have said requires no citation of authority, but requires only the application of that judgment and reason which, as Senators and lawyers, we all possess. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] very ably argued yesterday that it was necessary for the President pro tempore or the Speaker of the House to resign before he could act as President. He argued that because of the constitutional provision which prohibits a Member of Congress holding two offices, or any other civil office. That is a prohibition in the Constitution, and no Member of Congress can hold another civil office under authority of the United States.

Realizing that, with the wisdom which he usually displays in all matters, the Senator from Nebraska sought to avoid the conflict with that provision of the Constitution, and made it an absolute requirement that before either the Speaker or the President pro tempore could act as President, he must resign his office.

Mr. President, while I appreciate the thought and the consideration which the Senator from Nebraska gave in writing that provision, and seeking to avoid conflict with the provision of the Constitution which I have just mentioned, I think that in inserting the provision the Senator ran squarely afoul of and directly in conflict with another provision of the Constitution, another provision of the Constitution which is of even greater weight than the prohibition contained in the one he sought to avoid, for that is a mere prohibition, it does not relate to qualification to hold office at all.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield, but I cannot yield for long. I am under a limitation of time, and I regret it, because the Senator was so generous yesterday. I wish to appeal to him to listen to my argument, and I hope I can convince him, because I know he realizes the importance of this question, and his pride of authorship would not permit him to sponsor a bill which would be in conflict with the Constitution. I ask him to consider what I say, and if he thinks it raises a doubt in his mind—and I do not mean to be arbitrary and say I am absolutely right—if it raises a sufficient doubt in his mind, I hope that he himself will ask that the bill go back to the committee, and let the committee work it out with consideration of constitutional provisions which I shall suggest, and others which I shall put into the RECORD.

The constitutional provision to which I shall first refer is the one empowering Congress to provide for the case of the removal, death, resignation, or inability both of the President and Vice President, declaring what officer shall then act as President.

Mr. President, that constitutional grant of power to the Congress, which is its only source of power, to name an acting President, or to provide for one to act as President, comes from that provision of the Constitution which says that legislation providing for an officer to act shall prescribe an officer of the United States. The only power Congress has is to pass legislation providing for an officer of the United States to act as President. No other person can qualify, no private citizen can qualify. Congress can pass all the legislation it desires, but if it attempts to confer authority on any individual other than an officer of the United States to act as President, it is in sharp conflict with the Constitution, and that person would have no power or authority whatever.

Yet, Mr. President, that is exactly what the bill does. The bill by its terms provides that a private citizen shall act as President of the United States. That seems like a rather strong statement, in the light of the manifest purpose and intention of the bill, that the Speaker of the House of Representatives or the President pro tempore of the Senate shall act as President. It is argued that they are officers. With that argument I take issue, as will be shown in what I shall submit for the RECORD and in what I shall say in discussing the measure. But that is not the point now. The point is that no man can hold two offices, that when a man resigns one office there is an interval of time before he again assumes office. It is inescapable that, whether it be one second or a fraction of a second, there is an interval of time under the law, when a man resigns, during which he ceases to be an officer of the United States. He is not an officer. The moment his resignation becomes effective he ceases to be an officer of the United States; he becomes a private citizen only. No private citizen may act as President of the United States. This may seem like a technical argument; to some it may seem capricious; it may seem to some that I am splitting hairs. But I am not splitting hairs, I am not being capricious, it is not a mere technicality. Reason, judgment, and knowledge of the law prove to every lawyer Member of this body the truth of what I have said. When a man resigns his office, there is an interval of time before he assumes another office, during which time he becomes a private citizen. Congress does not have the power by legislation to confer upon a private citizen, even though he be such for merely a second of time, the power or authority to act as President of the United States. So, with all the seriousness and earnestness I possess, I submit that the bill provides an unconstitutional method and manner of succession to the office of President of the United States.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. WHITE. I make the point of order that the Senate is not in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will be in order. Senators will please take their seats.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I appreciate the point of order made by the Senator from Maine, but I have been in this body too long ever to expect that the Senate will be in order, or ever to contemplate that Senators will listen to another Senator, even though a constitutional question is being most earnestly and most seriously argued.

I had said that I hoped the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, and the distinguished author of the bill himself, would see that what I have said should at least raise a doubt, so that the bill would be taken back to the committee, the best advice possible obtained, the best authority on that committee, composed of able lawyers, consulted, and a bill reported about which none of us would have any confusion and about which we should have no doubt.

I want to say to the Senator from Nebraska something which he well appreciates to be true, that we are dealing here with one of the most important subjects that has ever been before this body. True it is that present succession laws have never been called into play. True it is that this law may never be called into play. But equally it is true that within this year, or within another 10 or 20 or 50 years, the measure we enact may determine whether or not the person who acts as President of the United States has any constitutional right or authority to act in that high office. It is something we cannot disregard and lay aside as of no importance and of but small concern. It is of the gravest importance that the person designated in this measure to act as President of the United States be legally qualified to act as President.

I submit that when the President pro tempore of the Senate resigns, he becomes a private citizen. When the Speaker of the House of Representatives resigns, he becomes a private citizen, and, under the Constitution, he is not longer qualified to act as President of the United States. In seeking to avoid the constitutional provision which prevents a Member of Congress from taking another office under the authority of the United States, the distinguished Committee on the Judiciary has brought forth a bill which is in direct conflict with the provisions of the Constitution which I have mentioned.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. When the President pro tempore of the United States Senate resigns as President pro tempore, he is a Senator, is he not?

Mr. HATCH. Then, if he becomes a Senator, under the pending measure he is not qualified to act as President of the United States, because he must resign and not be an officer, a Member of Congress, according to the Senator from Nebraska; because, if he be a Member of Congress, he cannot accept another civil office under the authority of the United States.

Mr. WHITE. That was the point of my question. I was seeking information.

Mr. HATCH. That is exactly correct. From that position there is no escape.

There is only one other point I wish to mention, and it, too, may seem farfetched. It has to do with the discussion that arose yesterday about the possibility of the Speaker of the House not possessing the qualifications for the Presidency, in which case he would therefore be ineligible for appointment. Very correctly, the committee has provided against such a contingency, by inserting a provision in the bill which says the successor to the Presidency must possess the qualifications of President. But the chief argument made for making the Speaker of the House of Representatives eligible to act as President of the United States is that he is the person who is closest to the people, he has been elected, and an elected officer should be the one who acts as President of the United States.

I think it is almost the unanimous opinion of the authorities that the Speaker of the House of Representatives can be chosen from outside that body. So far as the Constitution is concerned, he may never have been elected to the House of Representatives, he may never have been elected to any office whatever. He may only have been elected Speaker of the House of Representatives, for whom the people have never expressed a choice, either as a Member of the House of Representatives or as Speaker.

Mr. President, that argument is farfetched, I admit, but nevertheless it disputes and denies the chief argument made by those who would put the Speaker of the House of Representatives first in the line of succession. If that is to be the test, to have it assured and certain, the man to act as President should be not the Speaker of the House, but one who is elected, and that must be the President pro tempore of the Senate, because there would be no other assurance of absolute certainty that he would be so chosen and so elected.

Again I urge that the Senator from Nebraska—and I shall yield to him now for a moment, if he wants to ask a question on the point I raise——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. HATCH. I thought it had. That was why I was trying to yield a moment to the Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. To whom do the Senators in charge of the bill yield?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a legal discussion of several of the points involved, prepared by my office staff.

There being no objection, the legal memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOTES ON PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

CONSTITUTION

Article II, section 1, clause 6 of the Constitution provides that:

"The Congress may by law provide for the case of removal, death, resignation or inability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring what officer shall then act as President, and such officer shall act accordingly, until the disability be removed, or a President shall be elected."

ACT OF 1792

A bill designed to carry out this clause of the Constitution was introduced in 1791 and

became the act of March 5, 1792. This act provided:

"In case of removal, death, resignation or disability both of the President and Vice President of the United States, the President of the Senate pro tempore, and in case there shall be no President of the Senate, then the Speaker of the House of Representatives for the time being shall act as President of the United States until the disability be removed or a President shall be elected."

ACT OF 1886

The act of 1792 remained in force until January 19, 1886, on which date the present law (24 Stat. 1) was enacted. This act provides that in the case of removal, death, resignation, or inability of both the President and Vice President of the United States, certain members of the Cabinet shall "act as President until the disability of the President or Vice President is removed or a President shall be elected."

The order of succession provided in this act is as follows: Secretary of State, Secretary of the Treasury, Secretary of War, the Attorney General, the Postmaster General, Secretary of the Navy, and Secretary of the Interior.

S. 564

On February 11, 1947, Senator WHERRY introduced S. 564, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. On March 28, 1947, the committee reported the bill with amendments. Five Democratic Senators objected to the bill and filed a minority report. The bill, as amended by the committee, is summarized as follows:

(a) If by reason of death, resignation, removal fr.m office, inability, or failure to qualify, there is neither a President nor Vice President to discharge the powers and duties of the office of President, then the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall, upon his resignation as Speaker and as Representative in Congress, act as President.

If a Speaker should succeed under this section and die, resign, etc., while acting as President, the Representative who was then the Speaker of the House of Representatives would succeed the former Representative and act as President.

(b) If there is no Speaker, or the Speaker fails to qualify as Acting President, then the President pro tempore of the Senate shall, upon his resignation as President pro tempore and as Senator, act as President.

(c) A Speaker or President pro tempore acting as President under (a) or (b) shall continue to act as President until the expiration of the then current Presidential term, except in two cases:

(1) If he is acting because a President-elect or Vice President-elect has failed to qualify, he may act only until such elected person qualifies; and

(2) If he is acting because of the inability of the President or Vice President, he may be superseded by the removal of such disability.

(d) If the President pro tempore is unable to act as President, by reason of death, resignation, removal from office, inability, or failure to qualify, then qualified Cabinet members, in the following order shall act as President: Secretary of State, Secretary of the Treasury, Secretary of War, Attorney General, Postmaster General, Secretary of Navy, Secretary of the Interior, Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary of Commerce, and Secretary of Labor.

Any Cabinet member acting as President may be superseded by a Speaker or President pro tempore, but not by a higher ranking Cabinet member. When a Cabinet member takes the oath of office as Acting President, the bill provides that the taking of the oath shall be held to constitute his resignation from the Cabinet office.

(e) Sections (a), (b), and (d) apply only to such officers as are eligible to the office of President under the Constitution. Section (d) applies only to Cabinet officers appointed with the advice and consent of the Senate prior to the death, inability, and so forth, of the President pro tempore, and only to officers not under impeachment by the House of Representatives at that time.

(f) While acting as President, the successor shall receive compensation at the rate provided by law for the President.

(g) The act of 1886 is repealed.

CONSTITUTIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

It has been suggested that the variation between the qualifications required by the Constitution for Presidents and for Members of the House and Senate might constitute an argument against S. 564. It is believed that such an argument is not overly sound because Cabinet officers who would succeed under the existing statute are as likely not to possess the constitutional qualifications for President as are the Speaker and President pro tempore.

ARGUMENTS AGAINST S. 564

The most logical arguments against S. 564 which I have found are as follows:

(1) The Speaker and President pro tempore are not officers in the sense in which that term is employed in the Constitution.

(2) If an officer named to act as President resigns his office, he becomes ineligible, under the wording of the Constitution, to act as President.

(3) It would violate the separation-of-powers theory for a Member of the legislative branch to act as President.

(4) The Presidency is a national office, whereas Members of Congress are normally special pleaders for segments of the Nation.

FIRST POINT

(1) The Speaker and President pro tempore are not officers in the sense in which that term is employed in the Constitution.

OFFICER

The clause of the Constitution in question (art. II, sec. 1, clause 6) states that Congress may declare "what officer shall then act as President, and such officer shall act accordingly."

It is a legal axiom that in seeking to define a word which appears in a statute or constitution, one must first look to see if that word is defined within the statute or Constitution itself. Only in the absence of such an internal definition is it permissible to consult extrinsic aids. Therefore, we turn first to the Constitution itself to seek the meaning of the term "officer." [1]

Article II, section 2, clause 2, provides as follows: "He [the President] shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States, whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law; but the Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of the departments.

Interpreting this provision, the Supreme Court has held in three cases that unless a person in the service of the Government holds his place by virtue of an appointment under article II, section 2, clause 2—that is, by the President or of one of the courts of justice or heads of departments authorized by law to make such appointments, he is not an officer of the United States in a constitutional sense (*U. S.* v. *Germaine* (99 U. S. 508, 1878); *U. S.* v. *Mouat* (124 U. S. 307, 1888); *U. S.* v. *Smith* (124 U. S. 525, 1888)). In the Germaine case, the court declared: "The argument is that provision is here made (that is in art. II, sec. 2) for the appointment of all officers of the United States. * * * The Constitution, for purposes of appointment, very clearly divides all its officers into two classes. The primary class requires a nomination by the President and confirmation by the Senate. But, foreseeing that when officers became numerous, and sudden removals necessary, this mode might be inconvenient, it was provided that, in regard to officers inferior to those specially mentioned, Congress might by law vest their appointment in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments. That all persons who can be said to hold office under the government about to be established under the Constitution were intended to be included within one or the other of these modes of appointment, there can be but little doubt." In the Smith case, the court stated: "An officer of the United States can only be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, or by a court of law, or the head of a department. A person in the service of the Government who does not derive his position from one of these sources is not an officer of the United States in the sense of the Constitution."

Since neither the Speaker of the House nor the President pro tempore of the Senate holds his office by virtue of an appointment under article II, section 2, clause 2, it would seem that neither can be regarded as an officer in the constitutional sense. Professor Tucker, concurring in this view in his Constitution of the United States, volume 2, stated flatly that "neither the President pro tempore of the Senate nor the Speaker of the House of Representatives is an officer of the United States," within the meaning of article II, section 1, clause 6 (p. 713).

The use of the term "officer" at two other places in the Constitution should be noted. Article I, section 2, clause 5, provides: "The House of Representatives shall choose their Speaker and other officers." Article I, section 3, clause 5, provides: "The Senate shall choose their other officers, and also a President pro tempore, in the absence of the Vice President." Thus, both the Speaker and the President pro tempore are referred to as officers. However, it seems clear from a reading of these provisions that the Speaker is referred to an an officer of the House and the President pro tempore is referred to as an officer of the Senate; this is something considerably different from an officer of the United States, which is the kind of officer contemplated in article II, section 1, clause 6.

Other provisions of the Constitution also make it clear that neither the Speaker nor the President pro tempore can be considered officers of the United States. Article I, section 6, clause 2 provides that "no person holding any office under the United States shall be a Member of either House during his continuance in office." Article II, section 3, provides that the President "shall commission all the officers of the United States." Neither the Speaker nor the President pro tempore receive such a commission.

Nor, in a constitutional sense, is either the Speaker or the President pro tempore an officer by virtue of his position as a Member of Congress. This conclusion has been reached by all authorities on the basis of several provisions of the Constitution which clearly distinguish an officer from a Member of Congress. Thus article I, section 6, clause 2, providing that "no person holding any office under the United States, shall be a Member of either House during his continuance in office," would be rendered meaningless if a Member of either House were deemed an

[1] Material used in preparing this argument obtained from anonymous brief inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD August 1, 1945, p. 8272, by Senator CARL A. HATCH; 18 Harvard Law Review 182; 1 Watson Constitution of the United States, 891.

"officer under the United States." Article II, section 2, declares that: "The President, Vice President, and all civilian officers of the United States, shall be removed from office on impeachment for, and conviction of, treason, bribery, and other high crimes and misdemeanors." A Member of Congress has been held not to be within the purview of this provision,[2] although the term "civil officers" includes all nonmilitary officers.

Article II, section 3, provides that the President "shall commission all the officers of the United States." A Member of Congress receives no commission from the President. Article II, section 1, clause 2, states that "no Senator or Representative, or person holding an office of trust or profit under the United States, shall be appointed an elector." The fourteenth amendment, section 3 also takes cognizance of the constitutional distinction between a Member of Congress and an officer. It provides that: "No person shall be a Senator or Representative in Congress, or elector of President and Vice President, or hold any office, civil or military, under the United States, or under any State, who, having previously taken an oath as a Member of Congress, or as an officer of the United States," etc. The Attorney General of the United States, in the opinion cited above, stated that "these clauses show a marked discrimination between Members of Congress and officers; the latter term in the sense in which it is there (in the Constitution) used, not including legislators." He goes on to say in the same opinion that: "In the penal legislation of Congress a like discrimination is made," and points out several examples of that discrimination.

Professor Tucker, in concluding that a Member of Congress is not an officer in a constitutional sense, states that: "Nowhere in the Constitution is a Senator or Representative spoken of as an officer of the United States." On the other hand, the word "officer" is frequently employed in the Constitution and in a manner which necessarily excludes a Member of Congress from its purview. Judge Story, in his famous work on the Constitution, arrives at the same conclusion.[3]

On the other hand, it is true that in many statutes the word "officer" covers Members of Congress. Thus, as stated by the Attorney General,[4] "provision is made for administering an oath of office to the Members of both Houses of Congress (secs. 28 and 30, Rev. Stat.). So the words 'every person elected or appointed to any office of honor or profit, either in the civil, military, or naval service,' employed in section 1756, Revised Statutes, which prescribes an oath of office, includes Members of Congress. So in section 1786, which provides that whenever any person holding office, except as a Member of Congress, etc., the station of Members of Congress is distinctly recognized as an office."

In arguing in support of a bill, similar to S. 564, on the floor of the House, Representative Sumners, of Texas, relied upon the Supreme Court's decision in the case of *Lamar v. United States* (241 U. S. 107) to prove that a Member of Congress, and, therefore, the Speaker and President pro tempore, is an "officer" in the constitutional sense.[5] In the Lamar case the Supreme Court held that a Member of Congress is an officer of the United States within the meaning of section 32 of the Penal Code. But the word "officer" in those statutes has been employed in a broader sense than the technical and narrow one fixed by the Constitution. In the Lamar case itself the Court, recognizing the distinction between the technical use of the word "officer" in the Constitution, and its ordinary, broad meaning, declared that: "The issue here is not a constitutional one, but who is an officer acting under the authority of the United States within the provisions of the section of the Penal Code under consideration." In *U. S. v. Gradwell* (234 F. 446) the circuit court notes the distinction made by the Supreme Court in the Lamar case between the scope of the word as used in the Constitution and its customary broader coverage. It is, therefore, irrelevant that many statutes and all dictionaries employ the word "officer" in a sense broad enough to cover the Speaker, the President pro tempore, and other Members of Congress. The problem here is to determine the scope of the word as used in the Constitution. Since the word is defined within that instrument, we may not consult extrinsic aids.

The House Committee on the Judiciary, in reporting a similar bill during the first session of the Seventy-ninth Congress,[6] made the following statement regarding the constitutionality of the proposed bill:

"In designating the Speaker as the 'officer (who) shall then act as President' in the contingencies described in the Constitution, the bill resembles the original statute governing succession to the Presidency. That statute, enacted by the Second Congress on March 1, 1792, provided that in the contingencies stated 'the President of the Senate or, if there is none, then the Speaker of the House of Representatives for the time being, shall act as President until the disability is removed or a President is elected.' This statute remained in force almost a century until 1886, when the present law was enacted. The act of 1792 thus represents a construction by an early Congress, whose views of the Constitution have been long regarded as authoritative of the provisions empowering Congress to designate the 'officer' who shall act as President. The act of 1792 reflects also a long-continued acquiescence in the construction of the Constitution under which the Speaker and the President pro tempore of the Senate are deemed to be officers within the meaning of the article."

The committee thus relies upon the following two arguments in support of the constitutionality of the bill:

(a) The bill was passed by the Second Congress whose views on the Constitution have long been regarded as authoritative.

(b) The act remained in force for nearly a century, thereby reflecting a long-continued acquiescence in its constitutionality.

With respect to the first argument, it may be said that, while the views of the Second Congress on the Constitution ought to be given serious consideration, they are certainly not to be deemed conclusive. It must be remembered that the Supreme Court found an act of the First Congress unconstitutional (*Marbury v. Madison* (1 Cr. 137; Feb. 24, 1803)). Also, it is a matter of history that the original succession law was the offspring of a rivalry existing at the time between Mr. Hamilton, the Secretary of the Treasury, and Mr. Jefferson, then Secretary of State. It was the "product of the personal and political animosities of that hour rather than one of deliberate judgment of the Congress that passed it."[7] Madison, himself, at the time the act of 1792 was first proposed, questioned its constitutionality on the theory that the Speaker and the President pro tempore are not officers of the United States.[8] Subsequent to the passage of the act, in a letter to Edmund Pendleton, Madison attacked the law vigorously, again stating that in his opinion the Speaker and the President pro tempore are not "officers" in the constitutional sense and adds that "As they are created by the Constitution, they would probably have been there designated if contemplated for such a service, instead of being left to the legislative selection."

With respect to the argument that there had been, in 1886, nearly a century of acquiescence in the constitutionality of the act of 1792, it may be said that there was no acquiescence in any real sense, since there was never any occasion to invoke the law. In this regard, a statement of Professor Tucker, made shortly after the Succession Act of 1886 was passed, is illuminating. He states: "Congress in 1792 provided that the President pro tempore of the Senate should act as President, and if there were none, then the Speaker of the House of Representatives should act as President. By a late law this has been changed, and it would seem on good reason. Neither the President pro tempore of the Senate nor the Speaker of the House of Representatives is an officer of the United States."[9]

Indeed, the debates on the proposed Succession Act of 1886, both in the Senate and in the House, reflect a widespread doubt as to the constitutionality of the act of 1792, based, in large part, upon the scope of the word "officer."[10]

SECOND POINT

If an officer named to act as President resigns his office, he becomes ineligible under the wording of the Constitution to act as President.

S. 564 would require the Speaker or the President pro tempore to resign their offices as such before they assume the position of Acting President. Even if the Speaker and the President pro tempore are deemed to be officers of the United States, there remains considerable doubt as to whether they may constitutionally be named to act as President subsequent to their resignation from the offices by virtue of which they qualify to act as President.

DUAL OFFICES

A close reading of article II, section 1, clause 6, wherein it provides that Congress may declare "what officer shall then act as President and such officer shall act accordingly until the disability be removed or a President shall be elected" would seem to indicate that the authors intended that the officer nominated by Congress should not surrender his office but, rather, that he should perform the duties of President as an additional function. Thus, for example, if the Secretary of State should be required to act as President, he would also continue to be the Secretary of State. This fact, not generally known, is stated by Madison, who declares that the performance of the duties of President by an officer pursuant to article II, section 1, clause 6, is "an annexation of one office or trust to another office," and that the original office of the person who acts as President is the "substratum of the adventitious functions."[11]

---

[2] Blount Impeachment Case, U. S. Senate, 1799; 17 Op. Atty. Gen. 419.

[3] Story on the Constitution, Fol. I, 5th ed., p. 577, also sec. 733.

[4] 17 Op. Att. Gen. 419.

[5] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 91, June 29, 1945, p. 7022.

[6] H. Rept. No. 829, June 27, 1945.

[7] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 17, 49th Cong., 1st sess. Statement of Mr. Ryan based upon material in the Life and Times of Madison, p. 223. See also speech by Senator Hoar, December 15, 1885, pp. 180–181.

[8] 1 Madison's Papers, pp. 548–549.

[9] Tucker, Constitution of the United States, vol. 2, p. 713.

[10] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 17, 49th Cong., 1st sess., pp. 180–182, 214–225, 248–252, 664–680, and 684–695.

[11] "Either they will retain their legislative stations, and then incompatibility will be blended; or the incompatibility will supersede those stations, and then, those being the substratum of the adventitious functions, these must fail also. The Constitution says what officers, etc., which seems to make it not an appointment or a translation, but an annexation of one office or trust to another office. The House of Representatives proposed to substitute the Secretary of State, but the Senate disagreed, and there being such delicacy in the matter, it was not passed by the former" (1 Madison's Papers, pp. 548–549, and letter to Edmund Pendleton).

Edwin S. Corwin, the constitutional authority, has recently restated this proposition.[12]

A similar conclusion has been reached by another constitutional authority, Mr. Benjamin F. Butler.[13]

It is submitted, therefore, that the office, by virtue of the holding of which the officer qualifies to act as President, is the substratum of the adventitious functions. The officer must continue to hold that office in order to continue to qualify to act as President. If the person who holds the office by virtue of which he qualifies to act as President is removed from that office, then he is no longer "such officer" within the meaning of the Constitution. It is the office, not the officer, that is the substratum of the adventitious functions, for the performance of the duties of the President is an annexation of one office or trust to another office. S. 564 proceeds upon the apparently erroneous theory that the person who holds the qualifying office at the time he is to begin the discharge of powers and duties of President obtains a vested right in the office of Acting President.

THIRD POINT

It would violate the separation of powers theory for a member of the legislative branch to act as President.

It may be true, as the President stated in his message to Congress last year,[14] that the Speaker's selection stems from the people more directly than does the selection of a Cabinet officer. This supposition does not, however, remove the constitutional objections outlined above nor does it preclude the fundamental objection that the proposed bill would in effect permit the legislature to appoint the head of the executive branch of our Government.

SEPARATION OF POWERS

The theory of separation of powers is so firmly imbedded in our form of government that it needs no explanation here. For a century and a half it has been one of the main foundation stones of this Republic. Would it not be wiser to permit the Presidency to be held by a less direct representative of the electorate for short intervals than to jar this foundation stone even slightly?

It seems inevitable that if any reasonable man, being a Member of Congress, should succeed to act as President under the circumstances contemplated by S. 564, his honest and quite natural reaction would include a sense of obligation to his fellow Members of the House or Senate for bestowing such a grandiose honor upon him. It cannot be said with finality that such a sense of obligation would destroy the system of checks and balances, but it surely permits a suggestion that it might have an adverse effect upon that system. Without endorsing the existing succession plan, it is suggested that S. 564 may not present a desirable alternative.

FOURTH POINT

The Presidency is a national office, whereas Members of Congress are normally special pleaders for segments of the Nation.

SPECIAL PLEADERS

The intent here is not to question the executive ability of the incumbent Speaker and President pro tempore. Both men are able and perhaps entirely capable of filling the office of President. The point to be emphasized is that they do not hold their high offices as a result of a Nation-wide election on their merits as high executives. On the contrary, they were elected by citizens residing in relatively small areas to represent a small segment of the Nation's voters. True, they have received the great honor of being selected to head their respective Houses of Congress, but the qualifications for such an office are not commensurate with those for a President. Many considerations enter into the selection of a Speaker or President pro tempore, but the principal considerations are these: In the first instance, he is elected as the individual best able to represent his district or state in the Federal Legislature. His capabilities as a debater and legislator are normally the prime considerations at this stage. Subsequently, he is chosen by his colleagues to occupy the chair in one of the Houses of Congress. And what are the qualifications by which a candidate for those high offices are measured? Generally, they are party fidelity, seniority, and parliamentary acumen. It should be noted that the elevation of a Member to the speakership or to the office of President pro tempore does not per se make him Nation-minded. He is not thereby relieved of his duties to represent his State or district.

As stated above, the Speaker or President pro tempore may be said, by reason of having been through the fire of an election, to stem more directly from the people than a member of the President's Cabinet. This does not avoid the undeniable fact that a Member of Congress is a special pleader—a representative of a special or limited number of the Nation's voters. The interests of our States and districts are not always analogous. It would perhaps be fairer to the greater number to permit the current law to stand than to provide for succession by a special pleader. It seems reasonable to assume that Cabinet officers are more likely to view problems from a Nation-wide aspect, notwithstanding the appointive nature of their positions.

CONCLUSIONS

The solution to the problem of Presidential succession proposed by S. 564 is subject to at least two constitutional objections and seems to violate two of the basic theories of our form of government. The existing system is admittedly not above criticism. It seems necessary, therefore, that some steps should be taken to assure the country of a smooth transition in the event of the death or disability of both the President and Vice President.

In addition to the questions discussed above, there are several problems relating to the election and succession of Presidents and Vice Presidents which neither the farvisioned authors of our Constitution nor our predecessors in Congress have adequately anticipated. Logically, all problems relating to election and succession of the President and Vice President should be considered and debated at the same time. They are all interrelated. The legislation necessary to their solution must fit together and must work together. Some of these additional problems are as follows:

1. Whether or not the President and Vice President should be elected by the electoral college as at present; and if so, whether or not the members should be legally bound to vote in accordance with their instructions.

2. Whether or not provisions should be made for the case where before the election of Presidential electors, or after such time but before the election of President and Vice President, a candidate for the Presidency or for the Vice Presidency dies, declines to run, or is found ineligible to take office if elected.

3. Whether or not provisions should be made for the case of the death of any of the individuals from whom the House of Representatives may choose a President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them and for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the Senate may choose a Vice President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them.

4. Whether or not provisions should be made for the case where, after election, the President-elect or Vice President-elect, or both, die, decline to serve, or fail to qualify.

5. How it shall be determined whether the President, or individual acting as President, is unable to execute the powers and duties of the office, and how the duration of such inability shall be determined

6. Whether there are, or should be, any differences between the status, powers, duties, and privileges of an elected President and any other individual executing the office of President.

7. Whether more than one Vice President should be elected.

Some of the problems here listed are set forth in the minority views attached to the committee report on S. 564.[15] The suggestions herein contained are not made for the purpose of delay, but rather from a sincere belief that the pending bill, S. 564, is an ill-conceived measure, incapable of making adequate provision even for the single phase of the election and succession process which it is designed to cure. The additional questions listed above have been the subject of speculation and discussion for many years. It is believed that the wisest course Congress could adopt at this juncture would be to reject S. 564 and approach the problem as a whole.

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the Senator from New Mexico upon the constitutional argument which he has made, and in which I think there is considerable substance. I also wish to congratulate the Senator from Nebraska on the scholarly presentation that he made yesterday of this problem. The historical research and study that went into it is indeed commendable. I regret that he reached a conclusion with which I am unable to agree.

In presenting a proposal for the solution of this problem to the Committee on Rules and Administration, I stated that it was certainly my intention that we should enact a solution that would stand the test of the ages, and be not merely a solution for tomorrow. The proposal that I submitted to the committee was briefly, that we should provide by statute—and I have an amendment by way of a substitute that embodies the provision about which I speak—we should provide that the electoral college should be called together, and it should elect a Vice President, if the Vice President has succeeded to the Presidency; and, of course, pending such event, in the present situation we should now call the electoral college together, to elect a Vice President at this time.

Mr. President, I think that proposal has considerable merit. I realize that the electoral college has been under heavy attack for the last 75 or 100 years. I also wish to point out that the founding fathers found a greater source of congratulation for themselves over how they had solved this problem than about any other in the Constitution.

Mr. President, I think the advantages of the plan in this modern day and age are obvious. It was not my intention when I presented this proposal to the Rules and Administration Committee to speak of the possibility in this atomic age of the wiping out with one fell swoop of

[12] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 91, p. A3415.
[13] North American Review, vol. 133, p. 433.
[14] House Doc. 246, 79th Cong., 1st sess., June 19, 1945.
[15] S. Rept. 80, 80th Cong., 1st sess.

the entire Government here at Washington. No matter what we do here we run the risk, as was pointed out by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], of having the entire line of succession wiped out. I do not agree with the Senator from Wisconsin as to his solution, which is that we should then turn the Government over to the military, because it seems to me that that is not our traditional way of doing things.

Mr. President, we have an electoral college—to do what under the Constitution? To elect a President and a Vice President of the United States. I have provided in my amendment that upon the death of the President and the Vice President, the Secretary of State shall succeed to the office of President, and that if less than 4 months intervenes from the date of the accession of the Secretary of State to that office, then, of course, no special election by the electors is called for, the theory of that being that the 4 months' period is so short that it would not be necessary for such an election to be held.

However, I have provided that if more than 4 months intervene, the Secretary of State, as the President of the United States, shall call upon the chief executives of the various States to call together the electors of their States, who shall thereupon ballot for a candidate for President, or a candidate for Vice President, as the case might be.

I have been asked: Suppose there have been deaths in the electoral college? Under the Constitution each State is given the right to say how its electors shall be chosen. Until after the War Between the States, the electors in Delaware and South Carolina were elected by the legislatures.

I have been asked: Would it be possible for the States to fill the quota? I say, yes, that under the State statutes which are enacted in every State the remaining electors have the power to fill up their electoral quota.

It would seem to me, therefore, that we are only going to the Constitution and using the constitutional process about which there can be no question whatever. We are only availing ourselves of an instrument which is here at hand. I say, furthermore, that we are fulfilling the requirement that the Chief Executive was so anxious about, namely, that we should have an elected officer in the President of the United States.

Mr. President, I think that describes the proposal. I think it is a meritorious one. I think it avoids any charge of unconstitutionality such as the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] has, I think with good merit, made against the pending bill. I should very much like to see the amendment adopted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, before the Senator from Connecticut sits down I should like to ask him one question in my time, and I will yield myself 10 minutes. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Connecticut if he agrees with the philosophy expounded by the Senator from New Mexico that the Constitution requires that one must be an officer of a legislative body in order to qualify for the Office of President.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I did not say of a legislative body. I said "an officer."

Mr. WHERRY. Well, that one must be an officer in order to qualify.

Mr. McMAHON. I will say to the Senator from Nebraska that that is a point which I have not studied, which I did not consider. Until I heard the Senator from New Mexico, I frankly say, that point had not occurred to me. However, I will say to the Senator from Nebraska that on a matter of such grave importance as the right of succession to the Presidency of the United States in the day and age in which we are now living, I think there should not be a shadow of a doubt upon the right of succession, and, after listening to the Senator from New Mexico, I am convinced that at least there would be a shadow of a doubt.

Mr. WHERRY. If there is a shadow of a doubt, then the plan suggested by the senior Senator from Connecticut fails, because, if I correctly understand the plan of the Senator from Connecticut, it becomes mandatory upon the electoral college to elect someone to fill the vacancy existing in the office of President. It seems to me we cannot proceed in both directions. If we are going to give the power to the electoral college to choose whomever they please to become President of the United States we would not have any control over the electors. If we adopt the plan suggested by the Senator from Connecticut certainly the argument made by the Senator from New Mexico would not be effective.

Mr. McMAHON. I will say to the Senator from Nebraska that I do not think the analogy is a good one, because under the Constitution there are inherent in the electoral college certain rights and duties which do not exist in the Congress.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly. I should like to remark that we cannot go in both directions. If the interpretation of the law made by the Senator from New Mexico is sound, then it would be impossible for the Congress of the United States to confer upon the electoral college the power now suggested by the Senator from Connecticut, because we could not compel them to elect an officer who is to continue as an officer during the period of the unexpired term for which he is appointed President. That is the complete answer to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, so far as his plan is concerned.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for one moment.

Mr. WHERRY. I will yield to the Senator from New Mexico. Of course, my time is limited also.

Mr. HATCH. Would not the electoral college be bound by the same Constitution that binds us?

Mr. WHERRY. That is the point. Mr. President, we cannot bind the electoral college.

Mr. HATCH. I am not proposing that we should. The Constitution would bind it to elect an officer.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in answer to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico I wish to say that I am surprised that one who possesses so much legal ability as he does would ever raise such an issue on the floor of the United States Senate. I can understand perfectly why there might be an issue raised as to whether or not a Representative or a Senator is an officer. There is a dispute over that question. I can see why there might be considerable argument over whether a Member of Congress is such an officer. But to interpret the Constitution to mean that one who finally is selected to serve as President for the interim period has to continue to be an officer, certainly is beyond my concept of the provisions of the Constitution.

Let me read the provision of the Constitution under which the Speaker of the House or the President pro tempore of the Senate would accede to the Presidency. The Senator read it, but I should like to read it again. Article 2, section 1, paragraph 5 of the Constitution provides—what? We are now talking about one who is qualified to accede to the Presidency. We are talking about one who is eligible, one who can be considered for the office, one whom the Congress in the proposed legislation would say is eligible to become President. This is what the Constitution provides:

> In case of the removal of the President from office, or of his death, resignation, or inability to discharge the powers and duties of the said office, the same shall devolve on the Vice President, and the Congress may by law provide for the case of removal, death, resignation, or inability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring—

What?—

> declaring what officer shall then act as President.

It does not say that he must continue to be an officer of Congress, and also President. It does not say anything about continuing in office. It simply provides the eligibility requirements of those who are eligible to succeed to the Presidency of the United States. If a man is an officer at that time—and under the provisions of the bill he would be the Speaker or the President pro tempore—he is eligible; and if he is eligible he is called upon to act. The minute he takes over the duties of President, he is no longer required by the Constitution to maintain his status as an officer in the Congress of the United States.

We have a very good precedent for that view. I suggest it to the distinguished and able Senator from New Mexico. Turning to article I, section 3 of the Constitution, the fifth paragraph reads as follows:

> The Senate shall choose their other officers, and also a President pro tempore, in the absence of the Vice President, or when he shall exercise the office of President of the United States.

What does that mean? It means that if the President dies and the Vice President succeeds to the Presidency, the Vice President then becomes President of the United States. He no longer exercises the office of Vice President. There is nothing in the Constitution contrary to

that position. If a man is eligible at the time of the succession, and if he is then qualified as an officer, he takes over the office of President; and when he does, he ceases to hold office in the Congress. He ceases to perform the functions of a Member of Congress, and he rightly should.

So the bill amply provides for the very point raised by the Senator. It provides for the very thing he is talking about. If and when a President dies, the Vice President succeeds to the office of President of the United States. If the office of Vice President is vacant, then who is eligible? Under the terms of the bill the first one who is eligible is the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Why? Because he is a legislative officer.

It seems to me that the point raised as to the lapse of time between the time he resigns and the time he assumes the office of President is trivial. At that time the only one who is eligible to be the President is the Speaker of the House. At the time he becomes eligible, he is an officer of the Congress of the United States. He meets the eligibility requirements. He resigns and becomes President, and continues as President during the unexpired term. That procedure complies with every provision of the Constitution. The precedent for this procedure is the case of the Vice President himself. We agree that the moment he succeeds to the Presidency he no longer perform the functions of the office of Vice President.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am always glad to yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Has the Senator canvassed the idea that the Speaker of the House, if he became President in the first part of his 2-year term, might continue to be President after his term expired, in which event he would not be an elective Members of the Congress?

Mr. WHERRY. We canvassed that point thoroughly yesterday afternoon for 2 hours. That point has been raised; but if the point is good as against the Speaker, it seems to me that it is equally valid as against the unexpired term of a Senator.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. So it really makes no difference. I do not say that the point is good; but if it is good against one it is good against the other.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the logic of that argument is inescapable. Therefore, if the logic is transcendental, it seems to me that we must go elsewhere, where such a hiatus would not occur.

Mr. WHERRY. That raises the constitutional question as to whether or not a President is elected for 4 years, and 4 years only. The Constitution provides that a President shall serve for a 4-year period; but it also says in unmistakable terms that the Congress shall have the power by law to select an officer for the unexpired term for which a President was elected. So I say to the distinguished Senator from Maryland, for whom I have a high regard, especially on constitutional questions, that we have met the requirement laid down in the Constitution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes more to myself.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. There is no doubt in the world, in my opinion, that the Senator's ground is substantial. We have the power to say who shall step in. We can make any other officer of the Government President. I think the constitutional question is answered completely.

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate very much the observations of the distinguished Senator from Maryland.

In conclusion, on the point raised by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], I appeal to his fairness, his legal ability, and his judgment. I submit to him that we have covered the question which he has raised. At the time the Member of Congress succeeds to the Presidency he is an eligible officer; and as an eligible officer he meets all the requirements of the office. After he takes the oath of office as President he should no longer be an officer of the Congress or an elective officer of the Senate. In support of that argument I cite the case of the Vice President, when he succeeds to the Presidency.

I am not sure what the President had in mind when he suggested the line of succession which we have embodied in the bill. I did not talk with any of the legal counsel who advised him on that point. However, I am satisfied that if there had been any difficulty about the point, that question would have been raised. No doubt he has had the best legal advice in recommending what he feels should be the order of succession.

I have just been advised by the legal counsel who has worked with me that he feels that my position is absolutely sound. It is a question of who is qualified. If a man is qualified, and he happens to be the President pro tempore of the Senate, and the office falls upon his shoulders in the line of succession, if he meets the requirements and takes the oath of office, he becomes President. He should no longer be an officer of the United States Senate. He is to act as President of the United States for the interim period.

So I submit to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico that my argument is sound. To show how fair I am, even though the Senator could not yield to me because of the limitation of time, I shall yield to him some of my time in order that he may reply.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator very much. He has been very gracious and kind.

Let me say to the Senator from Nebraska that the views which I have expressed are not mine alone. The Senator from Nebraska stated that he was surprised that I should advance the theory which I have expounded. I am standing in company with former President James Madison, who was somewhat of an authority on the Constitution of the United States. I am standing in company with Mr. Chief Justice Story, Professor Tucker, and other distinguished men who have written on this subject.

Despite what the eminent legal counsel have said, I cannot agree with the position which they take. They are in conflict with the eminent authorities whom I have mentioned. I do not believe that we dare take a chance, and I do not believe that the Senator from Nebraska dares take a chance. If I have done nothing more than to raise a doubt, the question should be resubmitted to the committee, and the committee should give it its complete attention. Neither I nor any other Senator should have a doubt.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, constitutional questions can be raised against any succession bill which can be brought before us. The answer is not to send the bill back to the committee for further consideration.

As I stated on the floor of the Senate yesterday, a joint committee has studied this question from A to Z and back again. Certainly we are now in a better position, after the adoption of the twentieth amendment to the Constitution, to have the line of succession extend through the Speaker and the President pro tempore, than we have ever been before.

I am satisfied with the precedent that I have offered. I am satisfied that now the Speaker is eligible. At the time these arguments were advanced he was not eligible as an officer, because of the interim period between the election and the fourth of March. That question is now eliminated.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator, in my time, this question: Does the Senator agree with me that if we adopt the McMahon plan the electoral college might select whom it pleased, and if it did so, and did not select an officer of the United States, the plan would be unconstitutional?

Mr. HATCH. No; the plan would not be unconstitutional. The action of the electoral college in selecting a person who is not qualified would be unconstitutional.

Mr. WHERRY. That is what I meant.

Mr. HATCH. That is what I meant when I said that the Senator's plan was perfectly constitutional.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I yield five more minutes to the junior Senator from Nebraska, so that the Senator from New Mexico can complete his answer to my question.

Mr. HATCH. I would assume that the electoral college would act in accordance with the same Constitution which binds all of us, and would select an eligible officer. If they did not do that, their selection would be void; but the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut would not be unconstitutional.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in that connection?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to yield to the minority leader.

Mr. BARKLEY. In that connection, I will say that the electoral college is not bound by any law to elect the nominee who has been chosen by a political convention. They could elect anyone as President of the United States. They could elect a man who was not 35 years

of age or who was not a native-born citizen of the United States, but the election would be void. But the electoral college is not a void institution merely because it might do that void thing.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the very point I am raising, and it is the very situation which we want to eliminate. I could not ask for a better argument against the McMahon plan than the one which has been suggested by the minority leader.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was not suggesting an argument against the McMahon plan; I was emphasizing the reply of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. WHERRY. I could not have done a better job myself, and I want to thank the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is very generous of the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. I will yield now to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I want to take a brief time to supplement the argument of those who have found the pending bill to be unsatisfactory and as being no improvement over the present law. The one objection that I now wish to make is that it is another example of piecemeal legislation.

There are many uncertainties in our law as to the succession to the Presidency, all of which should be provided for. Unfortunately, politics has entered into the question almost always when solutions of these difficulties have been suggested. Since the very beginning, in 1792, when the first provision was made, up until 1886, when the last provision was made, always there has been in the minds of some of those concerned the question as to who would succeed to the Presidency now; who occupies the official position which would be in the line of succession. It is very unfortunate. It seems to me that all these questions ought to be examined together, since they all relate to the succession to the Presidency, and that some logical plan covering all the questions should be adopted at the same time.

Seven Presidents have died in office. Six Vice Presidents have died. It is extraordinary that the country has never been found in a position of being without either a President or a Vice President. We cannot expect such good fortune to continue indefinitely. But, in addition to that, several times a President has been incapacitated from acting in his official capacity; and no provision is made for a solution of that contingency.

Conscious of these facts, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and I, in the last session, introduced a concurrent resolution for the appointment of a joint commission to study and report a solution for all these questions. That concurrent resolution was considered by the committee to which it was referred, was reported favorably, was passed by the Senate, and went to the House, where, for some reason, I do not know what, it died in committee.

On the first day of this session the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and I introduced practically the same concurrent resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, and it is now before the Committee on Rules and Administration. It seems to me undesirable that any piecemeal legislation should be passed until the committee has reported on that concurrent resolution and the Senate has acted upon it, because this is but one piece of legislation. There may be other constitutional amendments ultimately recommended by such a joint committee, if appointed.

Let me remind the Senators of what these questions are. Senators seems to have directed their attention almost entirely to what would happen in case the President died and there were no Vice President in office. I think this joint commission should study—and the concurrent resolution so provides—the following questions:

Whether or not the President and Vice President should be elected by the electoral college as at present, and, if so, whether the members should be legally bound to vote in accordance with instructions. The moral duties of the members of the electoral college certainly have changed. The question is whether their legal duties have changed with them, or whether we must apply, as we have in other branches of the law, an equitable system to supplement and possibly supplant the legal system.

The question may sometimes arise, Is a member of the electoral college bound to vote for the President and Vice President nominated on the ticket? Most people nowadays do not know who are the members of the electoral college. They do not know who are these people whose names may appear on the ballot. On some ballots they do not appear. The people are voting for President and Vice President, and that question should be settled legally.

The next question is whether provision should be made for a case in which, before the election of Presidential electors, or after such time, but before the election of President and Vice President, a candidate for either office dies, declines to respond, or is found ineligible. There is another hole in our provision for the succession to the Presidency.

Then there also arises the question of whether provision should be made in case of the death of any of the individuals from whom the House of Representatives may choose a President, whenever the right of choice shall devolve upon it, or in the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the Senate may choose a Vice President, whenever the right of choice shall be devolved upon the Senate; and then—and this is very important—whether provision should be made for a case in which, after election, the President-elect or the Vice-President-elect, or both, die, decline to serve, or fail to qualify. That is the only question of the eight enumerated in the concurrent resolution to which consideration has been given.

But we should also determine the following questions: How shall it be determined whether the President or the person acting as President is unable to execute the duties and powers of that office? Three times in our history question has arisen as to whether the person acting as President was able to carry on the duties of President—whether he made the decisions, or whether the decisions were made for him by others. It is vitally important that that question be determined, because nowadays, in view of all the hazards of travel, it is quite as likely that an occupant of the Presidential office be incapacitated as it is that he be killed.

Other questions are these: Whether provision should be made for a person to execute the duties of the office of President in case of the removal, death, resignation, or inability of both the President and Vice President, including provisions for selecting a person to execute the duties of that office; also, whether there are or should be differences between the status, powers, duties, and privileges of the elected President and those of any other person executing the duties of the office of President.

The last question arising in connection with the concurrent resolution, but which did not arise under the one which passed the Senate at the last session, is whether there should be any limitation on the number of terms a person may serve as President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCMAHON in the chair). The time of the Senator from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. GREEN. Then let me conclude by offering a motion that the pending bill be returned to the committee until it is ready to report on Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 1. I make that motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that such a motion would not be in order at this time. It would be proper after 2 o'clock.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty-six minutes remain to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, is that much time left to the opponents of the measure?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes. Twenty-two minutes remains to the proponents, and 26 minutes to the opponents.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not know that any other Senator wishes to consume any time in speaking in opposition to the bill. I do not know that I wish to consume all the 26 minutes at my disposal.

Mr. President, I am opposed to this measure because I do not believe it solves the problem with which we are undertaking to deal. The history of the Presidency and Vice Presidency, from the time of the Constitutional Convention on, is a very interesting story. During the sitting of the Constitutional Convention, the question of having a Vice President was not considered or, apparently, thought of, until late in the session. When the first report came from the subcommittee of the Convention to the full Convention, there was no provision for a Vice President; but before the deliberations had terminated, provision for a Vice President was included.

In 1792 Congress undertook to implement the provision of the Constitution providing that on the death or disability

of the President and Vice President, Congress should by law determine what officer should act as President. In the debates preceding adoption of the act of 1792, James Madison took the position that neither the Speaker of the House nor the President pro tempore of the Senate were officers within the meaning of the Constitution, and therefore he voted against that bill, as a Member of the Congress. However, that provision remained law until 1886, although sporadic efforts were made to change it, because no one seemed to have been satisfied with it, although it was somewhat similar to the bill now proposed, except that it made the President pro tempore Acting President first, and then the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

In 1881, and from then on, efforts were made to correct the situation which seemed to exist under the act of 1792. Senator Hoar, of Massachusetts, took the same position, as I now recall, as the one which originally was taken by James Madison, namely, that neither the Speaker nor the President pro tempore of the Senate were officers within the meaning of the Constitution. Notwithstanding the adoption of the twentieth amendment, so far as I know there has been no decision with respect to whether the Speaker and the President pro tempore are officers within the meaning of the Constitution. That question may have to be passed on at some subsequent date.

The whole subject has been shrouded in doubt and confusion from the very beginning of our history, and it is probably fortunate that death has never gone beyond the President, so that we would have to see what would happen under any law providing either for the Speaker or the President pro tempore or the Secretary of State or any other officer of the Government to become Acting President.

All of us know that the Constitution requires that the President shall be native-born; no man can be elected President who is not born in the United States. No man can be elected President who is not 35 years of age. There is no such requirement either in the case of the Speaker of the House or in the case of the President pro tempore of the Senate. The Speaker of the House may be 25 years of age. He is eligible to membership at the age of 25, and he might be elected Speaker. Henry Clay was elected Speaker the very day he arrived to serve as a Member of the House of Representatives. He was not then old enough to be President, and not then even old enough to be a Senator. The Constitution requires that a Senator shall be 30 years of age, but it does not require that the Speaker or the President pro tempore shall be Members of either the House or the Senate. It has never occurred, but the House of Representatives might, under the Constitution, elect as its Speaker some one entirely outside of its membership. The Senate of the United States could do the same thing, insofar as the Constitution is concerned, for the only requirement is that it elect a President pro tempore to serve in the absence of the Vice President. The Constitution does not fix any qualification or does not say that the President pro tempore must be a Senator, or even that he must be 30 years of age. A person 25 years of age might be elected President pro tempore of the Senate, without violating the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. President, notwithstanding the enactment of the legislation now before us, the confusion and the chaos and the uncertainty would still continue, because if the bill should be enacted and any Speaker of the House of Representatives were not a native-born citizen—and he does not have to be—he would be ineligible for the Presidency. He could not act as President. He could not assume the duties of acting President. The same would be true if he were under 35 years of age. So that if the bill became the law, and the President and Vice President should die, and there were a Speaker who was neither native born nor 35 years of age, he could not succeed to the Presidency. Then the office would devolve upon the President pro tempore, and in the event of his ineligibility, on the Secretary of State, and so on, ad infinitum, if the Secretary of State were not native born or 35 years of age, he could not act as President, no matter what we may do here by way of legislation. Although these difficulties may be in a sense fantastic, they are entirely possible of occurrence.

There is another problem with which the bill does not deal, or if it deals with it, it deals with it inadequately.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield, but I have only a little time.

Mr. WHERRY. On page 6, lines 18 to 22, the bill does provide that if a Speaker or President pro tempore is not qualified, there shall be succession.

Mr. BARKLEY. I said that. It would go on to the Secretary of State, and in the event he were disqualified for the reasons mentioned, the succession would go on down.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly.

Mr. BARKLEY. There is another contingency to which I wish to call attention. I stated yesterday that no one questions that, so far as the Constitution is concerned, there is no provision for the reassembling of the electoral college after it has chosen a President and Vice President. It has no further function. Congress has never provided by law, and I do not know for sure whether it could provide by law, that after the electoral college chosen in November has met and elected a President and Vice President and adjourned, it may be recalled in the event death should overtake both the President and Vice President prior to the day of their inauguration. It seems, then, that the electoral college, when once it has chosen a President and Vice President, is no longer in existence, and there is no provision for electing another President and Vice President ad interim, or until the next 4 years have rolled around.

Suppose that after the November election, and after the counting of the ballots by the House of Representatives, under the Constitution, in which it is determined who shall be President and Vice President, the Vice President should die; and he is just as apt to die in that 3 months as in any other period of the year, unless he goes by the rather amusing statement of an old man I once knew who said that he had noticed that if he lived through the month of March he lived the rest of the year. But the Vice President might die between the day of his election by the electoral college and the day on which he was to take the oath of office, when there would be no Vice President to take the oath of office.

Suppose that when the day comes, which is now the 20th of January, the President-elect is ill in a hospital, unconscious, but he later recovers; his illness is not fatal. Let us assume that on the 20th of January, when he is supposed to take the oath of office under the Constitution he is ill, so ill that he is unconscious and cannot take the oath. Then what would happen under the proposed legislation?

Let us assume that the Speaker of the House should assume the duties of acting President, there being a Speaker. He must resign as Speaker, he must resign as a Member of the House of Representatives in order to qualify to be President, and if the President-elect should recover in a week or 10 days and take the oath of office, as he might do, the Speaker, who would in the meantime have been out of office, the House having elected another Speaker, having occupied the office of President for a week or 10 days, would be out of office. That might be unfortunate, but it seems to me that contingency presents a situation which the Senator from Nebraska and his committee should have considered, because it is a fatal weakness, what Chief Justice Hughes in the famous chicken case called a fatal infirmity. The Speaker of the House of Representatives must have quit the Speakership and membership in the House, or the President pro tempore must likewise have resigned from the Senate of the United States in order to serve as acting President for a week or 10 days, or until the sick President recovered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in my time?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. That point was covered thoroughly in the Senator's absence. The bill does provide that if a Speaker takes over and there is a disability on his part, and the same situation exists as to the President pro tempore, the Secretary of State would assume the office.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand that.

Mr. WHERRY. We require that if the Speaker resigned and took over the office of President, it would overcome the very difficulty mentioned by the Senator from Kentucky. The Speaker will not resign if there is a temporary disability.

Mr. BARKLEY. Why not?

Mr. WHERRY. Because he would not have to.

Mr. BARKLEY. He would have to resign.

Mr. WHERRY. No; he would not.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is provided that if the Speaker or the President pro tempore becomes President, he must resign

not only his position, but membership in the House or Senate, as the case may be.

Mr. WHERRY. Still interrupting in my time, let me say to the Senator that the bill makes it discretionary. It is at the option of the Speaker. The Speaker does not have to resign unless he wants to resign. He does not have to resign.

Mr. BARKLEY. The weakness is that the Speaker does not have to accept the Presidency, but if he does accept it, he must resign.

Mr. WHERRY. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is what I said. A man who is elected President by the electoral college does not have to accept. He can refuse to accept. No one is required to hold any office.

Mr. WHERRY. Still interrupting in my time, let me say that we are in total agreement. The minority leader is just a little apprehensive that a Speaker would resign in a period of 1 week of temporary disability on the part of the President, in order that he might become President. I say that is left entirely to the good judgment of the Speaker or the President pro tempore, and if there is a temporary disability, neither one of them would resign, of course, to become President for 1 week. So the bill does provide for the very emergency the minority leader has so forcefully presented to the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. The bill would not have to provide that a Speaker who was eligible for the Presidency would have to accept it. No one has to accept any office I know anything about, unless he is drafted into the Army. A man does not have to accept a senatorship. He may be elected by the people and then change his mind, and say he will not take the oath of office. I do not know of anyone who has done that, or would do it, but it could be. No one can be forced to become a Member of the House of Representatives or of the Senate, or President pro tempore or Speaker. But the point is that, no matter how brief the time when the President pro tempore or the Speaker would act as President, he would be compelled to resign the speakership and membership in the House, or the office of President pro tempore and membership in the Senate, in order that he might accept the Presidency.

Mr. WHERRY. In my time, let me say that I appreciate the distinguished minority leader bringing up that point today, but the bill does provide for the emergency he mentions. The same situation applies today, so far as disability is concerned, whether we pass this bill or not. I tried to point out yesterday, just as clearly as I could, that the bill does not cover the question of disability; it deals with the question of succession. I did point out that the Speaker or President pro tempore would have to make his own determination as to whether to resign as an officer and take over the Presidency, and no doubt, if the occasion did present itself, it would be in the case of permanent disability or death. Of course, as I pointed out yesterday, the question of disability has never yet been determined. It has been raised only a couple of times, first in the case of James A. Garfield, and then in the case of Woodrow Wilson. So that, as far as the argument being made against the bill is concerned, the same argument could be made against the succession law that is now in effect.

Mr. BARKLEY. I grant that, but my point is that when we deal with the question of succession to the Presidency, in the event of death, removal, or disability, Congress ought to legislate the manner in which it may be determined what is a disability that will justify the taking over of the office by somebody else.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. HATCH. Unless the Congress does legislate in the manner portrayed by the Senator, would not the majority party lay itself open to the charge of trying to legislate for a particular and immediate situation?

Mr. BARKLEY. It could be so charged, though I do not think that is in any way connected with the pending legislation, but it could be charged that that was what was being attempted. I am not opposing the pending measure because it affects any particular individual. I was against the bill the very moment the President's message was read here 2 years ago, in which he recommended the bill now pending, or substantially that bill. I thought then it was unnecessary; I think now it is unnecessary and I think it not only does not improve the present situation, but it may add confusion to it.

I have the greatest regard for the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States, and I have the greatest regard for the Speaker of the House of Representatives; but I went into the House of Representatives on the very same day, the 4th of March 1913, when SAM RAYBURN became a Member of the House of Representatives from Texas. Notwithstanding my long association with him and my personal friendship for him and the intimacy of our relations, I was opposed to this bill when he was the Speaker. I was opposed to it when my good friend and neighbor the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] was the President pro tempore, not because I was not willing for either one of them to be President of the United States, but because I did not believe it was the solution to our problem. I do not think it covers enough ground. I do not believe it goes into all the difficulties that have surrounded and yet surround the question of who shall be the President of the United States in the event of the death, removal, resignation, or disability of the President.

The situation has arisen a number of times. When Garfield was shot, he lingered 2 or 3 months. He performed only one act, and that was to sign the commission of an appointive officer, I think. The question was discussed as to whether he was disabled, under the Constitution, but there was no law on the subject. Woodrow Wilson became ill, and there was a question as to whether under the Constitution he was disabled. There were reports around here that Secretary of State Lansing rather advanced the idea that he ought to take over in an informal way the Presidency of the United States.

When Andrew Johnson was being impeached, the question arose as to whether he ought to be automatically removed as President while the impeachment was in progress, but he did not resign. He did not retire. He remained President all during his impeachment. So that there has been no law on the subject determining what is an inability or disability, or whether upon impeachment, prior to a verdict of the Senate, there should be an automatic removal of the President.

In time of war, in the event the President of the United States were accused of treason by the House of Representatives, it could conceivably become very important whether he should be allowed to remain in the office while the Senate of the United States tried him on the charge of treason.

All these questions greatly bother me, and I believe genuinely that the committee ought to give further consideration to the whole subject, that it ought to bring in a comprehensive bill dealing with every possibility; because any possibility may become a probability and even a certainty at any time in our history

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question in the time of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. BARKLEY. Certainly, I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BALDWIN. I have been impressed always by what the learned minority leader has to say on questions of this kind. It seems to me there is some force to the argument that there ought to be legislation which would deal with the question of how and by whom a determination of disability of the President of the United States, in event of illness, is to be made.

The Senator has referred to the case of former President Garfield and the case of former President Wilson. I assume, without knowing, that there is no legislation on the subject. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Kentucky if, in his judgment, the Congress could pass legislation dealing with the question of who should determine the disability, and whether or not another man should be called upon to qualify for the office.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think that under the Constitution Congress could pass a general law providing a method by which the disability of any President could be determined. For instance, to use what is probably a fantastic illustration, suppose a President should become insane while in the White House. There is no way by which it can be determined that he is insane, unless he is tried in a lunacy court and sent to an asylum. Even then, it is not provided that he should be deemed disabled, by any law that Congress has ever enacted. I suppose the Congress would determine later in some way that he was suffering under a disability, but so far as the laws on the statute books are concerned, even though a President were tried by a jury and determined to be insane, and committed to an insane asylum, there is no law under which he could be declared disabled, so far as the Presidency is concerned.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Is it not a fact that the Congress has given no authority to make any such determination; there is no such authority any place?

Mr. BARKLEY. Not now. But I ask whether Congress should not enact legislation to determine that matter.

Mr. HATCH. It did so, Mr. President, in the case of judges, providing for an additional judge in certain instances, where the President of the United States makes a finding of fact of the inability or incapacity of the incumbent to serve.

Mr. BARKLEY. My judgment is, I will say to the Senator, that Congress could pass a law that would provide the machinery by which to determine, in a case like that or in other similar cases, whether a President were disabled, were suffering under a disability, that would justify another person holding the office during the disability, or, if it were not removed, during the remainder of the term.

Mr. BALDWIN. In other words, the pending measure does not deal adequately with the question of disability?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; it does not.

Mr. BALDWIN. But it does, in my humble judgment, deal adequately with the question of removal of the President by death.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I think it deals with that question, by naming persons who shall succeed. Whether that is an adequate provision is another matter. In the case of death, removal, or resignation, of course, there is no trouble. Under the present law, either the Secretary of State would succeed him, or the Speaker, or the President pro tempore, if the pending measure should become the law. But the question of disability has never been passed upon, either as to what comprises a disability, or as to how it can be determined; and that is what I am speaking about, that Congress, in my judgment, does have the power to adopt some method, by general enactment, to determine whether in any given case the President is disabled.

Mr. BALDWIN. I thank the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have taken, I think, most of my time. I do not care to extend the discussion any further. I believe that the bill ought to be sent back to the committee, and that a resolution similar to the one offered by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] ought to be adopted; so that the Congress might make an exhaustive inquiry into the subject, and bring about a comprehensive law that would leave no further uncertainty as to the circumstances under which anybody might succeed to the Presidency, or who might succeed in the case of an emergency.

Mr. GREEN rose.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, does the Senator from Kentucky have any time remaining?

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If so, will the Senator yield? I want to make a short statement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kentucky has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. BARKLEY. I would be glad to yield 5 minutes, although the Senator can speak on an amendment, if he wants to, up to 2 o'clock. I will yield him 5 minutes now, but before doing so, may I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island for a moment?

Mr. GREEN. I simply wanted to ask whether I could read an editorial from a local newspaper, right along the lines of what the Senator from Kentucky has just stated.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know how long it will take, but I will yield.

Mr. GREEN. It will take about a minute.

Mr. BARKLEY. Very well. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. GREEN. This is an editorial published in the Washington Post on June 2, 1947. It reads as follows:

NEXT IN LINE

Among the five bills put on the Senate Republican Policy Committee's must list for action is the proposal to dispel the present uncertainty as to succession to the Presidency when there is no Vice President. The House adopted a bill for this purpose last year. The Senate failed to act. Now the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration has taken the lead by reporting out a substitute for the bill introduced by Senator WHERRY. This follows the lines of the House bill. Such action is surprising because the effect would be to make the Speaker of the House heir apparent to President Truman and then the President pro tempore of the Senate. However, even Speaker MARTIN is more acceptable to GOP Senators than is the prospect of Secretary Marshall succeeding to the Presidency under the present law.

We quite agree with the committee majority that in any change in the line of succession the Speaker of the House should have precedence over the President pro tempore of the Senate. The bill itself, however, makes it evident why neither is in a good position to serve as heir apparent. The Speaker, for example, would be expected to perform the duties of the President if the latter should be disabled by illness or otherwise, although no means of determining when the President is unable to perform the duties of his office is provided. In order to qualify for this temporary service the Speaker would have to resign as Speaker and as a Representative in Congress. Surely it is asking a good deal of a man who has spent his lifetime climbing to the speakership to give it all up in order to be Acting President for possibly 6 weeks or even less time.

No provision is made for special elections. In the case of death of the President and Vice President the country might have to get along with a substitute Chief Executive for nearly four years. This seems to us a mistake. Surely arrangements could be made for naming a President at the midterm election in such circumstances. To be sure, the committee would make it virtually certain that no nonelected official would occupy the White House for any length of time; for while Cabinet members are listed in the line of succession following the President pro tempore, any one of them would be bumped as soon as a Speaker or President pro tempore could qualify. But we see no reason why accident should put a Senator or Representative in the White House for three years or more without a confirming vote of the people.

Minority members of the committee make the most telling point against the bill when they condemn it as "piecemeal legislation." It leaves several aspects of the presidential succession problem untouched. Even if this measure should be passed by both houses, therefor, we think that Congress should also approve the concurrent resolution introduced by Senators GREEN and SMITH calling for a thorough study of all the issues relating to the problem, including abolition of the so-called electoral college. The Senate passed this resolution last year. We doubt that the committee bill can be made at all palatable without some such promise of more comprehensive action after the immediate emergency has been met.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think that editorial confirms what I said yesterday, at the time I said the Senator was about to accuse me of political bias respecting the legislation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I am in complete agreement with the position taken by the minority leader that the bill should be recommitted to the committee. I believe the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] should be adopted, that the bill should then be recommitted, and a complete study made of the subject.

Mr. President, at the time the suggestion was made by President Truman I did not take his suggestion seriously, nor did I take seriously the bill when it was introduced. I certainly think it provides for piecemeal legislation. I do not think it is in accord with the provisions of the Constitution on this subject, nor is it in agreement with the attitude of the founding fathers when, in 1792, they adopted the original succession act.

I call the Senate's attention to article II, section 1, paragraph 5 of the Constitution:

and the Congress may by law provide for the case of removal, death, resignation or inability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring what officer shall then act as President, and such officer shall act accordingly, until the disability be removed, or a President shall be elected.

It is very clear that that language contemplated either the temporary disability being removed or an election being held.

Senators will recall that the original act of 1792 provided that if a vacancy occurred due to the death or permanent disability of the President or Vice President, the President pro tempore succeeded to the Presidency, but the act provided for an election to be held. The President pro tempore was to act as President only until the election, and an election must be called if the vacancy occurred at a time more than 5 months before the end of the term. I do not think the succession measure now before us is in accord with the Constitution at all, because it contemplates that the Speaker, or the President pro tempore, legislative officers whom no one has contemplated would be an executive officer, shall be President, that is, they shall not merely act pending an election, but they succeed to all the rights and powers and privileges of a President.

In addition to that there is the constitutional question involved as to wheth-

er or not these two men, the President pro tempore and the Speaker, are officers. Madison raised the same question, and listed objection to the particular provision of the original act as to the succession of the President pro tempore and the Speaker. He asserted that the bill certainly erred, and listed four objections, the first one being:

It may be questioned whether these are officers—

That is, the President pro tempore and the Speaker—

in the constitutional sense.

Since that time there has been a continual argument and no agreement with respect to the constitutionality of providing for the succession of these officers. But that question would not be so important if the bill, as did the original act, should provide that they act only as intermediate officers, temporary officers, pending the calling of an election. If we are going to pass an act of this nature without any study, it seems to me it would be very wise for us to adopt the original act. I proposed that in the committee, but of course the committee did not see fit to adopt my suggestion. I really think, however, that the procedure proposed by the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from New Jersey is far preferable, and that a thorough study should be made with particular reference to the constitutionality of the proposal.

There is another little aspect of the situation. It might well occur that the Speaker of the House would not, under the pending bill, have the qualifications necessary to be President. I do not mean the political qualifications; I mean he might not be a natural-born citizen. The Constitution of the United States provides that an elected President shall be a natural-born citizen. A great uncertainty would exist in this respect. There are several Members of the House who are not natural-born citizens who might be elected Speaker. So there would be that further possibility of uncertainty in the use of the approach now proposed.

I think there is no question but that there exists sufficient doubt, in addition to the matter mentioned by the minority leader, as to the constitutionality of the measure, and that this is a very slipshod, piecemeal way to approach the problem.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. In my opinion the statement made by the Senator from Arkansas is absolutely correct. In the event the bill should become law we are liable to find ourselves in this situation: Certainly someone is going to test the constitutionality of the act in order to have a determination made as to whether the Speaker of the House and the President pro tempore of the Senate are officers under the meaning of the Constitution, and during the time that test is being made a cloud will constantly be hanging over the one who is Acting President of the United States. Certainly, when the world is in such a precarious condition we should not have a President of the United States acting under a constitutional cloud. If in the final review of this matter by the highest Court of the land, a decision should be made that the Speaker of the House and the President pro tempore of the Senate are not officers under the Constitution, I can readily see confusion and chaos of great and dangerous magnitude growing out of the deeds and activities of the so-called Chief Executive. This is a dangerous bill. It could well plague not only those who are proposing it, but our Nation as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Arkansas has expired. All time under control of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] has expired.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HATCH. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, as I understand, amendments may be offered until 2 o'clock, and thereafter 5 minutes will be allowed for the discussion of each amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HATCH. Would a motion to recommit fall within the same category as an amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the opinion of the Chair, since the unanimous-consent agreement covers motions as well as amendments, such a motion could not be voted upon until 2 o'clock.

Mr. HATCH. I desire at this time to enter a motion to refer the pending bill to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, whose time is being consumed at this point?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Nebraska. The Senator from New Mexico made a parliamentary inquiry. The answer is that the Senator can file his motion, although nothing can happen with respect to it until 2 o'clock.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time I have occupied be not taken from the time of either side.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is sorry, but the time the Senator is using belongs to the Senator from Nebraska. There is no other time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I now yield time to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, it would seem to me that it is a good thing for Americans once in a while to take out the fundamental documents of their Government and give them a thorough going-over. I assume from the lengthy discussion which the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], who is handling the bill, made yesterday on the subject, that this particular phase of government has had a pretty thorough and exhaustive examination. Consequently, Mr. President, it would seem to me a rather futile thing if, after all the work that had been done to date, we were to adopt a motion which would refer the whole matter to another committee.

There seems to be a tendency on the part of legislative assemblies, whenever they are up against a rather knotty legislative problem, to call for a further study and examination of the subject. I believe that often that is a very good thing; but in this particular case it seems to me that it is not. It might well be that further examination and study would produce new information and different viewpoints; but there is no reason why this bill cannot be enacted into law. Then we can proceed with further examination and study to improve it at the next session of this Congress, or in the Congress to follow.

It seems to me that the bill deals very effectively with a situation which must be dealt with. The fact that it must be dealt with has no greater authority to support it than the President of the United States, who has sent a message to the Congress on this very subject. I believe that the bill is an earnest, effective, and able attempt to carry into legislative enactment the recommendations made by the President.

The bill has been attacked on the ground that it is not designed to avoid confusion. Certainly in the event of the death of the President of the United States or of his resignation or removal from office, and likewise in the event of the death or resignation or removal from office of the Vice President, the bill deals very effectively and completely with a long line of succession. It provides, for example:

That (a) (1) if, by reason of death, resignation, removal from office, inability or failure to qualify, there is neither a President nor Vice President to discharge the powers and duties of the office of President, then the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall, upon his resignation as Speaker and as Representative in Congress, act as President.

(2) The same rule shall apply in the case of the death, resignation, removal from office, or inability of an individual acting as President under this subsection.

That would not only take care of the man who had been elected directly by the people as President or Vice President, but it would also take care of anyone who might succeed to the office by the terms and provisions of this bill.

Further:

(b) If, at the time when under subsection (a) a Speaker is to begin the discharge of the powers and duties of the office of President, there is no Speaker, or the Speaker fails to qualify as Acting President, then the President pro tempore of the Senate shall, upon his resignation as President pro tempore and as Senator, act as President.

The bill further describes what shall happen if he fails to accept, to qualify, or to act.

It seems to me that it is highly desirable, in this representative democracy which we call a Republic, that the man who should succeed to the office of President should not be a man who has been appointed by the man who has died or resigned, or who refuses or fails to act. The selection should be made from those who have been most recently elected by the people themselves to hold office in the Federal Government. So it seems to

me highly appropriate that the bill should provide that the man who should succeed in the event there is no President or Vice President should be the Speaker of the House. There is no man in the whole Government, aside from the President and Vice President, who holds office more directly as the result of the exercise of the suffrage of the people themselves than does the Speaker of the House. Furthermore, should the death, resignation, or disability of the President or Vice President occur in the first 2 years of the term, the Speaker of the House would be that person in the Government of the United States upon whom the people had most directly and most recently acted at the polls. Were it to occur in the second 2 years of the term, the same thing would be true. Then, too, if the Speaker of the House of Representatives were to succeed to the Presidency, he being a man who had been recently chosen as Speaker by the membership of the House, the Members of that body would have to answer for their choice of the man whom they had elected as Speaker, under a law which provided that he might become President. They would have to answer at the very next election. Every Member of the House of Representatives, which body made the choice, would have to answer at the very next election to the people of the United States on the question of the choice which they had made.

The suggestion has been made that in the event of their being no President or Vice President the vacancy should again be filled by the electoral college. An examination of article II, section 1, of the Constitution of the United States would seem to indicate that it was the intention of the framers of the Constitution that the electoral college should act only once. As a matter of fact, it seems that the language specifically provides that they should, for in paragraph 5 of section 1 of article II we read this language:

> In case of the removal of the President from office, or of his death, resignation, or inability to discharge the powers and duties of the said office, the same shall devolve on the Vice President, and the Congress may by law provide for the case of removal, resignation, or inability, both of the President and Vice President, declaring what officer shall then act as President, and such officer shall act accordingly until the disability be removed or a President shall be elected.

It seems to me that that language clearly excludes the possibility of any Congress providing that the electoral college shall again act, because the language specifically says that the Congress shall act by declaring what officer shall then assume the duties of that office. That is what the bill purports to provide for.

The question has been raised as to whether or not a Member of Congress—the President pro tempore of the Senate or the Speaker of the House—is, under the law, an officer. I have not had the opportunity to examine the authorities on that particular subject, but it seems to me that the Constitution of the United States, in providing for Congress made up of a House of Representatives and a Senate, certainly created offices for men to hold. Can we say that the term "officer" describes only one who exercises an executive function? There must be thousands of cases in which mandamus proceedings have been brought, or other legal proceedings had, to test whether or not A or B was entitled to hold a particular office. Thousands of such cases deal with the subject of membership in State legislatures, and I dare say some of them with membership in the Congress of the United States.

It seems to me that under any fair intendment of the English language, or any fair interpretation of the word "officer" as we Americans understand it, a man who holds a seat in the House of Representatives or in the United States Senate is an officer within the plain intendment of the law.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not want to interrupt the Senator, but the Senator is making an argument about what is an officer, as I understand.

Mr. BALDWIN. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. I want to direct his attention, although I have no particular concern with the amendment, to the fact that Judge Towner, of Iowa, in 1920, or approximately that time, when he was a Member of the House, made a very elaborate speech on that very point. The occasion for it was the fact that he was demonstrating that the courts had not exempted Congressmen from income taxes by reason of the fact that they were officers of the Federal Government. He took the position that a Representative or a Senator was not a Federal officer under the meaning of the Constitution and the statutes. As I have said, I am not particularly interested in maintaining that view, but I thought the Senator might be interested in it by reason of his observations, and I would commend Judge Towner's statements to him, and he can perhaps have the Library or someone get the speech for him. Judge Towner was a very distinguished Republican Representative, a very fine gentleman, and was appointed Governor of Puerto Rico after he finished his service in the House. He produced a very scholarly and a very elaborate speech on that very point.

Mr. BALDWIN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Texas. If I possessed the erudition and experience the distinguished Senator has I would have known about it, would have looked for it, and would have been more prepared than I am in the discussion of this particular phase of the question.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, how much time do the proponents have remaining?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. They have 19 minutes.

Mr. WHERRY. I now yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, at the time of the death of President Roosevelt the matter which we are discussing at the present time was precipitated before us for consideration. Mr. Truman succeeded to the Presidency from the Vice Presidency, and the office of Vice President therefore became vacant, and the succession was a matter of legislation which existed on the books. The question arose as to whether a man who might have been appointed by the incumbent should succeed; that is, a member of the President's Cabinet, such as the Secretary of State or the Secretary of the Treasury. There was no question of personality; it was a matter of principle.

I felt from the beginning of this discussion in the Seventy-ninth Congress that there were so many questions involved in the total factor of succession that I joined with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] in introducing a resolution which called for an investigation of all these questions, as the Senator from Rhode Island has pointed out, and which called for an early report from a commission which might be appointed to accomplish that purpose.

I also joined, on January 6 of this year, in Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 1, which had the same purpose; but I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that in Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 1, we asked for the appointment of a committee, and asked that it report not later than May 1, 1947. If it had been appointed, and if it had reported, we would have solved the problems we are considering, and would have a complete coverage.

It has been contended that that is the preferable way to deal with the matter, rather than passing the legislation suggested by the Committee on Rules and Administration. I am still of the belief that we should pass the concurrent resolution, irrespective of what we do regarding the matter presented by the Committee on Rules and Administration. But much time has passed, and the situation still presents itself. We have that isssue before us.

The Committee on Rules and Administration has done an excellent job in dealing with one phase of the matter, and I see no inconsistency whatever in supporting this legislation, and intend to support it, but, at the same time, I insist that the matter should be treated from the standpoint of an over-all study and coverage. It is my sincere hope that, regardless of whether this legislation is passed, Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 1 may be considered by the committee and reported out, omitting any of those matters which have already been covered by legislation as to the number of terms a President can serve, because that has already been disposed of. If this measure is passed that particular question should be taken away from the discussion of the whole subject.

It is vitally important, however, because of the many times during our history as a Nation when this issue has arisen. In the resolution which the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] and I prepared these matters are deemed questions of vital importance, but they have been relegated to the place of forgotten factors because of the fact that no immediate crisis has come up.

I am merely urging, in voting for the bill which is before us, the measure which

has been reported to us and which is before us now, that even if that bill shall pass, we still will make the complete investigation called for by the concurrent resolution to which I have referred. There is nothing inconsistent in insisting on that position and at the same time voting on the pending measure when it comes up for vote at 2 o'clock this afternoon. I am supporting the pending measure. I think it is the proper way to deal with this particular phase of the question, but it is my sincere hope that we may go into the whole subject, and not leave it as unfinished business, but take care of it some time during the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, analyzing the arguments which have been advanced by the opponents of the bill, I do not know of anything they have proposed which in any way has not been covered and will not be covered in the proposed legislation. The distinguished majority leader attempted to make a point this morning, as he tried to do yesterday——

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. The minority leader, if the Senator pleases. The Senator said "majority leader," and that would impugn the intellectual capacity of the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], and I would not want that to happen. It was the minority leader to whom the Senator had reference. [Laughter.]

Mr. WHERRY. I will accept the amendment as offered by the distinguished minority leader, who is the senior Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Temporarily I occupy the status of minority leader.

Mr. WHERRY. I think that the opposition should at least give me credit for yielding at every opportunity to help them make their arguments, and I wish they would take that into consideration during the rest of the debate.

In the 12 minutes that I have within which to make a summary of some of the suggestions, which I think are not even formidable arguments against the proposed legislation, let me say that the question of who would succeed to the office after the electoral college has finally acted has been answered in the twentieth amendment, which we have taken into consideration, and which was not up for consideration in 1880. Let us follow that through.

Under the twentieth amendment, section 2, it is provided as follows:

> The Congress shall assemble at least once in every year, and such meeting shall begin at noon on the 3d day of January, unless they shall by law appoint a different day.

So that if the President-elect or the Vice President-elect who would succeed him should die after January 3 and before the President-elect or the Vice President-elect took office, on January 20, the Congress would have assembled, there would be a Speaker already elected by the organization of the House, and there would be a President pro tempore elected by the organization of the Senate. Or, if that had not been done, the Secretary of State, who holds over until his office is made vacant by the accession of a new President on January 20, would step into the breach, and would take over temporarily. So there is no possibility that this proposed legislation does not meet the emergency.

Now, let us consider the other situation, namely, that a President who is in office prior to January 3 dies, and that the Vice President succeeds to the Presidency, and that the Vice President dies before January 3.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Nebraska means January 20, I am sure.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, January 3 is exactly what I mean. If the Speaker of the House fails to qualify—if all of the extreme situations which have been mentioned come to pass and the Speaker does not qualify—then the President pro tempore of the Senate will qualify; and, if for any reason he is prevented from qualifying, then the Secretary of State will succeed temporarily, until the next President of the United States is inaugurated and is ready to serve on January 20.

So, under the twentieth amendment, by which the Speaker is an elected Speaker for the term of 2 years, from January 3 until January 3 at noon, and also under the twentieth amendment by which a President pro tempore is elected for a term of not more than 6 years, from noon until noon, there is only that intervening period in the Senate in which the organization might require more than a few minutes; it might require a few days. But in the House of Representatives there is no lapse of time, because the Speaker is elected even before he is required to take his oath. So a Speaker would be elected at once.

Mr. President, we have gone through this subject thoroughly. Senators speak about further consideration. We have at our fingertips the complete investigation, away back in 1856 by the then Senate Judiciary Committee, which was exhaustive. We have all the arguments in the debates of 1886; and now we have the twentieth amendment and the changed Senate rules, and we have the procedure whereby the Speaker and the President pro tempore are elected for the full period, and during that period not only are they Members of the Congress, but they are also elected officers of the Congress. So there is no shadow of doubt that every emergency is taken care of; and if the person who is next in line fails to qualify, then the person who is next in line, after him, will qualify, under this legislation.

The minority leader has raised the question of disability. Of course, I admit that is a vulnerable point. The minority leader has said that he feels that by law we might prescribe for the situation in case of disability. That is a matter of opinion, Mr. President. Some of the most able constitutional lawyers say that it is most difficult to prescribe for disability without a constitutional amendment, for the very reason that it is not within the power of the Congress to declare when the office of President is vacant or when it should be vacated. So at least a constitutional question would be raised in the event that an attempt were made to write into the law a provision in regard to disability in the case of either the President or the Vice President.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I certainly want the Senator from Kentucky to know that I have been most generous in yielding.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate that; and if by yielding at this time, the result would be to impinge on the time of the Senator from Nebraska, I shall not ask him to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. No; let the Senator proceed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator think it would be more difficult to write into the law some provision by which disability could be determined, than it would be to write such a provision into the Constitution?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, no matter what we write by statute with respect to disability, it would not change the Constitution one iota.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; but neither does the Constitution provide what shall be regarded as disability.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I regret that the Senator from Kentucky attempts to answer my statements before I am permitted to complete them.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am sorry.

Mr. WHERRY. I have been over that question time and time again. To finally clinch it, I wish to say that the pending measure does not deal with disability, any more than the present act deals with disability. But inasmuch as the Speaker would be required to resign or the President pro tempore would be required to resign, the result would be that at least in the judgment of the Speaker and the President pro tempore there would be no doubt about the permanent disability of the person then in office. Certainly that is a much broader provision and a better provision than the one we now have.

Mr. President, many of the points which were raised have not been answered. Apparently it is admitted that the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut is not in order, because certainly it would be a violation of the Constitution, in light of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, to provide for an electoral college to select someone, when the Constitution provides that the Congress shall name the officer who is to succeed to the Presidency. Certainly that amendment falls by its own weight.

The Senator from Rhode Island has proposed an amendment calling for a further study. Of course, Mr. President, a further study by any legislative body would be in order, I suppose; but I should like to say to the Senate that this question was studied thoroughly in 1856 and in 1886, and we are studying it now. So it seems to me that we have given the matter ample study and consideration, and at least we can pass the bill that now is before us; and if thereafter it is desired to have a further study made, there will be no objection so far as I am concerned. But that is not the answer to the present emergency.

The distinguished Senator from Arkansas has stated that he did not take the suggestion of the President seriously, although the President submitted, in his

address to the Congress in 1945, a definite recommendation in respect to a problem which he set out as one of the most serious problems confronting the Congress, and one of the most urgent pieces of legislation that should be enacted. I referred yesterday to the President's message to Congress on June 19, 1945. What did he say then? The President said this was a serious question, that there was an emergency. He said he did not believe that in a democracy the power of choosing the man who might be his successor should rest with the Chief Executive. What power was he talking about? He referred to the power of the President to nominate his own Secretary of State who, under present circumstances, would become President, following the death or disability of the President and Vice President. The President of the United States himself urges that the Congress vacate the right of the Chief Executive to appoint a Secretary of State who, in that event, would become President. The President takes that position because the Secretary of State might be a member of his own party, one of his own choosing, and probably never stood for election as an elected officer.

So further in his message the President suggests to the Congress that this officer—he himself admits that he is an officer; he agrees that he is an officer—should be the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Why? Because the Speaker of the House of Representatives is elected from his own congressional district; at least he stands for election; and then when he comes to the House, 434 Members of the House of Representatives, on both sides of the aisle, finally elect the new Speaker. So that Speaker, who is elected in the first place from his own congressional district, and who finally is elected by 434 Members of the House of Representatives, all of whom have stood for election within the 2-year period, brings to the Presidency, if we pass this legislation, the person who is closest to the people, a person elected by an elective body in the United States, in the event the President dies. What could be fairer than that? It is argued that a Senator is possibly equally close to the people. A Senator is elected for 6 years. Many things may happen within 6 years. For that reason, a Senator is not so close to the people, at least in point of being elected, as a Congressman. Furthermore, each and every Congressman is elected. He must be elected. Even in the event of death a special election is the only way by which a Congressman may fill the vacancy. But in the Senate of the United States, a Senator can be appointed. He does not have to be elected. Therefore he is once again removed from the close proximity to the people in which the President pro tempore might stand, in contrast to the Speaker of the House of Representatives. So I want to say emphatically that I cannot see why there should be any objection to the suggested amendments offered to the pending bill. I think that inasmuch as the President has said that it is one of the most urgent pieces of legislation to come before the Congress, every Democratic Senator should support the legislation. Of course, if there be a difference of opinion, a Senator has a perfect right to his own opinion. But certainly the titular head of the Democratic Party having made the recommendation, it at least ought to be held to be a very important suggestion by the leader of the party.

I implore each of my colleagues to vote down the amendments, each and every one of them, and to pass the legislation, so that the succession may be in the order of the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President pro tempore, and then the Cabinet officers, as outlined in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All the time has expired. The first question is on agreeing to an amendment submitted by the committee, which is a substitute for the entire bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have an amendment to the committee amendment, which I desire to offer at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the Senator's amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, line 22, beginning with the word "Speaker", strike out all down to and including line 24 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "President pro tempore of the Senate shall, upon his resignation as President pro tempore and as Senator, act as President."

On page 5, beginning with line 3, strike out all down to and including line 8 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(b) If, at the time when under subsection (a) a President pro tempore is to begin the discharge of the powers and duties of the office of President, there is no President pro tempore, or the President pro tempore fails to qualify as Acting President, then the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall, upon his resignation as Speaker and as Representative in Congress, act as President.

On page 5, lines 23 and 24, strike out "President pro tempore" and insert in lieu thereof "Speaker."

On page 6, lines 23 and 24, strike out "President pro tempore" and insert in lieu thereof "Speaker."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's amendments all relate to the same subject, and may be considered en bloc.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was just prepared to ask that they be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia, with the consent of the Senator from Kentucky, who is in charge of the bill, is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have not been able to be present during the entire discussion which has taken place in regard to this measure, due to committee assignments, but on the occasions that I have been present and have heard the arguments, I have failed to hear any valid reason given why the Speaker of the House of Representatives should have priority over the presiding officer elected by the Senate of the United States in the line of succession to the Presidency.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the Senate is not in order. This is an important amendment, and I think Senators should listen; at least, I should like to be able to hear the discussion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has made a valid point. The Senate and the galleries will be in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I would not make any invidious comparisons between individuals, but I am sure that a study of the lives and services of all the men through all the years since we have had a House of Representatives and a Senate of the United States, will show that the presiding officer of the Senate, selected by the Senate of the United States, does not suffer in comparison, so far as patriotism and ability are concerned, with the presiding officer chosen by the Members of the House of Representatives. Every argument that has been made in favor of the succession devolving upon the Speaker of the House of Representatives applies with even greater logic in behalf of the succession devolving upon the President pro tempore of the Senate.

It is said that the line of succession should be changed from the Secretary of State, in order to go to one who had gone before the people and who had received an endorsement in an election by the people. Of course, it could be argued that Senators may be appointed by the governors of the respective States. But, under the Constitution, it is not necessary that the Speaker of the House be a Member of that body. The House of Representatives may elect anyone the majority of that body may desire, anywhere in the United States, so long as he qualifies under the constitutional provisions.

Since the direct election of Senators by the people of the United States, the Senate has become the representative body. A Member of the House may come from the heart of a great city. He may come from a great industrial area, where the members of some particular labor organization are in the majority. He may represent a district that is purely agricultural in its make-up, and therefore be inclined to devote himself only to matters that affect agriculture. But there is not a Senator of the United States who does not represent a wide diversity of interests. There is not a State that does not have cities, some agricultural interest, and a much wider diversity of interest than applies in the case of any single Member of the House of Representatives.

It has been argued here that the succession should not devolve on the President pro tempore, due to the circumstances which obtained in that tragic hour when President Johnson was facing impeachment proceedings in the Senate of the United States. It has been stated that perhaps there might be a President pro tempore of the Senate who might so far forget himself as to be overwhelmed by an ambition to sit in the White House, and therefore be unfair and partial in the trial of a President or Acting President of the United States. In answer to that argument, I submit that the Speaker of the House of Representatives, in the very nature of the rules of that body, possesses an infinitely greater power than does the President pro tempore of the Senate. If unscrupulous men are to preside over either of these bodies, under the rules of the House of Representatives

a Speaker of the House of Representatives could do more to bring about the impeachment of a President of the United States than could the presiding officer of the Senate.

Mr. President, I know of no reason why the Senate of the United States should admit that this body is inferior to any other parliamentary body in this Nation or in the world. We are as capable, when we select a presiding officer, of selecting one who is qualified to serve as President of the United States, as is the other body. In the name of the prestige and the tradition and the honor of the Senate of the United States, I offer this amendment, that, if the line of succession is to be changed, our presiding officer shall be the next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator has any time remaining, will he yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Georgia has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. I saw the Senator from Kentucky had risen, I hastened to conclude my remarks, that I might yield to him.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I think the pending succession bill should pass as reported. I believe its logic speaks for itself. With greatest deference for my able friend from Georgia, I rise solely to comment upon the amendment which would reverse the order of succession and put the President pro tempore in the line of succession ahead of the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Of course, Mr. President, this is an impersonal issue. This is not a popularity contest. I speak impersonally. I hope I speak with as profound a respect for the honor and dignity and high authority of the Senate as could any Senator who has ever enjoyed the privilege of serving in this body. I hope I speak with the deepest regard for the high office of President pro tempore, which I am permitted by my colleagues to hold for the time being.

The pending question involves no prejudice upon these scores. There is no question involved of superiority or inferiority as between the two Houses of Congress. It is solely a question whether the Presidential succession should reside, first, in the Speaker of the House, or in the President pro tempore of the Senate.

In my view, it should first reside in the officer reflecting the largest measure of popular and representative expression at the instant moment of his succession. The House is the larger body in membership, more nearly approaching the representative character and structure and distribution of power of the electoral college itself. The whole membership of the House is not more than a maximum of 2 years removed from the suffrage of the people. This is true only of one-third of the Senate. Thus, it seems to me that the House is the body which more appropriately should produce the first successor in a vacant Presidency.

I shall vote against the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska wish to avail himself of his remaining time?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I realize that there is nothing more that can be said, after the eloquent words just spoken by the distinguished Senator from Michigan. I feel we should vote now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Baldwin	Gurney	Moore
Ball	Hatch	Morse
Barkley	Hawkes	Myers
Brewster	Hayden	O'Conor
Bricker	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Bridges	Hill	O'Mahoney
Brooks	Hoey	Overton
Buck	Holland	Pepper
Bushfield	Ives	Reed
Butler	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Cain	Kem	Russell
Capehart	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Capper	Knowland	Smith
Chavez	Langer	Sparkman
Connally	Lodge	Stewart
Cooper	Lucas	Taft
Cordon	McCarran	Taylor
Donnell	McCarthy	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McClellan	Thye
Dworshak	McFarland	Tydings
Eastland	McGrath	Vandenberg
Ecton	McKellar	Watkins
Ellender	McMahon	Wherry
Ferguson	Magnuson	White
Flanders	Malone	Wiley
Fulbright	Martin	Williams
George	Maybank	Young
Green	Millikin	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] is absent on official business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. On this vote I transfer that pair to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family, and is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. The Senator from New Hampshire, if present and voting, would vote "nay" and the Senator from New York, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] is absent on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], who are absent on public business, would vote "yea" if present.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], who is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference at Geneva, Switzerland, would vote "yea" if present.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is absent because of illness, has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. The transfer of that pair to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] has been previously announced by the Senator from Kansas. If present, the Senator from New York would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 55, as follows:

YEAS—31

Barkley	Hoey	Myers
Connally	Holland	O'Conor
Downey	Kilgore	Overton
Eastland	Lucas	Pepper
Ellender	McCarran	Robertson, Va.
Fulbright	McClellan	Russell
George	McFarland	Sparkman
Green	McGrath	Taylor
Hatch	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Hayden	Magnuson	
Hill	Maybank	

NAYS—55

Baldwin	Ferguson	O'Daniel
Ball	Flanders	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Gurney	Reed
Bricker	Hawkes	Robertson, Wyo.
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Brooks	Ives	Smith
Buck	Jenner	Stewart
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Butler	Kem	Thye
Byrd	Knowland	Tydings
Cain	Langer	Vandenberg
Capehart	Lodge	Watkins
Capper	McCarthy	Wherry
Chavez	McMahon	White
Cooper	Malone	Wiley
Cordon	Martin	Williams
Donnell	Millikin	Young
Dworshak	Moore	
Ecton	Morse	

NOT VOTING—9

Aiken	Revercomb	Umstead
Johnston, S. C.	Thomas, Utah	Wagner
Murray	Tobey	Wilson

So Mr. RUSSELL's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The committee amendment is open to further amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert a proviso to read as follows:

Provided, That the provisions of this act shall become effective on the 20th day of January 1949.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GREEN. Earlier in the day I stated that I wished to move to recommit the bill to the Committee on Rules and Administration until it reported Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 1. I was informed that the motion was out of order at that time. Is it now in order?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is in order whenever the Senator is recognized.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, without debating the merits of the bill, without taking the position that the present rules and law of succession should be changed, but for the sake of argument and assuming that the bill is desirable as a long-range program and as a permanent legislation, it should not become effective during this Presidential administration. The change ought to go into effect at the beginning of the next administration, January 20, 1949, when a President duly elected by the people will take office. The effect of passing the bill now and making it immediately effective on approval by the President simply amounts to changing the rules in the middle of the game. It means a change in the law under this administration which, in the event of the disability or incapacity of the present President of the United States, would transfer Chief Executive responsibility from the Democratic Party and from the leadership of the party chosen by the people in the last election in which they had an opportunity to exercise their suffrage in choosing a President of the United States, to a Member of the Republican Party, which was defeated in the last Presidential election.

Mr. President, this is a time of world crisis. There is no real peace in the world. Great problems are yet to be settled before peace can reign. They are so important that in the event of the death or disability of the President of the United States the powers and responsibilities of the acting President, as his successor, should be reposed where they would repose under the present law, in the Secretary of the State. The man who occupies that position now is better able to know and understand, and has a greater knowledge of world affairs and of our international problems and the obstacles to peace, than does any Member of this body or any Member of the other body—either the Speaker of the House of Representatives or the President pro tempore of the Senate. That is necessarily so because of the peculiar opportunities afforded in the negotiations and conferences heretofore held and now going on with respect to world affairs, and in the solution of issues and problems incident to peace.

In the event this bill should become law and the effective date were not postponed to a time beyond this administration we would be by a new law transferring the Presidency of the United States from the party which the people of the United States chose for this term and to which they gave leadership and responsibility. Congress may have a legal right to do that, but I challenge the moral right of the Congress to transfer that responsibility and thus thwart and nullify the expressed will of the people of this Nation as they declared it to be under the constitutional and democratic processes of franchise which they freely exercised in the last Presidential election.

I do not care whether one is a Republican or a Democrat, the people made their choice of leadership; and power and responsibility ought to repose in that leadership until such time as the people of the Nation have spoken again under that same constitutional process. If we are to pass the bill, let the effective date begin with the new administration. In the event the people should choose a Republican President and a Republican Congress, certainly the responsibility would remain with the party which the people favored in the most recent election. I am unwilling by legislative act to change the law under which this administration assumed office.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in reply to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, and also to refute the purposes of the amendment, let me say briefly that if this amendment is adopted it will defeat the sole purpose of the legislation, which is to take care of the present emergency. If we change the date to January 20, 1949, we shall have a new President and Vice President, and there will be no emergency. So a vote for the McClellan amendment means a vote to defeat the very purpose for which the legislation has been asked.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I cannot yield under the limitation of 5 minutes. I have been very lenient with my time during the past 2½ days.

I invite attention to the statement of the President of the United States, who certainly is in total disagreement with the remarks of the Senator from Arkansas. The President, in his message of June 19, 1945, in his message on the state of the Union in January 1946, and in a letter to the President pro tempore of the Senate, stated that this was important legislation, and that there was an emergency. Let me quote his words:

> I think that this is an appropriate time for the Congress to reexamine the question of the Presidential succession.
>
> The question is of great importance now because there will be no elected Vice President for almost 4 years.
>
> The existing statute governing the succession to the office of President was enacted in 1886. Under it, in the event of the death of the elected President and Vice President, members of the Cabinet successively fill the office.
>
> Each of the Cabinet members is appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. In effect, therefore, by reason of the tragic death of the late President, it now lies within my power to nominate the person who would be my immediate successor in the event of my own death or inability to act.

These are the words which I wish to point out to Members of the Senate:

> I do not believe that in a democracy this power should rest with the Chief Executive.
>
> Insofar as possible, the office of the President should be filled by an elective officer. There is no officer in our system of government, besides the President and Vice President, who has been elected by all the voters of the country.
>
> The Speaker of the House of Representatives, who is elected in his own district, is also elected to be the presiding officer of the House by a vote of all the Representatives of all the people of the country. As a result, I believe that the Speaker is the official in the Federal Government, whose selection next to that of the President and Vice President, can be most accurately said to stem from the people themselves.

This statement is a total answer to the argument advanced by the Senator from Arkansas that an appointee of the President should continue for 4 years. I submit to him that the people have had a change of mind within 2 years. The policy which the President has advocated should be adhered to. The one who should be chosen as acting President should be one who is closest to the people. As the President has said, it is the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Nebraska has expired. All time for debate has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN].

Mr. McCLELLAN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] is necessarily absent and is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. The Senator from West Virginia, if present and voting, would vote "nay," and the Senator from South Carolina, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family, and is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. The Senator from New Hampshire, if present and voting, would vote "nay," and the Senator from New York, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] is absent on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], who is absent on public business, is paired on this vote with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "yea," and

the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is absent because of illness, has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. The transfer of that pair to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] has been previously announced by the Senator from Kansas. If present, the Senator from New York would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent on public business. If present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference at Geneva, Switzerland. If present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD] is absent on public business.

The result was announced—yeas 36, nays 50, as follows:

YEAS—36

Barkley	Hoey	Myers
Byrd	Holland	O'Conor
Connally	Kilgore	O'Mahoney
Downey	Lucas	Overton
Eastland	McCarran	Pepper
Ellender	McClellan	Robertson, Va.
Fulbright	McFarland	Russell
George	McGrath	Sparkman
Green	McKellar	Stewart
Hatch	McMahon	Taylor
Hayden	Magnuson	Thomas, Okla.
Hill	Maybank	Tydings

NAYS—50

Baldwin	Ecton	Moore
Ball	Ferguson	Morse
Brewster	Flanders	O'Daniel
Bricker	Gurney	Reed
Bridges	Hawkes	Robertson, Wyo.
Brooks	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Buck	Ives	Smith
Bushfield	Jenner	Taft
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Thye
Cain	Kem	Vandenberg
Capehart	Knowland	Watkins
Capper	Langer	Wherry
Chavez	Lodge	White
Cooper	McCarthy	Wiley
Cordon	Malone	Williams
Donnell	Martin	Young
Dworshak	Millikin	

NOT VOTING—9

Aiken	Revercomb	Umstead
Johnston, S. C.	Thomas, Utah	Wagner
Murray	Tobey	Wilson

So Mr. MCCLELLAN'S amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I move that the pending bill be referred back to the Committee on Rules and Administration until it reports Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 1.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island moves to recommit. The Senator is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, earlier in the day I explained Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 1. There are a number of Senators present now who were not present at that time, so perhaps I can summarize what I then said.

Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 1 is practically the same resolution which the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and I introduced at the last session. Hearings were held, the committee reported it unanimously, the Senate passed it and sent it to the House of Representatives. There it died in committee. On the first day of this session the Senator from New Jersey and I reintroduced it. The resolution goes to the very fundamentals of the question being discussed now. It does not deal with one phase only, but with all phases. If it shall pass, it will make unnecessary a series of bills or a series of constitutional amendments offered to the different States for action.

The question as to the succession of the Presidency should not come up in case a President dies without there being a Vice President living to take his place. There is uncertainty through the whole series of the months from the time the Presidential nominee is nominated until the time of the election, and, after the election, until the time of the inauguration. It affects not only the President and Vice President after they are nominated, after they are elected, and after they have been inaugurated, but it affects the manner in which the election takes place.

The electoral college should be considered in connection with the question. The question is whether the electoral college should continue its functions for the purposes for which it was originally appointed; that is, to meet together and advise together as to who should be the President; or whether the electoral college has changed its nature so that there is no choice in the members of the college, but that they must legally vote for those candidates for President and Vice President who appeared on the ballot with them.

There is the question also of the permanent or temporary disability of the President which should be considered. All these questions are covered by Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 1. It provides that a joint congressional committee shall be appointed, five members to be appointed by the President of the Senate and five members to be appointed by the Speaker of the House, who shall consider all questions, including those I have summarized, and then make a report. It is not obligatory on the Senate and House to adopt the report, but they will have the opportunity of considering a comprehensive plan instead of taking the question up bit by bit from time to time, and perhaps deciding on matters which help to make up the composite whole. It was for that reason that the resolution was introduced. It was a bipartisan resolution. It has been so treated in the past. The Senate has passed it once. I hope that it will pass it again. The way to get it passed again is by recommitting the pending bill to the committee from which it came until that committee reports on Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 1.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Rhode Island has expired.

Does the Senator from Nebraska wish any time?

Mr. WHERRY. No, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion offered by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN].

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there further amendments or motions?

Mr. MCMAHON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCMAHON. Mr. President, I shall repeat what I said to the Rules Committee and what I said earlier today on the floor of the Senate, about my approach to this problem.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the Senator from Connecticut offering an amendment?

Mr. MCMAHON. I offer an amendment by way of a substitute, which now is at the desk. I call it up and offer it at this time, and I shall explain it briefly.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That the act entitled "An act to provide for the performance of the duties of the office of President in case of the removal, death, resignation, or inability both of the President and Vice President," approved January 19, 1886 (24 Stat. 1; U. S. C., title 3, secs. 21–22), is amended by adding at the end thereof five new sections as follows:

"SEC. 4. If the powers and duties of the office of President of the United States shall devolve upon one of the persons named in the first section of this act at a time which is more than 120 days before the time provided by law for the appointment of the electors of President and Vice President, such person shall, within 10 days after the powers and duties of the office of President have devolved upon him, cause a notification of the event by reason of which such powers and duties have so devolved to be made to the chief executive of each State. The notification shall include a request, which it shall be the duty of each chief executive to carry out, that each of such chief executives shall cause the members of the electoral college of his State appointed for the last regular quadrennial election of a President to be assembled at some place in the State on the first Monday following the fifteenth day of such notification for the purpose of casting their votes for a President and a Vice President to fill the unexpired terms of the offices of President and Vice President, which have become vacant by reason of the removal, death, resignation, or inability of both the President and the Vice President. Any vacancy which has occurred in the college of electors since its appointment shall be filled in the manner provided by law for filling vacancies before a regular quadrennial election. The electors shall then proceed, in the manner provided by the Constitution and by law for the regular quadrennial election of a President and a Vice President, to cast their votes for a President and a Vice President, who shall serve the unexpired terms of the offices of President and Vice President, which have become vacant by reason of the removal, death, resignation, or inability of both the President and the Vice President.

"SEC. 5. The certificates and lists of the electors shall be transmitted in the manner as provided by the Constitution and by law for a regular quadrennial election of a President and a Vice President so as to reach the President of the Senate not later than the second Monday after the meeting of the

electors shall have been held. If such certificates and lists are not received by such time, the procedure provided in sections 5 and 6 of the act entitled 'An act providing for the meeting of electors of President and Vice President and for the issuance and transmission of the certificates of their selection and of the result of their determination, and for other purposes,' approved May 29, 1928, as amended, shall be followed.

"SEC. 6. For the purpose of counting the votes of the electoral college, the Congress shall meet on the third Monday after the meeting of the electors shall have been held. The certificates and lists of the electors shall be opened, presented, and acted upon in the manner provided by the Constitution and by law for a regular quadrennial election of the President.

"SEC. 7. Whenever, at a time which is more than 120 days before the time provided by law for the appointment of the electors of President and Vice President, a vacancy occurs in the office of Vice President, either by reason of the removal, death, resignation, or inability of the Vice President or by reason of the devolving of the powers and duties of the office of the President upon the Vice President, the President shall, within 10 days after such office has become vacant, cause a notification of the vacancy to be made to the chief executive of each State. This notification shall include a request, which it shall be the duty of each chief executive to carry out, that each of such chief executives shall cause the members of the electoral college of his State, appointed for the last quadrennial election of a President, to be assembled at some place in the State on the first Monday following the fifteen'h day of such notification for the purpose of casting their votes for a Vice President to fill the unexpired term of the office of Vice President. The college of electors shall then proceed, in the manner provided by the Constitution and by law for the regular quadrennial election of a President and a Vice President, to cast their votes for a Vice President who shall serve the unexpired term of the office of Vice President. The certificates and lists of the electors shall be transmitted and counted as prescribed in sections 5 and 6 of this act.

"SEC. 8. Except as provided in this act, the electors, where required by section 4 to elect a President and a Vice President and by section 7 to elect a Vice President, shall proceed in the manner provided by the Constitution and by law for a regular quadrennial election of a President and a Vice President and all laws relating to a regular quadrennial election of a President and a Vice President, so far as they are applicable, shall govern the election of a President and a Vice President or of a Vice President alone as provided in this act."

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, as I said, I told the Rules Committee, I told the Senate earlier today, and I repeat now, that my approach to this problem is designed to stand the test of time, and the amendment was not drawn in view of the present political situation in the Government.

In this amendment in the nature of a substitute, I have proposed that if the Vice President shall succeed to the Presidency he shall thereupon give notice to the governors of the several States, and the governors of the several States shall thereupon call together the electors who have been chosen at the past quadrennial Presidential election. The President of the United States in his message on this subject has stated that he thought it best that in the event of his death, an elected official should succeed him. It has been pointed out that the Speaker of the House of Representatives is not elected by the people of the United States, but only by the people of his district; and, similarly, it has been pointed out that the President pro tempore of this body is also, not elected by the people of the United States, but only by the people of his State, and later, when elected President pro tempore, is elected by the Senate alone.

In order to meet the qualification presented by the President of the United States, it occurred to me that we could make good use of an institution which the founding fathers took great satisfaction in, namely, the electoral college. There has been much criticism of the electoral-college system, but there is no Senator or Representative who can believe that it will ever be abolished. In view of the fact that we have this constitutional machinery, it would seem to be only good judgment that we put it to use and that we continue for a period of 4 years the policies which the people themselves have voted to continue for that 4-year term.

Mr. President, the proposition is very simple. That is the essence of the amendment. I personally believe that it is very much preferable to the suggestion which has come from the Rules Committee. I think it avoids the very serious constitutional question which was raised by the Senator from New Mexico in regard to a matter as to which there should be no question. I should also like to point out, and I beg the Senate to give this matter serious consideration, that in the age in which we now live, with the kind of weapons that could be employed against us in a future war, the proposal that is made by the majority does not solve the situation which would occur if one bomb were to burst upon Washington and wipe out the entire Government, whereas under my proposal we would use a constitutionally provided process, and we would have a method by which we could provide for the continuation of orderly government in this country.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to call attention to the fact that this amendment, if adopted, would defeat the very purposes of the proposed legislation which we are now attempting to make the law. In the first place, the amendment is unconstitutional, because article II, section 1, paragraph 5, of the Constitution, in addition to the twentieth amendment, which covers the subject of succession, only provides that the Congress shall declare what officer, in the event of necessity for succession, shall then act as President. Under that provision, this amendment would be a direct contradiction of the Constitution. So it seems to me that is enough to defeat the amendment.

In addition, I should like to say further that there is no authority for the Congress to provide for a special election, which is exactly what the amendment would call for. So that is an additional hurdle under the Constitution.

Furthermore the only provision of the Constitution with respect to the election of the President and Vice President calls specifically for terms of 4 years, which will begin on the 20th of January following the election. Under the amendment now proposed, the electoral college would call for a special election, which would fill only the unexpired term. That is another contradiction of the provisions of the Constitution.

But to my mind the most formidable objection is that the McMahon amendment would preclude the States from carrying out their constitutional right of allowing the representative State legislatures to direct the manner in which their electors shall be appointed—as provided in article II, section 1 of the Constitution. There it is provided that the legislatures may select their electors by law, as those legislatures determine. Some are placed upon the ballot in the primary elections. Some are selected in the convention. Some of the electors' names are not even upon the tickets. The amendment, if adopted, would practically require a definition of those terms. So I say that the amendment practically forecloses the right of the States to say how the electoral college shall be appointed.

Last but not least—because I think this point is most important—under the amendment, the electors would be called upon to perform a duty subsequent to the performance of their constitutional function, namely, to assemble to elect the President and Vice President. Under the Constitution, the electors are elected prior to the time when the President and Vice President are elected. But under the amendment, they would be given authority to act, subsequent to that time, to select a President and Vice President. Certainly it is most fallacious, it seems to me, to say that we should permit the delegates to a Democratic convention to select a Democratic President at such a time, especially when the Congress is entirely Republican.

Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be rejected.

Mr. McMAHON. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment, Mr. President.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from Connecticut.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, which is still open to amendment.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the committee amendment, which I offer and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 6, line 6, before the period, it is proposed to insert a comma and the following: "the highest ranking of those military or naval officers of the United States who are on active duty, are not under disability to discharge the powers and duties of the office of President, and are eligible to the office of President under the Constitution."

On page 6, line 14, after the word "individual", it is proposed to insert the following: "(other than a military or naval officer)."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be considered en bloc, without objection. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I should like to have the close attention of Senators for 5 minutes, because, while I shall vote for the bill as proposed by my distinguished colleague from Nebraska, I feel sincerely that while such a measure would have been adequate 3 or 4 years ago, before the bombing of Hiroshima, it is not adequate now. I talked to a gentleman, day before yesterday, who has just returned from Japan, where he had been on the site of Hiroshima. He told me it was the judgment of a Catholic priest, a resident of Hiroshima, who was rebuilding his church, that the bomb destroyed 300,000 lives. The bomb that destroyed Hiroshima is but a pigmy compared to what we have now. Hence, the purpose of my amendment is simply to enable the highest ranking military or naval authority on active duty to fulfill the functions of the office of the Presidency, in the event that the President, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House, the President pro tempore of the Senate, and the members of the President's Cabinet be unable to discharge the duties of that office.

As I have said, the present Presidential succession law might have been good prior to Hiroshima. At that time it would have been impossible to conceive of a situation in which all the officers whom I have mentioned could have been eliminated. But, if the bomb had fallen on Tokyo instead of Hiroshima, we would have had a picture of what would happen if it were to fall today on the city of Washington. We are a Nation of law. It is imperative, as suggested by the last Speaker, that we lay down a law that, no matter what the emergency or what the condition, we will be adequate in law to face it. That is all I am asking for. I agree with the provisions of the bill that is being discussed, but I say it would be inadequate, if all those proposed to be placed in the line of succession were wiped out. I understand the Senator from Nebraska will accept my amendment. I think this should be part of the law of today. It is very well to argue about what the succession should have been until 3 years ago. As between the existing law and the law that is suggested, I for one feel that it is six of one and half dozen of the other. Either of them should be amended in accordance with the suggestion contained in my amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have not gone into all the provisions of the amendment and studied them as I have the other amendments, and my reason for not doing so is, it seems to me, that Senators who apparently are considerably worried about an atomic bomb wiping out completely the civil government should understand that, in that event, what has been suggested as the reason for the proposed amendment would happen anyhow. I cannot see it any other way. For that reason, if it will ease the minds of those who are worried about what might happen in the event an atomic bomb should wipe out the entire line of succession that has been provided for, including all the Cabinet officers, it is agreeable to me to adopt the pending amendment. It simply puts into the law what I think would happen anyhow, if there were no civil government in the United States. So, Mr. President, I am not opposing the amendment, though I think it unnecessary. I state to my colleagues it is perfectly agreeable with me that we accept the amendment. It will, of course, have to be submitted to a vote.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. How would what is feared happen, anyway, unless a military officer took over as dictator?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am not going to get into a discussion or debate with the distinguished minority leader relative to what might happen. I will simply say this: That it is my humble opinion that in the event civil government should be entirely obliterated there would be a military government, and it is my opinion that the highest-ranking officer, whoever he might be, would be the one who would take over the administration of affairs.

Mr. BARKLEY. He might or he might not.

Mr. WHERRY. With that remark, so far as I am concerned, regardless of whether I have any time remaining, I would be extremely anxious to vote on the amendment. I suggest we have a vote on the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator's time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there further amendments to the committee amendment?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I had entered a motion to recommit. It was not exactly the same as the motion made by the Senator from Rhode Island.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico cannot be recognized except on an amendment or a motion.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I had entered a motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the Senator calling up his motion?

Mr. HATCH. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state the point.

Mr. WHERRY. If the motion that is now to be made by the Senator from New Mexico is germane and is similar in all respects to the motion entered by the Senator from Rhode Island, I say that it is not in order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Not necessarily; because the Senator from Rhode Island moved to recommit the bill, contingent upon a certain event. The motion of the Senator from New Mexico will be stated.

Mr. HATCH. My motion, Mr. President, was simply to recommit the bill. There was no qualification.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico moves to recommit the bill, and he is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I do not desire to take 5 minutes. The Senate has already definitely expressed itself. I want to make clear one certain thing. Much has been said about the emergency under which we now operate. There is no emergency. The present laws make it perfectly clear and certain that, in the event anything should happen to the present President of the United States, his successor would be the present Secretary of State, the Honorable George Marshall. About that there is no confusion; the law is clear.

The only thing the pending bill does, if I may say so, is to make out of the confusion, which has heretofore existed throughout the years, complete chaos, in the light of the questions which have been raised, and further, if the bill is constitutional, if it accomplishes everything that is intended and that is claimed for it, the net and the only result—and that is what I want the Senate and the country to know—is to transfer the line of succession from the present Secretary of State to the present Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico to recommit.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there further amendments to the committee amendment? If not, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. McCLELLAN and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent by leave of the Senate, and is paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD]. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont would vote "yea," and the Senator from North Carolina, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] is necessarily absent, and is

paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. The Senator from West Virginia, if present and voting, would vote "yea" and the Senator from South Carolina, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family, and is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. The Senator from New Hampshire, if present and voting, would vote "yea" and the Senator from New York, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] is absent on official business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] who is absent on public business, is paired on this vote with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay," and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea."

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD], who is absent on public business, is paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina would vote "nay," and the Senator from Vermont would vote "yea."

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent on public business. If present, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is absent because of illness, has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. The transfer of that pair to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] has been previously announced by the Senator from Kansas. If present, the Senator from New York would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], who is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference at Geneva, Switzerland, would vote "nay" if present.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is detained on official business at an important committee hearing, and if present would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 35, as follows:

YEAS—50

Baldwin	Ecton	Moore
Ball	Ferguson	Morse
Brewster	Flanders	O'Daniel
Bricker	Gurney	Reed
Bridges	Hawkes	Robertson, Wyo.
Brooks	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Buck	Ives	Smith
Bushfield	Jenner	Taft
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Thye
Cain	Kem	Vandenberg
Capehart	Knowland	Watkins
Capper	Langer	Wherry
Chavez	Lodge	White
Cooper	McCarthy	Wiley
Cordon	Malone	Williams
Donnell	Martin	Young
Dworshak	Millikin	

NAYS—35

Barkley	Hatch	McClellan
Byrd	Hayden	McFarland
Connally	Hill	McGrath
Eastland	Hoey	McKellar
Ellender	Holland	McMahon
Fulbright	Kilgore	Magnuson
George	Lucas	Maybank
Green	McCarran	Myers
O'Conor	Robertson, Va.	Taylor
O'Mahoney	Russell	Thomas, Okla.
Overton	Sparkman	Tydings
Pepper	Stewart	

NOT VOTING—10

Aiken	Revercomb	Wagner
Downey	Thomas, Utah	Wilson
Johnston, S. C.	Tobey	
Murray	Umstead	

So the bill (S. 564) was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for the performance of the duties of the office of President in case of the removal, resignation, death, or inability both of the President and Vice President."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1072) to extend until July 1, 1949, the period during which income from agricultural labor and nursing services may be disregarded by the States in making old-age assistance payments without prejudicing their rights to grants-in-aid under the Social Security Act.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3611) to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2436) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 6 to the said bill, and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 17 to the said bill and concurred therein with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED PROVISION PERTAINING TO APPROPRIATION FOR THE WAR DEPARTMENT (S. Doc. No. 69)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed provision pertaining to an appropriation of the War Department, in the form of an amendment to the budget for the fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, UNITED STATES SOLDIERS' HOME (S. Doc. No. 70)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of $76,000 for the United States Soldiers' Home, in the form of an amendment to the budget for said fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

DISTRIBUTION OF ELECTRIC ENERGY GENERATED AT FORT PECK PROJECT, MONTANA

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to transfer certain transmission lines, substations, appurtenances, and equipment in connection with the sale and disposition of electric energy generated at the Fort Peck project, Montana, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Lands.

ANDREW A. KOLESER

A letter from the Administrator of the National Housing Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Andrew A. Koleser (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

WILLIAM G. NELSON

A letter from the Administrator of the National Housing Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of William G. Nelson (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Petitions signed by sundry citizens of the State of Florida, praying for the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan to provide old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PEPPER:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Florida, relating to the Apalachicola National Forest in Liberty County, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

(See resolution printed in full when laid before the Senate by the President pro tempore on June 26, 1947, p. 7679, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 325. A bill to transfer Blair County, Pa., from the middle judicial district of Pennsylvania to the western judicial district of Pennsylvania; without amendment (Rept. No. 394).

By Mr. McCARTHY, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

S. 493. A bill to provide for the coordination of agencies disseminating technological and scientific information, and for the more efficient and orderly administration of a program to make the discoveries of engineers, inventors, scientists, and technicians more readily available to American industry and business, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 395).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on Civil Service:

H. R. 1389. A bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944; without amendment (Rept. No. 396); and

H. J. Res. 221. Joint resolution to provide for permanent rates of postage on mail matter of the first class, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 397).

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL RESERVE ACT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I ask unanimous consent to report an original bill, to amend section 10 of the

Federal Reserve Act, as amended, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 393) thereon.

There being no objection, the report was received, and the bill (S. 1519) to amend section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 27, 1947, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 125) to strengthen the common defense and to meet industrial needs for tin by providing for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

F. Clyde Keefe, of New Hampshire, as collector of internal revenue for the district of New Hampshire, in place of Peter M. Gagne, deceased; and

Harry M. Brennan to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 42, with headquarters at Louisville, Ky. (reappointment).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 1516. A bill for the relief of Izak Glasman, Jolan Glasman and Aron Glasman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 1517. A bill authorizing the issuance to James Perry Doyle of a patent in fee to certain lands in Big Horn County, Mont.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1518. A bill to authorize the Bloedel Donovan Lumber Mills to cut and remove from certain public lands in Snohomish County, Wash., certain timber purchased and paid for by it; to the Committee on Public Lands.

(Mr. BUCK, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, reported an original bill (S. 1519) to amend section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, and for other purposes, which was ordered to be placed on the calendar, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GURNEY (by request):

S. 1520. A bill to amend section 3 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 554), as amended, so as to provide reimbursement to the Post Office Department by the Navy Department for shortages in postal accounts occurring while commissioned officers of the Navy and Marine Corps are designated custodians of postal effects;

S. 1521. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to detail scientific and technical employees of the War Department or the Army, and the Naval Establishment, to duty in privately owned plants and laboratories;

S. 1522. A bill to authorize the sale of naval stores at naval establishments to members of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, to other specified or authorized persons or activities, to such additional persons as may be authorized by regulations to be promulgated by the Secretary of the Navy, and for other purposes;

S. 1523. A bill to authorize the creation of additional positions in the professional and scientific service in the War and Navy Departments;

S. 1524. A bill to amend certain provisions of law relating to the naval service so as to authorize the delegation to the Secretary of the Navy of certain discretionary powers vested in the President of the United States;

S. 1525. A bill to provide for furnishing transportation for certain Government and other personnel, and for other purposes;

S. 1526. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to proceed with construction at military installations, and for other purposes;

S. 1527. A bill to authorize the enlistment and appointment of women in the Regular Navy and Marine Corps and the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve, and for other purposes; and

S. 1528. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to accept and use gifts, devises, and bequests for schools, hospitals, libraries, museums, cemeteries, and other institutions under the jurisdiction of the War Department or Navy Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 1529. A bill to extend the time for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Shawneetown, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

(Mr. WILEY introduced Senate Joint Resolution 139, to continue for a temporary period of 15 days certain controls now exercised by the President under the Second War Powers Act, 1942, and under the Export Control Act, which was passed, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. BRIDGES introduced Senate Joint Resolution 140, to temporarily make available certain appropriations for the fiscal year 1948, which was passed, and appears under a separate heading.)

TRANSFER OF REMOUNT SERVICE FROM WAR DEPARTMENT TO DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3484) to transfer the Remount Service from the War Department to the Department of Agriculture, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

EXECUTIVE AND INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1948—AMENDMENT

Mr. GREEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3839) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 48, line 22, to strike out "$878,040,780" and insert in lieu thereof "$978,040,780."

INVESTIGATION OF CAUSES OF PETROLEUM RESERVE SHORTAGES

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit for appropriate reference a resolution to investigate the causes of petroleum reserve shortages, and request that a letter addressed to me from Under Secretary of Navy John L. Sullivan, dated June 17, 1947, may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution submitted by the Senator from Maine will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 134) was received and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study into the reasons and circumstances surrounding the apparent failure of transportation facilities to maintain petroleum reserves at adequate levels where needed for civilian and military necessities, and any or all other factors pertinent to the shortages and dislocations of our petroleum reserves. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem desirable.

The letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
Washington, June 17, 1947.

Hon. OWEN BREWSTER,
Chairman, Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BREWSTER: The current shortage of available refined petroleum products in the United States and Caribbean area has created a critical situation. The Navy has experienced difficulty in obtaining fuel to meet the current needs, and as a consequence continental stocks have been reduced to an inadvisably low level. In particular, the reserves on the east coast are inadequate to meet an emergency.

Appropriate action is being taken to improve the Navy stock position in regard to petroleum products with a minimum effect on the civilian supply, which is an equally critical situation. These measures include exploration of the possibility of obtaining additional supplies of Navy Special fuel oil from United States Gulf and Caribbean sources. To date only limited offerings have been made to cover these additional Navy requirements. These offerings fall short of meeting requirements, and in one case have been made on the basis of a premium of 90 cents per barrel above market price. It is considered that this price is excessive, and negotiations are continuing in an endeavor to obtain the quantities required at a reasonable and acceptable price.

The principal source that can be readily exploited to secure the additional quantities required is the Persian Gulf area. The Navy is obtaining 400,000 additional barrels of Navy special fuel oil over and above regular liftings from the Persian Gulf in June. In addition, for the 6 months beginning July 1, 500,000 barrels over and above moral liftings will be purchased each month for a 6-month period. This oil will be purchased at the price of $1.05 per barrel which is the current prevailing price for oil in that area. These additional quantities of oil, 400,000 barrels in June and 500,000 barrels per month thereafter for 6 months, will be transported to the east coast of the United States. To the extent that Navy oilers can be made available for this lift, this operation will result in Navy fuel oil from the Persian Gulf being laid down on the east coast of the United

States at a cost comparable with that which would obtain if the oil were purchased from the United States Gulf or Caribbean sources and transported in chartered tankers. For the remainder, the laid-down cost will be somewhat higher than would be the case if the fuel could be obtained from the latter source.

Barring unforeseen heavy drains on east coast stocks of Navy oil, the program described above will, by late fall, lift Navy fuel stocks on the east coast to a position compatible with the Navy's obligations for national security.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN L. SULLIVAN.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were each read twice by their titles, and referred, or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 775. An act for the establishment of the Commission on Organization of the executive branch of the Government; and

H. R. 3647. An act to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

H. R. 3810. An act to amend section 522 of the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to clarify the procedure in ascertaining the value of foreign currency for customs purposes where there are dual or multiple exchange rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

JAPANESE TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a report signed by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], and myself with reference to the cotton program for the Japanese textile industry.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Under the cotton program for the Japanese textile industry it was agreed sometime ago between the committee appointed by the cotton Senators and the State, War, and Agriculture Departments that 70 percent of the cotton shipped to Japan for consumption by the Japanese textile industry through October 31 of this year would be American-grown cotton. The committee has had a controversy with the War Department in that the committee maintains that the War Department agreed that 70 percent of all cotton shipped to Japan from October 31 to March 1 would be American cotton. Officials of the War Department has denied making such a commitment; however the committee announced today that the Secretary of War and the Secretary of Agriculture have assured them that 70 percent of all cotton shipped to Japan after October 31 would be American cotton provided it were possible for the United States Commercial Company to sell the cotton textiles manufactured in Japan for dollars. The Senators stated that they had implicit confidence in Secretaries Patterson and Anderson and have closed the matter on the basis of 70 percent consumption in Japan of American cotton in the future, provided the Government is able to sell the textiles purchased thereby for enough dollars to pay for the cotton.

JAMES O. EASTLAND.
BURNET R. MAYBANK.
JOHN SPARKMAN.
WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.
JAMES P. KEM.

THIRTY-FIFTH GRADUATING CLASS OF THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator WILEY on June 27, 1947, to the thirty-fifth graduating class of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE COURIER AND HIS CREED—ARTICLE BY REV. PIERCE HARRIS

[Mr. LANGER asked and otained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Courier and His Creed," by Rev. Pierce Harris, pastor of the First Methodist Church, Atlanta, Ga., which appears in the Appendix.]

UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE—STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAYBANK

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him in connection with Reorganization Plan No. 2, relating particularly to the retention of the United States Employment Service in the Department of Labor, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE FOREIGN POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES—ADDRESS BY HON. ALF M. LANDON

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have inserted in the RECORD an address on foreign policy, by Hon. Alf M. Landon, delivered at the tenth annual banquet of the Junior Chamber of Commerce, at Philadelphia, Pa., June 26, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

HENRY CLAY AS AN AMERICAN SYMBOL—ADDRESS BY DR. LUIS GONZALES BARROS

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Henry Clay as an American Symbol," delivered by Dr. Luis Gonzales Barros, first officer of the Diplomatic Department of the Colombian Foreign Office, at the opening of the Third Annual Institute on the United States in World Affairs, at American University, which appears in the Appendix.]

NEED HIM WHERE HE IS—EDITORIAL FROM THE MEMPHIS COMMERCIAL APPEAL

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Need Him Where He Is," published in the June 13, 1947, issue of the Commercial Appeal, of Memphis, Tenn., which appears in the Appendix.]

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 350) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States until June 30, 1948.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 135) to extend the succession, lending powers, and the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 3303. An act to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military Establishment of the United States; and

S. J. Res. 125. Joint resolution to strengthen the common defense and to meet industrial needs for tin by providing for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry.

EXTENSION OF CERTAIN POWERS OF THE PRESIDENT UNDER TITLE III OF THE SECOND WAR POWERS ACT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Senate bill 1461, calendar No. 347, a bill to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, there is one matter before the Senate, the disposition of Reorganization Plan No. 2, which under the rules must be acted upon by Monday evening. The House has agreed to a concurrent resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 2. The concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 49, was reported from the Committee on Labor and Education adversely, that is, a majority of the members of the Committee on Labor and Education recommended in favor of adopting the President's plan. However, there is a difference of opinion, I think, both on the Republican side and on the Democratic side—it is not a party matter in any way—and I should like, if possible, to reach some unanimous-consent agreement to debate the plan and dispose of it on Monday so that we may not have to meet on Saturday for the purpose of considering it. Debate is limited to not exceed 10 hours. If we cannot reach a unanimous-consent agreement, we will have to meet tomorrow in order to give opportunity for 10 hours of debate.

Therefore, Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that at 2:30 o'clock on Monday next the Senate set aside the unfinished business and proceed to the consideration of the concurrent resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 2, and that the time on the concurrent resolution be divided equally between the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL]—they are on opposing sides of the question—and that at 5 o'clock on Monday afternoon the Senate proceed to vote on the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution is reported, but it is reported adversely. The committee felt, however, that under the reorganization law it was its duty to lay the matter before the Senate and not default upon it. It is certainly within the spirit of the act that the Senate also vote upon that question before the expiration of the time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request submitted by the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to make a brief comment, not so much because of this particular request, but because of my general objections to the entire pro-

cedure of unanimous-consent requests. I shall have specific data available to the Senate by Tuesday, because I have asked the Legislative Reference Bureau to prepare data for me, based upon a study and compilation of unanimous-consent agreements for the past 10 years, both as to the number of such agreements that have been requested in the Senate of the United States and the number which have in fact been entered into.

The preliminary study indicates very clearly, Mr. President, that in this particular session of the Senate we have had more unanimous-consent requests made and granted than for several years combined. I think it is a practice which is subject to grave and serious abuse, and I think we need to pause and reevaluate the desirability of the practice.

Mr. President, we had an excellent example last Friday, it seems to me, of the type of abuse that can develop under our unanimous-consent rule. Last Friday some of us in the minority made a reasonable request to have a final vote on the Taft-Hartley bill go over from Saturday at 5 o'clock until Monday at 3 o'clock. However a dominant majority insisted that we either assent to a unanimous-consent request to vote on Saturday at 5 p. m. or start talking. Some of us felt that there was a very important principle at stake, namely, that of protecting minority rights under the unanimous-consent rule. Disliking, as many of us do, the filibuster as a technique, nevertheless, when a dominant majority takes a position, as it clearly took last Friday, that we either must accept their request for a unanimous consent to vote at an hour certain, or we would be forced into an all-night session and we would be forced to filibuster until Monday at 3 o'clock, we felt that the time had come to call a halt to such domineering tactics on the part of the majority. We thought the time had come to make perfectly clear that some of us at least would rise up here and protect our minority rights in the Senate, because, Mr. President, minority rights under the unanimous-consent rule become meaningless if the minority is to be put in the position by a majority that it either must accept the demand of the majority when it makes a unanimous-consent request or adopt filibustering techniques in order to protect its minority rights. If the majority is ever allowed to get by with such an assault upon minority rights then the unanimous-consent rule ceases to afford any protection to any Senator.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I will not yield, Mr. President.

I think the time has come for us to review this whole trend in this Congress of these frequent requests for unanimous consent to limit debate. I think I have made clear over the last 2 years how I feel about that practice as a matter of sound procedure. I know that there is great pressure to adjourn the Senate on July 26. I, of course, do not share the view that we ought to adjourn on July 26, and I am not going to stand here and be pressured into going along with a practice of having frequent unanimous-consent agreements to vote as of a certain hour in order to adjourn on July 26. I think the business that is confronting Congress and the problems that are confronting the Nation are of so serious an import that we should not even think about adjourning on July 26. We ought to stay on through August and September, if necessary, and after due deliberation and debate dispose of all important problems which are facing the country which can be handled by legislation. We are being paid well, Mr. President, as Members of the Congress, to stay on through the summer months. We are not an underpaid group of men. I think the people of the country have a right to expect us to stay here and transact national business in their interest until the fall.

I dislike to be constantly placed in the position where I feel an objection to a unanimous-consent agreement must be made, and certainly here is one, Mr. President, in regard to which I do not think the issue is of such vital importance that the request should be expressed.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. MORSE. I will be through in just a sentence or two.

What I wish to say is that I shall continue to object to these unanimous-consent requests because I think the rights of the minority in this body are too frequently jeopardized by them. We are constantly being embarrassed by them because there is always an attempt made to misrepresent our position on the merits of the principle involved. We object to them as a matter of principle. However, we know that our objections to these frequent unanimous-consent requests place us in the position of being looked upon as uncooperative and constitutional dissenters. I do not like to be placed in that position. Nevertheless, I am going to keep right on protesting these requests in the interest of protecting minority rights in the Senate. I think the Republican majority should stop its tendency of forcing upon the Senate by indirection a limitation of debate rule in the Senate by way of abusing the unanimous-consent rule.

If the unanimous-consent rule is to mean anything, then each Member of this body should feel free to exercise his rights under that rule without being placed in the position in which I was placed last Friday. The result was that there was the grossest type of misrepresentation on the part of some segments of the press of the country as to the principle for which I was fighting. The majority forced that filibuster because of its clear abuse of the unanimous consent rule.

Mr. President, I hope that these remarks will make clear and certain to my Republican colleagues that it will have to be an exceptional case indeed before they can ever obtain my consent to such unanimous-consent requests to limit debate. As to the one which the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] now submits—I object.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. MORSE. Certainly.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I only wish to place before the Senate the fact that this is an extraordinary case. This is a peculiar matter, governed by peculiar rules. There is no freedom of debate on the subject. The Reorganization Act itself involves a very peculiar procedure. The act provides that a motion to proceed to the consideration of such a resolution—

> shall be highly privileged and shall not be debatable. No amendment to such motion shall be in order and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which such motion is agreed to or disagreed to.
>
> (b) Debate on the resolution shall be limited to not to exceed 10 hours, which shall be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. A motion further to limit debate shall not be debatable.

Here we have a cloture rule imposed by statute. No minority right is being violated by the unanimous-consent agreement. Even the suggestion for 2½ hours of debate could be cut off by a motion to proceed to vote immediately. The unanimous-consent request is for the convenience of the Senate itself, in view of the fact that we felt that the whole subject could be adequately presented in 2½ hours. If the Senator believes that a longer time should be allowed, that may be done.

Without raising any question about the validity of the argument of the Senator as applied to the ordinary case, it does not apply in this case, because in this case there is cloture, and we could proceed to terminate debate at any time. So I ask the Senator if, purely as a matter of convenience to the Senate, and to avoid a Saturday session, he would not be willing to agree to let the Senate take this question up in an orderly way on Monday and dispose of it by 5 o'clock Monday evening.

Let me say, further, that the ordinary rule regarding a quorum call does not apply, because this is a concurrent resolution, to which the rule does not apply. We have just had a vote, at which there was a full attendance of Senators, so it seems to me that the spirit of the rule is complied with, even though there is no letter of the rule to be followed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. In connection with the statement made by the Senator from Ohio, I ask the Chair whether or not, in view of what the Senator has stated, a unanimous-consent agreement is necessary at all.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is necessary unless the Senate on motion further limits the time for debate.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, as I understand the present legislative situation, the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] has made a motion for the immediate consideration of Senate bill 1461.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KILGORE. That happens to be a bill in which I am vitally interested, as are other Senators. It seems to me that the unanimous-consent agreement in question is a method of getting around the present law, in a way, by permitting us to take up for consideration on Monday Senate bill 1461, on which I shall have a few remarks to make, and then to limit debate to 2½ or 3 hours on the concurrent resolution. I ask the Senator from Oregon if that is not his interpretation. I do not object to working on Saturday or any other time; but I do not wish to have two bills intervening.

There are two proposals before us. First, there is the motion to proceed to the consideration of a certain bill. Secondly, we have a unanimous-consent request to suspend consideration of that bill at a certain hour, and, at another hour, to vote without further debate upon a concurrent resolution. I think that makes it rather difficult for some of us who would like to take a few minutes to discuss a certain bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will say that there is nothing unprecedented about the suggested procedure. Frequently it is the practice of the Senate to set aside the unfinished business for a special purpose or for the consideration of privileged matters. That is all that is involved in the request of the Senator from Ohio, except that his request involves a postponement until Monday.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I object to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I shall not oppose the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]; but the privileged motion regarding the other measure will have to be made the first thing tomorrow, and the Senate must meet on Saturday.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Assuming that the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin shall be agreed to and that we proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1461, and assuming that consideration of the bill is not concluded today, would it be in order, in view of the privileged character of the motion to consider the reorganization plan, to move either tomorrow or Monday to proceed to consider the concurrent resolution?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It not only can be done, but it is directly authorized by the act.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1461.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I have felt all along that on Monday next we would proceed to the consideration of the bill for the unification of the armed forces. I am now advised that a privileged matter in connection with a reorganization plan, and one or two appropriation bills, must intervene because of certain dead lines. I am also advised that it is the intention of the majority to proceed to the consideration of the unification bill on Wednesday of next week, without specifying any definite time.

I make this announcement because I know, in view of the announcements which I have previously made that we would probably consider the bill on Monday, that there will be inquiries of me as to when we are really to consider it. Therefore I hope that no other matters will delay consideration of the bill later than Wednesday of next week.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1461.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Chair whether or not it is possible for the motion to be made to take up the concurrent resolution disapproving the reorganization bill, even though this motion might be pending and being debated?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is in order at any time.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, the Senator from Ohio can make the motion now if he so desires.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. I ask the Chair if the Chair is under the impression that the Senator from Oregon objected to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Ohio, or whether the Chair understands that the Senator from Oregon withheld his objection at the request of the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands that the Senator from Oregon withheld his objection.

Mr. MORSE. Who did finally object?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE.]

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1461.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill (S. 1461) to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That this act shall be cited as the "Second Decontrol Act of 1947."

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declares that it is the general policy of the United States to eliminate emergency wartime controls of materials except to the minimum extent necessary (1) to protect the domestic economy from the injury which would result from adverse distribution of materials which continue in short world supply; (2) to promote production in the United States by assisting in the expansion and maintenance of production in foreign countries of materials critically needed in the United States; (3) to make available to countries in need, consistent with the foreign policy of the United States, those commodities whose unrestricted export to all destinations would not be appropriate; and (4) to aid in carrying out the foreign policy of the United States.

TEMPORARY RETENTION OF CERTAIN EMERGENCY POWERS

SEC. 3. To effectuate the policies set forth in section 2 hereof, title XV, section 1501, of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, approved March 27, 1942, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1501. (a) Except as otherwise provided by statute enacted during the Eightieth Congress (including the First Decontrol Act of 1947) and except as otherwise provided by subsection (b) of this section, titles I, II, III, IV, V, VII, and XIV of this act and the amendments to existing law made by such titles shall remain in force only until March 31, 1947. After the amendments made by any such title cease to be in force, any provisions of law amended thereby (except subsection (a) of section 2 of the act 'An act to expedite national defense, and for other purposes,' approved June 28, 1940, as amended) shall be in full force and effect as though this act had not been enacted.

"(b) Title III of this act and the amendments to existing law made by such title shall remain in force only until June 30, 1948, for the exercise of the powers, authority, and discretion thereby conferred on the President, but limited to the materials, and to facilities suitable for the manufacture of such materials, as follows:

"(1) Tin and tin products (but not including import control of tin ores and tin concentrates);

"(2) Manila (abaca) fiber and cordage, and agave fiber and cordage;

"(3) Antimony;

"(4) Such materials for export which are required to expand or maintain the production in foreign countries of materials critically needed in the United States for the purpose of establishing priority in production and delivery for export, and such materials which are necessary for manufacture and delivery of the materials required for such export;

"(5) Fats and oils (including oil-bearing materials, fatty acids, butter, soap and soap powder, but excluding petroleum and petroleum products) and rice and rice products, for the purpose of exercising import control; and nitrogenous fertilizer materials for the purposes of exercising import control and of establishing priority in production and delivery for export;

"(6) Materials (except foods and food products and fertilizer materials) required for export, but only upon certification by the Secretary of State that the prompt export of such materials is of high public importance and essential to the successful carrying out of the foreign policy of the United States, for the purpose of establishing priority in production and delivery for export, and such materials as may be necessary for the manufacture and delivery of the materials required for such export.

"(c) Notwithstanding the extension to June 30, 1948, made by subsection (b), the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may designate an earlier time for the termination of any power, authority, or discretion under such title III. Nothing in subsection (b) shall be construed to continue any authority under paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 2 of the act entitled 'An act to expedite national defense, and for other purposes,' approved June 28, 1940, as amended, to negotiate contracts with or without advertising or competitive bidding; and nothing contained in this section, as amended, shall affect the authority conferred by Public Law 24, Eightieth Congress, approved March 29, 1947, or the Sugar Control Extension Act of 1947, or be construed to continue beyond June 30, 1947, any authority with respect to the use of transportation equipment and facilities by rail carriers."

TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF CERTAIN EXPORT CONTROLS

SEC. 4. To effectuate the policy set forth in section 2 hereof, section 6 (d) of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), as amended is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The authority granted by this section shall terminate on June 30, 1948, or any prior date which the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may designate."

EXEMPTION FROM ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT

SEC. 5. The functions exercised under title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended (including the amendments to existing law made by such title), and the functions exercised under such act of July 2, 1940, as amended, shall be excluded from the operation of the Administrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 237), except as to the requirements of sections 3 and 10 thereof.

ADMINISTRATOR OF IMPORT AND EXPORT CONTROLS

SEC. 6. (a) There is hereby established in the Executive Office of the President an Administrator of Import and Export Controls (hereinafter called the "Administrator"), who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum. The Administrator is authorized to appoint such officers and employees as may be necessary to enable him to perform his duties.

(b) The Administrator, subject to the direction of the President, shall have power to establish policies and programs to effectuate the general policies set forth in section 2 of this act, and to exercise over-all control, with respect to the functions, powers, and duties delegated by the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended, and the act entitled "An act to expedite the strengthening of the national defense," approved July 2, 1940, as amended. The Administrator is further authorized, subject to the direction of the President, to approve or disapprove any action taken under such delegated authority, and may promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary to enable him to perform the functions, powers, and duties imposed upon him by this section.

(c) The Administrator shall make a quarterly report to the President and to the Congress of his operations under the authority conferred on him by this section. Each such report shall contain a determination by him as to whether the controls exercised under title III of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended, and the act entitled "An act to expedite the strengthening of the national defense," approved July 2, 1940, as amended, should or should not be continued, together with the current facts and reasons therefor. Each such report shall also contain detailed information with respect to licensing procedures under such acts, allocations, and priorities under the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended, and the allocation or nonallocation to countries of materials and commodities (together with the reasons therefor) under the act entitled "An act to expedite the strengthening of the national defense," approved July 2, 1940, as amended.

(d) The President is authorized to appoint an advisory committee consisting of the Secretaries of State, War, Agriculture, Interior, and Commerce to advise the Director in the performance of his duties.

PERSONNEL

SEC. 7. Notwithstanding any other law to the contrary, personnel engaged in the performance of duties related to functions, powers, and duties delegated by the President under the Second War Powers Act of 1942, as amended, and the act entitled "An act to expedite the strengthening of the national defense," approved July 2, 1940, as amended, and whose employment was terminated, or who were furloughed, in June 1947, may be reemployed to perform duties in connection with the functions, powers, and duties extended by this act.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 9. This act shall take effect on July 1, 1947.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS' SALARIES—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CAIN submitted the following report:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS' SALARY ACT OF 1947

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3611) to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the same.

HARRY P. CAIN,
RALPH E. FLANDERS,
J. HOWARD MCGRATH
(by H. C.),
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
GEORGE J. BATES,
JOS. P. O'HARA,
JNO. L. MCMILLAN,
HOWARD W. SMITH,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report.

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CORDON submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2436) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 4, 13, and 18.

The the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 16, 23, 28, and 29, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$32,825,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$188,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$100,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$72,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,115,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$910,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,332,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$712,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$32,925,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$487,400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$13,257,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 6 and 17.

GUY CORDON,
CLYDE M. REED,
STYLES BRIDGES,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

GORDON CANFIELD,
P. W. GRIFFITHS,
CHARLES R. ROBERTSON,
J. VAUGHAN GARY,
JOE B. BATES,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question about the conference report. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Oregon the amount of money carried in the bill for the Treasury Department. The Senator will recall that the House cut the amount recommended by the Budget by approximately $30,000,000, and that the Senate increased the amount by $25,000,000. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Oregon what amount is now carried in the bill for the Treasury Department.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, in answer to the question of the senior Senator from Georgia I will say that the item to which he refers, I am sure, is the item in the Treasury Department budget relating to the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and the total amount requested by the Department was $208,000,000. The House allowed $178,000,000; the Senate increased that by $25,000,000 to $203,000,000, and in the conference the figure was reduced by $15,000,000, resulting in a conference recommendation of $188,000,000, or $10,000,000 more than the House allowed, and $15,000,000 less than the amount provided for in the Senate amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Fifteen million dollars less than contained in the Senate amendment?

Mr. CORDON. Exactly.

Mr. GEORGE. So that the force employed in the field and in the various offices throughout the country to collect revenues would be reduced to that extent?

Mr. CORDON. Assuming the approval of the conference report, how the cut will be allocated, Mr. President, I cannot anticipate. That is a matter wholly within the control of the Treasury Department.

I want to be perfectly frank with the Senator from Georgia, and I want to say at this time, Mr. President, that the last action taken by the conferees on the Senate side was on this particular item. Had there been any hope of any better agreement on it, I am sure the conferees would have continued for practically any period of time. It was not a satisfactory figure that was reached, but it was the best figure that could be reached in the conference, and we felt that it was better to reach a figure and get agreement than to return in disagreement to both Houses.

But the information which I have from the Treasury is that it will be most difficult to make the reduction, which is a 10-percent reduction over-all in the estimate for this year in that division of the Treasury. The officials say that it will be most difficult to allocate that reduction in any level manner throughout the activities of the Bureau of Internal Revenue; that it will be necessary to allocate more of the cut to the reduction of enforcement officers than to clerical help. Some of those who were in the conference, particularly those on the House side, disputed that statement very vigorously. The House presented a picture of more or less inefficiency throughout the Treasury Department and expressed the strong belief that the cut could be taken up without seriously affecting the so-called enforcement officers who are the inspectors and deputy collectors in the field.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I sincerely hope that is true; but it requires many men in any department to open envelopes, take out checks, and make entries. In other words, the clerical force which is necessary inside of the office cannot be very greatly reduced. This reduction in appropriation will undoubtedly result in the displacement of some 5,000 to 10,000 employees. I would say 5,000 is the minimum of collectors in the field, the people who are responsible for the collection of our taxes.

I am sure the Senator from Oregon has insisted all the while upon the Senate amendment. That is generally known; and I compliment and congratulate him. But actually this reduction will result in a loss of certainly not less than $300,000,000 in tax collections in the next 2 years. For this reason everyone who is familiar with the Treasury and with the Bureau of Internal Revenue knows that the checking of the returns for 1944 and 1945 is still to be made. It is within those years that large amounts are involved. If there should be a loss because of a lack of sufficient personnel in the field of only 1 percent, that 1 percent itself, in view of the very large amount of taxes involved, would mean a loss to the Treasury Department of at least $300,000,000.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I had risen only to ask the Senator about that feature of the bill.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arkansas will wait a moment, I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I was about to offer some information which the Senator may not have in mind, in connection with what the able Senator from Georgia had pointed out.

Mr. CORDON. I shall be glad to yield to the able Senator from Arkansas for that purpose.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In line with what the able Senator from Georgia said, orders have already gone out from the Bureau of Internal Revenue to the State revenue collectors to remove from the pay roll 2,100 persons between now and the 30th of June. In my State that means that out of 87 field collectors 31 are being removed from the service. I want to say that if this is going to be the policy and procedure with respect to tax collections, it will be simply impossible to do the work and will simply mean that we are saving pennies and losing hundred-dollar bills.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I can reassure the Senator from Arkansas to this extent: The Treasury officials withheld the sending of notices of termination to anyone just as long as possible in the hope that there could be agreement and definite knowledge with reference to the amount that would finally be evolved as the appropriation for 1948. However, the Under Secretary called the Senator from Oregon 3 days ago and advised him that it was impossible for them to withhold those notices any longer, as they must be received by the proposed recipients by the first of the fiscal year.

It was suggested on the part of the Senator from Oregon and the chairman of the conference committee of the Senate that the step should be taken, because there appeared at the time to be no hope of the conference reaching any figure above that set by the House. So the notices went out, and I am quite sure they were based upon the proposition that the figures set by the House represent the amount by which the Treasury will be bound for the fiscal year.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Does the Senator mean, set by the House or by the conference?

Mr. CORDON. By the House. At that time the conference figure was not known.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am advised, if the Senator will permit me, that the notices were sent yesterday after the Treasury Department was informed that the conferees had agreed. The notices did not go out until yesterday afternoon, after the Treasury Department had knowledge of what the conference report contained.

Mr. CORDON. The notices were sent. I was advised that the notices would be sent predicated upon the figure in the House bill as it passed the House.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Oregon is one of the able, industrious Senators in this body, and I presume he is completely familiar with what the evidence disclosed before his committee with respect to what these men could do in the way of collecting money from the taxpayers if they were kept on the pay roll. In view of the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] I should like to ask whether or not the Senator agrees with the statement that we could collect, by appropriating $15,000,000, the sum of not less than $300,000,000 from delinquent taxpayers throughout the Nation.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon can express no opinion on that subject, because it would depend upon the class of individuals who are employed and upon the work upon which they are engaged, and it would depend on whether an adequate number were doing that particular work.

Mr. LUCAS. What does the evidence show along that line?

Mr. CORDON. I want to say to the Senator from Illinois that I appreciate his references to the Senator from Oregon. The Senator from Oregon has endeavored, to the extent of his limited ability, to go into this matter in meticulous detail, and has called the officials of the Treasury back on two different occasions for break-downs in figures, not only to make the case before the Senate committee but before the conference committee.

The figures which were presented for a break-down in respect to the inspectors and the revenue agents show one group making collections and another group making recommendations for additional assessments. The break-down included the group of those who had returned nothing for the year, the group of those who had returned up to $1,000, and so forth, for the entire number. There was one group that did not even make a dent in paying its own way. There was another group, composed of a considerable number of persons, that broke even; in other words, it brought in about what it was being paid in the way of salaries. But the majority returned a collection which would represent, if the groups were combined, approximately $24 in money as a return for every dollar that was spent in salaries.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in view of that very candid statement by my distinguished friend the Senator from Oregon, I do not understand how the conferees on the part of the Senate could give way to the conferees on the part of the House in a matter of that kind, when the Senator from Oregon apparently believed, when he took this matter to conference, that for every dollar spent, it would be possible to obtain $24 in paid taxes for the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois is now combining two situations which existed. He has asked about enforcement officers, and that is one thing. But in considering the appropriation for the Bureau of Internal Revenue, we consider everything, from the salary of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue on down to the salary of whoever may be acting as janitor in a collector's office anywhere in the United States. That figure takes in all. The Senator from Illinois has inquired about one group, the total payment to which amounts to approximately $36,000,000 overall.

Mr. LUCAS. Perhaps I misunderstood the able Senator from Oregon. Let me say that apparently the Appropriations Committee found some good reason, as a result of the evidence which was presented before it, to vote in favor of restoring, not $1,000,000, but millions of dollars to this particular agency for the purpose of having it collect delinquent taxes throughout the Nation.

Now it is apparent that the conferees on the part of the House simply outtalked the conferees on the part of the Senate, and that seems to be what is going on in practically all the conferences. Even at this late date we cannot get a report on the Budget, because apparently the conferees on the part of the House are outtalking the conferees on the part of the Senate on that subject, also.

It seems to me that after able Senators have heard the evidence and have voted to increase the appropriation by millions of dollars, on the theory that millions upon millions of dollars will be collected from income taxpayers, if the Senate conferees then return from the conference committee and say that the conferees on the part of the House showed figures which the Senators did not know anything about, and that that is the reason why the Senators gave in to the position of the conferees on the part of the House—or perhaps I misunderstood the Senator from Oregon——

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the Senartor from Illinois not only misunderstood, if that is his view, but the Senator from Oregon has made no statement of that character anywhere in the course of his presentation of this matter.

Mr. LUCAS. I thought the Senator said that the Appropriations Committee convinced them, by citing facts and figures, that the appropriation should be reduced. Perhaps I am mistaken about that. If that is not the case, then why did the conferees on the part of the Senate decide to reduce the appropriation?

Mr. CORDON. The conclusion that was reached in the conference was based upon the same motivating factors which called for a conference. The Senator from Illinois knows as well as does the Senator from Oregon that when there is a conflict of views on the part of people all over the United States, people of all shades of opinion, in regard to any legislation, the legislative proposals which finally emerge are a compromise.

So I say that the action taken by the conference committee was a compromise, Mr. President. If the Senator from Oregon could have dictated the provision, it would have called for the figure as passed by the Senate. But, unfortunately, the Senator from Oregon had only one vote in the conference committee. The Senator wishes to compliment those who acted on the conference committee, representing the Senate there, in standing fast as long as they could, and in obtaining a compromise agreement.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Regardless of who yielded to whom and who out talked whom, the result is that the cut which was administered in the House to this division of the Treasury was practically retained in the conference report.

Mr. CORDON. No; it was not. The conference report recommends an increase of $10,000,000 over the figure voted by the House of Representatives.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; but it is still approximately $15,000,000 less than the Senate figure and $30,000,000 less than the budget estimates.

Mr. CORDON. No; it is $20,000,000 less than the budget estimate, $15,000,000 less than the Senate figure, and $10,000,000 more than the House figure.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; that is the situation as to the sum total.

It is true that currently about $2,000,000,000 a year is being recovered into the Treasury by the operations of these field men of the Bureau of Internal Revenue who go after delinquent taxpayers and those persons who have sought to, and have succeeded in, avoiding taxation.

Mr. CORDON. Let me say that the record indicates that approximately $560,000,000 is being collected, and $1,200,000,000 is being recommended, of which approximately three-quarters, according to experience heretofore, may result in collections.

Mr. BARKLEY. But with the present force in the Treasury, only approximately 3 percent of tax returns can possibly be screened. There may be a vast amount of money which should be returned to the Treasury; but with the present force it is possible to examine only about 3 percent of the total returns and to make recommendations as to them. So it is possible to examine only the outstanding cases in which there may be recoveries.

If it be true that the rate of recovery mentioned is possible with the present force of the Treasury, and if it be true that this reduction below the budget estimate—which I think is based upon the present force—would result in a loss of approximately $300,000,000 in taxes to the people, does the Senator from Oregon think it is good business, aside from politics and aside from legislation, to save $15,000,000 or $20,000,000, even, and to lose $250,000,000 or $300,000,000 in revenue?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the Senator asks a question as an abstract proposition. Of course, the question answers itself.

The Senator from Oregon is not prepared to admit that under the facts in this case and all the evidence, this cut must be taken entirely out of the funds for enforcement officers.

Mr. BARKLEY. That may be true, but most of it will come out of the enforcement branch.

Mr. CORDON. In that event, let us blame those who take it out of enforcement, when they could take it from some other source.

Mr. BARKLEY. We cannot shun the blame which should rest upon the Congress if we swap $300,000,000 for $20,000,000.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I am not prepared to concede that any such thing will occur.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let me say, in support of the position of the Senator from Oregon, that I was present at the committee session at which the amount of $25,000,000 additional was agreed upon by the committee. I was also present at several of the sessions of the Committee on Conference, and I was present when this additional amount was voted.

I say most respectfully to the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Kentucky that I believe that the chairman of the subcommittee did the best he could under all the circumstances. The highest amount the House would increase its recommendation at all was $3,000,000, and only two out of the four members would agree to that amount. The figure finally agreed upon was $10,000,000.

Let me say further to the Senator from Kentucky that in the committee's report it is specifically stated that the Bureau of Internal Revenue should insure that its enforcement activities are not curtailed in the process of any readjustment of its budget program.

The objection raised by most of the conferees on the part of the House was that there is a super number of clerks who do not give a full day's work for the pay they receive, and there was a very strong feeling by certain of the conferees on the part of the House that the number of such clerks should be reduced.

I would say that one Member of the House who served on the conference committee refused to sign the report because he would not stand for any adjustment upwards. One of the conferees on the part of the Senate refused to sign the report because he thought the amount was not large enough. Although I was only one member of the conference committee, I felt, after several weeks of negotiation, that all the Post Office appropriations and all the other Treasury appropriations should not be held up any further.

Personally, I should have liked to see a larger amount provided; but let me say that I think the Senator in charge of the bill did the best he could do over a long period of time, and that he obtained about as much from the conference as could be obtained from it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I hope that nothing I have said or any inquiry I have made will be interpreted as any criticism of the chairman of the subcommittee or any other Senator who served as a conferee on the part of the Senate. I am satisfied that the Senator from Oregon and his colleagues did everything they could do. They had a tough situation to deal with; and of course there must come a time, at some juncture in any conference, when an agreement must be entered into.

The very fact that the Senator from Oregon felt that there ought to be more money available, and that the Senator from Massachusetts felt the same way, and other Senate members of the conference felt the same way, confirms my belief that the cut is entirely too deep, and that we will lose money, so far as the Treasury of the United States is concerned, by reason of what may be described as the stubbornness of certain men who insisted on the cut regardless of the result on our internal-revenue collections. I do not blame the Senator from Oregon or any other Senate member of the conference for that.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I am sure the Senator understands that what I had to say, or the questions I asked, were not in criticism of himself or of any Senate member of the conference. I am quite sure that the chairman of the subcommittee has done his best to sustain the action taken by the Senate itself on this item. I should like to say this, that if the cut could be apportioned throughout the organization in such way as not to fall too heavily upon the collectors—that is, the field men working out of the offices of the collectors—all well and good; but it takes a certain amount of overhead to handle a volume of business such as the Bureau of Internal Revenue is now handling. This cut, although it seems insignificant, will certainly result, in my judgment, in a reduction of from 5 percent to 10 percent in the field forces, and, since the great bulk of the incomes, beginning in 1943, but particularly the later ones, in 1944 and 1945, are yet to be handled, I am quite sure that a very slight reduction in that force will result in a considerable Treasury loss.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Oregon ever participated in the trial of criminal cases.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon spent 11 years as a prosecuting attorney; so necessarily he participated in the trial of criminal cases.

Mr. KILGORE. The Senator from West Virginia spent a number of years as a criminal court judge. We never counted cost against the question of convicting a guilty party. Is not that correct?

Mr. CORDON. There were times when the question at least was considered, but generally speaking, I will agree with the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. KILGORE. Has the Senator from Oregon ever considered the report of the committee investigating banking, which told of a very distinguished man now dead, one J. P. Morgan, who said that he paid income taxes in England, but did not pay in the United States, because it was not cricket in England to dodge the income tax, but it was considered as a sort of great indoor sport in America. As long as we speak in terms of a 2- or 3- or 4-percent spot check, it is going to be a great indoor sport to dodge taxes in this country. On the other hand, once we get down to a 100-percent check-up, it will cease to be an indoor sport, and the same attitude will prevail that now prevails among the British people toward the question.

May I say that in this I am not criticizing the Senator from Oregon for his action, because I have been on a conference committee or two, myself, and I know the difficulties which confront the Senator from Oregon. But I think it is time for the people of the United States—not only the Senator from Oregon, not only the Senator from Massachusetts, but the people of the United States—to realize suddenly that it is better for us to spend 99 percent of the recovery, for a year or two, to effect a 100 percent recovery, than it would be to throw the thing out the window and lose a tremendous amount of money. That is the point I am making. That is the thing I think the Senate should consider, that we should educate the people of the United States to the fact that each of us, regardless of his feelings, must pay his fair share of the operating expenses of the Government.

There is one other thing I may say to the Senator from Oregon. We may not demand so much service from the Government, when, in turn, we have to pay for it. But all of us, as well as the gamblers, the race-track people, all the rest, should understand that. It is only through this enforcement provision that the money is obtained, that we are able to reach the hidden profits that are buried out in the fence corners.

My opposition is based upon the fact that I would like to have, hereafter, a 100 percent enforcement against tax evasion, against the fellow who makes $200,000 or $300,000 out of gambling and does not report it, against the fellow who makes a little side money out of something else that is not reported. That is my position, because I think the poor fellow who earns his money across the table and who pays his income tax, whether it be $1, $2, $3, $4, $50, or $100, should be treated the same as the fellow who picks up his money practically for nothing, or as the result of a lucky investment, and then dodges the payment of taxes; whereas, if he lived in England, he would pay it.

We may cuss England, we may fuss at England, we may fuss at the English, but we have to admit there is sportsmanship on the part of the English in dealing with their Government. The American people must be educated to a similar sportsmanlike attitude, so that they will pay when they win, and will not growl when they lose to our Government.

May I again apologize? I am not criticising the chairman of the subcommittee, I am not criticising the Senator, or any other member of the conference. I think we should insist to the House that the utmost be done in the matter of enforcement. This little spot enforcement, 3 percent or 5 percent or 6 percent, does not do much good, because everybody figures, "Well, I can get by; I am one of the 95 or 96 or 97 percent who are not going to be checked. It is that group that must be educated, that must be checked, who must learn that they must play ball with the Government. They should, in other words, learn that they should become 100 percent American citizens. If we could collect 100 percent of the taxes in the United States of America, the reductions that have been proposed in Congress would be insignificant, and we would still have plenty of money with which to carry on the Government.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I want the Senator from Georgia to know that I was a member of the Appropriations Committee at the time the Internal Revenue Bureau was first given $30,000,000 additional to employ additional internal revenue collectors and enforcement officers. I was a member of the Appropriations Committee when that was done. I think it has worked out to the benefit of the Government. I accept the statement of the Internal Revenue Bureau that it has collected in revenue from $5 to $24, or some such sum, for every dollar expended. I do not quite share the view of the Internal Revenue Bureau that no economy could be effected in the clerical forces throughout the country. However, this is all I wanted to say, and I hoped the Senator from Kentucky would be here. I had a share in the conferences. I was one of the conferees on this bill. This was as tough a conference as I have ever attended. I think we got all that can he had. So far as I am concerned, it would not hurt my pride a particle if the Senate refused to accept the conference report and sent it back to

conference. All I would want would be to be excused from further service on the conference committee. I think we got out of this all we could get, and it was then for us to determine whether or not we wanted to make a report to the Senate on the basis of what we thought we could get.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I would say to the Senator from Kansas that it is my understanding that our conferees got everything that could be gotten.

Mr. REED. Our only choice was whether we should come back to the Senate and make a report recommending its acceptance or whether we should insist upon something more.

Mr. GEORGE. I would not oppose the conference report because we did not get what we ought to have, as I think; but I do think that it is a great mistake to deny, say, $5,000,000 or $10,000,000, on this particular item, when we have already a field force that is capable of checking only a small percentage of the total tax.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I agree entirely with the Senator from Georgia in that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I shall be glad to yield in just one moment. I should like to make one statement, Mr. President, that the Senate bill carried an amendment to the House bill requesting the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation of the two Houses to investigate the conditions in the field service, and the collection of internal revenue, as to the cost thereof, and as to the advisability of more or fewer enforcement officers.

I shall presently call up an amendment to the amendment of the Senate, made by the House, suggesting that such a report be before both Houses by the 1st of January. That will be an independent investigation into the whole problem, directed by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation as having the most experience in this field.

I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, there is one other aspect of this. I do not want to go over the question of how much we will lose by cutting down on the force, but there is another aspect that from my own knowledge seems to me exceedingly bad, a result which I think we shall pay for in other ways than in the loss of money. In my own little town, which is certainly a small town industrially speaking, and in the matter of wealth, when a few of the people who made money during the days of OPA, the very years that will be checked, have suddenly acquired the means of purchasing choice pieces of real estate throughout the town, and farms, the effect on all the other people is really bad. I know this from the way they present it to me, both in person, when I return home, as I did recently, and in letters. They have the feeling and take the attitude, "Well, if you are not going to make these people pay we will not feel deeply interested in paying." Of course, they know in a town of that size, which individuals have made money in the automobile black market and in other black markets. The people who made their money in the black market are now the most prosperous people. The people in that town expect me to see to it that those who made their money in the black market pay their taxes. I have no way of doing so. I am obliged to pass that problem on to the Internal Revenue Bureau. The collector of internal revenue has told me he would be glad to check into the matter, but he said, "Every agent we have is already assigned to cases, and I do not know when we can come to it."

That situation has existed for 6 months to a year. The reaction would naturally be, "Well, if the Government is not going to collect from those who have made their money in the black market, who have made their money illegally, certainly there is no reason why I should pay." The bankers in the little towns will tell Senators how more and more people are beginning the use of $100 bills and $1,000 bills and not keeping books on their transactions. They have seen the punishment meted out to the few who have been caught, and have seen that on the whole, the penalties which must be paid by those who are not doing the right thing are relatively small. That is inducing more and more people simply to quit legitimate business methods. I think it is injurious in that it lowers the general respect for the Government. That is not speculation. I know that to be the case. I am sure it is true in all other States.

Mr. CORDON. The Appropriations Committee cannot impose a penalty, and in this instance set up a figure which is only 10 percent, over-all, less than the total budget estimate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Would the Senator care to speculate upon the attitude of the House if the Senate, after due consideration, instructed the conferees on the part of the Senate to go back and insist upon the increase of $10,000,000?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon does not desire to indulge in any speculation. The Senator from Oregon brought to the Senate the best conference report that could have been gotten, and so far as the Senate is concerned, it is at utter liberty to do what it pleases with the report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon has spoken about a provision in the bill, placed in it by the conferees, providing for the Joint Committee on Taxation to make a study of this matter. If the joint committee makes a study of the matter, is there anything the joint committee of itself can do other than to make a report to Congress? Does the language inserted by the conferees provide for a report or provide for any action by the committee?

Mr. CORDON. No action other than the report. That report, however, could be the basis for action in a supplemental way at the beginning of the next Congress, which would be only after the lapse of 6 months of the fiscal year 1948.

Mr. HILL. That would be at least 6 months off.

Mr. CORDON. Well, if there were a 10 percent reduction, and only 50 percent of the time had elapsed, a great loss would not be suffered if a supplemental appropriation were received at the end of 6 months. However, I suggest again that what will come in that respect is speculation.

Mr. HILL. It is speculation. In other words, the Senator does not pin too much hope on that committee.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon expects that the committee will go into the matter. It has indicated that it is interested in it, and the Appropriations Committee is looking forward to a comprehensive report after a thorough investigation has been made by that committee.

Mr. HILL. I did not mean that the committee would not go into the matter. Knowing the members of the committee as I do, and how conscientious and devoted they are, I am sure the committee will go into the matter very painstakingly and very thoroughly. The difficulty that arises is that no action could be expected for six months, and even then the committee has no power to do anything of its own accord. All it could do would be to make a report in the hope that the Appropriations Committees of the two Houses might take cognizance of the report and might bring in some kind of deficiency item.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Alabama is, of course, correct in that statement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. [Putting the question.] The ayes appear to have it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and will vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is necessarily absent because of illness in his family, and is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER.]

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] is absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] are unavoidably detained on committee business.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is detained on official business at an important committee meeting.

The Senator from New York, who is absent because of illness, has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. The transfer of that pair to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] has previously been announced by the Senator from Kansas.

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 26, as follows:

YEAS—51

Ball	Dworshak	Martin
Brewster	Ecton	Millikin
Bricker	Ellender	Moore
Bridges	Ferguson	Morse
Brooks	Flanders	Reed
Buck	Gurney	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Hawkes	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Byrd	Ives	Smith
Cain	Jenner	Taft
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Thye
Capper	Kem	Vandenberg
Chavez	Langer	Watkins
Connally	Lodge	Wherry
Cooper	McCarthy	Wiley
Cordon	McKellar	Williams
Donnell	Malone	Young

NAYS—26

Barkley	Holland	Maybank
Downey	Kilgore	Myers
Eastland	Lucas	O'Conor
Fulbright	McCarran	O'Mahoney
Green	McClellan	Pepper
Hatch	McFarland	Sparkman
Hayden	McGrath	Taylor
Hill	McMahon	Thomas, Okla.
Hoey	Magnuson	

NOT VOTING—18

Aiken	O'Daniel	Tobey
Baldwin	Overton	Tydings
George	Revercomb	Umstead
Johnston, S. C.	Russell	Wagner
Knowland	Stewart	White
Murray	Thomas, Utah	Wilson

So the report was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 2436, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
June 27, 1947.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 6 to the bill (H. R. 2436) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, and concur therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 17 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: At the end of the matter inserted by said amendment, following the word "Representatives" but preceding the period, insert the following: "on or before January 3, 1948, such report to be filed with the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate if the Congress is not in session on the date of filing thereof."

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate No. 17.

The motion was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. If the Senate meets on Monday at 11 o'clock and a motion is made to proceed to the consideration of the concurrent resolution relating to Reorganization Plan No. 2, will that motion supersede all other business?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is the opinion of the Chair.

Mr. TAFT. A further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President. If at that time a motion is made to limit debate to 2½ hours, to be divided equally, instead of the 10 hours provided in the act, will such a motion be in order?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion will be in order, and will not be debatable.

Mr. TAFT. It will not be debatable, and will be decided by majority vote?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. I inquire whether that means that a motion to limit debate can be made as a part of the motion to proceed to consider the concurrent resolution, or whether it will be made later.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion to limit debate is a separate motion.

Mr. TAFT. That is my understanding. Under those circumstances—although I understand that Senators who objected to the unanimous-consent request are not particularly insisting on the objection—I understand that an order will be made to meet at 11 o'clock on Monday, thus dispensing with a Saturday session. On Monday a motion will be made to proceed to the consideration of the concurrent resolution relating to Reorganization Plan No. 2; and following that, a motion will be made to limit debate to two and a half hours, along the general line of the unanimous-consent agreement. Therefore, under the ruling of the Chair, it will not be necessary to ask further unanimous consent with relation to this particular matter.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I heard the distinguished Senator say that it was proposed to go over until Monday. It seems to me that we must have definite action either today or tomorrow on the question which we are supposed to be discussing, because, as I understand, the Second War Powers Act, and also the Export-Import Act, will expire on the 30th of June unless extended, as we have provided for in the bill.

I hope we may soon reach the point of discussing this question, and I hope we can have action on it today—if not today, tomorrow—because personally I have some pretty strong convictions as to the importance of the bill. I believe that the Committee on the Judiciary likewise has strong convictions. I should like to have the reaction of the distinguished Senator from Ohio as to what he thinks the procedure should be.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, we have already had so many protests against meeting on Saturday that we do not wish to have such a meeting unless it is necessary. If the concurrent resolution is disposed of in two and a half hours after we meet at 11 o'clock, we shall be finished with it by 2 o'clock, and we can continue on Monday afternoon, with a night session on Monday, until the bill is disposed of.

I point out to the Senator that even if the Second War Powers Act should expire, and if there should be a hiatus of a day or so, the action of the Congress would promptly restore it. We had such a case in connection with the continuation of the President's power to devalue the dollar. There was a considerable hiatus in that instance. Several other similar examples have occurred; so the hiatus is not absolutely fatal.

On the other hand, with respect to the reorganization plan, there is a final dead line. The question must be settled on Monday. It was not the intention to meet tomorrow. However, we can proceed now with the consideration of the bill, and we shall have most of Monday to devote to it. Of course, it will probably be necessary to have a conference with the House, and to wait until the conference report is received.

Mr. WILEY. Does the distinguished Senator suggest that we introduce a separate measure continuing the present status of these acts for 2 weeks, say?

Mr. TAFT. I do not think it is at all necessary. The bill is certain to be passed on Monday or Tuesday. It seems to me that the bill is certain to be passed on Monday. The only question is whether the conference report can be agreed to before Tuesday. So far as I know, the hiatus of a few hours or a day or so means nothing.

EXTENSION OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION — CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BUCK submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 135) to extend the succession, lending powers, and the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"TITLE I—AMENDMENT TO RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION ACT

"SECTION 1. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 1. There is hereby created a body corporate with the name "Reconstruction Finance Corporation" (therein called the

Corporation), with a capital stock of $325,000,000 subscribed by the United States of America. Its principal office shall be located in the District of Columbia, but there may be established agencies or branch offices in any city or cities of the United States under rules and regulations prescribed by the board of directors. This Act may be cited as the "Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act."

"'SEC. 2. The management of the Corporation shall be vested in a board of directors consisting of five persons appointed by the President of the United States by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Of the five members of the board, not more than three shall be members of any one political party and not more than one shall be appointed from any one Federal Reserve district. Each director shall devote his time principally to the business of the Corporation. The terms of the directors shall be two years but they may continue in office until their successors are appointed and qualified. Whenever a vacancy shall occur other than by expiration of term the person appointed to fill such vacancy shall hold office for the unexpired portion of the term of the director whose place he is selected to fill. The directors, except the chairman, shall receive salaries at the rate of $12,500 per annum each. The chairman of the board of directors shall receive a salary at the rate of $15,000 per annum.

"'SEC. 3. (a) The Corporation shall have succession through June 30, 1948, unless it is sooner dissolved by an Act of Congress. It shall have power to adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal; to make contracts; to lease or purchase such real estate as may be necessary for the transaction of its business, to sue and be sued, to complain and to defend, in any court of competent jurisdiction, State or Federal: *Provided*, That the Corporation shall be entitled to and granted the same immunities and exemptions from the payment of costs, charges, and fees as are granted to the United States pursuant to the provisions of law codified in sections 543, 548, 555, 557, 578, and 578a of title 28 of the United States Code, 1940 edition, to select, employ, and fix the compensation of such officers, employees, attorneys, and agents as shall be necessary for the transaction of the business of the Corporation, in accordance with laws, applicable to the Corporation, as in effect on June 30, 1947, and as thereafter amended; and to prescribe, amend, and repeal, by its board of directors, bylaws, rules, and regulations governing the manner in which its general business may be conducted. Except as may be otherwise provided in this Act or in the Government Corporation Control Act, the board of directors of the Corporation shall determine the necessity for and the character and amount of its obligations and expenditures under this Act and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, paid, and accounted for, without regard to the provisions of any other laws governing the expenditure of public funds and such determinations shall be final and conclusive upon all other officers of the Government. The Corporation shall be entitled to the use of the United States mails in the same manner as the executive departments of the Government.

"'(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the right to recover compensation granted by the Act approved September 7, 1916, as amended (5 U. S. C., sec. 751), shall be in lieu of, and shall be construed to abrogate, any and all other rights and remedies which any person, except for this provision, might, on account of injury or death of an employee, assert against the Corporation or any of its subsidiaries.

"'SEC. 4. (a) To aid in financing agriculture, commerce, and industry, to help in maintaining the economic stability of the country and to assist in promoting maximum employment and production, the Corporation, within the limitations hereinafter provided, is authorized—

"'(1) To purchase the obligations of and to make loans to any business enterprise organized or operating under the laws of any State or the United States: *Provided*, That the purchase of obligations (including equipment trust certificates) of, or the making of loans to, railroads or air carriers engaged in interstate commerce or receivers or trustees thereof, shall be with the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission or the Civil Aeronautics Board, respectively: *Provided further*, That in the case of railroads or air carriers not in receivership or trusteeship, the Commission or the Board, as the case may be, in connection with its approva of such purchases or loans, shall also certify that such railroad or air carrier, on the basis of present and prospective earnings, may be expected to meet its fixed charges without a reduction thereof through judicial reorganization except that such certificates shall not be required in the case of loans or purchases made for the acquisition of equipment or for maintenance.

"'(2) To make loans to any financial institution organized under the laws of any State or of the United States.

"'(3) In order to aid in financing projects authorized under Federal, State, or municipal law, to purchase the securities and obligations of, or make loans to, (A) municipalities and political subdivisions of States, (B) public agencies and instrumentalities of one or more States, municipalities, and political subdivisions of States, and (C) public corporations, boards, and commissions: *Provided*, That no such purchase or loan shall be made for payment of ordinary governmental or nonproject operating expenses as distinguished from purchases and loans to aid in financing specific public projects.

"'(4) To make such loans, in an aggregate amount not to exceed $25,000,000 outstanding at any one time, as it may determine to be necessary or appropriate because of floods or other catastrophes.

"'(b) No financial assistance shall be extended pursuant to paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a) of this section, unless the financial assistance applied for is not otherwise available on reasonable terms. All securities and obligations purchased and all loans made under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a) of this section shall be of such sound value or so secured as reasonably to assure retirement or repayment and such loans may be made either directly or in cooperation with banks or other lending institutions through agreements to participate or by the purchase of participations, or otherwise.

"'(c) The total amount of investments, loans, purchases, and commitments made pursuant to this section 4 shall not exceed $2,000,000,000 outstanding at any one time.

"'(d) No fee or commission shall be paid by any applicant for financial assistance under the provisions of this Act in connection with any such application, and any agreement to pay or payment of any such fee or commission shall be unlawful.

"'(e) No director, officer, attorney, agent, or employee of the Corporation in any manner, directly or indirectly, shall participate in the deliberation upon or the determination of any question affecting his personal interests, or the interests of any corporation, partnership, or association in which he is directly or indirectly interested.

"'(f) The powers granted to the Corporation by this section shall terminate at the close of business on June 30, 1948, but the termination of such powers shall not be construed (1) to prohibit disbursement of funds on purchases of securities and obligations, on loans, or on commitments or agreements to make such purchases or loans, made under this Act prior to the close of business on such date, or (2) to affect the validity or performance of any other agreement made or entered into pursuant to law.

"'(g) As used in this Act, the term "State" includes the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

"'SEC. 5. Section 5202 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the words "War Finance Corporation Act" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act".

"'SEC. 6. The Federal Reserve banks are authorized and directed to act as custodians and fiscal agents for the Corporation in the general performance of its powers conferred by this Act and the Corporation may reimburse such Federal Reserve banks for such services in such manner as may be agreed upon.

"'SEC. 7. The Corporation may issue to the Secretary of the Treasury its notes, debentures, bonds, or other such obligations in an amount outstanding at any one time sufficient to enable the Corporation to carry out its functions under this Act or any other provision of law, such obligations to mature not more than five years from their respective dates of issue, to be redeemable at the option of the Corporation before maturity in such manner as may be stipulated in such obligations. Such obligations may mature subsequent to the period of succession of the Corporation. Each such obligation shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of the obligation of the Corporation. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to purchase any obligations of the Corporation to be issued hereunder, and for such purpose the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, are extended to include any purchases of the Corporation's obligations hereunder.

"'SEC. 8. The Corporation, including its franchise, capital, reserves and surplus, and its income shall be exempt from all taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States, by any Territory, dependency, or possession thereof, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority, except that any real property of the Corporation shall be subject to special assessments for local improvements and shall be subject to State, Territorial, county, municipal, or local taxation to the same extent according to its value as other real property is taxed: *Provided*, That the special assessment and taxation of real property as authorized herein shall not include the taxation as real property of possessory interests, pipe lines, power lines, or machinery or equipment owned by the Corporation regardless of their nature, use, or manner of attachment or affixation to the land, building, or other structure upon or in which the same may be located. The exemptions provided for in the preceding sentence with respect to taxation (which shall, for all purposes, be deemed to include sales, use, storage, and purchase taxes) shall be construed to be applicable not only with respect to the Corporation but also with respect to any other public corporation which is now or which may be hereafter wholly financed and wholly managed by the Corporation. Such exemptions shall also be construed to be applicable to loans made, and personal property owned by the Corporation or such other corporations, but such exemptions shall not be construed to be applicable in any State to any buildings which are considered by the laws of such

State to be personal property for taxation purposes. Notwithstanding any other provision of law or any privilege or consent to tax expressly or impliedly granted thereby, the shares of preferred stock of national banking associations, and the shares of preferred stock, capital notes, and debentures of State banks and trust companies, acquired prior to July 1, 1947, by the Corporation, and the dividends or interest derived therefrom by the Corporation, shall not, so long as the Corporation shall continue to own the same, be subject to any taxation by the United States, by any Territory, dependency or possession thereof, or the District of Columbia, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority, whether now, heretofore, or hereafter imposed, levied, or assessed, and whether for a past, present, or future taxing period.

"'SEC. 9. In the event of termination of the powers granted to the Corporation by section 4 of this Act prior to the expiration of its succession as provided in section 3, the board of directors shall, except as otherwise herein specifically authorized, proceed to liquidate its assets and wind up its affairs. It may with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury deposit with the Treasurer of the United States as a special fund any money belonging to the Corporation or from time to time received by it in the course of liquidation, for the payment of its outstanding obligations, which fund may be drawn upon or paid out for no other purpose. Any balance remaining after the liquidation of all the Corporation's assets and after provision has been made for payment of all legal obligations shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts. Thereupon the Corporation shall be dissolved and its capital stock shall be canceled and retired.

"'SEC. 10. If at the expiration of the succession of the Corporation, its board of directors shall not have completed the liquidation of its assets and the winding up of its affairs, the duty of completing such liquidation and winding up of its affairs shall be transferred to the Secretary of the Treasury, who for such purpose shall succeed to all the powers and duties of the board of directors under this Act. In such event he may assign to any officer or officers of the United States in the Treasury Department the exercise and performance, under his general supervision and direction, of any such powers and duties. When the Secretary of the Treasury shall find that such liquidation will no longer be advantageous to the United States and that all of the Corporation's legal obligations have been provided for, he shall retire any capital stock then outstanding, pay into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts the unused balance of the moneys belonging to the Corporation, and make a final report to the Congress. Thereupon the Corporation shall be deemed to be dissolved.

"'SEC. 11. (a) Whoever makes any statement knowing it to be false, or whoever willfully overvalues any security, for the purpose of obtaining for himself or for any applicant any loan, or extension thereof by removal, deferment of action or otherwise, or the acceptance, release, or substitution of security therefor, or for the purpose of influencing in any way the action of the Corporation, or for the purpose of obtaining money, property, or anything of value, under this Act, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than two years, or both.

"'(b) Whoever (1) falsely makes, forges, or counterfeits any note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or coupon, in imitation of or purporting to be a note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or coupon, issued by the Corporation; or (2) passes, utters, or publishes, or attempts to pass, utter, or publish, any false, forged, or counterfeited note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or coupon, purporting to have been issued by the Corporation, knowing the same to be false, forged, or counterfeited; or (3) falsely alters any note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or coupon, issued or purporting to have been issued by the Corporation; or (4) passes, utters, or publishes, or attempts to pass, utter, or publish, as true any falsely altered or spurious note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or coupon, issued or purporting to have been issued by the Corporation, knowing the same to be falsely altered or spurious, or any person who willfully violates any other provision of this Act, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000, by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

"'(c) Whoever, being connected in any capacity with the Corporation, (1) embezzles, abstracts, purloins, or willfully misapplies any moneys, funds, securities, or other things of value, whether belonging to it or pledged or otherwise entrusted to it; or (2) with intent to defraud the Corporation or any other body politic or corporate, or any individual, or to deceive any officer, auditor, or examiner of the Corporation, makes any false entry in any book, report, or statement of or to the Corporation, or, without being duly authorized, draws any order or issues, puts forth, or assigns any note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or draft, bill of exchange, mortgage, judgment, or decree thereof; or (3) with intent to defraud, participates, shares, receives directly or indirectly any money, profit, property, or benefit through any transaction, loan, commission, contract, or any other act of the Corporation; or (4) gives any unauthorized information concerning any future action or plan of the Corporation which might affect the value of securities, or having such knowledge, invests or speculates, directly or indirectly, in the securities or property of any company, bank, or corporation receiving loans or other assistance from the Corporation, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

"'(d) No individual, association, partnership, or corporation shall use the words "Reconstruction Finance Corporation" or a combination of these three words, as the name or a part thereof under which he or it shall do business. Every individual, partnership, association, or corporation violating this prohibition shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not exceeding $1,000 or imprisonment not exceeding one year, or both.

"'(e) The provisions of sections 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, and 117 of the Criminal Code of the United States (U. S. C., title 18, ch. 5, secs. 202 to 207, inclusive), insofar as applicable, are extended to apply to contracts or agreements with the Corporation under this Act, which for the purposes hereof shall be held to include loans, advances, discounts, and rediscounts; extensions and renewals thereof; and acceptances, releases, and substitutions of security therefor.

"'SEC. 12. The Corporation is authorized to exercise the functions, powers, duties, and authority transferred to the Corporation by Public Law 109, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved June 30, 1945, but only with respect to programs, projects, or commitments outstanding on June 30, 1947.

"'SEC. 13. If any provision of this Act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this Act, and the applicability of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.'

"TITLE II—MISCELLANEOUS

"SEC. 201. No provision of this Act shall be construed so as to prevent the Corporation from disbursing funds on purchases of securities and obligations, on loans made, or on commitments or agreements to make such purchases or loans, or on liabilities incurred, pursuant to law prior to the effective date of this Act.

"SEC. 202. The succession of U. S. Commercial Company, a corporation created by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation pursuant to section 5d (3) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is hereby extended through June 30, 1948.

"SEC. 203. All assets and liabilities of every kind and nature, together with all documents, books of account, and records, of The RFC Mortgage Company, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Maryland, all the capital stock of which is owned and held by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, shall be transferred to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. With respect to the assets, liabilities, and records transferred, 'Reconstruction Finance Corporation' for all purposes is hereby substituted for 'The RFC Mortgage Company', and no suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against such corporation shall abate by reason of the enactment of this Act, but the court, on motion or supplemental petition filed at any time within twelve months after the date of such enactment, showing a necessity for the survival of such suit, action, or other proceeding to obtain a determination of the questions involved, may allow the same to be maintained by or against the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

"SEC. 204. The Federal Loan Agency, created by Reorganization Plan Numbered 1 pursuant to the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1939, approved April 3, 1939, is hereby abolished, and all its property and records are hereby transferred to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

"SEC. 205. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to transfer as soon as practicable after the effective date of this Act, to the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to receive, all of the stock of the Federal home-loan banks held by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cancel notes of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and sums due and unpaid upon or in connection with such notes at the time of such cancellation, in an amount equal to the par value of the stock so transferred.

"SEC. 206. Section 201 (e) of the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932, approved July 21, 1932 (47 Stat. 709), as amended, and section 84 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933, approved June 16, 1933 (48 Stat. 257), as amended, are hereby further amended by striking out the name 'Reconstruction Finance Corporation' wherever it appears in such sections and substituting therefor the name 'Farm Credit Administration'.

"The following Acts and portions of Acts are hereby repealed:

"(a) Sections 1, 201 (except subsection (e) thereof), 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, and 211 of the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932, approved July 21, 1932 (47 Stat. 709), as amended;

"(b) Section 304 of the Act approved March 9, 1933 (48 Stat. 1), as amended;

"(c) Sections 27, 36, 37, and 38 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, approved May 12, 1933 (48 Stat. 41), as amended;

"(d) Sections 5 and 19 (c) and the last two sentences of section 8 (b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, approved May 12, 1933 (48 Stat. 33), as amended;

"(e) The Act approved June 10, 1933 (48 Stat. 119), as amended;

"(f) The last sentence of section 4 (b) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, approved June 13, 1933 (48 Stat. 129), as amended;

"(g) Sections 301 and 302 of the National Industrial Recovery Act, approved June 16, 1933 (48 Stat. 195), as amended;

"(h) So much of section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1932 (48 Stat.

41), as amended, as authorizes or directs the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make funds available to the Land Bank Commissioner;

"(i) The Act approved January 20, 1934 (48 Stat. 318);

"(j) The fourth paragraph of the Emergency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1935, approved June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1056), and section 202 of the Public Works Administration Extension Act of 1937, approved June 29, 1937 (50 Stat. 357);

"(k) Sections 10, 13, 14, 15, and 16 of the Act approved June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1105), as amended;

"(l) So much of sections 4 and 602 of the National Housing Act, approved June 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 1247), as amended, as relates to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation;

"(m) The first section and sections 9, 11, and 13 of the Act approved January 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 1), as amended;

"(n) The Act approved August 24, 1935 (49 Stat., ch. 646, p. 796);

"(o) The Act approved March 20, 1936 (49 Stat. 1185);

"(p) The Act approved April 10, 1936 (49 Stat., ch. 168, p. 1191);

"(q) The first section of the Act approved January 26, 1937 (50 Stat. 5), as amended;

"(r) The Act approved February 11, 1937 (50 Stat. 19), as amended;

"(s) So much of section 32 (b) of the Farm Credit Act of 1937, approved August 19, 1937 (50 Stat. 703), as relates to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and so much of section 33 (b) of the said Act as relates to the payment of the expenses of corporations formed by the consolidation of two or more regional agricultural credit corporations;

"(t) So much of the Act approved June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1193), as relates to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation;

"(u) Section 12 of the Federal Highway Act of 1940, approved September 5, 1940 (54 Stat. 867);

"(v) Section 5 of the Act approved June 10, 1941 (55 Stat. 250);

"(w) The Act approved October 23, 1941 (55 Stat., ch. 454, p. 744);

"(x) The Act approved March 27, 1942 (56 Stat., ch. 198, p. 174);

"(y) The Act approved June 5, 1942 (56 Stat., ch. 352, p. 326); and

"(z) Sections 1 and 2 of Public Law 656, 79th Congress, approved August 7, 1946.

"SEC. 207. The liquidation of the affairs of the Smaller War Plants Corporation administered by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation pursuant to Executive Order 9665 shall be carried out by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, notwithstanding the provisions of the last paragraph of section 5 of the First War Powers Act, 1941. The Smaller War Plants Corporation is hereby abolished.

"SEC. 208. (a) The Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall have the power to purchase any surplus property for resale, subject to regulations of the War Assets Administrator or his successor, to small business when, in its judgment, such disposition is required to preserve and strengthen the competitive position of small business. The purchase of surplus property under this section shall be given priority under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, immediately following transfers to Government agencies under section 12 of such Act, as amended, and disposals to veterans under section 16 of such Act, as amended. The provisions of section 12 (c) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, shall be applicable to purchases made under this section. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall not purchase any real property for resale to small business pursuant to this section in any case where any person from whom the property had been acquired by a Government agency, gives notice in writing to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation that he intends to exercise his rights under section 23 of the Surplus Property Act, as amended.

"(b) The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is further authorized for the purpose of carrying out the objectives of this section to arrange for sales of surplus property to small business concerns on credit or time basis.

"(c) For the purposes of this section the terms 'person', 'surplus property', and 'Government agency' have the same meaning as is assigned to such terms by section 3 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended.

"SEC. 209. During the period between June 30, 1947, and the date of enactment of legislation making funds available for administrative expenses for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, the Corporation is authorized to incur, and pay out of its general funds, administrative expenses in accordance with laws in effect on June 30, 1947, such obligations and expenditures to be charged against funds when made available for administrative expenses for the fiscal year 1948.

"SEC. 210. This Act shall take effect as of midnight June 30, 1947."

And the House agree to the same.

C. D. BUCK,
HOMER E. CAPEHART,
RALPH E. FLANDERS,
BURNET R. MAYBANK,
JOHN SPARKMAN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
JOHN C. KUNKEL,
HENRY O. TALLE,
BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUCK. For what purpose?

Mr. MALONE. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 1610, Calendar No. 372. The bill has been passed by the House, and favorably reported by the Senate Committee on Public Works.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not like to object, but under the present circumstances I think I must object to any measures being taken up which do not have immediate priority.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. BUCK. I misunderstood the Senator's request, or I would not have yielded.

Senate Joint Resolution 135 as it passed the Senate simply provided for the extension for 1 year of the succession of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and of its existing lending powers and other functions. The House amendment extended the succession of the Corporation for 2 years and extended for the same period certain of the lending powers and functions of the Corporation, but eliminated many powers and functions which were felt to be no longer needed and repealed a number of statutory provisions pertaining to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The House conferees accepted the provision of the Senate joint resolution which continued the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for only 1 year, and that provision is included in the conference report. The provisions of the House amendment which reduced the functions and authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation were for the most part accepted.

As agreed to in conference, the joint resolution would for the most part terminate the war-finance activities of the Corporation, as well as authority to purchase nonassessable stocks in national banks, State banks, or trust companies, for the purpose of supplying funds for capital purposes, and the authority for blanket participation in bank loans. The power given to the Corporation, at the time its succession was extended last year, to purchase loans guaranteed or insured under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, is terminated under the conference agreement.

I want to stress this point so that everyone present may understand it. I repeat, the power given to the Corporation, at the time its succession was extended last year, to purchase loans guaranteed or insured under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, is terminated under the conference agreement.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUCK. I will yield to the Senator in just a moment.

No foreign loans would be permitted under the conference agreement, and future lending powers would be restricted to the United States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

In the future the Reconstruction Finance Corporation will be prohibited from supplying the capital of other Government agencies or forming subsidiary corporations and capitalizing them.

The conference agreement also authorizes the Corporation to make priority purchases of surplus property for resale to small business, as previously provided in the Surplus Property Act, but preserves the rights of former owners in the case of surplus real estate.

Under the conference substitute the leading authority and financial assistance of the Corporation will be limited to $2,000,000,000 on new business entered into after June 30, 1947. The Corporation in extending financial assistance must be satisfied that such assistance is not otherwise available from private lending sources on reasonable terms. In other words, the Corporation is not to be made a competitive source of credit.

Mr. President, I move that the report be agreed to.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware has called the attention of the Senate to a very important part of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Extension Act, which will terminate on Monday, when the new law is to take effect.

I want to stress to the Members of the Senate the fact that approximately a month ago, the Committee on Banking and Currency reported a simple measure, which the Senate adopted, to extend for 1 year the Reconstruction Finance Corporation as it is today, and as it has been. The House passed the measure with an amendment and sent it to conference. The Senate accepted the

House amendment. The House conferees refused to give in, as the Senator from Delaware has stated, on the question of mortgage insurance of GI mortgages, and therefore there will be no more GI mortgages.

Mr. President, I want to read a statement from General Bradley on this matter:

Reference is made to Report No. 626, Eightieth Congress, reporting favorably on H. R. 3916, Eightieth Congress, A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and to extend the succession and certain lending powers and functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and for other purposes.

Section 206 (z) of H. R. 3916 provides for the repeal of sections 1 and 2 of Public Law 656, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 7, 1946. Section 1 of this act extends the functions and succession of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation through June 30, 1947, and section 2 of said act authorizes the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to purchase loans made or insured under the provisions of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (Public Law 346, 78th Cong., approved June 22, 1944), as amended.

The effect of section 206 (z) would be to prohibit the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Mortgage Company from purchasing loans guaranteed or insured in behalf of veterans under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended. The authorization for purchase by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Mortgage Company as contained in Public Law 656, provided a secondary market for loans guaranteed or insured under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended. It is increasingly apparent that the desirability of such a market is greater now than when Public Law 656 was enacted and there is every indication that the need for such market will become more urgent as the volume of loans under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, increases.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation secondary market has been in actual operation for less than 10 months in any State and in some States for 2 or 3 months only. Many lenders have incurred considerable expense in preparation of printed forms, and so forth, in contemplation of utilizing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation market. The Government has also undergone considerable administrative expense in inaugurating the program. Many builders and operators have procured mortgage commitments on projects involving the construction of a large number of homes from lenders who proposed to utilize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation market. These builders might be left suddenly without means of financing such projects and might have to abandon the proposed constructions or delay them until other means of financing have been found. This would result in delaying construction of needed homes.

The amount of mortgages purchased to date is small as compared with the amount anticipated. I am advised informally that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation at present is making purchase commitments at the rate of $1,500,000 per day and the total commitments at present are approximately $662,877,387. The value of the secondary market, however, to the production of homes for veterans will probably never appear conclusively in the dollar amounts in sales of mortgages actually made. The value to the lenders and to the veterans who seek loans for home purchases lies in the fact that lenders are assured of a secondary market for long-term mortgage loans in the event that it becomes necessary for the lenders to attain a more liquid position.

Many small town banks and other lending institutions find that the demand for loans to enable veterans to purchase homes in their communities would require the institutions to invest more of their funds in long-term mortgages than their directors may deem advisable or than their capital may provide. Such institutions can only supply the legitimate mortgage requirements of the veterans of their communities if a secondary market is available.

Only a small percentage of all eligible veterans have as yet received the benefits of the guaranty or insurance of loans for the purchase of homes. The Veterans' Administration is advised that a substantial number of lenders, particularly in smaller cities and towns, will not have any more funds available for such loans unless they can sell some of the mortgages which they have made.

It is most desirable that any veteran in a small community, particularly, shall be able to obtain his loan from a home-town banker or other lender whom he knows and is known by.

There probably is sufficient money available in the possession of banks and other lenders in the Nation to fulfill the requirements of veterans now and in the foreseeable future. However, experience indicates that the distribution of such available funds is such that money is not to be had from established lenders in many small communities unless they are assured of ready sale of mortgages in the event of need of cash.

Mr. President, I should like to digress merely to say that everyone knows there is enough money in the United States to carry on this program, but the difficulty is that the money is concentrated in big cities in the big Federal Reserve districts. In small towns, according to General Bradley's statement, and according to the check which has been made, the money will not be available. I read further from General Bradley's statement:

The Veterans' Administration is aware that the saturation point has been reached by many lenders for long-term mortgage commitments and there are indications that many other lenders will reach that stage. Several conferences with lender groups have demonstrated that the continuation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation purchase program is not only desirable but essential if veterans' needs for financing the purchase of homes are to be met.

The foregoing statement indicates the effect which H. R. 3916, if enacted, will have on the loan program of the Veterans' Administration under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended.

Mr. President, I read that statement because the distinguished Senator from Delaware brought out the fact that this was one of the provisions that we had passed, one of the provisions to which the House conferees would not agree. I know that some people will say that there is some other way to finance the project, but in the small communities where bank capital is small and where many banks failed in the 1920's and have only limited capital, they will not be able to get the money. I just wanted the record to show that.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, these mortgages are coming in in great quantities. They are being bought at the rate of one and a half million a day. It has already been found that many mortgages have had to be foreclosed, and that will continue. It puts them in the position of having to foreclose on veterans' loans.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. BUCK. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I would say "Yes," if it had to foreclose. But the total number of mortgages in that situation, out of the total number—which may have amounted to a million and a half a day—was only nine.

Mr. BUCK. They have had only since the first of October to handle the matter.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUCK. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. As one of the conferees, as were the able Senator from South Carolina, the able Senator from Delaware, and the able Senator from Vermont, I wish to say that, as all of us know, the RFC Act will die at 12 o'clock on June 30. The matter the able Senator from South Carolina has been discussing is one as to which we tried to get the conferees on the part of the House to recede. The Senator from Indiana offered the suggestion that in the case of GI or veterans' loans, the guaranty be limited to between $100,000,000 and $150,000,000, but that it be provided that the RFC be permitted to take them with recourse, rather than without, recourse, as is done at the present time.

The conferees on the part of the House refused to recede from the position previously taken by the House. Their chief argument was that there are many mortgage companies and many banks and other institutions in the United States that are taking veterans' mortgages and are paying very little attention to the value of the property mortgaged, are taking such mortgages without any appraisals, are taking mortgages on which in many instances the veteran has paid possibly too much for the property, and are taking them without making any checks or counterchecks or without paying any attention whatsoever to the value, but they are bundling them up and are bringing them to Washington to the RFC, and are receiving 100 cents on the dollar, without recourse. The situation resulting from that procedure is that should it be necessary to repossess the home from the veteran, the Federal Government will be placed in the position of being the one to repossess the home or to take it away from the veteran.

The conferees on the part of the House argued that there is sufficient capital in the country today to handle these mortgage loans.

I mention these facts to show that the conferees on the part of the Senate did argue the point. We argued it for quite a long time. Finally it developed that the conferees on the part of the House would not recede from their position.

At the moment, we are in the position of either agreeing to this conference report or else having the RFC go out of existence at 12 o'clock midnight on June 30. Of course, none of us want that to occur.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me once more?

Mr. BUCK. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to say that the reasons just stated by the Senator are

the reasons why I signed the conference report; because if the conference report is not agreed to, there will be no RFC at all.

Again I wish to say that when it was found impossible to persuade the conferees on the part of the House to yield in regard to the provision as to loans, the Senator offered an amendment, in which I concurred, to limit the amount to a certain figure. But the conferees on the part of the House would not agree.

I cannot agree with the statement that these mortgages have been bundled up and brought to Washington. It is true that the number of mortgages has recently increased, but I think that has occurred because many people throughout the country have been fearful that just what is happening would happen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I realize how serious is the question of adoption of the conference report permitting the RFC to continue in existence. I think I should raise my voice today in regard to one of the provisions of the conference report.

When a bill providing that what is proposed by the conference report should be done, and when that bill came up on the floor of the Senate, it was objected to, and went back to the committee; but it failed to come out of the committee, after having been voted upon there.

I simply wish to say to the Senate, in regard to the conference report, that if it is adopted, the RFC will transfer certain property to the War Assets Administration. I speak with some knowledge as to that, for I am chairman of the Subcommittee on Surplus Property. Under the conference report, the RFC will turn over certain property to the War Assets Administration. In accordance with section 203 of the conference report, the RFC will be permitted to purchase any amount of surplus property in the hands of the War Assets Administration; and by adopting the conference report, we would be amending the Surplus Property Act in such a way as to give the RFC a priority after the veterans. That is exactly what will be done by the conference report, if it is adopted.

In fact, Mr. President, by adopting the conference report we shall do more than that; we shall be allowing the RFC to step in and purchase property from the War Assets Administration, and in that connection we shall be allowing the RFC to become the agent of any little businessman. I am not speaking for big business here; I am speaking for all of small business.

Here is what would be done under this conference report: We would permit the RFC to take A as a purchaser, and, against all other small business, to go to the War Assets Administration and become a special purchaser for A. B, C, D, and E and a thousand—yes, a hundred thousand—other small businessmen could not get that property at all, because the RFC would become the special agent of one particular buyer. That is what has been done in the past.

We shall have to appropriate money to supply the officials of the RFC with funds to enable them to do duplicating work—work that the War Assets Administration should be doing. I realize that the War Assets Administration has not done a job, but I cannot understand why we would enact legislation to permit the RFC to repurchase the very property it turned over to the War Assets Administration. However, that is exactly what this conference report will do.

There is only one exception as to that, namely, that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall not purchase any real property for resale to small business, pursuant to this section, in any case where any person from whom the property has been acquired by a Government agency gives notice in writing to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation that he intends to exercise his right under section 23 of the Surplus Property Act. But in every other section, under every other set of facts, we would be creating the RFC as the agent to buy property on terms that every other small businessman could not purchase the property on.

I simply cannot understand this conference report. I have never been able to understand it. Why should one purchaser, the first man to go to the RFC, obtain a priority over and above all other small business? If we are going to amend the Surplus Property Act, let us give all small business a priority and a preference, after the veterans.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish to say that I know exactly what the Senator from Michigan is discussing, because the same situation has occurred, to my knowledge, in the little town of Lordsburg, N. Mex., where there was a prison camp, with many buildings and a great deal of material. The small businessmen in that area, the ex-servicemen in that area, the school officials in that area, and the municipality in that area, were willing to negotiate for the property; but due to the fact that the RFC had a priority even as against the municipality and the school system, some agent of the RFC went to a junk dealer in El Paso and sold the whole works, without giving a chance to the small businessmen. That has actually happened.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. I understood the able Senator from Michigan to say that he does not know why this section is in the conference report. I am sure he knows why it is in it.

Mr. FERGUSON. I did not mean my statement in the way the Senator from Delaware has taken it. This provision came from the House, and that is why it is in the conference report.

Mr. BUCK. I wish to say that the Senator from Michigan was considerate enough to leave another meeting and attend the meeting of the conference committee yesterday, and he presented his point, and the conferees on the part of the Senate tried to back him up; but the best provision we could get was a compromise provision, to which the Senator from Michigan objected. It would require those who apply to present a formal application.

The reason given by the conferees on the part of the House for retaining this section was that if it is not included in the conference report, the small businessmen will not be able to purchase such properties, but, on the other hand, those with sufficient money will be able to corral all the excess material and sell it at exorbitant prices. It was felt that this was the only way of getting trucks and other things to the small businessman.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. As one of the conferees, I want to say that RFC has been exercising all the power and authority that formerly was lodged in the Smaller War Plants Corporation, which was set up by Congress to purchase and handle surplus war materials for the small businessman. With respect to the provision to which the able Senator from Michigan is objecting, I may say that the Senator from Indiana likewise objected. I believe that all the Senate conferees objected to it, or at least it was discussed at great length. It was not a thing that was passed over lightly. It was discussed pro and con. The able Senator from Michigan will remember that we knew of his objection to it, and that we requested him to appear at the conference to explain his position; which he did. The position of the House, from which they refused to recede, was that in this particular section dealing with the RFC the right to buy for small business was a continuation of the function of the Smaller War Plants Corporation that Congress saw fit to set up to assist small business; that, if it were completely eliminated from the bill at the moment, there would be no agency making any effort whatever to assist small business. That was the position of the House, from which they refused to recede. The Senate conferees argued the case, I think, as strongly as they possibly could. They did not feel that they could do any better. They felt it was a matter of taking it or leaving it. It will be remembered that the House bill called for extending the RFC for 2 years. We finally succeeded in getting the House conferees to recede, and to reduce the time to 1 year. I again want to say that, unless the conference report is accepted, we shall have no RFC at 12 o'clock on next Monday, June 30.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, if it were possible under the terms of this section to accomplish for small business what the able Senator from Indiana has stated it was the purpose of the House to accomplish, I should be backing the report and backing its adoption but that is just not the way it has worked. It has worked exactly in the opposite way. Instead of allowing small business as a whole to purchase, it allows a preference. If ever there was any section of law adopted that would allow political preferences—and I use that word advisedly, because it has been used against this

same act in the past—it is the act in question.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I agree most heartily with the able Senator from Michigan. I feel just as he does about it, but I wish to call to his attention and to the attention of other Senators the fact that the Smaller War Plants Corporation, which was created by Congress, did exactly what both the able Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Indiana are stating as the ground of their objection. Therefore, there is nothing new that is being added by this particular legislation. The Smaller War Plants Corporation was established by the Congress to purchase specifically war surplus for individual small businessmen of the Nation. I personally feel that a mistake was made. I do not feel that it has worked to the best interests of the small businessman, to the best interests of the public, or to the best interests of the Government. The mistake, if one was made, was in the wording of the Smaller War Plants Corporation Act.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I merely want to reply in respect to what happened in the Smaller War Plants Corporation. That was established at a time when this country was at war. We were fighting with our backs to the wall.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. Not at the moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. It was felt that for the purpose of keeping all our industry busy—which included the supplying of arms and ammunition—that it was necessary for us to prefer small business and to take upon ourselves the right to give certain contracts to small business, and to give them supplies and machinery with which to carry out such contracts.

Mr. President, the War Investigating Committee has before it now scandals upon that same premise. I could cite one case in which there was a purchase of boats that could have been obtained from small business at $60 each. The Smaller War Plants Corporation compelled a contract price in excess of $100, under the claim that it was for war purposes. Yes; we used this provision during the war, but there is no reason now why we should set up a political preference. That is what it amounts to; because it is the man who can get to the RFC and have his case pleaded by the RFC, who obtains the surplus property, in preference to all other small business. If we make this a priority for small business, let us make it for all small business, and let us say to the War Assets Administration, "You shall give, after veterans, a priority to all small business," and let us keep this surplus away from big business. But let us not select one small business as against all other small business, and give them a political preference.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I may be wrong in the statement I am about to make, and if I am, I wish the able Senator would correct me. I feel quite certain that the Smaller War Plants Corporation, for many, many months after the war ended, was authorized by Congress, or by Executive order, to deal in surplus property and to purchase it for resale to small business. While I realize it was a war measure, I am certain it was continued until not many months ago, at which time, by Executive order, the Smaller War Plants Corporation was discontinued, and its functions and duties and authority were transferred to RFC; and that, for the past 2 years or so, the Smaller War Plants Corporation was making deals, buying and selling to small business.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I agree with what the Senator from Michigan has said, so far as profits are concerned, because I have witnessed it on many occasions. But I must as a member of the conference committee differ somewhat with the distinguished Senator from Michigan in his thoughts about political preference. I do not think that that is correct, for the reason that the House Members, as the Senator from Indiana and the Senator from Delaware have so ably stated, Republicans and Democrats, refused to budge in any way, even on the matter of amendments that were suggested. Frankly, I believe there was personal preference, but I do not believe there was political preference.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I did not say that there was only one political party that could be favored under this measure. I am talking about political favoritism. All the men who work in the RFC are not Democrats, as I understand, I say that this gives them the right, and that they exercise it for political reasons.

Mr. President, in reply to the able Senator from Indiana, it is true that as long as the Smaller War Plants Corporation continued, it exercised this power, but as soon as the Smaller War Plants Corporation ceased, RFC taking all the power that that corporation had ever been able to take, continued the very power, and the only reason they stopped exercising it was that the General Accounting Office would not approve any contracts made by the RFC for the purchase of the property. I know that if the bill passes, a burden will be placed upon the Surplus Property Committee of the House and also upon the Surplus Property Committee of the Senate, because those committees will have to continue investigating, in order that they may keep the administration of the act within reasonable bounds. But I say today that the proper thing for the Senate to do is to give all small business a priority, and let all small business compete and purchase on equal terms the surplus property in the hands of the United States Government, and not give preference to one small business over and above all other small businesses.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. In view of the fact that there is now a measure before the Senate requesting money to carry on a study of the past transactions of the RFC, does the Senator think that the committee could watch over further transactions for 1 year?

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not want to make this as a threat, but rather as a promise, that so far as the Surplus Property Committee of the Senate is concerned, if the measure is passed it will feel that one of its responsibilities will be to watch the operations of this particular section.

Mr. BUCK. Would that serve as a watch dog in this case?

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not want to say that it would be sufficient, because it is impossible to watch all the sales.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. [Putting the question.]

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President——

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho was seeking recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho was not heard until the question had been put.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, that is all right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair apologizes to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, it is more than a matter of an apology.

Mr. CAPEHART. As one of the conferees on the pending measure, I move that the Senator from Idaho may proceed if he desires.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to point out that if the Senator from Idaho says he was addressing the Chair he is entitled to recognition.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I was addressing the Chair before the vote was put, but it really is not material whether I speak before or after the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did not intentionally ignore the Senator. If the Senator wishes to proceed, the Chair will recognize him.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I wish to say that in the opinion of the Senator from Idaho, if it were the objective of the majority of the Senate to reward racketeers and black marketeers and profiteers and the greedy in general, they could not have done it better if they had set out to do it deliberately than has been accomplished by the legislation which has been passed by the Senate in recent weeks. The so-called rent-control bill was passed by the Senate a while back, and I want to comment on it for a moment. I do not intend to delay the Senate unduly, but I have been trying to secure the floor for several hours.

It has come to my attention that in New Jersey, the home State of the senior Senator [Mr. HAWKES], who sponsored the so-called voluntary 15 percent increase amendment, the practice is widespread of landlords going to their tenants now, before the bill has been acted upon by the President, or by the Congress finally one way or the other, and insisting that the tenants sign up for a 15 per-

cent increase in their rent. I have it from a very reliable source that the practice is widespread. The editor of one newspaper in Newark has had the proposition put up to him that he had better sign.

Mr. President, the rent control bill is no rent control bill. Rent control is dead, literally and factually. I sincerely hope the President will veto the bill. If the Congress is interested in maintaining any semblance of rent control then let us be honest about it and vote a real rent control bill and give the authorities money to enforce it. But the landlords see the handwriting on the wall—that there is no disposition on the part of the Congress to have really effective rent control. The whole bill is designed to scuttle rent control by indirection, as was the purpose and the accomplished purpose of the OPA extension voted here last year.

Let not the people be deceived by this so-called rent control bill. The landlords are not deceived. They are behaving just as if they had permission now to insert a 15 percent rent increase. They will nail up doors between different rooms, thereby increasing their accommodations, and they are thus out from under rent control. It is going to be a sordid business, and I hope that my party at least will not be a party to this farce.

As I said the other day, let us end rent control now honestly if we intend to, and let the tenants fight it out now in the warm weather while they can sleep out in barracks, instead of next winter when it is cold, and it will be very difficult for people who are caught in this squeeze to fight back. They will have to accede then to any demands that are made upon them. During the summer they can get tents to live in, and will have a better chance to resist unreasonable and extortionate demands than they will next winter.

I want to say further that the legislation we are about to vote on is of the same pattern. The old cry goes up here, "If you do not do this you will have nothing." Ver. well, Mr. President, I say then let us have nothing. I am tired of this business of being caught at the last moment with the statement that some law is better than no law and having it put up to us, "'Well, you will either take this or you will get nothing." I would rather have nothing than something worse than nothing. So I am going to vote against the conference report as I voted against the conference report on the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill awhile ago under which $24 was lost for every dollar that was saved. What kind of business is that, Mr. President? The report before us would cut out loans to GI's and would make it impossible any more for the RFC to make loans to our mining interests out West.

Yes; the Senate conferees acceded to almost everything in conference, but secured one concession, the concession being to extend the RFC for only 1 year instead of 2 years. That is some concession, I must say. Most Democrats would rather have had the House provision extending the RFC for 2 years. So it was a concession really that the House was very happy to have.

Mr. President, I am going to vote against the report. I am going to vote against all measures that come here which give us something worse than nothing, and ask us to accept it on the plea that we either take it or nothing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question before the Senate is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, yesterday House bill 775 was passed in the House. The bill passed by the House provided for the establishment of a commission on organization of the executive branch of the Government. The purpose of the bill is that a study shall be made by the commission on the organization of the executive branch. The House bill is identical with Senate bill 164 which is on the calendar, Calendar No. 351, which was endorsed unanimously by the subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and which was reported unanimously by the full Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments on June 14, 1947.

House bill 775 was passed by the House yesterday unanimously. It is a nonpartisan measure. The legislation has been explained thoroughly on the floor and in committee, and I ask that it be taken from the desk at this time, favorably acted upon, and that Senate bill 164 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be reported by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 775) for the establishment of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LANGER. I object to it at this time. I have not read it and do not know anything about it. I do not want to vote for something about which I do not know anything.

Mr. LODGE. Will the Senator withhold his objection for a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from North Dakota withhold his objection temporarily?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. There is a complete report on the bill in the file of calendar bills. It is a bill which was unanimously reported out of the committees in both branches of Congress. In fact, yesterday the acting minority leader in the House made a long speech in support of the bill. We have had complete hearings on the Senate bill. A long explanation was made of it on the floor. If the Senator would withhold his objection, I do not think he would ever regret it, and I shall certainly appreciate it.

Mr. LANGER. I object with the greatest regret. I simply do not know anything about this matter.

Mr. LODGE. The bill simply provides for a nonpartisan commission to study the matter of duplication and overlapping, and to report back in January 1949. That is all there is to it. It simply provides for a study to be made.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator give me a few minutes to look over the bill, just enough time to glance at it? What is the number of the bill?

Mr. LODGE. The Senate bill is S. 164, Calendar No. 351.

Mr. LODGE subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to recur to the request I made a moment ago regarding House bill 775. This bill passed the House unanimously yesterday. It is identical with Senate bill 164, which was reported unanimously by the Committee on Expenditures sometime ago. It is a nonpartisan measure which has received a unanimous report wherever it has been. It simply calls for a study and a report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request for the present consideration of House bill 775?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to call attention to the declaration of policy:

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to promote economy, efficiency, and improved service in the transaction of the public business in the departments, bureaus, agencies, boards, commissions, offices, independent establishments, and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Government by—

(1) limiting expenditures to the lowest amount consisting with the efficient performance of essential services, activities, and functions;

(2) eliminating duplication and overlapping of services, activities, and functions;

(3) consolidating services, activities, and functions of a similar nature;

(4) abolishing services, activities, and functions not necessary to the efficient conduct of Government; and

(5) defining and limiting executive functions, services, and activities.

As I view this bill, it will deal directly with Federal employees. For example, when this Commission meets for the purpose of considering overlapping services, no Member of the Senate or, so far as I know, no Member of the House Committee on the Civil Service will be present to protect the interests of the civil-service employees, the men and women who compose the overwhelming number of Government employees.

I think the object of the bill is a very good one. I have been assured by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts that there is no idea at all of taking away any of the powers or duties that are given to the Senate Civil Service Committee or the House Civil Service Committee by the La Follette-Monroney Act. Of course, I know that upon this floor we cannot make any deal of any kind or character. I know, too, of course, that the Senator is most sincere. But I should be glad to be assured by him that, for example, following the passage of this bill, the distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate, who will appoint the two members of the commission from the Senate—members who must be of opposite political faiths—will appoint, for example, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico

[Mr. CHAVEZ], who formerly was chairman of the Civil Service Committee, and who is perhaps one of the best informed men on the civil service, certainly in the Senate, if not among all the Members of the House and Senate combined. He has a big heart, and he is sympathetic to the Federal civil-service employees.

I can only say that during the brief time I have been chairman of the Civil Service Committee, time and time and time again I have been horrified at the callousness with which some of the poor civil-service employees have been treated. For example, after the Government persuaded thousands and thousands of girls to come to Washington, to work for the Government during the war—and in some cases the Government paid their transportation expenses—now, when it is found that they are no longer needed, they are suddenly told, "We do not need you any more, so you are discharged; you are separated. Get home the best way you can."

I know of instances of the rankest sort of discrimination because of race, color, or creed.

I wish to say that if there is some sort of understanding with the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts that a man such as the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] who is known for his sympathy with people of any color, race, or creed, is to be appointed to the Commission, I shall have no objection at all to the passage of this bill.

I may add that there are several other Republican members of the committee, but unfortunately all of them are now tied up with other work.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, let me say that I appreciate the point the Senator from North Dakota has raised, and I think it very thoughtful of him to do so. I shall be glad to give him assurance, here and now, that there is nothing in the bill, either in the words or in any hidden meaning, which in any way reaches into the matter of the Civil Service or the functions of the Civil Service Committee. I am glad to have that statement of mine on the record for future reference.

Insofar as it lies within my power, I shall express the hope to the President pro tempore that the Senators who are appointed to this Commission are Senators who have the sympathy and the fierce opposition to any form of discrimination that characterize the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, would the Senator from Massachusetts join with me in asking for the appointment of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]?

Mr. LODGE. I should be glad to see the Senator from New Mexico appointed. I think he is a splendid Senator.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I withdraw any objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill coming over from the House of Representatives.

The bill (H. R. 775) for the establishment of a Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request for the present consideration of House bill 775?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 164 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 164 is indefinitely postponed.

CONTINUATION OF CERTAIN POWERS OF THE PRESIDENT UNDER TITLE III OF THE SECOND WAR POWERS ACT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the unfinished business is Senate bill 1461. The bill pertains to the extension of certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act and under the Export-Import Control Act. It is very apparent to me that we cannot pass the bill quickly. There are a number of Senators who have some minor amendments they wish to offer to it. Apparently the leadership of the majority does not want the Senate to be in session tomorrow.

Therefore, Mr. President, because of the serious situation which a hiatus would create, I shall ask for consideration of a joint resolution which I shall presently introduce. Let me say to the Senate that the situation is indeed a serious one. On the west coast there are ships ready to sail to Russia, and if, on June 30, we do not have this export legislation passed, those ships will sail. As the law now is they are controlled. If Congress should permit a hiatus to exist it would be gambling with respect to many things that would upset the market and create a situation which would be dangerous to our economy.

All I am asking is immediate consideration of a joint resolution to extend these statutes until July 15. I promise that at the earliest convenience I shall insist that we take up and dispose of this problem, as we had intended to do in Senate bill 1461.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the joint resolution introduced by the Senator from Wisconsin will be received. The joint resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 139) to continue for a temporary period of 15 days certain controls now exercised by the President under the Second War Powers Act, 1942, and under the Export Control Act, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 1501 of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended, is amended by striking out "June 30, 1947" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 15, 1947"; and section 6 (d) of the act entitled "An act to expedite the strengthening of the national defense," approved July 2, 1940, as amended, is amended by striking out "June 30, 1947," and inserting in lieu thereof "July 15, 1947."

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask the Senator from Wisconsin if the joint resolution simply proposes to extend the same powers for 2 weeks so as to give the Congress that much more time in which to act upon the bill which was made the unfinished business a while ago, and upon which the Senator hoped to obtain action today. Is that correct?

Mr. WILEY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. So the only thing proposed by the joint resolution is to give the Congress a couple of weeks more in which to deliberate on the extension provided in the bill which is the unfinished business, because if there is as much as a day's hiatus between midnight next Monday and the time when we enact the pending legislation, great harm may result.

Mr. WILEY. Let me say to the distintinguished Senator that if we do not pass the joint resolution it is very plain that we shall not be able to obtain action. If the Senate takes a recess until Monday and we then pass the pending bill, the House will want a conference. Let us pass the joint resolution and send it to the House so that it will be on hand Monday morning. Then we shall be able to get the 2 weeks' extension. In the meantime I hope we shall find time to consider the very important measure which is the unfinished business.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. The only reason why I rise is to make clear that since yesterday members of the Committee on the Judiciary have been ready to proceed with the consideration of the pending bill. I do not agree with the statement which was made earlier in the afternoon, that a hiatus of a day or two would not result in any harm. I think it would. I think we made a mistake in not planning to meet tomorrow and pass the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution introduced by the Senator from Wisconsin?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INTERNATIONAL REFUGEE ORGANIZATION

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate Joint Resolution 77, the International Refugee Organization measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 77) providing for membership and participation by the United States in the International Refugee Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the President is hereby authorized to accept membership for the United States in

the International Refugee Organization (hereinafter referred to as the "Organization"), the constitution of which was approved in New York on December 15, 1946, by the General Assembly of the United Nations, and deposited in the archives of the United Nations: *Provided, however*, That this authority is granted and the approval of the Congress of the acceptance of membership of the United States in the International Refugee Organization is given upon condition and with the reservation that no agreement shall be concluded on behalf of the United States and no action shall be taken by any officer, agency, or any other person and acceptance of the constitution of the Organization by or on behalf of the Government of the United States shall not constitute or authorize action (1) whereby any person shall be admitted to or settled or resettled in the United States or any of its Territories or possessions without prior approval thereof by the Congress, and this joint resolution shall not be construed as such prior approval, or (2) which will have the effect of abrogating, suspending, modifying, adding to, or superseding any of the immigration laws or any other laws of the United States.

SEC. 2. The President shall designate from time to time a representative of the United States and not to exceed two alternates to attend a specified session or specified sessions of the general council of the Organization. Whenever the United States is elected to membership on the executive committee, the President shall designate from time to time, either from among the aforesaid representative and alternates or otherwise, a representative of the United States and not to exceed one alternate to attend sessions of the executive committee. Such representative or representatives shall each be entitled to receive compensation at a rate not to exceed $12,000 per annum, and any such alternate shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate not to exceed $10,000 per annum, for such period or periods as the President may specify, except that no Member of the Senate or House of Representatives or officer of the United States who is designated as such a representative shall be entitled to receive such compensation.

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually to the Department of State—

(a) such sums, not to exceed $73,325,000 for the fiscal year beginning June 30, 1947, as may be necessary for the payment of United States contributions to the Organization (consisting of supplies, services, or funds and all necessary expenses related thereto) as determined in accordance with article 10 of the constitution of the Organization; and

(b) such sums, not to exceed $175,000 for the fiscal year beginning June 30, 1947, as may be necessary for the payment of—

(1) salaries of the representative or representatives and alternates provided for in section 2 hereof, and appropriate staff, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; and

(2) such other expenses as the Secretary of State deems necessary to participation by the United States in the activities of the Organization: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 7 of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, and regulations thereunder, applicable to expenses incurred pursuant to that act shall be applicable to any expenses incurred pursuant to this paragraph (b) (2).

SEC 4. (a) Sums from the appropriations made pursuant to paragraph (a) of section 3 may be transferred to any department, agency, or independent establishment of the Government to carry out the purposes of such paragraph, and such sums shall be available for obligation and expenditure in accordance with the laws governing obligations and expenditures of the department, agency, independent establishment, or organizational unit thereof concerned, and without regard to section 3709 and 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 41, sec. 5, and title 31, sec. 529).

(b) Upon request of the Organization, any department, agency, or independent establishment of the Government (upon receipt of advancements or reimbursements for the cost and necessary expenses) may furnish supplies, or if advancements are made may procure and furnish supplies, and may furnish or procure and furnish services, to the Organization: *Provided*, That such additional civilian employees in the United States as may be required by any such department, agency, or independent establishment for the procurement or furnishing of supplies or services under this subsection, and for the services of whom such department, agency, or independent establishment is compensated by advancements or reimbursements made by the Organization, shall not be counted as civilian employees within the meaning of section 607 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended by section 14 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946. When reimbursement is made it shall be credited, at the option of the department, agency, or independent establishment concerned, either to the appropriation, fund, or account utilized in incurring the obligation, or to an appropriate appropriation fund, or account which is current at the time of such reimbursement.

SEC. 5. During the interim period, if any, between July 1, 1947, and the coming into force of the constitution of the Organization, the Secretary of State is authorized from appropriations made pursuant to paragraph (a) of section 3, to make advance contributions to the Preparatory Commission for the International Refugee Organization, established pursuant to an agreement dated December 15, 1946, between the governments signatory to the constitution of the Organization, at a rate of not to exceed one-twelfth per month of the United States contribution to the Organization contemplated by paragraph (a) of section 3 hereof. Such advance contributions to the said Preparatory Commission shall be deducted from the said contribution to the Organization for the first fiscal year as provided in paragraph 6 of the said agreement. The provisions of paragraphs (a) and (b) of section 4 of this joint resolution shall be applicable, respectively, to such advance contributions and to the procurement and furnishing of supplies and services to the said Preparatory Commission.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the Senate will recall the passage of the International Refugee Organization resolution about 90 days ago. The only controversy in the Senate was over the anxiety to be sure that the IRO resolution did not in any degree let down our immigration bars. It will be remembered that the able Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] were particularly anxious upon that score. In passing the Senate joint resolution the House has taken every word, precisely as the Senate passed it, in respect to the immigration phase. The only amendments made by the House are slightly to reduce the amount of money involved, and to recognize the fact that an interim commission must be permitted to proceed with the administration of the problem, inasmuch as the time expires on June 30 so far as existing arrangements are concerned.

I have canvassed the entire Foreign Relations Committee. It is the consensus of the committee unanimously that it is unnecessary to send the joint resolution to conference. Since it is highly desirable that the legislation be completed before June 30, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG].

The motion was agreed to.

SUSPENSION OF ANNUAL ASSESSMENT WORK ON CERTAIN ALASKAN MINING CLAIMS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BUTLER submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2369) providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the Territory of Alaska, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment.

HUGH BUTLER,
GUY CORDON,
CARL A. HATCH,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

RICHARD J. WELCH,
F. L. CRAWFORD,
ANDREW L. SOMERS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report.

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION TO THE SECRETARY TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE, ETC.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I submit an order, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will read the proposed order.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That during the recess of the Senate following today the Secretary be authorized to receive messages from the House and that the President pro tempore be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills or joint resolutions.

Mr. WHITE. I may say it is just the ordinary order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CONTINUATION OF CERTAIN APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, as Members of the Senate realize, the appropriation bills for the new fiscal year, which begins on Tuesday morning next, are delayed. Some of the bills have not yet come over from the House. Some are in conference. Some have been passed, and some have just come over and are in the process of hearing.

In years past when a similar condition has existed, we have passed what has

been called a continuing resolution. I have had one prepared by the Bureau of the Budget and the General Accounting Office, in which the legislative staff of the Senate has cooperated. It is similar to measures adopted in the past.

I therefore ask unanimous consent to introduce a joint resolution continuing certain appropriations, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

I may say that if the suggested action is not taken, continuing payments such as veterans' benefits, which are paid every day, day after day, will lapse. I think this is the simple way to handle the situation. I have conferred with at least five of the minority members of the Appropriations Committee, who are present in the Chamber, and they all concur.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Hampshire?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 140) to temporarily make available certain appropriations for the fiscal year 1948 introduced by Mr. BRIDGES, was received, read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there are hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of certain revenues, receipts and funds, respectively, such sums as may be necessary to liquidate the obligations incurred under authority of section 102 of the Second Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947, for the several activities named and appropriated for the appropriation acts, including any supplemental appropriation act, for the fiscal year 1948. Sums appropriated hereunder shall be deducted from the amounts respectively appropriated for such activities for the fiscal year 1948: *Provided*, That in the event there is pending in Congress on June 30, 1947, any provision involving change in jurisdiction over or method of financing of any activity, such activity shall be carried on in the same manner as provided in the applicable appropriation act for the fiscal year 1947 until such time as there shall have been enacted into law the final determination of such jurisdiction and financing.

SEC. 2. There are hereby also similarly appropriated such sums as may be necessary to defray during the month of July 1947 the expenses (1) of any activity for which funds were provided by Congress for 1947 and for which an estimate for the fiscal year 1948 was submitted by the President to the Congress but for which no provision for an appropriation is contained in any bill pending in Congress on June 30, 1947 (whether or not an appropriation is made for such activity for the fiscal year 1948), such expenses not to exceed one-twelfth of the amount of said estimate; or (2) of any activity for which a provision for appropriation is contained in a bill pending in Congress on June 30, 1947, but for which Congress fails to make an appropriation for the fiscal year 1948, such expenses not to exceed one-twelfth of the amount for such activity contained in the bill as pending on June 30, 1947: *Provided*, That the availability of the appropriations for obligation under (1) shall cease with respect to any activity on the date both Houses shall have acted and failed to make an appropriation for such activity, and under (2) shall cease on the date of the enactment of the act in which the appropriation for the activity would, if made, have been contained: *Provided further*, That such expenses may exceed one-twelfth of the amount of the estimate under (1), or one-twelfth of the amount in the bill under (2), in case of emergencies, seasonal operations, or operations incident to the liquidation of an activity, in such amount as may be determined by the Bureau of the Budget.

SEC. 3. This act may be cited as the "Temporary Appropriation Act of 1948."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, is the joint resolution based upon the current appropriations for the fiscal year 1947?

Mr. BRIDGES. It is based upon the current appropriations for 1947. They are to be continued, and expenditures in the interim, until the regular appropriation bills are passed, are to be deducted from the 1948 appropriations.

If a certain agency is to be discontinued as the result of the appropriations act of 1948, it will still continue up to the time the particular appropriation bill is passed. In other words, if we provide no money for a certain agency, and it is automatically to pass out of existence, it will continue in operation. There are one or two such instances. It will continue until the appropriation bill is passed and signed by the President, when it will automatically have to stop. However, under the terms of the joint resolution, everything will continue.

Mr. BARKLEY. So it will continue to breathe for a few days more, until the regular appropriations are made available.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LABOR SITUATION IN MARITIME INDUSTRY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to make a very few comments.

I have before me a large advertisement which appeared in this morning's New York Times presenting the views of the Bethlehem Steel Co. in regard to the labor controversy being a lock-out or a strike. I suspect, Mr. President, that it is a little bit of both. Of course, it is a very disconcerting stoppage of work. It involves an industry which is of great concern to us on the west coast, as well as those on the east coast, although as of now the stoppage has been limited to the east coast.

In this Bethlehem Steel Corp.'s advertisement there is a very interesting paragraph setting forth its attitude on an agreement which that company, along with other shipbuilding companies, has negotiated on the west coast recently in the port of San Francisco and the north. Of course, the workers on the east coast are seeking a contract at least as favorable as the companies saw fit to negotiate on the west coast. There is a very interesting paragraph in this advertisement regarding that west coast contract. The Bethlehem Steel Corp. says, through its advertisement:

> The union comment on the wage increase on the west coast calls attention to the excessive wage costs which have handicapped west coast shipyards in the past and will have serious effects on their ability to obtain business. The recent wage increase repeats the situation which existed there prior to the war when the higher wage rates obtaining in west coast shipyards kept the yards virtually empty. While Bethlehem has to meet the going rates in the San Francisco area, for such business as is available, it still feels that the situation there is unsound and detrimental to future business.
>
> Such a situation should not be repeated on the east coast.

In other words, the Bethlehem Steel Corp. is making clear, through this advertisement, that it proposes to fight for one wage scale on the west coast and a lower wage scale on the east coast. Again, Mr. President, we have the old play of trying to pull down wages in this country by adopting discriminatory practices within the industry on the east coast to the detriment of the workers and to the individual detriment, of course, of the workers on the west coast as well.

We have recently passed the Taft-Hartley bill, which has some very interesting provisions in it. I can think of few industries in the country, with the exception of coal and industries of that nature, as to which there is presented a more important need for giving this bill an opportunity to operate than in connection with the shipbuilding industry. That industry is vital to our merchant marine. It is vital to the defense of the country. It is vital to the whole question of world peace. If this is a beginning of a drive for a pulling down of the wages for the workers in this country, with a resulting lower standard of living for workers, I think we should step in immediately through whatever provisions of the act we may be able to accomplish any good, because it is not only a strike, Mr. President; it is also, as I have evidenced by the advertisement of the company, a determined effort on the part of both groups in this fight to fight it out.

I conferred with the president of the union, Mr. John Green, because he is one labor leader in this country who has impressed me most favorably. During the war he appeared before the War Labor Board in a great many cases, and I always found him a very reasonable and fair leader of labor, perfectly willing to negotiate on a fair and reasonable basis. For the life of me I could not see why the Bethlehem Steel Co. and the other shipbuilding concerns involved in this dispute, together with Mr. Green and his associates in the shipbuilding union, could not sit down around the collective bargaining table and negotiate a settlement of this dispute. After I listened to Mr. Green's account and took some notes on my conversation with him, I had a little better understanding, Mr. President, as to why he was having the difficulty he is having in carrying on good-faith collective bargaining with the shipbuilding concerns on the east coast. On the basis of such notes as I made of that conference with Mr. Green I want to make the following comment.

Again and again, since January of 1947, the Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America has called to the attention of the Government of the United States, the action of the employers, in the shipbuilding and ship-repair industry, abrogating their tripartite zone standards agreements. These tripartite zone agreements have been consented to by the Government of the United States—the United States Navy Department, the United States War Department, the United States Department of Labor, the United States Maritime Commission—management and labor.

Under the procedures set forth by these tripartite agreements, annual wage reviews were to be conducted in a manner to be determined by the Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee. Since August of 1946, shipbuilding and ship-repair management have refused to allow a quorum to sit upon the Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee, thus making the holding of the meetings of the committee impossible and the wage reviews inoperative.

In other words, the employers just do not wish to be at the meetings; they "take a walk," Mr. President.

The Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee has repeatedly ruled that the zone standards agreements and the obligations assumed thereunder are tripartite obligations which cannot be dissolved unilaterally by any single party to those agreements. Before such agreements can be terminated, all of the obligations under the agreements must be fulfilled.

Therefore, because of the action of management in this industry, labor has been locked out, by management, of any possibility of obtaining contractually under the terms of the tripartite zone standards its just and due wage reviews.

At the same time that management unilaterally abrogated the zone standards agreements, the same management negotiated for the northern Pacific coast—San Francisco and north—master collective bargaining agreements, also involving the question of wages, which allowed a 13-cent increase for ship-repair workers and a 13- to 15-cent increase for ship construction workers. At the same time that these managements—and here I have specific reference to the Bethlehem Steel Corp. and the Todd Shipyards Corp.—were willing to negotiate master contracts for the northern Pacific coast, they were refusing negotiation for any master contract for the Atlantic coast, but on the contrary on the Atlantic coast, were insisting on individual negotiation.

At the same time that management on the northern Pacific coast—again, the same management—was granting an increase in wages, it was refusing an increase in wages either through the peaceful adjustment provisions, under the conduct by the Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee of the wage reviews, or through individual collective bargaining on the Atlantic coast.

Management was following diametrically opposed policies on the Atlantic coast as compared with the policies followed on the Pacific coast.

The Congress of the United States has just passed a bill which in its opinion was meant to equalize responsibility as between management and labor.

Here we have a situation where it is alleged by a responsible union that the management of an industry is engaged in a conspiracy to abrogate an agreement to which it assented, by and between itself and the Government of the United States. We cannot allow this action to be taken certainly with impunity and certainly without criticism.

The Government of the United States has proven impotent to maintain or enforce these agreements to which it is a party. Even after a resolution of the four Government agencies signatory to the agreements, as to the policies which would be followed by them in the conduct of the annual wage review on March 13, 1947, management still refused to have a quorum present at the Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee meeting, and management still refused to carry out its just responsibilities.

The labor representatives in this industry allege that they have been forced to use their full economic strength. They claim that they could not do otherwise when they found clear evidence of a conspiracy on the part of management to evade its responsibilities, while at the same time mangement was attempting collectively to obtain the same sort of agreements on the entire Atlantic Coast but outside of the zone standards agreement.

The union which is at present striking against the Bethlehem Steel Corp. is not a subversive union. On the contrary, many of us in the Congress have commended this union—the Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America—for its fine patriotic presentation on the necessity for preserving our merchant marine and the industry in which it is engaged; for its magnificent war contributions; for its unsullied strike record during the war and during the time management was living up to its duly-contracted obligations; and for its forward-looking program for the preservation of the defense of the United States.

This is not an industry in which a break-down in labor relations can be afforded. This is an industry vital to the defense of this country, and management in this industry should not be allowed to violate its obligations under the zone agreements. I urge that all of the machinery of the Taft-Hartley bill be tried out in this case as an early test of the law.

I should like to see what can be done under the Taft-Hartley bill in regard to the alleged violation of the contract on the part of the employers involved in this situation.

I want to say, in closing, that I am inclined to think that an investigation under the machinery of the Taft-Hartley bill, if it can accomplish any good at all, will certainly make perfectly clear that this advertisement of the Bethlehem Steel Co. simply will not hold water once its tenets are investigated.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a statement issued by the Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, entitled "The Story of Shipbuilding Stabilization—a Tripartite Agreement."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STORY OF SHIPBUILDING STABILIZATION—A TRIPARTITE AGREEMENT

I. EARLY HISTORY

On November 27, 1940, Mr. Sidney Hillman, at that time Commissioner in charge of the Labor Division of the National Defense Advisory Commission (subsequently appointed Associate Director General of the Office of Production Management), announced the creation of the Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee, composed of representatives of labor, the shipbuilding industry, the United States Navy, the United States Maritime Commission, and the OPM.

At the time the committee was organized, labor shortages were already occurring in certain shipbuilding occupations. This was especially true of ship carpenters, loftsmen and shipfitters, while there was also an inadequate supply of marine architects, shop electricians, marine gas-engine machinists and template makers. A 500-percent increase of the total number of workers in the industry was expected by September 1942, according to the estimates of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Experience during the First World War had proven how exceedingly grave were the problems created by an even lesser expansion in the shipbuilding industry. Strikes had occurred in the summer and fall of 1917 with the country already at war. Practically the entire shipbuilding program on the Pacific coast was disrupted. The system of competitive bidding was leading on the one hand to a spiraling of wages and pyramiding of costs to the Government, and on the other to futile movement of men from yard to yard and city to city.

In the fall of 1940 there existed an extreme lack of wage uniformity. Skilled burners and welders along the Atlantic coast were being paid as much as $1.267 and as little as $0.621. This was leading to unnecessary migration of labor and adversely affecting production.

The committee was established, as stated by Mr. Hillman, to explore ways and means of stabilizing employment in the country's shipyards, in order to insure the most efficient and speedy construction of ships for defense. It was generally understood that the committee would undertake a detailed investigation of wage rates and working conditions, with particular emphasis upon the migration of workers from yard to yard, and its effect upon production. At the time the shipbuilding stabilization committee was appointed, it was suggested that if the stabilization plan worked out satisfactorily it might later be applied to aircraft construction. Stabilization was acceptable to all three interested groups. Labor favored it because such a system was akin to its desire for uniformity of pay for equivalent jobs. The industry saw in stabilization an opportunity to remove one item of competition normally beyond their control, unequal labor costs. Government, of course, wanted more and more ships with stabilized wages and costs.

The first members of the Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee were as follows:

I. Labor: (a) AFL—Harvey Brown, president of the International Association of Machinists, and John P. Frey, president of the Metal Trades Department; (b) CIO—John Green, president of the Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, and Philip H. Van Gelder, secretary of the same union.

II. Industry: Gregory Harrison, for the Pacific shipyards; H. Gerrish Smith, president of the National Council of American Shipbuilders, for the Great Lakes shipyards; E. A. Lidell, for the Gulf shipyards; and Prof. H. L. Seward, representing the Atlantic shipyards.

III. Contracting agencies: Jospeh W. Powell, special assistant to the Secretary of the Navy (Capt. C. W. Fisher, U. S. N., as alternate), Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission.

IV. OPM: Morris L. Cooke, industrial engineering consultant to the Labor Division of the OPM, chairman, and Thomas L. Horton, executive secretary.

The shipbuilding industry group which met to formulate a policy for the shipbuilding stabilization committee, was truly representative of the views of management, because the 21 members present represented 42 yards employing at least 90 percent of the workers in the industry. It cannot be said that management was forced into its participation in the shipbuilding stabilization agreements. All of the parties agreed that the zone standard agreements were to be formulated by national zonal conferences in four zones, and were to be arrived at by a process of collective bargaining resulting in unanimous concurrence with the provisions of the agreements.

The first Zone Standards Agreement to be negotiated was one covering all shipyards doing new construction work on the Pacific Coast. The Bethlehem Steel Co., shipbuilding division, declined to participate in the conference to formulate the agreement on this coast, but declared its willingness to abide by the working standards agreed upon by the conference. The agreement drawn up on the Pacific Coast was submitted to the principals and reviewed and accepted by them, including management, the procurement agencies representing Government, and labor. This Pacific Zone Standards Agreement merely set general principles. In this Pacific Conference at the first session only labor and management were active conferees. In all other conferences, the Government took an active part.

The Pacific Coast Zone Conference finished formulation of the zone standards on April 21, 1941. The three remaining zone conferences were held as scheduled for the Gulf coast, the Atlantic coast, and the Great Lakes. The Gulf coast zone standards agreement was more detailed than those of the other zones, because both the employers and the union representatives on the Gulf Coast wanted to incorporate the zone standards bodily into local agreements rather than to translate general working conditions into specific clauses.

All four zone standards agreements set the following types of working conditions: Standard skilled mechanics' rate on all zones but the Gulf, $1.12; Gulf zone, $1.07; overtime rates; night-shift premium; no strike and no lock-out pledge; agreement on arbitration of all disputes; a provision against limitation on production; a duration clause.

The zone standards were not local collective-bargaining agreements. The provisions of the zone standards agreements were incorporated into the local agreements, sometimes in toto and sometimes by reference. They were zonal agreements between management, Government, and labor.

It was felt that the shipbuilding stabilization committee alone, under whose auspices the zone conferences were called, would have the power to interpret the zone standards.

In 1942 the shipbuilding stabilization committee was revised. Industry evinced a desire to have 12 representatives instead of 6 (industry acted through the National Council of American Shipbuilders), and later it again increased representation. The Government added two representatives of the War Department.

An administrative order of Donald Nelson on August 1, 1942, established the new committee, giving it the following powers:

(a) To develop procedures for and conduct an annual review, and, if necessary, special reviews of wage rates; to recommend and take appropriate steps to bring about such changes in wage rates as the review indicates are required.

(b) To consider and determine all questions with respect to interpretation, application, and coverage of zone standards and the securing of compliance therewith provided that the committee shall not alter or amend the zone standards (which can only be done by zone or national conference).

(c) To establish or maintain approximate uniformity within zones or subzones in respect to length of shifts.

The committee was not granted the authority to alter or amend existing local agreements, except where such agreements were in conflict with zone standards.

When war broke out in December of 1941, it was contended that continuous operation of shipyards was necessary. The Pacific Coast zone groups had a conference on January 13 and 14, 1942, which agreed to abolish calendar premium days, to pay time and one-half for the sixth shift, and double time for the seventh shift and holidays.

II. CHICAGO NATIONAL CONFERENCE

The national shipbuilding conference began in Chicago on April 27, 1942. The very next day the conference recessed until May 16, leaving a working committee to dispose of its problems and to draw up national amendments to the zone standards agreements in the interim.

This conference was most important, in that it was the first time that representatives of management and labor met on a national and not on a zonal scale. It marked the beginning of Nation-wide planning for the shipbuilding industry, and the elimination of wage differentials for standard skilled mechanics. At many points during the meeting, it very much looked as if the conference would be forced to adjourn without accomplishing anything, but finally the zone standards were amended to the satisfaction of the majority, and accepted by unanimous vote.

The meeting had originally been called to arrive at a uniform national system of wage adjustments to the rising cost of living, which had not been done by the first zone standards. The faulty adjustment clauses in the zone agreements had raised the question of the specified wage adjustments scheduled in each of the four zones. It was recognized that price stabilization, as promised by the Office of Price Administration, would probably shift the level of retail prices in the United States back to that of the middle of March 1942. If this were to be the case, and the wage adjustment clauses in the zone standards agreements were to be acted upon before this became effective, after such price stabilization had been established the real wages of shipyard workers would be higher than those of any other group in the community. Moreover, if wages were actually adjusted according to zone standards, the latter would become more divergent than ever before and the practical measure of stabilization achieved throughout the country—$1.07 per hour for the Gulf coast zone, and $1.12 for the other three zones would be ruined. For example, according to a weighted percentage change in the cost of living, that of the Gulf coast rose 12 percent, the Pacific coast rose 13 percent and that of the Atlantic coast and Great Lakes area would not rise the 5 percent necessary for any wage adjustment as authorized by zone standards.

At the final meeting of this conference "amendments to the Pacific coast, Atlantic coast, Great Lakes, and Gulf coast zone standards" were adopted and forwarded to the procurement agencies.

These amendments made the following adjustments in the four zone standards:

(a) Wage rate for all standard (or standard first-class) skilled mechanics was increased to $1.20 per hour in all four zones.

(b) All other employees received an increase of 8 cents per hour, except in the Gulf zone, where the following schedule applied:

Wage rate per hour:	*Increase (cents)*
Up to 69½ cents	9
70–79½ cents	10
80–89½ cents	11
90—1.06½ cents	12
$1.07 and above	13

(c) Upon inclusion of repair work in the Pacific coast zone standards, this increase retroactive to April 1, was to apply. (The Pacific coast zone standards were the only agreements which do not include repair and conversion work.)

(d) Rates to remain in effect until June 1, 1943, on or about which date, and yearly thereafter, a wage review shall be conducted under procedure to be developed by the Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee.

(e) Calendar premium days were to be abolished.

(f) Sixth shift worked—time and one-half rate.

(g) Seventh shift worked—double-time rate.

(h) The following were to be considered "shifts worked":

1. Time lost through injuries in the course of employment.

2. Time lost through lack of work, or other reasons beyond employee's control.

3. Time lost because of holiday shut-down.

(i) Overtime and shift premiums for repair and conversion work to be referred to zone conferences.

(j) Employees might waive right to vacation, but should receive pay, over and above wages for work, at the time the vacation was due.

(k) Establish training programs.

(l) The shipbuilding stabilization committee has no power to alter or amend zone standards, but shall interpret and apply them.

(m) The Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee might convene conferences to establish approximate uniformity in length of shifts.

(n) The effective dates for the above provisions were:

1. Pacific coast, April 1.
2. Atlantic coast, June 23.
3. Gulf coast, August 1.
4. Great Lakes, June 2.

Further, the zone standards agreements were altered to apply for the duration of the national emergency, as proclaimed by the President of the United States. This was also unanimous.

It should be noted that the abolition of calendar premium days in the shipbuilding industry took place almost 4 months prior to President Roosevelt's Executive Order 9240.

III. LATER HISTORY—WAGE REVIEWS

Because of the issuance on October 3, 1942, of Executive Order 9250, the wage reviews of 1943 and 1944 as outlined by the Chicago amendments to the zone standard agreements were held by the National War Labor Board. The wage review for 1945 was held by the National Shipbuilding Conference in Colorado Springs, where an 18-cent-per-hour increase was granted by majority vote of Government and labor, with management dissenting. However, all parties to the Colorado National Conference agreed that the zone standards themselves could only be amended by unanimous consent.

Since the 1945 wage review had been postponed until December, it was felt by the stabilization committee that to hold the 1946 wage review at the customary time, in June, would be meaningless. Therefore,

the stabilization committee voted to hold the 1946 wage review in January of 1947. The shipbuilding workers still have an equity in the 1946 wage review which has not yet been held. Even if the national emergency were declared at an end by the President of the United States or by joint resolution of Congress, the equity of the workers in the 1946 wage review to be conducted under the auspices of the Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee would still remain, and the review, according to the promise of the committee, would still have to be held.

Since the wage review of 1945 management has been taking the attitude that the zone standards agreements should be done away with, even prior to the end of the national emergency. As a matter of fact, eight management members of the Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee have submitted their resignations to this committee. Management does not want to abide by its agreement of 1941 and 1942. It is trying unilaterally to dissolve its collective-bargaining contract. Labor takes the position that management cannot be allowed unilaterally to dissolve a collective-bargaining agreement even though such agreement be national in its scope. Such allowance of dissolution by a single party would lead to the abrogation with impunity of every collective-bargaining agreement in the United States. Management must abide by its contract and by its pledged word.

The termination of the zone standards agreements was set by the Chicago amendment to such agreements at the end of the national emergency. This termination date can be changed only by the unanimous consent of all parties, because to change this date would be amending the zone standards. Also, to change participation in the zone standards agreements can be done only by unanimous consent, because it would in effect be amending these standards. Thus one party cannot withdraw without the consent of the other two. The termination date of the zone standards agreements cannot be changed except by the unanimous consent of the parties.

During the wage review of 1945, the Government procurement agencies indicated their desire to withdraw from participation in the national conference, although promising to recognize the force and effect of the zone standards agreements. Both management and labor refused to allow a party to the zone standards to withdraw without unanimous consent, and would not give the Government agencies consent to withdraw.

Management has attempted to stop the working of the Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee itself by refusing to have a quorum present at the last two meetings of the committee. This is an indirect method of single-handed and arbitrary elimination of responsibility under the collective agreements.

This union has always taken the position that the zone-standards agreements and the stabilization committee should be continued after the termination of the state of national emergency, as proclaimed by the President of the United States. The other two parties to the zone standards agreements—namely, management and government—have refused to agree to our proposal to extend the termination date of the zone standards agreements In turn, they cannot shorten or abridge the termination date of the zone standards agreements without unanimous consent, nor can they destroy the previous action of the shipbuilding stabilization committee setting the 1946 wage review date for January 1947, without destroying the effectiveness of the zone standards agreements.

Even when the President of the United States abolished all wage and salary controls, he recognized the equity of labor in awards and gains previously granted by the wage and salary stabilization bodies.

The shipbuilding workers have such an equity in the 1946 wage review. This cannot be destroyed without a complete abrogation of the tripartite collective agreement.

The amendments to the zone standards agreements adopted at Chicago, specifically stated the following with regard to the wage review:

"The rates herein established and put into effect shall remain in effect until June 1, 1943, on or about which date a wage review shall be conducted under procedures to be developed by the Shipbuilding Stabilization Committee and thereafter annually on or about June 1, a like review will be conducted by that committee.

Management by refusing to allow a quorum of its representation to be present at the last two meetings of the stabilization committee, and thus obstructing the conduct of the wage review, is not abiding by the terms of its contract which is still in full force and effect.

Management is attempting unilateral abrogation of a tripartite agreement.

POSTAL SERVICE TO GERMANY AND AUSTRIA

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, about 6 weeks ago the Appropriations Committee was met with a most serious situation in Germany and Austria, but particularly in Germany. Over there at that time there was a tremendous amount of suffering, want, hunger, and starvation. All over the northwestern part of our country for example, in the States of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Nebraska, and a great many other States, including Missouri, the President's own State—there are millions of American citizens who have relatives in Germany or in Austria. Their relatives write to them and tell about the hunger, the want, the destitution, and the misery prevalent there. Yet the most that any American citizen has been able to send across has been one package a week, weighing not more than 11 pounds.

Finally we called a meeting of representatives of the War Department, the Department of Commerce, the State Department, and the Post Office Department, to see whether we could facilitate the sending of packages to Germany and Austria. We were very materially assisted by Mr. Robert Patterson, Secretary of War. The Secretary of War got in touch with the military in Germany. They said they would be very glad to have the Post Office Department appoint two representatives for that purpose.

The Post Office Department then got in touch with me; and we sent to the postal conference a distinguished citizen of North Dakota, Dr. Martin W. Roan, who was a major in World War I, and is a graduate of Heidelberg, and a man who can speak the German language. He has been in Germany and Austria at other times in his life.

To serve with him, there was selected Mr. Anton Reider, president of the Coast Packing Co., of Los Angeles, Calif., a man who was born in that country, a man who is one of the leading financiers and a great humanitarian from Los Angeles, a man noted for his philanthropy.

Those two men went to Europe, and spent some 6 weeks there. They attended the Postal Union Conference, for the Post Office Department; and then the United States military took them to place after place in Germany.

They made their report to me yesterday, upon their return. That report bears out many of the things that had been receiving consideration by many persons who are interested in German relief and the millions of Americans who are anxious to see to it that the size of packages which can be sent there is increased. I am happy to announce that the size of the packages has been increased from 11 pounds to 22 pounds. The mail sack is 3½ feet in length, and it has been agreed that not only can food be sent over there, but also garden rakes, for instance, if their handles are no longer than 3 feet 6 inches. In addition, kitchen utensils can be sent. The postage charge is to be exactly in proportion to that on the 11-pound package, which cost, on an average, $3.50, and the postage was $1.54. The 22-pound package will be worth approximately $7, and the postage will be $3.07.

I wish to make it clear to the people of America that when complaints are made about the high postage rates on such packages, it should be understood that our Government is not to blame, nor is the President of the United States to blame. The most of that postage goes to another country, where the postal authorities charge for the handling of the mail and the packages. As a matter of fact, for the seven million 11-pound packages that have already gone abroad, I am informed by the Post Office Department that, instead of making a profit as has been alleged repeatedly in the newspapers, who do not know what they are talking about, there actually has been a loss of approximately 14 cents a package in postage.

Mr. President, dealing with the same identical matter, bringing to the attention of the Senate the desperate situation in Germany, the hunger and the want that are rampant all over that country today, taking up also the manner in which our President and the Congress have treated those people, I wanted to discuss briefly the report of Dr. Roan, and Mr. Reider, on the subject, but I shall defer that for the present.

THE FOREIGN POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on June 4, 1946, I delivered a speech on the floor of the Senate on the subject Is America Today a Peaceseeking Nation? At that time I called attention to the confusion and double-talk which marked the "statesmanship" of our times by saying:

There has been so much said about America's new obligations in international affairs, and such a terrible misrepresentation of what is actually happening to America in the process of meeting those obligations, that I cannot permit another moment to go by without challenging again the completely false doctrine and the false philosophy which is destroying America, both from without and from within.

Until our foreign policies, our dealings with other people, and our external relations with all the other nations of the world, are firmly rerooted and reestablished in traditional

American concepts and practices, America, as we have known it, is doomed.

Mr. President, the distinguished Republican whip, the able junior Senator from Nebraska, repeatedly has risen on the floor of the Senate and brought this matter to the attention of the Senate. He has been most able in his treatment of the subject. He has made statements, and he has supported them by documentary proof; and yet nothing was done about it by our administration. Today, the situation is worse than at any other time since the war. In spite of all the glib talk to the contrary, Mr. President, we are being led further down the road toward our own destruction than we were a year ago. The same false doctrines are being preached, the same diplomatic double-talk is being used to beguile the American people, and the same forces which are already in process of destroying our ideals and our security, both at home and abroad, are in the saddle, riding mankind to its doom. The late President Roosevelt's warning to the American people is now being proved prophetic when he said: "We cannot purchase our security at the cost of other peoples' freedom."

Mr. President, it is incredible that the United States Senate should be placed in the outrageous position of being asked—even to discuss—to say nothing of confirm, the treacherous secret agreements that have been entered into by American Presidents, who have abandoned American principles and the dignity and honor of the Presidency itself, to become the world's chief power-politicians.

Let us take the Italian treaty for instance: It is exactly what Signor Orlando, the president of the Italian peace delegation at Versailles called it, "A massacre of justice."

On Feburary 10, 1947, none other than one of the master minds, Adolph A. Berle, described this "massacre of justice," in the following terms:

> It is not, in fact, a treaty of peace at all. The negotiations were only secondarily negotiations for a treaty of peace with Italy. The basis was the situation created by military occupations of territory set up when Germany collapsed. Treaties based on battlefield conditions, temporary occupations, and disturbances following a huge war are rarely enduring.

Mr. President, what are those conditions about which Mr. Berle spoke? Over a year ago I warned of what those conditions were and of what those conditions threatened to do to America if they were not altered by a radical change in our foreign policy. At that time, the distinguished Senator from Nebraska and the able Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] joined upon this floor in bringing to the attention of the Senate and of the administration what was being done in Europe and particularly in Germany.

At that time I said:

> The commitments made at Moscow, Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam have torn the world in two. The new world of internationalism which was promised the American people as a reward for their sacrifice and suffering is gone. That world required the genuine and voluntary cooperation of the major victors of this war in all economic, political, financial, and military problems of the world. That world required the voluntary and sovereign participation of a score or more nations which have now been swallowed up in the spheres of influence parceled out to each other by the Big Three. That world required the immediate supplanting of tyrannical and revolutionary regimes with the stable elements within each society which would have the power and which could be depended upon thoroughly to enter into negotiations and contracts as genuine representatives of the peoples and nations involved in all future transactions and agreements between nations. That world required the reincorporation of the vanquished peoples into the economic, social, and political structure of the family of nations on a just and equitable basis.

The war has been over for 2 years, Mr. President, and yet nothing has been done. I continue the quotation:

> Instead, Mr. President, the world has been torn in two. The system of sovereign and independent states upon which all our international law of the past 400 years has been founded has been destroyed. Russia stands today behind an iron curtain that stretches around half the world, including the Eurasian Continent. Russia has been left in control of the minority populations and the vast majority of the natural resources of both Europe and Asia.
>
> America has been left with a condition, which even in peacetime, means we must underwrite and support two bankrupt imperial possessions in western Europe and eastern Asia.

That is the same as what was said by the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska. That is what was said by the able Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. Yet nothing has been done even to this time.

As Mr. Berle said, "Treaties based upon such battlefield conditions are rarely enduring." These conditions have long since compelled England to start reneging on her commitments made under these secret agreements all over the world. The very fact that on March 9, 1947, England formally reneged on her commitments under the alleged Italian treaty makes it perfectly obvious that the Senate's ratification of this crime against the peace will only put a further strain on the American taxpayer, spread the seeds of future conflict and unrest and misery, legalize the very Tehran and Yalta betrayals which have placed Russia in the position which has become so frightening that the President has declared an all-out war against communism, while all the time taking us further down the road of power politics, from which we can never escape.

Mr. President, nowhere are we as a nation standing for principle. Expediency has become the order of the day. All the alleged progress we are making toward peace, about which our statesmen are so fond of talking, is now analogous only to a rake's progress in debauchery and dissolution. We are caught in a vicious circle of secret negotiations, double talk, Presidential precommitment of Congress, and the abandonment of honest and open discussion of basic American policies from which there seems to be no escape.

This dilemma of the leaders of our bipartisan foreign policy is nowhere better stated than in a letter of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], addressed to Representative HOWARD H. BUFFETT, of Nebraska. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], who was a party, a leading party, I may say, on the Republican side, to this matter of bipartisan policy for our Government, wrote to the distinguished Congressman, HOWARD H. BUFFETT, of Nebraska, as follows:

> Of course, I entirely share your anxiety that we shall have a maximum of public information in America regarding the conduct of our foreign affairs. At some stages in these proceedings it is impossible to pursue this public policy. On the one hand we are circumscribed by the fact that there are delicate stages in almost every negotiation when it would obviously be impractical for governments to disclose their proposals.
>
> On the other hand, our Government is not entirely a free agent in such matters because publicity requires mutual consent by us and by other foreign powers. But whenever negotiations arrive at a point which produces an American commitment, I agree with you, there should never be any secret commitment.

Mr. President, these treaties with Italy and the satellite countries are only a hint of what is coming when the treaties with the ex-enemy countries are brought before the Senate. If our statesmen continue to play the role of power politicians they may save their own faces for the time being, but they will not be able to save either America, or the peace, from destruction.

Recently, Anne O'Hare McCormick, one of the late President's closest friends and confidants, wrote of the frightening conditions in Europe by warning our statesmen that—

> Prolonging the present condition of suspense on the continent can only lead to catastrophe. There is no use outlawing the atomic bomb if the great powers follow policies that produce the conditions of war. In Europe, these conditions are creating a zone of pauper states. As to Germany, everybody now admits that the occupation is a failure in itself and a menace to the rest of the continent. The state of Europe today is the first threat to the peace of the world.

Mr. President, yesterday the distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and other Senators and Representatives witnessed the showing of 4,000 feet of film in the auditorium of the Archives Building. After witnessing that showing many members of the audience to whom I spoke, among whom were keymen in the various Government departments, said our occupation of Germany had been a total failure.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. It is now 15 minutes after 6. The Senator is making quite an attack upon his own party, upon the leadership in foreign relations in his party, upon the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. I do not know how long he expects to continue with that kind of attack and criticism. I think I shall be obliged to suggest the absence of a quorum. I hope I will not be obliged to do so.

Mr. LANGER. I may say, Mr. President, that I am making no attack upon the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VAN-

DENBERG]. I want to make that clear, to make it exceptionally clear. The Senator from Michigan time and again has spoken upon the Senate floor telling just how far he has gone in the matter of bipartisanship, that at times the administration has not said one word to him until the country had been committed, and then after the country was committed the administration had said to the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, "We are committed." Then the Senator from Michigan has done the best he could do under the circumstances. He has been a patriotic leader of the Republican Party. I do not agree with all the Senator from Michigan has done. I have made that very plain upon different occasions on the Senate floor. I want to make it very clear that this is not an attack upon our distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and as I proceed and read some more quotations I think that will be made very plain indeed.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I am not going to interrupt the Senator any more. I understand the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] desires to make a speech. May I ask the distinguished leader how long he expects the Senate to continue in session tonight?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the speech the distinguished Senator from North Dakota is making. It has a bearing on the foreign policy and upon the situation in Europe. I also wish to say that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], who wants to leave on an official mission this evening to study the problems of small business, would like to make a statement. I have said to the Senator from Washington that I would stay here if the acting minority leader will also stay until he has concluded his remarks, because I feel we should accommodate him, inasmuch as he is making an official trip. I am satisfied that the distinguished Senator from North Dakota, who has laid the basis for his remarks and has gotten well into his speech, will conclude quickly, and then the Senator from Washington can make his speech thereafter.

Mr. HATCH. I am perfectly willing to stay with the Senator from Nebraska and listen to the Senator from Washington. I suggest that we might proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota will proceed.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on March 12, 1947, President Truman called for an all-out offensive against communism, and declared in his Truman doctrine that we were going to take every step to put an end to the confusion, chaos, and suffering which were providing such a fertile ground for the spread of Soviet influence. Yet, the policies we are pursuing in central Europe, particularly in Germany, provide the grimmest evidence of the way this administration is double talking the American people and the American way of life to destruction.

Mr. President, it would be idiotic if now we permitted anything, any crisis, or any emergency, to distract us from following through on the imperative need for a complete reorientation of our policies toward the German people. For, as William Henry Chamberlain wrote in the April 16, 1947, issue of Human Events:

In diplomatic struggle, as well as in military warfare, there are primary and secondary fronts. President Truman's proposal to extend what amounts to peacetime lend-lease aid to Greece and Turkey has aroused Nation-wide and world-wide excitement. But these economically undeveloped Balkan countries do not represent the truly decisive area of the American-Soviet duel. That area, in Europe, is Germany.

The Soviet Government could easily resign itself to a temporary check at the Dardanelles if it could anticipate the absorption of the whole of Germany into its sphere of influence. Such an absorption might be expected to produce the same consequences that would probably have occurred if Hitler had achieved a knockout victory over Russia. A mighty totalitarian empire would stretch from the Pacific to the Rhine. This empire would be so large in population, so vast in resources, so deep in terms of space and distance, that it would be largely impervious to sea power. It would be a tremendous base such as no conqueror ever possessed in the past.

It is most unwise for President Truman to seek to get out from under his own responsibility by charging Russia with being a threat to the world peace, while at the same time he continues to be responsible for policies toward Germany which are forcing both Germany and Europe down the throat of the Russian bear.

Mr. President, the record plainly reveals that this administration, and its hate group, fellow-traveler hangers-on, either through a brutal thirst for vengeance, or through a deliberate desire to betray American principles and America's security, have played the role of Stalin's left hand in Europe. Furthermore, up until this moment, the record shows that neither the American people nor their elected representatives in either House of Congress have had one single word to say about the inhuman pro-Communist policies which this administration has imposed on the German people.

From the time the slogan "Unconditional Surrender" was announced to the world, in the Moscow declaration of November 1, 1943, until this very moment, the American people have been completely ignored by those who have directed the implementation of our policies of hatred and vengeance toward the German people.

The very term, "Unconditional Surrender," met with the almost universal repudiation of the American people. Yet they could not force this administration to abandon that brutal, empty, self-defeating slogan, for a constructive American statement of peace aims. As a consequence, Mr. President, the record now shows that this very slogan itself constitutes one of the major criminal blunders in the history of American statesmanship.

In the first place, Mr. President, the "Unconditional Surrender" slogan destroyed the American principles contained in the Atlantic Charter. In the Saturday Evening Post of March 1945, one of our most informed authorities on international affairs, Mr. Demaree Bess, wrote:

If we reread the Atlantic Charter carefully, we can see that when it was published in August 1941 it seemed possible to us then that the war in Europe need not become a continental revolution. Its comparatively mild provisions, drawn up by President Roosevelt still pictured the war in limited terms. All during the ensuing year, our discussion about postwar Europe generally foresaw some kind of acceptable place for Germany, with no sweeping territorial change in Europe once Hitler and his Nazi system were overthrown.

Those critics who have been complaining that Stalin and Churchill killed the Atlantic Charter by their action in Poland and Greece had failed to observe that the Atlantic Charter was killed from the day when the three greatest powers accepted unconditional surrender in its place.

In the second place, Mr. President, there is now no longer any question but that this asinine slogan indefinitely prolonged the war. On March 13, 1945, David Lawrence wrote:

Actually, few men in Washington know what's ahead. Again and again the German will to fight has been underestimated by official Washington. The slogan demanding unconditional surrender and the announcement from Yalta that portends economic strangulation for the German people for many years to come, are two factors which are constantly ignored here for the simple reason that to give weight to them is to criticize the administration here and the Allied spokesmen abroad for a blundering policy that prolongs the war.

In the third place, Mr. President, there can no longer be any question but that this slogan, "unconditional surrender," turned loose the Soviets in eastern Europe to loot, rape, plunder, and impose their system on the nations of eastern Europe, at the cost of the terrible sacrifices of American blood and treasure, following our second front in Normandy. In a December 1944 issue of the Stars and Stripes a leading editorial charged:

British and Russian preoccupation with objectives other than the defeat of Germany was responsible for allied failure to achieve expectations in the United States that the war in Europe would be over by now. Since D-day in France, greater preoccupation has been shown by Russia in her Balkan and Baltic campaigns, intended to insure her security, and by Great Britain in Italy, Greece, and Albania, to protect her lifeline through the Mediterranean to India than in achievement of the prime objective of our American Army—prompt defeat of Germany.

On January 3, Dorothy Thompson also charged:

We have been unable to transform the political coalition into an entity to deal with Germany. The allied approach to the German problem has been to try to find a compromise between opposite interests, instead of creating a new common interest, by creating a new world. We are unable to draft a program for a defeated Germany, because the accession of any part of Germany to any one of the Allied Powers means an extension of the power of one ally at the cost of another. At the bottom of our dilemma over Germany is the fear of the allied powers of each other.

In the fourth place, Mr. President, because of the fact that these allied fears of each other were the prime motivating factor in our treatment of the German problem. We actually abandoned the

German underground, and thus made all hope of an internal uprising or revolution impossible, thus making impossible the emergence of any German government with which we could deal.

In the Washington Daily News of April 22, 1947, Frederick Woltman wrote that Allan Dulles, the brother of John Foster Dulles, and the chief of the Office of Strategic Services in Switzerland during the war, had charged:

> With encouragement from the United States and Britain, leading members of the German high command stood ready to liquidate the Nazis and end the European war. Instead, Roosevelt-Churchill high strategy ignored official reports of an organized revolt against Hitler by the German generals and important civilians and missed the boat.
>
> As a result, the war was prolonged 10 months, with heavy casualties, especially at the battle of the Bulge, and with an added cost of billions.

Mr. Dulles further stated:

> More and more evidence is accumulating that we should have driven a wedge between the German Army and the Nazi gang and ended the war in the summer of 1944. But we were hamstrung by the Casablanca formula for "unconditional surrender", and by the fear that Russia would run out on us if we gave encouragement to the German underground.
>
> Both Washington and London were fully informed of all the conspirators were attempting to do, but it sometimes seemed that those who determined policy in America and England were making the task as difficult as possible by uniting all Germans to resist to the bitter end.

Actually, Mr. President, this formula "unconditional surrender" now appears to have been designed specifically to make it impossible for Germany to surrender at all.

On December 29, 1944, Dorothy Thompson made just such a charge against this administration when she wrote:

> The circumstances of the war make it impossible—exactly impossible to fulfill this demand. For unconditional surrender—surrender is an act from the enemy toward ourselves. It is not surrender if we beat him flat on the ground, army by army, and city by city. That is step-by-step conquest, but not surrender. There are pre-conditions to unconditional surrender. In the German case, it involves giving up the nation, not merely the armies, to something. From the side of the United Nations, it involves creating something to which the nation as such can surrender. She cannot surrender as a whole to a whole. She must surrender herself in parts to other parts. Surrender, therefore, involves the denial and destruction of her own existence by herself.

Thus, Mr. President, as a consequence of this slogan, we find ourselves confronted with a situation in Europe which would be frightening enough had this administration heeded the warnings and protests against unconditional surrender of the American people, and had the President found some constructive policy for correcting the tragic mistakes which followed the military annihilation of Germany as a nation. Instead, as with the war, so with the armistice and the peace, Mr. Morgenthau and his coterie of "bloody-bitter enders" had concocted a scheme designed to make the annihilation and the extermination of the German Nation and of the German people complete.

The record shows that, over a year ago, I entered into the RECORD a documentary account of the universal protest of the American people against the savage policies which this administration was following toward the German people in a speech entitled "America's Choice—Peace or the Morgenthau Plan." That record included protests from leading churchmen, businessmen, and labor leaders and organizations clear across this country.

That record of hate and vengeance against which I protested, included the refusal by this administration to make any attempt to distinguish between the guilty and innocent; the imposition of mass starvation on 20,000,000 Germans under the American flag; the singling out of Germany for special vindictive treatment; the refusal of UNRRA aid to German children while both Austria and Italy were granted UNRRA supplies; the refusal on the part of this administration to permit the American Red Cross to succor the helpless and the dying, if they were of German extraction; the rerefusal to permit even the Christian churches to minister relief in the name of Christ, for many long months following the end of the war, and general betrayal of American and Christian principles which resulted in such revolting consequences that representatives of our leading newspapers did not even dare to report the truth, even when they were granted permission to see for themselves. Even to this moment, this particularized hatred of the German people has been incorporated into the constitution of the International Refugee Organization, which denies any aid to any Germans of ethnic origin although no such restriction applies to any other nationality or race or people.

Mr. President, the Morgenthau plan, which had been incorporated into the Potsdam declaration, had produced such chaos in Germany even during the first 6 months following the war that President Truman asked Byron Price, on August 30, 1945, to investigate conditions in Germany. On November 9, Byron Price reported to the President that:

> There can be no question that the vengeance of nature's god lies heavily on the German people. They are paying in kind for the unparalleled misery and cruelties for which they are responsible. There is plenty of evidence that the Germans are nursing old and new hatreds with mounting bitterness as their situation becomes more desperate.

As a consequence of Byron Price's warnings and urgent recommendations, on November 28, 1945, President Truman sent a request to the secretaries of the War and Navy Departments, asking for their earliest consideration of the Price recommendations. I am informed that when this request of the President's was passed on to the military government in Germany, General Clay took it upon himself to let it be known he wanted no change in the Morgenthau directives, and word came back from Clay's headquarters to the President that everything was going well.

Yet, when American protests continued to mount, on March 28, the Allied Control Council issued their 3-year plan for the "level of German industry." This was at least the beginning of a modification of the colossally stupid Morganthau recommendation which was released to the world on September 15, 1944, in Quebec, a plan which would have flooded the Ruhr mines, and which would have put the entire Ruhr and Saar industrial centers out of action.

Yet, because of this completely inadequate so-called agreement among the Big Four, conditions continued to steadily deteriorate in German and central Europe at such an alarming rate that 5 months later, Secretary Byrnes made his now famous Stuttgart speech in which he called for a reversal of past American policies and promised new hope to the German people.

Yet, Mr. President, since then, the conditions in Germany have continued to grow steadily worse.

We were encouraged to believe that, when on December 2, 1946, the bi-zonal agreement between the British and Americans was entered into, we had turned the corner and were implementing Byrnes' Stuttgart speech, thus reversing the trends in Germany. Yet, Mr. President, I want to quote here from a letter just written by one of the highest ranking American officials in Berlin:

> It is true that the British zone has been worse off than was ever admitted before the merger. I personally doubt that General Clay would ever have agreed to a merger if he had really been informed of how very much worse off food conditions were in the British zone—but it is too late to worry about that now. Since January 1, under British pressures, conditions have been steadily improved in the British zone and steadily deteriorating in the United States zone.

Mr. President, from our highest levels of government, as well as our press and radio, now come belated admission that the catastrophe now brewing in Germany threatens to drag the whole of Europe into chaos and communism.

The list of those who are now fearful of what is taking place in Europe has now become a long and very respectable one. As far back as March 30, 1946, George Fielding Eliot, a former member of the infamous "Society for the Prevention of World War III," who has never been known for his softness toward the German people, wrote:

> It is perfectly clear that the British taxpayer cannot and the American taxpayer will not, continue much longer to support the German population or the population in the Anglo-American zones, in idleness and misery. Nor is it conceivable that we could maintain an army of occupation and continue to accept political responsibility in a country whose population we are permitting to starve to death. Therefore, we are faced with a perfectly clear alternative: Either to withdraw altogether, in which case either the Russians will move in and take over, or a new German dictator will appear and take over, or take the necessary steps to revive the German economy on the only practicable basis which will enable the German people to earn their bread—that is, by manufacturing for export.

On September 10, 1946, my distinguished colleague the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] charged this administration with unprincipled appeasement of Russia, and especially in our policies toward Germany, when he said:

Not only has our policy in Germany been wrong, it has been futile and impossible. We have pursued contradictory policies which have only created contempt as well as hatred for America.

On October 19, 1946, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] urged a complete change in this administration's policies toward Germany, when he said:

The industrial rebirth of Germany is necessary for Europe and the United States doesn't want to destroy that vanquished nation.

On November 3, 1946, Gen. Lucius D. Clay warned this administration, and the American people, over the Columbia Broadcasting System, that:

The minimum German economy must be restored if we are to have any lasting success in reeducating the German people to a peaceful philosophy of life and in implanting permanently the democratic processes in which we believe.

On November 22, 1946, George Meader, chief counsel for the special Senate Committee Investigating the National Defense Program, stated in his report:

Our policy needs to be spelled out in more specific terms than it now is. We may be creating more problems than we solve. After the program of the "Level of industry plan" has been accomplished, we may be further from peace, stability, and a high level of civilization in Europe than before the program was formulated. This is the field in which Congress was not consulted, but for which it will have to pay the bill. In justice to Congress and the American people, they both should be fully and accurately informed. The committee ought to explore thoroughly and in a continuing investigation, the conduct of government in occupied areas on the part of United States agencies. Considerable opposition has developed to the committee's investigation. In my opinion, the facts obtained in the preliminary investigation, indicate clearly the need of a thorough study by the committee. Efforts which have been recently made to block this inquiry, fortify that conclusion, by raising the suspicion that there is something to hide which the committee might uncover if it did conduct the investigation.

Mr. President, in the light of the President's recent call for an all-out offensive against communism, and for a weeding out of pro-Communist sympathizers here at home, I wonder whether this demand for an investigation of subversive elements has been extended to the personnel, which thus far has been carrying out these betrayals of American principles in Germany.

The Saturday Evening Post of January 18, 1947, stated in its leading editorial:

The lag between the time when Americans sense that something is wrong and the time when they decide to do something about it is usually wide. True to form we have taken almost 2 years to demand that the mess in Germany be cleared up, insofar as we are responsible for it. Disquiet, first aroused by stories of looting in Germany and the persuasive ways of American soldiers with fraulein, is now felt for the whole structure of American prestige abroad and for the permanence of any contribution we may make for the pacification of the world. The popular demand is for reform.

On January 21, 1947, General McNarney called for the immediate revision of the wartime blacklist of foreign companies to permit the swift revival of German export trade, and called further for the immediate abolition of the trading with the enemy act.

On January 24, according to the Washington Post of January 25, 1947, the union of South Africa joined with Australia in demanding "a quick revision of the Potsdam agreement to improve Germany's war-blighted economy, which it described as a dangerous potential menace to peace."

On February 21, 1947, General McNarney called for an immediate end to the Army's rule of the American military government, saying:

The Army, which isn't organized or trained for governmental procedure, is not the proper instrument.

On February 24, 1947, Mr. Joseph E. Evans, the Wall Street Journal's staff correspondent in Berlin, wrote as the Moscow Conference on the German Treaty opened:

Germany on the eve of the Conference, which is intended finally to concern itself with her problems, is a frozen chaos of disillusionment, cynicism, and despair.

In the March issue of the United Nations News correspondents cabled from Europe:

After 20 months of occupation, western Germany still lies buried in social, political, and moral rubble.

On February 27, 1947, General McNarney reiterated his demand by saying:

Military officers are not equipped for military government, and the military should be a police force for the civil governor.

At the same time General McNarney warned that the Allies had failed in their four-power rule of Germany.

On February 28, 1947, former President Herbert Hoover, after being requested by President Truman to undertake the difficult assignment of investigating the economic conditions in Germany, reported:

Those who believe in vengeance and the punishment of the great mass of Germans, not concerned in the Nazi conspiracy, can now have no misgivings, for all of them, in food, warmth, and shelter, have been sunk to the lowest level known in a hundred years of western history. If western civilization is to survive in Europe it must survive in Germany. After all, our flag flies over these people. That flag means something more than military power.

On March 2, 1947, Hanson Baldwin, one of our ablest military analysts, wrote in the New York Times:

Germany is divided and broken, slowly starving, a cancerous growth in the heart of western Europe, a breeding place for the dark philosophy of Nietsche. There festers in her ruins the poison of fascism, the virus of communism; either totalitaranism flourishes in decadence and destruction.

On March 3, 1947, Mrs. Roosevelt, who has been one of the foremost champions of the Morgenthau plan, wrote:

All thinking people have long known that Germany has to return to a self-supporting basis. We must help Germany to build such industries as she needs for exports, since it is self-evident that we cannot expect to create in the heart of Europe a happy and democratic people unless they have hope for the future.

On March 24, Herbert Hoover re-enforced his warning of the gravity of the German problem when he stated in his Third Economic Report to the President:

At the present time the taxpayers of Great Britain and the United States are contributing nearly $600,000,000 a year to prevent starvation of the Germans in the British and American zones alone. The drain is likely to be even greater after peace unless the policies now in action are changed. We desperately need recovery in all of Europe; we need it not only for economic reasons, but as the first necessity of peace. There is only one path to recovery in Europe—that is production. The productivity of Europe cannot be restored without the restoration of Germany as a contributor to that productivity.

Again on April 12, 1947, Gen. Joseph McNarney warned this administration:

This concentrated population of nearly 70,000,000 must be offered an early hope for economic and political stability; if they are forced to live without hope, the inevitable consequence will be chaos in Europe followed by a rebirth of totalitarianism.

On April 28, 1947, Secretary of State Marshall confirmed all of these terrifying reports when he said:

The recovery of Europe has been far slower than was expected. Disintegrating forces are becoming evident. The patient is sinking while the doctors deliberate.

The Secretary went on to say that conditions were so alarming that the United States has determined to take its own independent course of action in a last ditch fight to prevent collapse, when he said:

I believe that action cannot await compromise through exhaustion. New issues arise daily. Whatever action is possible to meet these pressing problems must be taken without delay.

On April 29, 1947, Walter Lippmann warned the United States Chamber of Commerce that—

We stand virtually alone, in respect to money and military power confronting Russia in Europe and Asia. The British weakness, compelling her to withdraw from the Middle East will soon compel her to relinquish to the United States her commitments in Germany. There has been a steady deterioration in the world, which, if not reversed, most inexorably lead—and at no distant date—to the economic collapse of western Europe, including Britain, France, Italy and western Germany.

On April 29, John Foster Dulles backed up Secretary Marshall's statement that this administration has determined that we shall not permit our independence of action to be paralyzed while the patient sinks. Mr. Dulles stated in a radio broadcast that—

It is imperative that our two-zone merger be a success. Our joint area includes the Ruhr, which is the economic heart beat of Europe. Today that heart is barely beating. We should, of course, invoke the aid of the United Nations whenever it can do the job. But we cannot let ourselves be stymied merely because we cannot get agreement or because the United Nations is not yet able to take over the full task of maintaining freedom in the world.

On May 8, 1947, former Under Secretary Dean Acheson declared that—

> Failure of the Moscow Conference means America must push ahead with reconstruction of those two great workshops of Europe and Asia.

Mr. President, it is at this point where the American people will now be able to see the hydra-headed contradictions of this administration concerning their policies toward Germany in the form of double talk at its worst. We have been told that the time had come to change our policies. We have been assured that that change was in process of realization. We have been told by our highest Government officials, from Secretary Marshall down, that because we would no longer compromise American principles we could not reach any agreement with Russia at the latest Moscow Conference.

Yet, Mr. President, on April 28, 1947, the foreign ministers in Moscow signed five agreements which, in effect, pledged America's continued implementation of the very policies which have created such chaos in Europe. Nowhere, and at no point, did our representatives at Moscow stand on, or stand for a return to, basic American principles. According to this directive of April 28, agreement was reached to continue our policies toward the German people in the following five categories: First, demilitarization; second, denazification; third, democratization; fourth, population transfers; and fifth, prisoners of war.

Mr. President, it is unbelievable that the American people should be led to believe that we intend to oppose the extension of communism by taking unilateral steps to insure success in reviving Germany and Europe, while at the same time they are being forced to continue to underwrite policies of further destruction and dismantling of plants in Germany.

The whole question of deindustrialization was dealt with in the Hoover report, at the request of the President, and the recommendation made that:

> We adopt at once a new economic concept in peace with Germany. We should free German industry, subject to a control commission. The removal and destruction of plants (except direct arms plants) should stop.

Mr. President, I would go even further, in the light of terrible shortage of goods and manufactured material around the world, and demand that these direct arms plants, rather than be destroyed, ought to be turned into peacetime industrial use. Certainly, this kind of a policy would immeasurably hasten the beginning of a development toward a minimum standard of living, which would contribute tremendously to the revival of the whole European economy.

Mr. President, our policies of deindustrialization during the past year in Germany have been so stupid that the Congressional Committee on Postwar Economic Planning urged on December 30, 1946, that the level of industry orders of March 28, 1946, be ignored whenever they conflicted with exports so that there might be an earlier recovery and payment for the vitally needed food imports.

I ask the careful attention of the Senate as I read these following figures of the total production allowed the German manufacturers during the year 1946 by the American military government. Until December 1, 1946, the manufacturers of greater Hesse presented offers of peacetime manufactured goods to the American military authorities totaling RM61,788,907, comprising 1,361 single offers. Although the German producers regularly mentioned their old customers in their offers, only RM12,000,000 worth of goods were contracted for by the military. Of this sum, RM8,000,000 was for timber exported to England and RM1,610,000 for potash and stone salt.

In the Province of Bavaria, our authorities were offered from January 17 to December 1946, RM42,000,000 totaling 513 separate offers. Of this total only RM7,165,000 were contracted for including one large contract which the French took over and which left only RM1,742,572 worth of finished goods permitted to be manufactured.

In the Province of Wurttemburg Baden, the American military government received offers totalling RM55,100,000 worth of manufactured goods comprising 750 offers, of which only 40 offers totaling RM2,000,000 were accepted.

Mr. President, is there any Member of this Senate who would sanction a continuation of such insane policies in the future? Is there any Member who would be able to explain just how our basic policies in this regard are to be altered in the face of these new foreign ministers' agreements?

Certainly, a continuation of these ruthless policies in Germany and Europe cannot help but drag Europe down further into the misery and want and starvation on which communism feeds.

Mr. President, we read in the second agreement of April 28 that—

> The Control Council is directed: (1) to take all appropriate measures to hasten the process of denazification throughout Germany; (2) to complete as soon as possible the removal of former active Nazis and militarists from public and semipublic office and from positions of responsibility in important private undertaking.

In the face of President Truman's charge that Russia is now a dangerous threat to the world and an aggressor, and his demand that we must jump head first into an all-out offensive against communism, it is incredible that this administration has agreed to continue to follow out one of the most pro-Communist policies ever devised, namely, that of denazification. There is no quicker way to destroy our last hope for a democratic Germany than to continue our denazification policies of the past.

In the first place, this denazification process is based on a concept of law that is wholly alien to our own. We have proceeded on the brutal and dangerous thesis of "collective guilt," and we have fastened it on the German people as a whole. For instance, in part 2 of directive 38 of the Allied Control Council, we find the following categories into which the whole German population has been divided: First, major offenders; second, offenders—activists, militarists, and profiteers; third, lesser offenders—probationers; fourth, followers; fifth, persons exonerated—those included in the above categories who can prove themselves not guilty before a tribunal.

Mr. President, is there a single Senator on the Senate floor today who will rise to defend any such perversion of American justice as this? Is there anyone who would champion such a system of law for the United States? In our way of life, a person is innocent until he has been proved guilty. But under our denazification procedure, every German is guilty until he or she can prove himself innocent. It is little wonder that the Meader report recommended that this whole question of denazification be fully explored by a congressional investigating committee.

Certainly, the American people do not know that this denazification process, by destroying what remains of German law and jurisprudence, by the Gestapo techniques which completely destroy all security and makes personal liberties in Germany impossible of realization, by wiping out the middle classes, and by eliminating their potential tremendous contribution of skills and knowledge which are so desperately needed for reconstruction, are all playing directly into the hands of the Communists.

Mr. President, I want to quote directly from another letter written within the month by one of our highest ranking officials in Germany:

> It is unbelievable how much havoc the denazification policies are still causing. In some cases our best German people who have already been working for us, many, many months have been processed and reprocessed a half dozen times. Naturally, Germans hesitate to subject themselves to this kind of treatment. Furthermore, why should they move from established positions in one land to a headquarters in a strange land where they are viewed with suspicion by the local Germans and have great trouble obtaining proper living and food accommodations? A tremendous number of the most efficient Germans are still "damned" for having gotten on the Nazi bandwagon at some time or other.

Mr. President, the third directive is just as ominous as the two preceding. Under the democratization directive we read that the Allied Control Council shall "ensure the carrying out and completion of land reform in all zones of occupation in Germany."

I cannot believe that this directive could have been signed by our American Representatives. Certainly these land reforms in Germany are the basis upon which Russia propagandizes her claim to champion the proletariat and the common man. Just what are we doing playing the Russian game, Mr. President, when our own President has declared an undeclared war on all that Russia stands for? For what reasons should we directly sanction Russia's Communist land reforms in eastern Germany? The United States Senate ought now to be given the particulars of just what kind of land reform policies we are a party to, both in our own zone, as well as in the Russian.

The fourth directive to which we have become a party concerns one of the greatest crimes against humanity in all

of history, a crime to which we have directly been a party. Mr. President, under the directive titled "Population Transfers" we read:

D. The control council shall study further the whole question of transfers of population into Germany with a view to directing to areas best able to receive them, those populations whose transfer to Germany may be decided in the future.

It is unbelievable that American Representatives should continue formally to be parties to these forced mass-migrations which incriminate the whole American people as accomplices in mass crimes against humanity.

Nowhere in recorded history has such a grim chapter of brutality been written than in the account of what has already taken place in eastern Europe. Already fifteen to twenty million people have been uprooted bodily from their ancestral homes of a thousand years and thrown into the torment of a living hell to perish or to be driven like cattle across the wastes of eastern Europe. Women and children, the old and the helpless, the innocent and the guilty alike have been subjected to cruelties which have never been surpassed even by the Nazis themselves. Yet now we are committed to a continuation of these same inhuman policies in the future, although the conscience of the American people cries out against such bestial practices.

At this point it is well to remind ourselves of the charge against the Nazis, entered into the Nuremberg indictments. Count 3, section J, of the Nuremberg indictments, reads:

In certain occupied territories, purportedly annexed to Germany, the defendants methodically and pursuant to plan endeavored to assimilate those territories, politically, culturally, socially, and economically, into the German Reich, and the defendants endeavored to obliterate the former national character of these territories. In pursuance of these plans and endeavors, the defendants forcibly deported inhabitants who were predominantly non-German and introduced thousands of German colonists.

Mr. President, as far back as November 17, 1944, President Roosevelt agreed in principle to the very procedure which is now listed as a war crime by the Nurenburg Tribunal, when, in a letter to Mr. Mikolajczk, he stated:

If the Polish Government and people desire in connection with the new frontiers of the Polish state to bring about the transfer to and from territory of Poland of national minorities, the United States Government will raise no objection, and as far as practicable, will faciiltate such transfer.

Certainly the late President knew full well what he was doing, for only a few weeks later, Churchill stated in the House of Commons, on December 15, 1944:

The transference of several millions of people would have to be effected from the east to the west or north as well as the expulsion of the Germans, because that is what is proposed; the total expulsion of the Germans—from the area to be acquired by Poland in the west and the south. For expulsion is the method which, so far as we can see, will be the most satisfactory and lasting. I am not alarmed by the prospect of the disentanglement of populations, nor even by these large transferences, which are more possible in modern conditions than ever before.

Yet, Mr. President, it was the sight of the hideous suffering and brutality inflicted on helpless millions, under these arrangements, that caused Mr. Bevin to cry out during his visit to Berlin, "My God, it was the worst sight one possibly could see!"

Now, according to these directives of April 28, we are formally agreeing to underwrite more inhuman brutality, misery, and death. Is it not time that this administration gave an accounting of its policies, and answered to this further charge of betraying American principles?

It is high time that we knew what arrangements were reached to deal with the prisoners of war question at Moscow. This is mentioned in name only. We do not have any clue as to what the agreement is.

But here again, Mr. President, this administration has been a party to criminal betrayals of American principle, by sanctioning the revival and extension of human slavery to the white race.

We now know that at Yalta, President Roosevelt agreed to the use of German prisoners of war as human slaves under the innocuous phrase, "reparations in kind," which included "use of German labor."

The New York Herald Tribune of August 8, 1945, stated editorially:

The Big Three deal on slave labor was indicated to be the outgrowth of a secret and tentative agreement at Yalta, which might explain its omission from the Potsdam communique. When the Big Three opened their session at Potsdam, the British and American representatives found that the Russians, operating on the theory that the use of German slave labor had been sanctioned at Yalta, had made plans to ship German workers to Russia for reconstruction purposes. Prime Minister Churchill and President Truman, recognizing a fait accompli when they saw one, agreed to such Russian use of slave labor.

Thus, Mr. President, two American Presidents have been party to this betrayal of American principles. This, perhaps, might be condoned by some who wanted to stretch their consciences all out of recognition, but the added fact that this administration has been a party to the imposition of human slavery, not only on prisoners of war, but on civilian populations as well, is an outrage which America must now repudiate, both in word and deed.

It is hard to believe that General Eisenhower himself attached his name to such a document in the name of the American Government. Yet, the record now shows that on Septembe 20, 1945, General Eisenhower signed the following agreement:

The German authorities will carry out for the benefit of the United Nations, such measures of restitution, reinstatement, restoration, reparation and reconstruction, relief and rehabilitation, as the Allied representatives may prescribe. For these purposes the German authorities will provide such * * * labor and personnel and specialists and other services, for use in Germany or elsewhere, as the Allied representatives may prescribe.

Mr. President, on top of all of this, this administration is continuing to double-talk the German people into starvation. On May 7, 1947, the New York Times, Jack Raymond, Berlin correspondent, cabled:

Two years after the end of the war in Europe, the British and American military governments face the worst food crisis in the history of the occupation of the two zones.

Again, Mr. President, in spite of the magnificent work Herbert Hoover has done to champion American principles, I want to quote the honest and outraged concern of one of our highest ranking military officials, who now states:

Mr. Hoover's efforts have been magnificent; and without him we would certainly be much worse off. But the situation is much worse now than it was at the time of his mission and has definitely not improved in any way. The lip service which the public, the Congress, and the President have given to Mr. Hoover's extremely restricted proposals has been accompanied by a short fall of bread-grain imports (received or in prospect before the next harvest) approximating 15 percent of the absolute bottom figure at which we might have been able to maintain distribution of the inadequate 1,550-calorie ration. Then the press notices from America excuse the situation by saying that "earlier theater estimates of the need were too low" and that "theater collections have fallen down." The facts are that the theater estimates of the need have been constant and unvarying ever since last September; and although collections are down below earlier hopes—chiefly because of the severe winter—we shall still collect a higher proportion of the bread grain raised than was ever collected in Germany before, and a very much higher proportion than is being collected in any other country in the world. Such excuses on the part of Washington officials—most of whom have never made the slightest sincere attempt to do anything really adequate to the situation—leaves the theater personnel rather ashamed of the vaunted democracy which we are telling the Germans is so wonderful.

We are at present feeding approximately 500,000 children in the United States zone which we expect to increase to 1,400,000. The British zone is feeding a little better than 2,000,000, which should increase to 2,150,000. The feeding which Mr. Hoover refers to as a "hot meal" amounts to a bowl of soup into which everything goes. Since the normal consumer feeding level now actually being met is at least 1,000 calories short of anything Americans would consider decent and at least 500 calaries short of a slow-starvation level. I would say that all the people in Germany are being neglected, even under Hoover's plan.

Mr. President, because a catastrophe is in the making, in Europe and not only in Germany, as a direct consequence of the policies this administration is continuing to follow toward the vanquished peoples, I earnestly urge upon my colleagues the solemn consideration of a resolution which I ask unanimous consent to submit for appropriate reference.

The resolution reads as follows:

Whereas the Constitution of the United States places upon the Senate the responsibility and duty to advise with the President upon the writing of treaties, and to consent thereto; and

Whereas forthcoming treaties of peace will so vitally influence and determine the future well being of the American people, as well as to the peoples of all the world; and

Whereas the future demilitarized economic and political status of Germany will properly form the heart of these treaties: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the President pro tempore of the Senate direct the Committees on Finance, Foreign Relations, Banking and

Currency, Agriculture and Forestry, Armed Services, Labor and Public Welfare, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and Appropriations to appoint from their respective memberships a majority and minority member to a special committee which shall have the duty to assemble and organize all pertinent facts relative to the circumstances and conditions necessary to an enduring treaty of peace with Germany, and to report to the Senate their findings and their recommendations for the safeguarding of America's vital interests therein, to aid the Senate more competently to discharge its constitutional duties.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 135), submitted by Mr. LANGER, was received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I want to thank the distinguished Senator from North Dakota for the very forceful address he has made on the floor of the Senate this afternoon. The statement he has made and the history he has revealed respecting conditions in Europe, and what is going to happen in Europe as a result of our present policy, should merit the most serious consideration of every Member of the United States Senate. I hope the resolution the Senator has submitted will bear fruit, because certainly the membership of the Senate should make an inventory of what is being done to rehabilitate Europe, so that the people of Europe can see the light of day, and at the same time make an inventory of what the possibilities are in the United States and how we might better serve the people over there.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nebraska. I wish to say to my colleague from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] who lives so close to the borders of North Dakota, where I know so many fine German-Americans, that the letters I receive from them are like the letters received by him and by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska from his German-American constituents, and like one which I have received from one of the most outstanding citizens of the State of California. They all say that unless America sends food to Germany, unless America does something which is going to help the average common man in Germany, the Communists are going to take over Germany. We might as well realize that now when we still have a chance to do something about it rather than realize it 6 months or a year or 2 years from now.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate on official business, for the week beginning next Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, leave is granted.

UNIFICATION OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Washington expects to be absent from the Senate next week when action will probably be taken on S. 758, a bill to promote the national security by providing for a national defense establishment.

I should like to be present, Mr. President, to vote for S. 758 because of what the unification bill is designed to accomplish for the present and future good of our Nation. Since I am required to miss the debate I wish to offer some observations and my reasons for supporting the legislation. These reasons, which I consider to be conclusively sound and constructive, may help the thinking of others as they endeavor to determine how the national security can best be made certain.

I sometimes think that as to given vital issues before Congress, the country is far ahead of its legislative representatives. There is evidence that this is true of universal military training, and I am certain that it is likewise true of unification.

The country is not concerned with service attitudes, partisan politics or other factors which so obviously influence the thinking of many men where these measures are concerned. The country is interested only in results and in the application of common sense in arriving at results.

It is not necessary to sit through long hearings on unification to understand the necessity of it. If we did not understand it before, we certainly should have been able to recognize it after the disaster at Pearl Harbor. If we had been wise, we should have recognized it before Pearl Harbor. If we had, that page in our history might never have been written and the war in the Pacific might have been shortened by many months.

It is impossible now to say how many lives and how much wealth of other sorts were lost irrevocably by our own failure to unify the services before Pearl Harbor. We only know that we recognized the necessity for unified command and unified operations too late for our own good. It was not the services themselves that were to blame so much as those who headed the Government in Washington. If similar disasters should overtake us in the future from the same or similar causes, the country might well hold us responsible at that time—as it should.

Sometime after Pearl Harbor we set up a single command there under Admiral Nimitz. In the Southwest Pacific we gave General MacArthur command over the forces engaged in the campaign to retake the Philippines. But when our combined forces reached Okinawa the struggle for power between the services broke out anew, and these were not resolved until the President gave General MacArthur primary responsibility for the conquest of Japan.

Since VJ-day, General MacArthur, in complete command of all forces in the Far East, has made a record which most Americans regard as one of the brightest pages in our history. At Pearl Harbor, with the Navy in command of combined operations there, we have finally recognized not only the value but the necessity for entrusting responsibility of strategic areas to one top commander.

In Europe the course of events led by a different road to the same end of unified command by General Eisenhower. We all know that unified command was successful in Europe and that we could not have won the war without it.

The lessons of World War II in this respect are so obvious that I cannot see how anyone can ignore the necessity of operations in unified command in any theater in any conflict. But the lesson does not stop there.

Unification should begin at home and lead ultimately to the battlefield instead of the other way around.

What are the functions of the armed services in time of peace? What are they for? Why do we have a War Department and a Navy Department? Let us examine their functions, which I conceive to be eight in number.

First. Policy determination: The War Department and the Navy Department are planning agencies, operating under authority granted them by Congress and within the limits of appropriations provided by Congress. It is their duty to formulate policy for the security of the country, subject to Presidential and congressional approval. How can we formulate policy for the national security unless all of the services—all of the experts—air, ground, and sea—sit around a common council table and come up with recommendations based on common knowledge of their service functions, including capacities and limitations?

Second. Planning: Once policies are determined—once they know what they have to work with—it is the responsibility of the services to plan for the unified operations we know now to be necessary to win a war. How can they do this unless they themselves are united for planning? How can we have an intelligent plan if the ground forces, naval forces, and air forces all plan separately without taking into consideration the part to be played by the other services?

Third. Research: We are entering the age of science. New doors are being opened to us every day by men of science. The discoveries of our scientists have played and will continue to play an important part in all future war activities as well as in our peacetime economy. Is there any logic in duplicating research in the same fields? Shall we not be better off if research, in the interest of national security, is also conducted under unified direction? In financing research, as in other fields of governmental activity, we shall come finally to the bottom of the barrel. The funds for this purpose are not inexhaustible. Rivalry between the services is natural, and, within proper control, is healthy. We want the services to take pride in their own achievements, but we must not let them get out of hand or come to us with programs which have not been examined and coordinated at the top to make sure there is no unnecessary or wasteful duplication. There is only so much money and there are only so many scientists available for the services. Money and men will be used most wisely if allocated under direction by a single agency of the Government as proposed in the unification bill.

Fourth. Intelligence: The lesson is the same here. Three separate intelligence agencies were functioning in Hawaii when the Pearl Harbor attack occurred.

There were separate warnings from the Army, the Navy, and the FBI. Each had its own methods, its own sources of information, and its own organization. Yet without coordination and adequate appraisal of the reports received, and recognition of their significance, our battle fleet was sunk at the precise moment when we needed it most. Here again, I am quite sure that the country recognizes the imperative necessity of closely coordinating all intelligence activities beyond the boundaries of the country and bringing them under single direction here in Washington.

Fifth. Procurement: The Army needs socks. The Navy needs socks. The Air Force needs socks. They all need shoes. They need blankets and sheets and planes. They needs ships and trucks and jeeps. They need barracks and other land installations. They buy cotton clothes and woolen clothes. They buy silk, rayon, rubber, and many other materials for their common use. Is there any sense in having three separate procurement agencies to obtain the same or similar types of equipment, or supplies common to all services? Is there any business organization in the world that would permit three separate departments to bid competitively against one another for the same materials? Yet that is what happens in peacetime and in wartime. This is one of the many evils of divided responsibility that would be eliminated by the present bill.

Sixth. Budgeting: At present the services budget their requirements separately, submit them separately to the Budget Bureau and through the Budget Bureau to the President, and then fight for their budgets in Congress. Duplication and more duplication. Duplication is inevitable so long as budgets are made up separately by the separate services. This situation will continue until the services are unified. Coordination is not enough. The money available for the military and naval bureaus is limited. When the services engage in a struggle for power, as they too often do, there must be someone at the top who can decide between them for the President before the budget is sent to Congress. Someone must say how much each service shall ask and for what purposes.

Separate budgeting as at present is confusing not only to Congress but to the country. We find the several services lobbying on Capitol Hill for appropriations sought by their own bureaus, with no machinery other than the Budget Bureau for scrutinizing their applications and the billions they ask us to pour out. I should think the Budget Bureau itself would be completely bewildered by the present practice; and the budget contains evidence that it is. How can the Budget Bureau possibly know what the services actually require for effective operations when there is no common policy, no common planning, and no common budget?

Seventh. Administration: As in budgeting and procurement, the multiplication of agencies, duplication of activities, and mountains of red tape and paper work in connection with all Governmental activities cry out not only for coordination and simplification, but unification. We have an opportunity here to take a long step forward in the case of the Armed Services.

Eighth. Operations: In the hope of providing a common meeting ground for the services in planning our over-all strategy, and in giving directions to our field commanders, we set up during the war a small operating group under the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It worked well during the period of hostility. Since the end of the War the Joint Chiefs of Staff have literally failed to function. Why? Because they cannot agree among themselves. For a year and a half they have found it impossible to agree as to the respective functions of the several services. The struggle for power between the services has defeated them. Each Chief of Staff—as operating head—has felt that loyalty to his own service or to his own branch required him to maintain an unyielding position when interests came into conflict.

There is no remedy for this situation except unification. There must be decision at the top when the Joint Chiefs of Staff cannot agree among themselves. The Secretary of Common Defense in that case would decide and submit his recommendation to the President, subject to appeal by the several department heads in cases of disagreement with his decision. At present, the President alone can break the deadlock in the Joint Chiefs of Staff and he, with his mountainous responsibilities, should not be asked to do so.

The ideal solution would be to have a single Chief of Staff under the Secretary of Common Defense. This concept has been rejected by the legislative planners in preparing the legislation now before Congress. It caused too much hard feeling between the services. It will take a long time before current rivalry subsides to the point where the services will trust one another in peace as they have to trust one another in war. In the meantime, the Joint-Chiefs-of-Staff system will work only if there is someone over them to see that it does work, and to break deadlocks when they occur.

There must be an end to bickering between the services. The struggle for power so evident in connection with the preparation of this legislation is of no concern to anyone but themselves They must learn to take orders as well as give orders. They must learn to obey not only the commands of the country and decisions of Congress, but the dictates of common sense. I not only concede but assert that our Army, Navy, and Air Forces are superior to any in the world. But not one of them can win a war alone, and no one of them nor any of them in combination, can be permitted to impose their will or conclusions on the country in defiance of the common good.

As for the expressed fears that unification would threaten the existence of the Marine Corps or naval aviation, we can safely ignore that possibility. Everyone knows that the Marine Corps will not be abolished, and everyone knows why. The record of the Marine Corps speaks for itself. The American people will never permit its traditions to die. Its members may die, but its traditions will live always in the hearts of their countrymen. And the corps will go on to new glories as long as the country needs it and men can be found to volunteer for the kind of duty it offers.

As for naval aviation, any schoolboy knows that the Navy needs ships in the air as well as on the sea. The fleets of the future will be made up largely of carriers, and the carriers exist only to carry planes. There will be planes in submarines as well as with the surface fleet.

The Navy is as cognizant of air power as is the Army. In the operation of naval forces, air power is as indispensable as is operation of land forces. Air power is a part of the modern Navy in precisely the same sense that it is a part of the Army. The dispute over long-range bombardment is troublesome, and is one of the disputes that will necessarily have to be resolved by someone. But it is not an argument against unification. Rather, unification would bring a simple and sensible solution.

Someone must say also how guided missiles shall be used when launched from land, and who shall use them. We are not competent to do this, and there must be no rivalry between the services. It is too important in military operations and in warfare to risk a wrong decision, or one dictated by compromise.

All of these things will resolve themselves once the unification bill is passed. The thing needed now is to face the issue and face it quickly, that the country may know that we are not unresponsive to the public demand and the logic of events.

Mr. President, in closing, I express my personal appreciation and gratefulness for the willingness of the distinguished leaders of the minority and majority to sit until this very late hour.

REPORTS BY COMMITTEES ON PERSONNEL AND FUNDS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may I further impose upon the indulgence of the minority leader to ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Resolution 123, Calendar No. 397. I make that request because the Secretary of the Senate is responsible for publishing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the names of the personnel employed by the committees and subcommittees of the Senate.

I should like to say that Senate Resolution 123 as presented—and it has come unanimously from the Committee on Rules and Administration—clarifies subsection (b) of section 134 of the La Follette-Monroney Act, which contains within its provisions the words "Congressional Directory," whereas it should read "CONGRESSIONAL RECORD."

Secondly, it is provided that reports be published semiannually, or each 6 months, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and the same be issued as a Senate and House document, respectively, every 3 months.

If this resolution is agreed to it will clarify that subsection to provide that the names shall be reported only in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on the 30th day of June, 1947, and the 3d day of January

following; so that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will contain all of the publications, will eliminate the House documents, and change the words "Congressional Directory," which was a misprint, I think, to the words "CONGRESSIONAL RECORD."

I ask unanimous consent, with that explanation, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 123.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the resolution.

The resolution was read as follows:

Resolved, That every committee serving the Senate shall report to the Secretary of the Senate within 15 days after December 31 and June 30 of each year the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by such committee or any subcommittee thereof during the period covered by such report, and shall make an accounting of funds made available to and expended by such committee or subcommittee during such period, and such information when reported shall be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The first such report shall cover the period beginning on January 3, 1947, and ending on June 30, 1947, and succeeding reports shall cover the 6 months' period ending on the preceding December 31 or June 30, as the case may be.

SEC. 2. The information required to be reported and published under this resolution shall be in lieu of the information required to be reported and published under section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, in the case of committees of the Senate and their subcommittees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate recess until 11 o'clock a. m. on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, June 30, 1947, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 27 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

IN THE ARMY

CHIEF OF THE NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU

Maj. Gen. Kenneth Frank Cramer, National Guard of the United States, Army of the United States, to be Chief of the National Guard Bureau, with the rank of major general, for a period of 4 years from date of acceptance, under the provisions of section 81, National Defense Act, as amended, vice Maj. Gen. Butler Buchanan Miltonberger, to be retired.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be ensign in the Navy, from the 6th day of June 1947:

David M. Arter	James C. Greenlees, Jr.
Douglas D. Decker	Sumner Gurney
Lawrence A. Ferrara, Jr.	George R. Hugman, Jr.
	William B. Keepin
John L. Gehrig	Homer G. Sanborn III
William W. Gentry	Charles I. Williams

The following-named (Naval ROTC) to be assistant paymasters in the Navy with the rank of ensign, from the 6th day of June 1947:

Jerry W. Bates	Donald R. Haines
Darrell N. Coba	Jack M. Park
Paul F. Griffith	Richard A. Sodowsky

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be assistant paymasters in the Navy with the rank of ensign:

John D. Graziadei
John N. McCabe
Richard D. Willey

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be assistant civil engineers in the Navy with the rank of ensign:

James L. Paulk	William C. Stookey
Eugene L. Pickett	Richard W. Trompeter

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ARIZONA

Christine Atkins, Goodyear, Ariz., in place of M. A. Jenner, resigned.

ARKANSAS

Ruby Blackman, Forester, Ark., in place of C. E. Lindsey, resigned.

CALIFORNIA

Roland E. Willis, Northridge, Calif., in place of E. D. Cline, transferred.

FLORIDA

Michael Justice Hester, Lake Park, Fla., in place of A. J. Allen, declined.

HAWAII

Florence S. Yano, Haina, Hawaii, in place of P. H. Bartels, retired.

Tsukasa H. Ishii, Honomu, Hawaii, in place of B. B. Hay, resigned.

Harold T. Gyotoku, Paauhau, Hawaii, in place of Motoka Ichiyama, resigned.

ILLINOIS

Richard R. Atkins, Kinmundy, Ill., in place of F. O. Grissom, retired.

Tom Cloyd, Loami, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

William J. Thurman, Ludlow, Ill., in place of A. M. Markiano, resigned.

Helen F. Gleich, Menard, Ill., in place of F. V. McNabney, deceased.

Gwendolyn M. Albrecht, Union, Ill., in place of L. R. M. Yerke, resigned.

Lyman E. Goff, Xenia, Ill., in place of C. R. Morris, removed.

IOWA

Albert H. Mohr, Preston, Iowa, in place of J. B. McLaughlin, resigned.

James E. Brunt, Russell, Iowa, in place of G. J. Mettlin, transferred.

KENTUCKY

William A. Rambo, Stanford, Ky., in place of M. B. Helm, resigned.

MASSACHUSETTS

Robert F. Madsen, Southampton, Mass., in place of D. E. Quigley, retired.

MICHIGAN

Donald F. Crane, Mio, Mich., in place of J. H. Holmes, resigned.

Henry S. Blair, Warren, Mich., in place of N. J. Halmich, resigned.

MINNESOTA

Anna M. Lammers, Lismore, Minn., in place of Herman Olberding, removed.

John J. Jaschke, Minneota, Minn., in place of W. B. Gislason, resigned.

MISSOURI

Edna M. Keesling, Belleview, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

James E. Karr, Iberia, Mo., in place of H. C. McKee, transferred.

Don D. Graves, Nevada, Mo., in place of J. M. Moss, resigned.

Edgar W. Holt, Ozark, Mo., in place of W. L. Hixson, retired.

Carl B. Hardin, Raymondville, Mo., in place of T. S. Clayton, deceased.

NEBRASKA

Gertrude L. Hammond, Merna, Nebr., in place of M. W. Morrow, resigned.

NEW JERSEY

Harold K. Elwell, Beachwood, N. J., in place of L. B. Elwell, declined.

NEW YORK

Chester A. Pitney, Eastport, N. Y., in place of Gerald Carmichael, resigned.

Doris D. Smith, Hemlock, N. Y., in place of D. D. Smith, resigned.

Clifford A. Sherwood, Phoenix, N. Y., in place of A. C. Moyer, deceased.

OHIO

Edison Blackburn, Malta, Ohio, in place of M. M. Bankes, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

Joseph Ersagovich, Crucible, Pa., in place of W. D. Thompson, retired.

Emerson K. Musser, East Earl, Pa., in place of C. P. Shirk, resigned.

Steve J. Vrotny, Natrona Heights, Pa., in place of J. J. Roll, retired.

Louise Felin, Strabane, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

WASHINGTON

David N. Judson, Jr., Oak Harbor, Wash., in place of D. N. Judson, deceased.

WISCONSIN

Thomas E. Vinopal, Haugen, Wis., in place of I. J. Pevan, resigned.

Alvadore R. Harris, Kendall, Wis., in place of F. A. Pollard, transferred.

Harry A. Nohr, Mineral Point, Wis., in place of Levy Williamson, deceased.

Leo E. Kostechka, Mishicot, Wis., in place of R. W. Harpt, deceased.

Richard W. Gillett, Wausau, Wis., in place of O. L. Ringle, resigned.

WYOMING

Helen D. Weimer, Glendo, Wyo., in place of G. J. Snyder, retired.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JUNE 27, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in Heaven, who art supremely great and glorious, we confess our weakness, our frailty, and our sins. Thou, who ever sustains those who art susceptible to Thy holy will, grant that we may learn wisdom from the past and be comforted by Thy guidance in the future. O Lamb of God, send us Thy spirit, that it may dwell with each one of us until all selfishness is conquered and all sorrow taken away.

Blessed Lord, we pray for Thy richest blessing to abide with our Speaker, the Members, the officers, employees, and all families. O shine through every cloud, that they may see Thy immortal handiwork woven in garments of glory. Help us to understand that sacrificial labor outweighs the plaudits of men, with duty no longer the stern daughter of Thy voice, but our constant guide and inspiration on life's journey.

Now, O Lord, abundantly bless America. May no plague come nigh our national dwelling place, within or without.

"O God of love, O King of peace,
Make wars throughout the world to cease;
The wrath of sinful man restrain:
Give peace, O God, give peace again!"

In the name of our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On June 26, 1947:

H. R. 1344. An act to admit the American-owned ferry *Crosline* to American registry and to permit its use in coastwise trade;

H. R. 2257. An act for the relief of Southeastern Sand & Gravel Co.;

H. R. 3348. An act to declare the policy of the United States with respect to the allocation of costs of construction of the Coachella division of the All-American Canal irrigation project, California; and

H. R. 3604. An act to authorize the Methodist Home of the District of Columbia to make certain changes in its certificate of incorporation with respect to stated objects.

On June 27, 1947:

H. R. 3791. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills, a joint resolution, and concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3398. An act to extend the period of validity of the act to facilitate the admission into the United States of the alien fiancées or fiancés of members of the armed forces of the United States;

H. R. 3911. An act to continue temporary authority of the Maritime Commission until March 1, 1948;

H. J. Res. 193. Joint resolution to grant authority for the erection of a permanent building for the American National Red Cross, District of Columbia Chapter, Washington, D. C.;

H. Con. Res. 35. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 541, Seventy-ninth Congress; House Report No. 1205, Seventy-ninth Congress; and House Report No. 2729, Seventy-ninth Congress;

H. Con. Res. 39. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Un-American Activities to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearing held on February 6, 1947; and

H. Con. Res. 40. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Un-American Activities to have printed for its use additional copies of House Report 209, Eightieth Congress, first session.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1070. An act to provide for the cancellation of the capital stock of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the refund of moneys received for such stock, and for other purposes; and

S. 1498. An act to provide support for wool, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3303) entitled "An act to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military Establishment of the United States."

NAVY DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948, SENT TO CONFERENCE

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3493) making appropriations for the Navy for the fiscal year 1948, with Senate amendments, disagree to the amendments of the Senate, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PLUMLEY, JOHNSON of Indiana, PLOESER, SCRIVNER, SHEPPARD, THOMAS of Texas, and HENDRICKS.

WAR DEPARTMENT CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 4002) making appropriation for civil functions administered by the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 723), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. KERR reserved all points of order on the bill.

AGRICULTURAL LABOR AND NURSING SERVICES

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1072) to extend until July 1, 1949, the period during which income from agricultural labor and nursing services may be disregarded by the States in making old-age assistance payments without prejudicing their rights to grants-in-aid under the Social Security Act and its consideration at this time.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have the gentleman from New York tell us what this bill does.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, in 1943 there was a great shortage of nurses and of agricultural labor. There was passed a temporary bill to permit the old people, without sacrificing their rights under old-age assistance, to enter into agricultural labor and in the field of nursing in order to supply the needed labor at that time. It is essential that S. 1072 be continued for another year, because of the great floods throughout the country, which will produce a shortage of nurses and agricultural labor in many parts of the country, especially in the flood-afflicted States of the Southwest and Northwest part of the country. This is simply to extend the privilege to the States if they so desire to employ old persons in agriculture and in the field of nursing.

Mr. FORAND. It does not affect anyone but the old people who are now eligible for old-age assistance?

Mr. REED of New York. No it does not. They will be limited to $15 earnings beyond what the State allows unless this S. 1072 is passed. With this bill they can go out in nursing and in agricultural labor and earn more than the $15 without being penalized.

Mr. FORAND. Earn a few dollars without it interfering with the grants from the States?

Mr. REED of New York. Exactly.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I say that the committee went into this rather carefully and, as I understand it, this is the unanimous report of the committee. It is a very meritorious bill and is just simply justice to these old people.

Mr. REED of New York. The gentleman is correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 (f) of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943," approved April 29, 1943 (57 Stat. 72), as amended (57 Stat. 125; 59 Stat. 80), and section 5 (f) of the Farm Labor Supply Appropriation Act, 1944 (58 Stat. 15), are each amended by striking out "prior to the seventh calendar month occurring after the termination of hostilities in the present war, as proclaimed by the President" and inserting in lieu thereof "prior to July 1, 1949."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GOOD BUSINESS

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Speaker, this Congress is going to make available from four to six billion dollars to apply on the public debt of the United States. On May 31, 1947, the average interest cost of our national debt was 2.095 percent.

The interest cost on the $1,765,424,775 terminal-leave bonds issued and outstanding on said date under the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1947 is 2.5 percent, or 0.405 percent higher than the average rate.

Thus, since the rate of interest on terminal-leave bonds is 0.405 percent higher than the average rate on our national debt, we would save $7,149,970.34 each year by deciding to pay off the terminal-leave bonds in preference to paying the same amount of money on our general debt.

To pay these terminal-leave bonds now would thus be good business for the Government of the United States. It would also partially redeem the standing of the United States Congress with many GI's who rightfully feel that they were shabbily treated when the terminal-leave pay they had earned was given them in 5-year bonds instead of cash.

This move would not be inflationary as we are going to apply this money on the public debt in any event. In fact it would be deflationary to a minor extent because it would reduce the annual cost of running the Government by about $7,000,000 over what it would be if we applied the same amount of money to general debt reduction.

Let us take this good business step before Congress adjourns.

MOTIONS TO SUSPEND RULES IN ORDER ON NEXT MONDAY

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next it be in order for the Speaker to recognize Members to offer motions to suspend the rules.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include portions of an address she delivered before the General Federation of Women's Clubs in New York City on June 26, 1947.

Mr. BLACKNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in one to include a brief explanation of H. R. 3215, to establish a Medical Service Corps, passed by the House early in June, and in the other to include a petition and resolution by the Townsend Club members of Maine.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY, AND RELATED INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. KEEFE, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 4003) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, the National Labor Relations Board, the National Mediation Board including the National Railroad Adjustment Board, and Railroad Retirement Board (Rept. No. 724), which was read the first and second time, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. FOGARTY reserved all points of order on the bill.

OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I think it will clearly appear that due to scientific and medical progress and research our people are living longer and the number of people past 60 years of age is constantly becoming greater and greater. Thus accentuates in the minds of thinking people the problem of old age and the necessity of doing something to relieve those in distress. I was privileged last evening to go to the Uline Arena and there see a great convention assembled of thousands of people from all over the United States promoting and enthusiastically speaking for the principles of the Townsent organization. It would be an inspiration to the Members of Congress if they would go out there and see those God-fearing people who have come here asking that the Congress give consideration to the problems that affect the aged people of this country. I hope that that question can soon be brought before the Congress for consideration.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WELCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Hal Boyle, Associated Press staff writer, on San Francisco.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unaimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $408.25, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Hon. FRED A. HARTLEY, JR., relating to the President's veto on the labor bill.

OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, the average income of our senior citizens, who are dependent on old-age assistance, is only $30 per month throughout the United States; while some of the States are paying old-age assistance of $10 and less per month. Think of it, only $10 to $30 a month old-age assistance afforded to American citizens, who have given the best years of their lives to build up this country. That is a disgrace and a blot on the good name of the United States—the richest nation in the world. I ask you—how far will the average old-age assistance go toward paying the grocery bill, the meat bill, and the clothing bill of these people today?

We are so rich, we are giving away billions to other nations of the world. If we give them all they are asking, we will make gifts to these foreign nations amounting to many billions more. If we can make gifts of billions to foreign nations, surely we should be able to set aside funds sufficient to cover the appropriation necessary to carry out the provisions of H. R. 16—an appropriation that is infinitesimal in comparison with the loans and gifts we have made, to nations who do not expect to repay us for our gifts.

What are we doing for our own people who have reached the age of 65? Under the present system we compel them to sign a pauper's oath. If they own their own homes, we compel them to execute a deed turning over their homes to the State. We charge them interest on whatever old-age assistance they receive, whether it is $30 or $10 a month or less; then if they do not pay the interest and the principal of the loan—which the States and the Federal Government wrongfully call old-age assistance—their homes are sold at public auction on foreclosure. I am told that in some States even the life insurance of our senior citizens must be turned over to the State before any so-called old-age assistance is given these American citizens.

It is this unfair and ungrateful treatment of our fathers and mothers on the part of our Government, the richest in the world, that prompts me to appear here before the House today on behalf of these good deserving folks, whom our Government has apparently forgotten in the mad rush of turning over our money and our substance to everybody else in the whole world.

I feel that the Congress of the United States owes a moral obligation to our senior constituents to insure them a Federal annuity, and insurance for all those over 60 who are disabled, so that all who come under the provisions of H. R. 16 be paid a monthly allowance that is adequate, decent, and respectable.

I ask all my colleagues who want to rectify this inequity and injustice against our senior citizens, to step up to the Clerk's desk and sign petition No. 7 to bring H. R. 16 out on the floor of the House so that equitable legislation can be passed by the House of Representatives to take care of our senior citizens as all good Americans should be taken care of.

WOOL BILL VETO

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I do not know how we will pay old-age pensions if we pass a lot of the legislation that is requested by the Chief Executive. He vetoed the wool bill. He does not want a tariff on wool, under which the people who buy the wool would have to pay the tariff in order to keep the price up. He wants to take the tariff off so that the State Department can make agreements with foreign countries, and then the American people will have to take $100,000,000 to $180,000,000 out of the Treasury. Further, if you take $180,000,000 out of the Treasury to pay for this wool, you do not know what the State Department might do in cutting down the tariff that we already have, and the total cost might finally run to three, four, or five hundred million dollars.

It just does not make sense to look after all the other nations of the world without giving consideration to the people of our own country. It seems to me it is time for the Congress to look after the American people first.

THE CASE OF COMMANDER LITTLE

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, the acquittal by a naval court of Lt. Comdr. Edward N. Little, accused of maltreating fellow Americans in a Japanese prisoner-of-war camp, may or may not be justifiable. I presume that it is. The fact remains that the acquittal has given rise to such widespread charges of whitewash by secret court martial as to undermine public confidence in the armed forces. The best way to scotch rumors and restore confidence is to bring the whole truth to light. It is my understanding that the Secretary of Navy has been requested to make the records in this case available to the Committee on Armed Services. This move, followed by a thoroughgoing investigation, has my enthusiastic support.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Evening Bulletin of June 21.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a Supreme Court decision.

Mr. KENNEDY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial and a letter on the Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing bill.

MAXIMUM PRICE REGULATIONS

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the conference report on the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, H. R. 3203, which passed the House on June 17, 1947, provided under section 201 that Congress declares that it is its purpose to terminate at the earliest possible date all Federal restrictions on rent and housing accommodations. Sections 201 to 213, except section 207, deal therewith.

Let us consider section 207—it is a most astonishing section. All sections except 207, as I have already stated, deal with rent and housing. Section 207 reads as follows:

SEC. 207. No action or proceeding, involving any alleged violation of Maximum Price Regulation No. 188, issued under the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, shall be maintained in any court, or judgment thereon executed or otherwise proceeded on, if a court of competent jurisdiction has found, or by opinion has declared, that the person alleged to have committed such violation acted in good faith and that application to such person of the "actual delivery" provisions of such regulation would result or has resulted in extreme hardship.

What is Maximum Price Regulation 188? In the Federal Register, volume 10, No. 146, page 9109, it states that this Maximum Price Regulation 188, including amendments 1 to 65, enacted under provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, deals with maximum prices for consumer's goods other than apparel. As I read this regulation, it deals with furniture, bedding, carpets, radios, and numerous diversified items. This MPR–188 is just one single regulation of more than 500 regulations of the OPA which deal with commodities, and has nothing whatsoever to do with rent or housing, which is the subject matter of H. R. 3203.

Why is section 207 in this bill? This provides that any violator of this regulation shall be granted amnesty, or any judgment obtained in any court of competent jurisdiction against such violator shall be declared null and void if the court, even though judgment was rendered, expressed an opinion that he believes the said violator acted in good faith. Who then is to determine what is good faith. Let us assume that the attorney for the Government and the attorney for the defense appeared before the court in chambers to discuss the case of an alleged violation, and the court stated, with an impromptu opinion, that he deemed the violator was guilty, but that he thought his intentions were good, the wording of this section would then mean that the attorney for the defendant could appear before the court and ask for a dismissal of the case on the ground that the court had expressed an opinion and it would then become mandatory under section 207 of H. R. 3203 for the court to dismiss the claim. To the alleged violators of any other of the more than 500 OPA regulations no such relief is granted.

We must not legislate to grant special privilege to alleged violators of MPR–188, to exempt them from payment of judgments which have been or may be obtained against them in any court of competent jurisdiction, or to exempt them from the imposition of any sentences for violations of MPR–188 or to declare null and void the execution of any sentence that has been imposed, and still penalize those alleged violators of other regulations, which other regulations are in excess of 500 in number, against whom judgments have been rendered and paid, or may be rendered and paid, or sentences imposed and served or are being served, or may be imposed and served, for which they have and will have no recourse.

I have only one conclusion from section 207—that certain special interests endeavored, and successfully so far, to render a service to their particular clients or friends who are alleged violators of MPR–188 by granting them amnesty for violations for which others who allegedly violated other OPA regulations and have been punished by either the payment of a judgment or by imprisonment for which they have, and will have no recourse.

H. R. 3203 purportedly is concerned exclusively with housing and rent regulations, and if any relief is to be granted to alleged violators of MPR–188, it is my opinion that legislation for such relief has no place in and should not be made a part of this legislation.

Legislation to grant special privilege to alleged violators of MPR–188 should be considered on its own merits and not made any part of a housing and rent act.

I urge the President to veto H. R. 3202 for the reason that section 207, a "sleeper," should be deleted.

AMERICAN VETERANS' COMMITTEE

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I should like to discuss briefly what I regard as one of the most reassuring events which has taken place in the last year. Last week the American Veterans' Committee—AVC—one of the youngest World War II veterans' organizations, held its second annual convention in Milwaukee, Wis. You will recall that the first convention of this organization was described by such writers as Thomas Stokes as an inspiring miracle and democracy in action. Press reports of this year's convention are equally enthusiastic. The Milwaukee Journal, reporting on the convention, said that the letters AVC could stand for ardent virile citizens. The Army Times Vet Letter reports that seasoned observers at the convention were flabbergasted by the maturity of political thought and the energy and alertness displayed by the AVC delegates.

I know many of the leaders of AVC well and I have a deep respect for their interest not only in the problem of aiding the veteran to readjust to civilian life but in the over-all problems which affect us all as citizens of the community, the nation, and the world. AVC has stated its philosophy well in its theme "Citizens first, veterans second."

Delegates to the convention made the position of the organization clear on the hotly debated issue of communism. A group in the organization led by Franklin D. Roosevelt Jr., Oren Root, Jr., and Robert R. Nathan formed an informal caucus of delegates who were opposed unequivocally to any Communist influence in the organization. The slate of delegates selected by this caucus was avowedly anti-Communist. The members of the organization showed their support of this group by electing this complete slate to national office. In the words of the organization's new national chairman, Mr. Chat Paterson, who many of us know well as the former legislative representative of the organization, the results are stated clearly:

By electing a complete slate of 26 national officers whose independent progressivism is unquestioned AVC has answered once and for all the canard of Communist influence in the organization. The AVC convention provided conclusive proof of the democratic way of meeting and defeating the Communist problem.

The AVC delegates in other words adopted the counsel of J. Edgar Hoover and proved that the way to defeat communism in America is not by denying them their civil rights but by outworking, outthinking, and outvoting them.

In its new national chairman and vice chairman, AVC has two outstanding leaders. Mr. Paterson served overseas in England, France, Germany, and Austria, as an enlisted man and an officer and was instrumental in collecting evidence which led to the conviction of Alfred Rosenberg, top-ranking Nazi. Before becoming legislative representative for AVC he served with the State Department in Nelson Rockefeller's South American division and in the exchange of persons division. The new national vice chairman, Richard Bolling, of Kansas City, Mo., rose from staff sergeant to lieutenant colonel on General MacArthur's staff in 18 months, and has experience in organizing work in the South and Midwest. Before being elected vice chairman of AVC he was regional field director in the Midwest of Americans for Democratic Action.

AVC's second annual convention has proved again that the organization represents one of the most healthful new developments on the American scene. Instead of spending their time in the usual convention debauch while a little group of self-seeking insiders made all the decisions, the delegates spent long hours, in many cases remained up all night, debating such important issues as housing, racial discrimination, and full employment. I commend the American Veterans' Committee to the Members of Congress as an organization which has much to offer to this country and whose program and policy should be carefully studied.

OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join with those other Members who have just expressed the hope that the Ways and Means Committee will give the earliest possible consideration to legislation in behalf of our senior citizens.

I urge this action in the strongest language possible.

A great Townsend convention is now in progress in Washington. The galleries are at this moment filled with Townsend delegates. I do not rise as a Townsendite. I have never had the support of the Townsend organization as such. Indeed I have always had its opposition because, believing in the impossibility of the original Townsend plan, I have at all times been candid with this group.

There is within me, and I believe in the hearts of the majority of the Members of Congress, an honest desire to enact some law providing a higher compensation or pension for our elderly people. Emotional and enthusiastic speeches by Members of Congress are pleasing but do not increase the pension checks. If these fine old citizens are ever to receive any benefit from increased pensions, it must be done now. Time is marching on and they are falling by the wayside at a terrific rate.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the Ways and Means Committee report a bill to the Congress at once giving us an opportunity to vote on some kind of an increase in pension for these people. That bill should come before us under an open rule so that amendments may be offered and the true sentiment of the majority of our membership may be recorded.

This needed relief has been delayed too long. Signing petitions to discharge the committee and procedure of that kind very seldom ever get legislation on the statute books. I want to do something to help these elderly people and not to fool them.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, since the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] is the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, he might assume jurisdiction of the old-age pension legislation, for which he has just spoken, and bring the measure to the floor of the House.

It is rather amusing to me to hear men who voted to cut the income taxes of the most prosperous people in the United States and who voted to send money abroad to give to people who will not work, never have worked, and never will work, now take the floor and advocate a readjustment of our old-age pension laws without making any specific recommendations.

You know the man who is overlooked in this country—the forgotten man—is the man who pays the man who pays the taxes.

If you are going to do anything you ought to wipe out the State contributions and make the old-age-pension program a national affair and pay them all alike, just as you do our soldiers.

The hardest-working people in the Nation are the American farmers. If any of you have any doubt about that, go out and try it awhile. They do not make enough to pay income taxes, but they pay through indirect taxes to keep up every enterprise in America. They gave the largest percentage of their sons to this war of any people under the American flag; and yet they draw the smallest old-age pension of any people under the American flag.

If you want to do justice to the old people let us do it in a national way and treat them all alike.

CIVIL LIBERTIES

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, history shows that after each of our great wars there has been a wave of fanaticism, a wave of persecution, and a wave of denial of civil liberties to the individual.

I have asked today for a special order after the completion of business to speak on this subject. I believe it is a subject that can be spoken of with a great deal of benefit at this particular time.

We should be alert to the smallest encroachment on our basic liberties. It is indeed true that "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therewith a statement by the Catholic War Veterans.

EXTENSION OF MARITIME COMMISSION

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to file a report to accompany the bill H. R. 3911.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

HUNTER A. HOAGLAND—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 368)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith without my approval H. R. 723, "An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Hunter A. Hoagland, a minor."

The purpose of this bill is to pay to the legal guardian of Hunter A. Hoagland, a minor, of Glen Rock, N. J., the sum of $3,000 on account of personal injuries sustained and medical and hospital expenses incurred as a result of the explosion of an Army shell.

It appears that on January 27, 1944, two gun positions occupied by an Army antiaircraft artillery battalion near Glen Rock, N. J., were vacated by the battalion in compliance with military orders which also directed that all ammunition then on the positions be left there. Four boxes of live 40-millimeter antiaircraft shells were left in the canvas-curtained compartment or magazine inside a revetment, and the balance of the ammunition was stored in the ammunition dump located on the area where the positions were situated. The entire area was surrounded by a barbed-wire fence. When the battalion vacated the area a sergeant and six other enlisted men were left behind to guard the Government property left on the area.

It further appears that prior to February 8, 1944, several boys from Glen Rock had on a number of occasions entered upon the gun positions and taken live ammunition both from the revetment and from the ammunition dump and carried it away; that they had also built fires and had exploded some of the shells by placing them in the fires; and that they had taken other shells apart so that the powder could be removed and burned. On February 8, 1944, these boys while at school told Hunter A. Hoagland, 15 years of age, about the live ammuni-

tion at the gun positions, and at about 7 p. m. on that evening he, with two of the boys, proceeded to the positions. When they approached the fence surrounding the area in question they saw a light in one of the barracks, but not seeing any soldiers, they climbed through the fence at a point not visible from the barracks. Entering the revetment they removed nine rounds of 40-millimeter ammunition from an open ammunition box and placed them in a knapsack. After being on the military reservation for about 15 minutes the boys returned to their homes, and Hunter A. Hoagland took with him one of the shells. On February 28, 1944, he attempted to remove the charge from the shell in the basement of his home by drilling a hole in the shell case. The shell exploded and the boy sustained serious injuries to his right knee and both of his hands and minor lacerations on his face and neck. It was subsequently found necessary to amputate the distal end of his right index finger and the thumb and the third and fourth fingers of his left hand.

The evidence in this case clearly establishes that Hunter A. Hoagland was a trespasser on a military reservation when he obtained the shell by which he was injured. He and his companions were not casual or unintentional trespassers, but went upon the reservation with the fixed design to take and carry away live ammunition. They approached the reservation from a direction which gave them concealment from the soldiers then on guard. They entered by climbing through a fence erected for the purpose of denying the public access to the area. While the boys were filling a knapsack with shells they posted one of their number as a lookout against discovery by the guards.

It is a general rule of law that the possessor of land owes no duty to trespassers other than to abstain from willfully or wantonly injuring them, and so, ordinarily, is not liable for injuries to trespassers caused by conditions on the land or by articles taken by them from the land. It appears that the law of New Jersey, the jurisdiction in which this incident occurred, recognizes no exception to this general rule. While some other jurisdictions allow an exception to such rule of nonliability to trespassers in the case of trespassing children of tender years, this exception is in all cases based on a recognition of the inability of young children, because of their youth and inexperience, to appreciate the dangers to which they expose themselves. Hunter A. Hoagland, however, was 15 years of age at the time of this incident, attended junior high school, and possessed at least an average intelligence for a boy of his age. He was fully aware of the danger latent in the shell in his possession. Prior to visiting the military area he had been present on, or had been told about, the several occasions when his companions had exploded shells by throwing them into a fire. He had also removed and burned the powder from some of the ammunition, and he knew that shells could be detonated by a blow as well as by fire. He was not a "child of tender years" and as such entitled to protection from dangerous instrumentalities and conditions on the land even though he was trespassing. In attempting to remove the propelling charge from a shell by drilling a hole through the casing he was doing a thing he knew to be dangerous. In so doing he was negligent and his negligence was the sole proximate cause of his injury.

In the light of all the facts and circumstances in this case, there is no justifiable basis for an appropriation for the relief of the legal guardian of Hunter A. Hoagland on account of the injuries sustained by this boy. I am, therefore, obliged to withhold my approval from the bill.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 27, 1947.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message and bill be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered printed.

The motion was agreed to.

TREASURY-POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1947—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2436) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year 1948 and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2436) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 4, 13, and 18.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 16, 23, 28, and 29, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$32,925,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$188,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$100,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$72,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,115,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$910,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,332,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$712,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$487,400,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 26: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$13,257,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 6 and 17.

GORDON CANFIELD,
P. W. GRIFFITHS,
CHAS. R. ROBERTSON,
J. VAUGHAN GARY,
JOE B. BATES,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

GUY CORDON,
CLYDE M. REED,
STYLES BRIDGES,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the

Senate to the bill (H. R. 2436) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, submit the following report in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I, TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Amendments Nos. 1, 2, and 3 provide that the appropriation of $450,000 for salaries, Office of General Counsel, as proposed by the House, be divided into two appropriations, namely: salaries, Office of General Counsel and Tax Legislative Counsel, $250,000; and salaries, Division of Tax Research and Research and Statistics, $200,000; but reduces the total of $550,000 proposed by the Senate for these functions to $450,000, the sum proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 4 limits funds of the Bureau of Customs for personal services in the District of Columbia to not more than $826,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 5 appropriates $32,925,000 for salaries and expenses of the Bureau of Customs, instead of $32,500,000 as proposed by the House and $34,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6 is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 7 provides that the amount available to the Bureau of Internal Revenue for printing and binding is not to exceed $2,530,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8 provides that the amount available to the Bureau of Internal Revenue for stationery is not to exceed $1,500,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 9 appropriates $188,000,000 for salaries and expenses of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, instead of $178,000,000 as proposed by the House and $203,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. The Bureau of Internal Revenue should insure that its enforcement activities are not curtailed in any readjustment of its budget program.

Amendment No. 10 corrects punctuation.

Amendment No. 11 appropriates $372,900 for salaries of the White House Police, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 12 appropriates $9,000 for uniforming and equipping the White House Police, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 13 provides specific prices which shall not be exceeded in the purchase with appropriated funds of various models of typewriters in the fiscal year 1948, instead of the limitation proposed by the Senate that such price could not exceed 70 percent of the commercial list price in effect at the time of delivery of typewriters so purchased. In recommending that the Senate recede from its amendment, it was understood and agreed by the managers on the part of the two Houses that a report of the full investigation being conducted for the Committee on Appropriations of the House regarding the purchase of typewriters by the Government, including all considerations relevant thereto, is to be completed and filed by January 3, 1948.

Amendment No. 14 appropriates $100,000,000 for salaries and expenses of the Coast Guard instead of $97,000,000 as proposed by the House and $109,483,123 as proposed by the Senate.

In recommending that $100,000,000 be appropriated for the Coast Guard, the managers on the part of the two Houses desire that the Coast Guard in adjusting its budget program insure that ocean weather stations shall be maintained so as to provide adequate aid to navigation, both surface and air. It was further understood that the managers on the part of the House will recommend that the Committee on Appropriations of the House investigate and give consideration to the possible need of additional funds for loran and ocean weather stations.

Amendment No. 15 provides that funds to be expended for the hire of quarters for dependents of officers or enlisted personnel; for recruiting and for other specified purposes is not to exceed $72,000,000, instead of $70,000,000 as proposed by the House and $77,153,271 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16 provides that the circumstances under which the limitation respecting pay for "Civilian Employees, Coast Guard" may be exceeded are also applicable with respect to the "Office of the Commandant."

Amendment No. 17 is reported in disagreement.

TITLE II. POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Amendment No. 18 appropriates $375,000 for salaries, Office of the Postmaster General, instead of $390,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 19 appropriates $1,115,000 for salaries, Office of the First Assistant Postmaster General, instead of $1,100,000 as proposed by the House and $1,130,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 20 appropriates $910,000 for salaries, Office of the Second Assistant Postmaster General, instead of $900,000 as proposed by the House and $920,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 21 appropriates $1,332,500 for salaries, Office of the Third Assistant Postmaster General, instead of $1,325,000 as proposed by the House and $1,340,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No 22 appropriates $712,500 for salaries, Office of the Fourth Assistant Postmaster General, instead of $700,000 as proposed by the House and $725,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 23 apppropriates $83,800 for salaries, office of the purchasing agent as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 24 appropriates $1,600,000 for printing and binding for the Post Office Department and postal service instead of $1,500,000 as proposed by the House and $1,700,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 25 appropriates $487,400,000 for compensation to clerks and employees at first- and second-class post offices instead of $487,000,000 as proposed by the House and $487,817,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26 appropriates $1,800,000 for carfare and bicycle allowance instead of $1,700,000 as proposed by the House and $1,900,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 27 appropriates $13,257,000 for rent, light, power, fuel, and water for first-, second-, and third-class post offices instead of $13,000,000 as proposed by the House and $13,457,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 28 provides that of the appropriation of $36,500,000 for the hire, purchase, maintenance, repair, and operation of vehicles, $4,514,000 shall be available exclusively for the purchase of trucks, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 29 appropriates $520,000 for transportation of equipment and supplies as proposed by the Senate.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

Amendment No. 6 makes available not to exceed $100,000 of the funds appropriated for the Bureau of Customs for defraying the expense of a management study of that Bureau. The managers on the part of the House have directed that a motion be made that the House recede from its disagreement to the said amendment and concur therein.

Amendment No. 17 authorizes and directs the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation to make a study of the enforcement of the internal-revenue laws with a view to ascertaining the numbers of personnel needed to insure the maximum net tax return to the United States, and to report thereon. The managers on the part of the House have directed that a motion be made that the House recede from its disagreement to the said amendment and concur therein with the following amendment thereto: At the end of the matter inserted by said amendment, following the word "Representatives" but preceding the period, insert the following: "on or before January 3, 1948, such report to be filed with the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate if the Congress is not in session on the date of filing thereof".

GORDON CANFIELD,
P. W. GRIFFITHS,
CHAS. R. ROBERTSON,
J. VAUGHAN GARY,
JOE B. BATES,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, this report is self-explanatory. In several instances events which have transpired since the House originally passed this bill by a unanimous vote on March 11 have caused the House conferees to agree to some increases in funds. In all, the conference report places the final figure of appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office for next year at $12,402,485,761. This is $14,455,700 more than when originally passed by the House, but is $26,520,723 less than passed by the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

Mr MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, it is a wise man who knows when he is licked; however, I do appreciate the opportunity to have a few minutes to comment on amendment No. 13 from which the Senate receded. I am certainly not quarreling with the House conferees. I have too high a regard for them individually to try to press the subject any further if that were possible. I do regret that the Senate did recede on this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, this is the amendment relating to the price ceiling on typewriters. Under existing law and under the House appropriation bill the Government is not allowed to pay more than $77 for a 10-inch standard typewriter, with higher prices for larger machines. This in spite of the fact that no price ceiling whatever in this law or any other law is placed on other office machines and equipment and with the possible exception of the purchase of automobiles by some departments, as far as I am aware, there is no other price ceiling set by law on the amount that can be paid by the Federal Government for any of the thousand and one commodities which the Government buys.

I have contended throughout this discussion for a principle which is involved here. I do not pretend to know just what is a fair price for a typewriter, but I do know that a ceiling of $70 was set by law in 1920, which was increased to $77 a few years ago. I am thoroughly convinced from the figures that have been available to me that as of today a manufacturer cannot build a standard 10-inch typewriter for $77. The result is that one of our larger typewriter manufacturers has very reluctantly notified the Government it can no longer absorb the losses they have been absorbing on typewriters and can no longer supply the Government at this ceiling price. Other manufacturers have set a quota. Last week one agency of the Government bought

300 electric typewriters at a cost of over $300 each at the full list price—no discount whatsoever.

I am glad that the committee investigators are going to continue their study during the recess and that they will make a report to the House before January 3, 1948. I am afraid, however, that the report will not be helpful unless they should decide that the principle of trying to write into law a price ceiling is in itself wrong. I would be just as much opposed if the limited language provided that the Government could pay the full retail list price price of $149.50 instead of the existing ceiling of $77. I do not know where it would lead us if we attempted here in the Congress to write a price ceiling on all of the commodities bought by the Government.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 6: Page 10, line 14, insert as follows: ", and of which not to exceed $100,000 shall be available for defraying, on a contract basis or otherwise, the expense of a management study of the Bureau of Customs."

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, this amendment provides for a management survey of the Bureau of Customs, and has the approval of the Treasury Department.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 17: Page 32, line 11, insert as follows:

"The Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation is authorized and directed to make a study of the enforcement of the internal-revenue laws with a view to ascertaining the numbers of deputy collectors, revenue agents, and other personnel, who should be employed by the Bureau of Internal Revenue in order to insure the maximum net return to the United States from taxes imposed by such laws, and to report the results of such study to the Senate and the House of Represntatives."

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House conferees, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANFIELD moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment No. 17 and concur in the same with an amendment as follows: At the end of the matter inserted by said amendment, following the word "Representatives" but preceding the period, insert the following: "on or before January 3, 1948, such report to be filed with the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate if the Congress is not in session on the date of filing thereof."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS' SALARY ACT OF 1947

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3611) to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3611) to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the same.

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
GEORGE J. BATES,
JOS. P. O'HARA,
JNO. L. MCMILLAN,
HOWARD W. SMITH,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HARRY P. CAIN,
RALPH E. FLANDERS,
J. HOWARD MCGRATH (by H. C.),
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3611) to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendments Nos. 1 and 2: The House bill provided that attendance officers in the department of school attendance and work permits assigned to class 32 are to be entitled, in accordance with regulations made by the Board of Education, to cumulative sick leave with pay at the rate of 10 days per calendar year, the total accumulation not to exceed 60 days. Under the Senate amendments such officers will be entitled to cumulative leave with pay because of personal illness, the presence of contagious disease, death in the home, or pressing emergency. The Senate amendment does not affect the number of days of such leave to which such an officer is entitled in any one year nor does it affect the total number of days of such leave which may be accumulated. The House recedes.

Amendments Nos. 3 and 4: These are technical amendments necessitated by the fact that in the retirement law covering the District teachers specific references are made to the District of Columbia Teachers Salary Act of 1945, which is repealed by this act. This amendment merely provides that any such reference in the retirement law shall be construed to refer to this act. It is further provided that this provision shall not require recomputation of annuities granted prior to the effective date of this act. The House recedes.

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
GEORGE J. BATES,
JOSEPH P. O'HARA,
JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
HOWARD W. SMITH,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this report of the committee of conference we feel will completely settle the teachers' salary increase bill that was presented to the Congress during the early part of the year. I need not tell the Members of the House that not only is this a bill of far-reaching importance to the 3,700 or 3,800 school teachers in the District, but I think it might well be predicated as the fundamental basis upon which school teachers' salaries all over the country may be considered.

I hold in my hand a printed copy of the committee hearings in relation to the over-all tax system of the District. This committee began this study in the early part of the year and continued through until only a few days ago. A very complete study was made of the whole tax structure over a period of 11 years, from 1937 up to and including the year 1948, upon which the budget laid before the subcommittee on appropriations for the District of Columbia is based.

This bill is of far-reaching importance. While it is true that we did not concur in the recommendations of the Board of Education, and neither did we concur in the recommendations of the Board of Commissioners, we did bring the bill out adjusting the salaries of the school teachers and other employees of the school system and, with few exceptions, it met with the unanimous approval of those who are engaged in the school system of the District and with the approval of the Commissioners of the District.

The amendments we have before us today are amendments that were appended to the bill in the Senate and are minor in nature. They have no real bearing on the substance of the bill itself, except as it relates to leave for certain departmental officers in the school system that do not have any leave today except for personal illness. If, for instance, they have a contagious disease in the family or a death in the home, or any pressing emergency, they do not have any leave pay on that account, as many other employees in the school system do. The Senate amendment in which we ask you to concur simply provides that they be given cumulative sick leave with pay at the rate of 10 days per calendar year. That is all that one amendment provides. In order to bring these attendance and other officers in line with the other employees of the

school system, we are asking the House to concur in the Senate amendment in that respect.

The other is a very technical amendment relating to the question of the retirement law. That was associated with the Teachers' Salary Act of 1945, which it was felt was repealed by this new Teachers' Salary Act. We do not feel that it was repealed, but in order to clarify the situation the Senate adopted an amendment that makes it clear that any language in the Teachers' Salary Act of this year does not in any way affect the Teachers' Retirement Act. In other words, it leaves the Teachers' Retirement Act as it is.

For those reasons, we are asking the House to concur in the Senate amendments.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3993) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3993, with Mr. DONDERO in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes. I may say that I do not believe we will require 1 hour on this side.

Mr. Chairman, in bringing in the legislative bill this year the committee has had quite a task. The reorganization bill created many problems and growing out of it all the committee adopted a new system. Heretofore in the appropriation bill for the legislative branch the positions and salaries have all been outlined individually. In the bill this year we use the same form as is used in appropriation bills for other departments.

The committee has worked very hard. I commend each member of the committee for the care and attention he has given to this bill. I think the hearings are probably longer than they have been in previous years, and the committee has gone into more detail than heretofore.

The report is quite comprehensive and sets out in very plain and concise language just what is in the bill and the changes that have been made. I shall not take time to explain all that.

I may say that the bill this year is 27.9 percent below the budget estimates and 11.8 percent below the 1947 appropriations.

The principal increase that has been made in regard to the legislative branch is due to the Reorganization Act which set up many new positions and many committees and committee clerks and assistants. That practically comprises all of the increases in the bill.

The committee has made quite a few cuts in the bill. We have tried to get matters organized so that we can have real efficiency. Toward that end the committee has recommended that before the bill comes up for consideration next year an exhaustive and extensive survey be made to determine just what positions should be retained and what the classifications should be with a view to eliminating those that are not necessary and which should not be in existence.

We find the committees are not utilizing all the help that is provided in the reorganization bill. There is a total of 180 positions provided, and we find that the committees are utilizing at this time, or rather as of May 1947, 122 of those positions. However, the committee has power to appoint members of their staffs if they wish to do so. The Reorganization Act permits it. Therefore, the committee felt that it could do nothing but appropriate for the positions that are enumerated and permitted under the Reorganization Act. We feel confident that the committees will not use all the money that has been appropriated for that purpose and will not use all that the law permits.

The House by resolution, as you know, set up a Coordinator of Information. In that connection, of course, the appropriations to take care of that office have been made in this bill. It is a new appropriation.

The work that is contemplated previously has been done by the Reference Service of the Library of Congress. The desire of Congress, however, for its own staff, its own experts, and its own coordinator of information has been reflected in the reduction in the amount allowed for the Legislative Reference Branch in the Library.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I yield to my colleague from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. As I understand, there is a lump-sum allocation for the various departments. Is that in the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. That is correct.

Mr. SPRINGER. What information has the gentleman received with reference to the effect that such provision would have on the various employees, respecting their salaries, in the various departments of government?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I am glad the gentleman raised that question. On page 4 of the report the matter is mentioned. I will read just briefly from the report:

> The items for salaries of officers and employees of the House and the Senate do not include, as heretofore, a detailed listing of all the positions appropriated for and the salary of each. Inasmuch as these positions and the salaries therefor are all statutory the repetition in the appropriation act each year of the list is unnecessary and meaningless. The language of the accompanying bill provides, in a lump sum, the amount necessary to pay the salaries of all persons employed under the particular appropriation as authorized by law.
>
> A complete list of House positions appropriated for and the salary of each as provided by law will be found on pages 408–412 of the hearings.

In that connection, I may say that section 105 of the appropriation act for 1947 listed the appropriation by positions and salaries as always has been done heretofore, but there was a provision in that bill to the effect that the provisions of the 1947 act became permanent law.

The 1948 act making the appropriation in a lump sum according to law leaves them as they were last year in the 1947 bill.

So there could be no mistake about the matter and in order that we might be certain, a letter was written to the Comptroller General of the United States for an official opinion. His letter is set out on page 5 of the report, but for the information of the membership I will read it:

> COMPTROLLER GENERAL
> OF THE UNITED STATES,
> *Washington 25, June 26, 1947.*
>
> Hon. NOBLE J. JOHNSON,
> *Chairman, Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Legislative Branch, House of Representatives.*
>
> MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Consideration has been given your letter of June 25, 1947, as follows:
>
> "Attached hereto is a copy of the proposed legislative appropriation bill for 1948 and a copy of the Legislative Appropriation Act for 1947. I call your particular attention to section 105 of the 1947 law.
>
> "It will be noted that the proposed 1948 act, with respect to House and Senate items, is radically different in form from the 1947 act in that the detailed list of positions and salaries is omitted.
>
> "The question is raised as to whether or not the proposed bill for 1948 will provide for any salary or position at a rate or in a manner different from the provisions of the 1947 act unless there is a specific provision in the 1948 act relating thereto.
>
> "To cite a specific example, under the Office of the Doorkeeper of the House the following language is included in the 1947 act: 'Superintendent of document room (Elmer A. Lewis), $3,960 and $2,040 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent.'
>
> "It is the contention of the committee that the proposed wording of the bill will not affect those positions specifically set out in the 1947 act, will authorize no one to make any change whatever in such positions or rates of pay, and will not confer upon the disbursing officer of the House or any other officer or employee of the House any authority to make adjustments in salaries or in personnel or in titles of positions which he does not now have and, specifically, the law in the fiscal year 1948 in respect to the employment of Elmer A. Lewis will be exactly the same as it is in 1947.

"Any specific provisions in the 1948 act relating to particular positions would, of course, make changes in the permanent law with respect to such positions, but unless there is a specific provision in the act for 1948 relating to a particular position, the 1948 act would have no effect whatever on the salary or status of such position.

"Your advice in the premises will be appreciated."

In the appropriation item for the House of Representatives in the proposed 1948 Legislative Appropriation Act, under the heading "Salaries, officers and employees," is found the following provision:

"For compensation of officers and employees, as authorized by law, including increased and additional compensation provided by the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended by the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946, as follows:"

A similar provision heads the item covering Senate appropriations for salaries of officers and employees. In the 1947 Appropriation Act, approved July 1, 1946, Public Law 479, the appropriations for "Salaries, officers and employees," gave the title of each position and specified the salary to be paid. Section 105 of that act further provided:

"SEC. 105. Whenever any office or position not specifically established by the Legislative Pay Act of 1929 is appropriated for herein or whenever the rate of compensation or designation of any position appropriated for herein is different from that specifically established for such position by said act, the rate of compensation and the designation of the position, or either, appropriated for or provided herein, shall be the permanent law with respect thereto, and the authority for any position specifically established by such act which is not specifically appropriated for herein shall cease to exist."

A provision substantially similar to said section 105 is contained in section 105 of the proposed Legislative Appropriation Act for 1948, except that the language relative to positions not specifically appropriated for is omitted. It is understood that the specific salaries set out in the 1947 act were augmented by the increases authorized by sections 501 and 502 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, Public Law 106, as amended by section 5 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946, Public Law, 390. As to employees of standing committees for whom provision is made in section 202 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, as amended by acts of January 31, 1947, Public Law 1, and February 19, 1947, Public Law 4, section B-63025, January 20, 1947, to the Speaker, House of Representatives.

Accordingly, I am in agreement with the understanding expressed in your letter.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. SPRINGER. In other words, the provisions of the act of 1947 will control with respect to the payment of these various employees under the provisions of this act.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. That is absolutely correct. It will remain that way until such time as Congress by affirmative action changes it. It is the permanent law now.

Mr. SPRINGER. I desire to congratulate the gentleman, my colleague from Indiana, and his subcommittee upon their careful and painstaking inquiry into this matter because it means so much to the employees who come under the provisions of this bill. You have done a splendid job. I know every employee, who comes under the provisions of this law, appreciates the specific information which the gentleman has been able to obtain, and for their benefit. They appreciate this great service, and I appreciate what he has done. You are doing a fine service for the people and for our country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself three additional minutes.

I thank the gentleman very much.

There was one matter, Mr. Chairman, I wanted to mention just briefly. While the committee has worked hard for the very purpose of trying to reduce expenditures where they could be reduced there was one matter in which we increased expenditures and that was on books for the blind.

The appropriation for this purpose for 1947 was $500,000. We raised it to $1,000,000 under the authority of a resolution authorizing $1,125,000 to be appropriated for that purpose. The committee after going into the matter fully allowed $1,000,000. From the evidence we had and the understanding we could get that is all the money that could be judiciously expended during the next year. We all feel sorry for people who have lost their sight and want to do what we can to assist in their welfare.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. I wish to commend the gentleman for the fine work he and his subcommittee have done and especially to commend them for their handling of the appropriations for the Library of Congress. I think they are doing a perfectly grand job in assisting Members of Congress in all their problems, and I trust the Librarian is pleased with the way the committee handled his office. Am I correct in saying that?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I hardly think they are. I do not believe he is very well pleased, yet we think we have done the right thing.

Mr. BENDER. The committee I trust will be most generous.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I just came in the door and heard the gentleman speaking about an additional appropriation for books for the blind.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Yes. Last year it was $500,000. This year we made it $1,000,000, just doubled the amount. It is for books, machines, and such things.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am delighted because I can carry the news to six blind veterans who are outside the Chamber now. They were just asking about this appropriation. They came over in order to try to secure passage of the bill which would give them automobiles in order that they may be transported about to and from college and to and from work.

As everyone knows, traffic is tremendously heavy here and the amputees are asked to step aside. The other evening they were asked to get up from a table. Everywhere it is a push to make room for people, especially in the streets. If they have their automobiles they can get to their college in time for classes, they can get to their businesses.

I know the gentleman joins me in the hope that either a rule will be granted or that the bill will be brought up under a suspension of the rules.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the preparation of this bill was a labor of love. We had one of the most amiable committees, and certainly one of the ablest and fairest chairmen under whom it has been my privilege to serve. I regret that I cannot go along with them in unwarranted expenditures proposed by the bill. I am glad to approve the reductions with the exception of the untenable reductions in the provisions for the Congressional Library.

Of course, the claim of a reduction of 11.6 percent below 1947 appropriations and 27.7 percent below the budget estimates is wholly unsubstantiated.

In one item alone, the appropriation for working capital at the Government Printing Office, a reduction of $10,000,000 is claimed, when as a matter of fact there is no real reduction in the amount taken from the Federal Treasury and no saving to the Government. The printing and binding requisitioned by the Government agencies must be handled and will be handled, and if and when sufficient working capital is not available they will come back for what is needed. In view of the increased wage scale and higher cost of paper and other materials, the likelihood is that they will have to come back, and if they do, the money will have to be provided. There is no alternative.

So, instead of the bill affecting a reduction of 11.6 below the 1947 bill, it is actually an increase of $2,776,309.44 over and above the current year, and a bare 15 or 16 percent below the estimates. In other words, it is another phony reduction to the extent of $10,000,000 or more.

I am profoundly impressed, Mr. Chairman, at the discrepancy in the attendance this morning and in the attendance at the time we adopted the famous reorganization bill of 1946 under authorization of which much of the appropriations carried in the bill is proposed. On that eventful day every seat was filled and the embattled membership of the House presented a solid phalanx against every effort to adopt even the slightest amendment to that celebrated enactment. Never in the records of the House has any bill been so heralded and so press-agented as was the reorganization bill of 1946. There were literally acres of newspaper space used in its advocacy and on the floor of the House there was a continuous barrage in favor of the bill, with the daily inclusion in the index of innumerable newspaper editorials in its favor. So it is a little surprising that on the occasion of the first full appropriation under the authorization conferred by that bill we find so few Members present, and it is still more surprising to note

that we take up the bill in direct violation of the express provisions of the same Reorganization Act.

It is all the more significant in that it is the last step in the complete wreckage of the famous Reorganization Act.

The Reorganization Act of 1946 provides that no general appropriation bill shall be considered unless the bill, hearings, and report shall have been made available to the membership of the House for not less than three calendar days before the bill is taken up. No provision of the Reorganization Act was more insistently demanded and more vigorously debated than this requirement for at least 3 days' notice before consideration.

The pending bill was reported last night just before adjournment. It has not been available a full day, much less 3 days. This report is a flagrant violation of the letter and the spirit of the act. And when we take it up this morning, by direction and request of the leadership of the House, we abandon the last hitherto unviolated provision of that much-advertised act—touted at the time of its enactment as the supreme and infallible panacea for all legislative ills.

Never has any enactment by the Congress promised so much and delivered so little.

I shall not take the time of the House to recount in detail the step-by-step catalysis of the Reorganization Act. It is sufficient to note only the major provisions of the bill which have become notorious through their violation or lack of observance on the part of the House.

Of course, the bill revolved largely around the committee system. The 81 committees of the House and Senate were reduced to 34 and it was emphasized that this number would suffice for all needs of both Houses and no special committees would be required. The custom of establishing special committees for every real or imaginary need, and on any occasion, was condemned as one of the evils of the existing committee system and the 34 committees were provided once and for all as the ultima Thule of all committee requirements.

The ink of the signatures on the law was hardly dry before the creation of additional committees started and has continued apace without interruption.

Furthermore, the standing committees were no sooner formed than a process of decentralization began which has resulted in the creation of more subcommittees than the original number of committees, each of which has approximately the same jurisdiction and the same duties as the old committees supplanted by the Reorganization Act.

The reduction in the number of committees has in no way decreased the work of any Member. It has in no way accelerated the business of the House. It has not simplified procedure. It has afforded no appreciable advantage.

On the contrary it has condemned Members of the House to treadmill duties on which they work as hard but without recognition or credit for work accomplished. Under the former procedure, after a Member had remained here three or four terms and had worked faithfully and effectively, he was awarded a chairmanship.

He was accorded tangible recognition of his service. His constituency appreciated the distinction conferred on him. It was a credit to them as well as to him. And why not? A manufacturer who operated his plant successfully during the war was awarded an E; a scholar who distinguished himself in his particular field is given a degree; an army or naval officer serving creditably at his desk here in Washington is given a bronze star or a promotion. Why should not the man who has served effectively on this floor have some slight recognition?

Why should not he have a chairmanship when he does the work and carries the load? But under the consolidation there are only 18 chairmanships in the House and men may come here and serve a lifetime without attaining one. The country at large cannot understand why he never attains that rank. It is unfair to the rank and file of the membership of the House pocketed behind the 18 men who monopolize the chairmanships.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I have no reason to speak for any other committee. I wish to say to my distinguished colleague from Missouri that so far as the Committee on Agriculture is concerned, I wish to disagree with the gentleman. I am not saying that any of the other chairmen that I have served under, such as Mr. Jones or Mr. Fulmer or Mr. Flannagan, could not have accomplished possibly as much as the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] has accomplished, but I want to say to my colleague from Missouri, who has always been interested in agriculture, that there has never been a time that the committee had the grasp of and the information about agriculture that they have under this reorganization. The reason it is so is because of the same situation that the gentleman complains about; that the subcommittees get the facts; they do not have to believe some bureaucrat; they have the facts and they have the machinery for getting the facts in the personnel in the office of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture. In all fairness I want that to appear in the RECORD because it is the truth and it is the fact.

Mr. CANNON. I am glad to hear my good friend from Wisconsin speak in such laudatory terms of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE]. I was deeply gratified when he succeeded to the chairmanship of the committee. No one is better qualified to hold that position or more deeply and sincerely interested in the welfare of agriculture. And I am glad he has the advantage of the association of the gentleman from Wisconsin on that important committee. There is no greater friend of the farmer in this Congress. But there are men on that committee, and every committee in the House, including the gentleman from Wisconsin, who are also entitled to recognition for duty well performed.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. I am wondering if the distinguished gentleman from Missouri will agree with me that perhaps the work of the committees now is not as efficient as it was before the Reorganization Act. With a subcommittee of four or five or six members hearing important issues, and all important issues being presented only to subcommittees, does it not logically follow that the full committee relies upon the judgment of four or five members, and therefore the entire Congress may be acting upon the judgment of four or five or six members of a subcommittee?

Mr. CANNON. That is true; and the lack of association of the rank and file of the whole committee with the broad field covered by the jurisdiction of the committee is a distinct loss to the members and to the Congress and is reflected in its legislation.

Mr. CANNON. Then going a little bit further into the operation of the Reorganization Act, it was especially provided that the committees of both Houses should meet in open session; that there should be no executive sessions. The public were to be invited and we were to have only open covenants openly arrived at. Again the provision is distinguished by its lack of observance.

There has not been a single session of the committee or the subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations in open session. The provision of the Reorganization Act is, and has been from the date of its approval, a dead letter; another refutation of the charges that the procedure of the House was antiquated and in need of streamlined revision. Likewise, it was provided that there should be no riders on appropriation bills. You can remember when Members stood on this floor and decried the iniquitous practice of tacking legislative riders on appropriation bills, and yet we have the remarkable instance—in the consideration of the agricultural appropriation bill—of the Committee on Appropriations, in violation of that provision of the rules of the House, going before the Committee on Rules, and the Committee on Rules, in violation of the express provision of the Reorganization Act, reporting out a rule under which we could not make a point of order against any item in the bill, and which permitted, as everybody understood before the rule was enacted, far-reaching legislation by riders on appropriation bills.

The Reorganization Act also provided that every committee and subcommittee should report the names of staff members and that these committee reports should be printed every 3 months. If the requirement has been complied with, it has not been called to my attention.

Then there was that one particular provision in the Reorganization Act that was advertised as the greatest advance ever made in the budgetary system of the country. It insured, we were told, that there should be no appropriation beyond revenues, and if there should be excess appropriation, provision should

immediately be recommended for increasing the national debt or for making appropriate increase in taxes to finance it. It was specifically provided that this joint legislative budgetary committee should report not later than February 15. Mr. Chairman, February 15 is so far back of us that it has become ancient history. We are now within 3 days of the end of the fiscal year, and still this joint committee that was to revolutionize the budgetary system of the Government has never even brought in a conference report.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 additional minutes.

And we were going to abolish lobbying. The lobbyists were to be brought in and be registered and ticketed, and such drastic supervision was to be enforced as to completely eliminate this highly objectionable feature of national legislation. Why, Mr. Chairman, the lobbyists have been more powerful and better paid and more aggressive in this year of our Lord 1947 than they have ever been in any previous Congress.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I have also found that we have had more activity on the part of Government officials and employees in lobbying since the Reorganization Act was passed than we have ever had before.

Mr. CANNON. I am sorry to have my good friend from Minnesota concede that the law is ineffective and is being so flagrantly disregarded when we were promised the millenium when it was enacted.

Mr. Chairman, in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 there is another notable provision. It expands a service in the Congressional Library, the Legislative Reference Service. Its provisions are mandatory. They are not optional. The Librarian of Congress is directed to establish a separate department known as the Legislative Reference Service.

He is not given permission. He has no choice but to comply with the provisions of the law. It is provided that the service shall operate not merely upon request but on its own initiative to make available certain data. The authorization for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1948, is $650,000.

The development of the Congressional Library is an interesting and heartening story. In a little more than a century and a half our people progressing from uncouth pioneers who through force of circumstances were concerned only with the utilitarian, have reached a status of intellectual attainment unexcelled, if not unequaled, by any other people on the globe. And the Library of Congress is the visible, irrefutable evidence of that progress. The Library is a symbol and a monument to the academic and intellectual achievement of the American people.

We are not only the greatest military power on the globe—and the recent war demonstrates that fact beyond cavil; we are not only the richest nation in the world, with more wealth than all the rest of the world combined—but we are the most progressive and intellectual people the sun has ever shone upon. And this great Library daily testifies to that preeminence.

Our armies, our fleets upon the air and on the seas, our record of battles won and enemies vanquished, testify to our military power. Our bank balances, business statements, trade balances, our standard of living, in even the poorest quarter of the poorest county in the union, testify to our wealth and our libraries and universities are convincing evidence of our academic attainments.

This great library is known and accepted throughout the world as proof that we are not merely shopkeepers as Kaiser Wilhelm insisted, not merely mobilizers of battalions of brute strength, but that we are a people of culture and learning.

Libraries are the last capstone of civilization and have been so accepted throughout human history. One of the most irretrievable misfortunes that ever befell mankind was the burning of the Alexandria Library. And during the Middle Ages one of the supreme contributions of the church, second only to its spiritual mission, was the preservation of the last vestiges of the golden age of Grecian and Roman literature. Mr. Chairman, it is difficult to estimate ancient literature. Ideas have always paced man's progress, and books, the record of men's thoughts and achievements, are the information upon which we build. They are the tools with which we implement modern research.

Both Washington and Franklin believed, and it is the verdict of modern historians that the American Revolution could not have been sustained without the doctrines disseminated by Thomas Paine in his book The Crisis. One of the determining factors which precipitated the Civil War was a book by Harriet Beecher Stowe, Uncle Tom's Cabin; and it was Randall's poem, printed on the front page of a Baltimore newspaper, Maryland, My Maryland, which in 1 day swept the great Old Line State into the Confederacy. And more recently, Thomas Dixon's The Clansman exerted profound influence upon national thought.

Mr. Chairman, with all of our military might and fabulous wealth we have in that library across the plaza, more powerful influences than are piled up in all our arsenals or bank vaults or in our State and national treasuries. It is our national repository of Americana, American literature, American thought, American ideals the symbol of the predominance of American attainments in the realm of the mind.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, if there is anything of which we have reason to be proud it is this library, the greatest library in the world.

I remember in the Sixty-second Congress hearing on this floor the boastful statement that the United States had the fourth greatest library in the world. At that time the first library in the world was the British Museum, the great national English library in London; the second library was the French library in Paris; the third was the Royal Library in Berlin; but the speaker was very proud that we had here in our Congressional Library the fourth greatest library.

Mr. Chairman, in the intervening years, and they have not been so many, we have come successively from fourth to third, from third to second, and today up to first place. We have here today the greatest library, the greatest institution of its kind that the sun ever shone on. We, as Americans, have every right to be proud of that great institution.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I appreciate the revealing description and the splendid tribute which the gentleman has given in this description of our Congressional Library. As one who is a lover of books and of learning I think it is the best I have ever heard. The pen is mightier than the sword and the gentleman has given conclusive argument to that effect in the description of our Congressional Library. I am given a better understanding of its significance.

Mr. CANNON. As the gentleman well says, it is our greatest strength. We cannot win a war with arms until we have previously won it with ideas. The world is not governed by armies or navies, but by ideas. The Congressional Library here contains the greatest treasures of our national heritage.

All can remember a few years ago when a young man, after studying here in America, and graduating from our greatest universities, if he wished to complete his education, felt he had to go abroad. He would leave America to have the advantages and opportunities offered by the libraries and universities of England, France, Germany and Italy. No man was considered to have attained the highest academic status until he had been abroad and had had the advantages afforded by the great libraries across the sea.

Today we possess here in America preeminently the greatest facilities for study and research to be found anywhere. No boy need go abroad to study in any foreign land. In no country upon the globe are to be found such cultural, educational, and academic opportunities as are provided here.

This great library is the key to the library system of the Nation. Every major library in America, including those of our large universities, depends upon the Congressional Library to supply it with its organizational charts, its library cards, its indices, which it regularly prints and distributes to the libraries of the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, this national institution renders not only a spiritual and intellectual service—a service both to religion and to learning—but at the same time, and strange as it may seem, it contributes directly to the development and maintenance of national defense. That is borne out by a remarkable article which appeared some time ago published

by the Russian business organization in this country, Amtorg. It published a list of the centers of production where consumer goods were produced in time of peace and munitions in time of war. It gave the location of such plants with identifying data. Along with the TVA and with the steel mills of Pittsburgh and the motor factories of Detroit, it included the Congressional Library. In short, they considered the Congressional Library as one of America's wartime assets. But in writing this bill we do not seem to realize it. If a fleet of planes with atomic bombs ever breaks through our first-line defenses and falls upon our centers of production in this country, they will not only take out the power dams and the munition plants and the factories producing war materials but it is down on the list that they propose to get the Congressional Library. Stalin—and who will deny that he is an authority upon that subject?—knows that the Congressional Library—this vast repository of maps and books and scientific information on every war we have fought—is of inestimable value to the national defense of this country.

Now, the most astonishing thing I think, my friends, I have ever seen in any bill presented in this House is the slash made in the provisions for the Library. It amounts to sabotage. It does not leave a vestage of any material increase in the Congressional Library. It does not even leave the Library the amount it had last year. Of course, there is a provision in there of $500,000,000 for the blind, which is not primarily a Library activity, and when that is classified as it should be classified we are providing for this great Library this year $450,000 less than it had last year.

And it is based on a statement in the report to this effect that in 1933 the Library had 853 employees. My friends, they must be in sad need of argument in support of the cut in item when they have to go back to 1933, 14 years ago. The entire world has changed in those pregnant 14 years. If you compare the number of employees in the Federal Government in 1933 with the number provided by the bills which have already passed this House this session, you will see the significance of the change.

I have here a statement from the Kiplinger magazine of last month. It says there are 1,000 book publishers in the United States; that 600,000,000 books were printed in 1946, and that in 1946 there was greatly increased demand for business books. We might base our justification of library support on purely altruistic grounds—that life is more than meat and the body more than raiment. An even on these grounds an adequate appropriation is justified. But it is also justified on a purely business basis, for the statistics quoted by the Kiplinger magazine show that in 1946 the demand for business books alone went up 37 percent over the previous year. But, instead of increasing the appropriation to care for that increased service, we are decreasing it. It is unbelievable.

The time mentioned by the committee in the report is 1933. Since that time church membership in the United States has increased by 10,000,000 communicants. The enrollment in our colleges and universities has increased from 1,055,360 to 2,103,000 students. The population of the United States has increased nearly 15,000,000. The cost of living in the United States has increased more than 64 percent. The cost of every constituent expense has increased, but they expect the Library to get along on less than it had when the cost of living was lower. The national income increased from $42,000,000,000 to $180,000,000,000, yet the committee expects the Congressional Library, the greatest repository of human knowledge ever accumulated, a symbol of America's greatness, to be measured by 1933 figures.

Why this sabotage of this representative American institution? Why this vendetta against the Congressional Library? And in the report of the committee we have something that is seldom seen in a formal statement to the House. It speaks of the Librarian as "obstinate." It speaks of his justification of the budget as "long winded."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 additional minutes.

A formal statement by a committee of the House should be more dignified even if it were true. When the report speaks in such terms of one of the most eminent men in the service of the Nation, especially on such an infinitesimal matter as the use of a vault in the Library, it betrays hostility toward the Library rather than the warm support which should animate every American.

Mr. FOLGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. FOLGER. In that connection, I notice this proviso under the appropriation for the Library of Congress:

> That hereafter the gross salary of any position in the Library which is augmented by payment of an honorarium from other than appropriated funds shall not exceed such rate as, combined with such honorarium, will not exceed $10,000.

Why should that figure drop so low?

Mr. CANNON. There can be no logical explanation. It is a breach of faith with the philanthropists who generously provided these endowments. It is a violation of the terms on which these benevolences were granted. They were accepted with the understanding that they would be applied and administered according to the wishes and directions of the donors. The incorporation of a provision, denying the use of such funds to supplement Government salaries in order to secure better men for important work—is the imposition of a restriction not contemplated by the grantors. It is the initiation of a public policy never before followed and will inevitably result in the drying up of such sources of endowment. I am certain the gentleman will agree that the adoption of such a policy would be most unfortunate. It would be a slap in the face for the men who, out of their generosity and their interest in the utilization of the material in this vast storehouse of information for the benefit of mankind, having provided these honorariums. The Congress is within its rights in fixing salaries paid from the United States Treasury but it has no right to change the terms on which such contributions have been made and accepted. If a Member of this august body is worth more than $10,000 a year why is not an eminent scientist or savant, who has spent a large part of his life in study and research and attained the highest rank in scholarship, likewise entitled to more than $10,000?

Many men have in their wills or through foundations or direct personal gifts made contributions to the Library of Congress to establish endowments which will benefit mankind down through the ages. Let us keep faith with them.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I am glad the gentleman is kind enough to yield. But if such a proviso is applied to employees of the Library of Congress, why would it not be just as sensible to have the same proviso for the employees of the Congress?

Mr. CANNON. I agree with the gentleman. But why not include the Congressmen themselves? If we are to limit the compensation of the most scholarly men in the Nation, why not place a similar limitation on the salaries of the Congressmen?

Mr. Chairman, the Reference Service of the Library of Congress is not only one of the most valuable aids to congressional work, but it is one of the most efficient. It is used by practically every Member of Congress. And I have never yet heard any Member cite an instance in which its work has not been satisfactory. I have heard many Members say they rely upon it, but so far as I know, there is no instance in which it has failed to supply promptly and accurately any information requested. If there have been any such instances, it would be a service to the committee which prepared this bill and to the House if any instance of lack of promptness or accuracy were placed in the RECORD or filed with the committee.

During the last few months especially, the record of the Legislative Reference Service is replete with notable contributions to the work of the Congress. It supplied consultants at the San Francisco Conference who were so satisfactory that Senators VANDENBERG and CONNALLY took them to the following London conference. And the service was used effectively by Senator TAFT in the work on the labor bill which has just been passed over the President's veto. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who sits here, utilized the Legislative

Reference Service in preparing a study and analysis of communism, one of the most timely and intricate subjects of the day, and produced a work so comprehensive and authoritative that it has become the foremost reference work on communism in America today and has had to be reprinted to meet the demand. Where else, either in the congressional staffs or out of them, can you find a service competent to produce such a work as that?

And in response to the suggestion made here that some of the committees are not using this service and that its staff have nothing to do, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] advised the committee that so heavy is the load carried by the Legislative Reference Service that since the first of the year the top men of the Service have devoted 2,000 hours of overtime to the work without compensation. It is difficult to understand why such baseless charges of inefficiency or inaccuracy are made when practically every Member of Congress can testify to the contrary.

The difference in the caliber of men in the Library service and those selected for the staff of the House and in the scholarship which characterizes their work is illustrated by a comparison of their output with the study in communism just referred to.

By way of example, I quote from one of the compilations prepared here in the House and appearing on page A2938 of the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Here are excerpts from it:

When we Republicans organized the present Congress * * *. Confronting us were hundreds of money-spending boards, bureaus and commissions—the spawn of 14 years of Democratic misrule.

The House Appropriations Committee, aided by some of the soundest authorities on administration of government, labored hours without end to bring a semblance of order out of the chaos that had been compounded by slipshod fiscal policies during the war.

* * * * *

President Truman * * * has not kept that solemn pledge. He has openly protested against cutting his spend-and-spend and tax-and-tax budget one dollar.

* * * * *

Yes, the New Deal was repudiated in the last elections, but New Dealers, from the President down, are still beating the drums of spend and spend and tax and tax at their old stands.

* * * * *

President Truman, in a shocking abuse of the veto power, vetoed the tax-relief bill and told the people that if they spend their own money the result would be inflationary, but if the Government takes it from them and spends it the result would not be inflationary. Nonsense.

* * * * *

Since that tragic action by the President and his followers I have been asked by many anxious persons whether scuttling of the tax-relief bill means the end of our Republican economy efforts. My emphatic answer is, "No." The Republican Party will not let the people down. * * * The way of the economizer is difficult when faced by an administration bent on spending every dollar in sight.

* * * * *

The House of Representatives last February set as a theoretical goal to obliterate 14 years of New Deal spending psychology, a reduction of $6,000,000,000 in expenditures for 1948. * * * Herewith is the bulletproof record of the gratifying progress made, which no New Deal "chair bottomers" can shatter.

Now, that would be an appropriate campaign speech for a remote up-State precinct or a downtown ward the night before election. But it has no place in debates in the greatest legislative forum in the world. Compare it with the documented accuracy and logical discussion of the work on communism just referred to. The "soundest authorities on administration of government" who write the articles are not identified, but they speak very highly of themselves. Perhaps it is well that they do.

One glance at it will convince anyone that it was not prepared by any of the FBI or other investigators the Committee on Appropriations has used for the last 3 years. And no one would make the mistake of attributing it to the Legislative Reference Service of the Congressional Library.

May I also include a report by one of the new staff of investigators which has displaced the nonpartisan investigators used by the Committee on Appropriations up to the opening of the Eightieth Congress. It is self-explanatory:

INDIANA STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

THE OLD SHELL GAME, PEANUT VERSION, OR FEEDING PEANUTS TO SQUIRRELS IS NOT MONKEY BUSINESS

(Howard Friend, our research director, and Robert Hammer, head of our business-agriculture department, were requisitioned some time ago by the House Appropriations Committee as part of the staff of experts to work for the committee in checking into various departmental budgets. Friend and Hammer were assigned to the Agriculture Department, and Friend is in charge of the crew working in that Department. We had a letter from him a few days ago written in a light mood about a serious trend in governmental affairs. Of course the peanut people probably have a good story also, but this is just a sample of the difficulties of reducing Federal expenditures and taxes.)

DEAR BOSS: I hope you and all other Hoosiers appreciate the importance of the peanut.

Bob and I have discovered that we (meaning the great and wise United States of America) are planning to spend—or rather to lose—$16,000,000 next year on peanuts we don't need. On second thought, we must need them, for why else would we spend $16,000,000 on peanuts we don't need.

It is all wound up with the CCC. See? That's the Commodity Credit Corporation, which happens to be one of the outfits we are examining to see how much tax support it needs so it can support the price of this and that—including peanuts.

It seems that during the war peanut production went up because somebody wanted peanut oil for something. Now we don't need the oil, but peanut producers still like the idea of producing lots of peanuts whether anybody wants peanut oil or peanut butter or not. Of course, we can't let the price drop because maybe peanuts would go back to a nickel a bag, or if it stayed at 10 cents a bag peanut eaters might get too many peanuts for a dime and thereby get the bellyache. Besides, it wouldn't be any fun producing too many peanuts unless somebody like Uncle Sam spent a bagful of money (and we don't mean just a dime peanut bagful) to keep those old prices up where we like them.

So, therefore, it is down in black and white in the United States budget that we are gonna figure on spending $16,000,000 to support the peanut producers and guarantee that the peanut eaters don't get the idea that peanuts are plentiful. That means CCC will end up with a whale of a mess of peanuts on its hands. Perhaps someone will suggest that the surplus is needed to feed the monkeys and squirrels. That should make the taxpayers look and act more like their alleged ancestors.

We might do this with all of these peanuts. Bob and I have in mind recommending that a peanut oil having all the virtues and what not of castor oil be developed. Then feed it Mussolini style to the guys who dreamed up the $16,000,000 grow-more-but-eat-less peanut deal.

Of course, $16,000,000 is just peanuts down here. Or is it? I seem to remember that Indiana just passed a 20-percent sales tax on cigarettes with the hope of raising about half of this amount.

Still and all, they tell us the average income-tax bill paid by citizens who pay any income taxes at all to Uncle Sam is about $425, so you see it only takes 37,647 taxpayers to pay the $16,000,000. Statistics show that there are 791,720 individuals who pay income tax on Form 1040 in Indiana, so only 4¾ percent of these people's tax money would go to the $16,000,000 peanut program.

Come to think of it, if all the people in a town about the size of Lafayette paid $425 each into the Federal Government, it would just about take care of this peanut matter. I'll leave it to you, is that peanuts?

Of course, CCC also is looking forward to a few other minor items in 1948—such as losses of $42,899,000 to put a jack under the prices of eggs, $36,984,000 for potatoes, and $42,398,000 for wool. But why not? It figures on making a little profit on cotton and wheat and on ending the year only $160,870,000 in the hole for its battle to keep low prices from violating this thing called parity.

And what is a measly $160,870,000? Oh, just six and one-half million more than the total expenditure of State government in Indiana for all purposes in the 1945–46 fiscal year.

Just thought you would like to know.

Cordially yours,

HOWARD.

Compare this with any of the factual, unbiased reports made by FBI for the Appropriations Committee in the last Congress. In that Congress our investigators were selected from the ranks of the most carefully trained men in the world, the Federal Bureau of Investigation. They were under instruction to secure the facts and report them impartially and without bias. And although we investigated every agency of government on which an investigation was requested by any member of the committee over a period of 3 years, no report they ever made was ever criticized by any Member on either side of the House. If any report had been objected to we would have sent another investigator, and continued to send new investigators until all information requested by the objecting Member had been secured. It is a matter of regret that we have abandoned the FBI and have substituted a class of service represented by the above reports.

Incidentally, it would be interesting to know what the farmers of Indiana think of the reference to "this thing called parity."

Mr. Chairman, I shall not offer any amendments. I do not believe the Congressional Library should be made a political football. There should be no division along party lines on any question pertaining to the Library. I trust that in another body or in another bill the interest of every American citizen in the Library can be adequately protected.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES. The gentleman has suggested that the House has seen fit to employ individuals to do work that he thinks should have been done by the employees of the Library of Congress. Is that correct?

Mr. CANNON. What I have said is——

Mr. REES. Just a minute. Does the gentleman mean to suggest that we have incompetent people employed by the Congress and that he thinks we ought to have hired employees of the Library of Congress to do the work? Who is he talking about?

Mr. CANNON. There has never been any need that has been so emphasized on this floor——

Mr. REES. But I want to know who the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. CANNON. I trust the gentleman will permit me to reply. There has never been any need so emphasized on this floor as the necessity for eliminating overlapping duplication.

This bill provides for duplication of the most flagrant character. In this bill, we are appropriating money to pay men who are doing, or proposing to do, precisely the work performed by the staff of the Congressional Library, including a superfluous office which, according to a statement by the committee itself in its report, duplicates the work of the Legislative Reference Service.

The material prepared by these men, and just read, is the best criterion of their competency.

The proposition is accentuated by the fact that at the time we are giving the Library the heaviest cut below the budget estimate ever given it since it was established, we are increasing the appropriations for our own service here in the House to the highest figures in the history of the Congress. Although we are pledged to a program of economy reducing all departments, in the House we are breaking all records for number of employees and amounts of expenditure. The cost of the House service is twice what it was in 1946, an increase of 100 percent in 2 years. And, at the same time, the Library is cut lower than the current year.

Mr. Chairman, economy, like charity, begins at home.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TIBBOTT].

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Chairman, the general aspects of this bill have been thoroughly covered by our very able chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON] who has done a grand job in conducting hearings on the measure before us. Great credit is due him for his courteous treatment of the witnesses appearing before our committee.

In discussing this bill I shall be content to consume little time and to give some information about the Congressional Library. It is of great concern to me, and I believe it is of concern to the other members of the committee, just where the administrators of the Library are going with this institution. At times I wonder if they are victims of their own innocence and if they ever give thought to the practical problems of the Library. It seems to me that it is difficult for them to form an opinion on the practical and real things of life. I have no purpose whatever in indulging in personalities and abuse, but we have a practical common sense proposition before us which is: To what extent should the Library of Congress be permitted to carry on its activities in an extravagant manner.

There can be no doubt that the Library in the past has rendered meritorious service to the whole Nation. Many laudable accomplishments have been made by this institution. There is no doubt in my mind that those at the head of it will continue to give the service in the future that they have given in the past. Those of us who are presently making an effort to reduce the over-all appropriations of the Library are doing so largely because we feel as though its officials have gone too far without considering the relief and protection to which the taxpayers are entitled.

In the 1947 hearings on appropriations of the House and Senate having to do with the Library of Congress, there is sufficient evidence that their requests for funds should be thoroughly considered. In these hearings it was pointed out there is a need for determination as to what the policy of the Library of Congress is going to be in the way of expansion and service to the public and to Congress. In the report there will be found the original purpose in establishing the Library which was to serve Congress. It would seem that the Library has moved into a position not only as a Congressional Library but a national and even an international one. Of course, the responsibility rests with Congress who is charged with with the operation of this institution.

Dr. Luther Evans at the Senate hearings last year expressed an opinion that there was no question of policy to be settled. He said that this matter had already been approved by Congress, and the House was mistaken in its views. Whether or not the House was mistaken in this direction last year is a matter to be settled by Congress, probably not now, but in the very near future. In the final analysis, however, Congress must decide the future of the Library of Congress.

In the 1948 budget justifications a study was made of the present personnel of the Library of Congress with an aim toward discovering the fitness for positions and the qualifications of individuals, their ability, and their loyalty to the Government.

In my opinion, there are many changes which should take place immediately. An impartial investigation by a group not connected with the Library reached certain conclusions, which are interesting from the standpoint of efficiency, economy, and loyalty. Undoubtedly, a report will be filed very shortly wherein there will be found evidence to sustain these assertions.

We found in our observations that there is a large expenditure of the Library's funds for overtime work. To some degree this overtime, as we understand it, is the result of what the Library regards as a shortage of help. It is very doubtful if this is the real answer to the situation. Discovery was made that the attendance records of the employees are very well within reason. Little loitering was observed, but too little to really be considered serious. The employees of the institution appear to be competent and willing to cooperate.

The Library's 1948 budget originally requested 2,973 employees. Twenty-seven of this number would receive salaries of $9,775 or above. Ninety-three positions would pay in excess of $7,100 and 472 in excess of $4,500. These 93 positions are grade CAF–13 or P–6 or higher. The Library would have 15.8 percent of its employees receive a salary in excess of what in 1944 was equivalent to $3,200. During the past year the Library program of upgrading its employees has been on a rapid basis.

A request was made of the committee this year for an additional 1,263 employees. It is well known that the buildings accommodating the present staff of the Library of Congress are not more than sufficient to take care of the needs. Placing more help over there at this time would mean crowding employees into rooms already overtaxed. Some of us are of the opinion that the groundwork is being laid by the administrators of the Library to seek from Congress appropriations in the near future for the construction of another large building.

The Processing Division of the institution, it must be said, has made an effort to reduce the cost of processing material. Changes in procedure have been adopted which we understand are not being well received by the employees of this Division and the morale of the employees is not any too high. They feel that the Division is being overstaffed with experts. Catalog cards, under existing regulations, and this is authorized by law, are sold for the printing cost plus 10 percent. As a result of this the cards cost the Library many times what other libraries pay for this kind of material. There does not appear to be any valid reason why the Library of Congress should be charged more for these cards than other institutions pay for them.

The Administrative Department has, as we understand it, been in operation for about a year. The present Director has not held office long enough to put into effect plans he has for reviewing many of the existing practices; however,

it is understood that he anticipates different controls.

The Personnel Office could be improved upon as far as an applicant's character and loyalty are concerned. It is suggested that a more thorough investigation be made of the background of certain individuals employed at the Library of Congress. Those having tendencies opposite to the American way of doing things cannot be expected to remain there, or to be classed among the Library's employees. This is a function which the Personnel Office must handle with as little delay as possible.

The Copyright Office operates on a fee schedule. There is evidence in the hearings that the administrators of the Library recognize that their practice is very much out of date. It is a matter of record that a great deal more economy can be accomplished by changing the practice in this division, which has been in operation over the years.

The usefulness of the Motion Picture Division of the Library of Congress may be better understood by quoting its Director:

> It is not inconceivable that the proposed national film library should, with the cooperation of all concerned, some day equal in size and usefulness the largest library now in existence.

Whether this aim is to be realized is a matter of policy. If the Division is to be continued as a useful one technical assistance will be required to save films which are in danger of being destroyed.

The division handling books for the blind is most efficient. I am convinced that the justifications of carrying on this splendid service are well within reason. These unfortunate people should be given every aid possible in helping to relieve the many hardships facing them.

I may say here that the committee appropriated to this department of the Library the sum of $500,000 for 1947. For the fiscal year 1948 we increased the amount to $1,000,000 and I believe it is entirely justifiable.

An item appearing in the Library's justification calls for Library chauffeurs. This, to the committee's way of thinking is out of the question entirely. Frankly, I cannot conceive of the Librarian of Congress having a chauffeur to drive him and other officials of the institution around town. That would be a consideration extended to the Librarian to which many high ranking Government officials are not entitled.

In conclusion I have tried to be fair in my remarks on the justifications of the Library of Congress. We realize what a great institution it is and how it should be kept as such. Employees of the Library should not hesitate to give to us valuable information concerning those who are disloyal to our Government. If concrete evidence is submitted to us in this direction I believe we can accomplish much in keeping the Library of Congress a leading institution of the country.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TIBBOTT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I want to make inquiry regarding the Legislative Reference Service. As a new Member I want to pay high tribute to the cooperation which I have received from the Legislative Reference Service. I wonder whether in this reduction the gentleman feels that it will lead to a reduction in the staff of those who deal with Members of Congress in connection with the preparation of legislation and matters of that kind?

Mr. TIBBOTT. I do not think it will. The subcommittee reduced the amount from $650,000 to $300,000; later in the full committee it was increased to $400,000. Considering the number of employees they have at present and the number the Legislative Reference Service has allotted to the different committees of the House, which are not being used by the committees, I believe the amount of $400,000 will be sufficient funds to carry on the work of the Legislative Reference Service.

Mr. KEATING. I am interested in the statement that the committees are not using them. It has been my experience, perhaps not unique, that the newer men by reason of seniority do not have a call on them as committee members and might in fact use them more than the committees themselves. I just thought that for myself I dislike to see anything done which would cut down the possibility of their use by those of us who do not have a call upon the staff of a particular committee. Then I have the assurance from the gentleman that he does not think that would happen under this bill.

Mr. TIBBOTT. I will say to the gentleman that it is my opinion $400,000 for the Legislative Reference Service will be sufficient.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> House Office Buildings: For maintenance, including equipment, waterproof wearing apparel, miscellaneous items, and for all necessary services, $665,000, including the salary of the superintendent of the House Office Buildings, which shall be at the gross rate of $7,373 per annum so long as the position is held by the present incumbent.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: Page 20, line 20, strike out "$665,000" and insert "$652,500."

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is simply to correct an erroneous figure that appeared in the bill. The correct figure should have been as set out in the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for these few minutes to discuss briefly some of the features of this bill that provide for appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government.

As I understood the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] a while ago, he seemed to charge that the House or committees thereof had employed the services of persons who are incompetent or are not qualified to do the work, instead of employing or using the services of employees on the staff of the Library of Congress. What I wanted to know is whether he referred to employees of our standing committees. In other words, I wanted him to point out, if he would, the persons disqualified for holding jobs. I did not get a reply. Why not tell us, so it may be corrected?

Now, I would like to call attention to another matter. It is with respect to the upgrading of employees of the Library of Congress. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TIBBOTT] discussed this matter. I realize a certain amount of upgrading is proper, but the information that comes to me is that those in the higher brackets are the ones that get the upgrading. They do not seem to upgrade the employees who receive lower salaries, but those that get $5,000 or more, according to my information, are the ones that are favored. My attention was just called to one person who started at $3,000 a year ago and now gets $7,000. The fact of the matter is there are too many agencies in the Government who are practicing this sort of thing.

Another thing I would like to mention, included in this bill, and that is whether the committees utilize the services of the research staffs in the Library. Complaint was made that the Appropriations Committee did not allow enough money. I really think a sufficient amount was allowed if properly and wisely expended, especially in view of the amount of use that is made of the research staffs. I think someone representing the House or representing this committee, should find out just how much time the research staffs give to the committees of this Congress and just how valuable this service is to the committees.

In reply to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, I think this committee has been pretty liberal in its appropriations under this bill. They have been liberal with the Library of Congress, as well as other services.

The gentleman from Missouri suggested a while ago that a comparison of the appropriations with those of 1933 were unfair. I think he should remember that the Library of Congress is not a war agency and did not necessarily expand or should not have expanded in line with others during the emergency. Therefore, I see no reason why he should expect such great expansions now.

I am informed that those who testified on behalf of the Library thought we should employ 1,200 more employees in that institution. Of course, I am not entirely familiar with the management of the Library, but I think after reading the hearings, the committee has been very fair in its appropriation under this bill. As a matter of fact I think there could have been some reductions without injury to anyone.

I want to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TIBBOTT] for his analysis of this bill, especially as it relates to the Library of Congress.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to direct your attention briefly to a matter that I regard as rather important. It is not new at all. We are considering a bill providing for the expenditure of many millions of dollars. Members, other than members of the committee, have not even had a chance to see the bill or the report until a few hours before it is presented to the membership of the House. Printed copies of hearings comprising testimony taken over a period of many weeks, and covering approximately 600 pages, are not made available until the legislation is submitted for consideration and debate, and vote. If it were a simple matter the situation would be different, but legislation comprising many different items on various subjects of expenses amounting to millions of dollars ought to be reported a few days, at least, before action is taken thereon. This is not a criticism of the committee—not at all; the committee did a good job, I am sure. I do criticize the policy that has been in practice for a long time.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to take the time of the House to answer point by point the criticisms of the legislative reorganization bill as voiced by the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations on the Democratic side.

I feel that our job is to complete the reorganization of the Congress and carry out its provisions as we are permitted to do so as the Eightieth Congress gets more under way. I think it would be very foolish, with only 5½ months of experience, to write reorganization off as a failure, to abandon it and go back to the hopelessly obsolete machinery we had before the passage of the act.

Unfortunately, you do not complete reorganization of anything, much less the Congress, by merely passage of a legislative act. To give reorganization the force and effect intended by the plan will require much additional effort, many changes yet of our historic and traditional procedures and practices. But the Congress must be willing to try and make these reforms work if they are to truly succeed.

I should like to address my remarks to the Committee, however, and try to clear up a little bit what seems to me to be a misunderstanding as to why the Congress needs a research staff in the Library of Congress and at the same time needs an expert committee staff at the committee level.

The problems the congressional committees are dealing with today are a thousand times more complex than the problems the committees dealt with 20, 30, and 40 years ago. The Committee on Banking and Currency in the last 18 months authorized something over $9,000,000,000 worth of Federal lending, both domestic and international.

The study of any one of these bills, such as Bretton Woods, or the British loan, or the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, would almost be equivalent to a year's course in economics; yet the best that our committee—and we have able men on the committee and an able chairman—could possibly do would be to rely on one professional employee of our committee, a man paid about $2,700 a year last year.

Do you think any small business organization would attempt to operate a business of $100,000 or $200,000 volume a year, let alone $9,000,000,000, with that kind of advisory or expert staff? I hardly think so.

That was the idea that we gave these professional staff members to the reorganized committees. When we reduced these committees from 48 to 19, we saved some money on the reduction in unnecessary committees, and determined that this money should be put with other money to give the Congress the benefit of the very best professional staff advice. I think many of the professional staff members who have been employed for the most part are good; efficient, and effective men. You are not going to get all world-beaters in your first choice, you are not going to be able to go out some sunny afternoon and hire four experts that are the world's best.

You are going to have to have some trial and error. There is going to be some up-grading, perhaps at the start and clerical assistants who will be promoted who are not qualified and who should not be employed as technical experts, but you have to make a start.

I believe the Members of Congress and the members of the committees, if they are capable of being trusted with the management of a thirty-two- or thirty-three-billion-dollar Government, ought to be able sooner or later to hire efficient and effective staff employees, who will be paid $10,000 a year. If we cannot, then I hardly think we can justify the job the public has given us.

It is going to be slow to get the Congress to learn to use this professional staff that we have given them, because we have been going on and on under an old system that we have inherited since the Civil War days, when the work load of Congress was infinitesimal as compared with what it is now.

We give the committees staffs of four members, but we dare not, we must not stop there, because these four staff members who must do specialized work for the 26, or 26 members of a committee, are not going to be able to have time to give service, research, and information to 435 individual Members of Congress, as well.

We Members of Congress who are not on these committees are entitled also to research information and data on which we can rely. That was the reason we provided for joint staffing, to have an adequate, reasonable staff at the committee level to aid and assist the committees in the search for proper data and information on which to make momentous committee decisions, while we also provided for a staff over here in the Library of Congress for individual Members' use.

I agree with my former chairman on that point, that the Library of Congress is the greatest storehouse of information to be found anywhere in the world. Congress should have this research staff working for the 435 Members over there, should have men to mine out the gold of trustworthy information that lies over there in those voluminous files, books and reports.

Every Member of Congress knows that if we do not equip ourselves with the research facilities at both committee levels and with the Legislative Reference Service, we then must depend upon handouts from the Government departments or from interested pressure groups seeking legislative enactment of their measures. If we can have truthful, reliable information on which to base our decisions here in Congress, the interest of the people will be much better protected.

No Member of Congress dare rise in his seat and say we have the time with our crowded days of work for our constituency and floor sessions and committee hearings to go over there and do the research that is required, yet we must have before us the proper disinterested factual information on the things that the Congress must pass upon.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES. The distinguished gentleman from Missouri, as I understood him, was criticising the House for employing people to do the work instead of using the Library of Congress. He suggested that they were not employing competent people to do it. I would like him to point out who they were, I mean what kind of folks they are and why they were not competent. That is the thing I do not understand.

Mr. MONRONEY. I have not had a chance to search the record on the men who are employed. But I believe this deeply—that the committee that has hired inefficient or unqualified men, men who are not competent to measure up to this work, will let those men out and in the long run, after some trial and error, the committees will be staffed properly on a nonpartisan basis to furnish this information.

We have the very efficient and effective Joint Committee on Revenue and Taxation against whom no word of criticism has ever been raised by any political party. That is the pattern we followed in attempting to staff the committees. We provided when the bill was up in the other body for a congressional personnel director to certify, not to pick the men, but to certify them as to their qualifications for these expert jobs. But that was cut out, and we need not cry over spilled milk.

But going back to the point that I am trying to get the committee to understand—it is not a question of "either or"—it is not a question of, Shall we have experts at the committee level or have experts in the Research Division of the Library of Congress? It is a question of the necessity of having them in both.

The Congress that votes tens of millions of dollars to the executive departments downtown for research and information, and then denies itself access to research and technical information for itself in its present legislative job is being indeed pennywise and pound-foolish.

I sincerely hope when this bill goes to the other body that more money will be put back into the very necessary work that is being done in the Legislative Reference Service. I understand no effort is going to be made to put it in here. We provide not to enlarge this service so much at one time because we wanted it to expand slowly in order to get the proper type of men who are needed for that kind of work.

But it must be expanded if it is to properly serve the need which was so clearly demonstrated to the Special Committee on the Organization of Congress. To deny adequate funds would be to place the people's branch of government again at the mercy of relying on hand-outs from groups, both governmental or outside pressure groups, on which to make vital legislative decisions.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, on July 19 last year the then chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], addressed the House on the reasons why so many appropriation bills were late. It was not until July 20 that the last bill, the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill, became law. Others had been passed during the previous week in July, so it is nothing new to have a late appropriation bill.

Last year's bills were passed during the second session of the Congress, and the appropriation subcommittees had been operating for more than a year when they started the hearings. This year the committees had to be named and organized before we could start work. This year we had to make reorganizations and readjustments by reason of the Reorganization Act, while last year the system in effect was one which had been followed for many years. This year we carried out a mandate to cut Federal expenditures. It is always a difficult task to operate on Federal bureaucracies.

The Committee on Appropriations this year, under the able leadership of the distinguished gentleman from New York, need make no apology for the work it has done or is doing.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I invite the attention of the subcommittee to a subject which I think is worthy of consideration. I refer particularly to the appropriation of $1,000,000, which I understand is double the amount of last year's appropriation, for books for the adult blind.

In this connection, I call the attention of the committee to the fact that during the month of February of this year while serving on another subcommittee in charge of appropriations for the Labor and Federal Security Agency I asked a question as to the printing of obscene, profane, and indecent braille books and talking books.

While we were on that subject I asked a question of those in charge of the appropriations for the American Printing House for the Blind, thinking perhaps that organization was responsible for the books. They immediately disclaimed any responsibility after I had told them of the blind who had narrated these facts and circumstances to me; and Mr. A. C. Ellis of the American Printing House for the Blind said he would investigate the matter and would write to the committee or to the budget officer Mr. M. A. Stephens in charge of the Federal Security Agency budget.

On February 26 last Mr. Ellis did so write a letter. In fact he wrote two letters on the same date to Mr. Stephens. I have those letters here and wish to read just a portion from them which will bring to the committee's attention the fact that these books are being published, and that indecent, obscene, blasphemous books are being published and distributed in braille to the blind by the Library of Congress.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. I want to thank the gentleman for calling this matter to the committee's attention. When we had this bill under consideration making appropriation for books for the blind this year we did not go into the type of material that was in the books. We assumed the books were all right. Now that the question has been raised I can assure the gentleman that the committee will go into that matter and we shall find out just exactly what is being done.

Mr. SCHWABE of Oklahoma. I was sure the committee would as soon as it was brought to their attention. I wish to bring it still more forcibly to the attention of the committee and the House by reading very briefly from Mr. Ellis' letter, just one sentence from one letter:

> It is true that some of the most popular adult books are highly objectionable to a great many people.

And the following from this letter written more confidentially to the budget officer under date of February 26, 1947, by Mr. Ellis:

> Thank you for sending me the letter about the obscene books. Frankly, I have been expecting something like this for a long time. For several years the Library did put out some pretty raw books and I was one of those who bitterly complained about it. Fortunately, the present director of the books for the adult blind of the Library of Congress does not approve of salacious reading, and I am sure that the situation will get progressively better. Do not hesitate to write or call me if you need further assistance in this matter.

I thank the committee for this opportunity. I hope it will be looked into very carefully in the future.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DONDERO, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3993) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and the amendment to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address on the subject Security for the Masses and Not Just Classes, delivered at Uline Arena, June 26, 1947.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on Senate Joint Resolution 135, to extend the succession, lending powers, and the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 135) to extend the succession, lending powers, and the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"TITLE I—AMENDMENT TO RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION ACT

"SECTION 1. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 1. There is hereby created a body corporate with the name "Reconstruction Finance Corporation" (herein called the Corporation), with a capital stock of $325,000,000 subscribed by the United States of America. Its principal office shall be located in the District of Columbia, but there may be established agencies or branch offices in any

city or cities of the United States under rules and regulations prescribed by the board of directors. This act may be cited as the "Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act".

"'SEC. 2. The management of the Corporation shall be vested in a board of directors consisting of five persons appointed by the President of the United States by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Of the five members of the board, not more than three shall be members of any one political party and not more than one shall be appointed from any one Federal Reserve district. Each director shall devote his time principally to the business of the Corporation. The terms of the directors shall be 2 years but they may continue in office until their successors are appointed and qualified. Whenever a vacancy shall occur other than by expiration of term the person appointed to fill such vacancy shall hold office for the unexpired portion of the term of the director whose place he is selected to fill. The directors, except the chairman, shall receive salaries at the rate of $12,500 per annum each. The chairman of the board of directors shall receive a salary at the rate of $15,000 per annum.

"'SEC. 3. (a) The Corporation shall have succession through June 30, 1948, unless it is sooner dissolved by an Act of Congress. It shall have power to adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal; to make contracts; to lease or purchase such real estate as may be necessary for the transaction of its business; to sue and be sued, to complain and to defend, in any court of competent jurisdiction, State or Federal: *Provided*, That the Corporation shall be entitled to and granted the same immunities and exemptions from the payment of costs, charges, and fees as are granted to the United States pursuant to the provisions of law codified in sections 543, 548, 555, 557, 578, and 578a of title 28 of the United States Code, 1940 edition; to select, employ, and fix the compensation of such officers, employees, attorneys, and agents as shall be necessary for the transaction of the business of the Corporation, in accordance with laws, applicable to the Corporation, as in effect on June 30, 1947, and as thereafter amended; and to prescribe, amend, and repeal, by its board of directors, bylaws, rules, and regulations governing the manner in which its general business may be conducted. Except as may be otherwise provided in this Act or in the Government Corporation Control Act, the board of directors of the Corporation shall determine the necessity for and the character and amount of its obligations and expenditures under this Act and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, paid, and accounted for, without regard to the provisions of any other laws governing the expenditure of public funds and such determinations shall be final and conclusive upon all other officers of the Government. The Corporation shall be entitled to the use of the United States mails in the same manner as the executive departments of the Government.

"'(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the right to recover compensation granted by the Act approved September 7, 1916, as amended (5 U. S. C., sec. 751), shall be in lieu of, and shall be construed to abrogate, any and all other rights and remedies which any person, except for this provision, might, on account of injury or death of an employee, assert against the Corporation or any of its subsidiaries.

"'SEC. 4. (a) To aid in financing agriculture, commerce, and industry, to help in maintaining the economic stability of the country and to assist in promoting maximum employment and production, the Corporation, within the limitations hereinafter provided, is authorized—

"'(1) To purchase the obligations of and to make loans to any business enterprise organized or operating under the laws of any State or the United States: *Provided*, That the purchase of obligations (including equipment trust certificates) of, or the making of loans to, railroads or air carriers engaged in interstate commerce or receivers or trustees thereof, shall be with the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission or the Civil Aeronautics Board, respectively: *Provided further*, That in the case of railroads or air carriers not in receivership or trusteeship, the Commission or the Board, as the case may be, in connection with its approval of such purchases or loans, shall also certify that such railroad or air carrier, on the basis of present and prospective earnings, may be expected to meet its fixed charges without a reduction thereof through judicial reorganization except that such certificates shall not be required in the case of loans or purchases made for the acquisition of equipment or for maintenance.

"'(2) To make loans to any financial institution organized under the laws of any State or of the United States.

"'(3) In order to aid in financing projects authorized under Federal, State, or municipal law, to purchase the securities and obligations of, or make loans to, (A) municipalities and political subdivisions of States, (B) public agencies and instrumentalities of one or more States, municipalities, and political subdivisions of States, and (C) public corporations, boards, and commissions: *Provided*, That no such purchase or loan shall be made for payment of ordinary governmental or nonproject operating expenses as distinguished from purchases and loans to aid in financing specific public projects.

"'(4) To make such loans, in an aggregate amount not to exceed $25,000,000 outstanding at any one time, as it may determine to be necessary or appropriate because of floods or other catastrophes.

"'(b) No financial assistance shall be extended pursuant to paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a) of this section, unless the financial assistance applied for is not otherwise available on reasonable terms. All securities and obligations purchased and all loans made under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a) of this section shall be of such sound value or so secured as reasonably to assure retirement or repayment and such loans may be made either directly or in cooperation with banks or other lending institutions through agreements to participate or by the purchase of participations, or otherwise.

"'(c) The total amount of investments, loans, purchases, and commitments made pursuant to this section 4 shall not exceed $2,000,000,000 outstanding at any one time.

"'(d) No fee or commission shall be paid by any applicant for financial assistance under the provisions of this act in connection with any such application, and any agreement to pay or payment of any such fee or commission shall be unlawful.

"'(e) No director, officer, attorney, agent, or employee of the Corporation in any manner, directly or indirectly, shall participate in the deliberation upon or the determination of any question affecting his personal interests, or the interests of any corporation, partnership, or association in which he is directly or indirectly interested.

"'(f) The powers granted to the Corporation by this section shall terminate at the close of business on June 30, 1948, but the termination of such powers shall not be construed (1) to prohibit disbursement of funds on purchases of securities and obligations, on loans, or on commitments or agreements to make such purchases or loans, made under this Act prior to the close of business on such date, or (2) to affect the validity or performance of any other agreement made or entered into pursuant to law.

"'(g) As used in this Act, the term "State" includes the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

"'SEC. 5. Section 5202 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the words "War Finance Corporation Act" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act".

"'SEC. 6. The Federal Reserve banks are authorized and directed to act as custodians and fiscal agents for the Corporation in the general performance of its powers conferred by this Act and the Corporation may reimburse such Federal Reserve banks for such services in such manner as may be agreed upon.

"'SEC. 7. The Corporation may issue to the Secretary of the Treasury its notes, debentures, bonds, or other such obligations in an amount outstanding at any one time sufficient to enable the Corporation to carry out its functions under this Act or any other provision of law, such obligations to mature not more than five years from their respective dates of issue, to be redeemable at the option of the Corporation before maturity in such manner as may be stipulated in such obligations. Such obligations may mature subsequent to the period of succession of the Corporation. Each such obligation shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of the obligation of the Corporation. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to purchase any obligations of the Corporation to be issued hereunder, and for such purpose the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, are extended to include any purchases of the Corporation's obligations hereunder.

"'SEC. 8. The Corporation, including its franchise, capital, reserves and surplus, and its income shall be exempt from all taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States, by any Territory, dependency, or possession thereof, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority, except that any real property of the Corporation shall be subject to special assessments for local improvements and shall be subject to State, Territorial, county, municipal, or local taxation to the same extent according to its value as other real property is taxed: *Provided*, That the special assessment and taxation of real property as authorized herein shall not include the taxation as real property of possessory interests, pipe lines, power lines, or machinery or equipment owned by the Corporation regardless of their nature, use, or manner of attachment or affixation to the land, building, or other structure upon or in which the same may be located. The exemptions provided for in the preceding sentence with respect to taxation (which shall, for all purposes, be deemed to include sales, use, storage, and purchase taxes) shall be construed to be applicable not only with respect to the Corporation but also with respect to any other public corporation which is now or which may be hereafter wholly financed and wholly managed by the Corporation. Such exemptions shall also be construed to be applicable to loans made, and personal property owned by the Corporation or such other corporations, but such exemptions shall not be construed to be applicable in any State to any buildings which are considered by the laws of such State to be personal property for taxation purposes. Notwithstanding any other provision of law or any privilege or consent to tax expressly or impliedly granted thereby, the shares of preferred stock of national banking associations, and the shares of preferred stock, capital notes, and debentures of State banks and trust companies, acquired prior to July 1, 1947, by the Corporation, and the dividends or interest

derived therefrom by the Corporation, shall not, so long as the Corporation shall continue to own the same, be subject to any taxation by the United States, by any Territory, dependency or possession thereof, or the District of Columbia, or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority, whether now, heretofore, or hereafter imposed, levied, or assessed, and whether for a past, present, or future taxing period.

"'SEC. 9. In the event of termination of the powers granted to the Corporation by section 4 of this Act prior to the expiration of its succession as provided in section 3, the board of directors shall, except as otherwise herein specifically authorized, proceed to liquidate its assets and wind up its affairs. It may with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury deposit with the Treasurer of the United States as a special fund any money belonging to the Corporation or from time to time received by it in the course of liquidation, for the payment of its outstanding obligations, which fund may be drawn upon or paid out for no other purpose. Any balance remaining after the liquidation of all the Corporation's assets and after provision has been made for payment of all legal obligations shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts. Thereupon the Corporation shall be dissolved and its capital stock shall be canceled and retired.

"'SEC. 10. If at the expiration of the succession of the Corporation, its board of directors shall not have completed the liquidation of its assets and the winding up of its affairs, the duty of completing such liquidation and winding up of its affairs shall be transferred to the Secretary of the Treasury, who for such purpose shall succeed to all the powers and duties of the board of directors under this Act. In such event he may assign to any officer or officers of the United States in the Treasury Department the exercise and performance, under his general supervision and direction, of any such powers and duties. When the Secretary of the Treasury shall find that such liquidation will no longer be advantageous to the United States and that all of the Corporation's legal obligations have been provided for, he shall retire any capital stock then outstanding, pay into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts the unused balance of the moneys belonging to the Corporation, and make a final report to the Congress. Thereupon the Corporation shall be deemed to be dissolved.

"'SEC. 11. (a) Whoever makes any statement knowing it to be false, or whoever willfully overvalues any security, for the purpose of obtaining for himself or for any applicant any loan, or extension thereof by removal, deferment of action or otherwise, or the acceptance, release, or substitution of security therefor, or for the purpose of influencing in any way the action of the Corporation, or for the purpose of obtaining money, property, or anything of value, under this Act, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than two years, or both.

"'(b) Whoever (1) falsely makes, forges, or counterfeits any note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or coupon, in imitation of or purporting to be a note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or coupon, issued by the Corporation; or (2) passes, utters, or publishes, or attempts to pass, utter or publish, any false, forged or counterfeited note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or coupon, purporting to have been issued by the Corporation, knowing the same to be false, forged, or counterfeited; or (3) falsely alters any note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or coupon, issued or purporting to have been issued by the Corporation; or (4) passes, utters, or publishes, or attempts to pass, utter, or publish, as true any falsely altered or spurious note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or coupon, issued or purporting to have been issued by the Corporation, knowing the same to be falsely altered or spurious, or any person who willfully violates any other provision of this Act, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000, by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

"'(c) Whoever, being connected in any capacity with the Corporation, (1) embezzles, abstracts, purloins, or willfully misapplies any moneys, funds, securities, or other things of value, whether belonging to it or pledged or otherwise entrusted to it; or (2) with intent to defraud the Corporation or any other body politic or corporate, or any individual, or to deceive any officer, auditor, or examiner of the Corporation, makes any false entry in any book, report, or statement of or to the Corporation, or, without being duly authorized, draws any order or issues, puts forth, or assigns any note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or draft, bill of exchange, mortgage, judgment, or decree thereof; or (3) with intent to defraud participates, shares, receives directly or indirectly any money, profit, property, or benefit through any transaction, loan, commission, contract, or any other act of the Corporation; or (4) gives any unauthorized information concerning any future action or plan of the Corporation which might affect the value of securities, or having such knowledge, invests or speculates, directly or indirectly, in the securities or property of any company, bank, or corporation receiving loans or other assistance from the Corporation, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

"'(d) No individual, association, partnership, or corporation shall use the words "Reconstruction Finance Corporation" or a combination of these three words, as the name or a part thereof under which he or it shall do business. Every individual, partnership, association, or corporation violating this prohibition shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine of not exceeding $1,000 or imprisonment not exceeding one year, or both.

"'(e) The provisions of sections 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, and 117 of the Criminal Code of the United States (U. S. C., title 18, ch. 5, secs. 202 to 207, inclusive), insofar as applicable, are extended to apply to contracts or agreements with the Corporation under this Act, which for the purposes hereof shall be held to include loans, advances, disccunts, and rediscounts; extensions and renewals thereof; and acceptances, releases, and substitutions of security therefor.

"'SEC. 12. The Corporation is authorized to exercise the functions, powers, duties, and authority transferred to the Corporation by Public Law 109, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved June 30, 1945, but only with respect to programs, projects, or commitments outstanding on June 30, 1947.

"'SEC. 13. If any provision of this Act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this Act, and the applicability of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.'

"TITLE II—MISCELLANEOUS

"SEC. 201. No provision of this Act shall be construed so as to prevent the Corporation from disbursing funds on purchases of securities and obligations, on loans made, or on commitments or agreements to make such purchases or loans, or on liabilities incurred, pursuant to law prior to the effective date of this Act.

"SEC. 202. The succession of U. S. Commercial Company, a corporation created by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation pursuant to section 5d (3) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is hereby extended through June 30, 1948.

"SEC. 203. All assets and liabilities of every kind and nature, together with all documents, books of account, and records, of The RFC Mortgage Company, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Maryland, all the capital stock of which is owned and held by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, shall be transferred to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. With respect to the assets, liabilities, and records transferred, 'Reconstruction Finance Corporation' for all purposes is hereby substituted for 'The RFC Mortgage Company', and no suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against such corporation shall abate by reason of the enactment of this Act, but the court, on motion or supplemental petition filed at any time within twelve months after the date of such enactment, showing a necessity for the survival of such suit, action, or other proceeding to obtain a determination of the questions involved, may allow the same to be maintained by or against the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

"SEC. 204. The Federal Loan Agency, created by Reorganization Plan Numbered 1 pursuant to the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1939, approved April 3, 1939, is hereby abolished, and all its property and records are hereby transferred to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

"SEC. 205. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to transfer as soon as practicable after the effective date of this Act, to the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to receive, all of the stock of the Federal home-loan banks held by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The Secretary of the Treasury shall cancel notes of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and sums due and unpaid upon or in connection with such notes at the time of such cancellation, in an amount equal to the par value of the stock so transferred.

"SEC. 206. Section 201 (e) of the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932, approved July 21, 1932 (47 Stat. 709), as amended, and section 84 of the Farm Credit Act of 1933, approved June 16, 1933 (48 Stat. 257), as amended, are hereby further amended by striking out the name 'Reconstruction Finance Corporation' wherever it appears in such sections and substituting therefor the name 'Farm Credit Administration'.

"The following Acts and portions of Acts are hereby repealed:

"(a) Sections 1, 201, except subsection (e) thereof), 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 209, and 211 of the Emergency Relief and Construction Act of 1932, approved July 21, 1932 (47 Stat. 709), as amended;

"(b) Section 304 of the Act approved March 9, 1933 (48 Stat. 1), as amended;

"(c) Sections 27, 36, 37, and 38 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, approved May 12, 1933 (48 Stat. 41), as amended:

"(d) Sections 5 and 19 (c) and the last two sentences of section 8 (b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, approved May 12, 1933 (48 Stat. 33), as amended;

"(e) The Act approved June 10, 1933 (48 Stat. 119), as amended;

"(f) The last sentence of section 4 (b) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, approved June 13, 1933 (48 Stat. 129), as amended;

"(g) Sections 301 and 302 of the National Industrial Recovery Act, approved June 16, 1933 (48 Stat. 195), as amended;

"(h) So much of section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1932 (48 Stat. 41), as amended, as authorizes or directs the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make funds available to the Land Bank Commissioner;

"(i) The Act approved January 20, 1934 (48 Stat. 318);

"(j) The fourth paragraph of the Emergency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1935, approved June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1056), and section 202 of the Public Works Administration

Extension Act of 1937, approved June 29, 1937 (50 Stat. 357);

"(k) Sections 10, 13, 14, 15, and 16 of the Act approved June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1105), as amended;

"(l) So much of sections 4 and 602 of the National Housing Act, approved June 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 1247), as amended, as relates to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation;

"(m) The first section and sections 9, 11, and 13 of the act approved January 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 1), as amended;

"(n) The Act approved August 24, 1935 (49 Stat., ch. 646, p. 796);

"(o) The Act approved March 20, 1936 (49 Stat. 1185);

"(p) The Act approved April 10, 1936 (49 Stat., ch. 163, p. 1191);

"(q) The first section of the Act approved January 26, 1937 (50 Stat. 5), as amended;

"(r) The Act approved February 11, 1937 (50 Stat. 19), as amended;

"(s) So much of section 32 (b) of the Farm Credit Act of 1937, approved August 19, 1937 (50 Stat. 703), as relates to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and so much of section 33 (b) of the said Act as relates to the payment of the expenses of corporations formed by the consolidation of two or more regional agricultural credit corporations;

"(t) So much of the Act approved June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1193), as relates to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation;

"(u) Section 12 of the Federal Highway Act of 1940, approved September 5, 1940 (54 Stat. 867);

"(v) Section 5 of the Act approved June 10, 1941 (55 Stat. 250);

"(w) The Act approved October 23, 1941 (55 Stat., ch. 454, p. 744);

"(x) The Act approved March 27, 1942 (56 Stat., ch. 198, p. 174);

"(y) The Act approved June 5, 1942 (56 Stat., ch. 352, p. 326); and

"(z) Sections 1 and 2 of Public Law 656, 79th Congress, approved August 7, 1946.

"SEC. 207. The liquidation of the affairs of the Smaller War Plants Corporation administered by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation pursuant to Executive Order 9665 shall be carried out by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, notwithstanding the provisions of the last paragraph of section 5 of the First War Powers Act, 1941. The Smaller War Plants Corporation is hereby abolished.

"SEC. 208. (a) The Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall have the power to purchase any surplus property for resale, subject to regulations of the War Assets Administrator or his successor, to small business when, in its judgment, such disposition is required to preserve and strengthen the competitive position of small business. The purchase of surplus property under this section shall be given priority under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, immediately following transfers to Government agencies under section 12 of such Act, as amended, and disposals to veterans under section 16 of such Act, as amended. The provisions of section 12 (c) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, shall be applicable to purchases made under this section. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall not purchase any real property for resale to small business pursuant to this section in any case where any person from whom the property had been acquired by a Government agency, gives notice in writing to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation that he intends to exercise his rights under section 23 of the Surplus Property Act, as amended.

"(b) The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is further authorized for the purpose of carrying out the objectives of this section to arrange for sales of surplus property to small business concerns on credit or time basis.

"(c) For the purposes of this section the terms 'persons', 'surplus property', and 'Government agency' have the same meaning as is assigned to such terms by section 3 of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended.

"SEC. 209. During the period between June 30, 1947, and the date of enactment of legislation making funds available for administrative expenses for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, the Corporation is authorized to incur, and pay out of its general funds, administrative expenses in accordance with laws in effect on June 30, 1947, such obligations and expenditures to be charged against funds when made available for administrative expenses for the fiscal year 1948.

"SEC. 210. This Act shall take effect as of midnight June 30, 1947."

And the House agree to the same.

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
JOHN C. KUNKEL,
HENRY O. TALLE,
BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

C. D. BUCK,
HOMER E. CAPEHART,
RALPH E. FLANDERS,
BURNET R. MAYBANK,
JOHN SPARKMAN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 135) to extend the succession, lending powers, and the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate joint resolution extended for 1 year the succession and the existing lending powers and functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The House amendment struck out all the Senate joint resolution after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute extending for two years the succession and certain of the lending powers and functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The joint resolution as agreed to in conference is a substitute for both the Senate joint resolution and the House amendment. Except for the differences noted below, and except for typographical and clarifying changes, the conference substitute is the same as the House amendment.

The conference substitute adopts the 1-year extension as provided in the Senate joint resolution but retains in general the provisions of the House amendment which extended only certain lending powers and functions of the Corporation.

Section 3 (a) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as proposed by the House amendment, contained the following provision: "Except as may be otherwise provided in this Act, the board of directors of the Corporation shall determine the necessity for and the character and amount of its obligations and expenditures under this Act and the manner in which they shall be budgeted, incurred, allowed, paid, and accounted for, without regard to the provisions of any other laws governing the expenditure of public funds and such determinations shall be final and conclusive upon all other officers of the Government." The conference substitute contains the same provision, but in order to make it clear that it does not supersede the provisions of the Government Corporation Control Act the words "or in the Government Corporation Control Act" have been inserted after the words "Except as may be otherwise provided in this Act" and the word "budgeted" has been omitted.

Section 208 of the House amendment repealed, among other provisions of law, certain provisions affecting both the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Farm Credit Administration. The conference agreement, in lieu of repealing those provisions of law in their entirety, modifies them to eliminate their application to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation but to retain their application to the Farm Credit Administration.

Among the provisions of law repealed by section 208 were sections 2 and 3 of the Act of January 31, 1935. Section 2 provides a 1-year limitation on the disbursements following a commitment to make a loan, and section 3 authorizes the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, within its discretion, to determine the date of maturity of any loan made by it, except that certain types of loans may not be permitted to run beyond January 31, 1955. The conference agreement does not repeal these two sections.

Section 208 of the House amendment which authorized the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make the priority purchase of surplus property for resale to small business (previously provided in sec. 18 (e) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended), contained a provision which prohibited the Corporation from purchasing any surplus property pursuant to this section unless a small business had previously made application to the Corporation for such property. The conference substitute omits this provision.

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
RALPH A. GAMBLE,
JOHN C. KUNKEL,
HENRY O. TALLE,
BRENT SPENCE,
PAUL BROWN,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the conferees agreed substantially with the House language. The only material change is in the date. The Senate provided a continuance of RFC for 1 year. The Senate has a companion resolution to authorize, I believe, $50,000 for a complete investigation of Reconstruction Finance Corporation activities from its inception. Because of that situation and also the fact that the U. S. Commercial Corporation, a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, is continued in the House bill for only 1 year it would obviously be necessary for us to have hearings on the U. S. Commercial Corporation within the year and might well have hearings at the same time on any further continuance of Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The House yielded in that respect.

The changes which were made in the House language are so minor perhaps as to not have to be discussed. They are changes of a typographical nature, changes in grammar, and some other very minor changes. The bill in substance and almost in its entirety as it was agreed to by the conferees is the bill which the House passed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, this is substantially the bill passed by the House with the exception that the limitation date was changed from 2 years to 1 year. It is the unanimous report of the conferees and I hope that the House will approve the conference report.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. May I ask this question: Under this conference report can GI loans be accepted by the RFC any longer?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Under the language of the House bill and under the language of the bill as agreed to by the conferees, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation will not be authorized to purchase those loans guaranteed by banks or other lending institutions.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. What about the paper they have been permitted to take already?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Any commitments made previous to the enactment of this law will be honored by the RFC under definite language in the bill. It is very definitely stated in the bill that any commitments made in any of these respects will be honored.

I call the gentleman's attention to section 201, title II, on page 7 of the conference report, which reads as follows. I think this is a very definite answer to the gentleman's question:

SEC. 201. No provision of this act shall be construed so as to prevent the Corporation from disbursing funds on purchases of securities and obligations, on loans made, or on commitments or agreements to make such purchases or loans, or on liabilities incurred, pursuant to law, prior to the effective date of this act.

All of the commitments made previous to the enactment of this bill for the purchase of mortgages guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration, will be honored under the provisions which I have just read.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. GRAHAM) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the Pennsylvania State Legislature.

Mr. MONRONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Chicago Sun.

Mr. TIBBOTT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a statement.

Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short article.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD following the passage of the Commodity Credit Corporation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

SUSPENSION OF ANNUAL ASSESSMENT WORK ON MINING CLAIMS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement on the bill H. R. 2369.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 3150.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to announce the program for next week. On Monday it is proposed that the Speaker may permit some measures to be called up for passage under suspension of the rules. Of course, any conference reports that are ready will be in order. Then we propose to take up House Resolution 212, providing for statehood for Hawaii.

On Tuesday we will call the Private Calendar, and we also hope to take up the civil functions War Department appropriation bill.

On Wednesday we hope that the District of Columbia appropriation bill will be ready.

Thursday there will be a continuation of the above bills.

Friday, being the Fourth of July, we expect to adjourn over from Thursday until Monday. Of course, urgent rules may be called up at any time. It occurs to me also that it might be well to suggest that in all probability matters of considerable importance will be called on Monday, July 7.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The majority leader possibly cannot, I understand, but if he can, in connection with suspensions on Monday, will he advise the House as to any that he has in mind?

Mr. HALLECK. I cannot announce that at this time.

Mr. McCORMACK. I realize that, because I have been in the same predicament myself. That is why I made a guarded inquiry.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 350) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States until June 30, 1948.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 7 of the act approved January 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 4), as amended, is amended by striking out "June 30, 1947" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1948."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this bill merely extends the existing law for a period of 1 year. I introduced a bill some time ago to make Commodity Credit Corporation a permanent agency. This Corporation should become a permanent Government agency. Its contribution to agriculture, to the farmer, and to the economic stability of our country is beyond reproach. Legislation next year must make the Commodity Credit Corporation a permanent agency of the Government.

A short time ago the Senate passed S. 350 extending the authority of the Corporation for a period of 1 year. This, coupled with the fact that by June 30, 1948, a new Federal charter is required in lieu of the present Delaware charter, gives some justification for the continuation of the Corporation for but 1 year, or until Congress may have an opportunity to enact a new Federal charter. We did not have time this session to have a full hearing on my bill, so it is absolutely necessary that the law be extended by June 30 of this year.

The Commodity Credit Corporation was created under the laws of the State of Delaware pursuant to an Executive order of the President October 16, 1933. A congressional act in 1935 directed that the Corporation should "continue until April 1, 1937," and by successive amendments to this act the Corporation has been continued until June 30, 1947.

The charter powers of the Commodity Credit Corporation authorize this Agency, among other things, to engage in buying, selling, lending, and other activities with respect to the agricultural commodities, products thereof, and related facilities. These powers have enabled the Corporation to engage in extensive operations for the purpose of increasing production, stabilizing prices, assuring adequate supplies, and facilitating the efficient distribution of agricultural commodities, foods, feeds, and fibers to meet the needs of the war emergency. For more than a decade those interested in agriculture have pressed for enactment of certain basic agricultural laws which now stand as a cornerstone—especially during this postwar period. Extension of the Commodity Credit Corporation is

vital to the welfare of the farmer and to the farm program.

The Corporation's function has implemented many of the other basic farm programs. For example, the Corporation's price-support operation has resulted largely from legislation making it mandatory for the Corporation to provide price support for certain agricultural commodities through loans, purchases, and other operations. This price support operation includes loans to producers upon any crop of the basic commodities—cotton, corn, wheat, rice, tobacco, and peanuts—and at the present time the support rate is 90 percent of parity in the case of all the basic commodities other than cotton, and 92½ percent in the case of cotton.

In addition to the basic commodities, there are the so-called Steagall commodities which are supported in price through the operation of the Commodity Credit Corporation. These Steagall commodities are: Hogs, eggs, chickens and turkeys, milk and butterfat, dry peas of certain varieties, soybeans for oil, peanuts for oil, flaxseed for oil, potatoes, and sweetpotatoes.

Measured by commodities, the acreages farmed, the individuals producing, and the dollar income from agricultural production during the coming years, it is not difficult to observe the scope of the solemn obligation accruing to nearly every American farmer as a result of basic agricultural legislation. The responsibility of implementing many of these programs is made possible by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The Corporation has capital stock of $100,000,000 and is authorized to borrow $4,750,000,000 in conducting its operations. The budget estimates show that its purchase activities during the fiscal year 1947 will approximate $1,500,000,000, that sales will exceed $2,000,000,000, that new loans will be made approximating $735,000,000.

It is gratifying to know that except for the subsidy payments authorized by the Congress that the Commodity Credit Corporation during its entire life has made several million dollars for the Federal Government, while at the same time it has aided the American farmer and the general public beyond measurement.

The activities of CCC over the past 14 years have, in my opinion, contributed more to the lot of the farmers than any other phase of the farm program.

Now, let me take just a few minutes to describe the basic functions of the Corporation.

The price-support activity, through which we have endeavored to see that farmers receive an income commensurate with their contribution to the Nation's economy, is the heart of our agricultural program.

You know what this program has meant—both to the farmers and the rest of the Nation. You know how the cotton loans saved our cotton farmers from ruin while at the same time building up a cotton backlog which meant much to us during the war. You know the ever-normal granary and its value to the Nation during the war and since. You know how tobacco loans have saved those producers when sudden termination of foreign markets threatened to drive tobacco prices to ruinous levels.

But even more important is the price-support function of the Corporation today. It is the agency which carries out the promises made by the Congress to support the price of agricultural commodities through the calendar year 1948.

During the war and since it has made purchases for our Army and Navy, for foreign governments, the American Red Cross, and other similar agencies. During the fiscal year which ends Monday, this Nation will have shipped more than 550,000,000 bushels of grain and grain products to foreign countries for emergency feeding. That is more grain than has been shipped by all the other countries of the world in any previous year. Most of that grain was bought by the Commodity Credit Corporation and bought in such a manner as to cause the least possible strain on our domestic market.

Another major function of the Corporation is to purchase for the American consumer certain scarce agricultural commodities in the foreign market. Such purchases include sugar, fats and oils, and rice. The world supply of most of these commodities is allocated to each country by the International Emergency Food Council. The Corporation buys our portions which are then divided among the various claimants in this country.

One of the best examples of the need for a flexible organization such as CCC was seen in this connection in the work it did in reviving the Philippine copra industry. Through the use of CCC and other funds a quasi-governmental agency was set up which got that industry back to prewar production within half the time which the industry experts thought possible. This gave great relief to the world oil shortage and incidentally netted this Government a profit.

Another function is to export certain agricultural commodities. This work is well known to you. Because world prices are generally lower than prices here at home, the Corporation is authorized, under certain circumstances, to subsidize the exportation of surplus quantities of the basic agricultural commodities. Currently, this program applies only to the remaining stocks of low-grade cotton which we have accumulated over a period of 14 years. Practically all of that cotton has now been sold. The Government had a profit at one time of more than $200,000,000 on cotton it held.

Another function is the payment of subsidies. During the emergency period producers' costs were frequently too high to maintain adequate production under ceilings. So CCC was directed to make up the difference between the ceiling and production costs. Since this has been the major function which put the Corporation in the red, I am glad to report that all subsidies, except the one on sugar, have now been removed.

Some of these functions are becoming less important as we move back toward normal conditions, but the price-support program—which is its major job—is still in full swing.

If we exclude the subsidy program, which was carried out by the Corporation at the direction of Congress, the Corporation actually showed a profit of $228,000,000 for the period October 1933 through December 1946, after deducting administrative and other expenses, including administrative expenses and interest properly chargeable to the subsidy program.

In addition to the price-support functions, the charter of the Corporation makes possible an export program. Whenever surpluses approach unmanageable proportions, it is imperative that farmers have necessary machinery to control and adjust these supplies to total demands of markets so as to prevent wrecking of farm prices, destruction of farm purchasing power, and the resulting unbalanced national economy.

Under the commodity-export program of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Corporation exports or causes to be exported, agricultural commodities and products. The purpose of the program is to obtain foreign markets for agricultural commodities and products thereof produced in the United States and to aid in the disposal of surplus agricultural commodities.

Since so much of our present farm legislation is tied into the existence of the Commodity Credit Corporation, our failure to continue that Corporation would have the effect of throwing out our whole price support program and defaulting on our solemn promise to the farmers of the Nation.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, THE FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY, AND RELATED INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 263, Rept. No. 731), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That during the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4003) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, all points of order against the bill or any provisions contained therein are hereby waived.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REVENUE ACT OF 1947

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3737) to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3737) to provide revenue for the District of

Columbia, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the same.

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
GEORGE J. BATES,
HOWARD W. SMITH,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HARRY P. CAIN,
RALPH E. FLANDERS,
J. HOWARD MCGRATH (by H. C.),
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3737) to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 1: The House bill defined the word "resident", for the purpose of the income tax, to mean every individual domiciled within the District on the last day of the taxable year, and every other individual who maintains a place of abode within the District for more than 7 months of the taxable year, whether domiciled in the District or not. The House bill also provided that the word "resident" shall not include any elective officer of the Government of the United States or employees of the United States Government, nor shall it include any officer of the executive branch of such Government whose appointment to the office held by him was by the President of the United States and subject to confirmation by the Senate of the United States and whose tenure of office is at the pleasure of the President of the United States. The House bill also provided that for the purposes of the act the domicile of such officer or employee shall be in the State in which he expressly declares to be the State of his domicile, with the proviso that he shall have acquired a domicile in such State under the laws of such State prior to the beginning of the annual period for which the tax is claimed. The declaration must be made in writing, under oath, to the Assessor, and the time for filing such declaration shall not expire until 60 days after written demand shall have been received by such officer or employee.

The Senate amendment provides that the word "resident" means every individual domiciled within the District on the last day of the taxable year, and every other individual who maintains a place of abode within the District for more than 7 months of the taxable year, whether domiciled in the District or not. The Senate amendment further provides that the word "resident" shall not include any elective officer of the Government of the United States or any officer of the executive branch of such Government whose appointment to the office held by him was by the President of the United States and subject to confirmation by the Senate of the United States and whose tenure of office is at the pleasure of the President of the United States, unless such officers are domiciled within the District on the last day of the taxable year. Under the Senate amendment, a Federal employee is not exempt from the District income tax if such employee maintains a place of abode within the District for more than 7 months of the taxable year whether or not he is domiciled within the District. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 2: The House bill provided that the words "gross income" shall not include all amounts up to and including $2,000 paid during the taxable year to veterans under any law of the United States, or under any law of any State, Territory, or political subdivision thereof as benefits or pensions and disability arising out of injuries received during any period of war.

The Senate amendment provides that the words "gross income" shall not include payments of benefits made to or on account of a beneficiary under any of the laws relating to veterans. The Senate amendment restates existing law. The House recedes.

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
GEORGE J. BATES,
HOWARD W. SMITH,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 93]

Allen, Ill.	Gallagher	Morgan
Andrews, N. Y.	Gathings	Morrison
Barden	Gavin	Murray, Tenn.
Beall	Gifford	Nodar
Blackney	Gore	Pace
Bland	Granger	Patterson
Bloom	Hall,	Pfeifer
Boykin	Edwin Arthur	Philbin
Brooks	Hartley	Poulson
Buckley	Hays	Powell
Bulwinkle	Heffernan	Rabin
Byrne, N. Y.	Herter	Rayburn
Case, N. J.	Javits	Rayfiel
Celler	Jenkins, Pa.	Redden
Chadwick	Jennings	Rich
Chiperfield	Johnson, Okla.	Rivers
Clark	Jones, Ala.	Robsion
Clason	Jonkman	Sanborn
Clements	Kearney	Scoblick
Clippinger	Kearns	Seely-Brown
Colmer	Kelley	Sheppard
Cooley	Kennedy	Short
Corbett	Keogh	Sikes
Coudert	Kilburn	Smathers
Courtney	Kirwan	Smith, Ohio
Cox	Klein	Snyder
Crow	Lane	Stanley
Dague	Latham	Stratton
Dawson, Ill.	Love	Taylor
Dawson, Utah	Lusk	Thomas, N. J.
Delaney	Lynch	Twyman
D'Ewart	McDowell	Van Zandt
Drewry	McGarvey	Vinson
Eaton	Macy	Vorys
Elston	Madden	Walter
Fallon	Mansfield, Tex.	West
Fuller	Miller, Nebr.	Wilson, Ind.

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 316 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEFAUVER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one an address he delivered, and in the other an editorial.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REVENUE ACT OF 1947

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the matter presently before us is the conference report on the so-called District of Columbia revenue bill. This entire subject matter of District revenues has been gone into very thoroughly by the Subcommittee on Fiscal Affairs of the Committee on the District of Columbia, of which I happen to have the privilege of being chairman ever since the early part of this year.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of this Committee on the District of Columbia, serving with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], chairman of the committee, for the last 10 years, I want to say frankly that during that period of time no matter has given us so much concern or has taken so much of our time as the fiscal relations confronting the District of Columbia for not only the year 1948 that lies ahead of us, but the several years that we must necessarily plan for if we are going to have sound administration within the District of Columbia. In the early part of the year the District Commissioners were confronted with a $10,000,000 deficit for the year 1948, an estimated deficit of over $12,000,000 in 1949 and a further estimated deficit in 1950 of approximately $20,000,000. Something had to be done to adjust the financial program of this District so that we could bring the revenues of the District up to meet the operating costs. During the early part of the year the District Commissioners recommended 9 different types of legislation in the form of revenue bills. One was the income tax, a matter which we are presently going to discuss here on the floor of the House. Second, the sales tax. Third, an alcoholic-beverage tax. Fourth, a motor vehicles excise tax. Fifth, an inspection fee on motor vehicles and trailers. Sixth, an excise tax on cigarettes. Seventh, an amusement tax. Eighth, an excise tax on gas, electricity, and telephone bills. Ninth, the payment for water that is used by the Federal Government.

Over a period of many weeks this committee labored at great length, and this volume of nearly 1,100 pages will testify to the extent of the study we have given it. It is a very thorough study of the finances of this district over the period of 10 years past, and also the difficulties the District is facing at the present time. After many, many weeks of very thorough study on the part of this committee we came to the conclusion that if we resorted to the most basic of all taxes, namely, the real-estate tax, together with the income tax and the revenue coming from the Federal payment, we would not only be able to meet the obligations of the District during the fiscal year 1948 but we would have a sizable surplus at the end of the year, but we programed the fiscal affairs of the District so that we could meet the obligations over a period of 2 years, ending with a surplus at the close of the fiscal year 1949 without the innovation of the multiplicity of new taxes recommended by the District Commissioners.

The question primarily today is in regard to the conference report we recommended. We were able to reconcile the revenue picture here in the District so that by increasing the real-estate tax, that has not been increased in 11 years,

25 cents, making it $2 on a hundred-dollar valuation or $20 on a thousand dollars, with an increase in the Federal payment from eight to twelve million dollars, and an increase in the water rates of 25 percent in order to put the water system on a pay-as-you-go basis, we would save $10,000,000 in interest charges that would be necessary if the program that we recommended was not accepted by the Congress.

We recommended also a 1-cent increase in the gasoline tax. In addition, we thought it would be imperative, in the interest of fairness and equity, to make a readjustment of the income-tax system in the District of Columbia so that people who get the benefit of the municipal services here would make a contribution to that end.

We therefore brought to the House a bill which embraced a tax on those who were domiciled in the District on the 31st day of December, and every other individual who maintains a place of abode within the District for more than 7 months of the taxable year, whether domiciled in the District or not.

The House adopted in place of our recommendations the O'Hara amendment, which retained precisely the same provisions except that it made certain exemptions within the provisions of the law, which will be thoroughly explained when the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] takes the floor, together with other members of the committee.

When the bill went to the Senate the Senate struck out the O'Hara amendment and substituted the original bill that was recommended by the House Committee on the District of Columbia when we reported it out a short time ago.

This matter is of tremendous importance not only to the people in the District, who have to pay these bills in the form of real-estate taxes and income taxes, but to the Members of Congress who have approved a Federal contribution of $8,000,000 up to last year and $12,000,000 in the bill we recommended only a short time ago.

The determination of what ought to be done in the District to meet our obligations has been a very serious question, and we have come to the conclusion that, if we can adjust the income tax on a fair basis so that those who live here the year around or who live here 7 months of the year and pay no income or intangible tax elsewhere and get the benefit of all the services that are rendered by the District will pay their share of the cost of those services, then together with the real-estate tax and the Federal contribution we will meet all the obligations necessary in the fiscal years 1948 and 1949.

The question of income tax is one that has been discussed on the floor of the House, to my memory, ever since the introduction of the original income tax back in 1939. It was approved by an overwhelming vote by the Congress of that year. We specifically set out then as we do today, to achieve a fair and equitable method so that everyone who benefits from the municipal services of the District will pay his just share of the cost of government. The income tax would not be in excess of $25 or $30 on a net income, let us say $5,000 to $7,000 a year. Through that means he would be paying less than what he would through the alternative, which is the sales tax.

We must have in mind that 31 States in the Union have income taxes. We provide in this bill that those domiciled in States having an income tax will pay the tax back home and will be entirely exempt from payment of income tax in the District of Columbia. The reason they would not be compelled to pay an income tax in the District is that the rate of income tax in the District under the present law—which is not changed by this bill—is so much lower than what it is in any of those other States that once a payment is made in those other States they do not have to pay a tax here.

There is a provision in the bill also that in the other States, 17 in number, which have an intangible personal property tax, and they pay that intangible personal-property tax, the amount they pay in tax will be deducted from the amount they would have to pay in income tax in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, in the very limited time that we have at our disposal I want to say that we have given a great deal of thought and study to this whole tax structure over a period of many weeks, ever since the beginning of this year, and we sincerely hope the recommendation of the committee to concur in the Senate amendments will be adopted by the House this afternoon.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, this is the fourth time that the principle of the so-called O'Hara amendment has been before the House. It was adopted as general legislation in 1944. It was adopted again in 1945 after full hearings before the Committee on the Judiciary of the House, which unanimously reported out the measure, and after there were full hearings before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, which also reported it out unanimously. It came back to the House with an amendment which was placed on it in the Senate. As I stated to you before, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] objected to it going to conference, and it was thereafter locked up in the Committee on Rules until we now have it before us in the form of the District tax bill.

May I say to the Members of the House I share with the gentleman from Massachusetts and the gentleman from Illinois the same keen interest in the District of Columbia that they and other Members of the House have with reference to the problems of the District. I volunteered for service on the Committee on the District of Columbia. I worked very hard and I think I have the best interests of the District at heart as well as anyone else. But I say to you that we have many problems confronting us in this tax bill. We are legislating with reference to many temporary residents of the District of Columbia who are employed here.

This is an important matter, and I do not want to impose upon the membership at any great length, because I feel that it is unnecessary. But the situation simply is that the House adopted the O'Hara amendment when it was before us by a vote of 70 to 30 on June 9, 1947. The so-called O'Hara amendment included in the bill provides for an exemption to Federal employees who have a bona fide domicile in some other State.

The language of the bill as adopted by the Senate and as originally reported by the District Committee, made this exemption, and I wish to make it plain to you so there will be no misunderstanding: It exempts Members of the Senate and Members of Congress, elective officers and officers appointed by the President, namely the ambassadors and other high appointive officers. Then it puts everybody else who lives here 7 months into the class of taxpayers, after we have taken care of the top brackets, I say in the interest of simple equity and justice that is not right, it is not right to our loyal and efficient office staffs and Government employees who come here from our own State who pay an income tax if it is an income-tax State, because they must maintain their residence.

Let me call your attention to one further significant thing, under the civil-service system Government employees must maintain a State residence when it comes to the matter of apportionment. That is the civil-service law.

I want to say to the membership of the House that this is the fanciest little income tax collecting bill that was ever conceived at any time or any place. It has been worked out by experts who have been in court too many times on tax bills. They put in this proposition that anyone who is here—that means your secretary and your office staff—more than 7 months and 1 day must pay an income tax in the District of Columbia. Now, my dear and beloved friend from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is going to follow me and say that they should pay an income tax here if they live here and enjoy the benefits of the District of Columbia. So should we as Members of Congress. I repeat, it is an equitable situation when we go back to our office staff and say, "Well, I voted to exempt myself but you, my office staff, you are going to pay."

What else happens in these little matters of tax collection? Oh, yes; they hound these people, and they will hound them. I do not know how much of a group they will have enforcing this provision if it is passed in its present form, but I will venture to say that every one of your office help will be paying a tax if they are here only a seven-month-and-one-day tax period, and the collectors will insist they should pay it even though they are not here the extra day.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I wish the gentleman would let me proceed a little further; then I will yield.

Let me call attention to one other thing. My amendment is as much a tax-collecting amendment in this bill as anything else. What does it do to the person who has an honest-to-goodness bona fide domicile and is employed on your staff? It gives them the right you have,

to claim you are a resident of the State you come from. Is there anything wrong with that? The ordinary Member has his domicile back in some little precinct in his district. That is his domicile. But this foxy bill does not refer to domicile except to say that residence is the determinate thing.

Now, I want to say anotner thing to you. They are going to hold out as the very compelling argument that if they pay income taxes back in their home States the tax here is so low they will not have to pay any here. That is not exactly true, because there are a couple of States where the income-tax rate is lower than it is in the District of Columbia.

Let me call attention to another thing that is absolutely discriminatory. There are 19 States, Mr. Speaker, that have no State income-tax laws. They may say they are supposed to be credited for their intangible tax. Well, try to figure out your intangible tax, try to figure out what you may have paid under the sales tax. I have here a list of the States that have no income tax, and I want to read it in the RECORD. I also want to correct a statement I made previously. I said there were 16 non-income-tax States. As a matter of fact, there are 19, and I am going to read the list so the information will be in the RECORD. These States are Connecticut, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Maine, Michigan, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Washington, West Virginia, and Wyoming.

Why, bless your hearts, about half the population of the United States are in those States.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I prefer to proceed a little further before yielding.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I wish to make a statement in support of the gentleman's argument.

Mr. O'HARA. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I wish to call attention to the fact that we do not have a State income tax in South Dakota. We adopted the sales tax and that is a replacement tax as far as the income tax is concerned.

Mr. O'HARA. Let me make this point absolutely iron-clad: Those people who live in those States, your employees, Government employees, your own staffs from those States, if they reside here 7 months and 1 day are going to have to pay an income tax in the District of Columbia. And you people back in the non-income tax States, do not think you do not pay taxes, for you pay plenty of them just as we pay plenty of taxes here, the various hidden taxes, even though we are exempted under this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is ridiculous to have to come back on this proposition. It was obvious when the conferees were appointed that the result of the conference would be as it is.

When this bill was before us on June 9 we used 45 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD fully debating the bill. For the information of the Members of the House, a great deal of this time was on the so-called O'Hara amendment. I agree that the District needs more taxes. May I call your attention to the fact that in this bill we have increased the Government allotment from $8,000,000 to $12,000,000. We did not increase the liquor tax. The gentleman from Illinois or somebody else may claim this amendment is going to defeat the bill, but that is a lot of hooey. They may claim it will take $1,600,000 from this bill, but I do not care if it takes that or more. I think we should deal justly, fairly, and equitably with the employees who work in our offices as well as the Federal employees who like ourselves are down here working in the interest of the Government and the people of the United States and who pay taxes back home in addition to the various types of taxes that they pay here.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to offer a preferential motion at the conclusion of the debate that the conferees be instructed to follow the position of the House as originally indicated. As I say, we had 45 pages of debate upon this subject when it was before the House.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, when the bill went over to the other body there were only four pages of discussion on this bill, about two lines upon the very important controversial question here, the O'Hara amendment and its fairness, which I think it has.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Will the gentleman explain the motion he is going to offer?

Mr. O'HARA. The motion I will offer will be to instruct the conferees to follow the position which we took originally in the House and upon that motion, of course, those who feel as I do would vote "yea" and those opposed to me will vote "no." That is about the situation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, we have discussed this matter in the House before. I do not know that there is much left to be said on it. I am supporting the conference report as I supported the bill in the House originally. I am supporting it upon the theory that the gentleman from Minnesota has just said he is opposing it on. The gentleman has stated that all he wants is a just bill. I think this is a just bill.

What this bill does is merely to say to these people who make their homes in Washington: "You ought to pay some taxes somewhere; if you pay your income tax back in the State in which you claim domicile, you do not have to pay it here. If you do not pay any income tax anywhere else and you do not pay any intangible tax anywhere else, then you must pay it in the District of Columbia."

The fact is that Washington has many thousands of people living here who come from other States, as you all know. They live here for years. They take advantage, and quite properly, of the services of this city. They educate their children in the public schools of Washington. Surely they ought to be willing and glad, and I think they are, to do the just and fair thing of paying some tax somewhere. I think that is the just and fair thing to do and I am with the gentleman from Minnesota on that matter of fairness.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HENDRICKS. If it is fair for our secretaries and other Federal employees to pay a tax here, would it not be fair also for Members of Congress to pay a tax here?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I will not debate that question with the gentleman. Does the gentleman want to put that in the bill? If he does, all right.

Mr. HENDRICKS. I want to leave them all out.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. And you want to leave out a lot of other people too.

We have to come down to this sooner or later. In the District of Columbia, the Nation's Capital, which you all claim you want to run as the best city in the country, it takes money and you have to get the money from somewhere. If you are unwilling to accept the income tax feature, let us have the sales tax. We have got to have some kind of tax. It is up to the House. I want you to know that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], has worked over this situation for months. The joint Senate and House committee, and I was an humble member of that committee, have investigated every source of revenue that could be thought of for raising of the necessary revenue to operate the city. If you do not like the bill we bring in let us have another bill; but do not forget, from somewhere, from somebody, some place, has got to come the revenue to operate this city. Somebody has got to pay it.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a fair bill and I hope the House will adopt the conference report.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. I want to call the gentleman's attention to this fact that in Illinois the burden of carrying the expenses of our government is paid by a sales tax.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. There is no sales tax in this bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The question I wanted to ask, if the gentleman wants to raise revenue, the most obvious way would be to bring in a sales tax and you will have all the revenue the District of Columbia needs.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that that problem was submitted to the House at the same time this bill was submitted. The House refused to take the sales tax; the House refused to take the income tax. Now, how are you going to run the Government if you do not pay in taxes

for it? We had that problem up on the very same day that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] presented his proposal for an income tax. You voted that down and you voted down the sales tax, and I suppose if there is another bill presented for raising taxes, you will vote that down. Now, you cannot vote for all appropriations and against all taxes and balance the budget, and that is all there is to the proposition.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. PLUMLEY. The gentleman would not insist, and I know he would not urge, that by reason of the fact that he is elected to Congress and maintains a residence in his home State and has to maintain one here, that he should bear the burden of running this Government.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not debate that subject with the gentleman at all, sir.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. MCMILLAN].

Mr. MCMILLAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that I find myself in disagreement with my distinguished chairman, and especially the chairman of the subcommittee, who worked so hard on this bill. I just cannot reconcile myself to going along with taxing Government employees, who are compelled to come here for nearly 9 or 10 months, to pay an income tax in the District of Columbia. I am in agreement with the conferees and our committee on about 95 percent of the bill, but I believe that we can leave this item out of the bill without causing any of the function of the District to suffer. I hope that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] and his committee will make a thorough investigation of the affairs of the District of Columbia and try to reduce expenses here. It costs more to operate the government of the District of Columbia than it does my entire State. I believe that every person who works in Washington contributes something to operating the District government. I know that every one of my employees spends approximately every penny they make here in Washington, and in some way or another it certainly comes back to help run the District government. I do not believe there would be very much to the city of Washington if it was not for the pay roll of the Government clerks. I venture to say that there would not be any of these people who have moved down to Washington to exploit Government employees if it were not for this large pay roll. If you give us this pay roll in my State, I venture to say that we will give you people here in the District of Columbia $100,000,000 a year, at least. I believe the Federal Government owns as many acres of land in my district as there are in the District of Columbia, and they do not pay our State Government a dime in taxes. All this land is taken out of tax circulation. I think that if we are going to be fair and give $12,000,000 to run the District government out of the Federal Treasury, we should place the same tax on some of the property owned by the Federal Government throughout the States and help run some of these State governments.

I wish I could go along with my chairman and the other members of the Committee on the District of Columbia who are in favor of this tax, but, as I said before, I cannot reconcile myself to the fact that we are due to take this kind of action toward our constituents. It is possible that every one of my constituents may pay taxes in the District of Columbia. The income tax in the District of Columbia is lower than it is in my State.

No one has asked me to oppose this item of the tax bill. However, I do not think it is my place to be a party to making these temporary Government employees pay income tax to the District of Columbia unless they desire to do so.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCMILLAN of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Will not the gentleman agree there is also a vital principle involved as to the effort of this Congress to dictate to the States of this Union what kind of tax they shall levy?

Mr. MCMILLAN of South Carolina. I certainly do.

Mr. POAGE. Is it not true that every State levies on its own people and property all the taxes that are needed to run that State? It should not make any difference to the citizens of other States or the District of Columbia what form of taxation the several States of the Union levy. If my State or the gentleman's State wants to exempt the girls and the other employees who work here in Washington from taxation, we have to do it by getting those taxes through taxing somebody else. If our citizens are willing to pay those taxes, is it not our problem? It is not the province of somebody else to tell us how we shall levy our local taxes.

Mr. MCMILLAN of South Carolina. I agree with the gentleman. Again, let me say that I believe every person who lives in the District of Columbia pays in some manner toward operating the District government. He may not pay an income tax but he pays just about all he makes to the stores, hotels, and other places here in the District of Columbia, who should be taxed sufficient to pay the expenses of the local government.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY].

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, we are thrashing some old straw here today. Several years ago the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] introduced and there passed through this House by unanimous consent a bill which substantially does what he is attempting to do in this tax bill. That bill died in another body. Two years thereafter he reintroduced the same bill on which a rule was granted. It was thoroughly debated on the floor of the House. I believe that was in the Seventy-eighth Congress. It passed the House by a very large vote. I do not recall the vote, but it could be that it was unanimous. Two years later, in the Seventy-ninth Congress, he introduced the same bill. It was reported from the proper legislative committee, objected to on the Consent Calendar, and died in the Rules Committee.

I intend to support the O'Hara motion, and as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia may I urge you to support it as you did a few days ago. I see no reason why you should change your stand now, more particularly since the House has on three occasions voted for the principles involved.

It may be said that if you do not vote down the O'Hara motion you will kill the bill. That is far from the facts. The fact is that the Federal contribution to the District of Columbia is being increased by $4,000,000 under the bill. Two years ago the Federal Government was contributing $6,000,000 to the District of Columbia. It was increased to $8,000,000, and this bill increases it to $12,000,000. The real-estate tax is increased, water rates are increased, and other revenues are provided. So if you support the O'Hara motion, it will be a long way from defeating the District revenue bill.

Mr. BATES of Massachuetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The gentleman does not wish to imply that sufficient revenues will be developed under this new tax bill we have reported, the income tax bill as recommended by the committee?

Mr. ABERNETHY. No. I am not saying sufficient revenues will be raised by it. I do not know.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I say they will not.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Well, when I am called on to vote on a matter like this that is of little concern to me. If you cannot find a right way to do a thing, I would not attempt it at all, and I do not think this is the right way. I am not willing to say to anyone who maintains an apartment in Washington, whether they live in an apartment or not, that they have to pay an income tax to the District of Columbia, and that is just what the bill does. If you do not believe it, I will read it to you. This is what the statement of the managers on the part of the House has to say about it:

> Every individual who maintains a place of abode within the District for more than 7 months of the taxable year.

It says nothing about being a legitimate resident of the District but makes one a taxpayer who simply maintains a place of abode whether he uses it or not.

What are you going to do with all of these so-called lobbyists running around Washington who maintain a place of abode back home or somewhere else? What are you going to do with the large group of lawyers who maintain offices in Philadelphia, New York, or Baltimore, but who actually do their practice in the District of Columbia before Government boards and commissions?

This bill would send them home tax free but it would include some little grade 3 stenographer down here in a Government department. You would say to her, "You are going to pay taxes

to the District of Columbia." Why? Because you are fortunate enough to have a job which brings you here although you actually reside in another State where you pay other taxes and vote.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is right to compel them to pay an income tax to the District of Columbia when they actually reside in some other State. It is not right.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I think perhaps you remember a definition which never has been successfully controverted to this effect: "Residence is the place to which when absent therefrom one has the present intention of returning thereto." And you cannot beat that definition.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I think I recall such a definition, but I am not certain.

Mr. Speaker, this is indeed a beautiful city. It is a city that has been built with the money collected from all 48 States of the Union. Do not forget that. Every building that graces the avenues of the city of Washington was built with taxes collected from the people of Texas, Maine, California, and every other State of the Union. There is a contribution to the District of Columbia which no one seems to recognize. Give my own home town all these beautiful buildings, all of the Federal employees with the tremendous pay roll, and the beautiful trees and shrubs that line the avenues, the parks, and so on, and we will exempt every one of the Federal workers from taxes as well as provide them with a place to live. From that pay roll we would profit greatly to say nothing of the beauty of the buildings and parks.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERNETHY. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Would the gentleman ask for the $12,000,000 too?

Mr. ABERNETHY. We will take that, too; yes, we will take that, too—reluctantly, of course.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. O'HARA. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Does any Member of the minority demand recognition? If not, the gentleman is recognized.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. O'HARA moves to recommit the conference report on H. R. 3737 to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to insist on the provisions on the part of the House bill relating to:

"The word 'resident' means every individual domiciled within the District on the last day of the taxable year, and every other individual who maintains a place of abode within the District for more than 7 months of the taxable year, whether domiciled in the District or not. The word 'resident' shall not include any elective officer of the Government of the United States or employees of the United States Government, nor shall it include any officer of the executive branch of such Government whose appointment to the office held by him was by the President of the United States and subject to confirmation by the Senate of the United States and whose tenure of office is at the pleasure of the President of the United States. For the purposes of this act the domicile of such officer or employee shall be in the State in which he expressly declares to be the State of his domicile: *Provided*, That he shall have acquired a domicile in such State under the laws of such State prior to the beginning of the annual period for which the tax is claimed. Such declaration must be made in writing, under oath, to the Assessor and the time for filing such declaration shall not expire until 60 days after written demand shall have been received by such officer or employee."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Would not the motion be divisible?

The SPEAKER. A motion to recommit is not divisible.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 223, nays 78, not voting 129, as follows:

[Roll No. 94]

YEAS—223

Abernethy	Dingell	Horan
Allen, Calif.	Dolliver	Huber
Allen, La.	Domengeaux	Hull
Almond	Dondero	Jackson, Calif.
Andersen, H. Carl	Dorn	Jackson, Wash.
Anderson, Calif.	Douglas	Jenison
Andresen, August H.	Eberharter	Jenkins, Ohio
Andrews, Ala.	Elliott	Jensen
Angell	Ellsworth	Johnson, Calif.
Arnold	Engel, Mich.	Johnson, Ill.
Bakewell	Engle, Calif.	Johnson, Ind.
Barrett	Evins	Johnson, Tex.
Beckworth	Fellows	Jones, N. C.
Bender	Fenton	Jones, Ohio
Blackney	Fisher	Jonkman
Blatnik	Flannagan	Karsten, Mo.
Bloom	Fletcher	Kee
Boggs, La.	Fogarty	Keefe
Bolton	Forand	Kerr
Bonner	Gary	Kilday
Brown, Ga.	Gearhart	King
Brown, Ohio	Gillette	Knutson
Bryson	Gillie	Landis
Buchanan	Goodwin	Larcade
Bulwinkle	Gordon	LeCompte
Burke	Gore	Lemke
Burleson	Gorski	Lesinski
Busbey	Gossett	Lewis
Byrnes, Wis.	Graham	Lodge
Carroll	Grant, Ala.	Lucas
Case, S. Dak.	Grant, Ind.	Lyle
Chapman	Gregory	McConnell
Chelf	Griffiths	McDonough
Church	Gross	McGregor
Clevenger	Gwynne, Iowa	McMahon
Coffin	Hagen	McMillan, S. C.
Cole, Kans.	Hand	Mack
Combs	Hardy	Mahon
Cooper	Harless, Ariz.	Manasco
Cotton	Harris	Mansfield, Mont.
Courtney	Hart	Marcantonio
Cravens	Havenner	Martin, Iowa
Crosser	Hébert	Mathews
Cunningham	Hedrick	Merrow
Curtis	Hendricks	Meyer
Davis, Ga.	Hess	Michener
Davis, Tenn.	Hinshaw	Miller, Calif.
Deane	Hobbs	Miller, Md.
Devitt	Hoeven	Mills
	Hoffman	Morris
	Holifield	
Mundt	Richards	Stefan
Murdock	Riley	Stevenson
Norblad	Rizley	Stigler
O'Brien	Robertson	Teague
O'Hara	Robsion	Thomas, Tex.
O'Konski	Rockwell	Thomason
Pace	Rogers, Fla.	Tollefson
Passman	Rogers, Mass.	Trimble
Patman	Rohrbough	Vorys
Peden	Rooney	Walter
Peterson	Russell	Weichel
Phillips, Calif.	Sabath	Welch
Phillips, Tenn.	Sadowski	West
Pickett	Schwabe, Mo.	Wheeler
Plumley	Schwabe, Okla.	Whitten
Poage	Scott, Hardie	Wigglesworth
Preston	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	Williams
Price, Fla.	Scrivner	Wilson, Tex.
Price, Ill.	Sheppard	Winstead
Priest	Smith, Kans.	Wolcott
Rains	Smith, Maine	Wolverton
Ramey	Somers	Wood
Reed, Ill.	Spence	Worley
Rees	Springer	Zimmerman
Reeves		

NAYS—78

Albert	Fernandez	Miller, Conn.
Auchincloss	Folger	Mitchell
Banta	Foote	Monroney
Bates, Ky.	Fulton	Morton
Bates, Mass.	Gamble	Murray, Wis.
Bennett, Mo.	Hale	Nixon
Bishop	Hall, Leonard W.	Rankin
Bradley	Halleck	Reed, N. Y.
Bramblett	Harness, Ind.	Riehlman
Brehm	Harrison	Sadlak
Brophy	Heselton	St. George
Buck	Hill	Sasscer
Buffett	Holmes	Shafer
Butler	Hope	Simpson, Ill.
Canfield	Howell	Smith, Va.
Cannon	Jarman	Smith, Wis.
Carson	Jones, Ala.	Stockman
Chenoweth	Judd	Taber
Cole, Mo.	Keating	Talle
Cole, N. Y.	Kunkel	Tibbott
Crawford	Lanham	Towe
Davis, Wis.	LeFevre	Vail
Dirksen	McMillen, Ill.	Vursell
Donohue	MacKinnon	Whittington
Doughton	Mason	Woodruff
Durham	Meade, Md.	
Elsaesser		

NOT VOTING—129

Allen, Ill.	Gifford	Muhlenberg
Andrews, N. Y.	Goff	Murray, Tenn.
Arends	Granger	Nodar
Barden	Gwinn, N. Y.	Norrell
Battle	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Norton
Beall	Hartley	O'Toole
Bell	Hays	Owens
Bennett, Mich.	Heffernan	Patterson
Bland	Herter	Pfeifer
Boggs, Del.	Javits	Philbin
Boykin	Jenkins, Pa.	Ploeser
Brooks	Jennings	Potts
Buckley	Johnson, Okla.	Poulson
Byrne, N. Y.	Jones, Wash.	Powell
Camp	Kean	Rabin
Case, N. J.	Kearney	Rayburn
Celler	Kearns	Rayfiel
Chadwick	Kefauver	Redden
Chiperfield	Kelley	Rich
Clark	Kennedy	Rivers
Clason	Keogh	Ross
Clements	Kersten, Wis.	Sanborn
Clippinger	Kilburn	Sarbacher
Colmer	Kirwan	Scoblick
Cooley	Klein	Seely-Brown
Corbett	Lane	Short
Coudert	Latham	Sikes
Cox	Lea	Simpson, Pa.
Crow	Love	Smathers
Dague	Lusk	Smith, Ohio
Dawson, Ill.	Lynch	Snyder
Dawson, Utah	McCormack	Stanley
Delaney	McCowen	Stratton
D'Ewart	McDowell	Sundstrom
Drewry	McGarvey	Taylor
Eaton	Macy	Thomas, N. J.
Ellis	Madden	Twyman
Elston	Maloney	Van Zandt
Fallon	Mansfield, Tex.	Vinson
Feighan	Meade, Ky.	Wadsworth
Fuller	Miller, Nebr.	Wilson, Ind.
Gallagher	Morgan	Youngblood
Gathings	Morrison	
Gavin		

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Clements for, with Mr. Youngblood against.
Mr. Brooks for, with Mr. Chadwick against.
Mr. Sarbacher for, with Mr. Kean against.
Mrs. Norton for, with Mr. McCormack against.
Mr. Gavin for, with Mr. Andrews of New York against.
Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Case of New Jersey against.
Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey against.
Mr. Gallagher for, with Mr. Macy against.
Mr. Scoblick for, with Mr. Sundstrom against.
Mr. Jenkins of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Gwinn of New York against.
Mr. Klein for, with Mr. Rich against.
Mr. McDowell for, with Mr. Arends against.
Mr. Colmer for, with Mr. Kearney against.
Mr. Cox for, with Mr. Taylor against.
Mr. Lynch for, with Mr. Love against.
Mr. Morgan for, with Mr. Gifford against.
Mr. Gathings for, with Mrs. Lusk against.
Mr. Hays for, with Mr. Coudert against.
Mr. Heffernan for, with Mr. Ploeser against.
Mr. Delaney for, with Mr. Seely-Brown against.
Mr. Sikes for, with Mr. Short against.
Mr. Vinson for, with Mr. Clippinger against.
Mr. Pfeifer for, with Mr. Eaton against.
Mr. Feighan for, with Mr. Hartley against.
Mr. Corbett for, with Mr. Latham against.
Mr. Dague for, with Mr. Kilburn against.
Mr. Crow for, with Mr. Clason against.
Mr. Rabin for, with Mr. Fallon against.
Mr. McGarvey for, with Mr. Meade of Kentucky against.
Mr. Nodar for, with Mr. Maloney against.
Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Fuller against.
Mr. Lane for, with Mr. Patterson against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Beall with Mr. Stanley.
Mr. Javits with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Jones of Washington with Mr. Granger.
Mr. Jennings with Mr. Drewry.
Mr. Van Zandt with Mr. Barden.
Mr. Wadsworth with Mr. Lea.
Mr. Stratton with Mr. Morrison.
Mr. Smith of Ohio with Mr. Norrell.
Mr. Snyder with Mr. Dawson of Illinois.
Mr. Kersten of Wisconsin with Mr. Camp.
Mr. Bennett of Michigan with Mr. Battle.
Mr. Chiperfield with Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma.
Mr. D'Ewart with Mr. Kirwan.
Mr. Ellis with Mr. Philbin.
Mr. Goff with Mr. Murray of Tennessee.
Mr. Elston with Mr. Madden.
Mr. Owens with Mr. Redden.
Mr. Potts with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Smith of Wisconsin with Mr. Kefauver.
Mr. Ross with Mr. Kelley.
Mr. Poulson with Mr. Boykin.
Mr. Sanborn with Mr. Rayfiel.
Mr. Dawson of Utah with Mr. Kennedy.
Mr. Miller of Nebraska with Mr. Bell.
Mr. Twyman with Mr. O'Toole.
Mr. Wilson of Indiana with Mr. Smith of Virginia.
Mr. McCowen with Mr. Rivers.

Mrs. BOLTON, Mr. STEVENSON, and Mr. KNUTSON changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 139. Joint resolution to continue for a temporary period of 15 days certain controls now exercised by the President under the Second War Powers Act, 1942, and under the Export Control Act.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3611) entitled "An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes."

DISTRICT REVENUE BILL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the District revenue bill may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXPORTATION OF CERTAIN COMMODITIES

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3049) to continue in effect section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), as amended, relating to the exportation of certain commodities.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. COOPER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that this bill is unanimously reported by the Committee on Armed Services?

Mr. SHAFER. That is right.

Mr. COOPER. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman tell us briefly what the bill is about?

Mr. SHAFER. This bill extends the authority of the Office of International Trade to continue controls over exports until December 31 of this year, at which time the President shall designate certain items to remain under control. The items that he does not designate to be under control shall be automatically decontrolled, and then the bill is extended until the 30th of June of next year for the remaining items.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this the bill that was before the Committee on Rules?

Mr. SHAFER. Yes.

Mr. RIZLEY. Much as I regret it, Mr. Speaker, I shall have to object to the request.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBSION asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two items.

Mr. REED of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Dr. George J. Schulz.

Mr. WEICHEL (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday next it shall be in order for the Clerk to receive messages from the Senate and for the Speaker to sign any enrolled bill or joint resolution found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 40 minutes.

PRESERVATION OF CIVIL LIBERTIES VITAL IN THE DEFENSE AGAINST TOTALITARIANISM

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express today my deep concern over a new and dangerous tendency in American life, which I think threatens the very existence of the United States as a free nation.

I do not refer to any growth of communism or fascism as such, but I do refer to the conduct of those who are most vocal in their efforts to—they say—"defends us against communism and fascism."

I refer to a numerically small group of writers, newspapers, columnists, and people who are national figures who spend a great deal of their time in casting aspersions upon the loyalty of individuals and organizations.

These people, while castigating individuals and organizations as being Communists or Fascists, deny these same individuals or organizations the right of a fair trial, the right of self-defense, the right of equal opportunity, to publicize their defense, against their accusers.

CIVIL LIBERTIES GUARANTEED BY BILL OF RIGHTS

It has been well said that the foundation of our liberties is contained in the Bill of Rights, and within the Bill of Rights are some of the principles which I have enunciated.

Let me repeat them: The right of the accused to face his accuser before a fairly selected jury. The right to be represented by professional counsel, if the accused so desires. The right of defense against charges, whether founded on truth or

malice. These are the priceless tolerances of our democratic philosophy.

These are the safeguards against assassination of character, against the denial of civil liberties, and it is only through the exercise of these procedures that democracy shall prevail.

When these procedures are denied, we see the growth of communism and fascism. We have only to look at the countries that are afflicted by these alien philosophies to see that what I say, is true.

When civil liberties go out the window, fascism or communism comes in.

FREEDOM OF THOUGHT AND EXPRESSION VITAL

Mr. Speaker, we all know that the very root of our democracy is in the freedom and opportunity for each American to think for himself, to speak his thoughts to his neighbor, and that his ability to do so depends, most importantly of all, upon the freedom of his neighbors to speak their minds, upon any subject, without fear of reprisal or oppression.

If the expression of all points of view is in any respect curtailed, or citizens are to that extent deprived of the opportunity to reach their own conclusions, they are deprived of the founding father's principle of free speech, and free assembly, and therefore the play and interplay of free ideas among free men.

We know these principles by heart, every American has studied them from his school days up until his adulthood. They are in fact truisms which every American learns in his earliest years and carries in his heart to his death.

These are the principles for the protection of which the boys and girls of America were willing to shed their life's blood upon the battlefields of all the world. These principles spell out part of the great difference between the totalitarian, or the authoritarian, state and the free state, which functions only in a democracy.

HISTORY OF POSTWAR HYSTERIA REPEATS ITSELF

Let us turn now and review the pages of history. We find that immediately following every great war, we have experienced throughout the Nation, a wave of hysteria, a wave of fanaticism, a wave of persecution.

This happened after the Civil War—the War Between the States. It happened after World War I when we had the Mitchell-Palmer raids against the liberties of our people, deeds which we are ashamed of, as we look back upon those unhappy days.

It is beginning to happen again after World War II. World War II was fought against the principles of hate, against the principles of intolerance, against the principles of persecution of minorities.

We expended billions of dollars and acquired a million casualties in the fight to protect our people in the practice of freedom's rights. Shall we then so lightly consider these principles bought at such great price? Shall we now lose them by default?

FIGHT FOR THE AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE IN THE AMERICAN MANNER

The great mass of the people of our country are against communism. They are against fascism. I proudly count myself in that great middle class which holds that neither communism nor fascism contains the answer which we the people are seeking. I believe as they believe, that within the principle of constitutional democracy, there are adequate methods for obtaining all of the social benefits, all of the individual liberties, which we as a people have been seeking since the birth of the Republic.

We are opposed to communism, and we are opposed to fascism, but we expect to fight those foregn ideologies in the right way. We do not prcpose to succumb to their methods in fighting the ideologies which we despise.

We expect to use the democratic processes in opposing un-democratic philosophies. We intend to fight for the American way of life, but we intend to fight in the American manner.

We are not going to let our dislike of communism and fascism throw us into an undignified and dangerous panic. We are not going to approve the misguided efforts of a band of fanatics who say they are trying to "defend our way of life," but by almost imperceptible degrees, and by dangerous advocacy, are actually destroying the foundation upon which the American way of life is built.

DANGEROUS PRACTICES IN CHARACTER ASSASSINATION

Let us then review some of the dangerous practices of today. During the 1946 campaign, the red-smearing technique of Hitler was used, and used successfully, to retire many progressive men from public life. Men whose patriotism was unquestioned, men who stood for the best principles of American democracy.

But they found themselves helpless against the insidious technique of character assassination. By means of radio and newspaper propaganda, and in fact, all types of propaganda were open to the character assassins. In too many instances, there was no opportunity for the accused to face his accuser on an equal basis before the bar of public attention.

Because of the hysteria and because of the dislocations of war, many people were in a receptive mood. They believed the lies of the smear bund. The accused were punished and penalized without the traditional right to face their accusers on the same plane of propaganda dissemination. They could not defend their characters against the cowardly assaults which were launched against them.

Candidates for public office were defeated. Their civil rights had been violated, and they paid the penalty.

But the process which the victors used, holds within it a danger of which we should all be aware—that technique of character assassination continues. It continues in the press. It continues in the radio. It continues in the high places of our land: Members of Congress and congressional committees are granted certain immunities against the laws of libel, to use this immunity to destroy an individual's character is to indulge in a dangerous practice.

The accused in such instances, would not have the right to come before his accuser. He does not have the right of special counsel. He does not have the privilege of the same amount of publicity which is accessible to his accuser.

THE PRESIDENT'S LOYALTY ORDER

As a result of this hysteria, this panic against communism, President Truman has issued a so-called loyalty order. I believe that President Truman is sincere in issuing such an order. I question the wisdom of the methods proposed, however, in his loyalty order, the methods of determining loyalty, or disloyalty, the provisions for defense against one's accuser. I do not question the sincerity of the President, nor the desirability of his purpose. I realize that we do not want either Communists or Fascists taking part in confidential positions in our National Government. However, many imminently conservative, reputable people, such as Dean Erwin Nathaniel Griswold, of the Harvard Law School, think that certain terms of the order, and the loose method of determining disloyalty, are dangerously broad and lacking in safeguards for the freedom of the individual. The order bestows on the Attorney General arbitrary judicial power regarding civil liberties heretofore reserved to the courts.

I might point out, however, that the major response from among my colleagues in this House, is a demand that the order be made even broader by legislation. And, as a result, several bills have been introduced to effectuate the President's loyal order, by statute. I agree that statutory law is preferable to Executive order. It must at least stand the test of congressional debate and constitutionality.

COERCIVE PRACTICES CREATE FEAR OF FREE SPEECH AND ASSEMBLY

We had another very interesting, if dangerous, development lately. The Committee on Un-American Activities of this House recently intimated that it would have "observers" at the public address given by Henry Wallace. Now whether you believe in Henry Wallace or not, I submit to you that Henry Wallace has the constitutional right of free speech in the United States. I submit to you that any American citizen has the constitutional right of assembly to hear Henry Wallace speak.

A denial of this right of free speech to Mr. Wallace, or a denial of the right of assembly to his listeners, is a fundamental attack upon the Constitution upon which this democracy is founded.

The publicity given the threat of having "observers" at this public meeting, no doubt caused many Government workers to be afraid to attend and hear Mr. Wallace's speech. They were afraid that their attendance would be used by the "observers" as a pretext for investigating their loyalty to the United States Government, and therefore their right to retain their Government job. I want to point out here, however, that several thousand, including myself, went to hear Mr. Wallace speak, despite the attempt to stop the meeting.

On this point, I might site further that the American Anti-Communist Association tried to obtain a legal injunction

against the use of the Government-owned facility where the meeting was held. In my opinion, this, too, was a dangerous attack upon the right of free assembly and free speech.

CRITICISM OF PUBLIC OFFICIALS AND LEGISLATION ONE OF OUR HERITAGES

Another incident which occurred recently on the floor of this House, was the attack by a Member upon a large and respected religious organization for having expressed its views on the labor bill. The speech of the Member strongly implied that it was wrong to criticize a bill which a large majority of Congress had approved. I submit that as long as free speech is preserved in this democracy, that neither the views of a Member of Congress, nor the legislation passed by Congress, is sacrosanct and removed from the rightful field of public criticism.

I do not impugn the patriotism of the Members who were responsible for these acts, I question seriously the wisdom of their actions.

FORMATION OF AN INDEPENDENT SECRET POLICE DANGEROUS

Let me point out another dangerous trend, to wit, the suggestion made recently in another body that the Federal Bureau of Investigation should be made an autonomous body, not subject to the direction and the control of the President of the United States. This seems to me to be an ominous step towards a police state. It was in this manner that the dreaded OGPU was formed.

SEARCH-WITHOUT-WARRANT POWER BROADENED

Let me also point out that the Supreme Court's recent decision—Harris against United States—has greatly broadened the power to search without a warrant. While I am not a lawyer, and I would not deign to contest the Supreme Court's ruling on the point of legal technicality, it seems to me that this is a dangerous retreat from one of the landmarks of liberty in Anglo-American law.

I speak of the old English principles that "A man's home is his castle," and that "Even the king has no right to come within its doors uninvited."

DICTATORS IMPOSE TYRANNY OF MIND AND BODY

The practices and trends I have referred to put fear into the hearts of ordinary people—fear of their Government. We do not want to be responsible for creating fear, we want to create and maintain devotion to Government in the hearts of our people.

It is only the police states that desire the growth of fear in the hearts of their abject subjects. If we continue these practices, people will fear that their jobs will be jeopardized, or that their security will be threatened, or that they will be publicly attacked, and have no means of answering that attack.

They will be afraid to express or to listen to any ideas, whether radical or conservative. The totalitarian states purposely encouraged the growth of fear in order to control their people. They believe in both tyranny of the body and tyranny of the mind, and this, I believe, is a good place to quote the inscription which is found in the Jefferson Memorial: "I have sworn eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

Thomas Jefferson realized that the greatest enemy of democracy was the tyranny of the mind. He knew that it would ultimately destroy freedom of thought, and if freedom of thought and expression were destroyed, it would destroy the young democracy.

Mussolini and Hitler planted the seeds of fear in the minds of their people, and their people reaped a harvest of tyranny. Let us not add ourselves to the list of these foreign examples, by killing off the freedom of independent thought.

DESTRUCTION OF THE MIDDLE CLASS

The dictators destroyed the middle ground—the liberal and progressive philosophy of the middle class of their people. They forced the middle class either to the extreme left or the extreme right. They made the middle ground of thought and action impossible and when they had accomplished the elimination of the middle ground, the extreme took over control and individual freedom perished.

We know that neither Hitler, Stalin, nor Mussolini could rise to power until they had established the pattern for suppressing dissenting ideas. They established this pattern through intolerance of opposing ideas, and opposing people. They established it through their suppression of civil liberties and the persecution of the opposition. They created fear, panic, and hysteria in the minds of their people.

These are the things, therefore, that we must guard against.

We must guard against the suppression of civil liberties.

We must guard against intemperance and intolerance, whether it be of ideas or of minority groups.

If we do not guard against these insidious practices and methods, our best efforts to combat communism and fascism will fail.

These are the methods which destroy democracy. And when democracy is destroyed, either fascism or communism, rushes in to fill the vacuum.

TREND TOWARD SUPPRESSION OF CIVIL LIBERTIES SHOULD BE HALTED

You may say to me, "These are but straws in the wind" if you like. But I say to you that such a wind can increase to the size of a tornado, sweeping before it the civil liberties of the people of America, unless we see the danger and call a halt to such practices.

I have confidence in America; I have confidence in democracy. I believe that we will see the danger, and I believe that we will stop these trends. I do not believe that free speech will be illegally suppressed. I do say however, that we can do irreparable damage to the fundamental requisites of democracy, long before any important issue of illegal suppression arises.

I DETEST ALL THAT YOU SAY, BUT WILL DEFEND WITH MY LIFE YOUR RIGHT TO SAY IT

The greatest war known to history has been concluded and we have had approximately 2 years of so-called peace.

And yet, we find not the blessings of peace, but we find the penalties of war throughout the world. Hate, intolerance, poverty, and suspicion are rampant, not only in the devastated areas, but in our own beloved country

These are perilous times. They are days that call for coolness of judgment, and the calmness of reason.

May I in all sincerity, then, urge all of my colleagues and fellow citizens, who find the terms "Communist" and "Fascist" convenient substitutes for answers to arguments or people they dislike, to moderate their attacks. Let them be careful that they are not adding fuel to the flames of intolerance and hate. Let them beware. They may be attacking the roots of the tree of liberty which they seek to defend. If they follow the practices of the dictators, they will be candidates for an unenviable role in history. They will be known as the executioners of democracy.

Let me conclude my remarks by reminding you of the oft-quoted statement of Voltaire, "I do not believe a word that you say, but I will defend with my life, if need be, your right to say it."

That is the spirit of democracy, and that attitude of heart and mind must be our guide and compass in the perilous days that lie ahead.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RAMEY. Does not the gentleman believe the careless use of words is about the most dangerous thing we have now?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes, the use of words which label people in a general sense without specifically pointing out the individual's actual overt act or overtly expressed thoughts.

Mr. RAMEY. For instance, Communism has a certain history, Nazism a certain history and Fascism a certain history; but when folks want to call each other names now they use one of those terms and do not know what they mean?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I think that is a very dangerous practice unless you are sure that the other person comes under the heading of that label and you can prove that he is.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am very much interested in the gentleman's statement. I think he has made a good statement. I notice he used the terms "communism" and "fascism" with the conjunction "and." I was careful to note he used the conjunction "and" instead of "or." The gentleman does not mean to imply, of course, that those terms are synonymous?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I mean to infer that both communism and fascism are plans of an authoritarian state. They differ. There is a very distinct difference to me. To me they are both objectionable.

Mr. MURDOCK. They are both very objectionable to me, too, but I find in the public mind a tendency to regard these terms as synonymous. To me they are opposite extremes. Although they have points of similarity, they are as far apart as the North and South Poles, and, of course, are both very dangerous.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. They are synonymous at certain particular points; the denial of individual liberty within their so-called borders, the suppression of the individual, the idolizing of the state, the bringing up of the state, the state is supreme and the individual is but a vassal of the state. I believe in a democracy that the people are supreme and that the government serves the people.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is a good statement. We Americans believe government exists for the people and not the people for the government. Does the gentleman know of any greater confusion or ignorance with regard to the meaning of any terms than with regard to the meaning of those two terms "communism" and "fascism"?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. There is great ignorance on that score. Some time ago I voted for the printing of several thousand documents on communism. I understand one of the subcommittees has reported a similar study made on a nonpartisan basis by the Legislative Reference Bureau of the Library of Congress on fascism. I am hoping that we will bring to the floor an authorization to print an equal number on the subject of fascism that were printed on the subject of communism, because I believe that history will prove that great industrial, technological governments will go quicker into fascism than they will into communism. I believe history will show agricultural nations, agrarian nations, with small communities, small villages, go quicker into communism than into fascism.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman speaks of smearing and character assassination. Is it not true that the very confusion as to the meaning of communism or fascism in the public mind makes possible the misbranding or mislabeling in this smearing campaign?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I think that is a factor. However, I do think whether a person understands their meaning or not, if they use either one of those terms without proper judgment, that it is dangerous.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. First I would like to compliment the gentleman from California on the very excellent statement that he has just made. To carry on what the gentleman from Arizona has mentioned, if I might disagree with him. I do not think it is that there is such great confusion only in people's minds between fascism and communism. I think it is more dangerous than that. I think there is a tremendous confusion in our own people's minds as to what democracy is.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I think the gentlewoman is right.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I do not think we teach enough democracy in our schools, so that when people hear the housing program discussed, for instance, and they have no home, they are living in trailers—and we all know that there are millions of families today without homes—and someone comes along and says if the Federal Government has a housing program or if they put over the Wagner-Ellender-Taft Act, that is communistic, that has nothing to do with communism at all.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is right.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Communism is a form of government, as the gentleman expressed it. Communism is a form of government which is controlled by the state with a few heads at the top. Now, they may have a good program or bad program, but a few people at the top make their blueprint whether a great many people like it or not. In a democracy the people draw the blueprint, and it may be a good blueprint or a bad blueprint, but they have a right to continue with that program or discard it at any of the elections.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is right. The people have a right to ask for a Wagner-Ellender-Taft Act, the VA or MVA?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Exactly.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. And if the people's representatives vote for that type of a thing, then it becomes the people in action in a democracy, and they order the state to do it. The state does not order the people to do it.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. In other words, in the United States we could have a tremendous housing program where only the Government built the houses, if the people wanted it, and we could have a situation where the Government never put a hand on one brick. Now, that is democracy. In a democracy we are looking closely to the common good, we are looking at the issues; we try to make some evaluation of the conditions surrounding us and to find an answer, an intelligent answer. But, when you call programs Communist, that is a mistake that we all make. Some people call them Fascists or Communists, which adds to the confusion. When you begin to say, for instance, to the veteran who comes home and has no place to live, "In the different housing programs that they want to put through, the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill, that is Communist," what does he say? "Give me a little communism, for heaven's sake."

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is right.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. And it has nothing to do with communism.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentlewoman has brought out a wonderful point there.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. It has nothing to do with communism.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentlewoman has brought out a point which I think should be emphasized, and that is this, that by ultraconservatives branding certain things which are not Communist as communism, certain people who believe in liberal constitutional methods of proposing certain social changes, such as the TVA, such as an increased highway system, such as Federal aid to States in education under the direction of the State, but federally aided from richer parts of our country—when they label things like that communism it creates in the minds of the ignorant person a confusion, and he says, "If that is communism, I want some of it," and that is where the Communists get their strength. They get it through the confusion of the people.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Absolutely. What they should be doing is discussing these programs objectively, on a level up here, where the person who presents a program gives a reason why they need it. But the other person who comes along says it is useless here and there and there. Do you not see that if we approach it in this objective way we will be much further along instead of calling names?

I take this minute to say here and now that the manner in which the campaign has been carried on in this country by Republicans and Democrats—and I put more stress on the Republicans, not because I am of the Democratic Party but because it is so—the manner in which campaigning has been carried on has done more to confuse the average person as to the kind of government we live in and what communism and fascism actually are than any foreign agents planted here or any kind of propaganda machine that has been let loose in the last 10 or 12 years. We, ourselves, have attacked our own system, and it ought to stop. The problems that confront the American people are great enough for us to discuss them and to let the people choose their Representatives on the basis of that discussion rather than on the basis of calling names.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. On the basis of the issues and not on the basis of bad names. I thank the gentlewoman for her contribution.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. The luscious mushroom and the poison toadstool look very much alike. We ought to distinguish carefully between them, because one is food and the other is poison.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman as always makes a sage remark.

Mr. MURDOCK. I was just a little fellow when my father died, but I remember one story he told. It was about a Quaker who had been bitten by a savage dog. The Quaker, not losing his religion, said, "My poor doggie, I will not harm thee, but I will give thee a bad name." He called it a mad dog, and the neighbors shot the dog. That may have been a perfectly healthy dog and valuable as a watchdog with training, but when he was branded a mad dog he was disposed of. It is a rather effective technique.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman. It brings back that much-repeated question, that he who steals my purse steals trash, but he who steals my good name steals that which cannot be replaced.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RAMEY. I appreciate the gentleman's story. The gentleman spoke about folks calling names when under immunity from being sued for slander. Does not the gentleman think he might add to this valuable contribution those who wait until a President of the United States is dead? The gentleman knows that when a man dies his heirs have no right to bring an action for libel or slander. There have been slander books written about George Washington.

Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, Woodrow Wilson, and Warren Harding. Does not the gentleman think that is an extremely cowardly attack, to wait until a man dies and then write such a book about him?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I think that is one of the most cowardly methods of blackening a man's reputation, when he can no longer defend himself or be defended in a legal way.

I think that someone who is capable of doing it should take this floor some day and make a complete speech on the question of congressional immunity on the part of both individuals and committees. I think there is a real justification for congressional immunity. I think there are occasions and times when committees and individuals should be allowed to point out suspected dangers, in times of extreme peril, but I do not think a person should ever take this floor or utilize his position on a committee to take unfair advantage of any individual. I think every individual, as I brought out in my speech, should be given a hearing before being condemned. I can answer only for myself as 1 of 435 Members, but I personally pledge the Members that are here present that I will never take this floor to make a statement that I would be afraid to make on a public street corner or in the public press.

Mr. RAMEY. And if the gentleman would attack a President, he would not wait until he was dead, when he had no chance to defend himself. That is unfair.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I think I have a right to attack a President. I think that is one of the glorious liberties of a democracy which they do not have in Russia, and which they did not have in old Germany, Japan, or Italy.

Mr. RAMEY. I mean, to bring up something about his life that is untrue that relates to a moral situation. The gentleman knows some of the libelous statements to which I refer.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I would let the dead stay buried. I thank the gentleman for his interest, and I thank the Members of the House for staying so late.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PHILLIPS of California). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

RECKLESS BUDGET CUTS IMPERIL HOMES FOR MINORITIES

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of the House to a situation which is of vital importance.

In the midst of the deluge of expression regarding veto of the Taft-Hartley labor bill, there has arisen this week, a swelling chorus of protest against the action of the House majority in severely slashing the 1948 budgets of the Federal housing agencies and terminating the services of the regional racial relations advisers in these programs. The most compelling representations are coming from all over the country. South as well as North, reflecting the interest of political leaders, national and local organizations, concerned with the housing problem confronting minorities, builders, and other business institutions, city and county officials, local housing authorities, churches, veterans and fraternal organizations.

The governmental housing agencies and programs under Democratic administration lifted the hopes of these groups who, because of lower income and other restrictions, face difficulties above and beyond those of the general population in securing decent housing at costs they can afford. They view these administrative budget cuts and the termination of the 10-year-old racial relations staff by the House of Representatives as tragical set-backs in efforts to meet their desperate housing needs.

In the midst of extreme housing shortages for all, they feel that these actions by the House majority will serve to heighten frustration and resentment, aggravate intergroup and racial tensions and increase the possibilities of open conflict. They, therefore, urge the restoration of the budgets for the housing agencies and the continuation of racial relations services as contributions to increased housing production for those who need it most, eased racial tensions, and the resultant welfare of the entire Nation.

THE PROBLEM OF HOUSING RACIAL MINORITIES

It is generally recognized that Negroes and other minorities experience distinctive difficulties in obtaining decent housing beyond the disabilities of other groups. Land restrictions, negative community attitudes, and the traditional practices of builders, lenders, and realtors further limit the supply, induce disproportionate overcrowding, lower the quality, and increase the price of housing available to them, especially in a period of over-all shortage.

Census and other data reveal that the proportion of non-whites occupying substandard homes is practically double that for whites. And overcrowding is often two or three times as great in Negro areas as in neighboring white districts. The poorest dwellings in the country are those occupied by rural Negroes and Latin Americans. And the most acute conditions of shortage and congestion are among colored people in industrial cities, when concentrated and restricted into racial ghettos. Thus, ever since the first wave of Negro migration during World War I—through the boom, the depression, and World War II, to the return of the veterans—the pressure on the limited supply of homes available to Negroes and other racial minorities has been steadily increasing. Already forced to spend a disproportionately large part of their lower incomes for housing, non-whites get less for their housing dollar at every level of housing cost, whether for rent or sale, and in all geographic areas. They have also been forced to pay higher cost for their housing finance at all types of private financing institutions according to the 1940 census statistics. The blighted and slum areas in which they are largely restricted are inimical to the economic, social, and political welfare of the community and the Nation.

Today, however—enhanced by enlarged employment, higher wages, more education, added experience, and so forth—the rising status of these groups makes their urgent housing needs all the more acute in their own minds as well as in the Nation's awareness. Their competition with other groups for housing in the current shortage creates frustration, resentment, racial tensions, and even open conflict. These problems are being further aggravated by the continued migration of Negroes and other minorities being displaced from the farms by the mechanization of cotton cultivation and other agricultural pursuits, or seeking areas of less restrictions and wider opportunities.

Analysis of housing plans and present living arrangements of some 253,000 Negro veterans in eight northern and 24 southern localities, as revealed in sample surveys conducted by the Bureau of Census and Bureau of Labor Statistics—during July 1946 through March 1947—for the National Housing Agency, gives the latest factual indication of the situation. Pertinent highlights of these findings are:

First. In the 24 southern areas, the proportion of Negro veterans living in substandard dwellings is about twice that of white veterans, whereas in 7 of the northern areas the proportion of Negro veterans was from two to eight times that of total veterans living under these conditions. Only in Cleveland were the proportions about equal.

Second. Highest proportion of habitable vacancies for rent or sale to Negroes was only 0.5 percent. Washington, D. C., had highest proportion, over 70 percent, of married Negro veterans living in makeshift accommodations or doubled up with other families.

Third. From 15 to 46 percent of all Negro veterans in the 8 northern areas and 25 percent of those in the 24 southern areas were in the immediate market for other living quarters.

Fourth. If housing were available at desired prices and quality, demand would rise to levels ranging between 21 and 63 percent of all Negro veterans in the 8 northern areas and 44 percent of those in the 24 southern areas.

Fifth. Median monthly rents which Negro veterans indicated they are able to pay in the northern areas ranged from $25 in St. Louis to $40 in New York City. In the southern areas, the comparable figure was $31.

Sixth. Median purchase price which prospective home owners among Negro veterans indicated they could pay in the northern areas ranged from $3,500 in Kansas City and Philadelphia to $6,000 in New York City and Newark. For the southern areas the median purchase price was $3,700.

APPROACH OF GOVERNMENTAL HOUSING AGENCIES

Governmental agencies have come to recognize the problem of housing minority racial groups as one of the most complex and important phases of the national-housing scene. To meet the basic need for more land and living area available to occupancy by these groups and assure fair distribution of housing benefits in accordance with need and ability to pay have required consistent specialized attention for the development

of sound agency policies and effective techniques.

The approach in the Washington and field offices of the housing agencies has been and should be a continuing effort to define accurately the character of these special housing difficulties of minorities and to provide technical assistance to local communities, planners, builders, lenders, and realtors in focusing private and public resources—Federal, State, and local—upon the planning, financing, and construction of standard housing in good neighborhoods at prices bearing reasonable relationship to the family incomes and ability to pay of these groups.

Special emphasis is given to encouraging the fuller entry of private enterprise into this portion of the housing market, particularly in the provision of moderate and low-cost rental accommodations. Such assistance by the National Housing Agency includes: First, interpretation to minorities of the potentialities as well as limitations of governmental housing programs and reflecting to housing agencies the viewpoints and needs of these groups; second, encouragement of these groups to utilize private as well as public resources, including the possibilities of self-help and cooperative financing of developments; third, cooperation with the constituent operating agencies in the formulation and adjustment of policies and procedures to facilitate the equitable participation of minorities in all housing programs; fourth, cooperation with local communities, planners, builders, lenders, and realtors in: (a) identification of the effective demand among these groups; (b) selection of building sites; (c) marshaling of community support for housing developments open to minorities; (d) training and utilization of minority group construction labor; (e) assembly and distribution of cumulated experience in the planning, financing, construction and management of properties occupied by minorities, including their current status as credit risks, and as renters, purchasers, owners and maintainers of residential property.

Experience has revealed that racial relations advisory services require the utilization of specialized personnel, trained and experienced in the application of sound housing planning and economics to the problems of racial minorities within the scope of the program and policies of the National Housing Agency and its constituent administrations. Acceptable handling of the complex and delicately balanced factors involved in racial group adjustments in housing requires a combination of highly specialized skill and particularized experience.

The utilization of technical personnel to advise on the minority group considerations involved in Federal programs arose in response to early recognition of the need for informed attack upon special problems. Under guidance of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, progressive administrators of New-Deal programs experienced special difficulties in extending the benefits of their programs to the most underprivileged. To get past these barriers so that the base of the economic pyramid could feel the leavening benefits of these programs, the administrators utilized the advice of trained personnel experienced in racial and intergroup relations. In housing these racial relations operations began under the Housing Division of the PWA. Through 10 years of consistent operations in USHA, FPHA, and more recently in the office of the Administrator of the National Housing Agency the policies and procedures have been developed, tested by experience, and integrated fully into agency operations. These services, originally available in the public-housing program, are now operating in cooperation with FHA in efforts to open up to private builders the growing middle income market among Negroes and other minorities.

The major task of this Racial Relations Service is to assist the Expediter and the Administrator and the commissioners of the constituent agencies of the National Housing Agency and their staffs to discharge the governmental responsibility for effecting participation of minority groups in all aspects of national housing programs in accordance with their need and ability to pay. The activity includes assistance in formulating basic policy and procedures, facilitating smooth and equitable participation and thereby precluding or minimizing the rise of racial difficulties, resolving such problems should they arise, and reporting problems, approaches, and results with respect to minority groups.

WHAT FEDERAL HOUSING AGENCIES HAVE MEANT TO NEGROES—FEDERAL PUBLIC HOUSING AUTHORITY

The public housing program provided for the first time a significant number of new standard houses available to low-income Negro families. This accomplishment was in part due to the general approach of the New Deal and the sensitiveness of the administrators to the needs of the underprivileged. Early adoption of clear-cut policy of nondiscrimination in employment and equitable participation based on need in housing, and establishment of specific racial relations service to assist the Agency in executing these policies have been in large measure responsible for this record.

At the end of November, 1946, the estimated development cost of public dwelling units available to Negroes, excluding re-use, totaled $481,327,000.

In the prewar period, the public housing program was the only significant source of new housing available to Negroes. Of the total 132,600 units, 46,500 or 35 percent were available for Negro occupancy.

In the construction of these projects, Negro skilled workers were paid $3,330,000, or 7 percent of the total skilled pay roll of $46,641,000; and Negro semiskilled and unskilled workers received $11,648,000, or 31 percent of the total pay roll of $37,850,000 for this category. A considerable measure of this employment was due to the implementation of specific nondiscrimination procedure.

The administration, management, and maintenance of public housing projects have provided employment for hundreds of Negroes at all levels from professional to unskilled workers.

During the war, the criterion of housing need shifted from a combination of low income and substandard housing to employment in essential war industry. On July 3, 1945, just before VJ-day, Negroes occupied some 93,000 public war housing units, or 15.5 percent of the total 598,000 units completed. In the construction of these war projects, Negro skilled workers were paid $6,620,000, or 2.5 percent of the total skilled pay roll of $269,000,000, and Negro semiskilled and unskilled workers received $33,880,000, or 31 percent of the total of $108,225,000 pay roll for this category.

In the temporary reuse emergency housing program for veterans, 11,000 units have been designated for Negroes.

As of March 1947, FPHA employed 1,142 Negroes, or 11.9 percent of its total 9,554.

Gunnar Myrdal, of the University of Stockholm, whose brilliant reputation as a social economist stands unchallenged, has this to say on page 350 of his monumental An American Dilemma:

Indeed, the United States Housing Authority—

Now the FPHA—

has given him—

The Negro—

a better deal than has any other major Federal public welfare agency. * * * The main explanation, however, is just the fact that the USHA has had the definite policy of giving the Negro his share. It has a special division for nonwhite races, headed by a Negro who can serve as a spokesman for his people. Many of the leading white officials of the Agency, as well, are known to have been convinced in principle that discrimination should be actively fought.

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR, NHA

The Office of the Administrator of the National Housing Agency was established during the war to plan and program war housing policies and programs, and coordinate their execution by the FPHA, FHA, and FHLBA. It is still responsible for administration and policy supervision of FPHA, FHA, and FHLBA. Programing by the Office of the Administrator was, therefore, necessary before the FPHA could construct and make available to Negroes the public war housing units already noted. This was similarly true with respect to private units.

The nondiscrimination and equitable participation policies and racial relations procedures initiated in FPHA have been expanded and strengthened by the OA to make available racial relations service to all the Federal housing agencies. This made possible for the first time extension of racial relations services to the planning and development of privately-financed housing.

Prior to World War II, practically no new housing was made available to Negroes by private enterprise. Under war demands, however, private enterprise completed some 15,000 new homes—3,000 of them in Washington, D. C.—for essential war workers. By the end of September 1945, shortly after VJ-day, the 15,000 units completed for Negro occupancy

were 2.8 percent of some 539,000 total units completed under the private H–1 and H–2 priority war programs administered by the FHA. This result was stimulated under NHA leadership, such as pointing up the need and soundness of the market, locating and gaining support for suitable sites, finding interested builders and facilitating the financing, and, where necessary, limiting priority allocations to assure some new homes for Negro occupancy. Even this relatively small achievement, compared to the extent of this market, points up the real possibility of governmental assistance to private enterprise in meeting the minority-group housing demand.

As of March 1947, the Office of the Administrator employed 28 Negroes, or 11.8 percent of its total of 236.

Early in 1946 the Office of the Housing Expediter and the Office of the Administrator of NHA were joined together for over-all administration and supervision of a veterans' emergency housing program. An over-all coordinated racial relations service was established in the Office of the Administrator-Expediter to operate across the board, in Washington and in the field, in servicing all Federal housing agencies.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

Based on this wartime experience, several positive steps have been taken by the FHA to encourage and assist private enterprise to produce new private housing to accommodate Negroes and other minorities. In speeches across the country, in nearly every State, to builders, lenders, and realtors, the Commissioner has repeatedly challenged these groups to enter the neglected market of minority-group housing as a sound business venture. He has also established in each of the seventy-odd FHA State and district offices a continuing file of experience on minority-group housing and instructed these offices to utilize fully the services of the regional racial relations advisers.

As a result, racial relations advisers attended about 25 of the FHA sponsored industry meeting held in localities with the largest minority group populations. It is estimated that over 5,000 representatives of the building industry, attending these meetings, heard, perhaps for the first time, objective presentations by FHA directors and racial relations advisers concerning the character and scope of the minority group housing market and of the positive assistance they could expect in any efforts to build housing open to minority groups.

An additional series of special meetings on minority group housing were sponsored by the FHA with the assistance of racial relations advisers in 12 southern cities—Little Rock, New Orleans, Tulsa, Fort Worth, Dallas, Houston, Nashville, Memphis, Knoxville, Miami, Roanoke, and Richmond.

Review of reports covering accomplishments during the last year shows about 20,000 privately-financed units planned, under construction, or completed for occupancy by racial minorities. These reports reflect activities under way in the District of Columbia and about 120 cities throughout 31 States: Alabama, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, Washington, and West Virginia.

Requests for assistance from some 50 additional localities are reported from the various regional offices where even the present racial relations advisory staff is inadequate to cover the large areas where activity is being stimulated. For example, one adviser covers the eight States in the Southeastern region, with about 7,000,000 Negroes.

More than 13,000 of the units reported are in southern areas. Some 12,000 units are in planning stages during which the services of racial relations adviser are especially important to bring assistance to the developers in (a) site location and site planning, (b) gaining the support of the general community for the developments, (c) securing technical assistance to assure the soundness of the developments and their acceptability for FHA insured mortgages, (d) aiding in solving financing problems, (e) gaining the cooperation of local officials, including city and county planning bodies, zoning commission, and securing municipal aid in extension of street and utility installations.

Developments, many of which involve the cooperative efforts of city or county officials, mayors emergency housing committees, specialists from the Office of the Housing Expediter, including the regional racial relations adviser, FHA State or district offices, and local civic organizations, are under way in such localities as Los Angeles, Calif.; Orlando, Miami, and Tampa, Fla.; Atlanta, Ga.; Chicago, Ill.; Gary, Ind.; Baton Rouge, La.; Baltimore, Md.; Boston, Mass.; East Orange and Englewood, N. J.; Buffalo, N. Y.; Cincinnati and Dayton, Ohio; Tulsa, Okla.; Pittsburgh, Pa.; Nashville and Memphis, Tenn.; Dallas and Lubbock, Tex.; and Seattle, Wash.

For example, in Atlanta, Ga., which has experienced a history of racial conflicts with several sporadic outbursts of violence incident to the expansion of the Negro population in residential areas during the past year, a large-scale development plan is now under way. The plan has the interest and support of the mayor and the mayor's emergency housing committee, as well as the Fulton County Planning Commission. A coordinating committee has already moved forward on two important steps by preparing a plan covering six sites now circulating among key organizations, representing the leadership of both racial groups, and by the organization of a housing corporation to embark upon an extensive building program. The regional racial relations adviser, as consultant to this committee, has not only given the group the benefit of his own experience and skill but has also enlisted cooperation and secured technical assistance from the resources of the Federal housing agencies.

A unique experience is reported from Englewood, N. J., where a 12-man veterans' committee, launched on a program initiated at a meeting attended by racial relations advisers and regional officials, are acquiring a city-owned site with the cooperation of the mayor, common council, and real estate board. The city architect is assisting in the preparation of plans.

A comprehensive attack in Miami is spearheaded by the Dade County and Miami City Planning Commissions with the cooperation of the racial relations service. Several developers are ready to begin construction in areas which have been approved by these commissions and are now receiving final action by the FHA.

Projects planned or under construction in Dayton have been facilitated by the cooperation of city officials, FHA representatives, and the racial relations service with a building corporation.

The Tulsa, Okla., program was initiated by the regional racial relations adviser in cooperation with the FHA district office and the OHE locality expediter. The mayor of Tulsa made available local facilities and resources, including the city hall where the meeting was held. Representatives of the Tulsa real estate board, home builders association, chamber of commerce, council of social agencies, city commissioners, as well as the assistant FHA district director and other officials of the Federal housing agencies were welcomed to the meeting by the mayor. Thus the community leadership has embarked on a goal of 1,000 houses in a well-planned neighborhood for Negroes in 1948 in a city which was the scene of a post-World War I race riot.

Action of this type in many localities in every section of the country is under way as local programs are directed toward sound solution of the problems which, even during the war, retarded the development of decent housing for minorities. Today, Negro as well as white developers are finding encouragement and assistance where heretofore they were met only with unsurmountable problems in building for these groups. Substantial construction programs using the resources of the Negro group are under way in Atlanta and Macon, Ga.; Nashville, Tenn.; New Orleans, La.; Chicago, Ill.; Lubbock, Tex.; and various other cities. At the same time white businessmen have spearheaded corporations for the development of housing to accommodate Negroes in such cities as Orlando, Fla.; Indianapolis, Ind.; and Rochester, N. Y.

Self-help characterizes many of these programs as, in the case of Macon, the corporation is comprised of Negro enterprisers, or, as in Indianapolis, the future occupants of the development are to assist in actual construction as a means of lowering costs and sharing in responsibility for the success of the venture.

In order to comprehend the amount of work involved in each case, it must be pointed out that careful follow-up by racial relations advisers is maintained in every stage of launching and completing a housing program. The initial step of identifying the market among Negroes, one of the key points in assuring private developers of a successful venture in this field, entails an operation

of major proportion. This market has been identified in more than 30 localities through the cooperative efforts of the regional racial relations advisers and the regional economists. In several cities where public housing projects are located, the cooperation of the local housing authorities in making available lists of over-income public housing tenants had been used in these analyses. As a matter of fact, the executive directors of local housing authorities in several cities, such as Memphis, Tenn., and Dallas, Tex., have taken a leading role in pointing up the private enterprise market among Negro tenants in public housing projects for whom no standard housing is available in the community.

Following the market identification task is the most difficult job of locating acceptable sites where residency of minorities can be effected without encountering insurmountable community resistance. This has been a major activity of racial relations advisers in at least half of the 120 cities where the developments are now planned or under way. It entails not only location of technically sound sites, approvable by the FHA and local planning bodies, and available at reasonable costs, but also "selling" these sites to the community and gaining support for their use by minorities.

In most cities, this means finding sites outside of the areas where minorities are concentrated or where only slum neighborhoods are customarily relinquished to such groups. The impact of this situation in northern cities like Detroit and Chicago, is common knowledge; and in southern cities like Baltimore, with 20 percent of its population confined to 2 percent of the land area; or like Atlanta, with one-third of the population in less than a sixth of the land area, solution of this problem is regarded as the key to establishing sound racial relations.

The racial relations services continue throughout later stages of development with specific assistance in resolving such problems as finance, occupancy and compliance with FHA standards. Their extensive experience enables these advisers to identify pitfalls as well as sound approaches and assist in gaining understanding and cooperation between minority and majority groups to the mutual benefit of the entire community.

Public Affairs Pamphlet No. 128, Our Negro Veterans, just issued this year by the Public Affairs Committee, Inc., cites the race relations service of the National Housing Agency with these words:

The section under Dr. Horne's direction was a model of what services a Federal agency could offer minority veterans. It was reflected in a generally better record in housing for Negro veterans than other agencies could show in their fields. Only by recognizing the tendency toward discrimination can a Government agency ever satisfactorily meet the needs of those less privileged citizens. * * * It is to be hoped that the race relations service will continue in existence and become a model for other agencies.

WHAT THE HOUSING BUDGET CUTS MEAN

First. Administrative expense budgets of 21 corporations were cut $14,800,000. Of that total, $13,200,000 or practically 90 percent came out of the budgets of the constituents of the National Housing Agency.

Second. Federal Public Housing Authority:

(a) Administrative expense budget cut one-third, leaving the 1948 budget just about one-half that of 1947.

(b) Funds for annual Federal payments to make up the difference between the rents which the low-income tenants can pay and the cost of operating public housing projects were cut from $7,200,000 to $2,200,000. This means higher rents for the tenants or higher costs to the city.

Third. Federal Housing Administration, which requested an increase of 36 percent, received the same amount as for 1947.

Fourth. Office of Administrator, NHA, requested $1,200,000 and was granted only $100,000, which is less than the present cost of operating 1 month. This amount, arbitrarily set without reference to specific functions, is claimed by the committee as adequate to preserve the administrative and policy supervision of the Office of the Administrator for fiscal 1948. Actually, it is less than one-half the amount required even to liquidate the agency.

IF THIS HOUSE ACTION IS APPROVED BY THE SENATE

First. It means almost complete victory for the campaign of real estate and home-building lobbies to kill public housing and eliminate all Federal aids to bring decent housing within the reach of the masses of our people.

Second. The FPHA and Office of Administrator, the two housing agencies in which Negroes have gotten the best break are the hardest hit. In fact, the future of the entire low-rent public-housing program and the Racial Relations Service is in dire jeopardy.

Third. The FHA, which has launched a program to open up the middle income housing market among Negroes to private enterprise, must restrict its operations and possibly lose the momentum built up this year.

Fourth. Republican leadership must bear the full responsibility for the wrecking of the housing agencies and programs which have meant most to the masses of Negroes.

WHAT THESE CUTS MEAN TO NEGROES

The Negro press has universally protested in news items, editorial, and special columnists the termination of the Racial Relations Service and the curtailment of housing programs which have meant so much to Negro people. In addition, the most representative voices among all racial groups have spoken.

Dr. Mary McLeod Bethune, president of the National Council of Negro Women, who is recognized by many to hold the place once held by the revered Booker T. Washington, writes:

Today we find that the housing agencies which have been most considerate of the housing needs of racial minorities are almost hopelessly crippled under the blow of unprecedented appropriation reductions. In the wake of the virtual elimination of the NHA Administrator's Office and the ruthless curtailment of funds for the FPHA, the entire Racial Relations Service is wiped out. This action robs 13,000,000 citizens of the guidance of those specialists who have given us hope and assistance in our struggle for an equal chance to obtain decent shelter.

Much of real value—

Writes Dr. F. D. Patterson, president of Tuskegee Institute—

has been accomplished in the way Federal housing programs have reached Negroes. This has unquestionably been due in large measure by the untiring and effective work of advisory personnel both in Washington and in the field.

He urges the continuation of these racial advisory services "in an area of need which is unsurpassed in its importance to the welfare of the Negro people and to the national well-being."

The National Urban League—

Says its general secretary, Eugene Kinkle Jones—

has for many years been close to the housing needs and problems of Negroes. We have found the racial relations staffs of the various housing agencies an absolute necessity for realistic and intelligent Government action in meeting these needs.

Roy Wilkins, executive secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, speaking for 1,500 local chapters with over half a million members, states:

This association feels that, if the regional racial relations advisers are dropped, the whole program aimed at evolving a housing program in which minority groups will receive fair treatment will be seriously damaged, if not destroyed.

The Honorable James Kytle Williams, judge advocate of the American Legion, Department of Florida, writes:

We in Florida have set great store by the work of Dr. Horne and his regional staff in Atlanta. * * * Members of this staff have done the processing and leg work in connection with one of the most important projects scheduled for many years. I refer, of course, to the project of replacing the slums of Miami and other portions of Dade County area with modern dwellings.

Bishop William Alfred Fountain wrote to the President:

As senior bishop of the African Methodist Episcopal Church and presiding bishop of the sixth Episcopal district, namely, the State of Georgia, I have had considerable opportunity to note carefully and evaluate the services of the racial relations adviser in this region. Through my constituency of over one thousand ministers and a Statewide membership in excess of one hundred thousand members, I have been informed of several instances of services rendered to local communities during the recent war emergency and particularly during the present postwar housing crisis wherein local councils working with the Federal Housing Administration through the efforts of the racial relations adviser are planning and building developments which will alleviate in part the tragic housing problem faced by all our citizens but most particularly Negroes.

A group of white business leaders in Orlando, Fla., representing Rotary, Kiwanis, banking and real-estate interests who have set up a nonprofit corporation to help colored citizens to acquire land and develop a modern housing project in Orlando states:

Al Thompson, of the Atlanta office of the National Housing Agency, and Dr. Horne,

of the Washington Office, both being members of the Negro race and having to do with regional racial relations have been most helpful in developing this project, which we believe to be the outstanding attempt to solve this problem ever to be made in this country.

Willard S. Townsend, international president of the United Transport and Service Employees, stated to the President:

I strongly believe that not only Negroes themselves, but all the genuinely progressive people within and without the ranks of labor, had observed the housing gains of racial minorities motivated by the racial relations service. They will not be able to understand the Government's sudden and arbitrary disposition of this service while the housing shortage so distinctly remains and the particularized difficulty of housing racial minorities remains even more vexatious.

Rev. W. H. Jernagin, director, Fraternal Council of Negro Churches in America, representing 11 denominations with more than 7,000,000 members, writes:

As spiritual leaders in the community we know how important it is to our family life for our people to have decent homes in which to live and bring up their children. Our affiliated councils and their members have grown to depend upon the Racial Relations Service for assistance and guidance in the formulation and execution of local plans to make more and adequate housing available to racial minority groups in all income levels. * * * It is indeed a shock to us, who have been looking hopefully to the administration and the Congress for an expanded program of aids to assist in solving our housing problems to find instead that we are being disarmed by the removal of the services so vitally needed during the current housing emergency.

WHAT MUST BE DONE

In order that these minority groups and all people interested in their progress and the well-being of the Nation may not feel that the Government of the United States has turned its back upon the pressing housing needs of the underprivileged, it is mandatory that the Republican majority, supported by those of us on the minority side, join in effecting the following results:

First. Restoration by the Senate of the 1948 budget requests of the Office of the Administrator of the National Housing Agency and of the Federal Public Housing Authority, the Federal Housing Administration and the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration.

Second. Continuation of the Racial Relations Service and personnel to assure the necessary teamwork between the building industry and Government can concentrate their joint resources upon meeting the housing needs of all elements of the population and of all income groups.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1070. An act to provide for the cancellation of the capital stock of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the refund of moneys received for such stock, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1498. An act to provide support for wool, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1742. An act for the relief of Mary Lomas;

H. R. 3303. An act to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military Establishment of the United States;

H. R. 3398. An act to extend the period of validity of the act to facilitate the admission into the United States of the alien fiancées or fiancés of members of the armed forces of the United States;

H. R. 3611. An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3911. An act to continue temporary authority of the Maritime Commission until March 1, 1948; and

H. J. Res. 193. Joint resolution to grant authority for the erection of a permanent building for the American National Red Cross, District of Columbia Chapter, Washington, D. C.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to a joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 125. Joint resolution to strengthen the common defense and to meet industrial needs for tin by providing for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on June 26, 1947, present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 381. An act for the relief of Allen T. Feamster, Jr.;

H. R. 407. An act for the relief of Claude R. Hall and Florence V. Hall;

H. R. 493. An act to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia," approved July 8, 1932 (sec. 22, 3204 D. C. Code, 1940 ed.);

H. R. 577. An act to preserve historic graveyards in abandoned military posts;

H. R. 617. An act for the relief of James Harry Martin;

H. R. 1067. An act for the relief of S. C. Spradling and R. T. Morris;

H. R. 1144. An act for the relief of Samuel W. Davis, Jr., Mrs. Samuel W. Davis, Jr., and Betty Janes Davis;

H. R. 1318. An act for the relief of Mrs. Fuku Kurokawa Thurn;

H. R. 1358. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the management and operation of naval plantations outside the continental United States," approved June 28, 1944;

H. R. 1362. An act to permit certain naval personnel to count all active service rendered under temporary appointment as warrant or commissioned officers in the United States Navy and the United States Naval Reserve, or in the United States Marine Corps and the United States Marine Corps Reserve, for purposes of promotion to commissioned warrant officer in the United States Navy or the United States Marine Corps, respectively;

H. R. 1371. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to appoint, for supply duty only, officers of the line of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1375. An act to further amend section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, so as to provide for the clothing allowance of enlisted men of the Army, Marine Corps, and Marine Corps Reserve;

H. R. 1376. An act to amend the acts of October 14, 1942 (56 Stat. 786), as amended, and November 28, 1943 (57 Stat. 593), as amended, so as to authorize transportation of dependents and household effects of personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard to overseas bases;

H. R. 1514. An act for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1628. An act relinquishing to the State of Illinois certain right, title, or interest of the United States of America, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1807. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the county of Pittsburg, Okla., a perpetual easement for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a public highway over a portion of the United States naval ammunition depot, McAlester, Okla.;

H. R. 1845. An act to amend existing laws relating to military leave of certain employees of the United States or of the District of Columbia so as to equalize rights to leave of absence and reemployment for such employees who are members of the Enlisted or Officers' Reserve Corps, the National Guard, or the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1997. An act to provide seniority benefits for certain officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia who are veterans of World War II and lost opportunity for promotion by reason of their service in the armed forces of the United States;

H. R. 2248. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to grant an easement and to convey to the Louisiana Power & Light Co. a tract of land comprising a portion of Camp Livingston, in the State of Louisiana;

H. R. 2276. An act to authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to pay certain expenses incident to training, attendance, and participation of personnel of the Army of the United States and of the naval service, respectively, in the seventh winter sports Olympic games and the fourteenth Olympic games and for future Olympic games;

H. R. 2339. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the designation of Army mail clerks and assistant Army mail clerks," approved August 21, 1941 (55 Stat. 656), and for other purposes;

H. R. 2411. An act to authorize patenting of certain lands to Public Hospital District No. 2, Clallam County, Wash., for hospital purposes;

H. R. 2545. An act to provide funds for cooperation with the school board of the Moclips-Aloha District for the construction and equipment of a new school building in the town of Moclips, Grays Harbor County, Wash., to be available to both Indian and non-Indian children;

H. R. 2654. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to grant to the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore, State of Maryland, a permanent easement for the purposes of installing, maintaining, and servicing a subterranean water main in, on, and across the land of the United States Coast Guard station called "Lazaretto depot", Baltimore, Md.;

H. R. 2655. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant to the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore, State of Maryland, a permanent easement for the purpose of installing, maintaining, and

servicing two subterranean water mains in, on, and across the land of Fort McHenry, National Monument and Historic Shrine, Md.;

H. R. 2915. An act for the relief of Mrs. Frederick Faber Wesche (formerly Ann Maureen Bell);

H. R. 3124. An act to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the 81st National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held in Cleveland, Ohio, August 10 to 14, 1947;

H. R. 3372. An act authorizing certain agreements with respect to rights in helium-bearing gas lands in the Navajo Indian Reservation, N. Mex., and for other purposes;

H. R. 3629. An act to authorize the transfer to the Panama Canal of property which is surplus to the needs of the War Department or Navy Department;

H. R. 3769. An act to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to qualifications of part-time referees in bankruptcy;

H. R. 3791. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 92. Joint resolution authorizing the presentation of the Distinguished Flying Cross to Rear Adm. Charles E. Rosendahl, United States Navy;

H. J. Res. 96. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue posthumously to the late Roy Stanley Geiger, lieutenant general, United States Marine Corps, a commission as general, United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 167. Joint resolution to recognize uncompensated services rendered the Nation under the Selective Training and Service Act, of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SCHWABE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 30, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

858. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a volume containing the acts of the second and third special sessions of the Sixteenth Legislature of Puerto Rico, July 8 to 19, and December 5 to 14, 1946, and a volume containing the acts of the third regular session of the Sixteenth Legislature, February 10 to April 15, 1947; to the Committee on Public Lands.

859. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the acceptance and use of funds for support of the national weather service supplementing the funds appropriated for the operation of the Weather Bureau of the Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

860. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to detail scientific and technical employees of the War Department or the Army, and the Naval Establishment, to duty in privately owned plants and laboratories; to the Committee on Armed Services.

861. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the sale of naval stores at naval establishments to members of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, to other specified or authorized persons or activities, to such additional persons as may be authorized by regulations to be promulgated by the Secretary of the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

862. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the creation of additional positions in the professional and scientific service in the War and Navy Departments; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

863. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend certain provisions of law relating to the naval service so as to authorize the delegation to the Secretary of the Navy of certain discretionary powers vested in the President of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

864. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a revised estimate involving a decrease of $3,020,000 for the fiscal year 1948 for the Sugar Rationing Administration, Department of Agriculture (H. Doc. No. 367); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

865. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the enlistment and appointment of women in the Regular Navy and Marine Corps and the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

866. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to accept and use gifts, devices, and bequests for schools, hospitals, libraries, museums, cemeteries, and other institutions under the jurisdiction of the War Department or Navy Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

867. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of War to proceed with construction at military installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

868. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for furnishing transportation for certain Government and other personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

869. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 3 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 554), as amended, so as to provide reimbursement to the Post Office Department by the Navy Department for shortages in postal accounts occurring while commissioned officers of the Navy and Marine Corps are designated custodians of postal effects; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

870. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the liquidation of the trusts under the transfer agreements with State Rural Rehabilitation Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

871. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

872. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to facilitate the performance of research and development work by and on behalf of the War and Navy Departments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

873. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the annual report of the Foreign-trade Zones Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946, and the annual report of the city of New York covering operations of Foreign-trade Zone No. 1 during the calendar year 1945; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 4002. A bill making appropriations for civil functions administered by the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 723). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KEEFE: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 4003. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 724). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WEICHEL: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 3911. A bill to continue temporary authority of the Maritime Commission until March 1, 1948; without amendment (Rept. No. 725). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. CORBETT: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 3872. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; with amendments (Rept. No. 726). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 3127. A bill to provide for the loan or gift of obsolete ordnance to State homes for former members of the armed forces; without amendment (Rept. No. 727). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TOLLEFSON: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 1693. A bill to provide that the United States shall aid the States in fish restoration and management projects, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 728). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TOLLEFSON: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 3767. A bill to provide for the protection, preservation, and extension of the sockeye salmon fishery of the Fraser River system, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 729). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 263. Resolution waiving points of order against H. R. 4003, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 731). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3999. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to adjudicate certain claims resulting from evacuation of certain persons of Japanese ancestry under military orders; without amendment (Rept. No. 732). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GEARHART: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 3997. A bill to exclude certain vendors of newspapers or magazines from certain provisions of the Social Security Act and Internal Revenue Code; without amendment (Rept. No. 733). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. H. R. 2239. A bill to amend section 13 (a) of the

Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended; with an amendment (Rept. No. 734). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOWELL: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 3150. A bill to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 735). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ENGEL of Michigan:

H. R. 4002. A bill making appropriations for civil functions administered by the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. KEEFE:

H. R. 4003. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 4004. A bill to permit the National Housing Administrator to sell certain war housing projects to the Buffalo Municipal Housing Authority; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 4005. A bill to authorize the appointment as officers in the Regular Establishments of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of enlisted men who served as officers under combat conditions; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 4006. A bill to promote the national defense by increasing the membership of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MATHEWS:

H. R. 4007. A bill to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.:

H. R. 4008. A bill to amend the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4009. A bill to amend the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 4010. A bill to authorize any agency of the United States Government to furnish or to procure and furnish materials, supplies, and equipment to public international organizations on a reimbursable basis; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MACKINNON:

H. R. 4011. A bill to amend section 1602 of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 4012. A bill to provide for slum clearance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 4013. A bill to terminate certain tax provisions before the end of World War II; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina (by request):

H. R. 4014. A bill to require the use of the Vaughn record system of watch comparison by persons subject to the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa:

H. Res. 264. Resolution providing for the printing as a House document "Amendments to Rules of Civil Procedure for the District Courts of the United States," and "Report of Proposed Amendments to Rules of Civil Procedure for the District Courts of the United States"; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 4015. A bill for the relief of Abraham Lipetz, Gittla Lipetz, Jacques Lipetz, Leon Matthew Lipetz, and Eric Lipetz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL:

H. R. 4016. A bill for the relief of Aileen L. Sherwood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

690. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Municipal Council, St. Croix, V. I., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of H. R. 3108; to the Committee on Public Lands.

691. Also, petition of the Southern Pension Association, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the pension situation, requesting that protection be afforded to a group who are not now covered by any social-security or retirement law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

692. Also, petition of Mrs. Nellie Dawson and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

693. Also, petition of Angelia Allwurden and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

694. Also, petition of Miss Martha Moffitt, Sanford, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

695. Also, petition of F. W. Banks and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

696. Also, petition of Miss Katie Kerce, Zephyrhills, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

697. Also, petition of the national chairman, Protestant War Veterans of the United States, Inc., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to protesting the removal from the safekeeping of their proper custodians those sacred documents such as the Declaration of Independence and the Federal Constitution and the Bill of Rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 30, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord Jesus, we know of no better way to begin the work of another week than by rededicating our lives to Thee, resolving to trust Thee and to obey Thee and to do our very best to serve Thee by serving our fellow men. In these days that call for understanding, for mercy, for the salvation of men's souls and the healing of their bodies, may we have Thy spirit that we may work to that end, for Thou art the Saviour of the world, and we have no hope apart from Thee.

Hear our prayer for Thy mercy's sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 27, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following act and joint resolution:

On June 27, 1947:

S. 751. An act to continue a system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of school-age and under-school-age children in the District of Columbia through June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

On June 28, 1947:

S. J. Res. 125. Joint resolution to strengthen the common defense and to meet industrial needs for tin by providing for the maintenance of a domestic tin-smelting industry.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED DURING RECESS

Under the order of the Senate of the 27th instant,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that he had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 350. An act to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States until June 30, 1948;

S. 1072. An act to extend until July 1, 1949, the period during which income from agricultural labor and nursing services may be disregarded by the States in making old-age assistance payments without prejudicing their rights to grants-in-aid under the Social Security Act;

H. R. 775. An act for the establishment of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

H. R. 2436. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3611. An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 135. Joint resolution to extend the succession, lending powers, and the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

INTERNATIONAL REFUGEE ORGANIZATION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair wishes to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that when Senate Joint Resolution 77, providing for membership and participation by the United States in the International Refugee Organization and authorizing an appro-

priation therefor, was approved by the Senate on Friday, the House text, which was agreed to, identified the beginning of the next fiscal year as "June 30, 1947." Obviously this was an error, and it is necessary to change the reference from "June 30, 1947" to "July 1, 1947." Inasmuch as the legislation must be concluded today, with the indulgence of the Senate, the Senator from Michigan asks for the present consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 21 to make the correction.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 21) was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, in the enrollment of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 77) providing for membership and participation by the United States in the International Refugee Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor, to make the following changes in the House engrossed amendment, namely: On page 3 of said engrossed amendment, in the phrase "for the fiscal year beginning June 30, 1947," where it occurs in subsections (a) and (b) of section 3, strike out "June 30" and in lieu thereof insert "July 1."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who is necessarily absent from the city during this entire week, I ask unanimous consent that he be excused from attendance upon the Senate during that time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2 OF 1947

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in accordance with section 205 of the Reorganization Act of 1945, I move that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 49, dealing with Reorganization Plan No. 2.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 49), which was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Congress does not favor the Reorganization Plan No. 2 of May 1, 1947, transmitted to Congress by the President on the 1st day of May 1947.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I move that the time of debate provided by section 205 of the Reorganization Act of 1945 be further limited to 3 hours, that the time between now and 2 o'clock be divided equally between those who favor and those who oppose the concurrent resolution, the time to be controlled by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], and that the Senate proceed to vote at 2 o'clock on the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Ohio.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Ball	Hill	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Holland	Overton
Brooks	Ives	Pepper
Buck	Jenner	Reed
Bushfield	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Va.
Byrd	Kilgore	Robertson, Wyo.
Capper	Knowland	Russell
Chavez	Langer	Saltonstall
Connally	Lodge	Smith
Cooper	Lucas	Sparkman
Cordon	McCarran	Stewart
Donnell	McCarthy	Taft
Downey	McClellan	Taylor
Dworshak	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Eastland	McGrath	Tydings
Ecton	McKellar	Umstead
Ellender	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Magnuson	Watkins
Flanders	Malone	Wherry
Fulbright	Martin	White
Green	Millikin	Wiley
Gurney	Moore	Williams
Hatch	Morse	Wilson
Hawkes	Murray	Young
Hayden	Myers	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness in his family.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is absent because of illness.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The time from now until 2 o'clock is to be divided equally between the proponents and the opponents of House Concurrent Resolution 49. The time is in control of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL]. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, may I inquire how many minutes are allotted to each side?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-seven minutes to a side.

Mr. DONNELL. I yield to myself 45 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, the matter now before the Senate is Concurrent Resolution No. 49, by the terms of which resolution the Congress does not favor the Reorganization Plan No. 2 of May 1, 1947, transmitted to Congress by the President on the first day of May 1947.

I rise, Mr. President, in support of the concurrent resolution, and thereby oppose the Reorganization Plan No. 2. My opposition to the reorganization plan is based upon the contents of section 1 and section 2 of that plan. The majority of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has submitted a report opposed to the concurrent resolution, that is to say, in favor of the plan. The minority views in favor of the concurrent resolution, and thereby in opposition to the plan, are set forth in a statement which has been filed by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and myself. I shall discuss in order section 1 and section 2 of the proposed reorganization plan.

Section 1 of the plan permanently transfers to the Department of Labor the United States Employment Service. The opening sentence of that section reads:

The United States Employment Service is transferred to the Department of Labor.

The President's message of May 1, 1947, contains within it this sentence:

The plan permanently transfers to the Department of Labor the United States Employment Service, which is now in the Department by temporary transfer under authority of title I of the First War Powers Act.

In considering the advisability of the transfer which the President's plan would thus effect it is to be observed that under the presently existing law the United States Employment Service, abbreviated as USES, is, upon termination of title I of the First War Powers Act, to be returned to the Social Security Board in the Federal Security Agency. I think it of importance to quote at this moment a brief historical statement given by the Secretary of Labor in the hearings before the Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare recently. He said this:

The United States Employment Service was created in the Department of Labor by Congress in its act of June 6, 1933. It remained in the Department for 6 years, when it was transferred to the Federal Security Agency by the reorganization plan of July 1939. It remained there until September 1942, when it was transferred to the War Manpower Commission by Presidential order. The Service was returned to the Department of Labor 21 months ago by an Executive order issued September 19, 1945.

Continuing, the Secretary said:

To continue the present location of the Service in the Department of Labor, it is necessary that the President's plan take effect.

The President's order of September 19, 1945, transferring the Service to the Department was issued under the First War Powers Act, which provides that all transfers of Government functions accomplished under that act became ineffective 6 months after the termination of the war. Thus, if the plan is disapproved, the Service will revert to the Federal Security Agency on the termination of the First War Powers Act.

My objection to section 1 of the Reorganization Plan No. 2 is that it separates the United States Employment Service and the unemployment compensation functions. First, as has been observed,

and as the President says, it permanently fixes the United States Employment Service in the Department of Labor—of course, subject to later congressional action; but so far as this plan is concerned, it fixes the United States Employment Service in the Department of Labor. On the other hand, the unemployment compensation functions of the Federal Government are left where they now are, in the Federal Security Agency. It thus results that if the reorganization plan shall be adopted, there will be a separation, clear, well-defined, certain, and definite, of the United States Employment Service in the Department of Labor and of the unemployment compansation functions of the Government in the Federal Security Agency.

The basis of my opposition to section 1 of the reorganization plan is that important functions of the United States Employment Service and those of unemployment compensation are interrelated, and that the functions of both should be in one department. This interrelationship arises from a very simple fact, namely, that under State unemployment compensation laws a person seeking work but unable to get it draws unemployment compensation, and the State employment service seeks to obtain employment for that person. By success in so doing it may hold down the outlay for unemployment compensation. Obviously these two functions—on the one hand, furnishing employment to those who seek it and cannot get it, thereby keeping down to a minimum the obligation to pay compensation, and on the other hand furnishing compensation to those who seek work but are unable to get it—are closely interrelated.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I find myself very much in accord with the reasoning of the Senator from Missouri. It seems to me that the plan he is discussing not only would add to efficiency and economy but would enable the agencies to prevent fraud, which is one of the things we must do if we are to make this an efficient service in the interest of those who are actually entitled to help under the law and should be helped. I happen to know that in New Jersey certain persons drawing unemployment compensation have been calling on the USES agency to find out whether they can get a job, but they frequently refused a job when offered it and thereby they were kept on unemployment insurance. I think the Senator's reasoning, from the standpoint of efficiency for the administration of the law and in the interest of those who need its help, is extremely sound.

Mr. DONNELL. I very much appreciate the observation of the Senator from New Jersey.

At this point I should like to mention an argument which is stressed on the other side, so that we may have the full facts before us. I invite attention to the point made by Mr. Robert C. Goodwin, Director of the United States Employment Service. When testifying on June 16 of this year before the Subcommittee on Labor of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, he said:

> While the unemployment compensation program is concerned only with specified employers and workers who are subject to unemployment compensation laws and have developed an insured status, the Employment Service program is concerned with assisting all employers and all workers without regard to their insurance status.

Continuing, Mr. Goodwin said:

> Our total labor force now approximates 60,000,000 people of which about 25,000,000 are not subject to unemployment compensation. The Employment Service is available to assist the youth entering the laboring market for the first time, veterans who may have had no prior work experience, or whose work experience may not have been in insured employment, and millions not subject to employment compensation covered, such as agriculture, domestic service, government, and so on.

I think Mr. Goodwin has there summarized the most effective argument in favor of a separation of these particular functions, because of the fact that the Employment Service concerns itself not alone with employment of persons who are entitled to unemployment compensation. I invite attention, however, to the fact that according to Mr. Goodwin's own statement only 25,000,000 of the total number of approximately 60,000,000 persons constituting the entire labor force are not subject to unemployment compensation. So obviously the great majority of the workers are directly concerned with the compensation service; and to my mind his argument is greatly weakened in view of the preponderance of those who are so concerned.

This is a question upon which I think some expert evidence is of importance, because it is very difficult for any one of us who is not closely in touch with this work to know whether or not the most efficient service can be secured by the consolidation of the employment and unemployment-compensation functions into one department. So I submit a few expert witnesses upon this problem.

I submit, first, that both the Secretary of Labor and the Federal Security Administrator, who are the respective heads of the two departments into which these functions would be separated under the President's reorganization plan, have definitely expressed themselves in favor of combining the two sets of functions in one agency.

For approximately 7 years, over various periods, the Department of Labor has administered the Employment Service. Therefore the Secretary of Labor should have some knowledge as to whether or not a combination or separation is proper. He has expressed himself clearly—and I shall quote from him in a moment—in favor of a combination of the functions. However, he favors that combination in the Department of Labor.

On the other hand, the Federal Security Administrator, who is the head of the Federal Security Agency, is thoroughly familiar with the subject of unemployment compensation, because that Agency has administered unemployment compensation for about 11 years. Mr. Watson Miller, the head of the Federal Security Agency, like the Secretary of Labor, favors combination of the two functions, the Employment Service and the unemployment-compensation function, under one department. But Mr. Miller, the head of the Federal Security Agency, favors consolidation in the Federal Security Agency.

So we have the situation that the heads of the respective departments are undeniably on record in favor of combination, although each favors the combination in his own department. Referring to the point so well made a few moments ago by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], I desire to quote from a letter of January 6 of this year from Secretary of Labor Schwellenbach to Mr. Webb, Director of the Bureau of the Budget:

> In addition to the substantive administrative relationship of the Employment Service and the unemployment compensation system, there are significant administrative relationships arising out of the fact that they are Federal-State programs.
>
> Both programs are Federal grant-in-aid programs involving continuous State relations problems. At the State level, in virtually every case, both programs are administered by a single State agency.

I pause here, Mr. President, to emphasize the fact that the Secretary of Labor himself says that at a State level, in virtually every State, both programs are administered by a single State agency.

I continue with his observations:

> Thus, in virtually every State, a single State merit system, single fiscal arrangements, a single research and statistics unit, a single public information unit, and a single business management unit serves both programs. At the Federal level at present two independent Federal departments prescribe, interpret, and administer independent requirements with respect to those and the host of other items involved in a Federal-State cooperative program.

The attention of the distinguished Senator from New Jersey is called to this statement:

> There can be no justification for the imposition of inconsistent Federal requirements upon a single State agency with respect to a single State activity. Equally, there can be no justification for failing to achieve the economy and efficiency in operations which could be effected if both programs had common administrative direction under a single Federal department.

This, Mr. President is in exact consonance and accord with the views suggested by the Senator from New Jersey.

Continuing, the Secretary says:

> At present the two Federal departments must and do exert continuing efforts to maintain uniform requirements and consistency in their application. But irrespective of such efforts, perfect coordination cannot be maintained. Differences are inevitable, not only as between headquarters personnel, but even more between field personnel of the two agencies in the application of their respective headquarters instructions. Thus a single State agency deals with two Federal departments with respect to numerous identical subjects. The State agency is frequently the first to learn of differences of views or requirements on the part of the two Federal agencies.
>
> With respect to the organization and administration of the executive branch of the Federal Government, the location of the two

programs in independent Federal departments and the efforts of those two departments to maintain the necessary consistency means duplication in their activities, delays in administration, and the use of personnel for liaison and coordination work, all of which could be eliminated if the two functions were vested in separate bureaus in the Department of Labor and thereby became subject to coordination by a single department head. In the absence of such coordination, the two independent departments are required to look to the President for the resolution of their basic differences.

So, Mr. President, as I have indicated, the Secretary of Labor, who now comes in through this reorganization plan, by his testimony in support thereof, and advocates the transfer of the United States Employment Service to the Department of Labor, thus producing a separation of functions into two separate departments, is clearly on record, on January 6 of this year, in favor of consolidation, and he favors it in his own department.

I shall take but a moment to mention the testimony of Mr. Watson Miller, whose testimony before our committee will be found on page 42, in which he said:

It is a matter of record that on December 4, 1946, I recommended to the Bureau of the Budget that the United States Employment Service be returned to the Federal Security Agency. This reflected the experienced and conscientious view of our agency.

The interrogation of Mr. Miller on page 43 is as follows:

Question. Well, your view is, as a matter of fact, Mr. Miller, is it not, that the best service can be rendered by having both Employment Service and the Unemployment Compensation Service in one department of the United States Government?

Mr. MILLER. It is, sir; and whatever action the Congress may take will be approached by us with adult minds.

Question. Whereas the reorganization plan proposes the separation of the two functions, you in your own judgment believe that more efficient operation would occur where the two were combined into one department?

Mr. MILLER. That is true, irrespective where they may be combined.

So, Mr. President, these two expert witnesses upon the problem, the heads of those two branches of our Government, unite in their strong, vigorous testimony in favor of the desirability and importance of union rather than separation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Following out the thought which the Senator has just expressed as to putting both of these agencies in one department of the Federal Government, is it possible at the present time, in the Senator's opinion, to place the Unemployment Compensation end of the job in the Department of Labor?

Mr. DONNELL. I have no evidence in support of the proposition that it can be done. To my mind, it would be a very great experiment which would be fraught with very considerable and difficult problems. There is no affirmative evidence in favor of placing it in the Department of Labor, so far as I know.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So that if we are going to put both of these parts of the Employment Service in one place—to get jobs for applicants or to supply them with money if they do not find jobs—it must be in the Social Security Department rather than in the Department of Labor?

Mr. DONNELL. It would seem that way to me, so far as the evidence before our committee is concerned.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it not also true that all the funds that are subscribed by industry and by the workers out of their wages go into the Social Security fund?

Mr. DONNELL. That is correcet.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The fund is organized and run by the Social Security Department of the Federal Government?

Mr. DONNELL. That is correct. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HAWKES. Can the Senator explain for my benefit, and possibly for the benefit of some others, what is the argument for taking it out of Social Security and putting it into the Labor Department, when the fact remains that the Social Security Department has to administer the relief given to persons? A man says he needs a job and he cannot get one, and the Government, through these agencies, is trying to get him a job. We say to him, "If you cannot get a job, and we cannot get you one, then you can take advantage of the law and be compensated through unemployment compensation." The funds are all given to the same agency. What reason does the President give as to why this should be changed from that agency to the other one?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, the only reason that I observe in his statement—and I quote from the message of May 1—is as follows:

The provision of a system of public employment offices is directly related to the major purpose of the Department of Labor. Through the activities of the employment office system the Government has a wide and continuous relationship with workers and employers concerning the basic question of employment. To a rapidly increasing degree, the employment office system has become the central exchange for workers and jobs and the primary national source of information on labor-market conditions. In the calendar year 1946 it filled 7,140,000 jobs, and millions of workers used its counsel on employment opportunities and on the choice of occupations.

The Labor Department obviously should continue to play a leading role in the development of the labor market and to participate in the most basic of all labor activities—assisting workers to get jobs and employers to obtain labor. Policies and operations of the Employment Service must be determined in relation to over-all labor standards, labor statistics, labor training, and labor law—on all of which the Labor Department is the center of specialized knowledge in the Government. Accordingly, the reorganization plan transfers the United States Employment Service to the Department of Labor.

That is the President's position in the matter.

Mr. HAWKES. I thank the Senator for giving me that information.

The Governor of our State has written me a letter in which he clearly states that in his opinion efficiency and economy will be best served by keeping the operation in the Social Security Administration and unifying action through the State agency.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator was Governor of Missouri for a number of years. Did he not find that one of the great difficulties he had during the war years, and after the employment agencies were taken over by the Federal Government, was the problem of working out the administration of the State agency with the Federal Government?

Mr. DONNELL. I think difficulties along that line were experienced in many of the States, including my own.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And working with one department—Social Security—the State social-security agencies, particularly in the employment field, gradually improved their service, and were really providing good employment services and were functioning well in that respect.

Mr. DONNELL. I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If there are two Federal agencies, it will mean that one State agency will have to get its administrative funds from the two Federal agencies.

Mr. DONNELL. That is correct.

Mr. President, I now refer to a third witness, Mr. Stanley Rector, president of the Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies, a gentleman who, I think, is thoroughly informed upon these matters. He testified at length before our subcommittee, and he furnished a most interesting and informative memorandum in support of his views.

He pointed out the following facts:

After announcement of the Reorganization Plan No. 2, all top State administrators were given an opportunity to afford an estimate of the soundness of the proposal and to indicate whether the State agencies should (a) support the proposal. (b) oppose the proposal, or (c) remain neutral. Forty-two State administrators—

Forty-two out of the forty-eight, Mr. President—

stated that the Federal administration of unemployment compensation and employment service should be in a single Federal department. Of this 42, 35 expressed the further opinion that the consolidation should be effected in the Federal Security Agency. One was of the opinion that consolidation should be in the Department of Labor. Six, while maintaining that proper administration required one Federal agency, expressed no opinion as to what Federal agency this should be. Six desired to assume an official neutral position. In summary, 42 States favored administration by a single Federal agency, and not a single State expressed a preference for administration of unemployment compensation and employment service by separate Federal agencies.

Mr. President, 47 of the 48 States, Mr. Rector has pointed out, have placed the Employment Service and the unemployment compensation functions under a

single State authority. Of course, that conforms with what Secretary Schwellenbach said, as I previously quoted him—

> At the State level, in virtually every case both programs are administered by a single State agency.

Mr. President, it is of significance to observe that in the Social Security Act itself it is provided that all unemployment benefit payments must be made through public employment offices or such other agencies as the Commissioner for Social Security shall approve. It is further significant that he has not approved any other agency through which such payments shall be made. Obviously, the Social Security Act itself recognizes the fact that at the State level there should be a union of functions in one agency.

The Senator from Massachusetts has indicated the confusion which arises when two different Federal authorities must be consulted by the State agency. Mr. Rector testified at considerable length in regard to those facts. He pointed out that two budgets must be submitted by the State agency, one to each of the two Federal departments or agencies. Labor and expense are involved, he pointed out, in breaking down personnel and other cost items into employment-service and unemployment-compensation categories. He pointed out that where the local government is dealing with two separate agencies of the Federal Government, an audit is made by each of the two Federal agencies, and there are other fiscal controls which are imposed by the two separate agencies, thus leading to confusion and duplication among the State agencies.

I call attention to the fact that Mr. Rector mentioned the anomalous situation which has arisen, as follows:

> A number of the States find themselves in the anomalous position of having more than sufficient funds to operate a part of their agency and an insufficient amount of funds to operate the other interdependent part.

He further said:

> Since funds were separately granted to State agencies for the performance of their ES and VC functions many State agencies have found themselves "starved" on one side and "fat" on the other, with consequent unbalanced operations.

Mr. Rector pointed out that—

> Merit system standards, salary schedules, sums for salary increases, etc., should, in the nature of things, be under the surveillance of one Federal authority.

Mr. President, if two Federal departments are severally administering the employment service and unemployment compensation functions in the Federal province, it is logical to conclude, as does Mr. Rector, that each will regard its own jurisdiction as the more important.

Mr. Rector concluded as to this phase of the subject with the following language:

> The translation of these contrasting views in terms of grants, rules and regulations, management procedures, etc., can be of no possible benefit to the over-all program.

In connection with this phase of the matter I wish to call attention to a further expression by a witness, a very distinguished witness. From 1936 to 1939 the Social Security Board administered the Federal functions in unemployment compensation and the Department of Labor administered the Federal functions in connection with the employment service only, which is just what this reorganization plan proposes. The result was that friction developed, and further, that in December 1938 the State administrators requested Congress to bring about the unification of unemployment compensation and employment service functions in the Federal province. The result was that the Social Security Board, as I have already indicated, in 1939 recommended to Congress the coordination of the unemployment compensation and employment service activities.

In the first reorganization plan of 1939, President Roosevelt provided for the consolidation of the unemployment compensation and employment service functions in the Social Security Board. His message upon this subject reads as clearly and as concisely as it is possible to state the matter:

> The Social Security Board is placed under the Federal Security Agency, and at the same time the United States Employment Service is transferred from the Department of Labor and consolidated with the unemployment-compensation functions of the Social Security Board in order that their similar and related functions of social and economic security may be placed under a single head and their internal operations simplified and integrated.

He further said:

> The unemployment-compensation functions of the Social Security Board and the employment service of the Department of Labor are concerned with the same problem, that of the employment, or the unemployment, of the individual worker. Therefore, they deal necessarily with the same individual. These particular services to the particular individual also are bound up with the public-assistance activities of the Social Security Board. Not only will these similar functions be more efficiently and economically administered at the Federal level by such grouping and consolidation, but this transfer and merger also will be to the advantage of the administration of State social-security programs and result in considerable saving of money in the administrative costs of the governments of the 48 States, as well as those of the United States.

Concluding, the President said:

> In addition to this saving of money there will be a considerable saving of time and energy not only on the part of administrative officials concerned with this program in both Federal and State Governments, but also on the part of employers and workers, permitting through the simplification of procedures a reduction in the number of reports required and the elimination of unnecessary duplication in contacts with workers and with employers.

Mr. President, in view of the testimony of these witnesses, the Secretary of Labor, the head of the Federal Security Administration, the President of the United States, Mr. Stanley Rector, the head of the State authorities upon these matters, I submit that it is the height of unwisdom to do what these various witnesses have so clearly indicated should not be done, namely, separate these functions into different jurisdictions. They should be combined, and for that reason I oppose Reorganization Plan No. 2, because of the contents of section 1.

Mr. President, there is a second reason why I oppose the plan, namely, because of the contents of section 2. I call to the attention of the Senate these words in that section, which constitute the section:

> The functions vested in the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor by the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 1060, ch. 676), as amended, are transferred to the Secretary of Labor and shall be performed by the Secretary or, subject to his direction and control, by such officers and agencies of the Department of Labor as the Secretary may designate.

Mr. President, there are two reasons why the contents of this section 2 are, in my opinion, objectionable. Those reasons are, first, that the section vests, in a department required by law to be a fiduciary for labor, functions which, because they involve the making of decisions and rulings affecting both management and labor, should be vested in an agency independent of either.

The second reason why I oppose section 2 is that it creates a condition of harmful uncertainty in view of the contents of section 10 of the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947.

As to the first point, namely, that section 2 vests, in a department required by law to be a fiduciary for labor, functions which, because they involve the making of decisions and rulings affecting both management and labor, should be vested in an agency independent of either.

I need not emphasize the fact that the law which creates the Department of Labor prescribes as its purpose, in part, the following:

> The purpose of the Department of Labor shall be to foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States, to improve their working conditions, and to advance their opportunities for profitable employment.

I need not emphasize the fact that the rulings of the Wage and Hour Administrator refer not alone to the welfare of the laborers, but to the welfare of the employers—management—as well as labor.

Mr. President, the Fair Labor Standards Act recognizes the importance of having these functions vested in an independent agency, namely, the Wage and Hour Administrator, appointed by the President, confirmed by the Senate, making reports to Congress, and, as the Secretary of Labor testified, the Wage and Hour Administrator is placed in the Department of Labor under existing law only for "housekeeping purposes."

Mr. President, there is no showing of inefficiency in the Wage and Hour Administrator. There is no affirmative reason of any consequence shown why there should be a change in the location of the Wage and Hour Administration from an independent agency, as it is today under the statute providing fair-labor-standards provisions, into a mere subsidiary division under the Department of Labor.

Mr. President, I said not only that section 2 of the reorganization bill vests in the Department required by law to be a fiduciary for labor functions, which

should be vested in an agency independent of either labor or management, but I raised also a second point of opposition to section 2, namely, the fact that the section creates a condition of harmful uncertainty in view of the contents of section 10 of the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947.

Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate the contents of a portion of the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947, namely, section 10 of the act, which provides that—

> In any action or proceeding based on any act or omission on or after the date of the enactment of this act, no employer shall be subject to any liability or punishment * * * if he pleads and proves that the act or omission complained of was in good faith in conformity with and in reliance on any written administrative regulation, order, ruling, approval, or interpretation, of—

Now quoting from subdivision (b) of the section:

> * * * The Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor.

Mr. President, section 2 of the plan undertakes, according to its language, to transfer the functions of the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division to the Secretary of Labor. The language is crystal clear, for its says:

> The functions vested in the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor by the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, are transferred to the Secretary of Labor—

And so forth.

If it does bring about this transfer, there arises uncertainty as to whether there will hereafter be any officer on whose rulings, practice, or policy with respect to the Fair Labor Standards Act a person may rely under section 10 of the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947.

Mr. President, the officer on whose rulings persons are, by said section of the Portal-to-Portal Act, entitled to rely, namely, the Wage and Hour Administrator, would if this transfer were effected, as the Reorganization Plan purposes to effect it, no longer have any functions, therefore no longer have power to make rulings, and it is therefore entirely possible that rulings when made by the Secretary of Labor will not, by section 10 of the Portal-to-Portal Act, be entitled to be relied upon by anyone, because it is by the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947 only the Wage and Hour Administrator himself whose rulings as to the Fair Labor Standards Act can be relied on.

Mr. President, we find, however, that, curiously enough, the Secretary of Labor, one day after the conclusion of the hearings, raised a point which obviously had never previously occurred to him. That point he inserted in a letter, which is cited and quoted in full in the report of the majority. It says that in the opinion of the Secretary of Labor section 2 does not produce the transfer to the Secretary of Labor of the power to make rulings which may be relied upon under section 10 of the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947.

In the first place, Mr. President, if it does not produce that result, section 2 is meaningless as to these particular functions, because the section says that it does produce that transfer. In the second place, it is significant to observe that neither the Secretary of Labor nor the head of the Budget Bureau, nor the Undersecretary of Labor, nor Mr. Goodwin, of the Employment Service, had ever thought of this point until after the conclusion of the hearings to which I have referred.

Now, Mr. President, what is the situation, if Mr. Schwellenbach is correct that there is no transfer of functions by section 2 of the plan, no transfer of the functions that are referred to under section 10 of the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947? Obviously, inasmuch as section 2 of the plan prescribes that there shall be a transfer, there is an obvious source of uncertainty created by the very suggestion made by the Secretary of Labor that no such transfer would occur. On the one hand, we have the provisions of the plan itself, providing for the transfer.

I yield myself 5 minutes more, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is recognized for five additional minutes.

Mr. DONNELL. On the other hand, Mr. President, we have his opinion expressed to our subcommittee after the conclusion of the hearings—and, incidentally, backed up by an opinion which I had seen only a little while before starting this argument this morning; backed up by an opinion of the Solicitor of the Department of Labor, concurred in by the Assistant Solicitor General, Mr. Washington—we have this opinion of the Secretary of Labor to the effect that no transfer of the functions under the Portal-to-Portal Act will occur.

What is the effect? Obviously, a tremendous uncertainty is created under the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947. This uncertainty is apparent from a simple illustration. While Mr. Schwellenbach is in office, it is to be assumed from his letter of June 18 that rulings on the Fair Labor Standards Act will continue to be made by the Wage and Hour Administrator, and that they will not be made by a delegation of power from the Secretary of Labor. This follows from the fact that the Secretary says the power to make the rulings will not be transferred to the Secretary of Labor, and consequently they will remain, according to his contention, in the Wage and Hour Administrator. Now, suppose that an employer relies on one of the rulings of the Wage and Hour Administrator which holds him to be exempt from the wage-and-hour law, and that later on the employer is sued by his employees on the ground that he is not exempt. The employer defends on the ground that he relied in good faith on and acted in conformity with said ruling of the Wage and Hour Administrator; to which the employees respond that by the terms of the reorganization plan, the power to make the rulings has been, as it says on its face, transferred to the Secretary of Labor; and that consequently the Wage and Hour Administrator no longer has power to make the ruling which was relied upon.

Clearly, Mr. President, until the question of whether the Wage and Hour Administrator yet possesses the power to make these rulings shall have been determined by the Supreme Court of the United States, the employer who relies on a ruling of the Wage and Hour Administrator does so at his own peril.

It was one of the purposes of the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947 to remove uncertainty and to give to employers the right to know that they could rely upon the ruling of the Wage and Hour Administrator; yet we are asked here to adopt a plan which says in one breath that there is a transfer of functions out of the Wage and Hour Administrator to the Secretary of Labor, and on the other hand, the plan is clouded with uncertainty because of the ruling of the Secretary of Labor that this plan, as to section 2, does not effect what it says. Obviously, Mr. President, if we adopt Reorganization Plan No. 2, the certainty of being protected by reliance in good faith on and action in conformity with a ruling, which certainty was produced by the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947, will have been displaced by uncertainty, which only litigation long extended through the Supreme Court of the United States can remove.

Mr. President, I close these remarks by saying again that I oppose Reorganization Plan No. 2 because, first, of the contents of section 1, which separates into two departments functions which should be united into one; and, second, because of the contents of section 2 of the plan, for the reasons which I have indicated in these remarks.

Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Minnesota. I understand that I now have approximately 22 minutes remaining. Is that correct?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri has 27 minutes remaining.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I yield myself 20 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, there are just two salient features of Reorganization Plan No. 2. The effect of section 1 is to keep the United States Employment Service in the Department of Labor, where it now is. Section 2 transfers the functions of the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division to the Secretary of Labor. Section 3 simply provides that the Secretary of Labor shall issue the regulations under which the Walsh-Healey and Bacon-Davis Acts are enforced by the contracting agencies of the Government. The power resides in the Secretary of Labor now, and this is simply a clarification of his functions. So far as I know there was no objection to section 3 of the reorganization plan, so I shall confine my statement to sections 1 and 2.

Mr. President, the United States Employment Service has had a somewhat checkered career. When the Wagner-Peyser Act was passed in 1933, providing for Federal assistance to States in setting up public-employment offices, the function was placed in the Department of Labor, Congress recognizing that that Department had a primary interest in facilitating the providing of employment opportunities to the men and women

who happened to be unemployed. Subsequently the Social Security Act was passed, providing for unemployment-compensation insurance under a joint Federal-State plan.

As Members of the Senate know, a prerequisite to receiving unemployment compensation is that the unemployed worker shall register for work in a public employment office. In 1939, under a then existing reorganization act, the President transferred the Employment Service to the Social Security Board, and it was administered by that Board jointly with the unemployment-compensation activities until 1942, when, in order to further the prosecution of the war, all the employment offices were nationalized and their administration turned over to the War Manpower Commission. Two years ago, when the War Manpower Commission was liquidated, the United States Employment Service was, by Executive order, placed back in the Department of Labor.

Mr. President, I think it is essential that the functions of paying unemployment compensation and administering the public employment offices on the State level be closely coordinated. Most of the States, I think all but one or two, now have the same bureau administering both functions, and close coordination is essential on the State level. It would probably be preferable on the Federal level, but there is nowhere near the necessity of it on the Federal level, because in our various appropriation bills we have provided specifically for commingling of funds.

The testimony in our hearings showed that the Administrator of the Security Agency and Mr. Goodwin, who heads the Employment Service, have gotten together and issued joint rules and regulations. The testimony even of the State administrators, most of whom oppose this reorganization plan, shows that they are now getting along very well with the situation as it is, with unemployment compensation in the Security Agency, the Employment Service in the Department of Labor. The commingling of funds and the budgeting problems have been worked out very simply, and there is no great difficulty.

Admittedly, from the testimony before us, the reorganization plan is a compromise. Both the Secretary of Labor and Mr. Miller, the head of the Security Agency, felt that both functions at the Federal level should be in the one department. But both of them testified that if they were put in either department they would be administered by separate bureaus, so that the problem of dealing with two Federal bureaus would still remain, because both Mr. Miller and Secretary Schwellenbach feel that it is essential that a separate agency administer the Employment Service in order that the emphasis shall be on securing jobs and suitable wages rather than operating these offices merely as an adjunct to paying out unemployment compensation. The employment offices serve not only the applicants for unemployment compensation but many millions of other workers. It is a function which logically belongs in the Department of Labor, which was created to serve the interests of the men and women who work.

I should like to point out, Mr. President, that in the Labor Relations Act which we passed here last week we took out of the Labor Department and established as an independent agency the Conciliation Service. Under a reorganization plan approved last year, the President took the Children's Bureau out of the Department of Labor and placed it in the Federal Security Agency. If we now proceed to take out of the Department of Labor the Employment Service, we will leave the Department of Labor with the Women's Bureau and the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and very little else to do in the way of administering Federal laws. Personally, I believe that labor, whether organized or unorganized, is important enough in our society and our economy to warrant a Federal department which has real functions, and if there is any function that logically belongs in a department devoted to furthering the interests of the men and women who work it is an employment service.

I should like to remind the Senate, Mr. President, that in the 1946 session the Senate voted overwhelmingly for a bill reported out by the Committee on Education and Labor, which placed the Employment Service permanently in the Department of Labor.

Now, as for section 2 of the plan, which transfers the functions of the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division to the Secretary of Labor, the only serious question respecting that transfer, it seemed to me, was the fact that Congress, since passing the Reorganization Act had passed the Portal-to-Portal Pay Act, which vested new functions in the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division.

Just as a matter of history I think it is well to recall that in the so-called Case bill which we passed at the last session, which was vetoed and did not become law, Congress attempted to create a Conciliation Service as an independent agency in the Department of Labor similar to the present status of the Wage and Hour Division. Upon further study, Mr. President, the committee abandoned that kind of an attempt and created the new Mediation Service as a completely independent agency outside the Department of Labor. I think practically all the members of that committee would agree that the precedent followed in the passage of the Fair Labor Standards Act of creating an independent agency within a department and not subject to the general supervision of the Secretary, the Cabinet officer who heads that Department, just does not make good sense, and is bad administration. So that in the final analysis I think the Wage and Hour Division should be in a department. I do not think it should be an independent agency. It belongs in either the Department of Justice or in the Department of Labor. Logically, I think it belongs in the Department of Labor because certainly the main purpose of that law is to prevent sweatshop conditions in industry, and the enforcement of such a law designed to protect minimum standards of employment and wages is a logical function of the Secretary of Labor.

The members of the committee were somewhat concerned, at least I was, with the effect of this transfer on the Portal-to-Portal Act. We brought that out clearly in questioning the Secretary of Labor. I do not think it had particularly occurred to him before, but as the result of that discussion we received from the Secretary of Labor the letter which appears on page 4 of the committee report, and I may say that the committee reported adversely the concurrent resolution we are considering to disapprove the reorganization plan, by a vote of 6 to 5 of the Senators present, or 8 to 5 of the entire membership of the committee. The letter to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] recalls that section 5 (e) of the Reorganization Act of 1945 provides as follows:

> If, since January 1, 1945, Congress has by law established the status of any agency in relation to other agencies or transferred any function to any agency, no reorganization plan shall provide for, and no reorganization under this act shall have the effect of, changing the status of such agency in relation to other agencies or of abolishing any such transferred function or providing for its exercise by or under the supervision of any other agency.

The Secretary then goes on to say:

> It is my opinion, on the basis of this section of the Reorganization Act, that approval of Reorganization Plan No. 2 will not have the effect of transferring to the Secretary of Labor the powers of the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division referred to above. This follows by reason of the fact that section 10 (b) of the Portal-to-Portal Act, which was approved May 14, 1947, specifically designates the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor as the agency authorized to make such administrative rulings.
>
> You are authorized to make this letter a part of the record of the hearings on the reorganization plan.

We placed the letter in the report so it would be part of the legislative history of whatever action we take on the concurrent resolution.

In addition to that, Mr. President, I have the brief of William S. Tyson, Solicitor of the Department of Labor, on which the Secretary based the opinion that approval by Congress of the reorganization plan and its going into effect would not transfer the rule-making function on which employers are entitled to rely under the Portal-to-Portal Act from the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division to the Secretary, but that that particular function—because of the terms of the Reorganization Act itself—would still remain in the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the brief by Mr. Tyson, the Solicitor, on which the Secretary's decision was reached and a covering memorandum from George T. Washington, Assistant Solicitor General of the Department of Justice, concurring in the Tyson opinion be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the brief and the memorandum were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
June 20, 1947.

MEMORANDUM

The Attorney General concurs in the conclusion reached by the Solicitor. Reorganization Plan No. 2 would not have the effect of transferring functions specifically vested in the Wage and Hour Administrator by the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947. The plan is in conformity with the terms of the Reorganization Act of 1945, including section 5 (e) thereof.

By direction of the Attorney General:
GEORGE T. WASHINGTON,
Assistant Solicitor General.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR,
Washington, June 18, 1947.

Memorandum to the Secretary.
From William S. Tyson, Solicitor.
Subject: Scope of functions of the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division transferred to the Secretary of Labor under Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1947.

You have asked my opinion concerning the scope and effect of section 2 of the Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1947, which transfers to the Secretary of Labor the functions vested in the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor by the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (52 Stat. 1060, ch. 676), as amended. In particular, you request my opinion whether the plan has the effect of transferring to the Secretary of Labor the functions of the Administrator under section 10 of the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947.

It is my opinion that approval of Reorganization Plan No. 2 will not have the effect of transferring to the Secretary of Labor the power of the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division to issue administrative rulings which could be relied on under section 10 of the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947. I am of the view that there would be no legal objection to your so advising the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Reorganization Plan No. 2 was transmitted by the President to the Congress on May 1, 1947, pursuant to the Reorganization Act of 1945 approved December 20, 1945 (ch. 582, Public Law 263, 79th Cong., 1st sess., 5 U. S. C. secs. 133y to 133y–16).

Section 5 (e) of the Reorganization Act of 1945 provides in part as follows.

"(e) If, since January 1, 1945, Congress has by law established the status of any agency in relation to other agencies or transferred any function to any agency, no reorganization plan shall provide for, and no reorganization plan under this act shall have the effect of, changing the status of such agency in relation to other agencies or of abolishing any such transferred function or providing for its exercise by or under the supervision of any other agency."

The Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947 (ch. 52, Public Law 49, 80th Cong., 1st sess.), approved May 14, 1947, provides in section 10:

"(a) In any action or proceeding based on any act or omission on or after the date of enactment of this act, no employer shall be subject to any liability or punishment * * * if he pleads and proves that the act or omission * * * was in good faith in conformity with and in reliance on any written administrative regulation, order, ruling, approval or interpretation, of the agency of the United States specified in subsection (b) of this section * * *.

"(b) The agency referred to in subsection (a) shall be—

"(1) In the case of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended—the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor;

"(2) In the case of the Walsh-Healey Act—the Secretary of Labor, or any Federal officer utilized by him in the administration of that act;

"(3) In the case of the Bacon-Davis Act—the Secretary of Labor."

Section 5 (e) of the Reorganization Act of 1945 originated from an amendment to the Senate Reorganization bill, S. 1120 (79th Cong., 1st sess.), proposed by Senator TAFT and agreed to on November 16, 1945 (91 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 10756). The amendment as agreed to read as follows:

"Provided, That no reorganization plan submitted shall contain any disposition in conflict with any act of Congress passed after January 1, 1945, dealing expressly with the creation, transfer, consolidation, or coordination of any agency or the distribution or coordination of powers or functions between agencies or within any agency."

The Senate bill, as so amended, was substituted for H. R. 4129, the House reorganization bill, and the bill was passed bearing the House number and sent to conference (91 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 10803). By conference agreement the Taft amendment was deleted and the present language of section 5 (e) was substituted (H. Rept. No. 1378, December 12, 1945).

In the Senate debate on the conference bill, Senator TAFT stated, referring to section 5 (e) as amended by the conferees:

"The language * * * which was adopted by the conferees, covers the matters which I had in mind, except that it does not cover the fixing of powers within an agency" (91 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 11937).

In reply, Senator MURDOCK, who submitted the conference bill in the Senate for the Senate conferees, stated:

"I invite the Senator's attention to this factor, which was the basis of the objection of the House conferees to the intra-agency reorganization which would be precluded if the language suggested by the able Senator had been included in the bill: The House conferees pointed out that in nearly every appropriation bill there are many intra-agency distributions of functions which are given of necessity little attention by the Congress, and that if the language which was suggested by the Senator had been included, whatever was done in any of the appropriation bills would be a prohibition against the President interfering with or changing anything in the way of functions which had been prescribed in an appropriation bill. The House conferees felt that such a provision would be too restrictive."

It is apparent, therefore, that Congress clearly intended section 5 (e) to include any law dealing expressly with the distribution of powers between agencies.

The Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 established the Wage and Hour Division in the Department of Labor and provided that it should be "under the direction of an Administrator * * * appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate." It is provided in the act that the various governmental functions and powers under the act, except for those relating to the prohibition of oppressive child labor, are to be administered by the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division.

The Fair Labor Standards Act did not give to the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division any authority to issue interpretations having binding effect. Prior to the enactment of the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947 the Administrator's interpretations, even though the courts recognized that they were entitled to great weight, were merely advisory in character. Under section 10 of the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947 the administrative rulings of the Administrator have acquired authoritative status by virtue of the provisions that in any action or proceeding to enforce compliance with the act an employer shall not be liable for failure to pay minimum wages or overtime compensation if he pleads and proves that he acted "in good faith in conformity with and in reliance on" written rulings or interpretations of the Administrator.

In discussing the intent of section 10 of the Portal-to-Portal Act the committee of conference of the House of Representatives and the Senate stated in its report:

"Section 10 of the bill as agreed to in conference, relating to an action or proceeding based on any act or omission on or after the date of enactment of the bill contains a rule which is the same as the rule relating to acts or omissions prior to the date of the enactment of the bill, with two exceptions.

* * * * *

"(2) the regulations, practices, enforcement policies, etc., must be those of the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor—in the case of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended; of the Secretary of Labor, or any Federal official utilized by him in the administration of the Walsh-Healey Act—in the case of the Walsh-Healey Act; and of the Secretary of Labor—in the case of the Bacon-Davis Act."

The force of this indication of the congressional intent that it is the administrative rulings of the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division which are to have binding force in the case of the Fair Labor Standards Act, for purposes of section 10 of the Portal-to-Portal Act, is given added weight in the conference report's discussion of the comparable provision of section 9 which authorizes as to past claims reliance on the rulings or interpretations of "any agency." In discussing this provision the conference report states:

"It will thus be seen that the administrative regulation, order, etc., does not have to be * * * a regulation, order, etc., of the Federal agency which administers the act. It will be sufficient if the employer can prove that his act or omission was in good faith in conformity with and in reliance on any administrative regulation, order, etc., of any Federal agency."

Thus, with reference to wage claims in the past, which are provided for in section 9 of the Portal-to-Portal Act, Congress did not specify any particular agency as having the power to issue rulings which could be relied upon by employees under the act. When, however, it came to wage claims arising in the future which are dealt with in section 10 of the Portal-to-Portal Act, Congress specifically provided that the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division is the agency which has the power to issue administrative rulings which can be relied on by employers under the act. It should also be noted that while Congress specified that the Secretary of Labor alone is the agency for this purpose with reference to the Bacon-Davis Act, the act provides alternatively with respect to the Walsh-Healey Act that the agency is the Secretary of Labor or any Federal officer utilized by him in the administration of such act. It must be presumed from this that Congress did not intend any alternative agency, for purposes of issuing administrative interpretations which can be relied upon by employers, in the case of the Fair Labor Standards Act and the Bacon-Davis Act.

The clear implication of the conference committee's report is that the Portal-to-Portal Act created a new power with reference to wage claims arising in the future, namely, that of issuing binding administrative rulings and expressly provided that this power should be exercised by the Administrator who, in the words of the report, is "the Federal agency which administers" the Fair Labor Standards Act. Accordingly, under section 5 (e) of the Reorganization Act of 1945, section 2 of Reorganization Plan No. 2 cannot affect the powers of the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division under section 10 of the Portal-to-Portal Act.

It is a familiar rule of construction that the courts will pay particular attention and will give great weight in construing a legislative enactment of Congress to the interpretation of the scope and effect of that enactment adopted by the administering authority (*Robertson* v. *Downing* (127 U. S. 607); *United States* v. *Healey* (160 U. S. 136); *United States* v. *American Trucking Association* (310 U. S. 534)). Accordingly, if you, as Secretary of Labor, were to take the position that the powers of the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division under section 10 of the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947 are not affected by section 2 of Reorganization Plan No. 2, the courts in any action under that act would give great weight to your interpretation of the limitations of that section.

Mr. BALL. I also have here a General Order No. 29 of the Department of Labor headed "Delegation of functions," signed by L. B. Schwellenbach, the Secretary, reading as follows:

Effective upon the approval of the President's Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1947, the functions transferred to me under section 2 of that plan are hereby delegated to the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor.

Mr. President, I agree with the distinguished Senator from Missouri that there is a legal question that perhaps some employees might bring a suit, but in view of the clear statement of the Secretary of Labor, the opinion of his solicitor, concurred in by the Assistant Solicitor General of the United States, I do not think any court could do other than go along with the Secretary's own interpretation. Furthermore, although I have disagreed with him plenty on policy, I have complete confidence in the integrity of the Secretary of Labor, and I think he will administer the reorganization plan in complete conformance with his letter to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] which appears in our report. In other words, the rule-making function, the interpretation of the Fair Labor Standards Act on which employers are entitled to rely in good faith under the Portal-to-Portal Act, will continue to remain in Mr. McComb, who is now the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, having been appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate at the present session.

As I have previously stated, I do not believe that in the long run the creation of independent agencies within a Cabinet department is sound administrative procedure; and I think the sooner we can group such independent agencies into Cabinet departments and hold the Secretaries responsible for their administration, the better. Certainly the administration of a Fair Labor Standards Act designed to eliminate sweatshop conditions in industry and protect the working standards of labor logically belongs in the Department of Labor.

Already in this session Congress has taken out of the Department of Labor one of its major divisions, namely, the Conciliation Service, and established it as an independent agency. If we are to continue to take out of that Department bureaus, functions, and divisions which logically belong there, if they belong anywhere in Government, and gradually strip it down to simply a secretary and a few assistant secretaries with virtually nothing to do, I think we shall not be serving well the interests of the 60,000,000 men and women who comprise our labor force.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I should like to ask the Senator if the reason for taking Conciliation Service out of the Department was not the idea that in dealing between employers and employees there should be an independent agency, without bias or favor for either employer or employee.

Mr. BALL. The reason which impelled that change is that mediation is not exactly quasi-judicial, but a semi-judicial function; and having it administered by a Cabinet officer who by law is required to represent the interests of one party did not seem to us sound procedure. We thought it was better as an independent agency.

Mr. COOPER. Following out the Senator's logic, does not the Wage and Hour Administrator, in the issuance of rules and regulations, and in determinations, also occupy a quasi-judicial position?

Mr. BALL. No; I do not think so. I believe that rule making is an administrative function.

Mr. COOPER. But would not the Senator say that his function in making decisions and determinations is of a quasi-judicial nature?

Mr. BALL. No more so than rule making under any law would be. The same thing applies to the Bacon-Davis Act and the Walsh-Healey Act. Under the Portal-to-Portal Act the President has the rule-making authority. In other words, he interprets in greater detail the provisions of the law passed by Congress. Of course, his interpretations are finally subject to court review.

Mr. COOPER. Would not the Senator say that the same logic which prompted the Congress in removing the Conciliation Service from the Department of Labor should also apply to rulings of the Wage and Hour Administration, as between employer and employee?

Mr. BALL. No; I think that is an entirely different function. In administering the wage-hour law the official charged with that responsibility is in effect enforcing a law passed to protect the standards of working people. Even under an independent agency there has been a somewhat partisan administration. The enforcement is going to be as vigorous as it can be made; and it should be.

Mr. COOPER. I remember that during the hearings there was some testimony to the effect that the Wage-Hour Administrator had issued more than 100,000 decisions or rulings affecting employers and employees. Would the Senator consider that an agency which issued more than 100,000 rulings affecting employers and employees should be an independent agency, and not under a Department whose chief purpose is to promote the interest of labor alone?

Mr. BALL. His rulings, for example, in determining whether coal yards or lumber yards are in interstate commerce or not, are all finally subject to court interpretation. But his decision must be made in accordance with the rules laid down in the act. I think it is perfectly logical to have such decisions made by an agency which is part of a department primarily devoted to furthering the interests of labor and protecting labor standards.

Mr. COOPER. I understand the Senator's position, but I think he knows that the courts have held that while rulings of the Wage and Hour Administrator are not conclusive, the courts will give them great weight.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I yield myself five minutes more.

Mr. COOPER. It seems to me that there is an area in which his determinations would have great effect on the courts.

Mr. BALL. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. COOPER. For that reason, the agency should be impartial.

Mr. BALL. Merely because the Secretary of Labor is supposed to further the interest of labor, that does not mean that he is going to be completely biased in his interpretation of the law.

Mr. COOPER. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. BALL. I believe that he is going to interpret the law so as to carry out the intent, namely, to protect the working standards of men and women who work. I believe that he will carry out that intent as fully as possible. Personally, I hope that some day we can extend the protection of the Fair Labor Standards Act as far as possible under the interstate-commerce clause.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. If we take this agency from the Department of Labor, about all we shall have left will be the Women's Bureau and the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Is it true that the House eliminated altogether from the appropriation bill for the Department of Labor any appropriation for the Division of Labor Standards?

Mr. BALL. That is true.

Mr. BARKLEY. So if that elimination should stand, that Division would be abolished, in effect. There would be no money to support it.

Mr. BALL. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. That emphasizes what the Senator says, that if the reorganization plan is defeated, and the agency about which we are talking, the Employment Service, is eliminated, there will be left nothing but a skeleton of the Department of Labor under the Organic Act by which it was established in 1913.

Mr. BALL. The Senator is correct. We shall have a Secretary, an Under Secretary, and three assistants, with virtually nothing to do.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Secretary will be what we call "functus officio" with no "officio."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I ask the distinguished Senator from Minnesota if it is not true that prior to December 1941,

when the Federal Government took over the employment offices from the States, the Social Security Department of the Federal Government provided the funds with which the States administered the offices.

Mr. BALL. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So the offices operated in the States by the Unemployment Compensation Service received funds from the Federal Government, and all their funds came from one office prior to the time the Federal Government took over in 1941.

Mr. BALL. Yes; but there were always two separate grants, one for the Employment Service and one for the Unemployment Compensation Division, just as there have been for the past 2 years.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is true; but there was one administrator in the State government and one administrator in the Federal Government, who had dealings with each other relative to the administration of funds.

Mr. BALL. That is true. I pointed out that fact.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] says that there will be nothing left in the Department of Labor but the Women's Bureau and the Bureau of Labor Statistics. This was not a function of the Department of Labor prior to December 31, 1941.

Mr. BALL. It was from 1933 until 1939. The Employment Service was in the Department of Labor. It was placed there by the Wagner-Peyser Act, passed in 1933.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Then it was taken over——

Mr. BALL. From 1939 to 1942 it was in the Social Security Board, and from 1942 until 1945 it was in the War Manpower Commission. Since 1945 it has been in the Department of Labor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So in the period up to the time of the war, in 1942, when these employment offices were becoming more and more effective—at least in New England—they were being handled by one administrator in Washington dealing with the State administrator. Is not that correct?

Mr. BALL. That is correct.

Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to direct my remarks to the Report of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare concerning Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1947. I have in mind specifically that portion of the plan which deals with the location of the United States Employment Service. You will recall, Mr. President, that the majority of the committee concluded that the proper location for the United States Employment Service is in the Department of Labor. I am in complete agreement with this conclusion.

Anyone who is at all familiar with the objectives and functions of the United States Employment Service and the part which it plays in our public employment office system, must recognize that this program lies at the very heart of the labor functions. The Employment Service is an essential part of the Department of Labor and its activities coincide with the basic purposes for which the Department of Labor was established. There is, of necessity, a very close working relationship between the Employment Service and the other bureaus which make up the Department of Labor.

The Apprentice Training Service in the Department of Labor, for example, depends in a large measure on employment-service assistance and advice. The apprentice-training program is responsible for determining the character and scope of the apprentice-training program and the particular skills for which such training should be encouraged and developed. The Employment Service must advise the Apprentice Training Service on job opportunities and emerging labor requirements. In the States these two programs are closely related and involve the selection and referral of new entrants into the labor market and veterans and other workers who are best qualified by reason of their interests and potentialities to benefit from Apprentice Training Service programs. Similarly, the other bureaus in the Department of Labor—the Division of Labor Standards, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and the Women's Bureau—perform functions which require the cooperation of the Employment Service. Technical information and assistance are interchanged between the Employment Service and these bureaus.

Because of the very close working relationships that exist between the United States Employment Service and the other bureaus in the Department of Labor and because the employment-service activity is so clearly a labor function, it is difficult for me, Mr. President, to understand the position taken by the minority members of the committee.

I particularly note the position taken by the minority to the effect that any reorganization plan submitted to the Congress by the President should be judged with respect to the expressed purposes of the Reorganization Act. To my way of thinking, the most important purpose set forth in the Reorganization Act is to group, coordinate, and consolidate agencies and functions of the Government, as nearly as may be, according to major purposes. It is my belief that if this objective is pursued, then it is possible to bring about the other purposes of the Reorganization Act such as reduction of expenditures, promotion of economy, efficiency of Government operations, and the elimination of overlapping and duplication of effort. It is for this reason that I find it difficult to understand how the minority of the committee could be opposed to the permanent location of the United States Employment Service in the Department of Labor.

Mr. President, some 14 years have elapsed since the United States Employment Service was established by the Wagner-Peyser Act in 1933. Except for a period of 3 years, the United States Employment Service has always been outside of the Federal Security Agency. The only occasion on which Congress declared its position with regard to the location of the United States Employment Service was in the enactment of the Wagner-Peyser Act. That legislation specifically provided for locating the United States Employment Service in the Department of Labor.

The subsequent transfers of the United States Employment Service to other agencies have all been made by Presidential order. The transfer to the Federal Security Agency in 1939 by Reorganization Plan No. 1 resulted in the consolidation of the Employment Service functions with unemployment benefit functions of the Social Security Board. During that 3-year period, unemployment compensation functions were given precedence over Employment Service activities. Indeed, prompt payment of unemployment compensation benefits was given higher priority than placing an unemployed worker on a job. I regard it as significant, Mr. President, that when this country was faced by a national emergency and emphasis had to be given to mobilization of manpower resources, the United States Employment Service was removed from the Federal Security Agency and placed in an agency whose sole responsibility concerned the resolution of manpower problems. This agency, the War Manpower Commission, was liquidated in September 1945. On the basis of a careful review of the functions of the United States Employment Service in a peacetime labor market, the President transferred the United States Employment Service to the Department of Labor where it is now located.

During the period in which the United States Employment Service has been a part of the Department of Labor it has developed a program which is necessary to assure maximum employment and job continuity. The Employment Service program now provides for complete placement services, special services to veterans, employment counseling, labor market information, industrial services, and community cooperation with groups concerned with employment problems. This program did not exist at the time the United States Employment Service was a part of the Federal Security Agency. The Employment Service program now provides more services to employers than ever before in its previous history. At the request of employers, employment offices now provide them with industrial services concerning methods which will assure better selection, induction, and in-plant transfer of workers so that labor turnover can be reduced.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am sorry, but I want to get through with my prepared remarks. Then if I have time I shall be glad to yield.

The employment offices provide employers with occupational analysis materials, job-testing methods, and other related services. Labor market information reflecting employment and unemployment trends, hiring practices, and similar related data is provided to employers so that they may better determine location of plant facilities, hiring schedules, and the adjustments of their

working forces. The Employment Service is today making more placements in higher paying jobs having prospects of regular employment than ever before in its history. Obviously, the employment service could not carry on such a successful program unless it had employer confidence and job orders from employers.

It is my belief, Mr. President, that because the United States Employment Service has been operating in an agency free from welfare and relief programs, it has received wide public acceptance. Employers and workers have come to use the facilities of our public employment offices on a greater scale than ever before. It would be most unfortunate if this experience were to be reversed and public misunderstanding and confusion develop because the Employment Service was once again associated with welfare and relief activities. For this reason, I am heartily in favor of continuing the United States Employment Service permanently in the Department of Labor.

It may interest the Members of this body to know, Mr. President, that section 604 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944—the so-called GI bill—provides, and I quote:

> The Federal agency administering the United States Employment Service shall maintain that service as an operating entity.

This provision of the statute was enacted subsequent to the provisions of the reorganization plan of 1939 which abolished the United States Employment Service and consolidated its functions with those of unemployment compensation. In my opinion this section of the GI bill, providing for maintaining the United States Employment Service as an operating entity, is designed to assure that no matter what administrative reorganization might take place, no action should be taken to impede or interfere with the major or proper objectives of the public employment service. These objectives are to assure high levels of productive employment and to facilitate job stability.

The national veterans' organizations, working closely with the Congress at the time the GI bill was enacted, were particularly concerned that every effort be made to assure effective employment assistance and job counseling. It is for this reason that the GI bill provides for maintaining the identity of the United States Employment Service as an operating organization. It, in effect, rescinds that portion of the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1939 which consolidated the functions of the United States Employment Service with those of unemployment compensation.

The reasoning which justified this action so that veterans might be given the maximum of employment assistance is equally applicable to nonveterans. Only if the United States Employment Service continues in a department of Government, whose primary activities are concerned with the labor functions and the problems growing out of the labor market, can we have any assurance that the employment-service program will not be diluted or subordinated to other activities.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MORSE. May I have five more minutes?

Mr. BALL. I yield five additional minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I find that both the majority and the minority members of the committee are in agreement on at least one point. Both groups are agreed that the objective should be to find the unemployed worker a job, rather than to pay benefits. To me, this is a crucial point, and logically leads to the conclusion that the United States Employment Service should be permanently located in the Department of Labor. It is inevitable that if the United States Employment Service were to be located in some department of Government whose primary concern is with welfare, health, education, or relief activities, the objectives of the public employment service would fail to receive their proper emphasis. I think this point needs to be emphasized above all others.

As a matter of fact, the experience in the States where both the employment service and unemployment compensation programs are administered indicates that in some 15 States the employment service is locatted in a State department of labor or a comparable State agency. In six additional States, the employment service is located in a department which carries on responsibilities for unemployment compensation and other labor functions. It is important to note, Mr. President, that in no State are the employment service and unemployment compensation programs administered by an agency which also has responsibility for health, welfare, education, or relief activities.

I do not argue that the logic which compels the coordination of employment service and unemployment compensation activities in a single State agency is necessarily applicable to the organizational structure which should apply within the Federal Government. Much can be said, however, for bringing the unemployment compensation functions to the Department of Labor. But, on the contrary, little can be said for transferring the Employment Service out of the Department of Labor to an independent agency.

As I review the history of the United States Employment Service, the growth and development of the public employment service system in this country, and the advances made by the Employment Service when it was not a part of the Federal Security Agency, I must conclude that the proper permanent location for the United States Employment Service is in the Department of Labor. When, in addition, consideration is given to the related labor functions carried on in the Department of Labor, it seems to me that the justification for continuing the United States Employment Service in that Department on a permanent basis is overwhelming. I strongly urge my colleagues to support the President's Reorganization Plan which would have the effect of assuring this country the continuance of a vital effective public employment service.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks my answers to certain questions. Time does not permit my reading of the answers. The questions are important, and I wish to say to my colleagues that in my opinion the answers to these questions are favorable to placing the Employment Service permanently in the Department of Labor.

The first question is, Why not provide for the merger of unemployment compensation and employment service programs?

The second question is, Is it not a fact that both the Federal Security Agency and the United States Employment Service have about the same kind of programs and deal with the same agencies?

Mr. President, let me say, briefly, that my answer to that question is "No."

The third question is: Is it not true that local employment offices get workers jobs and also pay unemployed workers benefits?

Mr. President, that is not true.

The fourth question is as follows: Is it not true that the main arguments made by the State officials for the transfer of the United States Employment Service to the Federal Security Agency is based upon considerations of economy?

The fifth question: Is it not true that the transfer of the United States Employment Service to the Federal Security Agency would result in more economical and efficient administration of both the unemployment compensation and employment service programs, and would improve relationships with the States?

The sixth question: Since both the unemployment compensation and the employment service programs are administered in all States by a single agency, why should not the United States Employment Service be transferred to the Federal Security Agency, where the unemployment compensation program is now being administered?

The next question is as follows: What is the purpose of section 2 of the plan transferring powers of the Administrator under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938?

Next, Mr. President, someone may ask upon what I base my conclusion that the power to make administrative rulings will not pass to the Secretary of Labor.

The next question: Do I conclude that the Administrator will continue as a statutorily-created officer who, according to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, must be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

The next question is as follows: What are the practical reasons for transferring all other powers than those under the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947, from the Administrator to the Secretary?

Mr. President, I ask that those questions and my answers to them, which, I submit, support placing this Employment Service permanently in the Department of Labor, be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the questions and answers were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Question. Why not provide for the merger of unemployment compensation and employment service programs?
>
> Answer. Action along this line was taken in 1939 when the United States Employment Service was abolished and its functions were consolidated with those of unemployment

compensation in the Social Security Board. The experience was highly unsatisfactory. The employment service activities were subordinated to those of unemployment compensation. I am glad to note that there is complete agreement among both the minority and majority members of the committee that finding jobs for unemployed workers is more important than payment of unemployment benefits. However, if we were to merge these two programs and place them in an agency which is responsible primarily for social insurance, health, welfare, and education activities, we would once again find employment service activities subordinated. As a result, payment of benefits would be regarded as more important than finding jobs for unemployed workers.

I might note that the veterans organizations have been very much concerned about the danger of subordinating the employment service to unemployment compensation activities. As a matter of fact, you will find in section 604 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 a provision to the effect that whatever agency is responsible for the United States Employment Service must maintain that Service as an operating entity. In other words, the provisions of this act rescind the provisions of the 1939 reorganization plan, since that plan abolished the United States Employment Service and merged its functions with those of unemployment compensation. The veterans feel that maximum employment assistance and job counseling can only be assured if the employment service activities are not merged with those of other programs.

Question. Isn't it a fact that both the Federal Security Agency and the United States Employment Service have about the same kind of programs and deal with the same agencies?

Answer. No; this is true only in part. It is correct that the same State agency administers both the employment service and unemployment compensation programs, but these two programs are distinctly different. The statutory responsibilities placed upon the United States Employment Service are not the same as those placed upon the Social Security Administration in the Federal Security Agency. In the case of the United States Employment Service, the Wagner-Peyser Act requires that it shall maintain a national system of employment offices. The act also requires that the United States Employment Service shall provide technical assistance and promote uniformity in administrative and statistical procedures. The USES is required to collect and publish information on employment opportunities. It is required to assist the local offices in meeting problems peculiar to their localities. None of these statutory responsibilities is found in the Social Security Act as it relates to the administration of the unemployment compensation program. In other words, the public employment service system is made up of a Nation-wide network of local offices involving Federal-State cooperation. The unemployment compensation system, however, consists of independent State systems and are in no way set up as a national program. Just to cite one example, the USES is required by law to operate a system for the clearance of labor among the States. In the case of unemployment compensation, however, when a claimant wishes to receive benefits in one State for work performed in another State, the Social Security Administration has nothing whatsoever to do with that activity. In fact, the arrangements for interstate payment of benefits has been worked out between the States and the Social Security Administration has not participated in it at all.

Question. Isn't it true that local employment offices get workers jobs and also pay unemployed workers benefits?

Answer. That is not true. As a matter of fact, the Employment Service must provide assistance to all job seekers without regard to their prior work experience or whether they have been subject to unemployment-compensation laws. As a result, employment offices give assistance to youth who enter the labor market for the first time, to veterans who may have had no prior work experience and who may not be subject to unemployment-compensation laws, and to workers in such activities as agriculture, domestic service, Government, and the like, which are not covered by unemployment-compensation laws. In fact, there are 60,000,000 people in our labor force today and 25,000,000 of these people have no unemployment-compensation coverage.

It is true that in some States provision is made for housing certain unemployment-compensation functions in the local offices. When these functions are carried on, however, they are not as a part of the employment-service program. As a matter of fact, because of the specialized knowledge and qualifications required for employment-service activities, the use of employment-service staff for unemployment-compensation functions in a local office is highly uneconomical and inefficient and can be justified for only very short periods of time under emergency circumstances.

Question. Is it not true that the main argument made by the State officials for the transfer of the USES to the Federal Security Agency is based upon considerations of economy?

Answer. Yes. Many State officials do argue that the transfer of the USES to the FSA would result in increased economy. I am somewhat loath, however, to accept their views. I know as a matter of fact that these very same officials are the ones who submitted budgets to the USES indicating that approximately $79,000,000 would be required during the next fiscal year to operate the public employment offices. The USES independently estimated that about $72,000,000 would be required for this purpose and this amount was submitted as the budget request to the Congress. As you know, the Senate Appropriations Committee after reviewing this matter came to the conclusion that the public employment offices could be operated at a cost of $57,000,000. In other words, these same State officials who argued economy are asking for $22,000,000 more to operate the employment offices than the Senate Appropriations Committee has deemed necessary for that purpose.

Question. Isn't it true that the transfer of the United States Employment Service to the Federal Security Agency would result in more economical and efficient administration of both the unemployment compensation and employment service programs, and would improve relationships with the States?

Answer. Certain economies can be achieved when two agencies are in the same department of Government and those agencies deal with a single State agency. Such economies as can be achieved, however, have already taken place. The United States Employment Service and the Federal Security Agency have already issued joint instructions on fiscal matters, budget preparation, personnel merit standards, and auditing of State expenditures. The economies which are possible are limited entirely to the routine business management, housekeeping functions. No economies can be achieved with respect to the operations or functions which characterize the employment service program as against those which characterize the unemployment compensation program. These are distinctly different programs involving highly specialized and different technical instructions, procedures, and methods of operation. Even when the United States Employment Service was located in the Federal Security Agency, it was necessary to maintain a separate organizational unit for the activities which distinctly dealt with employment service program matters.

It is my opinion that more important than the few dollars saved through joint administrative instructions is the assurance that the objectives and purposes of the employment service program will be achieved. By the same token, I should not want to see the objectives of the unemployment compensation program distorted through any merging of the activities of that program with those of the employment service. In the final analysis, the employment service program is concerned with getting workers jobs and providing employers with the workers they need. The unemployment compensation program is concerned with the payment of benefits to workers who are involuntarily unemployed. Each has its own contribution to make and the merger of these programs would do neither one any good.

Question. Since both the unemployment compensation and the employment service programs are administered in all States by a single agency, why should not the USES be transferred to the Federal Security Agency where the unemployment compensation program is now being administered?

Answer. The administration of the two programs by a single agency in the States is quite proper. It is in the States where the actual operating activities take place for both the employment service and the unemployment compensation programs. It does not follow, however, that the same type of administrative organization is necessary at the Federal level. Indeed, the transfer of the USES to the FSA would do great harm to our public employment service system. The FSA deals with matters of health, education, welfare, relief, and social insurance. The only program in the FSA with which the employment service is concerned at all is that of unemployment compensation. It seems to me that a great deal more can be said for the transfer of the unemployment compensation program to the Labor Department. Particularly since little or no relations exist between the unemployment compensation program and the other programs administered by FSA. In the case of the Employment Service, however, with the USES located in the Department of Labor very close relationships exist to the other labor programs administered by that Department.

In some 21 States the employment service is now located in either a State Department of Labor or a State agency which administers additional labor programs. In those States the Employment Service is located in a State agency responsible for the administration of health, welfare, and relief activities. The success of the public employment service in this country and the increasing widespread use of its facilities by both employers and workers is largely attributable to the fact that its program is not regarded as one related to welfare or relief functions.

Question. What is the purpose of section 2 of the plan transferring powers of the Administrator under the Fair Labor Standards of 1938?

Answer. The purpose is to consolidate under the Secretary of Labor all administrative functions under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 with the exception of the power to make administrative rulings upon which employers are entitled to rely. The latter remains a function of the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division.

Question. Someone may ask upon what do I base my conclusion that the power to make administrative rulings will not pass to the Secretary of Labor?

Answer. The power to make administrative rulings upon which employers are entitled to rely is conferred by section 10 of the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947. This provision gives a new effect to the rulings of the Administrator under the Fair Labor Standards Act and to the rulings of the Secretary of Labor under the Davis-Bacon and Walsh-Healey Acts. If employers rely on these rulings in good faith they cannot be subjected to liability under the statutes.

By this provision new powers are given to the Administrator and to the Secretary in relation to each other, and legislative history of the Portal-to-Portal Act indicates a definite purpose on the part of Congress to give these powers under the three statutes to the particular officers specified and to no other officers.

Now, section 5 (e) of the Reorganization Act of 1945 prevents the transfer of any agency whose status has been established by law in relation to any other agency after January 1, 1945. The word "agency" in the act by definition includes the Administrator and the Secretary. The Portal-to-Portal Act clearly established the status of the Administrator in relation to the Secretary for the purpose of exercising the powers conferred by section 10. These powers therefore remain in the Administrator.

Question. Do I conclude that the Administrator will continue as a statutorily created officer who, according to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, must be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate?

Answer. For the purposes of exercising the powers conferred under section 10 of the Portal-to-Portal Act, that is true.

Question. What are the practical reasons for transferring all other powers than those under the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947, from the Administrator to the Secretary?

Answer. The Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division was given an independent status when the Fair Labor Standards Act was first passed in 1938. At the same time the division he administers is in the Department of Labor and the Secretary of Labor is generally held responsible by the public for the policies and personnel of the Administrator even though the Secretary has no statutory control over either.

At the present time the Secretary has final authority in regard to administration of the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act under which is prescribed prevailing minimum wages and under which is enforced these wages plus required overtime compensation and provisions relating to child labor. The Secretary also determines minimum wages under the Davis-Bacon Act and has the fixed responsibility for administering the child-labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act. Now these acts raise problems exactly similar to those under the Fair Labor Standards Act and it is the belief of the committee that all of these powers should be carried out as far as possible by the same agency of the Government. The Secretary of Labor as a Cabinet officer was the choice of the plan, and this choice seeems to be sound.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the pending concurrent resolution. I favor the President's Reorganization Plan No. 2.

As a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which held hearings on the plan, I have followed very closely the testimony presented before that committee concerning the permanent location of the United States Employment Service. I am in complete accord with the majority views expressed in the report of the committee to the effect that the United States Employment Service should be permanently located in the United States Department of Labor. This conclusion is based upon a careful review of the facts, and in no way has been dictated by considerations of party politics.

It is my opinion, Mr. President, that any consideration involving the administrative reorganization of Government agencies must be guided by a study of the Government functions performed by the agency and the relationship of those functions to others in the department or branch of government in which the agency would be placed. Our Federal-State system of public employment offices is concerned with two major objectives: First, increasing the level of employment; and second, maintaining job stability. The services rendered by the public employment offices to employers, veterans, and other job seekers, and to community groups concerned with employment problems, are designed to achieve these objectives.

No one can question for a moment that the functions, activities, and objectives of the public employment service system are labor functions. The United States Employment Service is the Federal agency with which the State employment services are affiliated. The statutory responsibilities placed upon the United States Employment Service and the functions with which that agency is concerned clearly constitute a labor function. Effective governmental action on labor problems requires proper assignment of responsibility for the administration of Federal programs involving labor functions. Surely, we are agreed that the labor functions carried on by the United States Employment Service are closely related to the other labor functions found in the United States Department of Labor. The policies and operations of the Employment Service must be determined in relation to over-all labor standards, labor statistics, labor training, and labor law—for all of which the Labor Department is the central point in the Government. The work of the Employment Service ties in with that of other units of the Labor Department, and there is an interchange of technical information and assistance between them. These considerations should be controlling in determining the permanent location of the United States Employment Service.

My concern with the proper location of the United States Employment Service arises not only from the importance of this question as it affects the Federal Government organization, but also because it has a very strong bearing on the activities of the public employment offices within the States. The unemployment-compensation and employment-service programs within the States are generally administered by a single agency, but it is important to note that in 20 States, plus Hawaii, the employment service is located in a State agency which is either the State department of labor or an agency responsible for additional labor functions.

Let me emphasize at this point, Mr. President, that the reorganization plan does not in any manner affect the rights of the States to place the services in one agency or to separate them. In other words, the States may run this activity at whatever level they deem wise and expedient. No State has located the employment service in an agency which is also responsible for health, welfare, education, or relief activities.

I was impressed by the fact that a number of State administrators who appeared before the committee in favor of the transfer of the United States Employment Service to the Federal Security Agency came from States in which their programs were supervised by a State department of labor. For example, the State administrator from New York testified to the effect that the United States Employment Service should not remain in the United States Department of Labor, although he and his agency are a part of the New York State Department of Labor. Again, a State official from Wisconsin appeared before the committee opposing the President's reorganization plan, so far as the location of the United States Employment Service was concerned. Yet that official is a part of the Wisconsin Industrial Commission, which is responsible for carrying out a number of labor functions in the State in addition to that of the employment service.

I am particularly impressed by a public statement recently made by Mr. Edward Corsi, industrial commissioner of the New York State Department of Labor, regarding the employment service and unemployment compensation programs. In that statement he said:

There was some fear, when the employment services were returned to the States, that the placement function would be subordinate to unemployment insurance. While placement and compensation are closely related, and in some respect interdependent, the compensation activities are concerned almost exclusively with matters having to do with financial and taxation problems and procedure. They require a different approach and a different type of thinking. Placement, on the other hand, is to a larger extent an activity concerned with personal, human relationships, and values. Over and above procedural requirements it necessitates mastery of a very specialized technique and personal contacts that place a premium on ability to be helpful to people, to influence them constructively, and to analyze human motives and behavior. The two functions are in many respects incompatible, and, if too closely combined or integrated, might lead to operative difficulties. We have therefore, to a very large extent, maintained the set-up which we had prior to federalization of the Employment Service. The two Bureaus cooperate administratively to the extent required by the law and operate separately as units in the field. In New York City placement and insurance offices are wholly independent, both as to location and operation. While in some up-State cities both occupy the same premises, their operations are wholly separate and distinct. We find that this set-up operates very satisfactorily.

The importance of permanently locating the United States Employment Service in the Department of Labor cannot be overemphasized. I am especially concerned with this question because of its implications for my own State of Louisiana. Within the past few weeks I have received a letter from Mr. H. B. Turcan, who is responsible for the administration of both the employment service and unemployment compensation programs in my State. This letter sets forth very clearly and persuasively the compelling reasons for locating the United States Employment Service in the Labor De-

partment. I think, Mr. President, that the contents of this letter should be known to all of my colleagues. This letter states:

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: I am taking the liberty of addressing this letter to you as a member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and as such you will have before your committee the question of passing on the President's Reorganization Plan No. 2.

As administrator of the division of employment security of the department of labor in the State of Louisiana I have the responsibility for seeing that an effective and efficient State Employment Service is available to the veterans and other working people of our State.

I am, therefore, submitting to you my reasons why I may hope that you will support the President's Reorganization Plan No. 2, which is devoted in part to retaining the United States Employment Service permanently in the United States Department of Labor.

As you know, the United States Employment Service was created as a Bureau in the United States Department of Labor for the specific purpose of minimizing unemployment through the prompt and efficient matching of men and jobs. This is an important part of the responsibility of the Department of Labor under the act creating that Department, namely, to advance the wage earners opportunities for profitable employment.

A Committee on Administrative Organization was appointed by President Roosevelt in 1937 to conduct a study of the various functions of the independent agencies that had mushroomed up in the Federal Government. This committee recommended to President Roosevelt that the United States Employment Service should remain in the Department of Labor, where it had been established in 1933 by the Wagner-Peyser Act. The committee's recommendation recognized that the Federal Department of Labor should be responsible for the following activities:

"To advise the President with regard to labor problems; to conduct research on employment, wages, cost of living, and working conditions; to handle labor relations and controversies; to enforce labor laws; and to administer employment offices and the Federal aspects of Federal-State programs of social security where right rather than need is the basis of payment to beneficiaries."

This same committee recommended the establishing of a Department of Social Welfare with the following responsibilities:

"To advise the President with regard to social welfare; to administer Federal health, educational, and social activities; to conduct research in these fields; to administer Federal grants, if any, for such purposes as to protect the consumer; to conduct the Federal aspects of Federal-State programs of social security where need is the basis of payment to beneficiaries."

As presently constituted, the United States Department of Labor includes the following units:

1. Apprentice Training Service.
2. Office of the Solicitor.
3. Division of Labor Standards.
4. Conciliation Service.
5. Children's Bureau (in part).
6. Women's Bureau.
7. Wage and Hour Division.
8. Bureau of Labor Statistics.
9. United States Employment Service.

The Federal Security Agency includes the following units:

1. Food and Drug Administration.
2. Office of Education.
3. Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.
4. Public Health Service.
5. St. Elizabeths and Freedman's Hospital.
6. Children's Bureau (part).
7. Social Security Administration consisting of three operating bureaus:
   (a) The Bureau of Old Age and Survivors Insurance.
   (b) The Bureau of Public Assistance.
   (c) The Bureau of Employment Security.

Thus while the Committee's recommendations for the establishment of a Department of Social Welfare have not been carried out, most of the appropriate functions of such a department have gradually been brought together in the Federal Security Agency. These Social Welfare programs deal with problems that arise irrespective of the labor market, in the fields of child care, old age, health, education, etc.

An examination of the responsibilities of the United States Department of Labor will show that the Department has as its responsibility national labor programs which have to do with problems growing out of the labor market, particularly as they arise out of the relationship of the worker to his job, and which deal with services to workers in obtaining employment, with problems of wages, hours, working conditions, and management-labor relations.

I am convinced that the Bureau of Employment Security is properly one of the labor programs mentioned and that administration of the law which grants the right to insurance of wage losses when employment is interrupted, should be the responsibility of the Department of Labor.

While I am strongly of the opinion that the United States Employment Service and the Bureau of Employment Security should be within the same department, I am just as convinced that the agency of Government (State or Federal) which assists an individual in finding employment should not be associated or identified as a relief agency. As pointed out, the Federal Security Agency deals primarily with need and the Labor Department deals primarily with workers' rights.

You may be interested to know that from actual operating experience during the past 12 years, we have found that both workers and employers respect and use the Employment Service to a much greater extent when they understand clearly that it is in no sense a relief agency and that the Employment Service operates solely on the basis of employers' specifications and workers' qualifications. We have succeeded in establishing this position of the Employment Service with both workers and employers, but it has been a long up-hill fight. If the Employment Service should be transferred to the Federal Security Agency, which administers its programs fundamentally on the basis of need, the Employment Service will again inevitably be identified as a relief agency. Thus, to effect such a transfer will destroy a good part of the progress we have made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The time of the Senator from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator an additional 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for an additional 3 minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I continue the letter:

Recently I wrote a letter to Mr. Hausman who is chairman of the legislative committee of the Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies, and made my position clear to him, that I believe the USES and the Unemployment Compensation programs should both be in the United States Department of Labor rather than in the Federal Security Agency. I am enclosing a copy of my letter to him.

There have been a number of arguments advanced by persons appearing before the House Committee for transferring the USES from the Department of Labor to the Federal Security Agency. For example, some of these people contend that the Federal Security Agency is the logical place for the USES, while in their own States both the State Employment Service and Unemployment Compensation administration are in the State Department of Labor.

At the present time there are about 18 States in which the employment service is administered by the State Department of Labor, and there is not, to my knowledge, a single State in which the employment service or unemployment insurance is administered by a State department of public welfare. Since it is obvious that no State feels that these programs should be administered by a public welfare department it seems equally obvious that they should not be administered by such a department at the national level.

Another peculiar argument advanced for transferring the USES is that employers will not use the employment service in their communities if the USES remains in the Department of Labor.

The facts completely explode this argument. For example, analysis of reports show that in 1940 when the USES was in the Federal Security Agency, the public employment offices of the Nation made approximately 3,700,000 placements. Of these placements, 36 percent were in domestic service—in private households and other service industries—and represented jobs of short duration and low wage rates.

On the other hand, in 1946 with the USES in the Department of Labor, total placements by public employment offices were more than 4,500,000, of which only 25 percent were in service industries, and more than 40 percent were in the manufacturing industry, where the highest skilled jobs are found and the best wages are paid. The 1946 placements in manufacturing totaled three times as many as those made in 1940.

I have observed from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that hearings on the President's Reorganization Plan No. 2 were scheduled before your subcommittee on May 23, and I understand there are other hearings scheduled on June 16 and 17 on this subject. Before that date I hope to communicate with you again as I wish to call your attention to certain points in the House report which accompanied House Concurrent Resolution No. 49 and which opposes the President's plan.

In conclusion, I would like to summarize the position of this Agency.

1. We believe that the USES should remain in the United States Department of Labor;
2. We believe that the USES and the BES (Bureau of Employment Security) should be organizationally placed in the same Department; and
3. We believe that until such times as the BES can be transferred to the Labor Department the USES should remain where it is.

Yours truly,

H. B. TURCAN,
Administrator.

Mr. President, I believe that our public employment service system plays a vital role in assisting both employers and job seekers to meet their employment needs. I believe that our Federal-State system of public employment offices can only be effective if the United States Employment Service is located in a department of Government whose sole concern is with labor problems. I do not want to see the functions or the activities of the public employment service made subordinate to welfare or relief programs. I strongly urge my colleagues to support the President's Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1947, and to vote in accordance with

the views of majority of the members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare which has thoroughly reviewed this reorganization plan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To whom does the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, the minority leader wanted to speak on the concurrent resolution, but he is not at present on the floor. I wonder if the Senator from Missouri would like to proceed now.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I should really prefer to wait until the other side has completed its presentation, if that could be arranged.

Mr. BALL. I will say to the Senator that I thought I had it arranged. The Senator from Kentucky, I presume, is at luncheon, and has not returned to the floor. So far as I am concerned I have completed all that I wanted to say on the subject.

Mr. DONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

During the calling of the roll,

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the quorum call be vacated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the quorum call will be vacated.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the senior Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, how much time have I?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifteen minutes have been allotted to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Minnesota. I do not know that I shall use the entire time at my disposal, because the Senator himself has covered the issues involved more completely than I could hope to do, because I am not a member of the committee. I wish very briefly to call attention to one or two things which I think the Senate ought to consider in determining the issue which is before us.

The Department of Labor was created in 1913 by the act of March 4, which was one of the last acts of the Taft administration, signed by President Taft on the 4th of March. I can very well imagine him, according to the custom of that day, coming to the Capitol and occupying the Presidential room in the Senate wing at a time when everyone supposed the President had to sign all bills before the adjournment of Congress on the 4th of March. At any rate, the Department of Labor was created by act of March 4, 1913. The Labor Bureau was created prior to that time, but the Department of Labor was created on the 4th of March 1913. The first Secretary of Labor was appointed by President Wilson when he took office on that day. I believe William B. Wilson was the first Secretary of Labor under that act.

It is true that the Department of Labor was created for the purpose of assisting those who labor for wages in the United States. The organic act states that—

> The purpose of the Department of Labor shall be to foster, promote, and develop the welfare of the wage earners of the United States, to improve their working conditions, and to advance their opportunities for profitable employment.

It is in accordance with that purpose, as stated in the original organic act, that the United States Employment Service was created. But specifically this Service was set up by the Wagner-Peyser Act of 1933 as a division in the Department of Labor, where it remained until 1939, when, by Executive order, it was transferred to the Federal Security Agency, because the war was coming on, and it was necessary to coordinate all activities of the Government with respect to employment. In 1942, because of the greater need for coordination and concentration due to the war into which we had entered, all these functions were then transferred to the War Manpower Commission, and remained there until 1945, to the end of the war, when the Commission's function had been completed, and then, by Executive order, the United States Employment Service reverted to the Department of Labor in which it was originally created.

The issue before us is whether it shall remain in the Department of Labor, a department which was created, among other things, in order to find profitable employment among workers, or whether it shall be transferred to the Federal Security Agency because that agency has to do with the compensation of men who are unemployed—two entirely different functions.

The more completely the Department of Labor, or the United States Employment Service, can find jobs for people, the fewer men and women there will be on the compensation rolls by reason of unemployment. One function is to find jobs for men and women. The other function is to pay them compensation if there are no jobs. The two functions are entirely different. There is, of course, a relationship between them, but there is no necessary organic connection between the two. One of them properly belongs to the Federal Security Agency; the other, in my judgment, properly belongs to the department set up for the purpose of promoting the welfare of laboring people and to find profitable jobs for them.

There are some Senators who seem to be under the impression that in some way or other the Reorganization Plan No. 2, upon which we are to vote in a few minutes, impinges upon the authority of the States with respect to employment services. On account of the necessity to concentrate all our efforts toward the organization of our manpower during the war, the Federal Government took over the functions of the States with respect to employment, and that was necessary. On November 16 last year these State functions were returned to the States, and they now reside within the States. But there must be a coordinating agency, there must be a Federal functionary whose duty it is to allocate the funds provided by the Federal Government to these State agencies. Since 1945 that has been done by the United States Employment Service in the Department of Labor, and there has been no complaint, so far as I know, as to the efficiency or the cooperative spirit of the Department of Labor with respect to the allocation of these funds. It should be said that in a majority of the States the function of finding jobs for people resides within the labor departments of those States. Some of them also have in that same department the function of unemployment compensation. But there are very few States whose unemployment activities are not within the Labor Department of the State.

So far as I can recall, no one has said that any State will suffer any embarrassment or unfairness in the allocation of funds or in the cooperation between the Federal Government and the States with respect to employment because this agency is in the Department of Labor instead of the Social Security Agency. That being true, inasmuch as Congress placed it there in the beginning, and replaced it there, in a sense, after the war had terminated—because it was removed therefrom only because of the exigency of the war and because of the necessity of concentrating and consolidating all the employment and unemployment compensation functions in one agency—it seems to me that there is no logical reason why the Department of Labor is not the proper repository for the authority of the United States Employment Service.

Reference has already been made to the fact that, by action of Congress, the Department of Labor has been stripped of a very large portion of its functions. The Conciliation Service has been removed. That is a fait accompli. There is no use in discussing it now. It has already been done. That agency has been established as an independent agency. Inasmuch as that has been done, I hope it will function successfully. I am more concerned about the welfare of American working men than I am about the agencies which shall administer their welfare. Although I objected to the elimination of the Conciliation Service from the Department of Labor, it has been done, and I accept it and trust that it will function successfully and admirably.

By refusing any appropriation for the Labor Standards Division of the Department of Labor, unless the elimination should be corrected by the Senate, the Labor Standards Divison would not be removed from the Department of Labor to some other department. It would simply die because of lack of food. It would die from starvation. So we might as well remove it from the Department of Labor to some other department as to kill it entirely. I do not know what the Senate will do about it; but the Labor Standards Division can be removed from the Department of Labor because of the lack of any appropriation whatever to support it.

If we take away the Employment Service, which is logically a part of a Labor Department organization to find

profitable employment for people, what have we left? We have the Women's Bureau—which I do not minimize—and the Bureau of Labor Statistics. We have a Cabinet member, in the tenth Department established by Congress to function in order to find profitable employment for working people, practically limited to gathering statistics about the cost of living and other valuable information with respect to our labor situation, in addition to the Women's Bureau. Originally the Children's Bureau was a part of the Department of Labor, but that was removed by Executive order several years ago.

So, Mr. President, the issue is really whether the Employment Service, which will be administered by the States, as at present, with the allocation of Federal funds to the States for administrative expenses, as at present, should be in the Department of Labor, where it resided for many years, or whether it should be removed to an agency whose chief function is to compensate men and women because they are not at work. It is not the function of that agency to find jobs. It is its function to compensate men and women who are without employment, but who must have registered for employment in order to receive compensation.

So, Mr. President, I shall vote against the concurrent resolution. I shall vote to support the position of a majority of the committee, which has adversely reported the concurrent resolution; and I trust that the resolution will be defeated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Kentucky has expired.

All time of the opponents of the concurrent resolution has expired.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, how much time remains to the proponents of the concurrent resolution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the proponents have 24 minutes.

Mr. DONNELL. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I rise to support the concurrent resolution rejecting Reorganization Plan No. 2 as proposed by the President. I have carefully examined this reorganization plan. It would not save a single dollar. It would not result in the dismissal of a single Government employee.

The power which we have granted to the President of the United States under the Reorganization Act was primarily for the purpose of affecting economies. The act itself provides that the reorganization plans should effectuate a saving of approximately 25 percent in the cost of the various agencies.

In order to verify the results of my own investigation, I communicated by telephone with the Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. F. J. Lawton, and asked him this question:

Would the President's plan 2 result in any economy or result in any increase or decrease in personnel?

Mr. Lawton's answer over the telephone was:

The answer to both parts of the question is "No."

Mr. James E. Webb, Director of the Budget, in testifying on the plan before the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, stated:

I am aware that the subject of economy has always been an issue in considering reorganization plans. The messages accompanying plans numbered 1 and 2 stated frankly that since most of the actions in these two plans had already been taken under authority of title I of the First War Powers Act, no additional savings could be claimed.

The President, in submitting the plan, stated:

Since the plan does not change existing organization, savings cannot be claimed for it. However, increased expense and disruption of operations would result if present organization were terminated, and the activities reverted to their former locations.

Mr. President, the State of Virginia and 37 other States are opposed to section 1 of the plan, which established the United States Employment Service permanently in the Department of Labor. This Service originated in the Department of Labor, under the old Wagner-Peyser Act. Under a previous reorganization plan President Roosevelt transferred the Service to the Social Security Board. Under the First War Powers Act it was moved first to the War Manpower Commission, and later to the Department of Labor, where it is now. However, unless this plan becomes effective the Service will revert to the Social Security Board on the expiration of the War Powers Act.

That is what the employment services of 38 States think should be done; and they are the agencies which have the primary responsibility for the operation of this part of the plan.

I want to read, Mr. President, a letter which was written to me by the Unemployment Compensation Commission of the State of Virginia. It is dated June 5, and I think it is a very excellent presentation of the entire matter. It reads as follows:

Under the provisions of the above plan, the United States Employment Service will be permanently administered by the Department of Labor. If the plan is rejected, the United States Employment Service will revert to the Social Security Administration upon the termination of title I of the First War Powers Act (U. S. C. 50, App. 601–605). We earnestly urge that this plan be rejected and hope that you will use your influence to that end.

You will recall that under the provisions of the Wagner-Peyser Act of 1933 the United States Employment Service was placed in the Department of Labor. This was logical at that time because the Social Security System had not been established. Subsequent to the establishment of the Social Security System and the acceptance by the States of the unemployment-compensation provisions thereof——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Virginia has expired.

Mr. BYRD. May I have about 3 minutes?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield three more minutes to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. I continue reading from the letter, as follows:

it became obvious that, since the States had assumed the functions of administering both the Employment Service and the Unemployment Compensation Service as integral and coordinated units, the two units could be more efficiently and economically operated at the Federal level by a single Federal agency. Therefore, in 1939 President Roosevelt, without objection from the Congress, transferred the Employment Service to the Social Security Board. In his message accompanying his plan under which the transfer was made, President Roosevelt stated that the consolidation was being done so as "to minimize overlapping and duplication, to increase efficiency, and to reduce expenditures to the fullest extent consistent with the efficient operation of the Government."

The reasons assigned by Mr. Roosevelt are as sound today as in 1939.

It is clear, I think, Mr. President, that unless this reorganization plan is disapproved, this service, which is vital to the States, will become perhaps a permanent part of the Labor Department of the Federal Government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert the letter, which I have not had time to read in full. It is written by the Unemployment Compensation Commission of the State of Virginia and signed by John Q. Rhodes, Jr., one of the commissioners.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,
UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION COMMISSION,
Richmond, June 5, 1947.

Re Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1947.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Under the provisions of the above plan, the United States Employment Service will be permanently administered by the Department of Labor. If the plan is rejected, the United States Employment Service will revert to the Social Security Administration upon the termination of title 1 of the First War Powers Act (U. S. C. 50, App. 601–605). We earnestly urge that this plan be rejected and hope that you will use your influence to that end.

You will recall that under the provisions of the Wagner-Peyser Act of 1933 the United States Employment Service was placed in the Department of Labor. This was logical at that time because the Social Security System had not been established. Subsequent to the establishment of the Social Security System and the acceptance by the States of the unemployment-compensation provisions thereof, it became obvious that, since the States had assumed the functions of administering both the Employment Service and the Unemployment Compensation Service as integral and coordinated units, the two units could be more efficiently and economically operated at the Federal level by a single Federal agency. Therefore, in 1939 President Roosevelt, without objection from the Congress, transferred the Employment Service to the Social Security Board. In his message accompanying his plan under which the transfer was made, President Roosevelt stated that the consolidation was being done so as "to minimize overlapping and duplication, to increase efficiency, and to reduce expenditures to the fullest extent consistent with the efficient operation of the Government."

The reasons assigned by Mr. Roosevelt are as sound today as in 1939.

On January 1, 1942, the employment service was taken away from the States and eventually was operated by the War Manpower Commission. Upon the abolishment of the War Manpower Commission, the United States Employment Service was placed temporarily in the Department of

Labor. Mr. Truman's plan seeks to keep the United States Employment Service permanently in the Department of Labor.

Our objections to this plan are for the following reasons:

1. It will cost less to administer the Employment Service at the Federal level if it is administered by the same agency now administering the Federal functions of the Unemployment Compensation System. Mr. Webb, Federal Budget Director, testified at the hearings before the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments on this matter that 1,803 persons are on the pay roll of the Department of Labor who give their full time to services in connection with the administration of the Employment Service. If this Employment Service should be returned to the Social Security Administration, it would seem that it would then be unnecessary to employ so large a number of individuals in the administration of the Service. Today two separate Federal agencies, with two separate groups of administrators, are estimating, making, and auditing expenditures of grants to States for (a) employment-service administration, and (b) unemployment-compensation administration. This entails two budget estimates, two Federal appropriations, two of nearly everything, in the Federal dealings with a single State agency. All the States excepting one have unified the unemployment-compensation functions and the employment-service functions under one head. So long as the two Services remain separated at the Federal level it is necessary for the States in their operations to attempt to separate the functions for budgetary purposes and to prepare two separate budgets. This is a useless burden on the States and involves useless expense. Both Federal agencies now send separate teams of auditors to each State in order to audit the State's expenditures. Consolidation, it seems, would make it possible for but one team of auditors in this connection. Therefore, from the standpoint of economy, the plan should be rejected.

2. Unemployment compensation and job placement are so closely related that coordination of their functions is necessary both at the Federal and State levels. They are inseparable units.

3. The finding of jobs for unemployed workers is not primarily a labor function. It is an economic problem. This service should be forever kept free from so-called labor influences. The States operate an insurance system on a business basis. Those who seek unemployment compensation because of lack of work must be willing and eager applicants for any reasonable, suitable work. The Department of Labor's influences with respect to wages, hours, and standards should not be used in such cases. The policies of both services—finding jobs and paying benefits—must be in the interest of the public welfare, independent of the influences of any particular group. The Federal Security Administration we believe to be a neutral agency. The Department of Labor is not neutral. We would object to placing the Employment Service in the Department of Commerce because it is primarily engaged in helping capital as distinguished from labor.

4. Thirty-eight States, as shown by a poll of the administrators of all the States, have expressed their opposition to the plan.

5. The Employment Service while administered by the States and supervised at the Federal level by the Social Security Board increased in usefulness and efficiency as compared with the period prior to 1939 when the Labor Department supervised at the Federal level. Since it has been under the Department of Labor its usefulness and efficiency have declined. Employers have not utilized its service to the degree desired. Since the return of the Employment Service to the States, employer interest in the Service has increased to some extent in Virginia. If the Service is completely and permanently separated from the Department of Labor, we feel that employer reaction will be favorable and that their interest in the agency will increase.

With kind personal regards, we are,
Respectfully yours,
JNO. Q. RHODES, Jr.,
Commissioner.
KENNETH C. PATTY,
Assistant Attorney General,
Counsel for the Commission.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I have not time to discuss the other provisions, but I urge that it will not save a single dollar and will not result in the dismissal of a single employee. It is desirable that at least 25 percent economy may be effected in these reorganization programs.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Massachusetts for 5 minutes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I shall speak very briefly on this subject, from my experience as governor of one of the States dealing with this question.

In the first place, I believe that the whole subject should be administered in one department. I should be perfectly willing to have all the functions placed in the Labor Department. Perhaps that could be done under the Lodge-Brown study legislation which we passed last Friday.

What is the situation? The employers and employees in a State pay in money for unemployment compensation. That money is paid to the Federal Social Security Administration. They retain a very small percentage for administrative purposes. They send more money for administrative purposes to the various State government unemployment-compensation offices. The balance is held to the credit of the State in the Federal Government for purposes of unemployment compensation when needed. There is one director in the State for both employment and unemployment service. One of the great difficulties during the war, when the Federal Government took over the employment offices, was the fact that the employment end was operated by the Federal Government and unemployment compensation continued to be operated by the State government. As a consequence the same person could not be employed in both functions. In Massachusetts—I do not know how it is in other States—the offices are the same. A person who is unemployed comes into the office in Worcester, for example, for his unemployment-compensation check. He can talk with the man who pays it out concerning his chances of obtaining a job, or at least with another man in the same office with reference to his getting a job. All requests from employers come into that one office. The whole subject is handled by one State director through one office, with local offices in various sections of the State. In Massachusetts I think there are either 27 or 29 offices. I am not sure of the number.

One of the great difficulties during the war, Mr. President, was in dealing with the Federal Government on administrative questions with relation to these offices. I believe that with one administrator in the State administering both functions, one man could deal with one person in one department of the Federal Government. That makes for efficiency, for economy, and for a smaller number of employees in the offices under the State government.

The junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] in his remarks pointed out the various things which were being done for the benefit of the veteran and for the benefit of the nonveteran in connection with employment opportunities. The answer to his argument is that those things are done in the State under the direction of State officers. If they are being done well, the State offices should receive a very considerable amount of the credit for doing them. The suggestions which come from Washington are handled in the State. I believe these two functions handled in the State by one office, by one director, in various sections of the State, would have a better opportunity by dealing with one office in the Federal Government. Ultimately that may be the Department of Labor. For some reasons I hope it will be, but as long as it involves one function in the State we ought to keep it as one function in the Federal Government.

So I hope that the position of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL] will be supported, and that the position of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] in this matter will be rejected.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, the opposition to this reorganization plan revolves around two propositions: First, that section 1 of the plan, which separates the United States Employment Service and the unemployment-compensation functions, is unwise and should not be placed in effect; second, that section 2, which undertakes to transfer certain functions from the Wage and Hour Division to the Secretary of Labor, likewise is unwise and should not be put into effect.

Mr. President, to my mind the observations of the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who is known from one end of the United States to the other because of his faithful adherence to the principles of economy and efficiency, should not be disregarded by the Senate. It will be recalled that only a few minutes ago the Senator from Virginia stated and repeated, in his simple yet courageous and straightforward language, that the reorganization plan will not save a single dollar, will not result in the dismissal of a single employee, and totally disregards that portion of the Reorganization Act itself which refers to contemplated savings of 25 percent as the result of the adoption of the plan. Mr. President, a warning such as that, one, which comes from the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia, should not go unheeded by the Senate.

In addition, we have the statement, made just a few minutes ago by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], whose administration of the affairs of the governorship of the great State of Massachusetts is likewise known from coast to coast. His words

should not be disregarded by the Senate, when he points out the importance of coordinating and combining, not separating, the functions of the Employment Service and unemployment compensation. Indeed, Mr. President, the observations of my good friend the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, in advocating the reorganization plan, were themselves significant, for it will be recalled that in the early portion of his remarks he stated in substance that he believes that the functions of unemployment compensation and Employment Service should, on the State level, be closely coordinated, and then, as my notes indicate, he said in substance that it probably would be preferable on the Federal level. Yet this section of the reorganization plan totally violates that idea of coordination, of union, of consolidation.

Earlier today I emphasized the fact that both the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Schwellenbach, and the head of the Social Security Administration, Mr. Watson Miller, the Federal Security Administrator, coincide in their position in regard to the proposition that the two functions should be united, and united not solely on the State level but also on the Federal level.

It was pointed out earlier today that Mr. Stanley Rector, president of the Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies, after an opportunity had been given to the representatives of the 48 States of the Union, found that 42 out of the 48 stated that the Federal administration of unemployment-compensation and employment-service functions should be in a single Federal department; 6 of them remained silent; but not one expressed a preference for administration of unemployment-compensation and employment-service functions by separate Federal agencies.

Then, Mr. President, it has been mentioned more than once today that in 1939 the President of the United States, the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, had this to say—I shall quote only a portion of his statement—when he himself consolidated the functions of employment compensation and employment service under the Social Security Board:

> In order that their similar and related functions of social and economic security may be placed under a single head and their internal operations simplified and integrated.

It will also be recalled that Mr. Roosevelt had this to say:

> Not only will these similar functions—

Mr. President, I pause at this point because, today, although the distinguished minority leader did not say there is an utter dissimilarity, apparently he did not perceive the very close similarity which applies to a large portion of the activities of these agencies.

As I was saying, Mr. President, the President of the United States said:

> Not only will these similar functions be more efficiently and economically administered at the Federal level by such grouping and consolidation, but this transfer and merger also will be to the advantage of the administration of State social-security programs and result in considerable saving of money in the administrative costs of the governments of the 48 States as well as those of the United States.

With that galaxy of experts—the Secretary of Labor, himself; the head of the Federal Security Agency, himself; Mr. Rector, head of the organization in the States, himself; and the President of the United States, himself, in 1939—all declaring themselves in favor of consolidation and unity, and with the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], advocate of economy and efficiency, pointing out repeatedly today the fact that thi reorganization plan will not save a single dollar, will not result in the dismissal of a single employee, and totally disregards the contemplated 25 percent of saving, I ask whether there is any reason why this plan should be put into effect.

It seeems to me that section 1 obviously violates the principles of consolidation and unity upon which the Reorganization Act itself, enacted last year or thereabouts, was and is based.

I pointed out earlier this afternoon that not only is this reorganization plan fatally defective, in my judgment, from the standpoint of section 1, but that section 2, which undertakes—whether successfully or not—to transfer to the Secretary of Labor the functions vested in the Wage and Hour Division, is likewise unwise because of the fact that with respect to matters with which not only labor is concerned but with which management is concerned, it would undertake to vest authority in an agency which by the provisions of a Federal statute is a guardian along labor lines only.

The Congress has recognized the fact that the Wage and Hour Administration Division is an independent agency. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 14, 1938, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], a Member of this great body, said:

> With the powers of the administrative agency so limited, we decided to set up, in place of the administrative board provided in the Senate bill, an independent Administrator in the Labor Department.

And so he has been. He has been appointed by the President, he has been confirmed by the Senate, he has reported to the Congress, and has not been subordinate to the guardian in the interests of labor alone. So I say that section 2 is unwise.

It is also unwise for the further and practical reason that it disturbs and introduces into the portal-to-portal legislation conditions of the greatest uncertainty. The Congress passed the Portal-to-Portal Act in order to assure the public that reliance could be had upon the administrative rulings and practices of the Wage and Hour Administrator with respect to matters relating to the Fair Labor Standards Act. We made that provision in the Portal-to-Portal Act, which was the subject of great discussion and profound consideration. But now it is proposed that by this section we undertake to transfer these very functions from the Wage and Hour Administrator to the Secretary of Labor, and that immediately raises the question whether there will remain any official upon whose rulings in regard to such matters and practices anyone can rely with safety. But now the Secretary of Labor injects a further note of uncertainty, when he takes the position that the functions are not transferred.

Certainly this reorganization plan undertakes to introduce a tremendous amount of uncertainty into legislation involving billions of dollars of the people of this Nation. There is no showing of any great need for the adoption of this reorganization plan. The House of Representatives by voice vote on June 10 of this year repudiated it. I say that no affirmative reason why it should be adopted has been shown.

Mr. President, in view of the facts indicated by the senior Senator from Virginia—the evidence that not one dollar will be saved, that not a single employee will be dismissed, and that there is a total disregard of the idea of a 25 percent saving—and in view of the further fact that the proposed plan would inject into our economy the gravest of legal uncertainties, so that a business man could no longer rely upon the rulings under the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947, I submit that the plan should be rejected.

Mr. President, I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry. House Concurrent Resolution 49 reads:

> That the Congress does not favor the Reorganization Plan No. 2 of May 1, 1947, transmitted to Congress by the President on the first day of May 1947.

My inquiry is this: Does one who desires to vote for the reorganization plan vote "nay" upon this concurrence resolution, and does one who desires to vote against the President's plan vote "yea" on the resolution?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Senators who are opposed to the plan will vote "yea." Senators who are in favor of the plan will vote "nay."

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

The question is on the adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 49.

Mr. DONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	O'Daniel
Ball	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Holland	Overton
Bricker	Ives	Pepper
Brooks	Jenner	Reed
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Va.
Butler	Kilgore	Robertson, Wyo.
Byrd	Knowland	Russell
Capper	Langer	Saltonstall
Chavez	Lodge	Smith
Connally	Lucas	Sparkman
Cooper	McCarran	Stewart
Cordon	McCarthy	Taft
Donnell	McClellan	Taylor
Downey	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Dworshak	McGrath	Tydings
Ecton	McKellar	Umstead
Ellender	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Magnuson	Watkins
Flanders	Malone	Wherry
Fulbright	Martin	White
Green	Millikin	Wiley
Gurney	Moore	Williams
Hatch	Morse	Wilson
Hawkes	Murray	Young
Hayden	Myers	
Hickenlooper	O'Conor	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to House Concurrent Resolution 49.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. As I understand the situation, in view of the adverse report of the committee on the House concurrent resolution, those who favor the President's Reorganization Plan No. 2 will vote "nay" when the roll is called?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, may I supplement that by saying that those who desire to oppose the President's plan will vote "yea." Is that correct?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct. The Chair will summarize the situation. Senators who are opposed to the reorganization plan will vote "yea." Senators who are in favor of the plan will vote "nay." The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REED (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. On this vote I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and will vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], who is necessarily absent, is paired with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK]. The Senator from Indiana, if present and voting, would vote "yea" and the Senator from South Carolina, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], who is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. The Senator from Washington, if present and voting, would vote "yea," and the Senator from New York, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], who is absent by leave of the Senate, is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], who is absent by leave of the Senate on official business. The Senator from Missouri, if present and voting, would vote "yea" and the Senator from Minnesota, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who is necessarily absent, is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. The Senator from New Hampshire, if present and voting, would vote "yea," and the Senator from Mississippi, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is necessarily absent, and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness in his family.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], who is absent on public business, is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. If present and voting the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay" and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], who is absent on public business, is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay," and the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea."

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], who is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference at Geneva, Switzerland, would vote "nay" if present.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is absent because of illness, has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. The transfer of that pair to the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] has been previously announced by the Senator from Kansas. If present, the Senator from New York would vote "nay," and the Senator from Washington would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 40, as follows:

YEAS—42

Bricker	Hawkes	Reed
Brooks	Hickenlooper	Revercomb
Buck	Hoey	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Holland	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Ives	Saltonstall
Byrd	Jenner	Smith
Capper	Lodge	Taft
Cooper	McCarran	Vandenberg
Cordon	McCarthy	Watkins
Donnell	Malone	Wherry
Dworshak	Martin	White
Ecton	Millikin	Wiley
Ferguson	Moore	Williams
Gurney	O'Daniel	Wilson

NAYS—40

Aiken	Johnston, S. C.	O'Conor
Ball	Kilgore	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Knowland	Overton
Chavez	Langer	Pepper
Connally	Lucas	Russell
Downey	McClellan	Sparkman
Ellender	McFarland	Stewart
Flanders	McGrath	Taylor
Fulbright	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Green	McMahon	Tydings
Hatch	Magnuson	Umstead
Hayden	Morse	Young
Hill	Murray	
Johnson, Colo.	Myers	

NOT VOTING—13

Baldwin	Eastland	Thye
Brewster	George	Tobey
Bridges	Kem	Wagner
Cain	Maybank	
Capehart	Thomas, Utah	

So the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 49) was agreed to.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which House Concurrent Resolution 49 was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I raise a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the statute the Senator's motion is not in order.

THE OIL SITUATION—NOTICE OF HEARING BEFORE PUBLIC LANDS COMMITTEE

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in view of the great importance of oil to the economy and national security of the United States, and in view of the widespread reports of oil shortages at the present time, I wish to announce that the Public Lands Committee has begun an investigation of the oil situation. The investigation is being conducted by the Special National Resources Economic Subcommittee under the chairmanship of the Senator from Nevada, Mr. GEORGE W. MALONE. This committee is continuing the work of the former special Senate Petroleum Committee.

The inquiry will embrace all of the important factors bearing upon the production, refining, and distribution of petroleum and petroleum products. Special attention will be focused upon the differential of costs of production between domestic producers and foreign sources of supply, as well as upon the forces responsible for current shortages of oil-drilling supplies and transportation facilities required for marketing of oil.

Although the war has been over for 2 years, our transportation system seems less capable than it was during the war years of transporting oil to the destinations where it is required.

Leading representatives from all branches of the oil industry, as well as those Government officials responsible for our domestic and foreign petroleum policies, have been invited to appear at the hearings, which will commence on July 14 in the caucus room of the Senate Office Building.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bill and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 715. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for investigatory personnel of the Federal Bureau of Investigation who have rendered at least 20 years of service; and

S. J. Res. 139. Joint resolution to continue for a temporary period of 15 days certain controls now exercised by the President under the Second War Powers Act, 1942, and under the Export Control Act.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3993) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 21) authorizing a change in the enrollment of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 77) providing for membership and participation by the United States in the International Refugee Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the

enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 77) providing for membership and participation by the United States in the International Refugee Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED PROVISION PERTAINING TO AN APPROPRIATION FOR DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE (S. DOC. NO. 71)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an appropriation for the Department of Agriculture in the form of an amendment to the budget for the fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PROTECTION OF THE NATIONAL SECURITY

A letter signed by the Secretary of State, the Secretary of War, the Acting Secretary of the Navy, and the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to protect the national security of the United States by permitting the summary termination of employment of civilian officers and employees of the Departments of State, War, and the Navy, and the Atomic Commission, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF PHILIPPINE REHABILITATION ACT

A letter from the Under Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946 in connection with the training of Filipinos as provided for in title III (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

STATEMENT ON PENALTY MAIL

A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a tabulation showing the number of envelopes, labels, and other penalty inscribed material on hand and on order June 30, 1946; the number of pieces procured, the estimated mailings, and the estimated cost by departments and agencies for the period July 1, 1946, to March 31, 1947 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Civil Service.

ACTS OF THE LEGISLATURE OF PUERTO RICO

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, two volumes containing the acts of the second and third special sessions and the acts of the third regular session of the Sixteenth Legislature of Puerto Rico (with accompanying volumes); to the Committee on Public Lands.

STATE RURAL REHABILITATION CORPORATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the liquidation of the trusts under the transfer agreements with State rural rehabilitation corporations, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF FOREIGN-TRADE ZONES BOARDS

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Foreign-Trade Zones Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946, together with the annual report of the city of New York covering operations of Foreign-Trade Zone No. 1, during the calendar year 1945 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Finance.

NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the acceptance and use of funds for support of the National Weather Service supplementing the funds appropriated for the operation of the Weather Bureau of the Department of Commerce (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolution 67

"Whereas the amount of tax collected under the Federal Unemployment Insurance Act is considerably in excess of the total amount appropriated for grants-in-aid to the several States and required by such States for the administration of their respective unemployment compensation laws; and

"Whereas the total amount of such tax should properly be returned to the States for administration of their respective unemployment compensation laws and the payment of benefits to unemployed workers: Therefore be it

"*Resolved* (*if the senate concurs*), That the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania hereby respectively memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact the necessary Federal legislation whereby all moneys collected from Pennsylvania employers under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act are returned to the Commonwealth for the administration of the Pennsylvania unemployment compensation law: *Provided*, That any such moneys in excess of the amount required for administration are transferred to the unemployment compensation account for the payment of benefits to unemployed Pennsylvania workers."

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Pennsylvania to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Resolution 27

"Whereas the St. Lawrence seaway and power project will produce no practical benefits for the people of the two countries it is designed to serve; and

"Whereas the General Assembly and the citizens of this State are greatly concerned about the effect the completion of this project would have upon them; and

"Whereas the construction of the project would burden the taxpayers of this Commonwealth and the United States with an initial sum estimated at from $543,000,000 to $1,350,000,000, and experience in similar public works would indicate that this project would cost much more; and

"Whereas existing facilities, the Welland Canal, which bypasses Niagara Falls, and the Great Lakes channels, amply provide for the present lake traffic. The railroads on both sides in the United States and Canada have demonstrated that they are prepared to handle all through traffic offered; and

"Whereas, with its channels closed to navigation for about 5 months of the year due to ice and weather conditions, it would be unreasonable to expect the railroads to perform the required service during the period that navigation is closed and to be in a position to handle the peak load. The railroads would be required to maintain equipment that would be idle or little used for 60 percent of the time and have the added problem of maintaining the personnel organization. Great numbers would have to seek employment elsewhere while tonnage was moved by Government-subsidized competitors. This situation would greatly affect the ports of Erie and Philadelphia; and

"Whereas seagoing boats cannot travel this great distance for nothing and the saving in transportation costs would be exceedingly small if any; and

"Whereas it would be disastrous to Great Lake shipping, injurious to American rail, highway, and inland waterways services, and seriously harmful to the American coal and iron-ore industries; and

"Whereas electrical energy that would be generated could only be used at nearby points, as it has been demonstrated that the cost of transmission over long distances greatly exceeds that generated locally; and

"Whereas such an agreement if ratified would reduce the exportation of manufacturing, mining, and agricultural products of this Commonwealth and result in loss of employment and contribute to increase taxation: Therefore be it

"*Resolved* (*if the senate concurs*), That the General Assembly of Pennsylvania hereby memorializes the Congress of the United States not to approve the agreement for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the chief clerk of the house to the President of the United States, the Presiding Officers of each House of the Congress of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative from Pennsylvania in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Pennsylvania; ordered to lie on the table:

"Resolution 56

"Whereas the United States Marine Corps has been a shining example of faithful and efficient service to our Nation for more than 172 years; and

"Whereas the United States Marine Corps has been a source of strength whenever our Nation has been threatened; and

"Whereas the United States Marine Corps possessed a vision to develop the science of waging amphibious warfare which knowledge permitted our Nation's offensive might to be carried to enemy shores and which proved to be the key to victory in a global war; and

"Whereas 50,872 of the young men of this Commonwealth of Pennsylvania have served our Nation during World War II in the United States Marine Corps; and

"Whereas the United States Marine Corps is threatened with extinction if the merger bill now pending in the Congress of the

United States is passed in its present form; and

"Whereas the abolition of the United States Marine Corps would be a disastrous loss to our Nation: Therefore be it

"*Resolved (if the senate concurs)*, That the existence of the United States Marine Corps be assured by amendment to any merger bill such amendment specifically providing that the United States Marine Corps shall continue to serve as our Nation's amphibious troops and as a force in instant readiness to protect our Nation; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the house of representatives is hereby directed to forward certified copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President pro tempore of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Secretary of the Navy, the Commandant of the United States Marine Corps, and members of the congressional delegation from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania."

A petition of the Arizona-United States of America Cancer Cure Society, signed by James O. McDowell, founder, and Hugh R. Carson, director, Bisbee, Ariz., relating to the cure for cancer; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BUTLER:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Finance:

"Legislative Resolution 22

"Resolution on development and administration of the assistance programs

"Whereas in the administration of the social program for assistance to the aged, the blind, and dependent children, each State has its own peculiar problems; and

"Whereas such State administration is often hampered and made more expensive by general rules formulated by the Federal Government and required to be carried out as a condition for receiving Federal aid; and

"Whereas more efficient and economical administration could be obtained if the several States were given greater authority in developing and administering the assistance program and conforming same to the special needs of each individual State: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the sixtieth session of the Nebraska State Legislature:*

"1. That the Council of State Governments, by and through its appropriate agencies, seek to obtain from the Congress of the United States modification of Federal legislation to the end that greater autonomy may be given to the several States in the development and administration of the assistance programs.

"2. That a copy of this resolution duly certified, be sent by the clerk of the legislature to the director of the Council of State Governments, and to each of the Members from Nebraska in the Congress of the United States.

"Introduced June 2, 1947, and adopted June 3, 1947."

PROHIBITION AGAINST LIQUOR ADVERTISING

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a letter from Rev. Herbert T. Punchard, of the First Baptist Church of Troy, Pa., informing me of the action of his church endorsing S. 265, which would prohibit interstate advertising of liquor products, and urging its enactment into law. I ask unanimous consent to present the letter, and request that it be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was received, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It is self-evident that any people engaged in business for profit will do all they can to encourage greater use of their product. In a free country any business contributing to the well-being of the people should have equal access with all others to all sources of advertising and distribution.

However, we do not believe this is true of the manufacture and distribution of alcoholic beverages. The facts by now should be clear to any informed mind that drinking results in physical, mental, moral, social, and economic harm. When the health and well-being of the people is at stake we cannot consent that those making the product responsible for this condition should be unrestrained in their efforts to increase the use of their product through the use of advertising mediums such as newspapers, magazines, and radio. It is one thing to tolerate the use of that product by addicts; it is quite another thing to give the makers of it the right to come into every home and encourage and educate for wider use of the product, by advertising directly aimed at the home and at youth.

Therefore, we, the Bradford Baptist Association of Bradford County, Pa., an affiliate of the Pennsylvania Baptist Convention and of the Northern Baptist Convention, in annual session, do hereby unanimously endorse bill S. 265, which would prohibit interstate advertising of liquor products, and we urge its enactment into law.

Respectfully yours,
HERBERT T. PUNCHARD,
Clerk, Bradford Baptist Association, Pennsylvania.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WHITE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

H. R. 599. A bill declaring Kenduskeag Stream, Penobscot County, Maine, to be a nonnavigable waterway; without amendment (Rept. No. 398);

H. R. 3333. A bill to authorize the transfer of the *Joseph Conrad* to the Marine Historical Association of Mystic, Conn., for museum and youth-training purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 399); and

S. Con. Res. 14. Concurrent resolution favoring a fair representation of American small businessmen on policy-making bodies created by Executive appointment; without amendment (Rept. No. 405).

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 959. A bill to amend section 3179 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code; without amendment (Rept. No. 401);

H. R. 1945. A bill to amend sections 2801 (e) (4), 3043 (a), 3044 (b), and 3045 of the Internal Revenue Code; without amendment (Rept. No. 402); and

H. R. 1946. A bill to amend section 2801 (e) of the Internal Revenue Code; without amendment (Rept. No. 403).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. Res. 120. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary, in making investigations under section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, to employ temporary assistants and make certain expenditures; without amendment (Rept. No. 404); and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 3—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I ask unanimous consent to report adversely the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 51) against adoption of Reorganization Plan No. 3 of May 27, 1947, and I submit a report (No. 400) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received, and the concurrent resolution will be placed on the calendar.

OWNERSHIP AND USE OF DANGEROUS WEAPONS—REQUEST TO PRESIDENT FOR RETURN OF H. R. 493

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit an original concurrent resolution, for which I request immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be read.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 22) was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, requested to return to the House of Representatives the enrolled bill (H. R. 493) to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia," approved July 8, 1932 (sec. 22, 3204 D. C. Code, 1940 ed.); that if and when the said bill is returned by the President, the action of the Presiding Officers of the two Houses in signing the said bill be deemed to be rescinded; and that the House engrossed bill be returned to the Senate.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, the need for this resolution is occasioned by a mistake which was made when House bill 493 was sent to the President. An amendment which was offered by the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and agreed to in the Senate, was not transmitted to the House with the bill, and therefore the House had no opportunity to act upon the Senate amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Delaware?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 22) was considered and agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 1530. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 1531. A bill to repeal section 404 (c) of the Nationality Act of 1940 and to provide that no person shall have lost his nationality thereunder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 1532. A bill to provide that bonds issued under the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 shall be negotiable, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1533. A bill for the relief of Ernest J. Jenkins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. MAYBANK):

S. 1534. A bill to establish a Savannah Valley Authority to provide for unified water control and resource development in the

basin of the Savannah River in the interest of the control and prevention of floods, the promotion of navigation, and the strengthening of the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 1535. A bill providing for the sale of the Trask homes housing project in Tillamook, Oreg.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McGRATH:

S. 1536. A bill to provide for the appointment of the Superintendent of Metropolitan Police of the District of Columbia by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(Mr. FLANDERS (for himself and Mr. BALDWIN) introduced Senate bill 1537, to increase the rate of compensation of heads and assistant heads of executive departments and of other officers, which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service, and appears under a separate heading.)

COMPENSATION OF HEADS AND ASSISTANT HEADS OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to increase the rate of compensation of heads and assistant heads of executive departments and of other officers. I request that a statement prepared by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] and myself may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1537) to increase the rate of compensation of heads and assistant heads of excutive departments and of other officers, introduced by Mr. FLANDERS (for himself and Mr. BALDWIN), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

The statement presented by Mr. FLANDERS (for himself and Mr. BALDWIN) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR RALPH E. FLANDERS, OF VERMONT, AND SENATOR RAYMOND E. BALDWIN, OF CONNECTICUT, ON A BILL TO INCREASE THE RATE OF COMPENSATION OF HEADS AND ASSISTANT HEADS OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS AND OF CERTAIN OTHER OFFICERS

In our efforts to secure better management and resulting economies in the executive branch, we must recognize that good management requires competent men to serve as the heads and assistant heads of our Government departments and agencies. One of the major considerations in recruiting and retaining capable men to manage any business, including Government, is the salary paid for the job to be done. Private industry has always recognized this fact and has paid what are in many cases exorbitant salaries to their top executives. The Federal Government must compete with private industry for competent management people. Although it is out of the question for the Government to pay the high salaries paid by industry for these people, the least the Government should do is to pay salaries for its executive positions which will allow people of high caliber to accept appointments to them without undue financial sacrifice.

All of us know of many competent administrators who have left the Government service to enter private business because they could not afford to continue their service with the Government.

The pay bills passed by the Congress in 1945 and 1946 provided substantial increases in pay for the Government employees in the less responsible positions. In approving these bills, Congress has passed over the people who, together with the Congress, are responsible for the management of the Government. The effect of these pay bills has been to compress the salary rates of the lower categories against the present $10,000 ceiling, giving pay increases to all employees except those responsible for the management of the departments and agencies. This does not make good sense. We all know that it is costing each of us more to live and maintain our homes today than it did before the war. It costs these men more, too, to maintain a reasonable standard of living at a level which they must maintain without going backwards.

The last session of Congress did take action to raise the salaries of some Federal officials. The salaries of the Members of Congress were increased $2,500 and in addition, a $2,500 tax-exempt expense allowance was provided; the salaries of the judiciary were raise, each Federal judge receiving a $5,000 pay increase; and the pay of the Foreign Service officers of the State Department was increased substantially, including pay of the highest-paid ambassadors. So it appears that the Congress has recognized in certain specific instances the fact that its highest-paid executives are not being paid enough.

The situation regarding the pay of our executives in the Federal Government is serious. So serious that many Members of the Congress have commented upon it on the floors of both the House and the Senate. This Government cannot afford to lose men like Dean Acheson and Harold Smith. Men of their caliber and ability to serve the Nation in the Government are already too few. The recruitment of such men should not be made impossible because of the low salaries paid by the Federal Government.

Our Government is the largest business in the world. Practically all of the agencies in our Government have programs which require them to be as large in size and their operations as complex in character as those of our largest private industries. To manage these programs efficiently requires the best management people we can hire and train. But to get and keep these people we must pay salaries more in keeping with the responsibilities involved.

We are introducing a bill that should go a long way in correcting the present salary situation for heads and assistant heads of executive departments and certain other Federal officers. The bill provides the basic compensation of the head of each executive department, the Cabinet, shall be $20,000; each under secretary of executive departments, the Solicitor General of the Department of Justice, and the Assistant to the Attorney General, $17,500; each assistant secretary of executive departments, Assistant Attorney General and Assistant Postmaster General, $15,000. The bill provides that the basic compensation of the head of each independent board or commission or other independent agency will be $17,500, or $15,000, or $12,500 per annum, to be determined by the President. The rate of compensation of other members of such boards or commissions, and the assistant heads of other independent establishments and agencies, are to be fixed at the next lower rate.

This bill would affect the compensation of 172 Federal officials within the executive branch. The estimated total cost of this increase is $653,065.

The attached table provides additional data:

List of heads and assistant heads of agencies within the executive branch, in connection with suggested schedules of rates of compensation

Department and position	Present			Proposed	
	Number	Salary	Total cost	Salary	Total cost
Executive Office of the President:					
Bureau of the Budget			$20,000		$32,500
Director	1	$10,000		$17,500	
Assistant Director	1	10,000		15,000	
Council of Economic Advisers			45,000		45,000
Members:					
Chairman	1	15,000		15,000	
Members	2	15,000		15,000	
Office of Philippine Alien Property Administration			10,000		12,500
Administrator	1	10,000		12,500	
War Assets Administration			21,975		32,500
Administrator	1	12,000		17,500	
Associate Administrator	1	9,975		15,000	
Departments:					
Agriculture			35,000		52,500
Secretary	1	15,000		20,000	
Under Secretary	1	10,000		17,500	
Assistant Secretary	1	10,000		15,000	
Commerce			35,000		52,500
Secretary	1	15,000		20,000	
Under Secretary	1	10,000		17,500	
Assistant Secretary	1	10,000		15,000	
Civil Aeronautics Board			50,000		65,000
Board members:					
Chairman	1	10,000		15,000	
Members	4	10,000		12,500	
Departments—Continued					
Interior			$45,000		$67,500
Secretary	1	$15,000		$20,000	
Under Secretary	1	10,000		17,500	
Assistant Secretaries	2	10,000		15,000	
Justice			85,000		130,000
Attorney General	1	15,000		20,000	
Assistant to Attorney General	1	10,000		17,500	
Solicitor General	1	10,000		17,500	
Assistant Attornies General	5	10,000		15,000	
Labor			55,000		82,500
Secretary	1	15,000		20,000	
Under Secretary	1	10,000		17,500	
Assistant Secretaries	3	10,000		15,000	
Navy			45,000		67,500
Secretary	1	15,000		20,000	
Under Secretary	1	10,000		17,500	
Assistant Secretaries	2	10,000		15,000	
Post Office			55,000		80,000
Postmaster General	1	15,000		20,000	
Assistant Postmasters General	4	10,000		15,000	
State			97,000		145,000
Secretary	1	15,000		20,000	
Under Secretary	1	12,000		17,500	
Under Secretary	1	10,000		17,500	
Assistant Secretaries	6	10,000		15,000	

List of heads and assistant heads of agencies within the executive branch, in connection with suggested schedules of rates of compensation—Continued

Department and position	Present			Proposed	
	Number	Salary	Total cost	Salary	Total cost
Departments—Continued					
Treasury			$55,000		$82,500
Secretary	1	$15,000		$20,000	
Under Secretary	1	10,000		17,500	
Fiscal Assistant Secretary	1	10,000		15,000	
Assistant Secretaries	2	10,000		15,000	
War			45,000		67,500
Secretary	1	15,000		20,000	
Under Secretary	1	10,000		17,500	
Assistant Secretaries	2	10,000		15,000	
Panama Canal			10,000		17,500
Governor	1	10,000		17,500	
Independent agencies and establishments:					
Federal Loan Agency			50,000		67,500
Administrator and Chairman of RFC	1	10,000		17,500	
Board members	4	10,000		12,500	
Federal Security Agency			22,000		32,500
Administrator	1	12,000		17,500	
Assistant Administrator	1	10,000		15,000	
Federal Works Agency			22,000		32,500
Administrator	1	12,000		17,500	
Assistant Administrator	1	10,000		15,000	
National Housing Agency			12,000		17,500
Administrator	1	12,000		17,500	
Atomic Energency Commission			77,500		77,500
Chairman	1	17,500		17,500	
Board members	4	15,000		15,000	
Civil Service Commission			30,000		40,000
President	1	10,000		15,000	
Commissioners	2	10,000		12,500	
Export-Import Bank of Washington			45,000		52,500
Chairman and President	1	15,000		15,000	
Directors	3	10,000		12,500	
Federal Communications Commission			70,000		90,000
Chairman	1	10,000		15,000	
Commissioners	6	10,000		12,500	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation			20,000		27,500
Chairman	1	10,000		15,000	
Directors (1 without compensation)	2	10,000		12,500	
Federal Power Commission			50,000		65,000
Commissioners:					
Chairman	1	10,000		15,000	
Commissioners	4	10,000		12,500	
Federal Trade Commission			50,000		65,000
Commissioners:					
Chairman	1	10,000		15,000	
Commissioners	4	10,000		12,500	
General Accounting Office			22,000		32,500
Comptroller General	1	12,000		17,500	
Assistant Comptroller General	1	10,000		15,000	
Interstate Commerce Commission			132,000		140,000
Commissioners:					
Chairman	1	12,000		15,000	
Commissioners	10	12,000		12,500	
Independent agencies and establishments—Continued					
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics			12,000		$15,000
Board members (without compensation)					
Director	1	$12,000		$15,000	
National Archives			10,000		12,500
Archivist	1	10,000		12,500	
National Labor Relations Board			30,000		40,000
Members:					
Chairman	1	10,000		15,000	
Members	2	10,000		12,500	
National Mediation Board			30,000		40,000
Members:					
Chairman	1	10,000		15,000	
Members	2	10,000		12,500	
Office of Housing Expediter			12,000		15,000
Expediter	1	12,000		15,000	
Philippine War Damage Commission			36,000		40,000
Commissioners:					
Chairman	1	12,000		15,000	
Commissioners	2	12,000		12,500	
Railroad Retirement Board			30,000		40,000
Members:					
Chairman	1	10,000		15,000	
Members	2	10,000		12,500	
Securities and Exchange Commission			50,000		65,000
Commissioners:					
Chairman	1	10,000		15,000	
Commissioners	4	10,000		12,500	
Smithsonian Institution			10,000		12,500
Secretary	1	10,000		12,500	
Tariff Commission			60,000		77,500
Commissioners:					
Chairman	1	10,000		15,000	
Commissioners	5	10,000		12,500	
Tennessee Valley Authority			30,000		40,000
Members:					
Chairman	1	10,000		15,000	
Members	2	10,000		12,500	
The Tax Court of the United States			160,000		240,000
Judges	16	10,000		15,000	
United States Maritime Commission			50,000		65,000
Commissioners:					
Chairman	1	10,000		15,000	
Commissioners	4	10,000		12,500	
Veterans' Administration			22,960		32,500
Administrator	1	12,960		17,500	
Executive Assistant Administrator	1	10,000		15,000	
Total	172		1,854,435		2,507,500

INVESTIGATION OF METHODS FOR DECENTRALIZATION OF DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. WILEY. I ask unanimous consent to submit for appropriate reference a resolution providing for a study into the methods for the decentralization of the Department of Agriculture. I request that the text of a statement which I have prepared on the subject may be printed at this point in the RECORD, to be followed by the text of the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the text of a statement will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Wisconsin.

There being no objection, the text of the statement presented by Mr. WILEY was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM WISCONSIN

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTION TO DECENTRALIZE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. President, I have spoken on numerous occasions on this floor on behalf of decentralizing Federal Government departments and agencies.

My reasons for doing so have been to advance the interests of:

(a) National security in this atomic age.

(b) Governmental efficiency.

(c) Economy in government.

(d) Closer relations between government and citizens at the grass roots.

(e) Getting the economic current of Government pay rolls out into the life streams of small communities at the crossroads of America instead of only in Washington, D. C.

DECENTRALIZE AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT

The matter of decentralizing the Department of Agriculture has always been one of my particular concerns. In March 1941, I stated in the Senate:

"There are too many swivel-chair farmers looking after the farmer's interests. We do not need our present great Agriculture Department here in Washington. Why centralize everything here? If the army employed in that building were put back in the sections where it could operate effectively, where the cotton division could get close to the cotton farmer, where the wheat division could get close to the wheat farmer, where the dairy division could get close to the dairy farmer, we might get results."

NEW RESOLUTION

At this time I am introducing a resolution under which the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee, or a subcommittee thereof, would be required to make a study of ways and means for decentralization of the Department of Agriculture. The subcommittee would be required to report back to the Senate within the next 6 months.

I am hoping that the Department of Agriculture might serve as a test case for decentralization, and that the work of the Agriculture Subcommittee might serve as a model for work by all of the other Senate committees along similar lines.

DISPROPORTIONATE NUMBERS IN WASHINGTON

I call attention to the fact that the total number of civilian personnel in the Department of Agriculture as of May 1, 1947, was 81,569. Of this number all but 1,269 served within continental United States. Of the 80,300 within our borders, Washington, D. C., has a total of 11,743.

This may not seem like a large number, but I respectfully submit that it is wholly disproportionate to the amount of work which should rightfully be done in Washington for purposes of integration of the work of the various units of the Department. I invite attention to the fact that, as of January 1, 1947, there was no single State in the Union which had even as much as one-half as many Agriculture employees as are working in Washington, D. C. On that date the following was a break-down of the principal

States in which Department of Agriculture employees were stationed:

Texas	5,290
California	4,178
Illinois	2,947
Georgia	2,293
Louisiana	2,103
Oregon	2,100
New York	2,044
Wisconsin	2,009

All other States had less than 2,000 employees each.

I believe that any Department, particularly one to which is allocated an appropriation such as the House of Representatives has made, of $572,000,000 for the 1948 fiscal year, should be decentralized in order to make sure that every dollar of that amount is spent for the best possible uses in accordance with the needs of America's farm population.

I might note incidentally, that the House approved sum is $232,969,342 below the budget estimate.

NEED TO DECENTRALIZE NOW

It seems to me that now is the most advantageous time for planning the decentralization of the Department of Agriculture. By that I do not only mean decentralizing personnel to field offices, but decentralizing functions and giving field offices maximum possible autonomy, subject to the over-all need for coordination. I believe, for example, as I did in 1941, that there is no reason under the sun why the principal dairy activities of the Department of Agriculture should not be conducted within the great dairy region of the United States—the Middle West—rather than in Washington, D. C., why the principal livestock work should not be done in the livestock region and so on down the line.

FAILURE OF FUNDS TO SERVE FARMERS' NEEDS

For many years, I have been calling attention to the fact that an insignificant proportion of the Department of Agriculture's total funds is actually going for the welfare of the American farmer. I remember, for example, in 1940 that I called attention on the floor of the Senate that the Department of Agriculture was receiving an appropriation of around $1,000,000,000 that year.

At the same time, farmers in my own State of Wisconsin were getting 90 cents to $1.25 per 100 pounds of milk, which cost them from $1.80 to $2.60 to produce. Obviously, the dairy farmers of Wisconsin, like the dairy farmers of other States, were hardly benefiting from the Department's billion-dollar fund.

DEALING WITH SURPLUSES

We are facing challenging times ahead for American agriculture. Although it seems inconceivable now in view of the present world shortage of food, we may shortly be facing critical problems of food surpluses, and have already experienced some problems along this very line. America insists that we shall never again return to the days of plowing under land or killing little pigs. Unfortunately, however, we are destroying potatoes these days, which seems very similar to our folly of years ago.

DAIRY PROBLEMS

June is Dairy Month, and it seems particularly appropriate to call attention to the problems of America's dairy farmers. The so-called parity price formula for dairymen has always worked an inequity on them in view of the fact that, as it is presently computed, the dairy farmer is placed at a disadvantage.

NEED TO REVERSE PARITY FORMULA

I know that the Agriculture Committees of the Senate and House have been doing conscientious work on the planning of a long-range farm program, and it seems to me that the establishing of the dairy price support on a new parity formula, including also farm wages, is in order.

There are those who will claim that this is an inflationary step. These are the same individuals who are protesting against the alleged high prices of dairy products. What they are really protesting against, however, is not the amount of money the farmer is receiving for his dairy items (which is certainly small and a mere pittance compared to the amount that a city laborer receives for his work) but they are protesting against the amount which the public pays after the farmer has received his pittance.

I make these comments, not only in the interest of the 177,000 farmers of Wisconsin, but in the interests of American agriculture which has suffered a terrific loss of population during the wartime years and which needs the most sympathetic understanding of the Federal Government if it is to prosper and flourish in the time up ahead.

The resolution (S. Res. 136), submitted by Mr. WILEY, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to possible methods by which the Department of Agriculture may be further decentralized and the activities of the Department transferred to field offices for purposes of economy, efficiency, national security, and the better and more expeditious handling of the needs of the country's farm population.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report to the Senate, not later than 6 months from the date of adoption of this resolution, the results of the study and investigation, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem desirable.

INVESTIGATION OF IMMIGRATION SYSTEM AND LAWS

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit a resolution on behalf of the Senator from Nevada and myself, for appropriate reference. I wish to state that I realize that it is very important that the State, Justice, and so forth appropriation bill be proceeded with, and for that reason I shall not make any extended remarks at this time on this resolution. The resolution has to do with a complete and thorough inquiry into the immigration situation and the immigration laws of the United States. So I ask that the resolution be appropriately referred. At a later date I shall make further remarks relative to it.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 137), submitted by Mr. REVERCOMB (for himself and Mr. MCCARRAN), was received and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to make a full and complete investigation of our entire immigration system, including, but not limited to, (1) the history and development of our immigration policy; (2) the administration of our immigration and deportation laws, and practices thereunder; (3) the extent, if any, to which aliens have entered the United States in violation or circumvention of such laws, and the extent, if any, to which aliens have been permitted to remain or have remained in the United States in violation or circumvention of such laws; (4) the situation with respect to displaced persons in Europe; and (5) the effect upon this country of any change in the immigration laws.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report its findings to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, together with such recommendations for changes in the immigration and naturalization laws as it may deem advisable.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $———, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, ETC.—AMENDMENT

Mr. MAGNUSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3311) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending July 30, 1948, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

On page 60, line 23, to strike out "$21,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$21,052,000."

APPROPRIATIONS FOR EXECUTIVE OFFICE AND SUNDRY INDEPENDENT EXECUTIVE BUREAUS, ETC.—AMENDMENT

Mr. MURRAY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3839) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 49, line 25, to strike out "$3,100,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$4,776,000, of which $1,676,000 shall be for the acquisition of a site and construction of a regional office building at Helena, Mont."

EXTENSION OF CERTAIN POWERS OF THE PRESIDENT UNDER TITLE III OF THE SECOND WAR POWERS ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1461) to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

TRIBUTES TO THE LATE SENATOR DAVID I. WALSH

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two editorials, one from the Herald-News, of Fall River, Mass., of June 1, 1947, and the other from the Union, of Manchester, New Hampshire, of June 1, 1947, in tribute to the late Senator David I. Walsh, of Massachusetts, which appear in the Appendix.]

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII—LETTER FROM GREGG M. SINCLAIR, PRESIDENT, UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Gregg M. Sinclair, president, University of Hawaii, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ROOSEVELT FAITH—ADDRESS BY JOSEPHUS DANIELS

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Roosevelt Faith," delivered by

Josephus Daniels at the dedication of The Little White House, Warm Springs, Ga., June 25, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICA'S LEADERSHIP FOR FREEDOM AND PEACE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on America's opportunity for leadership in international affairs, broadcast by him over the Columbia Broadcasting System on June 29, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

MAKING DEMOCRACY WORK—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MORSE

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject Making Democracy Work, by Senator MORSE, delivered at the closing session of the Thirty-eighth Annual Conference of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, at the Lincoln Memorial, Washington, D. C., June 29, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

HOW CAN WE HALT THE SPREAD OF RUSSIAN POWER IN EUROPE?—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MORSE

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject How Can We Halt the Spread of Russian Power in Europe? broadcast by him over the Town Meeting of the Air originating at Pueblo, Colo., June 26, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN DEFENSE—RADIO INTERVIEW WITH SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the text of a radio interview between him and Charles Parmer, broadcast on June 29, 1947, from Station WEAM, Arlington, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONGRESS AND LABOR LEGISLATION

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by him on Congress and Labor Legislation, broadcast from Station WOL, Washington, D. C., June 28, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE HALL OF HEROES—COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY DR. FRANK GLENN LANKARD

[Mr. BUSHFIELD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a commencement address entitled "The Hall of Heroes," delivered at Upsala College, East Orange, N. J., on June 7, 1947, by Dr. Frank Glenn Lankard, dean of Brothers College, Drew University, Madison, N. J., which appears in the Appendix.]

HOW CAN WE STRENGTHEN THE AMERICAN FAMILY?—LETTER FROM MRS. E. WYATT PAYNE

[Mr. REVERCOMB asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter written by Mrs. E. Wyatt Payne, of Huntington, W. Va., in the Town Hall's Nation-wide letter-writing contest on the question How Can We Strengthen the American Family? which appears in the Appendix.]

RACE RELATIONS IN NORTH CAROLINA—ARTICLE FROM SHELBY (N. C.) DAILY STAR

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from a recent issue of the Shelby (N. C.) Daily Star relating a story illustrative of race relations in North Carolina, which appears in the Appendix.]

KRUG DISAPPROVES MINING CITY DAM—ARTICLE FROM THE LOUISVILLE COURIER JOURNAL

[Mr. COOPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Krug Disapproves Mining City Dam," from the Louisville Courier-Journal, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTINUATION OF CERTAIN APPROPRIATIONS—MOTION TO RECONSIDER PASSAGE OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 140

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote on the passage of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 140) to temporarily make available certain appropriations for the fiscal year 1948.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion will be entered.

ANTILYNCHING LEGISLATION—CHANGE OF REFERENCE OF S. 1465

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, there was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare Senate bill 1465, for the better assurance of the protection of persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes, which is the antilynching bill, introduced by the Senator from California. Two antilynching bills have already been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be discharged from further consideration of the bill, and that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will be discharged from the further consideration of the bill and it will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONTINUATION OF CERTAIN POWERS OF THE PRESIDENT UNDER TITLE III OF THE SECOND WAR POWERS ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1461) to extend certain powers of the President under title III of the Second War Powers Act.

PERMANENT RATES OF POSTAGE ON FIRST-CLASS MAIL MATTER

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the unfinished business temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to consider House Joint Resolution 221, Calendar No. 407, to provide for permanent rates of postage on mail matter of the first class, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 221), to provide for permanent rates of postage on mail matter of the first class, and for other purposes.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, at midnight tonight, unless the joint resolution is passed, the 3-cent postage rate will expire. If the joint resolution is not passed, there will be an additional deficiency, according to the Postmaster General, of $273,000,000. The joint resolution was unanimously passed by the House and was unanimously reported by the Committee on Civil Service of the Senate. I hope it will be passed by the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY APPROPRIATIONS, 1948

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3311, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3311) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, several Senators have asked what it is contemplated shall be taken up in the Senate immediately after the pending appropriation bill has been acted upon. I think it only fair to announce that the contemplated procedure tomorrow is to consider, in executive session, the nomination of Joe B. Dooley to be United States district judge for the northern district of Texas. If that suggestion meets with the approval of the majority leader and the Senate, we will proceed in that manner. It is hoped the consideration of the appropriation bill will have been concluded by that time.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. In any event, we will proceed with the Dooley nomination tomorrow at noon.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. I thank the majority leader.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Several members of the Committee on the Judiciary are quite interested in the extension of export control. The Export Control Act will expire tonight at midnight.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will read the RECORD, he will find that we extended the Second War Powers Act for

a period of 2 weeks. Consideration of further extension of the Second War Powers Act is now the unfinished business. As soon as the nomination of Joe B. Dooley has been acted on, consideration of the unfinished business will be resumed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is expected that consideration of the unfinished business will be resumed after the Dooley nomination has been acted on?

Mr. WHERRY. I am quite sure that is what will be done.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Second War Powers Act was made the unfinished business without my knowledge, and because I had an understanding that we were to take up the unification bill on Wednesday, and also taking into consideration the 2 weeks extension of the Second War Powers Act, I hope that on Wednesday we can resume the original schedule, and that consideration of the extension of the Second War Powers Act can be temporarily laid aside until we complete action upon the unification bill. I hope that can be done. I had thought that perhaps we might be able to take up the unification bill last week. It is very important to get it out of the way as soon as possible.

I make this statement in view of the statement made by the Senator from Nebraska a moment ago.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am quite sure that the situation will be ironed out satisfactorily. After we have completed consideration of the Dooley nomination—I am not sure how long it will take—I am satisfied that we can conclude consideration of the bill dealing with the extension of the Second War Powers Act and be on schedule for the consideration of the unification bill immediately thereafter. I am satisfied that a satisfactory adjustment can be made.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, as passed by the House of Representatives, the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture would reduce the budget request by about 29 percent, or from $1,188,571,318 to $847,601,976 for the fiscal year.

I know that a great majority of our people want greater economy in Government. I agree with them wholeheartedly, and have consistently advocated cutting Government expenditures. Economy is absolutely essential to the future welfare and economic stability of our Nation. That is why I am interested in cutting down the cost of Government in every way that is possible without hurting or stopping any of the essential services that must be performed.

I have no doubt that many services offered by the Department of Agriculture are no longer necessary, and I believe that there may be considerable duplication and overlapping in administration of such services. I feel it is the duty of Congress to insist on efficient service, and we should demand sound, businesslike methods in this Department.

But I am not in favor of curtailing useful services to the American farmer and rancher. I am not in favor of economy which, in the long run, will cost us more money. I feel strongly that some of the reductions effected by the House should not be sustained by the Senate, and I shall urge that appropriations for certain items be restored to the full amount needed for essential operations.

Conservation of our productive farm lands is, in my opinion, one of the most essential of these services that must be performed. My own State is a great farm State, and I know how erosion can damage the land. I have seen it. It is not pretty. Erosion damage to farm land is not temporary. It leaves its mark on the land for years and generations. It means reduced production. It means nothing good. Everything about erosion is bad. People cannot live and prosper on eroded land. Eroded land provides little food for anyone—either on the farm or in the city.

Twelve years ago Congress called soil erosion a national menace; and nothing has since happened to alter that fact. Erosion today is still a national menace, perhaps more so now than then, because now our lands are suffering from the hard use we made of them during the war. Yes; it was hard use. We put more land under cultivation and kept it under cultivation to produce the food and fiber we needed to help win the war. We had to do it.

The record-breaking production from our farm and range land was not obtained without a price. The price was further exploitation, further damage, to our irreplaceable soil resources. We could not continue such production very long under our present system of farming and maintain our land at the same time.

Half of all the productive farm land of the United States has already been damaged by erosion. The war has served to speed up the rate of that damage. In such a situation, it is only good business sense—good common sense—to take whatever steps are necessary now to slow down the damage and reverse the process. We need to speed up the rate of soil conservation—the kind of conservation work that will be permanent and pay dividends year after year in high production per acre, at low cost, while protecting the land at the same time. We need our farm land; we must have it to continue as a great Nation. In the kind of world we live in nowadays, we must have it—and have enough of it, in good, productive condition—to keep the United States strong and prepared for any emergency.

There is only one way to do this job and do it right. That is by scientific analysis of the land and scientific application of the right combination of conservation measures. We have seen this demonstrated in South Dakota, just as it has been demonstrated in every other State in the country. Halfway measures simply do not work. We have seen that demonstrated, too. Only farm-by-farm and acre-by-acre treatment of the land will ever get this big and vital job done.

The appropriation which was cut most severely by the economy ax of the House of Representatives was the one for the agricultural conservation program. Under the bill, payments to farmers for 1947 would be reduced by about half. No appropriation is indicated for next year.

This is where I think the Congress should do some soul searching. This Nation has embarked upon a program under which we are sending millions of dollars abroad in loans to bring some measure of relief to foreign nations. In this connection, I insist that our first responsibility is to look after the needs of our own people.

Why take money away from American farmers and at the same time give lavishly to others? To my mind, we can best serve world interests by first looking after our own national interests.

We are sending millions of American dollars abroad, and there is serious doubt whether we will ever get our money back. So I submit that it is far more important to look to the conservation of our own national resources.

All during the war, and since the war, farmers have broken one production record after another. Part of the reason why farmers could do this was the conservation practices encouraged by the Government, which in some measure helped hold the line against what could have amounted to absolute soil destruction. The enormous crop production turned out by our farmers, however, could not fail to levy its cost in loss of soil fertility. So it is imperative that action be taken to protect our national economy adequately by bolstering—not weakening—programs which contribute markedly to the welfare and strength of the whole Nation.

Farmers were convinced of the need for soil and water conservation, and so they planned to increase the program practices carried out on their farms this year. Many farmers have gone ahead in carrying out their plans. They did this in good faith, for written large in the Agricultural Appropriation Act of last year was the congressional authorization for the development of a 1947 program amounting to $300,000,000. The Department of Agriculture based its plans on this amount, and farmers were told that they could count on funds this year for conservation assistance from the Government.

Farmers feel—and rightly, I believe—that they have been working under a definite commitment. Many of the program practices are well under way—some of them completed under contracts with earth-moving concerns. In some parts of the country farmers have in effect received full payment for carrying out practices, through grants of lime, fertilizer materials, and services.

If the appropriation for these payments were reduced by half, there would be a very serious problem in planning any sort of equitable distribution of the funds. It might mean attempting to recapture some of the payments already extended to farmers for 1947 practices, which in many instances would simply amount to putting them on the Federal debt register; or else farmers who have not yet received program payments would get much less than 50 cents on the dollar for the practices they have planned to carry out. More than 50 percent of the farm land in my own State is operated by

renters and tenants, and these people must farm for a living. Without help, they cannot always afford to farm the conservation way, in the long-time interests of the Nation.

Nor would farmers be the only one affected by this cut in appropriations. I understand that in South Dakota alone there are 600 contractors who have planned their year's operations on the assumption that the Government conservation program would be carried out as announced. Many of these contractors are veterans, who have assumed debts and taken out GI loans to buy earth-moving equipment, in the assurance that the program would provide business. What of these?

I feel that Congress should restore the full amount to the appropriation for the agricultural-conservation program. I urge you to allow the full $301,720,000 for this phase of work in the Department of Agriculture.

I should like to talk about the Soil Conservation Service, the agency which is charged with providing technical services for this work. As a word of explanation, the entire farm program ties in one with another. The agricultural-conservation program provides payments for service. The Extension Service is doing good work for education of the farmers, but the Soil Conservation Service which also suffered a drastic cut in appropriation—some $6,000,000—by the House of Representatives is the agency which provides the technical men and the know-how to carry on the conservation practices.

The Soil Conservation Service is the agency that goes out on the land with the farmer, into the fields and pastures and helps the farmer work out the best kind of land use and actually apply the right conservation measures on the land to get the job done.

This is not pampering the farmer. It is not providing a kind of luxury service he does not need. The farmer can rarely do this job alone, and in saying that I am not detracting in any way from the ability of our farmers. They are the best on earth. But effective soil conservation is a complex business. To do the job right, the farmer needs expert assistance, right on the ground. Every man in every business needs such expert assistance of one kind or another from time to time. That is what the Soil Conservation Service is providing—scientific assistance in soil conservation, farm by farm and acre by acre.

Once the job is done on a farm, it is done. It does not have to be done over and over again, year after year. If we had had this kind of service 50 or 100 years ago, we would not be faced with a conservation problem today. So if we are going to protect our farm lands against erosion, we do have to get the technicians out there working with the farmers on the land. The sooner we get this job over with, the less it is going to cost—in dollars and in ruined farm land.

The time to do this conservation job is now. We gain nothing by delay, because it must be done sooner or later. The House reduction in funds for the Soil Conservation Service slows down the soil-conservation program. It does not kill it; it does not change its character, or the nature of the work done. It just slows it down. That does not seem to make any sense. Why slow down the only conservation program that is giving us permanent results in protecting our farm lands against erosion?

We have only to glance at the news of the day to realize that more of such conservation practices such as terracing and building dams for erosion and flood control are most urgently needed. The farms of the Nation are the first line of defense in erecting barriers to control the floodwaters now on a rampage throughout the Nation. Surely, it is short-sighted economy not to take every step possible to prevent such destruction.

These programs have a solid record of accomplishment to their credit. And as the conservation movement has gathered force the amounts of practices completed have also increased. For instance, in my own State nearly 10,000,000 cubic yards of earth were moved in constructing dams and reservoirs during 1945, whereas 8,500,000 cubic yards were moved back in 1941; 66,000 linear feet of earth were moved in constructing wells during 1945, and 55,000 feet in 1941; 193,000 acres were seeded on the contour under the 1945 program, compared with 37,000 acres in 1941, 103,000 acres went into contouring intertilled crops in 1945, compared with almost nothing in 1941; 714,000 pounds of seed were used in reseeding pastures, and 84,000 pounds back in 1941.

All of these practices—dams, grass seeding, proper range management, and other types of conservation—do much to prevent excessive run-off of water. With enough of the right kinds of conservation practices, people who have made a study of this subject tell me that these destructive floods can be stopped.

The farmers are ready to go ahead. They have organized more than 1,800 soil-conservation districts throughout all the States of the country. In my own State they have organized 39 districts, covering nearly 18,000,000 acres. They are asking for this technical service. They like it. It does the job. They have learned that they cannot make much conservation progress without it.

Only the Soil Conservation Service is in a position to provide the farmer with the expert help he needs. Only the Congress can put the Soil Conservation Service in a position to meet this demand and do the job all of us really want done.

The House wants to cut the appropriation of the Service by more than $6,000,000. The net effect of such a cut would be to reduce the service to soil-conservation districts to an average 22 percent below what they are getting this year. And it would cut soil-conservation research in half. This is particularly serious, as conservation research is relatively new, and there is still much to learn about conserving our soil and water resources.

For example, we are going to need a great deal of information on soil and water conservation as it relates to irrigation in my own State and the other Plains States. Most of the good irrigation projects in the Mountain States have been built, and the expansion of irrigated lands must come in the Plains States where very little irrigation research has been done. The Soil Conservation Service's Division of Irrigation and Water Conservation Research needs to develop and adapt irrigation-conservation practices and measures to Plains soil, climatic and cropping conditions. We need to know much more about the control of wind erosion. Drainage problems will come with the new irrigated lands. Research needs in my own State are great. The State is assisting and will continue to assist in getting conservation research done. So far as I know, not a single experiment station director in this country has ever claimed that Soil Conservation Service Research duplicated or overlapped that done by his station. On the contrary, experiment station directors have consistently supported Soil Conservation Service Research with lands, equipment, facilities, office help and the like, and have publicly stated that Soil Conservation Service Research, as cooperatively carried on with their stations, supplements and complements State station research.

I said that the average soil-conservation district would have 22 percent less assistance in 1948 than the average district had in 1947. This needs some explanation, since the cut in soil-conservation operations item is only 12½ percent. The difference is accounted for by the increased number of soil-conservation districts. In other words, there is less money to serve more districts. The soil-conservation district governing bodies tell me that they need more assistance rather than less assistance. This is particularly true in my home State of South Dakota where the policy has been to organize relatively small districts and to add to the districts as nearby farmers and ranchers become convinced of their need for soil-conservation assistance and apply for inclusion of their lands within the district boundaries. In the 9-month period, June 15, 1946, to March 15, 1947, South Dakota farmers have added 2,300,000 acres to the district total in 9 districts. Since the beginning of the district program, 36 of the South Dakota districts have added nearly 10,000,000 acres to the district acreage as a result of 70 different additions or a little more than half of the total acres in soil-conservation districts in South Dakota. In addition to explaining why district supervisors say that they need more rather than less funds, I believe that the action of these South Dakota farmers rather effectively answers one of the points made by the House subcommittee in its report on this particular appropriations item. The report states, in discussing this item:

> The committee believes that many of the soil-conservation districts which have been in existence a number of years will be able to get along with materially reduced technical assistance and advice. The advice and assistance given in the initial years of these districts ought not to require repetition year after year, certainly not to the degree such advice was needed in the beginning.

The conservation job cannot be done on the basis of advice. It requires care-

ful farm-by-farm, field-by-field, acre-by-acre analysis of the conservation problems and technical assistance on the land in laying out and applying the needed combination of conservation practices and measures to meet the various problems revealed by the analysis.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield right there for a question?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The report submitted by the House committee would indicate that once soil-conservation practice is established one can go away and leave it, and that is the end of it. That is practically the implication in what they say in cutting down the appropriation for this work. Those of us who know anything about soil conservation know that it must be watched constantly in order to keep it where it belongs. Is not that correct?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The Senator is absolutely correct.

It was to get this specific kind of direct technical assistance that these South Dakota farmers and ranchers asked that their lands be added to existing soil-conservation districts. They had not been sure as the original districts were organized. They had not wanted their lands included in many cases, but after watching the progress within the boundaries of soil-conservation districts and observing the kind of results obtained from having a careful field-by-field job done, they decided they wanted to be included; and, therefore, they asked to be made a part of the soil-conservation districts in their neighborhood. They were not seeking advice, but they seek direct on-the-land assistance in meeting their problems, after being on the outside looking in and deciding that they liked what they saw.

The House cut implies that there is nothing to be gained by speed in doing the conservation job right. In my opinion, the House is wrong in this matter. I believe there is need for speed—not only to protect our farm lands before a great deal more damage is done, but to avoid paying an even higher price for the conservation work in 5, 10, or 20 years from now.

I believe the full amount of the budget estimate for the Soil Conservation Service should be allowed—$43,437,000 for soil-conservation operations and $1,423,000 for soil-conservation research. This is little enough to spend in a year for the protection of our greatest natural resource and the foundation of our agriculture, when we consider that we are spending many, many more millions of dollars for purposes that promise much less return.

As I have demonstrated many times here in Congress, I am vitally interested in the rural-electrification program, and I should like to take a few moments to ask that REA appropriations be returned to a sufficient amount to sustain this program.

The House action has resulted in a 10-percent reduction in REA loan funds—from $250,000,000 to $225,000,000—and a 28.5-percent reduction in the administrative expense item—from $5,600,000 to $4,000,000.

The need for rural electrification in the Nation is very great. As of June 30 last year, only 14.8 percent of the farms in my State had central electrical service. Only one State, North Dakota, has a smaller percentage of its farms electrified. The farm people in my State are most anxious for electricity, and I am most anxious that this service be made available to them. But I have not forgotten the farmers of other States, and I feel that the continuation of REA is essential to the welfare and well-being of our entire agricultural population.

At the present time, REA is striving to place its resources at the disposal of farmers in all sections of the country. With the reduction in the REA staff resulting from the House cut, it will become necessary to make essential departures from the present pattern of loan operations. The reduction in force will tend to divert the bulk of the loan fund to areas where feasibility can be more readily established with a minimum of REA staff assistance. As we know, the extension of rural electrical service in the Dakotas has lagged far behind the rest of the Nation. Lack of rural population density and high-construction costs due to natural factors have hindered progress.

The enactment of the 1944 amendments to the Rural Electrification Act liberalizing REA loan terms, made possible the tremendous advance in the last 2 years. But these gains were achieved only by concentrated effort in the field and here in Washington in assisting farmers to develop their projects. I have witnessed this development in South Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I think the Senator from South Dakota will recall that the farmers themselves asked for far more than the amount allowed in the President's budget, which was $250,000,000.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. YOUNG. And I think the Senator will agree with me that the appropriation of the entire amount of money is necessary if we are to electrify the farms of the United States at a rate needed by farmers, particularly in view of the increased production costs of today.

Also, Mr. President, I should like to know whether the distinguished Senator from South Dakota agrees with me that the farmers deem electrification to be even more important than the modernization of their farms by means of new machinery which they are buying at present very high prices.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. YOUNG. I and I am sure my colleague from North Dakota, Senator LANGER, wish to commend the Senator from South Dakota for his able and timely speech in behalf of increasing these appropriations, which are so necessary for the carrying on of a worthwhile farm program. I have always found you, as a member of the Agriculture Committee, sympathetic and understanding of farmers' problems.

I think the Senator from South Dakota, who is ex officio member of the Appropriations Committee, representing the Agriculture Committee, will agree with me that the opposition to this program has not come from the farmers themselves. Farmers want a continued soil conservation and use program, REA, and other programs with sufficient funds to carry them on. Every major farm organization appeared in favor of this program, and even labor organizations. There were only a few organizations in opposition, notably certain tax groups. But all the farmers and farm organizations were and are in favor of the program.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if there is any problem which should be exempt from any tinge of partisanship, it is the farm problem. I compliment the Senator from South Dakota for the statement he has made to us today.

I was particularly impressed with his statements in regard to the soil-conservation program. I think he will agree that without that program it would have been impossible for our farmers to have made the production of food and fiber which enabled us to fight and win the greatest war in history. However, today, at a time when we are appropriating $11,000,000,000 for national defense, we find that we are quibbling over a very minute sum for soil conservation which will enable the farmers of this country to furnish the food and fiber without which no army or navy could fight or win any war.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Our armed forces could not possibly have won the war without them.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course not. The farmers could not have made that contribution without the land which previously had been conserved or restored by means of the soil-conservation program.

Mr. President, the work in soil conservation is tremendously important. It is as important as any program for the construction of battleships or guns or tanks, because the soil-conservation program results in the conservation of the fertility of the soil of our Nation, thus making it possible for our people to produce the necessary food and fiber.

I congratulate the Senator from South Dakota for his support of the soil-conservation program, and also for his support of the rural-electrification program, and I further congratulate him for his broad-mindedness in saying that he is interested not only in the farmers of his own State, but also in the farmers all over the United States.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to associate myself with the remarks which have just been made by the junior Senator from Georgia, in speaking of the junior Senator from South Dakota. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota is a member of the Agriculture Committee. He knows that in that committee we have listened to testimony, from time to time, on the questions he has been discussing this afternoon.

With respect to the rural-electrification program, which the Senator from South Dakota has been discussing, I maintain that there is nothing more important from the standpoint of the farm wife, who delves in farm drudgery from sunup to sundown, than for her to have the convenience of electrical devices on the farm. So far, the Government has lost no money as a result of the rural electrification program, except a small sum used for administrative costs. The program is self-liquidating; it is conducted only in communities in which the farmers can pay for the electricity.

As I understand the present situation, it is proposed to make a reduction of $25,000,000 in the total amount requested by the President in his budget, but on the other hand it is said that if sufficient applications for the establishment of these various rural cooperatives come in by January 1, we shall then give them, in a deficiency appropriation, this $25,000,000, or even more, if they need it.

But the danger lurking in that kind of a proposition is that at the same time a reduction of over $1,000,000 will be made in the administrative appropriations, on which this program depends. That $1,000,000 is what counts in connection with this rural-electrification program because even if a deficiency appropriation in the amount of an additional $25,000,000 is made within 6 months or a year from now, nevertheless by that time the reduction in administrative appropriations will mean the loss of many valuable technical men who are skilled in doing the job of overseeing and planning this rural-electrification work throughout the Nation.

So I wish to join the Senator from South Dakota in saying to him that when the time comes for the consideration of the further appropriation, he will find me going along with him in regard to everything he has said about this farm program.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, I am very happy to hear the Senator from Illinois say that, because he has been associated with me for several years on the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; and it has been a very pleasant and happy association. There have been little partisan politics in connection with that committee, because the Senator knows, as does every other Senator, that agriculture is the basic industry of America, and that as agriculture goes this Nation goes; and, as a matter of fact, at this particular time as agriculture in America goes, practically the whole world goes.

These problems have been considered, at a time when the Democrats were in power, entirely without partisanship, because they affect the agricultural population as a whole, whether they be Republicans, Democrats, or whatnot. Under the able leadership of the Senator from Kansas, the work of the committee is being handled in just the same way that it was handled under the leadership of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. BUSHFIELD. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. I have been listening very attentively to the Senator's discourse on the subject of the various agricultural problems. He certainly has put his finger on two of the most important things to be considered from that standpoint today, the conservation of soil fertility and the extension of rural electrification. I join in complimenting the Senator upon his splendidly prepared and well-thought-out discourse, which he has not yet concluded. We who have interrupted him and have taken advantage of his courtesy and his kindness are interested, just as is the Senator, in these problems, but I am sure we should refrain from interrupting the Senator.

The conservation of soil in this country, as has been remarked by the Senator and by others who have interrupted him, is of supreme importance. I can think of nothing of greater economic importance to the country. As the Senator has observed, the loss of a large portion of the fertile soil of the Middle West, in Iowa and in other States, through the recent heavy rains and floods, it seems to me simply adds to the problem of the moment. I have been interested in the national soil fertility program called for by a bill introduced by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and other Senators, including myself. I think the soil fertility must be not only maintained, it must be increased. I have forgotten the figures at the moment, but I have understood that each year literally hundreds of thousands of acres become worthless for cultivation for one reason and another, one of the principal reasons being the lack of proper fertilization of the soil, perhaps through lack of knowledge on the part of the farmer cultivating the soil. The soil finally becomes so impoverished that it is absolutely impossible for the farmer and his family to earn a living on it. We had a concrete example of that in my State of Tennessee, in a community in a county near my home, comprising 60 farmers who had been operating small farms. They had completely worn out their land, because each year they had taken from the soil more than they had put back into it. Some years ago a very forward-looking energetic farm agent in that county undertook to work with the community. He found an immediate response. He taught the farmers how to build up their soil to a high state of cultivatability. Today they are producing crops of the finest sort. The farmers' homes are painted. Fences have been rebuilt. Beautiful churches have been built in the community. Of those 60 farmers, several of them have actually been paying income tax for the last few years. But for the increased fertility of the soil, they, indeed, might have been on the verge of accepting charity. Soil fertility is one of the most important things that we, as legislators, can seek to promote. I agree with the Senator, it is not only a short-sighted policy, it is an extremely dangerous policy to fail to appropriate money intelligently and in the right direction, to maintain the soil-fertility program.

Of course, rural electrification follows, without the necessity of elaboration, as one of the essential things for the farmers of this country. We have begun the program; we cannot afford to stop. A few days ago we extended for 2 years the period of time within which copper might be imported into this country, tariff-free. One of the arguments in favor of doing that was that copper ore is highly essential in the manufacture of electric wire and other equipment necessary to extend REA. I think that, during the 2 years when we may expect to receive copper ore from other countries tariff-free, we should take advantage of it. As pointed out by the Senator from North Dakota, the money requested by REA itself was far in excess of the amount set as the limitation in the President's budget, which I believe was in the amount of $250,000,000. I do not remember the amount asked by the President, but the amount requested by REA was considerably in excess of it. I think that the amount asked by REA, assuming it to be reasonable, should be granted. I think we ought to spend all that can be judiciously spent toward extending REA throughout the entire country, not only in the Senator's State and in my State, but in all other States. I think the Senator is making a fine talk.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I thank the Senator for his fine contribution. If the $250,000,000 in loan funds, as requested by the President, were made available, $9,000,000 would probably be made available for electrification in South Dakota in the 1948 fiscal year. This amount would fall short by $2,000,000 of meeting requests on hand and in process in the field. The 28.5 percent cut in administrative funds as specified in the House appropriation bill would make it especially difficult to make loans in the State of South Dakota. Construction progress all over the Nation would be slowed down by about 25 percent if the Senate sustains the House reduction.

It is difficult for me to see at this time how proper assistance can be made available with the few people that would be left for work on power generation and transmission problems. This is a field of great importance in South Dakota and all over the Nation, and the need for assistance will increase as rural lines are extended and the demand for power grows.

There can be no doubt of the merit of the REA program. Since REA began, the percentage of electrified farms has increased from less than 11 percent to about 57 percent; but 2,500,000 farms still lack electric service. The most of those still without electric service are in more sparsely settled and inaccessible areas, making the problem ahead bigger and far more difficult than it has been. Applications for loans have far exceeded the available funds. This reflects the strong demand for electric power by millions of our rural population.

I regard the request for $250,000,000 as the minimum amount necessary to enable borrowers to enter into contractual obligations and continue their progress in extending this essential service to rural people in the most orderly and economical manner.

Most of the REA borrowers are independent, tax-paying, locally owned cooperatives, organized by farmers for the purpose of bringing electric service to themselves. The sound financial condition of these cooperatives is testimony that their operations are managed on a businesslike basis in every sense of the word.

But the REA program is more than a money-lending operation. It brings into the hands of the rural people the power to improve through their own efforts their own welfare as they make their homes more livable and their farms more prosperous.

Can we, as Members of Congress, vote to hinder individual effort on the part of the farmer to provide for his own welfare? Can we, through short-sighted planning, stand in the way of the farmer who is trying to get for himself some of the comforts which we are so proud to speak of as being typical of America?

The farmer's life is not easy. We have continually made demands on him, and he has assumed these obligations with head high and conviction in his heart. He produced more food during the war, with less help than ever before dreamed possible. Did he complain? Did he strike? No, we may be sure he did not.

Is it too much now to ask for a small amount of Federal assistance to improve the lot of this sturdy fellow and his family?

The worth-while REA program demands the support of Congress. I beseech you, Senators, to restore sufficient funds to this appropriation so that the program can go forward and so that our farmers can take advantage of the great industrial progress which has been made available to the city dweller through his having electric power at his fingertips.

If we can contribute billions to the people of foreign nations, we certainly cannot forget the farmer and turn down a request for this relatively small increase in appropriation.

Another item in the appropriation bill about which I feel strongly is the one for crop insurance. As passed by the House, $1,000,000 is recommended for liquidating this program.

Now, this sum is entirely inadequate. About 450,000 crop-insurance contracts are now in force, and potential liabilities run into hundreds of millions of dollars. I ask, how can an operation of this size be supervised with a $1,000,000 fund, and at the same time protect the interests of the Government in any way? This amount would not provide enough even for liquidation, much less for building a sound foundation for any future crop-insurance program Congress may authorize. Experts say that about four times that much would be needed to do any kind of a satisfactory job.

In my opinion, crop insurance can be a vital means of cushioning the blows of bad weather and other blights which farmers cannot avoid. That any such program must be operated according to businesslike, efficient methods goes without saying. But one does not cure a headache by cutting off the patient's head; he finds out what is wrong and tries to correct it. Let us find out what is wrong with crop insurance and correct it. Given a sound foundation, I think crop insurance will work. This is no pious hope. In South Dakota the program has worked just the way it was intended to by Congress. Ever since 1940 the wheat-insurance program in my State has operated in the black, with premiums exceeding losses. These good years have served to offset the very bad crop years of 1939 and 1940, the first two years of the Federal crop insurance program. After 8 years under the program, South Dakota is for all practical purposes even with the board.

But each year some counties, some individual farmers, have lost heavily as a result of drought, excessive moisture, hail, or other unavoidable hazards. No one can say when disastrous years like 1939 and 1940 will return again. Farmers have thought they were building up protection against such catastrophes. Surely the Federal Government would not deny to farmers a measure of protection which is available to all business undertakings. So much for crop insurance.

Another program in which I am interested is that of the Farmers Home Administration. The House took a sizable chunk from the funds requested for the appropriation of this agency. As the bill now stands, direct loans for farm purchases for which 41,000 veterans have applications on file with the Farmers Home Administration would be eliminated. There is also a cut of a third in the funds for farm-operating loans.

Nation-wide demand for farm-purchase loans has developed among veterans who became eligible to participate in the program under section 505b of Public Law 346, the GI bill of rights. Farms purchased under this program must be bought on the basis of their long-time earning capacity.

Veterans across the Nation also have heavily increased the demand for farm-operating loans made to farmers who cannot get credit from private sources. During the first 10 months of the present fiscal year, more than 144,000 applications for new loans were received by Farmers Home Administration, 48,000 of them from veterans. With loan funds exhausted in most States, 11,600 of the veteran applications were still on file, although preference was given to them wherever possible. Not more than 6,500 operating loans can be made under the reduction in operating-loan funds prescribed by House action.

To meet the cut, the Farmers Home Administration is preparing to close 575 county offices and has given dismissal notices to more than 3,400 employees. In South Dakota 18 county offices will be closed. Nationally, the reduced staff will service more than 1,200,000 borrowers whose obligations to the Government total $700,000,000. Part of the Government's security for these loans has come from the assistance in farm and home planning and in on-the-farm guidance toward improved farm practices given borrowers by Farmers Home Administration personnel.

In South Dakota the Farmers Home Administration made 2,137 loans, totaling $3,081,152, during the first 10 months of the present fiscal year. Seventy-two percent of the funds went to veterans. As of April 30, 1,162 applications for loans were on file, 484 of them from veterans.

Direct loans totaling $4,336,538 for the purchase of 539 farms have been made in South Dakota under the program which has been eliminated by House action. Applications on file from veterans alone total 260. Operating loans totaling $78,489,951 have been made in South Dakota, and 473 applications are on file. The bill passed by the House reduces funds for this type of loan to the point that an average of only two new loans per county can be made during the next fiscal year. Almost all of the proposed funds will be needed to meet the credit requirements of present borrowers.

From the figures I have given, it is obvious that farm tenants and the veteran are taking advantage of the funds made available to them. I should like to look to the day when every farm would be home-owned; that is, owned and operated by the same farmer. This would make for a more stable farm economy for very apparent reasons. The Farmers Home Administration is certainly a way to promote this condition.

As I have shown, the veteran, whom we were all worried about getting back on the farm, is using these funds to establish or reestablish himself in agriculture. I think it is the obligation of the Federal Government to continue this program so that our veterans will be given every opportunity to take their places on the farms and ranches of the Nation.

The Farmers Home Administration should be continued, and I ask the Senate's support in adding sufficient funds to sustain an adequate program in this activity.

Now, last but not least, tucked away in the House committee report is an item headed "Bureau of Plant Industry, Soils, and Agricultural Engineering." There is a reduction of $100,000—a relatively small sum when we are used to dealing with millions and billions here in Congress—for soil improvement, management, and irrigation projects.

I have talked with officials in the Department of Agriculture, and they tell me that six dry-land experiment stations will be closed unless this appropriation is allowed. One of them is located in my own State of South Dakota. I am speaking of the Belle Fourche Irrigation and Dry-land Field Station at Newell.

As a citizen of South Dakota, I have watched the work of this station. It was

established in 1906 in an effort to study crop rotation, soil moisture, conduct maximum production tests, meteorological investigations, and also provide facilities for lamb feeding experiments.

The project has been a worth-while one, which has been entirely beneficial to the rancher of western South Dakota. New techniques have been developed. These have been made available to the rancher and dry-land farmer, and they have continually worked to his satisfaction.

I am sure the same is true at the other stations which are to be closed if the appropriation is not allowed.

The sudden closing of the Newell station would result in the loss of much valuable research material, and it would disrupt cooperative arrangements with the State experiment station.

I hardly see how we can justify closing this important project, and I ask that the Senate restore the $100,000 appropriation for soil improvement, management, and irrigation projects.

I have consistently argued for economy, and I have not changed my views. That is the reason I have spoken today. I feel that it would be false economy to abandon the worthwhile farm practices which I have mentioned. Our most valuable natural resource is our soil. Soil fertility is essential to the prosperity of our Nation. It is especially important now that the American farmer has been called upon to feed the nations of the world. If we are going to meet these commitments we must maintain our farm land at its highest level of production.

We must contribute to the welfare of the farmer. Agriculture is our basic industry, and upon it depends the prosperity of the Nation.

It is the obligation of us Members of Congress who are charged with the responsibility of determining the course of events for our Nation to look to this important industry. We must do everything in our power to assure the prosperity of the farmer, for when he prospers, so does the Nation.

We cannot break faith with the farmer by discontinuing the program upon which he has come to depend.

As was reflected in the election last fall, the farmer placed his faith in this Congress. We cannot betray him. I urge the support of Members of the Senate in restoring funds for the activities of the Department of Agriculture which I have mentioned today.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, ETC., APPROPRIATIONS, 1948

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3311) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—Department of State," on page 2, after line 1, to strike out "Office of the Secretary of State" and insert "Department Service."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 7, after the figures "$12,000", to insert "employment of aliens; temporary employment of persons in the United States, without regard to civil service and classification laws (not to exceed $9,000);."

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I move to amend the committee amendment in line 9, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$9,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$20,000."

The succeeding amendments deal with the so-called OIC, and I should like to take this opportunity to make a brief explanation of the changes made by the Senate committee in the bill.

The committee bill makes a net increase of $15,000,000 in the Department of State appropriations. That amount is made up of a one-and-a-half-million-dollar increase in the regular appropriations for the Department; a $500,000 increase for the research and intelligence program; a $700,000 increase for the international activities, which concerns the unscheduled, unforeseeable international conferences which are held; an increase of $1,300,000, in the appropriation for the Inter-American Affairs program; $13,000,000 for the OIC program; and a $500,000 increase in representation allowances. We reduced the funds available for the Philippine rehabilitation by $2,500,000.

The break-down of the $13,000,000 program for the OIC, which the House struck out completely on a point of order, is found on page 3 of the committee report. After conferences with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] I have agreed to accept an amendment to increase that amount by $470,000, which will allow the State Department itself to program its short-wave-broadcast programs to Russia, part of its German program, the oriental program, and some of the Balkan and east European programs. Their estimate as to the personnel required for that purpose totals $470,000. However, it will not permit the $3,000,000 operation which is now going on in New York City. That will be trimmed down considerably, and more of the programing will be contracted.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I am not sure that I heard all that the Senator said. Does this relate to the so-called Voice of America program?

Mr. BALL. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator be good enough to tell me how the amount appropriated compares with the amount requested by the Department of State?

Mr. BALL. As I recall, the request was for about $26,000,000. This year the Department had $9,146,000. $6,000,000 of the increase was for two new relay stations which, in view of the status of the whole program and the fact that it has no authority in law at the present moment, we did not feel we should allow in this year's appropriation. So with the amendment I have proposed, it represents a reduction of a little more than $2,000,000 under what they had this year. That arises from the fact that in the programing activities the State Department now contracts for about half the programing, and does half of it itself.

The half which the State Department does costs about three times as much as what it contracts. With the amount which the Department will have, with a limitation on personal services, the State Department will have to contract a larger percentage of the programing, and will thereby save considerable money, but will still have enough funds to program broadcasts to the critical areas in which it is most interested.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Are we awaiting the expected action of the House of Representatives authorizing this program in some way before we appropriate additional money?

Mr. BALL. No. Under the Reorganization Act, action by the House does not authorize the Senate to include the funds. Later I shall ask to suspend the rule in order to place in the bill language authorizing the State Department to carry on the program.

Mr. PEPPER. What is the total amount available for the Voice of America program?

Mr. BALL. The total amount will be $11,970,000 for operating expenses, plus approximately one and a half million for accrued terminal leave and other liquidation expenses which will be involved in cutting down the program.

Mr. PEPPER. As I understand, the State Department requested $16,000,000.

Mr. BALL. The State Department's request was for $26,000,000.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator tell me why the amount requested by the State Department was not granted?

Mr. BALL. It was not allowed because the witnesses who appeared on behalf of the State Department could not justify that much expenditure. In fact, there seemed grave doubt in my own mind as to whether they even justified as much as we have allowed. But in view of the fact that in the next few months the Foreign Relations Committee will review the whole program and act on permanent legislation, we wanted to keep the essentials of the program alive, particularly the short-wave broadcasting, preserve all the frequencies, and give them enough funds to operate the program about as it is being operated now, with the single exception that the Department will contract a somewhat larger percentage of the programs.

Mr. PEPPER. I should like to say a word on that subject, but I shall wait until the Senator has concluded.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH. I have two main questions which I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, which I shall come to in a few minutes, and some collateral questions; but before

asking those questions I wish to make a brief explanation of my part in this debate at this moment.

The matter of the information and cultural program of the State Department, the so-called Voice of America, apparently has a distinct bearing on our foreign policy. Because of that fact the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. VANDENBERG] appointed the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and myself as a subcommittee of two to check up on the Voice of America program. As the majority member of the subcommittee I was appointed chairman. Immediately on my appointment I conferred with Secretary Marshall at some length and became convinced of the necessity and immediacy of making financial provision for the continuation of the program in some form, at least.

It so happens that in the middle of our checking up on this question the so-called Mundt bill was passed by the House. That bill aims to regularize the procedures in connection with the Voice of America program—and, in fact, the whole information and cultural program—and if possible write legislative authorization for any congressional appropriation.

The Senator from New Mexico and I feel that it is proper to take up the Mundt bill immediately. Hearings will begin on Wednesday of this week, which will last for a few days, to determine whether the time has come for us to place this matter on a legislative basis. Heretofore it has been handled more or less under the discretion of the State Department, under what was supposed to be the authority of the Secretary of State.

We have some questions as to where we are going to be in the development of that important legislative program in the event the appropriation recommended by the committee is approved. Therefore I am raising these questions now.

Let me state briefly that after talking with Secretary Marshall and others, I am convinced that we have the problem of carrying on this program, and that issue is not challenged by anyone.

We are engaged in a war of ideologies. America is being constantly misrepresented and consequently misunderstood. We have a responsibility to give the peoples of the world the truth with regard to what is happening in America. The program which is being carried on by the State Department, and which is about to be legally authorized, should we pass the Mundt bill, involves radio broadcasts, news stories, information for libraries abroad, motion pictures, and exchange of students. I shall not go into a debate at this moment as to the merits of those steps, except to say that it is felt that a program along this line is vital at this time, in the light of the urgency expressed to me by the Secretary of State and also by General Eisenhower. I think we are agreed that we should continue the program.

So the question comes up as to what the appropriation should be for 1947 and 1948 and after we have acted on the appropriation, after we have considered the Mundt bill—whether if we pass that bill we would need additional appropriations for any particular program that might be developed from that legislation. So my first question is this. The State Department, in this connection, put in a budget, as I have the figures, of $31,000,000-plus for 1947 and 1948. They call attention to the fact that in 1947 the expenditures were $19,000,000-plus, so they originally asked for an additional $12,000,000. The Appropriations Committee, as the Senator has just reported, is recommending $13,000,000 plus the $470,000 increase which has just been referred to, making $13,470,000?

Mr. BALL. That is correct. Approximately a million and a half of that amount is for accrued terminal leave and other liquidation expenses which will be involved.

Mr. SMITH. As against that, Secretary Marshall, at my request, sent me an absolute minimum program under which he figured the State Department should carry on its broadcasting, which calls for $16,000,000. So that the issue between the minimum program of the Secretary of State and that of the Appropriations Committee is in the neighborhood of two and a half million dollars. Am I correct in that respect?

Mr. BALL. Yes. That is what the Secretary of State wanted. I say to the Senator that by the method which I am proposing we are giving the State Department what the Secretary requested as the minimum program of broadcasts, which I think is far and away the most essential part of the program. I am not in favor of and would oppose most strongly giving them the other $2,500,000 for the rest of the program which involves motion pictures and all kinds of expensive press service to newspapers and other publications in foreign lands.

Mr. SMITH. I understood that from talking to the Senator before the session this afternoon. But I should like to ask this specific question: If we approve the appropriation of $13,470,000, would it then be possible for those of us who are conducting hearings on the Mundt bill, in the event that bill should be reported out and conceivably passed, and an additional amount should be called for, whether it be what the Secretary is asking for or any other additional amount, between now and July 31, when the Congress will adjourn, will it be possible to bring in a deficiency bill for that difference, assuming that we convince the Senate that such an amount is necessary to carry out the program.

Mr. BALL. It would be possible. I understand that there is a deficiency bill being drafted in the House.

Mr. SMITH. I discussed this question with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and he was of the opinion that if those facts developed in the hearings of the Mundt bill it would be possible to bring in an additional deficiency appropriation between now and the adjournment of Congress.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point for just a moment?

Mr. SMITH. I do not know whether I have the floor. I think the Senator from Minnesota has the floor.

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. On the point which the Senator from New Jersey is now discussing I should like to say that he and I talked with the parliamentary clerk on the question, and we were told that while it would not be strictly a deficiency appropriation, it would be a supplemental request. But there is no reason why a supplemental request of that nature could not be attached to a deficiency bill, is there?

Mr. BALL. No. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH. If the Senator will yield a little further I will come to the second main question, that is, with regard to the whole problem of commercial broadcasting. In connection with my discussion of this point, I want to read from page 3 of the report of the committee, as follows:

> With the one exception of the International Broadcasting Division, the distribution of funds made by the committee as shown above—

Which refers to the table immediately above—

> is tentative and is not to be considered binding on the Department. Should the Department find it necessary, funds may be transferred from one division to another.

In other words, up to that point we are leaving it to the discretion of the Department regarding the fund for one purpose or another purpose. But I now come to this very important paragraph which I quote from page 3 of the committee's report:

> The committee also recommends that not to exceed $687,000—

I pause there a minute, because I understand that the $470,000 which has just been agreed to will be added to that amount. Is that correct?

Mr. BALL. Yes. The amendment has not been offered yet, but it will be at the proper time.

Mr. SMITH. That would make a total amount, if I am correct——

Mr. BALL. Of $1,157,000.

Mr. SMITH. Reading further from the paragraph to which I referred:

> The committee also recommends that not to exceed $687,000 of the funds allocated to the International Broadcasting Division be used for personal services. The committee is of the opinion short-wave broadcasting can be handled more effectively and efficiently by private broadcasters. The limitation is designed to limit the number of employees in this division so as to require the State Department to contract with private broadcasters for the short-wave programing.

I am not questioning the wisdom of that conclusion, but I will ask a question, because the same issue came up in the hearings on the Mundt bill in the House committee, and they handled the matter slightly differently, although they agreed in principle with the position taken by the Senate Committee on Appropriations, from which I have just quoted.

The point which I bring up at this time is this: I consider that a limitation like this in a committee report has the binding effect of legislation. In other words, the State Department could not adopt

any more flexibility than is contained within these limits. If they did not act exactly as laid down here, the appropriation might not be authorized.

Mr. BALL. It does not have the binding effect of legislation; but the departments generally follow recommendations in committee reports. The limitation on the amount that may be spent for personal services, in line 17 on page 3 of the bill, is definitely binding on the Department, and we would require them to contract a somewhat larger percentage of their programing than they now contract.

Mr. SMITH. In the bill itself no reference is made to this mandatory requirement of contracting with private broadcasters. The bill, at page 3, lines 17 to 19, contains this language:

Provided further, That not to exceed $687,000 of the funds—

Which is now raised to a higher figure because of the addition of the $470,000—

allocated to the International Broadcasting Division from this appropriation shall be available for personal services.

That does not say anything about short-wave broadcasting, except that that is all that can be spent for personal services.

Mr. BALL. It has this effect, that if they want to do more programing than they can do within that limitation they will have to contract with somebody to do it; it does not matter with whom they contract.

Mr. SMITH. The question which I should like to raise is simply this: At the time of the hearings in the Mundt bill in the House committee the same issue came up, and the conclusion arrived at, as I understand after talking with Members of the House, was the same conclusion at which the Senator has arrived, that they should contract with commercial concerns for as much of the program as possible. But the language used is slightly different and gave just enough flexibility in case there was some problem which came up which might not be handled without some discretion.

I shall read section 502 of the Mundt bill, which passed the House, and I am asking the Senator from Minnesota whether this kind of language would be as satisfactory to him, should the Mundt bill be passed, and whether, if Congress should pass the Mundt bill, it would supersede the provision in the committee report. After holding hearings on the Mundt bill I do not want to recommend legislation inconsistent with legislation which we have already passed through adopting the committee report. The section of the Mundt bill reads as follows:

In authorizing international information activities under this act—

And that includes more than just short-wave broadcasting—

it is the sense of the Congress (1) that the Secretary shall encourage and facilitate by appropriate means the dissemination abroad of information about the United States by private American individuals and agencies, shall supplement such private information dissemination where necessary, and shall reduce such Government information activities whenever corresponding private information dissemination is found to be adequate; (2) that nothing in this act shall be construed to give the Department a monopoly in the production or sponsorship on the air of short-wave broadcasting programs, or a monopoly in any other medium of information; (3) that the Department shall invite outstanding private leaders of the United States in cultural and informational fields to review and extend advice on the Government's international information activities.

The rest of it has to do with printed matter, which is not quite relevant to this point.

Then, Mr. President, there is another section covering the same point on page 20 of the Mundt bill, section 1006, from which I read:

In carrying out the provisions of this act it shall be the duty of the Secretary to utilize, insofar as is practicable, the services and facilities of private agencies, through contractual arrangements or otherwise. It is the intent of Congress that the Secretary shall encourage participation in carrying out the purposes of this act by the maximum number of different private agencies in each field consistent with the present or potential market for their services in each country.

My question is this: If we favorably report this bill and if it carries these provisions, will that be satisfactory to the Appropriations Committee, and will it be consistent with this paragraph in the report limiting the use of personnel, and so forth; or would the Senator be willing to say at this time that if we brought that in, it would supersede, because it would be legislation, the paragraph in the report? Do I make myself clear?

Mr. BALL. Yes; and I say that the language the Senator refers to would not supersede the specific limitation in an appropriation bill.

Mr. SMITH. That is what I feared.

Mr. BALL. In other words, we are giving them $1,157,000 of flexibility, which is quite some flexibility.

Mr. SMITH. I understand that; but I wished to know about the limitation.

Mr. BALL. There would have to be specific language in the bill, perhaps repealing this proviso in the appropriation bill. That would be the only way by which it would supersede the language of the appropriation bill.

Mr. SMITH. I thank the Senator; and we shall be guided accordingly in our hearings.

Mr. President, there are several other questions which I should like to ask, because this is an important matter.

First of all, is a large part of the program to be controlled by the private companies?

Mr. BALL. There is no question of having any private company control the broadcasts. The State Department determines the policies and issues the directives and determines what kind of program shall be broadcast—how much news, how much commentary, or what kind of commentary shall go into the program. The State Department is now contracting with the National Broadcasting Co. and with the Columbia Broadcasting System to have them actually prepare the program—in other words, the scripts, music, and so forth.

Mr. SMITH. I assumed that would be the Senator's answer; but the language on page 3 of the report does not clearly set that out, nor does anything in the proposed legislation set it out.

I have some further questions. Is the Secretary of State to control the policy?

Mr. BALL. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. Second, how can commercial programs be coordinated except by central control by the Secretary of State?

Mr. BALL. There would be no way, but the Senator is in error in calling them commercial programs. There is absolutely no profit to be made from such short-wave international broadcasts. The State Department contracts with the networks, or with those with whom it wishes to contract, to actually do the programing—in other words, to prepare the scripts and to broadcast them.

Mr. SMITH. The Senator says that the State Department will prepare the scripts—or does he say that the commercial company will prepare the scripts?

Mr. BALL. The State Department decides the policy and the type of programing it wants, and the contractor does the actual preparation of the script and its broadcasting.

Mr. SMITH. Is that set forth anywhere in the proposed legislation?

Mr. BALL. No; but it is what is meant by "programing."

Mr. SMITH. My next question is: How can the planning and integration of transmitter facilities and the use of frequencies be handled, and how about overseas relay bases?

Mr. BALL. The State Department will run the overseas relay bases. There is sufficient appropriation for that. The State Department now contracts with private companies for the actual broadcasting facilities—in other words, the actual transmitters. All that is now contracted for, and that will continue.

Mr. SMITH. The present practice will be continued; is that correct?

Mr. BALL. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH. The Mundt bill contains very strong provisions for careful screening by the FBI of all employees of the State Department concerned with this program. The question arose in my mind whether we would have the same control over employees of commercial companies who might be concerned with these programs.

Mr. BALL. No; we would not have direct control, but I know of no reason why the State Department could not specify in its contract that the employees engaged in the program should pass a check by the FBI.

Mr. SMITH. The Senator would agree that that should be done?

Mr. BALL. As a matter of fact, it badly needs doing in the present OIC set-up in the State Department.

Mr. SMITH. There is no question about that.

I have this further question: Is the intent of the language on page 3 to retain in the Secretary of State the responsibility and authority for the policy and

supervision of the broadcasts? The answer was, "Yes."

Next, I have the same question in reference to the program planning and coordination. Apparently the answer was "Yes."

Next, the frequencies, facilites, planning, and usage are to be carried on, as the Senator says, the way they have been carried on in connection with the use of these commercial companies.

As to personnel, I understand that the Senator agrees that FBI screening should be done of the personnel, regardless of whether the programs are handled by the State Department or by commercial companies.

Finally, the evaluation and control of programs would be entirely a State Department responsibility, would it? Am I correct in my understanding as to that?

Mr. BALL. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his patience in letting me obtain answers to these questions, because it seems to me they should be a matter of record. They will be a guide to the Senator from New Mexico and myself in the hearings this week on the Mundt bill, in which we are interested because it may give us the necessary guidance for the legislative program which is thought desirable.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. The questions the Senator from New Jersey has asked cover practically all the points I had in mind, with the exception of one, and I think the Senator from Minnesota covered it in the statement he just made. Questions have been asked, he suggested, as to whether under the present bill there is some requirement telling the State Department with whom it should contract, in connection with the matter of private-company contracts. I think the Senator from Minnesota stated a moment ago that the bill contains nothing whatever making any such direction.

Mr. BALL. No; not at all.

Mr. HATCH. Generally, then, insofar as private contracts are concerned, the bill makes no change from the present policies of the State Department, except as to the limitation on personnel within its own right?

Mr. BALL. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Is it correct to say that the amount appropriated is approximately $4,000,000 less than what General Marshall requested?

Mr. BALL. No; it is approximately $2,500,000 less.

Mr. PEPPER. I wish to say that I realize that the committee goes into detail regarding these matters, and I do not suggest the superiority of my own judgment over theirs. But I have always felt that this is a worth-while expenditure for the United States Government to make. When I was a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I did all I could do to support the program, and I have continued to support it. I think a few million dollars spent in this way will do, in good will, probably more than we could do in any other feasible way, and I regard it as false economy to attempt to save $2,000,000 or $3,000,000 if there is a chance that by making that reduction we diminish the effectiveness of the program and the effectiveness of the job we seek to do.

I assume that the State Department must have had some reason for doing the work directly, instead of contracting for it. I do not assume that General Marshall is over there just to spend the money of the United States, and I feel he has been over there long enough now to have some personal responsibility for this program. So, unless they agreed that the diminution in the amount of $2,000,000 would be in the public interest, I do not think we should subscribe to it.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, this whole activity was developed during the war as part of the OWI. At that time it did the whole job, and it has carried on since then without any authority of law. From year to year we have suspended the rule here in the Senate and have given them their appropriations.

From our extended examinations in the committee, we are convinced that they are doing many things that are completely unnecessary and useless. For instance, this year they are spending $3,000,000 on motion pictures, and they are contracting to have approximately 52 documentary shorts on America made, despite the fact that Hollywood is turning out literally scores and scores of motion pictures which they could very easily adapt to their own use. So we thought that expenditure was unjustified.

As I say, as to short-wave broadcasts we preserve their frequency by the amount of appropriation we are allowing; and we preserve the same number of hours of broadcasting, with this addition; and we have given the State Department sufficient funds for personal services to permit the Department itself to program all the broadcasts to the critical areas—Russia and eastern Europe—and to do some of the broadcasts in oriental languages, which they say they want to do themselves, because they are very critical, and that is where the Communist propaganda is stronger, and they wish to upset it.

I think we are giving them sufficient funds to permit of the carrying on of all the essentials of the program until the legislative committees have had a chance really to look into the subject and decide how we wish to handle this program—whether we wish to have it handled directly by the State Department or whether we wish to set up some kind of foundation to do the job. There are many questions involved.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am glad to have this statement by the able Senator from Minnesota. Undoubtedly he has given much thought to it, and so did the committee. Nevertheless, it is a rather serious matter for the Senate and our committees, who have limited time to devote to a study of this subject and to repudiate a program which must be presumed to have been carefully thought out and seriously proposed by a department as responsible as the State Department of this Government. The Senator says that they are going to contract to take special pictures, when Hollywood is making pictures all the time that could be used. Why would not the same argument lead us to say, "Why make any special broadcasts, when the four or five networks of this country are broadcasting programs all the time?" Yet the State Department evidently feels that the ordinary broadcasts that are being used and prepared by the broadcasting systems are not adequate for this purpose, that they do not present the picture of America in the way that we would like to see it presented. It seems to me the same is true about pictures. The pictures that are made in Hollywood are made for profit, by and large. They are not trying to sell America to somebody; they are trying to make money for their stockholders. I do not mean that they are not doing a great job for America; but, as I say, there is a difference in making a film for profit which may have some incidental or direct benefit, of very good quality and very large volume; I say that is one thing. But, to make the kind of picture that we think will show to foreign people the best that there is in America, or at least the true America, may require a specialized kind of film.

Personally, if I had any real chance to vote on this matter, I should be very reluctant to reject the program that General Marshall must have approved and for which he requested funds of the Congress, merely because, in my personal opinion, it might not seem to me to be a good thing. I think the motion picture, especially the talking picture, is an even more effective method of presenting our point of view than the radio. I think I remember that 87 percent of the knowledge we acquire comes through the eye, not through the ear. I am sure that one who saw a picture and heard the dialogue that went along with it would be much more impressed than one who merely heard a radio broadcast. There might, therefore, be very serious room for difference of opinion on this subject. To save two and a half million dollars at the expense of cutting out a material part of a program that means so much in trying to create the right kind of attitude in the world today respecting this country is, in my own opinion, I respectfully submit, a questionable, if not a dangerous, economy.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, to answer a question?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Can the Senator tell me what is included in the $2,500,000 which General Marshall requested and which the committee denied?

Mr. BALL. He did not specify. He wanted this increase. He asked for something more than $470,000. He wanted something for overhead, which we disallowed, in view of what we had already given him for that. He wanted it to

spread among the UNESCO appropriation, various area appropriations, appropriations for press and publications, and all those various activities.

Mr. LUCAS. How did the committee arrive at the reduction of $2,500,000?

Mr. BALL. The original request for operating expenses, as I said, was $26,000,000. After listening to the justification from each of the divisions, we made our own allowance for each of the divisions, then worked with the budget officer of the State Department to determine how much of that went into the department service, and how much went into foreign service. I will say to the Senator that we allowed them the full amount they are spending this year on the Wireless Bulletin, which goes to over 40 missions abroad, and it gives them the texts of important documents. We allowed them $500,000 needed only to publish the magazine America, of which we distribute about 55,000 copies in Russia, and we gave them the same they have this year for the library, which I think made a better case than did any of the other divisions.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator cannot tell me, then, where this $2,500,000 cut was made? As I understand it, it was taken practically from the over-all request.

Mr. BALL. I cannot tell the Senator where General Marshall wanted it restored, or for what specific items, because he talked entirely in generalities when he appeared before the committee.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LODGE in the chair). Does the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. All I know is that we cut back from the budget requests made by the various divisons of OIC. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH. I may say, in answer to the question by the Senator from Illinois, that at my request Secretary Marshall sent me a budget comparison of the actual expenditures in 1947, broken down under the different headings, and his minimum budget for 1948. It occurs to me in the light of having received those figures, and in the light of the colloquy which has just taken place between the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Minnesota, these matters should be shown in the RECORD. They show the reduction that was brought about in personnel, which was one of the matters that concerns the Department.

I am not defending the large personnel they have had in 1947, which is 2,852, but the minimum they request is 2,412. That covers both foreign personnel and those employed at home. The committee proposal apparently would cut that down very substantially. I am not sure that the figures on that, which I have here, are correct, but apparently there is a big cut, probably down to somewhere around 1,000. I think it is well worth while for us to have in the RECORD comparative figures. My reason for raising the point before is that, if we substantiate these figures in our hearings on the Mundt bill, I want to come back to the Senate and ask for the increase Secretary Marshall requested. I think the door ought to be open, even though we approve this appropriation today, to come back for the difference, because I agree with the distinguished Senators from Illinois and from Florida that the Secretary of State has the responsibility, and when he says these are the minimum, bedrock figures, I find myself in the position of defending him and saying that we ought to take those figures and not go below them. But, as I said to the Senator from Minnesota, I do not want to complicate this matter by having to work over a difference of two or three million dollars, as long as I can be assured that when we come back with assurances that the additional amount is needed, we can open up the question.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from New Jersey for those figures. It seems rather strange to me that, when a Senator is seeking information upon the break-down of $2,500,000, the Senator from New Jersey, who is not a member of the Appropriations Committee, comes up with the figures.

The Senator from New Jersey could get a complete break-down from General Marshall. The Senator from Minnesota tells us that General Marshall testified in general terms, giving no break-down at all. I do not quite understand why the Appropriations Committee could not get figures to show definitely where Secretary Marshall wants to use this money, rather than merely obtaining generalities, as the Senator from Minnesota states.

Mr. SMITH. I did not mean in any way to suggest that the Appropriations Committee did not get all this information.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not suggest anything, either; I am merely asking for information, which I have to get from the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH. I asked the Secretary of State if he would give me a break-down of the different headings under which the money was wanted, the number of employees under each heading, and what the effect would be of the committee's proposal. I received figures which led to a grand total for the minimum budget, under the Secretary of State's testimony, of $15,772,000, which is approximately the $16,000,000 that he was asking for, and a grand total of 2,412 employees, both overseas and at home. Those are the figures I wanted for my satisfaction. I did not urge that in the form of an amendment today only because this week the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and I are to conduct hearings on the Mundt bill, which raises exactly the same issues. We hope to come back with more intelligent recommendations than we could give on a cursory examination, or on just the first presentation of the figures.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand the Senator is in this debate only because of the fact that he and the Senator from New Mexico are to hold hearings on the Mundt bill, which has passed the House.

Mr. SMITH. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. May I inquire of the Senator whether or not General Marshall's figures show precisely where the cut took place?

Mr. SMITH. The table which Secretary Marshall sent me has a third column which is called the "Ball proposal," but that was the original suggestion by the Appropriations Committee, and I did not include it because it is not quite accurate. It arrives at a total of only about $10,000,000, whereas by the final figures, I understand the Senator from Minnesota comes to a total of about $11,000,000, before adding the extra $1,500,000 for the liquidation expenses.

Mr. BALL. Approximately $12,000,000.

Mr. SMITH. Approximately $12,000,000. I did not think it fair to put in these figures as against the Senator from Minnesota because they were not accurate as to what his proposal had been under the committee report, but I think for the purpose of the RECORD, I will ask that in connection with my immediate remarks, the table I have be inserted in the RECORD at this point merely as giving the break-down, so we shall have it before us.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OIC budget comparison

DEPARTMENTAL

Unit	1947		1948	
	Number	Actual expenditures	Number	Minimum budget
Director's Office (Administration)	58	$432,847	40	$275,000
UNESCO	25	----------	25	150,000
Inter-American Cooperative program	20	77,808	21	78,000
Overseas program supervision	116	718,382	75	521,000
Libraries and institutes	64	442,879	60	400,000
Exchange of persons	69	352,794	70	348,000
Motion pictures	54	2,703,313	30	1,400,000
Press and publications	113	1,458,217	60	1,000,000
Broadcasting	494	7,792,856	491	5,450,000
Total United States	1,013	13,979,096	872	9,622,000

FOREIGN SERVICE

Radio	45	$700,000	37	$650,000
Other	294	5,533,142	290	5,500,000
Total	339	6,233,142	327	6,150,000
Grand total	------	20,212,238	------	15,772,000

PERSONNEL SITUATION

	1947 actual	1948 minimum	Committee proposals
Overseas:			
Americans	339	327	131
Aliens	1,500	1,213	400
Total	1,839	1,540	531
Departmental and foreign service:			
Americans	1,352	1,119	387
Aliens	1,500	1,213	400
Total	2,852	2,412	787

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I merely want to make one final observation on this appropriation. I am of the firm belief that this is one of the most important appropriation items that can come before the United States Senate. I do not believe that we can afford to spend a tremendous amount of money in helping re-

habilitate any country in Europe unless we accompany that appropriation with the right type of American propaganda. I believe that when we talk about saving $1,000,000 or $2,000,000 through an appropriation of this character it is false economy. I, for one, am willing to take the viewpoint and the understanding of Gen. George Marshall, now Secretary of State, upon a question that involves a foreign policy, rather than the judgment of the Appropriations Committee upon a matter of this kind. A request is made for a break-down of the $15,000,000, or whatever amount it was that General Marshall requested. The break-down apparently cannot be obtained from the evidence that was submitted before the Appropriations Committee. It seems to me that we should have a line of evidence that would give to the Senate the exact amount of money Secretary Marshall desires upon each particular item of the total of $15,000,000 or $16,000,000 requested by him. The able Senator from Minnesota said that Secretary Marshall came before the committee and in general terms stated that he wanted this amount of money, but apparently without submitting budgetary estimates of the individual items.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like very briefly to support what the Senator from Minnesota has said. I was not present at all the meetings of the subcommittee, but I was present at both meetings at which Secretary Marshall testified. As the Senator from Minnesota said, he did not go into details with respect to the figures at any time, but he emphasized in his second appearance that the matter he considered important was the continuation of the broadcasting program under the charge of the State Department. The money proposed to be placed in the bill by the amendments to be offered by the Senator from Minnesota covers, as I understand, what is necessary so that the program which is now being carried on may be continued for 50 hours a week. The Mundt bill had passed the House just before the Senate Appropriations Committee acted on this appropriation measure. I personally voted for the amount as it is now submitted, without the language amendment, of course. That amendment has my approval.

The thought is that if the Mundt bill passes the Senate and becomes law, automatically we can put back into the appropriation the amount of money that is necessary to carry on what we legally authorize the State Department to do. At the present time, until the legislative amendment to be offered by the Senator from Minnesota is inserted in the bill there is nothing the State Department legally can do. It requires a two-thirds vote to put in the bill the amendment the Senator from Minnesota shall offer. It seems to me that since Secretary Marshall said the broadcasting was the important thing, we should make provision for it, and then after proper hearings by the Committee on Foreign Relations a bill be reported giving the State Department instructions as to what we believed is the right thing to do. Then we can later provide the money that is necessary to carry out the work. That is the basis on which I voted for the bill. I agree with what the Senator from Illinois has said in its entirety, but I believe the present appropriation covers what Secretary Marshall wants, so far as the broadcasting feature is concerned, and, as he emphasized, that is the important thing.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Massachusetts that that is probably the important item. But we are working here upon the contingency, apparently, that the Senate will pass the Mundt bill, and that a request will then be made for additional appropriations which are necessary to carry on this work. I do not believe we can legislate in any such manner.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the Senate does not pass the Mundt bill, then centainly the additional money should not be included, because the State Department has included it up to the present time as a war emergency. It will be necessary to pass the legislative amendment today, which is printed on the third page of the bill reported by the committee, by a two-thirds vote.

Mr. LUCAS. How did the Appropriations Committee arrive at the deduction of $2,500,000?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Minnesota will have to answer that question. I take his word for the statement made in his discussion with the State Department officials, that the amount he proposed to insert in the bill will be sufficient to carry on the broadcasting.

Mr. BALL. The two and a half million dollars the Senator from Illinois is talking about was never in the budget estimate. It never came up before the committee. The presentation by Mr. Benton and his associates called for restoration of the full budget estimate of $26,000,000 for operating expenses. After the subcommittee had acted and the full committee had acted and reported out the bill as it now stands, Secretary Marshall came before a special meeting of the full committee and said he would like to have $3,000,000 more. He had no breakdown with him at that time. He simply said he thought that much money was necessary. He had presumably been told by Mr. Benton and his subordinates that they would like that much more. That was the minimum program that came out after the Appropriations Committee had acted.

Mr. LUCAS. I want to say that I am surprised that Secretary Marshall would come before an Appropriations Committee of the United States and ask for $3,000,000 and not be able to tell the Appropriations Committee a single thing that he was asking for in that $3,000,000. That does not square with the General Marshall I know.

Mr. BALL. I was somewhat disappointed myself, because I have very great respect for Secretary Marshall.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In view of what the Senator from Illinois has just said, I believe that, as one member of the Committee on Appropriations, I ought to make a brief statement. Many of us on the committee were not at all satisfied with the action which the committee took from the point of view of the job which confronts the country and the job which should be done. But I am perfectly well satisfied that with the amendment which the Senator from Minnesota is about to offer, the action will be about all that we can expect to obtain. That is for the reason that the House of Representatives allowed not one penny to carry on these international broadcasts. The justification for the action of the House may be based upon the fact that there is no authorization for such an expenditure, and, as the Senator from Minnesota has said, these expenditures in the past have been carried on as wartime expenditures under suspension of the rule.

After the pending bill has been passed, the conferees on the part of the Senate will have to go back to the House conferees and convince them that, though the authorization has not been enacted by both Houses of Congress, this sum, or some similar sum, should be appropriated.

Now with respect to General Marshall. The general was in the position of having had a budget estimate presented to Congress which was ample in all details with a consideration of what was desired to be done from the point of view of the State Department. But he was also confronted with the fact that the House of Representatives had authorized nothing for the item. He was before the Appropriations Committee seeking the most that could be obtained out of the recommendations that had been submitted by the Bureau of the Budget. I want to assure the Senator from Illinois that as one member of the full committee, though not of the subcommittee, who heard the testimony of Secretary Marshall when he came before the committee the second time to urge a larger sum than that which had been allowed, I feel that he lived up completely to the reputation which he has established with Congress over many years of knowing exactly what he desires and exactly what ought to be done. He was in the position of saying, "The Congress is not giving me as much as we ought to have to carry out this program as set forth by the Bureau of the Budget."

Toward the close of his testimony I asked the Secretary a specific question, based upon the considerations which I have just now mentioned, namely, that the House of Representatives made no appropriation at all, and that it may be difficult to get anything there. I asked the Secretary what was the least amount he felt it would be possible to get along with, and it was then that he offered the figure of $16,000,000, and before there was any opportunity to go into detail the meeting of the committee broke up. It was adjourned, and later the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], as a member of the subcommittee dealing with the legislative bill, the Mundt bill, made his inquiries of the Secretary of State, inquiries which had not been made in the committee, and received a clear, specific answer, which is now in the RECORD.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator for that explanation. I was positive in my own mind that that was probably what took place, because, knowing General Marshall as I do, I know that he would not have come before any committee of Congress unless he was prepared. In other words, with respect to any questions that he might have been asked, he could have furnished any information the committee wanted. I have seen him before congressional committees time after time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is not the slightest doubt about that.

Mr. LUCAS. I saw General Marshall before the Pearl Harbor Committee, when they kept him before the committee six straight days, and he did not have any notes, but took care of himself very well.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. He is still measuring up to those standards.

Mr. LUCAS. I simply could not understand how the general would come before the committee and ask for $3,000,000 without knowing what he was talking about. I am glad the able Senator from Wyoming assures me that he did have the information, and had the Appropriations Committee wanted to find out what the $3,000,000 was for, they could have obtained it for the asking.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think it only proper to add that the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], who attended all the meetings, entered into negotiations, after the committee had adjourned, which brought about the proposal for increased appropriation which will be moved presently by the Senator from Minnesota.

I think it ought to be added further that we are facing a condition here. The Senate and the country ought to know the facts that are printed on the back of the daily calendar. This is the 30th of June. It is almost half-past four on the afternoon of the 30th of June. At midnight tonight the Treasury and Post Office Departments will be the only departments in the Government with an appropriation bill passed by both Houses of Congress for the fiscal year beginning tomorrow. There are 12 major appropriation bills, and of those 12, only 1 has passed both Houses of Congress, and upon which the conference report has been approved.

The State, Justice, and Commerce bill which passed the House on May 15, and was received in the Senate on May 16, was reported to the Senate on June 24. The committee in charge of the bill had before it many difficult questions, owing to the fact that in each of these departments substantial cuts had been made. I know the Senator from Illinois is particularly interested in the cut that was made with respect to air facilities in the Department of Commerce bill.

Unless we pass this bill, it means only additional delay for the State Department, the Department of Justice, and the Department of Commerce. We are in the position of having to do the best we can with a very bad situation, which results primarily from the fact that these appropriation bills have come to us very late in the session.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate that. Let me ask the able Senator what is going to happen with respect to the thousands of employees on the Federal pay roll if we do not pass these appropriation bills by midnight tonight.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There will be no possibility of paying Federal employees in the field or in Washington, except for those in the Treasury and Post Office Departments, unless we pass a resolution, which I understand is now in preparation in the House. An urgent deficiency bill carried an authorization to the departments to expend ratably the smallest amount that was allowed in either the House or the Senate. To my mind that is an utterly inadequate method of handling this matter. Last Friday the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a resolution which would have gone far toward correcting the difficulty. As I understand, it has been rejected in the House because the House felt that the Senate should not have acted first, should not have done anything about the matter, although the bills have been very slow in coming over here from the House.

Mr. LUCAS. Probably in the Senator's absence, a motion was made to reconsider the resolution which we agreed to on last Friday, with respect to continuing the payment of these employees. A motion to reconsider is now lying on the table. I presume that is done to appease Members of the House.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No doubt it was done for that reason. As the Senator knows, it has been the traditional system for the House to initiate tax bills, because the Constitution so provides, but also to initiate appropriation bills, because that has been the practice. However, the Senate was wholly within its rights in taking the initiative.

Mr. LUCAS. I know that. The surprising thing to me is that the leadership of the majority are continually appeasing the leadership of the House. I do not believe that that was always the case when the Democrats were in power. But every time we get into a "jam" in the United States Senate we find the majority party, with its fine leaders, with all their belligerency and tenacity, letting Members of Congress who are elected for only 2 years compel them to agree on practically everything. I was surprised at my friend from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] today when he asked for reconsideration of the resolution which we agreed to unanimously. Obviously the powers in the House came to him and said, "You must retract, sir," and he did so. Now we shall see whether or not we get a resolution from the House. It is a strange thing the way Members of the majority yield to the House. I served in the House for 4 years, and I do not remember that we had such a complex then. We always looked up to the Senate when I was a Member of the House; but today the Senate is looking up to the House, under the leadership of the majority.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I am particularly grateful for the explanation which was given to the Senate by the Senator from Wyoming. I had intended to make a rather extended address upon the subject of this appropriation. However, in view of his explanation, I shall withhold it until the Mundt bill comes before the Senate for action. Then I hope to join forces with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] in doing everything possible to see that the bill is enacted into law, and that a sufficient appropriation is granted.

If I may take just a moment, I think perhaps I should tell Members of the Senate why I feel as I do. After November of last year I made a trip to Europe. Incidentally, I had the pleasure of being with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who is now presiding over the Senate, on the trip across the ocean. One of my principal reasons for making that trip was to find out how our information program was functioning on the other side. I spent considerable time in the embassies in Paris and London, in personal investigation. What did I learn in Paris? I learned that we had 11 men in all of France, taking care of presenting America's side of the picture. Britain had about 55, and Russia had 1,014.

Let me show the Senate what the result was in connection with a subject in which I am particularly interested, namely, the effective control of weapons of mass destruction. The result was that all over France the Communists had pushed and pushed, and put over the Russian viewpoint upon this great subject. I found to my consternation and disappointment that we had not been successful, as I had hoped we would be, in presenting our viewpoint. Our viewpoint on that subject is so much sounder, so much more right and objective morally, that we should do everything we can to present it to the peoples of the world, because we are rapidly reaching the point where we shall have decisions to make; and it is important, when those decisions are made, that the peoples of the world comprehend why it is that we must take certain courses of action.

Mr. President, that is all I intend to say on the subject today. I shall speak at greater length when the Mundt bill is before the Senate.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, like the Senator from Connecticut, I shall not take time now to discuss many features involved in the information program which I think should be discussed. However, I cannot let the opportunity pass without expressing my own individual view that the appropriation has been curtailed too much. It is my judgment that if any change at all is made, the appropriation should be increased.

But, Mr. President, we in the Senate were faced with a condition under which, when the bill came over from the House, there was not a dollar in the measure for this work. The subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee spent a long time in going into the entire subject and making such investigations and reaching such conclusions as it could. It has recommended a sum of money which in my judgment will make it possible to carry on the program, which,

after all, is most essential, because if no appropriation had been made frequencies would have been lost, personnel would have been disbanded, and the whole program destroyed. Things would have been lost which might never have been recovered.

I am glad the Senate subcommittee and the full Committee on Appropriations have seen fit to do as much as they have done in connection with this measure. I think we should express our appreciation to the committee, for at least the program will continue. As the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] has said—and I wish to emphasize the point again, because it will be of some use in the Department—the provision limiting the funds and enlarging the work by contract will result in no basic change whatever. The Department will continue its supervision and control, as it has exercised such control in the past. The only difference will be in the matter of funds.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and others have expressed the thought that the Mundt bill, upon which hearings will commence next Wednesday, will likely take care of the situation, and that we can come back later with a request for a deficiency or supplemental appropriation.

I wish I could assure the Senate that that is true; but frankness compels me to say that I can give no assurance that the Mundt bill will be passed by the Senate at this session, or that there will be any request for a deficiency or supplemental appropriation. It may be that we shall have to continue to operate with the funds allotted in this particular bill. It is essential that we have this much money. I trust that the measure will shortly pass. Especially I urge that the conferees who are appointed—if there is to be a conference on this bill—stand squarely behind the Senate amendments, so that these appropriations will not be curtailed or reduced in conference.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from New Mexico that to my mind, much more important than the amounts we are to appropriate is the necessity for the State Department to control the broadcasts, and select a board or some individual who can write the proper kind of broadcasts. We are wasting money if we do not have the right kind of broadcasts. They should be dignified, and really reflect the facts with respect to the United States. We should not broadcast great quantities of jazz, hurrah, and trash such as characterize many broadcasts in this country.

I simply wanted to put that thought into the RECORD for whatever influence it might have with the State Department.

Mr. HATCH. I may say to the Senator from Texas that I do not think any persons in the Congress or in the Department of State who are advocates of continuing the program have evinced any satisfaction with programs as they have been broadcast in the past. There may have been much that was bad; I do not know about that; I pass no judgment. I do know that some of us are concerned with the question and hope that the Congress will exercise some authority, and make some investigation and study of the programs, so that in laying down the final and ultimate policy what the Senator from Texas has mentioned will not occur, and that "trash" will not be broadcast from America.

There is one thing which the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] said a moment ago which I think ought now to be made clear. He suggested that our own State Department should have an FBI investigation as to some of the persons employed in this service. Mr. President, I reveal no secret, I am sure, when I say that the FBI is actually now engaged in such an investigation of everyone connected with the activity. That investigation, of course, will be complete and thorough, as investigations conducted by that Bureau have always been.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator for that information. There is something more involved than simply the question of loyalty. A man might be entirely loyal and yet might not have a proper conception of the kind of messages that should be sent to another nation which would truly reflect and exemplify the attitude of Americans on these questions. So my interest is in that larger question, as well as in the loyalty question. Of course, if a man is not loyal he has no business being in the State Department or in any other department. But I do think that the State Department heretofore—perhaps it was because of the leadership of the particular service now being discussed—has not shown a grasp of the importance of the character of the broadcasts which we should send out in order to convey to the rest of the world what American ideals are, what we believe in, and what we are doing for the rest of the world. We should send out broadcasts of that nature, rather than the usual "blah, blah, blah."

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator will yield, I suppose in that connection he would also express the hope that we would not inflict upon foreigners some of the stuff of which we are ourselves victims over the radio in the United States. I shall not give any specific instances of it, but there is much stuff to which we have to listen, and we cruise around all over the dial trying to find a decent program, finally turning off the radio in disgust.

Mr. CONNALLY. I think the Senator should give us a break-down of that.

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall be glad to go into executive session with the Senator from Texas if he is interested.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thoroughly agree with the Senator, and that is probably what has been operating on my mind as to foreign broadcasts. If they are no better than some we have at home we had better not spend a dime on them.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I agree entirely with that statement, but it does not seem to me that in cutting the appropriation to less than half of the estimate we are likely to improve the quality. They must have some money in order to employ people with talent. We cannot expect them to get for so little money anyone with talent.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator that he evidently did not hear what I said when I first rose. I said that regardless of the amount, of much more importance was the quality of the programs we are going to send out.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is some relation between the ability to pay and the quality

Mr. CONNALLY. There is some, yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In addition to that, it seems to me that we have overemphasized the broadcasting feature, perhaps, because of the notoriety given to it in the newspapers. In addition to that, there is the library service and the maintenance of offices for information in the various countries, which I do not think have come in for any criticism of the kind which attaches to the radio programs. That is very important. I think I saw in the newspapers figures regarding the numbers maintained by one society in France. I think there are 1,453 rooms where they maintain information service under the name of the U. S. S. R.-French Friendship Society, whereas our force in France, I think, consisted of 10 people. The amount involved is very small in that field as compared with the amount shown by such a country as Russia, and, I understand, even by England. In her straitened circumstances she expends considerably more money than we do.

I would say that if this program is worth doing at all it should be done in a fair way. I think the amount involved is very small as compared with the amount we are likely to spend in such programs as the Greek and Turkish programs; and I do not know how much may be involved in anything which may come under what is known as the Marshall plan. I think we have been very short-sighted in cutting this program down as much as we have.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not wish to prolong the discussion. I merely rise to associate myself with those Senators who have expressed the hope that when we thoroughly understand this program, when it has been revised to the point where it is really worth while and informative, we shall appropriate enough money to make it effective.

During a recent hearing downtown, which was called by the Secretary of State, at which were present most of the heads of the large broadcasting companies, as were also a number of Senators and Members of the House, there was quite a discussion all the afternoon. It seemed to me that the need for this service was demonstrated beyond all doubt. There would be, and there is, doubt about the extent to which purely entertainment programs should go out under this system. That is where I find some difficulty in coordinating my mind with the kind of entertainment that should go out. Much of it does not truly reflect life in the United States, just as there are many moving pictures which I should not like to have go abroad all over the world as representative of the life of our people. I think there can be a refinement of the service brought about to give to the people whom we are trying to help accurate information not only about our lives, but about the kind of life we under-

take to lead as the disciples of genuine democracy. That is what the object of this service is, it seems to me.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, in line with what the Senator from Arkansas said, take the case of our action in regard to Greece and Turkey. It seems to me that would be a fine subject-matter to call attention to and let the rest of the countries of the world know about, showing that we have no selfish ambitions in those areas, but are trying to aid those nations in protecting themselves and getting on their feet, to restore them and to prevent hunger and misery. That sort of a message going out to the world would do us some good.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree. I happened to be in Greece and in Turkey just about the time that question came up. I was in Greece at the time the Greek-aid bill was being discussed on the floor of the Senate and in the House of Representatives. I was in Turkey also about that time. The strongest effort was being made at that particular time to convince the Greek and Turkish peoples, on the part of some other country—I do not have to name the country, but the ideology, I suppose, is well understood—that our object was to take over the Greek Government and to interfere with the Turkish Government; that it was a selfish motive on our part to use money in order to get control of the Greek Government and of the Turkish Government. There was nothing more strongly needed at that time than an effort to offset and rebut that sort of misinformation which was being fed to the Greek and Turkish peoples. No one could do it except the Government of the United States, and it could do it only through methods that would reach the Greek people and the Turkish people in language which they could understand.

It was unfortunate that that situation arose at a time when an effort was being made to create doubt of the good faith of the United States with respect to our efforts in Greece and Turkey or any other country. It was a very unfortunate effort, it seemed to me, one which did incalculable harm and might have done more if it had been more widespread and had been accepted at its face value. Nevertheless, the need to combat it was, to my mind, demonstrated in Greece and Turkey, and also in France. Although we were not momentarily helping France, the situation which did develop there was one which easily could have lent itself to a total misunderstanding of our motives, ambitions, and desires in respect to the reconstruction of the world. It still exists. The ferment is still there. It is capable of being misdirected and our attitude toward all those countries which we are trying to help, misunderstood.

Mr. VANDENBERG Some of the ferment has come back home.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I know the Senator will recall that in both countries we were told on absolutely reliable information that broadcasts were coming from other countries which were sowing the seeds of suspicion and distrust of us and of our motives, not once a day, but many times daily, in the Turkish and Greek languages; and they were not being offset. Those seeds of suspicion and distrust which were then being sowed and are even now being sowed may bear fruit. We cannot estimate how much fruit they may yet bear. For that reason I want to corroborate everything which the Senator has said, which explains my reason for saying that, if anything, we need to increase our appropriation for the right kind of work along this line.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think I may have called attention to this once before, and I am sure the Senator from New Mexico will corroborate it. When we were in Athens I took it upon myself to gather up one morning a large number of local newspapers printed in the Greek language. The back page of one of them contained nothing but cartoons. There were three cartoons on the back page of that Athens local morning paper depicting the President of the United States in terms of opprobrium. They were insulting to the greatest degree. I was informed in Athens that the plates for those cartoons were not made in Greece; they were made outside of Greece, were sent in, and were used by this local newspaper, which was seeking to whip up some opposition to the United States on the false theory that we were taking advantage of the situation, in our effort to help Greece, in order to get control of Greece. There was no agency in Greece that was in a position to counteract that influence—certainly none in the press and at that time no broadcast calculated to counteract that sort of influence was reaching the Greek people from the United States.

So, in addition to counteracting the radio broadcasting of misinformation from other sources that is poisoning the minds of those people, we need to counteract and offset the publication of falsehoods and misinformation in propaganda in many of the newspapers in other countries.

It may be that we do not have the facilities for offsetting what is contained in the printed word, because we do not have any newspapers in Europe, except for the Paris edition of the Herald Tribune, which is a most excellent newspaper and has a wide circulation. But I do not think there is any newspaper printed in the language of any of those countries that gives our viewpoint and states what we seek to do in the way of reestablishing peace, as well as in establishing political and economic freedom in those countries.

I think that when we have learned all about this problem, we should also enact certain substantive legislation, if our theory is worth anything; for in view of all the money we are spending throughout the world to help restore political freedom, as well as economic freedom, which is inseparably linked with it, we certainly can well afford to spend a little more money in letting the people of those countries know what we are trying to do, and in counteracting the attempts of others who pretend to show that all we seek to do is to establish imperialism throughout the world.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I should like to say that the discussions now going on in Paris only emphasize the importance of a true presentation of our ideas and motives under the so-called Marshall plan; and the Russians certainly will take advantage of our lack of facilities if we do not do something in this field. So the entire situation only emphasizes, in my mind, the growing importance, rather than the lessening importance, of this matter.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I simply wish to add that it seems to me inconsistent on our part to move our money into those countries and at the same time to move our intellectual and psychological influence out.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Certainly that is so.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is the proposition as it appeals to me.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota to the committee amendment on page 2, in line 9.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I should like to have a chance to vote "no." I appreciate the desire to expedite these matters, but I wish to be recorded as having voted "no."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair regrets that the Senator from Florida feels he did not have an opportunity to be recorded. The Chair never seeks to prevent the Senator from Florida from recording his position.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, the amendment we just voted on increases the allowance for the employment of aliens in the CIC from $9,000 to $20,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 2, line 9, as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 2, in line 11, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$26,000" and insert "$30,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$15,000" and insert "$65,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, in line 9, after the word "State", to strike out "$20,000,000" and insert "$30,097,250."

Mr. BALL. To that amendment, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 3, in line 9, it is proposed to strike out "$30,097,250", and insert "$30,567,250."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, in line 17, after "(19 U. S. C. 1354)", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That not to exceed $687,000 of the funds allocated to the International Broadcasting Division from this appropriation shall be available for personal services.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, to that amendment I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 3, in line 17, it is proposed to strike out "$687,000" and insert "$1,157,000."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 22, after the word "for", to strike out "$720,000" and insert "$960,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 2, to insert:

North Atlantic fisheries: For necessary expenses of surveys, discussions, and other preliminary activities incident to the negotiation of an international agreement relating to conservation of the North Atlantic fisheries, $25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Foreign Service", on page 5, line 11, after "title VIII", to strike out "and IX, section 901" and insert "and section 901 of title IX"; on page 7, line 10, after the word "exceed" to strike out "$200,000" and insert "$275,000", and in line 11, before the word "*Provided*", to strike out "$46,830,000" and insert "$49,437,750."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 9, after "(Public Law 724)", to strike out "$7,600,000" and insert "$8,130,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 13, after "(Public Law 724)", to strike out "$500,000" and insert "$1,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 20, after the word "Service", to strike out "$155,000" and insert "$180,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the subhead, on page 10, line 1, after the word "Obligations" to insert "And Activities."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 15, after "(22 U. S. C. 276, 276a)", to strike out "$20,000" and insert "$30,000"; in line 15, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "of which $10,000 shall be expended under the direction of the Speaker of the House of Representatives", and insert "of which $15,000 shall be expended under the direction of the President and the Executive Secretary of the American group"; on page 11, line 17, after "(20 Stat. 714, 43 Stat. 1687)", to strike out "$7,351" and insert "$8,314"; in line 18, after the numerals "1946)", to strike out "$350,000" and insert "$510,000"; in line 21, after the word "Unions", to strike out "$33" and insert "$163"; in line 25, after the figures "$675", to insert "International Geographical Union, $552;"; on page 12, at the beginning of line 1, to strike out "$6,066" and insert "$6,748", and in line 13, after the word "total", to strike out "$3,386,016" and insert "$3,557,661."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 13, line 2, after the word "vehicles", to insert "and purchase of six, including one at not to exceed $3,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 1, after the numerals "111)", to insert "entertainment"; in the same line, after the word "allowances", to strike out "(not to exceed $50,000)"; in line 3, after "(Public Law 724)", to insert "(not to exceed $100,000)"; and in line 4, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out $3,000,000" and insert "$3,700,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 4, before the word "for", to insert "eight."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, after line 11, to insert:

Appropriations for the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, are hereby made available for payment of claims pursuant to part 2 of the Federal Tort Claims Act of 1946, Public Law 601.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 11, after the words "to be", to strike out "necessary; $37,200:" and insert "necessary, $37,200:"; in line 20, after the word "this", to strike out "clause;" and insert "clause,"; and on page 20, line 8, after the word "line", to strike out "clear;" and insert "clear,".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 14, after "(Public Law 600)", to insert "not to exceed $12,000 for entertainment;"; on page 22, line 18, after the numerals "1939" to insert "purchase of six and", and in line 19, after the word "boats", to strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "$4,300,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 24, after the word "aircraft" to insert "purchase of health and accident insurance for trainees (for whom such benefits are not otherwise allowed) while in the United States in pursuance of training programs;"; on page 24, line 7, after the word "trainees", to insert "not to exceed $35,500 for a health-service program as authorized by the act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 658);" ; on page 25, line 4, after the word "Act", to strike out "$42,786,150" and insert "$40,286,150", and in line 6, after the words "in all", to strike out "$45,000,000" and insert "$42,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, after line 23, to insert:

Information and cultural program—Liquidation: To enable the Department of State to meet the necessary expenses incident to the termination, suspension, or curtailment of certain international information and cultural activities, $1,500,000: *Provided,* That the Secretary of State may, in his discretion, transfer the funds herein appropriated to any other appropriation or appropriations under this title for merger with such appropriation or appropriations for the purposes hereof, and such funds shall be available for obligation and expenditure under the authority contained in the appropriation to which transferred.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment, which goes along with the other amendments we have offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to amend the committee amendment, on page 27, line 3, by striking out "$1,500,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,430,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, at this point in the bill I want to offer another amendment which was called to the attention of the committee, after the full committee had reported the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 27, after line 13, it is proposed to insert the following:

The provision of law prescribing the use of vessels of United States registry by any officer or employee of the United States (46 U. S. C. 1241) shall not apply to any travel or transportation of effects payable from funds appropriated, allocated, or transferred to the Secretary of State or the Department of State.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, under existing law, all employees of the United States traveling on appropriated funds must travel in vessels of United States registry. During the war, we suspended that provision in the appropriation bill, because of the extreme shortage of transportation. People going abroad were booked on whatever boat was available, and the State Department informed me, after this bill was reported, that the House acted on the assumption that things were now back to normal. In fact, that is just not true. If this language is not placed in the bill, the State Department will have great difficulty in getting its Foreign Service officers to their posts. They can often get berths on vessels of foreign registry many months ahead of time, when they could not get them on United States vessels.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 21, after "United States", to strike

out the comma and "but such termination shall not affect the right of such officer or employee to seek or accept employment in any other department or agency of the Government if declared eligible for such employment by the United States Civil Service Commission."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I believe that while we are on the State Department appropriations, I should offer two amendments authorizing the Department of State to carry out the OIC program. To do this, it is necessary for me, in accordance with notice given, to move to suspend the rules. I now move to suspend the rules, so that I may offer the first amendment, which is on the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 1, after "1946", it is proposed to insert the following: "acquisition, production and free distribution of informational materials for use in connection with the operation, independently or through individuals, including aliens, or public or private agencies (foreign or domestic), and without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes of an information program outside of the continental United States, including the purchase of radio time (except that funds herein appropriated shall not be used to purchase more than 75 percent of the effective daily broadcasting time from any person or corporation holding an international shortwave broadcasting license from the Federal Communications Commission without the consent of such licensee), and the purchase, rental, construction, improvement, maintenance, and operation of facilities for radio transmission and reception; purchase and presentation of various objects of a cultural nature suitable for presentation (through diplomatic and consular offices) to foreign governments, schools, or other cultural or patriotic organizations, the purchase, rental, distribution, and operation of motion-picture projection equipment and supplies, including rental of halls, hire of motion-picture projector operators, and all other necessary services by contract or otherwise without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes; not to exceed $5,000 for entertainment."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the point.

Mr. CONNALLY. Should not the Chair state that the motion was carried by a two-thirds vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not unless a point of order is raised against it, in the Chair's opinion. The amendment was submitted directly.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thought it necessary to suspend the rules, in order to vote on it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that it is only necessary to suspend the rules in case a point of order is made against the amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. I take it the rule is suspended, then.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the second amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 16, after "(19 U. S. C. 1354)" and before the period, insert the following: "*Provided further*, That notwithstanding the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 665), the Department of State is authorized in making contracts for the use of international short-wave radio stations and facilities, to agree on behalf of the United States to indemnify the owners and operators of said radio stations and facilities from such funds as may be hereafter appropriated for the purpose, against loss or damage on account of injury to persons or property arising from such use of said radio stations and facilities."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota a question before proceeding to the next amendment. There is no amendment on page 29, but under the item for salaries and expenses of the Antitrust Division I notice that the committee has limited the activities of the Antitrust Division so that none of the appropriations may be expended for the establishment and maintenance of permanent regional offices of the Division. There were certain offices set up throughout the country, one in my own city of Seattle, and at several other places, I presume. What is the reason for this provision? Did the State Department request it, or did the committee itself arrive at that decision?

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that the Department of Justice did not ask for any changes in the bill in this item as it came from the House, so the committee did not go into the reason behind that particular limitation. I should assume that if the Department of Justice thought it would be a serious handicap to them, they would have requested us to take it up. The Attorney General did not do that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Is it the understanding of the Senator from Minnesota that, with the words "permanent regional offices" included, if there were a matter requiring the attention of the Antitrust Division on the Pacific coast, say at Los Angeles or Seattle, and it became necessary for the Department of Justice to establish an office there for that particular case, this would be no restriction on that type of establishment?

Mr. BALL. I do not think it would be. I am told the provision has been in the appropriation bill for 2 years.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Department of Justice—Legal Activities and General Administration," on page 30, line 19, after the word "services", to strike out "$2,550,000" and insert "$2,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, after line 9, to strike out:

Pay and expenses of bailiffs: For pay of bailiffs, not exceeding three bailiffs in each court, and meals and lodging for bailiffs or deputy marshals in attendance upon juries when ordered by the court, $230,000: *Provided*, That none of this appropriation shall be used for the pay of bailiffs when deputy marshals or marshals are available for the duties ordinarily executed by bailiffs, the fact of unavailability to be determined by the certificate of the marshal.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota to explain the cutting out of the payment of the expenses of all court bailiffs.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, in another section of the bill on the Judiciary, there is an appropriation, I believe of $320,000 to supply criers for the courts.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Is it the intention to call them criers instead of bailiffs?

Mr. BALL. Apparently that is the idea. That is pursuant to an act passed by Congress, I believe, at the last session, or shortly before that, which gave each court a crier. In view of that, we could not see the necessity for having a bailiff in addition to a crier. Furthermore, the crier is a permanent official of the court on an annual salary, whereas bailiffs, under a very outmoded, antiquated statute, are appointed from day to day, to serve on a per diem basis.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I recall, of course, having had some experience in Federal court when I was United States district attorney, and I know there are many courts in which a crier might be used, where the court sits only 2 or 3 months out of the year, in which case the crier would be paid for doing nothing; whereas, under the bailiff system, a bailiff would be brought in temporarily and paid on a per diem; when the court was not in session, he would not be working. It probably might be all right, if the committee had seen fit to handle it in that way. On what page is the section dealing with the criers?

Mr. BALL. It is under the Judiciary, title IV, on page 70 of the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Was this satisfactory to the Department of Justice?

Mr. BALL. They made no objection to it. It was discussed with one of the assistants to the Attorney General.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Immigration and Naturalization Service," on page 36, line 25, after the word "thereto", to strike out "$27,445,000" and insert "$27,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal Prison System," on page 39, line 10, after the word "livestock", to strike out "$18,750,000" and insert "$18,646,730."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, line 21, after the word "duties", to strike out "$1,430,000" and insert "$1,400,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 8, after the word "sidewalks", to strike out "$1,850,000" and insert "$1,750,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the title that is now under consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 37, line 1, after the word *"Provided"*, it is proposed to insert the following:

That none of the funds appropriated for the Immigration and Naturalization Service shall be used to pay compensation for overtime services other than as provided in the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 (Public Law 106, 79th Cong., 1st sess.), and the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1946 (Public Law 390, 79th Cong., 2d sess.): *Provided further,*

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, the amendment is necessary as the result of recent court decisions which require the Immigration and Naturalization Service under a law, the repeal of which is now being considered by the proper legislative committee, to pay employees of that service, immigration inspectors, who work on Sunday, three days pay for that day, instead of the normal time and a half which is paid to other employees. It is a terrifically expensive item for the departments. At all the ports of entry inspectors must be maintained on Sunday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Minnesota a question? I have not been able to find anything in the bill about the matter I have in mind, but there was a good deal of publicity given to statements that the House had eliminated altogether any appropriation for the employees of secretaries and law clerks for judges. Is that taken care of?

Mr. BALL. It is not in the bill, because there is no law authorizing it. We felt it was safer to offer it as a separate amendment, and I have already given notice that I shall move to suspend the rule so the provision can be placed in the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate that. I have not found anything in the bill covering that item.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title III—Department of Commerce—Office of the Secretary," on page 43, line 17, after "(not exceeding $3,000)" to insert "and not to exceed $1,000 for the entertainment of representatives of other countries by officials of the Department when specifically authorized and approved by the Secretary or the Under Secretary;" and in line 21, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "$800,000" and insert "$944,483."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, after line 4, to insert:

Technical and scientific services: For necessary expenses in the performance of activities and services relating to technological development as an aid to business in the development of foreign and domestic commerce, including all the objects for which the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary", is available (not to exceed $25,000), for services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (Public Law 600), and not to exceed $60,000 for printing and binding, $790,000: *Provided further,* That the Secretary is authorized, upon request of any public or private organization or individual, to reproduce by appropriate process, independently or through any other agency of the Government, any scientific or technical report, document, or descriptive material, foreign or domestic, which has been released for public dissemination, and to sell such reproductions at a price not less than the estimated total cost of reproducing and disseminating same as may be determined by the Secretary, the moneys received from such sale to be deposited in a special account in the Treasury, such account to be available for reimbursing any appropriation which may have borne the expense of such reproduction and dissemination and making refunds to organizations and individuals when entitled thereto.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, line 7, after "(39 U. S. C. 321d)", to strike out "$600,000" and insert "$650,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of the Census", on page 46, line 7, after the word "paper", to strike out "$5,000,000" and insert "$5,845,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the figure in the next line, line 8. I may say that in increasing the total amount for collection of current census statistics we overlooked the limitation which has been placed in the bill by the House, which should be increased by a like amount.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 46, line 8, it is proposed to strike out "$3,800,000" an insert in lieu thereof "$4,645,000."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 47, line 4, after the word "paper", to strike out "$1,200,000" and insert "$1,245,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, line 6, after the word "of", to strike out "Manufacturers" and insert "Manufactures."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Civil Aeronautics Administration", on page 47, line 24, after the word "services", to insert "not to exceed $2,000 for entertainment of representatives of other countries when necessary to the development of civil aeronautics and when authorized and approved by the Administrator;".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in line 9, after the word "aviation" to strike out "$71,081,484", and insert "$72,923,248."

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, the figure "$72,923,248" appears to be the sum of five items appearing on page 4 of the report. One of those items is for operation of CAA aircraft. I notice that the committee has reduced the appropriation figure of the House by $250,000. On that subject, Mr. President, as one who usually favors keeping the figures in appropriations at the lowest possible level, I find myself unable to agree with the able Committee on Appropriations.

The operation of CAA aircraft is definitely a safety measure. If there was a time in the history of our country and in the history of aviation when every step for safety ought to be taken I think it is now. We have had many tragic examples of the wrecking of airplanes and great loss of life.

As I understand, the original budget estimate for operation of CAA aircraft was $2,050,000. The House appropriated $1,750,000, and the Appropriations Committee of the Senate has cut that figure by $250,000, and made the figure $1,500,000.

The CAA aircraft are used, I am advised, to check and correct courses of flight on the regular air routes by the regular air lines, and also the smaller airfields which the regular air lines do not enter. It seems to me to be unwise to take any step that would lessen proper investigation by the Civil Aeronautics Administration. I am hopeful that the proponents of the measure will at least restore the figure to that of the House of Representatives, that is, increase the amount by $250,000, which is not a great sum considering the amount appropriated in the bill.

I am told that the safety men of CAA fly on the main regular transport planes. That is the understanding, I am advised, of the members of the committee. I made inquiry about that, and I am told that the CAA inspectors fly with the pilots of the regular planes upon the regular routes checking what the pilots do from time to time. But there is additional work to be done in safety, Mr. President, rather than fly on the regular planes. They must, as it is called, crisscross a route. They must see whether or not the beams are functioning correctly. They must test them. That cannot be done by flying on a regular passenger plane between two specific points.

As I stated, the CAA investigators are supposed to go into fields where the regular air lines do not go. It seems to me not one thing should be done or one step taken here which would in any way lessen the work of safety upon our air lines.

It will be noted from the report on page 4 that the House cut the Budget estimate a considerable sum, but now the Senate committee comes along and asks us to cut that amount $250,000

more. I urge upon the Senators who sponsor the bill to reconsider that figure and to restore the amount of $250,000, so these CAA safety workers and investigators can carry through their plans of making the kind of investigation they desire to make. I want nothing done that would lessen safety or would mean the taking of any chances on failure of inspections of these air routes. For that reason I rose on this point to ask that the amount of $250,000 be restored, and I hope it may be done with the consent of those who sponsor the bill upon the floor.

Mr. President, unless that is agreeable to the Senator from Minnesota, at this time I offer an amendment, if I may state it orally, that the figure of $72,923,248 be stricken and that in lieu thereof there be inserted $73,173,248, being an addition of $250,000 to be used for the purpose of the operation of CAA aircraft.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, the committee devoted perhaps more time to the CAA items in the bill than to any other single group. We found great difficulty in obtaining from the CAA justifications for some of their expenditures. The main appropriation item for safety enforcement is the enforcement-of-safety-regulations item, for which the House allowed $10,000,000, and the Senate committee proposes $10,000,000. That is an increase of nearly two and one-half million dollars over what they had in the fiscal year 1947, namely, $7,561,000. For the operation of aircraft this year they have $1,665,100. It was the consensus of the committee that they are carrying the flying of their own aircraft to extremes. They now have 226 planes owned by CAA which they fly around the country, including three big four-motored DC planes. We all know how terrifically expensive it is to fly one of these four-motored planes. I will say to the Senator from West Virginia that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], who is a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce investigating safety in the air, appeared before our committee and made this statement in advocating the reduction in the amount of flying in their own planes done by CAA personnel:

> Formerly the CAA inspectors rode on the commercial air liners to test and check. He would get on a commercial air line and ride with the pilot and check out his operation.
>
> Now they do this checking by their own planes, DC-4's and 3's. I have been unable to see why the other means was not quite practical, and why it perhaps was not even more effective, because these checks are on the airplane and the operators and at the same time it checks the operation of the radio and navigation facilities.

Mr. President, I heard nothing in the committee about cross-checking an air navigation radio beam, and I have difficulty in knowing what it would mean.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I made my statement upon information which I secured in answer to inquiry made of those who work with the CAA. This is the statement which was furnished me:

> In checking the operation of the air lines the CAA inspectors do ride in commercial aircraft on a routine time basis.

This is the information furnished me:

> The Federal Airways System, as suggested by the committee, cannot be checked by having inspectors do the checking while riding on commercial air lines. The air lines fly from point to point in as direct a line as possible, and base their revenues on the pounds carried. To check the operation of the Federal Airways System it is necessary that the patrol aircraft circle and crisscross the radio beam or range from all directions to determine its stability and accuracy. Since the air lines maintain a time schedule and fly in straight lines from point to point, it would be clearly impossible for the airways patrol inspectors to perform the necessary checks while riding the commercial air line. Also, the electronics equipment necessary to properly check the airway's facilities exceeds 700 pounds in weight and requires special installation in the aircraft. If this weight were added to the commercial air liner it would either reduce the air line's revenue poundage by that amount or would require an uneconomical payment by the Government to have the additional weight carried.

I can only accept the views of men who are doing this work. They say that in order really to check accurately the beam, which is the great safety instrument for flying, as I understand, they must crisscross and circle it, and in doing so they carry an apparatus which weighs 700 pounds. They point out that it is impracticable to place that equipment on a regular air liner on its regular route to make the check. I am advised that if this reduction is made—this is the claim that is made to me—it will mean less checking.

The argument appeals to me, for the reason that if there is one consideration to which we should give attention, it is safety. If the importance of safety in air transportation has ever been brought home to us and to the American people, it has been within the past few weeks. Of course, the inspectors say, "We fly the regular routes and check the pilots. We check what they do, and we check their lines as best we can, but for real testing we must crisscross and circle the radio beams."

Mr. President, it seems to me little enough to add $250,000 to permit them to carry on this work of safety.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] to the committee amendment on page 48, line 9. (Putting the question.) The "noes" appear to have it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 48, line 9.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota a question with respect to this amendment.

I notice the break-down in the report. I presume that aids to navigation, such as ILS, high intensity light lanes, and all the other aids to navigation, are included in the $72,000,000 amendment which we are now considering. Is that correct?

Mr. BALL. No. That is another item, entitled "Establishment of air navigation facilities."

Mr. MAGNUSON. On what page does that appear?

Mr. BALL. Page 49. What we are now considering is operation and maintenance of the Federal airways.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I shall wait until we reach the next amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 48, line 9.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 49, line 1, after the word "grant", to insert "the construction and furnishing of quarters and related accommodations for officers and employees of the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the Weather Bureau stationed at remote localities not on foreign soil where such accommodations are not otherwise available."

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator in charge of the bill why it was that the committee reduced the item in the House bill from $17,638,000 to $11,109,066. As I understand, this item covers appropriations to aid local authorities which establish airports.

Mr. BALL. No. This is for the establishment of air navigation facilities, providing for new radio beams, instrument landing systems, and ground-control approach and landing systems. As a matter of fact, well over $1,000,000 of the amount which we allow is for building housing for employees of the CAA who are operating these facilities in remote localities, both in the United States and out in the Pacific.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, this is the amendment about which I wished to ask the Senator from Minnesota. I notice from the break-down in the report, on the second page, under item No. 10, that the Alaskan program is completely eliminated. Instead of accepting the House reduction, which was considerably under the budget figure, the committee has eliminated the item entirely. I appreciate that much of it is for housing.

Mr. BALL. The House committee did not specify what it was allowing the funds for. In allocating the reduced amount allowed by the House the CAA itself eliminated the Alaskan program. From what little testimony we could get, most of it, as the Senator says, was for housing. There was very little in the Alaskan program for air navigational aids. In view of all the housing which the Army and Navy has built in Alaska, and which is now available, I assume, since the Army has moved out, and in view of the fact that all the construction crews which were working up there have moved out and the housing is available to CAA and similar agencies, we could not see that the expenditure of

more than $3,000,000 for housing was justified.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I agree with the Senator as to that portion of the appropriation. It probably can be deferred until we find out just what Army and Navy facilities can be used. Perhaps next year the authorities will know which facilities they are going to keep and which they are going to abandon or declare surplus. But I cannot see the necessity of eliminating the intermediate landing fields, the ILS high-intensity light lanes, and other aids for the wholly inadequately staffed Alaskan airports. There will be much flying in Alaska, both military and commercial. The Budget amount for intermediate landing fields is only $209,965. The Budget figure for ILS is $651,000; and the Budget figure for high-intensity light lanes is $203,170. If there is any place in the world where high-intensity light lanes are needed, it is throughout all of Alaska, particularly in the Aleutian area.

Mr. BALL. I may say to the Senator that we allowed the CAA two high-intensity light approach lanes. It can put them wherever it wishes. I assume that it will put them where it thinks the conditions are the worst. The testimony before the committee clearly indicated that, in the first place, high-intensity light lanes are terrifically expensive to maintain. Their consumption of power is tremendous, and they are by no means proved. It has not been demonstrated that by the time a pilot gets down close enough so that the high-intensity lights do him much good, he is entirely out of the woods. It represents a terrific expenditure for a very little additional safety.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I appreciate that this work is in the experimental stage, but all these safety navigational aids are of necessity in the experimental stage. I believe that the money we spent for them will be well spent. I think the Senator from Minnesota will agree with me that allowing the CAA two high-intensity light lanes does not solve the problem. If I know bureaus, I do not suppose that they will place either one of them in Alaska if they can be placed in southern California or Florida to be tested. But the place to test them in is Alaska. There is no better place in the world, and no place where flying conditions are worse.

The same observations are true of the general appropriation for airport landing aids. Instrument landing, of course, is in the research stage. For ILS the budget asked for $4,700,000. The House reduced that figure very substantially, to $2,600,000, which is wholly inadequate for such research. The Senate committee reduced the item still further, by $500,000.

The following statement, as to why the amount was reduced, is the most amazing statement I have ever seen in a report:

> The committee fears that following the installation of a large number of these sets attempts will be made at all-weather flying and the number of accidents will increase.

In other words, we should not continue research in air safety because if we do establish ILS, high-intensity approach lights, and other ground navigation facilities, the pilots will do more flying in bad weather, and therefore we shall have more accidents. It seems to me that that is progress in reverse. There may be some good reason for the action of the committee.

Mr. BALL. Let me say to the Senator that this is not the research program.

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; but it is the practical application of research.

Mr. BALL. It is the establishment of air navigation facilities which presumably are proved. The Bureau of the Budget wanted to install, at 68 airports, both instrument landing systems and ground-control approach. Those are both systems used in helping to land planes when the weather is bad. Both of them are very expensive to maintain once they are installed, and they are very expensive to install. As the Senator well knows, the Army and Navy are both experimenting with different types. The CAA now has approximately 98 ILS systems in operation. As a matter of fact, they are not being used much because very few of the commercial planes yet have the air-borne equipment necessary to use them. The subcommittee felt that the CAA and the Budget Bureau had gone completely hog-wild on installing landing devices. They are not only very expensive to install in the first place, but even more expensive to maintain afterward.

As stated by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], who was chairman of the subcommittee which investigated these accidents and as shown by the record, only approximately 10 percent of the airplane accidents in the past year would have been affected in the slightest degree by this system; and they were the less serious accidents. None of the last three crashes which killed over 150 people would have been averted in the slightest by this system. I think one reason why the air lines have been rather putting on pressure to get these all-weather landing aids is that they want to go in for all-weather flying. As the Senator well knows, when a flight is canceled there is a terrific loss to the commercial air line. When they get into all-weather flying, as they had to do during the war, when most of these devices were developed, the accidents in landing will multiply many times, inevitably, because no kind of a system can eliminate accidents when pilots are trying to land or take off in bad weather.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As the Senator well knows, the fact that the last three accidents might not have been caused by absence of such aids does not mean that in the future the situation may not change. The real problem of air lines is the fact that these aids do not exist in the so-called major airports. What the country needs is not more airports, but better airports, with such improved facilities. Some of them have been proven to some extent. The ILS has not yet been proven. Maybe the budget estimate should have been cut a little, but these devices may be the very things that will some day prove the answer to the prevention of many of these accidents. They cannot increase a great deal because of bad weather. Air lines complete over 98 percent of their schedules. Of course, it costs money to handle a flight, but we still have control of flights through the CAA, through air control-towers, the appropriation for which the House also cut.

Mr. BALL. The item for control towers has been increased.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Over the budget estimate?

Mr. BALL. We even went over the budget estimate. We provided for some additional towers, where the traffic justified it, to be operated by CAA. We have in this country, not including those in Alaska and in the Pacific, 98 instrument-landing systems now in operation. The committee has allowed no more ILS. Ninety-eight are taking care of all the major airports where there are bad weather conditions. We allowed two ground-control approach systems.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Was the action regarding the ground-control systems on the theory that they are not proven yet?

Mr. BALL. They are not entirely proven, as the Senator well knows. They were used by the Army and the Navy during the war, but they are very expensive systems to operate. They involve in the present set-up five maintenance men and operation men on duty 24 hours a day. Mr. Wright testified that they wanted them not as a primary landing aid—they consider the ILS the primary landing aid in bad weather—but merely as a standby in case something happens to ILS. That involves a cost of operation of something over $70,000 a year. It costs $110,000 to install. That struck us as an extremely expensive stand-by equipment which was not justified.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is going to cost us more money unless we properly approach this matter. Perhaps we are going to spend a little more than we need in the matter of air safety. I may be reading the report incorrectly or not reading it completely, but the CAA program for 1948 contemplates the operation of 19 additional towers. Included in that number are those at Baton Rouge, La., Williamsport, Pa., and Texarkana, Tex. I understand that 19 were cut out and 3 were put back. Perhaps I am not reading the report correctly on that.

Mr. BALL. Three more were added on the House floor, as the Senator knows. Since that time CAA itself has abandoned or closed down towers at three airports where the traffic had fallen to less than two or three thousand points of traffic density. We recommended one additional tower where their own report showed far less than 5,000 traffic points, where the CAA itself said there should be at least 7,500 traffic points to justify a control tower. We recommended that that be left out of the new program, and that Baton Rouge, Williamsport, and Texarkana, where the traffic is far less than 7,500 points minimum, be closed, and that five airports be equipped at Willow Run, Detroit, Petersburg, N. J., Muskegon, Mich., Westfield, Mass., and Bedford, Mass., where the traffic points run over 60,000. For some reason they were not in the CAA program.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I want to add just this further comment. I appreciate the problem of the committee and of the CAA in the matter, because it is a new field, and in respect to many of these research and navigation aids the problem is very difficult. But it seems to me that rather than skimp in this matter, which may be so vitally important to the efficiency of both our commercial and military aircraft, we might well have accepted a great deal of what the budget and the CAA asked for, with the exception of the planes. I am not convinced that the United States Government, as to both ground control and ILS, should give the impression that we want no part of this program, because 80 percent of airplane accidents—they may not all be fatalities—occur in landing and taking off.

Mr. BALL. I am sorry, but less than 10 percent of the accidents of record——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Is the Senator speaking about fatalities?

Mr. BALL. No; less than 10 percent of the accidents of record had anything to do with landing and taking off on the regularly scheduled flights.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Many are not reported, but the trouble is always in the airports; that is, failure to make schedules at airports, or inability to get off. One can fly from here to New York and be held up for 2½ hours because of inability to land the plane. The traffic is getting too dense.

I shall not object to this item. I appreciate that there is somewhat of a controversy between the Army, Navy, and CAA as to which system is the best, but I think the committee in the future should give encouragement to these research programs, rather than cut them down.

Mr. BALL. There are 98 systems now either authorized or already in operation, and we allowed for two experimental ones.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. I served on the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which investigated air accidents and studied the problems as to what should be done to bring about maximum safety. There is no intelligent American today who does not appreciate that nothing is more important than to do everything which is right and proper to provide the greatest maximum safety in air travel, if we are to keep our position in the air.

I agree with the Senator from Minnesota that this high-intensity lighting system is wanted by the pilots. They think it is very vital. I think it is their No. 1 request; but in all the evidence which came before our committee there was a vast difference of opinion as to what is the best lighting system. I think it is perfectly proper for us to find out what is the best system, before we permit them to go ahead and install numerous systems throughout the country. What the Senator has said has definitely come before our committee. I think there are 98 installations of ILS completely in effect, or the money is in the hands of the CAA to complete 98 installations?

Mr. BALL. That is correct.

Mr. HAWKES. The Army and the Navy are very strong for it. Some others are not so strong for it.

Mr. BALL. The pilots do not like it at all.

Mr. HAWKES. But that does not prove it is wrong. It simply proves that we have got to find out whether it is right.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I want to ask one question. Recently the Northwest Airlines had authority to make one east-and-west flight, landing at Aberdeen, S. Dak., and I was informed that this bill does not provide for communication systems, radio beam, teletype service on weather, and that sort of information. Can the Senator enlighten me as to whether that will be taken care of?

Mr. BALL. I am not sure whether it is included. We allowed the full amount for new air-communication stations, weather stations, and that sort of thing. There were 13 new airways which have been approved by CAB. We gave them everything they asked for. If this is a new route——

Mr. GURNEY. The service is presently being operated. I just wondered if there were funds enough to allow them to continue.

Mr. BALL. I am informed that the service is already there. I think all they were worried about was the continuance of it.

Mr. GURNEY. Yes; the continuance.

Mr. BALL. That is provided for.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, referring to the appropriation, in total, of $747,885, which has to do, among other things, with the erection of air-control towers, I notice in the committee print that towers are listed at Detroit (Willow Run); Teterboro, N. J.; Muskegon, Mich.; Madison, Wis.; Westfield, Mass.; Pueblo, Colo.; and Salem, Oreg.——

Mr. BALL. I am sorry; the only ones that are included are the five mentioned at the bottom of page 6 of the committee report.

Mr. WHERRY. That list includes Bedford, Mass. Are the others omitted because the budget estimates were not prepared prior to the time when they were submitted? For instance, in the list from which I was reading, No. 16 is Lincoln, Nebr., which is eligible for a tower, for it has more than 7,500 traffic points. Why are the five included in the bill, and the others omitted?

Mr. BALL. Because we had information from the Civil Aeronautics Administration in regard to those five, which are very high in traffic points and are regarded by the CAA as essential to the airway system. But the information on the others did not get in until too late.

I may say there are 15 or 20, I believe, that are above the minimum of 7,500 traffic points which the Civil Aeronautics Administration says merits a control tower. But we had no information, or in some cases only a guess, as to the traffic density at the others, so we did not feel justified in including them at this time.

Mr. WHERRY. The information as to the others came in only after the bill went to the House; is that correct?

Mr. BALL. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Can the Senator inform me whether a later bill will provide a chance for the inclusion of an appropriation for the others?

Mr. BALL. A deficiency bill will come up. Two items are required every time a tower is added: One for the equipment of the tower, and another for its operation and maintenance.

Mr. WHERRY. What would the Senator's suggestion be in the case of the tower at Lincoln, Nebr., now that that airport has qualified?

Mr. BALL. I would suggest that the Senator from Nebraska, and any other Senator who is interested in an airport which he thinks has qualified, first clear the information through the CAA and get the proper figures and a statement of what the CAA thinks about it, and then present that information to the committee.

I think it is very bad procedure to add airports to this program on the floor of the Senate, without having any committee consideration in regard to them.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is there not a controversial item on page 51, relative to Federal aid to airports? I understand there is. So I wonder whether it would meet with the approval of the Senator to pass over the controversial item, which I understand will be brought up by the Senator from Illinois, and pass on the rest of the bill tonight, and then take up that matter for consideration the first thing tomorrow when the Senate convenes?

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, we could continue with the committee amendments, and then let the bill go over, because no committee amendment is involved in that airport matter.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I wish to inquire about the three airports at which towers were discontinued by the committee. That action was taken over the recommendation of the Civil Aeronautics Administration; was it not?

Mr. BALL. The CAA itself had discontinued control towers at three of those airports where the traffic was falling off. We put in these three. The CAA did not take any position on that matter, because they had been placed in the list originally, as I understand it, by congressional action, either in the Congress or in a committee report or on the floor of the Senate, or in some other manner of that sort.

Mr. CONNALLY. I wish to say to the Senator that on page 6 of the report it is stated:

> The CAA program for 1948 contemplated the operation of 19 additional towers; however, included in this figure of 19 is Baton Rouge, La., * * * Williamsport, Pa., * * * and Texarkana, Tex.

So the CAA proposed to continue the towers at those points, but the committee has come along with its knife and simply has cut them out. I wish to inquire why the committee did that.

Mr. BALL. They were not continued. They were new proposals for 1948.

Mr. CONNALLY. I know. But the CAA planned activity at those points for 1948, but the committee cut them out.

Mr. BALL. That is correct; because the CAA's own basis for having a tower at an airport is that there must be a traffic density of at least 7,500 points. None of those three had such a density. The five which we included had densities of from 55,000 points to 16,000 points. But we felt we did not have sufficient information to include approximately a dozen others.

It seems to me that if the Federal Government is going to take over control towers, it should do so on the basis of assisting and improving the operation of a Federal airway system; but if the traffic density is so low as not to justify that, we simply think there is no justification for doing it.

Mr. CONNALLY. The CAA thought it wise, and the CAA proposed that program for 1948. But the committee cut them out.

Mr. BALL. That is correct. We do not always go by what the departments or the Bureau of the Budget tell us. Let me say that Texas now has, under the pending bill as it stands, 11 airports at which the CAA will operate control towers, and I suspect that is about twice as many as any other State of the Union has.

Mr. CONNALLY. Well, it is twice as many because the distances in Texas are so great and the business justifies it.

Mr. BALL. That is right. But it does not justify one at Texarkana.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is what I am talking about. The CAA's plan was to maintain it for 1948, but the committee now says, "No, we know more about it than the CAA does, and we will cut it out."

Mr. BALL. We cut it out because of the CAA's own standard for traffic density, because the traffic density at that airport did not justify including it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Then why did the CAA plan to have it included in 1948?

Mr. BALL. They had planned several others at which the traffic was not sufficient to justify their inclusion, so we decided to abandon them, insofar as this matter was concerned.

Mr. CONNALLY. I simply wish to enter my protest; I suppose that is all I can do. It seems to me that this action on the part of the committee is entirely arbitrary and is in direct contradiction of the attitude of the CAA.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. MYERS. I wish to inquire about the tower at Williamsport, Pa. Did the committee inquire why these three airports were included in the program for control towers, even though they did not meet the traffic-density standards as set up by the CAA?

Mr. BALL. We did; yes. We went into this whole airport control-tower program at some length with the CAA, and they did not have any explanation as to how it happened to get in there. They did not have any explanation as to why several of these airports, with very little traffic at them, had CAA-operated control towers under the 1947 appropriation—the appropriation for the present fiscal year—whereas a number of airports with very heavy traffic were not included in that program. We got a very complete picture. We tried to do the best job we could on the basis of the density of traffic.

Mr. MYERS. Did the committee direct a specific question to the CAA, and does it appear in the hearings, as to why these three airports were included, although they did not meet the standards for traffic density as set up by the CAA itself?

Mr. BALL. Yes; we did. We asked them for the information at the hearings. They were not able to supply it. Afterward we asked them to supply it for the record and give it to the subcommittee. They did furnish their list, and they furnished explanations of one or two airports where they had control towers, such as those in Alaska, which are essential. The traffic is very light there, but, nevertheless, they have to have them there. But they offered no explanation whatever as to why they had these in the United States in the control-tower program. So we eliminated them.

Mr. MYERS. Do I correctly understand that the Senator has said that the CAA has not offered, and it appears at no place in the record, any information as to why they included the tower at Williamsport, Pa.?

Mr. BALL. That is correct. We asked them why they had control towers in the program at airports which have less than 7,500 traffic points, and they offered no explanation for those which we eliminated. As I have said, they did offer an explanation in the case of some in Alaska, which we then proceeded to keep in.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 49, in line 1.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, line 8, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$17,638,000" and insert "$11,109,066"; in line 8, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out the comma and "together with the unexpended balance of the appropriation under this head for the fiscal year 1947 which is hereby merged with this appropriation"; in line 11, after the amendment just above stated, to insert the following proviso: *"Provided,* That the appropriation under this head for the fiscal year 1947 is hereby consolidated with and made a part of this appropriation to be disbursed and accounted for as one fund and to remain available until July 30, 1948"; and in line 24, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$500,000" and insert "$280,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 50, line 16, after the word "of", to strike out "one" and insert "two"; in the same line, after the word "motor", to strike out "vehicle" and insert "vehicles", and in line 17, after the word "aircraft", to strike out "$2,000,000" and insert "$1,600,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 51, line 1, after the word "lot", to strike out "$1,236,000" and insert "$1,102,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, at that point I should like to insert in the RECORD an amendment which I propose to offer, I hope tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

The amendment submitted by Mr. LUCAS is as follows:

On page 51, line 9, strike out "$32,500,000" and insert "$65,000,000", and strike out the remainder of the language under the heading "Federal Aid to Airport Program, Federal Airport Act."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Civil Aeronautics Board", on page 52, line 18, after the word "aircraft", to strike out "$2,500,000" and insert "$3,100,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, are we going to pass over until tomorrow the amendment on page 51, the Federal-aid airport program?

Mr. LUCAS. I may say to the Senator that the amendment I just offered was to the airport provision. It is not an amendment to the committee amendment. It is an amendment to the House language, which was agreed upon by the Appropriations Committee of the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. It is an amendment to the bill?

Mr. LUCAS. It is.

Mr. CONNALLY. If that is to go over, I shall defer my remarks; otherwise, I should want to interrogate the Senator from Minnesota about it.

Mr. BALL. I may say, Mr. President, that I have conferred with the leaders on this side, and they suggest that, since the hour is late, we should finish with the committee amendments. I have one amendment, relative to stenographers and law clerks for the judges, which I shall offer, and then we will let the other matter go over until tomorrow.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 52, line 19, after the word "binding", to strike out "$35,000" and insert "$40,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Coast and Geodetic Survey," on page 55, line 7, after the word "available", to insert "for the purchase (not to exceed 22), maintenance, operation, and repair of vehicles known as station wagons and suburban carry-alls without such vehicles being considered as passenger-carrying vehicles and."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce," on page 55, line 21, after "(not exceeding $50,000)" to strike out "$5,000,000" and insert "$4,493,537."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 56, line 6, after "District of Columbia", to strike out "$2,000,000" and insert "$2,375,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Bureau of Standards," on page 58, line 5, after the word "thereto", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,450,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Weather Bureau," on page 61, line 21, after the word "Act", to insert "and titles II and III of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945."

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for a question in connection with this Weather Bureau appropriation of $21,000,000?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I note from the committee report, on page 21, that sufficient funds presumably are to be allocated to take care of essential air navigation weather stations, including a station in Delaware, proposed by the Weather Bureau, in 1948. I am glad to know that Delaware is at least being taken care of, but there is one matter on which the Senator from Minnesota and the junior Senator from New York talked. That is the matter of $35,000 for a weather station in connection with Floyd Bennett Field in New York. The situation in New York City is becoming more and more congested, as I think everyone knows. LaGuardia Field is now practically overgrown insofar as its capacity to handle traffic is concerned. It is necessary now to turn to Floyd Bennett Field. Idlewild is not yet operating, or at least, if it is, the facilities are not in sufficient quantity to take care of anything. Consequently, if New York is to handle the traffic which presumably it will have in the coming year, it will require help in this direction. I am merely rising, because I understand the Senator from Minnesota agrees, to say that it is his understanding, here on the floor, that of this $21,000,000, it is expected that $35,000 will be used for the weather station at Floyd Bennett Airfield in New York.

Mr. BALL. That is correct; and we are so assured by the Weather Bureau.

Mr. IVES. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on page 61, line 21, there is a matter similar to the one mentioned by the Senator from New York, but I am going to offer an amendment to increase the amount by $52,000.

Mr. BALL. What is this for—an air station?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No, this is for the establishment of another weather station. I have only about 5 minutes. Perhaps the Senator will accept the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment is not in order at the moment. The committee amendments are not yet concluded.

Mr. BALL. I would suggest to the Senator that he allow the matter to go over until tomorrow.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator wishes the matter to go over until tomorrow?

Mr. BALL. Yes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is the understanding of the Chair that when the committee amendments are disposed of, the bill will go over until tomorrow.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 61, line 21.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 62, after line 16, to insert:

The appropriations "Salaries and expenses, Civil Aeronautics Administration"; "Salaries and expenses" Civil Aeronautics Board; and "Salaries and expenses", Weather Bureau, shall be available under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary, for furnishing on a reimbursable basis to employees of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and the Weather Bureau in Alaska and other areas outside the United States where determined necessary by the Secretary emergency medical services by contract or otherwise and medical supplies, and for the purchase, transportation, and storage of food and other subsistence supplies for resale to such employees, the proceeds from such resale to be credited to the appropriation from which the expenditure for such supplies was made and a report shall be made to Congress annually showing the expenditures made for such supplies and the proceeds from such resale; and appropriations of the Civil Aeronautics Administration and the Weather Bureau shall be available in an amount not to exceed $20,000 for furnishing food, clothing, medicines, and other supplies for the temporary relief of distressed persons in remote localities, reimbursement for such relief to be in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title IV—The Judiciary—United States Supreme Court", on page 64, after line 8, to insert:

Preparation of rules for civil procedure: For expenses of the Supreme Court incident to proposed amendments or additions to the Rules of Civil Procedure for the District Courts of the United States pursuant to the act of June 19, 1934 (48 Stat. 1064), including personal services in the District of Columbia and printing and binding, to be expended as the Chief Justice in his discretion may approve, including per diem allowances in lieu of actual expenses for subsistence at rates to be fixed by him not to exceed $10 per day, $5,420.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Miscellaneous items of expense", on page 69, line 1, after the word "assistants", to strike out "$3,600,000" and insert "$3,631,295."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 69, line 14, after "Wyoming", to strike out "Cumberland, Md.; Charlottesville, Va.; Big Stone Gap, Va.; Clarksburg, W. Va.; Springfield, Mass.; Key West, Fla.; Paris, Tex.; Victoria, Tex.; Richmond, Ky.; Cairo, Ill.; New Albany, Ind.; Terre Haute, Ind.; Batesville, Ark.; Harrison, Ark.; Chadron, Nebr.; Bellingham, Wash.; Pueblo, Colo.; Pendleton, Oreg.; Medford, Oreg."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 72, line 12, after "(Public Law 222)", to strike out "$800,000" and insert "$865,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That completes the committee amendments.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I have one more committee amendment, appropriating $1,800,000 for the law clerks and stenographers for the judges, which went out in the House on a point of order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 71, following line 12, insert the following:

Miscellaneous salaries: For salaries of all officials and employees of the Federal judiciary, not otherwise specifically provided for, $1,800,000: *Provided*, That the compensation of secretaries and law clerks of circuit and district judges (exclusive of any additional compensation under the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 and any other acts of similar purport subsequently enacted) shall be fixed by the Director of the Administrative Office without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, except that the salary of a secretary shall conform with that of the main (CAF-4), senior (CAF-5), or principal (CAF-6) clerical grade, or assistant (CAF-7), or associate (CAF-8) administrative grade, as the appointing judge shall determine, and the salary of a law clerk shall conform with that of the junior (P-1), assistant (P-2), associate (P-3), full (P-4), or senior (P-5) professional grade, as the appointing judge shall determine, subject to review by the judicial council of the circuit if requested by the Director, such determination by the judge otherwise to be final: *Provided further*, That (exclusive of any additional compensation under the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 and any other acts of similar purport subsequently enacted) the aggregate salaries paid to secretaries and law clerks appointed by one judge shall not exceed $6,500 per annum, except in the case of the senior circuit judge of each circuit and senior district judge of each district having five or more district judges, in which case the aggregate salaries shall not exceed $7,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does that complete the Senator's desire for the day?

Mr. BALL. It does.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota a question. In the appropriation we are considering I understand $13,500,000 has been allowed for cultural and information branch offices in different parts of the United States, such as New York, Miami, New Orleans, and San Francisco. As I correct in that?

Mr. BALL. For what type of branch offices? I am sorry, I could not hear.

Mr. OVERTON. Information and cultural branch offices of the State Department.

Mr. BALL. We allow a total of $13,500,000, approximately, for the whole program. There is one office in New York, I know. Where else do they have them?

Mr. OVERTON. They have only four. They have four in the United States. They are at New York, Miami, New Orleans, and San Francisco.

Mr. BALL. The matter of the branch offices was not gone into at all in our hearings except that an over-all allowance was made for the program. It is

for the State Department to decide how they will spend it, and what offices they will keep open.

Mr. OVERTON. Is that all they requested?

Mr. BALL. No, no; they asked for $26,000,000.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to address a question to the Senator from Minnesota, if he will permit.

I was called out of the Senate Chamber just at the moment when that stage of the bill was reached, and passed, having to do with the appropriation for the maintenance and operation of traffic control towers at air fields. Am I correct in my understanding that none of the traffic towers in the State of Florida were displaced by the committee?

Mr. BALL. No; no towers in Florida were affected.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 124) to enable the President to utilize the appropriations for United States participation in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration for meeting administrative expenses of United States Government agencies in connection with United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration liquidation.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2369) providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the Territory of Alaska.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4031) making appropriations to meet emergencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 2369. An act providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the Territory of Alaska;

S. J. Res. 139. Joint resolution to continue for a temporary period of 15 days certain controls now exercised by the President under the Second War Powers Act, 1942, and under the Export Control Act; and

H. J. Res. 221. Joint resolution to provide for permanent rates of postage on mail matter of the first class, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 30, 1947, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions:

S. 350. An act to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States until June 30, 1948;

S. 1072. An act to extend until July 1, 1949, the period during which income from agricultural labor and nursing services may be disregarded by the States in making old-age assistance payments without prejudicing their rights to grants-in-aid under the Social Security Act;

S. J. Res. 77. Joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the International Refugee Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor;

S. J. Res. 135. Joint resolution to extend the succession, lending powers, and the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation; and

S. J. Res. 139. Joint resolution to continue for a temporary period of 15 days certain controls now exercised by the President under the Second War Powers Act, 1942, and under the Export Control Act.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 3993. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4031. An act making appropriations to meet emergencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on today, June 30, 1947, the President had approved and signed the following acts and a joint resolution:

S. 350. An act to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States until June 30, 1948;

S. 1072. An act to extend until July 1, 1949, the period during which income from agricultural labor and nursing services may be disregarded by the States in making old-age assistance payments without prejudicing their rights to grants-in-aid under the Social Security Act; and

S. J. Res. 135. Joint resolution to extend the succession, lending powers, and the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

EXTENSION OF RENT CONTROLS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 370)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read and ordered to lie on the table.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 7914.)

JOHN B. BARTON—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 72)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I return herewith without my approval S. 423 "For the relief of John B. Barton."

The bill would authorize and direct the Federal Security Administrator to review under section 22 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Act a compensation order made in the case of John B. Barton on January 16, 1932, and to issue a new compensation order in the case notwithstanding the provision in section 22 of that act limiting the time for seeking review of such an order.

It appears that John Barton sustained an injury on March 20, 1931, while removing a stack from the S. S. *Traverse*; and that subsequently there was under consideration a compensation award covering temporary total disability of the claimant from March 20, 1931, to and including August 16, 1931, resulting from dislocation of the left hip.

At a compensation hearing held on November 9, 1931, Mr. Barton stated that as a result of the accident he was suffering from an injury in his right shoulder and that his sight and hearing were affected, in addition to the dislocation of his left hip. Medical testimony failed, however, to disclose any compensable condition other than that found previously from which the employee had originally recovered on August 16, 1931. Accordingly a compensation order was entered on January 16, 1932, awarding compensation under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act in the total amount of $494.58; and this amount was paid to Mr. Barton.

Mr. Barton failed to apply for a judicial review of the compensation order, as was his right under the act, within the period provided by the act for this purpose.

Mr. Barton's claim for compensation was against his private employer, the Calumet Shipyard and Drydock Co. (and the latter's insurance carrier). The United States does not pay compensation under the above-mentioned act, and has no interest in the case beyond seeing that it is properly adjudicated under the applicable statute. The statute as enacted has been applied, and properly so in this case and the limitations in the statute prevent further administrative action.

In enacting these limitations, the Congress undoubtedly considered the administrative desirability, from the viewpoint of all concerned, of settling these cases finally and expeditiously. Approval of this measure would be highly discriminatory in that it would extend to Mr. Barton the right to have his case reviewed while others similarly affected would not be accorded a like right.

The bill also singles out one private employer and its insurance carrier for discriminatory treatment as compared with all other employers and their insurance carriers similarly situated, since it, in effect, waives the provisions of the statute so as to pave the way for an award against the employer in this particular case.

The bill would establish an undesirable precedent whereby the purposes of the time limitations in the Longshoremen's Act could be defeated with resulting uncertainty and confusion as to the rights and liabilities under that act.

For these reasons I am constrained to withhold my approval from the bill.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 30, 1947.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

John M. Moore, of Kentucky, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Kentucky; and

Otto Kerner, Jr., of Illinois, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Illinois, vice J. Albert Woll, resigning upon the appointment and qualification of a successor.

By Mr. BUCK, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

James W. Lauderdale, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia for a term of 3 years from July 1, 1947 (reappointment).

By Mr. TAFT, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Arthur H. Neill and Richard B. French, for promotion in the regular corps of the Public Health Service.

RECESS

Mr. WHITE. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 1, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 30 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Abbot Low Moffat, of New York, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 2, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

William A. Conkright, of the District of Columbia, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 3, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

Robert B. Elwood, of Iowa, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 4, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

Neil M. Ruge, of California, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 5, a vice consul of career, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Hugh G. Appling, of California.
Richard W. Carlson, of Ohio.
Henry L. Coster, of California.
William R. Duggan, of Utah.
John M. Farrior, of North Carolina.
E. Allen Fidel, of Wyoming.
Richard E. Funkhouser, of New Jersey.
Harold G. Josif, of Ohio.
Abbott Judd, of Rhode Island.
James A. May, of California.
John L. Murphy, of Oklahoma.
Joseph W. Neubert, of Washington.
John M. Perry, of Massachusetts.
Harold C. Roser, Jr., of New Jersey.
Sidney Sober, of New York.
Edmund Owen Stillman, of New York.
George S. Vest, of Virginia.
Elmer E. Yelton, of Virginia.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Harley Hise, of California, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the unexpired term of 2 years from January 22, 1946.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Hon. Leo F. Rayfiel, of New York, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of New York, vice Hon. Grover M. Moscowitz, deceased.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Leo P. Flynn, of South Dakota, to be United States attorney for the district of South Dakota, vice George Philip, resigned.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers for appointment in the United States Navy in the Corps, grades, and ranks hereinafter stated.

The following-named officers to the ranks indicated in the line of the Navy:

(*Indicates officers to be designated for EDO and SDO subsequent to acceptance of appointment)

ENSIGNS

*Beaudoin, Amedee J.	Peters, James C.
*Bodziak, Edmund J.	Popoff, Alec N.
*Gallup, Herbert H.	*Rura, Michael J.
Grimm, George J.	Vitostko, Joseph J.
Keen, Timothy J.	Wicks, William F.
Nagle, Millard H., Jr.	

The following-name officers to the grade and rank indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

ASSISTANT SURGEONS WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Bates, Phillips L.	Lykins, Robert W.
Berman, Herbert R.	Montgomery, Robert H.
Garland, Charles M., Jr.	Mount, Houston F.
Holman, Bruce C.	Rhoades, Albert L.
Lonsdorf, Richard G.	Sherer, Bernard D.

The following-named officers to the grade and rank indicated in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

ASSISTANT PAYMASTER WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Pabst, Avery A.

ASSISTANT PAYMASTERS WITH THE RANK OF ENSIGN

Frushtick, William J.	Howard, Garnett E.
Gallagher, Edward C.	Paquette, Martin W.
Galligan, Charles H., Jr.	Swan, Alfred W.
	Schaer, Frederick D.
Marx, James H.	Whitsell, John D.
Banks, Richard A.	Windsor, James M.

The following-named officers to the grade and rank indicated in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

ASSISTANT CIVIL ENGINEER WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Robinson, James B.

The following-named officers to the grades and ranks indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

PASSED ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEON WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT

Fisher, Alton K.

ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEON WITH THE RANK OF LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

Garton, William C.
Walsh, Eugene A.

The following-named officer to the rank of commissioned warrant officer in the Navy in the grade indicated:

CHIEF PHARMACIST

Williams, Lindley

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 30, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, we beseech Thee to be present and favorable during this day unto our Speaker and all the Members of this legislative body. We thank Thee that day by day they are earnestly seeking to fulfill with pure and steadfast loyalty the many duties and responsibilities of their high vocation as the chosen representatives of our beloved country.

Thou knowest that our finite minds are so frequently blinded and enslaved by a sense of futility and frustration, of fear and uncertainty. We pray that Thou wilt emancipate us from everything that tends to eclipse our faith.

Show us how we may mobilize not only our material resources but all those inexhaustible riches of Thy grace whereby we may achieve for ourselves and succeeding generations the blessings of peace and prosperity.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 27, 1947, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution and a concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. J. Res. 221. Joint resolution to provide for permanent rates of postage on mail matter of the first class, and for other purposes; and

H. Con. Res. 49. Concurrent resolution against adoption of Reorganization Plan No. 2 of May 1, 1947.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 21. Concurrent resolution authorizing a change in the enrollment of a joint resolution (S. J. Res. 77) providing for membership and participation by the United States in the International Refugee Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor.

MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 28, 1947.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to the authority granted on June 27, the Clerk received the following messages from the Secretary of the Senate, namely:

S. 564. An act to provide for the performance of the duties of the office of President in case of the removal, resignation, death, or inability both of the President and Vice President.

House bill without amendment:

H. R. 775. An act for the establishment of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

Senate agrees to House amendments:

S. J. Res. 71. Joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the International Refugee Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor.

Senate agrees to conference reports:

S. J. Res. 135. Joint resolution to extend the succession, lending powers, and the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

H. R. 2369. An act providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the Territory of Alaska.

H. R. 2436. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; and that the Senate agreed to the House amendment to the Senate amendment No. 17 to said bill.

Very truly yours,

JOHN ANDREWS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had on June 28, 1947, examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 775. An act for the establishment of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government; and

H. R. 2436. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that, pursuant to the authority granted him on June 27, 1947, he did on June 28, 1947, sign the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

H. R. 775. An act for the establishment of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government;

H. R. 2436. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes;

S. 350. An act to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States until June 30, 1948;

S. 1072. An act to extend until July 1, 1949, the period during which income from agricultural labor and nursing services may be disregarded by the States in making old-age assistance payments without prejudicing their rights to grants-in-aid under the Social Security Act; and

S. J. Res. 135. Joint resolution to extend the succession, lending powers, and the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

INTERNATIONAL REFUGEE ORGANIZATION

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 21.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, in the enrollment of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 77) providing for membership and participation by the United States in the International Refugee Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor, to make the following changes in the House engrossed amendment, namely: On page 3 of said engrossed amendment, in the phrase "for the fiscal year beginning June 30, 1947," where it occurs in subsections (a) and (b) of section 3, strike out "June 30" and in lieu thereof insert "July 1."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The Senate concurrent resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SECOND WAR POWERS ACT

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 139.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 1501 of the Second War Powers Act, 1942, as amended, is amended by striking out "June 30, 1947" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 15, 1947"; and section 6 (d) of the act entitled "An act to expedite the strengthening of the national defense," approved July 2, 1940, as amended, is amended by striking out "June 30, 1947" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 15, 1947."

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I am acquainted with the matter, and I recognize the necessity of it. I think it is a very fine thing to do. However, will the gentleman from Michigan, for the RECORD, just make a brief statement as to the purpose of the resolution?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the House has passed a bill extending certain war powers. The Senate failed to act, due to a legislative jam in the Senate. All war powers and export controls cease at midnight tonight unless a law is enacted. I know of no opposition to this resolution. I have cleared through the leadership on both sides and the Speaker before asking this unanimous consent. None of us want all controls to cease tonight. Therefore, the Senate late Friday passed this resolution which does nothing but continue the status quo for a period of 15 days, during which time the Senate will act on its bill or the House bill and the whole matter can be disposed of within the time granted in this bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORARY DEGREE CONFERRED UPON HON. JAMES FORRESTAL, SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, recently Norwich University conferred an honorary degree of doctor of laws upon James Forrestal, Secretary of the Navy. This act was the pleasure of our illustrious Member from Vermont, Mr. CHARLES ALBERT PLUMLEY. Mr. PLUMLEY, formerly distinguished himself as the president of Norwich University as an additional accomplishment of a long notable career. I think it is of worth to note here the citation made the Secretary of the Navy by the University. I therefore include it with my remarks:

The Secretary of the United States Navy—James Forrestal, enlisted man in the Navy, World War I; Under Secretary and Secretary of the Navy, World War II, whose career, as he well said of a friend, is living proof there is no ceiling on achievement, no limit on opportunity in America; outstandingly able executive, capable, efficient administrator; pugnacious fighter for peace through proper preparedness; forged, built, developed a Navy, second to none, the most powerful expression of sea power in all history, in order to defend us against attack, to maintain our supremacy of the seas, to make possible the discharge of our obligation to civilization and to realize our destiny; he paid the price twice, as a man, for he risked his life in World War I, and in World War II on battle fronts world wide.

Mr. Secretary, Norwich humbly honors itself to number you among its distinguished honorary alumni, as it confers upon you the degree of doctor of laws.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TWYMAN, Mr. POULSON, and Mr. VURSELL asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. GOODWIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address by the Lieutenant Governor of Massachusetts.

Mr. COLE of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Topeka Daily Capital of Topeka, Kans.

Mr. LECOMPTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution of the Mahaska Bar Association.

PRICE CEILING ON TYPEWRITERS

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOOTE. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleague the gentleman from Connecticut the Honorable WILLIAM J. MILLER, in objecting to that section of the Treasury Department appropriation, Bureau of Federal Supply, which places a ceiling on the price of standard typewriters.

I note in the conference report that the managers on the part of the two Houses have agreed that the report of an investigation being conducted by the Committee on Appropriations of the House regarding the purchase of typewriters by the Government will be completed and filed by January 3, 1948.

Whatever the investigation of the committee may disclose, I doubt if it will justify the discrimination and inconsistency that exists in placing a ceiling price on typewriters and not doing so on any other article the Treasury Department may purchase. In fact, it is significant to note that even bookkeeping, billing, and electrical machines are not under a ceiling.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MEYER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial and a letter.

Mr. BRADLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix in two instances, in one to include a resolution of the city of Southgate, Calif., and in the other a short editorial from the Lakewood News-Times.

Mr. REEVES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement made before the Committee on Ways and Means on taxation by Mr. Mooney.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include the momentous speech made by Secretary of State Marshall at Harvard on June 5.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALMOND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] before the Roanoke Rotary Club, on June 26, 1947.

CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT AMENDED TO INCLUDE INVESTIGATORY PERSONNEL OF THE FBI

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 715) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for investigatory personnel of the Federal Bureau of Investigation who have rendered at least 20 years of service.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 (b) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(1) Any special agent, special agent in charge, inspector, Assistant Director, assistant to the Director, Associate Director, or the Director, who is at least 50 years of age and who has rendered 20 years of service or more as a special agent, or as aforesaid above, in the Federal Bureau of Investigation may, on his own application and with the consent of the Attorney General, retire from the service and such annuity of such employee shall be equal to 2 percent of his average basic salary for the 5 years next preceding the date of his retirement, multiplied by the number of years of service, not exceeding 30 years."

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, S. 715 amends the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide for granting annuities to any special agent, special agent in charge, inspector, Assistant Director, assistant to the Director, Associate Director, or the Director in the Federal Bureau of Investigation who is 50 years of age and who has rendered 20 years of service in such position or positions with the FBI. These annuities shall be based upon 2 percent of such employee's average basic salary for the 5 years next preceding the date of his retirement, multiplied by the number of years of Government service, not in excess of 30 years.

Any employee who reaches 50 years of age and comes under the provisions of this proposed legislation would be entitled to receive 40 percent of his basic pay after 20 years' service and 50 percent after 25 years' service. It should be pointed out that several States and municipalities grant 50 percent of pay to law-enforcement officers after 25 years' service.

Testimony of the Attorney General of the United States and the Assistant Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation at the hearings established the need for this legislation. It was pointed out to the committee that all of the FBI personnel affected by this bill are subject to arduous and hazardous duties in connection with law enforcement and are on call 24 hours a day. The committee believes that the proposed liberalization of retirement benefits to which these employees are entitled would be economical and beneficial to the Government and to the country.

Statements submitted to the committee by officials of the Department of Justice show that the average length of service of investigatory employees of the FBI is between 6½ and 7 years, that the Government invests from $6,000 to $9,000 in the instruction and training of every new agent, and that the passage of this legislation will decrease the number of resignations of FBI agents by 75 percent or approximately 270 annually. Thus, it was pointed out to the committee, it is clear that there would be a savings to the Government of not less than $1,620,000 annually by reason of the decreases in resignations of FBI agents.

The Civil Service Commission estimates that the cost of this bill will be $15,000 for each employee retired at 50 years of age. At the present time there are about 3,200 employees of the Federal Bureau of Investigation who eventually would come under the retirement benefits of the proposed legislation. However, the personnel records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation show that there are only 63 employees in the FBI who could come under the provisions of this bill within the next 5 years, provided all such employees elect to retire, which is doubtful.

Upon the basis of the above figures the cost to the Government during the next 5 years at most will be $945,000. However, by virtue of the estimate that resignations will decrease by 75 percent after the passage of the bill, the Government's investment of several million dollars in the instruction and training of agents, who otherwise would resign, will be saved.

The committee was impressed by the testimony at the hearings that the FBI is losing competent agents to private industry, and that a determining factor is the inadequate retirement presently granted to them which require their service until 60 years of age or more. The committee believes that the passage of this proposed legislation will aid in stabilizing the service of the FBI, and will make it more attractive to agents who otherwise would seek outside employment. Also, the committee believes that the increased retirement benefits provided for under this bill will serve as an inducement to young men to enter the service of the FBI. This will, in the words of the Attorney General, keep the FBI "a young man's service."

The Attorney General testified before our committee in support of this legislation and also submitted a letter under date of April 21, 1947, setting forth the reasons why this legislation should be approved.

We also have a letter from the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover in support of this legislation and expressing the view that the bill will not only be to the advantage of the men affected, but will be for the best interests of the service and for the people of this country.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded? [After a pause.] The Chair hears no demand for a second.

The question is on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider and a similar House bill (H. R. 2826) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for investigatory personnel of the Federal Bureau of Investigation who have rendered at least 20 years of service were laid on the table.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who so desire may have permission to extend their statements on this bill in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I had the honor to report this legislation to the House from the Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service after taking deep interest in the hearings before the subcommittee of which I was a member. I took an active part in the presentation and discussions with the full committee.

One of the outstanding and among other things the soundest investment this Nation has made is the establishment of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. That it has proved itself to be such on numerous and critical occasions is a matter of record. That it continues to maintain a high standard of performance against the inroads of all enemies of society and all would-be destroyers of our way of life is a tribute to its efficiency and to its round-the-clock vigilance.

Today the world is passing through a seemingly ephemeral peace and we cannot remain oblivious to campaigns directed against us by isms which are designed to cause our ultimate fall. We must forestall and must eliminate any and all such threatening dangers to our country. Fortunately, we have placed a goodly share of responsibility for watchfulness in the hands of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its Director, J. Edgar Hoover.

It goes without saying that the caliber of personnel must be, of necessity, the best that can be had. It must be highly trained in diversified fields to cope with the innumerable problems which confront the men of this extraordinary law-enforcing organization. The entrance qualifications of these special agents are unusually high, the training given by the Government is the most thorough conceivable, and the accumulated experience in the field well-nigh priceless. A more exacting and a more hazardous occupation in the investigatory field is unknown to me. These special agents, to whom we refer popularly as G-men, concern themselves almost totally with felons and not mere breach-of-the-peace offenders.

To let pass through our fingers this highly trained special agent is to reveal a lack of fundamental business acumen. Private industry, ever on the alert for outstanding individuals, gladly accepts all who leave the ranks of the FBI because therein lies the security which seems lacking in the Government organization. An inducement to remain with the Government must be provided.

The rapid pace the G-man is called upon to maintain, the hazards, the long, unlimited hours tend to slow him down and necessarily curtail his full effectiveness to the age of 50. There is also present the inherent fear for the future security of his family.

With these considerations before you, I urge immediate passage of this legislation providing annuities for investigatory personnel of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

COMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS — PERMISSION TO SIT DURING SESSIONS OF HOUSE

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Elections may have permission to sit during the sessions of the House, during general debate, on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday of this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

INCREASE IN RATES OF PENSION TO SPANISH-AMERICAN AND CIVIL WAR VETERANS AND DEPENDENTS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 3961) to provide increases in the rates of pension payable to Spanish-American War and Civil War veterans and their dependents.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all monthly rates of pension payable to veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion and the Philippine Insurrection, and dependents of such veterans which are payable under laws reenacted by the act of August 13, 1935 (49 Stat. 614; 38 U. S. C. 368, 369), or under acts amendatory or supplemental to such laws, are hereby increased by 20 percent.

The increases provided by this section shall be effective from the first day of the second calendar month following the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 2. That all monthly rates of pension payable to veterans of the Civil War and dependents of such veterans which are payable under any laws administered by the Veterans' Administration are hereby increased by 20 percent.

The increases provided by this section shall be effective from the first day of the second calendar month following the date of enactment of this act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, I doubt if the 40 minutes will be required to debate this bill, which provides a 20-percent increase to the Spanish and Civil War veterans and their dependents. This bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and a rule thereon was unanimously agreed to by the Rules Committee.

H. R. 3961, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

The bill, H. R. 3961, has the following provisions:

First. To increase by 20 percent certain service pensions—nonservice connected—to veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Boxer Rebellion, and the Philippine Insurrection, veterans of the Civil War and the widows and children of such veterans.

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs favorably reported this bill, which is sponsored by the Spanish-American War Veterans' Organization, and endorsed by other interested veterans' organizations after hearings and very thorough consideration.

The following are some of the reasons that prompted the committee's favorable action:

First. The increased cost of living and increased pay to Federal and other employees.

Second. As to the Spanish-American War veterans, no increase has been granted the most seriously disabled—those entitled to $75 per month for permanent and total disability or age 65 and those entitled to the $100 rate for regular aid and attendance, the former since March 1, 1944, and the latter since May 24, 1938.

Third. The other rates of the Spanish-American War comparatively small group which would receive a 20-percent increase are at present inadequate considering the cost of living and average age of these veterans.

Fourth. The Civil War veterans have not been granted an increase in the $100 rate for regular aid and attendance, the only rate now being paid to survivors of that war, since June 9, 1930.

Fifth. The World War I and II veterans received an increase in the rate of permanent and total disability by the act of August 8, 1946.

Sixth. Widows of World Wars I and II veterans receive $42 per month, whereas widows of veterans of the Spanish-American War—1898–1902—and the Civil War—1861–66—generally receive $40 per month.

The average age of Spanish-American War veterans is 72 years and their mortality rate 74 per 1,000. For the fiscal year 1947 there will be a decrease from the pension rolls of approximately 8,000 veterans. The average age of the widows of this group is 67 years and their mortality rate approximately 44 per 1,000.

As to Civil War, the veterans' decrease from the pension rolls was approximately 6 per month for the 10-month period from June 30, 1946, to April 30, 1947. Their average age is 100 and the mortality rate 427 per 1,000. The widows' decrease from the rolls for the 9-month period from June 30, 1946, to March 31, 1947, was 1,948 or approximately 216 per month. Their average age is 81 years and the mortality rate 138 per 1,000 for the year 1946.

Therefore, it will be observed that there will be a rapid decrease from the pension rolls in the combined number of veterans and dependents year by year and that the cost of this measure will be sharply reduced by the progressive increased rate of deaths as time goes on.

ESTIMATE OF COST

The Veterans' Administration estimates that section 1 of the bill; namely, the 20-percent increase for veterans of the Spanish-American War group of veterans and their dependents would af-

fect approximately 111,700 veterans with an estimated cost of $20,112,000 the first year and the dependents of approximately 74,110 deceased veterans at a cost of $7,338,000 or a total estimated cost of $27,450,000 for the first year.

As to section 2 of the bill namely, to increase by 20-percent increase for Civil War veterans and their dependents, the Veterans' Administration estimates it would affect approximately 90 veterans at a cost of $21,600 the first year and the dependents of approximately 15,800 deceased veterans at a cost of $1,467,000 or a total estimated cost of $1,488,600 the first year.

The grand total estimate of cost covering the 20-percent increase to veterans and dependents of the Spanish-American War and Civil War groups approximates $28,938,600 for the first year.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 10 minutes to the able and distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI], chairman of the subcommittee which had this bill under consideration, and who is the author of it.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, as stated by the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, this bill provides a 20 percent across-the-board increase for all veterans and their dependents of the Spanish-American War, the Boxer Rebellion, the Philippine Insurrection, and Civil War. I want to point out that the bill in no way adds any new veterans or new dependents to the pension list. It provides merely a 20 percent across-the-board increase under existing law; in other words, those dependents and those veterans who now are qualified, by the passage of this bill, and only those, will be entitled to a 20-percent increase. No new dependents and no new veterans are added by the provisions of this bill to the pension rolls.

The Civil War veterans and their dependents have not received any increase in pension since the year 1930. Many things have happened since then. The cost of living has skyrocketed tremendously since 1930 and I feel those people are entitled to this consideration.

The reason for this bill is that there is at the present time a discrepancy between the pensions paid the widows of the veterans of these wars and the widows of the veterans of World Wars I and II. The pensions for the widows of Spanish-American and Civil War veterans are lower than the pensions paid widows of veterans of World Wars I and II. This bill will bring them on more or less of a parity. We must remember that the average age of the widows of the veterans of the Spanish-American War at the present time is approximately 65 to 75 years. Those people cannot go out and supplement their incomes and, naturally, they are more in need of a higher pension, perhaps, than the younger widows who are physically able to supplement their income.

I may mention also that the Spanish-American War veterans are rapidly disappearing. They are dying at the rate of approximately 8,000 a year. In other words, although the first year the cost of this bill will be a little bit over what we are now expending—the total cost of the bill will be somewhere in the neighborhood of $25,000,000—this will be reduced year after year because they are dying at the rate of 8,000 a year. At the beginning of the fourth year of the effective date of this law, after the law goes into effect, the cost to the taxpayers will be nothing because of the rate at which they are dying.

We held comprehensive hearings on this bill. All of the veterans organizations, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Spanish-American War veterans organization, the Civil War veterans organization, all of the existing bona fide, recognized veterans organizations in the country, have endorsed unanimously this bill. There cannot be any serious opposition to it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The reason the Spanish-American War veterans were not included in the increases given veterans of World War I and World War II in the bill passed at the last Congress while I was chairman of the committee, is that the Committee at that time did not have jurisdiction of the Spanish-American War pensions.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I am glad he brought out that point.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I would just like to ask the gentleman if those who are covered under this legislation will receive their increases automatically or will they be required to make application?

Mr. O'KONSKI. They will receive it automatically 2 months after the effective date of the act.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I ask the gentleman what the average age of the Spanish-American War veteran is?

Mr. O'KONSKI. Seventy-two years.

Mr. SPRINGER. I think this is worth-while legislation. I would like to compliment the gentleman and his subcommittee on bringing this measure before the House.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS of Indiana. This legislation just brings simple justice to one group of veterans by giving them the same increases that we gave to all other veterans.

Mr. O'KONSKI. That is correct.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BRADLEY. May I ask the gentleman why the Indian War veterans have not been included along with the other veterans?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I will say to the gentleman that there is a separate bill pending for the Indian War veterans.

Mr. BRADLEY. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I am, of course, for the bill that the gentleman is sponsoring and I wish to compliment him for having taken up this matter. The purpose of my asking the gentleman to yield to me was to make the observation that I can think of no finer gesture that the majority might make than to include in the bill, by amendment, less than 100 of the old Confederate veterans. I am not going to offer the amendment, but I do wish that the majority party would, by putting it in evidence, insofar as they are concerned, that the strife of the sixties of the last century has been forgotten.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I thank the gentleman for his line of reasoning. I think that is something that ought to be given very serious consideration by the committee.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. ANGELL. It is true, is it not, that there was a separate bill pending for the Spanish-American War veterans, but that was laid aside because they are covered by this bill?

Mr. O'KONSKI. That is right.

Mr. ANGELL. I want to compliment the committee for bringing it out. I have had a great number of letters concerning this, particularly relating to the Spanish-American War veterans and the Civil War veterans. I think we have been dilatory in not providing this increase for them.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. I want to compliment the gentleman for bringing this bill out. Of course, I will be glad to support it. I am impressed with the suggestion that the gentleman from Georgia made. I am wondering if the bill could not be amended so that we might make this fine gesture, even at this late date, which would be beneficial, in my judgment, to the Nation, and would be nothing more than justice done.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. My recollection is that there were about 85 Confederate veterans living and 113 Federal veterans when these hearings were held a few weeks ago. There are 1,800 widows of

Federal veterans, but very few widows of Confederate veterans; because you will find these widows were young women who married these old Federal soldiers in soldiers' homes. Many of them were born long after the Civil War closed.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STEVENSON. I appreciate very much what the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] has done on this bill, as well as his subcommittee. As the gentleman knows, had the reorganization bill not passed, the Pensions Committee, of which I would now be chairman, had before it at the last session of Congress, a similar bill to the one that is now before the House, which was unanimously approved by the Pensions Committee at that time. I, therefore, am happy to add my voice in favor of this bill today, and I compliment the Committee on Veterans' Affairs; and I am very glad this bill has now been brought out. I trust that it will be passed unanimously by the Congress.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I commend the committee likewise for bringing out this fine bill. It will not cost the Federal Government as much as might be imagined, because the death rate must be very high. I imagine the gentleman's committee has gone into that.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Yes; it has.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Can the gentleman tell me something about how fast the veterans of the Civil War, the Boxer Rebellion, and the Spanish-American War are passing away?

Mr. O'KONSKI. The rolls are decreasing at the rate of approximately 8,000 a year.

Mr. LECOMPTE. This bill includes all the dependents of the soldiers of those wars who are now on the pension rolls?

Mr. O'KONSKI. That is correct, under existing law.

Mr. LECOMPTE. No exceptions are made?

Mr. O'KONSKI. No exceptions whatever.

Mr. RANKIN. It includes all the soldiers and their dependents.

Mr. LECOMPTE. And their dependents who are now on the rolls.

Mr. O'KONSKI. That is correct. No additional dependents of veterans will be added by the passage of this bill.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Nobody who is now on the pension roll as a dependent or a widow would fail to get the increase?

Mr. O'KONSKI. That is correct.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MORRIS. I wish to compliment the gentleman for having brought this bill out, and to say that it certainly, to my mind, is a just, a fair, and a proper thing to do, especially in view of the advance in the cost of living. I think it is very timely that we should pass the bill at this time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I also want to compliment the gentleman on bringing out this bill. I should like to second the remarks made by our distinguished friend from Georgia. I feel that it would be a wonderful thing if the majority party would see fit to include the old Confederate veterans and their dependents in this bill.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. He is a friend of the veterans.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There are less than 100 of them, as I understand.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks immensely.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a very meritorious bill, one that has been well considered by the committee. It takes into consideration the veterans of two of our wars, the Civil War and the Spanish-American War. The provisions of the bill are most deserving. The very fact that the bill will pass by what I think will be a unanimous vote of the Members of the House will be construed by the few remaining veterans of the Civil War and their dependents, and the remaining veterans of the Spanish-American War and their dependents, as a tribute on the part of the House which they richly deserve for the services they rendered in those wars, and a recognition of the heroic services of those who served in those wars who have taken the journey into the great beyond.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Will the gentleman join me in the observation that the only criticism that can be leveled at the bill is that it is long overdue? It should have been passed long before this.

Mr. McCORMACK. We are very glad that the bill is before the House now and that the consideration provided in the bill is extended to these two fine groups of people.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. Is it not a fact that because of the great increase in the cost of living many of these widows are unable to get along on the present allowances? It is necessary and justifiable that this bill pass, so that these poor widows can live, in view of the extremely high cost of living, especially in the last 9 months or so.

Mr. McCORMACK. I agree with the gentleman that that is one of the factors which constitutes justification for the passage of this bill.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. R. 3961, being a bill to provide increases in the rates of pension payable to Spanish-American War and Civil War veterans and their dependents.

In view of the increased cost of living and considering the fact that a great share of the recipients under this bill are people who are otherwise unable to provide for themselves, it is important that this legislation be approved. I think these veterans and their widows have long since been entitled to the considerations granted under this proposal. I am glad to render my support in securing the adoption of this legislation. This legislation will put this group in line with other veteran groups, insofar as benefits are concerned.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 339, not voting 91, as follows:

[Roll No. 95]

YEAS—339

Abernethy	Cox	Harris
Albert	Cravens	Harrison
Allen, Calif.	Crawford	Hartley
Allen, Ill.	Crosser	Havenner
Allen, La.	Crow	Hays
Almond	Cunningham	Hébert
Anderson, Calif.	Curtis	Hendricks
Andresen, August H.	Dague	Herter
Andrews, Ala.	Davis, Ga.	Heselton
Angell	Davis, Tenn.	Hess
Arends	Davis, Wis.	Hill
Arnold	Deane	Hinshaw
Auchincloss	Devitt	Hobbs
Bakewell	D'Ewart	Hoeven
Banta	Dingell	Hoffman
Barrett	Dirksen	Holifield
Bates, Ky.	Dolliver	Holmes
Bates, Mass.	Domengeaux	Hope
Battle	Dondero	Horan
Beall	Dorn	Howell
Beckworth	Doughton	Huber
Bell	Drewry	Hull
Bennett, Mo.	Durham	Jackson, Calif.
Bishop	Eaton	Jackson, Wash.
Blackney	Eberharter	Jarman
Bland	Elliott	Jenkins, Ohio
Blatnik	Ellis	Jennings
Bloom	Ellsworth	Jensen
Boggs, Del.	Engel, Mich.	Johnson, Calif.
Boggs, La.	Engle, Calif.	Johnson, Ill.
Bolton	Evins	Johnson, Ind.
Bonner	Fallon	Johnson, Okla.
Bradley	Fellows	Johnson, Tex.
Brehm	Fenton	Jones, Ala.
Brooks	Fisher	Jones, N. C.
Brophy	Flannagan	Jones, Ohio
Brown, Ga.	Fogarty	Jones, Wash.
Brown, Ohio	Folger	Jonkman
Bryson	Foote	Judd
Buchanan	Forand	Karsten, Mo
Buffett	Fulton	Keating
Burke	Gamble	Kee
Burleson	Gathings	Keefe
Byrne, N. Y.	Gavin	Kerr
Byrnes, Wis.	Gearhart	Kersten, Wis.
Canfield	Gillette	Kilday
Cannon	Goff	King
Carroll	Goodwin	Kirwan
Carson	Gordon	Klein
Case, S. Dak.	Gorski	Knutson
Celler	Gossett	Kunkel
Chadwick	Graham	Landis
Chelf	Granger	Lanham
Chenoweth	Gregory	Larcade
Chiperfield	Griffiths	LeCompte
Church	Gross	LeFevre
Clevenger	Gwinn, N. Y.	Lemke
Clippinger	Gwynne, Iowa	Lesinski
Coffin	Hagen	Lewis
Cole, Kans.	Hale	Lodge
Cole, Mo.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Love
Cole, N. Y.	Hall, Leonard W.	Lucas
Colmer	Halleck	Lyle
Combs	Hand	McConnell
Cooper	Hardy	McCormack
Corbett	Harless, Ariz.	McCowen
Coudert	Harness, Ind.	McDonough
Courtney		McDowell
		McGarvey

McGregor	Phillips, Tenn.	Simpson, Ill.
McMahon	Pickett	Smathers
McMillan, S. C.	Ploeser	Smith, Kans.
McMillen, Ill.	Plumley	Smith, Maine
Mack	Poage	Smith, Wis.
MacKinnon	Potts	Snyder
Macy	Poulson	Spence
Madden	Preston	Springer
Mahon	Price, Ill.	Stanley
Manasco	Priest	Stefan
Mansfield, Mont.	Rains	Stevenson
	Ramey	Stigler
Martin, Iowa	Rankin	Stockman
Mason	Redden	Stratton
Mathews	Reed, Ill.	Sundstrom
Meade, Md.	Reed, N. Y.	Taber
Merrow	Rees	Talle
Meyer	Reeves	Teague
Michener	Richards	Thomas, Tex.
Miller, Calif.	Richlman	Thomason
Miller, Conn.	Riley	Tollefson
Miller, Md.	Rizley	Towe
Mills	Robertson	Trimble
Mitchell	Rockwell	Twyman
Monroney	Rogers, Fla.	Vail
Morgan	Rogers, Mass.	Van Zandt
Morris	Rohrbough	Vorys
Morton	Rooney	Vursell
Muhlenberg	Ross	Wadsworth
Mundt	Russell	Walter
Murdock	Sabath	Weichel
Murray, Wis.	Sadlak	Welch
Nixon	Sadowski	West
Norblad	Sanborn	Wheeler
Norrell	Sarbacher	Whittington
O'Hara	Sasscer	Wigglesworth
O'Konski	Schwabe, Mo.	Williams
O'Toole	Schwabe, Okla.	Wilson, Ind.
Owens	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.	Wilson, Tex.
Pace		Winstead
Passman	Scrivner	Wolcott
Patman	Seely-Brown	Wolverton
Patterson	Shafer	Woodruff
Peden	Sheppard	Youngblood
Peterson	Short	Zimmerman
Phillips, Calif.	Sikes	

NOT VOTING—91

Andersen, H. Carl	Fuller	Miller, Nebr.
	Gallagher	Morrison
Andrews, N. Y.	Gary	Murray, Tenn.
Barden	Gifford	Nodar
Bender	Gillie	Norton
Bennett, Mich.	Gore	O'Brien
Boykin	Grant, Ala.	Pfeifer
Bramblett	Grant, Ind.	Philbin
Buck	Hart	Powell
Buckley	Hedrick	Price, Fla.
Bulwinkle	Heffernan	Rabin
Busbey	Javits	Rayburn
Butler	Jenison	Rayfiel
Camp	Jenkins, Pa.	Rich
Case, N. J.	Kean	Rivers
Chapman	Kearney	Robsion
Clark	Kearns	St. George
Clason	Kefauver	Scoblick
Clements	Kelley	Scott, Hardie
Cooley	Kennedy	Simpson, Pa.
Cotton	Keogh	Smith, Ohio
Dawson, Ill.	Kilburn	Smith, Va.
Dawson, Utah	Lane	Somers
Delaney	Latham	Taylor
Donohue	Lea	Thomas, N. J.
Douglas	Lusk	Tibbott
Elsaesser	Lynch	Vinson
Elston	Maloney	Whitten
Feighan	Mansfield, Tex.	Wood
Fernandez	Marcantonio	Worley
Fletcher	Meade, Ky.	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Case of New Jersey with Mr. O'Brien.
Mr. Kean with Mr. Lane.
Mr. Robsion with Mr. Chapman.
Mr. Andersen, H. Carl, with Mr. Gary.
Mr. Andrews of New York with Mr. Keogh.
Mr. Busbey with Mr. Clements.
Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania with Mr. Gore.
Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Lynch.
Mr. Meade of Kentucky with Mrs. Douglas.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Smith of Virginia.
Mr. Rich with Mr. Heffernan.
Mr. Clason with Mr. Rayfiel.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Donohue.
Mr. Jenkins of Pennsylvania with Mr. Kennedy.
Mr. Tibbott with Mr. Rabin.
Mr. Gillie with Mr. Price of Florida.
Mr. Buck with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Bennett of Michigan with Mr. Kefauver.
Mr. Butler with Mr. Lea.
Mr. Elsaesser with Mr. Pfeifer.
Mr. Grant of Indiana with Mr. Clark.
Mr. Latham with Mr. Feighan.
Mr. Maloney with Mr. Vinson.
Mr. Elston with Mr Camp.
Mr. Gifford with Mr. Dawson of Illinois.
Mr. Miller of Nebraska with Mr. Morrison.
Mr. Kearney with Mr. Philbin.
Mr. Kilburn with Mr. Somers.
Mr. Scoblick with Mr. Whitten.
Mr. Bramblett with Hedrick.
Mr. Kearns with Mr. Barden.
Mr. Nodar with Mr. Buckley.
Mrs. St. George with Mr. Hart.
Mr. Scott Hardie with Mr Boykin.
Mr. Fletcher with Mr. Fernandez.
Mr. Fuller with Mr. Lusk.
Mr. Bender with Mr. Rivers.
Mr. Dawson of Utah with Mr. Marcantonio.
Mr. Smith of Ohio with Mr. Cooley.
Mr. Cotton with Mr. Kelley.
Mr. Jenison with Mr. Delaney.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 30 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article that appeared in the Washington Post of yesterday.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. HINSHAW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of old-age pensions.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on a bill he is introducing today.

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

SUSPENSION OF ANNUAL ASSESSMENT WORK ON MINING CLAIMS HELD BY LOCATION IN ALASKA

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2369) providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the Territory of Alaska, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2369) providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the Territory of Alaska, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment.

RICHARD J. WELCH,
F. L. CRAWFORD,
ANDREW L. SOMERS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

HUGH BUTLER,
GUY CORDON,
CARL A. HATCH,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2369) providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the Territory of Alaska submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

It was the view of the Senate that this bill should also apply to mining claims in the United States as well as in Alaska. The House disagreed to the inclusion of this amendment, however, and after discussion in conference the Senate conferees agreed to recede from the position taken by the Senate, and accept the bill as originally passed by the House.

RICHARD J. WELCH,
F. L. CRAWFORD,
ANDREW L. SOMERS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FLOOD DISASTERS ALONG MISSISSIPPI RIVER AND ITS TRIBUTARIES—THE TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE INLAND WATERWAY

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include some excerpts from the RECORD and congressional hearings.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, today we are witnessing flood disasters along the Mississippi and its tributaries; people are being drowned, their homes swept away, and untold millions of dollars' worth of other properties destroyed.

The mighty Mississippi River, the greatest inland waterway in the world, is rendered useless for upstream traffic because of the inability of boats and barges to stem that swift current at anything like reasonable costs. All these adverse conditions can and must be overcome.

These are conditions that vitally affect our own people, and appropriations for their alleviation should come before the expenditures of billions of dollars for the improvement or rehabilitation of other countries.

Tomorrow we are going to have the civil functions appropriation bill before the House. I am going to offer an amendment, and I understand that Members from the flooded areas also have some amendments to offer.

Conditions have changed even since the Bureau of the Budget made its recommendations. I think Congress should take that into consideration when it comes to voting upon these amendments that are necessary for the protection of the American people.

I wrote many of you a letter Saturday, which you, no doubt, received this morning, about this connection between the Tennessee and the Tombigbee Rivers which would give you a short, slack water route, and a safe water route, for returning traffic, without having to fight that swift current on the Mississippi from New Orleans to Cairo.

I pointed out that several barges, photographs of which were furnished by the Army engineers, each of which carried 14,000 tons coming down from Pittsburgh and from Chicago and from Detroit.

If those barges went into Mobile and returned with similar loads, they would save more than $20,000 apiece on their fuel bills alone in going back to Cairo. If they went to Paducah to ascend the Ohio River, they would save more than $22,000 on each such load.

Today, owing to the strong current on the Mississippi River, the traffic can go down swiftly, but it cannot return except at terriffic expense.

This inland waterway will do more for the shippers in the great Mississippi Valley from the Alleghenies to the Rocky Mountains and from Sioux City, Iowa; Chicago, Ill.; Detroit, Mich.; Omaha, Nebr.; St. Louis or Kansas City, to New Orleans, La.; Mobile, Ala., than any other similar amount of money that has ever been spent or proposed on a project of this kind.

Here is the table showing the following in line-haul costs for the through traffic by the proposed Tennessee-Tombigbee Inland Waterway as an alternate route for upstream movement of existing traffic on the lower Mississippi based on an average tow of eight barges—mixed sizes—carrying 3,500 tons of freight.

You will note the cost per ton, and the cost per tow of 3,500 tons for upbound traffic moving via the Mississippi River, and also the cost per ton and per tow by way of this Tombigbee-Inland Waterway and the Tennessee River.

Also you will note the average saving per ton by using this new slack-water route, and the average saving per tow for 3,500 tons, as well as the average saving per tow of 14,000 tons.

From—	To—	Via Mississippi per ton	Via Mississippi, per tow of 3,500 tons	Via Tombigbee-Tennessee, per ton	Via Tombigbee-Tennessee, per tow of 3,500 tons	Average savings per ton	Average savings per tow of 3,500 tons	Average savings per tow of 14,000 tons
Houston, Tex	Cairo	$2.34	$8,190	$1.94	$6,790	$0.40	$1,400	$5,600
	Paducah	2.42	8,470	1.88	6,580	.54	1,890	7,560
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction	2.74	9,590	1.60	5,600	1.14	3,990	15,960
New Orleans, La	Cairo	2.02	7,070	1.32	4,620	.70	2,450	9,800
	Paducah	2.10	7,350	1.26	4,410	.84	2,940	11,760
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction	2.42	8,470	.99	3,465	1.43	5,005	20,020
Mobile, Ala	Cairo	2.39	8,365	.95	3,325	1.44	5,040	20,160
	Paducah	2.47	8,645	.89	3,115	1.58	5,530	22,120
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction	2.79	9,765	.62	2,170	2.17	7,595	30,380
Port Birmingham, Ala	Cairo	2.96	10,360	.95	3,325	2.01	7,035	28,140
	Paducah	3.04	10,640	.89	3,115	2.15	7,525	30,100
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction	3.36	11,760	.62	2,170	2.74	9,590	38,360
Demopolis, Ala	Cairo	2.68	9,380	.67	2,345	2.01	7,035	28,140
	Paducah	2.76	9,660	.61	2,135	2.15	7,525	30,000
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction	3.08	10,780	.34	1,190	2.74	9,590	38,360
Columbus, Miss	Cairo	2.83	9,905	.51	1,785	2.32	8,120	32,480
	Paducah	2.91	10,185	.45	1,575	2.46	8,610	34,440
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction	3.23	11,305	.17	595	3.06	10,710	42,940
Aberdeen, Miss	Cairo	2.88	10,080	.46	1,610	2.42	8,470	33,880
	Paducah	2.96	10,360	.40	1,400	2.56	8,960	35,840
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction	3.28	11,480	.13	455	3.15	11,025	44,100
Fulton, Miss	Cairo	2.93	10,255	.41	1,435	2.52	8,820	35,280
	Paducah	3.01	10,535	.35	1,225	2.66	9,310	37,240
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction	3.33	11,655	.08	280	3.25	11,375	45,500

As the Army engineers have said time and time again, there is not another place on the face of the earth where the traffic can be transferred from one major watershed to another with so much ease, so little expense, and such tremendous savings in transportation costs and distances.

It would simply bypass the swift current of the Mississippi for up-bound traffic by providing a slack-water route from New Orleans to Mobile and from Mobile to the Tennessee River at Pickwick Lake, and a downstream route from there to Paducah, 215 miles, or to Cairo, 262 miles.

There is not another project like it on earth.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

THE PARIS CONFERENCE

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, the press reports on the Paris Conference, which is considering the Marshall plan, inform us that this conference, like many previous conferences, is being wrecked by the Soviet Union. The Kremlin refuses to assist in the development of an overall economic program for the rehabilitation of the countries in western Europe. Russia wants the procedure on a national basis. We should not be surprised by this attitude. The Soviet Union does not want a movement by the entire continent for the rehabilitation of Europe because it would then be more difficult to spread communism. We can expect Russia to block any attempt to put Europe on its economic feet.

The United States is gravely concerned. Our security to a large degree depends on the economic rehabilitation of western Europe. In extending financial aid to the war-devastated countries we help guarantee the security of the United States. If the nations of western Europe are economically strong, it will be impossible for Russia to dominate France, Italy, and the rest of the nations on that continent. This is why Moscow is determined to stop the development of any plan for the over-all economic rehabilitation of Europe. If we are utterly realistic about the present situation, we will find out how much effort on our part is required to stabilize western Europe and to prevent it from going communistic. We will then put forth that effort no matter whether Russia likes it or not.

In this precent juncture of world affairs we should serve notice on Moscow that we will no longer appease; that whether the Kremlin cooperates or whether it does not cooperate, it is our intention to see to it, for the security of our own Nation, that the economies

of the war-devastated countries are rehabilitated, that these countries are prevented from going communistic, and that we intend to oppose on all fronts the aggressive march of totalitarian Russia toward world domination.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEMKE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Dr. A. V. Allen, M. D., on vivisection as a business.

FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, in 1933, Senator George W. Norris recognized what floods could do on the Tennessee River and its tributaries. As a result of legislation and the creation of the TVA, today we are not subject to the ravages of floods and the destruction brought about by heavy rainfalls which cause inundation of our fields and destruction of our homes and cities. In the West the situation needs correcting.

I wonder whether this Congress will be true to their duty and thus conserve and preserve the fertility of the soil and the energies of our people throughout the United States by curbing floodwaters. It is high time we were doing something about this situation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, coming from Massachusetts and the New England section, I thoroughly agree with the remarks made by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES] in connection with the terrible floods that have visited the Middle West, Missouri, and those States along the Mississippi River. I considered the solution of that problem to be a challenge to the Federal Government.

I remember in the early thirties we passed a law providing for the Federal Government and the States to cooperate, the State to furnish the land and to pay the administrative expenses. That did not work very well. In the later thirties I introduced a bill providing that the Federal Government pay 100 percent of any flood-control activities. I did that because I felt the control of floods was a challenge to the Federal Government. I have no floods in my district at all but I know how I would feel if I lived in an area where there was constant fear of floods occurring. I think we can do no better than to devote attention in the closing days of the Congress to the consideration of immediate appropriations that will tend to meet the flood situations that exist in the great areas of the country now beset by floods, and to bring to the people of those areas the message that this Congress is giving immediate consideration to their trying problems.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

POLISH HEROES REPLACED BY NAZI GERMANS — RECOGNIZING HJALMAR SCHACHT—FETING GERMAN TERROR CRIMINALS

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I intend at a later date to treat in detail three distinct subjects of interest before the House, but at this moment, because of the rise in temperature I am constrained to comment briefly, I want to call to the attention of the Members of the House the fact that the Army of the United States judging by recent actions of the high command has apparently gone wrong somewhere.

I read in the paper this morning about the British being aroused with regard to the German terror scientists who are being feted and treated as heroes and given every consideration by the Army. I read too a few days ago about Hjalmar Schacht, that arch scoundrel who should have been dangling from the end of a rope along with the others who were convicted at Nuremberg and who is now being consulted by American Army authorities, according to the admission of Gen. Lucius D. Clay, in formulating a German economic plan.

And again I want to comment on another matter with regard to the replacement of the Polish heroes, who as our Allies fought in every battle from the beginning to the end of the war, being replaced by Nazi Germans as guards on American installations and in American military camps because Communist Russia objects to them. These senseless tactics must cease and at once or we will be nailing someone's hide on our back door.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] has expired.

SEEING EVERYTHING

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my Creator for permitting me to see everything. This morning in this House I did see everything. I saw the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] in full accord with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 212, making in order H. R. 49, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 49) to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Lands, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Public Lands printed in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the adoption of this resolution would make in order the consideration of H. R. 49, a bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

Whether or not Hawaii should be admitted to the Union presents a serious question, and one which warrants the careful consideration of every Member of Congress. The Committee on Public Lands held extensive hearings on this bill before reporting it. Representatives of the War and Navy Departments testified on the military significance of Hawaii, and representatives of other executive departments testified on other aspects of the island, and upon the desirability of admitting it to the Union.

When reading the hearings on the bill, I was impressed with the number of organizations which submitted resolutions favoring statehood for Hawaii, while only one person submitted a statement opposing it. This shows, at least, that most of those interested in the question at all, favor admission of Hawaii into the Union.

In reporting the bill, the Committee on Public Lands pointed out that Hawaii possesses all the requisites for Statehood. Also cited were the favorable reports of numerous congressional committees that have studied the question.

During hearings to determine whether a special resolution should be reported providing immediate consideration of H. R. 49, the members of the Rules Committee were reminded of the numerous advantages that would accrue to the United States if Hawaii were admitted. No one appeared before the Rules Committee in opposition to the bill, and I understand all the testimony before the Public Lands Committee was also favorable.

If this bill becomes law, Hawaii will become the only State outside the continental limits of North America. This factor might prove the most serious objection to the bill, although other objections might be brought out in debating the measure on the floor. It is unlikely that opinion on the bill will divide along party lines, as the bill is entirely non-partisan.

In view of these facts, and in consideration of the seriousness and far-reaching nature of the question, the Committee on Rules was constrained to report this resolution. By so doing, the members of the Rules Committee have not committed themselves to support the bill, but have merely opened the way for consideration of this important question by the entire membership of the House. For that reason, I think this resolution should be adopted. A vote for this resolution would not commit your vote on the bill, but would merely indicate your desire to hear arguments for and against the bill. On the basis of these arguments should rest your decision as to the merits of the bill.

This resolution waives points of order against H. R. 49 and against the substitute recommended by the Committee on Public Lands which is now printed in the bill. The purpose of this provision in the rule is to guarantee that the bill is passed or defeated on its own merits. This can only be done by protecting it from parliamentary technicalities.

For purposes of amendment, the committee's substitute amendment will be considered as an original bill. Amendments to the bill will also be in order under the 5-minute rule. The rule also provides that any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments to the bill or to the committee substitute that may be adopted in the Committee of the Whole. Despite the pressure of other business in the House, the Rules Committee was of the opinion that ample time should be provided to discuss all aspects of the action contemplated in this bill. Four hours of general debate have therefore been provided in this resolution.

I therefore trust the Committee will vote for this resolution in order to give us an opportunity to hear arguments pro and con as to whether Hawaii should be admitted as a State of this Union.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the Rules Committee has stated, this rule makes in order a bill of far-reaching importance; namely, the legislation granting statehood to Hawaii. I am not going to detain the House to explain the rule because it has been thoroughly explained by the chairman of the Committee on Rules. I have at all times favored giving the people everywhere the opportunity to establish for themselves a free government through their own self determination. But this bill goes farther than that.

Mr. Speaker, this bill provides that Hawaii shall be admitted into the Union on equal footing with the original States. If I were not informed as to conditions in Hawaii I would not say anything relative to the dangers of giving favorable consideration to the bill. I have no objection to the rule. It is a broad rule. It waives points of order, and the matter being of such great importance I feel, as I have always felt, that the House should have the privilege and the right of deciding whether the request of the people of Hawaii and the recommendation of the committee should prevail.

Unfortunately Hawaii is controlled by what is referred to as the Big Five. Five organizations working jointly control the island. They control the production of sugar and pineapples and other crops and most businesses. Of course, it will be claimed there are 35 different sugar companies, which is true, but they are all controlled and owned by the Big Five, and this cannot be denied.

Of the population of about 500,000 I think 31 percent are Japanese and somewhere around 20 percent are Chinese. I am personally of the opinion that they have been loyal during the war and I feel they will remain loyal to the United States, but in view of the control of the islands by the Big Five I do not know whether we should perpetuate the Big Five control of Hawaii, as a State, knowing their past record and activities and how they appeared through their representatives years ago demanding larger and larger quotas of Japanse for the island for the purpose of obtaining cheap labor. Under these circumstances I know they have not the interest of the people who live there at heart.

I feel it would be a dangerous thing to allow that combination to control the sovereign State of Hawaii. As it is now, I feel that the people there should be satisfied with the manner in which the island is being governed. As I say invariably I have been and I am now for the right of the people to obtain for themselves that independence and freedom and liberty which all human beings are entitled to. But, as I said, I am fearful of this clique that controls that island. I am fearful of the control they will exercise over the people should it become a State.

As I said, I am not opposed to the rule. I feel that the House should have the right to vote upon it. Of course, this is not the first time that an effort has been made in this direction. I recollect at least 8 or 10 different occasions when efforts have been made to grant statehood to Hawaii. I understand the War Department and the Navy Department have approved the present bill, but I feel we should not look upon it solely from a military point of view. That statehood may be helpful and beneficial and advantageous from a military view cannot be argued. With the interest of all the people of our own country at heart, I doubt very much whether it would be for the best at this time to grant statehood while the Big Five, who virtually control labor, agriculture, manufacturing, banking, transportation, and public service, still dominate the economic life of the Hawaiian Islands.

Were it not for this fact, I should naturally be inclined to favor compliance with the wishes of a majority of the people of the Territory of Hawaii, regardless of their heterogeneous population. I cannot be quite satisfied, under present conditions, that a real democracy and the rights of the people will be safeguarded.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am very much in favor of this rule, and I hope it will be adopted and that the bill will be brought to the floor and passed.

Hawaii's statehood bill comes to the floor of the House after the most careful scrutiny and consideration by congressional committees. The subject of admission of Hawaii to statehood has had active and almost continuous attention by Members of Congress for the past 12 years.

Congressional committee hearings on this question were held in Hawaii as early as October 1935. A subcommittee on the Territories in that year reported to Congress that it "found the Territory of Hawaii to be a modern unit of the American Commonwealth, with a political, social, and economic structure of the highest type." The subcommittee recommended also that Congress give further study to the question of statehood for Hawaii.

A joint committee of Congress then visited Hawaii in 1937. It conducted extensive hearings throughout the islands. The committee reported to Congress that "Hawaii has fulfilled every requirement for statehood heretofore exacted for Territories." This was 10 years ago.

The 1937 joint committee of Congress made numerous recommendations. One was that a plebiscite be held in Hawaii to determine the wishes of the people. Another was that the subject of statehood be deferred due to the disturbed international situation.

The plebiscite recommended was held in 1940. The vote was 2 to 1 in favor of statehood.

During the period of the war, the people of Hawaii concentrated their efforts upon its prosecution. They played a vital part in our great victory. The record of the people of Hawaii in World War II is such that their loyalty to the United States cannot be questioned.

Congress again investigated Hawaii's qualifications for statehood last year. A subcommittee of the Committee on the Territories held hearings on all five of the major islands. More than 100 witnesses were heard. Upon its return to Congress, the subcommittee unanimously recommended immediate legislation to admit Hawaii to statehood.

H. R. 49 now comes to the floor of the House unanimously reported favorably from the House Public Lands Committee. This committee has examined carefully the exhaustive testimony compiled by the Larcade committee of last year. The Public Lands Committee incorporated into their report to Congress the conclusions and recommendations of the Larcade committee.

The House Public Lands Committee heard many important witnesses. Among them were Secretary Julius A.

Krug, Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz, and Maj. Gen. Charles D. Herron, retired.

Admission of Hawaii to statehood has been supported by the two major political parties.

It was recommended by President Truman in his message to Congress in 1946.

The measure has the support of the Interior Department. The War and Navy Departments offer no objections to statehood. Even with the national prominence given to the hearings last March, not a single person appeared to testify in opposition to the bill.

A recent Gallup poll of public opinion shows, by a vote approximately 3 to 1, that the American people favor admission of Hawaii as a State. It is approved by uniformly large majorities in all geographical sections of our country. The rank and file of both the Republican and Democratic voters polled in the coast-to-coast survey have supported statehood for Hawaii. National editorial comment likewise supports this view.

Consideration of this bill in this Congress is due to the people of Hawaii. These 519,000 people, nearly 90 percent of whom are American citizens, are ready for admittance to the Union as a State. For 47 years they have been led to believe that when they desired statehood, and had met the requirements for it, that Congress would admit them as they have the other 29 Territories.

Beginning in 1903, the people of Hawaii, through their legislature, have asked Congress 15 times to admit them to statehood. This measure before us allows the people of Hawaii to do now what they have long desired—to form a State constitution and enter the Union on the same footing as the 48 States.

Statehood for Hawaii would be the fulfillment of a policy, the inception of which was the act of Congress giving Hawaii an organic act in 1900. By that act, Hawaii was incorporated into the United States as an integral part of the Union.

The implications of the territorial form of government are those of provisional statehood. The people of Hawaii have demonstrated beyond question, for more than 50 years, that they can maintain the responsibilities of self-government.

Hawaii has a sound economy. Except for certain payments for salaries mandatory under the organic act, Hawaii has assumed all of the financial burdens of our States. Hawaii has paid for more than 10 years Federal income taxes which surpass those paid by 14 States. Hawaii is fully capable to meet all the financial responsibilities of a State.

Hawaii has a modern government. The territorial organization is almost an exact duplicate of a State government, and there would be no problems entailed in changing to State government.

Congressional committees investigating the question of statehood have found Hawaii to have almost no illiteracy. Public health, welfare, and educational facilities have been found to equal, and, in many instances, to surpass our State jurisdictions.

The extension of statehood to Hawaii would strengthen America's position in the Pacific. When war struck Hawaii, every American said, "We have been attacked." Every American knew then that Hawaii was a part of our country. For her part in an American crisis, Congress should not continue to hold Hawaii in the status of territoriality. Such a stand denies the fundamental rights of American government to a large body of American citizens.

At this point I would point out that Hawaii has many more American citizens in the Territory than do quite a number of the States of the Union at the present time

The cry of our forefathers, "No taxation without representation," is an axiom as much a part of our creed today as it was then. Hawaii, already an integral part of the United States, and subject to all of the laws and responsibilities of our country, should be given State government and representation in this Congress of the United States of America.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On June 26, 1947:

H. R. 310. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to permit the delivery of water from the District of Columbia and Arlington County water systems to the Falls Church or other water systems in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia in Virginia.

On June 27, 1947:

H. R. 3372. An act authorizing certain agreements with respect to rights in helium-bearing gas lands in the Navajo Indian Reservation, N. Mex., and for other purposes.

On June 28, 1947:

H. R. 3398. An act to extend the period of validity of the act to facilitate the admission into the United States of the alien fiancées or fiancés of members of the armed forces of the United States;

H. R. 3911. An act to continue temporary authority of the Maritime Commission until March 1, 1948; and

H. R. 3303. An act to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military Establishment of the United States.

HOUSING AND RENT ACT OF 1947—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 370)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I have today signed H. R. 3203, the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, despite the fact that its rent-control provisions are plainly inadequate and its housing provisions actually repeal parts of the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act which have been most helpful in meeting the housing needs of veterans.

Had I withheld my signature, national rent control would die tonight. It is clear that, insofar as the Congress is concerned, it is this bill or no rent control at all. I have chosen the lesser of two evils.

Without any rent control, millions of American families would face rapidly soaring rents and wholesale evictions. We are still suffering from a critical housing shortage. Many families are desperately seeking homes. In their desperation, they would have to submit to demands for exorbitant rent. Even this inadequate law presents fewer dangers than would the complete lack of rent control.

I have been confronted with a problem similar to the one which the Congress placed before me in the price-control bill which it sent me on June 28, 1946. That bill was so damaging to price control that I vetoed it and addressed the country on the subject. Then, on July 25, the Congress sent me a second price-control bill, in some respects worse than the first. The time was so late that I had to sign that bill in order to prevent the complete destruction of price control. But effective price control was impossible under the new law.

If I had vetoed H. R. 3203, rent controls would end, and the prospects of another bill being sent to me would be negligible. I had no choice but to sign.

It is clear that this legislation marks a step backward in our efforts to protect tenants against unjustified rent increases arising out of war conditions. For millions of families, it will result in substantial increases in rents which until now have been held at reasonable levels. The cost of living is already too high without this additional burden.

It is evident that the present high cost of living should not be increased further by a sharp increase in rents. We must get prices down, not devise means of getting the price of shelter up.

Since the end of price control, the consumer price index has risen 17 percent. Food has gone up 29 percent. During the second quarter of 1947, we have made real progress in checking these sharp price increases. On the whole, prices and the cost of living have leveled off. This progress—and the further progress we must make—would be nullified for millions of families by higher rents. Rents amount to 25 percent to 35 percent of many family budgets. Rent increases could revive the inflationary dangers which we have greatly reduced.

A basic weakness of the rent-control provisions of the act is the so-called voluntary increase of 15 percent in cases where the landlord and tenant enter into a lease that will continue until December 31, 1948. This is voluntary only so far as the landlord is concerned. Many tenants, however, will feel that there is no choice. The tenant will naturally fear that unless he enters into such a lease he will be subjected to even more exorbitant increases when rent control is ended. Whenever a vacancy occurs the landlord can refuse to rent except under a lease providing for the rent increase. Many landlords will press for rent increases whether or not

there is need for adjustment. Severe hardship will thus be imposed on many tenants. The hardship will be particularly acute in the case of veterans, who comprise such a large portion of those seeking rental housing accommodations.

The act also weakens the protection against eviction which is necessary for effective rent control, and completely removes the protection of rent control in many cases where it is still badly needed. Administration of the law will be made more complex by the injection of new procedures and will be made less effective by the weakening of enforcement provisions.

All of this represents the abandonment of a system which has been both fair and effective. In its administration of rent control the Federal Government has made every effort to give full protection to both landlords and tenants. The net rental income of landlords today is substantially higher than in the prewar years of 1939 and 1940, or in the previous decade. Provisions for granting rent increases in meritorious cases have been liberalized and simplified. Over 1,000,000 rent increases have been granted. Controls have been removed in cases where the need no longer appeared acute. These steps and many more have been taken to keep the administration of rent control simple, practicable, and fair, and to prevent hardship. This has been accomplished without permitting substantial increases in the general rent level.

Since Federal rent control is being irreparably weakened, I appeal to the governors of the States—particularly those populous States where rental housing is more prevalent—to exert every effort to protect tenants from hardship, eviction, or exploitation. They can soften, although not avoid completely, the blow to rent control dealt by H. R. 3203.

The Housing and Rent Act of 1947 also marks a step backward in our efforts to solve the critical problem of providing sufficient additional housing for our citizens. It repeals almost all the emergency aids to housing provided in the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act of 1946.

In January 1946 I recommended the enactment of legislation to meet an immediate emergency in housing. I recommended that the Housing Expediter be given the necessary powers to expedite the production of building materials and the construction of houses.

The Congress responded to my recommendations by passing the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act of 1946. With the emergency measures provided by that act, the supply of building materials has increased tremendously and the number of new homes built has increased at a rate surpassing our best prewar achievements.

The veterans' emergency housing program was announced in February 1946. By the close of that year 670,500 permanent family housing units, in addition to over 300,000 units of other types, had been started. In the first 5 months of this year 280,300 new permanent family dwelling units were begun and 300,000 were completed. Although this accomplishment is heartening, it is not enough. H. R. 3203 will weaken rather than strengthen our means for greater achievement.

The most serious loss in housing aids under this act is the virtual elimination of controls which have prevented the diversion of building materials from homes to nonessential and deferable construction. As the supply of building materials has increased, the Housing Expediter has eased and simplified controls over materials and construction. Those which were retained were necessary and important, however, and their removal by this act may prove disastrous to home building.

The increased demand for materials and labor resulting from removal of these controls may delay a decline in building costs and may even result in further cost increases. Already many veterans are unable to pay for homes at present cost levels, and this will further aggravate their problems. Moreover, delays in the completion of veterans' hospitals and of other essential construction will result from the increased competition for materials and labor.

It is of deep concern to me that this most unsatisfactory law represents the only major action taken by the Congress at this session with regard to the housing problem which confronts the Nation. We should be taking steps to provide additional aids to housing, rather than eliminating the aids which have been in effect.

On many occasions I have placed housing high on the list of subjects calling for decisive congressional action.

On September 6, 1945, in my message to the Congress, I called attention to the shortage of decent homes and the enforced widespread use of substandard housing and warned that the housing shortage would become more acute as veterans returned and began to look for places to live. I urgently recommended that the Congress enact comprehensive housing legislation to meet this problem. My proposals were directed especially to the needs of those families of low or moderate income who cannot buy or rent high-priced houses. The overwhelming majority of veterans need such legislation for this reason.

On January 14, 1946, in the message on the state of the union, I again emphasized that we faced a major postwar housing problem. I recommended that the Seventy-ninth Congress promptly enact general legislation for a comprehensive housing program along the lines of the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill then under consideration. The Senate approved the bill, but the House of Representatives was denied the opportunity to vote by delaying tactics within one of its committees.

On January 6, 1947, in the message on the state of the Union, I again recommended action by the Eightieth Congress on comprehensive housing legislation. Such legislation has been introduced and favorably reported to the Senate during this session, but has not yet been passed by either the Senate or the House of Representatives.

The obligation upon the Federal Government is one which cannot be ignored.

Again I urge the Congress to complete action upon legislation to accomplish the following objectives:

1. To provide public aid to localities for low-rent housing for families in the lowest-income groups.
2. To encourage private investment in rental housing by Federal insurance.
3. To provide a more adequate program of farm housing.
4. To extend aid to our cities for the clearance of slums and blighted areas.
5. To perfect and supplement existing aids to home financing.
6. To provide a substantial program of housing research to assist industry in progressively reducing the cost of housing.

Means are at hand for the prompt enactment of legislation which will go far toward accomplishing these objectives. I refer to the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill now before the Senate. This bill has been developed after long and careful consideration of our housing needs. These needs are known. Now is the time for action to set in motion a comprehensive program which will assure the greatest possible number of Americans a decent place to live, in a decent environment, at a cost they can afford.

In the face of our acute need for more effective aid for housing, it is unthinkable that the Congress would actually take steps to make more difficult or even impossible the efficient administration of the Government's present activities relating to housing and home finance. Yet, I fear that this may happen.

The House of Representatives has already indicated its disapproval of a reorganization plan which would preserve the grouping of our principal housing functions in a single establishment. The administration of these functions within a single establishment is essential if our housing policies are to be carried out with a consistency of purpose and a minimum of duplication. I strongly urge that this plan be allowed to become effective.

Another danger threatening even the existing aids to housing and home financing arises from the action of the House of Representatives upon the appropriations for the National Housing Agency, including the Office of the Administrator and the constituent agencies. The drastic cuts made by the House of Representatives in these appropriations, if they are allowed to stand, will seriously handicap the efforts of both Government and private enterprise. The effectiveness of the National Housing Agency will be greatly impaired. If we are to have an effective housing program now and in the future, this Agency must have adequate funds and personnel.

A continuing high volume of homebuilding activity is essential to provide decent housing for all the people. It is equally important because of its contribution to the maintenance of prosperity and full employment. Home building should provide continuous employment to several million workers, directly or indirectly, and be a strong support to the rest of the economy when postwar restocking is over and when the extraordinary foreign demand for American products has leveled off. In the

past, this major industry has been an unstable element in the national economy, fluctuating between boom conditions and almost complete stagnation. Without effective action, it cannot contribute its full share to the maintenance of high levels of production and employment.

To be successful, an attack on the housing problem will require vigorous action by Federal, State, and local authorities, in cooperation with representatives of industry and labor. It will require simultaneous action in many fields, including an expanded program of research—both public and private—on housing materials and techniques and joint action to standardize and simplify construction items. It will require farsighted action by industry and labor to eliminate restrictive practices. It will require revisions of zoning ordinances and local building codes to remove archaic and obsolete provisions. Finally, it will require a good measure of the genius for which American business is famous to improve home-building methods and to apply mass-production methods to the manufacture of houses and housing components.

One of the most stubborn obstacles in the way of any constructive housing program has been the opposition of the real-estate lobby. Its members have exerted pressure at every point against every proposal for making the housing program more effective. They have constantly sought to weaken rent control and to do away with necessary aids to housing. They are openly proud of their success in blocking a comprehensive housing program.

This group has sought to achieve financial gains without regard to the damage done to others. It has displayed a ruthless disregard of the public welfare.

It is intolerable that this lobby should be permitted by its brazen operations to block programs so essential to the needs of our citizens. Nothing could be more clearly subversive of representative government. I urge the Congress to make a full investigation of the activities of this selfish and short-sighted group. When the truth is known I am confident that this obstacle to constructive housing legislation will be removed.

The lack of adequate housing marks a glaring gap in our achievements toward fulfilling the promise of democracy. The American people today are better fed than ever before. They have more clothes and more goods of almost all sorts. In the few cases where war-induced scarcities still exist, American industry is catching up with demand at great speed. But this is not true of housing.

The progress in housing has not kept pace with progress in other fields. Private industry has not done and cannot do the whole job without Government aid. Much has been achieved with the measures heretofore authorized by the Congress. But they are far from adequate. In no part of our national life is there more urgent need for constructive legislation at this time.

I sincerely trust that the Congress will not end this session without meeting the problem squarely.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 30, 1947.*

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, while in the hallway of the Capitol this morning I did not hear the bells and missed the vote on H. R. 3961. Had I been present I would certainly have voted in favor of that bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial by David Lawrence and a resolution adopted by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors.

Mr. HAVENNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial and an article.

HAWAII STATEHOOD

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 49) to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 49, with Mr. ARENDS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration (H. R. 49) to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government, and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, was introduced by the able delegate, the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. FARRINGTON].

The gentleman from Hawaii, Delegate FARRINGTON, made a forceful and factual presentation of his bill before the Committee on Public Lands, of which he is a member. This meritorious measure received the unanimous approval of the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Public Lands has unanimously reported H. R. 49, "to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States," to the House with the recommendation that it receive immediate approval.

Since the original 13 States banded together into a Republic, 35 States have been admitted into the Union. Great care and caution have been exercised in every instance before final action by Congress looking to the admission of the Territory as a State. Your Committee on Public Lands has not deviated from that care and caution in this case. It not only held extensive hearings on H. R. 49, which would grant statehood to Hawaii, but it had the benefit of hearings held in Hawaii by committees of both the House and Senate during the past 12 years. It also had the unanimous report of the subcommittee of the Committee on Territories of the Seventy-ninth Congress favoring statehood.

Prior to the hearings widespread publicity was given through both the press and the radio. Notwithstanding this, no one appeared before the committee in opposition to this legislation. This in itself is a remarkable fact. Only three communications were received in opposition to the legislation up to the time the report was filed and from that date to the present only one other American citizen has written the committee opposing the bill.

The overwhelming support for statehood has come to the committee from a wide variety of national organizations and associations throughout the United States. I am advised that over 90 percent of the Nation's newspaper editors favor statehood for Hawaii. Both major political parties have carried planks in their platforms for many years past supporting statehood.

Reports on this legislation were requested from the War and Navy Departments in addition to the Department of the Interior. The Secretary of War, Hon. Robert P. Patterson, approved this legislation, recommending an amendment which has been incorporated into the bill by the committee.

The Navy Department, through the Acting Secretary, Hon. John L. Sullivan, gave its approval to this legislation, volunteering the information that no acts of sabotage were committed against the United States by any resident of Hawaii throughout the war.

The Secretary of the Interior, Hon. Julius A. Krug, not only submitted a favorable written report on the bill but appeared before the Committee on Public Lands in person to strongly endorse its enactment into law.

In addition, Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz, who was commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet and Pacific Ocean area during the war and who is now Chief of Naval Operations, personally appeared before the committee to testify in favor of the passage of this bill. Admiral Nimitz pointed out that from a military and naval standpoint he could see no objection to the granting of statehood to Hawaii.

Gen. Charles Herron, United States Army commander of the Hawaiian department immediately preceding the attack on Pearl Harbor, testified strongly in favor of the enactment of the legislation.

It was further testified by members of the committee who had recently visited Gen. Douglas A. MacArthur in Tokyo, that he stated to them that he favors statehood for Hawaii as it would prove of assistance to him in meeting problems

confronting his administration in the Orient.

The enactment of this legislation is not a new idea. Beginning in 1903 either by petition or resolution of the Territorial legislature the desire for statehood has been brought to the attention of Congress on 15 different occasions. From the Sixty-sixth to the Seventy-ninth Congresses, 15 bills were introduced looking toward statehood, while in the present Congress 11 bills have been introduced in the House.

The prompt admission of Hawaii to statehood will confirm and establish American prestige in the Pacific. It will, by specific example, indicate to the world our belief in self-determination of people.

The people of the United States, particularly Members of Congress, have had their attention directed westward to the Pacific in recent years. The location of Hawaii in the Pacific is of tremendous advantage to the United States. To make it a State will reemphasize the fact that the central and western Pacific Ocean areas constitute a national defense zone of the United States.

Statehood will further develop the great wealth of the Territory which is already the fifth best customer of the continental United States. It will also relieve the Federal Government of the financial obligation involved in maintaining a Territorial regime, now 49 years under apprenticeship. It will achieve two major objectives of United States policy: economy and self-government.

The Committee on Public Lands felt that the status of an unincorporated Territory was intended only as a stopgap stage in government for Hawaii—a necessary incident of probation. But Hawaii has been on probation longer than any other Territory except New Mexico, though constitutional government has been in effect in Hawaii for more than a hundred years.

Hawaii today has a population of more than half a million people, well over 85 percent of whom are American citizens. These people have made remarkable progress in the past 47 years in spite of the disadvantages of their Territorial status.

Mr. Chairman, I reemphasize my personal conviction, as well as the unanimous recommendation of the Committee on Public Lands, that H. R. 49 be passed by the House of Representatives today.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. FARRINGTON.]

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, it is with a deep sense of responsibility not only to the people I have the honor to represent, but to our common country that I appeal to you today in a sense of American fair play to head our request for admission to the Union, and to act favorably.

I want to take this occasion to express particularly to the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands the deep sense of gratitude that I feel for the courteous consideration that he has always shown every appeal that has come from the Territory of Hawaii for legislation affecting our welfare. I say the same also for all of the members of the committee, and I say the same, too, for the members of the subcommittees of other Congresses whose Members over a period of more than 10 years, have given this subject most careful attention.

Enactment of H. R. 49 would enable the Territory of Hawaii to qualify as the forty-ninth State of the Union.

In its main outlines, the bill follows the same pattern as the measures by which 29 other Territories, having served their period of pupilage, were admitted to the Union as States.

It authorizes the duly qualified voters of the Territory of Hawaii to choose delegates to a convention to form a State constitution. The bill provides certain fundamental conditions that shall be met in this constitution. It defines the procedure by which the constitution must be submitted, first to the people of Hawaii for their approval, and then to the President of the United States for his approval, after which the new State is proclaimed.

The delegates to the convention would be chosen on a nonpartisan basis. The number of delegates would be 63. Of these, 42 would be chosen from separate districts. The remaining 21 would be chosen at large in the four principal counties of the Territory in accordance with the practice by which members of the upper house of the legislature have always been chosen.

These provisions of the bill follow the recommendations of a bipartisan committee appointed by the Governor of the Territory.

The same bipartisan committee recommended the provisions of the bill requiring incorporation in the State constitution of the customary safeguards of religious freedom, maintenance of a system of public schools, and assumption by the new State of the debts of the Territory.

The title of the Federal Government to vitally important areas set aside for military, naval, and coast guard purposes is adequately protected. The same conditions apply to the lands set aside for national parks and for other civil agencies of the Federal Government.

Under the provisions of this bill, the lands set aside for the rehabilitation of the native Hawaiian people by act of Congress some 25 years ago would remain under the control of the Federal Government. This is in accordance with the wishes of the people of the Territory.

The title to all other public lands, now administered by the Territorial government under laws enacted by Congress and generally described as Territorial lands, would remain in the Federal Government for a period of 5 years after the enactment of this bill, and then pass to the State of Hawaii unless Congress provides otherwise. The bill provides that a joint committee of the Public Lands Committees of the Senate and House shall undertake an investigation immediately after the enactment of this bill to determine the future disposition of these lands.

It is the belief of the people of Hawaii that title to these lands properly should repose with them following the admission of Hawaii to the Union as a State. The revenues from these lands have always been received by the government of the Territory, and not by the United States Government. This is evidence that the United States assumed title to the lands in trust until this responsibility could be assumed by the State of Hawaii. The benefits from ownership of the lands never were ceded to the Federal Government.

A satisfactory solution of this problem undoubtedly will result from the special inquiry provided for in the bill.

The bill would give the people of Hawaii, now numbering in excess of 519,000 persons, two Members in the House of Representatives and two in the United States Senate.

The two Members of the House would be elected at large.

The bill provides that, for purposes of this act, the total membership of this House shall be increased to 437 Members, and remain at that number until the expiration of the Eighty-second Congress. After that, the total membership of the House shall return to 435 as at present, and Hawaii's representation shall be determined as a part of the reapportionment that takes place at that time.

The people of Hawaii would also be qualified to participate in national elections with a vote for President and Vice President. They would choose their own Governor, who is now appointed by the President of the United States with the approval of the Senate. The financial burden of the salaries of the Governor and Secretary of the Territory, the 3 members of the Supreme Court, the 6 members of the circuit courts of the Territory, and the 45 members of the legislature of the Territory as now constituted, all of which are at present paid by the Federal Government, would be assumed by the State of Hawaii.

The Department of the Interior would be relieved of the responsibilities it now carries for the administration of the government of Hawaii as a Territory.

Enactment of this bill, therefore, will serve the purposes of economy and transfer from Federal to local control responsibilities that properly should be borne in the latter field.

Under the provisions of this bill, the process of qualifying the Territory of Hawaii for State government probably will require from a year to a year and a half from the time this bill is enacted until the officials of the new State take office. At least 6 months will be needed to choose the delegates to the convention and to form the constitution, and even more time will be needed to secure popular approval of the constitution and qualify the new officers of the State.

The bill also provides for the orderly transfer of litigation from the Territorial to the State courts. It authorizes an appropriation of $200,000 to carry out the provisions of the entire act.

Enactment of this bill will not mark the adoption of a new policy for this country but will represent the fulfillment of a policy that had its inception in the

adoption by the Congress of the Organic Act of Hawaii in 1900. By that act the Hawaiian Islands were incorporated as an integral part of the Union following their voluntary annexation in 1898. At the time Hawaii became a Territory, Oklahoma, New Mexico, and Arizona were all Territories.

It was the belief of the people of Hawaii then, and it has been their understanding through all the intervening years, that when they met all the requirements of State government, they, like other former Territories, would become a State. They have been aware that only under State government could their aspirations for the full privileges of American citizenship be realized. This belief has been fostered in many ways.

For example, Senator Morgan, of Alabama, who visited Hawaii prior to and after the period of annexation and was a member of the commission which drafted the organic act, told the people of Hawaii in 1898, "The road to statehood would not be long."

Judge Walter F. Frear, a former Governor of Hawaii and the only living member of the commission which drafted the organic act, says that statehood for Hawaii was well understood by those who drafted the organic act to be the ultimate objective of that measure.

During the consideration of the organic act in Congress, amendments were offered in both the Senate and House providing that the adoption of this law should not be construed as offering Hawaii the promise of statehood. These amendments were rejected in both Houses.

The promise of statehood for Hawaii has been contained in the platforms of both major political parties.

The assumption that this was the destiny of Hawaii is plain in every investigation conducted by Congress. Three congressional committee investigations were conducted in Hawaii during the past 12 years to ascertain whether the Territory was qualified for statehood. After extensive hearings in 1935, the first congressional committee found "the Territory of Hawaii to be a modern unit of the American Commonwealth, with a political, social, and economic structure of the highest type."

In 1937, a joint committee of Congress found that Hawaii then met all the requirements hitherto exacted for admission of Territories to the Union, but recommended that statehood be deferred until the sentiment of the people of the Territory on this question could be determined by a plebiscite and the international situation clarified. A reexamination of this issue, such as was recommended by the 1937 committee, was carried on early in 1946 by a subcommittee of the House Committee on Territories. This subcommittee found, after lengthy hearings on all the five major islands, that the people of Hawaii met all the requirements of statehood and recommended immediate consideration of legislation for this purpose.

In the meantime, the plebiscite of 1940 showed the people of Hawaii more than two to one for statehood. Since the war, the sentiment in Hawaii is beyond dispute overwhelmingly in favor of the immediate admission to the Union as a State. The latest evidence of this is the creation, by a unanimous vote of the last session of the Territorial Legislature, of the Statehood Commission with $200,000 to defray the expenses of a campaign to advance the cause of statehood for Hawaii.

Hawaii, today, is an American commonwealth with long experience in local self-government. It is a community whose development through a period of more than a century has been completely in the American pattern. It is American in thought, in spirit, and in action.

We pay the same Federal taxes as do the people of the States. Our contribution to the Federal Treasury is, in the aggregate, normally in excess of that made by some 14 States. The standards of government maintained within the Territory have been well above the average of the States. The capacity of our people to assume the responsibilities of State government has never been successfully challenged.

It is a common conviction in Hawaii that the Territory is today on the verge of a period of great development. The people of these islands see in the great undeveloped expanses of the Pacific and the vast unexplored markets of the Far East the plains of the twentieth century. They believe that the center of the world's attention is certain to shift to this area. The strategic position in which this territory is situated makes certain that it will always remain the crossroads of the Pacific, the principal gateway for the flow of commerce and travel to the Far East and the common meeting ground of the East and the West.

The people of Hawaii believe that the time for statehood has come. They feel that the many vexing problems that confront them—and they are not essentially different from the problems facing most of the States—can be met best by giving them the responsibilities that will come with State government. They believe that, if they are ever to realize their great ambition to the full realization of American citizenship, they are entitled to realize it now.

Our development in Hawaii has reached a point where the territorial form of government no longer meets our needs. With local officials responsible directly to the people of Hawaii and with representatives in Congress privileged to vote, we of Hawaii will be in a better position not only to meet our local problems but to play our part in solving national problems as well. We are fully prepared, by long training, to carry the tasks that these great responsibilities involve.

To deny Hawaii statehood at this time will serve to weaken the tradition of self-reliance that has marked the history of the Territory and will encourage the Islands to become more and more dependent in every way on the Federal Government. It will inevitably result in the suggestion of other formulas that have dependency as their purpose.

But the case for statehood for Hawaii does not rest only on the promises which have been made; nor does it rest only on the fact that the people of the Territory have met all the requirements of statehood. The case for statehood for Hawaii rests, above all, on the conviction that our people will make an even greater contribution to this Nation as a State.

Admission of Hawaii to statehood will give the Nation the full benefit of one of the most successful experiments in American democracy.

It will also give to the people of the whole Pacific area and of the Far East a vital example, close at hand, of American democracy at work. Thus it will reinforce immeasurably the efforts this Nation is making to strengthen democracy everywhere.

It will help greatly to establish the far-reaching beneficial influence of this country throughout the Pacific and serve to emphasize to this country its responsibilities and opportunities in the Pacific area.

It will bring to the United States Congress, for the solution of our national problems, representatives who are familiar with the people, the trade, and the culture of the Pacific as well as with the problems of our national defense.

The granting of statehood to Hawaii will be notice to freemen everywhere that, wherever the American flag flies, democracy shall prevail.

Mr. KEATING and Mr. COX rose.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield first to the gentleman from New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Hawaii has expired.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. KEATING. I rise, Mr. Chairman, to express the hope that the people of Hawaii who seem about to achieve their manifest destiny and the goal for which they have labored so long, thoroughly appreciate the magnificent effort which has been made in their behalf by their representative in this Congress.

I overheard a couple of my colleagues talking the other day regarding this bill. One said to the other: "What is there in favor of this bill besides the fact that JOE FARRINGTON is for it?" and the other replied: "Well, that is just about enough for me."

Although our votes as Members will be based, as of course they should be, not on the popularity of the proponent of this measure, but rather on its inherent merit as disclosed in the comprehensive and convincing unanimous report of the Committee on Public Lands and the debate as it here ensues and upon our determination of the long-range welfare of this Nation, it does seem appropriate at this point to call attention and pay high tribute to the indefatigable industry and tireless effort of the distinguished gentleman from Hawaii in the interests of his constituents and to congratulate them on their selection of their spokesman in this Congress who so completely enjoys the profound respect and deep affection of his colleagues in this body.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. While I applaud the efforts the gentleman is putting forth in behalf

of his own people, I am compelled to say that to me it is incredible that this House, made up of solid, sound people, should be seriously considering this resolution conferring statehood upon Hawaii.

Mr. MACKINNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MACKINNON. There are many States that have stood in exactly the same position with reference to the Congress that the gentleman's coming State stands in today. My own State experienced that sensation 90 years ago. The remarks of the Delegate from Hawaii, the able and genial Mr. FARRINGTON, are thus historic and will be long remembered. He has forcefully described the ambitions of his constituents and the compelling reasons which support their plea for statehood. I know I speak the sentiments of many Members of Congress when I say I hope, come statehood, that a grateful constituency will honor the ability and statesmanship of the Honorable JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON by sending him back to the Congress of the United States as the first United States Senator from the State of Hawaii.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE].

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, the Congress of the United States has heretofore taken into consideration certain factors in determining the readiness of a Territory for statehood. Among these are the area of the Territory, its population, its economic resources and state of development, and the ability of its people to maintain stable and orderly government.

Three very complete and thorough investigations of Hawaii's readiness for statehood have been made in the past 12 years by our Congress. It is my firm belief and conviction that these investigations show without a doubt that the Territory of Hawaii fully meets, and in most instances, far surpasses the requirements for statehood heretofore exacted of Territories.

The first congressional Committee on the Territories to hold hearings in Hawaii on the question of admitting Hawaii to statehood traveled to the islands in October 1935. The six members of the committee visited various parts of the Territory and endeavored to obtain the views of its residents in regard to the question of statehood.

The committee made a thorough investigation and study of all phases of the question of statehood for Hawaii. Exhaustive hearings were held on all of the five principal islands. Two members of the committee remained in Honolulu after the formal hearings had been completed, and made individual research into the subject.

In all, there were 105 witnesses heard; 90 of these witnesses testified in favor of changing from a Territorial status to that of a State.

The committee reported:

> The Territory of Hawaii to be a modern unit of the American Commonwealth, with a political, social, and economic structure of the highest type.
>
> Its educational program is an advanced one, with a large proportion of the tax dollar being spent for the training of its youth. Even during the period of the depression this program was neither relaxed nor reduced, and its school facilities compare favorably with those of the most advanced States.
>
> Hawaii's economic standards are high, with an industrial and agricultural development forming a sound basis for the continued growth of the Territory.

Nevertheless the committee concluded that considerable further study was necessary before a favorable report might be made on a proposal to admit Hawaii as a State.

In October 1937, pursuant to a concurrent resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives, a joint congressional committee visited the Territory of Hawaii.

Sixty-seven witnesses appeared before the joint committee of 12 in Hawaii. Although the majority of the witnesses favored statehood, and the testimony received by the committee afforded substantial reasons in support of statehood, the report of the committee recommended that the question of statehood, because of the disturbed international conditions, should again be deferred until further study and consideration could be given.

It was the committee's view also "that unmistakable evidence that a substantial majority desire statehood should precede affirmative action by Congress."

The committee indicated that their failure to act affirmatively upon the question of statehood would not prevent further consideration of the subject, particularly after the sentiment of the people of Hawaii had been fully determined.

A plebiscite to determine the wishes of the people of Hawaii was authorized by the legislature of the Territory in 1939. The vote for statehood was in the majority in the ratio of 2 to 1 at the general election in Hawaii in 1940.

The first Gallup poll on statehood held on the mainland in 1941 revealed that opinion in the continental United States for and against statehood for Hawaii was in almost the same proportion as the Territorial view expressed in the plebiscite.

During the war years Congress was not able to give renewed consideration to Hawaii's statehood ambition. But with the end of the war in sight the duly elected representatives of the people of Hawaii in the Territorial house and senate adopted in 1945, by overwhelming vote in each house, resolutions that the Congress of the United States take immediate action on admitting Hawaii to statehood.

Up to this point, the Legislature of Hawaii had petitioned Congress 14 times for admission to the Union and had made 11 appropriations for congressional investigations of statehood.

It was my assignment and distinct honor to act as the chairman of the Subcommittee of the Committee on Territories which investigated statehood for Hawaii in January of last year. Along with five other Members of Congress, I traveled extensively throughout Hawaii for a period of nearly 2 weeks. Our committee heard more than a hundred witnesses. The testimony heard by the committee amounted to more than 500 printed pages. Statements presented by interested citizens of Hawaii and the exhibits offered in support of the sound operation of the government of Hawaii as a modern American community were compiled and printed, along with the comprehensive testimony taken, for the record.

In all due humility, and with the greatest respect for the untiring efforts of every member of the Subcommittee on Statehood, I would like to indicate that the data collected by our committee is said to be a most complete and searching record of the Territory of Hawaii, and that it clearly shows the readiness of Hawaii to assume the role of a State.

On the basis of the data collected, and our own investigations of Hawaii's readiness for statehood, our committee unanimously recommended, in January 1946, that the Committee on the Territories give immediate consideration to legislation to admit Hawaii to statehood.

I am very glad to note that the case for statehood made by our group last year received further confirmation in the overwhelmingly favorable report of the House Public Lands Committee in March of this year.

This, Mr. Chairman, is the gratifying indication of the completely bipartisan and unanimous support which is being given to the movement for Hawaiian statehood. I also note that not a single person in the entire Nation testified against the bill now before us.

Congressional committees of the House have thoroughly investigated Hawaii's readiness for statehood, and documentary evidence gathered by Congress has proven Hawaii has earned the right to be admitted to the Union as a State.

Hawaii has an area larger than three of our States. Her population at present is larger than the combined total of eight of the States when they were admitted to statehood. Normally, her resources make her our fifth best customer, and she more than pays her own way on the financing of the National Government. Her apprenticeship under American principles of constitutional government for almost 50 years, and the distinctly American pattern of Hawaii's way of life, have eminently fitted the islands for statehood.

Hawaii and its people are entitled to an affirmative vote by this Congress on their petition for acceptance as the forty-ninth State in the Union.

Mr. Chairman, statehood for Hawaii has been approved by the majority of the people of the United States, as indicated by the Gallup poll. Statehood for Hawaii has been almost unanimously endorsed editorially by all of the leading newspapers of the United States, by all of the officials of the Army and Navy, by former Secretary of the Interior Ickes, by present Secretary of the Interior Krug, and by both political parties of the United States. Both the Democratic and Republican Parties made statehood for

Hawaii a part of their platform. Last, but not least, statehood has been endorsed by the present President of the United States, Harry S. Truman.

Hawaii is an integral part of the United States. Its people are as much American citizens as citizens from any other State of the Union. They enjoy the same rights and privileges as any other American citizen. We are responsible for the protection and welfare of the Territory of Hawaii just as we are for any other State.

In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, Hawaii should be admitted into the Union as the forty-ninth State.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LARCADE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. May I say that all through the war period, while on my many visits to Hawaii in relation to the defense of Hawaii, the commandant of the naval forces and the commanding general of the Army there testified as to the outstanding loyalty of the people of Hawaii to the cause of the United States and the allies all during that period of time, and the outstanding contributions the regiments and other citizens of Hawaii made to the cause of freedom in the recent war.

Mr. LARCADE. That is correct. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

The committee went very thoroughly into this question. We subpenaed witnesses from throughout the Territory. We had before us representatives of the FBI, who testified that notwithstanding the reports and the propaganda that was spread in regard to sabotage and espionage in Hawaii by citizens of Japanese ancestry, before, during, and after the war, their investigations disclosed that there was no such espionage or sabotage on the part of any citizens of Japanese ancestry or any other citizens of the Territory of Hawaii. The committee made a most exhaustive and thorough study of this question. The record of the hearings will disclose that dozens of people testified as to this question. Other speakers here today will bring out this point when they address the committee.

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LARCADE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE of California. I think it should be pointed out that in the hearings which were held when this bill was under consideration by the committee we called before the committee the man who was the joint Chief of Intelligence for both the Army and the Navy in the Hawaiian Islands, and who occupied such position immediately before the war, during the course of the war, and after the war. He testified unequivocally that the people of Hawaii, including those of Japanese ancestry, were absolutely loyal to the United States; in fact, he said that he received very wonderful cooperation from the Japanese-Americans in handling some of the problems of intelligence.

I may say that I was vitally interested in that problem because I come from California, where the people have not always been friendly to the Japanese. We were certainly prepared to raise that question in the event the question of statehood for Hawaii came up. Our very, very thorough investigation of that subject substantiates what the gentleman from Louisiana has stated, that is, that there is not one iota of evidence as far as we could find a disloyalty on the part of those people.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LARCADE. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusettts. In fact, there is a tremendous amount of evidence of the fact that they have been extremely cooperative in maintaining discipline and cooperating with the United States Government forces in that entire area, even under the most difficult circumstances under regulations which have been put into effect in the Hawaiian area.

Mr. ENGLE of California. May I add that Admiral Nimitz appeared and added his testimony in corroboration of the statement which has just been made.

Mr. LARCADE. That is quite correct. I would like to make this further statement to the committee that practically all of the first generation of Japanese who had migrated to Hawaii have practically all died and that most of the Japanese now in Hawaii are native-born. As a matter of fact, 85 percent of the present population of Hawaii are native-born people of the territory.

Aside from the hearings of the committee where we had the benefit of testimony by all the high-ranking Army and Navy officers, I have, since the investigation by the committee, had an opportunity to speak to many Army and Navy officers who were stationed in Hawaii from 1 to 4, 5, and 6 years, and on various occasions they told be that they approved of statehood for Hawaii unqualifiedly.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LARCADE. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. I have been very much interested in what would happen if we admitted Hawaii into the Union at this time and made no provision for the other islands of the Pacific. I have a feeling that it might very probably mean that we would leave such islands as Guam and the rest of the islands of the Pacific in an indefinite status to remain in that status for the rest of time.

I wonder what the gentleman from Louisiana thinks of the idea of including in the state of Hawaii the entire Ameirican territory in the Pacific Ocean.

Mr. LARCADE. I do not think that question has any bearing at all upon this matter. I do not think there is any comparison there because Hawaii is in a separate and distinct category. For the last 50 years Hawaii has been part of the United States and these other possessions of ours are in a separate category entirely. Hawaii is part of the United States by virtue of the fact that it now is a Territory and they are qualified in every respect to assume the responsibilities of statehood.

Mr. POAGE. But Guam has been an American Territory for 50 years. If we create a State that does not include all of the territory in the Pacific Ocean, will we not make it impossible to pick up at a later date and provide civil government for those islands? They were managed from Hawaii. Their government actually has been administered from Hawaii for quite a long time. I wonder why we could not simply make them a part of the State or make them counties of that State and give them a civil government at this time. We have done it with the islands off the coast of Louisiana which have been made a part of the State of Louisiana.

Mr. LARCADE. In reply to the gentleman from Texas, I might say that there is nothing to prevent us from considering this problem in the future, but we do not have that question under consideration at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I have read the entire debate in the House and Senate when Hawaii was admitted into the Union as a Territory, and reference thereto will disclose that there was no question but that Hawaii would be granted statehood after being admitted as a Territory. As a matter of fact, the then distinguished Senator Caffery, from Louisiana, who opposed the admission of Hawaii into the Union as a Territory, stated that if Hawaii was admitted as a Territory, from the law and precedent quoted in the argument that Hawaii must be admitted into the Union as a State. The entire debate and argument bears this out, and I think that this country and Government assumed this obligation when Hawaii was admitted into the Union as a Territory, and in view of the fact that Hawaii is prepared to assume all of the responsibilities of statehood that Hawaii is now entitled to be admitted to statehood.

Therefore, the issue of whether or not Hawaii should be granted statehood is not the issue. This issue was closed when Hawaii was admitted as a Territory.

The only issue here is whether or not Hawaii will be granted home rule or self-government and be entitled to representation in the Congress of the United States, or, as our forefathers claimed, the issue in the American Revolution—whether Hawaii shall have "taxation without representation."

Our flag flies over every public building and over the islands of Hawaii, and Hawaii is our first line of defense in the Pacific, and this is the only part of the United States that was actually attacked during the last World War II.

Mr. Chairman, is there any question that Hawaii is part of the United States now?

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I know that many of my distinguished colleagues from the South have asked me why I have given my approval to the admission of Hawaii into the Union because of the racial issue which has been raised in this debate due to the large Asiatic and Mongolian population of Hawaii.

Mr. Chairman, every Member of this House is aware of my position on this question, as I have stated same here on the floor of the House, and I do not think that I am inconsistent in my position in regard to this question in approving the admittance of Hawaii into the Union.

As I have stated here, my people, the South, and myself have definite opinions in regard to the racial question; how-

ever, on my visit to Hawaii I observed men and women and children of all races intermingling and assimilating in perfect peace and harmony. If that is their way of life, that is their business, and they are entitled to their way of life.

In the South we do not approve of this way of life, and this should be our business; and, like Hawaii, all that we ask is that we be given the same privilege to make our own determination in this respect.

Mr. Chairman, I have no fears for the future of Hawaii, and I am of the opinion that when Hawaii is admitted into the Union that there will be another shining star added to the constellation in our flag, and that we may depend upon Hawaii exercising the fullest realization of a glorious, patriotic, and peaceful State.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LEFEVRE].

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that, if we are going to demonstrate to the rest of the world our sincerity in promoting democracy, we are justified in granting statehood to Hawaii now.

The House Committee on Public Lands had long and intensive hearings on this subject and not a single witness appeared in opposition to the bill. In addition to several Congressmen who have visited the islands in connection with this proposed statehood, we heard representatives of the Army, the Navy, and Secretary of the Interior Krug. Secretary Krug's report was the result of his recent visit to Hawaii and was very much in detail, favoring the passage of the bill now. Several witnesses from Hawaii also were here. These native Hawaiians represented the island government and also the business interests, and without exception each and every witness proved that these people have fulfilled every requirement for statehood.

Hawaii became an organized Territory of the United States in 1900 and the Organic Act, under which it has operated since that time, resembles in every material respect the original treaty under which the Territories that were created in the continental United States later became States.

As our continental Territories ultimately became States, by the same token the people of Hawaii have a right to expect statehood. This is not a new desire on their part. Since 1903, either by petitions or resolutions of the Territorial legislature, on 15 different occasions these loyal Americans have let their desires become known to the Congress. Up to now 15 different bills have been introduced in the Congress to grant statehood to Hawaii. This year we have H. R. 49, introduced by my friend the Delegate from Hawaii, the Honorable JOSEPH RIDER FARRINGTON, and by a strange coincidence bill No. 49, if passed, will give our Union the forty-ninth State.

I regret that I have not had the opportunity to visit this "gem of the Pacific," as Hawaii has been called, but I hope to have this opportunity some day. We should picture over 500,000 people, nearly 90 percent of whom are American citizens, waiting patiently for the day when they might receive the full benefits of American citizens.

In 1945 Hawaii's internal-revenue payments to the United States Treasury were more than was paid by any of 14 States, and they have maintained this relative level consistently for upward of 10 years. Citizens of Hawaii pay Federal taxes on exactly the same basis as do the citizens of any State, but they have no vote in either levying the taxes or disbursing the revenues. This is taxation without representation.

We must not have the idea that in granting statehood to Hawaii we are taking on an additional burden. Quite the opposite is true. The gross assessed value of real property in these islands is over $500,000,000. With the exception of Oklahoma, this is higher than that of any State at the time of admission into the Union. In 1944 internal-revenue collections in Hawaii were 13 times greater than the Federal grants to Hawaii, including expenditures for relief and other aid. The total value of her three leading agricultural products, namely, sugar, pineapples, and coffee, exceeds $112,000,000, and the total imports from the mainland of the United States to Hawaii in 1940 ranked Hawaii fifth among the customers of the United States.

Hawaii maintains a high standard in Government service and the people have shown a keen interest and ability in local self-government. Except for the appointed offices for over 40 years, the Territory has had complete local self-government. Records show that in 1944, 85 percent of the registered voters voted, and I ask how many of our States can meet that average? I could say a great deal about their fine schools, but it will suffice to say here that their teachers are exceptionally well-equipped and better paid than the average teacher in our own schools. Furthermore the attendance records exceed what we find here at home.

Some have worried about the loyalty of these people. Both Army and Navy intelligence authorities testified that not a single act of sabotage was committed by any resident of Hawaii before, during, or after the attack on Pearl Harbor. Hawaii furnished its quota in the armed services under selective service, and also by voluntary enlistment raised a battalion of infantry among those of Japanese descent which made an outstanding record for bravery.

Therefore the Committee on Public Lands feels that this Territory of Hawaii has met every necessary requirement to be granted statehood and unanimously approved H. R. 49. I hope the House today will agree with the committee.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished Delegate from Hawaii, the Honorable JOSEPH FARRINGTON, and the Public Lands Committee both have performed a great service in drawing attention to the importance of Hawaiian statehood in our national defense and in our good relations with Asia and the people of the Pacific. No one could have worked harder than Mr. FARRINGTON for Hawaiian statehood; no committee could have been more considerate.

Asia has more people than has any other continent. Over half of the people of the world are in countries bordering the Pacific Ocean. It is very fortunate for us that we have a strong, loyal, Pacific-minded body of American citizens living and working harmoniously together in the middle of the Pacific area. Immediate admission of these people of Hawaii to statehood would have a powerful psychological effect throughout the entire Pacific. It would extend a permanent and substantial sphere of influence thousands of miles west of the mainland toward Guam, our western-most line of defense. It would signify to thousands of Pacific islanders and to millions of people in Asia that the ocean is no longer a barrier to the extension of the democratic way of life. It would confirm our national reputation for the full development of local self-government and for the democratic application of the federal principle.

We are going to be called upon to develop plans of government for Guam and American Samoa and for the former Japanese mandated islands which are now under United States trusteeship. As we do so, our activities and policies will be watched by the entire international community. I cannot think of a better way to inaugurate these activities than by granting full statehood to the people of Hawaii, thus recognizing their maturity as a loyal American community and their strategic importance to the Nation as a whole.

Hawaii as a State would always be defense-minded. Her congressional delegation would support the armed forces as do the congressional delegations from all seacoast States.

Hawaii will also be a great asset to the Nation in fostering our national programs throughout the Pacific area. It could help to provide the vast number of Pacific islands with agricultural, educational, and public-health facilities, for in all of these fields its achievements have already been exemplary. It could in effect be an agent of the Nation as a cultural, economic, and educational center.

During the recent war, Hawaii was much more than a military base. It was an outpost of valiant civilian effort. It demonstrated what a sturdy American citizenry can do to protect their own and the Nation's integrity under constant threat of enemy action.

The people of Hawaii have long been paying tribute to the American way of life by their persistent demand for statehood. They are not asking for independence. They are not asking for dominion status nor for any status that would merely glorify their local separateness. Their only nationalism is American nationalism. They are asking with an overwhelming voice for normal absorption into the body politic of the United States with all of the privileges and obligations of American citizenship.

This is a vindication of the liberal policy of the United States. But we must follow out the logic of that policy. If

we hold out the American way of life to our newer citizens and that way of life is wholly and enthusiastically adopted by them, we must accord to them the full privileges and responsibilities which their experience and loyalty deserve.

Today the people of Hawaii are making rich contributions to our national life, materially and culturally. Rather than their being financially dependent upon us, we are dependent upon them. Their contributions to the national revenues far exceed the benefits they receive from the National Treasury, and they buy from the mainland much more than we buy from them—including our tourist expenditures.

We are already the gainers from Hawaii's participation in our national life. Let us even the score, at least politically, by according them the equal status which, as loyal and vital citizens, they richly deserve.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 14 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I should much rather be spared the necessity of standing here and raising my voice in opposition to those hard-working and distinguished members of the subcommittee who are sponsoring this bill and particularly to stand up in opposition to that delightful, charming gentleman who represents the Territory of Hawaii. Fortunately, perhaps for my objectivity, as a new Member, I do not know the gentleman very well and so I can be objective in my judgment of this matter because I gather that if one knows him well enough one has to very definitely and inevitably support the bill. If the distinguished gentleman really were the issue and if he were to be the State of Hawaii, or if he might be the two Senators for the rest of the natural life of the Republic I would be for the bill. It happens, unfortunately, that that delightful gentleman, like all the rest of us, is only mortal and even if he is elevated, as one of my colleagues characterized it, to election to the Senate, he could not go on forever and he could not perform some feat of parthenogenesis and be two Senators at the same time. I may add further, to demonstrate my objectivity, that I have not even visited the islands so that I have not become subject to the delightful and seductive influences of which one hears so much. So let us get right down to the essentials of this situation.

The chairman of the Rules Committee, in discussing the rule, indicated that there was not any opposition. I think he said no witnesses appeared in opposition before the committee. There is, however, a witness very much in opposition to this bill, a witness whose testimony I caused to be spread upon the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some months ago. He is a gentleman well known to the American people, whose voice has been heard and whose judgment has been respected throughout the length and breadth of the land for more than half a century. I refer to that great citizen, that great statesman, the president emeritus of Columbia University, Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler.

I should like to call the attention of the membership at this time to Dr. Butler's comment upon this subject. Writing to the Secretary of the Interior, before this bill was reported to the floor of the House, he said:

> MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: May I call to your attention a matter which I regard of extreme importance to the Government and people of the United States. Under no circumstances, should Alaska, Hawaii, or Puerto Rico, or any other outlying island or Territory be admitted as a State in our Federal Union. To do so, in my judgment, would mark the beginning of the end of the United States as we have known it and as it has become so familiar and so useful to the world. Our country now consists of a sound and compact area, bounded by Canada, by Mexico, and by the two oceans. To add outlying territory hundreds or thousands of miles away, with what certainly must be different interests from ours and very different background, might easily mark, as I said, the beginning of the end.
>
> Think of what would happen were the vote of one Senator from Alaska or Hawaii or Puerto Rico to defeat the ratification of an important treaty affecting the policy and good order of the world. It is unthinkable that we should allow any such possibility.

At that point I cease quoting Dr. Butler goes on with a paragraph indicating how this matter might be dealt with and other ways of satisfying any aspirations of the Hawaiian people for a greater measure of self-government.

Now, another voice was raised in support of this bill to which not sufficient emphasis has been given in this discussion, particularly on the Republican side of the aisle. In 1946 President Truman in his annual message on the state of the Union recommended immediate statehood for Hawaii. I think we just heard a message from President Truman making certain observations about a bill that passed this House. We have had various veto messages. I do not think it essential that we blindly follow the advice of the President in this matter.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. Not now, please; in a few moments. If the gentleman is not convinced when I get through, I will be delighted to yield.

President Truman also advocated the admission of Alaska, as a State as soon as it is certain that that was the desire of the people. There has since been a plebiscite, and the Alaskans have indicated that they would like to be a State. And then the President goes on again:

> A plebiscite for Puerto Rico is advocated by which the island's people might choose their form of government and ultimate status.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the message of the President puts us where we are, squarely up against the issue of what we are going to do about these islands and Territorial possessions. There are a good many findings reported by the subcommittee as the result of their hearings; a good many points of interest, but many of them, to my mind, irrelevant biologic fission. They point out, for instance, that the population of the islands is some sixty-odd percent of oriental origin. They point out that the overwhelming area of land is owned by a tiny percentage of the people; they point out that the total registration for the election of 1944, was a mere handful, 84,000 people, of whom only 71,000 voted. And yet the sponsors of this bill would give those 71,000 people 2 United States Senators, 1 for each 35,000, whereas the State of New York gets 1 for each 2,500,000.

The real issue to my mind boils down to this, that the constitutional structure of the United States is such as not to permit, as a practical matter, the admission of any such Territory as the eight tiny volcanic islands 2,000 miles off the coast, or any other similar outlying territory because under the Constitution there must be two United States Senators from each State.

Much is made of the fact that when some of the existing States were admitted to the Union their population was less than that of Hawaii at the present time. The population of Nevada was less than that of Hawaii, but they were not 2,000 miles off in the wastes of the Pacific. They were admitted at a time when conditions were very far different from the conditions that prevail today. Who would have the temerity now to suggest that if it were put up to the people of the United States anew they would vote to sustain the basis of representation that now exists in the Senate, to wit, two Senators for each State, no matter how widely the States may vary in number, wealth, and territory?

The existing States came in as part of the development of our national continental domain. They were a perfectly inevitable, natural development of our own population moving west and conquering the great virgin continent. Those States were admitted at a time when the States were still most important entities—much more so than they are today in this great centralized new Government which has grown up in the last 20 years. If we begin admitting outlying territory, and if we are to give any credit to the President's recommendation of 1 year ago to take all three of them in, that will mean six additional United States Senators. Thus, we must admit that we are confronted with something of far-reaching significance.

Bear this in mind: These people who are espousing this measure from outside and the committee itself speak of giving the Hawaiians self-determination. All right, give them more self-determination, but do not let them in as a State of the Union—they and the other Territories—to exercise two Senators' worth of self-determination on us in the continental United States. My objection is constitutional. I think this bill should be voted down.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I recognize that the gentleman is a great constitutional lawyer. On the basis of the arguments he has advanced he is opposed to Hawaiian statehood, one, because it is so far away over the waters from the continental United States, and two, because it would give Hawaii two Senators on the basis of 81,000 citizens eligible to vote in comparison with New

York's probably five or six million voting citizens. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that since the period of the Civil War Nevada has been a State of the Union and has fewer eligible voters at the present time than does Hawaii. I would also call the attention of the gentleman to this additional fact. I think the statement is correct, and he can correct me if I am in error. The Republican National Convention, in its national platform, stated that it was in favor of statehood for both Hawaii and Alaska. Is the latter statement correct?

Mr. COUDERT. That I do not know, but this is not the national convention. We are confronted with a present problem. I am perfectly well aware of what the gentleman said about the State of Nevada. I can only say to that that I think there are two very important distinctions. I think in the first place there is the historic distinction, the historic process that brought Nevada in as part of the development of our continental contiguous domain. I think that there is all the difference in the world right now between the State of Nevada and Hawaii, because of the fact that the former is part of the continental domain, where the population of the United States is swarming like bees from one State to another, and has all become one great, almost indistinguishable mass.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. May I say that the gentleman's address is statesmanship of the highest order. I trust that when the bill is considered under the 5-minute rule he will continue the discussion because this proposal cannot stand up under his attack.

Mr. CHELF. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present. This is a most important matter, and I think we ought to have as many of the Members here as possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-one Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 96]

Andersen, H. Carl	Delaney	Jenkins, Pa.
Anderson, Calif.	Domengeaux	Kearney
Andrews, N. Y.	Douglas	Kearns
Barden	Elliott	Kee
Bates, Ky.	Ellis	Keefe
Bender	Elsaesser	Kelley
Bland	Elston	Kennedy
Bloom	Feighan	Keogh
Boykin	Fernandez	Kerr
Bramblett	Flannagan	Kilburn
Brooks	Fletcher	Lane
Buck	Fogarty	Latham
Buckley	Folger	McGarvey
Busbey	Fuller	Maloney
Butler	Gallagher	Mansfield, Tex.
Byrne, N. Y.	Gary	Marcantonio
Camp	Gifford	Meade, Ky.
Carroll	Gillie	Miller, Conn.
Case, N. J.	Gore	Miller, Nebr.
Celler	Grant, Ind.	Morrison
Chapman	Gwinn, N. Y.	Morton
Clark	Hand	Murray, Tenn.
Clason	Hart	Nodar
Clements	Hartley	O'Brien
Cooley	Hébert	O'Toole
Cotton	Hedrick	Pfeifer
Davis, Tenn.	Heffernan	Philbin
Dawson, Ill.	Horan	Powell
	Javits	Price, Fla.
Rabin	St. George	Taylor
Rayburn	Scoblick	Thomas, N. J.
Rayfiel	Scott, Hardie	Tibbott
Rich	Scott, Hugh D. Jr.	Towe
Richards	Simpson, Pa.	Vinson
Rivers	Smith, Ohio	Vursell
Robsion	Smith, Va.	Whitten
Rogers, Fla.		Worley

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ARENDS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 49, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 320 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ARENDS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 49) to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I address the House for the purpose of making the request of the Members that before they come to a vote on the bill which the Committee has just been considering they read the splendid address of our colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Denver Post of June 27 on wool.

APPROPRIATIONS TO MEET EMERGENCIES FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1948

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 4031) making appropriations to meet emergencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums are appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated for the fiscal year 1948, and for other purposes, namely:

OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT REPORTS

There is hereby appropriated such amount as may be necessary to enable the Office of Government Reports to continue in operation at the same rate and under the same authority as provided for such agency in the fiscal year 1947 until the date of enactment of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1948.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is hereby authorized to disburse, during the month of July 1947, one-twelfth of the amount provided in each appropriations for the Veterans' Administration included in H. R. 3839 as passed by the House of Representatives, and there are hereby appropriated such amounts as may be necessary for such disbursements.

Automobiles and other conveyances for disabled veterans: The authority and funds provided under this heading in the "First Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1947" (Public Law 663, 79th Cong.) are hereby continued available until June 30, 1948.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Bureau of Animal Industry

Control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture, during July, 1947, to control and eradicate foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest as authorized by the act of February 28, 1947 (Public Law 8), and the act of May 29, 1884, as amended (7 U. S. C. 391; 21 U. S. C. 111–122), including expenses in accordance with section 2 of said Public Law 8, $5,000,000, to be merged with the appropriation made under this head in the Second Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947 (Public Law 122).

Sugar Rationing Administration

Salaries and expenses: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to perform, during July 1947, the functions and duties vested in him by the Sugar Control Extension Act of 1947 (Public Law 30), $750,000, including personal services in the District of Columbia; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946; printing and binding; not to exceed $10,000 for test purchases of commodities and ration currency for enforcement purposes; and hire of passenger motor vehicles: *Provided*, That not to exceed $40,000 may be transferred to the regular departmental appropriation for penalty mail as required by the act of June 23, 1944: *Provided*, That the amount herein, $400,000, shall be available exclusively for terminal leave.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to incur obligations for administrative and force account expenses for the continued operation of any activity of the Department of the Interior for which provision is made in H. R. 3123, a bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, or in any Senate amendment thereto, but for which obligations may not be incurred under the provisions of section 102 of the Second Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947 (Public law 122), and for War Agency Liquidation in accordance with the terms of the budget estimate contained in House document No. 312: *Provided*, That such obligations shall not exceed the rate of obligation provided for such activity for the fiscal year 1947: *Provided further*, That the authority conferred hereunder shall continue until July 31, 1947, or until the date of enactment of H. R. 3123 into law, whichever is the earlier date, except in the case of War Agency Liquidation, which authority shall extend until the date of approval of the appropriation act providing the supplemental appropriation for this activity for the fiscal year 1948.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

United States Conciliation Service

For salaries and expenses from July 1, 1947, to August 21, 1947, United States Conciliation Service, including printing and binding, travel, penalty mail and all expenses

authorized for such service in the Department of Labor Appropriation Act, 1947, $430,000.

SEC. 2. This act may be cited as the "Emergency Appropriation Act", 1948.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, we have here a bill providing for certain things that seem to have to be taken care of right away before the first of July. One or two of them are necessary so that certain agencies will not be wiped out arbitrarily before the Senate and House conferees may get together and agree on a provision for them or, on the other hand, agree that no provision should be made.

That would apply to the Office of Government Reports, which may operate for 1 month or until the bill is disposed of.

There is also a provision that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may disburse one-twelfth of the amount provided in each appropriation for the Veterans' Administration so that they may make all disbursements that they require.

There is also included for the Veterans' Administration a continuance of availability of authority of funds provided under the First Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1947, Public Law 663, Seventy-ninth Congress, providing for the purchase of automobiles for veterans who have lost an arm or leg.

There was $30,000,000 carried in that bill. The Veterans' Administration estimates that they will have purchased somewhere between 14,500 and 15,000 automobiles at a cost of approximately $24,000,000 by the 1st of July.

In the Department of Agriculture there is $5,000,000 made available for the continuation of the operation of the foot-and-mouth disease control in Mexico. I do not know what we have to do in connection with that. I do know that we have a committee presently in Mexico, with representatives from the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Agriculture, going over the picture and the method of operations. When they come back at the end of the week, we expect to have them in a week from today, and go over the picture and be able to present a final program, or as near as we can, with reference to that matter.

There is also an item to allow the Secretary of Agriculture to continue to operate the sugar-control proposition, $750,000, of which $400,000 will be for terminal leave. I do not know what we will have to do with that after the month of July. It is confined now to the one thing, industrial operations.

In the Department of the Interior, funds for administration and force account expense are allowed to be continued to be obligated.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. There is one particular matter which the gentleman mentioned and about which I should like to inquire in order to be clear about it. In the last Congress legislation was enacted and money appropriated for the purchase of automobiles for amputee veterans.

As I understand it, there is a continuance of that authority and an appropriation contained in the resolution that is presently before us?

Mr. TABER. That is correct. I have referred to that. There will be about $6,000,000 carried forward in the fiscal year 1948 so that they can continue to buy those automobiles as these people apply, who are entitled to them under the law.

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. FORAND. Just following up the question of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] do I understand the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to say that there is authority for the continuation of the purchase of these automobiles, in addition to the appropriation itself?

Mr. TABER. None beyond the amount of funds that is presently available.

Mr. FORAND. But I mean the date.

Mr. TABER. The date is set forward to June 30, 1948.

Mr. FORAND. In this bill?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. FORAND. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. Do I understand that there is an appropriation of $5,000,000 carried in this resolution to continue the fight on foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico?

Mr. TABER. The gentleman is right.

Mr. BARRETT. I understand they are or will shortly be out of funds, and I am very happy that the chairman has included that item in this resolution.

Mr. TABER. There is one other item of $430,000 to continue available funds for the United States Conciliation Service in the Department of Labor so that there will be no question of that service going out for the moment.

I believe that is all I care to say. These things we are told must be done at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, this bill is an extraordinary remedy for an extraordinary situation. We reach the deadline today. This is June 30, the end of the fiscal year; and at 12 o'clock midnight tonight all financial provision for the operation of the Government expires. All agencies and departments of the Government are without funds, and unless the rules are suspended and this radical departure from the usual procedure is agreed to by a two-thirds vote of the House the Government closes its doors. There is no money to continue.

Mr. Speaker, we are in the throes of a legislative jam without precedent in the history of the Nation. Never since the administration of President George Washington have we reached the end of the fiscal year with so little accomplished in the annual appropriation program. Of the 12 bills necessary to run the Government we have sent only one to the President.

There is a reason for everything. Certainly there must be a reason for the delay which makes it necessary to take up a bill of this character on the last day of the year. What is the reason? Why is it that for the first time in 158 years Congress has failed in its duty; has failed to perform its constitutional function? What extraordinary condition brought this situation about?

They explain by saying they had to get organized. But we had to get organized 2 years ago. In the last corresponding session, the first session of the Seventy-ninth Congress, ending on the 30th day of June 1945, we had passed all the supply bills. Every bill had gone to the President and had become law.

Then they tell us the legislative budget delayed them. There was no occasion for the legislative budget to delay them. They have not paid any attention to it, anyway. So there is no alibi there.

Now, there is a reason. Why have we been so dilatory? The original schedule which was printed and distributed to the members of the committee called for the report of the last of the 12 supply bills to the House on May 20. It was prepared after the committees had been organized and were ready for business. Why has not the schedule been adhered to?

The answer is that to be found in the failure of the committee to make an aggressive attack on the program, in its predilection to make fruitless excursions up blind alleys, in the verboseness and addition to pointless detail. Page after page of the voluminous hearings contribute nothing to the information required to draft the bills. The inquiries have not been properly analyzed and organized. Hours are consumed on collateral matters which could have been dispensed with and the final draft of the bill have remained unaffected. We simply did not get the work done. There has been plenty of time in which to do it, but we have not done it.

Another cause for delay has been the lack of competent investigators. Instead of employing trained investigators from the FBI as we have done heretofore—men who were experienced and especially qualified for this work, men who could be relied on to handle it efficiently and expeditiously—we have gone out in the highways and by-ways and brought in men with preconceived opinions and objectives.

They were to uncover unsavory conditions of maladministration, diversion of funds or other matters prejudicial to the departments and when they failed to find such conditions the investigations were extended into a series of fishing ex-

peditions which consumed more time than the investigations warranted.

In other words, we are in precisely the same situation in which we found ourselves at the close of the last world war.

When the Sixty-sixth Congress convened in 1920, its first interest was to investigate the conduct of the war. Surely, in the expenditure of all those funds, billions of dollars, and in the management of a world war there were rare and racy scandals galore to be unearthed, and no stone was to be left unturned.

We spent a million dollars investigating the war. Every recess was explored, every transaction was sifted. And all we ever discovered of a derogatory nature was that the Army bought more bridles and saddles than we had horses. No indictments were ever returned. No criminal processes were ever started. But we got a million dollars' worth of satisfaction out of knowing that Americans are honest and trustworthy.

We are going through the same processes today. The only difference is that it was a bigger and longer war and we spent more money and covered more territory. The result will be the same. Americans are still honest and efficient. But it is taking so long to find it out that all the investigators have not yet reported and the supply bills have not been passed in time to meet the dead line at the close of the fiscal year.

I am glad to be able to commend the bill in one particular. It maintains inviolable the constitutional prerogative of the House of Representatives to originate appropriations bills. An attempt was made in another body to usurp this long-established privilege of the House by reporting a similar bill, one perhaps more conprehensive.

As a matter of fact, this bill is deficient in many respects. It comprises only five items when there are numbers of agencies and services in the same predicament. Practically all departments of the Government are left without visible means of support at the closing of the fiscal year prior to enactment of the money bills. You ask how those not provided for in the pending bill are to be maintained. And you will be surprised to know. The others are being called up over the telephone and told to go ahead and pay no attention to appropriations or lack of appropriations, and we will make it all right.

In other words, we have government by telephone. It is an astounding way of running the Government, but nothing should surprise us these eventful days. Why bother to pass the appropriation bills when we can settle the whole matter by dialing the right number and reassure the dazed bureaucrats at the other end of the line without authorization from the subcommittee, from the committee, or from the House, much less the Senate and the President. We live in a wonderful age.

But we are maintaining the primacy of the House in appropriations. Every few years another body decides to take over the initiation of money bills and starts proceedings, but each time, as in this instance, prompt and emphatic action and comment have reaffirmed the constitutional right of the House. I congratulate the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], for his prompt action in protection of the rights of the House.

Mr. Speaker, while I regret the tardiness with which the appropriation bills have been reported, we face a condition and not a theory. There is no alternative but to pass the pending bill. Under the circumstances, the minority must perforce join in the passage of the continuing resolution.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, at the hotel where I reside in Washington, and where I have resided for the last 13 years, there is a very frequent visitor in the lobby of evenings. I know very little about the gentleman except I know him by name. But he is one of the most happy and felicitous gentlemen I ever knew. When he discusses the affairs of the day he is never handicapped by facts. One night he can tell you that he has had dinner with John D. Rockefeller and the next night, with the greatest of eclat he will say that he has just come back from Miami, where he had done all the interior decorating of the homes of 10 United States Senators. His flights of fancy are so unique that they baffle all description. But he is not handicapped by the facts.

Now, my dear friend from Missouri certainly is not handicapped by the facts either. The fact of the matter is that the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill was approved on July 20 last year, when our very esteemed friend from Elsberry, Mo., was chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives. This year it went to the White House before the fiscal year ended.

The appropriation bill for the District of Columbia was approved on July 9, 1946, for the current fiscal year.

The appropriation bill for State, Justice, and Commerce was approved on July 5.

The appropriation bill for the Interior Department on July 1.

The legislative appropriation bill on July 1.

The Navy appropriation bill on July 8.

The appropriation bill for the Department of Labor and Federal Security was not approved until July 26, 1946, when my esteemed friend from the great Commonwealth of Missouri was the chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives.

He mentions the fact that the jam is greater than it was since the days of George Washington. That does not make me a bit unhappy. We had very solid government in the days of George Washington, and if by time, and by scrutiny, and by exploration of all the items it takes a little longer, and we retrieve those essences of freedom that were manifest in the days of George Washington, I shall be happy even in 1947.

The fact of the matter is that our friend, if anyone in the United States and particularly in the Congress of the United States, is responsible for any delay that may have ensued in the preparation of appropriation bills. Certainly some measure of the responsibility can be laid upon his doorstep.

I was one of that joint committee of 12 Members of the Senate and the House that fabricated and formulated the Reorganization Act. I was deeply interested in the legislative budget. So was the President of the United States. On the 2d day of August 1946 when he handed me a pen at the White House after he signed that bill, he expressed his particular interest in the legislative budget in the hope that it would make for efficiency and economy in Government. But it is not so easy to pull a legislative budget out of the air, sometimes. There should be some background and there should be some effort, and there was, consonant, of course, with the time that was available.

My friend from Missouri, instead of chiding the Congress and particularly this side of the aisle for any dereliction of duty, ought to remember that he went home when the session was over in 1946, and no investigating staff was set up and no effort was made to develop the groundwork upon which a legislative budget should be predicated in January of 1947. We came here without tools, we came here without data, we came here without information except that which we could gather in a short space of time. But from the 3d day of January until the 15th day of February we organized 104 Members of the Senate and House into the Joint Legislative Budget Committee, and in that time a committee of 20 was selected, 10 from either body, to do the work. In that time we sat down with accountants very special in character and ability for the purpose of getting the background and formulating the necessary estimates with which to make a report to the Congress. The law itself said that the deadline was the 15th day of February, so we had 30 days in which to wrestle with the President's $37,500,000,000 budget.

My friend from Missouri, who can sometimes be a little difficult, and I say it in a friendly way, because I have a deep affection for him, could at least have given us a little pitch and engaged some people and suggested that, if there was going to be a change of political complexion in this and in another body, perhaps we ought to get together and provide money and regularize the procedure, whereby when we came back in January of 1947 we would have a foundation upon which to build the superstructure of economy. My friend from Missouri will not deny it. We all went home, certainly, but the responsibility was on the Democratic side of the aisle because they were in charge of the Congress. He was the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and he could have come to us and said, "Now, there is a possibility of a change in the political complexion of this body."

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I want to commend the gentleman, who is an able member of the Appropriations Committee, and the chairman of that great committee, the very able gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], together with their Republican colleagues on that committee, for the splendid and diligent efforts they have put forth to cut the President's padded budget. The gentleman from Missouri inquires why it takes time to get these appropriation bills out. I am sure the gentleman from Illinois will agree with me that it takes more time to examine a budget carefully and to find the places where items can be cut without interfering with any essential function of Government than it does to just rubber stamp the executive request. As the gentleman ably pointed out, the Republicans of this Congress have been cutting the budget and they have been cutting it over the stubborn, unrelenting resistance of Mr. Truman, his administration, and his satellites here in the House of Representatives.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank my good friend, the majority leader, for that very great contribution.

Finally, let me say this: Is there such a magic to June 30? The Government still has not lost its capacity to deal with an emergent situation. The difference is, of course, that we used to have an emergency every 24 hours, years ago. Now we get one only at the end of the fiscal year, and perhaps one other in the course of a whole fiscal year. So we have the capacity to deal with it and that is precisely what we are doing today. We are doing it because the House has a deep and abiding conviction as to the reductions that have been made in the appropriation bills.

We do not propose, therefore, to relent even slightly in that conviction because these economies are in the interest of the people of the United States of America.

So, I am not concerned about the capacity of Republican representative Government to deal with any crisis that may come along. This will enable us, of course, to give a great accounting of our economical stewardship to the people of the United States.

If you want an example—we were taking testimony on the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture for seven long weeks. There were 413 witnesses. It took nearly 3 months to start with a bill and finally get it to the floor of the House. There you have to scrutinize and explore the appropriation of every dollar. That is one of the reasons why with some pride, and with humility, we can say that economies totaling hundreds of millions of dollars were finally effectuated. If we ever expect to eliminate duplication, lack of efficiency, and waste from Government, it will be only in proportion as we take every dollar that the humble, horny-handed, hard-fisted citizens of the country contribute to the Treasury of the United States of America, lift it up, turn it over twice, then lay it down and determine what to do with it. That, of course, is a technique somewhat unknown to our friends on the other side during their stewardship of the last 14 years.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. As long as the gentleman has made such an elaborate statement concerning the Members on this side of the aisle, may I ask the chairman a question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. With the greatest of pleasure.

Mr. SHEPPARD. During the time that you were chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, how many objections did you have from the Democratic side, the minority, to legitimate cuts in the bill?

Mr. DIRKSEN. From my friend from California, very little. I take off my hat to him. He deserves a pat on the back for his good work. But my friend will agree that perhaps I could not as properly say as much about some others.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman from Illinois spoke about the gentleman from Missouri not laying the groundwork here before January 3 for the legislative budget. I remember very distinctly that certain of the Republican leadership moved in here shortly after November 5 and worked so hard that the tax bill introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] was brought up very shortly after the 1st of January.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But my friend forgets that notwithstanding the fact that some of our people may have moved in here, we still had no authority until the complexion of the House had finally and officially changed, that is, as to the speakership and the chairmanship of the various committees.

Before the time is up, may I venture one other observation with respect to my friend from Missouri's observation about George Washington and the allegation that today sees the most acute delay in completing appropriation bills since Washington's day. The answer is very simple. There was but one New Deal since the days of the Father of Our Country and among the many other chores which the Republicans inherited was the job of exploring its many activities carefully so that sound government in the true American tradition might be restored.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, within my brief lifetime I have heard most of the great orators of both pulpit and platform in public life in America during the last quarter of a century. And it is my considered opinion that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], is the premier of them all. He excells in charm of address, and in his ability to convince against their will any audience that might be assembled. And his golden eloquence would charm the birds out of the trees.

And when you associate with him the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, whose rating as a prospective contender for the nomination at Chicago next year is rapidly mounting, and who has just spoken so effectively on the bill, I tell you, you have there a real team to deal with.

But even the persuasive eloquence of these two gifted advocates cannot obscure the real issue before the House.

The gentleman from Indiana says it takes time to investigate and legislate economically, and he patiently explains that it is because it has required so much time that they have not been able to get more than one bill to the President in six calendar months. But he overlooks the fact that 79 Congresses, many of them controlled by his party, have been confronted 158 times with this situation, and certainly he would not have us believe that those under Republican control were derelict in their duty and did not investigate thoroughly enough. It is an engaging talking point but it falls far short of explaining why for the first time in 158 years they have only been able to get one bill to the White House in 6 months.

And then he offers a further novel suggestion. He suggests that because the dictatorial minority would not cooperate, the downtrodden majority have not been able to get the rest of the appropriation bills to the White House.

But we did cooperate. We cooperated better than the members of the gentleman's own party. When the question of cutting the budget $6,000,000,000 or $4,500,000,000 hung in the balance it was my personal vote in the committee that determined the amount of the proposed cut. I voted to cut six billion instead of four and one-half billion, and my vote was decisive. But so few of the gentleman's colleagues on the committee favored retrenchment that I have been unable to get them to cooperate with me in bringing out a conference report that would reduce the budget $6,000,000,000 or any other amount.

It is not necessary for us on this side of the aisle to protest our determination to save money. We rescinded more money in the last Congress than has been rescinded in all other Congresses combined. The amount rescinded in this Congress is a mere token compared with the amount we returned to the Federal Treasury in the Seventy-ninth Congress.

There is a mark to shoot at. And if we had been in control of this Congress it is my conviction that we would have rescinded a larger sum than is to the credit of the party in power up to this time. And I shall demonstrate the accuracy of that estimate before the end of the session.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I do not recall whether I picked it up in the newspapers, or where, but my understanding somewhere along the line has been that the gentleman was against the $4,500,000,000 cut or the $6,000,000,000 cut; that he was standing right with the President.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman's information is nebulous. It was my personal vote that set the proposed cut in the budget at $6,000,000,000. On a sub-

sequent occasion in the House I voted, not against the $6,000,000,000 cut, but against the refusal of the majority to indicate where the cut was to be applied.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Illinois is trying to throw a smoke screen across the present situation by charging that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] failed to appoint experts and investigators on the Appropriations Committee. I wonder what charge would have been hurled against the gentleman if he had appointed them. I can see the wave that would have gone out through the country about a Democratic chairman, who would no longer be chairman after January 3, stacking the committee, and the charge of patronage would have been hurled at the gentleman. The responsibility rested with them after the election date, because they knew they were going to take over control of the House. The responsibility was with them to negotiate or contact the gentleman in connection with appointments. Furthermore, the gentleman from Indiana, the majority leader [Mr. HALLECK] certainly went out of his way—and we accept it as a compliment but the gentleman did not intend it as a compliment—the gentleman went out of his way to bring about discord in the House, which we refused to recognize although he made the mistake when he made the sarcastic reference to those on the Democratic side as being satellites of President Truman.

Mr. CANNON. Precisely. Backsight always has the advantage of foresight.

But, Mr. Speaker, I must not neglect my friend, the gentleman from Illinois. As he well says, we should stick to the facts.

My friend says I should have organized an investigation during the interim between the adjournment of the Seventy-ninth Congress and the convening of the Eightieth Congress.

That is exactly what I did do. The gentleman will recall—and all members of the committee will recall—that 3 weeks prior to adjournment I requested them—collectively and individually—to file with the clerk of the committee a list or statement of agencies and activities they thought should be investigated during the vacation of Congress. I asked them to cooperate in making investigations of the departments on items in the bill on which they would sit in this session. And I recall, and the gentleman will recall, that he did not ask for an investigation of any agency. If he had indicated any investigation which he thought might be prosecuted with advantage while Congress was in recess, the investigation would have been made by men from the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the most carefully trained operators in the world, and we would have presented him with an authoritative and unbiased report on his return to the House in January—or sooner if desired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is it not a fact that my friend from Missouri labored long and earnestly to have the legislative budget deferred until the 15th of April, fully 60 days, rather than to have it on the 15th of February? And is it not true that my friend from Missouri had at least 90 days from August 2 until election day when he was still chairman of the Appropriations Committee and as a matter of fact, properly so, expected to remain in charge after November of 1946, and could have set up some kind of a regularized staff so that this data could have been assembled whether he was in charge or he was not in charge?

Mr. CANNON. We did have such a staff.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But they did nothing, they did nothing.

Mr. CANNON. They did nothing for the gentleman from Illinois because he requested nothing. I not only requested the committees to requisition investigators for studies during recess but I requested every individual member of the committee to indicate any subject or department he wanted to investigate; and the gentleman from Illinois was not interested. He did not indicate anything he wanted taken up. If he had we would have put the FBI on the job and they would have given him any information he wanted. In the last 3 years they have never failed to deliver. In all the investigations made there has never been the slightest criticism of their work or the results they secured. If there had been any criticism we would have put another man on the job and have kept putting men on the job until it was satisfactory.

But, Mr. Speaker, let us get back to my first statement. For the first time in the history of the Congress we have reached the end of the fiscal year with only one supply bill in the White House.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I come not to apologize for the record of the Republican majority in this House upon appropriations, but to brag about it.

We have been through a troublesome time, a troublesome time with the departments representing the only New Deal since George Washington. We have had to set up an investigatorial staff, and it has been a staff of the greatest accountants, analysts, and Government specialists in the United States; and the service they have rendered is something of which we and they may well be proud. In one agency alone the Government's position was bettered as a result of their operation to the tune of $750,000,000, and in many other agencies the foundation was laid for the recovery of enormous sums of money this year, and next year, and years after.

No member of the Republican majority has offered a motion to recommit an appropriation bill restoring practically all the cuts that were made in the agriculture appropriation bill and some of the other bills, as some of our friends on the minority side of the aisle have done.

The gentleman from Missouri upon the roll call on the adoption of the legislative budget—and I have it here in front of me on page 60 of the general committee report—was among the 22 "noes" who voted against the adoption of that report calling for a $6,000,000,000 cut. I remember occasions when he voted against the $6,000,000,000 over in the committee, and then against the $4,500,000,000; but let me indicate this so that we may have the picture completely. There were a couple of bills that my friend from Illinois left out of his account, bills that were left over after July 1 of last year. One was the military appropriation bill that did not become law until the 16th of July. The other was the Government corporations bill which did not become law until the 25th of July. Nine out of 12 of the regular annual bills did not become law before the 1st of July last year. This year I hope we shall do better than they by getting them all out by the 15th of July.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken, and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPEAKER EMPOWERED TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until tomorrow it shall be in order for the Clerk to receive messages from the Senate and for the Speaker to sign any enrolled bill or joint resolution he finds properly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes after the other special orders today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 49) to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 49, with Mr. ARENDS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at the point following my statement earlier in the day on this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE].

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Chairman, I am for statehood for Hawaii because, in the first place, its people are nearly all American citizens who have played and are destined to play a constructive role in our national life; secondly, because I want to eliminate every possible barrier to our prosperous commercial relations with the richest overseas Territory of the United States; and finally, because I am fully convinced that, as a State, Hawaii will become an even stronger factor in our national defense and in our good relations with the entire Pacific area, including the continent of Asia.

Apparently the people of the Nation are already overwhelmingly convinced of this, too, for national organizations, public-opinion polls, and editorials have strongly supported statehood for Hawaii.

In view of Hawaii's economic importance and the fact that she is normally the fifth best customer of the continental United States, it is easily understandable that businessmen would support statehood. Resolutions supporting statehood have been received from the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, California State Chamber of Commerce, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, and the National Association of Real Estate Boards. Many State and city chambers of commerce and other business organizations throughout the country have reiterated the stand of their national bodies.

However, businessmen are by no means the only ones who feel that Hawaii should become an equal partner in the Union. Groups with widely diversified interests and views have given their support to statehood at their national conventions and meetings.

Organizations representing labor and veterans are on record in support of statehood.

Women's organizations, too, have added their endorsement at national conventions. These include the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution; the Zonta Clubs of America; the Soroptomists; and the YWCA.

Educators have voiced their approval of statehood through the National Education Association.

One of our largest service clubs, the Lions International, at its national convention in Philadelphia last year, took up a resolution calling for statehood for Hawaii now, and the 12,000 delegates present arose to their feet in unanimous support of it.

It is a well-known fact that both the Democratic and Republican organizations have for many years been on record in their national platforms as favoring statehood for Hawaii.

Not only are various groups in favor of statehood, but individual citizens favor it. Public-opinion polls and newspaper comment indicate that the American public and the press are overwhelmingly in favor of making Hawaii the forty-ninth State. Last year, a report by the American Institute of Public Opinion, popularly known as the Gallup poll, showed 60 percent in favor of having Hawaii admitted as the forty-ninth State; 19 percent opposed, and 21 percent expressed no opinion. The poll showed no important difference in sentiment on party lines. Sixty-one percent of both Republicans and Democrats favored statehood.

Opinion in Hawaii, of course, strongly supports it. A plebiscite conducted in 1940 showed two out of every three voting wanted statehood. Island leaders claim that if a similar survey were conducted today it would show 9 out of every 10 want statehood.

The Hawaii Statehood Commission recently undertook an analysis of editorial opinion in 59 daily newspapers over a period of 6½ months. The results showed 93.5 percent in favor of statehood. These papers comprised key or representative journals in all 48 States whose combined circulation totaled about 9,000,000. Some editorials simply stated the issue without taking a stand. The papers analyzed represented a wide variety of party viewpoints. Another survey of the same papers undertaken at the time of the statehood hearings before the House Public Lands Committee in March showed 100 percent favorable comment.

Incorporated in our committee record is the favorable editorial comment on statehood for Hawaii from 45 of the 48 States. No opinion of any kind was received from papers in the other 3 States. This compilation of opinion covered 165 news publications with a combined daily circulation of nearly 20,000,000. Here is what the San Francisco Chronicle has to say:

> It is nineteenth century nonsense to hold back on the score that the islands are not contiguous. * * * Hawaii is closer to Washington today than Utah was a quarter-century ago. On all scores it is a natural union, and we should end the anomaly which has kept Hawaii voteless.

I think the New York Times summarizes the general attitude of public opinion and the press with these words:

> There have been numerous committee visits to the islands, the Library of Congress must be bulging with reports, and the facts about the islands are well known to the American people. Forty-nine years of apprenticeship, since annexation in 1898, should be enough to qualify Hawaii for membership in these free and independent United States. That is a longer period than any present State was forced to wait.

The people of the west coast are particularly aware of the great commercial value of Hawaii's close relations with the rest of the United States. Our committee heard nothing but favorable testimony concerning statehood from our west coast chambers of commerce, as well as from the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. The statistics show that Hawaii has normally bought much more from the mainland than the mainland has bought from her, and all evidence points to mutually prosperous trade relations in the future—especially if all barriers to trade can be removed.

We want to provide immediate statehood for Hawaii in order to remove a very serious inequity which may operate as a handicap to a continuation of our good relations. I refer to the violation of one of our most cherished American traditions—the principle that there must be no taxation without representation. It was brought out in our committee investigations that during the first 40 years after annexation Hawaii paid into the Federal Treasury $150,000,000 more than it received from it. In still more recent years its payments of internal revenue into the Federal Treasury have been greater than those of many of the mainland States. Yet the American citizens who pay these taxes still have no voice in deciding upon Federal taxes or Federal expenditures. We must bring an end to this discrimination at once.

Like all California citizens, I am always interested in the problems of our national defense. I am glad that our State is protected and that the Nation is protected by a strong outpost in Hawaii. I am glad, too, that such an outpost is under American sovereignty and that it is inhabited by American citizens who have distinguished themselves by their loyalty and by their excellent standards of community life.

No doubt the people of Hawaii, being even more exposed than we of the west coast, are at least equally concerned with national defense. How can they help being conscious of their obligations to protect the Nation and the Nation's obligation to protect them? Since we are entitled to rely upon their loyalty, we must take every step to assure the conditions in which such loyalty can flourish. We must remove from the minds of the Hawaiians any unsettling doubts about the way in which the Nation regards them. Territorial status, as they well know, is a tentative or transitory status. It imposes all of the obligations of citizenship, such as taxes and selective service, but it does not allow for the privileges of participation in the National Government. This transitory status is not good enough for Americans who have long outlived their period of tutelage. It is not good enough for citizens who have a vital role to play in the Nation's defense.

We owe it to ourselves to make the Hawaiian people feel secure as an integral part of the national community. In the interest of our national security and welfare, let us enjoy not only their loyalty and service but the full benefit of their wisdom and experience.

(Messrs. JUDD, POULSON, ANGELL, JOHNSON of California, BRADLEY, BUCK, MCDONOUGH, and MILLER of California asked and were given permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the pending bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, the United States of America stands for democracy against totalitarianism and for the principle of federation in government under which local self-government has been preserved against the encroachments of centralized power. I cannot imagine a better opportunity to demonstrate the value of these two great principles than by bringing Hawaii immediately into this Union of States. No step could be more timely when we are resisting the advance of the totalitarian system throughout the world. I am convinced that we must throw the weight and prestige of this Nation into the maintenance of democracy everywhere; but, if we are to do so effectively, it is urgent above all for us to complete the splendid structure of self-government within our own sovereign domain.

Hawaii already stands in the Pacific area as our most conspicuous outpost of the American way of life. Nowhere else has there been a more striking demonstration of the ability of people of different races, different national origins, different tongues, different cultural and social and intellectual backgrounds to work together in mutual respect and teamwork for the good of all, as the surest way to promote the good of each.

Hawaii is no longer an experiment in American democracy. It is an accomplished fact, and our recognition of the success of the experiment is long overdue. That is why I am sure that the Congress will enact H. R. 49 at this session. The voluminous evidence favorable to statehood which has been placed in our hands by our investigating committees carries overwhelming conviction.

I know that there used to be doubts about the ability of the Pacific races to merge into a loyal American community. But this ability has now been tested in Hawaii under conditions of war as well as under conditions of peace. The community spirit and the American patriotism of these people have been even more impressive than many had thought possible. No finer tributes have been made to Americans anywhere than those which were made concerning Hawaii for the record of this Congress.

After all, it is not surprising that Hawaii should be a truly American community. It inherited some of the best traditions of our national life. The early missionaries from New England brought with them a strong faith in public education and in the worth of the individual human being. Then many of the plantation owners, some of whom were sons and grandsons of the missionaries, promoted education and public health in their communities. Today, Hawaii's standards of rural health and rural education are an example to the entire country. Indeed, the high moral and physical standards which have resulted from Hawaii's rich heritage are the foundation of its success as a democratic American community.

It is fortunate that this is the case, because, from a mainland point of view, we must place a stronger national reliance upon the people of Hawaii. Their position is one of key importance in the Pacific world. They are on the life lines of trade and cultural intercourse between all peoples of the area, and the diversity of their own racial background gives them an intense and broad interest in Pacific affairs. Can anyone doubt that representatives in Congress from this thoroughly American mid-Pacific state will broaden our horizons, enrich our congressional debates and contribute in many ways to the national welfare?

No Americans are more alert to our problems of national defense than those who live on our frontiers, especially those who, in 1941, suffered the severest enemy attack ever delivered on our soil and were compelled for many months to toil unceasingly in their own and the Nation's defense.

I am sure, therefore, that one of the advantages which we as a united Nation will derive from having the State of Hawaii fully represented in Washington will be an increasing alertness to all problems of national security and an added ability to meet those problems effectively. A loyal island people, firmly united with the rest of the American people, will have a high strategic value for the entire Nation.

Above all, I am convinced that our national policies will be judged in no small measure by the decisions we make with respect to the people of Hawaii and the other island peoples of the Pacific. We should continue to demonstrate the reality of our belief that every people should have a government of their own choosing. It will be a great advantage to the United States everywhere in the world to have one of our great self-governing States in the mid-Pacific as a convincing example of the success of our principles and system of Government.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, as a sponsor of one of the several bills, namely, H. R. 1125, for the admission of Hawaii as the forty-ninth State in the Union, I am happy to endorse H. R. 49 and urge the Members of the House to vote favorably on this bill.

In my opinion Hawaii has proved itself eligible to become one of the States of the Union from an economical, political, and social point of view. This question is not a new one, having been thoroughly investigated by the former Territories Committee of the House in 1935, and recently by the same committee in 1946.

I believe the conclusions of the subcommittee of the Territories Committee contained in House Report 1620, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, are sufficiently comprehensive to justify the admission of Hawaii to statehood. I agree with their conclusions which are as follows:

That Hawaii, with a population of over 500,000, has a larger population than any other State at the time of admission to the Union with the exception of Oklahoma.

That the heterogeneous peoples of the Territory live and work together amicably, democratically, and harmoniously.

That the mixed racial complexion of Hawaii existed at the time of annexation, was not regarded as an obstacle to annexation, and should not now be considered an obstacle to statehood.

That the percentage of persons of Japanese ancestry reached its peak in 1940 and has declined steadily since then due to prohibition of immigration, lower birth rate, and the increasing immigration of other peoples.

That the people of Hawaii have demonstrated beyond question their loyalty and patriotism to the Government of the United States.

That on the record of their behavior and their participation in the war, American citizens of Japanese ancestry can be little criticized.

That such evidence of bloc voting as exists among Americans of Japanese ancestry is not likely to assume serious proportions, because they, like other peoples, are divided amongst themselves by differences, political, social, and economic.

That Hawaii has been a Territory for 46 years, and now appears to be fully capable of self-government.

That there is a concentration of land holdings in the hands of a few persons, companies, or estates, but attempts have been made to improve the situation. The 1943 legislature created a land laws revision commission, which recommended the creation of a public corporation for the acquisition, subdivision, and sale of lands for home sites. A bill of this character, known as the Hawaii Home Development Authority Act, was introduced in the last session. Although it failed of passage then, and no further steps have been taken, it may in the near future be enacted into law. It provided:

> The authority is directed to acquire by purchase or eminent domain undeveloped lands suitable for residential purposes on the island of Oahu, where the acute shortage of home sites exists. Lands thus acquired are to be subdivided into residential lots and offered for sale to those of the public most in need of houses. The development projects contemplated by the act are self-sustaining in nature. The act calls for an initial loan to the authority to be repaid to the Territory as the authority secures funds from its bonds, the issuance of which is provided for by the act.

That the Big Five dominates a great portion of Hawaii's economy, but this economic dominance has not prevented the establishment of many and varied businesses. There are good prospects for small business in Hawaii. Further, the influence of the Big Five has not prevented the enactment of progressive legislation in the field of labor, education, health, and welfare.

That in many communities of similar size, business policies are formulated by a relatively small number of individuals who hold positions of responsibility. There is no occasion to believe that these positions are maintained through stock control, either directly or by means of proxies in Hawaii, to any greater extent than is the case in many of the cities on the mainland. The committee's investigations were, in the main, confined to statehood, but in all the evidence presented to it, nothing indicated the existence in business life of collusion or fraud or any agreement or combination in restraint of trade.

That labor has made great strides since 1937 and has contributed greatly to the Territory's progress in the field of social and economic legislation.

That there is a growing mutual respect and confidence between management and labor in industrial relations.

That the school system of Hawaii has been successful in instilling into the people of many races and backgrounds the objectives and ideals of democracy, and has produced a literate population capable of discharging the duties of citizenship.

That modern inventions have annihilated distance. Honolulu today is closer to the American mainland in time than the cities of Boston and New York were to the Capital in the early days of the Nation. Hawaii is closer to the seat of the Government today than all but the immediately adjacent States were when Washington first became the Capital of the United States. With efficient and rapid communication by cable, radio, or telephone, and 12- to 18-hour service for mail or passenger planes to the mainland, Hawaii can no longer be characterized as isolated.

That a majority of the people of the Territory are in favor of immediate statehood. No organized group has appeared in opposition. If a plebiscite were again held on the statehood question, in our opinion the people would vote for statehood in the same proportion as they did in 1940.

Therefore, since—

The people of the Territory of Hawaii have demonstrated beyond question not only their loyalty and patriotism but also their desire to assume the responsibilities of statehood; and since

The policy of the United States Government is one of self-determination: That peoples be allowed to choose freely their form of political status; and since

Hawaii's strategic location in the Pacific plays so large a part in our country's international position in this area; and since

The Congress of the United States has, through a series of acts and committee reports, indicated to the people of the Territory that Hawaii would be admitted into the Union when qualified; and since

The Territory of Hawaii now meets the necessary requirements for statehood:

It is the recommendation of this subcommittee that the Committee on Territories give immediate consideration to legislation to admit Hawaii to statehood.

I also desire to include in this statement the following endorsement of the California State Chamber of Commerce which indicates the favorable attitude of the people of the State of California to the admission of Hawaii to statehood:

FEBRUARY 15, 1946.

Hon. GORDON L. MCDONOUGH,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCDONOUGH: Acting on a recommendation from a special committee, our board of directors has gone on record in favor of the granting of statehood to the Territory of Hawaii. After an extensive study of the problem, including the report of the subcommittee of the Committee on Territories, Hon. D. LARCADE, chairman, we feel that statehood should be granted to Hawaii. We feel that the report of the Larcade committee offers inescapable proof of the desire of the people of Hawaii for statehood and their ability for self-government.

We strongly urge that you give the matter your deep consideration and we hope that you will see your way clear to back the passage of legislation to admit Hawaii to statehood.

Sincerely,

JAMES MUSSATTI,
General Manager,
California State Chamber of Commerce.

It is my considered opinion that the House will be responding to the wishes of the majority of the people in the United States by acting favorably on H. R. 49, for the admission of Hawaii as one of the States of the Union.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have spent a considerable time in the Hawaiian Islands, commencing in 1908, and have served as captain of the yard, at the Navy Yard, Pearl Harbor. During these years I have had the pleasure of becoming rather well acquainted with the people of the islands and of learning to appreciate their excellent qualities.

I have found those people loyal to the United States, determined to achieve that status of statehood which is so highly prized by every American citizen, and well worthy of every consideration by the people of this Nation.

I hope that the House will see fit to pass this bill which will start the people of the Hawaiian Islands on the road toward becoming the forty-ninth State of the Union.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I was a member of the subcommittee on the Territories Committee of the Seventy-ninth Congress that visited the Hawaiian Islands and we had an opportunity at that time to make an extensive examination of the islands and their peoples.

We held hearings in most of the important cities on the islands, and we interviewed many of the citizens—those in prominent positions as well as workers; men and women in all walks of life—and I think it was the unanimous view of the subcommittee that made those examinations that statehood should be granted to the islands.

In view of that, I introduced one of the companion bills in the Eightieth Congress seeking the admission of the Hawaiian Islands as a State of the Union on a par with other States.

The committee found from these examinations and interviews and hearings that the islands have developed economically to a position which entitle them to admission as a State of the Union. Their economic development, both industries and agriculture, have proceeded to a far greater extent than any of the Territories that have been admitted into this Union.

From the social and cultural standpoint, they have developed to a position which, in my judgment and in the subcommittee's judgment, is on a par, if not higher in some respects, than some of the States of the Union. They have a very healthy view of the political and social demands upon citizens. They take an active part in the political affairs of their islands.

The racial issue is another problem that our committee went into thoroughly because there have been some charges that the racial issue is such there that it might militate against the admission of the islands to the Union as a State. The committee, after its examination, had an opportunity to discuss the problem with the residents of all racial mixtures and felt that that was not a deterrent. We felt that the islanders have handled the racial question perhaps better than we on the mainland have in many respects. The various groups of racial origin in the islands cooperate and get along well socially and politically, as well as in their business relationships, so that the racial issue is not a factor that would militate against the admission of the islands as a State.

We found the residents of the islands who were of foreign origin were exceptionally well educated. They used excellent English and showed themselves to be fully posted on civic, social, political, and public affairs, and were possessed of the faculties, education, and loyalty to exercise full citizenship.

When a Territory has remained in a pupilage status for 47 years as Hawaii has, with its people required to pay taxes to the Federal Treasury just as mainland citizens do, the time for statehood has arrived. Hawaii is now denied the right to elect representatives with power to represent it effectively in the Congress.

We know that Hawaiians want statehood. They decided that in their 1940 plebiscite. When the House subcommittee, in 1946, held hearings in Hawaii, almost every witness favored statehood. Full opportunity and encouragement was given to the opponents of statehood to come before us with their objections, but only a few appeared, and there was no organized opposition. What did appear plainly from the testimony and exhibits filed with the committee was that Hawaii has conducted its affairs in a highly intelligent and efficient manner, that its revenue-producing structure is sound, its businesses diversified, and its electorate politically conscious. I was partciularly impressed by the high percentage of its qualified voters who exercised their franchise and by the excellent representation among the voters of the various racial groups in the Territory. The evidence before us showing that bloc voting, a reference to which so frequently is made in discussions of Hawaii statehood, was not prevalent to anything like the extent one might suppose. Our subcommittee concluded that while some bloc voting was inevitable, it was not likely to assume serious proportions, since the racial groups are divided within themselves by differences in economic social, and political outlook which transcend their common racial backgrounds.

Hawaii's Legislature, like its electorate, is composed of members of a great many racial groups and, in no small measure, due to the intelligence and interest of the voters, has consistently enacted legislation which, for progressiveness and social policy, ranks favorably with our leading States. The Territory has adopted many of the uniform laws enacted by our States in such fields as partnerships, sales, negotiable instruments, workmen's compensation, and criminal extradition. It has a Territorial retire-

ment system, comprehensive public-health laws, progressive labor legislation, including a child labor, a workmen's compensation act, and wage-and-hour law, and an unemployment compensation law which provides more liberal benefits than the laws of any State except New York. Labor organization has penetrated all industries, including sugar and pineapple, and Hawaii has extended collective bargaining to agricultural labor.

The stature of the United States can only be increased by incorporating such a forward-looking community into the Union in the fullest sense.

While the advantages of statehood to Hawaii are great—permitting its people to elect their Governor, send voting representatives to the Congress, and vote in Presidential elections—the advantages to the United States are no less great, militarily and economically. The strategic importance to the United States of Hawaii's geographic location is surely obvious by now. Hawaii has been called the crossroads of the Pacific, lying, as it does, closer to North America than to any other large land area. America's interest in the Pacific has grown enormously as a result of the war, and it would be of distinct advantage to the United States to have in the Senate and House representatives from Hawaii who know the history and problems of the Pacific area. Its nearness to the Orient, in effect, brings the United States coastline 2,400 miles nearer the oriental markets. Tourists from the mainland, particularly from the western coast States, knew Hawaii well before the war, and now that air transportation is becoming more readily available, through frequency of service and lowered costs, tourists from the Eastern States are brought within reach of Hawaii. It can no longer be argued that distance militates against Hawaiian statehood. The Pacific Northwest area, and Oregon in particular, has close commercial ties with Hawaii and would welcome Hawaii's entry as a State. Over 800 firms in that area are doing business with Hawaii, and much of Hawaii's lumber comes from Washington and Oregon, 94,000,000 board feet having been shipped in 1940. The potentialities of future expansion of commerce between the two areas, especially if Hawaii should become a State, are great.

Hawaii is a modern American community, maintaining to a high degree of efficiency the same type of educational, health, and welfare facilities to be found in our highly organized State jurisdictions. Hawaii has well-equipped schools for its 81,000 school children, more than 99 percent of whom are American citizens. The schools are better attended than the schools of any State except Maine and Michigan. To an unusual degree, rural schools in Hawaii are on a par with city schools. Teachers are higher paid on an average and have a lighter pupil load than the teachers in mainland schools.

This equality of educational opportunity in Hawaii is maintained because of Hawaii's unique school organization. Although Hawaii's public-school program is controlled in the typical American practice under a lay board of education, the largest city or the smallest village in Hawaii, regardless of the degree of wealth of the area, is provided with comparable school facilities. All schools in Hawaii, both large and small, are comparable in their organization, the 5-year certification requirement for the teaching personnel, the salaries paid, and the educational supplies and equipment made available.

Only one State, Delaware, has a comparable centralized school system, although such States as North Carolina and California, in their financing of education, have moved forward in bringing about the type of equalization of educational opportunity maintained by Hawaii for nearly 50 years. Under statehood, Hawaii hopes to improve, yet maintain, the centralized feature of its educational system.

Hawaii's educational system was inspired by American missionaries from New England early in the 1820's. One school organized by these Americans in Hawaii celebrated its one hundredth anniversary in 1940. Californians used to send their children to school in Hawaii because boat travel to the Islands was safer than coach travel to New England.

The public schools of Hawaii have been surveyed at least once every decade since 1920. The opening paragraph of the 1946 report on education in the Hawaiian Islands, made by the American Council on Education, states:

> The Territory of Hawaii has convincing evidence in the days which followed December 7, 1941, that its educational program has faced a critical test, and that the objectives and ideals of democratic citizenship had become a part of the lives of a people of many races and backgrounds. Every American citizen owes a debt of gratitude to those people in the Territory who had the vision to plan and develop a democratic school program. Few other communities can boast of having done so much educationally in such a short period of time.

Hawaii's school system is patterned after the best in American tradition. Modern dental-hygiene facilities, hearing and vision testing is a part of the regular program. Its nutrition program and its cafeteria service are exemplary.

Health education and service is another well-developed phase of Hawaii's educational system. That is not surprising, for an official board of health in Hawaii preceded that of any State in the Union. King Kamehameha III in 1839 created, by royal proclamation, a board of health. The first State board of health was created by the State of Massachusetts in 1869.

During the fiscal year 1945, 90 percent of all births in Hawaii were attended by physicians.

A bureau of mental hygiene has been in operation since 1939, when it was created by Hawaii's Legislature.

No individual in Hawaii need go without medical care if he is ill. In the rural sections of the Territory, a county health unit is maintained, and a physician paid a salary by the board of health. Funds for certain types of health care of medically indigent persons are also provided through the county governments and the Territory's Department of Public Welfare.

According to statistics published in 1945, no State or State health department, but only the District of Columbia and the Virgin Islands, exceed Hawaii in per capita expenditures of funds for public health. Two-thirds to three-fourths of the funds for public health spent in Hawaii are appropriated by the Territorial legislature.

Public health developments in Hawaii include maternal and child-health activities, a program for the aid of crippled children, certain sanitary procedures and efforts to lower venereal diseases. The decline of infant and maternal mortality rates and venereal disease rates has been more propitious in Hawaii than in the continental United States as a whole.

Although Hawaii is world famous as an unusually healthful place in which to live, the Territory's health record has been reached over a period of years not by accident, but by the application of sound principles of public health.

The Territorial Department of Public Welfare has developed a modern program of public assistance. Relief is extended in the fields of old-age assistance, aid to the blind, to dependent children, and general assistance for those needing medical and dental care, hospitalization and burial services.

A summary made by the United States Social Security Board of the Welfare Department's personnel requirements and salaries showed Hawaii's standards in this regard are the highest in the United States.

All told, Hawaii has been successful in instilling into her citizens the objectives and ideals of our democracy. By having the American pattern of high standards in public education, health and welfare as a primary objective during her 50 years of apprenticeship under the American flag, Hawaii has unqualifiedly been fitted for statehood.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to be one of the Members of this House who introduced bills to enable the people of Hawaii to become a State.

As a member of the Committee on Public Lands, I have followed very closely the evidence that has been presented concerning Hawaiian statehood and concerning the government of the other Pacific islands. I also visited Hawaii, Guam, and American Samoa during the past winter in company with Secretary of the Interior Krug, Congressman Engle, and Delegate Farrington.

These inquiries have convinced me beyond any doubt, not only of the readiness of these areas for a greater measure of self-government, but of the need for immediate steps toward that end, in the national interest.

One of the most essential immediate steps is statehood for Hawaii. Half a million American citizens in that Territory have more than fulfilled the standards we exact for full and effective participation in the Nation's affairs. Forty-nine years after annexation these American citizens still have no voice in the

election of the President or Vice President of the United States and no vote in the National Congress. Their Governor is appointed by the President instead of being elected by the people. Indeed their position is not unlike that of the people of the Thirteen Colonies prior to 1776.

Yet, despite these disabilities, the people of Hawaii waited patiently and patriotically until the war was over to renew their demand for equal status. That demand is now reinforced by the voices of many thousands of mainland people who went to Hawaii during and since the war and who, by so doing, have disenfranchised themselves as far as their voice in the United States Government is concerned.

I am convinced that this Congress is now ready to act. Few important measures have ever been given such thorough and prolonged study by committees of the Congress. The overwhelming support which the statehood bill has received from the Nation—indeed the almost total absence of any adverse testimony in the recent public hearings—shows clearly that Hawaii is going to be welcomed with affection and gratitude into the sisterhood of States.

This is not just a case of justice to the American residents of Hawaii. As a Nation today, we are proud of our position as the mainspring of democracy in the world. By according full self-government and statehood to our own people in Hawaii, we can do more good in our international relations than by any amount of rhetoric about maintaining democracy in other countries. Common sense tells us that our good faith in world politics will be measured by our actions under our own flag.

When General MacArthur was visited by Secretary of the Interior Krug and by Congressmen Engle, Farrington, and myself, he expressed the opinion that statehood for Hawaii would definitely support his efforts in democratizing Japan and other areas of the Orient and would assist in overcoming the inroads made by nondemocratic forms of government.

One of the most impressive things about Hawaii is the way in which the people there have handled the problem of race. We in the States worry a great deal about legislation and other means to prevent racial discrimination. In Hawaii, they have largely solved this problem without legislation. Race equality is taken for granted. It is part of the tradition of the islands. It permeates the atmosphere, having been derived from the tolerant Hawaiian people, from the missionaries and other Caucasians who settled in the islands, and from the high educational standards which have prevailed there for over a hundred years.

The spirit of tolerance is contagious, as all newcomers to Hawaii are aware. The whole Nation will be fortunate to have a sister state in which this spirit prevails, based not on law, but on deep-rooted traditions of hospitality, good will, and gracious living.

Putting my conclusions briefly, Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of immediate action on statehood for the people of Hawaii, because:

First. Through our west coast ports each year pass about one-fourth of a billion dollars' worth of goods between Hawaii and the mainland points; it would certainly be to the advantage of the entire Nation to develop these mutually beneficial commercial and cultural relations with Hawaii by doing away with every remaining barrier, both legal and psychological.

Second. The people of Hawaii now constitute a modern American community; the evidence of their loyal Americanism, adduced before committees of this Congress, dispels all possible doubts on that subject.

Third. I believe that a community which has so distinguished a record for its spirit of racial and religious tolerance will be a very great and welcome addition to this family of States.

Fourth. I am convinced that the final recognition of Hawaii as a fully self-governing State and as an integral part of our national life will go far to establish the good faith of the United States before the eyes of the world as the great exponent of democracy.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, when this House votes today to admit the Territory of Hawaii as a State of the Union—as I am confident it will—the dynamic quality of American democracy will be reaffirmed. By this act alone we shall have given evidence to the world that the form of government under which we live remains filled with life and vitality. We shall have demonstarted once more that the American system of self-government knows no narrow boundaries. Its frontiers are the frontiers of American homelands wherever they may be.

Certainly no territory could be more fully prepared to enter the Union. The House has learned of Hawaii's extraordinary progress, economically and culturally. From the standpoint of population and productivity and other factors which have been taken into account, it may be fairly said that no territory in the history of our country has been so excellently prepared to make the transition from territorial status to statehood. I hope it may be proved to you at a time not too distant in the future that Alaska likewise is fully ready to assume the obligations as well as to enjoy the privileges of statehood. When that time comes it will be evident that the position of Alaska today is strikingly similar to that of most of our western Territories when they became States. As population increases, greater business activity and industrial development took place in the West only after statehood had been granted, it may be fairly argued the same will be true with respect to Alaska. But Hawaii does not have to go through that period. The development process is far advanced.

As one who has spent a lifetime in a territory, I should like to say to you that the quality of citizenship is sadly diluted for those Americans who are obliged to live under territorial government. Powers of home rule which ought to be theirs as a matter of right are long and even continually denied and essential powers of government are retained in Washington. Always in the last analysis we must depend upon decisions made at the distant Capital by those who may or may not be well equipped to make those decisions, on matters of vital concern to us. That is not in the American tradition. We are subjected to taxation without representation. That is not in the American tradition. It is utterly alien to that tradition. There is no cure except statehood.

Of course the benefits which will be extended to Hawaii if it becomes a State are so many they cannot be listed here. But the benefits will not be local. The entire United States will be aided. It will be aided in a practical way, in a dollars and cents way. More important, we shall in granting Hawaii statehood given as nothing else could give testimony that our Nation is still growing; that it will no longer deny to its own citizens the kind of government to which they are entitled; that old concepts which frowned upon a State not immediately contiguous to some other State, have no meaning in the world in which we live today.

By voting statehood for Hawaii today this House will have honored itself and it will have done full justice to our good citizens in Hawaii.

I hope before another year has passed opportunity will be given to vote on statehood for Alaska. And I hope the vote then will be as substantially for the Alaska bill as I am sure the vote will be for the Hawaii bill today.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, it has been a surprise to many people to find that Hawaii is neither a dependency nor a backward colonial area.

Instead of being a dependency, it actually contributes more to the Federal Government than it receives; and it buys from us more than we buy from it.

Instead of being a backward colonial area, it is a typical, prosperous American community, with standards of public health and education which are among the highest in the country.

It was my privilege to be a member of the congressional committee which held hearings in Hawaii for 2 weeks in 1946. One fact which was brought out very clearly during those hearings was that Hawaii has an excellent educational system, older than those of many of the States. There has been an education department in the government of Hawaii for over 100 years. Since the annexation in 1898 the public school enrollment has doubled every 10 years, and in case anyone is still concerned about Hawaii's Americanism let me add that 99.77 percent of its school children are American citizens.

I think it should be brought out also that Hawaii has paid for 98 percent of its own educational expenditures.

In rural education the Territory is second to none in the entire Nation.

These facts about education will show why Hawaii is now one of the most literate areas in the country and why its community affairs are conducted on a very high standard. It also shows why race prejudice has been almost elimi-

nated. Our committee last year was particularly struck by the fact that the people in Hawaii, from many racial and national backgrounds, work together as harmoniously as those of any mainland community.

This community solidarity in Hawaii is a benefit to the entire Nation:

First, because it demonstrates the ability of a heterogeneous people, under a good American educational system, to overcome quickly the dividing influences of race and national heritage. It has worked in California, too.

Secondly, because it adds immensely to the strength of Hawaii as our defense outpost in the Pacific; and

Thirdly, because it makes Hawaii a center from which the peoples of the Pacific can learn our best American traditions and the meaning of American democracy.

Hawaii's record of participation in World War II leaves nothing to be desired. The conduct of the Four Hundred and Forty-second Infantry Combat Team and the One Hundredth Infantry Battalion and the oversubscribed war-bond drives afford eloquent testimony of loyalty.

The people of Hawaii patriotically accepted war conditions more burdensome and more complete than those experienced by any mainland community. They endured military government, which was not invoked in any other part of the United States. Their lands and buildings, public and private, were at the complete disposal of the armed forces. Their schools were turned into hospitals, agricultural lands into airfields, office buildings into military offices, and homes into recreation centers. Their scant stores of merchandise were often commandeered to supplement the supplies of the armed forces. Thousands of the people of Hawaii served in the varied and essential activities of civilian defense, the story of which is one of the glorious phases of Hawaii's war record.

The investigating committee on which I served had the opportunity of meeting nearly all of the principal officials of the Territory and its counties, and in many cases we heard their detailed testimony. We found them to be men and women of high caliber. The average salary of department heads—both Territory and county—is over $10,000 per annum—considerably higher, I believe, than the salaries paid by most of our States and municipalities, even to their Governors and mayors. This is another evidence of Hawaii's high educational standards and the importance its people attach to public service.

I am glad to learn that our findings of last year have been strongly and impressively confirmed by the Committee on Public Lands in this Congress. The testimony of Admiral Nimitz, General Herron, Secretary Krug, and other high authorities concerning the hundred percent loyalty of the residents of Hawaii confirms what we heard from every side while we were in Hawaii.

This is the way the former head of FBI in Honolulu, Robert L. Shivers, summed up the loyalty record for our committee last year:

First. Hawaii's people of various racial ancestries can and do work together, particularly in the face of a major crisis.

Second. What goes on in the countries of their ancestors is of minor concern to them as compared to what goes on in their own country, the United States of America. The latter is their major concern as Americans.

Third. Hawaii's people of all racial ancestries did cooperate with the constituted authorities in preparing for and in prosecuting the war against Japan.

Fourth. This community, despite its polyracial composition, is essentially American in thought, purpose, and action.

Fifth. The united effort of the civilian community during the war was the result, at least in part, of the preparations made jointly by the civilian and official leaders before tht war.

Sixth. If the actions of the people of Hawaii before and during the war is any criterion, they can be expected to work together in the future toward a common goal.

I am glad to see that the Public Lands Committee has pointed out that statehood will reinforce our national defense in the Pacific. The people of Hawaii, from the intensity of their own experience, are acutely conscious of our problems of defense.

Now that our investigations are complete, there is no reason to delay action further. Delay will not alter the eligibility of Hawaii, which has been found fully qualified. The President declared his strong support of statehood in his message to Congress in January 1946. Committees for both the Seventy-ninth Congress and the Eightieth Congress have given it their strong endorsement. The chairman of the present committee tells us that, despite the wide publicity given to the hearings in March, not one person in the entire Nation offered to testify in opposition to Hawaiian statehood.

By passage of the statehood bill we will confirm the principle that there is no place for second-class citizens under the American flag. I hope that our action will reflect the very warm feeling which I believe the present 48 States have for our loyal fellow citizens in Hawaii.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, by every criterion, Hawaii is entitled to statehood. To bracket her with Alaska and Puerto Rico is merely to becloud the issue. Every tub should stand on its own bottom.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, while I have taken little part in the debate today on H. R. 49, providing statehood for Hawaii, it has been due, not to lack of interest but because I wanted other members of the committee and those not of the committee who were better informed to discuss this matter. Of course, I favor this bill and shall vote for it. I am a strong believer in the rights of the people to govern themselves and also in local self-government to whatever extent a given population are prepared to govern themselves. The printed committee hearings will attest my attitude in this respect.

One reason why I am sympathetic toward the struggles of Hawaii for statehood, and have been sympathetic during the hearings before the committee, is that I am rather familiar with the struggle of Arizona, through the same period of time, about a half century, to gain the coveted prize of statehood. Yes; Arizona was kept waiting a long time.

I heard one gentleman say this afternoon that there was no politics involved in this bill and this question for Hawaii, and I believe he added, "Politics do not enter into the question of the admission of a State." If the gentleman did say the last part, he needs to reread his American political history. However, he was right in the first part, for it is true that a large bipartisan support has favored the passage of this bill and the admission of Hawaii. President Truman recommended it. Three Cabinet officers a few weeks ago approved it, and it has received unanimous support from the committee. Secretary Krug came in person to testify in favor of this bill. Admiral Nimitz also appeared in person. The War and Navy Departments expressed approval and appeared to regard the matter as a step toward national security.

Perhaps it is unnecessary to recall our political history, but the favorable attitude of both major parties on this bill is really in marked contrast to their action in regard to the admission of certain other new States through the years. I need scarcely remind you of the long struggle prior to the War Between the States, especially during the 30 years between 1820 and 1850, when partisan struggle for power was aroused with each application of Territories for statehood. There was a fierce political struggle over the admission of Missouri. There was an equally fierce political struggle over the admission of California 30 years later, and during the intervening 30 years there was such a political struggle every time a Territory applied for statehood that States had to be admitted in pairs—one known to favor the North and the other known to favor the South. Ah, yes, indeed. We have had plenty of political struggle between the major parties in Congress over the admission of new States. There was a great deal of political controversy at the time Arizona asked to be admitted, which probably accounts for the half-century which required Arizona to knock on the door of the Union for admission. We are thankful that no such political struggle is evidenced on this measure today.

I listened to the gentleman from Ohio, Congressman BROWN, as he spoke on the rule making this bill in order today, and I recalled that an outstanding Ohio Senator, also a Republican and a good friend, I understand, of the Congressman's father, did Arizona a good turn, even though he broke with the Republican administration in doing so in 1910. Arizona history records this good turn and gives credit to Senator J. B. Foraker for it, and I doubt not that the historians of Hawaii will later give the gentleman from Ohio, Congressman BROWN, a proper share of credit for action taken by the House today on this bill.

In view of the testimonny of the great fidelity of the people of Hawaii during the recent war and the proof conclusive of their fine Americanism and their remarkable progress, I feel that there can be no question but that the people of Hawaii now deserve and should receive statehood.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I hope that this bill (H. R. 49) will pass and I wish that it might do so unanimously. The case for Hawaiian statehood seems to me complete. It derives no benefit from the personal popularity of the present Delegate for Hawaii, Mr. FARRINGTON, but I should like to take this opportunity to say that I consider the House to be indebted to him for the fidelity and intelligence with which he has pleaded the cause for Hawaiian statehood. He has been eminently fair, and I think it most significant that there has been no opposition to this measure in committee.

There is not much factual material that I can add to what has already been given by previous speakers. The report on the bill gives the necessary data. The Territory has desired statehood from as early as the year 1854, 44 years before Hawaii became an American possession. The Treaty of Annexation of Hawaii was concluded on June 16, 1897, and was ratified by the Hawaiian Senate on September 9 of the same year. Annexation was concluded by a joint resolution of Congress in 1898. A bill for Hawaiian statehood was introduced in the House in 1920 and, continuing through the Seventy-ninth Congress, no less than 15 bills for statehood have been introduced.

I never thought that Territorial status in our Federal union should endure beyond the point where a Territory reaches a situation in population, in economic activity, and in political experience which justifies admission to statehood. Hawaii is larger in population than any other Territory at the time of its admission to statehood with the single exception of Oklahoma, and Oklahoma was admitted long before the State had reached anything like its present population and long before the great wealth of Oklahoma in natural resources was fully realized.

The mixed character of the Hawaiian population has always seemed to me to be rather a reason for statehood than a reason in opposition. In the Committee on Public Lands I called attention to the fact that no democracy in Europe had been so successful and so celebrated as the Swiss, though Switzerland has four languages and a population as mixed in racial strains as any in Europe. The spirit of tolerance which has characterized Hawaiian institutions and life is the best possible evidence of an advanced stage of civilization. There are many portions of the United States which can learn much from Hawaii in tolerance and interracial harmony.

Nevertheless, the mixed racial character of the Hawaiian population is undoubtedly the principal ground for serious opposition to this legislation. I happen to represent a State which is generally regarded as one inhabited predominantly by persons of British descent whose ancestors have been for centuries in this country. And yet an analysis of national and racial strains even in a State like Maine would show great diversity. We have French-Canadians, Greeks, Italians, Poles, Russians, Finns, Scandinavians, and Jews from many European countries.

Let us be frank about it. The opposition to this measure arises primarily from the fact that the racial strains in Hawaii are more Asiatic than European. This opposition springs from a dangerous form of racism. I know of no evidence that the people of Asia and the Polynesian Islands are inherently inferior to those of Europe. I tremble to think what the American future will be if we predicate any national policy on an assumption of inferiority in Asiatic people. All our efforts have been to cultivate our position as a great Pacific power and to obtain the friendship of other Pacific nations.

We have recently repealed the Chinese Exclusion Act and have condemned the racial discrimination which it implied. China has been our ally and we have testified unbounded faith in its people. We have gone to the limit in our gift of independence to the Philippines. While all of us have been shocked by evidences of Japanese brutality during the war, we are trying with some success to create a democratic Japan. There is simply no evidence whatever that the Hawaiians of Japanese descent were anything but loyal American citizens. If you doubt it, read the casualty lists in the War Department of the Nisei regiments.

As an admirer of the eminent president of Columbia University, I regret that his letter on Hawaiian statehood should have been brought to the attention of the House. It will certainly not enhance President Butler's reputation for wisdom or perspicacity. Nothing seems to me more absurd than to suppose today that Hawaii is disqualified for statehood simply because it is not in the continental area of North America. Hawaii is much more accessible to Washington today than was New York to Pennsylvania at the time President Butler's college was founded. The Army and Navy witnesses have testified that statehood for Hawaii would be strategically advantageous. Are we to prefer President Butler's view to Admiral Nimitz's and General Herron's? To suggest as does President Butler that Hawaii be given her independence is really the height of absurdity. Hawaii desires independence no more than Maine or New York.

The argument of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] is in large part a plaint against the provision of the Federal Constitution which gives the several States equal representation in the Senate and indeed provides—article V—that no State without its consent shall be deprived of its equal suffrage in the Senate.

I deplore the complacency of some Members who talk as if the continental United States were an area into which no evil had ever entered, and one that would suffer contamination from giving statehood to islands in the Pacific. Does anyone seriously think that the election in New York last November, or the Missouri primary in which Roger Slaughter was defeated, evidence political mores so perfect that we cannot risk having elections for Congress in Hawaii? If that were true, we ought not to admit to this Chamber even a Delegate from Hawaii, lest he corrupt us.

I believe that if Hawaii is admitted to statehood she will make a record in political competence and law observance which could well be emulated by many of the States. Hawaiian statehood is long overdue and I hope that it will not be much longer delayed.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the inhabitants of all that part of the area of the United States now constituting the Territory of Hawaii, as at present described, may become the State of Hawaii, as hereinafter provided.

SEC. 2. That all citizens of the United States who have the qualifications for voters for representatives to the Territorial legislature are hereby authorized to vote for and choose delegates to form a convention in said Territory.

Such delegates shall possess the qualifications of such electors, and members of the Territorial legislature shall be eligible to election as such delegates, and with no resulting disqualification as such members of the Territorial legislature, the provisions of sections 16 and 17 of the Hawaiian Organic Act to the contrary notwithstanding.

The aforesaid convention shall consist of 63 delegates apportioned among the counties and city and county, and the representative districts within the limits of the proposed State on the following basis:

County of Hawaii, at large, four delegates;

First representative district, one delegate each from precincts combined as follows: Precincts 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7; precincts 8, 9, 10, and 11; precincts 12, 13, and 14; precincts 15, 16, 30, and 17; precincts 18, 19, 20, 21, 31, and 22; precincts 23, 32, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, and 29;

Second representative district, one delegate each from precincts combined as follows: Precincts 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 16; precincts 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15.

County of Maui, at large, three delegates;

Third representative district, one delegate each from precincts combined as follows: Precincts 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5; precincts 6, 7, 8, 10, and 11; precincts 9, 12, 13, and 28; precincts 14, 15, 16, and 17; precincts 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, and 27; precincts 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 34;

City and county of Honolulu, hereinafter included in the word "county," at large, 12 delegates;

Fourth representative district, one delegate each from precincts combined as follows: Precincts 24, 25, and 26; precincts 19, 20, 21, and 22; precincts 15 and 16; precincts 12, 17, and 32; precincts 11 and 18; precincts 13 and 14; precincts 6 and 36; precincts 7 and 8; precincts 9 and 10; precincts 34 and 31; precincts 5 and 35; precincts 4, 30, and 33; precincts 1 and 2; precincts 3 and 29;

Fifth representative district, one delegate each from precincts combined as follows: Precincts 5, 7, 30, and 31; precincts 6, 29, 8, and 9; precincts 10, 11, 32, and 26; precincts 12, 33, and 13; precincts 14, 15, 16, and 17; precincts 18 and 19; precincts 22, 23, 28, and 27;

Fourth and fifth representative districts, one delegate each from precincts combined as follows: Precinct 28, fourth district, and

precincts 1, 2, 3, and 4, fifth district; precinct 27, fourth district, and precincts 20 and 21, fifth district; precinct 23, fourth district, and precincts 24 and 25, fifth district;

County of Kauai, at large, two delegates;

Sixth representative district, one delegate each from precincts combined as follows: Precincts 1, 2, 3, and 4; precincts 5 and 6; precincts 8, 9, 10, and 11; and one delegate from precinct 7.

The precincts herein mentioned are as they existed on November 5, 1946.

The Governor of said Territory shall, within 30 days after the approval of this act, issue a proclamation ordering a primary election for the nomination of candidates for the offices of the delegates aforesaid on a day designated by him in said proclamation, not earlier than 60 nor later than 90 days after the approval of this act; and a final election not earlier than 30, nor later than 40, days after such primary election.

The name of no candidate shall be printed upon any official ballot to be used at such primary election unless at least 20 days prior to such primary a nomination paper shall have been filed in the office of the secretary of the Territory in his behalf, nominating him as a candidate for delegate from the county concerned, or from a precinct or combination of precincts in a representative district or districts, as may be the case, and signed by not less than 25 qualified electors of the district concerned, and the sum of $25 shall have been paid to the secretary of the Territory, which fee shall be a Territorial realization.

Each person shall be a qualified elector of the county or precinct or combination of precincts in which he is a candidate for delegate.

No such nomination paper shall contain any reference to or designation of any political party, and the ballots used at such election shall be nonpartisan and shall not contain any reference to or designation of the political party or affiliation of any candidate. The names of the candidates in each county and of the candidates in the precinct or combination of precincts of the representative districts shall be on separate ballots.

The ballots submitted to the voters of each county, precinct, or combination of precincts shall separately set forth the names of candidates for delegates from such county or precinct or combinations of precincts, and shall instruct the voters that the number of candidates to be voted for by such voter shall not exceed the number of delegates to which the county, precinct, or combination of precincts is entitled, or the number of such delegates remaining to be elected, as the case may be, which number shall be stated. The ballots in each county shall also instruct the voters that the number of candidates to be voted for by each voter shall not be less than a majority of the number of delegates which such county is entitled to elect at the particular election, primary or final, as the case may be, and the number constituting such a majority shall be stated. At such primary election any candidate in a precinct or combination of precincts who receives a majority of the votes of the voters voting therein shall be declared elected, and any candidate in a county who receives such a majority of votes, not exceeding the number of delegates to be elected from each county, shall likewise be declared elected. The names of the remaining candidates receiving the highest number of votes, not exceeding two from each precinct or combination of precincts, or double the number of delegates to be elected at large from each county above the number already declared elected as aforesaid, if any, shall be placed on the ballot for the final election.

No ballot in a county ticket shall be counted at either the primary election or the final election unless the number of candidates voted for by the voter is at least equal to a majority of the number of delegates which the county concerned was entitled to elect at such election.

Only those nominated at such primary election shall be eligible to run for delegate at such final election. The ballots for such final election shall be in substantially the same form as those for the primary election, and the requirements of this act as to such primary election shall, as far as appropriate, apply to such final election. In case of a tie vote at either the primary or final election, the candidates so tied shall draw lots under the supervision of the county clerk to determine which of them shall be nominated or elected as the case may be.

In case any office of delegate has not been filled or shall become vacant for any reason the Governor shall appoint an elector of the same county, precinct, or combination of precincts, to fill such vacancy.

Except as otherwise specifically provided by this act, the primary and final elections for such delegates shall be conducted, the returns made, the results ascertained, and the certificates of persons elected to such convention issued in the same manner as is prescribed by the laws of said Territory regulating elections therein of members of the legislature. The convention shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of the delegates.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, when my time expired during general debate, one of the gentlemen on the other side, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], I believe, asked me if the Republican platform of 1944 did not specifically pledge the enactment of this bill, and I think the record will bear me out that I frankly admitted my ignorance. Since that time I have obtained a copy of the platform which I shall read. As to Hawaii it says:

Hawaii, which shares the Nation's obligations equally with the several States, is entitled to the fullest measure of home rule looking toward statehood.

That is what some people have been construing as a plan of immediate action at this session. Bear with me further a moment. Precisely the same language is used in connection with Alaska:

Alaska is entitled to the fullest measure of home rule looking toward statehood.

So, Alaska and Hawaii, as far as the Republican platform is concerned, are Siamese twins, completely identical. There is one further Territory now, Puerto Rico:

Statehood is a logical aspiration of the people of Puerto Rico, and legislation should be in harmony with the realization of that aspiration.

Now, Mr. Chairman, can there be any longer doubt that we are confronted in this bill with a problem concerning all the territorial possessions of the United States? What we do on this bill is bound to call the turn, and set the precedent for Alaska, Puerto Rico, and such other insular territory as we may now or later possess. They are one for all practical purposes. They are so treated in the President's annual message of 1946. They are treated by the Republican platform as one in identical fashion.

So, I say, Mr. Chairman, in considering the position we take on this bill, we must consider all three of those dependencies and determine whether or not we are to admit them to statehood with the two Senators that go with statehood, and the resultant further distortion of popular representation in the Congress.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from New York has quoted the Republican platform of 1944. That platform was adopted 3 years ago. He has failed to present to the House the resolution adopted by the Republican National Committee in its meeting in Washington in May of 1946. The resolution follows:

Whereas the Republican Party in its national platform has supported policies looking toward ultimate statehood for Hawaii; and

Whereas the people of Hawaii have demonstrated beyond question their loyalty, patriotism, and, by an overwhelming vote, their desire to assume the responsibilities of statehood; and

Whereas the capacity of the people of this Territory to assume the responsibilities of State government has been fully demonstrated; and

Whereas the admission of the Territory of Hawaii as the forty-ninth State would be in fulfillment of a promise long made, is in keeping with a policy of self-determination and would strengthen the position of this country in the Pacific: Be it

Resolved, That the Republican National Committee endorse the effort of the people of Hawaii to obtain immediate statehood.

May I say also in reply to the remarks of the gentleman from New York that were based on a letter of Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler that the point he overlooks is that Hawaii basically is American. He proposes that we be made an independent country. Speaking for the people of Hawaii, I wish to say that nothing would be more abhorrent to us than to become an independent country.

Dr. Butler wants to give us a status which would be a departure from American policy. The decision as to whether or not the borders of this country should be extended beyond the Pacific coast was made in 1900. At that time Congress adopted the Organic Act of Hawaii. It considered in full the implications of giving Hawaii a Territorial form of government, understanding full well this meant that ultimately Hawaii would become a State. We have now come to the point where we feel that we have met all the requirements to be a State. Now the distinguished gentleman from New York proposes that instead of moving in the direction of closer unity we should move in the direction of independence.

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE of California. The gentleman from New York raised the point that granting statehood to Hawaii would give a small group of people, some 500,000, two United States Senators. I believe his objection is fundamentally opposed to the constitutional system, whereunder small States are given two United States Senators, whereas great States like New York and California also have only two. Can the gentleman from Hawaii give a comparison between the population Hawaii now has and that possessed by other territories or independent republics at the time they were

admitted to the Union? Does the gentleman recall the number of people in the various States admitted to the Union since the original 13, and the place of Hawaii in that group from the standpoint of population?

Mr. FARRINGTON. My recollection is that there was only one Territory whose population at the time of admission exceeded that of the Territory of Hawaii, and that was Oklahoma. I think the best answer to the point raised in that respect by the gentleman from New York is that today in the House there are 13 States that are represented by 2 or fewer than two Representatives. If objection is to be raised to Hawaii from the standpoint of population, then it reasonably follows that their representation in the Senate should be reduced. After all, we are not responsible for the method of representation.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. I hardly think the argument as to population is well made as comparable to other territories which were continental, immediate, integral parts of an economy and of a section of a country that should be bound together as one living community. The admission of Hawaii to statehood expands the borders 2,400 miles across the ocean. I believe the argument of comparability is not usable on either side of this question. I am more interested from the standpoint of the nature of the population of Hawaii and its economy. I do not mind telling the gentleman that I am very much opposed to his bill and regret to see the support for it that seems to be apparent in the House.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Delegate from Hawaii be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Listening to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] I got the impression that the Republican platform of 1944 was all for Hawaiian and Alaskan statehood but was afraid to come out and say so. What you have said as coming from the Republican National Committee in 1946 would seem to bear out my interpretation of that point of view. The gentleman from New York mentions Nicholas "Miraculous" Butler and his argument against the admission of Hawaii. I gather from Dr. Butler's argument that his main reason against the admittance of Hawaii is that it is 2,000 miles overseas from the continental limits of the United States. I think it would be more accurate to say that Hawaii at the present time is 10 to 12 plane-hours away from the continental United States rather than 2,000 water-miles away.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I think it is inappropriate for the gentleman from New York to loop together so many different Territories as Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and others, implying they all call for the same treatment. We have a fundamental division or two classifications of such territories. There are incorporated territories and unincorporated territories. I might point out that all of the incorporated territories which we formerly had have been admitted to the Union except Hawaii and Alaska. Puerto Rico and the others are in the unincorporated territory class and in that respect are not on a par with Alaska and Hawaii.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I yield.

Mr. COUDERT. I wonder if the gentleman from Arizona means that he does not agree with the President of the United States when he links all three of them together in the annual message of 1946.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT. I think the gentleman from New York is precisely 50 years late in making his argument here. When the question of the annexation of Hawaii was before the Congress in 1897, the same identical argument was made on the floor of the House. The same argument was made on the floor of the Senate. In fact, the Senator from Connecticut objected to the annexation of Hawaii at that time unless his amendment providing that Hawaii would never become a State was added to the bill. But the Senate voted it down. The House voted it down. Then and there I contend that by implication we promised the people of Hawaii that when they were ready they would be granted statehood. I contend that today they are ready for statehood and morally they are entitled to it.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I yield.

Mr. PLOESER. After listening to the statement of our good friend the gentleman from Wyoming, I wonder if the basic tenets which apply to all sound arguments throughout the ages should be thrown away because they are 50 years old. I wonder if the basic tenets of liberty and free institutions must be thrown away because they are 50 years old. If so, this institution known as the Government of the United States of America would have to give up its rights to even argue for our perpetuation.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I would remind my good friend from Missouri that there was quite a little difficulty over getting Missouri into the Union, but they finally did take Missouri into the Union. It has been a very good State until lately. They may have deviated a little lately, but most of the time it has been a pretty good State. If his argument had prevailed when Missouri was seeking to be admitted into the Union, the gentleman from Missouri would still be one of the outlaws of Missouri in the Territory of Missouri.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of California. I would like to take this opportunity to tell the gentleman I am heartily in favor of statehood for Hawaii. Having had the privilege of serving Hawaii, it is my fixed conviction that the people of Hawaii have set such a standard in the way of ability to live together and get along together and observe the law that they might well point out something of benefit to a great many other portions of this earth.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I would like to thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Hawaii has expired.

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. I would like to observe with reference to what my distinguished friend from Ohio has just seriously said about the State of Missouri. I am willing to admit the State of Missouri in some of its precincts has gotten into some extremely bad habits. Those precincts emanate principally from the Democratic Party strongholds on the western side of the State, and it is precisely for such reasons that I fear we would have additional troubles from Hawaii were she admitted to statehood. I do not condone those damnable practices in the stealing of elections, but I see nothing in the nature of the populace of Hawaii that would lead us to believe we would have any other type of election than that which we have had in Kansas City for years, and that which we might have found even in the great State of Ohio a number of years ago.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is very interesting to note the very uncomfortable position that my good friend from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] has placed the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] in his present weak and frantic effort to get away from the unsound premise he originally placed himself in by the argument he made against the bill pending today.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Referring to the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] concerning the possibility of similar election difficulties we might have in Hawaii, as compared with those

in Missouri, I think it is only fair to observe that the present Representative from Hawaii is a Republican and not a Democrat. Further than that, we do not have a Pendergast in Hawaii yet, as far as I know, and it is an unfair indictment of the possibility of a State that might become one of the valuable assets of the Nation to point such a finger at Hawaii before she is admitted.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The advocates of this proposal that statehood be conferred upon Hawaii reminds me of Aesop's rooster that crowed so grandly but scratched so poorly. Not a single good reason has been produced, in my judgment, as to why this resolution should be accepted.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FARRINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. I was just about to make the observation that if Hawaii is admitted to statehood, I think no election will ever be held there as disgraceful as was held in the State of the gentleman from New York last year.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not feel like I am 50 years behind the time in opposing this bill. I think that when the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] made that statement, he proposed a very good reason why we should not pass this bill today.

There is no better barometer of public sentiment to be found anywhere than the votes taken in the National Congress or the sentiments that exist in the National Congress. For years upon years the Members of the House and Members of the other body have decided that it would not be wise to give Hawaii statehood.

Why this sudden change of mind on the part of the Congress?

In my opinion, of all the times it might have been considered in the past today is the worst time we could consider it. We are being accused on all sides of being imperialists. The propagandists of Russia say we are reaching far out into the Pacific, far out into Europe, that we are controlling Greece and Turkey, that we are controlling this, that, and the other country in an effort to gain world power. They will capitalize on the fact today that we are trying to give Hawaii statehood. They will say it is just another example of our policy of reaching out and gaining world power.

The gentleman from Georgia, my colleague [Mr. Cox] made a statement a moment ago in which I concur heartily. I have not heard a good sound reason proposed here today why this bill should be passed. On the other hand, what does it do? It makes citizens with equal rights with you and me of 180,000 Japanese people who reside in Hawaii. It gives those people the same rights you and I have, we, the decendants of those who created, fought, and maintained this country. Who are those people? They are descendants of the recently deposed Emperor of Japan, who McArthur says must be controlled for 100 years, in his opinion. When you give those people the same rights we have today you will have 2 Senators speaking for those 180,000 Japanese, saying: "Let us take restrictions off of Japan. They have learned their lesson. Let us turn them loose." Having gotten the voice of our country through 2 Senators who will represent Hawaii, they will plead that we remove all controls that have been proposed by General MacArthur on the Japanese people in an effort to democratize that country.

The facts reveal that there are 519,000 people in these 20 islands. There are 20 islands in Hawaii, 8 of them principal islands. Listen to me, you Members who are believers in and sponsors of the Stratton bill. I cordially invite your attention to these statistics, and want to say this to you people who intend to support the Stratton bill and are going to be here in the well of this House pleading for its passage very soon, you are going to be disappointed in some of the people who are sponsoring this bill. You are going to expect support from those people in return for your support of this bill, but you are not going to find them here when your bill comes up for consideration. I well remember the time in the discussion when we southern Democrats were told that if we would support the wool bill that we could get support for our conservation program. The wool bill went through, but you know what happened to the conservation program. Now you are going to find some of these politicians absent when the Stratton bill comes up.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRESTON. I decline to yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Will not the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. PRESTON. I decline to yield at this time.

I want to point out to you that out of the 519,000 people in the Hawaiian Islands, 33½ percent are Japanese; 6 percent are Chinese; 1½ percent are Puerto Rican. The people about whom you have heard, the Hawaiians, the natives, make up only 2½ percent of the population of the Hawaiian Islands—of the true Hawaiians, there are only 2½ percent.

Mr. COX. And those are the people whom the advocates of this bill are asking the Congress to incorporate into the body politic of this country.

Mr. PRESTON. Yes; the 2½ percent of the population.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

(Mr. PRESTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section close in 5 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to speak on this bill but I am going to do my level best to answer the argument of the gentleman who preceded me. About 20 years ago I became a member of a committee in California known as the joint immigration committee, as a representative of the American Legion. We had a representative of the American Federation of Labor, the attorney general, a representative of the Native Sons of the Golden West, and others. Our problem was to devise ways and means to keep orientals from coming to California. For 10 years following my entry on this committee, it was my firm conviction from my studies and observations that Hawaii was a Japanese outpost. I worked on the premise that Hawaii was an outpost of Japan.

Since that time I have visited the islands, I have noted their record and last summer was over there and made as much of an investigation as I could. From that study and from my thoughts and studies during the past 10 years I convinced myself, and I think I am correct in my conclusion, that the Hawaiian Islands are an outpost of the United States of America.

The Japanese in Hawaii, judged by their record under fire in the most trying circumstances, were more loyal, were more devoted, gave a better service to the United States than did the Japanese from the mainland, and they gave good service. Therefore, the observation that the gentleman made that the Representatives that Hawaii would send to Congress, if it became a State, and who would represent 180,000 of them who are of Japanese extraction, are going to speak for Japan, falls of its own weight because those men, regardless of the color of their skin, are just as loyal as the people in Hawaii who have a white skin. They are Americans, not Japanese. His premise is fallacious. The representatives will in fact represent real Americans.

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. ENGLE of California. I think it would be appropriate to point out at this time, further answering the gentleman from Georgia, inasmuch as he raised the proposition that we would be conferring American citizenship on these people, that according to the committee report 90 percent of these people are now American citizens. In other words the only Japanese in Hawaii who are not American citizens are the ones who came in from Japan many, many years ago.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is exactly right. All of those native-born persons of Japanese, or any other racial strain, are Americans now and there will be no more coming from Japan who will increase the number of aliens.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. I want to quote from the record introduced at the committee hearings. This is taken from

a story in the Stars and Stripes. Of the 10,000 men who passed through the One Hundredth Battalion, made up of Japanese, and the Four Hundred and Forty-second Combat Unit, made up of Japanese, 4,500 of them were battle casualties, wounded under fire, which earned for this unit the title "Purple Heart Battalion."

Mr. JOHNSON of California. According to every method of fairness and common sense Hawaii is entitled to statehood. She has a population of over a half-million people. They are entitled to be admitted into the Union. Hawaii has wealth, Hawaii has a very successful government, it is close to the United States when measured by travel time. I can leave my congressional district tonight and tomorrow morning I will be in Hawaii. They are much nearer in travel time than California was to the Capitol 30 years ago. So I say from every approach, from the standpoint of loyalty, from the standpoint of population, from the standpoint of the successful way in which they have handled their social and other problems, Hawaii ought to be a State. I hope the House will pass the pending resolution overwhelmingly.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I want to go on record as approving everything that the gentleman has said. From my investigation, I hope no prejudice will be allowed to sway the opinion of any Member on this bill when he comes to vote on its passage.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I thank the gentleman for his contribution and feel complimented to hear him agree with my brief argument.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. That the delegates to the convention thus elected shall meet at the seat of government of said Territory on the second Tuesday after their election, excluding the day of election in case such day shall be Tuesday, and, after organization, shall declare on behalf of the people of said proposed State that they adopt the Constitution of the United States, whereupon the said convention shall be, and is hereby, authorized to form a constitution and State government for said proposed State.

The constitution shall be republican in form and make no distinction in civil or political rights on account of race, color, or sex, and not be repugnant to the Constitution of the United States and the principles of the Declaration of Independence. And said convention shall provide in said constitution:

First. That perfect toleration of religious sentiment shall be secured, and that no inhabitant of said State shall ever be molested in person or property on account of his or her mode of religious worship.

Second. That provisions shall be made for the establishment and maintenance of a system of public schools, which shall be open to all the children of said State and free from sectarian control.

Third. That the debts and liabilities of said Territory of Hawaii shall be assumed and paid by said State.

Fourth. That the property in the Territory of Hawaii set aside by Executive order of the President or the Governor of Hawaii for the use of the United States and remaining so set aside immediately prior to the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union is ceded to the United States, as more particularly provided in the next section of this act.

Fifth. That authority is granted to and acknowledged in the United States to the exercise by the Congress of the United States of the power of exclusive legislation, as provided by article I, section 8, clause 17, of the Constitution of the United States, in all cases whatsoever over such tracts or parcels of land as are now owned by the United States and held for military, naval, or coast-guard purposes, whether title to such lands was acquired by cession and transfer to the United States by the Republic of Hawaii and set aside by Executive order of the President or the Governor of Hawaii for the use of the United States, or acquired by the United States by purchase, condemnation, donation, exchange, or otherwise: *Provided*, That the State of Hawaii shall have the right to serve civil or criminal process within the said tracts or parcels of land in suits or prosecutions for or on account of rights acquired, obligations incurred, or crimes committed within the said State but outside of the said tracts or parcels of land; and the Legislative Assembly is authorized and directed to enact any law necessary or proper to give effect to this article.

Sixth. That, as a compact with the United States relating to the management and disposition of the Hawaiian homelands, the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, is adopted as a law of said State, subject to amendment or repeal only with the consent of the United States and in no other manner: *Provided*, That (1) sections 202, 213, 219, 220, 222, 224, and 225 and other provisions relating to administration, and paragraph (2) of section 204, sections 206 and 212, and other provisions relating to the powers and duties of officers other than those charged with the administration of said act, may be amended in the original constitution or in the manner required for ordinary State legislation, but the Hawaiian home-loan fund and the Hawaiian home-development fund shall not be reduced or impaired, and the encumbrances authorized to be placed on Hawaiian homelands by officers other than those charged with the administration of said act shall not be increased, except with the consent of the United States; (2) that any amendment to increase the benefits to lessees of Hawaiian homelands may be made in the original constitution or in the manner required for ordinary State legislation but the qualifications of lessees shall not be changed except with the consent of the United States; and (3) that all proceeds and income from Hawaiian homelands, shall be availble to said State for use in accordance with the terms of said act.

Seventh. That the lands and other property belonging to citizens of the United States residing without said State shall never be taxed at a higher rate than the lands and other property belonging to residents thereof.

SEC. 4. (a) The State of Hawaii and its political subdivisions, as the case may be, shall retain all the lands and other public property title to which is in the Territory of Hawaii or a political subdivision thereof, except as herein provided, and all such lands and other property shall remain and be the absolute property of the State of Hawaii and its political subdivisions, as the case may be, subject to the constitution and laws of said State: *Provided, however*, That any such lands or other property heretofore or hereafter set aside by Executive order of the President or the Governor of Hawaii, pursuant to law, for the use of the United States, whether absolutely or subject to limitations, and remaining so set aside immediately prior to the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, shall be and become the property of the United States absolutely or subject to such limitation, as the case may be.

(b) The United States shall retain title to all the public lands and other public property (except as hereafter provided) for a period of 5 years after the enactment of this act. Such land and public property shall continue to be administered in accordance with the laws applicable thereto immediately prior to the admission of said State until otherwise provided by the Congress: *Provided*, That immediately after the enactment of this act an investigation and report shall be made by a joint committee composed of the members of the Committees on Public Lands of the Senate and of the House of Representatives upon the subject of the public lands and other property in Hawaii, and the Congress shall thereafter make a final determination and disposition of the remaining public lands and other public property. In the event the Congress has made no other disposition thereof within said 5-year period, then title to all of the public lands and other public property undisposed of shall thereupon vest in the State of Hawaii absolutely: *Provided, however*, That any such lands or other property heretofore or hereafter set aside by Executive order of the President or the Governor of Hawaii, pursuant to law, for the use of the United States or the Territory of Hawaii or a political subdivision thereof, whether absolutely or subject to limitations, and remaining so set aside immediately prior to the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, shall be and become the property of the United States or the State of Hawaii or of such political subdivision, as the case may be, absolutely or subject to such limitations, as the case may be.

(c) The State of Hawaii, upon its admission to the Union, shall be entitled to select, and the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue patents to said State for, 180,000 acres of public lands, as that term is defined in section 73 (a) of the Hawaiian Organic Act (42 Stat. 116, 48 U. S. C., sec. 663), within the boundaries of said State. The selection of such lands by the State of Hawaii shall be made and completed within 5 years from the admission of said State into the Union. The lands so selected shall be in lieu of any and all grants provided for new States by provisions of law other than this act, and such grants shall not extend to the State of Hawaii.

(d) The lands patented to the State of Hawaii pursuant to the preceding subsection, together with the proceeds thereof and the income therefrom, shall be held by said State as a public trust for the support of the public schools and other public educational institutions, for the betterment of the conditions of native Hawaiians, as defined in the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended, for the development of farm and home ownership on as widespread a basis as possible, and for the making of public improvements. Such lands, proceeds, and income shall be managed and disposed of for one or more of the foregoing purposes in such manner as the constitution and laws of said State may provide, and their use for any other object shall constitute a breach of trust for which suit may be brought by the United States. The schools and other educational institutions supported, in whole or in part, out of such public trust shall forever remain under the exclusive control of said State; and no part of the proceeds or income from the lands patented under the preceding subsection shall be used for the support of any sectarian school, college, or university.

(e) Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union all laws of the United States reserving to the United States the free use or enjoyment of property hereinabove vested in the State of Hawaii or its political subdivisions, or the right to alter, amend, or repeal laws relating thereto, are hereby repealed.

SEC. 5. That when said constitution shall be formed as aforesaid, the convention form-

ing the same shall provide for the submission of said constitution, together with the ordinances of said convention requiring ratification, to the people of said Territory for ratification at an election which shall be held on a day named by said convention not earlier than 60 nor later than 90 days after said convention adjourns, at which election the qualified voters of said Territory shall vote directly for or against said constitution, for or against any provisions thereof separately submitted, and for or against said ordinances. Persons possessing the qualifications entitling them to vote for delegates under this act shall be entitled to vote on the ratification or rejection of said constitution, the provisions thereof separately submitted, and said ordinances, under such rules or regulations as said convention may have prescribed, not in conflict with this act. The returns of said election shall be made by the election officers direct to the secretary of said Territory who, with the Governor and the chief justice of said Territory, shall constitute a canvassing board and they, or any two of them, shall meet at the city of Honolulu, on the third Monday after said election, and shall canvass the same.

The said canvassing board shall forthwith certify the result of said election to the Governor of said Territory, together with a statement of the votes cast upon the question of ratification or rejection of said constitution, also a statement of the votes cast for or against such provisions thereof as were separately submitted to the voters at said election, and for or against said ordinances. If a majority of the legal votes cast at said election shall reject the constitution, the Governor of said Territory shall, by proclamation, order the constitutional convention to reassemble at a date not later than 20 days after the receipt by said Governor of the documents showing the rejection of the constitution by the people, and thereafter a new constitution shall be framed and the same proceedings shall be taken in regard thereto in like manner as if said constitution were being originally prepared for submission and submitted to the people.

When said constitution shall have been duly ratified by the people of said Territory, as aforesaid, a certified copy of the same, together with such provisions thereof as have been separately submitted and duly ratified, and such ordinances of the convention as have been duly ratified, shall be submitted to the President of the United States for approval, together with a statement of the votes cast upon said constitution, and upon any provisions thereof separately submitted, and upon said ordinances. And if the constitution of said proposed State is republican in form and makes no distinction in civil or political rights on account of race, color, or sex, and is not repugnant to the Constitution of the United States and the principles of the Declaration of Independence, and if all of the provisions of this act relating to the formation of said constitution and State government have been complied with, it shall be the duty of the President of the United States thereupon to approve said constitution, and the said separate provisions thereof and ordinances, and to certify his approval to the Governor of said Territory. Within 30 days after the receipt of said notification from the President of the United States, the Governor shall issue his proclamation for the election, as hereinafter provided, of officers for all elective offices provided for by the constitution and laws of said State, except those offices for which the constitutional convention, by ordinance duly ratified by the people, shall have made other temporary provisions, but the officers, so to be elected shall in any event include two Senators and two Representatives in Congress. Until and unless otherwise required by ordinance of said convention duly ratified by the people, or by the constitution or laws of said State, said Representatives shall be elected at large: *Provided*, That if the President of the United States shall approve said constitution but shall disapprove any provision thereof separately voted upon by the people, or any ordinance of said convention, the same shall be certified to the Governor of said Territory, and said election shall be held and all further proceedings for the admission of said new State shall be the same as if the provisions and ordinances so disapproved had been rejected by the people. And if the President shall disapprove said constitution, such disapproval shall be certified to the Governor of said Territory, with the President's objections to the proposed constitution; the Governor thereupon by proclamation shall order the constitutional convention to reassemble at a date not later than 20 days after receipt of such notification and thereafter a new constitution shall be framed and the same proceedings shall be taken in regard thereto in like manner as if said constitution were being originally prepared for submission and submitted to the people.

SEC. 6. That said constitutional convention shall provide that in case of the ratification of said constitution by the people, and in case the President of the United States approves the same, all as hereinbefore provided, an election, or primary and general elections, as may be required, shall be held at the time or times named in the proclamation of the Governor of said Territory provided for in the preceding section. Said election shall take place not earlier than 60 days nor later than 90 days after said proclamation by the Governor of said Territory ordering the same, or if a primary election is to be held, then the primary election shall take place not earlier than 60 days nor later than 90 days after said proclamation by the Governor of said Territory, and the general election shall take place within 40 days after the primary election. At such election or elections the officers required to be elected as provided in section 5, shall be chosen by the people. Such election or elections shall be held, and the qualifications of voters thereat shall be, as prescribed by said constitution and the laws of said State for the election of members of the State legislature, except as otherwise provided by ordinance of said constitutional convention duly ratified by the people. The returns thereof shall be made, canvassed, and certified in the same manner as in this act prescribed with respect to the election for the ratification or rejection of said constitution, as hereinbefore provided. When said election of said officers above provided for shall be held and the returns thereof made, canvassed, and certified as hereinbefore provided, the Governor of the said Territory shall certify the result of said election, as canvassed and certified as herein provided, to the President of the United States, who thereupon shall immediately issue his proclamation announcing the result of said election so ascertained, and, upon the issuance of said proclamation by the President of the United States, the proposed State of Hawaii shall be deemed admitted by Congress into the Union by virtue of this act, on an equal footing with the other States. Until the said State is so admitted into the Union, the persons holding legislative, executive, and judicial offices in or under or by authority of the government of said Territory, and the delegate in Congress thereof, shall continue to discharge the duties of their respective offices. Upon the issuance of said proclamation by the President of the United States and the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, the officers elected at said election, and qualified under the provisions of the constitution and laws of said State, shall proceed to exercise all the functions pertaining to their offices in or under or by authority of the government of said State, and officers not required to be elected at said initial election shall be selected or continued in office as provided by ordinance of the constitutional convention duly ratified by the people, or by the constitution and laws of said State. The Governor and Secretary of said State shall certify the election of the senators and representatives in the manner required by law, and the said senators and representatives shall be entitled to be admitted to seats in Congress and to all the rights and privileges of Senators and Representatives of other States in the Congress of the United States.

SEC. 7. Upon the admission of the proposed State of Hawaii into the Union the House of Representatives shall be composed of 437 Members until the expiration of the Eighty-second Congress, and shall thereafter be composed of 435 Members.

Subsection (a) of section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide for apportioning Representatives in Congress among the several States by the equal proportions method", approved November 15, 1941 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. V, title 2, sec. 2b), is hereby amended, effective on the date of the admission of the proposed State of Hawaii into the Union, to read as follows:

"(a) Each State (other than Hawaii) shall be entitled, in the Seventy-eighth and in each Congress thereafter until the taking effect of a reapportionment under a subsequent statute or such section 22, as amended by this act, to the number of Representatives shown in the statement transmitted to the Congress on January 8, 1941, based upon the method known as the method of equal proportions, no State to receive less than one Member; and the State of Hawaii shall be entitled to two Representatives from the time of its admission into the Union until the taking effect of such a reapportionment."

SEC. 8. That the sum of $200,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated for defraying the expenses of the elections provided for in this act and the expenses of the convention and for the payment of compensation to the delegates to said convention. The delegates shall receive for their services, in addition to mileage at the rate of 20 cents a mile each way, the sum of $1,000 each, payable in four equal installments on and after the first, twentieth, fortieth, and sixtieth days of the convention, excluding Sundays and holidays. The disbursements of the money so appropriated shall be made by the Secretary of the Territory of Hawaii. The Territorial legislature is hereby authorized to appropriate such sum as it may deem advisable for the payment of additional compensation to said delegates and for defraying their expenses and for such other purposes as it may deem necessary.

SEC. 9. That the State of Hawaii shall constitute a judicial district within the ninth judicial circuit, to be known as the district of Hawaii. To the United States district court hereby created two judges shall be appointed, and to it and to them all laws relating to United States district courts and district judges shall be applicable. The regular terms of the court shall be held at Honolulu on the second Monday in April and October, and the office of the clerk of court shall be kept at Honolulu.

SEC. 10. That in addition to its normal jurisdiction as a United States district court, the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii shall have also that jurisdiction heretofore conferred upon its predecessor by the act of August 13, 1940 (54 Stat. 784, ch. 662).

SEC. 11. That in the manner prescribed by law there shall be appointed a clerk for the district court, a United States attorney, a United States marshal for the district, and such assistants, deputies, court officers, and clerical and other personnel as are provided for by the laws relating to district courts, judges, and judicial districts.

SEC. 12. No action, case, proceeding, or matter pending in any court of the Territory of

Hawaii, or in the United States, District Court for the Territory of Hawaii, shall abate by reason of the admission of said State into the Union, but the same shall be transferred to and proceeded with in such appropriate State courts as shall be established under the constitution to be thus formed, or in the District Court of the United States for the District of Hawaii, as the nature of the case may require. And no indictment, action, or proceedings shall abate by reason of any change in the courts, but shall be proceeded with in the State or United States courts according to the laws thereof, respectively. And the appropriate State courts and the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii shall be the successors of the courts of the Territory and the United States District Court for the Territory of Hawaii as to all cases arising within the limits embraced within the jurisdiction of such courts, respectively, with full power to proceed with the same, and award mesne or final process therein, and all the files, records, indictments, and proceedings relating to any such cases shall be transferred to such appropriate State courts and the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii, respectively, and the same shall be proceeded with therein in due course of law.

All civil causes of action and all criminal offenses which shall have arisen or been committed prior to the admission of said State, but as to which no suit, action, or prosecution shall be pending at the date of such admission, shall be subject to prosecution in the appropriate State courts or in the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii in like manner, to the same extent, and with like right of appellate review, as if said State had been created and said courts had been established prior to the accrual of such causes of action or the commission of such offenses; and such of said criminal offenses as shall have been committed against the laws of the Territory shall be tried and punished by the appropriate courts of said State, and such as shall have been committed against the laws of the United States shall be tried and punished in the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii.

SEC. 13. Parties shall have the same rights of appeal from and appellate review of final decisions of the United States District Court for the Territory of Hawaii or the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii in any case finally decided prior to admission of said State into the Union, whether or not an appeal therefrom shall have been perfected prior to such admission, and the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and the Supreme Court of the United States shall have the same jurisdiction therein, as by law provided prior to admission of said State into the Union, and any mandate issued subsequent to the admission of said State shall be to the District Court of the United States for the District of Hawaii or a court of the State, as may be appropriate. Parties shall have the same rights of appeal from and appellate review of all judgments and decrees of the District Court of the United States for the District of Hawaii as successor to the District Court of the United States for the Territory of Hawaii, and of the Supreme Court of the State of Hawaii as successor to the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, in any case pending at the time of admission of said State into the Union, and the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and the Supreme Court of the United States shall have the same jurisdiction therein, as by law provided in any case arising subsequent to the admission of said State into the Union.

SEC. 14. Effective upon the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, paragraph "First" of subsection (a) of section 128 of the Judicial Code, as amended (28 U. S. C. A., sec. 225), shall apply to the United States District Court for the District of Hawaii and paragraph "Second" thereof shall be inapplicable.

SEC. 15. All laws in force in the Territory of Hawaii at the time of its admission into the Union shall continue in force in the State of Hawaii, except as modified or changed by this act or by the constitution of the State or by ordinance of the constitutional convention duly ratified by the people, and shall be subject to repeal or amendment by the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, except as hereinbefore provided with respect to the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920, as amended; and the laws of the United States shall have the same force and effect within the said State as elsewhere within the United States.

SEC. 16. Notwithstanding the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, the United States shall continue to have sole and exclusive jurisdiction over the area which may then or thereafter be included in Hawaii National Park, saving, however, to the State of Hawaii the same rights as are reserved to the Territory of Hawaii by section 1 of the act of April 19, 1930 (46 Stat. 227), and saving, further, to persons then or thereafter residing within such area the right to vote at all elections held within the political subdivisions where they respectively reside. Upon the admission of said State all references to the Territory of Hawaii in said act or in other laws relating to Hawaii National Park shall be deemed to refer to the State of Hawaii.

SEC. 17. All acts or parts of acts in conflict with the provisions of this act, whether passed by the legislature of said Territory or by Congress, are hereby repealed.

Mr. WELCH (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be printed at this point, and that amendments thereto be in order to any part thereof.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments?

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I regret to hear the political arguments that have been raised against the admission of Hawaii to statehood. This is not a political matter. I think both parties by their platforms have indicated that they favor statehood for Hawaii when the citizens there were ready for it. If we had gotten into politics on matters of statehood we would have had great difficulty creating the fine Union that we have. So, it shall not make any difference to me in considering this bill whether we might have Republican or Democratic Senators or Congressmen from Hawaii. The matter should be decided on its merits alone.

The record shows that most of the people in Hawaii are well educated; they have a good school system; the literacy is well above the average. The people of Hawaii are capable of making political decisions on the basis of the issues and I think they will do so without regard to whether that places their Representatives in the Democratic or Republican camp.

The gentleman from Georgia a few minutes ago stated that the passage of this bill now would indicate an imperialistic policy on the part of the United States Government. It seems to me that it would have exactly the opposite effect. We may have pursued an imperialistic course when we annexed Hawaii as a Territory. But bringing them into the brotherhood of States is anything but an imperialistic policy. It seems to me that it would be an indication to the people of the world that we are truly a growing democracy. We gave the people of the Philippines their independence because they wanted independence and we felt they were ready for it. We had promised them independence and we kept faith. The people of Hawaii have been promised statehood when they were ready for it. They are now capable of assuming that responsibility. We would be pursuing an imperialistic policy if we did not keep faith with them. Granting Hawaii statehood would be considered by the thinking people of the world as an act of justice and fairness on the part of this great country in dealing with its territorial citizens.

Mr. Chairman, on this question of race and ancestry, we have people in this Nation from all countries, all nations, all lands. This fact is one reason for the greatness of our country. That argument was never validly raised in connection with any State that has been admitted into the Union. The question is, Are these loyal people; are they entitled to the privileges of American citizenship? The thing that impresses me is that every committee, every commission, and every official who have gone to Hawaii to consider the educational and the social conditions, the living standards and the loyalty of those people, have reported that they are ready for statehood; that they are entitled to be full-fledged citizens of the United States. That is the report of the Secretary of the Interior, the chairman of this great committee. If they meet that test, I cannot see why we should deny them statehood just because they are 2,000 miles away from the mainland. The world, after all, has gotten very small of late. If we are going to keep Hawaii under our dominion, why not give them the advantages of statehood and pass this legislation.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. On the question of imperialism, if ever imperialism was practiced in any sense it was at the turn of the century, when we annexed Hawaii to the United States.

I think that now we can extend democracy with real representation in granting them statehood at this time. It is the fair, the decent, the American thing to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ARENDS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 49) to enable the people of Hawaii

to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, pursuant to House Resolution 212, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Cox and Mr. COUDERT) there were—ayes 103, noes 46.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 195, nays 133, not voting 102, as follows:

[Roll No. 97]

YEAS—195

Albert	Engle, Calif.	Lynch
Allen, Calif.	Fletcher	McCormack
Allen, Ill.	Fogarty	McCowen
Anderson, Calif.	Foote	McDonough
Andresen, August H.	Forand	McGregor
Angell	Fulton	McMahon
Arends	Gearhart	McMillan, S. C.
Arnold	Goff	Mack
Auchincloss	Goodwin	MacKinnon
Bakewell	Gordon	Macy
Barrett	Gorski	Madden
Bates, Mass.	Granger	Mansfield,
Beall	Griffiths	Mont.
Bennett, Mo.	Hagen	Martin, Iowa
Bishop	Hale	Merrow
Blackney	Hall,	Meyer
Bloom	Edwin Arthur	Michener
Boggs, Del.	Hall,	Miller, Calif.
Boggs, La.	Leonard W.	Miller, Md.
Bolton	Halleck	Mitchell
Bradley	Havenner	Morgan
Brehm	Hébert	Murdock
Brophy	Hendricks	Murray, Wis.
Brown, Ohio	Herter	Nixon
Buchanan	Heselton	Norton
Buck	Hill	O'Konski
Burke	Hinshaw	O'Toole
Byrne, N. Y.	Hoeven	Owens
Byrnes, Wis.	Holifield	Passman
Canfield	Holmes	Patterson
Carroll	Hope	Peden
Carson	Horan	Peterson
Case, S. Dak.	Howell	Phillips, Calif.
Celler	Jackson, Calif.	Plumley
Chiperfield	Jackson, Wash.	Potts
Church	Jenison	Poulson
Clevenger	Jensen	Price, Ill.
Clippinger	Johnson, Calif.	Ramey
Coffin	Jones, Wash.	Redden
Cole, Kans.	Jonkman	Reed, Ill.
Cole, Mo.	Judd	Rees
Courtney	Karsten, Mo.	Reeves
Crawford	Keating	Riehlman
Crosser	Kefauver	Rizley
Crow	Kersten, Wis.	Robertson
Davis, Wis.	King	Rockwell
Dawson, Utah	Kirwan	Rogers, Mass.
Deane	Klein	Rohrbough
Devitt	Knutson	Rooney
D'Ewart	Lanham	Ross
Dirksen	Larcade	Russell
Dolliver	Lea	Sadowski
Doughton	LeCompte	Sanborn
Eberharter	LeFevre	Sarbacher
Ellsworth	Lemke	Scott,
Engel, Mich.	Lewis	Hugh D., Jr.
	Lodge	Scrivner
Seely-Brown	Stockman	Weichel
Sikes	Stratton	Welch
Simpson, Ill.	Taber	Wheeler
Smith, Maine	Talle	Whittington
Smith, Wis.	Tollefson	Wigglesworth
Snyder	Vail	Wilson, Ind.
Somers	Vorys	Wolcott
Stefan	Vursell	Woodruff
Stevenson	Wadsworth	Youngblood
Stigler	Walter	

NAYS—133

Abernethy	Graham	Monroney
Allen, La.	Grant, Ala.	Morris
Almond	Gregory	Morton
Andrews, Ala.	Gross	Muhlenberg
Banta	Gwinn, N. Y.	Mundt
Battle	Gwynne, Iowa	Norblad
Beckworth	Hardy	O'Hara
Bell	Harness, Ind.	Pace
Bonner	Harris	Patman
Brooks	Harrison	Phillips, Tenn.
Brown, Ga.	Hays	Pickett
Bryson	Hess	Ploeser
Buffett	Hobbs	Poage
Bulwinkle	Hoffman	Preston
Burleson	Hull	Priest
Cannon	Jarman	Rains
Chadwick	Jenkins, Ohio	Rankin
Chelf	Jennings	Reed, N. Y.
Chenoweth	Johnson, Ill.	Richards
Cole, N. Y.	Johnson, Ind.	Riley
Combs	Johnson, Okla.	Rogers, Fla.
Cooper	Johnson, Tex.	Sabath
Corbett	Jones, Ala.	Sadlak
Coudert	Jones, N. C.	Sasscer
Cox	Jones, Ohio	Schwabe, Mo.
Cravens	Kean	Schwabe, Okla.
Dague	Kee	Shafer
Davis, Ga.	Keefe	Short
Dingell	Kilday	Smathers
Dondero	Kunkel	Smith, Kans.
Dorn	Landis	Spence
Drewry	Lucas	Springer
Durham	Lusk	Stanley
Evins	Lyle	Teague
Fallon	McConnell	Thomas, Tex.
Fellows	McDowell	Trimble
Fenton	McGarvey	Twyman
Fisher	McMillen, Ill.	Van Zandt
Flannagan	Mahon	Williams
Folger	Maloney	Wilson, Tex.
Gamble	Manasco	Winstead
Gathings	Mathews	Wolverton
Gavin	Meade, Md.	Zimmerman
Gillette	Miller, Conn.	
Gossett	Mills	

NOT VOTING—102

Andersen, H. Carl	Elston	Morrison
Andrews, N. Y.	Feighan	Murray, Tenn.
Barden	Fernandez	Nodar
Bates, Ky.	Fuller	Norrell
Bender	Gallagher	O'Brien
Bennett, Mich.	Gary	Pfeifer
Bland	Gifford	Philbin
Blatnik	Gillie	Powell
Boykin	Gore	Price, Fla.
Bramblett	Grant, Ind.	Rabin
Buckley	Hand	Rayburn
Busbey	Harless, Ariz.	Rayfiel
Butler	Hart	Rich
Camp	Hartley	Rivers
Case, N. J.	Hedrick	Robsion
Chapman	Heffernan	St. George
Clark	Huber	Scoblick
Clason	Javits	Scott, Hardie
Clements	Jenkins, Pa.	Sheppard
Colmer	Kearney	Simpson, Pa.
Cooley	Kearns	Smith, Ohio
Cotton	Kelley	Smith, Va.
Cunningham	Kennedy	Sundstrom
Curtis	Keogh	Taylor
Davis, Tenn.	Kerr	Thomas, N. J.
Dawson, Ill.	Kilburn	Thomason
Delaney	Lane	Tibbott
Domengeaux	Latham	Towe
Donohue	Lesinki	Vinson
Douglas	Love	West
Eaton	Mansfield, Tex.	Whitten
Elliott	Marcantonio	Wood
Ellis	Mason	Worley
Elsaesser	Meade, Ky.	
	Miller, Nebr.	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hedrick for, with Mr. Chapman against.
Mr. O'Brien for, with Mr. Colmer against.
Mr. Bender for, with Mr. Clements against.
Mr. Huber for, with Mr. Hart against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Andrews of New York with Mr. Keogh.
Mr. Hand with Mr. Norrell.
Mr. Jenkins of Pennsylvania with Mr. Lesinski.
Mrs. St. George with Mr. Rayfiel.
Mr. Love with Mr. Gary.
Mr. Busbey with Mr. Feighan.
Mr. Hardie Scott with Mr. Delaney.
Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania with Mr. Lane.
Mr. Hartley with Mr. Rivers.
Mr. Rich with Mr. Pfeifer.
Mr. Eaton with Mr. Domengeaux.
Mr. Elsaesser with Mr. Camp.
Mr. Towe with Mr. Vinson.
Mr. Robsion with Mr. Wood.
Mr. Sundstrom with Mr. Kelley.
Mr. Latham with Mr. Gore.
Mr. Case of New Jersey with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Kennedy.
Mr. Gillie with Mrs. Douglas.
Mr. Grant of Indiana with Mr. Powell.
Mr. Bennett of Michigan with Mr. Smith of Virginia.
Mr. Scoblick with Mr. Heffernan.
Mr. Thomas of New Jersey with Mr. Rabin.
Mr. Taylor with Mr. Philbin.
Mr. Tibbott with Mr. Price of Florida.
Mr. Javits with Mr. Marcantonio.
Mr. Kearney with Mr. Sheppard.
Mr. Mason with Mr. Worley.
Mr. Kilburn with Mr. Thomas of Texas.
Mr. Bramblett with Mr. Fernandez.
Mr. Fuller with Mr. Donohue.
Mr. Curtis with Mr. Boykin.
Mr. Cotton with Mr. Whitten.
Mr. Clason with Mr. Clark.
Mr. Kearns with Mr. Dawson of Illinois.
Mr. Miller of Nebraska with Mr. Cooley.
Mr. Nodar with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Gifford with Mr. Barden.
Mr. Elston with Mr. Harless of Arizona.
Mr. Cunningham with Mr. Blatnik.
Mr. Butler with Mr. Elliott.
Mr. Meade of Kentucky with Mr. Bland.
Mr. Smith of Ohio with Mr. West.
Mr. Ellis with Mr. Kerr.
Mr. Carl H. Andersen with Mr. Bates of Kentucky.

Mr. BUCHANAN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LABOR-SOCIAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement on the labor-social security appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain extraneous matter.

Mr. LEA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BEALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Post.

Mrs. BOLTON asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include two items.

Mr. MUNDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some extraneous material.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include what I consider to be a very important article from the Washington Post of today, which I recommend that the Members of the House read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

PAUL J. QUATTKEBAUM AND JESSE A. LOTT

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw from the files of the House papers in relation to the bill (H. R. 1141) for the relief of Paul J. Quattkebaum, and the bill (H. R. 1144) for the relief of Jesse A. Lott, these papers being in the files of the War Claims Committee of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 124) to enable the President to utilize the appropriations for United States participation in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, for meeting administrative expenses of United States Government agencies in connection with United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration liquidation.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That in order to provide necessary administrative expenses for executive departments, agencies, and independent establishments of the United States Government incident to the liquidation of activities undertaken prior to June 30, 1947, in connection with participation of the United States in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $2,370,000 of the unobligated balance as of June 30, 1947, of the appropriation "United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration" provided under the Third Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1946.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

If not, the question is on suspending the rules and passing the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

PURCHASE OF AUTOMOBILES FOR AMPUTEES

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the passage of the appropriation bill the House approved an hour ago and which contains a continuing authorization for the purchase of automobiles for veteran amputees and paraplegic cases, those that have lost the use of their legs or have lost their legs, settles temporarily the plight of some thousands of veterans who have made applications for the cars, for today the authorization and the appropriation for those cars would be stopped without this legislation. In the case of the men in the hospitals, they could not now apply for cars because they cannot even apply for an automobile until they are discharged and become veterans. Now under the terms of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York which provides automobiles and other conveyances for disabled veterans, the authority and funds provided under this heading in the "First Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1947"—Public Law 663, Seventy-ninth Congress—are hereby continued available until June 30, 1948. If the $5,000,000 unexpended of the appropriation which went through last year should not happen to be enough, then a deficiency bill could take care of added appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my pleasure over the fact that the Veterans' Administration has been working steadily Friday, Saturday, Sunday and today in order to process applications of veterans who were late in applying for these cars. They plan to work until midnight tonight in order to get as many as possible processed. This in nowise excuses the House for not passing the bill which was introduced by the very distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, Judge MATHEWS, who reported the bill out of his subcommittee by unanimous vote and passed by the full committee.

The bill is now before the Committee on Rules and we are waiting for favorable action on it. It would include a very deserving group of veterans and give them permission to apply for automobiles. The bill includes some 2,000 blind veterans. Groups of them have come to Washington ever since last summer for the purpose of trying to secure for themselves and other blind veterans automobiles. With transportation as difficult as it is today, it is very important that this group should be included.

The blind, amputees, and men and women who have lost the use of their limbs are classed together for rating purposes. So it is perfectly logical to include the blind in the car bill.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. RAMEY. I compliment the chairman of our Committee on Veterans' Affairs for her bill. I have not only known of your work as chairman of our committee but it would never have been known if it had not been for you. You have had these folks about the Capitol at your own personal expense in order that we might see things personally. It seems that we are in such a state that the Congress in a moment would pass such a measure if it had been for the purpose of relieving veterans of Greece or Turkey or some other country. Among all of these people that we have met we have seen no self-pity or resentment. But because of your work psychologically these people have been given a new outlook on life. Their life is as a parchment to bear everlasting testimony to what mechanics will do for veterans so that they may help themselves. It was a New England gentlewoman known by the name of Mrs. Mary Baker Eddy who, quoting the Talmud, said, "The only thing we can give people is something so that they can help themselves so that they can be on their own." I again compliment the gentlewoman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman has been very active in this work and in fact in all work for the veterans. He is chairman of a subcommittee and he and this subcommittee have secured passage out of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs some greatly needed legislation which should soon become law. The gentleman knows that this particular bill is the one which was introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey, Judge MATHEWS, who worked so tirelessly in his subcommittee and brought a very fine bill before the full committee—it is a very much better one, I think, than the committee had last year.

Mr. RAMEY. That is right.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I know everybody in the House, if they could see the amputees and other disabled as I have seen them and worked day after day with them and as some of you have seen and worked with them, would realize the great importance of this. You will be giving these men a chance to go to and from their work. As one man told me, an amputee, the other day:

> You see, Mrs. ROGERS, they can always see what my disability is. People can always see the hooks which are used for hands, but a man with a leg off, for instance, with his trousers leg down, does not show his disability. We are less employable than the leg amputees.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BRADLEY. It has been my understanding that the emergency resolution just passed today included $5,000,000 for the purpose you indicate.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes and no. It is to care for certain leg cases, but further legislation must be passed to care for the hand and arm amputees. It simply continues the legislation that was passed a year ago. That was a rider attached to a bill in the Senate, and then the House accepted it, and it became law. That took in certain of the amputees, but it did not care for those without arms and the blind. It went through very hastily in the closing day of Congress. Members on the floor of the House and the Senate felt there was a great discrepancy when the bill was passed, but it was the best that Congress could do at that late date.

Several doctors have stated they thought this measure was one of the most civilized measures that was ever passed in the Congress, because it gave these men a chance to be much more normal—a chance to compete with

others on a more equal basis. In the old days, in the days of savagery, when a person was blinded or injured no one helped him. He was left by the roadside to die. No effort was made to bring him back to normal.

Mr. BRADLEY. I thank the gentlewoman for clarifying the situation.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey, the author of the very fine bill under discussion. The gentleman has worked tirelessly and exhaustively on this measure.

Mr. MATHEWS. The gentleman from New Jersey has not worked half as tirelessly as the gentlewoman from Massachusetts. I want to pay my tribute to the untiring interest, the unflagging zeal, and the deep sympathy shown by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts for the persons whom this bill is intended to benefit. I have been immeasurably impressed with her sympathy and her human understanding. I do hope, not only for the sake of the men who will be benefited, but for the sake of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts, that we have success with this bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I feel the gentleman will have success with his bill, because I know there is not a Member in Congress who would vote against the measure.

We just passed a bill taking care of people over 65, in the Spanish-American War, and the older Civil War veterans and their dependents. That will cost $29,000,000. This bill for the very badly disabled at most would not cost more than $15,000,000 over a period of 3 years. The cost is small and economy must not be practiced at the expense of the disabled veterans.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. I would like to add my wholehearted endorsement to the statement of the gentleman from New Jersey, Judge MATHEWS, with respect to the work of the chairman of our committee.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman for his fine assistance on the Veterans' Affairs Committee. I think any chairman of the committee who had seen the men as I have seen them would not do anything else. You see their courage, their anxiety for an opportunity to get back into the world again. You know their desire to take an active part in school or in business. You see them in the hospitals, you see them waiting for their cars, and then you see them in schools and at work on their jobs and you realize what an automobile can do for them.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. I would like to add my word of endorsement for the work the chairman of our committee has done. She is a splendid woman. She is at it all the time. She has the complete confidence of the Democrats and the Republicans.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for his splendid words. No chairman could have a more cooperative or finer committee. I think it is the finest committee in the entire House. There is no politics in the committee and every member works very hard to secure the legislation that veterans need. It is a staggering task, and the members realize it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I want to congratulate the gentlewoman from Massachusetts on the splendid record she is making as chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. However, I am wondering if in this bill to which she has reference if it would not be better possibly to give these veterans a comparable amount in cash rather than to give them an automobile, in order to let them spend that money in the way they see fit. In other words, there is a possibility that their needs may be better served by something other than an automobile. I am wondering if the lady does not feel it would be better to give them instead of a $1,500 automobile, $1,500 in cash and let them decide how that money should be spent.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. There is a little history there, I may say to the gentleman from Mississippi, that might interest him and the others. When I was asked by the amputees at Walter Reed Hospital to introduce a bill last year which did not pass as we wanted it, I personally worded it to provide "The sum of $1,500 or an automobile."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. When the amputees read that bill they said: "Oh, Mrs. ROGERS, please take that money out of the bill, we do not want it. It sounds like a bonus bill. We do not want that. All we are asking for is an automobile. We want it as a means of rehabilitation as a sort of prosthetic appliance. We would much rather have it than the $1,500, for we would be sure then of getting an automobile. We need the automobile for mobility."

In spite of their protests I kept the $1,500 cash provision in the bill; but, as the gentleman knows, the Congress removed that provision, and I began to see that the men were right, because if they had $1,500 it might go for something for the family, for a piano, for instance. I know some men do not like to refuse their wives things. It would go for something else and they would not have such a practical thing as an automobile, the means of mobility. For these veterans an automobile is a necessity.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am certainly not against the bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I realize the gentleman is not; I know he is not.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Being possibly the only Member of the House who will benefit under this bill, I certainly cannot vote for it and I intend to vote "Present" when the vote comes on the bill.

In bringing up the point of making cash rather than an automobile available to the veteran I am simply stressing a point I made in the House the other day. I am afraid that through such bills as this which gives an automobile rather than cash, and through bills such as the terminal-leave-bond bill which gave bonds instead of cash to our veterans, this Congress is discrediting the fact that our veterans are grown men and fully capable of handling their own affairs rather than being coddled.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. May I say that my desire to see the automobile given rather than cash is that I feel that many men would be perhaps so tender-hearted that their families would get something instead of the men getting a means of transportation to and from their work. I know the gentleman has a very gallant war record and has been very severely wounded.

Mrs. LUSK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mrs. LUSK. I may say to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that I have a message for her and I think this would be a very appropriate time to deliver it. It comes from the veterans' organizations in New Mexico. I have just visited there the VFW and the American Legion conventions. They were very much interested in the work of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts and her committee and discussed at length the plans the committee had for consideration of first, the disabled veterans and their needs; and, second, the young veterans who were continuing their education.

They asked me to extend to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] their appreciation for her efforts in their behalf. They feel that the Veterans' Committee has been loyal to the needs of the veterans all over the Nation. I thought the gentlewoman would like to know that.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I thank the gentlewoman from New Mexico. She has been of enormous help in the effectiveness of the work of the committee.

I am hoping the leadership will allow the bills that the committee has reported to be called up for consideration. They deserve support and I am sure the membership of the House is just as anxious for their passage as is the Committee on Veterans' Affairs which has labored hard in the preparation of the measures.

Mr. MATHEWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. MATHEWS. I wish to answer the question raised by the gentleman from

Mississippi. In the testimony taken on these bills, time after time it was proven that the automobile was a prosthetic appliance, actually, and a means of rehabilitation. I am sure the gentlewoman from Massachusetts will recall that General Bradley himself said he would regard it as both a prosthetic appliance and a means of rehabilitation. With that in view would the gentleman from Mississippi say as far as prosthetic applances were concerned that we should give a man cash instead of a leg or an arm? That we should give a blind man the money for a seeing-eye dog rather than the seeing-eye dog itself?

I believe those things should be taken into consideration, especially when this had proven to be and is now administered upon the theory of being a prosthetic appliance and a means of rehabilitation, both. I feel that to follow the gentleman's suggestion might lead us into a situation where we would give cash instead of any other benefit, and then I think we would be in a rather serious and sordid situation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. May I say to the gentleman that I have not had one request for an automobile from a veteran with any other disability than the disabilities named in the gentleman's bill. They all seem to recognize that they are a sort of prosthetic appliance which amputees and paraplegia and the blind need; and, in my opinion, that is one of the best answers that I can give and I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for bringing that up.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I want to repeat that I am not opposed to this bill. My contention is, however, that veterans should be allowed, inasmuch as it does not cost the Government any more money, to choose whether they wish to take cash or an automobile. Many of the one-armed veterans already have automobiles, yet they are just as much entitled to the benefit as the ones who do not have an automobile. I feel that possibly those who already have automobiles would much rather have the cash and make a down payment, possibly, on a home or something else. That is my position.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I value the gentleman's opinion highly, but the cash provision failed last year; so I think the Congress rather settled that point quite emphatically.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has again expired.

(Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks and include a letter from General Bradley regarding certain housing for paraplegic veterans.)

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. HOFFMAN (at the request of Mr. JENISON) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD at this point and insert excerpts of testimony of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE].

THE NATIONAL DEFENSE ESTABLISHMENT

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on the question of the necessity for the kind of and the functions of a national defense organization, the gentleman from New York, the Honorable W. STERLING COLE, today, testifying before the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, made a clear, concise, and informative statement, which was as follows:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE COLE OF NEW YORK BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS ON JUNE 30, 1947, RELATING TO H. R. 2319

Mr. Chairman, personally grateful as I am for the indulgence of this committee in permitting an expression of my thoughts on H. R. 2319 I confess that it was with considerable amazement that I learned the decision of this committee to discontinue hearings on this most vital matter on July 1. This decision, coming as it did barely 24 hours after the Secretary of the Navy had issued a general directive releasing naval personnel to voice their views on the proposal, has peremptorily restored the gag on naval officers at the moment the Navy Department removed it. Being confident as I am that some features of the pending bill are disfavored by the practically unanimous concurrence of naval officers, only one conclusion can be drawn from that action of the committee, and that is that the proponents of this measure are fearful for the fate of the bill if the criticisms against it are publicized. The implications contained—yes; even concealed—in some features of the bill are so profound, so far reaching, and so dangerous both to our military security and the civil establishment that this committee and the Congress fail in its duty to the people of our Nation unless the investigation thoroughly examines the objectionable aspects of the proposal.

Mr. Chairman, what is the rush? Whence comes this pressure for hasty, ill-considered legislation as revolutionary in character as any Congress has contemplated in this generation?

Before continuing further, I will emphasize that the greater part of the pending bill has my complete approval. I refer specifically to those provisions creating the War Council Joint Chiefs of Staff, Munitions Board, Research and Development Board, Central Intelligence Agency, National Security Council, and National Security Resources Board, together with most of the miscellaneous provisions. Such criticisms as I shall make will be directed to the creation of a Secretary of National Defense and a Department of Air Force. I know that I have substantial public support in those opinions. As to the unobjectionable portions of the measure, there is no reason why early and prompt action could or should not be taken by the Congress. They can be enacted immediately and with unanimity. But with respect to the two portions which I have just mentioned, I most emphatically hold that the Congress should proceed with extreme caution and wisest deliberation before it takes a step so revolutionary of our Military Establishment and civil government. We must not lightly make radical adjustments in the military machinery which has evolved and matured over 150 years, which has given to our people a security enjoyed by no other nation in the world, and which has just won a two-hemisphere war against nations whose Military Establishment we now propose to imitate.

A moment ago I asked—why the rush? The necessary integration of our national security agencies, the working parts of this bill, can be adopted forthwith, and no one will dissent. Everything that the test of experience has demonstrated to be necessary for the close coordination of the several military establishments and civilian agencies can be had without inflicting upon our Government the alien and discredited concept of one-man domination, and the division of our armed forces into three parts which other nations have found impracticable—if not, as in Germany's case, disastrous.

This committee has heard numerous witnesses testifying in support of the bill who admitted that the next war, if it comes within 10 years, will be fought with the weapons employed at the close of the last war. One such witness was Dr. Vannevar Bush, the Nation's leading authority in the application of science to warfare. Dr Bush also expressed his surprise that this bill should strip the Army of its tactical air support of ground forces. If it had not been for the tactical support by naval aviation of the Army in the Carolines and the Marianas, those battles would have been endlessly prolonged at hideous cost of life. The Navy supplied the close support of the troops on the ground. The Army Air Force could not or would not. And yet this committee is denying itself and the Nation the benefit of the expert opinion of outstanding naval aviators in rushing the hearings to premature and unnecessary conclusion. I repeat, what is the rush?

The natural assumption is that since the responsible officials of the branches of the services affected are in agreement on H. R. 2319, the Congress should concur in the agreement without serious inquiry or controversy. Such an attitude falls far short of our performance of the constitutional responsibilities placed upon us as Members of Congress. Under the Constitution authority for the organization and maintenance of our Military Establishment is not vested in the Commander in Chief, or Chiefs of Staff, or Secretaries of the service departments. The responsibility for providing and maintaining an army and navy rests solely, squarely, and exclusively upon the Congress of the United States. Consequently, to the extent that we blindly accept any agreement made by the operating heads of our military establishments, to that extent we fail in our duty to the people of the country. To this end, then, I implore the members of the committee to complete a thorough, exhaustive, and searching inquiry into those portions of this bill over which there is serious controversy, before it makes its recommendations to the House of Representatives.

Much has been promised about the economies this bill will effect. The declarations have been general, promises as airy as a department store Santa Claus makes to children. But when pressed for details witness after witness has admitted that the proposed new establishment will be more expensive than our existing departmental system. The promise of economy is transferred to the remote future.

I do not think economy is a compelling argument. A cheap army, navy, or air force is little better than none at all. It is like a cheap diamond. It has superficial glitter but is full of flaws. Savings in dollars which might be effected today may result in terrific expenditures at a later date when the strength of our security is put to the test and our weakness, inspired by the desire to save money, makes itself evident when it may be too late. Who is there who will claim that money spent even on duplication, competition, or overlapping or paralleling activities of our military branches, which resulted in producing the most effective instruments of war and the overwhelming superiority of our arms, was money wasted? In expressing this thought, I do not, for a moment, infer that we should be wasteful or extravagant in the support of our military machine. It must be watched like any

other Government agency, but by the terms of this bill so many more barriers are erected between the Congress and the military budgeteers that the economy is sacrificed to cheap and undemonstrated promises of remote savings. With the bureaucracy of the single Secretary's office interposed between Congress and the military bureau chiefs, the fiscal committees of the Congress are thereby further insulated from scrutiny of the budget estimates. I definitely assert that it is false economy to predicate a Military Establishment basically upon the consideration of dollar costs.

Years ago, as a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, I first became interested in military matters and my duties took me to various fields of military operations. I saw what then appeared to me to be evidences of unnecessary duplication of effort as between the Army, the Navy, and the Army Air Force. My first impulse was that that sort of thing should be stopped and the way to stop it was to put them all under one authority. Further consideration of the elements involved in such a solution has brought me to the very definite conclusion that a single authority in our Military Establishment is the most disastrous step which this Nation could take.

History is a continued story of the disastrous experience of other nations of the world which have followed the practice of a single Military Establishment. History, ancient and modern, cries out to us against our adoption of a similar system. It doomed the Persian Empire of Xerxes the Great, it doomed Napoleon, it doomed the Kaiser and Hitler. Every nation of the world which has had either a single department of military science or whose Military Establishment was dominated by one of the branches of the military sciences has gone down to utter, complete, and catastrophic defeat. Britain barely averted it by breaking the grip of the RAF on naval and coastal defense aviation. It is unthinkable that we should embark upon a similar system with our eyes wide open to the dire consequences of such a step and the vast evidence of failures by other people who surround us.

What is there about the operations of a Military Establishment which makes us insist on the removal of all elements of competitive enterprise between the services when we, at the same time, insist that our business and private economy should be based on individual or competitive enterprise? The great business establishments themselves do not subscribe to the theory that motivates this bill. Consider General Motors, whose several divisions are wholly autonomous. In procurement of materials, of manpower, of brains, Buick competes with Cadillac and Chevrolet. General Motors tried "merger" and abandoned it as costly, stifling, and stultifying. Experiences of people throughout the history of the world demonstrate that competition is wholesome and productive of better material and spiritual results. Not for a moment would we consider requiring, to say nothing of even permitting, the combination of great corporate establishments into one unit of operation and, yet, that is the very thing which this bill proposes to be done to our Military Establishment when in it authority is given to a single person, the Secretary of National Defense, to "establish policies and programs for the national defense establishment and for the departments and agencies therein; * * * exercise direction, authority, and control over such departments and agencies; * * * supervise and coordinate the preparation of budget estimates by the departments and agencies; * * * formulate and finally determine the budget estimates of the national defense establishment; * * * supervise and control the budget program of the national defense establishment." Scores upon scores of instances could be cited which indicate that the competitive operation between our two existing departments of national defense has resulted in improved war mechanisms and tactics. The Navy's contributions to Army aviation are priceless. Competition made them possible. The Marines invented amphibious warfare. The Navy was doubtful, and the Army was even more reluctant, but without it where would we have been in this war? The inevitable result of the consolidation of military authority under one head is the destruction of this competitive operation with its resultant less efficient military machine.

Outside the military aspects of the authority which this bill vests in the Secretary of National Defense, there are also grave, domestic, political implications. In recent years a great many people in this country have been apprehensive that a dictatorship for this Nation was in the making. This fear was expressed largely by members of my own political party. Consequently, it is with some degree of amazement that I observe some who, in years past, were most outspoken against one-man government and control but who now so enthusiastically espouse legislation which would vest in a single man practically unlimited military power and authority. It is, indeed, most difficult to understand how those who were so fearful of one-man authority in government should now be so sanguine in their attitude toward one-man authority in our Military Establishment. No single person in our entire Federal establishment is given such vast, sweeping power and authority by statute as this bill vests in the Secretary of National Defense, under whose authority practically one-third of our national budget will be spent. Those who are fearful of dictatorship for America may do well to consider with extreme alarm the power vested in this one man, realizing, as they must, that dictators, wherever they have grown, sprang from a supreme military authority.

With all due respect to American manhood, there is no single person in this country who has the capacity to perform this tremendous responsibility with effectiveness, impartiality, and safety to the American system of government. From the practical, human standpoint, consider the effect of this bill creating a supersecretary who, though the identity of the operating departments of Government are preserved, is to exercise control over the secretaries of the military departments. While it is true that the bill preserves the right of a secretary of the department to appeal over the head of the supersecretary to the President in any controversy that may arise, either one of two things will happen—either the secretaries of the departments will be weak, docile, readily amenable to the will of the supersecretary or if strong, courageous, independent, as they should be, will hold office but a very short time after a few appeals to the President over the protest of the supersecretary. Furthermore, the bill contradicts itself by dividing rather than concentrating responsibility for the efficient operation of the Military Establishment in that both the secretary of a department and the supersecretary are charged with the responsibility of effectively organizing and operating the department under him. That invites dissension, conflict, and jealousies. It is axiomatic, both in military operations and civil operations, that where authority and responsibility are divided between persons there is no responsibility or authority. The secretary of a department could very well assume the attitude that it is the duty of the supersecretary rather than his to see that the departments are properly functioning; on the contrary, it is entirely conceivable that the supersecretary would rely completely upon the service secretaries for this responsibility. And the third possibility is that both will try to exercise the responsibility and be at loggerheads as to who is the boss.

Although the bill does not expressly say so, it has been announced that only the supersecretary will have cabinet status which is to be denied the department secretaries. This, in itself, the denial of cabinet rank to department secretaries, inevitably will discourage prominent, capable, fearless men from accepting an appointment as secretary of any of the departments, realizing as they must that instead of being heads of departments they are underlings.

You have heard it denied that this bill exalts the military. You have heard testimony that, to the contrary, it strengthens civilian controls over the armed services. And yet it creates the counterpart of an all-over general staff vested with tremendous authority, unlimited in tenure of office. It permits, without risking criticism by specific phases, the perpetuation of the War Department's ponderous general staff in addition to the tri-service general staff. It loads the new subordinate agencies of coordination with military men or their representatives, and makes of the very important National Security Resources Board a head without a body, having no participation in or control over the munitions board and research agency which are logically its components.

The other part of the bill to which I take very grave exception is that which creates a new Department of Air in our Federal establishment. If it were not so tragic, it would almost be ludicrous, that those who are so vehement in their demand that our military policy should be administered by a single authority should, at the outset, further divide military responsibility at the base and then try to corral it at the top. With three departments of Government it will be four times as difficult to coordinate and unify as with two. Further, a new department necessarily entails the additional administrative costs attendant upon the operation of any department. I doubt if it is necessary for me to recite to this committee illustration of how administrative overhead costs will be duplicated and increased by the creation of this new department.

Nor is the creation of a separate department of air advisable from a purely military standpoint. True it is that air force is the dominating power in present-day military operations. To set this power off by itself as a governmental agency is contrary to all modern military reason, practice, and policy. I would bore you with statistics of the superiority in marksmanship of the Navy's integrated aviation, but let us take just one example, the battle of Midway, where the sea-air team of ships, carrier and marine aviation made all the hits on the enemy and the Army Air Force made none. The statistics are supplied by the United States Strategic Bombing Survey, which is equally composed of civilians, Army and Navy. Instead of being by itself, air force should be an integral part, if not the dominating part, of all branches of military service. Dependent upon the nature of its use, the airplane is either but another weapon or another type of vehicle but, in either case, a type which is essential to the effective operations of either land or water military forces. Air power is well coordinated and integrated into our Naval Establishment. The same thing should be done in our Army for land operations. To set it apart in a unit by itself, free, distinct from any inherent relationship with the other services can result only in the weakening of the other services. General Arnold himself has publicly declared that the piloted military aircraft is rapidly becoming obsolete. Who should know better than that great leader of our Army Air Forces? Much as we might write into the law provisions to preserve naval aviation, the time will soon come when the Navy will have

lost its air force because the men of naval aviation will immediately cease their naval connections and join with the new independent group, feeling as they must that within the independent group is their own personal future and salvation. And when the Navy loses its air arm, it loses most of its potency.

What is to become of the aviator of an independent air force after he has outlived his comparatively brief usefulness as an aviator if a new department is to be created and air-force personnel is not an integral part of our military machine? It is unnecessary for me to emphasize to this committee that after a pilot has passed his thirtieth birthday his usefulness in military air operations is about over. Not all of them can be used in the training of new pilots, mechanics, observers, etc.; only a small fraction of them can be used in administrative military posts; only a few can be placed in command of military air establishments. The vast majority of them must either be turned loose, back into civil life with some compensatory bonus, or carried on the retirement rolls as an added expense to the Government. If trained as an integral part of the land force, as the naval aviator is trained as an integral part of the naval force, when his usefulness as an active pilot, observer, or what not is over, he is still qualified for other types of military command, not necessarily related to that of aviation. If it appears that a greater degree of independence be given to the Army air force than it has heretofore had, this can be done by setting up the air service as an independent corps, but under the Secretary of War, in much the same pattern as now exists for it by virtue of Presidential or administrative order. In fact, I believe that is the only method sanctioned by the Constitution. This I strongly urge be done so that the air force will be as independent, but as much a part of the Army, as the Marine Corps is independent of but a part of the Navy.

My objections to these two phases of the bill are further predicated upon constitutional grounds. Perhaps, in this day and age, it is a little old-fashioned to raise the constitutional question in connection with any legislation under consideration, but this matter is of such vital importance to our national security that we must be absolutely certain of our ground.

Section 8 of the Constitution sets forth the powers of the Congress. Congress shall have power, among other things, to provide for the common defense, to raise and support armies, to provide and maintain a navy, to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, to provide for calling forth the militia. The Constitution is rather precise in its enumeration of powers with respect to the armed forces. There is no power to raise, support, provide, maintain, or call forth an air force such as the bill, H. R. 2319, would establish. There is no power to make rules for the government and regulation of an air force. The power of Congress to provide for the common defense is not broad enough to include the creation of an air force in view of the further precise enumeration of powers with respect to the land and naval forces. Perhaps the Constitution requires amendment in this regard, but at present it does not authorize the creation of a new military unit outside the present constitutionally recognized Army and Navy. It is to be noted that the Marine Corps is a part of the naval service. All other armed branches have been and are covered into the Army or the Navy.

The bill, H. R. 2319, creates a United States Air Force. This force will be entirely separate from the Army or the Navy. The personnel of the Air Force will be a part neither of the Army nor the Navy. The Constitution provides that "the President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States." The President would not be Commander in Chief of the Air Force. It is contrary to the constitutional concept of this Government to create a fighting force, such as the Air Force, which would not be subject to the military control of the President in his capacity as Commander in Chief. An amendment to the Constitution is necessary to make the President Commander in Chief of the Air Force, and such an amendment is necessary, therefore, to create a military Air Force.

Section 102 (a) of the bill, H. R. 2319, provides that the Secretary of National Defense shall formulate and finally determine the budget estimates of the National Defense Establishment for submittal to the Bureau of the Budget. If this provision envisions a single appropriation for the Army and the Navy, it does violence to the constitutional concept that appropriations for the Army and Navy shall be separate. The Constitution provides that the Congress shall have power "to raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than 2 years." There is no such time limitation placed upon appropriations made by Congress to fulfill its power "to provide and maintain a Navy." A single appropriation for the Army and Navy would be an unconstitutional delegation by Congress of its power to provide separately for an Army and a Navy.

Section 306 (c) of the bill, H. R. 2319, would permit certain of the powers granted to the President by title I of the First War Powers Act, 1941, to be exercised in perpetuity by the Secretary of National Defense. The Secretary could, by invoking authority contained in Executive Orders 9082, 9722, and 9635, organize the National Defense Establishment as he pleased within vague limits and without observance of standards proscribed by Congress. This is an unconstitutional delegation of legislative authority. The Constitution provides that "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States." It provides further that "The Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers." The Congress is not permitted to transfer to others the essential functions with which it is vested (295 U. S. 495). The broad authority given the President by the First War Powers Act can probably be justified on constitutional grounds only in the event of national emergency. Authority given the Secretary of National Defense by section 306 (c) to assign functions (with which section 309 of the bill would include powers and duties) to organizational units within the War and Navy Departments would be a broad authority which would enable him to cripple or control present units of the armed services at will. Such power is not contemplated by the Constitution.

When the announcement was made in January that the chiefs of the interested military departments and services had come into an agreement on a pattern of unification, I hailed it as a welcome step in the improvement of our Military Establishment, believing as I did then that it had the enthusiastic concurrence of the men of the services. It was not long afterward, however, that through conversation with various military officers, principally of the Navy, I learned of an apparent widespread disaffection. In order to evaluate the extent of this feeling, I solicited from the Secretary of the Navy his permission for naval officers to speak freely on the subject. In spite of urgent appeals in this connection, the Secretary did not see fit to grant this release until just a week ago, the 23d of June.

However, I felt it my duty, both to the naval service and to my responsibility as a Member of Congresss, charged as we are with the duty to provide an Army and Navy, to inquire further into the attitude of officers of the service toward the agreement. We must bear in mind that no pattern or formula or unification, merger, consolidation, or whatever it may be called, can be successful, unless it has the concurrence of those who are to make the pattern or formula operative. Accordingly, I sent letters of inquiry to a random list of officers, enclosing copies of this bill and also one on the general subject which I had introduced, asking for their comment and assuring them of protection against disclosure of their responses. Out of the approximate 175 inquiries which were sent, 118 replies have been received and almost without exception those who answered asked to have their names withheld because at that time they were under an inferential directive from their superior to support the agreement. Of those who replied 18 expressed approval of the agreed proposal, and it is fair to assume that those who failed to reply were opposed to the plan but did not express themselves out of fear of retaliation by their superiors. Not long ago, while discussing the matter with a high-ranking official of the Navy, I inquired how general was the approval of naval officers to the bill which is now before you. His reply was to the effect that the number of responsible naval officers who approved this plan could be counted on the fingers of a single hand.

Mr. Chairman, in dealing with a subject of such profound importance as this, when a great preponderance of those who are so vitally interested express concern over its wisdom, then most certainly you should proceed with extreme care, caution and deliberation. While, of course, a problem such as this cannot be decided upon the basis of popular poll these responses have indicated the reasons for the concern, and the objection to the proposal, of professional men in the one service that operates in all three elements—air, sea, land. Sufficient excerpts from the letters have been compiled by me for distribution to the Members for such consideration as they may care to give them. The expressions which I have previously made are largely a consolidation of the major points indicated by the officers. I am sure you will agree with me that fairness and reason require that the same degree of credence, sincerity, capacity of judgment be allowed to those who oppose this proposal as is granted to those who espouse it.

Fifteen years ago, the Congress was confronted with the same proposition as you are now considering. A bill was pending which would abolish the War and Navy Departments and create a single Department of National Defense with three subordinate branches of Army, Navy, and Air. The pending bill does exactly the same thing in substance. The then Chief of Staff of the Army who, in later years, was to write a brilliant and everlasting page in the history of American military genius and who now sits in Tokyo as commanding general of the American forces, General Douglas MacArthur, expressed his opinion on the measure then under consideration by the Congress in the following clear, unmistakable and emphatic terms:

"No other measure proposed in recent years seems to me to be fraught with such potential possibilities of disaster for the United States as is this one."

"Not only the military history of this country but of every country gives indisputable proof of the advantages of maintaining in time of war the integral control of the two great branches of national defense—the Army and the Navy."

"I know of no responsible soldier or sailor in the whole gamut of history who has advocated such a plan as is now proposed."

"* * * such an amalgamation as proposed would endanger victory for the United States in case of war."

"The super-Cabinet officer at its head could not fail to be the acquisitor of one of

the largest and undoubtedly the most powerful governmental organizations the United States has ever known. * * * Rather than economy this amalgamation would in my opinion, represent one of the greatest debauches of extravagance that any nation has ever known."

"This bill would run counter to the experience of the world."

Mr. Chairman, I shall close my remarks on this subject with the exact words used by General MacArthur as he concluded his appeal against the merger of 1932: "Pass this bill and every potential enemy of the United States will rejoice."

Mr. Speaker, in addition, the Member from New York [Mr. COLE] offered certain correspondence which every Member of the Congress should read in connection with his testimony. That correspondence is as follows:

CORRESPONDENCE RE H. R. 2319 AND H. R. 3469

APRIL 2, 1947.

The Honorable JAMES FORRESTAL,
Secretary of the Navy,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: You will recall that on February 27, in reply to an inquiry from me, you wired that no orders had been issued to the members of the naval service to support the agreement made by yourself and the Secretary of War, relative to the pattern of merging the military forces of the Nation.

In private conversation with naval officers, I find that there is a general feeling of reluctance among them to speak critically of the proposed plan. This feeling is so genuine that they refuse to express themselves even in private conversation and certainly will not be critical in any testimony they might give to a committee of the Congress on the question.

I am sure that you agree with me that any fundamental reorganization of our Military Establishment is of so grave importance that its implications should be explored and considered thoroughly from all angles before a change is made. To the extent that career officers of the military services withhold their views on the problem, especially those which may be critical of the proposed plan, to that same extent full and thorough consideration is denied.

Accordingly, if it is the fact that naval officers are free to express their views on the question, I think it highly desirable for you to make suitable expression, either by way of public statement or reply to this letter for purposes of publication.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

W. STERLING COLE,
Member of Congress.

APRIL 16, 1947.

The Honorable W. STERLING COLE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for your letter of April 2, 1947.

I wish to assure you of my wholehearted concurrence with your thought that all persons in the military service should be free to express their personal opinions on the important questions of fundamental reorganization of our Military Establishment.

In promulgating the agreement between the War and Navy Departments which the President announced on January 16, I advised the naval service that the reorganization plan was deserving of the support of all within the naval service. In a later letter I expressed the hope that study and consideration of the plan would lead all in the naval service to conclude that it deserved their support.

As you know, the traditional policy of the Navy Department is that every person in the naval service is at liberty to voice his professional and personal opinion on any subject when testifying before the committee of the Congress or when engaged in private conversation.

I assure you that it is not my intention to attempt to alter this policy. I know you will agree with me that the public office which I hold in no way empowers me to abridge the constitutional right of free speech which every American citizen enjoys.

I appreciate your interest in clarifying this matter.

Sincerely,

JAMES FORRESTAL.

MAY 2, 1947.

The Honorable JAMES FORRESTAL,
Secretary of the Navy,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This is in further reference to the question of departmental control over the expressions of opinion by naval officers on the pending proposal to consolidate, unite, or merge the armed services.

In your reply to me of April 16, 1947, you give assurance of your wholehearted concurrence with the thought that all persons in the military service should feel free to express their personal opinions on the important question of fundamental reorganization of our Military Establishment. Permit me to extend my genuine compliments to you for the very fair attitude which you have taken in this regard.

Now, the problem seems to be one of implementing your declaration in such fashion that officers who might be in disagreement with the merger proposal, will freely voice their thoughts without fear of reprisal. While it may be true that it is the "traditional policy of the Navy Department that every person in the naval service is at liberty to voice his professional and personal opinion on any subject when testifying before a committee of Congress," the Navy regulations prohibit any officers from applying to Congress or any committee or Member thereof for congressional action of any kind and, further, they prohibit all remonstrances from any officer to Congress on any subject of legislation relating to the Navy or the Marine Corps except by authority of the Department. In view of these provisions of the regulations and ALNAV No. 21 which states that the merger plan "is deserving of the loyal and wholehearted support of all with the naval service," no member of the naval service feels that he is allowed any latitude of expression. Certainly, the expressions made in your letter to me of April 16, laudable though they are in themselves, do not provide an official basis for unrestricted self-expression by Navy people on the merger question.

Any legislation so vital as this concerning the military forces of the Nation, is so important that the Congress must have professional information freely given and not given under pressure. So far, in the consideration of the proposed legislation, only four professional naval officers have testified. These four have been very closely identified with the official policy of the Navy. It is very questionable, to my mind, whether the official policy of the Navy truly reflects the opinion of the majority of the professional and Reserve officers. It is my belief that not less than 90 percent of these men are opposed to this legislation in its present form, and yet they dare not say so.

I am definitely unwilling to cloak those of the services who favor the proposal with a mantle of patriotism, unselfishness, and wisdom and at the same time require those who disapprove the proposal to stand naked in treason, selfishness, and ignorance. Both groups must be credited with the same degree of sincerity of purpose and capacity of judgment. To be qualified to pass upon this vital matter, the Congress must have the truth, and the truth cannot be had when only one side of the matter is allowed to be expressed.

It is my present purpose to make inquiry of various responsible and prominent officers of the services in an effort to learn their attitude on this question. In order that they may have the freedom of expression which they and the question they discuss deserve, I respectfully ask that the declaration contained in your letter of April 16 be embodied in an immediate ALNAV, or that the equivalent be expressed by you by letter to me which, upon publication, will free the men of the service to speak their minds. Both you and the Congress owe this much to them and the country.

The principles involved in this controversy are so profound and the issues at stake are so vital to the security of our country that no element of pride, position, or ambition of any individual or group connected with it should be allowed to color either our judgment or our courage.

The Navy in years gone by has possessed a high prestige in Congress. Its great achievements culminating in victory during the war just ended has elevated its prestige to the highest position it has ever had in th minds of the people and of Congress. I do not want to see this enviable reputation lost or marred. It is, therefore, in this spirit that I am again writing to you with the hope that the same spirit will command your reply.

Very respectfully yours,

W. STERLING COLE,
Member of Congress.

MAY 10, 1947.

MY DEAR MR. COLE: Until I received your letter of May 2, I was under the impression that it was generally recognized, as I said in my earlier letter to you, that "every person in the naval service is at liberty to voice his professional and personal opinion on any subject when testifying before a committee of Congress."

I believe that anyone reading the recent testimony of Admiral King, Admiral Halsey, Admiral Hart, General Vandegrift, and General Edson will reach the conclusion that officers of the Navy and the Marine Corps not only possess this liberty but also exercise it.

As regards private conversations, there has been no restraint laid upon officers of either the Navy or the Marine Corps and no denial of the right to express their personal views on this question. It is true that I issued an ALNAV under date of January 18, 1947, saying that support of the bills S. 758 and H. R. 2319 would be the official position of the Navy Department and that I sincerely hoped the bills would command the support of all hands. By implication this might cause some to be reluctant to express their views in private conversations. But realistically, I doubt if this assumption is soundly based because in the cases of those persons who disagreed with the officially expressed policy of the Navy Department silence could be just as effective an instrument of disagreement as speech. In other words, I am aware that there is no way, nor should there be under our form of government, of denying the right of opinion to anyone be he civilian or service individual.

I have tried to dissuade naval personnel from soliciting the time of Members of the House and Senate to express their views on this subject, because I regard it as inappropriate for members of the services to seek out Members of Congress in order to present their individual opinions. There is a proper place for the presentation of such opinions and that is in the committee hearings.

To sum up: There is no denial of free speech on this or any other subject to officers of the naval service or the Marine Corps. On the other hand, I shall continue to do my best to persuade these men that the proposed legislation constitutes a desirable and imperative improvement in planning for our national security.

Sincerely,

JAMES FORRESTAL.

MAY 27, 1947.

DEAR ADMIRAL DOE: As you know, the Congress has under consideration a bill (H. R. 2319) which represents the plan of the War and Navy Departments relative to the consolidation of the armed services, pursuant to the directive of the President. In my opinion this is the most important measure to come before the Congress so far as our national defense and national security are concerned.

While it is true that the official position of the Navy Department is in support of the plan, substantial critical and apprehensive expressions on the subject have come to me from responsible persons in all of the services. As a practical matter, it is impossible for all of those who are vitally interested in this problem from the standpoint of national security to appear before an appropriate committee of the Congress to give expression to their views. Accordingly, my purpose in writing you is to seek an expression as to your judgment and recommendations with regard to the proposed plan, or an alternative plan. A copy of H. R. 2319, and also of H. R. 3469, the latter representing my own personal suggestion of an alternative, are enclosed.

I am sure that all will agree that some steps should be taken in order to bring about a closer coordination of Army, Navy, and Air Force operations. The pattern of this step is the important factor. Because of your knowledge of the subject and your years of service experience, I am seeking your advice.

Also, enclosed herewith are copies of communications exchanged between the Secretary of the Navy and myself with regard to the latitude of expression available to members of the service. From this exchange, I hope you will find it possible to express yourself freely and without hesitation. If it is your wish, your response will be held by me as confidential; otherwise, I shall feel free to release your expression to the Congress.

In view of the fact that action may be taken by the Congress on this subject in the near future, I hope that I may have the benefit of your reply at an early date.

Very truly yours,

W. STERLING COLE,
Member of Congress.

P. S.—What is the opinion of the men in the service on this question?

REPLIES TO COLE LETTER OF INQUIRY

My personal conclusions are that—

(a) Much effort and study has been put into obtaining the agreements resulting in H. R. 2319 by men of the broadest war and administrative experience and of the highest integrity.

(b) More good to the services and to the country is to be gained by settlement of this question, as agreed upon by our qualified leaders, in stability of organization and a resultant spirit of cooperation, than is to be gained by reopening the study of the form such an acknowledged need for improved cooperation should take.

In answer to your question regarding the opinion of the men of the service, my impression is that we can obtain nearly as many answers as the number of men questioned.

My experience in the last war indicates to me that the setting up of a new, separate, and distinct Air Force, as proposed by H. R. 2319, would ultimately aggravate the disunity which we experienced from time to time during the last war, although I must say that I believe these instances of disunity were exaggerated. It is obvious that a separate Air Force would constitute a third entity which would engage in a struggle for prominence and authority with the Army and Navy.

I have always felt that a good deal of the lack of unity of command in the field could have been avoided if the practice had been followed of ordering all subordinates on duty in a certain area to report to the area commander in the role of subordinates, i. e., if, for example, all Army, Navy, and Marine Corps officers in Admiral Nimitz' area had received orders directing them to report to Admiral Nimitz for duty and if it were clearly understood that all such officers were in the same status and if all orders from Washington, intended for these subordinate officers, would have come to Admiral Nimitz, I believe that conditions would have been improved.

Perhaps I am venturing too far in this belief, but that is the impression that I obtained from my travels to the various combat areas. There was too much direct communication between Washington and subordinate commands in the area.

I have felt, too, that the organization of a separate Air Force must inevitably lead to additional expense without commensurate increase in efficiency.

I feel that in the best interests of national defense, no bill should be enacted which would go beyond the provisions of H. R. 2319 as written, or which would extend over into the field of actual physical merger of elements of the armed forces or of their integral supporting services. I believe that such legislation would bring about full coordination of the functions and operations of the separate branches of the armed forces, and insure that all feasible and justifiable economies would be realized.

I would have no objection to any reasonable alternative bill which embodies the foregoing principle which I believe to be basic, for example, effective coordination without features of merger.

When I have studied H. R. 3469, I will make further reply concerning the bill.

With respect to H. R. 2319: I testified before the Senate Armed Forces Committee on the companion bill, S. 758, and expressed my support of that measure, with certain reservations, as Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Logistics), my principal concern was with the logistical aspects of any measure dealing with unification of the efforts of the armed forces. The views that I expressed were my own, and I stated that I was not instructed.

The hearings on S. 758 later convinced me that several interpretations were being placed on the language of the bill, and that there was no certainty that the intent of the language would be fulfilled by the bill as written, nor maintained without infringement should the bill, as first written, be enacted. I understand that S. 758 may be modified by a preamble and certain safeguarding language designed to remove the possibility of unintended interpretations or infringement, but have as yet no first-hand knowledge of any such new language.

I firmly believe that the most efficient and economical use of all of our national resources and strengths must be sought in these days of total war and mass destruction; however, I also feel convinced that the measures and techniques which crushed our enemies in 1945 must not be abandoned in favor of untried theories. With those two ideas in mind, I strongly support (a) the theory of effective coordination at the policy level, (b) the retention of such war-tested agencies as the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Munitions Board, and (c) the autonomy of the several services within the framework of top-policy coordination. My meager political experience limits the value of any opinion I might have as to what the organization should be for effecting top-level policy coordination, but I am prepared to state my views on logistical implications.

I appreciate your thoughtfulness in offering to hold my response to your letter as confidential, but I do not wish to take advantage of your offer inasmuch as these are freely expressed opinions voiced at the invitation of a member of the Armed Services Committee.

With respect to your final question, I am unable to make any worth-while estimate as to the cross section of service opinion in this matter other than to say that of those with whom I have talked there is virtually unanimous objection to merger, a single department, and the vesting in a single Secretary of any power enabling him to arbitrarily assign or change the roles and missions of the services or their components.

I doubt that I will be able to make any substantial contributions or submit a proper evaluation of the proposed plan. I feel that the Marine Corps has been most ably represented before the committees of the Congress by our Commandant, Gen. A. A. Vandegrift.

To me it appears perfectly legitimate for an individual to present his views in writing to a committee or a member thereof when such action is initiated by the latter and, for whatever reason, conversations and appearance before the committee are not possible nor desirable.

This feature is not covered by the correspondence enclosed with your letter of May 19. Does not clarification on this point seem to be in order if you are to obtain the free expression of views which you seek?

As you suggest in your letter, no thinking person will contest the need for closer coordinations of the elements of national security. The problem confronting the Nation today is that of finding an effective, economical, and democratic method of effecting such coordination. In my opinion, H. R. 2319 is not a satisfactory answer to the problem.

It has frequently been claimed in support of H. R. 2319 that coordination of the military departments and the armed services can come about only through the establishment of an office with complete authority over these departments and services. The same argument might equally well be applied to any combination of Government departments which are required to closely coordinate their activities. But I have heard no demands for unification of such other departments under a super-Secretary. The fact is, of course, that there is already in existence a common head for all of the executive departments—the President. If the coordination of the executive departments exceeds his capabilities, then the proper answer would seem to be to give him the necessary assistants—call them coordinators if you will—to do the job. It does not impress me as good management to inject a new echelon of command to solve every new problem of coordination.

I regard the building of superdepartments and the creation of supersecretaries as unnecessary, even undemocratic—a poor solution to a management problem and a dangerous one. The concentration of power in nonelected hands is an unsafe road for a democratic nation to follow.

The provision for a National Security Council to serve as the principal advisory body concerned with matters of national security is basically sound, in my opinion. This is an age in which warfare directly affects every segment of the population and every element of the national life. The National Security Council should bring together the diverse viewpoints of these elements and insure that security measures truly reflect the national interests in the broadest sense. Unfortunately, the composition of the Council as proposed by H. R. 2319 is not such as to achieve this purpose. The membership of the Council must be considerably broadened if it is to do so.

Broadening of the membership of the National Security Council would also have the very desirable effect of diminishing its military complexion. Under H. R. 2319 four of the six named members of the Council are spokesmen of the military departments. I doubt if anyone will be so naive as to assume that their viewpoint would be a civilian viewpoint.

The Central Intelligence Agency is open to the same criticism of undue military influence. Such an agency has considerable capacity for harm unless it is under firm civilian control and its functions circumscribed by law.

I have no comment to make with respect to the National Security Resources Board and the Munitions Board except to state that I have observed considerable difference of opinion over the relationship between these two bodies. Since this relationship involves the important question of civilian versus military control of the national economy in time of war or emergency, a concise definition of the relationship seems most desirable.

The provision of H. R. 2319 for a War Council seems to me to be unnecessary. I can see little purpose in establishing a War Council so long as a Secretary for National Defense is permitted to exist. If that functionary were eliminated, on the other hand, the War Council could serve a most useful purpose as the agency for the coordination of the military departments. I do not regard the coordination of the military departments as a proper function either for the National Security Council, which has a broader function, or for the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The proper functions of the Joint Chiefs of Staff are the preparation of strategic and logistic plans, the establishment of unified field commands, and the strategic direction of the field commands. These are purely military functions, and do not extend to the administration of the military departments in any way. They are the same functions which the Joint Chiefs of Staff performed so ably in the war just ended. I regard it as essential that this body and these functions be perpetuated.

I cannot subscribe, however, to the need for or the desirability of a Joint Staff to serve the Joint Chiefs of Staff. From my study of the history of national general staffs I am convinced that such staffs are an instrument of militarism and a menace to democratic governments. I therefore, believe that provision for a Joint Staff should be eliminated from the proposed legislation. A secretariat charged with clerical and administrative duties should adequately meet the requirements of the Joint Chiefs of Staff for assistance in the performance of its functions.

The perpetuation of the existing Joint Research and Development Board as the proposed Research and Development Board is a sound provision, and one which should be incorporated in any legislation for the coordination of the armed services.

Coming now to the armed services themselves, it is my belief that an independent air force should be established under a separate Department of the Air Force. The exercise of strategic air power, including the defense of the United States and its possessions against aerial attack, should no longer be hampered by treatment as an element of land power or sea power. It is a distinct and separate element of over-all military power and should be treated as such.

I cannot subscribe, however, to any philosophy which would place all military aviation in a single air force. To do so would be to flagrantly disregard one of the most important lessons of the recent war—the lesson that the ground forces and the naval forces must each possess their own aviation components if they are to operate effectively. Close-support aviation is an essential element of land power and an inseparable component of an effective ground force. By the same token naval aviation is an essential element of sea power—perhaps the most essential element—and an inseparable component of an effective naval force.

The same philosophy which dictates that the Naval Establishment should contain the necessary aviation to make it an effective force for the exercise of sea power, also requires that the Marine Corps be maintained as a part of that establishment. History offers countless instances of the truth of this statement. There is no evidence that its validity will be diminished in the foreseeable future.

Along with many other Marine officers who have had the opportunity to study the pending unification proposals, I am greatly concerned over the future combatant role of the Marine Corps if H. R. 2319 should be enacted in its present form. The vulnerable position in which the Marine Corps will be placed by enactment of this bill has been pointed out repeatedly in the course of the past few months. It is this position of vulnerability, coupled with expressions of intent such as those appearing in the 1478 series of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, which arouses the fears of marines and their friends throughout the country. These fears will be set at rest and their substance removed only when Congress spells out in unmistakable language the future status and functions of the corps.

I can offer no suggestion which would improve the statement of Marine Corps status and functions which General Vandegrift, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, incorporated in the amendment which he submitted to the Senate and House committees considering unification. I think it would be appropriate if Congress were to enact similar statements of basic functions for all the services. I can think of nothing which would do more to promote future harmony among the services than legislation marking out for each service a clear-cut field of endeavor.

Possessing the views which I have outlined herein, I would consider it most unfortunate if H. R. 2319 were to be enacted in its present form. It would require extensive alteration of this bill to arrive at a real solution for the problem confronting the Nation today—that of achieving the closer coordination of the elements of national security in an effective, economical, and democratic way. I believe that the problem is solvable, however, and that a close approximation to the ideal solution has been achieved by Senator ROBERTSON in the bill which he recently proposed as a substitute for S. 758, the Senate counterpart of H. R. 2319. I have studied Senator ROBERTSON'S bill, S. 1282, and am of the opinion that it is an admirable instrument for national security.

I have also given careful attention to H. R. 3469 which you have offered as a suggested alternative to H. R. 2319, and I am pleased to observe that your proposal also eliminates many of the objectionable features of H. R. 2319. Inasmuch as S. 1282 coincides more nearly with my views, however, in that it provides for a War Council, establishes a separate Department of the Air Force, and spells out the functions of the armed services in what I believe to be the necessary specific terms, my preference is for S. 1282 rather than for H. R. 3469.

In closing, I wish to thank you for the opportunity you have accorded me to express my views on this important subject. Again let me say that I have set forth my personal views—that I do not flaunt them, neither do I have any desire to conceal them.

On a subject of this nature it would be necessary to interview a great many men to obtain a completely accurate cross section of their views. I will, therefore, confine myself to those things which I have heard specifically mentioned by men in discussing the possibility of unification. The majority of them agree that unity of command is absolutely necessary, but the following questions invariably arise: (1) Are we justified in changing a system which worked efficiently and won the last war? (2) Is this the time to experiment and adopt a system which, more or less, was the one used by the Axis nations and which proved a failure? (3) Will there be any real economy either in personnel or money? (4) Will it create more efficiency? (5) Will our national defense and security be improved?

These are questions which can only be answered in years to come, but you and the other Members of Congress will have to make the decision which is so vital to the security of our country.

With VJ-day we emerged from the most devastating war in the world's history, victorious over the strongest enemies, in both an absolute and relative sense, which the United States had ever faced. It seemed to many of us in the Navy that the Nation, the home front, the armed services, and the Navy itself could well be proud of this achievement. It seemed to many of us that the war-making organization of our country had been thoroughly tested, and within the limits of human fallibility had successfully passed that test, and therefore required no radical change to an untested organization. It seemed to many of us in the Navy that the war had brought a high measure of appreciation and sympathetic understanding and ability to cooperate among every element of the United States war machine, including the civilian home front, the Army, the Army Air Force, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, naval aviation, submarines, surface ships, amphibious forces, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, etc.

To our astonishment then, instead of an atmosphere of mutual congratulation and good will and a determination to continue the teamwork which had proved itself so successful, the Navy found itself the target of an unrestrained and intemperate attack, the object of abusive and extravagant criticism with little regard for facts, logic, or reason in the charges that were made, emanating chiefly from a certain element of a sister service which apparently had devoted considerable effort, not to say expense, before VJ-day to planning an anti-Navy campaign while the Navy was devoting all its energies to bringing about a successful conclusion of the war.

My only purpose in raking over these dead ashes is to make the point that it all brought about a serious deterioration in the relations between the services, and therefore impaired their ability to cooperate, and therefore weakened the total of our military strength in the face of a serious international situation which required unity and not dissension in the United States and especially in the armed services of the United States. And this situation made it imperative that the wounds be healed, that some sort of compromise be reached.

As one who had no direct responsibility and no direct part in the drafting of what has since become the substance of H. R. 2319, it seemed to me that, with minor reservations, this bill represented about as good a compromise as could be hoped for. I don't like it. I prefer the present organization (with legislative authority for the Joint Chiefs of Staff and Central Intelligence). I don't like H. R. 2319, but at least it was arrived at by democratic process of give and take, it was a compromise and it gave promise of restoring the brotherhood-in-arms of the various elements of the armed services.

As to H. R. 3469, I prefer that in principle to H. R. 2319 though my first preference is

still the present organization (with legislative authority for the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Central Intelligence, and comparable coordinating agencies in other fields). It is most important, however, that (a) the breach between the services be healed and (b) that a firm decision be reached quickly. The particular compromise, if any, which will best effect these results is the problem. If it were to be decided by a sort of Gallup poll I should vote for the present organization. Statesmanship might produce a different solution, possibly H. R. 3469 or H. R. 2319.

Since my answer to your letter of May 19, I have endeavored to study and compare the original Unification bill, H. R. 2319, with that submitted by you, H. R. 3469. It is my considered opinion that the bill proposed by you will, in effect, produce far more economies, and be more conducive to the national security than the original proposed bill. I feel that the national welfare will be better served by close cooperation under a two-department system, coordinated by a director of national defense, than a virtual three-department system.

I am of the opinion that your bill provides the only solution to the national-defense problem and that H. R. 2319 is entirely unacceptable. I have not had sufficient time to study your bill to permit detailed comment. I am, of course, familiar with H. R. 2319.

I consider that a two-department organization as envisaged by you to be the only logical guarantee for an air-sea Navy that can fulfill its missions effectively. I am of the opinion that formation of a third Department for Air will result in an unbalanced defense organization wherein ground-force and naval requirements will gradually be neglected to a point that may be catastrophic to our country. I state this advisedly as the private and public utterances of Air Force leaders leave me with no illusions as to their future intentions concerning the Navy and naval aviation when autonomy under their own Secretary is achieved.

As much of an examination of the alternative proposal, H. R. 3469, as I have been able to make in the limited time available, indicates that it will not accomplish the improved efficiency and economy of administration to the extent intended by the President to result from the organization of a National Defense Establishment administered by a Secretary of National Defense.

The greatest advantage in H. R. 3469 is its basic concept of a coordinated two-department organization. I believe 100 percent in this concept for a solution of our problem.

In the first place, a third department or a third prong to a corpulent single department cannot be accepted as representing economy. It may very well be that closer coordination will produce gradual economies in comparison with present practice, but the overhead of the third department will have to be faced. The same steps of coordination are bound to produce greater over-all economies if applied to only two departments or two prongs.

With respect to the actual coordination the mechanical and mathematical advantage is of the order of 4 to 1 in favor of attaining success in the two department set-up where only "a" and "b" must be pulled together. In a three department set-up the following coordination would have to be effected: ab, bc, ac, and finally abc.

If we suppose that the need for coordination could be eliminated in a real single department wherein, as one example, personnel of all branches would be controlled and detailed to duty by one personnel division, we would run contrary to the experience of American big business. I believe that a merger of Montgomery Ward and Sears, Roebuck was once considered and given up because the result would be too corpulent for efficiency. Our military organization dwarfs any existing business corporation. Even if such a huge military organization were manageable, it would prove unhealthy by regimentation and the elimination of competition. If all automobiles were manufactured by a single concern, I doubt if anyone in his right mind would expect to obtain the best and cheapest product. Thus the two-department military organization will provide maximum economy compatible with a healthy fighting machine.

If a separate department of air is set up, I foresee a real weakening of our future military strength. I believe that this will come about with the acceptance on the part of the Congress and the public that such an air department will be the source of all expert opinion on the application of the military airplane in all fields. Competent as the AAF has proved itself in its own field, it does not understand (see postscript) or believe in naval air power whereas our air power is the Sunday punch of the fleet today. It would be a national tragedy if naval air power were relegated to an accessory role. The Navy would be crippled and as the weak link determines the strength of a chain so would a weak Navy weaken the whole organization. Neither the Army or the Navy can be very effective today without air power and for obvious reasons in order to exert maximum striking force the air power should belong to the using service. To those who demand coequal status for air along with the Army and Navy, I say that they are on the right track but they have not gone far enough. What the country needs now is two services: A Navy which is largely a seagoing air force but complete with all necessary supporting and other components, and an army which has its heaviest striking power concentrated in a land-based air force but augmented by the necessary supporting and other components. Each of two such services represents a speciality and each is broad enough to absorb one's full career. Thus air would achieve more than a coequal status or 33⅓ percent; it would be the backbone of each service. Military history supports the above position since victory has been attained by the side which employs the dominant weapon of the times most effectively. Today the dominant weapon has proved to be the airplane. Tomorrow it may be the long range guided missile. A two department organization retains sufficient flexibility to adjust to future requirements.

It seems to me that setting up a single air department would prove faulty in two other respects. First, such a department would be built around a weapon—if this had occurred in the old days a department of horse, archers, or spear bearers might have been the result. The history of all weapons is transitory and the airplane can expect to be superseded in time by the long-range guided missile. Second, and in the meantime, the Air Force can be expected to duplicate every function of the Ground Forces. The Air Force will require its own engineers (to build fields, roads, buildings), Artillery (AA defense of airfields), quartermasters, etc., plus airborne troops—it will have to develop tanks and artillery transportable by air plus the personnel to man these tools. It will also have to develop capsuled food and condensed fuels for air delivery. A reexamination of the problem within 10 years will pose the question, "In view of the duplication why do we have the Ground Forces?" Thence if the Ground Forces are turned over to the Air Forces, we return to a two-department pattern but I contend that this is the hard way to do it.

P. S.—There are many examples of incomplete understanding on the part of the AAF with respect to naval air power as reflected by public statements of generals, a few: "The Navy needs carrier aircraft for the defense of the fleet."

As a matter of fact these planes are the Navy's big offensive power; these planes, their flying "fields" and logistic support all move together and they can strike some areas long before land-based bombers can get there.

"The time has come to admit that the Army and Navy are only service forces for the AAF."

However, Navy fighters from carriers cleared the air over Japan for AAF bombers—no other type of fighters could be brought to bear.

"We will let the Navy keep its carrier aircraft for the time being."

A clear forecast that the AAF intends to go after naval air power.

Referring to your letter of May 16, 1947 I heartily endorse your bill H. R. 3469 as being the plan best suited to giving the country the best national security of any proposal, as regards to the armed services, that I have yet seen.

To my mind, your bill does two outstanding things:

1. It prevents a supersecretary from having too much power.

2. It safeguards the interests of the Navy, Naval Aviation, and the Marine Corps by maintaining a two-department system.

I believe that a coordinator is all that is needed at the higher levels. To have an all-powerful Secretary would offer an opportunity for a strong man to become a dictator.

I believe that your bill gives the present Army Air Forces all the independence they need. It permits them to fight a war in any fashion they choose, and yet leaves them under the Secretary of War, who can order them to support the ground forces when the ground forces need air support.

I have heard a good many arguments pro and con about the Vice President being the coordinator of national defense. I strongly favor this because he is an officer endorsed by the electorate. It has been said that his duties as President of the Senate might interfere, but the fact that we have not had a Vice President for 2 years would lead me to the opinion that if we had one, he could spare enough time to coordinate the armed services.

I believe membership of your National Defense Council might well be reduced. The more people who are in on high-level planning, the more difficult it becomes to maintain necessary secrecy of planned operations.

I heartily agree that the Marine Corps should be included in the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and I prefer that the coordinator of the national defense be a member as listed in your bill.

All the objections I have to your bill I consider of a minor nature.

If we are to have a navy, it should be a fighting navy. I recognize the predominant role of air power—which includes guided missiles—in a future war. I do not see how the Navy can expect to maintain a naval air force to fight with if a separate Air Department is established.

Most of the naval officers with whom I have talked are heartily in favor of maintaining a two-department system, and those who have studied your bill are favorably disposed to it in the main.

There can be no question that modern war between great powers, such as the United States now is, requires the closest coordination between all branches of the armed forces and a close coordination of the military effort with the civilian effort on which the military effort is based. I believe all of the proposals for legislation have these ends in view.

Insofar as the Navy is concerned, I am certain that a navy without efficient naval aviation is of little value in modern war and that our Marine Corps is an asset of tremendous value to both the Navy and the country. In any law to coordinate the armed forces, I think there should be included a sufficient description of the functions of each service to insure the future status of naval aviation and of the Marine Corps. From what I have read recently in the daily press, this appears to be in process of accomplishment by amendment to the bill. Such a description of the functions of each service should be broad enough to prevent any attempts to whittle away or practically to take over the functions of any one service by the others, and at the same time not be so restrictive in its terms as to prevent necessary adjustments between the services being made from time to time. I think a declaration of policy, such as is contained in your H. R. 3469 and in Senator ROBERTSON'S S. 1282, is a valuable addition to any legislation on this subject.

Whether or not the Army Air Corps should be continued under the War Department as the United States Air Force as in your bill, or be established as a separate Department of the Air Force as in H. R. 2319 and S. 1282, is a question on which my personal opinion favors your stand. I believe that both sea fighting and land fighting require the closest integration with their respective air efforts. If in the coming reorganization the Navy Department continues to have its naval and marine aviation components, while the Department of the Army has to depend on the Department of the Air Force for its aviation, as in H. R. 2319, there is no consistent principle followed in this matter. If, on the other hand, the Department of the Army is to have its own aviation as in S. 1282, then we set up strategic bombing as the principal offensive function of the new Department of the Air Force; and we would have the aviation used in major land fighting placed under two separate Departments.

The position of the present Army Air Corps in the future military establishment is, however, something which is of primary concern to the Army, provided that the efficiency of naval aviation and of the Navy is in no way impaired by what is done in this respect. While I, personally, believe that we would have a sounder organization with the present two Departments and with Army aviation closely integrated with the War Department, I am inclined to think that the setting up of a separate Department of the Air Force has such backing both in the Congress and throughout the country that it will be accepted. Any organization will work if we get it staffed by able men who will pull together.

Whether we have a Coordinator of National Defense as in H. R. 3469 and S. 1282, or a Secretary of National Defense as in H. R. 2319, is a subject on which I have no very decided opinion. There is an important job to be done in coordinating—for the President as Commander in Chief—the Army and Navy, provided the President wishes to delegate this authority. So long as the new position remains one of coordination and of laying down policy and does not grow into one of administration of the separate Departments, I believe the new official will serve a very useful function in our Federal Government. He must, of course, be given sufficient assistance to enable him to act effectively, but not enough so that another big bureaucracy will come into being.

I am in full accord with your statement that closer coordination of Army, Navy, and Air Forces should be affected. As you point out, the pattern of the steps taken in this direction is the important factor. However, I am in firm opposition to certain proposals on these matters which are being entertained in the Congress today.

It is my view, Mr. COLE, that an important factor in bringing the so-called merger to the forefront of public discussion was the highly voluble support given by the Army Air Forces. The reason for this is not difficult to understand since the Air Forces would revert to their original status, under the Army Chief of Staff, unless some remedial legislation were enacted. The Air Forces wanted a completely autonomous position; their interest in closer coordination with the Army Ground Forces or the Navy is today what it has been for many years past, very limited indeed.

For reasons set forth hereafter, I believe that the Army Air Forces should be developed into a closely integrated part of the United States Army in very much the same relation that naval aviation bears to the forces afloat.

The first point I would present is that of cost, since it is evident that for some years to come the Congress may be expected to be decidedly economy-minded so far as concerns the armed services. The establishment of a third service must obviously entail greatly increased costs, which at no time in the future can possibly show economy over the two-service system for a national defense establishment of equal strength. Statements of expected economies in future years, presented by various witnesses, apply to coordinated efforts which are applicable to either the two or the three armed forces arrangements, though less readily affected under the latter. Basically, therefore, it is apparent that the taxpayer will get less for his defense dollar with the formation of a third armed service.

So far as integration of Air with Army Ground Forces is concerned, I cannot conceive of any effective combat Ground Forces in this day and age operating without an appropriate air component. The usual explanation is that the separate Air Force will furnish this support. Lacking interest, lacking common understanding, lacking integrated planning and direction, I cannot believe that the separate Air Force can or will give intelligent and adequate support. In this connection I invite your attention to the air arm of the Royal Navy, which was provided by the Royal Air Force between World Wars I and II. The efficiency and effectiveness of that service was of such low order, when its state compelled return to the Navy in 1939, that it was late in the war before reaching an acceptable standard, largely with American equipment. I feel sure that air support given our own Army by a separate Air Force can be properly compared with that given the Royal Navy by the Royal Air Force.

It seems evident to me that a modern Army having continuous and major requirements for air transport and supply, as well as direct support when in combat, will soon demand that these components be directly attached to the ground command. In such case it would seem impossible to avoid direct duplication of large numbers of aircraft at greatly added cost, or alternatively, reduction in strength of the other services.

There has been much ballyhoo the last year or two about strategic bombing, with the suggestion that ultra long-range super aircraft will soon be able to attack any spot on the earth from bases in the homeland. The fact is, however, that senior Air Force commanders are agreed that strategic bombing in the pattern of the last war is finished. The common availability to all nations of the proximity fuze is the major cause of this, and the condition will become more unfavorable with the early introduction of ground-to-air target-seeking rocket missiles.

In this day of the atomic bomb it would appear that the major air offensive power of the United States should consist of a modest number of maximum-performance aircraft especially adaptable to A-bomb delivery, together with the fighters required to escort such bombers; both types necessarily of moderate range. The bulk of our Air Forces, however, should be closely integrated with the naval and ground elements, and largely devoted to their support in capturing and holding forward bases close to the enemies' borders. This means amphibious operations much in the pattern with which we closed the last war. And from all present indications we will fight alone, in the manner of the Pacific war, rather than from bases held for us by allies as was the case in Europe.

Since the discussion of the merger of the armed forces was initiated, there have been new developments which, in my opinion, further strengthen our position that we must not rush in precipitately to change the basic organization of our security forces. The development of guided missiles, planes, and projectiles with supersonic speeds, explosives of great power, bacteriological and virus warfare, probable development of radioactive materials which can be dispersed by guided missiles, etc.—all point to the desirability of building on what we have rather than tearing down any part of our existing organization. In other words, my thought is that, for the time being at least, and until we have a much more clear picture of the function that will be played by aviation, as we knew it in the recent war, we should not place all of our eggs in the "aviation basket," but should reserve decision until we expand our knowledge.

After careful consideration, I have come to the conclusion that we should stand on our original position—that a completely integrated naval force, with supporting service functions, including an adequate air arm, is essential for the national security. The character and scope of the naval air arm should be determined by strategists and tacticians, not by legislators, nor as a result of a deal between the Army and Navy.

Despite the assurances given in the letters enclosed from Mr. Forrestal, you will probably find that very few, if any, active officers in the Navy will wish to have their views held other than confidential. The officers who have testified before Congress, mentioned in the Secretary's letter of May 10, are, with the possible exception of General Edson, not in a position to suffer by any displeasure which might be incurred through such remarks. None of them have any future to worry about.

Personally, I have been strongly against the so-called merger of the armed services right from the start. I remember when a board headed by Admiral Richardson came through the Pacific early in 1945 and questioned all senior officers available. The situation confronted us unexpectedly, and I had little time to give it thought, but spoke against it then. Basically, it is my opinion that no one person can take over such a tremendous job as is envisioned in H. R. 2319 and be anything other than a hindrance or a figurehead. To couple with this the control of about half of our national budget would strike a severe blow at our democratic form of government. This Secretary would, in effect, combine four Cabinet positions in himself. The Secretaries of the Armed Services would be ciphers. I have felt all along that Congress would never permit such a setup to be made into law. Despite all of the forebodings of my service and civilian friends, I have had a sense of security in the good judgment of the House and the Senate in this matter and have not worried too much about it.

Now, if we do not make a Secretary of the National Defense as envisioned in H. R. 2319, there is no urgent need to do much of anything in a big way, except perhaps to set up the Joint Chiefs of Staff on a little more secure basis than at present. The President can always fortify and implement the Joint Chiefs of Staff himself, and he has done so up to the present time. This may be sufficient. However, there is the danger that the civilian Secretaries might get into the Joint Chiefs of Staff picture in wartime and cramp their style. Right now anything that comes out of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is accepted as gospel by everyone and obeyed without question. Getting back to the Secretary of National Defense, section 103 is very dangerous if you do not wish a big military staff set-up. What would you have but a military staff where the Secretary of National Defense has four special assistants and the power to detail as many Army, Navy, and Air Force officers to duty in his offices as he desires? In order for such a Secretary to really function he must have a big staff and will, in my opinion, absolutely dominate all other military activities. Even the Joint Chiefs of Staff, section 111, are under his control, and would merely form a part of his staff.

In regard to unity of command, which is really what this is all about on a rather high level, I have had 4 years of experience with it during the recent war. There is nothing new about unity of command, and it has always been provided, and known by the Army and Navy that the President may order it whenever and wherever he sees fit, and this has been done at various times, extending clear back to the Mexican War. It has been my experience that whenever the President or the Joint Chiefs of Staff ordered unity of command in a certain theater or for a certain campaign or operation, it worked excellently when clearly stated and backed up. Regular officers in the Army and Navy know how to obey orders and they do so without quibbling.

In regard to your own bill, H. R. 3469, it has many excellent points. Concerning your Coordinator for National Defense, he is really a Chief of Staff to the President, and you have him properly lined up under the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and in the National Defense Council. I would expect you not to limit his selection to that of a civilian. It would seem the man himself is the thing wanted, regardless of his previous status.

I am also with you in thinking that the Army Air Forces should remain under the War Department, though it is hard for me to visualize the Secretary of War having practically two separate departments under him. He practically has this now, and, as you know, there is considerable jealousy and bad feeling. Perhaps in separating them by law we will achieve more harmony and better results. I have always felt that this Army and Air Corps trouble could, at any time, be straightened out by the President.

As Vice Chief of Naval Operations, I have maintained close touch with all aspects of the unification issued. I am in full accord with the views on this question expressed by the Chief of Naval Operations before committees of Congress. While I personally support H. R. 2319, which reflects the agreements reached by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, I have been conscious of uncertainty in the minds of certain officers regarding the adequate protection of the interests of the Marine Corps and naval aviation under the original language of the bill.

This legislation is of such far-reaching importance that no effort should be spared to devise language that will impart confidence and a sense of security to those whose interests are directly affected. If the proposed new National Defense organization is to be a success, it must have the endorsement and whole-hearted support of all implementing agencies and branches. For the above reason, I favor amendments relating to the Marine Corps and naval aviation recently made by the Senate Armed Services Committee which, I believe, will accomplish the purpose desired.

Subject to the above qualifying remarks, I like your bill better than I do H. R. 2319. My principal reason for this is that your bill makes fewer changes in the existing two department set-up, which after all, has just carried us through to victory in the greatest war in history. Perhaps this is a somewhat smug point of view, but I believe that you should not break up a winning team while it it still winning. I do not believe in burning down the barn to get rid of rats.

I consider that the Commandant of the Marine Corps, Gen. A. A. Vandegrift, has very ably presented my objections to the legislation in question. Any comments which I might make about it would be, therefore, merely a repetition of facts which are already available to you.

Naturally H. R. 3469 appeals to me because of my firm conviction that the two services, Army and Navy, with their respective air and Marine components, are necessary and sufficient. On the other hand, the National Defense Council, as described in H. R. 3469, appears to be unnecessarily inclusive and unwieldy, and I would prefer that it be constituted as is the National Security Council in H. R. 2319.

I believe that the organization structure as set forth in H. R. 3469 more nearly meets the objections that have been raised against S. 758 and H. R. 2319. It provides a more effective integration of all departments and agencies of the Government concerned with the national defense, and closer collaboration between the fighting services.

The creation of this third Department under S. 758 and H. R. 2319 is absolutely contrary to any step leading to closer coordination between the armed services and is believed to be a fatal defect in these bills. Once all connections with the Army are severed, it is logical to believe that the Air Force will attain a status like that of the Royal Air Force, with similar uniforms and ranks. In this connection, it is not understood as to why the Air Force requires more autonomy than is now accorded in order to exercise its functions.

The Air Force has conducted an extremely effective publicity campaign through the newspapers, with the result that the public has been led to believe that the present compromise bills are strongly desired by all services, and any delay in their enactment into law can only show a callous disregard for the future security of this country. Those of us who have lived with the meager legislation during the past 1½ years know that nothing is further from the truth.

I strongly believe that no Department of National Defense should in essence be built around any specific weapon. If we should proceed contrary to this principle we should be equally justified in a department of submarines, field artillery, guided missiles, etc. While the airplane is unquestionably one of our most dominant weapons today, there is no reason to believe that it will not be replaced with a more effective weapon in the near future.

Such controversial items as the creation of the office of a super or over-all Secretary or a Coordinator of National Defense and the powers to be vested in such individuals should be the subject of separate legislation in order that the pros and cons of each major change may be thoroughly and deliberately explored before their enactment into law.

In the final analysis the success of any plan for coordination of the military establishment will depend on the whole-hearted acceptance of the plan by the personnel concerned, on the spirit of mutual trust, confidence, and sincere cooperation exhibited in its implementation, and on the preservation of the morale and integrity of the component forces. I feel sure that this favorable result can be attained within the framework of H. R. 2319.

I am an officer of long and rather varied naval experience. My specialty is aviation and my experience in that specialty is extensive. During the recent war I served in the Navy Department and overseas. I had ample opportunity both to observe and participate in the planning behind the war effort, particularly as related to joint plans and operations. Summarizing, I have had an opportunity to observe the workings of the armed services under prewar conditions, war conditions under the changes made under War Powers Acts, and I am familiar with most of proposals for postwar reorganization.

I am firmly of the opinion that the current statutory organization of armed services must be changed, but I am most seriously concerned over the manner in which the present move for change has delevoped, and the results therefrom. The manner has been loud outcries from officers of the Army, particularly the Army Air Forces, against the conduct of war and demands for an immediate reorganization along certain definite lines, all without impartial examination of the criticisms or careful, unbiased examination of the proposed changes. For example, so far as I can ascertain, the demand by most of the officers in responsible positions in the Army Air Forces for a separate coequal department of the air has been accepted, almost blindly, by the majority of the public, the press, and I believe the Congress as a fundamental requisite to any reorganization, without any real unbiased examination of the subject. The validity of the demand cannot be supported by war experience, if anything that experience supports the contrary view. Actually this demand stems back many years. It is generally admitted that naval aviation belongs as it now is integrated with the Navy as a whole. I see no reason why this thought does not apply equally well with regard to Army Air and the Army, except the Army Air Force officers do not want it that way. Their leaders decided that back in the early twenties. There has developed progressively an estrangement between the Army ground forces and air forces as a result of this attitude. I know for a fact that this is the reason the proposal for a separate Air Department has considerable Army ground force support. The ground force is fed up with the family argument. They know that separation is not sound, but regard it as the lesser of two evils.

My assumption is that the primary purpose of all of the bills under consideration is to improve the efficiency of the military services in order to enhance the security of our country. The closest possible coordination is essential to efficiency. Three departments will be four times as difficult to coordinate as two. (Call the departments a, b, and c. With two you only have to coordinate a with b. With three it becomes a with b, a with c, b with c, and a, b, and c together.) It is my firm belief that a separate Department of the Air is unnecessary, will not strengthen national defense, will add materially to the national financial burden and will make coordination much more difficult. I concur with the proposal in section 301 of your bill.

In considering H. R. 2319 it should be recognized that it is a compromise bill. It was drafted after a long series of arguments and in many cases without any real reconciliation

of ideas. It appears to me but natural that the language which would be acceptable on points in dispute would be language subject to different interpretations by those who were parties to the drafting of the bill. This is borne out by a great deal of the testimony presented before the congressional committees. I had no part in the drafting of the bill. To me the language is clear and unmistakable. Referring to section 22 (a), it appears entirely clear to me that the language gives to the Secretary of the National Defense complete authority and control over the Departments of the National Defense establishments, subject only to such curbs as the President may apply by Executive order or otherwise, which curbs, of course, may be modified at any time. The language of this section appears to me potentially to destroy the integrity of the Departments and to reduce their respective secretaries to the level of administrative assistants. I regard that as dangerous and wholly unsatisfactory. It is my understanding that this section is being redrafted in Senate Armed Services Committee but I have no first-hand knowledge of the revised language.

It is my opinion that the Secretaries of the Departments of the National Defense Establishments should retain their Cabinet level. I consider it in the national interests that the President and the other members of his Cabinet get first-hand information regarding those Departments and also have available the advice and counsel of those Secretaries on any other matters directly or indirectly affecting those Departments. There is no language in H. R. 2319 dealing specifically with this subject but there have been statements, presumably authoritative, that the Secretaries of the Departments will not be members of Cabinet.

I favor the establishment as provided in H. R. 2319 of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Munitions Board Security Council, Central Intelligence Agency and Resources Board.

H. R. 3469 (your bill) provides a "Coordinator of National Defense" and with certain rather minor exceptions leaves it to the President to determine his duties. It appears to be the intent of H. R. 3469 to reduce the importance and authority of the Coordinator well below that of the Secretary of National Defense provided in H. R. 2319. If such is the case, I agree with the idea of reducing the authority in order better to safeguard the integrity of the Navy Department, but it appears that under H. R. 3469 the President could delegate to the Coordinator any or all of the authority he holds under the Constitution and statutes.

Section 102 establishes a National Defense Council with a very widely spread membership. I question the need for, and usefulness of, such a council and specifically I question the appropriateness of Members of Congress being included. The National Defense Council appears to be in place of the War Council and the National Security Council provided for in H. R. 2319. As stated in paragraph 7 above, I favor the provision of the boards, councils, etc., set up in H. R. 2319 and much prefer them to the provisions of H. R. 3469.

I am heartily in favor of section 301 of H. R. 3469 which creates the Army Air Forces as part of the Military Establishment of the United States within the Department of War. This subject was discussed in detail in paragraphs 3 and 4 above.

The postscript of your letter inquired as to my views regarding service opinion on the question of reorganization. I believe I am safe in saying that a majority of the responsible officers would heartily endorse any measures which would bring about a better coordination between the Army services, but want to be assured in advance that such measures would accomplish that purpose without jeopardizing the integrity of the Navy, including its aviation and the Marine Corps. They have grave doubts as to whether H. R. 2319 has sincerity of purpose behind it or whether it is intended as a first step in gaining a control over the Navy towards the end of depriving it of its aviation and the Marine Corps and eventually reducing it to a point where it could play but a minor role in the national defense. Their concern in this matter appears to me to be justified by past and continuing statements of officers in responsible positions in the Army and particularly in the Army Air Forces. They are extremely bitter over the methods employed by those officers to drive through their plans. I believe naval officers in general are fearful both of the future defense of the country and of their individual careers because of the likelihood of the provisions of H. R. 2319 in its present form becoming law. I am reliably informed that a considerable percentage of naval aviators have reached the conclusion that if a separate Department of Air is created, naval aviation is doomed, and have convinced themselves that their individual interests best would be served by transferring to the Army Air Forces and that the best interests of the country would be also served by such transfer, supporting this conclusion with the argument that if the country's military aviation is to come wholly into the hands of the Army Air Forces it is essential that that organization have within it as soon as possible a sizeable element that understands the application of air power to naval warfare. The very serious effect of the loss of this experienced personnel from Naval Aviation is obvious.

You may gather from the foregoing that I do not concur in either H. R. 2319 or H. R. 3469 as presently drafted. Of the two I prefer H. R. 3469, although there are many changes necessary to make it suitable from the standpoint of the country, the Army, and the Navy.

In view of the controversy that has been going on between the Army and Navy over the subject of the consolidation of the two services and the bitter feelings that have been aroused, it is my firm belief that no legislation to that end should be enacted at the present time.

Consolidation, or rather coordination, is a matter of education; a long step in this direction has been made through the establishment of joint schools, such as the National War College at Washington and the Armed Forces Staff College at Norfolk. Officers from other services attend the special Army and Navy schools. It will be a matter of several years before the officers who have passed through these schools arrive at positions of high authority.

It will take time to dispel the ill feeling that has arisen between the two services. This has been due in part to two causes:

(a) The efforts of the Army Air Force to hamper and restrict the expansion of naval aviation since the days of General Mitchell. Naval aviation has always been an integral part of the Navy. Aircraft carriers are now the backbone of the fleet, but they are still Navy.

The Army Air Force has been working for its independence since the First World War. That has been their primary mission. At times their loyalty to the Army has been dubious.

(b) The Army's dislike of the United States Marine Corps and its increased power to reduce Marine Corps strength and efficiency under a unified department.

In case some legislation is considered necessary at the present time, I prefer H. R. 3469 to H. R. 2319. It produces the least disruption of the present organization. It provides a National Defense Council on which the appropriate committees of Congress are represented by their chairmen, a most essential provision.

It leaves the Army Air Force as a part of the Army, where it belongs.

Referring to H. R. 2319, my principal objection is to the separate Air Force proposed in that bill. The very name is a misnomer, for approximately one-third of the air forces of the United States are now and will remain in the Navy. But the important points are: First, that the difficulty of coordinating three armed services and their parent departments will not just be 50 percent greater than two, but three times as great, for three main links of cooperation or coordination must be forged instead of one; second, that the additional expense of the new independent Department of the Air Force will offset many of the alleged economies which the proponents claim for it. I am confident that the Air Force would insist upon its own supporting corps and services, duplicating some of those in the Army, such as the Ordnance Corps and the Signal Corps, for instance.

While cooperation, or the lack of it, between Army Ground and Army (or independent) Air Forces is principally their concern, and not the Navy's, I cannot refrain from remarking that there seem to be two major activities of growing importance in modern warfare which involve both these types of forces, and which, it seems to me, will be accomplished more efficiently by their remaining in one service than by separating. These functions are: (a) the antiaircraft defense, by a combination of air and ground weapons, of both fixed and mobile ground positions, and (b) the air-ground operation of air-borne troops. I think these important activities dictate an even closer bond between our air and ground forces, rather than a separation of one from the other. The same thing is true of tactical air support of ground force combat operations. In fact, it seems to me that the only possible excuse for a separate air force is strategic air power. Numerous aviators believe strategic bombing by manned airplanes is obsolescent. General of the Army H R. Arnold, Commanding General of the Army Air Forces in World War II, has expressed this thought by saying that the recent war was the last war of the pilots. If that is so, and strategic bombing is to be succeeded by guided missile bombardment, surely no new and separate armed service is necessary, since the latter type of arm will be essentially nothing more than a glorified form of artillery.

I view the creation of a complete new secretaryship of national defense, as proposed in H. R. 2319, with considerable apprehension. In the first place, the position will surely lessen the prestige of the present Secretaries of War and the Navy, and may render difficult the procurement of men of stature to occupy those posts. Then there will be a constant tendency to overdo the consolidation job, to search out dissimilarities and duplications in matériel or procedures in the various armed services, and arbitrarily eliminate them, when in some cases, for best efficiency, they should not be eliminated, lest each service emerge with some weapon or procedure which is a reasonably good compromise, but not quite good enough for maximum efficiency for any one service. And in war, almost good enough weapons or tactics usually have the same value as second-best poker hands.

There is also the danger of losing time in having to refer too many matters to the supersecretary for decision. Even such matters as are really of joint concern should often be left to direct negotiation between the two organizations for settlement; Army and Navy Ordnance settled many such problems between them smoothly and expeditiously in World War II. But that method probably would not satisfy some of the strong-minded officers who would inevitably

be drawn to the supersecretary as his assistants. Too often, they might feel the necessity of persuading the Secretary of National Defense to exert his powers of coordination to effect some economy of material or manpower, and thus incur delay, whereas the third element of war strength—time—might be the most important. In other words, proper decentralization of effort and authority becomes more difficult if the top management becomes too ponderous.

As regards economies to be effected by the creation of the new secretaryship, undoubtedly some would eventually be achieved. Whether they would offset the additional expense of the separate Department of the Air Force, and the new superimposed administrative echelon, only time would tell. In peace, with the volume of purchasing greatly reduced, I have serious doubts as to any net gain.

Your alternative bill, H. R. 3469, seems to correct most of the defects in H. R. 2319 which I have noted above. I like the "Coordinator of National Defense" better than the "Secretary of National Defense," as it describes better the only functions which I believe this administrative echelon should perform.

Summing up, I believe the Army Air Forces have, in the recent war, demonstrated their great value to the national security, and have earned the right to complete parity with the Army Ground Forces, instead of remaining a mere supporting corps. But I see no need for a completely separate air service. I fully believe it will be more expensive, and no more efficient, than the present (not the prewar) organization. Also, I would prefer a Coordinator of National Defense, with limited authority, to a new supersecretary with complete supervision over the armed services departments.

This is in reply to your letter of May the 16th in which you asked my comment on H. R. 3469. Before making that comment I must state that ever since I first heard of the so-called merger of the armed services, I have been alarmed at the possible impacts of a merger on effective national security. I can visualize no effective national nor international security that will be effective without a highly mobile, closely integrated Navy fabricated to exercise air-sea power against any enemy. I become apprehensive, therefore, when under a merger the Navy appears to be considered entirely of ships, and air power seems to be defined as all-inclusive of every means of bringing aviation to bear against the enemy. A modern Navy must be largely an air Navy and it must have every facility it requires to support that air Navy and to use it for its designed purpose; that is, initially as a spearhead (and a sustained spearhead at that) against the enemy; and later as the on-the-spot mobile pounding force which enables amphibious forces to do their jobs.

To repeat, my unease about the merger was occasioned by my belief that under a merger naval aviation would disappear and with it the Navy would disappear.

The past war, however, demonstrated very clearly that there must be closer coordination of the various armed services to obtain the greatest impact in the shortest time against an enemy. There must be closer planning for war including, not only strategic plans, but also logistic plans; there must be closer coordination of training and training methods, but that coordination should not be exercised to the point where individual armed services become weakened to the point of impotence.

I have been apprehensive over the formation of a third executive department to be known as the Department of the Air Force because throughout the years of my service in naval aviation the proponents of "single Air Force" have sharp-shot at naval aviation, belittling it and stating as early as 1925 that the carrier was obsolescent. And even now there is too much talk of restricting the functions of naval aviation's shore-based aircraft to patrol the sea lanes, to antisubmarine warfare and to the protection of shipping. The Navy should have the bombers to hit, at once, the menaces to the sea lanes that the searchers and patrollers find. In World War II the Navy patrol-bombers did just that and there was no question, that I know of, as to their right and duty to attack.

Certainly no one with my long association with aviation can be other than an enthusiast for air power but, on the other hand, my experience convinces me that ground forces and naval surface forces and aviation are mutually dependent upon each other to the extent that no armed service should be deprived of that air power which is required to impose its will on the enemy.

I like the declaration policy in H. R. 3469. It seems to assure to the elements of the military structure the balanced forces necessary for the exercise of their responsibilities. Furthermore, the declaration policy provides for a sufficiently autonomous strategic air force to permit the proper development of that air force without having it engulf everything that flies to the detriment of other armed forces.

If the concept of future warfare envisages air-borne armies largely supported by air, it seems entirely proper that the proper integration and cooperation between the Army and the Air Force will be assured by placing both of them under the Secretary of War without strangulating effect on either one. However, I cannot see that a single promotion list for the Air Force will have any healthful unifying effect within the War Department.

Regarding the coordinator of national defense, I like the description of his duties with the restrictions imposed on his activities.

The National Defense Council appears to be large and may be unwieldy when quick decisions must be made. I like the idea of bringing representatives of the Congress into the Council, but it might be advisable to reduce the total membership of the Council to provide for a smaller organization.

Summarizing: H. R. 3469, for the present, seems to spell out the functions of the armed services in more dependable form than does H. R. 2319.

Regarding H. R. 2319, I am in agreement with Secretary Forrestal and Admiral Nimitz, providing that this bill is not a "foot in the door" for future emasculation of naval aviation or the Marine Corps for the Navy or for tanks for the Army or for strategic air forces for the air component.

I shall try to be brief. I feel that I am expressing the thought of many officers, in that many of us fear that the Navy and the Marine Corps may lose that complete autonomy in the conduct of its own affairs which we feel necessary in the best interests of national defense. We feel that any unification bill which may allow one man control of the destinies of the armed forces may be to the detriment of the Navy in the inner councils where two or more opinions or votes (one for the Army and one for the Air Force) might obtain against one for the Navy.

We of the Navy hold the tradition that our service is the strongest instrument by which our Nation's policies may be upheld throughout the world. We are trained and are accustomed to sail to the farthest reaches of the earth and stay there in support of these policies. We view with apprehension the tendency on the part of some of our people to believe the doctrines currently advanced by the Air Forces that they may take over this traditional role of the Navy and fly to the uttermost reaches of the earth to enforce our policies with a show of force. We know this premise is unsound—just as unsound as many of the other radical ideas propounded in our public prints by the rabid advocates of air power, who would carry on all wars from the air alone. We are not unmindful of the fact that a majority of our citizens were ready to believe the pronouncements of deServersky in 1942, and though these pronouncements have now been thoroughly discredited, that many of the generals of our Army Air Corps are making similar statements for public consumption today—with just as little factual sense—but with the obvious objective of influencing public opinion in favor of unification of the armed services.

Of late in the testimony of Admiral King, General Vandegrift, General Merritt Edson, and others there can be no doubt that in the opinion of many the provisions of this bill might possibly allow the Army and the Air Corps together to overslaugh the Navy to the detriment of the best interest of our national armed strength. Personally, I feel the same way about it.

Science is undoubtedly pointing the way toward "push button" developments. If unification of the services is to lead us to a position whereby the Army Air Corps is to push all the buttons—as stated publicly by some of the Air Corps' more extreme spokesmen—we shall be led to a position detrimental to our national security. Unification legislation must definitely ensure that there be no such single control.

The question arises as to whether the Army and the Navy should be tied together at the top administrative level of the armed forces through the medium of a single Secretary of Armed Forces or whether, below the President and the Supreme civil coordinating agencies mentioned above, the Army and the Navy should each have its top civilian administrative official, with interagency bodies to insure cooperative functioning.

Based on an experience of 16 years in Washington, during which I have had many contacts with the various departments of the executive and legislative branches of our Government, I am firm in my opinion that if we are to have the best Army and the best Navy within the limitations of our financial resources, they must be kept separate administratively.

This conclusion is founded on my conviction that with one Secretary of the armed forces, whether he be, in fact, the administrative head of those forces or whether he be somewhat of a figurehead, as proposed by the so-called Collins War Department Plan, he will inevitably be dominated by one or the other branch of the armed forces and, depending upon the limitations of his authority, that branch will be more or less favored at the expense of the other. The two (or three) branches (three if we have a completely separate strategic Air Force) will be in a continuous struggle for the favor of the Secretary. I hope that this does not sound too derogatory with respect to the independence of thought of the prospective Secretary of the armed forces. I know, from experience, that it will work out that way.

The principal reason for my conclusion, however, is, that, with separate civilian secretaries having administrative control of the separate branches of the armed forces, each secretary reporting to separate committees of Congress and making his needs known to those committees each service will have greater opportunities to make known its requirements and thus to overcome to some extent, at least, the proverbial opposition to the developments of the armed forces in time of peace. In other words, we will come closer to obtaining the essential support for each branch of the armed forces, if they plead their cases to Congress separately.

While the Army and Navy are basically military organizations, they are also huge business enterprises. In time of war they become the largest business enterprises in the world. In time of peace they must be organized for rapid and efficient expansion to their war magnitudes. One of the chief advantages claimed by the advocates of merger has to do with the conduct of the Army and Navy as business enterprises and particularly with the procurement of goods and services.

In this area, it is claimed that the proposed merger would result in lowered costs and greater efficiency by reason of elimination of duplication and reduction of overhead staffs in such matters as:

(a) Production, procurement, and inspection.
(b) Storage, packaging, and issue.
(c) Transportation and distribution.
(d) Construction of facilities.
(e) Mobilization and training.
(f) Housing of troops and workers.
(g) Medical facilities.
(h) Disbursing, accounting, and auditing.
(i) Communications.
(j) Internal security.
(k) Real estate acquisitions and disposals.
(l) Research and development.
(m) Administration and management.

In an effort to avoid pure speculation, I have studied the experiences of several of our large industrial organizations, where the claimed advantages would accrue if the reasoning of the advocates of merger is correct.

The two greatest business organizations in America, greater in magnitude of operations in time of peace than the Army and the Navy, are the United States Steel Corp. and the General Motors Corp. For the years between wars the corporations spent more money and did more purchasing than the Army and Navy. Therefore, since the corporations occupy an intermediate position between Army-Navy peacetime and wartime activities, it is reasonable to assume that procurement policies of these highly successful business enterprises will give us something of a guide for proper Army-Navy procurement organization.

It may surprise you to learn that neither United States Steel nor General Motors operate consolidated procurement services. United States Steel is made up of 34 companies, each of which purchases its own requirements in competition with the others as well as with outside purchasers. Each subsidiary company operates almost entirely independently, its president having practically a free hand. If he fails to make a profit someone else gets his job; but the parent corporation gives him no ready-made alibis for failure by imposing restrictions on his freedom of thought and action.

Consolidation in the case of these great industrial organizations brings very definite gains in such top policy matters as labor relations, financial resources, selling practices, and business contacts. But great care is taken to leave with the responsible officers of each subsidiary complete freedom to exercise their ingenuity and individual talents.

Private enterprise has learned through hard experience that mere size does not in itself promote efficiency and that the absence of competition within a large organization may be the cause rather than the preventative of waste.

The Army and the Navy is each individually too large for efficient consolidation in procurement. For this reason both Departments have largely decentralized their procurement functions to the component organizations within their own structures. In the Navy, procurement has actually been dispersed so that the various matériel bureaus are now to a considerable degree their own procurement agencies for their own specialized technical equipment. Adequate coordination is provided by the Material Division of the Assistant Secretary's office.

This decentralization of procurement has contributed notably to the speed and effectiveness with which the fleets and their supporting activities have been served. It has concentrated the responsibility for achieving an end objective in a particular bureau and it has given that bureau all of the authority necessary to accomplish its mission. If a bureau were dependent upon someone else for the performance of one or more of its vital functions, it would be helpless in the case of failures of the other party to make delivery.

We must recognize that efficient procurement in itself does not necessarily mean efficient end performance. We may have an aggregation of very efficient components without an efficient end objective. To illustrate: We tried out in the Navy Department at one time a system of centralized stenographic services. An executive who wanted a stenographer would touch a button and a stenographer would arrive from the central pool. It was not long before we learned that while we were saving money on stenographic services, we were wasting the time of our top level administrative and executive personnel because of the unfamiliarity of the stenographers with the specialized requirements of those they were serving.

It is claimed that merger will eliminate competition. While that is true, in a sense, I cannot concede that this is necessarily an unmixed blessing. Competition is the very foundation stone of American enterprise. Monopolies tend to become stagnant, unresponsive, and stultified. On the other hand, competition within healthy limits leads to greater alertness, progressiveness, and efficiency; and frequently contributes to new developments, technical advances, and greater over-all effectiveness.

Competition between the services resulted in the development of the dive bomber by the Navy. It has been claimed at various times during this war that the Marines were in competition with the Army and the Seabees in competition with the Army engineers. Our war experiences has proved conclusively that both Marines and Seabees have their specialized functions to perform and both have amply justified their existence.

Competition is the lifeblood of progress. To deliberately stifle it by consolidation would be a wanton waste of one of our greatest American assets. Domination of the thinking of either service by officers who do not have the "feel" of that service would have ruinous effect.

Much point has been made of the so-called duplication of facilities between Army and Navy. Before entering upon a discussion of this matter, we should define just what we mean by duplication. What we are really seeking to avoid is waste resulting from the construction of excess or surplus facilities.

Whether this excess or surplus results from the unnecessary duplication by one service of facilities built by the other or is the result of excessive building within a service is not significant, since all of the money comes out of Uncle Sam's pocket. If one of the services builds two hospitals when only one is needed, the sin as just as grievous as if each service built a hospital when one hospital would have been sufficient for both.

If we examine the record, we will find instances of excess building within a service which appears superficially to be more flagrantly wasteful than the so-called duplication of facilities.

There has been, I believe, a disposition to speak of "duplication" of facilities in such manner as to give the impression that there was a vast amount of excess construction by both Army and Navy. While excess or surplus construction by either service may be indicative of poor planning by that service, consolidation of construction under one service would certainly not have prevented such poor planning; on the contrary, the poor planning if it existed would have been aggravated because of the increase in the work load.

In summary, I believe:

(a) That the proposal for amalgamation of Army and Navy procurement and other service functions is based on a fallacious concept which emphasizes the efficiency of the means rather than the efficient accomplishment of the mission. The advocates of merger erroneously asume that great size is automatically conducive to efficiency; and, therefore, advocate a concentration of administrative control at the expense of command authority in the hands of those responsible for end results.

(b) That parallel operations in the various phases of procurement and other service functions are not per se unwarranted and inefficient duplication, but may well be conducive to great improvements in equipment and methods.

(c) That complete integration of the service functions I have listed above does not necessarily insure reductions in overhead, savings in cost, reduction in the necessity for coordination, or increase in efficiency, but on the other hand, may easily lead to worse conflicts of jurisdiction, internal difficulties and confusion, and loss of direct contact and decisive action; and

(d) That the efficiency of our combat forces would not be improved by consolidation of procurement and other service functions along the lines proposed.

Organizations are made up of human beings, not of small rectangles outlined on a piece of paper. Almost any organization will work effectively, provided the people who compose it are imbued with enthusiasm, pride of organization, and the will to win by working together. Therefore, that organization which is most conducive to the development of such spirit and enthusiasm is the organization which should work best.

The American temperament is stimulated by competition and by independence of thought and action. In practice, these are achieved by centralization of the determination of policy but decentralization of the execution of that policy.

In considering the organization of our military forces, we must give great weight to economy but we must not permit economy to be the controlling factor. Expenditures for the military services are productive only to the degree that they contribute to the efficiency of those services in time of war. Expenditures for functions in the Army and Navy which appear to be and are, in fact, duplications may well be very productive by stimulating competition in development of personnel and material, and by instilling a pride of organization which will pay off in times of great stress.

The most effective savings which we can make in financing our military services is to so equip them that they are strong enough to prevent wars and, if war does come, they can fight it to a successful conclusion.

(a) From the beginning of consideration of the merger of the Armed Services I have been opposed to the thesis that merger is necessary simply because people who want the merger say it is necessary as distinguished from serious study and consideration of the pros and cons. I think we are all agreed that better coordination can be effected in some fields than existed during the war. As you must know, much has been accomplished along this line since the war. To accept, without critical examination, the views of high ranking Army officers, who are not the best qualified to pass on naval matters, that the military forces must be merged is to reject past experience, particularly that of Germany in World War II wherein many of its internal problems were clearly attributable to domination of the Navy by the Army.

(b) I consider that H. R. 3469 as introduced by you on May 14, 1947, represents a satisfactory approach to solution of the problem. I consider also that the statement of Fleet Admiral E. J. King before the Senate Committee on Armed Services, S. 758—National Security Act of 1947, and other testimony he has given as to merger, should be given careful consideration. It was my privilege to serve on Admiral King's staff on three separate occasions immediately before and during the war. If the lucid and intellectually honest position he takes in this matter is not given due consideration, we shall have failed to weigh evidence that is of the best.

(c) You undoubtedly recall, perhaps some 6 months ago, an article on the subject of merger by George Fielding Eliot. His thesis was that a few years of patient and honest examination of what is needed is preferable to enactment of a hastily drawn bill which the Nation might live to regret. I believe also that he advanced the view that a master in chancery might well be considered. With these views I also agree. * * *

* * * * *

(e) As to the opinion of the men of the service on this question, I have yet to talk to a naval officer who favors the merger in its present form. I am convinced that this opposition does not stem from the fact that the Army is the principal proponent of the scheme but rather from a conviction—the need for merger not having been demonstrated—that the Navy's obligations to the country are far more important and should be more convincing than pressure, unsupported by logical presentation, constantly being exerted by proponents of merger. Put in other words, I feel—and have reason to believe that many others are of the same mind—that immediate merger as advocated would likely jeopardize rather than improve over-all defense and security. I also have the impression that if the proponents of merger would devote the energies they are now expending in attempting to force it down the throat of the Nation to an all-out effort toward better coordination of the machinery presently available, the need for merger would then not appear to be so great.

Admittedly, there is need for more coordination and cooperation, if you will permit me. My simple opinion is that a start in that direction should be made now by enacting legislation to provide departments and agencies concerning which there is full agreement on all but details of membership. Further study on controversial issues seems justified in view of sincere doubt as to their real benefit.

It appears clear to me that whatever solution is made that there are two basic matters that must be established by statute:

(a) Air power made the predominant force.

(b) The series of boards, councils, and agencies to coordinate and supervise the inter-relation of the State Department, Armed Forces and the civilian economy of the country to be activated.

In regard to (a) above it is my conviction that it can be best accomplished by establishing a three-department organization headed by a Coordinator as outlined in section 101 of your bill. However, all military and naval aircraft and corresponding personnel must be a part of the Air Force; in any operation involving aircraft as the major offensive or defensive agent that the command be vested in the senior Air Force officer present. This is inevitable in time of war and therefore should be established as soon as possible so that the rough spots (and there will be plenty of them) can be worked out at leisure while the stakes are low. Further, this is the real long-range intent of the Army Air Force, in my opinion, and the public opinion which gained them autonomy will compel a later rework of the current problem if a partial solution is now effected.

While strongly concurring in the purpose of both H. R. 2319 and H. R. 3469, I am convinced that if H. R. 2319 becomes law, there will be a wider separation of the various arms of the national defense, less cooperation in command and administration and greater cost for a less effective, more cumbersome, military organization. The bill should be termed a "separation" bill rather than a "merger" bill. An additional and even more alarming probable result of this bill will be the gradual reduction of both the Marine Corps and naval aviation to impotent forces. This will result even though the mission of either or both of these services is written into the bill in general terms or in detail. It will be accomplished simply through the powers of the Secretary of National Defense to "finally determine the budget estimates of the National Defense Establishment—and control the budget program"

I believe that a "Secretary of National Defense" with specifically defined authority would be more effective than a "Coordinator." The concept of a single Military Establishment, headed by a Secretary dealing with broad policy, assisted by department secretaries to handle the administration of the departments, seems to me to provide a sound framework of authority, responsibility, and administrative machinery.

The idea of keeping the Army Air Force within the War Department by the method proposed in H. R. 3469 appeals to me. In fact, my personal opinion is that close integration of all Army air with other Army elements, as has been done in the Navy, would be even better for our military efficiency if an amicable patrnership could be established.

As for a true merger (where all the services combine to a degree even comparable with the present merger of the sea, ground, and air arms now existing within the Navy) I am an uncompromising opponent. The degree of bureaucracy involved alone would spell disaster. But aside from such bureaucracy, the necessary merger of thinking does not exist and no head (civilian or otherwise) could eliminate the schisms which would exist within such a superdepartment. Furthermore, even if we assume a close meeting of all military minds and the absence of bureaucracy, and screening, channelizing, and crystallization of military thinking resulting from a single Chief of Staff would deprive the Congress of one of its most vital functions. The President and the Congress must continue to guide and direct us. Clemenceau had good reason for his famous statement that: "War is too important to be left to the Generals."

As for the so-called autonomy of the Air Force, as represented by H. R. 2319, I again find myself in opposition. Inevitably, a separation into three departments will be more expensive, regardless of the many theoretical savings claimed. But of even more vital interest to our national security is the fatal blow this will deal to naval aviation. Inevitably, every Air Force man who would grow to look upon every dollar appropriated for naval aviation as a dollar out of his pocket. This would put naval aviation in a position of being an activity within a department which is fighting the full strength of another department.

For the foregoing reasons I am convinced that any move away from the present two-departmental administration of our armed forces will be a step backward, not forward. The Army Air Forces have just fought a war under this system and it is an understatement to say that its performance compares favorably with the strategic bombing operations of other countries.

I recognize the deep schism existing between the ground and air arms of the Army but I cannot see how this schism can be cured by further separation (the three-departmental system) or integration (the one-departmental system). Only patience, education, and the fact that air power has come of age can rectify the mistakes of the past. I believe the bill that you have introduced follows this sound method of approach.

It is my personal view that the Navy, as organized today, is well balanced and equipped to carry out its essential mission, that of control of the seaways vital to the defense of this country. Any law which might disrupt this balance, now or possibly in the future, I would consider as jeopardizing the national security. I, of course, realize that closer cooperation between the Army and the Navy represents increased efficiency and economy; but I believe the vital role that our Navy has played in the United States history, and the vital role the British Navy has, in the past, played in world history should not be lost sight of.

I will say, however, that I fully realize the need for such coordination of the armed services as will adequately provide for team work between the services both in peace and in war.

In view of the wide divergence of views concerning the consolidation of the armed services and the necessity for realistic compromises, I cannot, in the time available offer a sound recommendation.

At the risk of oversimplification on a very complicated and controversial subject, it is my firm conviction that if there is created a separate department of air, Naval aviation will be subjected to ultimate and inevitable strangulation, a similar trend will develop with regard to the Marine Corps, and organizational barriers will exist which will prevent the full realization of possible tactical air support for the Army Ground Forces.

I believe that these possibilities are so real as to offer a threat to national security which will far outweigh the advantages of a three-department system. I am therefore definitely opposed to H. R. 2319 and favor H. R. 3469 in its stead.

Regardless of the final bill which may be passed, your efforts to obtain and evaluate the views of responsible personnel on a broad basis are of inestimable value to the Nation. So few people appreciate the fact that our national existence may be determined by the work that you are doing at this time.

It is a bit difficult to put down my specific objections to this conception of a National Security Organization, but I just don't like it. It gives too much power into the hands of a nonelective official. It would permit changes in composition and organization without sufficient knowledge of resultant effectiveness or ineffectiveness. It reduces the prestige of both Army and Navy, and thus also tends to lower morale and esprit de corps, both of which are vital in fighting forces.

I am in full agreement not to set up a separate air department. Such a separate department will be sure to increase the expense of the military requirements, for there is sure to be developed an organization as large as the War or Navy Departments.

May you have success in your efforts to arrive at an effective national security structure for I believe you are on the right track, and more power to you.

I believe that the organization structure as set forth in H. R. 3469 more nearly meets the objections which have been raised against H. R. 2319. I feel your bill provides a more effective integration of all departments and agencies concerned with national defense. I prefer the title of Coordinator of National Defense, which I believe to be more accurately descriptive of the functions contemplated for this high office, to the title of Secretary of National Defense. In my opinion the coordinator should not be the head of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I feel it is unsound to make a civilian the head of the Joint Chiefs of Staff or give him membership since most all of the functions are strictly military. One of the greatest advantages of your bill (H. R. 3469) is its basic concept of a coordinated two-department organization which is more sound than a three-department organization. I believe in this concept 100 percent for the answer of our national defense problems.

In diagraming your bill (H. R. 3469) in comparison with the organizational pattern of H. R. 2319, I think that in general the top of the pattern (composition of membership and flow of responsibility) is better in your bill, H. R. 3469, with respect to the Coordinator for National Defense Council, National Defense Council, National Defense Resources Board, Central Intelligence Agency, Munitions Board, Research and Development Board, than in bill H. R. 2319. I strongly feel that there should be a two-department organization, Army and Navy, with air predominant in both by statute, with the ground forces and surface forces (excepting submarines) playing roles. From the lessons we have learned from World War II it is shown that air will become increasingly predominant in the years to come. So I say to give it the place it so rightly deserves in the Nation's military structure now. It has been said that no department of national defense should be in essence built around any specific weapon (airplane). I disagree, as the airplane is not specific weapon but is a carrier of many weapons.

I believe, therefore, that there is no more need for a separate Army Air Force than there is for a separate Navy Air Force. Each has its mission closely coordinated with that of the Army and Navy, respectively, and their separation from those services would, to my mind, only tend to make coordination in time of war more difficult.

My final recommendations are as follows:

Make no change in present organization of War and Navy Departments with regard to merging same;

Strengthen present coordination of activities of War and Navy Departments by the Joint Chiefs of Staff;

Add one more naval member to the present Joint Chiefs of Staff, this member to be the senior naval aviator on duty in the Navy Department; and

Initiate a comprehensive study of supply problems of both Departments with a view to unification of control of certain features of their supply bureaus.

In regard to the Secretary of National Defense, I would much prefer that his duties of coordination be effected by a Coordinator or Assistant President or a Deputy President and that the Secretaries of the three services remain in the President's Cabinet. It is basic and fundamental in our country that the military be subordinate to the civil authority. Therefore, it is highly desirable that the civilian head of each of the armed services be in a position strongly to present the requirements of each service without having to bypass a Secretary for National Defense.

It is my belief that the Air Force should be an integrated part of the Army, as in H. R. 3469. However, the Air Force has succeeded in breaking away from the Ground Forces and has convinced the vast majority of the citizens of our country that its importance warrants a separate department. Therefore, the separate Air Force is acceptable to me and I have every belief that, once established, it will cooperate with the other armed services.

On the other hand, the bill H. R. 2319 seems to me to have certain outstanding merits, which are the War Council, the provisions for the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Joint Staff, the Munitions Board, the Research and Development Board, and the three agencies for the coordination of national security, that is, the National Security Council, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the National Security Resources Board. In summary, I would be relatively happy with H. R. 2319 were the Secretary of National Defense to be replaced by a Coordinator, leaving the three departmental secretaries as Cabinet members, or, if the Cabinet were enlarged by two, that is, the Secretary of National Defense and the Secretary of the Air Force.

I consider that your bill H. R. 3469, provides a sound plan for national defense for the reason that it retains the two department organization of the services.

I am opposed to the establishment of a third department because I believe it is only natural that a separate air force or department will develop along lines of independent air action to the detriment of real coordination or cooperation between the Army, Navy, and air elements of our armed forces. To me, it was apparent that the British RAF had developed on the concept that the air force would fight separately and independently of other forces and little interest was shown in the requirements of the Army and Navy for air support or in the development of suitable equipment for the execution of these vital functions. This was particularly apparent in the lack of development of carrier aircraft, or for that matter, of carriers themselves.

I know the purpose of your letter was to elicit a perfectly frank statement from me on this subject and I believe, as between the two plans, H. R. 2319 will be productive of better results than your plan as contained in H. R. 3469.

I do not believe that the central coordinating agency should be in the form of a Secretary of National Defense as set forth in H. R. 2319. This belief is not based on the fear of lodging too much power in one individual. It is based on the belief that no one individual has the capacity to absorb the mass of data that must be considered before a vital decision affecting the national security can be made. It is my belief that such vital decisions should be made only by the President after consultation with a group of experts who have made a complete study of the problem.

In my opinion the organizational outline under titles I and II of H. R. 3469 is more appropriate, in establishing the coordination and control required, than is H. R. 2319. H. R. 2319 gives the Secretary of Defense power of decisions in the War Council. H. R. 3469 places the power of decision in the President.

I sincerely believe that no appreciable savings in funds will be realized from the establishments of a separate Air Force or by combining the Marines with the Army. The particular job to be done will require the same funds, material and personnel in accomplishment, regardless of the organization assigned to perform the mission. Certain specialized equipment and personnel will be required for special (or different) types of warfare.

Present legislation before the Congress to unify the Armed Services (H. R. 2319) fails in its purpose for several reasons. In the first place, it is anachronistic to approach unification by creating a third department, namely, the Department of the Air Forces. At a time when integration and coordination should be the result which we are seeking, the initial step is a decentralization followed by a superimposing of an all-powerful secretary over the two present departments and the new third department. Organizationally this process is unsound. Another feature which should make this bill undesirable is the failure to provide safeguards for the Marine Corps and Naval Aviation at a time when senior officers of the Army and the Air Forces have committed themselves in writing as to their concept of the future roles of both of these Naval branches. But even if this safeguard were written in, there is still the possibility of a future change. Take for instance the case of Naval Aviation. Should a separate Air Force be established, it is only natural to suppose the nation as a whole would consider this department to be the authority on military aviation. In due course this department could and probably would point out to Congress in future budget hearings that two air forces are expensive, that the Air Force can perform all the missions of Naval Aviation and that there is no longer a necessity for that branch. Today's Navy without its integral arm, Naval Aviation, is no longer an effective weapon in modern warfare. Consequently, the logical conclusion to be reached is the final relegation of the entire Navy from a fighting force to a seagoing service force supporting the overseas movements of the Army Ground Forces and the Air Force.

In conversation with officers of various rank in the Army Air Forces, their one obsession is to get free of the Army Ground Forces. They feel that through the years the best interests of the Air Forces have not been served by the Army, which I am forced to admit is true. However as much as I sympathize with their views, and as much as I realize that their ambitions will be realized in an autonomous air force, I cannot subscribe to the belief that such a move is in the best interests of the national security. Today we have two well-functioning departments with naval aviation as an integral part of the Navy. The same should be true of the Army Air Force and the Army. And to those of the air force who believe that air would not be properly recognized, I say that it is inevitable that those officers schooled in air warfare, sea warfare, and land warfare will of necessity gravitate to the high command of the services. When that occurs, we will have then the most efficient fighting force in the world, a complete Army and a complete Navy, thoroughly indoctrinated in the principles of all kinds of modern warfare. And the quickest, most efficient way to accomplish this is within a two-department defense system, coordinated as indicated in your bill. I might add that to quiet the few of those who fear the power of nonelectoral coordinator, the duties of that office might well evolve upon the Vice President.

Originally, being somewhat in doubt as to whether these matters were really settled by the proposed legislation (H. R. 2319), I was uncertain as to whether or not it was a good enough answer to the problem. Finally, however, I concluded that the need for definite action of some sort was so great, and that H. R. 2319 came so close to being the best that could be hoped for in the way of fair handling of the disagreements that have militated against unity, that it ought to receive early and favorable legislative action.

I am opposed to the bill for a variety of reasons. My main objection, however, is based upon the fact that history is replete

with examples of nations that have adopted a single, or unified, air force with disastrous results. The naval component of that force has invariably been relegated to a secondary position; assigned officers, men, and matériel of such inferior quality and in such limited numbers that the result has been that it has been reduced to impotence.

As noted above, the foregoing is my major objection to the bill. Additionally, I do not understand how the proponents of this bill can claim economy as one of its accomplishments; I am not a student of Government, but I do not see how the passage of the bill can fail to do anything but add tremendously to the cost of the Nation's armed establishment.

I have given a lot of thought to the problem of consolidation of the armed services and have talked with many people in the naval service who are familiar with the subject. I am opposed to the plan proposed in H. R. 2319. Practically every person with whom I have discussed the question is unalterably opposed to this plan. Although I must say in fairness that there are undoubtedly some in the naval service who think that H. R. 2319 is an acceptable plan, I do not personally know of anyone who favors it except the top administration of the Navy Department. I also feel sure that there are many people in the Army who are opposed to the present plan but, in view of the administration's support I think it would be very difficult to get them to express their views in other than an off-the-record manner.

The fundamental faults of H. R. 2319 are: (1) A unification or merger into a single establishment in fact; (2) a single supersecretary of practically unlimited powers; (3) relegation of the service departments to a secondary place in the National Defense Establishment; and (4) the creation of a separate Air Force. To so radically change the organization of our armed forces at the present time is not only unnecessary, but also is actually dangerous to our national security. Certainly creating a third department will not promote economy.

Rather than go into a lengthy discussion of H. R. 2319 I am enclosing a copy of a study on an organization for national security, together with the draft of a bill to implement it, that is, I believe, sound. It, incidentally, is very similar to your bill H. R. 3469.

Both H. R. 2319 and H. R. 3469 appear to fulfill the requirements of providing an agency under the President for coordinating the efforts of the various branches of the armed forces. The major defects of H. R. 2319, in my opinion, are as follows:

(a) The Secretary of National Defense appears to have too much power, particularly over the budget.

(b) The functions of the services are not defined in the bill.

Personally, as previously stated, I see no good reason for separating the Army Air Force from the Army. But this appears to have been accomplished, practically, already, and it is in accord with the general trend throughout the world. My principal objections to this step are the reduction of the naval weight in the councils of our national defense from 50 to 33⅓ percent, the greater difficulty of effecting real unity of command, and the danger of attempted interference by Army Air with the Naval Air and its proper function.

I further regret to see the Secretary of Navy (and War) lose Cabinet status.

To summarize, I believe that H. R. 2319, as amended in accordance with the aforementioned Times article and amended further to include the definition of the functions of the armed services, as contained in the proposed Executive order submitted with the Joint War-Navy Agreement of January 16, will afford a satisfactory solution of the problem of coordinating the armed services. I believe further that this opinion is probably shared by the majority of other naval officers. The greatest apprehension has been the fear that the Army might appropriate functions which properly belong to the Navy, that the Army Air Force might attempt doing away with or greatly decreasing the Naval Air Force, and that the Marine Corps might be abolished or reduced to relative impotence. I believe that the bill, modified as stated, would provide adequate protection against these possibilities.

I am in favor of the merger bill now under consideration by the Congress (H. R. 2319). I have only slight misgivings relative to the power given the Secretary of National Defense because I have confidence that the man appointed to that important office, assisted by his War Council, would impartially utilize all of the armed services in the best interests of our country. I believe the proposed structure can be effective, efficient, and economical.

One very simple approach to reducing the effectiveness of any particular service is through the budget. It is better to have someone connected with the services establish an over-all budget and a budget for each service than to have the present national budget officer state that there will be a certain percentage cut across the board, regardless of the needs of any particular service. A Secretary of National Security can serve a very useful purpose in this regard as well as in the broad policy field.

Militarily there is no need for either an over-all Secretary of the Armed Forces or for a separate air force. Economy alone speaks forcibly against the establishment of additional bureaus, departments or agencies within the armed forces organization, especially when they add nothing to the national security, but, on the other hand tend to weaken the military establishment. Our experience has clearly demonstrated the necessity of integrating the air power of both the Army and the Navy within those services. Economy and coordination between and within the services can be accomplished by joint committees without the additional overhead of an administrative organization with a secretary to exercise control over and direct the military services.

My personal opinion as to the merits of H. R. 2319 happen to coincide with the opinions so ably presented by General Vandegrift at your committee hearings. I see no objection to some form of a merger of the Armed Services, provided such a merger will affect the economy and efficiency of operation. I am concerned as a Marine Officer in seeing that my Corps does not lose its identity nor have its traditional functions curtailed or completely eliminated by this proposed legislation. The suggested change in language proposed by General Vandegrift, which I have just read in the current Army-Navy Register, would, if enacted, insure against any such possibility.

Referring to question 1 (b), the suitability of H. R. 2319 to accomplish the purposes outlined above, I doubt it. Doubtless it could be amended to accomplish the purposes specified in paragraph 3 (b), (c) and (d), relative to Marine Corps and Naval Aviation in particular. Probably, it could be amended to define more specifically powers for the Secretary of National Defense. Admiral Nimitz is reported to have stated that if Congress feels H. R. 2319 should be so amended, "he certainly would have no objection."

Regarding question 1 (c), suitability of your alternate bill, H. R. 3469, in my personal view it would be preferable although certain amendments might be desirable. Objections to it have been raised that it does not provide: (a) a war council; (b) a single secretary with adequate power of decision; (c) definite provision for integrating appropriations for all services; (d) inclusion of military membership in National Defense Resources Board; (e) a separate Air Force.

In my opinion, the natural and inevitable result of the establishment of a third department within the single Department of National Defense will be the eventual elimination of naval aviation and the United States Marine Corps. If the public and the Congress believe this will better provide for national security it is their prerogative and duty to decide and act accordingly. I submit that the public should not be deceived as to what is taking place, however. Nor, in my opinion, should the issue be confused by claims regarding economy. The criterion here is the effectiveness as a national-security measure.

If it has now been determined by the Congress that the President's Cabinet, for whatever reasons, is incapable of coordinating effectively the departments of the Government including the military services, and therefore find it essential through legislation such as H. R. 2319 or H. R. 3469, to insure coordination not only of the military services, but of this country's entire economic and manpower potential for atomic warfare, then I favor, at least for the foreseeable future, a bill such as H. R. 3469 rather than H. R. 2319.

I do not subscribe to the creation of a separate autonomous United States Air Force. Human nature being what it is, I believe that this would inevitably spell the doom of naval and marine aviation under the guise of "economy" and "elimination of duplication." These two catch by lines have a great appeal during peace, and are used to railroad through measures which would take the tools from the hands of persons responsible for missions in war.

What I fear, however, is that passage of H. R. 2319 would result eventually in a weakened Naval Establishment lacking naval air units to conduct antisubmarine warfare and protect naval task forces with no comparable Air Force units capable of performing these missions. The present Army Air Force has little conception of the problems connected with operations involving close coordination with naval task forces, and is not likely to exert sufficient effort, time, and funds to prepare units for these specialized assignments.

With regard to H. R. 3469, I concur in general with the provisions of the bill, but I believe the choice of the title "Coordinator of National Defense" was unfortunate. In many quarters there is a certain onus attached to the term coordinator. I can see no need for any title other than "Chairman, National Defense Council." There are many who believe the duties of the office should be assigned to the Vice President when we have one. I think that is a good idea, but might require a constitutional amendment.

In the various comments which I have seen, I have been most impressed by the testimony of Fleet Admiral King and Mr. Ferdinand Eberstadt, and I definitely recommended that most serious consideration be given to their testimony and recommendations, particularly that testimony recently given before the Senate committee.

We're being hurried into a "best guess compromise" set-up, when we have just fought the greatest war in the history of the world successfully with a set-up which has been the subject of argument, experiment,

and improvement since the birth of this Nation. And now, of all times, we are trying to change a proven system in such a manner that our national security may be very seriously jeopardized. For at least 5 years, and more likely 10 years, what we know about warfare and the tools we use therein will be very similar to World War II. Great changes are inevitable and we have the machinery now to insure their efficient usage, coordination, and development. We should maintain that system until another system is proven better. I say that we have no right, no basis, for such change now though definitely, I do believe that certain changes are in order. Those changes, however, are in general agreement among all services and are based on war experience. They deal primarily with procurement, command functions, and so forth. These changes, together with the majority of organizational changes envisioned in the National Security Act of 1947, most people heartily agree to. Therefore, let's adopt these changes forthwith. Let's function under these changes for a couple of years, at least. Then, let's see where we stand.

I have been deeply concerned over the proposed unification ever since it came to my notice in the fall of 1945. I am still apprehensive over the results to the Navy and the Nation. I am opposed to H. R. 2319 for the following principal reasons:

(a) I believe that the political and military powers accruing to an office of such magnitude are too great for any nonelected official of the Government.

(b) I consider that too much is left to chance in that the authority of the proposed Secretary over the various departments is not clearly defined.

Regarding H. R. 3469 I favor this or a similar bill except that I believe the Coordinator of National Defense should not be included in the membership of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, but in his stead the Chief of Staff to the President as is the present practice.

In response to your letter of May 27, 1947, I must say that your proposed bill, H. R. 3469, comes nearer to my idea of the "merger" or "unification" than anything as yet suggested.

I like the two-department idea with autonomy for the Army Air Force. I'm fearful lest under H. R. 2319, irrespective of the safeguards for naval aviation, that our country might be deprived of what I consider its mobile weapons, namely, the aircraft carrier capable of launching long-range bombers, or guided missiles from any of the waters of the earth into the heartland of our prospective enemy.

I believe I can state that practically all contemporaries of mine are very apprehensive about the pending merger legislation, and hold views similar to mine.

As for my general comment on the proposed consolidation, I am personally in agreement with the official position of the Navy Department.

In general, I believe that I am accurate in stating that most of the experienced naval officers, who have had no responsibility for the drafting of the consolidation plan, believe that it will do the Navy and the national defense irreparable harm. This belief stems from the following:

1. There is too much power vested in the Secretary for National Defense.

2. While the overhead in connection with the Office of the Secretary of National Defense, as drafted in H. R. 2319, is modest, in a bureaucracy, the functions of an office have a habit of growing beyond all belief.

3. The duties and functions of the various armed services are not definitely drafted and delimited in the plan.

4. The duties and responsibilities as well as the strategic employment of the Navy, if not directly controlled, will be too strongly influenced by the military.

Other than the above comment it would appear that H. R. 3469 is a much more practical plan to achieve coordination than H. R. 2319.

That what I may say may not be constructive is to be regretted, since it is so easy to find flaws in any positive course of action yet so difficult to put forward something better. In this case, however, the issue is so important I feel entirely unsympathetic to the apparent widespread belief that any course is better than none. The safety of the country is dependent on the decision in this issue. It is disturbing to me that a precipitant course is to be followed when there are such divergent views on the matter held by the services who in the end must implement any decision that may be adopted.

A merger at the top with the establishment of another antonomous arm will not, in my mind, result in economy. We may not spend more, but I doubt we will spend less. The handling of budgets will essentially be unchanged since they at present are channeled through an executive office responsible to the President.

As for H. R 2319 and H. R. 3469, I consider your bill much the preferable of the two, since I believe some of the thoughts above are already incorporated therein.

If I recollect correctly, and I believe I do, the original basis for all this discussion, so far as the public was concerned, was unification wherever overlapping functions existed in order to effect economies in our national defense and to provide for unified command in Washington. As I have followed this matter through the press and the reports of the hearings, it seems to me that the current proposed legislation has drifted quite far afield from the original concept. Economies will not be effected by the supercontrol agencies which are proposed in securing a so-called unified command in Washington we will establish a general-staff system, the danger of which is very apparent if one studies German military history.

I am going to state in the beginning that I like the two department system outlined in your H. R. 3469, and have never cared for the three-department set-up of H. R. 2319. I make this statement based on what I have seen.

I realize that I have been rather critical of the formation of a third independent department, that of air, in this country. My remarks are not intended to be critical of our present Army Air Force. While I am a product of the Navy-Marine Corps system, I had the opportunity of attending the Army Air Corps tactical school at Langley Field in 1930. There I became friendly with many of the leaders of the Army Air Force today. Also I served with, under, and over units of the Army Air Force in the South Pacific during the past war. I never saw an Army Air Force officer that I didn't like personally; they are the same as anybody else. However, I do not believe that their case for independence, as outlined in H. R. 2319, is justified or for the best of this country. I believe that their future activities are amply protected in your H. R. 3469.

I consider H. R. 3469 as far more desirable than H. R. 2319. H. R. 3469 maintains the two-department system and, in my opinion, fully provides for the Air Corps by giving it autonomy within the War Department. While there is some doubt that the office of the Coordinator of National Defense, which would be established by H. R. 3469, would have satisfactory standing and prestige in dealing with the various Cabinet members and others in the proposed National Defense Council, it is believed that this organization would be far superior, and would insure better coordination of the services, than the three-department organization under a single Secretary of National Defense.

There appears to be a widespread fear, in which I share, that if H. R. 2319 is enacted, the other services will be reduced to minor proportions and status by budgetary action once the Air Force has been established as a separate department. While this undoubtedly arises partially from self-preservation and the fear of officers in the services that their careers will arbitrarily be cut short, it also arises from a real fear for national security. Nothing has been presented, other than extravagant statements, to prove that the merger will result in a better and more economical organization of national defense, while there are indications, based on war experience, that it actually will be inferior because of expected domination of one service over the others. Nothing that has appeared in reports of testimony at hearings held on H. R. 2319 have served to dispel this fear which has become aggravated by the public statements during the past year of various Army Air Force officers.

I know personally no officer who does not subscribe to the views expressed above.

Despite the fact that the present uncertainty regarding the merger of the armed forces is adversely affecting the general morale of the services, it is believed that the Congress must not rush this matter through until it receives more information from operational personnel. Therefore, it is strongly recommended that experienced naval aviators, general line, and staff corps officers of the rank of commander and above be summoned fresh from operational units of the Fleet outside the Washington area to testify before the pertinent committees of the Congress. Cross examination is the age-old method of obtaining the truth and in my opinion it is the best.

As you know, many people in the Navy are suspicious of the motives of the Army in the whole unification set-up.

The remarks of many Air Corps officers to the effect that it was only a question of time before they would take over naval aviation; the plans the Army has for the Marine Corps which have been so ably brought out by General Vandegrift; and such reports as the Kirk plan which recently came out in which the Army made clear its intent to combine all medical services under them and the Lutes' report on logistics, all tend to make the Navy very suspicious of their Army compatriots.

I do not like the power placed in the hands of the Secretary of National Defense by H. R. 2319, particularly as regards control of the budget and power of decision in the War Council. I doubt if our country is ready to place this much power in the hands of one individual other than the President. The difficulty of finding a man competent to handle this job properly will be very great.

As to the Army Air Forces, I see no particular objection in setting up the Strategic Air Forces as an independent agency, in view of the fact that this force operated as an independent agency during the last war. I feel that the Army should keep its ground support aviation under Army control, similar to Navy aviation. However, the Army, as far as I know, does not appear to be interested in this matter as I have not seen or heard any discussion of it.

Many naval officers feel that the representatives of the Navy Department who finally acceded to the bill (H. R. 2319) did so because they felt that some sort of a unification bill would be forced upon the Navy, and that the proposed bill was the best compromise obtainable. I believe that the Navy representatives do not think that bill (H. R. 2319) contains the best possible provisions for the security of the United States, but that they think this is the best that can be done, considering Army Air's attitude and the effect of the prolific publicity which Army Air inspired. Everybody in the Navy realizes the very bad effects that these interservice fights have on the morale of the personnel of the Navy, and probably of the Army, too. It may be better to accept a decision which is not quite right and raise the morale than it would be to continue to struggle with the ensuing demoralization of our combat personnel

Also, naval officers do not understand why, if unification is so desirable, that autonomy of the Air Forces is necessary. The two ideas are conflicting.

I believe that H. R. 3469 is a better alternative than H. R. 2319, but I would like to reiterate that legislation alone will not restore the Navy's former high regard for the intentions for Army Air. This can be done only by the future actions of Army Air.

If the powers of the proposed Secretary of National Defense were properly circumscribed and the necessary protection for the Marine Corps written in, I would not oppose its passage. Your proposed alternative, H. R. 3469, seems to have taken care of my first objection very well, but I was disappointed to see that it did not include a statutory delineation of the functions of the Marine Corps.

The effects of H. R. 2319 and its companion measure S. 758, if enacted into law, will be most profound; and I am personally apprehensive that some of the results will not benefit the Navy. I believe with you that it is the most important measure to come before the Congress, with respect to our national security, and it should receive such serious consideration that the language of any law passed will in no measure impair the confidence and interests of the Navy.

I most certainly agree that the closest coordination between operations of the Army, Navy, and Air Forces should be provided for; but I am not sure that unification, even by law, is a magic word that will bridge all difficulties. I do not believe in a single Secretary for National Security, except in the role of Coordinator and Assistant to the President for national security matters. I do not believe that he requires Cabinet status, and I am personally opposed to any loss of Cabinet status by the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Army.

I will not comment upon the propriety of setting up the Army Air Forces as a separate Air Department, coequal with the Army and Navy, beyond the statement that unification should begin at home and the creation of a separate Air Department seems to me a poor solution for failure to integrate the Army Air Forces into the Army.

In addition, I am impressed that the original move for merger of the armed services, with creation of Air Department, was generated almost entirely from War Department sources. It is true that merger is being softened into unification, to which term it is more difficult to object; but I question the necessity of the steps proposed to obtain unification and coordination. I believe that the measures proposed are not essential to unification, and I feel that they discount the morale and esprit de corps of the Navy and the Marine Corps, the priceless and necessary ingredients in the success of those organizations.

I am afraid that unification in the form proposed will lead to an Army-dominated Navy and Marine Corps. I shudder at that thought when I think of the army dominated navies of Germany and Japan, and even of Russia and France. I am told that I discount the morale and spirit in the Navy and Marine Corps when I express the fear of Army domination; but my reply is that the elements for such domination exist in the proposed National Security Organization and we should not be subjected to a set-up that even requires efforts and thought to prevent Army control and development of naval services.

There are many good features in the proposed legislation and they should be provided for by law and retained. The Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force, if a separate Air Department is created, should all be Cabinet officers. A civilian Coordinator for National Security as a deputy, or assistant, to the President, should be created; a War Council should be provided as indicated, with the Civilian Coordinator as chairman and where top decision is required it should come from the President in his constitutional role as Commander in Chief (after obtaining recommendations from the Joint Chiefs of Staff) through the War Council; the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Munitions Board, and the Research and Development Board should be retained with suitable staffs and secretaries. Further, for national security there should be provided a National Security Council, a National Security Resources Board, and a Central Intelligence Agency as generally indicated, allowing for the differences indicated above.

The above proposals are little different from your measure H. R. 3469, and I believe it could be modified easily to assure the features mentioned. Personally, I rather favor your idea of giving autonomy to the Army Air Forces, but under the Army organization, similar to our Marine Corps in the Navy set-up Naval aviation should be kept integrated with the Navy, and the Marine Corps organization should be maintained. The War Department should be changed to the Department of the Army and its Secretary designated as the Secretary of the Army.

However, in regard to H. R. 2319, I note that the Secretary of National Defense is given the authority to establish policies and programs and to exercise direction, authority, and control. These powers are extensive. It seems to me that with this bill the question is: How is it to be interpreted and administered? It would be the many rulings based upon such legislation which might lessen the effectiveness of one service. Such interpretations made by the single Secretary would have the effect of law insofar as the services are concerned. A policy, program, ruling, or interpretation effected by the Secretary over the objections of one service would be difficult of correction, and much harm could be done, particularly before such action could be overtaken by corrective measures taken by the Congress or by Executive action. Functions could be transferred, one by one, from one service to another, leaving the former impotent. On the other hand, I believe the duties laid down for the Coordinator, as presented in your proposed bill H. R. 3469, would accomplish the results desired as to coordination, effectiveness, and economy, and at the same time prevent the possibility of arbitrary action by one man to the detriment of the national security.

As for the Army Air Force, everyone agrees that they did a fine job in their contribution to the winning of the recent war. However, I do not believe that they would have been more effective had they been organized under a separate department. With the advent of the guided missile and other new implements of warfare, conditions of warfare will continue to change. Guided missiles can be launched from the ground, from ships, and from aircraft. The introduction of the guided missile and other implements of warfare, will, in the future, tend to reduce the relative importance of the piloted aircraft—including the Strategic Air Force—as it now exists. I believe that the War and Navy Department structures proposed in H. R. 3469 would promote desirable coordination and further, that the results would be more effective. On the other hand, I do not believe that it would be economical to provide for a separate Air Force.

Briefly, I favor (1) the continuance of the two Departments, with coordinating agencies, and without the addition of a third Department of the Air; and (2) each with its air component becoming increasingly predominant as the parent department's other components become sublimated, in accordance (a) with lessons of the past war, and (b) with predictions as to future methods of warfare. Such an organization of two departments can more effectively, more economically, and with greater facility perform the functions spelled out for three department organizations.

Hasty perusal of your proposed bill, H. R. 3469, indicates that you entertain similar ideas and I heartily endorse its basic principles.

Aside from the obvious military disadvantages in attempting to coordinate and correlate the activities of three separate departments as compared with two departments, I am unable to visualize the economies to be effected by organizing a third department, that of air, as proposed in H. R. 2319. It appears to me to be an expensive horse-trade move: The Air Force gets full independence and departmental status; the Ground Forces get perpetuation of their waning organization. The Navy—an innocent bystander—gets temporary guaranties of no dismemberment of its naval aviation by one horse trader and no dismemberment of its Marine Corps by the other trader.

There are those who argue that organization of a Department of Air is due recognition of the distinguished services of our air forces during the recent war. With no thought of belittling their splendid performance, I consider appropriate recognition of the magnificent services of the air forces is obtainable, at less cost and without sacrifice of national security, by suitable reorganization within the War Department, granting the air component the predominating position therein to which it is entitled.

Only time can give the correct answer to your question, but in my opinion the merger is worthy of a trial run, and somehow I am confident that it will wear well and improve as time goes on, despite its size.

I fully agree with you that some steps should be taken in order to bring about a closer coordination of Army, Navy, and Air Force operations. After a detailed study of the question, I am sincerely of the opinion that the pattern of this step as expressed in S. 758, as amended and as reported to the Senate, represents a sound solution—the best that could be made to work—in fact, the most practicable which has been devised to date. I freely and fully support that bill as amended.

The remaining provisions of the bill establishing the three military departments and the Secretary of National Defense are far more controversial. For many years I have opposed the idea of either a separate or a united air force or air department as being both unnecessary for and detrimental to our over-all

military efficiency. During the war I was strengthened in this belief by military developments in those countries which had adopted the air-force idea, notably Great Britain and Germany. An examination of these developments reveals certain serious dangers inherent in the separation of the air forces from the other arms, and indicates that if such separation is undertaken it must be accompanied by clearly defined safeguards to prevent fatal weakening of the Army and the Navy and the over-all military effectiveness. H. R. 2319, as originally introduced, does not include these safeguards. I understand that certain amendments along this line have been introduced by the Armed Services Committee of the Senate, but, since I have not seen them, I am unable to comment on them.

However, it seems to me that the overriding consideration is to adopt some plan which will attract the loyal support of all the services. Without such support, no organization can produce the unity of effort which we must achieve. Because of the strong and sincere convictions on both sides of this question, it appears that the three-department plan provided in H. R. 2319 is the only one which can attract this vital support. I believe that two departments, each with its own air element, a sounder organization from a military standpoint, but an inferior plan, loyally supported, is preferable to a better plan which would produce continuing friction and conflict between the services. For this reason it appears wisest to adopt H. R. 2319, which has the support of all responsible officials of both departments, provided it is amended to define clearly the functions of each department.

I am a captain in the United States Naval Reserve on active duty. It is not in that capacity that I volunteer this letter, but as a professional civilian, a newspaperman of sufficient Washington seniority to have become, for illustration, one of the elders of the gridiron, and who was before the war head of a substantial news bureau in this city.

My opposition to the Senate and House committee versions of the armed services unification legislation—Senate 758 and House 2319—is therefore from the viewpoint of an informed civilian. There are not many of us, even in the Congress or in journalism, and outside those two categories the public is dangerously uninformed and, editorially, dangerously misinformed, of the threat to the national defense, and, indeed, to the republican form of government inherent in these bills. For the public's ignorance, I blame my colleagues of the press.

You have tried to remedy the gravest danger by substituting a coordinator of the military departments for the fantastically empowered single Secretary delineated in the committee bills. If your amendment could be advertised and explained to the public I believe it would produce such popular support that that revision would be forced upon Congress.

What the committee bills propose is to delegate to one man almost autocratic powers over the military establishments of the Nation. The powers to be conferred upon him exceed those suggested by the Secretarys of War and the Navy, and their military advisers.

This legislation is not being written for the day, or the next 5 years. It cannot be gaged by the personal statures of any likely candidate for the office this year or in 1949. It is to be the basic law for the administration of the national security structure for as far as we can see into the future.

Who is this autocrat of our safety to be? He will be a man rewarded with the office for his assistance in winning the election for an administration. He will come to Washington charged with the responsibility not only of maintaining the Nation's security but, to great extent, the peace of the world. The chances are good that he will be an earnest, zealous, loyal, and ambitious public servant. The chances also are, by statistical evidence, that he will relinquish the office as soon as it interferes with his personal affairs. And the odds are that he will be as familiar with the enormous duties with which this Congress is preparing to charge him as I am about abdominal surgery or atomic energy.

The inevitable result will be the domination of the composite department by the professionally military, in violation of the spirit of the Constitution, however the proposed law is adjusted to the letter of the charter.

No one can plead, except speciously, that the same criticism applies to the President as Commander in Chief, or that the President's ultimate authority remains intact. The President is an elected servant of the people, a politically appointed secretary is not. Under the existing system, the President's administration of the national defense is delegated to two Cabinet officers, thus halving the likelihood of malfeasance. The proposed law would double it, besides creating a self-perpetuating military staff in fact, although it may not so be called in name, as the mentor of the innocent in nominal charge. Will we not have a military bureaucracy, concealed from the public and beyond reach of the Congress?

Without going into too infinite detail, I believe that the proposed unification—which contains many desirable and necessary improvements on the existing defense structure—contains all the germs of a militaristic organism which when implanted in the body politic can cancerously overcome it. The law is being propelled to enactment by a hysteria produced by distorted images of approaching war. I can believe that the bill, if made law, might even hasten conflict and by the topheaviness of its creation, make that war costly and difficult to win.

Reverting to the letter of the Constitution, what consideration has been given to the articles forbidding appropriations to the Army for more than 2 years? Will the entire defense budget under unification have to be placed under that time limit? The Constitution also says there shall be an Army and a Navy. Will not then the creation of a coequal Air Force be technically unconstitutional? Is not your redefinition of the Army Air Force as analogous to the Marine Corps unconstitutionally compulsive?

These are practical questions, not rhetorical ones, and the answers cannot be evaded.

The necessity of such integrating agencies as the National Security Council, the Joint Chiefs and Central Intelligence, are in any event above debate, and can easily be established forthwith by noncontroversial legislation. Their establishment by law is all the Nation now needs for its coordinated security, until a completely objective, unhurried, scientific study of truly integrable defense can be accomplished.

Sincerely,

WALTER KARIG.

I have not had the time to analyze the various provisions in the two bills, also I have been out of touch with naval developments in recent years. However, I like the declaration of policy in H. R. 3469. The detailed provisions of H. R. 3469 appear to conform to the declaration of policy and should provide for the coordination of the armed services without disrupting any of the organizations which have proved their effectiveness.

I agree with you that close coordination of land, sea, and air operations is absolutely necessary. In obtaining this coordination through the decisions of one man, I think the command of a theater is the highest limit which can be expected of a human being even when advised by a well-rounded joint staff. For this reason I am uneasy concerning the interests of the Navy when one man in Washington has the power to reduce the activities and functions of the Navy by means of adjustments within the over-all security budget. History has repeatedly shown that few men other than those with naval training understand the importance of control of the sea and just what is involved in the way of means and operations required to secure and exercise this control. The reports of the Fuehrer conferences now being published by the Navy Department are excellent examples of what happens to a Navy when under the over-all direction of someone who does not understand control of the sea by sea-air power.

Fleet Admiral King in his statement before the Armed Services Committee of the Senate on May 6, 1947, said, "I feel that in the controversies and discussions that have so far taken place (in relation to an improved organization for national security) the emphasis has been wrongly placed; that, so to speak, the cart has been put before the horse." To me this is the essence of the present situation. Before the country, the Congress or the services had time to evaluate properly the results of the last war or the prospects of the future insofar as both pertain to a proper organization for national security, we were plunged into a discussion of detailed organization which largely missed the main point. It is not so important to change the departmental organization of the military services themselves as it is to set up permanently and quickly the machinery which will enable this country to wage efficiently the total war of the future if it ever becomes necessary to do so. From a national-security standpoint our most pressing need of the moment is an agency which will coordinate and tie together all those activities of government which have to do with the political, the military, the economic, and the industrial factors involved in the common defense.

As to the reorganization of the military departments themselves, it is my feeling that by a process of evolution and real interservice education a truly single service might become a probability within a generation. Any such solution will, of necessity, have to await the arrival in command ranks of military and naval men who are now starting their careers and who, properly trained, can assess each other's problems with an understanding which is most certainly not existent at the present time.

As an interim organization I am unalterably opposed to the proposal for three military departments contained in H. R. 2319. It is organizationally unsound from a military standpoint because it would freeze the services into the pattern of World War II. At a time when every prospect of the future indicates a necessity for a simplified and economical structure, it establishes an organization which multiplies, complicates, and one which will strain the financial resources of this country to maintain. Money badly needed for real military needs will be used for a greatly enlarged departmental structure and overhead.

The crux of the matter in this respect is, of course, the demand of the Army Air Forces for autonomy. Without this demand, we could proceed with an orderly coordination of the two services on an economical basis and ultimately to a single service.

There is nothing, military or otherwise, that cannot better be accomplished by two departments, as against three. Insofar as air is concerned, and I consider myself qualified to speak, I feel that at the moment, as of today, the Air Forces of the Army and Navy are the most essential offensive and defensive components of our military strength. Nothing should be done to weaken them in any way and "air mindedness" must continue to be a requisite in all military and naval planning and thinking. However, if the Army Air Forces attain separate

departmental status, it is my belief that they will tend to become frozen in an outmoded pattern due to lack of competition. They will soon become the only Air Forces of the United States for I am certain that the Naval Air Forces cannot long maintain their present status and efficiency vis a vis a separate Air Department. Without air, the ground Army and the surface Navy, still able to exert tremendous influence, will tend to become completely reactionary in their efforts to maintain their own size and prestige.

To my mind there is less reason for a separate Department of Air now than there was 25 or 30 years ago when proponents of such action were just as strong in their convictions and used many of the same arguments to back up their contentions. Had they had their way then, there would have been no naval air forces in this war. This, however, is history, certain details of which will become more generally appreciated as better histories of World War II become available. What concerns us as a nation now is the future. What of the future of military air? No one knows exactly, but in this connection I invite your attention to Dr. J. C. Hunsaker's letter transmitting the thirty-second annual report of the NACA to the President, dated January 10, 1947, wherein he says: "The close of the war marked the end of one whole phase of development of the airplane as conceived by the Wright brothers. The airplane in its present form is no longer a sound basis for future planning for the national defense." This does not mean that the strategic bomber is obsolete as of today, but it does mean it is obsolescent as a type. It also means that air warfare of the future will bear little or no resemblance to the air warfare of World War II.

My personal recommendation for an immediate solution to the problems involved in improving our organization for national security would be a coordinated two-department establishment with adequate and positive safeguards for the air forces of each department. Such an organization could be relatively simple and economical. What is more important, it could be made to lead to the eventual and ideal establishment of a single service. It would also have the major advantage of maintaining within the ground army and the surface navy the air-mindedness which is so essential to each at this time.

H. R. 3469 more nearly approaches my ideas than any bill I have seen. It contains certain provisions which I would like to see changed but I would take it "as is" if it could be substituted for H. R. 2319 because I consider the latter so completely undesirable in its major features.

However, the crux of the problem is whether or not to have one over-all head, such as the Secretary of National Defense of H. R. 2319. This I consider would be inadvisable and unnecessary. I consider that not only is the proposed position too much of a task for one man, but also, and what is more important, it gives too much power to one man. I much prefer a continuation of the system of the Joint Chief of Staffs, which was employed during the war, with its checks and balances imposed by the fact that all decisions had to be unanimous.

As for the opinion of the men in the service, I can speak only in general of my contemporaries with whom I have had contact—mostly officers of my rank. The opinion is against any unification, as we know it, i. e., with one supreme head over all the services. I believe that most everybody feels that progress can be made towards closer relationships between the services and that some functions can be consolidated, but that these questions should be a matter of evolution and not revolution.

I agree fully with you "that some steps should be taken in order to bring about a closer coordination of Army, Navy, and Air Force operations." However, after consideration of your alternative plan as represented by H. R. 3469, it is my opinion that it will not accomplish the desired coordination as well as the plan contained in H. R. 2319, or its companion Senate bill 758, with amendments as recently reported. This latter plan as amended will, I believe, provide a sound workable plan under which the several services can operate.

I firmly believe that a three-departmental system for the armed services is the worst measure we can take to improve our national security. Further, it is my considered belief that retention of the two-department system administered by the agencies proposed by Mr. Eberstadt, and eliminating separation of the Army Air Force, can be made a workable, efficient instrument of national policy. A single department is far more to be desired than three.

Of the three means for promoting national security exemplified by H. R. 3469, H. R. 2319, and S. 2044, which was considered by the last Congress, I prefer the type or organization proposed in H. R. 3469. I prefer it because it provides a national defense council which is the most important deficiency in the present security structure, because it continues the basic structure of the armed services which has proven successful in war, and because it provides additional means for reinforcing that structure by coordinating action.

To sum up briefly, it is my opinion that if it is necessary at this time to change the present military set-up, it should be done with extreme caution. The Secretary of the Navy and the Chief of Naval Operations have assured us that the bill, as proposed by the War and Navy Departments adequately protects the Navy's integrity, including the Marine Corps and air force. I accept their appraisal of the bill with the provisos as set forth in the preceding paragraph.

If a consolidation of the services is effected under the provisions of H. R. 2319, I am convinced that such action will lead to the eventual destruction of naval aviation as it exists today. In doing so the Congress would be destroying one of the most potent weapons of the recent war. The integration of naval aviation in the Navy had been accomplished over a period of years prior to the war, and I believe its record during the war speaks as complete justification for its continued existence. The fast carrier task force, as an example, was a development of integrated naval aviation and its value as a powerful weapon cannot be questioned.

It is my opinion that the present plan, as supported by the Navy Department, has been thoroughly and intelligently considered from all angles by the various committees of the Navy Department.

I am strongly opposed to the provisions of H. R. 2319 establishing a separate Air Force. The experiences of Great Britain and Germany along such lines have so fully demonstrated the futility of the air fighting an independent and uncoordinated war that I dread the possibility of such a policy being adopted by this country. If the amendments to H. R. 2319 protect us from such a danger, and protect the future operation and development of naval aviation (ship and shore based), some of the disadvantages of H. R. 2319 will have been overcome.

Militarily there is no need for either an over-all Secretary of the Armed Forces or for a separate Air Force. Economy alone speaks forcibly against the establishment of additional bureaus, departments, or agencies within the armed forces organization, especially when they add nothing to the national security, but, on the other hand tend to weaken the military establishment. Our experience has clearly demonstrated the necessity of integrating the air power of both the Army and the Navy within those services. Economy and coordination between and within the services can be accomplished by joint committees without the additional overhead of an administrative organization with a secretary to exercise control over and direct the military services.

I am unalterably opposed to H. R. 2319 and the revised S. 758 as recently reported out of committee, and my ideas are covered by some of the points included in your suggestions embodied in H. R. 3469.

With regard to your question of opinion of men in the service, on the subject of merger, unification, etc., I am going to testify that from conversations with officers in the naval service over a long period, I can say that 99 percent of these were opposed to it. Just recently, I had the opportunity to take a poll of about 200 officers assembled and of that number only 2 were in favor of it. This maintains my previous estimate of 99 percent.

In conclusion I should like to say that your plan appears to me to be much superior to the other. It leaves to each service the determination of what it needs whether it is in the air, ground or on the sea. It also retains for the Army its air arm which I think is necessary. Perhaps the best solution would be one such as we have with the Marines in the Navy; they are 20 percent of the size of the entire Navy. Perhaps "air" in each service could operate on a fixed percentage in a similar manner.

Although H. R. 3469 contains interesting and novel features, I prefer S. 758 chiefly because I am of the opinion that the latter bill would stand a better chance of receiving the loyal support of the armed services. I am sure you will agree that without this support, coordination and unity of effort will be impossible.

With regard to your inquiry concerning the opinion of the enlisted men in the Navy on unification, I believe that the majority are opposed to unification principally because they fear such a step might eventually result in domination of the Navy by the Army.

I have given the matter considerable thought and it is my belief that, under existing conditions, the latest draft of the bill which the departments are now supporting is the more favorable. It should provide both the required coordination and necessary safeguards. I believe that it would be a decided improvement over the existing situation.

It is my opinion that a third military department, as provided for in H. R. 2319, stems largely from the Army Air Force's desire for autonomy and should be more carefully studied for its effect upon the efficiency and effectiveness of our national defense system. I find it difficult to see how a third department with its necessarily large departmental organization and overhead can be maintained without a permanent increase in cost over that required for a two-department system. Furthermore, if a United States Air Force is established as a third department, it is reasonable to expect that this force, with its

Chief of Staff holding relative rank and position with the Chief of Staff of the United States Army and the Chief of Naval Operations and sitting as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, will not only speak through the Secretary of the Air Force for all aviation but be generally recognized as the principle advisor and final authority on the development, procurement, maintenance and operation of all the Air resources of the United States, particularly so in the integration of the aviation budget. The inevitable result will be the relegation of naval aviation to a secondary or minor role without regard for the records of World War II in which the Navy, with an integrated air arm as its most powerful weapon, not only established and maintained control of the sea but provided air as well as gunfire support for troops that were fighting beyond the range of Army tactical air support. It will be difficult to impose restrictions on a United States air force to protect naval aviation that may not later be removed as theory replaces war experience as the basis for military organization.

The majority of officers with whom I have discussed the subject of reorganization believe that the best interests of the United States would be served by a two-department system with Air soundly integrated and playing a dominant role in each department. It is difficult to reconcile an independent United States air force which excludes naval aviation.

In your letter you asked also what I considered the opinion was of the men in the Navy regarding H. R. 2319. During the last several months I have talked with a great many officers of the Navy, both regular and reserve. I have been surprised to find so many of these men well informed on the subject of merger or unification, and many of them are quite well acquainted with the details of the proposed legislation in H. R. 2319. All of the officers I have talked with are opposed to this legislation with the exception of two. I believe it can be said at least 90 percent of the naval officers are sincerely opposed to this proposed legislation. Included, of course, are the regular and reserve officers of the Marine Corps.

H. R. 3469 which you inquired about in your letter, I believe is an improvement over H. R. 2319 if in fact there must be an over-all law reforming and recasting our military organization. Personally, however, I much prefer to use great caution and consideration of all of the factors involved before remolding and reorganizing the whole military and national security structure. It seems to me that it is much better to consider improvements on a step-by-step basis. In any organization so large as our military establishment, the necessity for improvement always is apparent. These should be made forthwith as they arise. At the present time, I do not see any reason or urgency for wide-sweeping reform legislation. To avoid disaster, caution must be controlling.

With regard to H. R. 2319, I believe that this bill does not properly solve the questions involved but rather accentuates them. It does not seem reasonable to me that required integration is to be obtained by separation of Army Air Forces from Army Ground Forces. On the contrary it appears rather evident that experience during the past war indicates strongly the need for closer integration, rather than separation of these elements. As to the question of political expediency, I can only say that if this be a prime factor then the safeguarding of the national interest is indeed in jeopardy.

I view with considerable apprehension the creation of the proposed office of the Secretary of National Defense. It seems to me that, unless proper and adequate safeguards are written in the law, this office would tend toward such powers as would be improper for any single individual short of the President, and therefore is not a proper appointive office. Since this point has been raised many times no further elaboration is required here. A further point which I believe important is that the office would tend to channelize all new developments and to eliminate all traces of duplication, whereas a reasonable amount of competition and duplication is not only healthy but sound practice for prevention of stagnation.

I am strongly opposed to the enactment into law of the National Security Act of 1947 for two basic reasons. First, I believe that this bill will set up an administrative structure out of which will evolve a military policy which will not meet the peculiar military situation of the United States. Next, I oppose the National Security Act of 1947 on the grounds that it is conducive to the establishment of a degree of military control over the Government of the United States which is not compatible with our democratic, constitutional form of government.

In my opinion the establishment of administrative parity of the Army Air Forces and the Army Ground Forces with the Navy of the United States will lead to a situation where the exponents of land, surface and air power will outweight the exponents of naval, surface, and air power in a ratio of 2 : 1. A logical outgrowth of this condition will lead to a situation where the seapower of the United States, including the air over those seas, is subordinate to its land power, including the air over that land. The realities of global geography make it clear that the control of the seas and of the air over the seas, which can only be exercised by naval forces, is now and will continue to be the primary factor in the defensive or offensive war which we will be required to conduct against our most likely enemy. If we control those seas and the air over them we will be able to interpose insuperable barriers against an attack through 80 percent of the circle which we must defend. Admittedly, 20 percent of that circle that is the polar route, may be defended by the Army Air Forces. If we control those seas and the air over them we will impose a decisive offensive threat against our most likely enemy through 80 percent of the circle which she must defend. Admittedly, here again the Army Air Forces can impose a threat, though at much longer range, through 20 percent of the circle.

High-powered propaganda has advanced the absurd theory that we no longer require a Navy because our most likely enemy has none. The enactment of this bill will create the administrative structure which may dictate a military policy under which the United States will cease to have the naval power. This propaganda has grown to such proportions that this Nation is now considering the abandonment of sea power and air power over the seas as our first line of defense. It would have made as much sense for England to cease to be a sea power despite her dependence upon the seas, or for Switzerland to undertake to become a sea power despite her lack of access to the seas.

With regard to my opposition to the National Security Act of 1947 on the grounds of its incompatibility with our democratic form of government, I am concerned with the extent to which that act places tremendous powers in the hands of an official who is not elected by the people. I am concerned with the extent to which this bill is supported by those who have always cast admiring glances at the power and influence of the German General Staff.

All Americans have an instinctive distrust of the concentration of command of total land and naval power in a single man. I share this distrust, in spite of the fact that I have been in the naval service since I was 16 years old. Such power is too heady a wine for any man, no matter how competent and well intentioned.

In times of peace the professional soldier and sailor must fight to avoid stagnation and solidification of his thinking in established grooves. Healthy competition and divergence of thought between services during these periods can help avoid this. For example, before the present war, there was a difference in opinion between the Army and Navy Air Forces concerning liquid-cooled and air-cooled engines. It is fortunate that this divergence occurred. Another difference which has recently developed, and which I think is a healthy one, is the marked difference between the naval ROTC and the Army ROTC. If the integration of the Army and Navy had been so firm as to require each service to use the same officer-training program, the new naval ROTC could never have been developed and approved by the Congress. I have been intimately connected with the latter program and am confident of its continued success. However, even if it should prove wrong, I believe the fact that this method has been tried cannot do other than make for better officer training for both Army and Navy in the long-run picture.

Rear Adm. Walden L. Ainsworth.
Capt. George W. Anderson, Jr.
Rear Adm. John J. Ballentine.
Rear Adm. Donald B. Beary.
Commander J. T. Blackburn.
Admiral W. H. P. Blandy.
Vice Adm. G. F. Bogan.
Rear Adm. John F. Bolger.
Capt. F. A. Brandley.
Rear Adm. Charles R. Brown.
Rear Adm. John H. Brown, Jr.
Capt. A. A. Burke.
Vice Adm. Robert B. Carney.
Maj. Gen. Clifton B. Cates.
Rear Adm. Joseph J. Clark.
Capt. J. C. Clifton.
Rear Adm. Charles M. Cooke.
Capt. J. G. Crommelin.
Capt. E. A. Cruise.
Rear Adm. Arthur C. Davis.
Rear Adm. Glenn B. Davis.
Admiral Louis E. Denfeld.
Capt. R. E. Dixon.
Rear Adm. A. K. Doyle.
Capt. P. R. Durgin.
Admiral Richard S. Edwards.
Maj. Gen. Graves B. Erskine.
Commander E. K. Eynon.
Capt. H. D. Felt.
Rear Adm. James Fife.
Capt. W. S. Fisher.
Rear Adm. D. V. Gallery.
Vice Adm. Thomas Gatch.
Capt. Robert Goldthwaite.
Capt. G. B. Hall.
Maj. Gen. Field Harris.
Rear Adm. Robert W. Hayler.
Capt. J. H. Hean.
Admiral Henry K. Hewitt.
Capt. W. R. Hollingsworth.
Vice Adm. J. H. Hoover.
Admiral F. J. Horne.
Rear Adm. George F. Hussey, Jr.
Rear Adm. Thomas B. Inglis.
Col. C. C. Jerome.
Rear Adm. Charles T. Joy.
Admiral Edwin C. Kalbfus.
Capt. Joseph L. Kane.
Capt. Walter Karig.
Admiral Thomas C. Kinkaid.
Admiral H. E. Kimmel.
Vice Adm. Emory S. Land.
Commander C. B. Lanman.
Capt. H. K. Latta.
Admiral William D. Leahy.
Rear Adm. E. W. Litch.
Rear Adm. Charles A. Lockwood.
Vice Adm. Francis S. Low.

Rear Adm. Frank J. Lowry.
Vice Adm. L. D. McCormack.
Brig. Gen. W. L. McKittrick.
Commander A. S. Major, Jr.
Rear Adm. J. J. Manning.
Brig. Gen. Vernon E. McGee.
Vice Adm. Earle W. Mills.
Capt. Lucian A. Moebus.
Capt. W. A. Moffett.
Lt. Col. E. A. Montgomery.
Capt. J. A. Moreno.
Vice Adm. Ben Moreell.
Vice Adm. G. D. Murray.
Rear Adm. Ralph A. Ofstie.
Vice Adm. J. B. Oldendorf.
Rear Adm. Charles A. Pownall.
Rear Adm. Alfred M. Pride.
Vice Adm. Arthur W. Radford.
Admiral D. C. Ramsey.
Capt. J. C. Renard.
Rear Adm. John W. Reeves, Jr.
Capt. W. F. Riggs, Jr.
Rear Adm. Thomas Robbins.
Capt. R. W. Ruble.
Rear Adm. Allan E. Smith.
Rear Adm. T. L. Sprague.
Admiral Raymond Spruance.
Admiral Harold R. Stark.
Capt. Edward C. Stephan.
Rear Adm. Earl S. Stone.
Capt. R. J. Stroh.
Rear Adm. Clifford A. Swanson.
Capt. R. H. Taylor.
Capt. Steadman Teller.
Brig. Gen. G. C. Thomas.
Rear Adm. W. G. Tomlinson.
Admiral John H. Towers.
Gen. Allen H. Turnadge.
Capt. J. P. W. Vest.
Capt. J. O. Vossellar.
Rear Adm. Frank D. Wagner.
Capt. R. R. Waller.
Admiral R. F. Whitehead.
Maj. Gen. Louis E. Woods.
Admiral Henry E. Yarnell.
Admiral Ellie M. Zacharis.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 564. An act to provide for the performance of the duties of the office of President in case of the removal, resignation, death, or inability both of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2369. An act providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the Territory of Alaska.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles:

S. J. Res. 77. Joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the International Refugee Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor; and

S. J. Res. 139. Joint resolution to continue for a temporary period of 15 days certain controls now exercised by the President under the Second War Powers Act, 1942, and under the Export Control Act.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on June 28, 1947, present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 775. An act for the establishment of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government;

H. R. 1742. An act for the relief of Mary Lomas;

H. R. 2436. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3303. An act to stimulate volunteer enlistments in the Regular Military Establishment of the United States;

H. R. 3398. An act to extend the period of validity of the act to facilitate the admission into the United States of the alien fiancées or fiancés of members of the armed forces of the United States;

H. R. 3611. An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3911. An act to continue temporary authority of the Maritime Commission until March 1, 1948.

H. J. Res. 193. Joint resolution to grant authority for the erection of a permanent building for the American National Red Cross, District of Columbia Chapter, Washington, D. C.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 1, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

874. A letter from the Secretary of State, Secretary of War, Acting Secretary of the Navy, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to protect the national security of the United States by permitting the summary of employment of civilian officers and employees of the Departments of State, War, and the Navy, and the Atomic Energy Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

875. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a tabulation showing the number of envelopes, labels, and other penalty inscribed material on hand and on order June 30, 1946; the number of pieces procured, the estimated mailings, and the estimated cost by departments and agencies for the period July 1, 1946, to March 31, 1947; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

876. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BRADLEY: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 1036. A bill to provide for the licensing of marine radiotelegraph operators, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 736). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 3323. A bill to enable the Osage Tribal Council to determine the bonus value of tracts offered for lease for oil, gas, and other mining purposes, Osage Mineral Reservation, Okla.; without amendment (Rept. No. 737). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 2825. A bill to provide additional funds for cooperation with public-school districts (organized and unorganized) in Mahnomen, Itasca, Pine, Becker, and Cass Counties, Minn., in the construction, improvement, and extension of school facilities to be available to both Indian and white children; with amendments (Rept. No. 738). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 3322. A bill to facilitate rights-of-way through restricted Osage Indian land, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 739). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 3173. A bill relative to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 740). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 742. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BISHOP: Joint Committee on Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 743. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. TABER: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 4031. A bill making appropriations to meet emergencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 744). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 3952. A bill to amend section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 745). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. House Joint Resolution 222. Joint resolution terminating consumer credit controls; without amendment (Rept. No. 746). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REED of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1810. A bill to amend the Criminal Code to permit certain referees in bankruptcy to prosecute claims against the United States before the courts and the executive departments and agencies; with an amendment (Rept. No. 747). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GOODWIN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3690. A bill to amend the Federal Tort Claims Act; with amendments (Rept. No. 748). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAND: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 3247. A bill to provide basic authority for the performance of certain functions and activities of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 749). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TOLLEFSON: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 3505. A bill authorizing an appropriation for investigating and rehabilitating the oyster beds damaged or destroyed by the intrusion of fresh water and the blockage of natural passages west of the Mississippi River in the

vicinity of Lake Mechant and Bayou Severin, Terrebonne Parish, La., and by the opening of the Bonnet Carre spillway, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 750). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HAND: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 3541. A bill to define the functions and duties of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 751). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TOLLEFSON: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 3598. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) of the Pacific coast and creating the Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission; with an amendment (Rept. No. 752). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union

Mr. LODGE: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Senate Joint Resolution 124. Joint resolution to enable the President to utilize the appropriations for United States participation in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration for meeting administrative expenses of United States Government agencies in connection with United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration liquidation; without amendment (Rept. No. 753). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1078. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Audrey Ellen Gooch; with amendments (Rept. No. 741). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLACKNEY:

H. R. 4017. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to provide that bonds issued under such act shall be redeemable at any time after September 1, 1947, to permit settlement and compensation under such act to be made in cash, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BURKE:

H. R. 4018. A bill authorizing the transfer of certain real property for wildlife or other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. R. 4019. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to create a civilian board to review discharges and dismissals from service in the armed forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ (by request):

H. R. 4020. A bill providing for the administration by the Bureau of Land Management under the act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269), of certain lands in certain Western States, valuable for grazing, acquired by the United States under various relief and emergency acts; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 4021. A bill relating to the continuation of the transportation services of the Inland Waterways Corporation and to the sale and lease of its transportation facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 4022. A bill providing for taxation by the States and their political subdivisions of certain real properties owned by the United States of America or its agencies; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 4023. A bill to authorize the establishment of the De Soto National Memorial in the State of Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PHILLIPS of California:

H. R. 4024. A bill to promote the agriculture of the United States by acquiring and diffusing useful information regarding agriculture in foreign countries and the marketing of American agricultural commodities, and the products thereof, outside of the United States; to authorize the creation of an Office of Foreign Agricultural Service in the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STIGLER (by request):

H. R. 4025. A bill to amend section 22 (k) of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to alimony payments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 4026. A bill to extend for 1 year the time within which application may be made under the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 for settlement and compensation for terminal leave; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 4027. A bill to transfer certain transmission lines, substations, appurtenances, and equipment in connection with the sale and disposition of electric energy generated at the Fort Peck project, Montana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MUNDT:

H. R. 4028. A bill to authorize the Office of Education to procure and make available to the schools and colleges of the country a series of educational motion pictures, film strips, and related materials depicting the basic freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution, the organization and functioning of the Congress, the contrasting ways of dictatorship, and other subject matters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 4029. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1937, as amended, to change the base period for the determination of parity for Maryland tobacco from August 1919 to July 1929 to the period from August 1934 to July 1939; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILSON of Indiana:

H. R. 4030. A bill to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by recent floods, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TABER:

H. R. 4031. A bill making appropriations to meet emergencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 4032. A bill to amend certain provisions of law relating to the naval service so as to authorize the delegation to the Secretary of the Navy of certain discretionary powers vested in the President of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4033. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to detail scientific and technical employees of the War Department or the Army, and the Naval Establishment, to duty in privately owned plants and laboratories; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4034. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to accept and use gifts, devises, and bequests for schools, hospitals, libraries, museums, cemeteries, and other institutions under the jurisdiction of the War Department or Navy Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4035. A bill to facilitate the performance of research and development work by and on behalf of the War and Navy Departments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4036. A bill to provide for furnishing transportation for certain Government and other personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4037. A bill to authorize the sale of naval stores at naval establishments to members of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, to other specified or authorized persons or activities, to such additional persons as may be authorized by regulations to be promulgated by the Secretary of the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 4038. A bill to authorize the enlistment and appointment of women in the Regular Navy and Marine Corps and the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FENTON:

H. R. 4039. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McMAHON:

H. R. 4040. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

H. R. 4041. A bill to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. R. 4042. A bill to control the export to foreign countries of gasoline and petroleum products from the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 4043. A bill to change the order of priority for payment out of the German special deposit account, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 4044. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to create a commission to make an inquiry and report with respect to war claims; and to provide for relief for internees in certain cases; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 4045. A bill to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 4046. A bill to amend section 1602 of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

H. Res. 265. Resolution making H. R. 3488, a bill to declare certain rights of citizens of the United States, and for the better assurance of the protection of such citizens and other persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes, a special order of business; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact the necessary Federal legislation whereby all moneys collected

from Pennsylvania employers under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act are returned to the Commonwealth for the administration of the Pennsylvania unemployment-compensation law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States on Federal contribution to old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States not to approve the agreement for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States that the existence of the United States Marine Corps be assured by amendment to any merger bill, such amendment specifically providing that the United States Marine Corps shall continue to serve as our Nation's amphibious troops and as a force in instant readiness to protect our Nation; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to roads providing access to veterans' homesteads; to the Committee on Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EATON:

H. R. 4047. A bill for the relief of Edmund Huppler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. R. 4048. A bill for the relief of William Price; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILLIPS of California:

H. R. 4049. A bill for the relief of Lee Freddie Lambert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 4050. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Moke Tcharoutcheff, Mme. Lucie Baptistine Tcharoutcheff, and sons, Raymond and Robert Tcharoutcheff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

698. By Mr. LARCADE: Petition of residents of Jennings, La., relative to S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

699. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mrs. W. Waring, Orlando, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

700. Also, petition of Miss Matilda Oberd, Sarasota, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

701. Also, petition of the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requested veto of the Taft-Hartley labor bill; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

702. Also, petition of the Council of the City of New York, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opposition to the Wolcott bill, H. R. 3492; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

703. Also, petition of William H. Boese and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

704. Also, petition of Mrs. Evelyn Scott and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

705. Also, petition of Mrs. S. L. Apgar, Clearwater, Fla., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

706. Also, petition of Myles N. Murry and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to legislation to increase student veteran allowances under the GI bill of rights; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JULY 1, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Teach us, our Father, how to look at the things we see, and to look at them without bias or prejudice. We may not know how much of our troubles are caused by refusing to look at the facts or by viewing them so differently.

We are all too familiar with "dirty looks," "scornful looks," "unbelieving looks," "black looks." Give to us discerning and understanding looks. With the truth waiting to be looked at, discovered, and applied, forgive us when we refuse to look at it or to welcome it. If Thou wilt help us to cast the mote of prejudice and pride out of our eyes, then shall we see clearly.

We pray for good sight and good sense, in the name of Jesus Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, June 30, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 49. An act to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; and

H. R. 3961. An act to provide increases in the rates of pension payable to Spanish-American War and Civil War veterans and their dependents.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 715. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for investigatory personnel of the Federal Bureau of Investigation who have rendered at least 20 years of service; and

S. J. Res. 124. Joint resolution to enable the President to utilize the appropriations for United States participation in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration for meeting administrative expenses of United States Government agencies in connection with United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration liquidation.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to sit today during the session of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate this afternoon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy be permitted to sit this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF LEO F. RAYFIEL TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, July 8, 1947, at 10 a. m., in the Senate Judiciary Committee room, room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of LEO F. RAYFIEL, of New York, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of New York, vice Hon. Grover M. Moscowitz, deceased. At the indicated time and place, all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], chairman; the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB]; and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN].

BENEFITS FOR FILIPINO WAR VETERANS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication from the President of the United

States, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Finance:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 1, 1947.

Hon. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
President of the Senate pro tempore,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am transmitting a draft of a bill "To provide a more satisfactory program of benefits relating to active service in the armed forces of the Commonwealth of the Philippines during World War II, and for other purposes." I request the early consideration of this measure by the Congress.

The proposed legislation would enlarge veterans' benefits available to Philippine Army veterans who were called and ordered into the service of the armed forces of the United States pursuant to the military order of the President dated July 26, 1941. Under the provisions of the First Supplemental Surplus Appropriations Rescission Act, 1946, all veterans' benefits were taken from this group except those providing compensation for service-connected disabilities or death (which are paid on the basis of one Philippine peso for each dollar authorized) and benefits of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, under contracts entered into prior to February 18, 1946.

The draft submitted would revise the compensation benefits on a practicable basis and would restore the following classes of benefits which were taken away by the Rescission Act: (1) Educational, (2) hospitalization for service-connected disability, and (3) burial and funeral allowance. Existing benefits under the National Service Life Insurance Act would not be altered except to extend for 2 years the time within which eligible persons may apply for gratuitous insurance benefits after the death of a veteran who was deemed to have been issued such insurance under the law. This extension would not be limited to cases involving Philippine Army veterans, but would be of general applicability. However, it is designed primarily to afford relief to the dependents of Philippine Army veterans who were unable to make the necessary applications for benefits by reason of the extended occupation of the Philippines by the enemy. The proposal also contains general administrative and penal provisions which are deemed necessary to carry out its provisions. Further details of the proposed legislation are set forth in the enclosed section-by-section analysis.

You will recall that upon approving the Rescission Act I took exception to that portion of the act which limited veterans' benefits available to Philippine Army veterans. I stated, among other things, that enactment of that legislation did not release the United States from its moral obligation to provide for the heroic Philippine Army veterans who sacrificed so much for the common cause during the war. Practical difficulties in administering benefits to such veterans were recognized and, accordingly, I referred the matter to the Secretary of War, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and the United States High Commissioner to the Philippines to prepare for me a plan to meet these difficulties.

On May 18, 1946, I submitted to the Congress the plan evolved by these officials. In my communication I stated in part:

"The record of the Philippine soldiers for bravery and loyalty is second to none. Their assignments were as bloody and difficult as any in which our American soldiers engaged. Under desperate circumstances they acquitted themselves nobly.

"There can be no question but that the Philippine veteran is entitled to benefits bearing a reasonable relation to those received by the American veteran, with whom he fought side by side. From a practical point of view, however, it must be acknowledged that certain benefits granted by the GI bill of rights cannot be applied in the case of the Philippine veteran. * * * [Enactment of the proposed legislation] will clearly indicate to the Filipinos that it is the purpose of the United States Government to do justice to their veterans. More important, it will provide the help so direly needed by many Filipinos who served our cause with unwavering devotion in the face of bitter hardship and wanton cruelty."

Those statements are equally applicable at this time.

The legislation proposed last year was passed by the Senate but failed of enactment in the closing days of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

This year I requested an Interdepartmental Committee, consisting of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of War, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and the United States Ambassador to the Philippines, to reconsider the problem and submit its recommendations. After extended study the committee recommended enactment of the enclosed draft of a bill and the legislation which is pending before the Congress to restore the benefits of the Missing Persons Act to Philippine Army veterans. In its latest report, with which was submitted the enclosed draft of a bill, the committee stated:

"It is the view of the committee that, if the proposal submitted with this report and the mentioned legislation pending before the Congress are enacted into law, the discrimination against Philippine Army veterans brought about by the First Supplemental Surplus Appropriation Rescission Act, 1946, will, so far as possible, be removed and that substantial justice will have been done such veterans."

I concur in these views of the committee and, accordingly, urge upon the Congress the early enactment of the proposals in question.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

RESOLUTIONS OF NEBRASKA STOCK GROWERS' ASSOCIATION

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD 13 resolutions adopted by the Nebraska Stock Growers' Association, at its fifty-eighth annual convention, held at North Platte, Nebr., June 12–15, 1947.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS OF NEBRASKA STOCK GROWERS' ASSOCIATION, PASSED AT THEIR FIFTY-EIGHTH ANNUAL CONVENTION, HELD AT NORTH PLATTE, NEBR., JUNE 12–15, 1947

RESOLUTION 1. HOOF AND MOUTH DISEASE

Whereas the outbreak of hoof and mouth disease in our neighboring country of Mexico constitutes the gravest threat ever before experienced to our Nation's livestock industry, to the population of our country who are dependent on meat and many livestock and dairy products for their daily food and to the economy of our Nation in general; and

Whereas our State of Nebraska stands among the highest in production and feeding of cattle, swine, and other livestock to which hoof and mouth disease is a grave menace: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Nebraska Stock Growers' Association assembled in annual convention at North Platte, Nebr., June 14, 1947, commends officials of the Department of Agriculture for working out a joint program with Mexico to stamp out the disease and respectfully urges that the proper departments of Government in Washington do everything within their power to expedite the program now under way to eradicate hoof and mouth disease in our neighboring country of Mexico, that the Bureau of Animal Husbandry be given ample funds to carry on the work of eradication, that the Mexican border be patrolled properly until such time as a border fence can be completed and thereafter in such a manner as is deemed necessary to absolutely prevent any animals from entering the United States from Mexico and that these and other measures deemed necessary to safeguard our country from the ravages of hoof and mouth disease be carried out with strict diligence until such time as Mexico is declared free of hoof and mouth disease by the proper authorities.

RESOLUTION 2. SANITARY EMBARGO

Whereas the outbreak of hoof and mouth disease in Mexico emphasizes the importance of the sanitary embargo provisions (sec. 306–A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, which prohibits the importation of livestock or dressed meat products from any country where foot and mouth disease exists: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge our Representatives in Congress vigorously to oppose any effort to modify that provision in any manner.

RESOLUTION 3, 28–36 HOUR LAW

Whereas the present 28–36 hour law has adequately met all necessary humane requirements in connection with the transportation of livestock by rail; and

Whereas it is proposed to enact a new law and replace the present law which would be very burdensome to shippers and without any apparent benefit: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge the continuation of the law in its present form.

RESOLUTION 4

Whereas members of our association are firm believers in free economy and expansion of business as needs be without the shackles and hindrances of regulations that only serve to restrict and hamper production; and

Whereas many Federal laws relating to labor relations as an outgrowth of the war emergency are hampering and are detrimental to the reestablishment of full peacetime production and promotion of national unity; and

Whereas full establishment of business and expansion thereof cannot be obtained under the present tax load and cost of government which has increased some 371 percent in the past 7 years, all of which must be borne by the taxpayer: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Senator KENNETH B. WHERRY and the entire Nebraska delegation in Congress be commended for their work and leadership toward the ending of OPA, support of the Hartley-Taft bill and other legislation leading to the lowering of taxation and the lessening of cost of Government by fuller economy and elimination of costly bureaus and commissions.

RESOLUTION 5. MEAT INSPECTION

Whereas the House Appropriations Committee has recommended that the cost of Federal meat inspection be passed back onto the industry; and

Whereas this service originated in 1905 as a public health measure and has thus well served the consumers; and

Whereas the change proposed undoubtedly would drive many packers out of interstate commerce and might also have a harmful effect on the morale of the service: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge the Senate to restore the funds to carry on this essential service.

RESOLUTION 6. RECIPROCAL TRADE

Whereas the proposed program of writing new trade treaties with sharp reductions in tariff rates is a direct threat to the restoration of stable conditions in agriculture, industry and labor in this country; and

Whereas many foreign countries are now making bilateral agreements which are directly in opposition to the United States' program for multilateral agreements, and will make such program ineffective so far as opportunity for exports from this country is concerned; and

Whereas it is now impossible to forestall the conditions that will exist in 2 or 3 years when new agreements made now will become fully effective: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we strongly oppose the making of these new agreements and tariff reductions because it is opposed to the national interest and unfair and unequitable to American agriculture, industry, and labor; and be it further

Resolved, That we wholeheartedly endorse and support testimony presented to the United States Congress by the American National Livestock Association in support of this policy.

RESOLUTION 7. PLEDGE TO PRODUCE

Whereas we are deeply gratified that the livestock industry no longer is hamstrung by Government controls, such as price ceilings, slaughtering quotas, OPA, edicts and regulations and the uncertainty and confusion created therefrom; and

Whereas we in the livestock industry are happy to be relieved of the yoke of Federal subsidies and price controls on livestock and meat and are permitted to produce under a free economy so fitting to a free nation; and

Whereas our own American people as well as people living in conquered and war-scarred foreign lands are still badly in need of meat and livestock products; and

Whereas some of our imports of cattle have of necessity been halted for sanitary protective reasons thus tending to shorten our meat tonnage: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we pledge ourselves for continued high production so far as possible to the end that the supply of meat will fill the demand.

RESOLUTION 8. PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ADMINISTRATION

Motion made and carried to table Resolution No. 8.

RESOLUTION 9. ROADS AND HIGHWAYS

Whereas the livestock, agricultural products, and the hundreds of other products grown, produced, or manufactured in our country cannot be properly marketed or transported without good roads and highways; and

Whereas the range area of Nebraska, commonly called the sand hills, is almost without adequate all-weather highways and many ranchers find it necessary to travel as much as 50 miles over sand hills trails before reaching a highway; and

Whereas the trucking of our livestock, hay, and other products to a rail loading point or to central markets and the hauling in by truck of our concentrated feeds, grain, and all other ranch supplies is very difficult and costly; and

Whereas livestock cannot be trucked over rough and nearly impassable roads only in very small numbers per trip with much shrink and a maximum of bruises and some crippling of such animals and with great loss of time en route; and

Whereas it becomes more difficult each year to trail cattle across the premises of others while on the way to a railroad loading point: Therefore be it

Resolved, That our association urge our county boards of commissioners, the State department of roads and irrigation, and the Federal Public Road Administration to work in close cooperation in formulating a program for the construction of both east-west and north-south all-weather highways across our vast range area with the thought in mind, not only transportation of our products, but also relieving some of our present highways of the heavy traffic now necessary for them to bear and the ever-increasing need for more and better roads both in peacetime and war.

RESOLUTION 10. CATTLE AND BEEF INDUSTRY COMMITTEE

Whereas the Cattle and Beef Industry Committee, representing the various segments of the industry, have done some very effective work; and

Whereas there will doubtless be a need for further cooperation in the study and working out of cattle and beef problems and the promotion of meat products: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we urge the continuation of this committee and their work and that full support be given it.

RESOLUTION 11. NATIONAL LIVESTOCK AND MEAT BOARD

Whereas the National Livestock and Meat Board is carrying on a most valuable service to our industry in its program of bringing before the public the value and necessity of meat in our diets; and

Whereas the field remains broad for further research into the valuable proteins, minerals, acids, and various other highly desirable properties which meat contains; and

Whereas the meat board has performed a most excellent service in the educational field on meat: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this association hereby expresses its appreciation and gives full endorsement to the National Livestock and Meat Board.

RESOLUTION 12. AMERICAN MEAT INSTITUTE

Whereas the American Meat Institute has been carrying on an extensive and valuable Nation-wide meat advertising program; and

Whereas we firmly believe this program has been highly effective in advertising and popularizing meat; and

Whereas there will be greater need in the future for such carefully planned attractive and educational advertising: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we express our appreciation and hearty approval of the commendable efforts of the American Meat Institute and urge continuance of their program.

RESOLUTION 13. NATIONAL LIVESTOCK TAX COMMITTEE

Whereas we believe that the work of the National Livestock Tax Committee has been of great value to the livestock industry and through their diligent efforts to clarify the regulations of the Internal Revenue Office we have received great benefit; and

Whereas there still exists a need for the service of the committee: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we urge the continuation of this committee and that full support be given it.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 3861. A bill to allow to a successor railroad corporation the benefits of certain carry-overs of a predecessor corporation for the purposes of certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code; with amendments (Rept. No. 406).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 1508. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to express the intent of the Congress with reference to the regulation of the business of insurance," approved March 9, 1945 (59 Stat. 33); without amendment (Rept. No. 407); and

H. R. 770. A bill for the relief of Norman Abbott; without amendment (Rept. No. 408).

TERMINATION OF CERTAIN EMERGENCY WAR POWERS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted a report (No. 339, pt. 2), setting out the statutory provisions appearing in Senate Document 42 (80th Cong., 1st sess.), relating to termination of war controls, and indicating how such provisions are affected by the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 123) to terminate certain emergency and war powers.

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. LANGER, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation two lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. 1538. A bill for the relief of the city of Harriman School District; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

S. 1539. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mrs. Anna Richard Lone Dog and other heirs of James Richard, deceased, to certain lands;

S. 1540. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mrs. Anna Richard Lone Dog and other heirs of Sophia Richard, deceased, to certain lands;

S. 1541. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Elsie Kills Plenty DeSersa a patent in fee to certain land; and

S. 1542. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Clyde Cecil Banks a patent in fee to certain land; to the Committee on Public Lands.

(Mr. SPARKMAN introduced Senate bill 1543, to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 1544. A bill for the relief of Arthur De Filippis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 1545. A bill to authorize a bridge, roads and approaches, supports and bents, or other structures across, over, or upon lands of the United States within the limits of the Colonial National Historical Park at or near Yorktown, Va.; to the Committee on Public Works.

AMENDMENT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION ACT RELATING TO GI LOANS FOR HOUSING

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on yesterday the President signed the bill

continuing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for 1 year, with its powers considerably limited. One of the powers thus taken away from the RFC is that of handling GI loans for housing.

I think the Congress made a terrible mistake in doing that; and I believe that unless the Congress restores that power, there will be a much more difficult time in providing housing, particularly for our returned veterans.

So I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill on that subject.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1543) to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONALITY ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. WILEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 518) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the nationality of citizens who were unable to return to the United States prior to October 14, 1946; which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

STUDY OF OPERATIONS OF WHOLLY OWNED GOVERNMENT CORPORATIONS

Mr. BYRD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 138), which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Whereas a number of corporations which have been created under State law are wholly owned by the Government of the United States; and

Whereas the provisions of the Government Corporation Control Act require the liquidation, on or before June 30, 1948, of all wholly owned Government corporations which have not prior to such date been incorporated by act of Congress; and

Whereas, as a result of such requirement, the Congress will be called upon during the second regular session of the Eightieth Congress to examine into the purposes and activities of these corporations in order to ascertain whether any of them should be chartered by act of Congress and continued, whether any of them should be merged with other Government corporations, whether any or all of their activities should be transferred to other Government agencies, or whether they should be dissolved and liquidated; and

Whereas certain of these corporations or their functions are related to or dependent upon the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or its functions; and

Whereas the Committee on Banking and Currency has proposed to make a comprehensive study of the operations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries for the purpose of determining whether its extension beyond June 30, 1948, is desirable: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study of the operations of all wholly owned Government corporations with a view to ascertaining (1) which corporations should be chartered by the Congress, (2) which corporations, or activities thereof, should be merged or consolidated in the interests of efficiency and economy, and (3) which corporations should be dissolved and liquidated. The committee shall report to the Senate, not later than March 1, 1948, the results of its study together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it deems desirable.

INVESTIGATION OF SO-CALLED REAL-ESTATE LOBBY

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, yesterday the President of the United States reluctantly signed the so-called rent-control bill. His message in that connection was very critical. He pointed out that in this body we should have taken action on the housing shortage facing our people. Furthermore, he stated that the actions of certain real-estate lobbyists were most reprehensible and questionable. He suggested that it might be a good idea for an investigation to be made of the activities of the real-estate lobby.

In that connection, Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to submit a resolution authorizing such an investigation, and I request that it be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 139) submitted by Mr. TAYLOR, was received and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

Whereas the President of the United States in a message to Congress dated June 30, 1947, has charged that "One of the most stubborn obstacles in the way of any constructive housing program has been the opposition of the real-estate lobby. Its members have exerted pressure at every point against every proposal for making the housing program more effective. They have constantly sought to weaken rent control and to do away with necessary aids to housing. They are openly proud of their success in blocking a comprehensive housing program. This group has sought to achieve financial gains without regard to the damage done to others. It has displayed a ruthless disregard of the public welfare;" and

Whereas the President of the United States has further found that this lobby has, through its brazen operations, been able to block programs essential to the need of American citizens, and that practices of this real-estate lobby have been "clearly subversive of representative government"; and

Whereas the said real-estate lobby has, through the use of apparently dishonest and illegal methods, prevented the construction of homes urgently needed by veterans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation into the activities, connection, methods, and financing of all organizations and groups, commonly known as the real-estate lobby, which are seeking to influence legislative or executive action detrimental to the maintenance of fair and stable rents and prices for new housing and to increased construction of shelter for the people of the United States and especially for demobilized veterans of World War II and their families, during the period of the Seventy-ninth and Eightieth Congresses.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such corrective legislation as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 1, 1948.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable, and is authorized, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000 shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 49. An act to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 3961. A bill to provide increases in the rates of pension payable to Spanish-American War and Civil War veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Finance.

A SOCIAL-SCIENCE COMPREHENSIVE—SURVEY BY WILLIAM G. CARLETON

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a survey entitled "A Social-Science Comprehensive," by William G. Carleton, published in the Journal of Higher Education, which appears in the Appendix.]

SOVIET DILEMMA—ARTICLE BY BARNET NOVER

[Mr. McGRATH, on behalf of Mr. McMAHON, asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Soviet Dilemma," by Barnet Nover, published in the Washington Post of July 1, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATES AND UNITED STATES SCHOOL AID—EDITORIAL FROM THE JACKSONVILLE (FLA.) JOURNAL

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "States and United States School Aid," published in the Jacksonville (Fla.) Journal of June 20, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE STEEL SITUATION

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, a subcommittee of the Small Business Committee, under the leadership of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], investigating steel scarcity, has been doing a marvelous job. I have followed their efforts with interest and approval, and to the best of my ability have attempted to make contributions.

I am in receipt of a letter from Mr. Frank R. Nichols, president of Nichols Wire & Steel Co., of Davenport, Iowa, relating to the problem concerned. It not only gives an analysis of the conditions now existing, but offers constructive suggestions in addition thereto. Mr. Nichols tells directly why subsidy payments at taxpayers' expense are wrong and why they reject such payments. This firm expresses the sentiment of the great people of Iowa and I hope of our Nation. I know that the people of the great Middle West agree when he says:

We dislike the idea of having the Government subsidize us out of the taxpayers' pocket, to cajole us into doing what it was proper for us to do.

I commend this forthright statement. I ask unanimous consent that the letter referred to be incorporated at this place in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NICHOLS WIRE & STEEL CO.,
Davenport, Iowa, June 21, 1947.

The Honorable GEORGE A. WILSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WILSON: Since my visit with you a couple of weeks ago, I have thought a great deal about the bad steel situation, and my company is taking action in a way which I believe will interest you. We are returning housing nail subsidies paid to us by the RFC in the amount of $3,600, and are waiving claims previously made for $4,420, an aggregate amount of $8,020. Our company is returning this money, and waiving its claims, for the following reasons:

1. It was clearly our responsibility to make as many nails as possible, and we dislike the idea of having the Government subsidize us out of the taxpayers' pocket, to cajole us into doing what it was proper for us to do.

2. Through many vicissitudes, we have stood on our own feet without governmental financial assistance for forty-odd years, and we don't want to, nor do we need to, lean on Uncle Sam.

These payments were made from October 1, 1946, to March 31, 1947, for nail production beyond a quota established on average production figures. They were paid to us and all other nail manufacturers to stimulate production in an effort to alleviate the nail shortage that bedeviled the housing program, and were ostensibly to cover overtime and added expense.

An additional subsidy of $7 a ton was paid to producers of wire rods when their rods were sold to be made into nails. The RFC has also paid subsidies on pig iron to be used for housing purposes.

Hundreds of thousands of dollars have been paid out to the steel industry at a time when its profits were the highest in history. As far as I know, Inland Steel is the only company which has previously rejected a subsidy.

The subsidy has not been paid for nail production since March 31, and I am informed that nail production has dropped. But the black market in steel nails still exists. A decline in production since subsidies stopped indicates to me a lack of responsibility on the part of the industry.

Another example of the same thing is the baling wire situation. According to Department of Agriculture statistics, total bale tie requirements for 1947 will be 156,500 tons. Last year 123,757 tons of bale ties were produced and less will be made this year. The deficiency spells the loss of about $100,000,000 worth of hay at an average price of $20 a ton for all types, as estimated by Fred K. Sale, secretary and treasurer of the National Hay Association.

Hay is largely converted into meat and milk. Look how they have already increased in price. The feed situation may further be complicated by a poor corn crop, because of the wet, cold spring. If shipping hay is short because of a lack of baling wire, hay will go up, and the prices of meat and milk may be still higher.

Well, there isn't a nonintegrated bale tie manufacturer in the country who can get sufficient steel to operate at capacity. That's wrong, and the steel industry is responsible.

In an effort to help out, my company is making aluminum bale ties, which are considerably more expensive than steel at legitimate prices. We should have steel, but if we don't make something the farmers who ordinarily buy our ties through our dealers won't have anything with which to bale their hay, and comparing the price of aluminum ties to legitimately priced steel, the difference is only about 75 cents a ton of hay. Black market prices on ties, and that's where a lot of them are, almost entirely offset this difference.

The steel sheet situation is a well known public disgrace, and needs no further amplification, nor does the deplorable condition that exists in pipe.

Integrated mills, which represent the bulk of the steel industry, have a very great responsibility to the country at large as well as to their stockholders, and they must accept it. They must manufacture steel in types and sizes to meet the country's needs. They must see to it that all of their products shall be distributed for the benefit of the country at large. They cannot permit situations to arise which will bedevil entire communities and economic groups. If the industry does not do its level-all-out-best in attempting to solve these problems, it will not be working in the public interest. I quote a comment made by Fowler Hamilton, former special assistant to the Attorney General: "Private property only passes into public hands when it fails to serve the public interest."

"Free us from controls and we'll do the job" was the attitude of the industry. Well, it's not working out that way.

My point is that if the steel industry doesn't police itself, the Government inevitably will have to police it. Legitimate purchasers of steel in this country are not going to remain forever at the mercy of speculators, nor is the Government going to continue to pay subsidies for production. To accept subsidies is simply to invite governmental control. In fact, it is a kind of governmental control.

Now, steel which is reaching the black market, and the premium export market, if spread equitably among regular mill customers, would go a long way toward alleviating the shortages everyone faces.

I do not suggest that this country should not export steel. The economy of the United States is definitely committed to a large continuing export program. I do believe, however, that mills should not charge foreign purchasers premiums for steel because this takes an undue amount from our domestic economy. Over and beyond that, the foreign purchaser is going to feel that he has been gouged at a time when he was unable to do anything about it. When real competition sets in, this will surely mean an unfavorable reaction.

There is world-wide famine in certain types of steel. The United States is the only country that can begin to furnish the materials required. Present demand far exceeds the industry's capacity to produce. There just isn't enough to go around.

Everyone who buys steel knows this to be the case; no one resents the demand which exists. But there is a definite resentment, however, and it is bitter. It is rooted in the fact that steel finds its way from producing mills into the hands of opportunists and speculators who capitalize on the situation by charging outrageous prices at a time when legitimate users are unable to get steel at mill prices from the producing mills.

There are pious declarations and deprecatory statements by the ream to the effect that not much steel is getting to the black market. I say there's a lot of it.

Estimates recently made are to the effect that only 5 percent of the steel production may be reaching the black market, but that in any case, it is no more than 10 percent, or possibly 15 percent. Well, let's use only 2.5 percent against 91,000,000 net ingot tons, and the figure is 2,275,000 tons. That's a lot of steel. Italy's production in 1940 was 3,000,000 tons, and that country was at war. France, at war, made 6,000,000 tons in 1940.

At an average black-market price of $150 a ton, and, I believe that's low, the 2,275,000 tons of steel extends into $341,250,000. To be more conservative, let's cut that in half, and the amount in dollars is $170,625,000. Any way you slice it, it is a lot of steel, and a lot of money.

Now, nothing can be done immediately about increasing capacity to satisfy world demand, but measures can now be taken—and most certainly should be taken by the steel industry—to correct present evils.

The steel industry's brilliant record during the war is attributable to its management. The Iron and Steel Division of the WPB was staffed by men from the industry. Steel went where it was needed in vast floods and at legitimate prices.

These same men are still in the industry, and are, by and large, still employed by the same mills. Most of the mills are members of the American Iron and Steel Institute, which without doubt is one of the finest industry organizations in the world. It seems to me that without in any way laying themselves open to antitrust prosecution, the top management of the mills could meet, under the auspices of the institute, and discuss ways and means of exercising self-control. It is suggested that they—

1. Agree to stop making tie-in sales, i. e., scrap for semifinished or finished steel.

2. Determine from the various governmental agencies the steel needs of the country. Agree to manufacture steel in sizes and types to fill the needs as effectively as possible.

3. Ship steel where it is needed, and not just to territories where there is no freight absorption.

4. Agree not to accept premium prices for steel that is exported.

5. Utilize existing open surplus capacities to the utmost in converting for legitimate customers at legitimate prices.

I know personally that far-sighted steel management is much concerned by the fix they are in, and I urge them to make this effort. I know that they are aware of the feeling which is growing against their companies. Many of their old customers are definitely up against it, and some have been forced to go out of business. As for ourselves, we don't get enough steel to justify our company name, and we're staying in business only because we have largely converted to aluminum.

Respectfully yours,
NICHOLS WIRE & STEEL CO.,
FRANK R. NICHOLS, *President.*

JUNE 21, 1947.

MANAGER LOAN AGENCY,
RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR SIR: Attached hereto is our check in the amount of $3,600, which is a return of premium payments received under EPPR–11, Housing Nails, in accordance with the following tabulation:

October 1946	$720
November 1946	1,280
December 1946	340
January 1947	1,260

We hereby waive all claims submitted for payments due us in February and March, in an amount of—

February 1947	$1,840
March 1947	2,580

This action is taken because, upon having given a great deal of thought to the principle of accepting subsidies, we find that we are opposed to it.

I will appreciate acknowledgment of your receipt of this check and our waiver to claims made for payment of February and March subsidies.

Yours very truly,
NICHOLS WIRE & STEEL CO.,
FRANK R. NICHOLS, *President.*

REPORT ON MAJOR GOVERNMENT LENDING AGENCIES

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have delivered to each Senator a copy of the re-

port on Major Government Lending Agencies, prepared at my request by the Library of Congress Legislative Reference Service. In connection with the report I have prepared a statement which I shall not ask time to deliver, but will ask unanimous consent that it be printed as a statement in the RECORD at the proper place.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR GEORGE D. AIKEN, OF VERMONT

REPORT ON MAJOR GOVERNMENT LENDING AGENCIES

Mr. President, I have here a report on Major Government Lending Agencies, both incorporated and unincorporated, which has been prepared by the Legislative Reference Service. First, I wish to commend the quality of this report which the Legislative Reference Service constructed entirely on its own initiative, being guided only by my request for the information in which I outlined broadly the fields which might most profitably be covered. The work was done under the direction of Dr. George B. Galloway, senior specialist in political economy with the Legislative Reference Service, and is indicative of the greatly improved staff work resulting from the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

The report deals mainly with actual Federal lending activities, as distinguished from the guaranteeing of loans made by private business, and provides detailed information with respect to those agencies on:

1. Origins and purposes.
2. Management, organization, and ownership.
3. Extent and type of loans.
4. Number of employees and administrative expenses.
5. Assets and liabilities.
6. The controversial subject of competition with private enterprise and other matters of primary importance.

This report contains a great deal of information of interest, and I have arranged for the duplication, by the Legislative Reference Service, of a supply which will be distributed to each Member of the Senate.

Mr. President, it is not my intention to take up the time of the Senate with a confusing amount of statistical detail, but it occurs to me that it would be timely to point out a few salient facts. These figures are representative of conditions at June 30, 1946, which, of course, would be the latest date for which any extensive compilations would be available.

At that time the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury showed that there were 35 Government corporations and certain other unincorporated agencies which had loans receivable. However, of the total number of agencies, this report deals primarily with only 14, 11 of which are corporations and 3 are unincorporated lending agencies. The activities of the remainder were too small to justify detailed inclusion in the study.

One of the most important pieces of information reflected in the report is that, from the inception of the agencies dealt with up to June 30, 1946, loans had been made in the total amount of $41,200,000,000; credits to principal amounted to $35,100,000,000; these loans had earned interest of $4,200,000,000; and there was outstanding at June 30, 1946, a gross principal of approximately $6,000,000,000.

It should be pointed out that the credits to principal include write-offs of loans. Cumulative figures for these write-offs are unfortunately not available but, for the fiscal year 1946, they amounted to some $7,000,000 for the 14 agencies involved in this report. Write-offs undoubtedly were much higher in prewar years.

As of June 30, 1946, the total amount of principal and interest reported to have been in default exclusive of write-offs, is $265,000,000; less than 1 percent of the total amount of loans which had been made, and I wish to emphasize that these lending activities have been going on since as far back as the year 1917. Also, the sum in default is just over 4 percent of the total amount of principal outstanding at June 30, 1946.

This record speaks fairly well for the various Federal loan programs in general and of their administration in particular. The recoveries which some agencies have made are little less than remarkable, especially in view of the fact that the great majority of loans were authorized by the Congress, and actually made, in cases where private credit was not obtainable due to depressed business conditions, poor risks, and other unfavorable factors.

It might be of interest to the Senate to have a summary break-down of these total loans of $41,200,000,000.

In round figures, $8,900,000,000 were loaned to private business. This would include banks, manufacturing concerns, and private enterprises of all kinds.

Seven billion one hundred million were loaned in the interest of public and private housing.

Twenty-four billion two hundred million dollars of these loans fall in the general category of agriculture, but it must be remembered that included in this category are the financing activities of such organizations as the Commodity Credit Corporation and the Rural Electrification Administration, both of which are productive of definite benefits to industry as well as to agriculture.

Slightly less than $1,000,000,000 had been loaned to foreign countries by the Export-Import Bank. This does not include the commitment of one and two-tenths billions to France.

It should be remembered, too, Mr. President, that these lending agencies represent a very considerable asset to the Federal Government.

While I do not have readily available any balance sheet figures for the 14 selected agencies with which this report is principally concerned, I would direct attention to the balance sheet starting at page 33, covering all Government corporations and those unincorporated agencies which had loans receivable or tangible assets.

As of June 30, 1946, their combined assets amounted to $42,300,000,000 as against liabilities of only $20,000,000,000.

Of the capital interest of approximately twenty-two and three-tenths billions, the Federal Government owns twenty-one and nine-tenths billions, while about four-tenths of one billion is owned by private interests outside the Federal Government.

A portion of both the assets and liabilities are, of course, interagency, that is, are receivables and payables within the Federal structure and the balance sheet should be viewed in that light.

Of further interest is the fact that, as of June 30, 1946, the total investment of the Federal Government in the group of agencies included in the balance sheet was $39,800,000,000, of which, as I have stated earlier, the Government retains a proprietary interest of some $21,900,000,000. But it must not be forgotten that, although the Government has invested $39,800,000,000 in these agencies, their assets amounted to $42,300,000,000 on June 30, 1946. That is, the book assets exceeded the total Government investment by $2,500,000,000.

A variety of methods has been utilized by the Congress in connection with the financing of lending agencies. For example, in some instances the capital has been provided by direct appropriations and in others by financing from other Government corporations and credit agencies and by sales of obligations to the United States Treasury and to private interests. Furthermore, the capitalization in some agencies operates as a revolving fund and repayments of loans, together with the interest, is available for the financing of new lending activities.

In connection with this report, Mr. President, I wish to make a few remarks regarding the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has recently received the report of the Comptroller General on the RFC, reflecting the condition of that agency at June 30, 1945. The Comptroller's report shows that, from the date of its inception to June 30, 1945, the RFC had a profit from lending activities, that is, from the Corporation's primary function, of around $500,000,000. This fine showing, however, is definitely qualified by the fact that RFC has been able to borrow from the Treasury at an interest rate of 1 percent and then lend the same money at higher interest rates. While this has naturally resulted in a profit to RFC, it has also resulted in a loss to the Treasury of the difference between the interest cost to the Treasury of borrowing the money to lend to RFC and the interest paid to the Treasury by RFC.

During the war, the RFC was extensively engaged in a variety of activities foreign to its basic purpose. Those wartime functions included preclusive buying of strategic materials, stockpiling, subsidization, and so forth. The Comptroller's report indicates that, at June 30, 1945, the cost to the Government from these activities amounted to some $2,400,000,000 and by June 30, 1946, had risen to approximately $5,000,000,000. The Comptroller further advises that these losses, or costs, may reach almost $9,000,000,000, without deducting the value of certain facilities acquired by RFC and possibly to be declared surplus without reimbursement or credit to the Corporation. Those assets are very considerable and their value will offset to a substantial extent the total cost of RFC's wartime enterprises.

Mr. President, I have several thoughts in mind in bringing this report to the attention of the Congress.

First of all, it seems to me that there is a tendency on the part of the Congress and the public to consider appropriations and the agencies to which they go purely as additional burdens on the taxpayer. I believe that some recognition is due the considerable number of Federal organizations that not only pay their own way in substantial measure, but actually earn a profit on the Government's investment.

Another thing I have in mind is that this report shows that all of the Government's aid in the form of loans is not going to agriculture. Out of the total of $41,200,000,000 loaned to June 30, 1946, approximately seventeen billions were distributed between foreign countries and domestic business and housing. While it is true that some $24,000,000,000 have been loaned in the broad fields of agricultural interests, I repeat that a considerable portion of that money served the direct interest of business enterprises.

It should be of interest to the Senate to know that of a group of 10 Government lending agencies, for which figures were available, that through June 30, 1944, their administrative expenses amounted to less than three percent of the total of their loans during the same period. This should help to refute the broad charges of general maladministration that are frequently heard in the Congress and elsewhere.

This report is not simply a collection of statistical data. It contains much information of historical and other value. For instance, the report touches on the subject of Federal competition with private enterprise in the lending field. It points out that there

have been thus far three major surveys on the subject and concludes that the result of all three tends to establish fairly definitely that the cries of Federal infringement on private business activities are raised by a very small group and are certainly not representative of the attitude of business at large.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I might take this opportunity to direct to the attention of the Senate that, in his budget message for the fiscal year 1948, the President submitted eight recommendations regarding Government corporations.

Three recommendations which are of vital financial importance would—

1. Repeal the authority of Government corporations to issue federally guaranteed obligations to the public;

2. Require that the Treasury be reimbursed for the full cost of money which the Treasury advances to Government corporations; and

3. Liquidate a certain group of Government corporations.

The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has already started work along these lines. We believe that restricting the method of capitalizing Government instrumentalities to direct advances through the Treasury Department will provide the Congress with a control over functional activities which it completely lacks at the present time and will undoubtedly result in a substantial increase in economical operation.

The committee is very interested in seeing to it that all Government activities which receive money from the Treasury for purposes such as the making of loans, pay out of their profits to the Treasury not less than the cost of that money to the Treasury. At the present time it is a fact that the taxpayers of this country are financing a part of the public debt which could be financed by the interests which are enjoying the money.

Under the Government Corporation Control Act, which was passed in December 1945, the General Accounting Office has been given permanent authority to conduct annual audits of all Government corporations and I would like to say for the record, Mr. President, that the reports which have thus far been submitted to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments have been excellent. They are comprehensive and written in a style fully intelligible to the layman, and I think it is safe to say that they set a precedent in the quality of Federal fiscal reporting.

One of the many results of these audits is that the General Accounting Office is able to bring to the attention of the Committee those corporate activities which may profiably and safely be liquidated.

Along with its other activities in the field of management, the committee is keeping a close watch on all Government corporate activities and intends to make suitable recommendations to the Congress as rapidly as possible.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that Mr. TABER had been appointed a manager on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2700) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, vice Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN, excused.

The message announced that the House had insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 254) for the relief of the legal guardian of Glenna J. Howrey, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. JENNINGS, Mr. REEVES, and Mr. CRAVENS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 22) relative to House bill 493, concerning the possession, sale, transfer, and use of dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, ETC., APPROPRIATIONS, 1948

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3311) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

Mr. LUCAS obtained the floor.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hill	O'Daniel
Ball	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Holland	Overton
Bricker	Ives	Pepper
Bridges	Jenner	Reed
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Kilgore	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Knowland	Russell
Byrd	Langer	Saltonstall
Capper	Lodge	Smith
Chavez	Lucas	Sparkman
Connally	McCarran	Stewart
Cooper	McCarthy	Taft
Cordon	McClellan	Taylor
Donnell	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McGrath	Tydings
Dworshak	McKellar	Umstead
Ellender	McMahon	Vandenberg
Ferguson	Magnuson	Watkins
Flanders	Malone	Wherry
Fulbright	Martin	White
Green	Millikin	Wiley
Gurney	Moore	Williams
Hatch	Morse	Wilson
Hawkes	Murray	Young
Hayden	Myers	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness in his family.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is absent because of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). Eighty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the amendment I shall discuss briefly deals specifically with the Federal aid airport program which was adopted by the Congress of the United States during the seventy-ninth session. The legislation was approved in May 1946, and authorized annual appropriations amounting in the aggregate to $500,000,000, to be expended over a period of 7 years, to aid in the development of civil airports in this country.

The first appropriation made last year amounted to $45,000,000. The President requested an appropriation this year of $65,000,000. The Senate committee has recommended that the second appropriation be thirty-two and one-half million dollars instead of $65,000,000. At this rate, the 7-year program will take 14 years to complete. I submit we are not economizing by cutting down at this time the appropriation for aid to airports. This work must go forward. Sooner or later we are going to have to spend the half billion dollars which we authorized originally. Putting off that expenditure is not a real economy. The need for the development of civil airports at the present time is overwhelming. There is a huge, pent-up demand which could not be satisfied during the war when airport construction and improvement were brought almost to a complete standstill. The materials and manpower needed for this purpose had to be devoted to the war effort. We desperately need new airports and to improve the old ones.

The Federal Aid to Airports Act recognizes that it is as much a Federal responsibility as it is a local responsibility that a well-planned, Nation-wide system of commercial airports be developed for the healthy and even growth of the aviation industry in this country.

The fact of the matter is that we are not getting the airports built that we need. The Civil Aeronautics Board has granted certificates of necessity and convenience to 350 cities. More than 70 of these cities are not now being served by the air lines because of a lack of airport facilities.

In 1941 the air lines of this country owned 350 two-engine passenger planes. The air lines now own, as of today, 450 two-engine passenger planes and 200 four-engine planes. In 1941 we had 23,000 private planes. As of today we have 90,000 private planes, and by the end of 1948 it is estimated that we will have 170,000 private planes using the airport facilities of this country. Our cities were prepared to expend $240,000,000 in excess of the amount which the Civil Aeronautics Administration has been able to program under the appropriations made so far.

More and better airports are a very important contribution to safety in the air, a subject in which we are all interested. When we cut down the Federal Aid to Airports program, we are cutting down on the installation of better lighting facilities, on the improvement of ex-

isting runways, on the lengthening of runways. Additional runways go a long way toward eliminating the stacking of airplanes in the air waiting for space in which to land. Air traffic is now so heavy that the existing airport facilities, particularly in bad weather, are not adequate to cope with it.

Mr. President, I plead with the Senate to restore the appropriation which has been reduced by such an unusual and heavy cut. We have witnessed in the past year one air tragedy after another. Many Americans have perished in these unfortunate accidents. When we cut down appropriations in the name of economy, or for any other reason, we give great impetus to an already existing psychological fear with respect to present air safety which now disturbs the minds of many Americans who are tremendously air conscious. In the name of safety alone, and of the saving of human lives in the future, the present air program should in no wise be impaired or curtailed.

I submit that the airport program was well considered last year, was well thought out by Congress at that time. It is a 7-year plan. Cities throughout the United States agreed with the plan, and one after another proceeded to prepare their own communities to carry out the plan by matching Federal funds for airports in their various communities.

There is one more point that seems to me to be most important. We are all anxious to save as much money as possible. All we are doing here is putting off the spending of money. What happens? All that happens as a result of the delay in the construction of airports is that the desirable airport locations are being snapped up for other uses—for the building of factories and for housing developments. When we get around to building these airports in later years, we shall find that the only locations available are far removed from the cities which they are to serve and in locations which will require a much greater expenditure for grading and conversion into airports.

I am, of course, particularly concerned about the effects of this cut on the development of airports in the State of Illinois. The largest single project in Illinois is Douglas Field in Chicago. That is where the Douglas plant was located during the war. It was one of the great plants which produced munitions and instruments of war which helped to defeat the Axis powers. If the Congress approves the appropriation in the full amount, recommended by the President, for the coming fiscal year for the Federal airport program, the Federal Government will contribute $2,868,750 to the development of Douglas Field, which will be matched by the expenditure by the city of Chicago of $8,506,250. This sum of over $11,000,000 will be spent almost entirely for the acquisition of the land required to build the new Chicago airport, which is sorely needed as a link in the chain of airports across the country. The development of Douglas Field will take a long time; the project is an ambitious one, but no more ambitious than is required by the size of the city of Chicago and its importance to the economy of the Nation. If at this point there is a reduction in the appropriation of the kind proposed by the committee instead of the Federal Government contributing $2,868,750, the Government will contribute only $1,788,750, which constitutes a reduction in the Federal contribution of $1,080,000. This kind of reduction cannot have any effect except to delay and hinder very seriously the completion of this airport. It will mean that for many more years than are necessary, air travel in and out of Chicago will have to be accommodated by a woefully inadequate airport. Anyone who has traveled into or out of Chicago by plane knows that what I am saying is correct, so far as the inadequacy of airport facilities in that metropolitan city is concerned.

The city of Chicago is the second largest city in the United States. The whole economy of the Midwest, and in a large degree the economy of the United States, revolves about the activities carried on there. But not only is Chicago important from an economic point of view; its strategic location in the center of the Midwest area makes it a key point in the defense of the United States. Its importance must be viewed both from the point of view of our economy and our military security.

The Douglas Airport will become one of the chief airfields of the world. Does anyone suppose that we would hesitate to spend enormous sums of money in the construction and improvement of Douglas Field in the event that the safety and security of the United States were endangered by the threat of a military force? No one would hesitate for a moment to spend whatever was required to strengthen that airport as a military matter.

If I may digress for a moment, I should like to make one observation. Every time a great emergency arises the American people rush pell mell to meet the emergency, spending billions of dollars, much of it needlessly, because they would not have to make such large expenditures had they spent money ahead of time in proper planning for an adequate national defense. Anyone who knows anything about the present world situation realizes that in the event of war in the future, attacks will be from the air.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I invite the Senator's attention to a statement which appeared in the press the other day, by the great Chief of Staff of the United States Army, in which he said that if an attack were to be made upon us it would come from the North and hit first the industrial centers of Chicago and Detroit.

Mr. LUCAS. I saw that statement, and that is what I am talking about. I am stressing the importance of this particular section of the country from the standpoint of the future defense of the Nation.

It has become tremendously popular to save a few million dollars here and there, in order to economize, regardless of where the cut is made. If we reduce the program of civil aviation by almost one-half, we delay and hamper it to the point where, if anything should happen, it would cost us billions in the future, which we might save by spending a little more money at the present time. I contend seriously that any cut in this aviation program, realizing what the future may hold in store for us, is utterly false economy.

Because of its location, the city of Chicago is bound to become the hub of the flying universe; and yet for alleged reasons of economy—which, as I previously stated, I deem false economy—we are prepared to delay indefinitely the completion of Douglas Airport.

There is another airport in the State of Illinois which was built during the war. It is not yet quite completed. It was built for military reasons. I refer to the airport at Quincy, Ill. All that the Government has to do is to appropriate $86,000 of Federal funds to complete that airport. The airport in Quincy has been given a certificate of necessity and convenience by the Civil Aeronautics Board. The air lines are anxious to accommodate travelers in and out of Quincy with air-line service, but because of a lack of adequate facilities that cannot now be done. An administration building is desperately needed, additional aprons must be built, adequate access roads must be constructed, and public utilities must be furnished to the building area. If the committee action stands, there will be no Federal contribution at all for the required construction. The Quincy Airport was constructed during the war and needs to be completed with all convenient speed. A reduction in the appropriation would mean that there would be no Federal contribution. The citizens of Quincy voted for a bond issue of $200,000 back in 1941 for the construction of an airport. They took a chance, because they earnestly wanted an airport that would link their city with the airways of the Nation. Yet the proposed reduction in Federal aid to airports would leave them with nothing. The public-spirited citizens of that community are going to have to do without Federal funds next year in the development of their airport.

In the city of Springfield additional approach zones must be constructed; an administration building is sorely needed. The CAA proposed to match a contribution of the city of Springfield of $276,500 with Federal funds of $250,000. Under the committee proposal the Federal Government would contribute nothing to the construction of an airport at Springfield.

Mr. President, here is the capital of the State of Illinois; here is the home of Abraham Lincoln; here is the place where Abraham Lincoln is buried. The city has a wonderful airport. As the result of a great deal of civic pride in the city of Springfield the airport is just about to be completed. If we pass the appropriation bill which has been passed by the House of Representatives and reported by the Appropriations Committee of the Senate, we will delay the completion of that important airport.

I have never been able to understand why it is that the Congress of the United States, once it begins a building program

of some kind, will delay the progress of the project. I just cannot understand it. In other words, the Federal Government encourages a community to go ahead and says to that community, "We will match funds with you in the event you want to construct an airport or a water system in your city," or whatever it may be in the way of a civic project, then it finally turns thumbs down, and later on says, "We have not the money. You will have to wait." I have never been able to understand that. That is exactly what we are doing in connection with the airport program. If we do not want it we should not have started it in the first place; we should not have passed the law last year; we should not have gone throughout the United States of America and encouraged one municipality after another to go into this kind of a program, with the Federal Government matching funds.

The city of Decatur is prepared to spent $300,000 to be matched by CAA funds. Applications are now pending from the air lines to go in and out of that city. But unless an administration building is provided, obviously there can be no use of the airport facilities which are now in that city.

The city of Champaign is prepared to spend $72,500 to be matched by Federal funds. Both of these projects would receive no Federal funds whatsoever if the committee action stands. In total, it would mean that for the State of Illinois, there would be a contribution of Federal funds of only $1,788,750, which would be used exclusively in connection with the Douglas airport if the committee action is sustained; whereas, otherwise, there would have been a Federal contribution of $3,577,250 for fiscal 1948 matched by Illinois contributions of $9,241,250. All of the airports I have mentioned, with the exception of Douglas Field, are class-4 airports. Douglas Field would be a class-5 airport.

Class 4 and class 5 airports are being affected as a result of this cut. That is the kind of airport that is obviously essential for Nation-wide travel.

Refusing Federal funds for the construction of airports means, for the most part, that airport facilities which are partially completed, some of which were constructed as a matter of military necessity during the war, are not going to be used in the near future. It means that we shall leave these facilities undeveloped for more years than are necessary. To my mind, that is not economy. That is waste. I cannot understand an economy drive that postpones the maximum utilization of the resources of this country.

I note in the committee report that one of the reasons assigned for reducing funds for airports is that the committee is of the opinion that Federal funds should not be allocated for building construction at the present time, in view of the housing situation in this country. This painstaking regard for the difficulties in the present housing situation is in marked contrast with the attitude of the Republican leadership regarding the Federal controls of housing.

House bill 3203, now awaiting the signature of the President, removes all controls of building materials over housing and other construction, with the exception of controls over amusement and recreation projects. This, of course, is perfectly in line with the desire to dump Government controls as fast as possible. But what it means is that we shall have fewer houses for veterans. It means that there is no limitation on the size of a house, and valuable building materials may go into luxurious mansions, beach cottages can be constructed, siphoning off materials that are needed for the construction of permanent-type houses. It means that the steel industry is no longer under any obligation to see to it that a certain quantity of steel goes into the manufacture of bath tubs, furnaces, building hardware, electrical wiring devices, and so forth. We are going to have fewer of these as a result of the removal of controls. Our precious building materials are now free to go, without limitation, into factories, stores, public utilities; and the builders of houses will just have to get into the race to get materials to build houses with. But when it comes to reducing appropriations for the construction of airports, we forget what we did with respect to housing, and insist that the needs for veterans' houses is such that we cannot afford to build administration buildings on airports, which are an urgent civilian and military necessity. I do not find any consistency in this attitude.

Mr. President, as I understand the situation, the real reason this cut took place is the fact that last year Congress appropriated $45,000,000, and that sum was allotted to class 1, 2, and 3 airports, and as a result of what the Board did in the allocation of funds, more or less committing itself to class 1, 2, and 3 airports, class 4 and 5 airports have suffered.

The Appropriations Committee is now taking the position, while it is not a matter of record, that the Civil Aeronautics Board had no right to allot what it did and therefore they are giving the Board a little punishment.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. With respect to the $45,000,000 which the Senator has mentioned, will they get that $45,000,000 in addition to the appropriation, or is that out?

Mr. LUCAS. No; it is not out. As I understand, it is allotted to communities that have class 1, 2, and 3 airports, and in the event that those communities can finally comply with the regulations laid down by the Civil Aeronautics Board, they will get that money.

Mr. CONNALLY. They will get the balance of the $45,000,000?

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. And then, in addition, what we give them in the present bill?

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am in sympathy with the Senator's views on this subject. There are a couple of cases in my State of the character mentioned by the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from Texas. There are cases all over the country just like those I am talking about. There are cases in the State of Nebraska, the home State of my friend, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the majority whip, I am sure he will be interested in them. I am sure he might be interested in the situation in Omaha and North Platte.

The fifth region has included in Senate Document No. 14 a $400,000 administration building. They do not, however, mention it in their justification. At North Platte the fifth region proposes development of a new building area to permit adequate clearance between runways and buildings so that an instrument landing system can be installed. Included in the project is a terminal building.

The Senator from Nebraska will not get that under this appropriation.

The Senators from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON and Mr. VANDENBERG] might be interested in Saginaw and Battle Creek. This is a DLA airport and funds are needed now to convert certain military buildings to civil use and to provide the first unit of a permanent administration building. This is a scheduled stop on PCA and is also used by several intrastate carriers. At Battle Creek the prewar administration building and certain other facilities are deemed inadequate. They should be rehabilitated or replaced now.

Recommendations have been made, and if we carry out the airport program as voted on last year, irrespective of politics, these objectives will be accomplished.

Both Senators from Massachusetts may be interested in the project at Worcester. There is no adequate administration building at the airport there at the present time. They have set up $100,000 for that purpose.

I know that both Senators from Nevada are interested in the project at Las Vegas, Nev. The administration building proposed there is an important part of the completely new airport there. The people of the Midwest, where are found the wide-open spaces, need all the airports and all the airport facilities they can obtain, in order to get in and out of that section of the country.

I am sure the Senators from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR and Mr. STEWART] are interested in the situation at Memphis. The Second Region there says that a new administration building is sorely needed in order to accommodate the passengers from 52 scheduled flights daily, provided by five major air lines.

We also find that at Nashville, Berry Field, which is served by two air lines with 52 scheduled flights daily, needs relief from the passenger-handling standpoint, which can be accomplished by the construction of an administration building. We are informed that the existing building is entirely inadequate to accommodate present-day air travel.

Mr. President, to accommodate present-day air travel is what all of us are trying to do.

The two Senators from Maryland no doubt are interested in the construction of a proposed administration building at

Cumberland, Md. A temporary frame building there, which is grossly inadequate, serves as an administration building at the present time, so we are informed. That is a class 5 airport, and the TWA has applied to the Board for permission to operate there. If TWA is granted permission to operate there, a permanent administration building will be needed.

A similar situation exists at Salisbury, Md., where there is no administration building at the present time. Chesapeake Airways are now operating interstate schedules there, and several other air lines are interested.

Also from the list we find that there is need for an administration building at Nogales, N. Mex., and Tucson, Ariz. The Senators from those States no doubt are interested in those projects, which also are listed in the report which I have received.

Mr. President, it is only necessary to run down the list to find one place after another where the funds can be used advantageously in the interest of safety, in the interest of security, in the interest of the further development of a program of aviation. Whoever attempts to stop the development of aviation in this country for a few million dollars, in my humble opinion, will be doing a disservice to the safety and security of the very Nation all of us love.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I wish to tell my distinguished friend, the Senator from Illinois, that I entirely agree with him. At this point I should like to call a particular matter to the attention of the Senator from Minnesota.

The Senator from Illinois has been talking about the provision on page 11 of the report. I realize that it is not a part of the act, but at that point in the report the committee states:

> The committee is of the opinion Federal funds should not be allocated for building construction at the present time in view of the housing situation in this country.

Then the report goes on to say that administration buildings and other necessary buildings at airports can be deferred.

The Senator from Illinois has given several examples of where the proposed cuts might result in false economy, and I specifically wish to ask the Senator from Minnesota today about that matter. I shall give him an example which I think is even more compelling than some of those the Senator from Illinois has mentioned.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I have picked out only a few, at random. This situation exists all over the United States.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course it does.

Mr. President, the Congress has committed itself to a Federal airport program; and relying on the grants-in-aid, many communities, as pointed out by the Senator from Illinois, including the great cities of Chicago and Springfield, Ill., have proceeded in good faith under that program, and have bonded themselves and thus have obtained money with which to build airports.

Out in my section of the country, the city of Seattle and the city of Tacoma, through the medium of the port of Seattle, have spent a great deal of money, and have bonded themselves in that connection, for the purpose of building a huge airport between Seattle and Tacoma, serving a population of approximately 1,000,000 people. There is no adequate airport in Tacoma, a city of 180,000 people. Seattle's Boeing Field is inadequate, because the Boeing Co. itself uses that field most of the time. I think there are approximately 80 schedules a day going in and out of that field to Alaska, Hawaii, and the Orient, and three of four major air lines serve Seattle.

The people of those communities bonded themselves and obtained money with which to build the airport, and the Federal Government gave them a very generous sum—over $1,700,000, as I recall—for the other parts of the airport. Everything is ready except the buildings; there is nothing there but the runways.

The air lines have made contracts with the port of Seattle to move out there, and all the flights are scheduled there, into what we call the Bow Lake Airport.

If that airport stands idle for lack of administration buildings, the result will be not only to jeopardize the activity by air through the natural gateway to the Orient, but, in addition, approximately a million people will not have the use of that airport.

As I have said, all that remains to be done is to construct the buildings there. The contracts have already been made.

I appreciate that the language to which I have referred is not an absolute prohibition; but I say to the Senator from Minnesota that I am fearful that when the port of Seattle and the representatives of the other worthy projects which have been mentioned by the Senator from Illinois come to the CAA for an allocation—and in the case at Bow Lake, all that is needed is the administration buildings; everything else is completed—the CAA will say, "Well, we would like to do this for you, but you know what the Senators told us,"—and they will quote page 11 of the report.

I hope the Senator from Minnesota will clear up this matter as it applies to very worthy projects, such as I believe the Bow Lake Airport in Seattle is, and also many of those mentioned by the Senator from Illinois, so that when their representatives appear before the CAA for allocations for those projects, the allocations will be made. That will result in greater economy to the Government and in the Government's keeping faith in the development of great airports, such as the one I have mentioned.

So I hope the Senator from Minnesota will make clear for the record that this is not a prohibition against a grant-in-aid for that project.

I think the Senator from Illinois probably has the same question in mind.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, of course, the language in the report is not an absolute prohibition.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I appreciate that.

Mr. BALL. It was the opinion of the subcommittee, in going over the projects listed for the fiscal year, covering this $65,000,000 budget request, that an exceptional amount of building and construction was listed. We came across several airports—notably, one at Toledo, I believe—where they have an administration building now, and they need a new one, as many airports do, and they were going to use the funds for that purpose.

The committee was of the opinion that in cutting down the appropriation, such buildings, which are not obsolutely essential to the operation of the airport, should be among the first projects cut down.

Of course, the situation the Senator mentions, where an airport is completed insofar as the runways are concerned, and where an administration building and a control tower are needed for the operation of the airport, presents a situation which falls into an entirely different category. I know the committee had no intention of forbidding that kind of project, and of course the language does not do so.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I appreciate the reply of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in conclusion, I wish to read one paragraph of a statement which was put into the RECORD a few days ago by the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], in which he challenged the figures contained in the committee report concerning buildings. He contends that the report is misleading. He said:

> The $25,200,000 quoted represents total costs of buildings in a contemplated 1948 budget of $65,000,000. Actually the Federal money represented in the proposed building construction is approximately $12,500,000 of the $65,000,000. With the 1948 appropriation reduced to $32,500,000 from the $65,000,000 it is likely that the portion of the funds to be expended on buildings will also be reduced 50 percent or $6,500,000.

One other point, and then I shall yield the floor.

Paragraph (b) of section 5 of Public Law 377, Seventy-ninth Congress, to provide Federal aid for the development of public airports, is as follows:

> For the purpose of carrying out this act with respect to projects in the several States, annual appropriations amounting in the aggregate to $500,000,000 are hereby authorized to be made to the Administrator over a period of seven fiscal years, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947. The appropriation for any such fiscal year shall not exceed $100,000,000 and shall remain available until June 30, 1953, unless sooner expended.

In other words, Mr. President, Congress solemnly authorized an appropriation for projects in States in the amount of half a billion dollars, to be spent in the next seven fiscal years, no appropriation to be made in any 1 year of over $100,000,000. The Congress of the United States laid down that law in the way of an authorization of half a billion dollars, to be spent over a period of 7 years, and went throughout this country, to the cities and States, saying, "This is what the law is, and you can depend on the Congress to carry it out," yet the first opportunity we get, we break

faith with the States and the communities where these air programs have been established.

Mr. President, that is exactly what the Committee on Appropriations is doing in many cases. It is legislating. The Committees on Appropriations of the House and the Senate are taking the power of legislation in their own hands, and defying a law which was passed by the Congress of the United States, and they are doing it times without number.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. Just a moment, until I finish. They are doing it times without number, in order to make a record of economy.

Mr. President, of course the Congress can turn this amendment down, or it can follow the edicts of the Congress as laid down in the Seventy-ninth Congress, a year ago. But certainly when Congress said in the law I have quoted that the States and the municipalities throughout the country were entitled to a 7-year program, half a billion dollars to be spent in that length of time, they had a right to rely upon the Congress as passing the law in good faith. Under the present appropriations, it will take 14 years, instead of 7. This is the wrong approach. The people expecting the program to be carried out according to law will be angry and disappointed.

I now yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois how many times he has heard the argument made on the floor of the Senate, when it was considering a bill authorizing appropriations of various sums of money, that an authorization is not the same as an appropriation. It is a maximum limit, and the Committee on Appropriations and the Congress can later decide how much they think really is needed for a particular activity. The Senator is using the argument in reverse now—that an authorization is the same as an appropriation. I do not know why we have a Committee on Appropriations, if that is true.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator is partially correct and partially wrong. The point I am making is that after we passed this law last year we went out to the States and the cities throughout the country and said, "Here is the program. It is a 7-year program." We said definitely, "We cannot spend over $100,000,000 a year on this program." It seems to me that if we delay the program by failing to appropriate in line with the authorization made on the 7-year plan we are breaking faith with the communities throughout America. Congress said, "You can depend on us to go through with a 7-year program. You can have this. We will authorize it, and we authorize it on a 7-year basis." We say to Tulsa, Okla., for example, "You are going to get this money over a period of 7 years in order to take care of this airport of yours." But they do not get it. In other words, the first year they do not get any money at all, after they have gone ahead and laid their plans, in Tulsa, Okla., in line with the money they are supposed to get from the Federal Government. It does seem to me that under those circumstances the people of Tulsa, Okla., would have every right to conclude the Federal Congress was breaking faith with an obligation due their city. I may be wrong about that, but I think I am right. I think I understand the situation. I see the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] smiling. I do not know whether there is an airport in Tulsa or not. Perhaps he would like to tell us whether there is one or not.

Mr. MOORE. Yes; we have the finest airport in the world in Tulsa.

Mr. LUCAS. That is wonderful. I am glad to know it, and I am glad the airport was built before he had to depend on this 7-year plan, which is now being postponed to 14 years. I suppose next year it will be postponed to 21 years at the rate we are now proceeding.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The situation is even worse when a city goes ahead with a 2- or 3-year plan, as in the case of a port district or county or State, and gets an airport half built, then the contract is canceled, and the equipment is moved. It costs more when they have to resume construction.

Mr. LUCAS. The Federal Government lays out a plan for the city of Quincy, Ill., and says, "You go ahead, and we will take care of you next year, because this is what the Congress has said." Men are sent from the CAA to the city of Quincy to make a contract with them, then after the city has voted bonds to prepare for the airport, the Congress comes along and says, "No, we will economize on you," and stops the construction of the airport before it gets started; and it may be made worthless because of the delay.

I think Congress stultifies itself every time it does a thing of this kind to the people of America, when we pass a law providing for a program 1 year and tell the country, "Yes, you can go ahead, and you may depend on it," and then the next year the Congress puts the meat-ax to it and says, "We do not think Quincy is entitled to an airport, and we do not think Seattle is entitled to an airport, because we want to make a record of economy in this Republican Congress."

Mr. President, that is the whole situation in a nutshell. I yield the floor.

Mr. President, at this time I offer my amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 51, line 9, it is proposed to strike out "$32,500,000" and insert "$65,000,000", and strike out the remainder of the language under the heading "Federal aid to airport program, Federal Airport Act."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois ask for a vote on his amendment?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes. First I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. MURRAY. I should like to make an inquiry of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], in charge of the bill. What action has been taken with reference to the field offices of the Department of Commerce? Has that matter already been acted upon?

Mr. BALL. That was acted upon yesterday. I may say the Senate increased the House allowance by $375,000, providing for 17 field offices which were eliminated by the House. The purpose of that increase was to provide for at least one field office in every State.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am informed that the Commerce Department made a very careful study of this matter and decided that the sum of $4,069,000 was the minimum amount required to continue the services of 77 field offices during the fiscal year 1948. The allowance made by the Senate committee will be totally insufficient to maintain those offices in an efficient manner. It will not provide the proper staffs to enable them to conduct the affairs of those offices in such manner as to be of any service whatever to the small business concerns of the country that use them.

Mr. BALL. I will say to the Senator from Montana that it is proposed to close a number of offices that have been open in the last half of the current fiscal year. The staff will be about the same in the offices that will be left.

I may say that the Senator from Montana is correct in his statement that the Department asked for restoration of the full budget request for the field offices. The Department, however, did not justify the restoration to the satisfaction of the committee. The Department could not show us that there was enough business at the field offices to justify the amount requested.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am informed by the Commerce Department that the offices which will remain and operate under the proposed appropriation will have to function with about 50 percent of the personnel they have had, and consequently will not be able to render the character of service that was intended to be rendered by the Commerce Department. The staff of specialists trained especially to serve the small business concerns will be completely eliminated, the Department informs me. Instead, each larger office that remains would operate with merely two generalized staffs, one dealing with foreign trade and the other with domestic trade and industry. The adoption of the amendment recommended by the Senate committee will not correct this understaffing of the field offices. It seems to me it would be much better to discontinue them entirely than to have offices set up over the country which will not be properly staffed, which will not be able to render efficient and satisfactory service, and which will result in a mere boondoggling program. I, for one, would rather see the program entirely eliminated, if it is not going to be conducted in a manner in which it can render satisfactory and efficient service to the small business concerns of the country.

Mr. BALL. The amount added by the committee for 17 field offices pro-

vided for four employees each, which is what the Department of Commerce informed the sponsor of the amendment would be needed. These field offices do not originate the informational material which is furnished the businessmen making inquiries. They are purely service offices. All they do is handle the inquiries. The information is gathered at the Washington office of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

Mr. MURRAY. Does the Senator assume that under the new arrangement they will be able to furnish the necessary information and assistance and give the needed advice to the small business concerns all over the United States?

Mr. BALL. They cannot furnish all the advice that is necessary to small business, but they can certainly furnish two or three times the amount of service which the Bureau was able to furnish before the war, because they have two or three times as many employees now for the field service as they had then, and more offices.

Mr. MURRAY. I understand that during the war many hundreds of thousands of small concerns disappeared from the scene, and since that time many hundreds of thousands of new concerns have been brought into operation. The new small-business concerns will not be equipped with the proper managerial advice and understanding that is necessary for them to be successful. The program set up last year by the Commerce Department was intended to assist the small concerns in meeting the problems which will arise as the result of the competition that is now developing, and various other problems that will arise as the result of changing conditions. These small concerns will find themselves unable to cope with present conditions unless they have some very competent advice and assistance.

It seems to me that it is very important to the country that these small concerns be kept in operation. A great many thousand of them will probably go bankrupt in the near future unless they are given this kind of advice and assistance. It will be of no help to them, after they reach the brink of bankruptcy, to try to give them assistance. Now is the time, when they are getting started, to have the kind of assistance which the Commerce Department has gone to a great deal of trouble to provide. It has established and placed in operation an organization to provide such assistance, and now we come along and destroy the whole thing.

It seems to me that the whole purpose is merely to make a record for the Republican Party, to show that they are saving some funds. It seems to me that that is an unwise economy program. It will do a great deal of injury to the small concerns of the country. I think the Senate should reconsider the question, and restore the funds requested by the Commerce Department. Unless we do that, I believe that we should eliminate the entire program, because in my judgment it will become nothing but a boondoggling activity which will bring discredit to the Commerce Department and the Nation, and will do a great deal of damage.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider the action——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS].

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	Myers
Baldwin	Hoey	O'Conor
Ball	Holland	O'Daniel
Barkley	Ives	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Jenner	Overton
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Reed
Bushfield	Kilgore	Revercomb
Butler	Knowland	Robertson, Va.
Byrd	Langer	Robertson, Wyo.
Capper	Lodge	Russell
Connally	Lucas	Saltonstall
Cooper	McCarran	Sparkman
Donnell	McCarthy	Stewart
Downey	McClellan	Taft
Dworshak	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Ellender	McGrath	Tydings
Ferguson	McKellar	Umstead
Flanders	McMahon	Vandenberg
Fulbright	Magnuson	Watkins
Green	Malone	Wherry
Gurney	Martin	White
Hatch	Millikin	Wiley
Hawkes	Moore	Williams
Hayden	Morse	Wilson
Hickenlooper	Murray	Young

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS].

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I want to take just a few minutes in which to oppose the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois. He is proposing to double the amount in the bill for the Federal Air Force program. The sum of thirty-two and a half million dollars is provided in the bill, and the Senator wants to increase that amount to $65,000,000, which is the budget estimate. Much of his argument was a reprimand of the Senate Appropriations Committee for having the temerity, apparently, not to appropriate the $100,000,000 a year which is authorized in the authorizing act. Apparently it is wrong for the Congress not to appropriate the full amount authorized, although it was perfectly all right for the President of the United States to freeze $41,000,000 of the $45,000,000 appropriated last year for this program.

Mr. President, on page 883 of the House hearings Representative STEFAN, the chairman of a subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, in questioning Mr. Wright, developed the fact of the Presidential freeze of $41,000,000 of this fiscal year's funds, and also the fact that out of the total of $110,000,000, $45,000,000 last year and $65,000,000 in the budget request of this year, the CAA, which administers this program, actually expected to spend only $54,000,000. The other $56,000,000 would be committed during the fiscal year 1948, but not spent until after July 1, 1948. So that all the House and Senate Appropriations Committees have done has been to deduct two and a half million dollars from the $56,000,000 which might have been obligated in the fiscal year 1948 but not spent under the program proposed by the CAA.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am wondering why the CAA gave the budget an estimate of $65,000,000 as the amount they could spend for this program if they said they could spend only the amount which the Senator suggests.

Mr. BALL. I cannot explain why the CAA does certain things. I was quoting from the House hearings in which Mr. Wright said that all they expected to be able to spend during 1948 was $55,000,000.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But they asked the budget for even more than $65,000,000.

Mr. BALL. They asked the budget for $85,000,000.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In other words, they must have estimated that they could spend somewhere in the vicinity of $85,000,000; but the budget said the amount should be $65,000,000.

Mr. BALL. Mr. Wright told the House Appropriations Committee that he could not spend over $55,000,000.

Mr. MAGNUSON. So the Senate committee gave him $32,000,000?

Mr. BALL. No. I am coming to that point. The CAA incidentally told the staff of the Senate committee last April that they expected to have obligated, of the $45,000,000 appropriated for this fiscal year, by June 1, $21,000,000. In the hearings toward the last of May they had obligated exactly $2,200,116. That is all that has been obligated of the $45,000,000 appropriated for this fiscal year, plus $600,000 for administrative expense.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, there is a difference between an obligation and an allotment, but I think the Senator will agree that the Civil Aeronautics Board has been allotted part of this amount.

Mr. BALL. According to their own figures on page 424 of the Senate hearings, they have allocated—which is an entirely different thing from obligated—exactly $36,284,662, and that includes $1,000,000 for future administrative expense. That leaves $9,000,000 of last year's $49,000,000 unallocated and unobligated and available to go on immediately with the program of the larger airports.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. The only point I want to make with respect to the allocation of this fund is that it is certainly a moral obligation. The Civil Aeronautics Board has contracts with communities, and the communities are still trying to comply with the regulations laid down by the Civil Aeronautics Board. While it is not strictly a legal obligation, it is a moral obligation, and we cannot get away from it.

Mr. BALL. I agree with the Senator, if the community finally goes along. Let

me tell the Senator how these funds were committed, as Mr. Wright calls it. The airport plan, which had to be published before any commitments of the fund could be made, was finally published on January 15 of this year, and on that same date Mr. Wright sent out letters committing virtually all the funds. Since that time many of the commitments have fallen through because many of the smaller communities, when they find out how much it is going to cost them to maintain a class 1, 2, or 3 airport according to CAA standards, decide that it is too expensive, that the maintenance cost will be too large, and they abandon the project and decide to get along as best they can with their own funds.

The junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] was just calling to my attention the fact that in Virginia, in a little community of approximately 600 people, CAA has allocated $100,000 to build an airport. That little village will never be able to afford the $5,000 or $6,000 or $10,000 annual maintenance cost of that airport, and it is a ridiculous allocation of funds.

A great many of those allocations will not become obligations, because the local communities will cancel out, and those canceled funds then will be available in the Administrator's discretion to be applied to appropriations for class IV and class V airports, where the work, in the opinion of the subcommittee, is most essential.

In the subcommittee we tried to secure the adoption of language which would require the Administrator, as the sponsors to whom funds have been committed cancel out, to use the balance for the larger airports in the same States. Such a provision was objected to on a point of order, because it would lessen the Administrator's discretion, and was not in the bill. But the Administrator has that discretion, and in my opinion he should exercise it as the smaller airports cancel out.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course, the reason why many of the funds were not actually allocated and committed was that the program was started only last year. Many of the communities had to issue bonds, and in many cases elections were needed. Materials were hard to obtain. This program was intended to be accelerated as the years go by and as expenditures under the so-called 7-year plan were made.

Under the action of the Senate Appropriations Committee, whereas last year, at the beginning of the plan, $45,000,000 was given for these purposes, at a time when in many cases the communities were not quite ready to expend the entire amounts, yet today, instead of moving forward with the plan, our committee proposes that the amount of the appropriation be reduced to $32,000,000 for this year, whereas there will be many more commitments and obligations and actual contracts.

I was just talking to the general manager of the port of Seattle's Bow Lake Airport. They have already contracted for the buildings. The Government already has spent $4,500,000 there. The big expenditures incident to the completion of the airport, in the interest of that community and in the interest of the Government, should come in the next few years.

It seems to me that to revert to what was done last year does not give an accurate comparison, in view of the conditions.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, the Senator himself has reverted to that.

As a matter of fact, only $2,500,000 has been obligated from the appropriation made last year, leaving an unobligated balance of approximately $42,000,000.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That happened because they were not ready to proceed at that time.

Mr. BALL. In addition, the present bill provides $32,000,000, which will make a total of approximately $75,000,000 of unobligated funds which will be available to the CAA for obligation and expenditure in the fiscal year 1948. If that is not an extensive program, I do not know what it is, particularly in view of Mr. Wright's own statement before the House committee that all they felt they could actually spend in 1948 was $55,000,000.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is a far cry from $32,000,000.

Mr. BALL. But they will have $74,000,000 in all, and all they believe they will be able to spend is $55,000,000.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Much of that is committed.

Mr. BALL. I am sorry; it is not committed. They wrote a letter saying:

> If we can reach a sponsor's agreement and sign a contract with you, the money is here.

But they have signed contracts for only approximately $2,000,000.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The communities have gone ahead, but it has taken approximately a year for them to get ready. There is a moral obligation. Of course, the contracts have not actually been signed on the dotted line; but many of the communities have held elections, and many of them now are ready to go ahead. It took about a year to get the program started.

Mr. BALL. Yes; and Mr. Wright said, as shown at page 883 of the House committee record, that he expected, even if he received the full budget estimate of $65,000,000, plus the balance of the $45,000,000 which was appropriated this year, to actually spend only $54,000,000 or $55,000,000 during the fiscal year 1948. He wanted the other $56,000,000 as a cushion which he could obligate this year, for expenditure after July 1, 1948.

By the action taken by the House and by the action of the Senate committee, that amount is cut down; we have cut down the amount the CAA can obligate this year, for expenditure in future years.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment of the Senator from Illinois will be defeated.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this program was studied over a long period of time. The Congress fixed a specified sum to be spent over a period of years, and specified that not over $100,000,000 would be spent in any 1 year.

Today the country is, for the first time, beginning to go forward with this program. As stated by the Senator from Minnesota, the program could not be set up, and was not set up until about January of this year. The allocations were made thereafter.

But after the allocations were made, in many instances the communities were required to conduct bond elections. They had to find ways and means to match the Federal money. The beginning of the program has been somewhat retarded because of that fact.

But the program is in the minds of the people, because today in the United States our communities are much more air-minded than ever before.

If we were to tell some of the small communities that they could not have an airport, we would greatly discourage the people of those communities, because they are looking forward to commerce by air, and rightly so. If we are to become a commercial nation—and if we do not, it is highly doubtful that we shall ever be able to pay off our obligations—we must keep abreast of commerce by air, and the airport program is an important part of that activity.

Mr. President, it seems to me that in keeping with the promises we have made to the people of the respective States and communities, we should carry on the program for this year. The amount of the budget estimate should be restored. There is no question that the restoration of the amount of the budget estimate should take place now. The total amount will be nowhere near $100,000,000, the amount fixed as a limit for expenditure in any 1 year. This matter has been studied by the Bureau of the Budget and by the communities and by the CAA. Unquestionably the amount of the budget estimate should be restored, and I understand that the amendment of the Senator from Illinois proposes that that be done.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois. On this question the yeas and nays have been demanded and ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business. The Senator from Washington, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. The Senator from Kansas, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are unavoidably detained.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], who are unavoidably detained, would vote "yea," if present.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], who are absent on public business, would vote "yea," if present.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], who is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference at Geneva, Switzerland, would vote "yea," if present.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is absent because of illness, has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and would vote "yea," if present.

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 39, as follows:

YEAS—38

Aiken	Johnson, Colo.	O'Conor
Barkley	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Connally	Kilgore	Overton
Downey	Lucas	Pepper
Ellender	McCarran	Russell
Flanders	McCarthy	Sparkman
Fulbright	McClellan	Stewart
Green	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Hatch	McGrath	Tydings
Hayden	McMahon	Umstead
Hill	Magnuson	Watkins
Hoey	Murray	Wilson
Holland	Myers	

NAYS—39

Baldwin	Gurney	Morse
Ball	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Revercomb
Bridges	Ives	Robertson, Va.
Brooks	Jenner	Robertson, Wyo.
Bushfield	Knowland	Saltonstall
Butler	Langer	Taft
Byrd	Lodge	Vandenberg
Capper	McKellar	Wherry
Cooper	Malone	White
Donnell	Martin	Wiley
Dworshak	Millikin	Williams
Ferguson	Moore	Young

NOT VOTING—18

Brewster	Eastland	Smith
Buck	Ecton	Taylor
Cain	George	Thomas, Utah
Capehart	Kem	Thye
Chavez	Maybank	Tobey
Cordon	Reed	Wagner

So Mr. LUCAS' amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have an amendment on the desk, which I wish to offer.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington offers an amendment, which the clerk will read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 60, line 23, it is proposed to strike out "$21,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$21,052,000."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment, adding $52,000 to the allocation given by the committee to the Weather Bureau, is to accomplish something that has long been of concern to me. I hope the Senator from Minnesota will accept the amendment. For 12 long years I have been trying to get the Weather Bureau and the Appropriations Committee of both Houses to establish a general weather station in the Pacific Northwest. For 12 long years I have been unsuccessful. I had a measure of success in 1941, but the war broke out, and that ended it. The Weather Bureau, under its annual appropriations maintains a general weather station in San Francisco.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I discussed the amendment with the Senator. I am a little surprised that he did not present it to the committee. I doubt whether we will have much success with it in conference, in view of the fact that there was no presentation of it to the House committee. I do recognize the force of the Senator's argument, and will take the amendment to conference if it is agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Minnesota will take the amendment to conference. I have appeared, I should say, either 9 or 10 times before different appropriations committees on this matter. This year I did not appear before the Appropriations Committee because again I understood that the Weather Bureau, within its budget estimate, would try to work out the station, so I left it with the Bureau. Now, however, I understand that because of the cut in the appropriation the Seattle station again will be cut out, and again we will receive our weather information from a thousand miles away, from San Francisco.

Mr. BALL. I suggest to the Senator that he furnish a detailed memorandum on this item for submission to the conference.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have a statement and a complete breakdown which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There have been many requests during the past 10 years for the establishment of a Weather Bureau district forecast center in the Pacific Northwest. It is understood that previously the Weather Bureau requested funds for the establishment of such a center in 1941 but funds for this purpose were not provided in the Bureau's appropriations at that time. Owing to the war, the request for the establishment of this forecast center had to be deferred.

During the war, owing to the labor shortage and the excessive demands on agriculture, it became necessary for the Weather Bureau of the Department of Commerce, in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture, to provide special forecasts and information designed especially to assist in every type of operation on the farms and on the ranges. In recent years operators in all branches of business, industry, and commerce have found many additional uses of weather information and forecasts to prevent losses and delays due to weather. An additional item of importance is that the increasing requirements of aviation have made it necessary for the Government to collect a much greater quantity of weather information daily, including frequent soundings of the upper air, than was the case prior to the war. These reports will be even more useful if they can be studied and issued for agriculture and business as well as for aviation. The charting and study of these additional reports and the many new uses of weather information and forecasts for agriculture, business, industry, and commerce have doubled or tripled the work at forecast centers and other offices of the Bureau.

The forecasts, warnings, and advices for Washington, Oregon, and Idaho are prepared in the Weather Bureau forecast center at San Francisco, which also serves California and Nevada. The additional load of public service plus the much larger number of weather reports which must be handled makes it more and more difficult for the forecast center at San Francisco to attend to the requirements in this large area of the Pacific Northwest.

In addition to this service, the important seaports in the Pacific Northwest require small craft and storm warnings for the protection of shipping from Pacific storms, which are especially dangerous along these northern coasts. The prompt dispatch, display, and distribution of these warnings, plus the urgency for the immediate issue of warnings of dangerous weather to farmers, stockmen, and others, make it imperative that the forecast center for these purposes shall be located at a communications and forecast center within the Pacific Northwest.

The Weather Bureau already has an aviation forecast center at Seattle for service to aircraft operating within the United States and also has a limited forecast staff for protection of aircraft flying between the States and Alaska. Under these conditions it is possible to use the information collected at Seattle for aviation purposes and, with a very moderate expenditure of funds to provide an additional staff, take care of the service which is needed for agriculture, business, industry, and commerce.

The estimated costs of adding forecasts, warnings and advices for agriculture, shipping, industry, business, and commerce to the specialized forecasts which are now supplied to aviation from the center at Seattle are as follows:

5 additional forecasters	$21,060
10 additional aides to the forecasters for charting and preparing reports[1]	22,100
Transportation of household goods and matériel	1,500
Travel	1,125
Communications (teletype service and telegraph tolls)	4,327
Office supplies and materials	1,095
Office equipment (machines, furniture, etc.)	1,052
Total	52,259

[1] This would provide the minimum staff required for 24-hour service during a 7-day week.

Of this amount approximately $2,500 for some of the costs of transportation of household goods, office equipment, and other items would be nonrecurring, making the cost after the first year approximately $49,749 per annum.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
WEATHER BUREAU,
Washington, April 30, 1946.

Mr. WARREN HARDY,
Seattle, Washington.

DEAR MR. HARDY: We have your letter of April 19 regarding weather forecasts for the

Seattle area and regret to learn that you consider these unsatisfactory.

It is true that forecasts for your State originate in our forecast center at San Francisco. There are 12 district forecast centers for the United States which means that each center must serve a number of States. The area embraced in the San Francisco district includes central and southern California, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, and Idaho. Estimates have been submitted for establishment of a separate forecast center at Seattle for the Pacific Northwest but funds have not been made available. To set up a district forecast center at Seattle would entail considerable expense for quarters, communication facilities and personnel and could not be undertaken in the absence of a specific appropriation for that purpose.

Although the general forecast for Washington is issued at San Francisco, the forecast for Seattle and vicinity is issued by our office at Boeing Field. This forecast is an adaptation of the general State forecast to fit local conditions. We can assure you that our Seattle officials fully realize the importance of accurate forecasts to Seattle interests and are endeavoring to provide the best possible service. A copy of your letter is being sent them for their information.

Yours very truly,

I. R. TANNEHILL,
Chief, Division of Synoptic Reports and Forecasts.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a few moments ago the Senate defeated the amendment which I offered to the bill, which was as follows:

On page 51, line 9, strike out "$32,500,000" and insert "$65,000,000", and strike out the remainder of the language under the heading "Federal aid to airport program, Federal Airport Act."

That amendment was defeated by only one vote. That vote definitely indicates that many Senators are interested in carrying out, as far as we possibly can the language and the allocations of the Airport Act, as it was passed by Congress during the last session.

Mr. President, I am for economy, but I say again I believe the cutting of the appropriation represents false economy. I am sure that as a gesture toward economy the Senate should agree to the amendment I am now about to offer. Instead of an increase to $65,000,000, I offer the following amendment:

On page 51, line 9, strike out "$32,500,000" and insert "$50,000,000," and strike out the remainder of the language under the heading "Federal Aid to Airport Program, Federal Airport Act."

I offer the amendment, Mr. President, as a gesture toward economy, by reason of the closeness of the vote just had. It seems to me that by reason of the attitude of the Senate, represented in the vote just taken, the Senator from Minnesota could well afford to agree to the amendment and take it to conference.

Mr. President, I offer the amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 51, line 9, it is proposed to strike out "$32,500,000" and insert "$50,000,000," and to strike out the remainder of the language under the heading "Federal aid to airport program, Federal Airport Act."

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Minnesota. Does the item in question in any way involve the matter of air safety, the safety of passengers traveling by airplane?

Mr. BALL. It does not. It is purely an item for Federal assistance in the construction and improvement of airports.

Mr. LODGE. As one who flies all the time I am, naturally, interested in the matter of air safety. From what I can read it is not so much a question of more airports as it is a question of having the airports we now use improved, that is, by installation of ground control, approach, and all the devices of modern science. Does the item in any way involve the improvement of our existing airports?

Mr. BALL. It involves improvements in some cases, the lengthening of runways, and items like that. It does not involve landing devices, ILS, ground control, approach lights, and all that sort of thing. That is contained in another item in the bill. The maintenance and operation of the airways are not included.

Mr. LODGE. Then this is not an air-safety item?

Mr. BALL. It is not directly.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I do not agree with the Senator from Minnesota. The item does go in the direction the Senator from Massachusetts is talking about. Any time the Federal Government aids in the construction of an airport by furnishing the equipment that is necessary to operate that airport, the Government is aiding in the safety of it. For instance, in Quincy, Ill., we need financial aid for final construction work to make the airport safe. However we do not receive any money from the appropriation for this class of airport. If the Senate should raise the amount contained in this item even to $50,000,000, as now suggested by me, the chances are that the airport at Quincy, Ill., which was built during the war for military purposes, but not quite completed until the war was over, will receive the necessary equipment to complete it, so that a four-motored bomber can land there at any time. That is an example of what I am talking about. I still contend that there are spots all over the country, like Quincy, Ill., that ought to be taken care of by appropriating a few million dollars, but which is not provided under the pending appropriation bill. If the Senate will agree even to the $50,000,000 now proposed by me it will do much toward increasing the safety and the security of those who travel by air.

Mr. President, I simply do not agree with the Senator from Minnesota at all when he says that the money provided in this item will not in any way affect the safety of airports. One of the reasons for appropriating the money is to provide greater safety.

Not only that, Mr. President, but something more is involved. Chicago has for years needed a class-5 airport. We need it now, and the need may soon be even greater, if some generals who should know what they are talking about are giving us correct information about the future of the country and the world. Yet at a time when the world is in such troubled condition, and when other countries are becoming more and more dependent upon the United States, we in Congress quarrel about a few millions of dollars to take care of an aviation program which is essential to the defense and safety of the country.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota made a statement a few moments ago which struck with some force upon my ear, and that was that the amount proposed in the amendment of the Senator from Illinois could be used for the lengthening of runways. There come to my mind quite impressively two airports in this country, and I know there must be others, which within the last 2 years have been dropped from commercial travel because of the length of the runways. If the amount of the proposed increase were kept in the appropriation and used for the purpose of lengthening the runways of the airports, I must say that I would feel very much inclined to support the amendment. I want to put this question to the Senator from Minnesota. Is there any other appropriation in the bill that will permit the lengthening or extending of some of the runways of existing airports?

Mr. BALL. I will say to the Senator that this is the only appropriation covering actual construction of airports, but as I pointed out in commenting on the previous amendment, Mr. Wright's own testimony before the House committee was that all he could spend on this airport program during the fiscal year 1948 is $54,000,000. He has an unobligated balance of $42,000,000 from this year's appropriation, $41,000,000 of which was because the President froze it and would not let him expend it. He will have in addition to that $42,000,000, the $32,500,000 contained in the bill, or a total of $74,500,000, as compared to his own estimate of $54,000,000, as what he can spend. So if the amount were increased in the bill, all the Senate would be doing would be to give the CAA another $17,500,000 of Federal aid which they can keep on their shelf and dish out later on.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me ask the able Senator, what is the amount of money that is carried over and is now in the hands of the Government?

Mr. BALL. Forty-two million dollars is unobligated.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is unobligated money. Can any part of that $42,000,000 be used for the extension and lengthening of the runways of existing airports?

Mr. BALL. All of it can.

Mr. REVERCOMB. All of it can be used for that purpose?

Mr. BALL. It is all in the discretion of the Civil Aeronautics Administrator. He can allocate it to any project he sees fit, and he is directed in the act to allocate it to projects which are essential to improvement of the Federal airways system.

Mr. REVERCOMB. How much is added by the bill to the $42,000,000?

Mr. BALL. Thirty-two and one-half million dollars.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Making a total of how much?

Mr. BALL. Seventy-four and a half million dollars, which is available for expenditure this year, whereas Mr. Wright's own estimate is that the maximum he can spend is $54,000,000.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I want to ask again, so that we may have it perfectly clear in the RECORD. Any part of that $74,500,000 may be used for the lengthening of the runways of existing airports?

Mr. BALL. Of course.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Any part of it can be used, but there is nothing to say that it shall be used for that purpose; is that not correct?

Mr. BALL. No; the act itself guides that. We cannot dictate in the appropriation bill what particular project shall be approved. The Civil Aeronautics Administrator is given that discretion in the authorizing act, which, of course, directed him to establish a priority list of projects in the order in which they are necessary to improve the Federal airways system.

Mr. LODGE. But under that act the Administrator could use some of it for lengthening runways, or he could use none of it for lengthening of runways, if he so desired?

Mr. BALL. He must sign a project agreement with the sponsor, and that probably covers a number of things beside lengthening runways and building runways.

Mr. LODGE. Exactly. There are those who think that it does not help air safety to increase the number of airports, but that it does help air safety to increase the length of runways. I ask the Senator whether or not he can confirm this statement: We have no assurance that this money will be used for lengthening runways. It could be used for other things not so directly related to air service.

Mr. BALL. As a matter of fact, in the original $65,000,000 budget request $12,500,000 was allocated to building construction.

Mr. LODGE. We could place a limitation in the bill——

Mr. BALL. No; we cannot. That is legislation. We tried to place a similar limitation in the bill in committee, and a point of order was raised. It would limit the discretion guaranteed to the Administrator by law.

Mr. LODGE. It boils down to this: If we vote for the funds we have no assurance that they will be devoted to improving air safety.

Mr. BALL. Not at all. As a matter of fact, the project which the Senator from Illinois is discussing has nothing to do with runways. The entire two-million-dollars-plus which was allocated to the Douglas Airport in Chicago is being used for the purchase of land.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The able Senator, in conducting the hearings upon this appropriation, certainly received some testimony with respect to how the money would be used. I should like to ask him at this point if there was any indication from the testimony that some of the money would be used for lengthening runways. Was any estimate made before the committee by those who were seeking the appropriations that any part of the seventy-four and a half million would be used for the lengthening of runways?

Mr. BALL. Yes. Quite a few projects were submitted to the committee, as well as to the House committee, which involved the lengthening of runways. I invite the Senator's attention to the language in the committee report on page 11:

> The committee is of the opinion Federal funds should not be allocated for building construction at the present time in view of the housing situation in this country. Administrative buildings and other necessary buildings at airports can be deferred until the veterans of World War II are properly housed, and the funds allowed by the House can be used for improving landing strips, extending runways, and other projects that are vital to the safety of flying.

In other words, the committee recommended to the CAA that it use the funds appropriated for projects which are vital to flying safety.

Mr. REVERCOMB. It seems to me that when one of the established air lines removes its planes from two airports to which it had been flying for 40 months or more, giving as the sole reason that the runways were not sufficiently long for safety, we have definite proof that the lengthening of runways contributes to air safety. I have referred to two instances in which it would be a safety measure to lengthen the runways. It follows as a proved fact that the runways should be lengthened for the sake of safety in the use of those airports for commercial and private flying.

I should like to ask the able Senator a question, so that we may have a clear statement in the RECORD. Did those seeking appropriations before the committee indicate that in such cases as the two I have mentioned the money would be used for the extension of runways?

Mr. BALL. They had a number of other projects besides actual improvement of runways and landing strips It was the recommendation of the committee—which I hope they will pay some attention to—that they give priority to that kind of project. As I have previously pointed out, in hurrying to get all of the $36,000,000 of the $45,000,000 appropriation of last year committed, they have allocated hundreds of thousands of dollars to build airports at little villages of less than 1,000 population, which cannot possibly raise the funds by taxation to maintain them after they are built. I do not think that makes good sense.

Mr. REVERCOMB. We have no argument upon that point. I am speaking of airports of substantial size. The point I am interested in is this: Was it indicated in the hearings that the $74,500,000 which will be available under the bill as proposed by the committee will be used for the extension and lengthening of runways at the larger airports?

Mr. BALL. Yes; and it was so recommended by the committee.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, it seems to me that this is a pretty poor place to try to economize in our expenditures. As I understand, virtually every dollar appropriated under authority of the Airport Act of 1946 can be and undoubtedly will be used to promote safety in air travel. This money cannot only be used to extend runways, but in many places it must be used to strengthen runways so that larger planes with heavier loads can land. It can be used to cut down hills and forests and to remove other obstructions which now constitute hazards to flying.

It has been said that there is a backlog of money available. Is there not always a backlog of money available in our highway-construction program? All the money cannot be used in the year in which it is allocated. It must be allocated a year or two ahead so that the various towns and cities may plan to develop airports in their communities in order to expand their economy and make life and industry better in those communities.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I do not like to hear anyone say that we should not pay attention to airports in small communities. One of the reasons why they are small is that they do not have transportation. If we are to construct airports and develop our program in accordance with plans for national security, it is essential that airports be well distributed all over the country. I believe that we ought to appropriate at this time the $50,000,000 suggested by the Senator from Illinois. I think we should have appropriated $65,000,000. Of course, it will not be spent this year; but until the money is appropriated the various towns and cities, whether they have large or small airports, are not going to make plans and call special town and city meetings to raise money and look ahead to the development of better transportation facilities for their communities.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Vermont for the statement which he has made. I concur in all that he has said.

I should like to direct my remarks to the able Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] and the able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] in connection with the points which they were discussing a moment ago. I can cite an example at Quincy, Ill. As I understand the facts, during the war a wonderful airport was constructed at the city of Quincy, Ill. It was not quite completed. As I recall, approximately $100,000 is needed for aprons and to complete the runways at that particular airport.

Under the provisions of the bill as reported by the Senate Committee on Appropriations, Quincy would not get a dime of this money. At least, that is what I am told by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Springfield needs approximately $75,000 or $100,000 to complete a magnificent airport. It will not get a nickel under this bill.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator is speaking of airports and needs in the State of Illinois. I trust that the figures

which he has given us would not consume all of the additional appropriation. We may need some of it in other States.

Mr. LUCAS. I mentioned Quincy, Ill., because I presume it is the kind of airport which the Senator from West Virginia had in mind. The question of safety is involved in these airports. The Quincy Airport has applied to the Civil Aeronautics Board for a license for commercial planes to land there. It was built on the basis of having bombers land there, if necessary, in wartime.

It seems to me an utter shame that for the sake of saving a few million dollars airports like the ones at Quincy and Springfield, Ill., and others throughout the country, cannot be completed now, instead of waiting for another year or two years.

We all know what would happen if an emergency should arise. We would all rush in here pell mell and appropriate billions of dollars to construct airports in every section of the globe. But when we attempt to do the same thing in time of peace, at a time when we are all thinking of economy—and it is proper that we should do so—we meet with resistance. It seems to me that we should be thinking a little about the future so far as the aviation program is concerned. We ought to adopt this amendment.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	O'Daniel
Ball	Hill	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hoey	Overton
Bricker	Holland	Pepper
Bridges	Ives	Revercomb
Brooks	Jenner	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Butler	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Byrd	Knowland	Smith
Capper	Langer	Sparkman
Chavez	Lodge	Stewart
Connally	Lucas	Taft
Cooper	McCarthy	Taylor
Cordon	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	McFarland	Tydings
Downey	McGrath	Umstead
Dworshak	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ecton	McMahon	Watkins
Ellender	Magnuson	Wherry
Ferguson	Malone	White
Flanders	Martin	Wiley
Fulbright	Millikin	Williams
Green	Moore	Wilson
Gurney	Morse	Young
Hatch	Murray	
Hawkes	Myers	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BALDWIN in the chair). Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS].

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President——

Mr. LUCAS. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire was addressing the Chair at the time the clerk was about to call the roll.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the only thing I want to say is that the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee on State, Justice, and Commerce, under the able leadership of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], did a very painstaking and thorough job on all the subjects under their jurisdiction. The matters were gone into in great detail. The subcommittee did a concentrated job, because the bill was very late in arriving from the House. Then, in turn, the full committee considered the recommendations; and I think all the recommendations, under the general circumstances, were fair and just, and they certainly will work no hardship on anyone.

I hope very much that as long as we have appropriations committees and subcommittees which do long, tedious, hard, and conscientious work, the Senate will back up committee action. For that reason I hope the amendment will be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll. The question is on the amendment.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business. The Senator from Washington, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] has a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]. The Senator from Kansas is necessarily absent. If present and voting, he would vote "nay."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], who are absent on public business, would vote "yea" if present.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], who is detained on official business, would vote "yea" if present.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], who is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference at Geneva, Switzerland, would vote "yea" if present.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is absent because of illness, has a general pair with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. If present and voting, the Senator from New York would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—39

Aiken	Holland	O'Conor
Barkley	Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Overton
Connally	Kilgore	Pepper
Downey	Lucas	Revercomb
Ellender	McCarthy	Russell
Flanders	McClellan	Sparkman
Fulbright	McFarland	Stewart
Green	McGrath	Taylor
Hatch	McMahon	Thomas, Okla.
Hayden	Magnuson	Tydings
Hill	Murray	Umstead
Hoey	Myers	Wilson

NAYS—43

Baldwin	Ferguson	O'Daniel
Ball	Gurney	Robertson, Va.
Bricker	Hawkes	Robertson, Wyo.
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Brooks	Ives	Smith
Buck	Jenner	Taft
Bushfield	Knowland	Vandenberg
Butler	Langer	Watkins
Byrd	Lodge	Wherry
Capper	McKellar	White
Cooper	Malone	Wiley
Cordon	Martin	Williams
Donnell	Millikin	Young
Dworshak	Moore	
Ecton	Morse	

NOT VOTING—13

Brewster	Kem	Thye
Cain	McCarran	Tobey
Capehart	Maybank	Wagner
Eastland	Reed	
George	Thomas, Utah	

So Mr. LUCAS' amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H. R. 3311) was passed.

Mr. BALL. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BALL, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. MCKELLAR, and Mr. TYDINGS conferees on the part of the Senate.

FREIGHT-CAR SHORTAGE (S. DOC. NO. 73)

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I desire to make a few observations concerning a situation which is of vital interest to the country as a whole, but of particular interest to all of the Western States, namely, the actual and impending serious freight-car shortage.

In my judgment, this subject is not receiving the attention it deserves. This is probably because it is less spectacular than many of the international and domestic issues which have been absorbing the attention of the public, the press, and the Congress in recent weeks.

Mr. President, the freight-car shortage is of especial interest to the citizens of our Western States. Our agricultural and mineral activities in the far West are almost wholly dependent upon the mass transportation normally provided

by the railroads. We have no alternative water routes, such as the Great Lakes, coastal, and river areas enjoy. If we cannot get freight cars to haul our products, our business diminishes in proportion.

We legislators here in Washington may think that the freight-car shortage is a dry subject made up of statistics and red tape. But to the people of the West the freight-car shortage is a matter of bread and butter, of business success or failure.

As of the moment, the freight-car shortage is not as acute as it was last spring. The reason for this is that the old crop has been moved and the new crop is just now beginning to move. Normally, car shortages reach their peak in October and November; their low point, in June and July.

Mr. President, the outlook for the months ahead is very dark. The estimated crop of wheat for this year in the western States far surpasses anything we have seen before. For example, it is estimated that the five States of Texas, Oklahoma, Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska will produce 690,000,000 bushels of wheat this year. It is interesting to note the comparison of the normal crop in these States with the 1946 crop and the forecast of the current crop. In Texas, the average production of winter wheat is 41,000,000 bushels. Last year, Texas raised 63,000,000 bushels, and this year the crop on June 1 was indicated at 142,000,000 bushels—100,000,000 bushels over the average, or over three times the normal crop. Oklahoma, whose ordinary crop is about 58,000,000 bushels, last year harvested 88,000,000 bushels, and this year the indication is for 115,000,000 bushels. In Kansas, where the normal crop is 158,000,000 bushels, production last year was 217,000,000 bushels, and this year it is going to be 278,000,000 bushels, according to estimates prepared by the Crop Reporting Board of the Department of Agriculture.

The movement of a crop of that size would be a tremendous task in normal times with plenty of boxcars available to be distributed throughout the wheat-producing country ahead of the harvesting of the crop. In the late thirties there were years when the railroads had as many as 40,000 to 45,000 cars on lines in the West waiting for the harvest to begin. During the war years it was not possible to do much of that. Last year the most the railroads could accumulate was only 7,000 cars to receive the wheat harvest. This year they were able to marshal about 17,000 cars in anticipation of the big crop estimated. But even with this number, now that the crop is starting to move, the backlog is being rapidly absorbed.

Car shortage and surplus statistics reflect cars that have been ordered by shippers and not furnished by the railroads. This spring, the shortages were running around 30,000 to 35,000 cars a day on lines all over the country—far worse than the worst shortages during the war. Statistics for the week ending Saturday, June 14, 1947, show an average daily car shortage of 14,223.

Mr. President, to appreciate the significance of these statistics on freight-car shortages, we should realize that at no time during the war, until the end of 1944, did the maximum freight-car shortage exceed 8,000 cars. (In the first quarter of 1945, the minimum shortage was 5,053 and the maximum shortage 19,397.) It should be noted that these 1945 and prior figures are minimum and maximum figures of car shortages, whereas the current figures I have used are the average daily shortages for 1 week. In other words, even at the present time, when the freight-car shortage is less acute than it was last spring and is far less acute than it is certain to be when the grain crops in the Western States begin to move in volume, we are worse off than we were during the war when our transportation system was thought to be strained to its maximum.

No one can forecast with any degree of accuracy, in terms of statistics of cars demanded by shippers which the railroads are unable to supply, the extent of the impending freight-car shortage. It is possible to say, however, that unless there is a substantial decline in the demand for cars for the movement of non-agricultural products resulting from some national emergency, such as a serious and prolonged coal strike or an economic recession, the tremendous 1947 crop of grain products will produce a far more serious shortage of freight cars than during the corresponding months of 1946. Indeed, it is most likely to become the most serious car shortage this country has ever seen.

Therefore, Mr. President, if we are to take action which will have any beneficial effect in minimizing the severe impending shortage of freight cars, we must act at once.

All the important wartime powers for the control of the movement of traffic remain in effect. We still have the heavier loading orders and the demurrage penalties provided by wartime orders of the Office of Defense Transportation. We even have an Interstate Commerce Commission agent, appointed by order No. 534, with authority to divert cars from one railroad line to another and distribute cars as between railroads. From all the information that I can gather, the shippers of the country, as they did in the war, have cooperated wholeheartedly, even though the observance of the wartime Office of Defense Transportation orders increases their cost as, of course, do the heavy demurrage charges.

Freight-car production is lagging. Responsibility for producing at the rate of only about one-half of what was forecast lies somewhere between the steel companies and the car-manufacturing companies. Appropriate congressional committees should ascertain where the bottleneck in this program is and focus the spotlight of public attention on it.

But the relief from increased production of freight cars cannot help very much this fall. Even if the rate is stepped up from the present 4,000 cars a month to the 7,000 a month goal previously set, the alleviation of the car shortage will be only slight. At the present time, old, worn-out cars are going out of service more rapidly than the new ones are coming in.

The only substantial contribution to the alleviation of the impending car shortage is the more efficient utilization of our existing fleet of freight cars. In view of the existence of the wartime traffic orders affecting shippers and their cooperation in observing these orders to date, it is doubtful if any further substantial savings of car days can be squeezed out of the shippers. This means that the only area where savings can be made is while cars are in the possession of the railroads in transit.

Mr. President, it should be ascertained whether the railroads are moving cars speedily and with dispatch when they have been loaded or unloaded and turned over to the railroads by the shipper. It also should be ascertained whether or not solicitation of freight for unduly circuitous routes is resulting in an unnecessary wastage of car-days.

The Interstate Commerce Commission is competent to ascertain whether or not the operating efficiency of the railroads, or rather the lack of it, is contributing to the impending car-shortage crisis. If the Interstate Commerce Commission ascertains that the efficiency of the railroads can be improved and can tend to alleviate the car shortage, then the Interstate Commerce Commission has the power to compel corrective action. But, as legislators, it is our responsibility to the people to find out whether the Interstate Commerce Commission is diligently pursuing this inquiry and promptly and forthrightly exercising the powers we gave it in order to protect the public interest.

A caucus of 112 Members of the House of Representatives from 19 Western States has established an executive committee under the chairmanship of the Honorable CECIL R. KING, of California, to examine into the causes of the present continuing shortage of freight cars and to seek to point the way to corrective measures to alleviate the present crisis and at the same time to make progress toward exposing the underlying and more permanent defects in our transportation system and in Government controls of transportation which have been responsible for decades for the plague of recurrent freight-car shortages.

I wish the best of success to the endeavors of this House committee and shall assist their inquiries in every way that I can.

Mr. President, I have the privilege of being a member of the Special Senate Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program. I am one of its newer members. However, Mr. President, I recalled that during the war and before I became a Senator, this committee—which at that time was known as the Truman committee—had conducted an investigation of transportation insofar as it affected war production. During this most recent crisis in freight-car shortages, I inquired of the staff of our committee if any studies of the transportation system had been conducted

subsequent to the issuance of the Transportation Report in late 1943. I learned that the committee had followed the recommendations which it had made in that report and had collected material which had been summarized in a memorandum prepared by a member of the staff. I asked to see this memorandum for the purpose of ascertaining whether that study might be useful in connection with the situation we are facing today.

Mr. President, this memorandum was prepared on May 7, 1945—the week following VE-day. It contained statistics bringing up to date, at that time, certain of the phases of transportation which had been of interest to the committee and which had been the subject of comment in its previous reports to the Senate.

Of particular interest to me was an analysis contained in that memorandum reporting on waybill studies conducted by the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Office of Defense Transportation seeking to ascertain the extent to which unnecessary circuitous routing of carload rail shipments was constituting an unreasonable burden on our railroad system and limiting the usefulness of the Nation's fleet of freight cars. To the best of my knowledge, this analysis of waybill studies of shipments on May 27, 1942, and January 12, 1944, has never been published. I believe this information is of general interest to the country as a whole. But it is of particular interest to those concerned with transportation, and of even more especial interest to the shippers of the country who find it impossible to obtain freight cars for the shipment of their products.

In addition, this memorandum makes certain comments and suggestions concerning improvements in transportation which I believe would be of general interest. It also furnishes statistics on transportation at that time which should should be a part of our national wartime record. I am informed that this study of transportation was prepared by Mr. George Meader, now the chief counsel of the committee, who was at that time an assistant counsel and had been in charge of the committee's earlier transportation studies.

This memorandum was not submitted to the entire committee at the time of its preparation and has not been presented to the committee now for its approval. For that reason it was not, and cannot be, issued as a committee report to the Senate. I do not, by this statement, intend to imply that there was any desire to suppress the memorandum, either at the time it was prepared or at the present time. I merely point out that it cannot be considered a committee report, although it was prepared by the staff of the committee and is a part of the committee's files.

Mr. President, because of my interest in the present transportation crisis resulting from the freight-car shortage, I urged that the committee make this study available to the Senate and the public for the information it contained which would be useful to any present consideration of the impending freight-car shortage we are facing.

The committee authorized me to make such use of this material as I thought appropriate and helpful under present circumstances. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the document, which I send to the desk, on transportation, prepared by Mr. George Meader, chief counsel of the Special Senate Committee Investigating the National Defense Program, dated May 17, 1945, be printed as a Senate document for the information of the Senate and the public in connection with the present transportation crisis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EMERGENCY APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1948

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside; that I be permitted to report, from the Appropriations Committee, House bill 4031, with an amendment; and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4031) making appropriations to meet emergencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with an amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, let me say in explanation that on Friday last the Senate passed Senate Joint Resolution 140, which was for the purpose of continuing appropriations so that the various departments of Government might continue to function until the regular appropriation bills were passed. That measure went to the House of Representatives. No action was taken on it by the House, but the House has sent to the Senate House bill 4031, the measure now under consideration. It was referred to the Appropriations Committee, and, in turn, the Appropriations Committee by unanimous vote this morning amended the House bill by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting the text of Senate Joint Resolution 140, the joint resolution the Senate passed on Friday by unanimous vote.

That is the situation. This measure provides for continuing appropriations. If the amendment of the Senate committee is adopted, and the bill as thus amended is passed, the result will be that the bill will go to conference, and the issue between the House and Senate will have to be decided in the conference.

Mr. President, I now ask that we proceed to consider the Senate committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The amendment was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That there are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of certain revenues, receipts, and funds, respectively, such sums as may be necessary to liquidate the obligations incurred under authority of section 102 of the Second Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947, for the several activities named and appropriated for in the appropriation acts, including any supplemental appropriation act, for the fiscal year 1948. Sums appropriated hereunder shall be deducted from the amounts respectively appropriated for such activities for the fiscal year 1948: *Provided*, That in the event there is pending in Congress on June 30, 1947, any provision involving change in jurisdiction over or method of financing of any activity, such activity shall be carried on in the same manner as provided in the applicable appropriation act for the fiscal year 1947 until such time as there shall have been enacted into law the final determination of such jurisdiction and financing.

SEC. 2. There are hereby also similarly appropriated such sums as may be necessary to defray during the month of July 1947 the expenses (1) of any activity for which funds were provided by Congress for 1947 and for which an estimate for the fiscal year 1948 was submitted by the President to the Congress but for which no provision for an appropriation is contained in any bill pending in Congress on June 30, 1947 (whether or not an appropriation is made for such activity for the fiscal year 1948), such expenses not to exceed one-twelfth of the amount of said estimate; or (2) of any activity for which a provision for appropriation is contained in a bill pending in Congress on June 30, 1947, but for which Congress fails to make an appropriation for the fiscal year 1948, such expenses not to exceed one-twelfth of the amount for such activity contained in the bill as pending on June 30, 1947: *Provided*, That the availability of the appropriations for obligation under (1) shall cease with respect to any activity on the date both Houses shall have acted and failed to make an appropriation for such activity, and under (2) shall cease on the date of the enactment of the act in which the appropriation for the activity would, if made, have been contained: *Provided further*, That such expenses may exceed one-twelfth of the amount of the estimate under (1), or one-twelfth of the amount in the bill under (2), in case of emergencies, seasonal operations, or operations incident to the liquidation of an activity, in such amount as may be determined by the Bureau of the Budget.

SEC. 3. This act may be cited as the "Temporary Appropriation Act of 1948."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to temporarily make available certain appropriations for the fiscal year 1948."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BALL, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. CORDON, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that Senate Joint Resolution 140 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate Joint Resolution 140 is indefinitely postponed.

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the New York Times of today relative to the action taken yesterday by the House of Representatives on the Hawaii statehood bill.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

After some 27 years of intermittent debate, Congress seems at last to be on the road to voting statehood for the Hawaiian Islands. The House yesterday passed by a vote of 196 to 133 the bill introduced by Delegate FARRINGTON, of Honolulu, which has been unanimously approved by the House Public Lands Committee and which is supported by President Truman and Secretary of Interior Krug. Although a Senate vote at this session appears unlikely, we believe the weight of evidence is in favor of prompt and affirmative action by Congress.

The Hawaiian Islands have been under the American flag since 1898 and a Territory since 1900. Their population of more than 500,000 persons is larger than that of any other Territory when it was admitted to statehood with the exception of Oklahoma. The islands pay more taxes to the Federal Government than 14 present States and are admittedly more advanced in education and public services than many others. Speed of transportation now makes its isolation from the mainland a factor of little importance.

The principal argument against granting statehood, that its polyglot population (which was 32.5 percent Japanese in 1945) would make it unassimilable, is not, we believe, a valid one. During the war the varied races of the Hawaiian Islands proved that they were good and loyal Americans. There is little evidence that any racial group has ever indulged in bloc voting in Territorial elections. If Congress believes in the American principles that all men are born equal and that there should be no taxation without representation, then its Members should vote to make Hawaii the forty-ninth State. Hawaii's estimated 519,000 people have, we believe, proved their right to that estate.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may I at this point announce to the Members of the Senate, especially those who are anxious to know something about the program for the balance of the week, that I am at liberty to announce that when the Senate completes its work on Thursday afternoon, there will be an adjournment until Monday at noon, if it meets with the approval of the Senate.

I should like further to announce that, after the confirmation or nonconfirmation of the distingished nominee for a judgeship, which is the temporary business at hand, the Senate will then proceed to the pending business, which is the extension of the Second War Powers Act. When that legislation shall have been completed—and we hope to complete it by late Wednesday or early Thursday afternoon—there will then be a call of the calendar.

That is all the business contemplated between now and Thursday night, unless some special bill shall be taken up for consideration by the Senate.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, there is one other matter which I think should have the consideration of the Senate and be disposed of. There has been pending for some time a controversy between the Senator from West Virginia and myself as to the proper reference of the nomination of a member of the Power Commission. The Senator and I have discussed the matter back and forth and have come to no conclusion as to what is the proper reference, so I want to give notice that, at the first opportunity, I shall move to discharge the Committee on Public Works from consideration and that the nomination be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I was glad to hear the announcement as made by the Senator from Nebraska. I want to ask at this time if it is his intent to schedule for Monday next, on the convening of the Senate at noon, consideration of the bill commonly known as the unification bill.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the intention. It will be necessary to move that it be made the business at that hour, noon, Monday, so that it will not come up for consideration until that time.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 53. An act conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Harold Turcean;

S. 394. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Raymond Wesley Doyle;

S. 396. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Thurlow Grey Doyle;

S. 397. An act authorizing the issuance of a a patent in fee to Lawrence Stanley Doyle;

S. 398. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Spencer Burgess Doyle; and

S. 399. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Gladys May Doyle.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. VANDENBERG, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Charles E. Saltzman, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of State;

Ellis O. Briggs, of Maine, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Uruguay;

Christian M. Ravndal, of Iowa, for promotion in the Foreign Service, from Foreign Service officer of class 1 to Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister.

Herschel V. Johnson, of North Carolina, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister;

Walter J. Donnelly, of the District of Columbia, and sundry other persons for promotion from Foreign Service officers of class 1 to Foreign Service officers of the class of career minister;

John H. Magonne, of Texas, and sundry other persons for promotion in the Foreign and Diplomatic Service; and

Carl Birkland, of Illinois, and sundry other Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls.

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on Civil Service:

Sundry postmasters.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION AND PROTOCOLS FOR THE REGULATION OF WHALING

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I report favorably Executive K, Eightieth Congress, first session, a protocol for the regulation of whaling, signed by the United States of America and other countries on December 2, 1946; Executive L, Eightieth Congress, first session, an international convention for the regulation of whaling, signed by the United States of America and other countries on December 2, 1946, and Executive P, Eightieth Congress, first session, a supplementary protocol for the regulation of whaling which was signed at London, March 3, 1947, and I submit a report (Ex. Rept. No. 6) thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BALDWIN in the chair). The report will be received, and the convention and protocols will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, we are now about to consider executive business, and as I understand, the first matter to come up is the nomination of a judge in the State of Texas. May I ask the Senator from Nebraska, after that matter shall have been considered, will it then be his purpose to continue executive business, so as to clear the calendar as it now exists?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I moved that we go into executive session. It was my intention to clear the calendar, with the exception of the nomination of Joe B. Dooley to be United States district judge for the northern district of Texas, and with the further exceptions of the nominations of Frank B. Potter and of Henry W. Moursund to be United States district attorneys. I think that could be completed in a few minutes, and we could then return to the pending business, which is the nomination of Mr. Dooley.

Mr. President, I ask that we proceed with the nomination of Francisco Corneiro, of the Virgin Islands, to be district attorney for the District Court of the Virgin Islands, and that we proceed to clear the Executive Calendar from there on, if there is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 254.

DISTRICT COURT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Francisco Corneiro to be district attorney for the District Court of the Virgin Islands.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. WILEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask that the nomination of James Bruce, of Maryland, be passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination of James Bruce will be passed over, and, without objection, the other nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. WILEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of F. Clyde Keefe to be collector of internal revenue for the district of New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Harry M. Brennan to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 42.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Otto Kerner, Jr., to be United States attorney for the northern district of Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of John M. Moore to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of James W. Lauderdale to be a member of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Public Health Service.

Mr. WILEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Without objection, the President will be notified at once of all confirmations of today.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Joe B. Dooley to be United States district judge for the northern district of Texas.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we now proceed to the consideration of the nomination of Joe B. Dooley to be United States district judge for the northern district of Texas.

THE ISSUES IN THE DOOLEY NOMINATION

On May 14, on behalf of the Judiciary Committee, I submitted Executive Report No. 3, recommending confirmation of the nomination of Joe B. Dooley, of Texas, to be United States district judge for the northern district of Texas.

This report followed the meeting of the full Judiciary Committee on April 28, 1947, at which time confirmation of the nomination was recommended.

Mr. President, the committee was not unanimous in recommending this matter favorably to the Senate. The vote stood 8 to 4 and 1 vote without recommendation.

I had listened to practically all of the testimony which was given, and my personal conclusion was that the nominee met the tests which have been applied by the committee in relation to qualification, character, pro-American philosophy, and so forth. The State bar of Texas has a rule that the bar, as such, will make no recommendations, but the committee received endorsements of the nominee from the officials of the bar.

NEED FOR LIMITING DEBATE

At the outset of the debate, let me say that I recognize that the time of the Senate, in view of the approaching recess, is extremely limited. Any debate on this subject must necessarily preclude consideration of many other important matters which are being held in abeyance.

Consequently, I believe that the public interest requires that the debate on this nomination be limited to the issues as I shall present them. I might say, Mr. President, that I attempted to get an agreement between the respective Senators and the Attorney General of the United States, which I hoped would obviate the necessity of discussion of the matter on the floor of the Senate, but I was unsuccessful in that respect. I shall endeavor to be very brief in my discussion of the matter.

THE TWO MAIN ISSUES

Broadly speaking, the issues are divided into two classifications:

First. Charges made against the nominee and relating to his integrity in view of his alleged participation in an alleged questionable transaction involving the Pantex ordnance plant, located in Carson County, Tex.

The subcommittee, as well as the full committee, conducted extensive hearings and thoroughly explored allegations as to the personal integrity of the nominee and his qualifications. The subcommittee and the committee were unable to find any evidence directly linking the nominee with so-called Pantex ordnance plant transaction, nor were they able to find any evidence derogatory as to the integrity and qualifications of the nominee.

ISSUE OF PERSONAL OBNOXIOUSNESS

In my judgment, that leaves only the second issue as an issue for discussion here today.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I should prefer to continue with my statement at the moment.

Mr. MOORE. I just wanted to ask one question before it slipped my mind.

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. I was chairman of the subcommittee of which the Senator speaks.

Mr. WILEY. That is correct.

Mr. MOORE. We did not consider the Pantex transaction. That was before the full committee.

Mr. WILEY. I brought that out, that the subcommittee and the full committee held hearings.

Mr. MOORE. The subcommittee, I may say to the Senator, did not hold hearings on that matter.

Mr. WILEY. The subcommittee did not conduct hearings on that one subject?

Mr. MOORE. That is correct.

Mr. WILEY. At any rate, I was not on the subcommittee. I am on the full committee. The matter was examined by the full committee, and I am stating my own personal conclusions. I want to get it clear, because it seems to me this is the important consideration. In my judgment, there is only one issue in the case, which is simply and solely whether the individual Members of the Senate shall give validity to the objection by a fellow Senator of personal obnoxiousness to himself.

There are precedents for recognition of such an objection and there are precedents for ignoring such objection. At this point I desire to have printed in the RECORD a memorandum showing instances of the action taken by the Senate on similar occasions in the past. These precedents date back only to 1932, since cases were not recorded prior to that date.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INSTANCES OF PERSONAL OBJECTIONS TO CONFIRMATION OF EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

(The following excerpts and statements were presented by the chairman (Mr. WILEY) for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary in considering Executive nominations:)

I. THE BURGUIERES CASE

(Ernest A. Burguieres, commissioner of immigration at the port of New Orleans, La. Recommitted and not again reported, 1932. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 72d Cong., 1st sess., vol. 75, pp. 13485–13487.))

Senator King moved to recommit nomination of Mr. Burguieres to Committee on Immigration.

Senator REED. The only thing against him was the personally obnoxious objection made by the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. Long). The committee took the position then * * * that if this were an office to be exercised wholly within the State of Louisiana the objection of the Senator would be conclusive, and we would report adversely on the nomination; but the committee took the position that as this is not such an office, as its functions extend over many States, and affect many States, no Senator from any one of those States ought to be allowed to interpose that objection successfully, just exactly as we have said several times before with regard to nominees for Federal commissions or nominees for courts whose jurisdiction extended over several States.

That was why the committee did not regard the Senator's objection as conclusive when he said that this nominee was personally obnoxious to him; and as all the testimony, according to the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. Hatfield), was in favor of the nominee, the committee voted to report the nomination favorably to the Senate.

Senator LONG. Mr. President, I just want to advise the Senator * * * that I presented some telegrams from the various interests opposing this man, particularly the laboring people, at the time I appeared there. * * * I was seeking to convey the information that it was not solely my objection at the time.

Senator KING. There was an understanding that the matter was shelved, and Senator Long was advised that no further action would be taken.

Senator NORRIS. It seems to me, without expressing any opinion about the merits, because I have none * * * it seems to me in real good faith we ought to send this nomination to the committee.

Senator REED. If the Senator from Louisiana expects to produce evidence tending to show that the nominee is unfit, of course, he ought to be given a chance to produce it, but if he merely wants this matter to go back to the committee so that he can claim the nominee is personally obnoxious to him, and rest on that, I am going to oppose sending it back to the committee.

* * * * *

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, in order that my position might not be misunderstood, I am one of the old-fashioned Senators who believe in State rights and in the right of a State to be represented by the Senators who sit here. I believe that when a Senator from a sovereign State stands up on the floor of the Senate and states that a nominee is not fit to hold a certain office, is personally obnoxious to him, that it is my duty, believing as I do, to vote with him, no matter how many of my friends may feel differently about the matter——

Mr. BROUSSARD rose.

Mr. BINGHAM. Even though the other Senator from the same State who is a personal friend of mine believes differently. The States are represented by two Senators, and if one of those two representatives makes such a statement as was made on this floor by the junior Senator from Louisiana, no matter how much I may disagree with him on every position he takes—and I think it fair to state that probably there are no two Senators on this floor who are more divergent in their views on public questions than the junior Senator from Louisiana and I—nevertheless, when he takes the position he has taken regarding this matter it seems to me that the only fair thing to do is to send the nomination back to the committee for further consideration.

I yield to my friend from Louisiana.

Mr. BROUSSARD. Did the Senator from Connecticut hear the junior Senator from Louisiana today express that objection?

Mr. BINGHAM. On the floor this evening, in response to a question of mine, he suggested that the nominee is personally obnoxious to him, and it has been my practice during the seven and a half years I have been here always to vote in accordance with any such preference expressed by a Senator, no matter on which side of the aisle he might be.

Mr. BROUSSARD. My understanding of the statement made two or three times by my colleague was that the nominee was obnoxious to the labor people.

Mr. BINGHAM. I asked the junior Senator, the Senator's colleague, whether the nominee is personally obnoxious to him, and he stated that he is. Then I suggested that I should vote with him, although he knows as well as any Senator on this floor that he and I rarely vote on any question on the same side of the issue.

II. THE YOKE CASE

(F. Roy Yoke, collector of internal revenue for West Virginia. 1933. Confirmed 46–15. Senator Holt, of that State, opposed confirmation. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 75th Cong., 3d sess., vol. 83, pp. 319–326))

Senator HOLT. I wish to say that Mr. F. Roy Yoke is personally obnoxious to me as a Senator from the State of West Virginia.

Mr. Yoke was superintendent of schools where I attended in Weston, W. Va. While superintendent of schools he took great delight in attacking every individual in the Holt family. * * * Mr. Yoke, before a student assembly in which the Senator was a student present, made the statement that "Old Doc Holt ought to be lined up against a white wall and shot until his blood stained the wall." May I say that "Doc Holt" * * * is my father.

[Apparently the statement grew out of the father's opposition to World War I.]

Senator BAILEY. We have the testimony of the junior Senator from West Virginia, which is unquestioned; we have the corroboration in the extract of the letter, and there is no contradiction of that, and we have three separate statements from Mr. Yoke himself, in none of which he denies that he made the statement. Taking the three together, we are bound to reach the conclusion that he did say it; at least he himself said that Mr. Holt's father should have been shot.

The question arises at once, Is that sufficient ground for the rejection of the nomination? I come to that on the testimony of the senior Senator from West Virginia, with which I thoroughly agree. As I recall his statement, he said just now that any son of a father would resent a statement such as this attributed to Mr. Yoke concerning his father so long as he had a scintilla of self-respect. I fully agree.

Mr. President, that is all there is here for me to pass on. Was the statement made? The witness accused admits it. Does the statement justify the objection of personal obnoxiousness? If it does not, then let us throw the rule as to personal obnoxiousness out of the window, and never let it come back here again.

So far as I am concerned, that is the whole case.

I do not care to become involved in the difficulties between any Senators. I do think if we are to sustain the unwritten law of the Senate known as the personal-obnoxiousness rule we have to apply it equally here amongst Senators.

III. THE MOORE CASE

(Daniel D. Moore, collector of internal revenue for district of Louisiana. Reported favorably, confirmed, and reconsidered by unanimous consent. Recommitted, again reported favorably, but never confirmed)

Senator Huey Long stated to the Senate that the nomination was personally offensive to him.

The above proceedings took place from January 4, 1934, to April 26, 1934. Part of this was in executive session (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 78: 5234).

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the matter that is under discussion is the confirmation of Mr. Daniel D. Moore to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Louisiana.

I present the opposition which I make to this nomination personally. I first state to the Senate that this nomination is offensive to me personally. Heretofore that has been regarded as sufficient in the Senate. In days past, unless it could be shown that a Senator was estopped from urging that objection, under the rules that have prevailed here I presume that would be sufficient. However, in deference to what I have been requested to do by Members of this body, I will present further data relating to this nomination.

I have never held the duty to be imposed upon any Member of the Senate to justify his reasons for stating that a nomination was personally obnoxious to him. I have held, as has been the majority of the thought in this body, that no Member of the Senate was called upon to justify his statement that a nominee was personally objectionable to him, but that when a State sent its ambassadors to the Senate, under the great doctrine of State's rights which my part of this country has held and upheld from the time the memory of man runneth not to the contrary, no Senator would have to present anything except his own objection and his own proposal that a nomination should not be confirmed by the Senate.

I am not one who is going to take the lead in destroying the prerogatives of the United States Senate. I am not one who is going to take part in destroying the prerogatives that existed here under Hoover and under Wilson and under every other President as far back as we know about. I urged personal objections to a nominee under Mr. Hoover, and the Republican Members of the Senate—who at that time were in the majority—voted to recommit the nomination. I urged personal objections to the appointment of Marcel Garsaud here as a Member of the Power Commission. I not only urged my personal objections, but I brought further evidence before the committee to show that Mr. Garsaud ought not to have been nominated and confirmed as a member of the Power Commission, and the committee refused to report out the nomination of Marcel Garsaud.

We took the same position when a nomination came in here for United States attorney for the district of North Carolina, and the objection then made was upheld here in the Senate. Uniformly has that objection been upheld, except in a case where it was shown by the letters of a Senator, by the fixed evidence of his own handwriting, that he had taken an entirely different view of the proposition of a man being personally objectionable, as in the case of Senator Ransdell in the Cohen case, where letters produced showed that he was sharing the patronage with Cohen, and as in the case of Mr. Luke Lea, who was contesting the nomination of a postmaster appointed for the city of Memphis, where he had written letters to this man saying that he would be glad to have him appointed to that position. In cases of that kind only has the Senate ever refused to sustain the personal objection of the Senator made on this floor.

Mr. WHEELER. As I gather the argument of the Senator from Louisiana, his position is not that, in occupying the office he has occupied, Mr. Moore was unfriendly to labor; but, in effect, that while he was holding a position of trust with the union he got them to sign a certain contract, and afterward he took advantage of his position of trust to betray the union.

I do not care whether he did it in a union or whether he did it in any other organization; a man who would do that, whether it was to a union, whether it was to a fraternal organization, or to any other organization, in my judgment, would not be fit to hold the

position for which Mr. Moore has been nominated.

Permit me to interrupt the Senator further by saying that it seems to me we are presented with a very peculiar situation. Not only do we have one Senator from the State objecting to the confirmation, but both Senators from the State are objecting to the appointment and confirmation of the nominee to the position of collector.

The Senate has on numerous occasions voted against confirming a man when he was stated to be personally obnoxious to one of the Senators and the other Senator from the same State favored him. I recall distinctly that in this body some years ago the late Senator Cummins, of Iowa, favored the confirmation of a certain man from the State of Iowa. Senator Brookhart took the position that the man was personally obnoxious to him; and by reason of the fact that Senator Brookhart took that position, and stated his ground, the Senate, notwithstanding the pleas of Senator Cummins, voted not to confirm the man's nomination.

Mr. President, I know nothing about the present controversy. I wish, however, to make the statement that if a Republican Senator were to state that the President had appointed someone from his State who was personally obnoxious to him, I would vote against his confirmation and I am going to do the same thing with respect to Democratic Senators who protest and say that a certain nomination is personally obnoxious to them.

I should expect Senators to do the same with me if I rose in the Senate and asked them to vote against a man who was personally obnoxious and offensive to me. I never have had occasion to do it, and I hope I never shall have occasion to do it; but if I were to do so I should certainly expect the Members of this body to have the courage to vote against confirmation under those circumstances.

In view of the fact that both Senators from the State say they do not want this man confirmed, that he is offensive to them personally, and that he is not fit for the position, I think the Senate of the United States owes it to itself, to its own dignity, not to confirm such a nomination.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I can readily understand the position stated by the Senator from Montana [Mr. Wheeler] in respect to any Senator who may observe that rule. That is not what I am talking about at all. Had the Senator from Louisiana contented himself with making that statement, it would have been one thing; but the whole tenor of his remarks in the Senate, as it seems to me, has been that the Senate of the United States should subordinate its judgment on the qualifications of a man to certain union officials because they write letters against him.

There are letters against this nominee, and there are letters in favor of him. If they asperse his character, if they exhibit the man as unfit for the position, no Senator ought to vote for him; but unless they do that, every Senator ought to exercise his own independent judgment about the matter.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me call the Senator's attention to the fact that never, to my knowledge, has a Senator ever been required to specify his objections in the Senate. As a matter of fact, as I said when the controversy was pending here between former Senators Brookhart and Cummins, all that Senator Brookhart did was to get up and say that the man who was nominated was personally objectionable to him, and Democrats on this side and Republicans on the other stood up and turned the nomination down.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

Mr. WHEELER. I will ask the Senator to allow me to finish my statement. The Senator from Louisiana, under the rules of the Senate, had a perfect right as a matter of fact, in my judgment, to feel when he filed a statement saying that the nominee was personally objectionable to him that it would not be necessary for him to go before the committee and disclose all the facts and circumstances as to why he objected to him. The Senator from Kentucky has been in politics long enough to know that many times a man may be absolutely objectionable to him for many reasons and yet he would dislike to stand upon the floor of the Senate and go into details as to why the man was personally objectionable to him.

IV. JONAS CASE

(Charles A. Jonas, U. S. attorney for the western district of North Carolina. Rejected. 1932. 26–42. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 72d Cong., 1st sess., vol. 75, pp. 6729, 7427–37.))

Senator Bailey stated that the nominee was "personally obnoxious" because of critical language used in a speech by Mr. Jonas which the Senator considered to be an insult to the courts of North Carolina.

"I have stated that his appointment is personally objectionable to me first on the ground that he made a statement concerning the courts in their capacity to do justice in election cases in North Carolina which tended to bring disgrace and obloquy upon the Commonwealth" (p. 7437).

[Secondly] he made the statement that he is responsible for the contest in which I am engaged. * * * [Thirdly] there is another ground of personal objection and personal obnoxiousness in that he uttered * * * a libel which has two aspects * * * it was libelous * * * of the so-called Nye committee * * * it was equally libelous of the Democratic Party. He said that the Nye committee ought to have been paid by the Democratic Party.

Mr. REED. What troubles me is not the point that the Senator had been making so forcefully. It is not the question of what we might do on these facts, but it is a question of the force that should be given to the objection, phrased as it was by the junior Senator from North Carolina, when he says that because of what he considers to be insulting language about the courts of North Carolina he feels constrained to make the objection that the nominee is personally obnoxious.

I do not believe that on the facts I would have made the objection if I had been in the Senator's place; but I am very much concerned to know what is our duty when the Senator does see fit to make the objection in that way.

If we are to go behind his objection to analyze his reasons in every case, then there is no sense in the objection by itself; and yet ever since the Senate was created it has been its custom to honor that objection, particularly when made to the nomination of a person who was to perform duties entirely within the Senator's own State.

If we are going to analyze his reasons, there never was any sense in the use of the phrase "personally obnoxious," because the reasons stood for themselves. It must be that the objection has been given a weight over and above the reasons that were ascribed for it or the Senate never would have paid any attention to it.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, when I came to the Senate, the rule or custom which has been under discussion today was practically an unbroken one. So far as my information goes, up to that time it had been universally applied, but since that time it has been broken a number of times, or disregarded. I want, therefore, to say just a word in explanation of my vote.

I think the able and candid Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] has brought himself within the rule, but I do not recognize the rule. I have not recognized it during the last 12 years. I became convinced it was unsound and not in the public interest. If the rule or custom is to be invoked and universally accepted, it is one thing. But broken as I have seen it done half a dozen different times, I do not think it is a safe guide or a safe rule to follow. But even if unbroken, is it a wise or just rule? The public is interested in just one proposition and that is whether the nominee is one who would be a fit public servant. Is he able; is he a man of integrity? The public is not interested in whether I like him or dislike him, or whether he is personally obnoxious to a Senator, or whether he is not. In my opinion there is only one safe rule the Senate can apply, and that is whether the nominee is a fit man to fill the place, not whether he is objectionable to someone.

I can well understand how the Senator from North Carolina could argue, and argue with force and logic, that this man is unfit to fill the position because of the fact that he libeled or slandered the institutions of the State wherein he seeks to hold public office. That would be a perfectly legitimate and logical position to take, and one might be induced to vote against a man who had taken the position that Mr. Jonas is alleged to have taken as to the courts of the State; but it would not be a personal matter with me. Therefore, in casting my vote I wish it understood that I am not recognizing the rule or custom which is sought to be invoked in this instance. I think when we place our objection on personal grounds we lose sight of the public interest.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am not sure that the Senator from Arkansas was in the Chamber at the time, but about an hour ago the Senator from North Carolina, if I heard him correctly, rose and stated that if he knew he could stop this nomination by the simple statement, "This is personally obnoxious to me," he would not make that statement; and that left me absolutely in the air. In other words, I believe that what this man Jonas said about the courts of North Carolina is not sufficiently serious to deny him confirmation. Evidently a majority of the Democratic judges in his own district think as I do, because they have written in letters of recommendation.

Notwithstanding that, because of the custom that has obtained in the United States Senate since the creation of this Government, if the Senators from North Carolina, or either of them, will rise and say, "I accept the responsibility of construing this man's language, and I construe it to be an insult to the courts, and because of that I take the responsibility of saying this nomination is personally obnoxious," then that closes the case for me, and I shall vote against the confirmation.

Mr. Walsh of Montana and Mr. Bailey rose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. REED. In just a moment I will yield to each Senator.

It is merely a question as to where the responsibility rests for weighing the nominee's fitness. If the Senator from North Carolina will assume that responsibility and exercise the power that is in him as a Member of this body, I will vote against the nomination. Otherwise, I will be compelled to say that I do not think that what this man said, in the heat of his anger, about the fruitlessness of appealing to the courts in election cases, is sufficiently serious to justify me in voting against him.

I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, some of these distinctions have become so very fine that I find it difficult to follow them. A man may be personally obnoxious to me because of some injury he has done to me personally which has no reference whatever to public affairs at all. It is a personal quarrel I have with him. He may be personally obnoxious to me, not because he has done any damage to me at all, but because he has mistreated someone else and has acted in a detestable way, so that I really abhor the

man. Again, he may have libeled my State, and he may be personally objectionable and obnoxious to me for that reason. Or he may be personally obnoxious to me for half a dozen reasons. Whatever it may be, if he is personally obnoxious to me, the rule or custom applies.

So here, as I understand the Senator from North Carolina, this man is not personally obnoxious or objectionable to him because of any harm he has done to him or any harm he has done to any of his friends, or because of any act of his that is detestable in character, but because he has libeled his State and the courts of his State he is personally obnoxious to him. Is not that, from the public point of view, a very much better ground than to reject him just simply because of a personal quarrel he has with the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, here is the difference. I have said that I will honor the objection if it is made by the Senator; and let me explain.

This is not so trivial and foolish a custom as it sounds. We know the people of our home States better than the President of the United States possibly can know them. There are occasions when the assertion of this privilege we have built up here through custom is of great advantage to the people of the United States. There are occasions when injury might be done to innocent people by narrating in detail the reasons for our objections. Fortunately, we do not have to do it often, because we generally are given some opportunity by the appointing power to make known such objections if they exist. But it is not as senseless a custom as it may sound to some people who hear us discussing the present case.

If only the Senator from North Carolina will make his position clear, the whole thing will be simple. If he will rise and say, "I am exercising the privilege of a Senator to appraise the nominee from my State, and to appeal on the ground of his personal offensiveness, for the reason I have stated," and rest his case on that, I unhesitatingly will vote with him. If he says, as he did say some time this morning, that "I am asking the Senate to weigh the justice of my complaint," then he is putting his objection on a totally different ground. All I am trying to find out is, what is he doing? Is he exercising the privilege I concede to him as a Senator or is he inviting me to appraise the soundness of his objections? In the first case, I will vote with him; in the second, I cannot.

V. THE MAC NIDER CASE

(Hanford MacNider, of Iowa, to be Minister to Canada. Confirmed 1930. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 71st Cong., 2d sess., vol. 80, p. 11313))

Senator BROOKHART. I do not object to nominee because of political opposition to me. * * * In this case, however, I was not consulted beforehand, but a representative of the President has informed me that that was not intended as any personal discounting or reflection upon me in any way.

This same man, MacNider, was the chief lobbyist against me among the Senators, and even insulted some of the Senators and was even ordered from their offices.

As soon as I was unseated, Hanford MacNider went to Boston to make a speech against me.

Mr. President, I have stated at least some of the reasons why I have a right to make a personal objection against this man. * * * But, Mr. President, I am not going to ask the Senate to vote against this man on account of my personal objections. I have stated other reasons. If Senators want to have him confirmed, the responsibility is on President Hoover. If he wants a man who will violate his own theory of law enforcement, and similar matters, to represent him in a foreign country, we shall take the responsibility. I have had my say.

VI. THE HOLMES CASE

(Edwin R. Holmes, to be circuit judge for the fifth circuit. 1936. Confirmed. Senator BILBO, of Mississippi, stated that the nomination was personally obnoxious to him. Vote to recommit the nomination was rejected 4–59. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 74th Cong., 2d sess., vol. 80, pp. 3987–4032))

Senator BILBO. Judge Holmes, as many Senators know, is the judge who in 1922, on the 16th day of April, incarcerated me in the Oxford Federal jail, imposing upon me a fine of $100 and costs and a jail sentence of 30 days, which sentence was later modified to 10 days. The judge imposed that sentence without authority of law, * * * he was anxious to destroy the man BILBO * * * who was then a candidate for Governor. As a result of this incarceration, I was defeated in that campaign.

* * * * *

I know it has been a rule of the Senate, honored for more than a 100 years, to refuse to confirm, out of courtesy and deference which have always been accorded to a Member of this body, with very few exceptions in its history, when a Senator from a State affected has personal objection to one whose nomination has been presented to the Senate for confirmation, if he is willing to stand on the floor of the Senate and say to the world that the nominee is personally obnoxious to him. That rule has been so stoutly adhered to that it has not been thought necessary to require a Senator to stand on the floor and give the reasons why the nominee is personally obnoxious to him. All he has had to do was to intimate or say to his colleagues, "This man is personally obnoxious to me," and out of deference the Senate would reject the nomination.

Oh, but someone may say, and it may be contended that this rule, which applies to objections to confirmation because a nominee is personally obnoxious, obtains only where the functions of the office of the nominee are to be carried on within the State, where they are, so to speak, "intrastate." There may be extreme cases where such a contention may be successfully made, but my investigation shows that the Senate has not often observed the rule that it must be confined to "intrastate" appointments.

While looking up the authorities the other day I found a case involving the senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] back in 1912. The President sent to the Senate the nomination of a man from the State of Oregon, not from the Senator's home State, but from a sister State—a man appointed to the circuit court of appeals—a case similar to the present one, and the Senator from California objected to him because the man was personally obnoxious to him. He was personally obnoxious to the Senator from California, because the man who was then the nominee for judge had repudiated a preelection promise to vote for the Senator from California as the candidate for President of the United States in a national convention, and because the candidate for judge had failed to vote for the Senator from California in the National Republican Convention the Senator from California said:

"This man is personally obnoxious to me, because he has repudiated instructions from the State of Oregon."

And the Senate was gracious enough and deferential enough to a member of this body, the Senator from California, to refuse to confirm that nomination.

VII. THE BOYLE CASE

(Nomination of William S. Boyle to be United States attorney for the district of Nevada (76th Cong., 2d sess.))

Before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary Senator MCCARRAN stated:

"The ad interim appointment and the present nomination of William S. Boyle, now pending before the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, is personally offensive and personally obnoxious to the junior Senator from Nevada because of the foregoing and because the nominee has lent himself to a combination to take a slap at the junior Senator from Nevada and to demonstrate that whatever influence the junior Senator had in Washington had gone, and to demonstrate that he, the junior Senator from Nevada, had made it impossible to help the State of Nevada through the Federal authorities; that, in addition thereto, he, the nominee, has lent himself to a combination and conspiracy to defeat the spirit of the United States, wherein it is prescribed that nominations for Federal office, of which the United States district attorneyship for Nevada is one, shall be with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States."

The district attorney, E. P. Carville, had been recommended for reappointment by Senator MCCARRAN. The ad interim appointment of Mr. Boyle had effected his removal without the advice and consent of either Senator representing the State of Nevada. Senator Pittman appears to have sponsored a candidate named McKnight but this was withdrawn later.

In the debate on the nomination, which was adversely reported, Senator MCCARRAN stated:

"On July 13, when the President's train passed through Nevada, the secretary to the President, Mr. McIntyre, left the train momentarily and conversed with an acquaintance of his on the platform at Sparks, Nev., which is a division point at which the President's train stopped, and his friend inquired of Mr. McIntyre, 'Why was not Judge Carville reappointed?' Mr. McIntyre's answer was, 'To take a slap at PAT.'" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 84:8225.)

The nomination was rejected without record vote (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 84:8228).

VIII. THE ROBERTS CASE

(Nomination of Floyd H. Roberts to be United States district judge for the western district of Virginia (76th Cong., 1st sess.). Rejected 9–72)

Before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary Senators Glass and BYRD stated their positions as follows:

Senator GLASS. As a matter of fact, the President of the United States did give to the Governor of Virginia the veto power over nominations made by the two Virginia United States Senators. He was given ample opportunity by me personally to deny the accuracy of that statement, and he has not done so. He has confirmed it by taking from the six applicants for that position, all of high character and capabilities, the only man who is personally offensive to the two Virginia Senators—offensive to them in that he lent himself to the conspiracy to discredit and to dishonor their recommendations to the President. Any man would be personally offensive to me, whoever he might be, however near he might be, how much he may have supported me politically, if he would be a cheerful and willing recipient of the benefits of a proposal that the two United States Senators from Virginia, charged by the Constitution with the duty of advising and consenting to Federal appointments, should have their recommendations vetoed by the Governor of Virginia, who has not disputed his connection with the proposition.

Senator BYRD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, my colleague has very adequately stated the objections of the Virginia Senators to the confirmation of this nomination. It is my sincere and honest conviction that this nomination was made for the purpose of being personally offensive to the Virginia Senators, and it is personally offensive to the Virginia Senators, and is personally obnoxious to me, as well as to my colleague. I am well aware of the responsibility that I take in making this statement of complaint of personal obnoxiousness, but

I want to say to the committee that I make that complaint with full knowledge of that responsibility as a Senator from Virginia.

Mr. Roberts' nomination was reported adversely and rejected by record vote without debate.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, It will be noted from the memorandum which has been submitted that back in 1932 Senator REED said in relation to the Commissioner of Immigration of the Port of New Orleans that if it were an office to be exercised wholly within the State of Louisiana, the objection of the Senator would be conclusive. Senator Bingham said:

When a Senator from a sovereign State stands up on the floor of the Senate and states that a nominee is not fit to hold a certain office, is personally obnoxious to him, it is my duty to vote with him.

In 1938 the nomination of the collector of internal revenue was being considered and Senator Holt registered the objection that he was personally obnoxious to him, stating that the nominee said his father ought to be lined up against the white wall and shot. The late Senator Bailey said:

I do think if we are to sustain the unwritten law of the Senate known as the personally obnoxious rule, we have to apply it.

Nevertheless, the Senate confirmed the collector of internal revenue by a vote of 46 to 15.

In 1934 the collector of internal revenue for the district of Louisiana was not confirmed because Senator Huey Long said he was personally obnoxious to him. Senator Wheeler said that on numerous occasions the Senate has voted against confirming a man when it was stated that he was personally obnoxious to one Senator and the other Senator from the same State favored him. He said further:

If a Republican Senator were to state that the President had appointed someone from his State who was personally obnoxious to him, I would have voted against his confirmation.

Senator Glass said that had the Senator from Louisiana contented himself with making that statement, that is, that he was personally obnoxious, it would have been one thing, but that the whole tenor of his remarks had been that the Senate of the United States should subordinate its judgment on the qualifications of a man. Senator Wheeler replied:

Never to my knowledge has a Senator ever been required to specify his objections to the Senate; that many times a man may be absolutely objectionable to him for many reasons and yet he would dislike to stand up on the floor of the Senate and go into details as to why this man was personally objectionable to him.

In 1932, in respect to the nominee for United States attorney for the western district of North Carolina, Senator Bailey stated the nominee was personally obnoxious, and set forth his grounds, and Senator Reed then stated:

Ever since the Senate was created it has been its custom to honor that objection when made to the nomination of a person who was to perform duties entirely within the Senator's own State. If we are going to analyze his reasons, there never was any sense in the use of the phrase personally obnoxious.

Senator Borah acknowledged the rule, saying that the rule or custom was practically an unbroken one until he came to the Senate, but that since that time it had been broken a number of times or disregarded. He said it was unsound and not in the public interest. He further said that a safe rule to apply is whether the nominee is a fit man to fill the place, not whether he is objectionable to someone.

Senator Walsh of Montana said:

A man may be personally obnoxious to me because of some injustice he has done to me personally, or not because he has done any damage to me personally at all, but because he has mistreated someone else and has acted in a detestable way—he may have libeled my State; he may be personally obnoxious for a half dozen reasons. Whatever it may be, if he is personally obnoxious to me, the rule or custom applies.

Senator Reed said:

If the Senator from South Carolina will make his position clear, if he will rise and say, "I am exercising the privilege of a Senator to appraise the nominee from any State, and to appeal on the ground of his personal offensiveness, for the reason I have stated," and rest his case on that, I will vote with him. If he says, "I am asking the Senate to weigh the justice of my complaint," then he is putting his objection on a totally different ground. In the first case I will vote with him; in the second I cannot."

In that case the nomination was rejected.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILEY. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator two or three times has referred to Senator Reed. Was it Senator Reed of Pennsylvania or Senator Reed of Missouri?

Mr. WILEY. I cannot say which Senator it was.

Mr. WHITE. Perhaps it is not important, but I was interested.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in 1936 the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] filed an objection to the confirmation of a circuit judge for the fifth circuit. The objection was "this man is personally obnoxious to me." The judge was confirmed.

The Senator from Mississippi in his remarks told of a time when Senator Johnson objected to the confirmation of a man from Oregon who had been appointed to the circuit court of appeals, and the ground of objection was "this man is personally obnoxious to me because he has repudiated instructions from the State of Oregon and failed to vote for Senator Johnson." The Senate sustained the objection.

In the Seventy-sixth Congress the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] objected to the appointment of William S. Boyle on the ground of personal obnoxiousness. The Senator stated certain reasons:

Because the nominee had lent himself to a combination to take a slap at the junior Senator from Nevada and to demonstrate that whatever influence the junior Senator had in Washington had gone; to demonstrate that he, the junior Senator from Nevada, had made it impossible to help the State of Nevada through the Federal authorities.

The nomination was rejected without record vote.

In the Seventy-sixth Congress the nomination of Floyd H. Roberts, of Virginia, was reported adversely by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. Senator Glass said—and well I remember that occasion, Mr. President—that the President of the United States had given to the Governor of Virginia the veto power over nominations made by the two Virginia United States Senators. Both Senators objected. The nomination was reported adversely and rejected without a record vote, Senator Glass stating that the nominee was personally offensive to the two Virginia Senators, offensive to them in that he lent himself to the conspiracy to discredit, to dishonor their recommendations to the President.

I will say that at that time I also heard the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia, now the senior Senator from Virginia, when he appeared before the committee and in very emphatic terms repeated in substance the language of the senior Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator stated that the nomination was rejected unanimously. It was defeated by a vote of 72 to 9 in the Senate. If I recall correctly, the vote in the committee was 14 to 3 to report the nomination adversely. So the vote was a recorded one in both instances.

Mr. WILEY. I am glad to be corrected, Mr. President. In that case the objection made by the distinguished Senator was heard and complied with emphatically.

From the precedents, it appears there is no hard and fast rule or custom; that apparently each case has to stand on its own bottom. I personally feel that the rule I would apply might be phrased in this way—that a Senator, in fulfilling his responsibility under the constitutional provision of advice and consent, must in each individual case take into consideration all of the facts, as well as the obligation he owes to a fellow Senator, to the public, to the nominee, and evaluate the facts in each given situation as it comes up and then arrive at his evaluation of the broken custom or rule that we have been discussing. I can envision a number of cases in which a Senator might make the plain objection that the nominee is personally obnoxious to him. If the nominee had insulted his wife, he would not want to bring that to the attention of the Senate. If his fellow Senators were satisfied that there was a real personal objection of that nature, the Senator should let his conscience be his guide.

But that is not the situation here. Here we have a nominee who is apparently above reproach. He himself is in between the fire of two Senators who have not been able to agree. One Senator has been totally neglected by the administration for 6 years or better in relation to patronage. There is a vacancy in Texas. The people need a judge.

THE TWO SENATORS' VIEWS

We are today confronted with an issue in which the senior Senator from Texas

[Mr. CONNALLY] has agreed to the nomination and the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] has disagreed with it, stating that the nominee was personally obnoxious to him.

It is not my intention at this time to defend the position of either Senator or otherwise to enter into the controversy. I believe that my function as chairman of the Judiciary Committee is merely to point up the historical precedents, to outline the main issues that we should consider, to specify some of the implications of either type of action which we may take.

Thus, I should like to make a few brief comments at this time as to the background of this general subject.

STEPS IN JUDICIAL CONFIRMATION

Mr. President, as we know, there are three steps that must be taken before an individual can become a Federal judge:

(A) There must be nomination by the President.

(B) His nomination must be by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(C) There must be execution of the commission by the President.

THE SENATE'S ROLE

The United States Senate, of course, has the absolute right to reject any nomination; and the action of the Senate is not subject to reversal anywhere or by anyone.

The words "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate" do not, of course, mean with the advice and consent of any particular group or individual, but rather by the entire Senate as a going concern. The Senate, of course, is not obliged to give any reasons to anyone for its acts, nor is any Senator required to explain why he voted for confirmation or rejection.

SENATORIAL COURTESY

Our principal problem comes from the application of the rule of so-called senatorial courtesy in this situation. It is a difficult rule to apply, because, as I have mentioned before, the precedents on it are conflicting.

In his book, The President—Office and Powers," Prof. Corwin, on page 69, states the following:

> Much more extensive is the control which is exerted over the President's freedom of choice by a set of usages which go by the name of "senatorial courtesy." If the President in nominating to an office within a State fails to consult the preferences of the Senator or Senators of his own party from that State, he is very likely to see the appointment defeated upon an appeal to the Senate by the slighted Member or Members. Reciprocally, the Senate will ordinarily interpose no objection to the President's nominees for Cabinet or diplomatic posts. While any attempt to find a basis in the written Constitution for this interesting understanding would be disappointing, since it is the advice and consent of the Senate which the Constitution requires and not that of individual Senators, yet there is no usage of the Constitution affecting the powers of the President which is more venerable.

INDIVIDUAL INTERPRETATION OF SENATORIAL COURTESY

As my colleagues read through the Judiciary Committee's memorandum on this subject, they will note that the force of the personal-obnoxiousness objection is one that each individual Senator will have to determine for himself on the merits of the given case. Under the Constitution, the Senate is called upon to advise and consent, but each individual Senator, in turn, has the responsibility for interpreting that language.

I point out that there can be no absolutely inflexible rule with respect to adhering to or ignoring the personal-obnoxiousness objection.

Let us consider the implications of both actions.

(A) If the obnoxiousness objection were always accepted, than we would be giving a powerful and arbitrary weapon to the individual Senator who would utilize this weapon to continually embarrass the Executive without any reference to the qualifications of nominees.

(B) On the other hand, if we were to always reject the obnoxiousness objection, it would mean that the Executive would have a virtually undisputed appointing power unless there were some very obvious and damaging evidence to disqualify his nominees. There would be no bar to mediocrity via the personal-obnoxiousness objection, and there would be no bar to purely political appointees nominated solely to serve some purely partisan purpose.

FACTORS IN EVALUATING OBNOXIOUSNESS

What, then, are the major factors which we must bear in mind in evaluating our actions along this line? I submit that those factors are:

(A) The United States Constitution itself giving the advice-and-consent power to the Senate.

(B) The broken practice of respecting personal obnoxiousness and senatorial courtesy.

(C) The obligation which a Senator may feel to the objecting Senator to respect the latter's judgment.

(D) Justice for the nominee himself. We must bear in mind, of course, that when a nominee is rejected by the United States Senate for whatever reason, forever after he lives, in a certain sense, under a cloud of official disapproval.

(E) Our obligations to the American public which means our obligation to secure the appointment of fit public servants.

(F) The factor of whether or not a given nominee is to serve within the particular State of the objecting Senator.

(G) Whether or not this is the first instance in which the objecting Senator has raised the personal obnoxiousness issue or whether it is a part of a long series of such objections.

(H) Whether or not circumstances permit open discussion of the reasons on which the objecting Senator bases his objection. We can well understand that if a nominee had insulted a given Senator's wife in some manner, the Senator might not want to bring that to the open attention of the Senate. Whether or not other Senators would be willing to accept the blanket statement of personal obnoxiousness from a particular Senator without specifying the reasons would depend on one of the preceding points which I stated, namely, the obligation which other Senators feel to the objecting Senator.

PRESENT SITUATION

Mr. President, we are presented with a situation in Texas in which the nominee is apparently above reproach. He is caught between two fires, so to speak. Here we have two Senators who have not been able to agree. For 6 years one Senator has been totally neglected in relation to patronage by the administration. We have a judicial vacancy in Texas. The people need that vacancy filled. What, then, should the Senate do in fairness to all parties concerned and on the basis of the factors which I have above mentioned?

Mr. President, I conclude with this thought: This is an instance in which no Senator can "pass the buck." What we do here, in view of the past history, as I have stated it, may be of some importance in shaping what has been called a broken custom. But I come back to the point with which I started. The problem is an individual problem for each Senator, under all the facts and circumstances as they are developed. Personally I feel that it is unfortunate that we must spend the time of the Senate on a matter of this kind. I feel that it probably indicates that, after all, men are but boys. In seeking to get things out of the way we should probably clear them up by cooperation and agreement. But when we allow the element of politics to enter in, it seems at times not only to affect our ability to reason and evaluate, but to stop action on more important matters.

I believe that the problem is one for each individual Senator, to determine in view of the precedents, in view of the facts as they will be developed, and in view of his relationship to brother Senators who are involved. Each Senator should cast his vote accordingly.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. No doubt this is a question with respect to which Members of the Senate who are also distinguished members of the bar will have more to say than will those of us who are laymen and not attorneys.

I was impressed with the statistics which the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee gave with reference to the historical facts in similar cases. Apparently there is precedent for bringing to the floor a dispute of this kind; but I wonder if in the consideration of the question in the committee the distinguished chairman of the committee took into consideration another method which has been used—and personally I think it should be used in such cases—namely, to keep the nomination in committee until such time as the two Senators are in agreement.

Mr. WILEY. I will say that the question was held open from time to time. Hearings were granted; and I am sure that anyone who is cognizant of the facts will say that the committee was very patient. We tried our best, but if we had followed the course which has been suggested, unless the President had withdrawn the nomination, I am sure that Texas would have had no judge. There

might have been a great deal of misunderstanding.

Mr. President, in saying what I have said, I did not intend to assume the position of lecturing the Senate.

I want to compliment the committee, and I am sure that both Senators will say they were given every consideration and that there was no partiality or preference shown. I early came to the conclusion which I have now placed before the Senate, after the evidence was developed. I went into a study of the precedents to see how valid were certain contentions that had been made to me ex parte. Of course I arrived at my own conclusion, as I have stated it here today. My conclusion, in a few words, is that each and every Senator must decide for himself. It does not call for any particular legal knowledge. The distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] suggested that it is a question for lawyers. That is not necessarily so. The question simply recognizes one's own personal obligation, under the advice and consent factor, taking into consideration the matter of personal obnoxiousness, and one's responsibility to his fellow Senators, to the Senate, and to the country.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I appreciate very much the calm, cool, learned, and deliberate summation which has just been given by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee. From the cases he has cited, as I understand, he has boiled this matter down to one of personal obnoxiousness.

The question which I would like to ask the able Senator and chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary is this: Is it his personal opinion that this unwritten law of personal obnoxiousness is one which belongs to and should be exercised by each individual Senator, and that the committee would not take unto itself the prerogative of exercising that function for the other Senators, and for that reason this nomination has been so thoroughly gone into? I congratulate the Senator and his committee for the patience and the time they have taken to go into this matter. The committee has decided features other than personal obnoxiousness, and the matter has been submitted to the floor so that each Senator may exercise his own prerogative as to whether he wants to support a personally obnoxious objection. In other words, would it be possible for a member of the committee to report favorably on bringing the nomination to the floor and then to exercise his own individual vote on the floor on the question of personal obnoxiousness?

Mr. WILEY. If I understand the question of the distinguished Senator, it probably has two phases. There is nothing binding upon any Senator in reporting a nomination to the floor, any more than there would be in reporting a bill to the floor. That is a rule of every committee. A Senator can vote for or against a bill or a nomination. I cannot say that what I have stated is the opinion of the committee. It is my personal analysis of the precedents and the facts of previous cases, taking particularly the dynamic statements of men like Borah, who said that this custom, as he called it, had obtained unbroken up to the time he came to the Senate, but from the time he came it was broken in numerous instances. I have taken language like that of former Senator Wheeler, of Montana, and of the late Senator Bailey. They held, apparently, that the feature of personal obnoxiousness is all that is necessary; that their obligation to a fellow Senator is such that they ask no further questions. Then there is the third position, namely, that there is apparently a group who feel that if and when an attempt is made to outline two bases for personal obnoxiousness, another factor is placed in the hands of the committee, and that is whether the facts justify the conclusion of personal obnoxiousness. That is why I cannot speak for each individual Senator or for the committee otherwise than by saying that they reported the matter to the floor of the Senate for the action of the Senate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As I understand, the subcommittee, composed of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE], myself and others, reported the matter to the full committee with no recommendation, stating the fact of the objection of the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] and a summary, after quite a lengthy hearing on the matter, at which many witnesses were heard. But it is my understanding that when the matter was voted upon by the full committee the motion was for confirmation?

Mr. WILEY. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And, therefore, those who voted for it, voted for confirmation of Mr. Dooley, and those who voted against it voted against confirmation of Mr. Dooley. It was not simply a vote to present the matter to the floor.

Mr. WILEY. I agree with that conclusion; but I do not think that is the question that was asked.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I merely wanted the record clear in that respect.

Mr. WILEY. The vote stood 8 to 4 to recommend to the Senate favorable action. There was one vote without recommendation as to action. But the Senator's question was whether any Senator who took that position in committee was thereby bound by that action. My answer to that is, No; that as I understand the rules of every committee of which I have been a member, that, again, is a matter of individual responsibility.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But the majority of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary voted to recommend the confirmation of Mr. Dooley?

Mr. WILEY. That is correct; otherwise it would not have come under the rules of the Senate.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. In the study of the precedents which has been presented here by the able Senator, did the Senator observe whether those assertions of personal obnoxiousness had anything to do with the political parties of the State, or were those instances observed by the Senator at all? The point I am now making is that I have observed the procedure, if the President makes an appointment he consults the Senator who belongs to his political party and does not consult the Senator who belongs to the opposite political party.

I want to call the attention of the Senate, for the record, to the fact that the Senators from Texas belong to the party to which the President of the United States belongs, which is the Democratic Party. Some call it one name and some call it another.

Mr. WILEY. Will the Senator briefly state his question?

Mr. MOORE. I want to know whether in the tracing of the history of objections made on the ground of personal obnoxiousness the Senator found any instance of such an objection coming from a Republican Senator in the administration of a Democratic President, or vice versa.

Mr. WILEY. I think I have in mind what the Senator is presenting. Here is a situation of two Senators, one objecting to and one asking for confirmation, and both belonging to the same political party. The only answer that comes to my mind is the statement of the late Senator Walsh, who said that it would make no difference what the objections were. He came out four square for the prerogative of a Senator. He said that if a Republican were to rise and object he would give the same validity to his objection as he would to that of a Democrat. That is in substance what he stated. I am sure that in the Virginia case no Republicans were involved. They have no Republicans over there.

Mr. MOORE. Oh, yes; they have.

Mr. WILEY. I have not seen any evidence of it in the Senate, for a long time, anyway.

Mr. MOORE. I live over there.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course, the word "personally" has some basis of reason for being attached to the word "obnoxious." There are no precedents governing the point of whether a person is a Republican or a Democrat. I have looked them up, as has the Senator from Oklahoma. The man who objects may belong to a political party, but his objections have to be of a personal nature.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to make an observation regarding the political angle?

Mr. WILEY. Yes.

Mr. HATCH. I think it will be found that very eminent Senators have expressed themselves on the subject which the Senator from Washington just mentioned. I think precedents will be found for Senators having expressed themselves to the effect that if the political angle becomes involved, then it is not a matter of personal obnoxiousness; it becomes simply a political matter, and under those circumstances the plea of personal obnoxiousness should be rejected.

Mr. MOORE. Does the Senator mean to say that if a Democratic President nominates a person in a State in which

a Republican Senator makes the statement that the nominee is personally obnoxious to him, that would have any bearing on the case?

Mr. HATCH. I do not see the connection.

Mr. MOORE. I did not quite understand the Senator from New Mexico, either.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I wish to answer the Senator from New Mexico by showing how the late Senator Walsh, of Montana, answered in regard to that matter. He said:

> Mr. President, some of these distinctions have become so very fine that I find it difficult to follow them. A man may be personally obnoxious to me because of some injury he has done to me personally which has no reference whatever to public affairs at all. It is a personal quarrel I have with him. He may be personally obnoxious to me, not because he has done any damage to me at all but because he has mistreated someone else and has acted in a detestable way, so that I really abhor the man. Again, he may have libeled my State, and he may be personally objectionable and obnoxious to me for that reason, or he may be personally obnoxious to me for half a dozen reasons. Whatever it may be, if he is personally obnoxious to me, the rule or custom applies.
>
> So here, as I understand the Senator from North Carolina, this man is not personally obnoxious or objectionable to him because of any harm he has done to him or any harm he has done to any of his friends, or because of any act of his that is detestable in character, but because he has libeled his State and the courts of his State he is personally obnoxious to him. Is not that, from the public point of view, a very much better ground than to reject him just simply because of a personal quarrel he has with the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. President, unless there are other questions, I have concluded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I think it would be unfortunate for the Senate to take action on this matter without having a quorum in attendance. Therefore, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Myers
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Ball	Hill	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Holland	Overton
Bridges	Ives	Pepper
Brooks	Jenner	Revercomb
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Kilgore	Russell
Byrd	Knowland	Saltonstall
Capper	Langer	Smith
Chavez	Lodge	Sparkman
Connally	Lucas	Stewart
Cooper	McCarran	Taft
Cordon	McCarthy	Taylor
Donnell	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McFarland	Tydings
Dworshak	McGrath	Umstead
Ecton	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ellender	McMahon	Watkins
Ferguson	Magnuson	Wherry
Flanders	Malone	White
Fulbright	Martin	Wiley
Green	Millikin	Williams
Gurney	Moore	Wilson
Hatch	Morse	Young
Hawkes	Murray	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BALDWIN in the chair). Eighty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The question is, Shall the Senate advise and consent to the nomination?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I understand the junior Senator from Texas desires the floor.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I do not want to run in ahead of my colleague from Texas on this nomination. I thought that, inasmuch as he obtained the floor and suggested the absence of a quorum, he desired to speak in favor of it; but, if it is agreeable with him, I shall proceed in opposition.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is perfectly satisfactory to me, Mr. President.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I thank my colleague.

Mr. President, I wish to say that so far as I am concerned, the question before the Senate at the present time is a serious one. Many nominations have come to the Senate, some of which have received more attention than others. The pending nomination deals with several fundamental principles that I think should be given careful consideration. It is more than a mere nomination. Many vital issues are concerned. Before entering upon a discussion of all the issues, I want to make it perfectly plain that so far as I am concerned this is not a fight between the two Texas Senators. It has been said in the press and by certain individuals that this is in effect a patronage fight between the two Texas Senators.

I refute that statement so far as I am concerned, because it is not a patronage fight between the two Texas Senators, as I view it. I am not concerned with patronage in Texas. I have been able to get along without it for about 6 years, and I do not intend now to begin a fight to obtain it. I can be reelected without patronage. Four times I have been elected by the people of Texas. This pending matter is of far greater importance than the matter of patronage.

I have gone into the unwritten law of senatorial courtesy very thoroughly, since the lightning struck me. I believe the lightning has to strike each individual Senator before he is fully awakened to the meaning of the unwritten law of senatorial courtesy. I think it is just as important as are certain other unwritten laws that govern the activities of citizens of the Nation. On former occasions I have expressed my great admiration for the form of government that our wise forefathers set up, and for that great Constitution which they wrote. Next to the Holy Bible, I believe it to be the greatest document ever written by the hand of civilized and Christianized men.

Mr. President, I believe that if ever men were inspired, our forefathers were inspired when they wrote the Constitution of the United States. The Constitution shows that in setting up our form of government the rights of the people were ever foremost in the minds of those men. They had all the past history of the world to guide them. They were students of that history. They knew all the defects of other governments that had been established, and they sought to eliminate all those defects. They sought to eliminate all that had been bad and all that had brought other governments to ruin. They sought to set up in this country a new and different form of government, a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. They began with the idea of keeping away from dictatorship. They wanted to avoid one-man rule, because therein lay the downfall of many great nations of the past. They set up a system of checks and balances. They said, "We will establish three branches of government, the legislative, the judicial, and the executive." They did that. For further checks and balances they established two Houses in the legislative branch, the upper and the lower, the Senate and the House of Representatives.

In order to give the people control of their own government, they devised a system for the selection of public officials. They said, "We will start with the lower House of Congress, which will be the most representative of the rank and file of our people. We will establish representation on the basis of population in the various congressional districts. That is subject to change, as time goes on. We will subject those Representatives to the will of the people every 2 years." They established a tenure of office of 2 years for Members of the House of Representatives. They made that the most numerous branch of our legislative government.

They then proceeded to the executive branch, and they wanted to devise an entirely different system of selecting the Chief Executive. They set up a rather intricate system, which to this day is greatly misunderstood by many of our citizens, a system comprising the electoral college, differing entirely from direct vote by the people for Members of the House of Representatives. It provides that the people of each State shall have an opportunity to set up a system of selecting electors, and that those electors shall vote for the President and Vice President of their choice. The tenure of office was made twice as long as the tenure of Representatives, or 4 years.

When they came to the upper House of Congress, they established an entirely different tenure of office. They made it 6 years, with one-third of the Senators to be elected every 2 years. Checks and balances were established. They reserved to the people themselves the right of selecting their own public officials. They considered the upper branch of Congress, the United States Senate, to be a somewhat different legislative council from the lower branch. So they devised a different system for selecting the Members of the United States Senate, which has since been changed by constitutional amendment. They established a tenure of 6 years. They considered the Senators to be ambassadors from the sovereign States.

May I interpose to say that the public officials of the people of this great Nation at that early date placed much confidence and authority in and greatly honored the sovereign States. They looked to them as individual entities, having governments of their own, having

their own elections, having their own public officials, conducting their own business, but, just as nations send ambassadors to foreign countries, they provided that each of our sovereign States should send ambassadors to the National Federal Government which they set up at Washington.

Having established the three different types of election, the three different tenures of office as providing checks and balances, they came to the consideration of the judiciary, and they were forced to devise some method for the people to select the members of the judiciary.

Mr. President, if there is any division of the Government that is important it is certainly the judicial branch of our Government. The judiciary must interpret the laws passed by both branches of Congress. In the cases which are brought before the judges questions of life and death of the citizens of the country are decided, as well as their rights and welfare. Judges pronounce the death sentence on citizens of the country. The founders, therefore, considered it highly important that the people have some voice in the selection of their Federal judges, and they made the tenure of Federal judges different from that of other officers. They made the tenure of office for life or during good behavior.

What voice do the people have in the selection of their Federal judges? They are not elected by the people. They are appointed by the President, who is elected by the electors, who are elected by the people of the sovereign States. But the nominations of judges are subject to confirmation by Members of the United States Senate.

Mr. President, I have long wondered, and have asked every one with whom I have come in contact I thought might know, why we have two United States Senators from each State other than the fact that it is so provided in the Constitution. Authority for having two Senators from each State comes from the Constitution, but what was the reason back of the setting up of the system whereby two Senators are allotted to each State? The office of Senator is certainly a different kind of office than any other office of which I have ever heard. We do not have two Presidents. We do not have two Governors in a State. We do not have two Representatives from the same congressional district. No business institution has two presidents or two heads. There is always one head to every government and one head to every division of government. The exception arises in the case of the United States Senate. I have sought and sought and sought for an answer to the question as to why each State should have two Senators representing it in the United States Senate, each with equal authority, with equal power, and with equal voice. I have never received an answer, but since the lightning has struck me, as I said, with respect to the pending nomination, I have been giving the matter considerable attention, and have figured out in my own mind the reason why there are two United States Senators of equal status from each State.

Perhaps there may be other reasons than the one I have arrived at, but I believe the men who established our Government were inspired men, if ever there were any inspired men, and I think they looked down the long years into the future, and I believe the reason they provided for two Senators was to provide for taking care of cases parallel to the one we have before us at this moment. They considered that the people of each State should have some small voice at least in the selection of the Federal judges who were to preside over the courts of their States, and that if there should be some people in a State who were entirely overlooked by one of the Senators of that State the other Senator might condescend to give them some consideration and bring their plea to the floor of the United States Senate, whereas it would not be brought to this floor if each State had only one Senator.

That is the case now before us. The nomination was given to the Senate without any advice or consent on the part of the junior Senator from Texas. The nomination was sent here by the President, and some of our people in the State of Texas registered great indignation. They thought it was a very bad appointment, and they came to the junior Senator from Texas and asked me to make objections to the nomination. Mr. President, that is what I am doing.

I wish to say for the benefit of all who might be listening or who might read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that it is not a pleasant task for a United States Senator to be forced to rise on the floor of the Senate in a case like this and make objections. I am naturally of an optimistic disposition, of a cheerful character, and do not like to convey sad tidings. But duty comes first with every Senator in this Chamber, and it is my solemn duty to stand before my colleagues in the Senate and explain to them why the nomination is a bad one, and why the Senate should not advise and consent to the nomination.

When the nomination first came to the Senate, I made objections in the subcommittee and later made objections in the full Committee on the Judiciary. I appeared before the Committee on the Judiciary and registered my objections. The members of the committee gave earnest and sincere consideration to what I had to say, and I have no criticism to offer whatever of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

I regret very much that it became necessary to take up the time of the Committee on the Judiciary with this subject.

The nomination was sent to the Senate on the 8th day of January, and it is now the 1st day of July, and the nomination has been constantly tantalizing the members of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. It seems to me there should be some system devised so that situations like this will not arise. For my part, I apologize for having had to take the time of the Committee on the Judiciary, as well as now having to take the time of the Members of the Senate.

I have done everything within my power to have the system of appointment straightened out in my State since I have been in the Senate. I do not know when patience ceases to be a virtue, but I was elected by the citizens of the State of Texas as one of their Senators, and I have had absolutely nothing to do with any appointment to Federal office from the State of Texas until after the present appointment was made. Since that time two attorneys whom I recommended to be United States attorneys have been appointed by the President. The two attorneys are good men. Their appointments are now before the United States Senate. The appointments have been before the Senate for some time, and I do not know why the nominations have been held up. They have been held up, however. I hope the two nominations will be confirmed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOPER in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Are those nominations now before a committee of the Senate or have they been reported by the committee and are now on the Executive Calendar?

Mr. O'DANIEL. The nominations have been reported by the committee. The nominations were considered by a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, and were favorably reported and have been on the Executive Calendar for quite a while.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Have the two nominations never been called up for consideration by the Senate?

Mr. O'DANIEL. They have never been called up. The chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary mentioned the two nominations, which are Frank B. Potter, of Texas, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Texas, and Henry W. Moursund, of Texas, to be United States attorney for the western district of Texas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Does the Senator have any information as to why they have not been called up so the Senate might act on them?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I have been told that it is because it is desired to hold the nominations on the calendar. It is the desire of someone that they be held until the Dooley nomination is disposed of; for what reason, I do not know.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Did they reach the calendar before the Dooley nomination, or subsequent thereto?

Mr. O'DANIEL. After the Dooley nomination.

Mr. President, I do not wish to exercise the prerogative of the President of the United States with respect to nominations. All I would like to have done is to have the Constitution followed. The Constitution provides that the President shall nominate and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoint Federal judges. In further explanation of the system established by our forefathers with reference to the selection of public officials, let me say that it seems to me that they envisioned a case like this. And possibly, many other things which we of today, lacking the wisdom of those great men, have not yet envisioned. After they had written the Constitution they apparently and immediately recognized

the necessity of an unwritten law; and it was used during the administration of President Washington. Our first President, the Father of Our Country, recognized the unwritten law of senatorial courtesy, and did not even ask for the reason for objection by a Senator, but submitted another nomination. So, apparently our forefathers who wrote the Constitution and established the unwritten law believed that no one would know more about Federal appointments in the individual sovereign States than would the Senators from those States. They reasoned that the two Senators from a given State should know more about the qualifications of Federal judges and other Federal appointees than would Senators from North Dakota, Pennsylvania, New York, or any of the other States which existed at that time or which might come into the Union subsequently.

It seems to me that that is sound logic. If the people of the sovereign States are to have full protection and full value for the salaries paid to United States Senators, they should have the protection of the approval of both Senators from the given State. I think we would be more likely to get better judges if the people of a State had the benefit of the judgment of both Senators. I say that even though one might be a Republican and the other a Democrat. In the early days Republicans and Democrats were unknown. Our forefathers were looking to the people. They were talking about people, not political organizations.

Mr. President, I believe that if more attention were paid to the nomination and appointment of Federal judges throughout the country the Nation would not today be in the deplorable condition in which it finds itself so far as the judiciary is concerned. I am not an attorney. I have the greatest respect and admiration for members of the bar. They are learned men. They pursue a very useful vocation. I wish that I might have had the advantage of attending some great university and studying law; but unfortunately, being the son of a tenant farmer, I was busy plowing corn and was unable to avail myself of the opportunity for a legal education. But I certainly admire members of the bar. I enjoy listening to them argue and debate. I love the correct English which most of them use. As I say, I am not an attorney. I am only giving my opinion as a layman, an average American citizen.

In conversation with some of the best attorneys I know, in Texas and other States, the subject of the judiciary is not discussed very long until they bring out the point that the judiciary of the United States is in the mud, that it has sunk to a low level, that it is in a deplorable condition. We have some evidence of that. I refer to an article written by the able chairman of our Judiciary Committee, and published in the Journal of the American Bar Association. In part, he states as follows:

> The present political character of the membership of the Federal bench is, according to my preliminary study, grossly lopsided on the side of Democratic leftists. I shall strive to restore a balance so as to assure for the bench an adequate supply of able jurists, including a fair proportion of Republicans, all of whom will be of unimpeachable judicial standing and dedicated to our constitutional system of checks and balances.

All along the line, from the Supreme Court on down, we hear criticism of the judiciary. I ask, Mr. President, who is to blame for the depreciated value of the judicial system of America? Has not the nomination of every one of these judges been confirmed in the United States Senate? Can we place all the responsibility on the Chief Executive, who sends the nominations to the Senate? I think we are bound to assume our share of the responsibility.

I have sat in this Chamber for 6 years and have seen nominations go through like greased lightning. I wonder if each and every one of them received the scrutiny and careful consideration of every individual Member of this great deliberative body? I do not believe so. I do not like to believe that Senators would willingly vote for confirmation of the nominations of judges who are now a part of what has been characterized as a deplorable mess. That is not true of all of them, of course. I do not want to believe that Senators would willingly vote for any such judges; but their nominations have been confirmed in the Senate.

I shall be satisfied if I do nothing more than bring to the attention of the Senate the importance of cleaning up the judicial system. When are we going to start? I say that now is the time to start, because we have before us one such nomination, a nomination which will turn out to be just as rotten as any of the other nominations, because the man is not qualified.

Are we to resort to the old system of political back-scratching with reference to nominations? Or will the Senate declare that from now on we shall put in a little time without complaining, and that we shall listen to the earnest plea of every Senator who has sufficient fortitude to rise on the floor of the Senate and announce that a certain nomination should not be confirmed?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator says that this nominee is not qualified. Frankly, I have not had an opportunity to read the record. I am wondering if the Senator could give me a little more information as to what he means by the statement that the nominee is not qualified?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I appreciate the Senator's question. Later in my discussion I shall go into that subject fully. At the present time I am discussing the personal obnoxiousness feature. Incidentally, I made the statement that the nominee was not qualified. I intend to prove it at the proper time.

Mr. LUCAS. May I ask the Senator a further question?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Certainly.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator has made objection to the nomination of Mr. Dooley on the ground that he is personally obnoxious to the Senator. I presume that the Senator is intimately acquainted with this man.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I shall discuss the "personal obnoxiousness" feature, I hope to the entire satisfaction of the able Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I am sorry that I interrupted the Senator at this point.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I do not mind the interruption. However, I shall reach that question later in the discussion.

Mr. LUCAS. I am sorry I interrupted the Senator.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. In reply to the suggestion of the able Senator from Illinois with regard to not having read the record, let me say that I do not believe the record has been printed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Does the Senator mean the record of hearings?

Mr. MOORE. Yes. Does the Senator from Texas know whether it has been printed?

Mr. O'DANIEL. No. The record has not been printed for distribution to Senators.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. There is one point which I should like to clear up in my own mind. The Senator has been discussing a possible dereliction of the Senate in the confirmation of nominations of judges. Is he making any complaint about the investigation of Mr. Dooley by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary? Has the investigation not been thorough enough, in his opinion?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I am pleased to answer the able Senator, my colleague from the neighboring State of New Mexico, able attorney that he is, and say that I have expressed myself as complimentary to the efforts of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HATCH. If the Senator will yield further, let me say that I thought that was his position, but in the light of his other remarks I wanted to be sure that I correctly understood him to have no objection to the action of the committee insofar as sufficient investigation of the particular nominee in question is concerned.

Mr. O'DANIEL. There is no criticism whatever of the activities of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. I think they have performed their duties gallantly.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. May we assume from that statement that Members of the Senate, by reading the record or the abbreviated report of the record made by the committee, would have fair information and sufficient information upon which to base their conclusions with respect to whether the candidate is qualified for the position for which he is nominated?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I think the Senators can depend upon the brief report of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. However, I do not believe that that precludes them from listening to further argument and debate which might be beneficial.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Certainly.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am not raising the point that we would be precluded, nor do I think we would want to fail to listen to any argument which might be made. But the very first thing that I want to determine in connection with a nominee for a position is this: Is he qualified? That is the first question. If he is not qualified, it does not matter what other gifts he may possess, he ought not to be confirmed. If he is qualified, if there is no controversy about that, then Senators can forget about it in their further deliberation. If there is a question as to his qualifications, naturally some of us would like to inquire into it. I am sure that all of us would like to satisfy ourselves regarding it. Is it conceded by the Senator from Texas that professionally the man is qualified for the position? That is what I should like to know.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I think the vote which was taken, 8 to 4, with one Senator voting to report to the Senate and stating that he was against the confirmation, would indicate that the committee was not in thorough agreement with reference to some of the facts. I do not know whether the committee members are in agreement with reference to the qualifications of the nominee, because their vote does not indicate that; but it does indicate that there is a difference of opinion.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That difference of opinion might arise from the personal obnoxiousness objection which has been introduced.

Mr. O'DANIEL. No; I do not believe it would.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I cannot say how that arises, but the question I want determined is this, and I would like to have the Senator answer my question frankly, because this is a difficult problem for some of us. I should like to have the Senator tell me whether, in his opinion, this man possesses the professional qualifications requisite to holding the office, or does the Senator know as to that?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I would say that he does not possess all the qualifications which I consider essential.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I asked about his professional qualifications, his knowledge of the law, his training, experience, and background, that would qualify him to perform the duties of a judge.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I understood the Senator from Arkansas to say "professional qualifications," and my answer applies to that question. Professionally I do not consider that the nominee possesses all the qualifications that a judge should have. In view of the fact that in Texas we have so many good attorneys—more than 3,000 in the one district which is involved—many of whom do possess all the qualifications necessary, I do not believe that the people of Texas should be deprived of any of their rights in this matter by taking an inferior subject at top price.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am not asking the Senator whether the nominee is the best-qualified man available. I am trying to determine whether he lacks any of the professional qualifications requisite for a good judge. If the Senator says he does, I should like to be enlightened as to what qualification or character of qualification professionally he lacks.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I appreciate that question. It is the same question which was propounded by the able Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and I advised the Senator from Illinois that later in my discussion I would get to that point of professional qualifications.

Mr. President, we are getting a further taste of the character of Federal nominations as indicated in the articles published in Collier's and written by Mr. James A. Farley, who was chairman of the Democratic National Committee for several years. He should be an authority on the question.

On page 13 of the issue of Collier's of June 21, 1947, Mr. Farley is quoting the late President and himself. They seem to have been talking about a certain Court-packing plan which was up for discussion in the Senate at one time, I believe. Mr. Farley says:

> "Well," I yielded, "I suppose it's all right, but I wouldn't let it happen again."
>
> "I'll watch out for it in the future," he promised. "This is very important to me; it's something that affects the heart of my program. I'll keep them here all year to pass it, if necessary. I want you to help."
>
> "You can count on me, boss. I will keep in contact with those who are supporting you on the Hill and do my best to bring the others around."
>
> "First off," continued the President, "we must hold up judicial appointments in States where the delegation is not going along. We must make appointments promptly where the delegation is with us. Where there is a division we must give posts to those supporting us. Second, this must apply to other appointments as well as judicial appointment. I'll keep in close contact with the leaders."

Somehow or other I cannot see how that system of appointing Federal judges comes within the intent of the Constitution of the United States, that is, using it for the purpose of trying to influence people.

In the next edition of Collier's, that of June 28, Mr. Farley has something else to say. He is talking about purging some Senators. There are pictures of some of the Senators in connection with the article. There are pictures of some who are here and some who are not here, one of whom is the late Senator Smith, of South Carolina. There are pictures of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], former Senator Van Nuys, of Indiana, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], former Senator Bennett Clark, of Missouri, former Senator Lonergan, of Connecticut, the late Senator Adams, of Colorado, and former Senator Gillette, of Iowa, all of whom were slated, according to this article, for a purge.

The article continues:

> In Georgia the President wanted Senator WALTER F. GEORGE defeated, as an object lesson to the southern bloc which had been opposing his social reforms.
>
> He was no less eager to defeat Senator TYDINGS in Maryland. TYDINGS, he felt, had been most difficult in 1932, doing his best to block the Roosevelt nomination.

Those are things that bring out permanently the fact that the appointive power has been used in recent years for the purpose of trying to purge Senators who would not go along and vote exactly as the administration desired. Some of the purges were not wholly successful. That is the reason for this nomination, Mr. President. It is a continuation of that policy to purge a United States Senator who will not go along with all the policies of the present administration.

I think that every Senator is entitled to his own opinion. I hope our system of government will never be changed so that a Senator will vote contrary to his own conscience, his own will, and his own desires; and I hope that no pressure within the Government, from the Executive department, the Judiciary department, or any other department will be brought to bear to try to force a Senator to vote with the administration or to punish him if he does not vote with the administration. But that is one of the objectives of the appointment of Mr. Dooley.

This is a continued story. The New Dealers never give up, once they start after one of their opponents. I was twice elected Governor of the State of Texas by the Democrats. Soon after my election to a second term as Governor of Texas on the Democratic ticket, the State of Texas suffered a great loss in the passing of Senator Sheppard. The House of Representatives of the State of Texas, which used to be responsible for sending Senators to the Federal seat of Government, met and unanimously passed a resolution asking me to take the place of Senator Sheppard. Until that time, I had had no political ambitions, no thought whatever of being a United States Senator. But based on the unanimous resolution passed by the Texas House of Representatives, I offered myself. I did not accept in the easy way of resigning and hoping that my successor would appoint me until an election could be called, but I accepted in the democratic way, and I offered myself as a candidate; and in the meantime I appointed Senator Andrew Jackson Houston, the son of the first Senator Texas ever had, Sam Houston, to serve as Senator; and he sat here in the Senate until his death, just before the election.

Somehow or other the administration up here got in collaboration with the politicians in Texas—and Mr. President, I want to tell you that we in Texas do not take our hats off to any State so far as politicians are concerned; in Texas we have them just as crooked as they are anywhere, and they are active all the time. They are above ground and below ground. The politicians never were particularly elated over the fact that the

people of Texas elected me as their Governor. They were not any more elated when the people of Texas elected me the second time. Then the politicians got the idea that it would be a terrible thing if the people were to send me to Washington. I am referring to the Texas professional politicians, who work hand in glove with the professional politicians in Washington and keep the wires hot between the two seats of Government. So they commenced to concoct a plan to keep me from becoming United States Senator; and this appointment of Dooley is just a continuation of that diabolical plot of the New Deal gang to try to purge me. They have tried everything else under the sun, and, of course, it is all right for them to try this move.

In the first campaign they used the executive branch of the Federal Government to try to tell the people of Texas whom they should elect as their United States Senator. Then the President of the United States blessed one of his young stooges, a Member of the House of Representatives, and sent him to Texas with all the CIO money he needed, to try to keep the Governor of Texas from being elected Senator. But the plan did not work. They had pictures of the President shaking hands with this opponent. They had those pictures plastered so thickly all over the State of Texas that the sun could hardly penetrate through to the earth. But the plan did not work.

When I came up for reelection they were still at work. They never give up. This is part of a plot they have to try to purge me because I am not in favor of the socialistic or communistic government that has been thrust on the American people during the last 14 years by the New Deal gang. I say they never give up.

So they said, "We will use the judiciary this time. We will surely get the junior Senator from Texas this time." This time they dragged one of the judges off the bench.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Gladly.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Texas has been saying that the Federal Government has been a communistic government for the last 14 years. I wish the Senator would elaborate a little on that point. I dislike to interrupt him; but a great many laws were passed during that time, many of them being the so-called New Deal laws against which the Senator from Texas is always inveighing. I have been in the Senate 6 years, but I do not think the Senator from Texas has ever yet introduced a bill to repeal one of those laws. Has he?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I am not surprised that the Senator from Illinois does not know about the bills I have introduced, because they have been hidden under the rugs in the committee rooms. They have never seen the light of day.

Yes; I have introduced several bills to repeal some of what I call the communistic legislation.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to have a record about that, some time. I have been in the Senate for about 6 years during the time the Senator from Texas has been a Member of the Senate, and I have been waiting for him to make a fight on some of this New Deal legislation. I simply have not been able to discover that he has done so at any time, aside from doing a lot of talking on the floor of the Senate and charging every Senator who has ever voted for one of these measures during the last 14 years as being directly or sometimes indirectly alined with a Communist organization.

When the Senator from Texas says that that "crowd" for the last 14 years has been communistic, such a statement is a reflection on every Senator who voted for the passage of such measures, and the Senator from Texas by his remarks would imply that all such Senators have a communistic tinge.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, is it the contention of the Senator from Illinois that a communistic law cannot be passed by Democrats and Republicans?

Mr. LUCAS. That is not the point. The Senator from Texas is not talking about Republicans when he speaks of those who have been in power during the last 14 years.

When the Senator looks at the record, he will find that a great number of Republicans voted for a great number of the measures against which the Senator from Texas is always inveighing.

Now the Republicans are in power, and the Senator from Texas is rather close to them, and it would seem to me that the time has come when those who are constantly talking about the New Deal measures that have been thrust on the American people should have the courage to introduce bills to repeal such measures, including the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, the Securities and Exchange Act, and 17 or 18 other important measures that have become the law of the land and that are measures passed under the Roosevelt administration about which the Senator from Texas is talking. I should like to see that happen now. Ever since the Republicans came in power, I have been waiting for them to join with the Senator from Texas in introducing a number of bills to do that very thing. But so far I have not seen that happen.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I am very sorry the Senator from Illinois has not observed that. I thought he was more observing than that, because some of the bills the junior Senator from Texas has introduced during the last 6 years, and which have been lying around untouched, not receiving any consideration, were discovered by the newly elected Republicans. They found those bills out in the cloakroom, or in the committee rooms or somewhere else, and they have picked them up and have put the Republican label on them, and now some of them are wrapped up in the Taft-Hartley bill.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas does not mean to say that the Wagner Act has been repealed, does he?

Mr. O'DANIEL. No. One bill I introduced provided for the complete repeal of the Wagner Act, but the Republicans are a little timid, and they have not gotten that far yet. But with another election like the one last November, possibly the Wagner Act will be repealed.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Texas has said that he introduced a bill to repeal the Wagner Act. Let me ask when the Senator introduced that bill.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I do not now recall the exact date, but it has been several years ago.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas introduced that bill in 1945.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I introduced it at every session.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, at one time the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] and former Senator Burton introduced a bill providing for the repeal of part of the Wagner Act, and the Senator from Texas criticized it.

Mr. O'DANIEL. No, Mr. President; I did not criticize it. I praised it, but I simply said it did not go far enough.

I have been introducing bills to amend and repeal the Wagner Act ever since I have been a Member of the Senate, but the first measure by which that act has been amended is the Taft-Hartley bill. I do not think that goes far enough, but certainly it is a step in the right direction.

So, Mr. President, when I refer to communistic legislation, I am not referring to any Member of the Senate or any Member of the House as being a Communist or a fellow traveler. I make the claim that it is possible for any person, regardless of his affiliation, to vote for and to participate in the enactment of communistic legislation. Perhaps some such legislation has been enacted. I think some has.

At any rate, I was telling the story about the purge and the continuation of the purge, as outlined by Mr. Farley in his articles in Collier's magazine. That is one of the objections I have to this nomination. I got far enough to say that in the first election they used the White House in trying to effect this purge, but it did not work.

Then they used the Federal bench; they pulled one of the judges off the Federal bench by making what a great many persons believed to be a promise that if and when he was defeated, he would be appointed to another Federal bench. So they pulled that honorable judge off the bench because he had a great vote-getting history. He had been attorney general of the State of Texas and Governor of the State of Texas, and had gotten lots of votes. They got another party in Texas who had been attorney general twice and governor twice, and they ran both of them. I called them the Gold Dust twins. They ran both of them against me in the second election, in an effort to purge me from the United States Senate. It did not work. We are approaching another election, and they have got this same old build-up. They are going to try to use the United States Senate this time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the Senator three questions. I have just been reading the memorandum that

was left on our desks. I should like to ask the Senator, first, this question: Referring to this gentleman whose appointment as a judge is under consideration by the Senate for confirmation, are his duties to be performed completely within the State of Texas?

Mr. O'DANIEL. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. My second question is: Is this appointment personally obnoxious to the Senator from Texas who is now speaking?

Mr. O'DANIEL. It is.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. My third question is: Is the Senator from Texas, who is now speaking, attempting to give reasons why this man is personally obnoxious to him, or is he making statements generally surrounding the appointment and confirmation?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I am not giving reasons for the nomination being personally obnoxious.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Then does the Senator from Texas, who is now speaking, rest his case simply on the precedents in the Senate, that a man personally obnoxious is generally refused confirmation?

Mr. O'DANIEL. The record speaks for itself. In most cases I believe that confirmation has been refused when a nominee is personally obnoxious, and when the duties of the nominee are to be performed wholly within the Senator's State.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Then, if the Senator does not rest his case on that, does he ask Senators who have a vote on this question to decide whether the objections he is stating to the man's confirmation are sufficient to determine that his confirmation should be rejected, or that the appointment should be rejected?

Mr. O'DANIEL. As I said before, I am not offering any reasons for the obnoxiousness. I consider that no one else knows so well as I do that the nomination is objectionable; and the RECORD bears me out. Former Senator Glass, former Senator Wheeler, and other Senators on down the line, have made the statement to the effect that no one should know better than the Senator himself whether or not the nomination is objectionable. When an attempt is made to give reasons, one Senator might say, "The reason is good"; another Senator might say, "It is bad." But it devolves upon the Senator to decide, and for other Senators then to decide as to whether or not the nomination is obnoxious to another person. I do not believe that other Senators can decide it, so I rest my case on stating that the nomination is personally obnoxious. Then, I give other reasons as to why I think the nomination should not be confirmed, so that any Senator that does not believe in the philosophy or the unwritten law of personal obnoxiousness might find from the statements that I make and the records that I give some other reason, and vote against confirmation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. O'DANIEL. There are many reasons. One of the reasons is that I do not consider the nominee fully qualified. I shall give other reasons as I go along. But with respect to my personal obnoxiousness objection, I shall not ask Senators to rule on whether or not that is proper, and whether I have reasons for that or not. I say that the nomination is personally obnoxious. That is the theory that has been followed, and that is the statement that has been used by many Senators in the past. I read from the RECORD in the Boyle case. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] stated, in part, as follows:

> The present nomination of William S. Boyle, now pending before the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, is personally offensive and personally obnoxious to the junior Senator from Nevada.

In the Roberts case, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] said:

> It is my sincere and honest conviction that this nomination was made for the purpose of being personally offensive to the Virginia Senators.

From the booklet, to which I shall refer after awhile, I shall read what certain other Senators have said about nominations being personally obnoxious to them. I am now attempting to show that there is another election approaching, next year, that is motivating the same political crowd that have been trying to use the White House, first, to purge me, and second, the House of Representatives, and then the judicial system. They dragged a judge from his exalted position on the Federal bench in the State of Texas and put him in the race in an effort to get me into a runoff so one of the "Gold Dust Twins" might win. That did not work.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator said a moment ago that the Federal Government had been attempting to purge him, in the State of Texas, from time to time, and that they are going to do the same thing again by carrying on the same practice they followed in the past. Do I understand by that that the Senator is going to be a candidate for reelection to the Senate?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I was just starting to explain that to the Senate, and if the Senator from Illinois will only be patient until I finish the next sentence, he will know the great secret.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not desire to pry into the Senator's secrets. I was interested merely because I knew the Senator from Texas campaigned all over the country on a one-term issue, and I wondered whether or not he was getting around to the point where he might reverse his previous position.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Not only did the Senator from Texas do that, but he brought that issue to the floor of the United States Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. O'DANIEL. There was but one vote in favor of it, and that was mine. If I am not here, who is going to carry on the fight? [Laughter.]

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is noted for his militant consistency. I expected him to make that very answer. I was only interested in the matter because of its national implication. The issue attracted the attention of many people throughout the United States.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I hope so. That was the intention.

Mr. LUCAS. I know it was, and I am sure that when the Senator changes his mind, for the sole reason that he is the only one fighting for such a principle, he will be a candidate to succeed himself and I am sure he will still get an impressive amount of recognition throughout the country. I thank the Senator. I shall not take any more of his time.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I thank the Senator from Illinois for developing this important point.

Mr. LUCAS. I knew the Senator was interested in such a political issue and so is the Senator from Illinois. We are in agreement on that.

Mr. O'DANIEL. My adversaries have speculated that possibly I might run for reelection next year, and they have been dragging this Dooley nomination along now for about 3 years, in order to bring it in front of the coming election. Judge Wilson, as I shall read from his letter very soon, wanted to retire in June 1944, almost 3 years ago. They had to string this thing along and get it in position, right in front of the next election, because they think I am going to run. Now, whether I run or not is a matter that is going to be announced later; but it is a momentous question. In fact, I have been asked that question before, and I expect the answer will come along some day.

Mr. LUCAS. It is always a momentous question, if I may interject, with every Senator, as to whether he shall be a candidate to succeed himself. One usually finds a Senator saying he does not think he is going to run again, and giving you excellent reasons for his position. This occurs about a year and a half before the election. But, as former Senator Tom Heflin said, the uncertain and vacillating Senator finally succumbs to the clamor of the people, and is forced to run, whether he wants to or not. I suppose it is not speculating too much to say that the junior Senator from Texas may find himself in that same position.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I believe it is very hard to turn down the voice of the people on a momentous question like that, and also to subdue the urge that is constantly in one's heart, after he has had a taste of public office. So the objection that I am making to this nomination is the fact that it is a deliberate attempt on the part of those who figure these things out—the politicians—to use this high deliberative body—the United States Senate—as a political weapon for the purpose of trying to purge one of its Members. Now, that can get extremely close to every Member here. It is possibly closer to me now than to anyone else, and that is why I used the expression that one seldom, if ever, realizes the shock until he is struck by lightning himself. But if Senators permit the United States Senate to be used as a tool of the politicians, for the purpose of purging any Member, whether Senators like him personally or whether they do not, it seems to me that they are

using it for an ulterior purpose. It seems to me that they are helping to drag down their own castle upon their heads. It seems to me it is something that should not be done. It was done, down in the White House, and look what resulted—all this political consternation, all this criticism, and all this uproar. Even the Democrats lost the House and the Senate last year simply because of the things they did that were wrong. I tried to save the Democratic Party. I stood here on the floor and talked for over 8 hours trying to get the Democratic Party to abolish OPA because I felt that it was going to be the last straw that would break the camel's back, causing the Democrats to lose out. I predicted that here on the floor of the Senate, and it happened.

OPA was continued, and many people were sorry. Some came to me afterward and said, "You are absolutely correct. If we do not get rid of this regimentation, this socialistic order trying to tell every woman what she can receive for a pound of butter, and every man what he shall be paid for a dozen eggs, we will be in a sorry state. If we do not get rid of the OPA we will lose out in the next election." I urged the Democratic Members of the Senate to abolish the OPA. That is another of the laws which, I should like to remind the Senator from Illinois, I stood on the floor of the Senate and asked to have repealed.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I think the Senator from Texas told us what would happen to prices immediately after Congress repealed the OPA statute.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I do not believe the Senator will find that I stated what would happen to prices if OPA were abolished, because I was not concerned with what would happen to prices. I do not think prices should be any concern of the Federal Government. The Federal Government should not concern itself with what price a woman shall receive for a pound of butter after she has gone out in the early morning and milked her cow and skimmed the cream and churned it into butter, which she must sell because she needs the money she receives for the butter to buy things which her children need. I do not think the Government should concern itself with whether the price of butter is 30 cents or $3. That is why I argued against further Government control.

Mr. LUCAS. That may be true, and I may be wrong in respect to what the Senator said I know he made a very determined stand against OPA. Many of his senatorial friends who went along with him told us what was going to happen to prices, that they were going up for about 30 days, and then would go back down, with the operation of the law of supply and demand.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I agree with the Senator from Illinois that there were many who made the statement that if OPA were abolished prices would come down. I did not make that statement. What happens to prices does not make any difference. The man who sells is an American citizen and the man who buys is an American citizen, and the exchange is between American citizens, and it is not an affair of the United States Government.

Mr. HAWKES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. HAWKES. The Senator undoubtedly knew then, as every American should have known, that just so long as we short the market in the United States by sending hundreds of thousands and millions of tons of material out of the country prices will go up. Anybody ought to know that the law of supply and demand would put prices up in that case. But the big question is whether the higher prices we have here, which have been coming down a little, are better for the Nation than destroying the producers of the source of supply that keeps a nation going.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I thank the Senator from New Jersey. I have had some experience with the law of supply and demand, and I do not believe it can be repealed, regardless of how strong the government is which ever would attempt it. Its efforts along that line would eventually fail. As I stated, I tried to save democracy and our American form of government and our Democratic Party, but I could not do so. The Senate proceeded to pass the bill anyhow.

Then came the voice of the people of the United States on November 5. They backed me up in what I had said and made a considerable number of changes in this town. It did not take President Truman very long to find out what caused the people to vote the way they did, and he came out and wiped most of the OPA regulations off the map. That is when his prestige went up. The people said "Hurrah for Mr. Truman." The President did a mighty fine thing then. If he had done it before election we would now have more Democrats on this side of the aisle. I am not, however, kicking about the Republicans. I want the people to have anyone in office they want to vote for, whether they are Democrats or Republicans. I get along with all of them.

Mr. President, use is expected to be made of this great deliberative body in next year's election in Texas. It is proposed to drag this body down in the political mire so the record of what is done can be used all over the State of Texas next year in case I run for reelection. It is proposed to make the statement "We have been telling you all the time that the junior Senator from Texas had absolutely no power in the United States Senate, that he was just a weak sister up there. He could not even get anyone from his State appointed to office. He was entirely ineffective. That is shown by the vote." If the vote should be in favor of confirming Mr. Dooley, it would be said, "This is what the United States Senate thinks of the junior Senator from Texas. They did not back him up. He is ineffective."

That, Mr. President, cannot make the situation much worse down there, because all the people in Texas know that whenever the junior Senator from Texas, until recently, made a recommendation to the President for the appointment of a man to Federal office, his endorsement meant the kiss of death to that man. He never could obtain such an appointment. He never could get anyone appointed and confirmed to Federal office from the State of Texas. The people, however, may think conditions are improving somewhat by reason of the fact that recently two men backed by the junior Senator from Texas were actually appointed to office by the President.

Mr. President, I wish to read a letter I received from the honorable judge who wishes to retire and has been trying to retire for 3 years. It is a very enlightening letter. It contains many significant sentences and paragraphs. I shall take the time to read the letter to the Members of the Senate, Mr. President, and comment as I proceed. The letter was written on January 10, 1947, from Fort Worth, Tex.:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT,
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS—

The letter is addressed:

Senator W. LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR—

The letter is dated 2 days after the President sent the nomination of Mr. Dooley to the Senate on January 8. On January 10 the judge wrote this letter to me. Senators will see what he is interested in. He said:

The papers here in Texas announce rather definitely that you are coming up for reelection in 1948.

That is the burning issue in many places. The Senator from Illinois just mentioned it a while ago. Here is a judge in my home district, my home town in Texas, the place in which I have lived ever since I have been in Texas. He started out by telling me that I am going to be up for re-election next year.

They also report that you reaffirmed—

Oh, oh, this is interesting—

They also report that you reaffirmed your stand for limiting the terms for Senators and Congressmen, the idea being that their terms be extended and not be eligible for reelection. I have believed you were right from the time you announced it many years ago. Possibly you recall that I wrote you a letter telling you how thoroughly I was with you. I am of the same view yet.

Mr. President, it will be seen that I am not alone. Here is a judge who is with me in respect to limiting the tenure of office of Members of Congress. I am alone in the Senate, but the Texas judge is with me. That is preliminary to what we are getting to in this letter. We are now getting down to what the judge is interested in:

Also the papers announce that you are opposed to Mr. Joe B. Dooley, of Amarillo, whom the President has nominated to succeed me.

Mr. President, what has that to do with my running for reelection? I want Senators to notice as we go along insinuations that may be gathered from sentences in the letter.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for 15 minutes to make a speech?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Does the Senator wish to make a speech against the Dooley nomination?

Mr. BUCK. No. The speech is against the message we received yesterday from the President.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I think that is an important subject. If the Senator proposes to discuss the message from the President, yes, I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. BUCK. Will the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I shall yield unless someone objects.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. May I ask what the plans are for the remainder of the evening? Is it proposed to open up another line of discussion at 5:20 in the afternoon? It might very well be, based on what the Senator from Delaware has said, that other discussion of the same subject will be had.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. It had been my thought that the Senator from Texas might not desire to continue after half past five, and that at that time we might either resume legislative session and legislative business or we might recess until tomorrow.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. If the Senator yields, I will try not to take more than 10 minutes.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I shall be glad to yield, Mr. President.

Mr. WHITE. Of course, if the Senator from Texas yields the floor to someone else to make a speech he does so at the peril of losing the floor.

Mr. O'DANIEL. If that is the parliamentary situation, I should ask unanimous consent to yield for the purpose suggested by the Senator from Delaware without losing the floor. I might say that I have a great many matters to discuss in connection with the nomination.

Mr. WHITE. I suggest to the Senator from Texas that he ask unanimous consent that he may be recognized tomorrow upon the convening of the Senate, to continue his speech, and that the Senator from Delaware may proceed now for 10 or 15 minutes, or whatever length of time he sees fit to take, if the Senator from Texas is protected in his right to proceed tomorrow.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Delaware for 10 or 15 minutes, with the understanding that I shall have the floor when the Senate reconvenes tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I reserve the right to object. I happen to know that there are several Senators who will be provoked into a discussion of what I anticipate the Senator from Delaware is going to discuss.

Mr. BUCK. I may say to the Senator from New Mexico that perhaps my speech will not be as bad as he anticipates.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have no idea of what the Senator is going to say, but when he announced that he was going to discuss the message of the President of the United States, knowing how strongly certain Senators feel about the matter—and some of them are not on the floor at this time—I would feel compelled to suggest the absence of a quorum before that request is acted upon in order that those Senators might be present. I have no objection to the request of the Senator from Texas that he may yield now and continue when the Senate convenes tomorrow, but I call attention to the lateness of the hour——

Mr. WHITE. Without involving in the request of the Senator from Texas any speech the Senator from Delaware may choose to make, I make the suggestion that the Senator from Texas ask permission now to conclude for today and to be recognized tomorrow on the reconvening of the Senate.

Mr. HATCH. If the Senator from Texas now desires to conclude his speech for today and resume tomorrow, I have no objection to that procedure.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I make that request. I ask unanimous consent that I may conclude for the day, with the understanding that I am to be recognized tomorrow upon the convening of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I said I had no objection to the request. However, in the light of the fact that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] is to address the Senate, and the possibility that he may not wish to yield for a quorum call, I think I should suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WHITE. That is a situation which I cannot control.

Mr. HATCH. If the Senator from Delaware would yield for that purpose——

Mr. BUCK. I request the Senator not to suggest the absence of a quorum at this late hour.

Mr. HATCH. I am trying to persuade the Senator from Delaware to postpone his speech until tomorrow, and not make it at this late hour. Other Senators may wish to be heard.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MOORE. Has the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Texas been acted upon?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not.

Mr. HATCH. I am reserving the right to object.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, apparently the Senator is expecting me to say something. I cannot speak for the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may conclude my remarks for the day at this time, and resume tomorrow, after other Senators have answered the Senator from Delaware, if they care to do so tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I had suggested that if the Senator from Delaware would yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum, I would not object to the request of the Senator from Texas. However, I understand that the Senator from Delaware is about to obtain recognition from the Chair. It will be entirely within his power to take the floor and hold it. I could not suggest the absence of a quorum unless he were willing to yield for that purpose. Therefore, under the parliamentary situation, the only thing I can now do to protect the rights of other Senators is to object; and I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, is it the intention of the majority leader now to move for a recess?

Mr. WHITE. I do not see anything else to do.

Mr. WHERRY. Would the majority leader permit me to suggest a unanimous-consent request on the basis that a quorum call be had to satisfy the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. WHITE. That is satisfactory to me.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Texas to renew his request, and comply with the request for a quorum call.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate take a recess at this time, and that I have the privilege of the floor when the Senate convenes tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, that is not the request which I hoped the Senator from Texas would make. It was my understanding that the distinguished Senator from Delaware had a short speech which he wished to make after obtaining recognition from the Chair. As I understand, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] had no objection, provided a quorum call were had. The reason why the Senator from New Mexico objected to the request was that he wanted a quorum call.

I ask the distinguished Senator from Texas if he will not renew his unanimous-consent request that he be permitted to conclude his remarks for the day and obtain the floor tomorrow to continue his speech so that the Senator from Delaware may deliver his speech, with the idea in mind that there be a quorum call to comply with the request of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I make that request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

Mr. WHERRY. We are to have a quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As the Chair understands, the Senator from Texas asks unanimous consent that when the Senate reconvenes he may have the floor, but that a quorum call, which has been requested by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], be had, and that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] may now address the Senate.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, if I correctly understand, I think that meets the situation which I had in mind.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Myers
Baldwin	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Ball	Hill	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Holland	Overton
Bridges	Ives	Pepper
Brooks	Jenner	Revercomb
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Kilgore	Russell
Byrd	Knowland	Saltonstall
Capper	Langer	Smith
Chavez	Lodge	Sparkman
Connally	Lucas	Stewart
Cooper	McCarran	Taft
Cordon	McCarthy	Taylor
Donnell	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McFarland	Tydings
Dworshak	McGrath	Umstead
Ecton	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ellender	McMahon	Watkins
Ferguson	Magnuson	Wherry
Flanders	Malone	White
Fulbright	Martin	Wiley
Green	Millikin	Williams
Gurney	Moore	Wilson
Hatch	Morse	Young
Hawkes	Murray	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS in the chair). Eighty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT ON RENT-CONTROL BILL

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate was treated to a most unusual proceeding, a procedure which should shock the conscience of every Member of Congress. I refer to the message President Truman submitted to Congress reporting that he had signed H. R. 3203—the 1947 housing and rent-control bill and roundly denouncing Congress for having passed such an act.

The President not only gave vent to his feelings against Congress for its part in the drafting and enactment of the act, but he saw fit to castigate what he termed a "real-estate lobby"; even going so far as to urge Congress to make a full investigation of the activities of this selfish and shortsighted group.

I hold no brief for real-estate lobbyists, but I do heartily resent the President of the United States signing the rent-control bill and then sending to Congress a highly critical message setting forth his views on this legislation. I not only object to the procedure he followed in this instance, but I question his authority for submitting to Congress his views on any bill which becomes a law by his signature. The Constitution of the United States gives him no such power, and I quote the following from section 7, article I:

Every bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate, shall before it becomes a law, be presented to the President of the United States; if he approve he shall sign it, but if not he shall return it with his objections to that House in which it shall have originated, who shall enter the objections at large on their Journal, and proceed to reconsider it.

I would also direct the Senate's attention to section 3492, Hinds' Precedents of the House of Representatives, from which the following excerpts relating to an act of President Tyler are taken:

SECTION 3492, HINDS' PRECEDENTS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The act of President Tyler in filing with a bill an exposition of his reasons for signing it was examined and severely criticized by a committee of the House.

On June 27, 1842, a message was received from President John Tyler, announcing that he had approved and signed an act originating in the House of Representatives "for the apportionment of Representatives among the several States according to the Sixth Census." The message also continued as follows: "and have caused the same to be deposited in the office of the Secretary of State, accompanied by an exposition of my reasons for giving it my sanction."

Mr. John Quincy Adams, of Massachusetts, said that this mesage was a novelty in the history of the country. The Constitution required the President, if he approve a bill, to sign it and not accompany his signature with reasons. After dwelling on the danger of the precedent Mr. Adams moved that the message be referred to a select committee, and that the commitee have power to send for persons and papers. On June 29 this motion was agreed to, and the committee was appointed as follows: Messrs. Adams, John Pope, of Kentucky; Thomas M. T. McKennan, of Pennsylvania; Robert M. T. Hunter, of Virginia, and George H. Proffit, of Indiana.

On July 16, 1842, Mr. Adams made a report, and on August 2 and August 11 he attempted, by a suspension of the rules, to bring the report before the House, but on each occasion failed to obtained the needed two-thirds.

The report reviews the constitutional provisions relating to the presentation of bills to the President, beginning with the first injunction, "that if he approve he shall sign it," and goes on to say: "That is all his power; that is all his duty. No power is given him to alter, to amend, to comment, or to assign reasons for the performance of his duty. His signature is the exclusive evidence admitted by the Constitution of his approval, and all addition of extraneous matter can, in the opinion of the committee, be regarded in no other light than a defacement of the public records and archives."

"The committee can find in the Constitution and laws of the United States no authority given to the President for depositing in the Department of State an exposition of his reasons for signing an act of Congress made by his signature a law, and most especially none for making the deposit in company with the law. No such power is expressly conferred by the Constitution; none such is necessary or proper for giving effect to any other power expressly granted to him. They believe it to be a power the toleration of which would be of the most dangerous and pernicious tendency; and they deem it the duty of the House to arrest and resist this first attempt to exercise it. They have reason to believe that, unless disavowed and discountenanced in this first example, its consequences may contribute to prostrate in the dust the authority of the very law which the President has approved with the accompaniment of this most extraordinary appendage, and to introduce a practice which would transfer the legislative power of Congress itself to the arbitrary will of the Executive."

After discussing the reasons of the President, the report continues:

"The committee considers the act of the President notified by him to the House of Representatives in his message of the 25th ultimo, as unauthorized by the Constitution and laws of the United States, pernicious in its immediate operation, and imminently dangerous in its tendencies. They believe it to be the duty of the House to protest against it, and to place upon their journal an earnest remonstrance against its ever being again repeated. They report, therefore, the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives consider the act of the President of the United States, notified to them by his message of the 25th ultimo, viz, his causing to be deposited in the office of the Secretary of the State with the act of Congress entitled 'An act for an apportionment of Representatives among the several States according to the sixth census,' approved and signed by him, an exposition of his reasons for giving to the said act his sanction as unwarranted by the Constitution and laws of the United States, injurious to the public interests, and of evil example for the future; and this House do hereby solemnly protest against the said act of the President and against its ever being repeated or adduced as a precedent hereafter."

While the above precedent refers specifically to a President writing on the face of a bill his comments on it, or attaching comments to a bill which he has already signed, the principle still follows, in my estimation, when the President expresses himself to the Congress and to the public, derogating a particular law to which he has affixed his signature.

The practice indulged in by the President in this instance is one which, in effect, undermines the very law to which he has put his signature. I pose this question: How can an executive charged with the duty of enforcing the laws of the United States hope to gain the support of the people when enforcing those laws, and honestly enforce the laws himself, if he deplores the law? Sound logic, sound administrative practice, and plain common sense lead one to the conclusion that pure politics was the cause for the action taken yesterday by the President.

The door is open for a straightforward message to the Congress of the United States on any matter which the President deems of public interest, requesting congressional action thereon. No one questions the President's right and duty at appropriate times to request Congress to take action on matters such as, one, provide public aid to localities for low-rent housing for families in the lowest income group; two, to encourage private investment in rental housing by Federal insurance; three, to provide a more adequate program of farm housing; four, to extend aid to our cities for the clearance of slums and blighted areas; five, to perfect and supplement existing aids to home financing; six, to provide a substantial program of housing research to assist industry in progressively reducing the cost of housing, or any other matter

which he considers of public interest. The door should be closed to political maneuvering and ward politics such as were displayed in the message sent to us yesterday.

I humbly urge that the President recognize in such cases his obligations as the Chief Executive of the country, and carry those obligations out to the best of his ability. The President should be given to understand that the Congress will hereafter not countenance politically inspired messages from the Executive after he has taken affirmative action on a particular piece of legislation. Congress will welcome, on the other hand, any message containing objections which he may have to a bill from which he withholds his signature, as the accepted constitutional means for the President's expressing disfavor to congressional action.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I shall take just a moment. At the time when question arose about the Senator's address about the message from the President, it had not been my intention to make any remarks concerning it. I did not know what the Senator was about to say. But in sum and substance, it appears to me that we have listened to a rather caustic criticism of the President and a lecture to the President on the constitutional powers, duties, and functions of the President.

I do not object to that. It is perfectly in keeping with the right of a Senator for him to rise on the floor of the Senate at any time and discuss any subject he desires to discuss, and discuss or advise or criticize the President of the United States, if he desires to do so. I think it is perfectly proper for a Member of either branch of the Congress to do anything of that sort. But by the same token, when the Congress or an individual Member of the Congress exercises the right to criticize the President of the United States, I think it is equally proper and right for the President to express his honest, sincere thoughts in regard to legislation passed by the Congress.

So it comes with ill grace and ill form for a Member of the Senate to object to criticism from the Chief Executive and in the same breath criticize and find fault with and condemn him.

Mr. President, the message under discussion is not an ordinary message in regard to a bill, merely criticizing a measure which the Congress has passed; not at all. If the bill is read and if the President's message is read, it becomes perfectly clear that the message is within the President's constitutional duties, powers, and functions, for it is a message from the President to the Congress urging the passage of legislation which the President deems important to the welfare of the country.

Is the President to be condemned or criticized because he points out the deplorable housing situation which exists in the country today? Is he to be found fault with because in this special message he asks the Congress to enact needed legislation along these very lines? Is not that within the proper province and function of the Chief Executive of this Nation?

Let us read what the President said and what he urged the Congress to do, and let us see why the honorable Senator objects so strenuously. The President said:

> On January 6, 1947, in the message on the state of the Union, I again recommended action by the Eightieth Congress on comprehensive housing legislation. Such legislation has been introduced and favorably reported to the Senate during this session but has not yet been passed by either the Senate or the House of Representatives.
>
> The obligation upon the Federal Government is one which cannot be ignored.

What is the obligation to which the President is directing the attention of the Congress, and what is the President urging the Congress to do? Do Senators object to having the Congress urged to do these things:

> 1. To provide public aid to localities for low-rent housing for families in the lowest income group.

Is it unconstitutional for the President to make that recommendation to the Congress? Is it unconstitutional for him to try to have private investment in rental housing encouraged by Federal insurance?

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. BALL. As I listened to the statement the Senator from Delaware made, I understood him to list the points the Senator from New Mexico is now listing, and to say that in his opinion the President had a perfect right to make those suggestions to the Congress. It seems to me that the only point the Senator was making was that the President was then signing a bill, and will be charged with the administration and enforcement of the act, but at the same time he was criticizing it most severely.

It seems to me the point the Senator was making—that that action by the President at least cast some doubt as to how good the enforcement would be in that kind of situation—has some merit. I thought the Senator made perfectly clear that, in his opinion, the President has a right at any time to recommend particular legislation to Congress, including a recommendation of the points the Senator from New Mexico has been referring to.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am frank to confess that I did not distinctly understand the remarks of the Senator from Delaware as he made them, and I did not understand that he made the statement which the Senator from Minnesota has just said he made. I did distinctly hear the Senator from Delaware very sharply criticize the President.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. I did make those points, and I read them, and some of them are the ones the Senator from New Mexico now is mentioning. Of course, the President had a right to make them.

Mr. HATCH. Then it is agreed that the President had a right to make those points in his message to the Congress in which he urges legislation, and it is agreed that the President in doing so is clearly acting within the proper functions of the Chief Executive. That is admitted, and I am glad that matter is cleared up; for if it had not been cleared up, I would have gone on and would have read at length other things the President said, to which I am sure Senators would agree.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. I understood the Senator from Delaware to take the position that in approving a measure, as the President did, his approval should not be a vehicle by which at the same time the President would castigate the Congress and would derogate the law which had been passed by the Congress; and I understood the Senator from Delaware to make the point that in making that derogation of the law the President would make it very difficult for that law to be properly enforced, because the people of the country would be led to believe that it was a bad law and that there would be no reason to expect its enforcement.

I further understood the Senator from Delaware to say that he would always welcome and that Congress would always welcome any recommendations for legislation when the President made such recommendations at a proper time and in a proper way, but that the President should not use his legislative approval, as he did in this case, as an occasion for lecturing Congress and making a political speech at the same time.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield, and then I shall try to reply to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to make just one point, Mr. President. I have before me the message, which is Document No. 370. It would indicate that the President made this message part of his signature of that measure and part of his official act in making it an enacted law, because it is headed in this way: "The Housing and Rent Act of 1947—Message from the President of the United States returning with his approval the bill H. R. 3203, the Housing and Rent Act of 1947."

As I understand the Constitution, the President has no right to file with Congress any memorandum or any document when he signs an act. The only time when the President is permitted to file a memorandum or document is when he returns a bill unsigned, vetoed, and gives his reasons for doing so.

Mr. President, it appears to me that the objection of the Senator from Delaware is that the President has done something which he is not constitutionally authorized to do.

The message indicates that it is not a message to Congress recommending the enactment of a law, but is a message in which the President returns to Congress a bill which he has signed, and gives his reasons for signing it.

I judge that in the State Department and in the Archives we shall find as part of this bill the signature of the President and the message he has sent to Congress. The Constitution does not provide for that, nor does any law provide for it or authorize it.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the Senate, for the hour is late, but I desire to say to the Senator from Michigan, in reply to his statement, that the only argument he has made or the only argument the Senator from Delaware has made or the only argument that was made in the committee report in the First Congress was that there was no specific constitutional authority for the President to return a bill, when he approved it, by writing a letter or a message to accompany it. Certainly there is no prohibition against that in the Constitution. Many powers which the President has are conferred on him by the general authority provided by the Constitution, and they would be more than sufficient to authorize the procedure which has been followed, notwithstanding the condemnation which has been heaped upon it.

Mr. President, it is a matter of rather small concern, I think, to find fault with the Chief Executive for using a letter of transmittal. He would have had a perfect right to make a speech on the radio and to criticize the Congress at that time. He could have said anything he wanted to say, because the constitutional guaranty of free speech extends to the President of the United States, as well as to everyone else in the United States.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I do not yield now.

Mr. President, merely because the President addresses a message to the Congress and sets forth his reasons why he has approved a bill, we have a great deal of condemnation made by Senators who find fault with the President. I am sure that no partisan politics motivates anyone who makes those criticisms! Oh, it is easy enough to criticize the President and say that he has made a political speech, and of course no political speech ever was made in this Chamber by any Senator on either side of the aisle, I am sure!

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The thought occurs to me that the Senator from Michigan and also the Senator from Delaware have been indulging in some rather far-fetched assumptions when they speak of this message as being recorded in the Department of State along with the bill. As a matter of fact, I do not know; I do not have the printed copy, but I do have the mimeographed copy that came to us, and it is headed, "To the Congress of the United States," and there is no word in that message about the returning of the bill. As a matter of fact, we know he did not return the bill. If I understand correctly the procedure, when he approved the bill, it went to the Secretary of State. This message came to Congress, and in the terms of section 3 of article II of the Constitution, it is explicitly provided, speaking of the Chief Executive—

> He shall from time to time give to the Congress information of the state of the Union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient.

What is there in the message that is not covered by that provision of the Constitution?

Mr. HATCH. I thank the Senator from Alabama, and that was exactly the point I was making about the general powers of the President.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. No, I am not going to yield; I want to finish what I have to say, and then I shall yield the floor, and Senators may take their own time. The only language in this message which indicates at all that it refers to the Rent Control Act is the statement that he is returning it with his approval, which is in the heading. That is not found in the original message. He merely says:

> I have today signed H. R. 3203, the Housing and Rent Act of 1947.

Then he proceeds to point out certain defects in the measure. He then comes to make constructive recommendations, and he concludes with the statement:

> I sincerely trust that the Congress will not end this session without meeting the problem squarely.

I submit that, notwithstanding the criticism which has been made, the President was well within his rights in sending this message to the Congress. He may have found fault with the law that was passed, which he did not approve, and which it has been said he will have difficulity in administering because he did not approve it. If the Congress exercises its duty as well and faithfully in legislating on these important questions as the President of the United States has done, and as he will continue to do in administering them, the country will indeed be well off.

Mr. FERGUSON and Mr. TAYLOR addressed the Chair.

Mr. HATCH. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I have read from House Document No. 370, Eightieth Congress, first session, and I read again:

> The Housing and Rent Act of 1947—Message from the President of the United States returning with his approval the bill H. R. 3203, the Housing and Rent Act of 1947. June 30, 1947, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

Mr. President, this is not the only occasion on which the President has returned a bill with his signature and has commented upon the bill. We had exactly the same thing, in respect to an interpretation of the law in the Portal-to-Portal Act. The Judiciary Committee of this body saw fit to make a report upon the conduct of the President in that particular case, returning the bill with comment and with interpretation, if Senators please, of that act.

I notice it has been brought out that the President of the United States desires an investigation of the real-estate lobby. If the things which the President of the United States says are true, he should not ask Congress to investigate, but his Department of Justice should do the investigating of the real-estate lobby. I think it is time that instead of Congress having to do the investigating, the Department of Justice, the executive branch of the Government, should do the investigating. Here is what he says——

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. Not at this time. I quote:

> One of the most stubborn obstacles in the way of any constructive housing program has been the opposition of the real-estate lobby.

Mr. President, if that is true, the Department of Justice should look into the real-estate lobby, and if the President has any facts, he should put them in the message, so that Congress could investigate the lobby.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Since the Senator has brought up this question of the real-estate lobby, referred to in the President's message, and the fact that he says there is a real-estate lobby that is blocking his program, does the Senator from Michigan know of any real-estate lobby?

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall have to answer that in the negative; I do not know.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I will say, if I may, in line with the question that I have put to the Senator, I have seen the idea of a real-estate lobby mentioned by certain writers in newspapers. The President of the United States, in a message, speaks about a real-estate lobby, in respect of the rent-control bill. I have never been approached on the rent bill or on any other bill by anybody representing a real-estate organization. Of course, I have received letters, I will say to the able Senator, from land owners and house owners, saying the rent is too low; on the other hand, I have received letters from tenants saying they want rent control continued. But, so far as any lobby or organization is concerned, I have never seen a representative of them, I have never heard about them, and I do not know of their existence; and apparently the President does know about them.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BUCK. I might undertake to answer the question of the Senator from West Virginia. I followed this legislation for 4 or 5 or 6 months. I cannot recall that there was ever in my office any man connected with the real-estate business who came to see me about this bill or any other matter. I do know that when hearings were held—and there were extensive hearings, which covered 3 or 4 or more weeks—any number of men interested in business of this kind appeared before the committee and made known their objections to certain features of the act as it was on the books, and as it had been administered previously. But, as for a real-estate lobby, I do not know where it is. I have never come in contact with it.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a number of questions?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. McMAHON. I would ask the Senator from Michigan, does he think it possible that the caption under "The President of the United States," which says "Returning with his approval the bill H. R. 3203," and so forth, was put on it by some House clerk? In other words, is it not possible that this was a message from the President of the United States to the Congress, without that wording?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is possible. I am not familiar with it.

Mr. McMAHON. I would not think that the President, who signed the bill, which must go to the Secretary of State, would have included that language. It would be my guess that, if the Senator investigated, he would find that when it went to the House it was in the form in which it came to the Senate; a copy of which I hold in my hand now, addressed "To the Congress of the United States," saying, "I have today signed," etc. I am just wondering whether the bill ever came back.

Mr. FERGUSON. I will answer that in this way: The only knowledge I have is that when this came to the floor, I sent for the information that had come to the Senate and the House. I received from the document room Document No. 370, and I read the message from that.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I had the same thought in the mind of the Senator from Connecticut. I inquired at the desk, and I was handed this mimeograhed copy of the original message sent. The mimeographed copy does not contain the language to which the Senator from Michigan has referred. It is merely addressed "To the Congress of the United States." I have sent for the original message, and I think it is being brought to me now.

Mr. President, I now have in my hand the original message of the President of the United States. There is no caption. The language to which the Senator has referred does not appear. The message is merely addressed "To the Congress of the United States," and is signed "Harry S. Truman, the White House."

Mr. FERGUSON. I am very glad to have that.

Mr. HATCH. Everything that was put on the other copy was added either by a clerk or by someone in the Printing Office. I ask, Mr. President, that the first page of the original message be copied in the RECORD, to show the absence of the identifying marks, about which so much comment has been made.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

I have today signed H. R. 3203, the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, despite the fact that its rent-control provisions are plainly inadequate and its housing provisions actually repeal parts of the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act, which have been most helpful in meeting the housing needs of veterans.

Had I withheld my signature, national rent control would die tonight. It is clear that, insofar as the Congress is concerned, it is this bill or no rent control at all. I have chosen the lesser of two evils.

Without any rent control, millions of American families would face rapidly soaring rents and wholesale evictions. We are still suffering from a critical housing shortage. Many families are desperately seeking homes. In their desperation, they would have to submit to demands for exorbitant rent. Even this inadequate law presents fewer dangers than would the complete lack of rent control.

I have been confronted with a problem similar to the one which the Congress placed before me in the price-control bill which it sent me on June 28, 1946. That bill was so damaging to price control that I vetoed it and addressed the country on the subject. Then, on July 25, the Congress sent me a second price-control bill, in some respects worse than the first. The time was so late that I had to sign that bill in order to prevent the complete destruction of price control. But effective price control was impossible under the new law.

If I had vetoed H. R. 3203, rent controls would end, and——

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I will ask that there be placed in the RECORD the first page of Document No. 370, beginning with the word "Message," so that what was said here on the floor will be perfectly clear in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES RETURNING WITH HIS APPROVAL THE BILL H. R. 3203, THE HOUSING AND RENT ACT OF 1947

(June 30, 1947, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed)

To the Congress of the United States:

I have today signed H. R. 3203, the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, despite the fact that its rent-control provisions are plainly inadequate and its housing provisions actually repeal parts of the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act which have been most helpful in meeting the housing needs of veterans.

Had I withheld my signature, national rent control would die tonight. It is clear that, insofar as the Congress is concerned, it is this bill or no rent control at all. I have chosen the lesser of two evils.

Without any rent control, millions of American familities would face rapidly soaring rents and wholesale evictions. We are still suffering from a critical housing shortage. Many families are desperately seeking homes. In their desperation, they would have to submit to demands for exorbitant rent. Even this inadequate law presents fewer dangers than would the complete lack of rent control.

I have been confronted with a problem similar to the one which the Congress placed before me in the price-control bill which it sent me on June 28, 1946. That bill was so damaging to price control that I vetoed it and addressed the country on the subject. Then, on July 25, the Congress sent me a second price-control bill, in some respects worse than the first. The time was so late that I had to sign that bill in order to prevent the complete destruction of price control. But effective price control was impossible under the new law.

If I had vetoed H. R. 3203, rent controls would end, and the prospects of another bill being sent to me would be negligible. I had no choice but to sign.

It is clear that this legislation marks a step backward in our efforts to protect tenants against unjustified rent increases arising out of war conditions. For millions of families, it will result in substantial increases in rents which until now have been held at reasonable levels. The cost of living is already too high without this additional burden.

It is evident that the present high cost of living should not be increased further by a sharp increase in rents. We must get prices down, not devise means of getting the price of shelter up.

Since the end of price control, the consumer price index has risen 17 percent. Food has gone up 29 percent. During the second quarter of 1947, we have made real progress in checking these sharp price increases. On the whole, prices and the cost of living have leveled off. This progress—and the further progress we must make—would be nullified for millions of families by higher rents. Rents amount to 25 percent to 35 percent of many family budgets. Rent increases could revive the inflationary dangers which we have greatly reduced.

A basic weakness of the rent-control provisions of the act is the so-called "voluntary" increase of 15 percent in cases where the landlord and tenant enter into a lease that will continue until December 31, 1948. This is voluntary only so far as the landlord is concerned. Many tenants, however, will feel that there is no choice. The tenant will naturally fear that unless he enters into such a lease he will be subjected to even more exorbitant increases when rent control is ended. Whenever a vacancy occurs, the landlord can refuse to rent except under a lease providing for the rent increase. Many landlords will press for rent increases whether or not there is need for adjustment. Severe hardship will thus be imposed on many tenants. The hardship will be particularly accute in the case of veterans, who comprise such a large portion of those seeking rental housing accommodations.

The act also weakens the protection against eviction, which is necessary for effective rent control, and completely removes the protection of rent control in many cases where it is still badly needed. Administration of the law will be made more complex by the injection of new procedures and will be made less effective by the weakening of enforcement provisions.

All of this represents the abandonment of a system which has been both fair and effective. In its administration of rent control, the Federal Government has made every effort to give full protection to both landlords and tenants. The net rental income of landlords today is substantially higher than in the prewar years of 1939 and 1940 or in the previous decade. Provisions for granting rent increases in meritorious cases have been liberalized and simplified. Over 1,000,000 rent increases have been granted. Controls have been removed in cases where the need no longer appeared acute. These steps and many more have been taken to keep the administration of rent control simple, practicable, and fair and to prevent hardship. This has been accomplished without permitting substantial increases in the general rent level.

Since Federal rent control is being irreparably weakened, I appeal to the governors of the States—particularly those populous States where rental housing is more prevalent—to exert every effort to protect tenants from hardship, eviction, or exploitation. They can soften, although not avoid completely, the blow to rent control dealt by H. R. 3203.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the matter I wanted to touch upon is not in the caption. It is what the President knows in relation what he calls the real-estate lobby. If the matters he now relates are true, the things on which he bases his conclusions, there should be an investigation of what he calls the real-estate lobby. Let me read this to the Senate:

One of the most stubborn obstacles in the way of any constructive housing program has been the opposition of the real-

estate lobby. Its members have exerted pressure at every point against every proposal for making the housing program more effective. They have constantly sought to weaken rent control and to do away with necessary aids to housing. They are openly proud of their success in blocking a comprehensive housing program.

This group has sought to achieve financial gains without regard to the damage done to others.

Mr. President, that would indicate that there is a conspiracy existing, that an unlawful act is being committed by a combination of men, and the Department of Justice should look into the conspiracy and submit the facts to a grand jury in order that there may be prosecution.

The President in his message further said:

This group has sought to achieve financial gains without regard to the damage done to others. It has displayed a ruthless disregard of the public welfare.

It is intolerable that this lobby should be permitted by its brazen operations to block programs so essential to the needs of our citizens.

Mr President, if any lobby, if any combination of men, has done that, then I say the Department of Justice should look into it.

The President continued:

Nothing could be more clearly subversive of representative government.

There are no exceptions to what these people have done that could be more subversive to American Government. The President in his message further said:

I urge Congress to make a full investigation of the activities of this selfish and shortsighted group. When the truth is known I am confident that this obstacle to constructive housing legislation will be removed.

Mr. President, I now raise my voice and call upon the President of the United States to send to this body the full and complete facts upon which he drew those conclusions, and then I will rise on the Senate floor and demand that the Senate proceed to make an investigation of this despicable conspiracy which is "subversive of representative government." But I think we should have the facts.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield the floor.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I listened with great care to the Senator's comments about the President's description of the conspiracy as a criminal conspiracy. I may be in error about it, but as the Senator reads it, frankly I think it is the kind of conspiracy which is not criminal under the laws of the United States. The Senator realizes, I am sure, and will agree with me, that there are many conspiracies that are per se not illegal. They may be despicable, they may be things in which none of us would want to engage, but the Congress has not seen fit to make them criminal acts. For instance, under the Reorganization Act, we have prohibited any lobbying of the Congress without registration. Let us assume that these real-estate lobbyists, if they are such, have engaged in a combined attempt to talk to the Senator from Michigan, to talk to the Senator from Connecticut, and to all other Senators. I doubt very much whether that could be the subject of any prosecution. The Senator sees that we might run into the right of petition.

Mr. FERGUSON. We might run into the right of petition, but petition never goes to this extent. If the President has facts upon which he drew these conclusions, after the Department of Justice shall have concluded its investigation, if it finds the conspiracy is not a criminal one, if it is a matter which only the Congress of the United States can expose, then I say the facts should be sent to the Congress so that the Congress could create a committee to look into the matter. I am not a member of the committee handling the matter in question, and I know of no facts that would indicate the existence of a conspiracy, but I would be the first to urge investigation of anything which would be "clearly subversive of representative government," as the President says in his message. Certainly such conspiracy should be either prosecuted or exposed so the public would be able to deal with it. But here we have received a message only, and no facts.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I think I have the floor. I yielded to the Senator from Michigan. Does the Senator from West Virginia wish to address a question to me?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes.

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Going back to the question of the real-estate lobby which is referred to in the message as an existing thing, the Senator from Michigan has said he knows of no such organization, and I must say that I know of no such organization. I have never been approached by a real-estate lobby affecting legislation or urging legislation. The President stated in his message:

Its members have exerted pressure at every point against every proposal for making the housing program more effective.

May I ask the able Senator from Connecticut if any member of such a group has ever tried to exert pressure on him with respect to any legislation touching rent control or housing?

Mr. McMAHON. I will say to the Senator that I have been subject—I may call it that—to the pressure that comes from communications from hundreds and hundreds of people arguing with me and suggesting that I vote one way or the other, but certainly no improper suggestion was made to the Senator from Connecticut by anyone.

I think the Senator will agree that the President might well be within his rights in denouncing a group of men who get together, no matter how legally, to frustrate what he thinks, in his judgment, as the Chief Executive, are the best interests of the American people. That is part of his constitutional prerogatives. The fact that it is not illegal does not prevent him from denouncing that sort of thing. The Senator and I have denounced political conduct of people with whom we do not agree, but we do not necessarily call them crooks.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. When we use the word "lobby" I think it has a very definite meaning. It is a descriptive word with a limited meaning. We require lobbyists to register, and properly so. Does the Senator know of any lobby or of any organized group of men which has tried to influence rent-control legislation? Has he been approached by any of them in an attempt to influence his vote on the rent-control bill?

Mr. McMAHON. I will answer the Senator in this way, that it has struck me that the communications I have received—and I am sure the Senator from West Virginia, if he will look at the communications he has received, will be struck in the same way—seem to be of one kind, of one design, of one pattern. If they were stimulated from a central point, I do not see anything criminal in that. I am trying to get at the point that it is not necessarily within the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice simply because it has denounced it as something against the public interest. There are so many things in this country that might thoroughly be denounced, but they are certainly not within the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice so it should send out the Federal Bureau of Investigation or take action in court. This is a government of law.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am very glad to have the views of the able Senator from Connecticut upon the powers of the Department of Justice to investigate, but I am gettting at the basic fact as to why the President in his message made the statement he did respecting a real-estate lobby. I will say to the Senator that the messages I received on this matter were letters, and not of a definite pattern at all. On one side I would receive letters from owners of houses, some of them widows, some of them people who have owned them for a long time, some of them complaining about their tenants, individuals, not organizations in any sense. I have received no communications from any organizations. On the other side I have received letters from the renters who are afraid that their rent would be raised by the passage of the legislation. There was no organization on either side sending letters.

Now we are confronted with an assertion by the President of the United States that there is a real-estate lobby which is acting in respect to this matter. I do not know of it. If there is such a thing it ought to be brought forth. It has never approached me. It has not approached any of the Senators I have questioned on the floor here today, including the Senator from Connecticut. I feel that when such a charge is made by the President of the United States the facts should be given to us. I agree with the position taken by the Senator from Michigan that if there is such a lobby which is committing this subversive act—and the word "subversive" is

used by the President—if the organization is doing something which is subversive to the Government, we ought to know about it. It must, however, be a real, existing thing, and I think the facts ought to be laid before us.

Mr. McMAHON. Does not the Senator realize that the Communist Party of this country is denominated as being subversive?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. Let me finish. Let me point out to the Senate that it is a legally existing party, and a man who is a Communist cannot be prosecuted merely because he is a Communist. Suggestions have been made that we outlaw the Communist Party; that the very existence of that party should be made illegal. When the Congress decides to do that, then it would be within the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice to go after it and to prosecute it. But the mere labeling of an individual or a movement as subversive of the best interests of the citizenry of this country does not per se bring it within title 18, United States Code Annotated.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The question is not one of prosecution. The Senator from Connecticut has brought a very clear and pointed fact before us. We say the Communist Party is subversive. The President says that the real-estate lobby—something about which we know nothing—is subversive. Let us have the real-estate lobby revealed, so the Senate may provide for an investigation of it.

Mr. McMAHON. That is quite all right with me.

Mr. REVERCOMB. But we must have the facts so we may know what we are to investigate. Let us have the facts.

Mr. McMAHON. What I was trying to point out to the Senate, and particularly to the Senator from Michigan, was that I did not think he was accurate in calling upon the Department of Justice for an investigation of something which on its face does not come within the purview of the Federal criminal statutes, as I see them. I may be wrong.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Just a moment. I feel that the question of prosecution is largely beside the point. The President has charged that there is a lobby or group. I do not know why the President brought up the question. Certainly he feels that a lobby exists. If it is a fact that there is a lobby, let the President bring before us the facts showing whether or not the lobby exists, and let him give us the basis for his conclusions and for the investigation.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. If the Senator will submit a resolution calling for proof, with the idea that if it is forthcoming he will then sponsor an inquiry, I will vote for it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I will say to the Senator from Connecticut that I will certainly not submit a resolution until I know that the thing to be investigated exists.

Mr. McMAHON. The President of the United States says it exists. The Senator quarrels with that statement.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I do indeed.

Mr. McMAHON. It seems to me that if the Senator wishes to go further and use the powers of the Congress he should sponsor a resolution calling upon the President of the United States for more detailed information, so that the Senate may determine whether or not it wishes to proceed with an investigation of the lobbying activities of the real-estate agents. That would seem to be the orderly way to proceed.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Before taking such a course I should want to know that there was cause for such an investigation.

Mr. McMAHON. Does the Senator intend to call upon the President to produce his proof?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I think the President ought to produce it without a call, after making such a charge.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, on the question of subversive activities, it is a well-known fact that for years the Department of Justice, through the FBI, has investigated subversive activities. That is one of the things the Department of Justice has been doing.

In the message and upon the floor of the Senate this alleged activity is being compared to communism. Certainly the Department of Justice is daily investigating the activities of Communists, because they are subversive. The difficulty I find is that there are no prosecutions in connection with conspiracies to overthrow the Government of the United States.

The common law definition of conspiracy is a combination of two or more persons to do an unlawful act, or to do a lawful act in an unlawful manner. Certainly if there is any group in America which is subversive of representative government, the facts should be known by the people. If there are any criminal acts or violations of law they should be prosecuted. At least, if such acts are subversive of representative government, the facts should be known by the people. They should be exposed to the public gaze.

It is nothing new to ask that the Department of Justice look into activities such as are described in the message of the President. The message contains a number of conclusions. I now ask the President to send to the Congress the detailed information upon which he drew the conclusions in his message to Congress, so that the Congress may act. If those conclusions are founded upon facts, then we need legislation; and Congress should certainly have the facts so that it may act.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I hesitate at this late hour to prolong the discussion, but I should like to say just a few words on the housing situation.

I think it is unfortunate that we have this message, because it seems to me that every time the Congress attempts to criticize the President or the President attempts to criticize Congress, all we do is generate heat, which is dissipated into thin air. We do need housing legislation; but I do not believe that indulging in political debate over it will prove very helpful in producing such legislation.

As I have previously stated, it seems to me that the point of view which the Senator from Delaware has expressed with reference to this message is sound and proper. I should like to refer to one paragraph in the message, which appears on the first page:

> I have been confronted with a problem similar to the one which the Congress placed before me in the price-control bill which it sent me on June 28, 1946. That bill was so damaging to price control that I vetoed it and addressed the country on the subject. Then, on July 25, the Congress sent me a second price-control bill, in some respects worse than the first. The time was so late that I had to sign that bill in order to prevent the complete destruction of price control. But effective price control was impossible under the new law.

It seems to me that that particular paragraph—and I have no doubt that there are others in the same category—is extraneous to this whole discussion. I for one want to see housing legislation enacted in this session of Congress; but it does not seem to me that we shall get anywhere if the President continually castigates Congress in messages of this kind. I have introduced a housing bill which I should like to see enacted into law. Furthermore, I will support the Wagner-Ellender-Taft bill. I am very hopeful that we can get some action on that particular bill; but we shall not get it merely by engaging in political debate. We can get it by devoting ourselves to the enactment of that bill or some other housing measure.

With reference to the criticism of the rent-control bill, it is the honest judgment and opinion of earnest and sincere Members of Congress that one way to obtain more housing is to release rent controls, and thus encourage the private building of homes. One of the big factors in the housing situation today is the fact that many persons who own houses are not able to obtain a fair return on their investment. Under existing prices they are unable to obtain a sufficient return to encourage them to build more houses.

There are those who can afford to pay higher rents; and thus, by being willing to pay higher rents, encourage the private building of houses. However, I believe that along with that sort of program we must have adequate housing legislation. In particular, we must have housing legislation which will deal with the problem of veterans' housing. In that field it seems to me that we must face the situation frankly. We must recognize that a large group of the people, particularly the veterans, need houses. We must provide some form of subsidy or enact amendments to the Federal Housing Act which will make it possible for private enterprise, encouraged by a subsidy, or by amendments to the Federal Housing Act extending the time of payment, lowering the rate of interest, or guaranteeing a higher percentage of the loan, to build housing for veterans.

I earnestly believe that we must have housing legislation; but I believe that

when we indulge in political argument about it, we get nowhere. I hestitate to criticize the President, but I think this message is a political document. One of the points which the President no doubt had in mind in this document was to castigate the Congress for its failure to act. He has done so without offering any constructive suggestions from the Administration or the Federal Housing agencies.

Some of the Federal housing agencies have been very effective, and some have not. But I think we must get down to business and enact some housing legislation. However, I do not believe that political debates between the executive department and the Congress will do more than generate heat which will be dissipated into thin air. We shall end by doing little, if anything.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I have been somewhat surprised at some of the statements emanating from the majority side. On the other hand, some of the things which have been said could well have been expected. The statement by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK] that he resents the President signing the message and criticizing the bill can well be understood. It would have been much better if the President had just signed and not criticized, because there is so much to criticize. It would have been even better if he had vetoed it, and then the majority could have shouted to high heaven that the administration had scuttled the rent-control program, when in truth it has been scuttled by the majority party with the passage of a bill which is in no way a rent-control program.

In fact, Mr. President, the bill places a premium on undercover dealing. We hear much about a "voluntary 15 percent increase." Why did they not come right out in the open and say it was a 15 percent increase across the board? Or why did they not come out and abolish rent control entirely? But, as I have stated previously on the floor, that is not the strategy of the majority party at this session. It is to do one thing by indirection and then try to make the people believe they have done something else for the people.

I do not know; the President may have made a mistake in signing the bill and then criticizing it. Personally, I think his mistake was not in criticizing the bill, but in signing it in the first place.

As I said the other day, I am tired of having things presented to us and having it said, "Well, here is the best you are going to get on the face of it." It is little better than nothing, and it is difficult to decide whether it is better than nothing. That is the decision with which the President was faced. I am tired of that. I would rather take nothing than to take these bills that are dished out to us here which are so little better than nothing that one cannot tell the difference.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Was there a single objection noted in the President's message that was not noted here on the floor by various Senators from time to time?

Mr. TAYLOR. The objectionable features of the bill were so obvious that naturally they were noted on the floor.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The President made reference to the existence of a real estate lobby. That seems to be the thing that is irritating so many. Was that not referred to time after time on the floor of the Senate and on the floor of the House when the legislation was under consideration?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I may say, further, that the Senator from Idaho is a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and so am I. I am sure that the Senator from Idaho can testify with me that there is a real estate lobby functioning in this country; not only that, but many other lobbies. Goodness knows this Capitol is running over with them from day to day. We have seen them parade before the Banking and Currency Committee not only on the rent-control bill, but on every measure affecting housing in any manner whatsoever which has come before that committee. Even in connection with the Reorganization Plan they came in and testified against it, simply because in the reorganization we have to take notice of the fact that there is such a thing as public housing in our general housing program; and the same real estate people—call them a lobby or whatever they may be—who testified against rent control also testified against the Taft-Wagner-Ellender bill and against housing of every kind. Lobbies have come in and tried to defeat that measure, just as they have tried to defeat every other measure. Does the Senator not agree with me in that statement?

Mr. TAYLOR. Certainly I will agree with the Senator that the woods are full of lobbyists. Whether their actions are illegal I do not know. I know I have had called to my attention——

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I shall be glad to yield as soon as I finish this sentence.

I have had my attention called to building trade publications boasting of the lobby in Washington, asking that the membership contribute further, and bragging about the huge sums of money they had raised and spent to influence legislation here. Whether they have ever approached any Senators I do not know, but they were very happy about the work they were doing and the good they were accomplishing for the vested interests. So most definitely there is a lobby. I am not attempting to argue that point, however.

It was said, Mr. President, that the criticism by the President of this bill could undermine the law. I take exception to that statement. I submit that he cannot undermine something unless it has a foundation; and this bill has no foundation whatever. It is not a rent-control bill. It is, as the President has pointed out—I have forgotten his words, but I think he said——

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes. That will give me a chance to find the quotation which I want.

Mr. BALDWIN. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that in his opinion, for the reasons stated in the message, the President should have vetoed the bill?

Mr. TAYLOR. Most certainly. I would have vetoed it if I had been in his place.

Mr. BALDWIN. For the reasons stated in the message, in the opinion of the Senator, the President should have vetoed the bill?

Mr. TAYLOR. In my opinion, but I am not the President.

What I was trying to find, Mr. President, was this:

> We must get prices down and not devise means of getting the price of shelter up.

That word "devise" is a very good word in this connection, because what we have done in this bill has been to devise nefarious methods of increasing rent. It has been called voluntary. It is not voluntary when one is living in an apartment house and expects to live there for some time to come, and the landlord comes and shoves a contract under his nose and says, "Do you want to sign this thing for a 15-percent increase?" We have enough intelligence to know that the whole program will end in the middle of next winter, when one cannot move outside; and at that time the landlord can raise the rent 100 percent, 200 percent, or 300 percent. I am not exaggerating. That is what has happened in Idaho where rent control has been removed. Rents have risen by those fabulous figures.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes.

Mr. BALDWIN. I understood the Senator to say that rents have been raised by a fabulous amount in Idaho. Does not the Federal Rent Control Act apply in Idaho?

Mr. TAYLOR. The Senator probably misunderstood me. In some areas of Idaho, rents have been decontrolled, and in those places where controls have been taken off—they are permitted to do that, and have been in the past—rents have gone up two or three hundred percent in many instances. I have received a number of letters about it. War veterans have had their rent increased to such a figure that their rent alone is twice the amount of their income. I do not know what the veterans have done to deserve that. It is summer now, and I guess they can live in a tent; but next winter they cannot do that. It will be very embarrassing.

So, to say that the President's criticisms can undermine the law is not true. I entirely disagree with that statement.

It has been said that the President's message is pure politics. I should like to know what has been going on in Congress all this session, with all this double dealing in connection with the laws which have been passed. It is pure politics. This particular law is pure politics.

It lets the landlords out from under control, and yet we can go on the stump or on the radio and say, "See, we renewed rent control for you." In my estimation, that is politics of the most reprehensible type, when we do not have the courage to stand up and bring the thing out in the open and take the consequences for it.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes.

Mr. BUCK. I should like to remind the Senator that he was a member of the committee that drafted the bill.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes; but I did not sign the report.

Mr. BUCK. But the Senator was present, and I do not recall that he ever contributed anything particularly constructive to the bill.

Mr. TAYLOR. No; there is nothing constructive in the bill. At the time we were considering advisory boards I did suggest—I saw what was coming—that the boards be made large enough so as to handle the cases which would come before them. That was not to make it a good bill; it was simply to make it less bad in case the President should sign it. That is exactly what happened, and that is why I offered the suggestion.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I understand the Senator to say that he is not in favor of the bill which has been passed by the Congress and signed by the President. Is it the Senator's desire to continue rent control as it was prior to the passage of the bill?

Mr. TAYLOR. That was my desire; yes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Under the bill, as the Senator well knows, the authorities could decontrol sections of a State, just as the Senator has mentioned with reference to Idaho.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. And the Senator favored that power being in the bill to decontrol sections here and there at the wish of the Administrator?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. So that eventually, as declared in the bill, decontrol would be effective everywhere?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes; when it was justified; if the situation warranted it. But here we have a 15-percent increase across the board, right off the bat, and we have a provision which says that a landlord can reconvert and make additional accommodations and then he is out from under rent control. With very little reconverting he can be out from under rent control. There are no specifications laid down as to how much reconverting must be done. That is why I say it places a premium on practices which are not altogether honest. A landlord can reconvert a little bit and be out from under rent control. There is no rent control to the bill at all.

I was rather surprised to hear the suggestion from the other side of the aisle that there be no investigation by the Congress of the lobby, but that the Justice Department should do that job. I should have thought, from what has gone on here previously in the session, that the majority party would be very grateful to the President for suggesting another investigation. It would be an opportunity for someone to share in it and get some money to spend. But now it is suggested that the Department of Justice do it. At the beginning of the session it was suggested that the Department of Justice could investigate various things, but the majority party insisted that we have special committees for that purpose.

I should like to ask, Mr. President, what has been accomplished at this session by those two very controversial special committees that were established, one to investigate the war effort and the other to investigate small business? What has been accomplished by either one of those committees in this session to warrant the expenditure of the money which was appropriated?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator makes the point that the majority party apparently does not want to investigate the so-called real-estate lobby, or any other lobby, so far as that is concerned. I notice that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is quoted in the press. I believe he is the chairman of the policy committee of the majority party, and is, by the way, the sponsor of the housing bill which has been approved by the Committee on Banking and Currency, and which is now on the Senate Calendar. He was reported as saying that he would like to do the job himself. Probably he has realized the work that the real-estate lobby has done in regard to the bill he has sponsored in an effort to get some kind of adequate housing program for America.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I should like to see an investigating committee set up with the Senator from Ohio at the head of it. He would do a thorough job, because he is always thorough in anything he sets out to do.

So, Mr. President, I am surprised to see, all of a sudden, this reluctance to set up a special committee to investigate this matter, and the desire to have the Department of Justice do it.

I should like to inquire whether anything the President said in criticizing this bill is unjustified. He said:

> It is clear that this legislation marks a step backward in our efforts to protect tenants against unjustified rent increases arising out of war conditions.

That is the truth; I do not think anyone can deny that.

The President then said:

> For millions of families, it will result in substantial increases in rents which until now have been held at reasonable levels.

Mr. President, that is a true statement. I do not believe anyone would care to argue about that.

The President further said:

> The cost of living is already too high without this additional burden.

Mr. President, there are thousands and millions of people in this country who will testify to the truth of that statement. I myself am happy to testify to the truth of it. The other day I went to the store with my wife, and I felt sorry for people who do not get a Senator's salary check. I do not know how they get by. It really is a problem, even for Senators.

The President further said:

> It is evident that the present high cost of living should not be increased further by a sharp increase in rents.

Mr. President, does anyone wish to argue about that statement?

The President then said:

> We must get prices down, not devise means of getting the price of shelter up.

No, Mr. President; I think the President of the United States is perfectly justified in criticizing the Congress for the passage of that bill, which is not what it purports to be. I do not blame the majority for crying aloud against the President's suggestion that the Congress do something about housing, because all the Congress has done thus far is to scuttle housing, under this so-called rent-control bill. We took off controls that the Housing Expediter said would cost approximately 200,000 homes. Yesterday we forbade the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans for homes, even to GI's. As has been pointed out, the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill has been reported, but no action has been taken on it.

So I think the President's message, all in all, is a very healthy thing—pointing out to the people of the United States exactly what is being done, and saying that he signed the bill with the greatest reluctance because in his opinion—but not in mine, Mr. President—it is better than nothing at all.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, several times I attempted to obtain recognition to propound several questions, and I asked Senators to yield to me, but I did not have much success.

I just wish to say now, since the crossfire has ended, that I wish to commend the Senator from Delaware for making a very fine contribution to the proceedings in the Senate. I think that anyone with any intelligence cannot but feel that the President, in signing the act, used that occasion for the purpose of castigating the Congress of the United States. There is no question about that. Politically, it is a new low, so far as I am concerned.

I do not know anything about a real-estate lobby. If any of the members of the Banking and Currency Committee do, they should tell it to the United States Senate, under their responsibility as Senators. They should point out those who, they say, are subversive. Those who make these critical statements should point the finger at the guilty parties, and name their names, if they know them. But they do not do that, for they do not know them, and they cannot point them out. They are just making statements that they cannot back up.

And so did the President of the United States. He just signed something that someone else wrote for him. That is what he did.

If we examine the language he used, we find that it is one of the most scathing statements that has ever come from a President of the United States. Just read this, Mr. President:

It is intolerable that this lobby—

This so-called lobby, at which certain Members of the Senate on the other side of the aisle are pointing an accusing finger this afternoon, although they do not identify them; they do not identify even one man. I ask them to bring before us the name of even one man who has been engaging in such so-called subversive activities. But they have not done so; they cannot do so. It is just a bogeyman they are setting up, and then they are knocking him down for political purposes.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. I decline to yield until I finish my statement.

Mr. President, in that message the President said:

It is intolerable that this lobby should be permitted by its brazen operations—

Note the language he uses—

to block programs so essential to the needs of our citizens. Nothing could be more clearly subversive to representative government.

He is putting them right in a corner with a gang of Communists. He says it is subversive.

Mr. President, "subversive" means criminal, in my opinion. If there is any criminal liability involved, the President of the United States should have every one of those men brought before a court of justice and prosecuted, and certainly he should have them investigated. That should be and must be done; there is no doubt about it.

But after making that indictment, what does the President do—without giving any facts at all? He says:

When the truth is known—

Well, Mr. President, if the President of the United States knows these things to be true and if he wants the Congress to investigate them, why does not he put them in his message? Why does he not name the parties? Why does he not say who these men are? Why does he not set out these subversive activities? Why does he not do so? I ask the Senators on the other side of the aisle to tell us. Mr. President, the President does not do so because he cannot do so. Those are just low-down political methods, not becoming the President of the United States of America.

Mr. President, I endorse the statement of the Senator from Michigan, who made one of the most constructive statements I have heard when he said that he condemned the President for referring to "subversive activities," which would destroy the Government, by this so-called brazen gang of lobbyists which the President mentions. Mr. President, if such persons exist, let them be named. Let the President name them, for he says he knows them. The President says:

When the truth is known—

Thus and so. Well, Mr. President, let us have the truth.

I guarantee to the Senators on the other side of the aisle that if that is done, there will be an investigation, and there should be an investigation.

If there are subversive activities and if the President knows about them, the Department of Justice has a job to do, and the President should not shuttle it off on the Congress.

What happened is that under the theory of signing an act the President wrote a message which does not come within the province and the theory of the Constitution, and in it he castigates various persons.

If this rent law about which the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] has been talking all these months is such a good law, why do we not have sufficient housing and why are not rents reduced? The Senator from Idaho talks about his own State, and yet the very law he favors has worked to the disadvantage of the people in Idaho. If it is such a wonderful law and such a good law, why is it not extended? I have been sitting around here for months listening to that babbling spring of misinformation continue to flow; and there is not one correct statement he has made—not one statement. It is just continuing propaganda.

Mr. President, in closing, I should like to say that the President has made an indictment against a group of men not one of whom can be named by those who accuse them; those who accuse them cannot prove who such persons are. Yet the President says—

When the truth is known—

Thus and so will be found.

Mr. President, I demand that the facts be given; and if the President does not give the facts, he should apologize to the Congress, and should apologize to those whom he indicts, for making statements which simply are not based on facts at all.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if there is nothing more to be brought before the Senate at this time, I move that the Senate take a recess until noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 2, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 1 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

TO BE A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 2 AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

William J. Sebald

TO BE A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 3, A CONSUL, AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Donald D. Edgar

TO BE A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 5, A VICE CONSUL OF CAREER, AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Charles D. Withers

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 6, VICE CONSULS OF CAREER, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Thomas Boylan, Jr.
David C. Cuthell
Robert D. Davis
John B. Dexter
Leon G. Dorros
John N. Gatch, Jr.
Andrew W. Green
Norman B. Hannah
Gregory Henderson
William W. Kaufmann
John Keppel
Richard M. McCarty
Francis T. McCoy
Ellwood M. Rabenold, Jr.
John W. Rozier
Samuel O. Ruff
William E. Scott
Ernest L. Stanger
William Perry Stedman, Jr.
Philip H. Valdes
Theodore A. Wahl
Stephen Winship

DISTRICT COURT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

Francisco Corneiro to be the district attorney for the District Court of the Virgin Islands.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

APPOINTMENTS

Earl O. Heaton to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of commander in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, from May 1, 1947.

Lawrence W. Swanson to be hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of lieutenant commander in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, from May 1, 1947.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

F. Clyde Keefe to be collector of internal revenue for the district of New Hampshire.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Harry M. Brennan to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 42, with headquarters at Louisville, Ky.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Otto Kerner, Jr., to be United States attorney for the northern district of Illinois.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

John M. Moore to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Kentucky.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

James W. Lauderdale to be a member of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia for a term of 3 years from July 1, 1947.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR CORPS

Arthur H. Neill to be senior assistant sanitary engineer, effective July 12, 1946.

Richard P. French to be temporary senior assistant dental surgeon.

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

Bertha V. Linhares, Alamo.
Mary F. Feehan, Alma.
Howard I. Hollen, Brookdale.
Ruth A. Rodgers, Camp Meeker.
David T. Prenter, Dana Point.
Dexter H. Wilson, Death Valley.
Ethelyn M. Bushey, Desert Center.
Charles M. Tucker, Encino.
Chester N. Frost, Etiwanda.
Gerhard Wipf, Farmersville.
Bertha L. Groves, Farmington.
Lydia M. Riley, Gilman Hot Springs.
Ralph L. McKenna, Glendora.
William R. Woods, Gustine.
Raymond P. Melger, Hollydale.
Carol E. Howard, Kings Beach.
Eric A. Jewell, Kingsburg.
James A. Drace, Linden.
Everett C. Ulrich, Livingston.
Nellie J. Stonebarger, Los Olivos.
Ivy A. Dahl, Mokelumne Hill.
Marion Gorrindo, Montalvo.
Dixie E. Shaw, Niland.
Edward E. Enos, Niles.
Joe A. Sheeley, Portola.
Joseph M. Queirolo, San Andreas.

Byron H. Johansen, San Jacinto.
Roy J. Summers, San Simeon.
C. Harold Calef, Saticoy.
Genevieve DuBois, Selby.
Eddie D. Robertson, Sierra Madre.
Mary Louise Reid, Sloat.
Margaret M. Hale, Snelling.
Mable Clara Galle, Sunset Beach.
Grace D. Hyde, Thousand Palms.
John F. Buchholz, Three Rivers.
Laurence G. Bornholtz, Walnut Creek.
Elaine Wood, Weott.
John A. McConnell, Westley.
Otto C. Meeks, White Water.
Palmer A. Wells, Woodbridge.
Dennis T. Pelton, Woodlake.
Rudolf H. Kaisrlik, Yermo.

CONNECTICUT

Herbert W. Coleman, Cheshire.
Margaret B. Thornton, East Windsor Hill.
Arthur F. Merrill, Guilford.
Edward J. Dillon, Hartford.
John R. MacLean, Pine Orchard.
Henry B. MacQuarrie, Southport.
Earle G. Donegan, Windsor.

DELAWARE

Sidney A. Bennett, Bethany Beach.

ILLINOIS

LaVerne E. King, Ashkum.
James H. Randolph, Beason.
Jesse B. Thacker, Butler.
James A. Giesler, Cisco.
Donald R. Toberman, Coffeen.
Joseph H. Pulcher, East Carondelet.
James P. McGannon, Flora.
Marvin Randall, Forsyth.
Oscar Hayward Holman, Geff.
Frank R. Johnson, Geneseo.
John G. Robben, Germantown.
Arthur Lloyd Sinclair, Kansas.
George A. Brown, Mahomet.
Harold E. Hohenstein, Mount Auburn.
Eva S. Hooe, Niantic.
Gerald L. Hamer, Olivet.
T. Arthur Dyson, Palmer.
Guy E. Midget, Pittsburg.
Lincoln A. Hardcastle, Royalton.
James F. Hartman, Sadorus.
William P. Hohs, Skokie.
Roy M. Martin, Springerton.
Ada J. Ulrich, Thomasboro.
Waldo M. Hennings, Wayne.

MARYLAND

Harry R. Ringler, Bishopville.
Frank A. Beachley, Braddock Heights.
Milton T. Holt, Brandywine.
Mary R. Schmidt, Eccleston.
Vera M. Gordon, Fork.
Gertrude S. Chapman, Lanham.
Anita G. Swann, Piney Point.
John T. Smullin, Jr., Pocomoke City.
Cosette I. Hopkins, Tyaskin.
Alice A. Kellner, White Marsh.

MINNESOTA

Lester L. Matzke, Bingham Lake.
Irvin R. Johnson, Clarks Grove.
Robert B. Miller, Sr., Freeborn.
Otto C. Drenkhahn, Goodhue.
Elbert J. Larson, Hewitt.
Laurie J. Hilger, Iona.
Raynold E. Olson, Lake Lillian.
Henry E. Grube, Nassau.
Hilda G. Ruthenbeck, Okabena.

NEW MEXICO

Antonio D. Baca, Las Vegas.

NORTH CAROLINA

Fred E. Sluder, Alexander.
Exam A. Elliott, Barium Springs.
Ruby P. Edwards, Bolivia.
Henry Max Gunter, Bostic.
Clarissa M. McDaniel, Garland.
Beulah Johnson, Holly Springs.
Russell A. Parker, Middlesex.

NORTH DAKOTA

Madelyn F. Moulsoff, Barney.
Nicholas G. Abel, Karlsruhe.
Kenneth O. Martwick, Kief.
Odin H. Haagenstad, Maddock.
Naom F. Goldesberry, Osnabrock.
Harold H. Neustel, Robinson.

SOUTH CAROLINA

William D. Adair, Clinton.
Willie LeRoy Miles, Coward.
Clarence E. Crocker, Glendale.
Nelle C. Wells, Manning.
James E. Sanders, Mount Pleasant.
Jasper C. Moore, Simpsonville.

TEXAS

Wilbur H. Propes, Arp.
Andrew J. Hayes, Barstow.
Cordelia C. Hill, Beeville.
Marvin E. Ezell, Bovina.
Lula Lee Amsler, Clarkwood.
Melvin E. Johnson, Cookville.
Iris H. Wicker, Genoa.
Maggie F. Bobo, Giddings.
Melvin L. Ritchey, Hale Center.
David L. Haberle, Jacksonville.
Bonnie S. Langford, Mertens.
Arthur C. Black, North Zulch.
J. Leonard Gibson, Pickton.
David C. Waters, Poolville.
Charles L. Haynes, San Marcos.
Ludie C. Mitchell, Saratoga.
Nelle M. Edgeworth, Seabrook.
William Christian Horn, Spring.
L. H. Searcy, Stinnett.
Louise E. Gordon, Talpa.
Ozella H. Sharp, Vanderbilt.

VERMONT

Fay E. Wright, Westminster Station.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JULY 1, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of all majesty, grant unto us a vital and victorious experience of Thy divine presence as we address ourselves to tasks which are far beyond our own wisdom and strengtn.

We thank Thee for the great principles of righteousness and justice which are implanted in our national life and embodied in our leaders. Sustain us in fidelity to that which is highest and best. May we follow with confidence and courage those ways which Thou hast marked out for us.

Enrich our hearts with feelings of good will toward all mankind, and may we seek one another's welfare and so fulfill the law of the Christ in whose name we pray.

Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 22. Concurrent resolution relative to House bill 493, concerning the possession, sale, transfer, and use of dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Commerce.
2. Department of the Interior.
3. Department of the Navy.
4. Department of the Treasury.
5. Department of War.
6. National Archives.
7. Office of Selective Service Records.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had on June 30, 1947, examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 221. Joint resolution to provide for permanent rates of postage on mail matter of the first class, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that, pursuant to the authority granted him on June 30, 1947, he did on that date sign the following joint resolution:

H. J. Res. 221. Joint resolution to provide permanent rates of postage on mail matter of the first class, and for other purposes.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREE

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, the conferees on the Labor-Federal Security Agency appropriation bill have practically reached an agreement. It is necessary to have four signers of the conference report. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] left his proxy with me before he went to Mexico, but under the rules I am not permitted to sign that report for him. The gentleman from Minnesota is in Mexico as a representative of the Committee on Appropriations on the hoof-and-mouth-disease matter, which is very, very important, and therefore is not here to sign the conference report.

I therefore ask unanimous consent, under those circumstances, Mr. Speaker, that he be excused, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint another conferee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] to fill the vacancy on the committee.

The Clerk will notify the Senate of the action taken.

THE LATE JOHN H. TOLAN

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with great regret that I report to the Congress the death of Hon. John H. Tolan, to whose seat I succeeded in this Congress.

Mr. Tolan was spending some time in his summer home in the Sierra Nevada Mountains in California. His health had not been good. One of his grandchildren became lost, and the worry occasioned

when she was not quickly found brought death to him from heart failure. He was about 70 years old.

Mr. Tolan served in the Seventy-fourth Congress and continued to represent our district through the Seventy-ninth Congress. I think that he retired, in part, so that he might spend some years with the growing family of grandchildren whom he loved so well.

It is regrettable that he could not have lived to enjoy longer the years of leisure which he had so well earned. It is equally regrettable that Mrs. Tolan, who worked with him while he was in Washington, will not enjoy more of those same happy years with him to which she was looking forward. My sympathy is extended to the children and grandchildren whose more intimate company he had wanted to enjoy.

Mr. Speaker, the Nation has lost one who served it well through many difficult years. My home community has lost one that it loved more than most of those it loves quite well.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, tragedy struck twice yesterday in the home of a man who served in this Congress for 12 years, retiring the end of last year.

Everyone who knew John Tolan liked him; everyone respected him. There would be a feeling sadness and of personal loss had his death last evening come as the normal ending of a life of more than the proverbial threescore and ten years. Instead, his death came as the result of the shock to a weakening heart caused by the disappearance of his little granddaughter, Greta Mary Gale, known to everyone as Toni. Searching parties have been in the hills near Mount Lassen National Park, unsuccessfully, and it is reported today that the FBI has entered the search, on the suspicion that kidnaping may be involved. Our sympathies go to Mrs. Alma Tolan and to Mr. and Mrs. Gale, and our prayers are that Toni will be found safe and returned to them in the very near future. The California Members of the Congress have been stunned by the news of the tragedy.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. The death of John Tolan means a great deal more to me than it does perhaps to the rest of those who served in Congress with him, because he was my close personal friend and my mentor when I came to Congress.

Mr. Tolan was a graduate of the University of Kansas Law School and at one time was county attorney of Deer Lodge County, Mont. He moved to Oakland in about 1914, where he earned an enviable reputation for himself as a member of the bar and a public-spirited citizen. His subtle, dry humor, his great knowledge of human nature, and his interest in the welfare of man are a fitting monument to him. I know the House feels keenly the shock of his passing, as I do, and joins me in expressing to his bereaved widow and fine family our deep sorrow.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of California. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a more worthy man never served in this House than John Tolan, of California. I was thrown with him intimately during all the years he was a Member of this body. I once made a trip of investigation with him to the Hawaiian Islands, and enjoyed his cooperation on many measures of vital interest to the people we both represented, and I am prepared to say that he was one of the finest characters I have ever known. In the words of Shakespeare:

His life was gentle, and the elements
So mixed in him that Nature might stand up
And say to all the world, "This was a man."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of California. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. In the death of John Tolan I have lost a sincere friend. It was my privilege to work closely with him. John Tolan was a great citizen and a great legislator. His family life represented everything that is fine and good. I wish to extend to Mrs. Tolan and all his loved ones my most sincere sympathy. He was a man of great faith and I know that he has gone to his well-earned reward.

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, the name of John Tolan has been intimately associated for many years with the Second Congressional District which I represent. His many friends there will be deeply shocked and grieved to learn of his passing. He was a former assistant district attorney of Shasta County, Calif., a position of high public trust similar to the one he held in Montana. Some years ago he established a summer home near Chester, Plumas County, Calif., in the high Sierra Mountains, where he could be close to the great mountains and the magnificent California forests he loved so well. It is sad indeed that the tragedy which struck him down, the loss of his infant granddaughter, happened there. But I am happy for the rest and tranquillity he did enjoy in his mountain home, and the many friends he made who deeply admired him and valued his friendship. All who served with him here remember him for his kindness, his patience, and his understanding of his fellow man. John Tolan never had an enemy or even a critic in this House; he represented his people diligently, ably, and well. I can think of no tribute which will apply so well as that spoken by Robert Ingersoll at the graveside of his brother:

This brave and tender man in every storm of life was oak and rock, but in the sunshine he was vine and flower. He was the friend of all heroic souls. He climbed the heights and left all superstitions far below, while on his forehead fell the golden dawning of the grander day.

He loved the beautiful and was, with color, form, and music touched to tears. He sided with the weak, the poor, the wronged, and lovingly gave alms. With loyal heart, and with purest hands, he faithfully discharged all public trusts.

He was a worshiper of liberty, a friend of the oppressed. A thousand times I have heard him quote these words: "For justice all place a temple, and all season, summer." He believed that happiness was the only good, reason the only torch, justice the only worship, humanity the only religion, and love the only priest. He added to the sum of human joy, and were everyone to whom he did some loving service to bring a blossom to his grave, he would sleep tonight beneath a wilderness of flowers.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it was my good fortune to have known Mr. Tolan well. He was a noble man and a courteous gentleman at all times. I shall miss him, for he was one of my good friends.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to my good friend, John Tolan, who suffered a heart attack on learning of his lost grandchild.

A sweeter and a lovelier gentleman,
Fram'd in the prodigality of nature.
—*Shakespeare.*

Only a day or two ago in going over the contents of my billfold, I took out a little Catholic medal given me years ago by Mr. Tolan. Even though I do not embrace the same faith that he did, he wanted me to have something that was dear to him, something that he knew would assure me protection from the dangers that face us all daily. I put the little medal back into my wallet, not knowing that today I would learn of my good friend's passing. John Tolan was a fine Christian gentleman—kindly, tolerant, considerate, and humble.

There are some spirits nobly just, unwarp'd
by pelf or pride,
Great in the calm, but greater still when
dash'd by adverse tide;
They hold the rank no king can give, no
station can disgrace;
Nature puts forth her gentleman, and monarchs must give place.
—*Eliza Cook.*

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, the tragic death of Hon. John H. Tolan has saddened many Members of this House who knew and loved him during the 12 years he served as a Member of Congress.

John Tolan was devoted to his family, and he was adored by his wife, his children, and his grandchildren. Indeed, I have never known a man who had a more beautiful family life. The tragedy of his death lies in the fact that it was directly due to shock resulting from the disappearance of a beloved grandchild in the mountainous wilderness surrounding his summer home.

He was my very dear friend. During our joint service in Congress we spent many hours together, in and out of this chamber. When he decided to retire last year he told me that his heart was very weak and that his doctors had advised him that he could not stand the strain of additional official life. So he went back to California to live his remaining days with the family that he loved so well. Recently his son Jack told me that he was absorbed in his grandchildren and that nearly all of his time was spent in their company. I can well understand how his failing heart gave way when one of these beloved little ones was so mysteriously lost. And I am sure that all of the Members of the House will

join me in praying that the missing child may be safely returned to its parents.

John Tolan was one of those rare spirits who radiated the sunshine of life. It has been the fate of many men who have served in Congress to be forgotten soon after they retired from office. Not so with John. Almost every day during the present session some Member of this House who knew of our friendship has asked me about him in most affectionate terms. His service in Congress was able and distinguished. He will live long in our memories. My heartfelt sympathy goes out to Mrs. Tolan and the members of the family he loved and who loved him so well.

At a later time I hope to pay a more fitting tribute to the career of this fine public servant.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, this is a sad day. The shocking and sudden death of our former colleague, the Honorable John Tolan, of California, leaves a void that cannot be filled. My family and I join with the membership of the House in extending our deepest and most sincere sympathy to Mrs. Tolan and her bereaved family.

John Tolan was a fine man. Quiet, gentle, and of the highest character. He loved his family and he loved his friends and his friends are legion. I do not believe I have ever known a family where there was such a close and loving relationship as existed in the Tolan family.

Mr. Tolan served his country and his people faithfully and well. His life among us here will be long remembered. The Nation has lost an able citizen, and I have lost a friend.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, like many of my colleagues, I was sad when I read in the paper this morning of the death of our dear friend, John Tolan. He and I came to the Seventy-fourth Congress at the same time, and through a decade I have watched him. He was my friend. I realize how earnest and sincere and able was his service to his country.

I remember last year he and I were standing in back of the Chamber one day and he said to me: "Jasper, I am not going to run again because I want to go back to California. I have been gone so much that my grandchildren do not even know me." He said, "I am going home, and I am going to spend my retiring years with my family."

He hoped and I hoped that those years might be many. His untimely death brings to all of us the uncertainty of life. I cannot let this moment pass without joining others of my colleagues, those who have spoken and those of you who feel as we do without having spoken, in paying this tribute to a great American, a kindly, sincere gentleman, a man I am proud to have called my friend.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure we all learned with sadness of the sudden demise of our former colleague, John H. Tolan, of California. It was my proud distinction to have served with him many years, particularly as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary. He was indeed benign, and lovable, and wise.

The psalmist tells us that "better is the fragrance of the good name than the perfume of precious oils." John Tolan does, indeed, leave a good name. He did what the great Prophet Micah asked us all to do; to love mercy, do justice, and walk humbly. He was indeed just, and merciful, and humble.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Speaker, the news of the passing of our former colleague, the Honorable John Tolan, of California, comes as a deep shock to me. Words fail to express the sorrow in my heart and in the hearts of the people of Montana. John Tolan was not only the Congressman from California, but was also, in our opinion, the third Congressman from Montana. Having lived much of his young manhood in our State, he earned a position there achieved by few men in our history. We loved him for his kindness and consideration and we appreciated the many good things he went out of his way to do for us. The Nation has lost a great statesman, Mrs. Tolan has lost a good husband, California and Montana have lost an outstanding citizen.

To Mrs. Tolan and her family I extend the sympathy of the people of Montana in her hour of bereavement. A great, good, and understanding man has gone to his reward. May his soul rest in peace.

CONTROLLING FIREARMS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate Concurrent Resolution 22, relative to House bill 493, concerning the possession, sale, transfer, and use of dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, requested to return to the House of Representatives the enrolled bill (H. R. 493) to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to control the possession, sale, transfer, and use of pistols and other dangerous weapons in the District of Columbia," approved July 8, 1932 (sec. 22, 3204 D. C. Code, 1940 ed.); that if and when the said bill is returned by the President, the action of the Presiding Officer of the two Houses in signing the said bill be deemed to be rescinded; and that the House engrossed bill be returned to the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may meet during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include the text of the bill, H. R. 4019.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, July 3, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore entered, I may address the House for 30 minutes on the subject Pertinent Observations Concerning Uncle Sam's Tax System.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Christian Science Monitor of June 27 on the subject, Probe Bares Plight of Veterans Under GI Bill, and to add to that the justification found on page 2 of the report to accompany the bill, H. R. 246.

SPANISH WAR VETERANS' BILL

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, due to important business concerning the district I represent, I was necessarily absent from the House yesterday afternoon until about 4 o'clock. Had I been present, I would have voted in favor of the Spanish War veterans' bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Ansel E. Talbert on naval research and development.

TERMINAL-LEAVE BONDS

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy that the subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services which had under consideration the terminal-leave pay bill has recommended to the full committee that this bill be passed. It was 6 months ago—on January 3—that I introduced this bill to make these bonds payable and now the Committee on Armed Services is giving it their consideration. Although the bill that they are reporting was introduced yesterday as a committee bill, and does not bear my name, I claim that it is still my "baby," adopted by the committee.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield.

Mr. ARENDS. I might say for the gentleman's information that the full

Committee on Armed Services reported that bill out this morning.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I thank the gentleman. I know you have been interested in this and have done what you could to get the bill passed.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I hope your baby grows to be a big boy.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I thank the rich gentleman.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield.

Mr. DURHAM. I congratulate the gentleman on his fine work in behalf of this legislation.

THE LOST COLONY

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the three hundred and sixtieth anniversary of the birth of Virginia Dare, the first child of English speaking parentage to be born in America. She was born at Fort Raleigh, Roanoke Island, N. C., August 18, 1587.

Nineteen hundred and forty-seven also is the tenth anniversary of the showing at Fort Raleigh of the symphonic drama, The Lost Colony. The play was written by Paul Green and first shown in 1937. Showings were suspended during the war years. It portrays the story of Sir Walter Raleigh's colonies, the hardships the colonists underwent, and the determination of the English to establish a new world in America.

On behalf of the Roanoke Island Historical Association and the management of the drama, it gives me pleasure to extend to the Members of Congress an invitation to visit Roanoke Island and enjoy seeing this drama.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include therein outstanding reviews by leading Americans on this subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

NATION-WIDE PRAISE FOR THE LOST COLONY

Outstanding critics, writers and commentators greeted the opening of the fifth season of The Lost Colony with unanimous critical acclaim. Ann Batchelder, noted staff writer of The Ladies' Home Journal, wrote that Paul Green had dramatized "one of the most moving and tragic events in all our eventful history. It was incomparably beautiful. * * * I write this, wishing that you who haven't seen this play will go when you can. You won't forget it for the rest of your life. You will go again."

Burns Mantle, dramatic critic of the New York Daily News and editor of the standard Best Plays of the Year series, wrote: "The Lost Colony is an impressive exhibit in a gorgeous setting. * * * It is a profitable vacation pilgrimage." Writing in Variety, hard-hitting Broadway theatrical magazine, Hobe Morrison said: "The Lost Colony is one of the most impressive shows to be seen anywhere. But more than that, in its unique historical setting it stirs feeling of awe and pride in one's country."

Robert Coleman, dramatic critic of the New York Daily Mirror, declared that "the most impressive theatre in America is the Waterside Theatre" where The Lost Colony is presented. "It is an eloquent tribute to the pioneers who gave their lives that a nation dedicated to liberty might be born. * * * Should be seen by every American." The Newspaper PM, of New York City, called The Lost Colony "genuine Americana." Tom LeBrum, writing in the Philadelphia News, called The Lost Colony "North Carolina's tribute to American democracy."

MRS. ROOSEVELT SPEAKS

The opening performance of the third summer season of The Lost Colony was greeted by a large audience, including Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, who came in a CCC truck with a party of friends; Louis Kronenberger, dramatic critic of the magazine, Time; and John Selby, Associated Press arts editor.

To quote from the report of Mrs. Roosevelt's popular column, My Day, which appeared throughout the country: "Hyde Park, Tuesday. I want to tell you about the drama on Roanoke Island, N. C., and its lost colony. We saw the opening performance of the year, and I must say that it made the greatest impression on all of us. Mr. Paul Green, the author, has achieved a remarkable artistic success. I was interested to find that there were cars from almost every State in the Union, which shows that people are beginning to know that it is worth seeing, not only because of its historical interest, but because of its intrinsic beauty. History is interesting to me primarily because of the bearing it has upon the present. As we watched the hardships of The Lost Colony, I kept thinking what it had cost to establish this Nation. How lonely this little handful of men, women, and children were. How infinitely small our difficulties look in comparison with what they faced in such utter solitude." (Reprinted by permission United Syndicate Service from Mrs. Roosevelt's column, My Day.)

TIME MAGAZINE

Writing in the July 10, 1939, issue of Time, Louis Kronenberger praised both The Lost Colony and Roanoke Island. To quote part of the review: "Picturesque is Roanoke Island, with its masses of rose-red japonicas and milky-white gardenias, its nut trees, fig trees, scuppernong grapes. Yet with the traditions and island resort possibilities of a Nantucket or Mackinac, for generations Roanoke Island remained obscure, poverty-stricken, almost unpopulated. Today it has a boom-town look—new stores, cottages, hotels.

"Real cause of the boom was the three hundred and fiftieth anniversary of Virginia Dare's birthday in August 18, 1937. For this North Carolina's No. 1 playwright Paul Green (In Abraham's Bosom, The House of Connelly) wrote a historical play about Roanoke called The Lost Colony. President Roosevelt and 70,000 others visited Roanoke Island that year.

"By this summer Roanoke Island was a hustling resort. The sweeping open-air amphitheater has been enlarged to seat 4,000 people. The Lost Colony opened last week with a cast made up of Broadway actors, Federal theater people, CCC camp youngsters, and natives who perform for the fun of it, and Eleanor Roosevelt arrived to see it in a CCC truck.

"An elaborate spectacle, Paul Green wrote no glib anniversary pageant. His scenes range from the humorous to the heroic. With great sincerity he infused into the dreams of his lost colonists his own living dream of democracy. And by using lovely and moving old Elizabethan ballads and hymns he gave the Lost Colony a lyric quality that words could not have achieved."

THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

The same season Associated Press Arts Editor John Selby wrote in part: "To Paul Green and his associates, the whole Roanoke Island venture has become a broad canvas for theatrical experiment. This has been done along the most independent lines, and with no regard for what Broadway and the Shuberts would have done under similar circumstances. * * *

"They shy from producing a 'pageant,' just as many audiences refuse to watch them. But in the Lost Colony, there are scenes in which masses of people on the wide stage make the effects. * * * An opera could be written on the Virginia Dare story, but the superb music of the Westminster Choir and an organ woven subtly into the story serves far better. * * *

"All the so-called modern staging systems are used. A permanent set behind movable flats and props and two side platforms are used alternately. By clever lighting, the 11 scenes move along without a second's wait. * * * The production pleased the First Lady, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, who arrived last night sitting in the back of a CCC truck with a large party. It probably will please equally the 100,000 expected to see it before the season closes. * * * Paul Green's major dramatic experiment."

FIRST YEAR REVIEW

Brooks Atkinson, dramatic critic of the New York Times, was the only Broadway writer to review the original production. Writing in the Times for August 15, 1937, he said in part: "A community celebration * * * in a reverent mood * * * The Lost Colony has made an extraordinarily versatile use of spectacle, sound, pantomime, and cadenced speech. * * * The dances translate the freshness and wildness of the New World more eloquently than words or scenery could.

"The glory of the ancient English hymns, carols, and ballads, sung to an organ accompaniment, pulls the lost colonists into the great stream of human nobility. * * * The Lost Colony is a simply stated idealization of the adventurious impulse that founded this Nation in the restless image of Shakespeare's England. Paul Green has written history with a compassion that turns his characters into unconscious symbols of a brave new world."

THE MISSISSIPPI FLOOD

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, for the past several days my ears have been attuned to the radio and my eyes affixed to the headlines of the daily papers as the flood waters of the Mississippi reached their crest in the neighborhood of East St. Louis, East Alton, Wood River, Granite City, Venice, Dupo, and St. Louis. Year by year this disaster increases in size. This is the worst flood in 103 years reaching its crest at St. Louis today.

Some 30,000 people are homeless and 1,500,000 acres of farm land are under water.

This afternoon we commence consideration of the War Department Civil Functions bill. There will be flood control provisions in that bill which I shall support, but it seems to me that the old method of river control does not work; the higher we build the levees the higher

the rivers rise. It would seem about time we adopted the program of flood control which has been demonstrated to be so effective in the Tennessee Valley project.

The Missouri Valley Authority, which I think should have the attention of Congress immediately is the answer to the annual flood problems of the Missouri Valley and the Mississippi Valley.

I have fought hard, and with success, for improvement of the levee systems along the Mississippi and will continue my interest in levee programs because at the present time levees are our only protection. They are, however, only stopgap measures. But in the face of the records of recent years it is about time we realize that we must seek a final solution to the important problem of flood control.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, on last Friday I secured permission to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a decision of the Supreme Court. I am advised by the Public Printer that this will take two and a half pages of the RECORD and cost approximately $177.50. Nothwithstanding the cost, I ask unanimous consent that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the excess, without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. MEADE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Air Line Pilot; secondly, that I may extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a radio address given over Station WBAL, Baltimore.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three instances, in one to include an editorial which appeared in the Boston Daily Record; and in the second, to include an editorial from the Lawrence Evening Tribune on the veto of the wool bill, and in the third to include the platform of the Italian World War Veterans of the United States of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, at their regular convention held in Lynn over the past week end.

FEDERATION OF EUROPEAN STATES

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the failure of the British, French, and Russian ministers to agree in Paris on the Marshall plan for Europe is not unexpected. It means, however, that the United States and the democracies of western Europe must proceed regardless of the attitude of the Soviet Union. The unification of Europe, as I have pointed out on many occasions, is the only answer to its economic, political, and social problems. Therein lies the revival of democracy in western Europe and the means whereby it may find within itself the weapons to eliminate communism. I trust that the Committee on Foreign Affairs will soon hold hearings on my resolution calling for a United States of Europe.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include copy of Dean Acheson's speech and also a newspaper account.

Mr. FORAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. POAGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. MICHENER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the death of John Tolan.

Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

YORK, PA.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper article which appeared in the York Dispatch on April 19, 1947.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, in most communities in America today there is a dire need for greater recreation facilities, and in York, Pa., which is my home town, they decided to do something about it. A group of public-spirited citizens decided that the boys wanted to play baseball more than other sports last year. The equipment, supervision, and general support were missing.

What they attempted in the summer of 1946 grew into a tremendous program which has received the commendations of the local citizenry as well as many important people of the baseball world.

Representatives of the many veterans, athletic, fraternal, and civic organizations met together early in the spring of 1946 to discuss the possibilities of organizing a set-up which would provide the youngsters with a baseball program. They were brought together by Harry J. McLaughlin, assistant sports editor of the York Dispatch and community athletic director.

Each organization delegate talked over the problem with his own particular group. They met again and here is how the "Baseball For Boys Association" was formed:

Any amount of money, equipment, or personal effort could be given by the organizations. Some contributed money, others gave bats, balls, catchers' equipment, while some assisted with their talents and physical assistance.

In the community of York, which has a population of 80,000 persons, the association collected $1,100. They netted $600 from a benefit baseball game featuring the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Professional supervisors were hired. High-school coaches and war veterans with baseball experience took over the five fields secured from private sources, the city government, and the school district.

Each coach is paid $20 a week for a 10-week period. The baseball program opens on the day school closes. Bats, balls, and catchers' equipment were purchased. The local sporting-goods stores made a vital contribution to the undertaking.

The boys are divided into age groups, 8 to 12, 13 to 15, and 16 to 18. They are highly organized and there is real competition.

In the inauguration of this program the youngsters were brought together for a show of fun. In York we had a half-hour broadcast during which time local high-ranking city officials placed their blessings on the baseball program. For example, early in May we had Bob Hoffman and the world champion weight lifters, Joe Selak and his two talking crows, a high-school orchestra gave the boys 2 hours of entertainment. After that the boys enrolled, then they were told what the coaches had in store for them. Plans are now under way to play teams of the three age groups with the neighboring cities of Harrisburg, Lancaster, and Philadelphia.

The newspapers and broadcasting stations are back of Baseball for Boys 100 percent. The city government liked the set-up so much that they gave $1,000 through the recreation department to be used exclusively for baseball for boys.

Mr. Speaker, I include in my remarks a newspaper article concerning this program which appeared in the York Dispatch on April 19, 1947, as follows:

PRAISE PROGRAM OF BASEBALL FOR BOYS—JUSTICE DEPARTMENT AND FAMED SPORTS EDITOR LIKE SET-UP—NAME NEW YORK SPONSORS

Congratulations and high praise to the sponsoring organizations of the Baseball for Boys Association was recently extended by the juvenile delinquency department of the Department of Justice and Bus Ham, sports editor of the Washington Post.

A representative of the association, who went to the Nation's Capital to explain how the local baseball program for 8 to 18 years of age boys works was told that it was one of the best in the country.

The Justice Department and the sports writers and broadcasters have united to form a set-up that will benefit the youngsters throughout the United States. They have combined their efforts to give the boys and girls between 8 and 18 an opportunity to participate in athletics.

Several communities in which a particular program has been workable has been suggested to the sportswriters and they in turn will pass them along to other interested cities. Among them is the York plan. Over 1,000 boys are expected to participate

this year in the local program. There were 750 last season.

Sargent Shriver of the Justice Department, assistant to Miss Eunice Kennedy, director of the juveline delinquency section, and Sports Editor Ham said they liked the BFBA plans of no individual publicity for sponsoring organizations, the cooperating spirit among them, the pooling of funds and efforts, and the fact that the coaches of the boys are paid for their duties.

George Trautman, president of the National Professional Baseball League, expressed his approval of the York set-up. He has been urging local baseball teams, like the York White Roses, to aid in backing similar programs.

With the other sponsoring group, the White Roses have generously assisted in the campaign.

Harry J. McLaughlin, president of the association and assistant sports editor of the York Dispatch, said today that all civic, fraternal, athletic, and veterans' organizations should help give the boys of York the opportunity to play baseball. "The association should grow large enough that it can turn to other sports when baseball is over. By pooling money, talent, and efforts much more can be accomplished for the youngsters."

Continuing he remarked, "The cooperation and active interest by the sponsors is genuine. The representatives were and are still unselfish in their support. However, the job is not for 1 or 10 men to handle. Sponsoring groups should send their delegates to all meetings to make it a continuing success in 1947."

All associations, fire companies, borough organizations are being sent written invitations to join in the baseball association's work.

Members of the association include: Rotary, Kiwanis, York Exchange Club, Optimists, York White Roses, American Legion Post No. 127, Veterans of Foreign Wars, White Rose Post No. 556, Amvets, York Post No. 2, West York Vikings, Prince, Yankees, Girard, Victory, York Recreation Commission, Loyal Order of Moose, Fraternal Order of Elks, Crispus Attucks, York City School Board, Old Timers and York Umpires Association. Several individuals also contributed money and prizes last year. However they wish to remain anonymous.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was unavoidably absent and therefore unable to vote on the Spanish War veterans' pension bill. Had I been here I would have voted in favor of that bill. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD on that subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL PUBLIC HOUSING AUTHORITY EVICTION ORDERS

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, the occupants of the Federal Public Housing Authority projects in Fairfield County, Conn., have written me several hundred letters protesting the recent eviction directive issued by the Commissioner of the Federal Public Housing Authority. A careful reading of the many letters I have received indicates the fact that these tenants are honestly alarmed over these eviction notices, since there are no other rentals available to them in that area. Many of them would gladly move if other quarters could be found.

The clergy, elected State officials, city officials, veterans' organizations, and leaders of labor unions have written to me in behalf of these tenants, protesting the eviction order.

I have exchanged several communications with the Commissioner of the Federal Public Housing Authority with respect to this unfortunate situation. I have informed him that I do not believe that the availability of housing in Fairfield County has improved to such an extent that the execution of his directive is feasible at this time. The personal knowledge I have of this serious situation is reinforced by the comments of the tenants and of other persons thoroughly familiar with real estate in this area.

These tenants are being caused needless worry and anxiety.

I am of the opinion that the Commissioner's directive is ill-timed. I believe also that the Commissioner, knowing that there are no other available rentals, does not intend to evict these people. I suggest, therefore, that he postpone the effective date of these eviction notices by at least 6 months, thereby relieving the tenants in these Fairfield County projects from the apprehension he is causing them.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to stop playing politics on the heartstrings of innocent people.

I shall do all that I can to prevent this administration from evicting the good people of Fairfield County, Conn., under circumstances which would transform them into American DP's, consigned to the curbstone with their children and their belongings.

An editorial which appeared in the Bridgeport paper:

UNCLE SAM: BAD LANDLORD

All we can say of the Government order evicting 1,100 families from Government-built low-rent housing in Bridgeport is that if a private landlord did it he'd be tarred and feathered.

Here are all these tenants, many of them with children, to be turned out with no visible housing in sight. It is a good example of the way Government housing works in practice, no matter what the theories may be. Some bureaucrat in Washington orders it done and it must be done. Great are the bureaucrats and red tape is their god!

There are still some people who want the muddling, fuddling Government to interfere in more ways, in more private affairs, and to make bigger bungles if it can be done. Maybe those families being evicted from the housing projects of Bridgeport will be sent down to Alabama to live on the potatoes which the Government is throwing away.

Suppose private capital were destroying those potatoes when the world is starving—what a roar there'd be. Suppose private capital built those houses and was now evicting more than a thousand families? The trains wouldn't be big enough to carry the demonstrators to Washington.

But the Government can apparently get away with anything—and still there are people who want more government in everything.

There follow quotations from letters which I have received relative to this matter.

From a letter written to me by the Honorable Jasper McLevy, mayor of the city of Bridgeport:

These proposed mass evictions would certainly be calamitous in a city like Bridgeport at the present time, due to the fact that no rents or housing facilities are available either for those people who would be affected thereby or for the people who are now looking for living quarters.

From a letter received from the housing authority of the city of Bridgeport:

The housing authority feels that the timing of this directive is bad and is only going to work undue hardship, not only on the adult members of the ineligible families, but particularly on the children of those families. Inasmuch as forced removal at this time would lead not only to the families' breaking up, but leaves the children in a position of having to transfer from school to school until such time as their parents can establish themselves permanently in a new location. The directive in itself follows the existing State and Federal statutes and unless legislative relief can be given by Congress to prolong the necessity of evicting until such time as one-half of 1 percent vacancy exists in this area, or until such time as private enterprise can produce shelter to meet the requirements of the city's population, we feel that an unfair hardship is being placed upon these families in ordering them to move when we know, ourselves, that there is absolutely no place for them to go.

From the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, Local 203, states:

Mr. Myer takes the position that there is no appeal to the directive ordering the evictions, stating the law is on the books and the Federal Public Housing Administration and the Bridgeport Housing Administration have to obey the law. We contend that there is just cause to stay the evictions because of the present complete lack of housing in Bridgeport for those families facing eviction. This protest by local 203 is not aimed at keeping high-income families in housing projects built for the express purpose of providing homes for incomes ranging from $2,160 for 3-room apartments and less than three minor children, to $2,460 for an 8-room apartment. Nor, do we blame the Bridgeport Housing Administration in issuing notices of ineligibility early in June to all families who are above the eligibility limits. But, we do say, that the same dire need that prompted the Federal Government to permit war high-income defense workers and following the war, veterans in need of housing regardless of income, exists just as acutely today. It is small consolation that 5 percent per month of these so-called high-income families will receive their notices to quit and given 6 months before eviction. The complete lack of homes

will exist 6 months from now just as at present.

I quote from a letter forwarded to me by the Bridgeport Central Labor Union:

A critical situation exists in Bridgeport since the Federal Housing Authority, in compliance with the law, has called upon the Bridgeport Housing Authority to issue eviction orders to certain tenants in housing projects because their incomes have reached beyond the limits set for families entitled to occupy such premises. As you know, an acute housing shortage exists in Bridgeport. It is inhumane, therefore, to oust these people from their homes at present.

Father Kenneth C. Flint, of the Sacred Heart Church in Bridgeport, states:

But it is also true that there is simply no place for these people to go if they are ejected from housing. That is an indisputable and quite obvious fact. For this reason, I must protest against such a directive on the part of the Federal Public Housing authority. It is most difficult to see much justice or prudence in their order.

The resolution adopted by the residents of Marina Village in Bridgeport sets forth the following facts:

Whereas evictions, if carried out at this time, would cause extreme hardship and suffering for thousands of American men, women, and children, who, through no fault of their own, would be turned out in the street, with no means of procuring a home, a rent, or even shelter: Therefore

Resolved by the tenants of Marina Village, That our duly elected Connecticut representatives in Congress be informed of this dire emergency existing here in our village, and that they be requested to contact the proper Government officer or officers, agency or agencies, with the view of urging them to either suspend or abolish the directive of the Federal Public Housing Authority until such time as the housing situation in this area is relieved, so that rents will be available to the people.

From the Men's Club News of Yellow Mill Village:

DON'T BE FOOLED

Folks, don't be fooled by a petition which is being circulated by a Communist Party group in the village.

There is no doubt that the threat of evictions facing most villagers is a serious one; that this threat may require quick and drastic action; that the villagers facing eviction must unite and act together; and that aggressive leadership is required to handle such a situation.

Were it not for the fact that the village men's club and its ladies' auxiliary under the excellent leadership of Daniel Rodia, are taking all steps necessary to do what can be done to alleviate the serious condition which concerns so many of us, it might be understandable why drowning people might grasp for any help.

Reasonable people who are drowning cannot be expected to be worried about the political or other beliefs of others who offer to rescue them from danger. But, if a drowning man has a choice to make, one choice providing a safer and surer way of being saved, wouldn't it be foolish not to favor such a choice?

No one can deny that the local housing situation—at the present time and for some time to come—makes it impossible for folks to find living quarters in Bridgeport. Nor can anyone deny that it would create an intolerable condition if families were evicted under such conditions.

We don't need the Communist Party to tell us these things. They are self-evident. Therefore, do not take part in any move by the Communist Party which takes advantage of these conditions and tries to use them to further its own objectives.

Last Wednesday night an overflowing crowd completely filled our Community Hall at the Men's Club-Ladies' Auxiliary rally. Representatives from practically all community, church, labor, political, and other groups were on hand to convey their regrets at the threat facing us, to offer advice and encouragement, and to promise support in alleviating the dangerous condition created by the eviction threat. The city and local housing officials have gone on record as recognizing our plight and offering to do what they can to help us.

Why should we jeopardize all this good will by permitting the Communist Party to act as a spearhead for us? Don't be fooled. Avoid signing any petition or paper which bears the name of the Communist Party, no matter how well worded or appealing the petition or paper may appear to be.

Above all, keep cool heads. The threat of eviction is not immediate. At most, the evictions, even if intended to be carried out, couldn't be carried out in less than 6 months. Quite a bit of effort can be exerted during that time.

This serious situation is one that we could expect the Communist Party to use to their advantage. Notice the clear thinking on the part of these fine citizens in the remarks I have quoted.

I have chosen some pertinent paragraphs from letters received from tenants of these housing projects for your information:

Here's hoping you can do something to stop what I consider a mass eviction and a disgrace to what we fought for. I'm lucky—I'm only totally disabled. I'm still here, though. A lot of my buddies are still over there. Please see what you can do.

I'm a widow living in the FPHA with two children who support me. I have always been a sick woman. Now that we are getting along a little better, I am being evicted. Where are we to go when there are no homes for us? Please help us so that we may keep on living here. This home is the best home we ever had.

There are many families who will suffer greatly if something isn't done at once about this terrible situation. There are no rents available at this time for anyone to move into and even if there were, we could not get them as landlords don't even want one child, never mind five or six or more. It is also impossible to buy a house at the prices they are asking for them. * * * We are all worried sick about this terrible situation which confronts us and hope you will not let us down.

On June 3 I received a notice from the Bridgeport Housing Authority through order from the FPHA in Washington to vacate within 6 months. In a few words I wish to stress my efforts in looking for a suitable place to lodge my family which was done without the slightest success. What are we going to do? Eviction and no place to go. There are eight of us in my family and only two working.

I am a nervous wreck trying to solve this problem which is heavy upon my shoulders. I am a mother who gave two boys to defend the rights of our wonderful land. I was very lucky to have one return but one, a chief pilot for the Navy, met his death in a plane crash 26 months ago and upon receipt of the news I became partly paralyzed. * * * Won't you please intercede for me and many others who are in the same predicament until such time that we can find places to live modestly?

I am writing you to protest the evictions ordered by the FPHA against the tenants of Marina Village in Bridgeport. In view of the acute housing shortage in the Bridgeport area, these evictions come at a time when it is impossible to secure a rent.

The mass eviction is a terrible nightmare to everyone here.

Since we have received our ineligibility notice, we have had many sleepless nights not knowing where to turn. In Marina Village there are many more like myself.

I am a veteran of World War II. I waited 15 months to obtain this apartment and have only been in it 6 months. My wife, child, and I have no place to go. Would you kindly see what you can do about this matter?

This is an appeal asking you to please save our home for us. We have received a letter stating us ineligible to live here any longer. We are a family of eight * * * two adults and six children. I couldn't find a rent anywhere with the family I have that is why I am asking you to intercede for us. We thank you from the bottom of our hearts.

I am a widow with a son and daughter. My son served for 2 years in the Army overseas. Why is it that a veteran is being evicted from a Government housing project? If there was a rent available in the city that we could afford to pay we would gladly give up our rent to so-called low-income families.

An eviction is a pretty gruesome word. After knocking around for 8 months in furnished rooms then succeed in finding a home; only to find that we have to move. Where? Do you have room for my wife and two children? After 4 years' military service overseas, I looked forward to a real home. It seems I have a private battle to keep a roof over my family's head.

I am writing you in regards to our home in Marina Village. It is a shame the way we poor people are getting pushed around. They say our income is too high. It wouldn't be if I didn't have a son and his wife with me. They have no house to move into, and I can't find a home, not even a room. There is a baby coming too. It's an awful thing to have on your mind. Please do what you can to help us.

As a citizen and elector of Fairfield County I demand that you take immediate steps to prevent the vicious evictions that are taking place in the Federal housing projects. If these evictions are permitted to go on, it will magnify juvenile delinquency, work the most vicious hardship upon our citizens of Fairfield County, take the most unfair advantage of our veterans who have served our country so well. Are you going to let these people down now in their hour of need?

Won't you please help us? We are being evicted. Where are we to go? Are we still free people or are we going to go through what the people of Europe went through? Please help us. We need your help.

I am a widow with eight children, six of which are of school age. One girl is graduating from high school this year, and I have one girl working. I also receive State aid. I pay $42 a month rent. Could you please tell me if there is anything that can be done. There isn't a rent available in the city. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat: This is a serious situation.

GLENNA J. HOWREY

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 254) for the relief of the legal guardian of Glenna J. Howrey, insist on the House amendment, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana? [After a pause.] The Chair

hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. JENNINGS, REEVES, and CRAVENS.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. TEAGUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by General Bradley.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in PM.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he intends to make in the Committee of the Whole today and include certain excerpts from the committee hearings, and also excerpts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

RECOVERY OF THE GRANDCHILD OF THE LATE JOHN H. TOLAN

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I have just been advised by the Associated Press representative that the granddaughter of the late John H. Tolan has been found, and that physically she is in very splendid shape.

TOMBIGBEE-TENNESSEE WATERWAY

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the attention of every Member of this body. Since it seems that Joe Stalin is going to refuse the American money that some people insist on giving to Russia, we might use some of it on flood control and river and harbor projects, and that is what I want to speak to you about today. Our first duty is to the American people.

Now, turn to page 7911 of yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and look at the table I inserted there, compiled by the Army, and you will see what the Tennessee-Tombigbee waterway means to American shippers.

Now, compare them, and go out in the hall, if you will, and look at the map and you will see why this great raging torrent of the Mississippi prevents the return of barges and boats coming down from Pittsburgh, Chicago, Cincinnati, Cleveland, St. Louis, Detroit, and all those places, which could be returned by this short inland water route, with savings of untold millions of dollars in the years to come.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JACKSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the Independent Motion Picture Producers.

Mr. NORBLAD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Lands may sit this afternoon during the session of the House during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

SPENCER BURGESS DOYLE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1148) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Spencer Burgess Doyle.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Spencer Burgess Doyle a patent in fee to the following-described lands situated in Big Horn County, Mont.: The south half of the south half of section 20; the west half of the east half of the northeast quarter, the west half of the northeast quarter, the south half of the north half of the southwest quarter, the south half of the southwest quarter, and the southeast quarter of section 21; the south half of the southwest quarter of section 22; the north half of the northwest quarter of section 27; the north half of the northeast quarter of section 28; and the west half of the east half of the west half, and the west half of the west half of section 29; township 8 south, range 37 east, Montana principal meridian.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, after "That", insert "upon application in writing by the Indian owner named in this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 398, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, upon application in writing, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Spencer Burgess Doyle a patent in fee to the following-described lands situated in Big Horn County, Mont.: The south half of the south half of section 20; the west half of the east half of the northeast quarter, the west half of the northeast quarter, the south half of the north half of the southwest quarter, the south half of the southwest quarter, and the southeast quarter of section 21; the south half of the southwest quarter of section 22; the north half of the northwest quarter of section 27; the north half of the northeast quarter of section 28; and the west half of the east half of the west half, and the west half of the west half of section 29; township 8 south, range 37 east, Montana principal meridian.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 1148) was laid on the table.

GROWERS FERTILIZER CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1930) for the relief of the Growers Fertilizer Co., a Florida corporation.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Growers Fertilizer Co., a Florida corporation, the sum of $2,017.84, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for goods furnished to the clients of the Farm Security Administration of the Department of Agriculture upon the order and authority of an agent of said Farm Security Administration during the period from April 15, 1937, to March 22, 1938: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLARENCE J. WILSON AND MARGARET J. WILSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 718) for the relief of Clarence J. Wilson and Margaret J. Wilson.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

MRS. MILDRED WELLS MARTIN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 116) for the relief of Mrs. Mildred Wells Martin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Mildred Wells Martin, 1512 Lakeview Street, Camden, S. C., the sum of $4,000 in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of medical and hospital expenses incurred and loss of earnings and personal injuries sustained by the said Mrs. Mildred Wells Martin on April 23, 1944, when the automobile in which she was riding as a passenger was involved in a collision with a United States Army vehicle on United States Highway No. 521, near Camden, S. C.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent

thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, after "$4,000" insert a semicolon and the following: "to pay the sum of $2,500 to Mrs. Mabel Jones, of Camden, S. C."

Page 1, line 11, strike out "the said Mrs. Mildred Wells Martin" and insert "them."

Page 2 line 2, strike out "she was" and insert "they were", and strike out "a passenger" and insert "passengers."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mabel Jones and Mrs. Mildred Wells Martin."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THOMAS M. FARLEY AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 405) for the relief of Thomas M. Farley, Mrs. Susie Farley, Mrs. Helen Moss, the legal guardian of Donna Louise Farley, and the legal guardian of Melvin Moss.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,434.70 to Thomas M. Farley, of Olivehurst, Calif.; the sum of $158.50 to Mrs. Susie Farley, of Manton, Calif.; the sum of $528 to Mrs. Helen Moss, of Central Valley, Calif.; the sum of $50 to the legal guardian of Donna Louise Farley, a minor; and the sum of $150 to the legal guardian of Melvin Moss, a minor; such payments being in full settlement of all their claims against the United States for property damage, personal injuries, losses, and expenses arising out of an accident which occurred on September 13, 1942, near Crescent City, Calif., and which involved an Army truck: *Provided*, That no payment shall be made under this act until the above-named claimants have released all their claims against Anthony E. Badaracco, the driver of the Army vehicle involved in this accident, in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary of the Treasury: *And provided further*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WALTER R. AND KATHRYN MARSHALL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 406) for the relief of Walter R. and Kathryn Marshall.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000, to Walter R. and Kathryn Marshall, of Healdsburg, Calif., in full satisfaction of their claims for damage to their property located at 1251 Sunset Avenue, Santa Rosa, Calif., caused by United States Navy airplane TBF-1, bureau No. 06307, on October 2, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "satisfaction of their claims" and insert "settlement of all claims against the United States."

Page 2, at the end of the bill insert the following:

"SEC. 2. Such sum shall be a final release from any and all damages both insured and uninsured."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF PATRICIA ANN MOORE, DECEASED

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 990) for the relief of the estate of Patricia Ann Moore, deceased.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,534, in full settlement of all claims against the United States of America which are legally due and payable to the estate of Patricia Ann Moore, deceased, who was killed in an accident on or about August 2, 1944, near Lebanon Junction, Bullitt County, Ky., as a result of the wanton negligence and reckless and dangerous operation of a United States motor vehicle (a jeep) by a private in the United States Army, who, at a later date, was both tried and convicted by courts martial for converting the said United States Army motor vehicle to his own use and for operating the same in such a reckless, dangerous, and grossly negligent manner as to cause the fatal injuries which resulted in the death of little Miss Patricia Ann Moore, deceased, who was at the time of her death 15 years of age: *Provided*, That no part of the amount herein appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent shall be paid or delivered directly or indirectly to any agent or attorney on account of any service or services claimed to have been or actually rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in a sum not to exceed $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after "the sum of" strike out the remainder of page 1 and lines 1 to 8 on page 2 down to and including the word "age" and insert the following: "$3,534 to William B. Moore, of Lebanon Junction, Ky., in full settlement of all claims against the United States arising out of the death of his daughter, Patricia Ann Moore, deceased, as a result of an accident involving an Army vehicle in which she was riding, which accident occurred on August 2, 1945, about 3 miles east of Lenanon Junction, Ky."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of William B. Moore."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

P. L. (SPUD) MURPHEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1492) for the relief of P. L. (Spud) Murphey, coowner and manager of Spud's Tailors, Laundry & Dry Cleaning Works.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to P. L. (Spud) Murphey, coowner and manager of Spud's Tailors, Laundry & Dry Cleaning Works, Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii, the sum of $22,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of losses suffered as the result of the destruction of the accounting records of his company ordered by the Navy Intelligence in Honolulu on or about February 13, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any one agent or agency, or by any one attorney or firm of attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "coowner", and insert in lieu thereof "owner."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "$22,000", and insert in lieu thereof "$9,540,48."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of P. L. (Spud) Murphey, owner and manager of Spud's Tailors, Laundry & Dry Cleaning Works."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

O. DEAN SETTLES ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1736) for the relief of O. Dean Settles and Mrs. Ruth E. Settles, husband and wife; Mrs. Ruth E. Settles, individually; the estate of Ora H. Hatfield; and Mrs. Kittie B. Hatfield.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the person or persons specified in each of the following cases, the amount specified with respect to such case, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the

personal injuries or the property damage and death indicated in each case which resulted when a United States Army airplane crashed, on September 17, 1944, one-half mile southwest of Copeland, Kans., on the farm owned by Oro H. Hatfield, deceased, late of Gray County, Kans.:

(1) O. Dean Settles and Mrs. Ruth E. Settles, husband and wife, of Dodge City Kans., for the death of their minor son, Jay Dean Settles, and for damage to furniture, clothing, books, and other personal property, the sum of $10,734.14.

(2) Mrs. Ruth E. Settles, individually, for severe personal injuries, the sum of $5,000;

(3) The legal representative of the estate of the said Ora H. Hatfield, for the death of the said Ora H. Hatfield and for destruction of the dwelling house and barn, and their contents, and for damage to outbuildings, crops, equipment, and other items of real and personal property, on such farm, the sum of $24,098.59; and

(4) Mrs. Kittie B. Hatfield, of Dodge City, Kans., widow of the said Ora H. Hatfield, for severe personal injuries, and for damage to various items of personal property, the sum of $7,539.65: *Provided*, That no part of any sum appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with the claim satisfied by the payment of such sum, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 8, strike out "$10,734.14" and insert in lieu thereof "$7,234.14."

Page 2, line 10, strike out "$5,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,500."

Page 2, line 20, strike out "$7,539.65" and insert in lieu thereof "$5,539.65."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

CHARLES E. CROOK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2268) for the relief of Charles E. Crook.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

A. E. McCARTNEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 629) for the relief of A. E. McCartney and O. A. Foster.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to A. E. McCartney and O. A. Foster, of Newport, Ark., the sum of $9,162.80. Such sum represents the damages sustained by the said A. E. McCartney and O. A. Foster to their 1943 and 1944 rice crops as a result of malaria-control dusting of rice fields in Jackson County, Ark., by the United States Public Health Service in 1943 and 1944.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 6, after the sign "$", strike out the remainder of the bill and insert in lieu thereof: "3,087.02; to pay P. W. Woodyard and J. R. Mahon the sum of $2,982.69; to pay B. E. Truitt, T. L. Truitt, and W. B. Lacy the sum of $6,207.17; to pay G. W. Cox, J. M. Cox, and F. T. Cox the sum of $6,258.05; to pay W. W. Cox and Dr. J. W. Cox the sum of $7,116.60; and to pay Robert Cathcart and Claude Cathcart the sum of $3,688.69, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damage to rice crops sustained as a result of dusting operations by the United States Public Health Service in connection with certain malaria-control work in 1943 and 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of A. E. McCartney and O. A. Foster; P. W. Woodyard and J. R. Mahon; B. E. Truitt, T. L. Truitt, and W. B. Lacy; G. W. Cox, J. M. Cox, and F. T. Cox; W. W. Cox and Dr J. W. Cox; Robert Cathcart and Claude Cathcart."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANK F. MILES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 642) for the relief of Frank F. Miles.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $690 to Frank F. Miles (O-277842), Argonne-Armory Building, Des Moines, Iowa, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for terminal leave pay due him from the War Department when he was granted leave from active duty as a major in the Army of the United States, to go abroad as a war correspondent for the American Legion publications.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill add ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COHEN, GOLDMAN & CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1296) for the relief of Cohen, Goldman & Co., Inc.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DOLLIVER and Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin objected, and under the rule the bill was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HEMPSTEAD WAREHOUSE CORP.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1498) for the relief of Hempstead Warehouse Corp.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $41,945.80 to Hempstead Warehouse Corp., as equitable reimbursement and in full and final settlement and satisfaction for loss or damage sustained by it as owner of land adjacent to Mitchel Field, in Nassau County, N. Y., growing out of the extension and enlargement of Mitchel Field and any plans preparatory thereto and any use of said land in connection with the construction, use, and operation of said airfield as extended and enlarged: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out the figures "$41,945.80" and insert in lieu thereof "$36,570.21."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HERMAN TRAHN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1502) for the relief of Herman Trahn.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 3 (a) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended (54 Stat. 885; 50 U. S. C. 303), and the provisions of Public Law 205, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved October 29, 1945, Herman Trahn, of 65 Park Terrace East, New York, N. Y., may be permitted to become a naturalized citizen of the United States if he can otherwise meet all the requirements of existing law relating to naturalization.

With the following committee amendment:

On line 5, after "50", insert "App."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RALPH STANFIELD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1535) for the relief of the legal guardian of Ralph Stanfield, a minor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the legal guardian

of Ralph Stanfield, a minor, Tate, Ga., the sum of $12,800. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained by the said Ralph Stanfield on January 23, 1944, when a United States Army truck left the highway and ran him down at the intersection of Dawsonville Road with State Highway No. 5 at Tate, Ga.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of the act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceednig $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$12,800" and insert in lieu thereof "$10,000."

Page 1, line 8, after the word "injuries", insert ", medical and hospital expenses."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PITTSBURGH DUBOIS CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1670) for the relief of Pittsburgh DuBois Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $29,633.07 to Pittsburgh DuBois Co., in full and final settlement and satisfaction of all claims for damages and loss growing out of War Department contract No. W-650-cws-887, as amended and modified, dated April 27, 1943, for the furnishing of 60,000 incendiary bomb packing boxes and release bars: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with the presentation of this claim to the proper committees of Congress, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out the figures "$29,633.07" and insert in lieu thereof "$24,987.76."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELSIE L. ROSENOW

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1726) for the relief of Elsie L. Rosenow.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Elsie L. Rosenow, of Highland Park, Ill., the sum of $30,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses sustained as the result of a fall she suffered at the entrance to the Highland Park Post Office, Highland Park, Ill., on December 12, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of any services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$30,000"; insert in lieu thereof "$6,383.62."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. CARRIE M. LEE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2062) for the relief of Mrs. Carrie M. Lee.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Carrie M. Lee, Florence, S. C., the sum of $500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of a collision with a United States Army truck No. 4200246, south on highway No. 1, approximately 2½ south of Rockingham, N. C., on July 21, 1944.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 8, strike out line 8 and the remainder of the bill and insert in lieu thereof "arising out of an accident in which the automobile in which she was riding was struck by an Army truck on United States Highway No. 1, about 2½ miles south of Rockingham, N. C., on July 21, 1944: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELMER A. NORRIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2390) for the relief of Elmer A. Norris.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Elmer A. Norris, of Newport, Tenn., the sum of $3,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by him on or about June 16, 1936, near Calhoun, Tenn., when a Civilian Conservation Corps truck struck the Norris car.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 7, after the word "injuries", strike out the remainder of the bill, and insert in lieu thereof "and property damage sustained by him on or about June 6, 1936, near Calhoun, Tenn., as a result of an accident involving a Civilian Conservation Corps truck: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury shall make such payment only after receipt of evidence satisfactory to him that the judgment in the sum of $3,000 entered in the Circuit Court of Cocke County, Tenn., in Civil Minute Book No. 10, pages 235 and 283 in favor of Elmer A. Norris and against Claud Manis and William Smith, has been satisfied and discharged of record: *And provided further*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BARRETT & HILP

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2507) for the relief of the firm of Barrett & Hilp.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the firm of Barrett & Hilp, general contractors of San Francisco, Calif., the sum of $20,193.55. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said firm of Barrett & Hilp against the United States arising out of the explosion at Port Chicago, Calif., on July 17, 1944. Such sum represents the amount of loss determined by the Navy Department to have been sustained by such firm, less the amount received by such firm on contracts of insurance: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MACK GENE ODOM, A MINOR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2550) for the relief of Mack Gene Odom, a minor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the legal guardian of Mack Gene Odom, a minor, Logansport, La., the sum of $10,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained on October 12, 1941, as the result of an explosion of a blank cartridge which was left in the yard of the Odom residence by military personnel during special field exercises: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$6,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HAROLD TURCEAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 53) conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Harold Turcean.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Harold Turcean, a native of Rumania who lived in the United States from the time he was 3 years old, enlisted in the Army of the United States (serial No. 36576489) for service in World War II, and was killed in action in Normany on June 10, 1944, shall be held and considered to have been a citizen of the United States at the time of his death.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RAYMOND WESLEY DOYLE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 394) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Raymond Wesley Doyle.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, upon application in writing, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Raymond Wesley Doyle a patent in fee to the following-described lands situated in Big Horn County, Mont.: (1) The north half of the northwest quarter and the north half of the south half of the northwest quarter of section 27; the east half of section 28; and lots 3 and 4, the northeast quarter, and the north half of the southeast quarter of section 33; township 9 south, range 36 east, Montana principal meridian; and (2) the south half of the south half of the southeast quarter of section 19; and lot 1 and the northeast quarter of section 30; township 8 south, range 37 east, Montana principal meridian.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RICHARD JAY DOYLE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 395) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Richard Jay Doyle.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, upon application in writing, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Kathleen Doyle Harris, sole devisee of Richard Jay Doyle, deceased, a patent in fee to the following-described lands situated in Big Horn County, Mont.: The south half of the northwest quarter, and the southwest quarter of section 29; the southeast quarter of section 30; lots 6 and 7, the northeast quarter, and the north half of the southeast quarter, of section 31; and lots 1 and 2, the northwest quarter, and the north half of the southwest quarter of section 32; township 9 south, range 36 east, Montana principal meridian.

Mr. POTTS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POTTS: After the word "to" in the title, insert "Kathleen Doyle Harris, sole devisee of"; and after the name "Doyle" in the title, insert "deceased."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THURLOW GREY DOYLE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 396) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Thurlow Grey Doyle.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, upon application in writing, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Thurlow Grey Doyle a patent in fee to the following-described lands situated in Big Horn County, Mont.: The northeast quarter, the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter, the northeast quarter of the southeast quarter; and the south half of the southeast quarter, of section 17; lots 3 and 4, the south half of the scuth half of the northeast quarter, the east half of the southwest quarter, and the southeast quarter, of section 19; and the north half of the northeast quarter, the northeast quarter of the northwest quarter, the south half of the northwest quarter, and the southwest quarter of section 20; township 9 south, range 36 east, Montana principal meridian.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAWRENCE STANLEY DOYLE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 397) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Lawrence Stanley Doyle.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, upon application in writing, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Lawrence Stanley Doyle a patent in fee to the following-described lands situated in Big Horn County, Mont.: (1) The west half of section 28; the north half of the northwest quarter of section 29; lots 1 and 2, the northwest quarter, and the north half of the southwest quarter of section 33; township 9 south, range 36 east, Montana principal meridian; and (2) lots 3 and 4, the north half of the southeast quarter, and the north half of the south half of the south quarter, and the north half of the south half of the south half of the southeast quarter, of section 19, township 8 south, range 37 east, Montana principal meridian.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GLADYS MAY DOYLE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 399) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Gladys May Doyle.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, upon application in writing, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Gladys May Doyle a patent in fee to the following-described lands situated in Big Horn County, Montana: The south half of the southwest quarter of section 10; the west half of section 15; the northeast quarter of the southeast quarter of section 16; the east half of the east half of the northeast quarter of section 21; and the north half, and the north half of the south half of section 22; township 8 south, range 37 east, Montana principal meridian.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BECKER LITTLE LIGHT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2835) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Becker Little Light.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Interior is authorized and directed to issue to Becker Little Light, of Wyola, Mont., a patent in fee to the following described lands allotted to him on the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.: The northeast quarter of the northwest quarter of section 2, township 2 south, range 33 east, Montana principal meridian, containing 40 acres.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That the Secretary of the Interior or his authorized representative may, in his discretion, sell, for the benefit of Becker Little Light, the following-described land, situated in the State of Montana: Lot 3 of section 2, township 2 south, range 33 east, Montana principal meridian, containing forty and fifteen one-hundredths acres: *Provided,* That such portion of the proceeds received from the sale of the land as may be approved by the superintendent of the Crow Indian Agency shall be reinvested in Indian-owned inherited lands on the reservation."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RICHARD LITTLE LIGHT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2886) authorizing the sale, under supervision, of land of Richard Little Light.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior or his authorized representative,

may, in his discretion, sell under existing regulations, for the benefit of Richard Little Light, of Wyola, Mont., the following-described lands situated in the State of Montana: The south half of the southwest quarter of section 35, township 1 south, range 33 east, Montana principal meridian, containing 80 acres: *Provided*, That such portion of the proceeds received from the sale of the land as may be approved by the superintendent of the Crow Indian Agency shall be reinvested in Indian-owned inherited lands on the reservation.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RUSTON JAMSETJI PATELL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 650) for the relief of Ruston Jamsetji Patell.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Ruston Jamsetji Patell as of July 3, 1946, the day after Public Law No. 483 of the Seventy-ninth Congress (establishing an annual Indian (racial) quota) was approved. Upon enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Indian (racial) quota of the first year that the Indian (racial) quota is hereafter available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RIYOKO PATELL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 928) for the relief of Riyoko Patell.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Riyoko Patell, who entered the United States at San Francisco, Calif., on July 20, 1939, and that the said Riyoko Patell shall, for all purposes under the immigration laws, be deemed to have been lawfully admitted as an immigrant for permanent residence, any provisions of the immigration laws to the contrary notwithstanding: *Provided*, That the enactment of this act shall not be deemed to extend to Riyoko Patell the right or privilege to naturalization as a citizen of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 10, strike out the colon and the balance of line 10, and 11, and all of page 2, and insert "Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for persons born in Japan of the first year that the said quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

QUEENS CHAPEL METHODIST CHURCH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2511) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to quitclaim two acres of land near Muirkirk, Md., to the Queens Chapel Methodist Church.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to convey by quitclaim deed not to exceed 2 acres of land of the Agricultural Research Center near Muirkirk, Md., to the Queens Chapel Methodist Church, upon the payment in cash of $100. Such land shall be devoted to church purposes and the deed shall contain a provision that in the event the land shall cease to be used for such purposes the title to such land shall revert to the United States upon the payment of the sum of $100 or the tender thereof to the church.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. AUDREY ELLEN GOOCH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1078) for the relief of Mrs. Audrey Ellen Gooch.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the committee has passed over, without prejudice, H. R. 1078. I have been assured that the measure will be considered again in 2 weeks. I sincerely hope that the action of the Committee on the Judiciary in reporting this bill out favorably to the House will be sustained.

The purpose of the act is to reunite an honorably discharged veteran with his wife and young son. Because of a technicality he is being forced to maintain them in Australia and legislation becomes necessary.

The SPEAKER. That completes the calling of the Private Calendar.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the life and character of the late Hon. John H. Tolan.

WAR DEPARTMENT CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1948

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4002) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; and pending that, I ask unanimous consent that general debate may continue not to exceed 3 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR] and myself.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, that is agreeable.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] asks unanimous consent that the debate on the bill continue not to exceed 3 hours to be equally divided and controlled between himself and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR].

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4002, the War Department civil functions appropriation bill, 1948, with Mr. MICHENER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] is recognized for an hour and a half, and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR] will be recognized for an hour and a half.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, this is the second of a possible four War Department appropriation bills. The first of the four, the military appropriation bill, has already passed the House. The bill before us covers rivers and harbors, flood control, cemeterial expenses of the War Department, Alaskan communication system, and the United States Soldiers' Home. It also covers a $60,000,000 supplemental appropriation to defray the expense of bringing back the war dead. There is yet to be submitted to the House:

First. The $725,000,000 estimate for Government and relief in occupied areas. The original plan was to include this item in the civil-functions bill. However, after careful consideration, it was agreed to place all the appropriation bills for Government and relief in occupied and liberated areas in one bill.

Second. The original legislative budget contained an item for $225,000,000 for engineering service, $100,000,000 of which was for the construction of barracks and quarters in the United States and the remaining $125,000,000 for barracks and quarters in our island possessions. No estimate has as yet been submitted for this item. It is not included in this bill.

TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS

The bill includes a total of direct appropriations of $339,186,869. This amount is $43,540,231 less than a budget estimate, or an average reduction of approximately 11½ percent. No reductions were made, and the full budget estimates were allowed on the following items:

First. Maintenance of rivers and harbors.

Second. Maintenance of flood-control projects.

Third. Maintenance of the lower Mississippi.

Fourth. No reduction was made in the $12,000,000 allowed by the budget for new work on the lower Mississippi.

Fifth. No reduction was made in the $60,000,000 estimate to defray the expense of bringing back the war dead to the United States.

FLOOD CONTROL, GENERAL

The amount recommended in the bill for new work under "Flood control, general" is $122,269,800, which is a reduction of $29,314,200 below budget estimates. The committee considered each of the 78 projects submitted by the budget carefully and the projects were analyzed. Where a reduction was made we took into consideration the progress of the work and permitted completion of a certain item or items in that construction. Reductions and the reason for such reductions are covered in the committee report. I wish to state again that no reduction whatsoever was made in maintenance of either rivers and harbors or flood control. Both rivers and harbors and flood-control maintenance was postponed somewhat during the war, and any further postponement of this work would simply mean expenditure of more money for that purpose. It is not economy to postpone maintenance. The bill also contains $24,000,000 for flood control in the lower Mississippi—$12,000,000 for maintenance and $12,000,000 for new work. The committee made no reduction in this item either in maintenance or new work.

FLOOD-CONTROL POLICY

The first appropriation bill for new work for flood control after the war came in the fall of 1945. At that time, as I recall, the President submitted 118 projects for the consideration of the committee. The bill was brought to the floor of the House. I opposed the bill at that time on the ground that we were taking on so much flood-control work and so many large projects that it would not be long before all the money available for that purpose would be required to continue old work and there would be no money for new work, urgent though it might be. That is exactly what happened this year. The President instructed the War Department to submit only projects upon which work had already begun. This order eliminated many worthy projects. We need a new flood-control policy. I would like to see a definite flood-control policy established with a definite allocation each year. There are certain things one must do to construct a project economically. Projects under a million dollars should not be split up, but they should be constructed under one contract and, if possible, in 1 year, enabling the contractor to use his machinery and his equipment to the full extent. True economy in such a project lies in the speed at which it is constructed. Large projects running up to a million dollars or over should be constructed over a period of not more than 5 to 7 years, if we are to get economical construction.

When such a project is started the first funds are required for:

First. Purchase of land.

Second. Relocation of highways and railroads.

Third. Building of the town site and other items which are necessary pending the actual construction of the dam.

This usually requires relatively low appropriations the first 2 years. Once construction of the dam has begun then it must be completed at a certain speed if it is to be built economically. Slowing down that speed often makes impossible the use of large type of dirt moving and concrete machinery. The use of such machinery and equipment means more cubic yards of concrete or dirt removal for less money. Every engineer recognizes the fact that you must follow a certain curve of construction if we are to have economical construction.

LARGE PROJECTS ARE FREEZING OUT SMALL PROJECTS

The plea to "just give us a small amount for construction this year" has too often been successful and has in many cases committed us to build large projects costing from $50,000,000 to $150,000,000. In fact it has been so successful that it will require all the available money to construct a few new large projects to the exclusion of many small but very worthy projects.

Let us examine the status of present projects and funds. More than 700 flood-control projects have been authorized by law, the cost of which will run into billions of dollars. Seventy-eight projects were submitted by the 1948 budget, the total cost of which will be over $1,300,000,000. The allotments to date and not including 1948 estimates are $347,332,000. The amount required to complete these projects including 1948 appropriations is $963,000,000. There have been submitted 70 more projects for planning, the cost of which will aggregate over $850,000,000. The difficulty we are having is that we have so many large projects started that the amount available for expenditure for that purpose and which I think the country can afford to spend is such as to limit the amount that can be allocated to each large project. The amount so allocated is often so small that it makes economical construction impossible. At the present rate and under the present method of construction it will be 10 or 15 years before the first large flood control and power project will be completed. That means 10 to 15 years before we really get the benefit of flood control from some of these projects. I would rather take half the number of projects, spend more money on fewer large projects, complete them in 5 or 6 years, get the flood control and other benefits as soon as possible and then add new projects as fast as the old ones are completed. Such a policy will give you as many flood-control projects as the present policy does. It will give you more economical construction and give you the real flood protection much sooner. The same thing is true with regard to rivers and harbors projects.

FLOOD CONTROL POLICY MUST GIVE SMALL PROJECTS A FAIR SHARE OF FUNDS

I would like to suggest the following as a policy. I am assuming we would spend $200,000,000 a year for new general flood-control work.

First. Set aside at least 5 percent or $10,000,000 for small urgent projects of under $1,000,000. In my judgment this would probably give us from 25 to 30 projects which could be built within 1 year.

Second. Set aside $30,000,000 for the construction of projects from $1,000,000 to $5,000,000 which could be constructed within 2 years. This would probably give us from 15 to 20 more projects.

Third. Set aside $40,000,000 for projects from $5,000,000 to $20,000,000.

Fourth. The remaining $120,000,000 I would set aside for large projects costing from $20,000,000 on up, with the idea in mind of constructing these projects if possible within 5 years completing at least one large project each year.

This would give us not only economical construction but would give us flood control much sooner than under the present policy. I wish it distinctly understood that what I am trying to set forth in this policy is not a hard and fast rule as to figures and amounts but rather a policy which recognizes every phase and kind of construction and does not sacrifice hundreds of small projects in the interest of a few large projects.

RIVERS AND HARBORS

The budget estimate for new work for rivers and harbors amounted to $23,452,000. The amount recommended is $17,367,700 with a reduction of $6,084,300. Complete information is in the report. The report also contains a very interesting statement on the work in the Missouri River Basin which is well worth reading.

PANAMA CANAL

The budget estimate for the Panama Canal was $24,226,000 which was reduced by $3,650,000. Most of the reduction was in new construction including quarters. I have very complete information on the Canal Zone and particularly with regard to housing facilities. I have the tables showing the exact year when each dwelling was constructed, the type of dwelling and other like information. I visited these houses personally both in 1939 and in December 1946, when I was in the Canal Zone. These dwellings with few exceptions are constructed of wood. A few are concrete buildings. Eleven duplex concrete houses were erected in 1914 and 1915, more than 30 years ago. The wooden dwellings erected 20 and 30 years ago have deteriorated, are termite eaten and rotting and the maintenance has gone up so much on these buildings that the rent has had to be increased despite the fact that the quarters have deteriorated. The concrete quarters on the other hand are in practically as good condition as they were when erected more than 30 years ago. I went through them carefully. The only thing wrong with them is that the cast-iron water pipes which had been placed in the walls had corroded and the tile roofs will have to be relaid and some felt or material under the tiles renewed. I came to the conclusion back as far as 1939 that it was not economical to build wooden houses in the Canal Zone. I recommended then and I recommend now that only concrete structures be

erected. The Army has erected some dwellings for officers and enlisted men at Ft. Gulick and elsewhere in the Canal Zone at a fairly low cost. I asked the Governor of the Canal Zone to look into the matter. We have reduced the amount for quarters drastically. It was the intention of the committee that what construction money was left in the budget should be used to erect a number of concrete dwellings, not necessarily single dwellings. This will enable us to determine just what these dwellings will cost us per unit. I would further recommend that an architect be consulted or employed in order to make these dwellings as attractive and convenient as possible, taking into consideration of course the fact that we want as good, permanent, convenient, and modern houses or dwellings as we can have at a reasonable cost. I believe that the people in the Canal Zone are willing to pay a rent that will include maintenance and upkeep, interest on investment, depreciation and other items of cost if they are given good, decent, modern homes to live in. I expect the rent rate on these new buildings to include such items. I am sure such new buildings so constructed will not be vacant long on this basis.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. FARRINGTON. The gentleman made some comments about the establishment of certain cemeteries. Am I correct in understanding the gentleman's objection is not to the establishment of the cemeteries but to the estimates?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I want to see a nice cemetery in Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, one that is a credit to our dead, one that is suitable for the purpose; however, I do object to the estimates and to the costs as given because I feel they have not gone into the matter. They could give us no break-down whatsoever.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am very delighted to hear the gentleman say that, because at the rate of appropriations made for the Los Angeles County flood-control project it is going to be 50 years before it is completed.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. That is absolutely right.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I am very much disappointed in the cuts that have been made on some of the work planned by the United States engineers along the Missouri River where we are having record-breaking floods and record-breaking damage. I notice in your report you are making possible a delay in the construction of the dam at Fort Randall. Although you have some money for the access roads and the town site you are recommending a decrease in the height of the dam which will result in less power being furnished to the States of Nebraska and South Dakota. We are short of power there. I would like the gentleman to explain whether this bill contains anything which is going to delay the activity at Fort Randall.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. The report reads, in part, as follows:

> Before actual construction of the dam itself is begun, the committee believes that the Corps of Engineers should investigate the possibility of substituting a lower concrete dam with navigation locks for the high earth-filled dam now contemplated.

The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], I think, is going to speak on that phase of it.

Mr. STEFAN. If the gentleman will read further in your report you admit that the amount of electric power to be generated at the dam will be a great deal less when the fact is that the State actually needs power right now. I am very much disappointed. The gentleman knows I am in favor of economy and I have been cutting where I think cuts could be made. If we are going to be called upon now to vote $4,500,000,000 for 42 foreign countries and that money is being spent presently, some of it should be spent for irrigation and flood control.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. If everybody is going to add a project to this bill because we are giving something to Europe, God help the country and God help the flood-control projects.

Mr. STEFAN. Is there going to be any delay in the construction at Fort Randall Dam?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Naturally, if you take out some money, it is going to slow down any dam.

Mr. STEFAN. It is up to the United States enginers to decide whether they are going to make this change or not. Is that correct?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. It is up to the United States engineers to decide whether or not they are going to have a 50-foot dam or what kind of a dam they are going to have, unless Congress itself should limit them, and there is nothing in the bill to limit them.

Mr. STEFAN. There is nothing in the bill forcing them to change the present plans?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. That is correct.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I commend the gentleman and every member of his committee for the work that they have done in connection with this appropriation bill. I rose to say that I am as pleased as the gentleman from Nebraska is displeased with the cuts that you have already made. I do not think you have gone far enough. May I now inquire of the gentleman whether or not you have eliminated from this bill the Buggs Island project?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I shall comment on that when I reach that point.

Mr. DONDERO. I raised that question because that project, like the Clark Hill project in Georgia, is not a flood-control project. They are power projects.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I will answer that later, but I would like to finish now.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. What the gentleman has said would amount to a declaration of a new policy in the matter of making appropriations for flood control. The gentleman has given a great deal of study to this. I think I can say the members of the committee feel with him on it. We hope that when the budget estimates are prepared next year they may be given consideration to this idea of enough money on big projects to get them done with efficiency, and enough money allocated to the small projects to insure taking care of the urgent projects.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it has been heartbreaking to sit there and have people come to me and tell me they wanted projects and not be able to give them to them, but I felt that if I opened the door to one I should to all. We did open the door to a certain extent and tried to be fair about the matter.

Now, I want to come to this policy that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] spoke about. The chairman of the Public Works Committee [Mr. DONDERO] has written me a letter asking me to withhold funds from 11 projects, including the Buggs Island and Clark Hill projects. Most of these 11, I think, are in the South. It does not make any difference where they are. It is not political. I opposed these same projects in the House a year ago last fall when the matter came up. I opposed the projects at that time and the House overruled me, and by an overwhelming vote, appropriated funds for those 118 projects, including these 11 projects.

Again, a year ago, when the 1947 bill came up, some of these projects were appropriated for again.

I have taken the position, Mr. Chairman, that my subcommittee is not a legislative committee, that we cannot possibly go into every one of the 78 projects and determine whether or not those projects are or are not to be undertaken or continued. That is not our job.

We had nearly 400 witnesses before the committee, including 155 Members of Congress, 4 or 5 governors, and I do not know how many Senators. I think we have tried to give them a fair hearing. I have tried to be fair on this bill. I will not divide my judgment.

Let us assume for the sake of argument that my committee had withheld those funds and the House had sustained us, which is doubtful, and then the bill had gone to the Senate with these 11 projects dropped. Let us assume further that the Senate had passed the bill and the President had vetoed it, which he would have; you would then have had to stop all projects, you would have had to start them again. Every one of the contractors would have been off the

job and you would have to put them back on again when they finally were reauthorized.

I take the position, Mr. Chairman, that that is the function of the Public Works Committee. I feel, as does the chairman of that committee, that some of the projects should be deauthorized. There are some 700 authorized projects. Until these projects are deauthorized, until an act has been passed by the Congress and signed by the President, that my obligation is to carry out the mandate of this House and appropriate money for those projects.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Inasmuch as the gentleman has mentioned the Public Works Committee I wish to say to the gentleman that the chairman of that committee has already introduced a bill to deauthorize some 85 projects, way beyond the 9, on the basis and the ground that the rising costs of material and labor make most of them at this time uneconomical. It must be borne in mind that this is a new committee under the new Reorganization Act and came into being only in January. No reconsideration of flood-control projects has yet been completed. They came from the Flood Control Committee, but I want to inform the gentleman and the House that steps have been taken to deauthorize some projects.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I shall support the deauthorization for some of these projects.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Earlier in his remarks the gentleman referred to $200,000,000 that he thought should be set aside each year. Would that take care of emergencies?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. No; I am talking now only about general flood-control work.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. On page 327 of the hearings our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Michigan, is recorded as having said:

> We passed a resolution here years ago that when the cost exceeded the estimate by 25 percent we ought to go back for reauthorization.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. The gentleman from Michigan said that, and he referred to projects which had not been started. That resolution, which was passed in 1945, provided that where a new project came up and the cost exceeded the estimate by 25 percent we should refer it back. On these 11 projects the House overruled us and made appropriations for them.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. The gentleman has made himself perfectly clear on that point. I therefore ask him to yield further on another point.

Does the gentleman not remember that while such funds were appropriated for use last year the President froze a great portion of those funds and then at a convenient time, primarily on November 4, the Monday before the election on Tuesday, the President released some of those funds to start certain projects. Does the chairman feel that there could have been any political implication in the time the President released them? And does the chairman feel that the Appropriations Committee is responsible for carrying out those politically initiated projects with further appropriations, especially when the cost exceeded 25 percent of the original estimate?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. The chairman is taking the position that Congress has appropriated at least once, perhaps twice, for these projects and that the Congress itself, not merely the introduction of a bill, should stop these projects. May I say to the gentleman from Indiana that I have been on this committee for 11 years and regardless of what anybody else does I have not in the past and I shall not now begin to play politics in connection with flood control or rivers and harbors.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BRADLEY. As one of those who appeared before the gentleman's subcommittee, I should like to compliment him upon the fairness of his hearings and for the consideration he gave us. Do I understand the gentleman correctly when I assume that he states his committee has recommended appropriations only for those projects on which work has been actually commenced?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. No. We added some projects. We have a number of small projects down there. We tried to take care of some of the smaller projects. We are not bound by the Budget. Those proects were on both sides of the aisle and I think I can fairly say that this report comes to you unanimously from the committee. Am I right?

Mr. KERR. Correct.

Mr. BRADLEY. I am glad to get that clear.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. When a group of farmers come to the committee and show where they sold their cattle and a few hundred thousand dollars is going to help them, I am going to give it to them if I can.

Mr. BRADLEY. I think the gentleman is justified in that position.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. But there is a limit to what we can do.

Mr. BRADLEY. The gentleman recalls my home town is extremely interested in the Whittier Narrows Dam. Does the gentleman recall whether that is in the projects approved?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. The gentleman recalls that the Whittier Dam was before the committee last year and this year and that the membership on the Republican side of the aisle were divided, some arguing for it and some arguing against it. The gentleman knows that when they iron out their differences, we will give them the money for the Whittier Dam.

Mr. BRADLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. In connection with the question of policy the gentleman said something about certain percentages of each project. Was that confined to flood-control projects or did it include navigation projects?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. You cannot differentiate and distinguish between flood control, navivgation, and other elements that come in; I mean the projects that come under flood control, navigation, and others.

Mr. PACE. How would that policy of a certain part of the money being allocated to the smaller projects and the next in size projects conform to the gentleman's further statement that when a project is under construction at least 20 percent should be appropriated?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. You have to follow the policy until you get some of these projects built. We are establishing a policy, I may say, for years to come. I would like to see one large flood-control project completed each year so we can have the benefit of it. That is the policy I would like to see established. You build just as many flood-control projects over a period of 10 years. My program would complete one project a year for 10 years instead of trying to build them all at once with 10 at the end of 10 years. I am including navigation and such as you have down there in the Chattahoochee area.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as the distinguished chairman of our committee has told the House, the subcommittee which had in charge civil functions has worked laboriously for more than 6 weeks and heard more than 400 witnesses, quite a few of them Members of this Congress, and we have brought before you what, in our judgment, based upon the evidence and based upon the facts before us, we conceive to be the best bill at which we could possibly arrive.

I want to call your attention to the comprehensive report on this civil functions bill. Every item provided for in this bill for flood control and rivers and harbors will be found on pages 6, 7, 8, and 9 of the report. It is an unusual thing for an appearance of this kind to be put in the report, but this was put in there in order to facilitate the business of the House and in order that the membership of the committee and the membership of the House might understand what we did and be able to find the amounts recommended.

You will also note that the unobligated balances of June 30, 1947, that is, those unobligated balances which I do not think I ever saw before in a report, are also in this report, as well as the

amounts recommended for the construction, the total amount made available for the fiscal year 1948; in other words, there are three columns here in which you can get all the facts found by the committee and get the recommendations which the committee is making to the House.

In flood control and rivers and harbors the items recommended are of two types, and I will endeavor to discuss this matter so that it will be simple and so that we can understand it easily. For instance, you will find plans and specifications of one type and one lot of recommendations at one place, and for construction work in another place, all of which recommendations are for the construction of the work proposed.

I go back to get this over to the House so that they will understand. For plans and specifications the budget recommended $2,500,000 for rivers and harbors and $4,000,000 for flood control. This is for making plans and specifications and beginning these projects, both under rivers and harbors and under the flood-control items. The committee cut these recommendations 50 percent, and the evidence fully disclosed that these projects can be kept current and ready for construction if justifiable, as the work progresses.

Now, of your plans and specifications there are 20 rivers and harbors projects, and some money has been spent on 14 of these and none on 6 of them. Six are entirely new projects. There are 65 projects in the flood-control item, 21 of which are new authorizations and no money spent, and on 44 of these money has already been spent, and on some of them larger sums of money to complete the project. So you see how well we are along not only on plans and specifications for these authorized items, but we are well on the way in the construction of these projects. Of course, the larger amount of money proposed in this bill is for the construction of the projects. For construction work there are in this bill 33 projects for rivers and harbors and 88 projects for flood control. The money recommended in this bill would complete several of the rivers and harbors projects and 16 of the flood-control projects. The budget requested $23,000,000-plus for rivers and harbors and $151,000,000-plus for flood control. This bill appropriates $17,000,000 of the $23,000,000 for rivers and harbors and $122,000,000 for flood control.

Many of these projects for which appropriations are herein made have unobligated funds that will enable them to continue their work through the fiscal year 1948.

There are four other appropriations embraced in this bill, one for the Panama Canal, one for our national cemeteries, one for our Soldiers' Home, and one for our Alaskan communications system, which has been perfected just recently. In this report you will find that the Budget estimate was accepted for the Alaskan communications system, and an appropriation of $1,800,000 was approved for this item.

It is well known that from a strategic point of view Alaska is a very important part of this Nation now. It is a great area. It has very poor communications, and the Government has undertaken to complete these communications throughout Alaska. We have approved every dollar of this item that was requested, in order to make these communications proper and in order to facilitate business and to protect this country in the event of war.

You will note from the report that ample and sufficient sums were approved for the maintenance and development of our national cemeteries. That item was not controversial. Every member of the committee wanted to prepare not only an adequate place in which to inter our dead soldiers but a place that would reflect credit upon this civilization and reflect honor upon those men who lost their lives in the defense of the things we love best in this world. You will note that we have put a sufficient amount of money in the bill to take care of our several cemeteries throughout this country.

In respect to the item in the bill concerning the United States Soldiers' Home, this is an interesting institution. It is an institution that costs the Government not one cent. All we had to do was appropriate the amount that was already available for the care of the Soldiers' Home. That item is not paid out of the Treasury. This institution, as I said, costs the Government nothing. Each soldier in the Regular Army of the United States is required to contribute 10 cents per month to the fund in order to be eligible for a home in this institution in the event he has to go there. There is also a requirement that all fines and forefeitures incident to the Army control be paid into this fund. These funds, together with the interest on the trust fund, which the Government pays at 3 percent, is sufficient to maintain this institution without any cost to the Government.

The Panama Canal is one of the most strategic points in the world. Some of us who have had the opportunity to go there are convinced of that and we will never forget it. The Panama Canal is probably the most strategic point in the world. So far as this country is concerned, it means more than most anything else to us to have the Canal there so that we can easily slip from one side of our continent to the other and to have it guarded as it is, is a wonder achievement and accomplishment. Enemy airplanes cannot approach that Canal within 3,000 miles without the authorities there knowing about them and intercepting them and finding out what their mission is and why they want to cross that area. It would be a revelation to you gentlemen if you would go there and see the advantage that this Nation has by reason of having constructed that Canal.

You will note that the budget approved for the operation of the Canal and for all the work that is necessary for us to do down there is the sum of $24,260,000. The committee after carefully measuring and considering the elements reduced this item by $3,650,000. This reduction in no sense interferes with the administration of this important area owned by the Government. That is the sum total of what we have done in reference to this bill. I repeat again that we have endeavored to bring a bill to the House which will meet the requirements of this country and which would be satisfactory to the representatives and the people of this Nation.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. VURSELL. I am interested in what the gentleman had to say about protecting the Panama Canal because of its great strategic value to our national defense. I inquire now if the language in section 2 is new language or whether it is language which is generally written in all appropriation bills wherein it is sought to limit the employment in certain categories to persons who are American citizens notwithstanding civil-service status. The reason I raise that point is that heretofore the Committee on Civil Service, of which I am a member, has heard many interested people who are alarmed over a certain directive which extends equal rights to everyone, even though the person might be a Panamanian citizen. This directive would accord equal civil-service rights to any person on a parity with any citizen of the United States. There has been much testimony introduced before our committee to the effect that the carrying out of this directive might endanger our national defense by allowing people to get civil-service status so that they would be able to come in and work in close connection with this important matter.

Mr. KERR. If that is true, that right is extended only, in my opinion, to those who are citizens of this country and who live within the area that we occupy.

Mr. VURSELL. I certainly congratulate the gentleman for trying to protect this strategic area which is so important to our national defense. I believe it goes a long way toward alleviating the dangers pointed out by those who have testified before our committee. I think it is a very wise move.

Mr. KERR. We have been very fortunate down there in our administrative officers, and that situation has been taken care of. If that right is extended to these employees, it is because they are now citizens of the territory that we own and occupy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I realize that the number of flood-prevention projects to be included in this civil functions appropriation bill must be limited in the interests of economy. It is my desire to cooperate with the gentleman from Michigan, Chairman ENGEL, who has, through his boundless energy, ability, and unfailing fairness brought here a well-balanced and serviceable piece of legislation. It is constructive in that it has in it projects long needed to protect certain cities and communities which have suffered from frequent and violent floods. While I have other flood-control projects in the Forty-fifth Congressional District which have been authorized by Congress, neverthe-

less, our national debt, our service charge on the debt, the unprecedented present Federal tax burden suggest caution in the expenditures of the Government. I realize that the gentleman from Michigan, Representative ENGEL, and the able members of the committee have had to select for inclusion in this bill only such projects as appeared to them to be vital to the safety of the residents of those cities and communities where destructive floods are of frequent occurrence. The chairman and the members of the subcommittee in their wisdom selected as the project to be included in this bill one that will protect the city of Olean, N. Y., a city with a population of 21,506. The citizens of Olean, N. Y., had to meet an intolerable burden of local taxes resulting from recurring floods from 1889 to 1945, inclusive.

I am inserting a table which shows the damage from floods by years at Olean, N. Y. and also the types of properties affected by these recurring floods. This table also reveals the damages caused to Olean, N. Y. by the flood of 1942.

Estimated direct flood damages, Olean, N. Y., population, 21,506

June 1889	$2,190,000
May 1894	2,190,000
March 1909	1,150,000
March 1910	670,000
March 1913	1,150,000
March 1914	540,000
March 1916	1,000,000
May 1916	620,000
March 1918	430,000
March 1920	860,000
December 1927	1,070,000
Mar. 19, 1936	335,000
Mar. 28, 1936	335,000
April 1940	1,200,000
July 1942	3,721,000
May 1943	470,000
March 1945	570,000
Total estimate for the period 1889 to 1945, inclusive	18,501,000

Properties in Olean, N. Y., affected by floods

Type of property:	*Total*
Industrial	21
Commercial wholesale	21
Retail groceries and meat	51
Automobile and service	47
Restaurants, barber shops	64
Builders supply and junk	7
Miscellaneous	100
Residential	2,600
Hospitals, churches, schools	20
Agricultural (truck gardens)	Numerous
Railroads	3
Utilities	Various
State highways	Various
Municipal	Various

Damage due to the July 1942 flood

Type of direct damage:	
Industrial	$133,100
Commercial wholesale	230,200
Retail groceries and meat	62,500
Automobile and service	115,900
Restaurants, barber shops, etc.	45,700
Builders supply and junk	25,000
Miscellaneous	210,400
Residential	2,572,500
Hospitals, churches, schools	24,200
Agricultural (truck gardens)	9,000
Railroads	35,000
Utilities	54,000
State highway	3,500
Municipal	196,000
Total	3,721,000

Those damages I have enumerated, caused by the flood are only the direct damages; they do not include the indirect losses suffered by the community. It is a well-known fact that desirable industries, new business firms, are loath to locate in cities afflicted by extraordinary floods. Old established industries located in a flood area may hang on in such an area due to an investment made in earlier days, but not so with new enterprises at a time when every element of cost, present and future, has to be considered if the investment is to become a profitable one. This well-balanced flood-control bill has my full approval and support.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], chairman of the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I had no intention of taking the floor on this bill but in it I find two or three projects with which I am not in accord. At the proper time I shall offer an amendment to strike one of them from this bill. That is the Buggs Island project. There is $3,800,000 in this bill to continue the work on that project. Before saying what I desire to say on the proposed amendment and this project, I again want to compliment the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], and every member of his committee for the painstaking work they did. I know something of the labor they devoted on the projects in this bill. They have come forward with an answer to my request that some of these projects be omitted by saying that their committee is not a legislative committee; that they cannot pass upon the merits of these projects, and therefore they made some appropriation for many of them, which are included in the bill.

Both sides of this aisle, I think, in the last election received, what I think the people intended, instructions for economy in the Federal Government; but in this bill I find a project, the Buggs Island project which, in my judgment, does not in any way evidence a desire to bring about the economies the people desire. This is a new project. It was authorized in the Flood Control Act of 1944. At that time the engineers thought they could build this project for $32,000,000, including interest. They now say, in the short space of 3 years, this project, with interest, will cost $60,000,000. It is about 95 percent power project and 5 percent flood-control project. It is 1 of 11 projects on the Roanoke River which is contemplated, and if the same increase in cost prevails, the total amount that may be expended on that river may run to $200,000,000.

At the time this project was submitted the engineers believed it was economically justified by figuring the cost of power at 3.3 mills per kilowatt hour. They now say that this project will cost $60,000,000, that power has got to bring 11.69 mills per kilowatt hour. Power in the area where this project is located is now selling at wholesale by the untilities to their customers at 7 mills per kilowatt hour. In other words, you can buy power today from the private companies for about 4½ mills per kilowatt hour less than it would cost if generated at this particular dam. That is No. 1.

As to flood control, it is indicated that about 37,000 acres are involved below the dam on the Roanoke River, but above the dam there are 15,000 cleared acres and also 36,000 acres of wood and timber land that would be involved if this dam is completed. To a very large extent, therefore, one offsets the other in the matter of benefits. In addition to that, a dam in this area would fill up with silt and not prove very practical.

Insofar as the fish and wildlife are concerned, of course, fish and wildlife will be affected and very materially affected if this project is built. I am not however going to go into detail on that. There is one other item involved in this project which I think every Member of the House should know about and give some attention to.

In this area is perhaps the largest tungsten mine in the United States, and it is my information that last year it produced about one-quarter of all the tungsten produced in this country. If this project is built and this land is flooded where this mine is located I am advised that there is great danger that that mine will be destroyed and one of the real sources of tungsten in this country will be lost. How important is tungsten anyway? Let me call your attention to the fact that tungsten is a very necessary product to our national defense and is used for many purposes.

It is used for radar, radio, lighting, airplane spark plugs, high-speed tool steel, carbide tools, drawing dies, welding electrodes, contact points, X-ray targets; and one of the engineers stated that its use contributed in the development of the atomic bomb, and that tungsten was the hardest of the tubes in the proximity-fuse program. It is also used in large quantities for armor-piercing projectiles.

I looked at the hearings in a very superficial way and found the statement of but one witness in regard to this project and in regard to this tungsten mine.

The amendment I intend to offer does not deauthorize this project, it simply asks that this item be stricken from the bill until further consideration be given to it and to see if we are doing more harm than good by leaving it in the bill.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. Has this project been started?

Mr. DONDERO. I am not able to answer the gentleman, but I believe it has.

Mr. ALBERT. Would there be a waste of money if we discontinued the project in view of the interest we have in it now?

Mr. DONDERO. It will be a waste of money if we continue to complete it and thereby destroy one of the very essential materials so badly needed in our national defense, that is, this tungsten mine in the State of North Carolina.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Earlier in his statement the gentleman stated that the cost of hydroelectric power generated at this dam would be 11.69 mills per kilowatt hour.

Mr. DONDERO. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I wonder if the gentleman would inform me and the other Members of the House as to whether that charge of 11.69 is computed on the total cost of the dam or only on that portion of the cost allocated to power?

Mr. DONDERO. My understanding is that it is on that portion of the cost allocated to power.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Not to the entire project.

Mr. DONDERO. That is right; but 95 percent of the project is power and only 5 percent is flood control.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DONDERO. My point in mentioning that was to show that they could at the present moment get power from private utilities at a cheaper rate without incurring all this added public expense.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. PACE. Is this project included amongst those the gentleman proposes to include in his bill to deauthorize?

Mr. DONDERO. I believe it is.

Mr. PACE. Can the gentleman give me the number of the bill? Has it been introduced?

Mr. DONDERO. I do not recall the number, but I will be glad to furnish the gentleman with a copy of the bill.

I hold in my hand a copy of the Durham Morning Herald of March 2, 1947, with a headline across the top—"Largest tungsten mine on North American Continent located near Henderson now about $1,000,000 a year enterprise."

You have the option whether or not we are going to continue with the building of this dam and this project, with the possibility of destroying a source of material needed by this country, and also to reconsider it and see if this project can be economically justified before we spend any more money on it.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman. I understand this project is in the gentleman's district.

Mr. KERR. The gentleman has made the statement that this is a new project. This project was approved in 1936. The gentleman has made statements after only looking at one side, and which have been produced by opponents to the construction of this dam, the power companies in the States of Virginia and North Carolina.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. KERR. The committee has requested no one to discuss that side of the matter with the committee; is that true?

Mr. DONDERO. I do not understand the gentleman's statement.

Mr. KERR. The gentleman's committee has not requested anyone favorable to the construction of the dam to appear, those who have been favorable to it for years and years. The gentleman has not requested that side to appear at all before he makes his statement in respect to the dam.

Mr. DONDERO. There have been no hearings before our committee. It came from the Flood Control Committee before the Reorganization Act went into effect.

Mr. KERR. Has the gentleman ever examined the evidence that was before the Appropriation Committees of the House and Senate in respect to it?

Mr. DONDERO. I have examined some of the hearings, as I have already indicated.

Mr. KERR. The gentleman made another statement that I think if he wants to be fair he would not make. He stated that this is not a flood-control project. I want to inform him that for 90 years this river has been running over 350,000 acres of the finest agricultural land in this country. This is an endeavor by certain people in Virginia and North Carolina to eliminate this project more than anything else. That river has flooded that land some 31 times in 90 years and destroyed everything on it.

Mr. DONDERO. I think I understand the gentleman's statement and he in his own time can make a speech in opposition to my amendment. This project came before the Congress in House Document 650 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, which I understand was in 1944. If I am in error about that I shall be glad to be corrected. It might have been suggested in 1936, but it is in the document I have referred to.

Mr. DREWRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. DREWRY. I want to read from the report of the Chief of Engineers of the War Department:

> I enclose report of the Board in response to the resolution of Congress to examine this matter. It is also in review on reports on surveys of reservoirs in Roanoke River, N. C., authorized by Flood Control Act, approved June 22, 1936.

Mr. DONDERO. I understand this project was not authorized until 1944, in the 1944 Flood Control Act.

Mr. DREWRY. I will leave the matter between the gentleman and the Chief of Engineers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. KERR. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I have the highest regard for the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], but I cannot agree with some of his philosophy as to the great need for flood-control protection throughout the United States. I have had the privilege of serving for about 10 years on the Flood Control Committee of the House before the new Reorganization bill became effective. I have been privileged to hear volumes of testimony for the great need of flood-control protection throughout the United States.

I am going to speak principally about the State of California, my own State, but I do know that throughout the Nation the time has come when we must stop pinching our pennies and start protecting the people's property who produce foodstuff and fiber in time of peace and in time of war. Had it not been for the United States in the last war I do not know who the other countries could have gone to for food and fiber. Our richest lands in the production of food and fiber, as we all know, lie in the belt of terrible floods from time to time. Some people will say, "Well, what has that State done to help itself?" I want to give you some facts and figures as to the State of California, which produces about 11½ percent of the total revenue that goes into the Federal Treasury. California has spent $381,000,000 for flood-control works, and of that total amount $255,000,000 has come directly from the State and counties and $126,000,000 from the Federal Government. That figure shows that my people have endeavored to do something for themselves. Despite the expenditure of money for flood-control protection in California during the past 10 years, we have had an average damage of $10,000,000 a year, or a total loss of $100,000,000 in a 10-year period. Think of it; a $100,000,000 loss. In one area in my congressional district, if flooded tomorrow morning—something that we have no control over and only a dam will protect that area—$30,000,000 worth of grain could be destroyed in 24 hours. In Kern County, where the Kern River flows, we have over 50 percent of the oil production of the State of California, and over 30 percent of the wells lie in the flood area, and here we are today talking about rationing gasoline and oil in the Middle West.

Now, is it good judgment to continue to put off constructing a dam that will cost seven or eight million dollars on Kern River to protect those oil wells plus about 250,000 acres of highly developed agricultural land? I am asking you Members of Congress, is it good judgment on the part of anybody from the President of the United States, the Bureau of Budget, the Army Engineers, and the Congress of the United States to deny this construction? Nobody in business would operate his business or carry an insurance policy to protect his property without taking necessary precautions.

It is time this Congress should cast aside the thought that we should continue to operate in the road and channel we are following and which we are setting out today to follow. Not $1 is appropriated for Kern River, where all that oil is in the pathway of floods. On Kings, Tule, and Kaweak Rivers not $1 is set aside. All four of those streams flow into Kings County, where with my own eyes I have seen some 150,000 to half a million acres of land under water at one time for no longer than 3 or 4 years, and the only way it could be gotten out of there was by pumping.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I know what the gentleman wants to talk about. He wants to say there was $1,000,000 set up for

Kings River. There was in 1947, but there is not one dollar provided this year.

I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I was just going to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that on page 216 of the hearings, which shows the status of the money which was appropriated last year, he will find that the engineers estimate that as of yesterday, June 30, there was $247,000 of that one-million-odd dollars that had been available a year ago which was in the form of unliquidated obligations, that is, contracts which had not been fully worked out, and $623,000 that was unobligated as of yesterday, that had not even been contracted. So they do have $623,000 as of this morning for obligations for new work, for which no contracts whatsoever have been let.

Mr. ELLIOTT. That is quite true, but does the gentleman realize that it was just a few days ago that this project was released by the President so that we could proceed to construct it? The money has all been tied up.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I realize that, and I am glad that the gentleman brought this out. After the Congress had appropriated it, this money was impounded by the President. If it has only recently been released, that certainly is not the fault of Congress.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I grant you that, but we need another $3,000,000 to carry on the work. That is not enough to build the roads and trails to prepare for the construction. It is about a $33,000,000 project. On the basis of about $1,000,000 a year, it will take 33 years to complete the program. The gentleman certainly does not think that I am so foolish as to believe that that is the way to complete a construction program for the protection of the people's property.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Was the gentleman present during the remarks of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL]?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I was.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Then he heard him say that it was his hope, and he also heard me say it was the hope of the committee, that we could get on a sound base of appropriation so that when these projects get into the pouring stage they can get an appropriation of about 20 percent of the cost so that they can be expeditiously and efficiently prosecuted.

Mr. ELLIOTT. What I am trying to say to the gentleman is: Here we are expecting the farmers to continue to produce food and fiber. My congressional district has never received $1 for flood-control dam construction, yet that congressional district is the richest congressional district in food and fiber in all the United States, producing last year about $380,000,000 worth of food and fiber.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If it were not for the gentleman's able presentation along that line, as the gentleman knows, this project would not have had any money last year. It was because of his able presentation and as a result of the agreement in conference that there was some money provided. Had it not been for more understanding of that, there would not have been any money last year and the appropriation would not even have been in the started status.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I thank the gentleman, but let me reason just a minute. We are going to leave Kings River, where you have a small amount that has not been expended, due to the tie-up by the President, and which will be expended in the current year, and go to Kern River, where the project will cost perhaps eight or nine million dollars. There we have all of those oil wells. Sure, the Bureau of the Budget did not bring it in, and the Corps of Army Engineers did not recommend it, but we as Members of Congress have the responsibility placed upon our shoulders and should not rely on somebody down the avenue to tell us where to go and when to go.

The reason I point this out to you here is that every Member in the House knows how essential oil is. Gentlemen, it is not good business not to provide some money for dam construction to get things started, to get your roads and trails into Isabella. Money should be provided for next year's appropriations to protect those oil wells which produce so much of what the country needs.

When I said 50 percent of all the oil produced in California is produced in Kern County, about 30 percent of it is in that flood control project which is badly needed.

I do not think I am making an unreasonable request to ask for this protection. Suppose we were called upon 2 or 3 years from now to fight a war and found that at the same time we were having floods which would destroy these oil wells. Think of those fine wells being flooded and destroyed right at a time when we would need the gasoline and oil to protect our Nation. Gentlemen, it is just not good business.

I am trying to point out to you that it is within the right of each Member of Congress to determine that some of these things be started so that we can have them completed at the earliest possible date.

We have another condition in California. Since 1940 we have had an increase in population of 2,700,000 or about 40 percent. People are coming in at the rate of 20,000 a month or 700 a day. Where are they going in California? They are stopping on some of this land which may be flooded at any time. We do not have little rows of hills. We have mountain peaks 13,000 and 14,000 feet high. We have no control over the melting snow or the rushes of water caused by flash floods. Those conditions are created in the mountains and not in the valleys, and our people in the valleys suffer. There is only one way to protect them, and that is to place dams and reservoirs in these mountain streams. Only in that way can the people living below be protected. They are not our people. They are your people coming to our State to live. Seven hundred and fifty thousand of them are veterans of the last war who have come to California to make their home.

All I am asking the Members of Congress to do is to give consideration to them—if you cannot do so now, certainly next year. We should have more money.

I am going to close by saying that moneys should be provided for a number of projects in California and increases should have been provided above the amount allotted in H. R. 4002 for a number of projects in the State. In my own congressional district, the lands affected by four streams, namely, Kings, Kern, Tule, and Kaweah Rivers, should have sufficient money in this bill to start early construction. California should have received forty to fifty million dollars this year from the Federal Government for flood control instead of the approximate five million provided in the bill. At the present rate of providing the money for the approved projects in the State of California, on the basis that five million is all that California will get this year, it would require 100 years to complete the projects.

The people of the Sacramento Valley area, San Joaquin and Los Angeles areas, want early construction to protect the property and livelihood of the people in those flooded areas. While we are helping foreign countries with millions of our taxpayers' dollars, I urge this Congress to consider providing some of our money for needed protection to life and property in our own United States. We are not helping our veterans unless we can protect their property and homes and families.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and one Members are present, a quorum.

The gentleman from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, having served on the Flood Control Committee for four consecutive terms, and having been relieved of other responsibilities by the Reorganization Act, I have confined most of my attention to the work on flood control.

I regret very much that my time has been cut. Even though I had been given 15 minutes before the agreement on the limiting of time, I find myself cut to 10 minutes, and I cannot begin to cover the material which I have prepared.

We find our country today saddled with the greatest debt of any country in all history. Fortunately, our economy is such that, as of today, things do not look so bad. None of us can foresee a permanent continuation of the economy such as we are experiencing now. We are faced with the problems of meeting the expenditures of government by raising taxes, paying some on the debt, and rehabilitating our veterans. Those are tremendous problems. They necessitate cutting expenditures, and finding new sources of revenue. But the bill which we have before us today takes us diametrically in the opposite direction. If we continue to pursue the policy of encouraging public versus private enterprise, we will soon find this country

wrecked economically, and on the direct path to national socialism.

I want to refer specifically, in the little time I have, to one particular item in this bill. It is known as the Clark Hill project and is located on the Savannah River, about 22 miles upstream from Augusta, Ga. In 1935 the project was suggested as a "make work" PWA power project. Later on, in 1944, the Army engineers, finding themselves hard pressed for justification, reported that the project, which was estimated to cost $35,300,000, had an annual average value for flood control of only $16,750 which capitalized at 4.6 percent would warrant the allocation of only $364,000 or slightly more than 1 percent for flood control. This year, the cost of construction having gone up, the Army engineers estimated the cost of the project at $46,334,700 and reported the flood-control benefits at $32,000 a year or approximately double the amount in dollars estimated in 1944. Capitalized at 4.6 percent the benefits on this increased basis would warrant the allocation of less than 2 percent for flood control. In 1944 the Army engineers estimated the benefits, to navigation at $201,000, with a loss in potential annual power value of $147,000, resulting in a net annual gain of $54,000 in navigation benefits. This year, the Army engineers report the annual benefits from navigation as $201,000 but no reference was made to the loss in potential power value.

There is no assurance that the present estimate of $46,334,700 would be sufficient and based on the experience with other projects it would probably cost $50,000,000 to $60,000,000 before being completed.

Private enterprise is willing, anxious, ready, and able to build this project. I have a letter from the president of the Savannah River Electric Co., under date of March 27, 1947, reading as follows:

> The Savannah River Electric Co., when granted a license by the Federal Power Commission, will construct the Clark Hill hydroelectric development on the Savannah River substantially as planned by the Army engineers, and will reimburse the Federal Government for its out-of-pocket expenditures on this project to date.

A total of $5,500,000 has been allotted for the Clark Hill project to date. The Army engineers have been hurrying to try to get that amount obligated before this bill came to the floor of the House. In this they have been successful and the report of the committee shows an estimated unobligated balance of $979,000 as of June 30, 1947. The fact is that only about a million dollars have actually been spent and the balance is in obligations which would be disposed of without any loss to the Government. The Government would not lose a single penny under the proposal submitted by the Savannah River Electric Co.

I have heard the statement made on the floor here today that because the Government has spent approximately $1,000,000 on a project we should go ahead and continue the project or the money would be wasted. That is not true of the Clark Hill project since private enterprise is willing, anxious, and ready to reimburse the Federal Government for its expenditures and to build the Clark Hill project out of their own funds without any cost to the Government.

Let me show you further how the actions of this committee are working toward taking this country down the road to national socialism.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I decline to yield. If the gentleman will get me another 10 minutes I will yield. I have but 10 and I need 20.

The Subcommittee on Appropriations, I am sure, must realize that the money has to come from somewhere. When the Government builds a $46,334,700 project which private enterprise is willing, ready, able, and anxious to build they are taking that amount of property off the tax-producing assets of this country. They are not only doing that, they are competing with private enterprise which is presently paying taxes to reduce the debt, to rehabilitate our soldiers, and pay the expenses of running this Government; also, they are spending $46,334,700 out of our already depleted Treasury. I for one believe in doing a little more than just giving plain lip service to our form of government, to private enterprise, if you please. I deplore the fact that Members rise on the floor of the House and let their hearts bleed for private enterprise, yet while looking in that direction, travel in another.

I have clippings here from some of the southern papers to show you what has been going on down there and how the Army engineers have been trying to whip up public sentiment for the Government building this project. The Army engineers say that if this project is built by private enterprise that private enterprise will have to pay taxes. Sure they will. It is the taxes from private enterprise and others that provide the funds for Government projects. The Army engineers say that therefore the power from a private-enterprise development of Clark Hill will cost more because private enterprise has to pay taxes, because private enterprise has to put up the money, because private enterprise has to make a profit. That is the argument that was used in whipping up public sentiment.

Here is a statement made by Col. P. M. Strong, of the Army engineers, in charge of the project. Let me quote what he said at a meeting of a Lions Club:

> If the people give up control of Clark Hill to the power company they are selling their birthright for a mess of pottage.

He further said that the rates for service would be higher because they must produce dividends. That is how sentiment was whipped up by telling the people that if the Government builds the Clark Hill project that electric power will be cheaper than if private enterprise does it. They say that if private interests build it the rates will have to be higher because private enterprise will have to pay taxes and earn a profit to pay dividends. That is as anti-American as any statement that possibly could be made by the most high-ranking Communist in this country.

I could quote from a dozen clippings here, but time does not permit. In this article, I now pick up, the engineers again emphasize the fact that Government ownership and operation provides cheaper power for the people than private ownership and private operation. In a hearing held last week before the Subcommittee on Flood Control, an official of the Georgia Power Co., which has offered to purchase Clark Hill power from the Savannah River Electric Co. at the switchboard at rates to be approved by the Federal Power Commission and to distribute it at rates approved by the State regulatory body, testified that the use of electricity in the Augusta area, which they now serve and which is the area involved in this dam, has trebled in the past 10 years and is one of the highest in the East, exceeding the average of the TVA area. He further stated that the residential rate and rate to REA cooperatives are among the lowest in the United States and that there is no substantial complaints on the quality or quantity or price of service amongst their customers. Such a record is ample evidence that private enterprise is doing a satisfactory job in this area and should be permitted to develop Clark Hill at its own expense and risk and at a saving of at least $46,334,700 to the Government.

At the proper time I shall introduce an amendment striking from this bill all funds allocated to Clark Hill for the initiation—and it is only the initiation—of the work. They have not started on the dam proper. The money so far spent has been principally for surveys and preliminary work. I hope my amendment will be supported. I have introduced a bill (H. R. 3819) to deauthorize the construction of the Clark Hill project by the Government. Hearings are now being held and I hope to have my bill enacted into law at an early date. This legislation will pave the way for the construction of the Clark Hill project by private enterprise which is willing to reimburse the Government for its expenditures to date, anxious, willing, ready, and able to build Clark Hill within 3½ years and at a saving to the Government of over $46,000,000. I ask that you support my amendment to this bill removing funds for further use in construction of the Clark Hill project.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to reply to the distinguished Representative from the State of Indiana and to notify him that a majority of Congressmen clear across the country, east and west, north and south, has heretofore endorsed the development of Clark Hill by the Government, and before I take my seat I will prove to each of them that they are justified in taking this position from the evidence submitted to the House Appropriations Subcommittee considering the War Department civil functions appropriation bill for 1948.

The gentleman says that only $1,000,000 has been spent on this project.

Here is a report from the Appropriations Subcommittee on the War Department civil functions appropriation bill stating that there was appropriated $1,000,000 in 1945 and in May last year $4,500,000, which makes a total of $5,500,000 and the report of this honorable committee shows that all of the $5,500,000 has been spent or allocated except $979,000.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. There is a difference between "allocation" and "spent."

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Yes. You had the representatives of the power company up before your subcommittee on June 23, 1947, and up to this time you have not given the other side the opportunity to appear and testify against deauthorization.

If it was your purpose to defeat the appropriation for this project, why did you not quote the evidence of both sides which appears in the printed hearings of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations on the War Department civil functions appropriation bill for 1948, instead of quoting the evidence of the power company before your committee and not giving our side a chance to be heard before your motion to strike the Clark Hill item from the pending bill was made?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Would you like to be recognized?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Thank God, we have good men on both sides of this aisle. Men in Congress should not and do not vote on account of prejudice, and that applies to both sides of the aisle.

The gentleman from Indiana stated a few moments ago that he did not want any Yankee dollars sent south to develop a project like Clark Hill. Men of this Congress from the North appreciate the fact a Yankee dollar is worth no more than a Southern dollar and the people of the South appreciate the fact that the Southern dollar is worth as much and is equal to your so-called Yankee dollar. Certainly no one will get anywhere with this Congress in attempting to arouse one section of the country against the other. The Members of this Congress will support any great worthwhile project regardless of the section in which it is located. The members of this—appropriations—committee who heard the evidence, members from both sides, voted it out unanimously.

Surely no one would desire to create prejudice between the peoples in the different sections of this country when a meritorious project, like Clark Hill, is involved, and I am surprised that the gentleman from Indiana should undertake to give any assistance to the Commonwealth & Southern Corp. of New York, or the Savannah River Electric Co., to take from the people of my country what they own, the Savannah River, which has been a navigable stream for over 200 years and belongs to the people in that area.

In 1927 Congress authorized the Army engineers to make a complete survey of the Savannah and all other navigable rivers and streams in the United States with the view of finding out their potentialities for the generation of power, flood control, navigation, conservation of the soil, and for other purposes.

In 1928, shortly after the passage of this authorization, the Savannah River Electric Co., a subsidiary of the Commonwealth & Southern Corp. of New York, secured a license from the Federal Power Commission to construct a dam near Clark Hill on the Savannah River, about 20 miles about the city of Augusta. Upon filing an application for this license the company announced through the press and otherwise that work on the project would proceed as soon as a license could be obtained.

In 1932, after having had a license for 4 years permitting the company to build Clark Hill Dam, the company voluntarily surrendered the license without having started any construction work whatever on the project.

In 1935 the report on the Savannah River, which was authorized in 1927, was made public. The engineers in this report described the Savannah River in great detail and enumerated and emphasized its tremendous possibilities. The report stated that the river was capable of large-scale development and recommended its development by the United States Government.

Shortly after release of this report a committee of citizens from the Savannah River Basin conferred with Mr. Preston S. Arkwright, president of the Savannah River Electric Co. and also president of the Georgia Power Co., in an effort to ascertain what, if any, plans his company had for renewing its interest in the construction of the Clark Hill Reservoir.

Mr. Arkwright assured these citizens that his company had no plans for requesting another license for this project. The committee then came to Washington and conferred with Representatives in the lower and upper Houses of Congress from the States of Georgia and South Carolina, and with representatives of the United States Army engineers. Upon advice of these representatives, the committee prepared a letter to the President of the United States, with a brief attached, urging the President to appoint a special board to analyze all previous reports on the Savannah River and to recommend to the President some practical plan for getting the Clark Hill Dam started, provided the board found it to be a sound and justifiable project and one that would be in the public interest. The Representatives in Congress delivered this letter and brief to the President and requested him to appoint a committee to look into the Savannah River possibilities.

Within a few days the President appointed Col. Earl I. Brown, United States division engineer, Mr. Roger B. McWhorter, chief engineer of the Federal Power Commission, and Mr. Sherman Woodward, water consultant of the Department of the Interior, as a special board to make a report, as quickly as possible, on the Savannah River and particularly as to the feasibility of the Clark Hill Dam.

The board made an extensive study of the subject assigned to it and in 1935 conducted a public hearing at Augusta, Ga., which was attended by a large number of citizens, including manufacturers, public officials, farmers, bankers, newspaper editors, and others who had long been interested in seeing the Savannah River, the greatest natural resource in that section, developed.

Among those who attended the meeting was Mr. Preston S. Arkwright, president of the Savannah River Electric Co. and the Georgia Power Co. He made quite a lengthy statement and said, among other things:

I did not come here for the purpose of hurting this enterprise. I came here with the view of helping wherever possible. We are not in objection or antagonism toward it. We wish to cooperate with it to the full extent of our ability. I would like to say that we are here for the purpose of its support.

Mr. Arkwright further stated:

I do not demand that we distribute it (the power). I merely say that we have the facilities and the market and are willing to do it if you wish.

Continuing further, Mr. Arkwright said:

I state again that company information, records, men, and engineers are at your service. Any information we have will be available to you. Regardless of what plan you may finally recommend, we stand ready to cooperate to the fullest extent in making available to you any information we may have which you think pertinent to your investigation.

In concluding his statement before the President's special board, he said:

I hope you will act favorably on the project.

In 1943 Col. P. A. Feringa, resident member of the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, in testifying on the Clark Hill project before the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House, testified in part as follows:

There is no competition with private interests. I have received a letter in favor of the construction from Mr. Arkwright, who is president of the Georgia Power Co., which company would be as much affected by construction of this proposed dam as any other power company.

Continuing, Colonel Feringa said:

I would like to read the last paragraph of Mr. Arkwright's letter and I have been told by the Georgia Power Co. they would be glad to have it go into the record.

The letter referred to by Colonel Feringa was made a part of the record.

The Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House approved the Clark Hill project in 1941 and in 1943 without a dissenting vote. The House approved it unanimously.

In 1944 the Senate Committee on Commerce approved it unanimously for inclusion in both the rivers-and-harbors and the flood-control bills.

In December 1944 the flood-control bill, with the Clark Hill project included as a part of it, passed Congress and it was signed by the President on December 22, 1944. It passed both branches of Congress without any objection on the part of anyone.

Nor was there any objection when Congress in December 1945, a year after Clark Hill was authorized, passed the deficiency appropriation bill appropriating $1,000,000 to start work on it.

There was no objection from any source to the inclusion of an appropriation of $4,500,000 for Clark Hill when Congress passed the regular appropriation bill in May 1946. This was the third time that Congress had acted favorably on this project, without any opposition or objection, and this last congressional action came 18 months after the project was authorized.

For the long period from 1932 to August 1946, the Savannah River Electric Co. never made the slightest effort to undertake to reestablish the license which it surrendered in 1932, and since the passage of the flood-control bill in 1944 Congress has made no change in the bill as it was originally passed. The provisions with respect to Clark Hill and the other projects included in the 1944 flood-control bill are exactly the same as they were when the bill was signed by the President.

The power company knew as much about the provisions in the bill in 1944 as it knows today, therefore it is rather late for the power company to raise any question about how the power is to be distributed.

In August 1946, about 21 months after the authorization of Clark Hill, the power company filed an application with the Federal Power Commission for a license to construct Clark Hill. This was done after the project was authorized; after two congressional appropriations had been made for it; after a contract had been let to Chas. T. Main & Co. to prepare the plans, blueprints, and specifications for the project; after a contract had been awarded for an access railroad into the site; and after two field offices of the United States Army engineers, one at Augusta and one at Lincolnton, Ga., had been set up and staffed by the Government at considerable expense.

The Federal Power Commission conducted a public hearing in Atlanta, Ga., in October 1946, on the application of the power company for a license. After hearing the evidence presented, the Commission dismissed the application of the power company. A few days after the dismissal order was made public the power company asked for a rehearing and this request was dismissed.

The power companies say they are now willing to develop Clark Hill at this late date, but why should we expect them to do it? I might ask why haven't they developed some of the other power sites which they have owned for a good many years on many of the large rivers in Georgia.

One of these sites is situated on the Oconee River, and is known as Furman Shoals, where the power company owns a dam site and the lands needed for the reservoir. Some 18 or 20 years ago the power company started a large dam at this site and spent several million dollars on construction work which was suspended along about 1930 and which stands there today in a partially completed condition. Mr. Arkwright stated in a public hearing at Augusta that the Furman Shoals project could be completed for about $4,000,000.

The power company owns many other hydroelectric power sites, including at least two excellent sites on the Chattahoochee River near West Point, Ga. These sites have been owned by the power interests for probably 20 years, but no effort has been made to develop them, though in the meantime they have trebled the capacity of a steam plant—Plant Atkinson—near Atlanta, and near Macon they have built during the last few years a large steam generating plant which is known as the Arkwright Plant.

A study was made in March of this year by Thomas and Hutton, two eminent engineers of Savannah, on the flood-control feature of the Clark Hill project. These gentlemen have done much work for the Army engineers. The cost of the survey was borne by the business people of Augusta. These engineers received the cooperation of the Regional Office of the Soil Conservation Service at Spartanburg, S. C. They went into the possibilities and potentialities of this flooded area. They demonstrated that the land was rich. They found that only the recurring floods prohibited its use for farming and stock raising. They found a definite annual return and using the same process of capitalizing this annual return, which is used by the Army engineers, they came to a value for flood control of $25,610,000 or more than a million dollars annually. The potential benefits to this area for flood control were not taken into consideration by the Army engineers—that is in the area between Augusta and Savannah, which is some 202 miles. The land is level and this would be the potential value in that area alone if the dam is built by the Government. If the dam is built by the Government it would not be full and would be positive flood control which only the United States Government can provide. Should the power company build the dam, they, of course, would want the dam full because their interest would be entirely one of profit and gain for the stockholders.

Hon. Roger B. McWhorter, Chief Engineer of the Federal Power Commission, testified before the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House and said in part:

> It is of prime importance that Clarks Hill Reservoir be operated with a view to protecting the paramount interests of navigation below Augusta at all times.

He further stated:

> The investment for power could be amortized, in my opinion, within a period of 30 years; that is, if the profits from the operation were set aside each year to accumulate at 3 percent interest. If that were done, I think the power investment would be extinguished in less than 30 years. Thereafter the profits would, within a period of a few years, reimburse the Government for its entire investment; and the dam and power plant, properly maintained, would still be in excellent condition and serviceable. This project is just as sound as a dollar and the public can never lose a cent by constructing it, and I might say that immediately after the war, if Congress is disposed to build such projects, the Clark Hill project should be among the first to be constructed.

The company which owned the dam site and a part of the land, through its officials, came to the rescue of the people and joined our Congressmen and Senators from the States of Georgia and South Carolina and fought with us to get the Government to develop the project, and stayed with us until last August—11 long years. No one was more faithful to get the Government to develop this project than the power company.

It was revealed at a public hearing held by the Federal Power Commission in Atlanta last October that the Commonwealth & Southern Corp. showed their persuasive efforts to change the mind of the Savannah River Electric Co. when State Senator Brown, of South Carolina, asked Mr. Arkwright if the decision to again apply for a Federal license was made in Atlanta or New York, and Mr. Arkwright said the decision was made in New York, and, of course, everyone knows that the general offices of the parent company, the Commonwealth & Southern Corp., are located in New York.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] has just read a letter from the Savannah River Electric Co. saying, it was willing, ready, and able to construct and operate this project.

The vice president of the company may have said his company is ready, willing, and able to develop this project, but he did not give any supporting evidence of its financial ability. He did not even state the capitalization of his company; he did not say whether it was capitalized at $10,000, $100,000, or a million dollars, nor did he list any property holdings the company may have.

When asked by Mr. CASE in the Appropriations Committee:

> What guaranty did you give that you would proceed with it expeditiously, if the Army engineers were to step out of the picture?

Mr. Collier replied:

> I give no guaranties other than the application and our commitment and our good faith and our good word which, to us, is more valuable than any bond.

When asked by Mr. CASE why he was so anxious to defeat the appropriation rather than secure a legislative act to deauthorize the project, Mr. Collier replied:

> The time element does not permit. If they go ahead with a lot of construction work down there, there is a question in my mind as to whether we could offer to reimburse the Federal Government for the additional cost.

Now, if the company is not able to reimburse the Government $1,481,000, as is provided in this bill, how in the name of common sense would the company be ready and able to pay the remainder of the cost of $40,000,000 or $45,000,000, if they should be given another license? In other words, Mr. Chairman, they say in one breath "we are ready, willing and able" to construct the plant at a cost of $45,000,000 or $50,000,000 if you will just defeat this appropriation and give them a new license, and then they say in effect in the next breath that if you do not defeat the appropriation they will not be financially able to reimburse the Government $4,000,000 or $5,000,000. It is clear, therefore, that the only purpose of this company at this time is to defeat the Government development of this project.

The financial apprehension of the company is well-grounded because it was organized 20 years ago primarily for the purpose of constructing this project, but admittedly it has failed to do so because of financial inability.

This company can change its philosophy just as quickly, or more quickly than a chamelion. It obtained a license to develop the project in 1928. Then in 1932 it changed its mind and voluntarily surrendered the license because it did not want to be bothered with Government red tape, Government supervision, and Government direction, but now they are saying we are "ready, willing and able" to construct it under "Government specifications and operate it completely under Government control, Government supervision and Government direction.

The power company says it is willing to reimburse the Government for any expenditures made, but when pressed to be more specific, its Vice President stated to your committee on June 6, 1947, that his estimate was the Government has spent only $1,000,000 and he is offering to reimburse the Government for this amount, showing conclusively that his offer now is based solely upon the company's estimates and interpretations which is certain to result in disagreement between the company and Government officials, and can only mean the project will not be developed by the power company regardless of what action the Congress may take.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, some of the officials of the company say they want to develop this project without burdening the Federal Treasury with this expense. It is a mighty late day for them to take this position when for 11 long years they joined in a request to the Government to develop the project.

This is a self-liquidating project, and General Wheeler stated before the House Appropriations Subcommittee recently that within some ten or fifteen years the income from the project would be sufficient to reimburse the Government for its cost.

Hon. Roger B. McWhorter, chief engineer of the Federal Power Commission, testified in effect before the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House that the project was self-liquidating and that after the project is paid for from revenues from the same that the dam and power plant, properly maintained, would still be in excellent condition and serviceable.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TIBBOTT].

Mr. TIBBOTT. Mr. Chairman, our very able chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] has given you the over-all picture of this bill.

Once again I must compliment him upon his untiring efforts and willingness at all times to cooperate, not only with the Members of our committee, but with the witnesses coming from all over the country who appeared before us. One having the privilege of serving on the committee with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] cannot help but admire him for his honesty and integrity. He is deserving of these compliments and more too.

Our committe, impressed with the impartial cooperation of the Army engineers in their administering costly governmental activities on rivers, was very careful in its analysis of all the points brought out by the very many witnesses appearing before us.

Floodwaters are national problems, the solution of which are of vital importance to our Nation. Taking into consideration the cost of such projects as we have in the bill now under discussion, the protection which is provided is immeasurable.

There are many important dams to be constructed within a little more than a year, the appropriations for which are found in this bill. These flood-control projects will hold back millions of gallons of water, the result of which will mean protection of homes, health, agriculture, and industry.

Most of us from Pennsylvania know how disastrous the flood of 1936 was to the Pittsburgh area, where a short distance from this city the Conemaugh Dam will give the much-needed protection. Every major flood in and around an industrial section means huge property losses and loss in Federal income running into the millions of dollars and untold agony suffered by those living especially close to the rivers. Within the past several weeks we have witnessed what floodwaters have done over a large area of the entire country.

In 1926 in cooperation with the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania the War Department made detailed studies of the Allegheny and Monongahela Rivers. In 1927 Congress, realizing that it was time something should be done toward water conservation, authorized more than 300 surveys of the major rivers of the country in the combined interest of flood control, navigation, power development and irrigation. In these studies there was included the Ohio River and 23 of its tributaries and the reports thereon were submitted to Congress in 1930. The major flood in March 1936 demonstrated most conclusively the need for a national policy in flood control. Our Nation became conscious of a deep responsibility for flood-control legislation, the outcome of which was the 1936 Flood Control Act. Subsequent acts of Congress have gone far in the interest of flood control too.

It is our duty, from a social and economic standpoint, to authorize flood-control work in any fiscal year throughout the country. Without doubt flood protection is important to our national defense. I hesitate to think what the outcome of our war efforts would have been had a flood occurred 2 or 3 years ago such as we witnessed in 1936 and which we are witnessing today in the West.

The Ohio River is one of the bulwarks of our Nation as it can be depended upon to produce a large proportion of our needs in time of war. Floodwaters have a most damaging effect on life and health and cannot be measured in dollars and cents.

While discussing worth-while projects I want to make reference to Johnstown, Pa., a city in the congressional district which I represent. On May 31, 1889, a tragic flood submerged this city that took 2,300 lives. Since then the city prospered moderately, but at every heavy rain people would dash to the hills and conscientious industrialists would avoid the city in spite of its iron and coal. In the freak flood of 1936 one-third of the city was inundated. Though only 15 lives were lost the damage to property was $40,000,000. The United States Army engineers solved the flood problem by the construction of the Johnstown Channel, which was completed after 5 years work at a cost of $8,670,000. I believe and I think most everyone is in accord with me that the amount expended on the Johnstown project is an investment which our country can well appreciate. Johnstown has been rejuvenated and no longer has any reason to fear high water. During the recent war industry and its workers went ahead at top speed realizing that if there were a major flood in the community that it would not interfere with War Department production of defense materials. The construction of the channel gave to the city and the country the protection for which flood-free Johnstown is grateful.

I have always been, and I still am, a strong advocate for economy. My record in Congress proves that I have been consistent in my opposition to waste, extravagance, and inefficiency in Government. I have cooperated in every way possible to stand by those who believe in a stable economy.

There are so many projects in this bill which are definitely on the side of sound investments that I have no hesitancy in supporting them as justifiable projects. It is my opinion that if the Members of this House had the time to go over the hearings conducted by our committee that there would not be a single point raised against the projects which we have reported. There is a large number of authorized river and harbor flood-control projects in this measure. Flood-control projects now under way are at a conservative but economical rate. The estimates for initiation of work on additional projects in the fiscal year of 1948 provide additional funds for continuation of work on those projects now under way or scheduled for actual construction operations during the 1947 fiscal year.

The total river and harbor project authorizations date back more than 100 years, but have been modified from time to time to meet changing conditions. Generally speaking, the work now remaining to be done has been authorized within the last 10 or more years. The total amount requested in the budget for this bill is $291,000,000. There are 76 flood-control projects requested in the bill.

The fundamental principle underlying the Corps of Engineers in carrying out its civil functions fiscal practice is that appropriations are requested and made, based on a specific schedule of work on specific designated projects over a definite period of time. When an appropriation is made available to the Corps of Engineers, the funds are immediately earmarked for the specific projects and related work which has been designated

by the Committees on Appropriations of Congress, after consideration of the data furnished to Congress by the Corps of Engineers in support of the request for funds. Upon receipt of the appropriations, allotments are made to district engineers for the specific projects designated. The allotted funds can be used by the district engineers only for the specific project indicated with the allotment.

As the work proceeds during the fiscal year, the funds allotted for each project are applied by the district engineers in one or more of the following ways:

First. Contracts which will be completed with funds available.

Second. Continuing contracts for completion of as much work as funds are available in the current fiscal year.

Third. Hired labor work, land acquisition, and necessary government supervisory work for the project.

As soon as contracts are let for work on the project, most of the funds allotted for the project are obligated, thus becoming legally binding obligations of the United States. In this way the entire amount of available funds is either obligated or committed to the work designated by Congress and is not available for any other work. The funds cannot be diverted to other work except by action of Congress. Even at that, such action would involve breaches of contract. The unobligated funds refer to money which has not been expended. It is money committed but actually not obligated in the contract. Floods come at such seasons of the year and many times last so long that protection against them is absolutely essential to the livelihood to millions of people.

Perhaps the most serious problem on many rivers at the present time, is that of bank caving, which if not controlled would ultimately destroy the riparian developments and lengthen rivers to such an extent that flood heights would become more and more disastrous.

There is evidence from the hearings that there are some 192 general flood-control projects throughout the country that are ready to go forward, that are of high economic ratio, and which will be recommended annually for appropriations. As new projects come up and the urgency is indicated especially on flood control, and when the records of the Corps of Engineers on floods are being substantiated by actual occurrences, the War Department considers it important to put them in at that time. At the present a request was made for a list of projects which would give Congress 192 to consider as important. Accordingly, projects under way apparently are not considered problems by the Corps of Engineers; however, those that have not been started but are ready to start are receiving proper engineering consideration from the Army engineers.

Our committee, as evidenced by the report on the civil functions bill, is not deaf to flood destruction and suffering. We are not denying the necessary appropriations for bringing the desired relief to our people, but we have provided the funds for this fiscal year, which we believe are sufficient to prevent catastrophes caused by floodwaters in many sections of the country. There is no false economy when it comes to flood-control appropriations. I am sure that all agree with our position in this direction.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DREWRY].

Mr. DREWRY. Mr. Chairman, for many years, in fact, for so long has the Roanoke River been ravaging southern Virginia and eastern North Carolina, that the testimony of one witness was that it went back beyond the recorded history of man. The Roanoke River, which flows into Albemarle Sound, drains an area of 9,580 square miles.

The matter has been before Congress for some time, and the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944, in its general plan for the construction of the Buggs Island Dam and Reservoir on the Roanoke River, approved the project, and $4,500,000 has been authorized and partially expended on this project. The item in this bill approved by the Appropriations Committee is $3,800,000. It will be seen, therefore, that this appropriation is a continuation of a project which has been approved by Congress since 1944, and as said above a large percentage of the $4,500,000 formerly appropriated has already been expended.

It has been estimated that the flood damage on the Roanoke River in North Carolina alone, of which there have been 187 floods since 1899, totals $16,546,000. The largest flood of record on the Roanoke River, that of 1940, caused flood damage of $4,886,000. According to the report of the Army engineers, had the Buggs Island Dam been in existence during the period from 1899 to 1945 spoken of above, the damage from floods during that period would have been eliminated. Even in the tremendous flood of 1940 practically the entire flood damage would have been eliminated below the proposed Buggs Island site and the only damage which would have resulted would have been some negligible flooding of extreme low areas immediately adjacent to the river bed.

The flood of September 1945 caused damage on the Roanoke River estimated at $970,000. The floods, apparently, are causing more damage than formerly, probably due to the fact that the watersheds of the tributaries of the Roanoke River and the watershed of the Roanoke River itself are being denuded of timber. The drainage area of the Roanoke River, as said above, is approximately 10,000 square miles, and the construction of the dam and reservoir will save from inundation 300,000 acres of the richest land in Virginia and North Carolina, as well as save from devastation by flood large industrial developments in the river valley. It is proposed to build this dam at Buggs Island 178 miles above the mouth of the river which will control the run-off of water from 7,800 miles. The total number of individuals who will be affected in the counties and outside of the actual area to be flooded, that is, in the basin generally, total more than a million persons. In the actual basin area there reside a total of 700,000 citizens, 56 percent of whom live on farms and are greatly in need of this flood-control project. Such a dam would also protect present industrial areas which are of increasing value to the States of North Carolina and Virginia, through which the Roanoke River runs.

The report of the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army, based upon a long, extended survey, sets out in full detail the entire project, which was favorably recommended by said Chief of Engineers of the United States Army, and was the basis of the favorable recommendation of the first appropriation for the project. The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors recommended improvement of the Roanoke River and its tributaries for flood control, navigation, the generation, transmission, and sale of hydroelectric power and for other beneficial uses by the construction of the dam, the initial steps of which have been made and the project is being proceeded with. This report is so full and complete that I can only refer those interested to a study of same.

From the hearings, I quote:

> The plan of the United States Government, which has been approved by Congress and for which an initial appropriation of $4,500,000 has already been made, and an additional appropriation of $3,800,000 has been recommended, is to construct such a dam at Buggs Island as will provide maximum flood control based on a type flood similar to that of 1940 and at the same time will provide electrical energy, together with controlled stream flow and other benefits. The hydroelectric power is included in the project for the reason that under the law the Army engineers were required to submit to Congress a proposal which would be self-liquidating, and it is a conceded fact that however, great the flood benefits may be, it will be necessary to have the power development in order for the project to be self-liquidating.

While to my mind the most important part of this project is flood control, nevertheless, I cannot understand the force of the objection to building such a dam for flood control purposes that it will also create power. It would seem to me that a multiple-purpose dam would be welcomed. Of course, I can understand the objection of power companies to any interference with the sale of their power, but the existing power companies may have an opportunity to acquire some of the power generated by this project to add to their existing power production. The rates will be determined by the Federal Power Commission, and it would seem to me that the selfish reasons of a power company should not prevail, and that they, themselves, would be willing to withdraw their opposition, when the enormous benefits that will be derived by the great number of people in the Roanoke River Valley are taken into consideration. This project has been approved by a very large majority of the people of the area affected, and the Legislature of the State of North Carolina has recently voted overwhelmingly pledging cooperation of the State to the project and giving it approval. In addition, the Virginia State Planning Board has endorsed the project, and the State Highway Department and State Health Departments of both Virginia and North Carolina are active

in support of it. The National Rivers and Harbors Congress has also given the project its approval and urges speedy construction. This project should be pushed to a rapid conclusion in order that this economic waste may be converted into economic benefit to the people in the communities of the Roanoke River Valley.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss the recommendations of the committee in reference to Los Angeles County flood control projects in particular and in this connection may I say that previous to coming to the Congress I was a member of the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors for 12 years which included the responsibility of Director of the Los Angeles County Flood Control District. For these reasons I feel I am quite familiar with most of the projects that have been requested and especially with the limitation that the committee has placed upon projects that it appropriated money for.

I should like to refer to the situation in southern California. I do not know whether all of you are familiar with it or not, but our problem is far different from most of the flood problems in other parts of the country. We do not have the watershed to hold the water back in the mountainous areas. We have flash floods, we have a terrific downpour of rain from time to time and usually in the season of the year when the rainfall comes it comes for a period of sometimes 10 days to 2 weeks with a steady downpour.

Los Angeles County is not asking the Government for something for nothing. We have established this flood-control district and we assess ourselves to the extent of some 20 to 22 cents per hundred dollars assessed valuation to maintain our flood-control projects and we are this year raising some $3,400,000 to carry on maintenance work on flood-control projects that have been built in the county. It was only back some few years ago, about 10 years ago that the Federal Government recognized the flood-control problems in Los Angeles County as a national responsibility together with the other parts of the United States. We appreciate what aid we have had, but we want you to know that we are carrying on a lot of it ourselves and for that reason we think we are entitled to more than the present bill provides.

The bill provides new work along the Los Angeles River $1,314,000 with $50,000 left unexpended from last year, giving a total of $1,364,000. That is not one-third the amount of money that is fair and justifiable for that important project in Los Angeles County.

When I speak about flood control along the Los Angeles River I am not speaking of an area in wide open spaces; I am talking about a thickly populated section of the county, built up on both sides of the river. Where it is not built with homes it is industrial along its shores. We will be spending out of our own money this year practically the same amount that the Federal Government is contributing.

Along the San Gabriel River, which is the other valley, which is a treacherous flood-control problem in Los Angeles County, the committee is recommending $1,085,000 with $10,000 left over from last year. This does not even approach the recommendation of the Army engineers for the district. They realized that more than that should be appropriated.

Let me say that in comparison with these amounts that I have just given you the committee has recommended an appropriation of some $2,460,000 for Clark Hill Reservoir in Georgia and South Carolina, which, in spite of all the arguments to the contrary notwithstanding, a bill is now before the Public Works Committee of which I am a member asking that it be deauthorized, because private interests want to get in there and build the dam which they claim they can build in 3 years and the Army engineers claim it will take 7 years to complete. Now, they may need a dam down there, and if private interests want to build it, all right, but where there is a protest to the United States providing money for that project and where there is an appeal on our side of the picture in southern California for justifiable flood-control projects where we are contributing half of the cost out of our own taxpayers' money it does not seem fair that $2,460,000 should go to a project that is subject to consideration by the Public Works Committee on this House for the deauthorization.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Does the gentleman know that $1,000,000 annually can be saved on account of four floods a year on the land extending from Augusta, Ga., to Savannah, a distance of 202 miles, involving 241,000 acres of land; that it will save that amount of money, and General Wheeler said it could be paid for in 10 years?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I do not doubt that at all, and that same amount of money could be saved if the dam was built by private interests as well as by the Federal Government.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. But the private interests will not do it.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I have heard testimony to the contrary.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The gentleman just heard what the private power companies had to say.

Mr. McDONOUGH. No; I beg the gentleman's pardon. I heard the common ordinary citizens, the people who prided themselves on being common ordinary citizens, the duly elected officials in the counties concerned, who came before the committee and said they were representing the interests of the common people and wanted that dam to be deauthorized.

Another project which the committee has been very generous with and which is subject to deauthorization before the committee I am a member of, is the Dillon Reservoir in Ohio where this committee recommended $2,000,000. Now, I do not want to take any money from Clark Hill nor do I want to take any money from Dillon Reservoir, but I do think that in the economy that this committee has exercised in appropriating funds for Los Angeles County, they have overlooked the fact—and I think I am fair in stating—that we are justified in receiving more than has been allowed, when they allow some $4,264,000 for two other projects that are subject to deauthorization.

The total amount in this bill for flood control in Los Angeles County is $3,299,000. At the rate of the authorizations that have already passed this House and come before the Committee on Appropriations for consideration it will take 50 years for Los Angeles County to meet the comprehensive flood control plan that the United States Army engineers have outlined to protect the life, limb, and property in southern California. Let me tell you that as far as the life, limb, and property in southern California is concerned, what I mean is this, that it affects thousands and thousands, yes, 3,000,000 and more population in Los Angeles County, growing at the rate of 20,000 a month, coming there from the various States of the Union. That is an actual count at the border, at the agricultural check stations, showing that the people from all parts of the United States are flooding in there to live.

Now, gentlemen, I think that in fairness the Members of the House will agree that the amount of money allowed here is not fair to Los Angeles County. I trust that when this bill goes to the Senate there will be some consideration given to some of these projects that were so badly neglected in this bill. As to the Santa Fe Reservoir in Los Angeles County, I will say that the committee did meet the recommendation of the Army engineers. They appropriated $730,000 for that project, and with the $40,000 unexpended from last year it will carry along. But they did nothing about the Tujunga Wash, which is an important development in Los Angeles County. It is not even mentioned in your report. The Lopez flood-control basin, which was an important project there, the Tujunga Wash channel, the Burbank western project and other parts along the San Gabriel River are not included in this appropriation, for which of course they allowed nothing. The chairman accounted for the reason this morning. They allowed nothing for Whittier Narrows Dam, which affects a population of half a million people immediately below in the area in the southeast part of Los Angeles County toward Long Beach.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, we down at the mouth of the Mississippi Valley, of course, are as vitally interested in flood control as is any section of the country. We are also vitally interested in the development of rivers and harbors.

I am disappointed in this bill, especially in one item in the bill. This one item which I am especially disappointed in has reference to future planning. This means that over a long period of years there will be a slow-up in the program of development of rivers and harbors and in flood control. The reducing

of one item from $2,500,000 to $1,250,000 for planning, and this covers 20 items of planning, will have the effect of retarding the whole program of rivers and harbors development over a long period of years. I had hoped that the committee might see fit in its wisdom to include this item at least to the full amount recommended by the Army engineers.

Mr. Chairman, the express purpose of my taking the floor at this time is to mention something to this committee in which I think this committee especially is fundamentally interested. It is in reference to the item we placed in the Army personnel bill of 1947 which passed the House of Representatives the other day. I think it is an unfortunate item and a mistake, because this item in that comprehensive Army personnel bill specifically affects the organization of the Army engineers. That one item, while it is written in a generic manner covering all branches of the Army service, will have this effect upon the engineers: It means that in the future there is no requirement that the Chief of the United States Army engineers, who is charged with the responsibility of the work we are now discussing, must be an engineer. In future, the Chief of Army Engineers under that bill, if it becomes law, may be an infantry man, he may be an artillery man, he may be from any other branch of the service, yet his responsibility is going to be to see that the work of the Engineer Corps of the Army is carried out. I think that is a big mistake. I hope the Senate will rectify the mistake so we can prevent it from becoming law.

Even more important than that, Mr. Chairman, is a provision in the same bill which states that a vacancy in the office of Chief of Army Engineers must be filled by an officer having the rank of a general officer in the Army, in other words, major general. It means that a major general in the Army will be transferred over to the position of Chief of Engineers. Offhand, that does not look so bad, but if you will consider just how the engineers have worked over a period of more than 100 years you will understand the importance of it. The United States Army Engineer Corps was founded and organized by George Washington himself at a time when the British were moving down through New Jersey, in the dark hours of the American Revolution. Since then it has functioned in the manner as indicated by General Washington.

Under the operation of the engineers as presently functioning, the Chief of Engineers is often taken from the field offices of the engineers. In other words, let us say you have a district office of the United States Engineers down in your territory. The head of that office may be doing a brilliant job in flood-control work and in rivers and harbors work. He may be a lieutenant colonel, under the present law, with 28 years service; and if he is doing such a magnificent job, if he is satisfying the country and pleasing the people and getting the result Congress intends, he has a chance to be elevated to the position of Chief of Engineers. Under the bill which passed the House the other day that cannot be done. No longer can the head of the district offices or the field offices of engineers look for an immediate promotion from that grade to that of Chief of Engineers or Assistant Chief of Engineers. They must work up in the regular way until they have become a general officer or a major general and then be transferred over to the position of Chief of Engineers. I think that is going to hurt the morale of the engineers. I think that is going to hurt the morale of the people connected with the rivers and harbors flood-control work.

Therefore, I have taken this time to protest that particular provision of the bill which was passed the other day and to express the hope that the other body may see fit to make a change in that provision.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. Chairman, I note with great regret that the Whittier Narrows Dam project has not been recognized in this bill for 1948 appropriations. It is difficult to discover any project under flood control which is of more vital importance to a community than is this Whittier Narrows project to the city of Long Beach and its immediate surroundings.

Few realize the configuration of the land in this section of southern California. Few understand that we have a great plain extending from the mountains on the north for about 40 miles to the Pacific Ocean on the south. Natural drainage is largely lacking on this flat area and when a sudden heavy downpour occurs the floodwaters rushing to the sea sometimes sweep all before them.

In an effort to alleviate these conditions, the Army engineers have worked out a comprehensive plan for improving flood-control channels—for putting in dams or other controls where needed. Whittier Narrows Dam is an integral part of one of these flood-control systems and failure to construct that dam is endangering the homes of tens of thousands of Americans living along the San Gabriel River.

Disastrous floods in the Long Beach area are not just dreams or figments of the imagination. We have had these floods. We have seen the land covered with floodwaters almost as far as one can see. We have suffered loss of life and heavy damage even during recent years, and one does not know when such losses may come again.

Many of the people who now live in floodable areas bought their homes during war years without having any knowledge of the danger of flooding in their areas. They came to southern California because their services were needed by the Government in the conduct of the war. They had no choice as to where they could settle. They are in their present homes because of imperative governmental needs. It is the duty of this same Government to give them such protection as may be possible both in their persons and in their property. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that this bill does not carry an appropriation for the Whittier Narrows Dam. I hope most sincerely that the committee will see fit to have such an appropriation in the next bill of this character.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the chairman of this subcommittee for granting me this time to speak on the pending bill, H. R. 4002. I especially wish to compliment this subcommittee for the care and attention that has been given to this measure, and to the many and various items included therein. One of the projects included in this measure is an item of $60,000 for the completion of a flood-control project in the city of Muncie, Ind., which is within the Tenth Congressional District of Indiana. That being in the district which I have the honor to represent, I am very familiar with this project. It is located in Delaware County, and on both sides of the West Fork of White River, and this project is located 322 miles above the mouth of that river. White River runs directly through the city of Muncie, and for many long years flood control has been one of the very serious problems. During high water much damage is done to that city and to the surrounding communities. A large amount of channel excavation is required, and the construction of some 15,000 feet of boulevard levee is required, together with the construction of concrete walls and four pumping plants. When this flood-control project is completed, it is estimated that this will fully protect both the business and residential sections of this rather large city, and that it will also protect the surrounding communities.

Mr. Chairman, much of this work is already completed, and the rather small amount of money contained in this bill is requested in order that this project may be completed, and the flood waters controlled in that city and in its vicinity.

In order to review the need and necessity of this project, may I say that the city of Muncie has a population of approximately 70,000 people. This river passes through this city quite near the business section, and, also, it passes through one of the very fine residential sections of this city. When floods come both of these sections of this fine city—which has been denominated as the typical American city—are flooded, and much damage is done. The completion of this project will prevent this occurrence, and it will protect the people from suffering the damages they have suffered in the past. I am happy that this item is included in this measure, as it is deserved and greatly needed. It is my hope that this measure is passed today and that this item for flood control will be retained in this measure.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, there are many items no doubt scattered throughout the entire country that Members would like to see included in this bill which are not included. Some of these are large items and some are small items. I am assuming that many that might be included in the bill have not been included because some part of the preliminary report has not been completed in time for the committee to act thereon. This is probably the case with a flood-

control project involving Tucson, Ariz. I know that the need for that particular project is great, and I would like to see all the various steps which are required by law taken so as to make this project eligible for inclusion in the flood control part of this bill.

I think the various steps which the law now requires to make flood-control projects eligible for consideration are wise steps. These necessary examinations and surveys and approvals all tend to eliminate possible pork-barrel features which have a tendency to creep into such bills as the one before us today. Every step from the surveys by the Army engineers down to the submission of reports to the committees in the preparation of a bill all help to make successful projects appear feasible and to screen meritorious projects from those of lesser merit. Therefore I approve of the policy which we follow.

Sometimes, however, after the Army engineers have made their studies an intermediate step is found to be missing and thus the committee is unable to include that project in the flood-control bill. I had a case of that sort a few years ago with regard to a flood-control project on the Little Colorado River at Holbrook, Ariz. On that occasion, finding that only one of the intermediate steps had been delayed after the Army engineers had completed their survey and stated the great necessity for the protective work, I called attention to it in the House and the Arizona Senators completed the process and included the appropriation necessary. I do not know that the conditions are such as to permit that to be done in this bill with reference to this flood-control matter at Tucson, Ariz., but I regard the need of it as great. It may be that the Senate can include the item to protect Tucson which I do not find incorporated in this bill.

The city of Tucson, Ariz. occupies a unique place geographically. It is almost entirely surrounded by mountains and yet it lies on the level plain of the Santa Cruz River, which is a tributary of the Gila River. Most of the year the Santa Cruz River is as dry as a bone. In fact, its waters lose themselves in the desert plain and the location of the river can scarcely be traced on the surface. The whole area including and surrounding the city of Tucson is subject to cloudbursts and violent rains at times, and on such occasions great destruction of property is wrought, and sometimes lives are lost, and always lives are jeopardized.

Such floods more recently occurred in August 1940, in September 1943, and in August 1945 in and near Tucson, causing evaluated damages of $320,000, together with very large intangible damages and the loss of 12 lives. Our own former colleague, Congressman J. Buell Snyder, now deceased, had his own life jeopardized a few years ago in one of those storms. The accident created in his mind a most unfavorable attitude toward Tucson, Ariz., although in every other respect he had entertained a most favorable attitude toward and feeling for that old pueblo in southern Arizona.

The Army engineers have completed their survey on this project and submitted their reports in due form. That survey includes the estimated cost, 25 percent of which is to be borne by local contribution and 75 percent by the Federal Government. Knowing the hazard to property and life which the present uncontrolled situation offers, I feel that true economy dictates the expenditure for this purpose as recommended by the engineers.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

THE TENNESSEE-TOMBIGBEE INLAND WATERWAY

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I desire at this time to talk to you about the Tennessee-Tombigbee Inland Waterway.

I shall offer an amendment at the proper time for funds to start the work on this, the most important inland waterway project that has ever been presented to the Congress of the United States.

As I pointed out to you a few days ago, for 200 years the American people have been virtually denied the use of the Mississippi River, because of their inability to stem the swift tide of that stream for upbound traffic. Only recently the businessmen along the Ohio River were looking for an outlet to the Atlantic Ocean so they might escape the penalties of this devastating current.

For more than 100 years engineers have tried to develop a slack water route connecting the Tennessee River and the Gulf of Mexico by way of the Tombigbee River.

If you remember, the Tennessee River flows in a southwesterly direction to about Guntersville, thence westward to the Mississippi State line, then turns northward and flows 215 miles to where it empties into the Ohio River at Paducah. From Paducah the Ohio flows west, or southwest, 47 miles and empties into the Mississippi at Cairo.

Until recently the engineers were unable to find a way to connect the Tombigbee with the Tennessee without locks going up from the Tennessee and also locks going up from the Tombigbee. The two streams were separated by a sand ridge about 25 miles wide and there was no water supply at the summit. You cannot operate locks to lift water traffic to a higher level unless you have a water supply at the summit. Those of you who have seen the Panama Canal remember that we changed the course of the Chagres River and turned it into Gatun Lake in order to provide a water supply at the summit of the Panama Canal project, 85 feet above sea level.

In 1938 the Tennessee Valley Authority built the Pickwick Dam on the Tennessee River, just below the mouth of Yellow Creek where this proposed project joins the Tennessee. That raised the water level at the mouth of Yellow Creek about 55 feet. The Army engineers were called upon to make a new survey, and they came back the most enthusiastic group I have ever seen. They said, "We find now that we can cut through the sand ridge separating the Tennessee River from the Tombigbee 25 miles away, and put the summit of this project in the Tennessee River." That project was recommended by the Chief of Engineers, authorized by a vote of both Houses of Congress and signed by the President.

The Tennessee River at one time probably flowed down the Tombigbee Valley. Hernando De Soto, who discovered the Tennessee River up near its source, followed it down to the present site of Guntersville where he left it and went South. When he later discovered the Mississippi he thought it was the same stream. He published a map showing the Tennessee curving southward and flowing down the present course of the Mississippi. It never occurred to him that the Tennessee would turn north and flow in that direction for hundreds of miles.

Some upheaval in prehistoric times seems to have lifted that ground up and turned the Tennessee north, to where it flows into the Ohio River at Paducah.

The Tennessee River at the mouth of Yellow Creek is 100 feet above the Tombigbee, where it is formed by the confluence of Brown and Mackeys Creeks less than 25 miles away. So by cutting through this sand ridge and building locks and dams from the mouth of the Warrior River up to the Tennessee, they can put the summit of this project in the Tennessee River and provide a slack-water route up the Tombigbee 481 miles from Mobile into the Tennessee and then a downstream route 215 miles on the Tennessee River to Paducah and then down the Ohio 47 miles to Cairo, Ill.

If you will turn to page 7911 of yesterday's RECORD, you will find a table showing what this means. My time is limited, so I am going to talk to you in terms we can all understand.

From Cairo, Ill., to New Orleans down the Mississippi River 869 miles, then 156 miles across to Mobile, along the intercoastal waterway, which is slack water, then 481 miles up this proposed Tombigbee inland waterway, through slack water, to the Tennessee River, then 262 miles downstream to Cairo, Ill., a vessel or a barge from Cairo, or Paducah, making the round trip would travel 1,768 miles. Of that 1,768 miles, with this new development, 1,131 miles of it, or approximately two-thirds of the way, would be downstream, and the rest of it would be in slack water.

General Robins said to the Senate committee that if he were to promise to provide a slack water route all the way up the Mississippi to Cairo, just as if it were across the Gulf of Mexico, all the way up and back, they would throw up their hats and shout.

But, he said, "This is infinitely better, because," he said, "we give you a slack-water route up to the Tennessee, and then a downstream route to Cairo, 262 miles, and save the swift current of the Mississippi for the downstream traffic."

As it is today, your vessels cannot go back up the Mississippi River, except at tremendous expense.

I have here some photographs which were supplied me by the Army engineers. You will notice one of these barges is coming down from Pittsburgh, Pa., down the Ohio River. It is loaded with 14,000 tons of freight. When that barge gets to the mouth of the Mississippi River, or to New Orleans, with that stream raging as it is today, it is practically paralyzed so far as returning up the Mississipi River is concerned. The same

thing is true of this 14,000-ton barge coming down from Chicago. Here is one from Detroit, loaded with automobiles and automobile parts. Here is one probably coming down the Missouri River, probably from Omaha or Kansas City or down the Mississippi from St. Paul, Minneapolis, or St. Louis loaded with 14,000 tons of freight.

If they desire to take back the raw materials, cotton, cottonseed, or cottonseed meal and hulls, oil, lumber, bauxite, sea foods, tropical fruits, or other raw materials, if they are so loaded and undertake to go back, here is the difference they would pay:

Let us take a 14,000-ton barge. We will say it is returning from New Orleans to Cairo. To go across along the slack-water route from New Orleans to Mobile, up this slack-water route to the Tennessee River, and then downstream to Cairo, Ill., the saving would amount to $9,800; and if it were just going to Paducah, or any point on the upper Ohio, it would save $11,760.

Such a barge load going from Mobile up the Tombigbee to the Tennessee and then downstream to Cairo would save $20,000 on its fuel bill alone.

If that barge were going from Mobile to Paducah, Ky., Pittsburgh, Pa., Wheeling, W. Va., Cincinnati, Ohio, or to any other point on the Ohio River, it would save $22,120 on its fuel bill alone.

There is not another project—and I am quoting the words of the Army engineers—there is not another project on the face of the earth, or a place where one can be constructed, where the traffic can be transferred from one major watershed to another with so little cost, so much ease, and such tremendous savings in transportation costs and distances. The nearest we have found is the connection between the Don and the Volga Rivers in Russia, and even that does not have the benefit of a downstream route for approximately two-thirds of the round trip.

In addition, we have right here on the Tennessee River the greatest defense project the world has ever known, Oak Ridge, covering 70 square miles, where our atomic bombs are made. That is the project on which we are going to have to rely for our national defense in case of attack probably for generations to come. Not a man in this House knows the number of thousands, or millions, of tons of raw materials that have to be brought in for that purpose. This short water route will cut the water distance from Oak Ridge to Mobile by more than 800 miles.

Suppose you are going from Mobile with a load of materials for Oak Ridge; let us see how you would go. You would go along the intercoastal slack water route 156 miles to New Orleans, then you would have to fight the swift current on the Mississippi River all the way to Cairo, Ill., 869 miles, go up the Ohio River 47 miles to Paducah and then up the Tennessee 215 miles to the mouth of Yellow Creek, where this project intersects the Tennessee River which point you could have reached by moving 481 miles in slack water from Mobile up the Tombigbee along this new route.

I repeat, there is not another project like it on earth.

What we want is funds with which to begin this construction. With the devastating floods that periodically occur on the Mississippi River and its tributaries, with the need for their control and for the development of these waterways, I have no patience with this policy of pouring billions of dollars into the coffers of Europe, and denying funds with which to develop our own resources or protect our own people.

All we are asking is that you give us a reasonable amount to begin this construction in order that you may put us one or 2 years ahead of what we would be if we waited until the next Congress for this appropriation.

This project has already been approved. It was approved by the House in 1946. It went over to the Senate and it was approved by the Senate by more than 2 to 1—44 to 21 and signed by the President.

This project is just as sure to be constructed as night follows day. All the forces of the opposition could not take this project off the statute book and thereby deny this relief to the shippers in the great Mississippi Valley extending from Pittsburgh, Pa., to Sioux City, Iowa, from Chicago, Ill., to El Paso, Tex., and from Minneapolis and St. Louis to New Orleans, La., and Mobile, Ala.

The sooner this project is constructed the sooner your people will reap the benefits, and I am speaking of the people of Michigan and Illinois who shipped these boat loads of automobiles and other materials down the Mississippi River; I am speaking of the people of Pennsylvania whose vessels come down the Ohio River; I am speaking of the people of Minnesota whose material comes down from St. Paul and Minneapolis; I am speaking of the people of Iowa and Nebraska whose wheat we buy and with whom we exchange oil, lumber, and other products; I am speaking of the people of those great middle western States between the Allegheny and the Rocky Mountains, or the Cascades, and between the Great Lakes and the Gulf.

I urge you to join me when the time comes to adopt an amendment that will give us a start in building the greatest transportation project ever proposed on any river system throughout the entire world.

Mr. McDOWELL. How much money is involved?

Mr. RANKIN. The cost of the entire project is estimated to be $116,000,000, to be spent over a period of 5 or 6 years.

The Army engineers testified before the Rivers and Harbors Committee that they ought to have $9,000,000 to begin with. But we decided that to carry on this work until the next Congress, they can get along with $3,000,000. Therefore, I shall offer an amendment for that amount.

I am not for burdening the Treasury, I am not after piling upon a national debt, but I am tremendously interested in developing our national resources to take care of the American people now and for all time to come.

I am taking the same attitude I took on the construction of the Cape Cod Canal; I am taking the same attitude I took on the development of the Columbia River, and the Central Valley project in California. I am taking the same attitude I took on the developing of the TVA and the Arkansas and Missouri Rivers projects.

This is one project the construction of which we cannot afford to postpone; because the longer we delay the longer the American people will be denied its benefits.

Every year this construction is delayed will cost our people untold millions of dollars, to say nothing of the effect on our national defense. Let us start work on it now.

Here is the table showing what the saving of this great project would amount to for up-bound traffic.

From—	To—	Via Mississippi, per ton	Via Mississippi, per tow of 3,500 tons	Via Tombigbee-Tennessee, per ton	Via Tombigbee-Tennessee, per tow of 3,500 tons	Average savings per ton	Average savings per tow of 3,500 tons	Average savings per tow of 14,000 tons
Houston, Tex	Cairo	$2.34	$8,190	$1.94	$6,790	$0.40	$1,400	$5,600
	Paducah	2.42	8,470	1.88	6,580	.54	1,890	7,560
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction	2.74	9,590	1.60	5,600	1.14	3,990	15,960
New Orleans, La	Cairo	2.02	7,070	1.32	4,620	.70	2,450	9,800
	Paducah	2.10	7,350	1.26	4,410	.84	2,940	11,760
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction	2.42	8,470	.99	3,465	1.43	5,005	20,020
Mobile, Ala	Cairo	2.39	8,365	.95	3,325	1.44	5,040	20,160
	Paducah	2.47	8,645	.89	3,115	1.58	5,530	22,160
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction	2.79	9,765	.62	2,170	2.17	7,595	30,380
Port Birmingham, Ala	Cairo	2.96	10,360	.95	3,325	2.01	7,035	28,140
	Paducah	3.04	10,640	.89	3,115	2.15	7,525	30,100
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction	3.36	11,760	.62	2,170	2.74	9,590	38,360
Demopolis, Ala	Cairo	2.68	9,380	.67	2,345	2.01	7,035	28,140
	Paducah	2.76	9,660	.61	2,135	2.15	7,525	30,000
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction	3.08	10,780	.34	1,190	2.74	9,590	38,360
Columbus, Miss	Cairo	2.83	9,905	.51	1,785	2.32	8,120	32,480
	Paducah	2.91	10,185	.45	1,575	2.46	8,610	34,440
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction	3.23	11,305	.17	595	3.06	10,710	42,940
Aberdeen, Miss	Cairo	2.88	10,080	.46	1,610	2.42	8,470	33,880
	Paducah	2.96	10,360	.40	1,400	2.56	8,960	35,840
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction	3.28	11,480	.13	455	3.15	11,025	44,100
Fulton, Miss	Cairo	2.93	10,255	.41	1,435	2.52	8,820	35,280
	Paducah	3.01	10,535	.35	1,225	2.66	9,310	37,240
	Tombigbee-Tennessee junction	3.33	11,655	.08	280	3.25	11,375	45,500

As I said, it is the greatest project of its kind ever proposed, and the sooner it is constructed the better it will be for the people of the entire Nation.

I hope you will all support my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL].

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from North Carolina for granting me this time. I am not going to talk about rivers, but I am going to talk about a matter which deeply affects our country. I would not intrude at this time upon you if I did not feel the remarks I am about to make concern a matter of great general interest.

Back in 1929, and for a decade prior thereto, we had a period of very unusual prosperity. During that period all over the Middle West thousands upon thousands of farmers had grown well to do, had retired, and had gone to the west coast to spend their last years in that balmy climate out there in California. In 1929 the great depression was suddenly upon us. There is an old saying that "where dead meat lies the vultures gather."

As I say, thousands upon thousands of these good industrious farmers had moved to the west coast. A man who lived out there on the west coast—a shrewd, aggressive promoter—saw in that situation a chance to make a fortune. He bought a strip of sandy land along the coast; he planted it, divided it up, and put out some propaganda with the idea this land was going to be immensely valuable. So for a period of time he and those employed by him were very busy contacting these retired farmers, fleecing some of them out of the farms they had left in the Middle West and trading them in return this land which it was pictured suddenly was to become very valuable.

The Townsend movement had grown by leaps and bounds and had come to the attention of the Congress in those days. Time magazine had just challenged it and described it as the major Fascist threat to the American form of government. Many of you who were in Congress then were the recipients of thousands of cards and letters and telegrams of a very threatening nature demanding that you come out for the Townsend plan.

In addition to the propaganda letters, cards, and telegrams which were coming to the Members of Congress, there began also to come in from people all over the country, stories of some of the shameful things that were perpetrated by this band of racketeers who were running the so-called Townsend movement. At that time, I introduced in the House a resolution to investigate. The resolution was adopted by the House with only four votes against it. The Speaker of the House appointed an investigating committee consisting of eight Members, four of whom were Republicans and four were Democrats. I had the honor of serving as the chairman of that committee. For many months this committee worked tirelessly. We took thousands of pages of testimony. Many of Dr. Townsend's former associates in his organization came forward under oath and testified. Their testimony together portrayed a story of the most shameless abuse of trusting old people. It disclosed the ugly past of a number of Dr. Townsend's closest associates, some of whom had criminal records of a disgusting character. One of the highlights of the investigation was the fact that Dr. Townsend was cited for contempt by the House of Representatives. He was prosecuted and convicted in the United States District Court and sentenced to serve a term in jail. At the time of his conviction, he and his associates were making elaborate plans to portray him in the role of a martyr and to raise vast sums of money for his release. Much to the disappointment of himself and his associates, the President of the United States pardoned him at my request. I was moved to make this request of the President because I was opposed to seeing Dr. Townsend and his associates use this proposed synthetic martyrdom as another device through which to fleece his trusting followers of further sums.

During the course of the investigation it was learned that Dr. Townsend had been employed by the promoter who had made a fortune at the expense of these midwestern farmers. As time went on the land racket was beginning to wear off a little, and Dr. Townsend and his partner conceived the idea that there was a more lucrative field, so they got busy. They organized a corporation and Dr. Townsend took half of the stock and his partner took half of it. One share, to qualify him as a director of the corporation was given to a brother of Dr. Townsend, who was working as a hotel porter out in Los Angeles. They started preaching the so-called doctrine of Townsendism. Discouraged people from all over the country began to flock in contributing their little mite, and it was not long until that organization was taking in something like $150,000 a month. It was not very long until that movement, like other movements, attracted its racketeers, in addition to those who started it. A man by the name of Margett on the west coast became Townsend's manager for all that great west coast area. Margett was well known to the authorities of the law. He had been indicted for accepting the earnings of a prostitute. He had been the head of a big rug and jewelry stealing ring. He was at the head of a dope smuggling ring. During the First World War he was at the head of a bootlegging ring, and at that time the papers up in Seattle were filled with front-page items of gun battles between his outfit and another one. But when he hooked up with Dr. Townsend, he proclaimed himself a super American. He had been born in Vilna, Russia. He denied his birth in Russia. This, however, was later proved under his own signature. But, he became the dominating figure for a while in the Townsend movement.

I wish that I had more time, but my time is limited, and I just want to call your attention to the fact that for the first time in years around Washington we heard a lot last week about the Townsend movement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. BELL. When Dr. Townsend was in town last week with about 3,000 people, I saw many of them; they looked like fine, good people, apparently they believed in Dr. Townsend just like those poor people did who were fleeced 10 years ago.

I picked up a copy of the Washington Post the other morning and I read this short article quoting Dr. Townsend at a meeting held down here at the Uline Arena:

"Many voters have lost faith in the sincerity of both of the old parties.

"The good old American game of cops and robbers," he continued, "is being replaced by a new one called Commies and Reactionaries and both these names are often misapplied."

Through most of his speech, Dr. Townsend waged a recurrent attack on Representative JOHN C. BUTLER, Republican, New York, who, he said "would deprive this organization of its right to free speech and a free and untrammeled press." Representative BUTLER, he asserted, had called him a Communist and the Townsend group communistic in a "skulking cowardly assault upon our patriotism."

"The old-age pension planner declared that when banks and other financial institutions abuse, for private profit, their usurped power over the people's credit, we attack—and we shall continue to attack and attack and attack.

"If these things be communism make the most of it," he challenged.

The doctor has been proclaiming his patriotism for many years, but I want to say to you gentlemen here today that although Dr. Townsend sold his plan to those poor, innocent, old folks to the tune of $150,000 a month in those days, and although he held his meetings in churches and proclaimed himself a super American he has never hesitated for one moment to cooperate with those agents of Russia who have been attempting to destroy this country, if it was to Dr. Townsend's financial profit to do so.

I hold in my hand a copy of the Townsend Weekly under date of Monday, July 29, 1935. Here on page 14 of the Townsend Weekly is almost a half-page ad put in by the agents of Communist Russia. They are offering a free trip to Russia for the man on the West coast who organizes the biggest Communist club. They are peddling Communist literature. There on the face of this page in the Townsend Weekly you see frontispiece pictures of Communist magazines, selling their diabolical doctrines to poor innocent unthinking people of America, attempting to destroy the rights and privileges of the people of this country under the guise of doing something good.

It has been some time since that investigation took place. Many of the gentlemen and ladies of this body have become members since then. In view of the recent activities of that organization, in view of the recent statement of Dr. Townsend indicating that he is going to join hands with Henry Wallace and his fellow travelers in a third party

movement, I think it is high time that the people of this country know something about the record that was made back there a decade ago.

I insert in the RECORD at this point—having just obtained unanimous consent to do so—the page from the Townsend Weekly which I exhibited during the course of my remarks:

WHAT DO YOU REALLY KNOW ABOUT RUSSIA?

Regardless of what political views one may hold, every intelligent person is tremendously interested in what really is going on in the Soviet Union. More than anything else, it is important to know the truth. At the present time a campaign of slanders and lies unparalleled in the history of publishing is being conducted against the Soviet Union by a number of leading American publishers.

Soviet Russia Today is a monthly magazine, devoted entirely to spreading truthful, factual information about the Soviet Union. It is the only magazine of its kind in the United States. Each issue contains numerous articles by world-famous authorities which depict clearly the great advancement of the Soviet workers, of their struggles to build a Socialist society. Learn why workers in the Soviet Union have full social insurance, need fear no insecurity in their old age, have vacations with pay. Learn why wages mount constantly as living costs drop. Read the truth about the Soviet Union.

WHO LIES AND WHY?

You should know why lies are published against the Soviet Union because these lies may affect you directly. Find out why they lie. Read and subscribe to the profusely illustrated monthly magazine, Soviet Russia Today. Regular price, $1 a year.

FREE TRIP TO THE SOVIET UNION

Right now this magazine is holding a contest which you may easily win. The first prize is a free trip to the Soviet Union. Send us $1 today and we will enter your subscription for a whole year to this splendid magazine. We will also send you free the two important pamphlets shown above by Corliss Lamont, which will give you a complete understanding of what is going on in the Soviet Union and why; and how it affects you. Send your order today.

MAIL THIS COUPON

SOVIET RUSSIA TODAY,
Desk 26, 824 Broadway,
New York City:

Enclosed is $1. Please send me a year's subscription to Soviet Russia Today together with your two pamphlets, Socialist Planning in Soviet Russia and on Understanding Soviet Russia, by Corliss Lamont. Give me full details of your contest in which I may win a free trip to the Soviet Union and $200 in cash prizes.

Name_____
Address_____
City_____ State_____

Canada and foreign, $1.50

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. ELLIS].

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so that I may propound a question to the chairman?

Mr. ELLIS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. On page 7 of the report is an item of $2,000,000 marked "Dillon Reservoir, Ohio." It is my understanding that no part of this money will be used for actual dam construction. It can only be used for the land and rough grading work that is necessary in the relocating of the railroad. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. McGREGOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Chairman, I am interested today in a project in my own district, in Parkersburg, W. Va., a flood wall. May I say in the beginning that in the report there is listed $288,000 as unexpended money. I am informed by the delegation that came here from Parkersburg that the money has been expended in its entirety; there are no remaining funds from the past fiscal year.

Our purpose in going before the committee was to ask the committee not merely to allocate $300,000 toward the continuation of the construction of the wall, but to ask the committee to recommend the allotment of sufficient funds to insure the completion of the wall within the originally contemplated time, that is, December 31, 1948. The sum that will be required in these 2 years is approximately $3,000,000.

There is a situation prevailing there that, outside of the fact that we want a flood wall to protect the property of a great city, a great manufacturing center, from the damages of flood, we have a bond situation that is very involved and will cause the city a money loss and considerable trouble. Mr. Hoff, the flood-wall attorney, had a very concise statement on this feature of our difficulty. It is contained in the hearings, but they are very lengthy. I know a great many have not had the time to read them. I believe I can save time and give you a better picture by quoting from the statement of Mr. Hoff:

The factual, legal, and financial situation in reference to the Parkersburg flood wall is unique. There is no similar situation anywhere else in the whole of the United States. That point will be elaborated.

Irreparable injury and irretrievable financial loss with no offsetting benefit will result to the city of Parkersburg if the partially constructed Parkersburg flood wall is not completed within the originally scheduled time; that is, December 31, 1948.

The first and least-expensive section of the wall, an earthen dike, has been built. What remains to be done is a concrete and vastly more expensive portion of the wall, and pump stations.

Parkersburg financed its part of the cost of the wall; that is, $300,000, for rights-of-way and clearing rights-of-way by the issuance and sale of flood-wall revenue bonds, pursuant to chapter 8 of the West Virginia Act of 1935, which are payable solely from charges against real property in the benefited areas and under applicable West Virginia law such charges cannot be levied or collected until the wall is completed so as to protect the property charged.

In reliance upon the Government's assurances that the wall would be completed on or before December 31, 1948, Parkersburg made allowance for the payment of interest during the construction period out of the bond proceeds, and made the bond maturities begin in the year 1950, upon the theory that interest payments after the contemplated construction period and bond maturities in 1950 and subsequent years could be met from charges collected beginning with the year 1949.

This plan will be defeated if the funds are not made available to complete the wall on or before Dceember 31, 1948.

I might digress to explain that under West Virginia law and practice, taxes or charges—we call them charges here; we are obliged to do so, under West Virginia law—become a lien against the property as of the 1st day of January of a given year. They are collected, the first half, in October of that year, and the second half in May of the following year. But the benefit nust be there as of the 1st day of January of the year for which the tax or charge is levied; else it would be invalid under West Virginia law.

If the wall is not completed on or before December 31, 1948, Parkersburg will have no further funds to meet interest payments and bond maturities in 1950 and subsequent years as its general tax revenues are exempt from such use by law, even if they were not most urgently required for other municipal purposes.

If the wall is not completed on or before December 31, 1948, Parkersburg will be obliged to do one of two things: (1) Make default in the payment of its bonds, with ruinous attendant consequences, as it has never defaulted in the performance of any financial undertaking.

Of course, an answer to that might be that the general credit of the city of Parkersburg is not pledged, but all that the investing public ever remembers is that they defaulted the bond issue.

(2) Refinance the existing issue over a longer term and at prohibitively high loss and with a resultant irrecoverable loss of whatever interest there would be on $300,000, for whatever period of time completion is delayed.

It is gravely doubtful whether a refinancing issue of flood-wall revenue bonds could be sold at all, as such bonds have never been popular with investors, and the very circumstances here being discussed, such as uncertainty as to completion and completion date, would render such a refinancing bond issue particularly unattractive.

These factors would make the new interest rate prohibitively high. We now have an interest rate of 2¼ percent. But if we could not tell investors when charges could become effective, as we originally did, then they would say,

"We do not know when or if we are ever going to get our money."

My judgment is, from some considerable experience with bond issues and the sale of municipal bonds, that such a refinancing bond issue would go begging at any price under the circumstances here obtained.

The cost of refinancing and the interest paid during the period of delay in construction would be irretrievable losses. In other words, we have borrowed $300,000 upon the theory that it was going to be utilized in discharging our part of the undertaking within as short a time as possible; and because of the delay, for whatever reason, if we have to pay interest on that money for a longer term than we contemplated, for those extra years the interest will be irrecoverable losses.

At the rate of $300,000 annually and if conditions remain the same it would taken 10 years to complete the wall.

This project was authorized in 1938 and work started, I believe, in 1945. We are indeed sorry the committee has not fully appreciated our predicament. If this bill is not improved in the House to allow for a material increase in the allotment for Parkersburg it is our intention to appeal to the other body for relief. If we succeed there, and I believe we will, it is my prayer that the conferees, and in turn the House, will give our case their approval. If the Congress fails in this they will do great injury to a community which was not intended when the flood wall was authorized.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, the people whom I have the honor to represent naturally have a very vital interest in the legislation now pending before the committee. My distinguished colleague from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] a few moments ago, talking in behalf of the Tombigbee project, had here for the benefit of the Members of the House a very splendid map. That map, if you looked at it very carefully, traced the tremendous amount of water which flows into the Father of Waters, the Mississippi, which eventually flows past my front door in the old city of New Orleans.

The Mississippi River, as all of you know, is a fabulous river. It is steeped in tradition and charm and commerce and industry. More than that, it is a very vital river because it drains about two-thirds of the entire continental United States. But it is also treacherous and, when in flood, endangers lives and property. Sooner or later every drop of that water must go down its long tortuous path and into the Gulf of Mexico. Naturally, I say, the people of New Orleans who have lived with that river, fought that river, and made their living out of that river, are vitally interested in this legislation. I stand here today, not in criticism of the committee which has brought out this bill. I think the committee has done a splendid job but I say, advisedly, it is with regret that I have read the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget on the projects, both for new projects and for maintenance in the lower Mississippi Valley. I think those recommendations are a step backward. In approving today only $24,000,000 for the entire lower Mississippi Valley area, we are being very shortsighted. We are taking chances that we can ill afford to take. I realize the arguments that have been made and I realize their validity.

As a member of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, it is one of our duties to know something about the costs of construction. I know the cost of labor and maintenance is up all over the United States. I believe the Chief of Engineers testified that costs were up about 70 percent. But nevertheless, floods, rivers, rains, snow, and ice do not wait for construction costs to come down. It has taken us many, many, many years to develop the system of flood control which we now enjoy in the lower valley. This inadequate appropriation puts us in a position of danger, the like of which we have not experienced for many years.

I could cite many examples. I could talk about specific projects in my own area which have been pending for as long as 10 years. One of the famous projects completed by the engineers was the Bonnet Carre spillway, which cuts off the Mississippi River about 25 miles north of New Orleans and diverts the water out into Lake Pontchartrain and finally eliminates it into the Gulf of Mexico through two famous passes, Chef Menteur and Rigolets.

That spillway has been opened twice. On both occasions as the floodwaters of the Mississippi emptied into Lake Pontchartrain, about 200,000 people living in my congressional district have been endangered, and many millions of dollars worth of property has been endangered. Despite the fact that the Army engineers have recommended that project, the Bureau of the Budget did not recommended it; so I am not critical of the committee today.

I can cite another illustration: the great Morganza floodway. The intent of that floodway is to divert the waters of the Mississippi about 120 miles north of New Orleans out through the so-called Atchafalaya Basin. About 2 years ago the engineers were on the verge of opening that floodway. The Mississippi was at flood stage, and there was danger to millions upon millions of acres of the richest and finest alluvial land in the United States. Had that floodway been forced open, had the situation become so acute that it had to be opened, much of the southwestern section of Louisiana, including much of the sugar-producing area in that State, and much of the rice-producing area would have been flooded.

This legislation today carries $200,000 for work on the Morganza floodway. Despite the fact that hundreds upon hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent upon it, and if the time should arrive next spring that that floodway would have to be opened—and it is not ready to be opened—millions upon millions, if not billions, of dollars of damage would be done throughout that entire area of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] has expired.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] is recognized for 11 minutes.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, it is easy to understand why we are more flood conscious at this particular session of Congress than in previous ones, because every time we pick up our papers from the home town we find headlines which say that hundreds of thousands of acres washed away; that this now is the worst flood in a period of 103 years of American history; and so it is that we are aware of the flood situation that exists in this country.

I might say in passing just as a matter of suggestion to the Members of the House that I realize the position they are in sometimes, but if they desire to cooperate with the committee and make its work easier and more proficient they might help us by trying to cut down the size of some of these large delegations which come from hundreds and even thousands of miles to appear before committees of Congress. You might just as well tell the folks back home that the committee is not swayed by the numbers that appear from the home town, nor is it influenced by the number of letters or wires. Its judgment is based upon the facts. If you have some project you might better have some one man who is particularly conversant with the project who can answer questions that arise in the minds of the committee and can give us the information that we need. That will help us do a much better job.

Some of you have undoubtedly, as have members of the committee, been criticized because these floods have occurred, they say, because Congress has not legislated enough money. In all fairness to Congress you should tell the folks that the bill we are working on now is the 1948 fiscal year bill. You might also refer them to page 204, continuing over to page 208 of the hearings. There you will find a statement of the sums of money appropriated for rivers and harbors and flood control for the fiscal year 1947. You will find that in rivers and harbors they have had a little over $110,000,000, but the President—and where he gets the power I am still unable to find—the President placed a spending ceiling of $90,000,000 on the Engineers for those particular projects. Later, under pressure, I assume, he raised it to $105,000,000. Last year we provided the Engineers with $144,000,000 appropriations and $165,000,000 available from the previous year, making a net available of $307,000,000; but if you will read the hearings you will find that the President placed a spending ceiling later raised to $190,000,000 on the Engineers for flood-control work.

Therefore, some of the blame for some of these breaks that may have occurred in the levees should not be placed on the doorstep of the Congress which appropriated the money, but could well be placed upon the doorstep of 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue which did not permit the money to be spent for the purpose intended.

You might also find by reading a little further that for the fiscal year 1948 and apparently regardless of this Congress which makes the appropriations, the President has set a tentative spending ceiling of $253,000,000.

Going back to the matter of these delegations as they came before us there was not one of them but what painted a glowing picture of the returns that would come to the Government, but I must say that as I analyzed it the return to the Federal Government was either remote or too long delayed. Although some of these delegations would paint a very glowing picture of their particular project and how much it would return, when we made inquiry of some of their representatives as to how much the local community was going to invest in this particular project, we found that it was not going to invest anything at all. We have had experience along this line for many years. In my own home town, Kansas City, Kans., which is right at the junction of the Kansas and the Missouri and probably the third most critical point in the United States as far as floods are concerned, throughout that city and county drainage districts have been established and the people are spending their own money building levees and have been for scores of years. They will continue to spend their own money, and they have no hesitation doing it, because they are willing to help themselves, and when somebody else helps them they can help themselves that much more. I

think that practice might well be followed throughout the Nation, because if these communities put some of their own money in it you can be more assured that maybe it has some real value; otherwise I think we are justified in believing that some of these advantages that are pointed out to us are nothing more than mirages.

One other point I think might well be discussed is the fact that while these floods are serious, while they do great damage, there is a certain limit to the legislative right, and the financial ability of this Nation to meet all the requests that are being made on us. These delegations come not merely from the Mississippi Valley, for instance, and the Missouri Valley, but they are now coming from almost all over the United States. For instance, the small State of Vermont had floods that did more than $7,000,000 worth of damage in the last few weeks. That story is repeated all over the United States.

If we had unlimited funds, if we had unlimited power, if we had unlimited resources and unlimited legislative authority, we could comply with many requests. As far as the pull on the heartstring is concerned, the pull was there. Of course, we sympathize with these groups. Their plight is pitiful, but with the emergency fund of $15,000,000 recently appropriated and with the funds now available, many of these critical situations can be corrected during the coming fiscal year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE].

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, if I may digress for a moment I would like to join with my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS], and voice my deep concern over the proposed promotion system involving the Corps of Army Engineers which cleared this House within recent days.

I voice the earnest hope that the other body will revise the House legislation involving the promotion of this group of able, conscientious, and deserving members of the Corps of Army Engineers, and to the end that this faithful group of public servants may not be penalized under any new promotion system devolved by the armed services.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to address myself to the committee and highly commend the Subcommittee on Appropriations for its painstaking work and the very serious approach I am sure it took with regard to all of these flood-control measures. I realize that we are trying to reach a legislative budget and these men are charged with the responsibility of trying to bring in a fair, reasonable appropriation with reference to all these projects. However, I would like to direct you attention to page 11 of the report. "Plans and Specifications" which in speaking with the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] of the committee represents, as I understand it, certain projects that are not exactly new but for which the Army engineers have made certain plans or specifications and the projects throughout the country are in process now of being further developed. Is that correct?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman repeat the question?

Mr. DEANE. I was directing the attention of the committee to page 11 of the report, "Plans and Specifications" concerning not exactly new projects but projects that the Army engineers have recommended and upon which certain work has been started.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes. The item there has reference to $2,000,000 for plans and specifications on flood control projects. The Bureau of the Budget estimated $4,000,000 for plans, but in that group of projects for which it proposed to apply $4,000,000 were some very urgent projects that we moved over into the construction program; so that the amount requested for plans will be something less than $4,000,000. For that we provided $2,000,000 and it is within the discretion of the Chief of Engineers as to where that $2,000,000 should be applied. We assume he will divide it between the most urgent projects.

Mr. DEANE. I thank the gentleman. Among these projects referred to by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is the Yadkin-Pee Dee project in Wilkes County in my congressional district.

The grim specter of ghost towns and communities located in one of the choice bread baskets of North Carolina moves me to seek support of my friends and colleagues of this distinguished body in the matter of the appropriation for flood control contained in the bill we consider today.

The district which I have the honor of representing is greatly concerned as we of this deliberative body literally grasp the valve or spigot that controls the waters of the Yadkin River. The Yadkin drains an area of 16,340 square miles in the coastal plain, Piedmont Plateau, and mountain region of my home State. Our failure to close the spigot will result in devastating flood waters periodically rushing unchecked through fields and meadows, leaving in their wake scenes of heart-rending ruin and frustration.

Mr. President, the Yadkin River must be bottled up. I submit this can be accomplished through an adequate flood-control measure, which I now urge you to adopt.

I speak in behalf of a great host of people residing along the meanderings of this river rising on the eastern slopes of the Blue Ridge Mountains in western North Carolina, flowing northeasterly, easterly, and southeasterly about 202 miles to the mouth of the Uwharrie River near Baden, where it changes its name to the Pee Dee, or the Great Pee Dee River; there it continues southeasterly about 253 miles to enter the Atlantic Ocean through Winyah Bay, near Georgetown, S. C.

This beautiful valley is productive of great quantities of nature's contribution to the sustenance and well-being of not only the gentle folk in the immediate area but people within a wide contiguous region. The beneficence of this graceful river is exceeded only by its ravishing destruction as we permit it, the spigot to remain wide open. Certainly we do not expect the elements to control themselves for human benefit. Moreover, by just wringing our hands instead of turning off the water, we appear hypocritical as well as stupid. For we do know how to turn off the water. It can be accomplished through comprehensive flood-control measures.

Among my first efforts upon entering this Congress was to make an exhaustive study of flood control, soil erosion and reforestation as it applies to the Yadkin Basin. I find many precedents wherein the Congress was faced with identical situations in other parts of the country and this body had the courage and wisdom to take remedial steps and I suggest the Eightieth Congress emulate the wise and sufficient action of its predecessors.

As a result of this courage and vision, we witness not only the complete elimination of floods in the rich Tennessee Valley but the entire southwest has been transformed into a land of great beauty and bountiful crops.

In like manner we can bottle up not only the Yadkin, but the Missouri and the Mississippi. We, who live on the highlands, cannot justify our seat in Congress, when we see with our own eyes the devastation, witness the pain of human distress and the destruction of whole countrysides, unless we take steps to bring hope and relief to these grief-stricken farmers, business establishments, and homes which have been destroyed. They have suffered these losses many times before; they live in constant horror of the next flood which they know is sure to come.

It is my duty—my responsibility at this time to place the entire influence of my office behind a program which I am convinced will alleviate a situation which presently causes totally unnecessary suffering and anguish amongst the good people of the Yadkin Basin.

I heartily agree with the Honorable Josephus Daniels' recent warning to the effect that "this is not a piecemeal job." Mr. Daniels recalled when the late President Roosevelt was asked by newspapermen in 1937—when floods were raging in the Ohio Valley—if there should not be permanent flood control in that area, Mr. Roosevelt replied:

> Whenever we have a flood we have three or four different groups who rush to the Government to get money for this, that, or the other thing. There are the people downstream, who want more and better levees; and then the next group that wants dams in the rivers; and another group that wants to go up in the headwaters and plant trees; and another group that says it is entirely a question of soil erosion. So you get all these different groups that say their own particular theory will stop the flood. I have come to the conclusion that we have to pursue all of these things simultaneously.

Mr. Chairman, I call upon this Congress to get behind a three-point program and urge that we play our part in making available the necessary appropriations. Having in mind the Yadkin-Pee Dee Basin, I shall unceasingly strive for immediate adoption of the following program:

First. Erection of flood-control or detention dams in Wilkes County where the spigot is primarily located.

Second. Promotion and carrying out of the Tri Creek Soil Conservation District program, the details of which are now in the process of development at the Washington level.

Third. Fire prevention in the remaining forests and a cooperative reforestation program on the slopes of the Blue Ridge.

Time and space prevent the year-by-year review of the devastating floods which have visited the Yadkin Basin area. Yet I briefly scan the report of the United States Army engineers who have submitted an exhaustive study on the flood damage. I quote from their report on the 1940 flood:

This region is subject to frequent damaging floods, the most severe of which are caused by tropical hurricanes. A total of 27 damaging floods were recorded during the 30-year period 1916 to 1945, inclusive. The greatest flood of record occurred in August 1940 when a rainfall of 24 inches in 186 hours was reported and the average over the watershed above North Wilkesboro was 13.3 inches. The resulting direct and indirect damages in the reach above Donnaha were $1,632,000 and $621,000, respectively, a total of $2,253,000, exclusive of resulting fire losses, estimated at $1,000,000. The loss of nine lives was reported, one of which was downstream from the proposed dams. About 6,500 acres of cropland and the railway between Wilkesboro and Donnaha were flooded. The principal centers of urban damage were at North Wilkesboro and Elkin, and the small communities between and below Elkin. The average annual direct flood damages in the reach above Donnaha is estimated at $121,700 and $50,400, respectively, a total of $172,100.

The engineers recommend, and the Seventy-ninth Congress approved, the erection of flood-control detention dams in Wilkes County which they point out will prevent most of the direct and indirect flood damages suffered under present conditions.

In support of my first objective for the erection of these dams, there appeared before the Committee on Appropriations, at my request, Hon. Johnson J. Hayes, Wilkesboro; John E. Justice, J. B. Williams, Watson Brame, U. S. Forester, Jr., each of North Wilkesboro; as well as citizens from adjoining counties who joined me in urging the carrying out of the United States Army engineers' recommendation.

I am pleased to note, Mr. Chairman, that the Committee on Appropriations has seen fit to give to the engineers sufficient funds which will enable them to launch this project.

Mr. Chairman, when I appeared before the committee in support of the needed appropriation to launch this flood-control program on June 6, 1947, I pointed out that another flood could be expected at any time. Little did I dream that it would come so soon. Yet I call to the attention of this Congress that on June 13, 1947, another devastating flood hit this same Yadkin Basin.

Following the June 1947 flood and at my request representatives of the Tri Creek Soil Conservation District comprising Wilkes, Yadkin, Surry, and Forsyth Counties came to Washington to advise with me and Department of Agriculture officials. These men were Stanton McIver, North Wilkesboro, district conservationist; and County Supervisors Paul Speer, of Boonville, R. S. Burrus, of Dobson, and M. A. Hester, of Belew Creek. The reports brought by these men are the annual recurring story of great loss and devastation.

The floodwaters in the recent flood came principally from heavy rains covering approximately 60,000 acres of mountain territory, centering in the vicinity of Cub Creek on the south side of the Yadkin River. The heavy erosion damage and high run-off on approximately 50,000 acres of poorly managed and partially burned woodland and approximately 10,000 acres of open land in this territory on which the rain fell made worse the flood damage downstream. There were approximately 6,000 acres of cropland along the Yadkin River damaged, of which at least 4,000 were actually in crops such as corn, small grain, and hay. There were at least 2,000 acres more of cropland also damaged by this flood along Cub Creek and other minor tributaries to the upper Yadkin River. Many small farmers had their crops so completely destroyed that they feel it hopeless to continue their farming operations.

The latest flood being so severe, at my request, the Farmers Home Administration through the county supervisors made 5-year loans available to the stricken farmers to purchase seed, fertilizer and farming machinery. While this brought some temporary relief, I want to see the spigot turned off. The independent farmers of the Yadkin Basin do not seek pity through loans; they want the Yadkin bottled up and that is my plea to you ladies and gentlemen of the House, as you consider the appropriation for flood control now pending before us.

This recent flood emphasizes my second point in the development of this great Yadkin Basin to save it from becoming a wasteland, namely, the promotion of an outstanding soil-conservation program under the sponsorship of the Tri Creek Soil Conservation District in cooperation with the farmers and the United States Department of Agriculture.

A means must be developed whereby the waters from the smaller streams and tributaries must be slowed down to a walk. The farmers, all of them, must practice a soil-conservation program that will save their topsoil. For example, after the large flood in 1940, the fertile topsoil was washed down the river to a depth of 3 and 4 feet. This soil is gone forever.

It is interesting to note that the district supervisors of the Tri Creek Soil Conservation District, who came to Washington with me, confirm my opinion that this is a three-point program. Certainly, these men have the interest of all the people in the area at heart.

The attacks we must undertake, I repeat, are first flood control, detention dams in Wilkes County, soil-conservation measures, and a wise forestry program.

The soil-conservation program I have in mind will provide that the agricultural land be farmed under the best soil and water-conservation practices. Such a program will make a definite contribution, not only for flood control but such practices will bring added benefits in the form of better crops, better pastures, and better soil conditions for the general welfare of not only this watershed but the Nation. Strip cropping, contour plowing, diversion ditches, terracing, pasture reseeding, vegetative cover of lands during the winter season and a great many other soil-conservation measures to adjust the use of the farm land, will not only contribute to the overall objective of aiding in the reduction of floods but will result in an additional benefit of greater fertility of the soil, increased incomes for the farmer, and a general improvement of the welfare of this section and the Nation.

Let me repeat that installation of watershed measures in aid of flood control is good business for the farmers and forest owners whose land is involved. The measures fit in well with the conservation measures designed to retain and build up soil fertility, make farming operations easier, increase production, and maintain farms and forests in stable condition. The soil-conservation district program is doing some of these measures now. Intensification and expansion of the work for the purpose of reduction of run-off and therefore flood control is essential.

My third point concerns the fire-prevention and cooperative-reforestation program. The forests must be given greater protection from fire and a cooperative-reforestation program must be launched at once.

It is of great interest, not only to the local people, but to those here in Congress, that recommendations in the forthcoming flood-control survey report be carried out as intensively and expeditiously as possible to obtain the improvements of not only these forests but all land in the watershed.

A great area of woodland at the headwaters of this river is in a natural unit for a national forest because to the north and to the south lies the Pisgah National Forest which is an outstanding demonstration of how to wisely and carefully manage large areas of woodland not only for flood control but production of a most needed resource.

On the many small woodland tracts in the watershed, in-the-woods advice and assistance, which is now available in a small measure, must be afforded every farmer or small woodland owner. These farmers and woodland owners need to understand that to manage their woodland for timber production is not enough in itself. They must go a step further and initiate certain other measures that will add to the value of their own individual woodland as an aid in flood control.

Everyone living in the area and everyone interested in this serious problem of flood control should recognize that just as the lowlands provided astronomical quantities of food and fiber for the physical conduct of the recent war in all parts of this globe, the forest provided over 1,200 different items for military and naval equipment.

It took 1,400,000 truckloads of pulpwood each year to package food supplies

and munitions sent overseas to our soldiers. The war was planned on paper made from wood pulp and each year our Nation produced annually enough blueprint paper to make a band 1 yard wide which would go around the world six times.

Enough nitrocellulose to produce the smokeless powder used in 7,500 Garand rifle cartridges was obtained from one pine tree whose roots provide hundreds of small reservoirs under the soil.

The same trees that were cut from the slopes and valleys of this Nation produced 85 percent of the rayon used in parachutes or other fabrics of this type used in the war.

The deck of each battleship or aircraft carrier was covered with 10 boxcar loads of lumber and I was informed that on some occasions, 25 percent more wood by weight was used than steel each year during several critical years of the war.

To visualize what these forests contributed, picture a train of boxcars extending in triple column from San Francisco to New York City all loaded with lumber. That will give you some idea of the lumber required for just 1 year of war or that is now being required for peacetime construction and other uses. Thus, our forests not only in this great watershed of the Yadkin but in the Nation must receive every attention if they are to contribute their maximum in the aid of flood control and the important service of providing forest products to strengthen and maintain the stability of our democracy.

I again call to the attention of everyone living in the Yadkin River watershed and most particularly those people in the upper counties where the damage is always so severe that the watershed has been terribly abused.

The 1940 flood changed the picture and in the place of many familiar valleys, that produced crops or income, bare rock resulted.

The recent flood in June still further changed the picture even to the point that the technicians of the Soil Conservation Service responsible for the flood control survey report, and the foresters that assist, must take another quick look to see if still additional changes have occurred.

It behooves every individual living in this area to seriously and conscientiously discuss at all farm meetings this flood control problem which each year is becoming a greater menace. In the interim elapsing between submission of the completed flood control survey report on the Yadkin to the Congress and the time when watershed improvement work in the interest of flood control can be started, every effort should be made to accelerate the soil conservation practices on the farm and pasture lands and to instensify the forestry practices on all the woodlands in the watershed.

Every contribution to better land management, no matter to what use the land is now being put will result in some minor contribution to the solution of this problem.

It has been demonstrated most significantly to me and others that the Department of Agriculture is tremendously interested in preventing further deterioration of the land in this watershed and that the Army engineers have made definite recommendations for adequate flood control on the main stem of the river. The damage can and must be repaired.

Improvement work that will contribute to flood control and thereby reduce not only the hazards of living but the losses which periodically recur must be made. These improvements cannot be made overnight and many of the benefits will not be recognized or forthcoming immediately.

However, all along the way with the integrated program of flood control retention dams, soil conservation and forestry, untold benefits will result. I emphasize that the best and the only approach to flood control in this area is this comprehensive closely interwoven program including all the land use practices for better soil and forest conservation which I have mentioned several times preceding and the engineering structures recommended by the Corps of Engineers. All this will produce the most flood control for the least expenditure of funds both locally and on the national level. We do not undertake any piecemeal job. It is a challenging responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, to this task I join hands with the citizenship of the Yadkin-Pee Dee Basin to bring hope to the splendid citizenship of this area where despair now is more often the feeling.

We must and we can turn off the spigot and bottle up the Yadkin.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN].

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say in answer to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH] that I live in the Clark Hill area of South Carolina, and that more than 90 percent of the people in that area are in favor of continued Government construction and completion of the Clark Hill Dam. I would like to add also that I agree 100 percent with the authentic character, the truthfulness and the sincerity of the statement and speech today on this floor made by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] and I wish also to thank the chairman of this committee, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] for his courtesy throughout these hearings in allowing us to present our side of this most important matter. The committee has been most kind.

GENERAL LEAVE TO REVISE AND EXTEND

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the pending bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL

To be immediately available and to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers, and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the services of such additional technical and clerical personnel as the Secretary of War may deem necessary may be employed only in the Office of the Chief of Engineers, to carry into effect the various appropriations for rivers and harbors and flood control, surveys, and preparation for and the consideration of river and harbor and flood-control estimates and bills, to be paid from such appropriations: *Provided further*, That the expenditures on this account for the fiscal year 1948 shall not exceed $1,100,000, and the Secretary of War shall each year, in the budget, report to Congress the number of persons so employed, their duties, and the amount paid to each: *Provided further*, That the various appropriations for rivers and harbors and flood control may be used for the purchase, in the fiscal year 1948, of 200 passenger motor vehicles and 10 motorboats, and the purchase, maintenance, repair, and operation of 12 aircraft: *Provided further*, That no appropriation under the Corps of Engineers for the fiscal year 1948 shall be available for any expenses incident to operating any power-driven boat or vessel on other than Government business:

MISSOURI RIVER FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that this bill carries funds for flood control in a large amount, and in view of the current interest in the flood problems on the Missouri River, I thought it might be appropriate at this time to call attention to certain maps and explain to you what the approved plan for the Missouri flood control means in terms of the reduction of the flood flows at points of present damage.

The Missouri River might properly be called the longest river in the United States. I suppose if the Missouri had been known fully at the time the Mississippi was named, it might have been called the Missouri River system instead of the Mississippi. The Missouri River has its headwaters up in the mountains of Montana and Wyoming. I am borrowing this map of the United States which the gentleman from Mississippi used because I want to relate this to the other map of the Missouri River basin only.

The Missouri starts back up in here in Montana and Wyoming and runs for some 2,600 miles before it joins the Mississippi. The water that comes from the melted snows up there comes down here and causes the June rise in the lower Missouri. When you reach this point at Sioux City, the river, which has been following a reasonably narrow valley back up in here, comes into a broad flood plain, several miles wide.

If you will now transfer your attention to this map over here, you will see that it shows merely the Missouri to the point where it reaches the Mississippi at St. Louis. The program that was approved for the Missouri River Basin in the Flood Control Act of 1944 proceeded on the theory that if these waters were

stopped up here where the river channel is practically a canyon, and reservoirs can be created with large storage, it would reduce the floods from Sioux City on down all the way to the Gulf of Mexico. The flood-control program was proposed in response to a resolution which asked for a system of flood control for protection from Sioux City down.

The damages in the 1943 and 1944 floods exceeded $50,000,000 per year. The damage from the Missouri River flood at the present time I have seen estimated in the papers at something in excess of $100,000,000.

The authorized program for the Missouri Basin contemplates using the Fort Peck Dam up here at Fort Peck, Mont., which is already constructed, constructing another large reservoir at the so-called Garrison site in North Dakota, another big one at the so-called Oahe site in South Dakota, a smaller one at the Fort Randall site in South Dakota, and a couple of smaller dams in here, for additional power production and stream regulation when needed, and completion of a levee system below Sioux City based upon the controlled stream.

WOULD REDUCE FLOOD 100,000 CUBIC FEET PER SECOND

I think the Members will be interested in knowing that had this Garrison Reservoir or had the Oahe Reservoir been constructed and in operation at the present time it would have reduced the prevailing flood flow in the Missouri River by 100,000 cubic feet per second. What I am giving you here is not a guess or an opinion of mine but the measured opinion of General Wheeler, the Chief of Engineers, as stated in a letter to me from the Office of the Chief of Engineers dated yesterday. I shall place the letter in the RECORD.

At Kansas City, down here, the peak flow of the present flood has been 300,000 cubic feet per second. In other words, had either this Garrison Reservoir or this Oahe Reservoir been in operation the flood flow would have been reduced by one-third, which would have resulted in the reduction of the peak stage by from 2½ to 3 feet. Anyone who knows anything about a flood knows that a difference of 2½ to 3 feet is very material when it comes to the damage that ensues.

At Hermann, Mo., on the lower Missouri, between Kansas City and St. Louis, the peak flow is about 500,000 cubic feet per second. The operation of one of these reservoirs up here would have reduced the flood flow by one-fifth and the peak by 1 foot.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, at this point I will insert the memorandum letter to which I have referred, and for the insertion of which I shall ask permission of the House.

(The memorandum letter referred to follows:)

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, D. C., June 30, 1947.

Memorandum to Hon. FRANCIS CASE, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

As requested by you in a telephone conversation with General Wheeler this morning, the following information is furnished.

The Garrison Reservoir, if it had been in operation, would have reduced the prevailing flood flows in the Missouri River by about 100,000 cubic feet per second.

At Kansas City the peak flow is about 300,000 cubic feet per second, so that operation of Garrison Reservoir would have reduced the flow by about one-third, which would have resulted in reduction of peak stage by about 2½ to 3 feet.

At Hermann, Mo., on the lower Missouri River, the peak flow would be about 500,000 cubic feet per second and operation of Garrison Reservoir would have reduced this flow by about one-fifth, with reduction in peak stage of about 1 foot.

The reduction in flow of 100,000 cubic feet per second would also be effective at St. Louis, but as the extreme flood stages at that locality are caused by flows from both the upper Mississippi and Missouri Rivers, information on the reduction in stage is not available. It would doubtless be somewhat less than 1 foot.

If the Oahe Reservoir had been in operation, its effect on the current flood would have been similar to that described above for the Garrison project.

The effect of other authorized projects in the Missouri River Basin on the current flood is briefly as follows:

(a) The authorized levees along the main stem of the Missouri River between Sioux City and the mouth would have been extremely important in preventing the widespread overflow and damage along the bottom lands of the main Missouri River and the lower portions of its tributaries. These levees in conjunction with the authorized reservoirs would have given full protection along the main stem of the Missouri River.

(b) Harlan County Reservoir: The Harlan County Reservoir would have completely controlled the Republican River flood below the dam and would have reduced flows in the Kansas River, thereby reducing the flood on the lower Missouri and middle Mississippi Rivers. The Republican River flood below Harlan County Dam site is the second highest flood of record, having been exceeded only by the great flood of 1935.

(c) Tuttle Creek Reservoir: Tuttle Creek Reservoir would have controlled the flood on the Big Blue River and would have reduced flow in the Kansas River, thereby reducing the flood on the lower Missouri and middle Mississippi Rivers.

(d) Osceola Reservoir: During the current flood the Osage River is not in flood. Therefore, the Osceola Reservoir would have had only minor effect. In the great flood of 1944 on the lower Missouri and middle Mississippi Rivers, the Osage was a heavy flood-producing stream, and reservoirs on the Osage would have been very beneficial.

(e) Grand River, Mo.: The Grand River has been in very heavy flood and is contributing large amounts of water to the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers. The Chillicothe Reservoir or alternates therefor which are now proposed would have controlled the Grand River and have reduced flows and stages on the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers. In addition, it would have eliminated large damages which have occurred in the lower Grand River Basin itself.

P. A. FERINGA,
Colonel, Corps of Engineers,
Assistant Chief of Engineers
for Civil Works.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. You will note that the reduction of the flow by 100,000 cubic feet per second again would have meant a reduction in the water at St. Louis of something in the neighborhood of 1 foot. You can judge for yourselves what these reductions of from 1 to 3 feet would have meant all along the line in this great flood.

LANDS FLOODED FOR RESERVOIRS

Now, the suggestion has been made to me that the people of South Dakota and the people of North Dakota will be getting too much money in case this program is appropriated for. I think the record should show very clearly that as a matter of fact the people of North Dakota and the people of South Dakota are going to flood a lot of land forever for the purpose of taking the flood waters off the cities and the farm lands down here. These big dams are not being built for the benefit of the Dakotas; they are being built for the benefit of the States downstream all the way to the Gulf.

I have in my hand a table submitted to me by the engineers yesterday which gives the figures on this point.

The Oahe reservoir, which would be about 200 miles long and have a storage capacity of 21,800,000 acre-feet, will flood forever a total of 342,000 acres. Seventy-three thousand of that is cultivated land and 63,000 is meadowland, 91,000 pasture land, and 90,000 woodland, and about 25,000 islands and sandbars. The Fort Randall reservoir as presently contemplated at the height at which the engineers have proposed to build it would flood another 115,830 acres, of which 24,000 would be cultivated land; that is, 25 percent of it is cultivated land, and the balance pasture and meadowlands and woodlands. Fifty-two thousand acres of it is pasture land so that, in other words, 75,000 of 115,000 acres would be either cultivated or pasture land.

There is no benefit whatsoever to the State of South Dakota from the building of the Randall Reservoir, except the possibility that Nebraska and Iowa will consent to letting us have a little of the power to be generated and will permit it to be constructed so as to aid navigation instead of destroying it.

We will lose 75,000 good acres forever in the Randall Reservoir under the proposal for a high earth-fill dam there of 160 feet which would be a bar to navigation. The only possibility of benefit from the Randall Reservoir in South Dakota would be if some power is developed and we are permitted to buy some of it.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HOEVEN. The gentleman mentions Sioux City, which, of course, is mentioned by the War Department as being a very critical area. The people of my district are certainly interested in the completion of the Fort Randall project and the Garrison Dam and the others because they will retard the water as it reaches that peculiar bend in the river at Sioux City, which can readily be seen from the map. So it is for the purposes of flood prevention, even though the dam

is being built in South Dakota and elsewhere and is a protection for Sioux City at that critical point.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes, there are hundreds of thousands of acres of good land down here which will be protected. But the subcommittee handling this bill has requested that the engineers give us a report on the possibility of reducing the height of the Randall Dam and expediting the construction of the Oahe Dam with a capacity of 21,800,000 acre-feet which can take the entire flow of the Missouri River, both flood and normal, during the entire year and stop your floods forever.

Mr. Chairman, you could put the entire average flow of the Missouri River for 1 year in this big 200-mile reservoir at Oahe and stop it completely, so that not a drop of water will go beyond it. That is why the committee feels that consideration should be given to the possible reduction in the height of the Fort Randall Dam at a saving of $80,000,000 and expediting this Oahe Dam or expediting the Garrison Reservoir so that you would get some real flood control.

RANDALL CANNOT HANDLE SILT

The Fort Randall Reservoir cannot be closed until these dams above are built because the Yellowstone River and the tributaries which flow in here carry a great deal of silt. Randall's maximum capacity is only 6,000,000 acre-feet; Oahe is three and one-half times that—21,800,000. Garrison will store from 19,000,000 to 23,000,000 acre-feet, depending on its height. If you were to close Fort Randall Reservoir first, and let the silt from the Yellowstone and these other tributaries go into Randall then you would lose the Fort Randall Reservoir, and it would not be of any value for flood control.

That explains in part the action of the committee in recommending further study on the question of the height of the Fort Randall Reservoir and considering the possibility of using a concrete dam there with locks which would not be a barrier to navigation as the high earth dam would be.

The reason for wanting navigation to continue into this area in here is because right at this point where the map shows the words "Chamberlain" and "Oacoma," there is probably the largest manganese deposit in the world—certainly the largest in the United States. It is a manganese deposit which the Bureau of Mines says is larger than all the other manganese deposits in the United States and, if developed, would make us entirely independent of outside sources of supply.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the building of the dam affect those deposits by flooding the land?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Not the dam itself. But if you built an earth dam here 160 feet high, you will have difficulty getting around it. The engineers say you cannot get through it with locks, but you might lock around it, which is estimated would add another $30,000,000 to the cost of the construction. With a concrete dam, locks could be built at the time the dam is built.

Mr. DONDERO. Would it flood those deposits?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It would not flood the projects materially because they are on the exposed bluffs of the river at a sufficient height that the water would not cover them.

Mr. Chairman, for the purposes of convenient reference, with permission of the House, I shall place in the RECORD at this point, the recommendations in the committee report on the Randall and Oahe Reservoirs. I shall also insert a letter from the Chief of Engineers, which gives a short table setting forth the acreages of land which will be flooded forever by the proposed reservoirs. I shall also insert a table from the hearings giving tentative estimates by the Chief of Engineers on the costs, capacities, and comparative power features of the several reservoirs, with comparative columns to show these features as originally proposed by Gen. Lewis A. Pick, in House Document 475 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, the same for the presently contemplated plan, now known as the Pick-Sloan plan, and the same for the Pick-Sloan plan if modified by a 40-foot dam at Randall. This table will be found at page 418 of the printed hearings, but, because of the limited supply of the books, I shall include it with this other material.

I should add, Mr. Chairman, that the possibility of using a concrete dam at Randall, instead of earth, came to light through a statement in a letter from the Secretary of War to me to the effect that while the foundations at the Garrison and Oahe sites would not support a concrete dam, the foundation conditions at Randall were the best on the river, being the Niobrara chalk. Inquiry on that point developed that a concrete dam of 40-feet height could be built at least, and perhaps more depending upon what a specific study on that point would reveal.

The action of the committee in requesting the engineers to look into the matter is purely exploratory. We have not made a positive requirement or restriction. Because of the importance of the Missouri River program to flood control we provided money to prosecute the Randall Dam with less reduction from the budget estimates than were made on some of the other large dams. The contemplated work for the coming year consists of access roads and railroad, preliminary excavation and other things which can be carried on and will be needed regardless of the height and type of structure eventually decided upon. The action of the committee, then, in no way delays the project and may, in fact, expedite it, besides possibly saving from $80,000,000 to $110,000,000 which can then be applied to the larger reservoirs which bring very much larger benefits in all lines, flood control, power production, irrigation, and so forth.

In fact, it should be understood that there is absolutely no irrigation proposed from Randall Dam; very limited flood control, especially when you consider the 85,000 acres of farm land in the reservoir that will be flooded forever. It will produce substantial quantities of power under any plan, and if the lower dam should be used, the remaining head could be developed by building additional dams at known sites if the need ever arises.

NAVIGATION LOCKS HAD BEEN PROMISED

When money was appropriated a year ago to start construction of the Randall Dam, it was supposed that the plans of the engineers included provision for navigation works. Back in 1945, the summer following the adoption of the Flood Control Act of December 1944, which authorized the Missouri Basin program, when there was a doubt raised as to provision for navigation, I wrote a specific inquiry to the then Chief of Engineers, Lt. Gen. Eugene A. Reybold, and under date of July 13, 1945, received a reply which included this statement:

I am pleased to inform you that provision will be made for the installation of navigation locks at the Fort Randall and Gavins Point Dams authorized in the Flood Control Act approved December 22, 1944.

It was with that understanding in my mind, as a member of the committee, that funds were appropriated to commence work on Randall Dam, along with Garrison a year ago.

It was not until I attended a meeting of the so-called interagency committee at Pierre, S. Dak., last fall, Mr. Chairman, that I learned the plans under which the engineers were proceeding did not include a positive provision for navigation. General Pick, chairman of the interagency committee, answered my oral inquiry on the point at Pierre by saying, "You can't build locks in an earth-fill dam." Which, of course, I did not dispute, but certainly my understanding as a member of the committee appropriating funds for the project, up to that time, was that navigation works of some sort would be a part of the Randall structure, locks in the dam if concrete, locks around or a marine railroad, electrically operated perhaps if locks were not used.

This point should be kept in mind in considering the matter and the expenditure of funds appropriated last year, as well as the consideration of the possibility for locks, now perhaps revealed in the preliminary estimates by the Chief of Engineers. In studying the table, I should point out that General Wheeler in his testimony on the matter, appearing at pages 408 to 425 in our printed hearings, stated that the cost figures given for the modified Randall concrete dam includes navigation locks while $28,600,000 at least would have to be added if ever you were to lock around the high earth-fill dam. This in addition to the direct saving of $80,000,000 difference in the estimated cost of the dams makes the approximate $110,000,000 saving in appropriations which might be applied to expediting the real flood-control dams, Garrison and Oahe, or meeting other possible costs such as a desilting dam on the White River, or building additional power dams between Randall and Oahe, if ever desired.

Until the engineers have studied the matter further, the maximum height for a concrete dam at Randall cannot be told; the figures in the table are based upon a 40-foot dam which General Wheeler felt safe in saying could be con-

structed on the basis of information in the Washington office on the bearing strength of the Niobrara chalk. That is the picture which the committee wants explored.

LANDS REQUIRED FOR RESERVOIRS

WAR DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, June 30, 1947.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CASE: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter dated June 21, 1947, requesting the area of various classifications of land that will be acquired for the reservoir projects proposed for the Missouri River Basin in South Dakota.

The acreages relative to those reservoirs is listed in the following tabulation:

Classification	Oahe	Fort Randall	Big Bend	Gavins Point	Total
Cultivated	73,000	24,000	7,000	8,000	112,000
Meadow	63,000	8,000	-------	-------	71,000
Pasture	91,000	52,000	7,800	9,000	159,800
Woodlands	90,000	11,000	1,000	1,000	103,000
Islands, sandbars	25,400	20,830	8,000	12,000	66,230
Total	[1] 342,400	115,830	23,800	30,000	[1] 512,030

[1] Includes approximately 25 percent of the Oahe Reservoir area located in North Dakota; no breakdown of classifications by States is available.

The approximate figures for comparative purposes on the Fort Randall Reservoir with a 40-foot concrete dam as suggested are: Cultivated, 8,000 acres; pasture, 7,000 acres; wooded, 1,000 acres; islands and waste, 10,000 acres; total 26,000 acres.

I note your comment regarding the height of the Fort Randall Dam and I assure you that in the studies which we shall make as requested by the Committee on Appropriations, full consideration will be given to the heights of dam mentioned in your letter.

The above data are approximate only, but it is hoped that they will meet your present needs. If other information on these projects is desired, it will be furnished promptly on your request.

Sincerely yours,

R. A. WHEELER,
Lieutenant General,
Chief of Engineers.

PRELIMINARY ESTIMATES BY CHIEF OF ENGINEERS

Missouri River Basin main-stem reservoirs in comprehensive plan

Feature	Garrison [1 2 3]	Oak Creek [1]	Oahe (low) [1]	Oahe (high) [2 3]	Big Bend [2 3]	Fort Randall [1 2]	Fort Randall (low) [3]	Gavins Point [1 2 3]	Totals: As recommended in H. Doc. 475, 78th Cong., 2d sess. [1]	Totals: As now proposed [2]	Totals: Plan with modified Fort Randall [3]
As proposed in H. Doc. 475, 78th Cong., 2d sess.:											
Height, feet	210	150	147	----------	----------	160	----------	50	----------	----------	----------
Storage capacity, acre-feet	17,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	----------	----------	6,000,000	----------	200,000	35,200,000	----------	----------
Cost estimate	$130,000,000	$60,000,000	$50,000,000	----------	----------	$75,000,000	----------	$15,000,000	$330,000,000	----------	----------
Cost per acre-foot	$7.65	$10.00	$8.33	----------	----------	$12.48	----------	$75.00	$9.37	----------	----------
Present estimate:											
Height	210	150	147	227	70	160	40	45	----------	----------	----------
Cost estimate:											
Dam and appurtenances	$110,000,000	$88,557,000	$72,775,000	$81,750,000	$25,200,000	$97,327,000	$34,500,000	$14,750,000	$383,409,000	$328,827,000	$266,200,000
Power facilities	15,000,000	12,000,000	8,000,000	30,000,000	7,000,000	23,000,000	17,100,000	3,000,000	61,000,000	78,000,000	72,100,000
Lands	12,460,000	8,000,000	5,250,000	16,600,000	300,000	2,882,000	500,000	969,000	29,561,000	33,242,000	30,829,000
Relocations	20,540,000	12,000,000	8,000,000	29,650,000	----------	9,923,000	1,000,000	31,000	50,494,000	60,313,000	51,221,000
Total	158,000,000	120,557,000	94,025,000	158,000,000	32,500,000	133,132,000	53,100,000	18,750,000	524,464,000	500,382,000	420,350,000
Storage capacity, acre-feet	24,500,000	5,280,000	4,140,000	21,800,000	450,000	6,200,000	500,000	170,000	40,290,000	53,100,000	47,420,000
Cost per acre-foot	$6.45	$22.83	$22.71	$7.25	$72.30	$21.50	$106.20	$110.00	$13.00	$9.42	$8.88
Power installation, kilowatts:											
Initial	128,000	32,000	24,000	90,000	40,000	80,000	27,000	10,000	274,000	348,000	295,000
Ultimate	320,000	120,000	90,000	360,000	120,000	240,000	80,000	20,000	790,000	1,060,000	900,000

[1] Plan recommended in H. Doc. No. 475, 78th Cong., 2d sess. (original "Pick" plan).
[2] Plan as now proposed (the "Pick-Sloan" plan).
[3] "Pick-Sloan" plan with Fort Randall Reservoir modified.

STATEMENT FROM COMMITTEE REPORT ON H. R. 4002

Fort Randall and Oahe: Preliminary construction begun at the Randall site includes construction of the town site and access roads. Before actual construction of the dam itself is begun, the committee believes the Corps of Engineers should investigate the possibility of substituting a lower concrete dam with navigation locks for the high, earth-fill dam now contemplated. Preliminary figures submitted to the committee indicate that the lower dam could be constructed at a saving of $80,000,000 and be finished many years sooner than the high earth dam. The concrete dam would include locks, whereas it would cost an additional $29,000,000 to lock around the earth dam. In view of the possible importance to national security of making water transportation available to the huge manganese deposits which lie directly above the Randall Reservoir, and the fact that Congress has already spent large sums to make the river navigable to this point, the committee thinks the high dam which would be a definite hindrance, if not an obstacle, to navigation should be reconsidered. A table submitted to the Corps of Engineers shows that previous revisions in the original flood-control plan as originally recommended by the corps have increased the contemplated storage in upper reservoirs so that even with a lowered Randall Dam there would be an over-all storage of 47,000,000 acre-feet as compared with 40,000,000 originally proposed. While there would be a reduction in power production at Randall, generators for 80,000 kilowatts could be installed and their production would come many years earlier than from the high dam. Again, the original recommendations contemplated total generative capacity of the connected dams for 790,000 kilowatts; the revised plan even with a lowered Randall will provide 900,000 kilowatts and another low dam could be built at some later date, if ever needed, to fully utilize all the head between Oahe and Randall sites. The Oahe Reservoir, in the opinion of the committee, offers the greatest total benefits in flood control (21,800,000 acre-feet capacity), power production (360,000 kilowatts), and water conservation for irrigation or navigation of any of the projected reservoirs, being the farthest downstream of the big reservoirs and nearest to the point of flood control where it is needed. The committee has provided that $850,000 shall be available to complete the planning of the Oahe Dam. The completion of these plans is not to be construed as a congressional commitment for construction of said dam.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I know how difficult is the task of any subcommittee who must deal with the problem of appropriations. I congratulate the distinguished chairman the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] and his very able committee for the excellent work they have done in bringing to the floor this bill today. I am fully appreciative of the long hours it has taken and the extensive investigations and examinations that have been made in the preparation of this appropriation.

Speaking for the people of North Dakota, whom I represent at large, I am glad to say to you, Mr. Chairman, and to your committee, we feel grateful to you for what you have done in this appropriation for the projects which exist in my State. The newspapers of the country tell us that at this present moment the worst flood in 103 years has hit the St. Louis area. We are further advised that the Army sends aid. This is the result of excessively heavy rains that have occurred in the midcontinental area beginning in the northern sections near the Canadian border in Montana and the Dakotas, and then with apparently increasing violence as it has proceeded down the river. This is also the time of the year when the winter snows in the Rockies are melting and the water flows into the Yellowstone River, and then from the Yellowstone into the big Missouri. All of this is carried on into the rivers to the south, and this together with the rain has produced this unprecedented condition.

One of the great projects that was considered by this committee is the Garrison Dam, located on the Missouri River,

in the State of North Dakota. I am advised by the best authority in the country that had the Garrison Reservoir been completed at this time and been in operation it would have reduced the prevailing flood flows in the Missouri Reservoir by about 100,000 cubic feet per second. At Kansas City the peak flow is about 300,000 cubic feet per second, so that operation of Garrison Reservoir would have reduced the flow by about one-third, which would have resulted in reduction of peak stage by about 2½ to 3 feet.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to find in the report that the Garrison Dam is designated as the main dam in the whole Missouri River development program. I readily recognize that the appropriation for $6,500,000 for the Garrison Dam is far from the request made by the Budget Bureau and far from the request made by the Army engineers if the work is to be done on an economical basis. I also recognize, however, that the vast number of projects to be given consideration by this committee compels us to reduce the amounts that you might be inclined to give were the projects not so numerous.

When we take into consideration, however, the destruction that has occurred in this year alone by reason of the floods in the Missouri and the Mississippi channels, it is obvious that large projects like the Garrison Dam should be rushed to completion at the earliest possible date. It could be reasonably assumed that an appropriation of $6,500,000 is not altogether economy when the sum total would run in the vicinity of $160,000,000. If this is the main project in the development of the Missouri River program—if this is an important factor as the facts indicate in controlling floods—then it should seem merely a matter of good judgment to have appropriated the full amount asked by the budget this year in order that construction could start and the work move forward with speed to alleviate future disastrous floods which are bound to occur.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a few minutes to discuss the Missouri River Basin. It is said the Missouri River Basin comprises one-sixth of the area of the United States. The only State falling entirely within the basin is the State of Nebraska. I shall confine my remarks to one of the tributaries of the Missouri River Basin, the Republican River and its tributaries.

The Republican River starts in Colorado and enters Nebraska at about this point on the map. It flows along here and at this point goes south into Kansas and joins the Kansas River and then enters the Missouri River at about Kansas City.

You have been reading in the newspapers recently about the flood losses there. Last Sunday morning at Cambridge, Nebr., 14 people were drowned. It is estimated that the flood loss in the Republican River basin exceeds $15,000,000. That is the flood loss for this year alone. The total flood loss in the whole Missouri River basin exceeds something over $106,000,000. In estimating that they do not count the loss of future productiveness of the land, so it is going to run away over that.

The Harlan County Dam is under construction now. This river spreads out like a hand west of the Harlan County Dam. That dam will bring protection to four Nebraska counties, a wide agricultural area in Kansas, and it will make a great difference on the Missouri River at Kansas City. In fact, a great portion of its flood protection will be for the benefit of that area.

In 1935 we suffered a loss out there of 112 lives. Everyone thought such a flood would not come again, but 10 days ago it did come. The river was practically as high as it was before. Fortunately, it come at a time when the only place where there was loss of life was at Cambridge, Neb.

Out there in the Missouri River Basin is where the Middle West and the arid West meet. Most of this program, in fact I would say all of it, is the coordinated work of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Army engineers. They are working together. They are so authorized. On the tributaries of the Republican, five very small dams have been authorized. They are of such importance that their construction has been authorized by both the Army and the Bureau of Reclamation. In the Interior Department bill which will come back from conference shortly, will be an item for the Cambridge Dam on Medicine Creek. If that dam had been built, no doubt it would have saved the lives that were lost last Sunday. The Bureau of Reclamation is building that dam. About 65 percent of the capacity is for flood control.

Mr. Chairman, in considering this bill making appropriations for the civil functions of the War Department, we should bear in mind that flood control is something that has been neglected throughout the entire war. The need for flood control in that part of the country with which I am familiar was extremely great at the time the war came upon us. Now, we have gone through a period of 4 or 5 years with practically no construction and the need is much greater. If we are to save our internal economy and prevent a heavy economic loss, we must spend for flood control now. This type of spending is in the interest of long-range economy.

This bill appropriates to the Army engineers for flood-control work in the entire United States, the sum of $122,269,800. Of this amount, $3,775,000 is allocated to the Harlan County Reservoir in Nebraska. That project will have an unobligated balance at the beginning of this new fiscal year of $18,000 so the total money available for the Harlan County Dam will be $3,793,000.

The Harlan County Dam is on the main stem of the Republican River, one of the tributaries in the Missouri River Basin. The Congress originally authorized this reservoir in 1941. In the Flood Control Act of 1944, it was again designated as a key reservoir in the flood protection plan for a great section of Nebraska, Kansas, and it is very vital to the entire Kansas City area. The act of 1944 also authorized five dams on the tributaries of the Republican River. These dams were authorized to be built by either the Army engineers or the Bureau of Reclamation. The Enders Dam on the Frenchman is well under way. The Cambridge Dam on the Medicine probably will be under way soon. Both of these dams will be built by the Bureau of Reclamation and this bill before the House today does not pertain to them. I mention them at this time because they all fit into the flood-control program for the Republican River Basin.

When the great flood of 1935 came down the Republican River and took the lives of 110 or 112 of the people residing in that valley, it was felt by some who were not familiar with the problem that a flood like that would never happen again. On June 22 this year it did happen again. The floodwaters were almost as high. At Cambridge, Nebr., where the Medicine Creek enters the Republican, 14 people lost their lives. At many points on the river the water was almost as high as the 1935 level. Not only crops, but farm land has been destroyed, chickens, pigs, and cattle were drowned. The loss in property this year runs into millions and millions of dollars, probably as great as the cost of the flood-control works themselves. We must not forget that in each and every year from 1935 until the present there has been a heavy loss of property from floods. Among other things, the floods of 1947 have proved that we not only need the Harlan County Dam, but we need all of the authorized dams on the tributaries of the Republican River.

Within the last 48 hours the newspapers and radios have been telling us of the disastrous floods in the St. Louis area. Where did that water come from? A vast portion of it came from the Missouri River Basin. The Missouri River Basin comprises one-sixth of the land area of the United States. When the floodwaters rush down all the creeks and rivers in that basin into a main river, it is too late to do much about preventing damage. The place to stop floods is in the tributaries. The place to prevent economic loss in the great agricultural Missouri River Basin, in our cities such as Kansas City and St. Louis, and on down in the rich Mississippi Valley, is to hold the water back with tributary dams and reservoirs. Coupled with such a program the Department of Agriculture, through the Soil Conservation Service, is needed to complete the job. Water held on the farm where the rain falls is not going to drown somebody downstream or wash his property away.

Many people in the United States are not familiar with the water problems of the Missouri River Basin. That is where the Middle West and the arid West meet. We need protection from floods, but, at other times of the year, we need irrigation water. The Corps of Army Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation are coordinating their work in that area. The Bureau of Reclamation is not only distributing stored water to the farmers, but is building some of the reservoirs such as the Enders Dam and the Cambridge Dam in the Republican River Basin. Sixty-five percent of the capacity of the Bureau of Reclamation's Cam-

bridge Dam is for flood control. The entire United States, particularly such places as Kansas City, St. Louis, and the Mississippi Valley, have a stake in our irrigation program and in the appropriations for the Bureau of Reclamation. Disastrous floods seldom happen in the lower reaches of streams where the water for irrigation in the headwaters is fully utilized.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I wish to read a memorandum from the Office of the Chief of Engineeers in the War Department dated June 30, 1947, addressed to me:

Subject: Flood Situation in the Missouri River Basin

1. In accordance with your request of this date the following information is given regarding the flood situation in the Missouri River Basin as a whole, and with particular reference to the Republican River.

2. Missouri River Basin: Floods in 1947 to date (June 30, 1947) have overflowed a total of 3,350,000 acres in the Missouri River Basin, of which about 1,450,000 acres have been flooded two or more times. Since flooding is still under way it is not possible to present a complete survey of losses, but latest information and estimates indicate that in the entire Missouri Basin at least 28 lives have been lost, and that damages to crops, farms, urban property, and utilities have aggregated $106,000,000. About 60 percent of this loss has resulted from the more recent floods in June. The flooding and damages have occurred as follows:

Acres overflowed:	
Main stem Missouri River	1,027,000
Tributary streams	2,323,000
Total	3,350,000
Estimated damages:	
Main stem Missouri River	$39,900,000
Tributary streams	66,200,000
Total	106,100,000

3. Republican River: The Republican River, Nebr. and Kans., which enters the Kansas River at Junction City, has suffered severe floods and damages in its own valley, and has been one of the largest contributors to overflow and damage along the lower reaches of the Kansas and Missouri Rivers. Flood flows in the Republican have reached 100,000 cubic feet per second at a point about 2 miles below Harlan County Dam which is now under construction by the Corps of Engineers. The flood was the second highest of record; it was exceeded only by the great flood of 1935 on the Republican. Damages in the Republican River Valley, from upper reaches near Cambridge, Nebr., to its mouth, are estimated at $15,000,000 over an overflow area of about 240,000 acres.

The War Department in their memorandum went on to say in reference to the Harlan County Dam at Republican City, Nebr.;

It is of importance to note that had the Harlan County Reservoir been complete and in operation it would have controlled the most recent flood on the Republican, and would have prevented essentially all flood damages in the Republican Valley below the Harlan County site in Nebraska and Kansas. Operation of this reservoir would have also greatly reduced the flood flows, extent of overflow and damages in the Kansas River and lower reaches of the Missouri.

Mr. Chairman, the figures and estimates stated in the above memorandum are the result of the first estimate. Without a doubt, the damage will be much more than the above memorandum suggests. For instance, in the Republican Valley the Army engineers have estimated the damage from the floods of 1947 at $15,000,000. A final count will show more than that. The Army Engineers do not include loss of future productiveness of land ruined by flood. One authority in the Republican Valley says that when all of these things are taken into account, the loss figure for 1947 from floods in the Republican Valley will reach $50,000,000.

In connection with the Republican River, I was in hopes that the committee would allow the sum of $60,000 for some work to be done on Coon Creek near Indianola, Nebr. The State and local interests are required to put up a like amount. It so happens that the Bureau of the Budget did not recommend this item. I have asked them for a supplemental report on the matter, and I sincerely hope that before this bill becomes law that item can be included.

The committee has had a difficult problem before them in making the appropriations for flood control throughout the country. Due to the war and other causes, this very important work has been delayed a long time. It is fair to say that this bill was marked up, or the decisions in reference to the bill had been arrived at before the 1947 floods in the great Middle West had occurred. I firmly believe that when the Army engineers come in and make their showing of the situation as it stands today, that it will be the will of the Congress of the United States that these items be increased. I believe that such an increase will be in the interest of long range economy. As one who has served for 6 years on the Flood Control Committee of the House of Representatives, I know that there are many pressing problems in every part of the country. I feel that in fairness to the committee the people back home, and everyone, that before this bill becomes a law increases that are recommended by the Corps of Engineers, in the light of recent floods, should be made in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. REEVES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the prolonged and disasterous floods which are ravaging the Midwest will shock the administration and the Congress into the realization that we can no longer afford to neglect the flood-control program. With respect to the lack of necessary funds in the present bill, I have no criticism of the committee. The executive department cut the heart out of the program by freezing funds appropriated and available for expenditure last year and by reducing to an entirely inadequate amount the funds requested for the coming fiscal year.

My district lies almost entirely within Kansas City, Mo., which is recognized to be the No. 1 flood hazard in the United States. It is one of the great hubs in the Nation's transportation system. In the industrial areas of the city an investment of almost a half billion dollars in commercial properties lies exposed to the hazard of destruction and damage by flood waters. If a flood of the proportions of the 1903 flood were to strike Kansas City, a great part of the rail transportation into the Midwest, Southwest, and far West would be paralyzed for a long period, and the damage at Kansas City alone would amount to $100,000,000.

Five times during the month of June alone flood crests have surged down the Missouri River toward Kansas City and beyond. If the conditions creating any two of them had come about at the same time, indescribable damage and loss would have occurred. Already the loss throughout the Midwest has been estimated to exceed $160,000,000. Three and a half million acres of land or more have been flooded. Twenty thousand persons in Iowa, Missouri, Nebraska, and Illinois have been left homeless. Worst of all, the Missouri Valley has been cleaned out for this year so far as agriculture is concerned, according to a recent survey. There will be no crops harvested in hundreds of thousands of acres of the most productive land in America.

Water and soil are still our great basic national resources. Without them, our industrial economy cannot exist. Today incalculable amounts of precious and irreplaceable topsoil are slipping into the Gulf of Mexico, washed away by our swollen and untamed rivers. No future expenditure of money or work can bring it back; but an intelligent program of flood control and river development would prevent the recurrence of this destructive process. Every year that we delay adequate appropriations for flood control brings mounting losses and the sharply increasing risk of an overwhelming disaster.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REEVES. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. As I understand it, an amendment will be offered, I believe, to increase funds for this purpose. Is that correct?

Mr. REEVES. I do not know what the amendment will contain, I may say to the gentleman from Mississippi.

When the Committee rises, I shall ask permission to include in my remarks an editorial from the Kansas City Times of June 7, 1947, entitled "The Grim Risk of Floods," which graphically portrays the problem in the Missouri Basin.

THE GRIM RISK OF FLOODS

Rains are falling on the Midwest. The huge snow is melting in the mountains. But back in Washington the vast Missouri Basin flood-control program is fighting for its existence. The attack on flood protection comes from another of those combinations of the extreme left (MVA) and extreme right (power companies and friends). Between the two extremes is the uncertainty brought on by the urgency of the national economy program.

Every year that passes before the completion of the Pick-Sloan program is another year of gamble. At best, part of the risk must be taken for several years. Every additional year caused by unnecessary delay is playing with fate.

The big flood could come this year. For several days early in April the Army engineers were alerted for another 1903 flood. Just one more 2-inch rain on the saturated Kaw Valley

would have done the job. The rains subsided, but recently started up again. A series of heavy rains this month would hit at the time the bulk of melted snow from the mountains must pass under the A.-S.-B. bridge. And the snow accumulation this year is 30 percent greater than any previous year on record.

What kind of a gambler's risk is this? For full speed ahead the Army engineers this year asked $88,000,000 for the whole basin. The Budget Bureau tried to cut it to $33,000,000. Some Congressmen want to cut it still lower.

According to one local estimate the exposed property in Greater Kansas City alone is worth $450,000,000. One metropolitan area is risking five times as much as the Army engineers ask permission to spend this year on reservoirs, dikes, and flood walls on the Missouri all the way to North Dakota and on the tributaries. The total value of threatened property in this area is fantastic—to say nothing of human lives.

As Willard Breidenthal told the House committee in Washington, failure to protect this property isn't economy. It is simply failure to take out insurance.

Flood protection for the Missouri Valley is a national duty. It is a duty the Government assumed many years before it started piling billions on billions for all kinds of new services. In the Pick-Sloan program the Government of the United States accepted its duty to do the flood-control job right and to do it once and for all. Unless it goes back on its obligations, this job will have to be done eventually in any case. To put it off isn't saving money. It is only taking unnecessary risks with the lives and property of the people who live and do business in the Missouri Basin.

With floods threatening every year or two the risk is high. No sane gambler would lay $100 to win $1 on such a risk. Four years ago a comparatively mild flood was within 6 inches of pouring into the central industrial district.

The biggest flood on record in Kansas City came in 1844. The Army engineers catalog it as a 100-year flood, which means it is the type to expect about every hundred years. The 1903 flood was cataloged as a 40-year flood.

We are 3 years past our allotted time for the 100-year flood and 4 years past the time for a 40-year flood. We have been extremely lucky. We are living on borrowed time. The risk is staggering. There is no more time to waste.

Since that editorial was written the people of the valley and of Kansas City have been faced with a succession of crises brought about by flood crests which could have been prevented by an adequate system of upstream reservoirs and protective structures.

A comprehensive plan for the development of the Missouri River, with provision for flood control, irrigation and navigation has already been approved and authorized by the Congress. There is no sound economy in withholding the appropriation of funds for execution of the Pick-Sloan plan. Delay will only result in greater destruction of life and property. It will only increase the risk. It will only invite disaster.

This year Congress has already provided almost a billion dollars for the relief of foreign nations and their peoples from the ravages of war. A small fraction of that amount would carry forward in an orderly and effective manner the work of protecting our own people and our own economy against the ravages of destructive floods. While we are being generous to the needy peoples of the world let us not fail to protect and conserve our own strength and our own economy; let us not fail to be just to our own people and our own posterity.

It is imperative, Mr. Chairman, that in next year's budget and in the civil-functions appropriation bill there be included funds sufficient to carry forward at full speed the work which inevitably must be done to protect the bread basket of the Nation and the strategic industrial expansion of the great Midwest. Time is of the essence. We cannot justify prolonging this desperate gamble with destruction.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to compliment the committee upon the preparation of a good bill and to thank the committee for the fair treatment accorded not only me but all witnesses who appeared before it. I wish to address my remarks to the subject of a small but very important project in my congressional district. Unfortunately, for us at least, it comes under a rule which was promulgated by the President and obeyed by the Bureau of the Budget. The rule at the request of the President was that there be no money appropriated for projects that were not already under construction.

The project I speak of, namely, the Amazon Creek project in the city of Eugene, Oreg., is in a peculiar position with reference to this rule. In the first place, the rule, I am sure, was laid down for the purpose of preventing the beginning of large projects at this time when there are already numerous projects under construction remaining to be completed.

The Amazon project is a very small but urgently needed improvement. It has to do with the straightening out and channelizing of a small creek which frequently floods a large part of the city of Eugene, a city of about 30,000 people. I feel the project could be completed in 1 year and for this reason, in my opinion, the rule should not be applied to that project. The Amazon Creek project is in a peculiar situation in another way. It is really part of a project that has been completed rather than being a new one.

General Wheeler, when appearing before the committee, in response to a question stated:

> One feature of the Amazon Creek project is the diversion, by means of a cut-off canal, of a portion of the flood flow of Amazon Creek into the Fern Ridge Reservoir, which is a completed unit of the approved basin plan for the Willamette River Basin. The project is therefore physically connected to a completed portion of the approved plan for the Willamette River Basin.

So you see, in one sense we are out of luck because it is a new project, while the truth of the matter is that it is a part of a project that has been completed in the major project o. the Willamette Basin.

The reason I come before the committee at this time is that this project in Eugene, Oreg., is very urgent so far as the population there is concerned. The city of Eugene has pending for development in the area flooded annually by the Amazon Creek $2,500,000 worth of improvements and construction, including a high-school building, for which the money has been raised and is available, a recreation park, a business and industrial area, a swimming pool, and so forth. None of this $2,500,000 program planned by the city of Eugene can be undertaken until this project is completed, removing the flood hazard. One of the improvements planned, I may say, is a veterans' housing project.

I do not intend to offer an amendment regarding this project at this time. Five minutes is not sufficient time to explain the project to the House, and therefore I could not hope to secure the approval of the committee on an amendment. However, I am offering these remarks to the committee in the hope that, should the other body decide to put the item in the bill after giving the subject adequate hearings, the committee would take a favorable view of the project.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the members of the subcommittee that handled this bill for their serious and earnest work and for the very courteous treatment that they extended to those who came before them. I went before them with several interested parties, and I think they gave us most courteous treatment, and I appreciate it.

I do not appear here this afternoon in criticism of the action of the subcommittee. I realize the difficulties that confronted them, but I do feel, as did the gentleman who just preceded me, that there are many projects over this country that are of relatively small size but of tremendous importance to the communities involved, and that it is utterly impossible for this House as a whole to have a conception of the importance of each of those projects.

I am particularly interested in the development of the Brazos River Basin. The Brazos River is the largest stream flowing through the State of Texas, rising on the plains of eastern New Mexico and flowing more than 1,000 river miles to the Gulf of Mexico. Its drainage basin is larger than that of the Tennessee and the population of its basin is at least as great. This year marks the first year when the Federal Government has expended any considerable amount of funds on that entire river system. Work is commencing on the Whitney Dam on the main stream of the Brazos, but like every other river system the Brazos system is composed of a number of tributaries. The chief tributary of the Brazos is known as the Little River.

Now, I suppose there is a Little River in everybody's district, but the Little River of this central Texas district is a stream that belies its name. The records of the Army engineers show that that Little River in Texas carries at peak-flood stage more water than has been going down the Missouri River into the Mississippi River right now at the time of peak floods; that it carries almost twice as much water as is today passing Hannibal, Mo. Now, those things are startling; those facts are unknown to most of our people, and I realize that the Members of this House cannot be expected to know the details of every river in the United States, but I do plead with

you to familiarize yourselves with the tremendous damage that is occurring in the Brazos Valley. Approximately 170 people drowned in one flood. That is more people than have been drowned in all these midwestern floods over the past months. One hundred and seventy people drown in one flood. Millions of dollars worth of damage is recurring year after year.

Because Texas is a long way off, probably most of the Members of this House do not realize the importance of these Texas streams. Because of the fact that the State of Texas is a large State most of you are probably inclined to say, "Why, the Government is doing a lot of work in the State of Texas." And indeed it is, but it is a tremendous area, and there are a tremendous lot of streams down there. When we get floods we get big floods. Our rivers may be dry most of the year but our rains come in cloudbursts and our floods are just as destructive as if the streams were full the year around.

I am only asking that at the next opportunity, whenever that opportunity arises, it will be possible for this Congress to commence work on some of the authorized projects. Neither the committee nor the House, I am sure, will knowingly overlook the fact that our central Texas projects are of vast importance. And of all the vital projects now authorized, but not constructed, there is surely none more vital than the Miller Springs Dam to control the Little River. I want to be sure that this House knows, and that the committee knows, of the tremendous losses that are occurring in central and south Texas all the way down to the mouth of the Brazos River some 400 miles because of this untamed, uncontrolled flood situation on the Little River. It is going to take $15,000,000 to build this project, but it is going to stop more water than you are going to stop with any other project I know of with that amount of money. It will save lives and in a very few years it will save money. The Miller Springs Dam near Belton should be commenced at the first possible moment.

Do not charge up against us the fact that we have a vast area in our State. I am not suggesting that the committee should have done something they could not do, but as soon as it is possible to begin work on these authorized projects, I plead with you not to overlook this important project at Belton for the control of the State's worst actor, the incorrectly named Little River.

The Clerk read as follows:

RIVERS AND HARBORS

Maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works: For the preservation and maintenance of existing river and harbor works, and for the prosecution of such projects heretofore authorized as may be most desirable in the interests of commerce and navigation; for survey of northern and northwestern lakes and other boundary and connecting waters as heretofore authorized, including the preparation, correction, printing, and issuing of charts and bulletins and the investigation of lake levels; for prevention of obstructive and injurious deposits within the harbor and adjacent waters of New York City; for expenses of the California Débris Commission in carrying on the work authorized by the act approved March 1, 1893, as amended (33 U. S. C. 661, 678, and 683); for removing sunken vessels or craft obstructing or endangering navigation as authorized by law; for operating and maintaining, keeping in repair, and continuing in use without interruption any lock, canal (except the Panama Canal), canalized river, or other public works for the use and benefit of navigation belonging to the United States, including maintenance of the Hennepin Canal in Illinois; for payment annually of tuition fees of not to exceed 100 student officers of the Corps of Engineers at civil technical institutions under the provisions of section 127a of the National Defense Act, as amended (10 U. S. C. 535); for examinations, surveys, and contingencies of rivers and harbors; for the execution of detailed investigations and the preparation of plans and specifications for projects heretofore or hereafter authorized; for printing and binding and office supplies and equipment required in the Office of the Chief of Engineers to carry out the purposes of this appropriation, including such printing, either during a recess or session of Congress, of surveys authorized by law, and such surveys as may be printed during a recess of Congress shall be printed, with illustrations, as documents of the next succeeding session of Congress: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for any preliminary examination, survey, project, or estimate not authorized by law, $94,659,700: *Provided further*, That from this appropriation the Secretary of War may, in his discretion and on the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers based on the recommendation by the Board of Rivers and Harbors in the review of a report or reports authorized by law, expend such sums as may be necessary for the maintenance of harbor channels provided by a State, municipality, or other public agency, outside of harbor lines and serving essential needs of general commerce and navigation, such work to be subject to the conditions recommended by the Chief of Engineers in his report or reports thereon: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $3,000 of the amount herein appropriated shall be available for the support and maintenance of the Permanent International Commission of the Congresses of Navigation and for the payment of the expenses of the properly accredited delegates of the United States to the meeting of the Congresses and of the Commission.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

On page 7, line 6, after "authorized", insert the following: "*Provided*, That the sum of $500,000 is designated to be used for the purpose of advance planning of the Buford Dam on the Chattahoochee River, north of Atlanta, Ga., as authorized in H. R. 6407, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session."

On page 7, line 16, strike out "$94,659,700" and insert in lieu thereof "$95,159,700."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered for the purpose not of securing any money whatever for construction but for the purpose of providing sufficient money to allow for planning the Buford Dam on the Chattahoochee River just north of Atlanta.

If this project were advanced on its merits as a power project or a flood-control project, I would concede that there is nothing about it to take it out of the run of the mine projects, of which there are so many before the Committee here this afternoon. The things which differentiate this project from others are the military value of the city of Atlanta to our national security, and the relation of the Buford Dam to a water supply for the military installations of Atlanta and the surrounding territory.

I call to your attention the fact that there exist in Atlanta and the Atlanta territory these military installations which are vital to our national security: Naval air station, the Third Army headquarters, Fort McPherson, where troops are kept at all times, Lawson Veterans' Administration Hospital, the Veterans' Administration Hospital No. 48, the southeastern recruiting headquarters for the Uinted States Marine Corps, the Atlanta ordnance depot, at Conley, which is the largest in the country, and the Bell bomber plant, which gets its water from the Atlanta water system.

In addition to that, we have there the Federal penitentiary. In addition to that, I want to call your attention to these facts: That located there are the Georgia Tech School and Emory University, at which thousands and thousands of naval men were trained to serve in the war just ended during the 4-year period.

In addition to that, these educational institutions are now training thousands and thousands of veterans under the veterans' training program. In addition to that, a large unit of the Georgia University extension is located there in Atlanta, where thousands of veterans are being trained also.

I call to your attention that in 1925 the flow of water of the Chattahoochee River went down to 132 cubic feet per second. If any other drought at all comparable to that should occur, in view of the growth of Atlanta since that time and the increased importance of its military position to the security of this country, that area and these military installations would be in a tragic plight.

This Buford Dam, for which I am asking money, not for its construction but simply for the planning of it, will place us just that far ahead in the event there arises any emergency wherein these installations would again assume to our country the importance which they did assume to national security during this war.

Where is the economy to deny this small sum of money involved in this amendment and put off this work for another year, when if such an emergency does arise we would simply be a year behind in providing water which is vital to the maintenance of these military installations?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have just said that the drought of 1925 reduced the water flow here to 132 cubic feet per second. Since that

time another great water-supply system has been installed in the Chattahoochee River above that from which Atlanta draws its water supply, and that is the water supply of De Kalb County, which is a county of approximately 100,000 population. So you can see from that, that not only is the 132 cubic feet, if it were all available to Atlanta, insufficient for its present population, but with it divided between Atlanta and the water supply of De Kalb County, it places Atlanta and its military installations in a still worse position.

This dam will provide, the engineers say, 1,000,000 acre-feet which is sufficient to provide a constant flow in the low-water periods of 1,900 cubic feet per second. That not only will provide for sufficient water for these military installations, but will also provide for pollution control which would not be provided unless this dam is built and this controlled flow of water made available there.

This is one of the projects which properly comes under this bill which is labeled "War Department Civil Functions."

The provision for this advance planning is a true civil function of the War Department, because the relation between the War Department and this necessary water supply is undeniable.

At the time this bill was before the subcommittee—and I want to state that I deeply appreciate the courtesy which has been extended by the subcommittee, the chairman thereof, and the members—at that time it was believed, and, if I am not correct, I ask the chairman to correct me, that the $2,500,000 which is provided on page 6, and which is referred to on page 6 of the committee report, contained planning money for this Buford Dam project. I conferred with the chairman of the subcommittee on that, and he explained to me why the $2,500,000 was reduced by 50 percent to $1,250,000. The chairman of the subcommittee did not know at that time, I am sure, and I did not know at that time, that that reduction took every dollar that had been contemplated for planning the Buford Dam. I talked with Colonel Feringa, of the United States Engineers, yesterday afternoon, and Colonel Feringa assures me that the bill in its present form provides not one dollar for the planning of Buford Dam.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That would necessarily be true. The committee did not propose to specify where this planning money should be spent on rivers and harbors. The requested appropriation was a lump-sum appropriation for the planning of projects which ran over about three pages in our justifications. That list still stands, and the money that is available, $1,250,000, can be used for planning on whatever the Chief of Engineers wants to apply it.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Certainly. There is no dispute about that. What I said was that it was contemplated, when that was made up, that $450,000 was appropriated and designated for four dams on the Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint River project, of which the Buford Dam is one.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That was a tentative allocation, but a 50-percent reduction would still leave $250,000 for planning, if they applied the reduction to all projects in the same proportion that was given in the original estimate.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I say that is correct also, but I state to the gentleman in answer to that, that I have talked to the Army engineers, and Colonel Feringa tells me that the available money of the original $450,000 is not sufficient to complete the planning of the Junction Dam, which is the one nearest the Gulf, and that it will require all of that and $25,000 additional.

Colonel Feringa also says the Buford Dam is a vital dam and he concurs in what I have said about the military value of this project.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Under the testimony it was indicated that the dam at River Junction is the first one that should be built as a matter of engineering practice.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I understand that. But it is conceded that the Buford Dam is a vitally necessary dam from a military standpoint, and if this advance planning money is provided, the engineers will plan it this year. I call your attention to the following excerpts from a report by Gen. R. A. Wheeler, Chief of Engineers to the Secretary of War, under date of May 13, 1946:

11. The division engineer's plan provides for:

(a) Construction of a lock and dam at the junction site with upper pool at elevation 77 and a hydroelectric power plant with 27,000 kilowatts of installed capacity. Although generation of power would be precluded at times of high flow, the plant is credited with adding 19,400 kilowatts of dependable capacity to the power system in the general area since at such times other existing and authorized plants in the area could produce excess power. The prime power output credited to the plant is 169,900,000 kilowatt-hours annually and the estimated output of secondary power 9,574,000 kilowatt-hours annually.

(b) Construction of a lock and dam at the Upper Columbia site with upper pool at elevation 165 and a hyroelectric power plant with installed capacity of 88,800 kilowatts. This plant is credited with adding 54,400 kilowatts of dependable capacity, based on 60 percent load factor operation, to the power system of the general area. Provision of movable spans in three bridges which cross this pool would be necessary, and some other highway and railroad changes would be required in the reservoir area. The prime power output credited to this development is 286,500,000 kilowatt-hours annually and the estimated output of secondary power 72,380,000 kilowatt-hours annually.

(c) Construction of a lock and dam at the Fort Benning site with upper pool at elevation 190 and without a plant for the generation of hydroelectric power

(d) Construction of Buford Reservoir on Chattahoochee River, at mile 348.5, where the drainage area is 1,046 square miles, with a hydroelectric power plant having an installed capacity of 28,900 kilowatts and a dependable capacity of 24,000 kilowatts, based on 60 percent load factor operation. The proposed reservoir would have about 2,280,000 acre-feet of storage, of which about 578,000 acre-feet would be reserved for flood control. With 40 feet of draw-down the power-regulation storage would be 1,033,000 acre-feet. The annual outputs of primary and secondary power are estimated at 126,100,000 and 23,602,000 kilowatt-hours, respectively. Flow regulation by such a reservoir is necessary to the economical development of hydroelectric power at the upper Columbia and junction sites, would materially reduce the amount of dredging required to provide a 9-foot depth for navigation in Apalachicola River and would assure an adequate supply of water for municipal and industrial purposes in the Atlanta metropolitan area.

(e) Dredging and channel work on Apalachicola and Chattahoochee Rivers in conjunction with the above improvements.

14. He recommends that the existing project for Apalachicola, Chattahoochee, and Flint Rivers be modified to provide for improvement in accordance with the plan which he now presents with such modifications as may in the opinion of the Chief of Engineers be advisable, at an estimated Federal cost of $79,861,000 with $115,000 annually for maintenance and operation in addition to that now authorized: *Provided*, That local interests furnish, free of cost to the United States, all rights-of-way, spoil-disposal areas, easements, and other lands required for the provision and maintenance of a navigation channel in Apalachicola River below Junction Dam and agree to provide terminal facilities.

15. The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, having afforded local interests an opportunity to present additional information, concurs generally in the views of the division engineer. It recommends that the approved general plan for the river system be revised to include the improvements now proposed by the division engineer and that the existing project for Apalachicola, Chattahoochee, and Flint Rivers be modified to provide for construction of these works in lieu of the initial improvement authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945, at estimated increased costs to the United States of $73,361,000 for construction and $115,000 annually for operation and maintenance, provided local interests furnish lands and spoil-disposal areas for construction and maintenance of the channel in Apalachicola River and agree to provide suitable public-terminal facilities.

16. After due consideration, I concur generally with the Board. Accordingly, I recommend that the approved general plan for the Apalachicola, Chattahoochee, and Flint Rivers system be modified to include the improvements now proposed by the division engineer, with such changes as in the discretion of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers may be advisable, in lieu of the corresponding works of the existing approved plan. I also recommend that for initiation and partial accomplishment of the modified plan, the existing project for Apalachicola, Chattahoochee, and Flint Rivers, Ga. and Fla., be modified to provide for construction of Buford multiple-purpose reservoir, Fort Benning lock and dam, and the upper Columbia and Junction multiple-purpose improvements, and supplemental channel work, to provide a channel depth of 9 feet for a minimum width of 100 feet between the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway in Apalachicola River and Columbus, Ga., on Chattahoochee River and Bainbridge, Ga., on Flint River, in accordance with the plans of the division engineer and with such changes therein as in the discretion of the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers may be advisable, in lieu of the initial improvement authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945, at an estimated increased cost to the United States of $73,361,000 for construction and $115,000 annually for operation and maintenance in addition to that required for the work heretofore authorized; subject to the conditions that local interests agree (a) to furnish free of cost to the United States all lands, easements, rights-

of-way and spoil-disposal areas, as and when required, for provision and maintenance of the channel in Apalachicola River below Junction Dam; (b) to maintain and operate at their expense all utility and highway facilities which are relocated or otherwise altered as a part of the improvement; (c) to provide suitable public terminal and transfer facilities open to all on equal terms, and to hold and save the United States free from damages which might arise from the construction of the improvements.

R. A. WHEELER,
Lieutenant General,
Chief of Engineers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order merely to ascertain whether this was a flood-control or a river and harbor project. It was a river and harbor authorization, and I do not care to press the point of order.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we went over this matter very carefully. We tried to make the cuts where we felt they should be made. I personally went over every project with Colonel Feringa and Colonel Person of the Engineer Corps, and the committee, after careful consideration, reduced the planning, feeling that that money could better be used for construction.

We have not designated any particular project. We have left it to the engineers to say which project should be planned first. Under this amendment it would mean they would be compelled to spend this money on some particular project.

I trust the amendment will not be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Alteration of bridges over navigable waters: For payment of the share of the United States of the cost of alteration of bridges over navigable waters in accordance with the provisions of the act of June 21, 1940 (Public Law 647), $500,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANKIN: On page 8, after line 12, insert a new paragraph to read as follows:

"For prosecution of work of construction on Tombigbee and Tennessee Rivers, Ala. and Miss., in accordance with the provisions of the act of Congress approved July 24, 1946, Public Law 525, Seventy-ninth Congress, $3,000,000."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PACE. Several of us have been waiting to submit amendments to the $94,000,000 item in line 16 on page 7. It occurs to me that possibly, if this amendment is considered at this point, we may not be in order in offering amendments to that item.

Mr. RANKIN. I think they have passed that item.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk has read to line 12, on page 8.

Mr. PACE. Of course, Mr. Chairman, I should like to make a point there that the Clerk did not read the paragraph, but read "Alteration of bridges over navigable waters," and before we could get the floor for recognition, had passed on. I ask unanimous consent that after the consideration of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi it may still be in order to offer amendments to the $94,000,000 item on page 7.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I explained to the House a few moments ago the necessity for beginning this work on this great inland waterway. I understand the only reason for opposing it is that the Bureau of the Budget has not recommended it. But Congress has acted on it. It was authorized by a vote of both the House and Senate last year. Besides, conditions are continuing to change. They have changed even since the Bureau of the Budget sent in its estimate.

As I pointed out a while ago, not only will this be the greatest development for our inland waterway transportation system ever proposed, but it will also give us a short water route from our defense plant at Oak Ridge to the Gulf that may be vitally necessary at any time. So the longer we postpone this development the more it is going to cost and the more risks we are going to run. I am therefore going to ask the committee to give us this small amount now.

The Army engineers said last year that they would like to have $9,000,000 for the first year, but owing to the fact that Congress will be in session in January we have asked for $3,000,000 so that the Army engineers may proceed with this construction at once. It is just as sure to be done as the night follows the day, and the sooner it is started the better.

This project is made possible now by the construction of the Pickwick Dam which raised the water of the Tennessee River 55 feet and enabled us, as I have pointed out, to cut through that sand ridge and put the summit of this project in the Tennessee River itself. Therefore, as I said, the entire route from Cairo to New Orleans across to Mobile, up the Tombigbee River and then down the Tennessee and the Ohio to Cairo is 1,768 miles. With this project developed 1,131 miles of it will be downstream and the rest of it in slack water.

Nothing could be done for the benefit of our water traffic from Pittsburgh, Pa., to Sioux City, Iowa, from Chicago to New Orleans, from St. Paul and Minneapolis to Mobile—nothing could be done that would aid that transportation more or cut the cost more, than the development of this project.

All that we ask is that you give us this $3,000,000 now in order that the engineers may proceed with this work at once.

Examine the table which I inserted in my speech a while ago and you will see what this project will mean to your people and mine.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. Chairman, we have here another illustration of just how we add $100,000,000 with the plea that it is only $3,000,000 to start with. I want to repeat what I said in my earlier statement. There are 78 projects in this bill costing $1,310,000,000. Seven of those projects costing $50,000,000 or more will total $585,000,000. The project we have here will cost $116,000,000 and is purely a navigation project. There is no flood control to it at all. We have a plea here for flood control, so let us spend money on that if we are going to spend money at all. As I stated, the total is $1,310,000,000. There are seven projects costing $50,000,000 or more totaling $585,000,000; another 10 costing $25,000,000 to $50,000,000 total $321,000,000. That means that 17 out of the 78 projects cost $960,000,000. If we add this one, you have over a billion dollars for 18 out of the 78 projects, leaving nothing for the balance. I ask you to vote down this amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman talks about it costing a billion dollars for the upbuilding of our own internal resources. Look at the billions they are asking to give to Europe.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. If you are going to put in a project costing that much money, it should be a flood-control project.

Mr. RANKIN. We should help our own people first.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Let us handle flood control, because when we put this in, the President will come back in here and say, "You can have so much." Then you will be coming back here next year and asking me, "Can you not put in my project?"

Mr. Chairman, let us vote down this amendment.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Is it not a fact that on August 2 last year the President stopped everything in this building program except $85,000,000 for 1947 and

1948? Who knows but what he will do the same thing this year.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I do not want to cross that bridge until we come to it. I say let us not load this bill down.

Mr. JENSEN. I have a number of projects in my district, small projects, that would cost a few hundred thousand dollars or maybe two or three million dollars, just as most everybody has in their districts. Certainly those projects should have priority at a time when we need flood control instead of going into these great big projects that will swallow up all of the money that we need.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I want a certain amount designated for smaller projects. I said that in my earlier remarks today.

Mr. JENSEN. At some future time when the Nation can afford it, and I hope sometime we can afford it, we can then go into these big projects; but certainly today we owe it to more of the American people to confine ourselves to flood-control projects.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I am not opposed to the big projects but I want to finish some of the big projects we have started now before we start any more. This project will take at least $20,000,000 a year to build economically and it would take that amount of money from some other project.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 68, noes 78.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MICHENER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4002) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REEVES asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee today and to include an editorial.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, FEDERAL SECURITY, AND RELATED INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. KEEFE submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 2700) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to file a minority report on the bill H. R. 3150, the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by David Lawrence.

Mr. BELL asked and was given permission to insert in the RECORD at the conclusion of his remarks in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon about the Townsend movement a page from the Townsend Weekly of July 29, 1935.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include a letter and petition and a newspaper article.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include certain tables and correspondence with the Chief of Engineers.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include certain statistics.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include a statement.

GENERAL PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS—LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the War Department civil functions appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, as I understand, we will take up this bill tomorrow at 12 o'clock just where we quit today?

The SPEAKER. Unless a conference report precedes it.

Mr. RANKIN. Unless some privileged matter comes up.

Mr. KEEFE. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that we expect to take up the conference report that has just been filed on the Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill the first thing tomorrow, if it is agreeable to the leadership.

The SPEAKER. The conference report will come first.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on tomorrow, Calendar Wednesday, be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor holding hearings on minimum wages be allowed to sit tomorrow during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot recognize the gentleman for that purpose. Tomorrow the House will be reading the civil functions appropriation bill for amendment, and committees cannot sit during sessions of the House while bills are being read for amendment; only during general debate.

Mr. McCONNELL. We have a full schedule that we want to get through.

The SPEAKER. That is the policy that has been adopted. The minority leader has stated that he would object to any requests of that character.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. COOLEY (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), for 4 days, on account of personal business.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 715. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for investigatory personnel of the Federal Bureau of Investigation who have rendered at least 20 years of service; and

S. J. Res. 124. Joint resolution to enable the President to utilize the appropriations for United States participation in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration for meeting administrative expenses of United States Government agencies in connection with United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration liquidation.

BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on June 30, 1947, present to the President, for his approval, a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2369. An act providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the Territory of Alaska; and

H. J. Res. 221. Joint resolution to provide for permanent rates of postage on mail matter of the first class, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 2, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred, as follows:

877. A letter from the Administrator, Office of Temporary Controls, transmitting the Twenty-first Report of the Office of Price Administration, covering the period ended March 31, 1947 (H. Doc. No. 371); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

878. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting the report of the American National Red Cross for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1946, to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

879. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of $350,000 for the Department of Commerce (H. Doc. No. 372); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

880. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1948 in the amount of $750,000 for the Department of Commerce (H. Doc. No. 373); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

881. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 102 (b) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 to exclude certain experts and consultants from the coverage of the act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

882. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide a more satisfactory program of benefits relating to active service in the armed forces of the Commonwealth of the Philippines during World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WELCH: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 1602. A bill to establish within the Department of the Interior a National Minerals Resources Division, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 755). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POTTS: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 2273. A bill to amend the act of May 29, 1944, providing for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal; without amendment (Rept. No. 756). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LEWIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3958. A bill to extend temporarily the time for filing applications for patents and for taking action in the United States Patent Office with respect thereto; with amendments (Rept. No. 757). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JUDD: Committee on Foreign Affairs. S. 1020. An act to amend the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of 1946, as amended; with an amendment (Rept. No. 758). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REED of New York: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 4011. A bill to amend section 1602 of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 759). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JONKMAN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 3726. A bill for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions; without amendment (Rept. No. 754). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. RIZLEY:

H. R. 4051. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act approved June 21, 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana:

H. R. 4052. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to amend and consolidate the acts respecting copyright," approved March 4, 1909, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACK:

H. R. 4053. A bill to authorize creation of a special commission to be designated as the Commission on the Olympic National Park; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 4054. A bill to transfer certain lands from the Olympic National Forest, Wash., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MATHEWS:

H. R. 4055. A bill to provide increases in the rates of pension payable to veterans of Indian wars and the dependents of such veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WHEELER:

H. R. 4056. A bill to define the term "child" for the purpose of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration pertaining to compensation, pension, and retirement pay; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 4057. A bill to amend section 3443 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REDDEN:

H. R. 4058. A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act so as to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to purchase home loans guaranteed or insured under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 4059. A bill to provide for the settlement of certain parts of Alaska by war veterans; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PEDEN:

H. R. 4060. A bill to provide for the settlement of certain parts in Alaska by war veterans; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 4061. A bill to establish a criterion of invention with respect to patent applications and issued patents, and to amend section 4886 of the Revised Statutes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H. R. 4062. A bill to permit the Administrator of the National Housing Agency to sell war-housing project Oakland Heights Village, Miss-22041, to the Housing Authority of the City of Meridian, Miss.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. Res. 266. Resolution for the relief of Loretta McOwen, widow of Joseph A. McOwen; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to Federal assistance and support in solution of housing problems of that State; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 4063. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Elsie Kills Plenty DeSersa; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 4064. A bill for the relief of Fred Nightingale; Mrs. Fred H. Nightingale, and Mrs. Virginia Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

707. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Petition of S. H. Young, president, West River Cooperative Grazing District, Cottonwood, S. Dak., and 28 other signers, expressing themselves as being opposed to consideration and enactment of H. R. 1692, which proposes to grant the Secretary of Agriculture authorization to dispose of submarginal land acquired under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, based on appraisals of reasonable normal value; to the Committee on Agriculture.

708. By Mr. HARLESS of Arizona: Petition of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, relating to Federal participation in old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

709. By Mr. MURDOCK: Memorial of the House of Representatives, State of Arizona, on Federal contribution to old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

710. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mrs. Alice R. Praster and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

711. Also, petition of Miss Edna Evans and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JULY 2, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met in executive session at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord of our lives, we pray that Thou wilt fill with new meanings this sacred moment of prayer. Help us to feel and to believe that we are talking with God. In this interlude of intercession, may we forget all else save our deep need of Thy guidance and Thy help. In our hearts are fears and frustrations, and we cannot view the future of our world without misgivings. If there is a way for this God-believing Nation to live at peace with nations that deny Thee, Thou wilt have to reveal it to us, for we have not found it yet.

The disappointments and indecisions in our own lives teach us that we, ourselves, are not in tune with Thy will for us. God help us, and save us, and tell us what to do.

May the Great Physician minister to our brethren in sickness, and the sympathizing Jesus be near to those in trouble, and the Holy Spirit be in our hearts and minds this day, we ask in Jesus' name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the legislative proceedings of Tuesday, July 1, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following joint resolutions:

On June 30, 1947:

S. J. Res. 139. Joint resolution to continue for a temporary period of 15 days certain controls now exercised by the President under the Second War Powers Act, 1942, and under the Export Control Act.

On July 1, 1947:

S. J. Res. 77. Joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the International Refugee Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor; and

S. J. Res. 113. Joint resolution authorizing the erection in the District of Columbia of a memorial to the Marine Corps dead of all wars.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 116) for the relief of Mrs. Mildred Wells Martin, with amendments in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 395) authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Richard Jay Doyle, with an amendment to the title in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 405. An act for the relief of Thomas M. Farley, Mrs. Susie Farley, Mrs. Helen Moss, the legal guardian of Donna Louise Farley, and the legal guardian of Melvin Moss;

H. R. 406. An act for the relief of Walter R. and Kathryn Marshall;

H. R. 629. An act for the relief of A. E. McCartney and O. A. Foster; P. W. Woodyard and J. R. Mahon; B. E. Truitt, T. L. Truitt, and W. B. Lacy; G. W. Cox, J. M. Cox, and F. T. Cox; W. W. Cox and Dr. J. W. Cox; Robert Cathcart and Claude Cathcart;

H. R. 642. An act for the relief of Frank F. Miles;

H. R. 650. An act for the relief of Ruston Jamsetji Patell;

H. R. 928. An act for the relief of Riyoko Patell;

H. R. 990. An act for the relief of William B. Moore;

H. R. 1492. An act for the relief of P. L. (Spud) Murphey, owner and manager of Spud's Tailors, Laundry & Dry Cleaning Works;

H. R. 1498. An act for the relief of Hempstead Warehouse Corp.;

H. R. 1502. An act for the relief of Herman Trahn;

H. R. 1535. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Ralph Stanfield, a minor;

H. R. 1670. An act for the relief of Pittsburgh DuBois Co.;

H. R. 1726. An act for the relief of Elsie L. Rosenow;

H. R. 1736. An act for the relief of O. Dean Settles and Mrs. Ruth E. Settles, husband and wife; Mrs. Ruth E. Settles, individually; the estate of Ora H. Hatfield; and Mrs. Kittie B. Hatfield;

H. R. 1930. An act for the relief of the Growers Fertilizer Co., a Florida corporation;

H. R. 2062. An act for the relief of Mrs. Carrie M. Lee;

H. R. 2390. An act for the relief of Elmer A. Norris;

H. R. 2507. An act for the relief of the firm of Barrett & Hilp;

H. R. 2511. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to quitclaim 2 acres of land near Muirkirk, Md., to the Queens Chapel Methodist Church;

H. R. 2550. An act for the relief of Mack Gene Odom, a minor;

H. R. 2885. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Becker Little Light; and

H. R. 2886. An act authorizing the sale, under supervision, of land of Richard Little Light.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SESSIONS OF THE SENATE

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which is now sitting, I ask unanimous consent that it may continue to sit for a little while longer this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

JOE B. DOOLEY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of Joe B. Dooley to be United States district judge for the northern district of Texas.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Joe B. Dooley to be United States district judge for the northern district of Texas?

Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into last evening, the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] is recognized.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. WHITE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Byrd	Ellender
Baldwin	Capper	Ferguson
Ball	Chavez	Flanders
Barkley	Connally	Fulbright
Bricker	Cooper	Green
Bridges	Cordon	Gurney
Brooks	Donnell	Hatch
Buck	Downey	Hawkes
Bushfield	Dworshak	Hayden
Butler	Ecton	Hickenlooper
Hill	McMahon	Saltonstall
Hoey	Magnuson	Smith
Holland	Malone	Sparkman
Ives	Martin	Stewart
Jenner	Millikin	Taft
Johnson, Colo.	Moore	Taylor
Johnston, S. C.	Morse	Thomas, Okla.
Kem	Murray	Tydings
Kilgore	Myers	Umstead
Knowland	O'Conor	Vandenberg
Langer	O'Daniel	Watkins
Lodge	O'Mahoney	Wherry
Lucas	Overton	White
McCarran	Pepper	Wiley
McCarthy	Reed	Williams
McClellan	Revercomb	Wilson
McFarland	Robertson, Va.	Young
McGrath	Robertson, Wyo.	
McKellar	Russell	

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of illness in his family.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to the International Labor Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is absent because of illness.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I have risen on the floor of the United States Senate to exercise my constitutional right in opposing the nomination of Joe B. Dooley, of Amarillo, Tex., to be United States district judge for the northern district of Texas. A large number of citizens throughout the State of Texas have requested me to make this objection. Under our constitutional form of government the only voice the citizens of Texas have in respect to the important office of Federal judge is that of one or both of their United States Senators.

Mr. President, I explained yesterday how our forefathers, in their wisdom, set up the system of selecting public officials with checks and balances, providing a different system of selection of Members of the House of Representatives from that of Senators, and a different system for the selection of the President, and finally, a different system for the selection of judges, in each case a different tenure of office being provided. The difference in the systems of selection of public officials was to provide checks and balances, and, in each instance, to give the people of this great Nation a voice in the selection of their public officials.

I know of no office more important than that of Federal judge. Any citizen may be haled into court, and if found guilty a penalty may be imposed upon him by the Federal judge, in some extreme instances the penalty being the death sentence. The Federal judge

serves for life, or during good behavior. In a case where citizens of a State believe a nomination for Federal judge to be bad, they may appeal to their Senators, as many of the good citizens of the great State of Texas did in this case. They have the right to appeal to either or both of their United States Senators. In this case the appeal has been made to me.

I wish to assure all who are within the sound of my voice and all who may read the RECORD that it is indeed no great pleasure, as most Senators, if not all, will agree, to be forced to take the negative in a situation of this nature, but regardless of pleasure or personal desires, each and every Senator knows that duty must come first. So I am very serious in explaining to my brother Senators that this is my duty, and I am performing my duty, even though I have been informed of and threatened with political reprisals if I should attempt to stand on the Senate floor and exercise my constitutional right in the manner in which I am exercising it now.

Mr. President, Texas is a wonderful State. I am proud to represent the great Democratic State of Texas. I am proud to be one of its Senators. It is a wonderful State, largely so because the rank and file of its citizens are honest, hard-working, God-fearing people. I believe the rank and file of our Texas citizens to be as close to the fundamental principles of rugged Americanism and Jeffersonian democracy as will be found anywhere in the United States of America.

They are unalterably opposed to this new form of synthetic socialism or communism which has been heralded under the banner of new dealism for the past 14 years. They believe in keeping their government close to the county courthouses and the State Capitol Building. They can take care of their local public servants and keep them pretty well in hand. But, Texans are fundamentally Democratic, and because they are true to the Democratic Party they have had to suffer the punishment inflicted upon them by the national leaders in the Democratic Party, many of whom have forsaken the governmental philosophy of Thomas Jefferson, and departed from the Constitution of the United States.

Texas almost became a captive State of the New Deal dynasty. Texas almost became a captive State by infiltration from Washington of those who wear the respectable raiment of democracy above ground, but embrace the philosophy of Karl Marx while operating underground. Most of the dirty work done in Texas, which has deprived the citizens of many of their rights and liberties, has been performed by New Deal bureaucrats and stooges shipped into the State on orders from Washington, and by Federal appointments made in Washington for the political purpose of protecting the New Deal crooks and vandals who get caught in carrying out orders from their bosses.

Texas had its share of crooked war contracts, and as the political atmosphere throughout the Nation is undergoing a change the New Deal stooges who helped build up paper combines to defraud the taxpayers are beginning to run for cover. For their protection the New Deal gang has been packing the courts of this Nation, not only in Washington but in Texas and the other States of the Union, until the mere mention of the judicial system of the United States in any group of talented attorneys draws their ire. Almost to a man they condemn the system, from the Supreme Court on down. The nomination of Joe B. Dooley, of Amarillo, is a typical example. It has in it the making of a corrupt judicial system.

Our Federal Government has just instituted suit against most of the railroads of the Nation for alleged overcharge on shipments of war materials and soldiers during the war, running into hundreds of millions of dollars. Joe B. Dooley is a railroad man. His father was a railroad man. His law firm of Underwood, Dooley, Johnson and Wilson represent a railroad corporation. He was picked and sponsored for this appointment by railroad attorneys and lobbyists. One of the attorneys for the Santa Fe railroad corporation traveled personally throughout the Northern Judicial District of Texas back in 1944 inspiring petitions of attorneys recommending Mr. Dooley for this appointment. That was over 3 years ago. These lobbyists get inside information and work far in advance on important matters of this nature. Two of the attorneys or lobbyists for the Santa Fe railroad corporation traveled on free railroad passes on their trip to Washington to appear before the Senate Judiciary Committee in support of Mr. Dooley's confirmation. The two railroad lobbyists so testified before the Judiciary Committee. I ask, Mr. President, what could be better protection for the interests of the big railroad corporations than to have their hirelings sitting on the Federal benches? They have railroaded this man right up to the floor of the United States Senate.

Yes, Mr. President, the railroad attorneys and lobbyists can travel on free passes to help get their man on the Federal bench, but all the common citizens in the district can do is to write their Senator, and object to his confirmation. They cannot travel on free railroad passes to Washington to object. Three hundred and seventy-nine of these common citizens have written me protesting confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Dooley.

As a representative of the people of Texas, can I sit still and ignore the pleas of these citizens who fear that they will not receive just and fair consideration at the hands of this man should he become judge, and in case they have any lawsuits against the big railroad corporations? They fear that they will get very little, if any, favorable consideration.

Should I, as a United States Senator, sent here to represent the people of Texas, "throw in" with the big railroad corporations and help them get their employee on the Federal bench? I have been advised by the retiring judge that to oppose Mr. Dooley will incur for me the enmity of a large number of attorneys in the district, and he warns me that the attorneys can defeat any candidate they oppose, knowing full well that it is my time to come up for reelection next year.

Mr. President, I am the only man in Texas who can and will represent the hundreds of citizens who oppose the confirmation of this nomination. Disastrous to my political future as it is pictured, I cannot shirk my sacred duty as a United States Senator. I am thinking of the welfare of my State and Nation in opposing this nomination.

In order that Members of the Senate may know just what was written to me by the retiring judge, James C. Wilson, of the northern district of Texas, I wish to read from his letter. Many persons characterize him as Mr. Dooley's campaign manager. It is quite generally understood that Judge James C. Wilson, who has been the judge on the bench in the northern district of Texas for 25 years or more, seeks to retain that judgeship until he can name his successor. I do not believe that many United States Senators approve of a Federal judge insisting on naming his successor. I believe that I shall be able, if we can secure existing evidence, to prove that this is the case; and if that is not conclusively proven, it is the opinion of many of the attorneys who practice, and must continue to practice, in this district.

The letter from Judge James C. Wilson to me is dated January 10, 1947, 2 days after President Truman sent the nomination to the Senate. Judge Wilson writes:

> MY DEAR SENATOR: The papers here in Texas announce rather definitely that you are going up for reelection in 1948.

In my opinion the letter starts out in a rather political vein. I think every sentence in the letter is highly significant and requires full study and consideration by every Member of this august body.

The letter continues:

> They also report that you reaffirm your stand for limiting the terms of Senators and Congressmen, the idea being that their terms be extended and not be eligible for reelection. I have believed you were right from the time you announced it many years ago. Possibly you recall that I wrote you a letter telling how thoroughly I was with you. I am of the same view yet.

Mr. President, that makes two of us in favor of that. We had a vote in the Senate on whether Senators and Representatives should be limited to one term. I introduced an amendment to the bill, and happened to be the only Senator who voted for it. Now we have the word of Judge Wilson that he is for it also, and I appreciate it very much.

I will go on further into the letter. It continues, as follows:

> Also the papers announce that you are opposed to Mr. J. B. Dooley, of Amarillo, who the President has nominated to succeed me.

That is important; that is getting down to the real intent of the letter—to campaign for Joe B. Dooley to succeed Judge Wilson. I read further from the letter:

> The papers even report that you may make objection to him, that he would be personally displeasing to you, etc. Now I hope

you will bear with me just a little about that matter. There is quite a bit of background to this I am sure you are not familiar with. I feel on the other hand, that you would not want deliberately to do me an injustice. This is the background: I became 70 years of age June 21, 1944—

That was over 3 years ago—

A few days before that, in order that all of the bars of Texas would have a chance to furnish my successor, I announced that I was going to retire.

I turn from that letter, and shall refer to the remarks I made a few moments ago about this nomination being sponsored by railroad lobbyists, when I made the statement, I believe, that these railroad lobbyists are on their toes, they find out very quickly when something is about to happen, especially of the prospect of a vacancy on the Federal bench anywhere. They have no objection whatever to putting their employees on the Federal bench anywhere. They can see that to do this will do them no harm. So this letter states that:

A few days before that—

A few days before June 21, 1944—

in order that all the bars of Texas would have a chance to furnish my successor, I announced that I was going to retire.

One of the attorneys for the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe, Mr. H. C. Pipkin, of Amarillo, knew about it a few days before.

I do not know just how many days would be considered by the judge as a few days; but on June 12, which was 9 days prior to this announcement, Mr. Pipkin was busy in Amarillo. I have here a petition signed by many attorneys in Amarillo, Tex., and some petitions from other places in that district. This petition is dated June 12, 1944. This substantiates my statement that these railroad attorneys and lobbyists are on their toes. I call attention to the fact that when this petition was gotten up, in haste, on June 12, 1944, there was one thing which they apparently overlooked, that is, that their candidate, selected by Mr. Wilson and four others, and by the railroad corporation attorneys, was practically unknown throughout the State of Texas and throughout the northern district, as I shall show a little later by comments of Mr. Wilson regarding Mr. Dooley. So they thought they had better give the man a build-up.

They came before the Judiciary Committee with the strong argument that Mr. Dooley had been honored with the presidency of the Texas Bar Association.

I admit that is a great honor. But it so happens that he was promoted to that position as president of the Texas Bar Association after he had been proposed as a candidate. He was promoted to become president of the Texas Bar Association as a build-up for his candidacy for a Federal judgeship. Under such circumstances I do not believe the honor of being president of the Texas Bar Association should have as much effect on the confirmation of this nomination as if it had come about in the usual manner.

The lobbying department of the Santa Fe Railroad started getting signatures of attorneys to petitions, as I have stated before, according to this record, on June 12, 1944; and Mr. Dooley was elected president of the Texas Bar Association on June 29, 1944.

As I say, I think all the statements in the letter from the honorable judge have a great bearing on this nomination, showing how it has been sponsored by various influential groups, how painstakingly they have made a build-up for Dooley, and it shows why the nomination has been delayed during all these past months. I think all of that is highly significant, and I think Senators should give those facts full consideration.

This petition of June 12, 1944, was started before Mr. Dooley was elected president of the Texas Bar Association. It was held up and not sent to me until almost one year later, so that the argument of his being president of the Texas Bar Association might be more effective.

On May 29, 1945, almost one year later, Mr. Pipkin wrote me a letter which reads as follows:

DEAR SENATOR O'DANIEL: I am handing you herewith endorsements of Amarillo, Wellington, Pampa, Childress, and Memphis lawyers in behalf of Mr. J. B. Dooley, of Amarillo, for appointment as Federal judge to succeed Judge James C. Wilson.

About a year ago Judge Wilson announced his intention to retire. Thereupon Mr. Dooley was suggested as Judge Wilson's successor. Mr. Dooley has the endorsement and support of the lawyers in the Wichita Falls, Abilene, San Angelo, Lubbock, and Amarillo divisions of the Northern District of Texas. Many of these lawyers have written letters commending Mr. Dooley for the appointment, and you have doubtless received many such letters. While the enclosed endorsements are dated in 1944, they have been withheld pending Judge Wilson's decision as to the time of his retirement.

Judge Wilson was making it clear that he intended to hold on to this office until his successor was appointed and confirmed, and he was rooting for Joe B. Dooley to be that successor.

I continue reading from the letter:

It should be stated that Judge Wilson is fully advised as to the activities—

Listen to that—

It should be stated that Judge Wilson is fully advised as to the activities of Mr. Dooley's friends in urging his appointment.

Shortly after Judge Wilson's announcement of his intention to retire there were a number of aspirants for the appointment—

Get that—

there were a number of aspirants for the appointment but they have withdrawn and practically all of them are supporting Mr. Dooley.

It took almost a year to get that all fixed up.

You are advised, I am sure, concerning the changes which have taken place in the northern district of Texas. Since the Attorney General of the United States has recently been chosen from Dallas, the eastern end of our district, and since this area has never furnished a Federal judge, we of west Texas feel it is now our turn to make an outstanding contribution to the judiciary.

Mr. President, that is fair argument. But let me state one of the real reasons why this appointment was made in Amarillo, Tex. Fort Worth, Tex., has had this judgeship for almost 70 years. More than 500 attorneys have established themselves in Fort Worth. There they can consult the judge at any time, for he lives there. All the litigation handled by these attorneys has been built up during the years with the understanding, during that time, that Fort Worth was the seat of that court.

Mr. President, I have just read from Mr. Pipkin's letter the statement:

We of west Texas feel that it is now our turn to make an outstanding contribution to the judiciary.

Mr. President, that is a fair argument. Amarillo is in the northern district of Texas. Any citizen who is otherwise qualified and who lives in that district has a right to be appointed as judge in that district.

But as I have attempted to prove during the brief period I have spoken here, this appointment is used as a sinister, diabolical plot of the New Deal gang in Texas and Washington to purge the junior Senator from Texas, and the entire case points in that direction as proof.

Fort Worth is my home town. I have lived in Fort Worth ever since I have lived in Texas. Fort Worth is where I purchased my home a few days after I reached Texas, and it is where I reared my children and where they went to grammar school and later to high school. It is where I was president of the Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce. It is where I established my own business enterprise. It was from Fort Worth that I broadcast daily on the radio for almost 8 years. I love Fort Worth; I am loyal to Fort Worth. These fiends who would seek to humiliate and embarrass me decided that they would pick my home town of Fort Worth and would deprive it of the Federal judgeship simply to humiliate and embarrass me, the junior Senator from the State of Texas, in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. President, throughout our history Senators have been respected in the matter of appointments in their home towns; and any man who will not stand up and fight for his home town, in my opinion, cannot be classified as a man.

They knew I would fight for my own home town and that it would bring this nomination up for debate on the floor of the Senate. So, over the protest of a resolution adopted by the Fort Worth Bar Association and over the protests of many of the attorneys in Fort Worth, they went 340 miles away to select a judge. The President did not advise with me in regard to this nomination, and they tried to force this nomination through, and it has gotten this far. That is why they use this argument.

Mr. President, that is one of the real reasons for this nomination, namely, to use the Senate of the United States, this great, dignified body which has existed ever since our Republic was born, to use this Senate as a political weapon to purge one of its Members.

In the next campaign there will be plenty of proof of that. Plenty of proof of what I am saying will be found in the Texas newspapers at the present time. In the Texas newspapers of today propaganda will be found to the effect that the

junior Senator from Texas has proven himself to be entirely ineffective, and that Texas has only one Senator.

Mr. President, to show further how this reacts against every honest citizen in the State of Texas, how this kind of skullduggery reacts directly against the citizens of my State, let me say that it is well known that for any citizen of my State, regardless of his qualifications—he may have perfect qualifications for any Federal appointment—if he is recommended, or if he has in the past been recommended, up until the appointment now under consideration was sent in, it was the kiss of death, it was the seal of doom on that honest citizen, simply that he was known as the friend of the junior Senator from Texas.

Mr. President, I say that is a bad situation. I am fighting for the people, the good citizens of my State. They are the ones who should be protected, and they are the ones who were intended to have protection when our wise forefathers wrote the Constitution of the United States. That is why the framers of our Constitution gave each sovereign State two Senators, whom they looked upon as ambassadors from the sovereign States, to represent those States. Their United States Senators are the only voices the citizens of Texas have here. They cannot go to the polls and vote for their Federal judge. They must be content to have that great officer imposed upon them without their consent except for the wee small voice of one or both of the Senators who may choose to represent those who object to the nomination.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am here on the Senate floor performing my solemn duty, regardless of the political consequences. It is more important, for the sake of every Senator now present and every Senator who may come into the Senate in the future, that the United States Senate be not used as a political weapon than that I be reelected as a United States Senator. My personal career sinks into insignificance compared with this important matter that is before the United States Senate at the present time.

There are people throughout this entire Nation who are utterly disgusted with the manner in which Federal appointments have been used as political pap by the executive department during the last 14 years. It is the subject of news articles; it is the subject of stories written by men such as James Farley, former chairman of the Democratic National Committee, exposing the whole situation, showing how a Senator on this floor must be purged, as was stated by the President and reported by Mr. Farley, if he would not go along with the administration and vote as they said for him to vote.

Mr. President, I do not think any Senator here would ever claim he was infallible. We all make mistakes at times. I confess I may have been wrong at times. But I have been conscientious. I vote my conscience. I vote what I believe to be right, and that is what the people of my State expect me to do. They did not expect me to come here and be a "yes" man to the administration. One of the planks on which I ran was this: "If you send me to Washington as your Senator, I will exercise my own judgment, and will not be a 'yes' man for the President or anybody else."

Mr. President, I am fighting for that principle. I want every Senator to be protected. I do not want any Senator to vote on the nomination of Joe Dooley because he likes the color of my eyes or the color of my hair, or because he likes me or dislikes me. We have to get away from that. We have to get down to fundamental principles, because every judge who has been appointed to the bench throughout the United States has had the approval of the United States Senate. It is high time we were giving consideration to that thought.

I doubt that many Senators would relish the idea of having to rise on the floor of the Senate and oppose the nomination of any man from his State. It is not a very enjoyable task. But it is duty, and we must rise above the temptation to do enjoyable things, and must perform our duty, regardless of the consequences.

I know not what will happen, but when I finish this letter from Judge Wilson, the present judge in Fort Worth, my colleagues will see what he thinks they will do to me at the polls next year, if I dare rise on this floor and perform my duty.

I have not yet announced whether or not I shall run for reelection as United States Senator next year. Next year, when my present term expires, will be the time when I will run, if I decide to run. I shall announce at the proper time whether or not I shall be a candidate. But whether I am a candidate or not has no significance compared with the appointment we are discussing. I am objecting to this appointment because it is a bad appointment, it is a political appointment.

The decision of the United States Senators may have some bearing on my election, if it is heralded through the State of Texas, as was the approval of the President in the case of a former opponent of mine. It may have some bearing on the outcome of the next election, if I run, but there is one thing sure, the action of the Senate will have no bearing whatsoever on my decision as to whether I shall run or not. That is a matter for me to decide at a later date.

Mr. President, this letter from the attorney of the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe, Mr. H. C. Pipkin, continues:

> Mr. Dooley was born at San Angelo, Tex., was educated in the public schools and at the University of Texas, where he graduated in 1911. For a number of years his father, now deceased, was associated with the Southern Pacific interests in Texas, at Nacogdoches, and later at Shreveport. Mr. Dooley came to Amarillo in 1911, entered the practice of law here, and through the years has been an outstanding member of the bar. He is now president of the State bar of Texas.

Mr. President, that statement could not have been made when this petition was signed. The petition was dated June 12, 1944, and not sent to me until almost a year later, May 29, 1945, in order that the statement might be made that Mr. Dooley was president of the Texas Bar Association. That was part of the campaign, as I have said before. The letter continues:

> He is now president of the State bar of Texas and has had a fine administration. Mr. Dooley is unquestionably of the judicial type of temperament. He would come nearer than any lawyer I know in having the unanimous support of the bar, and in addition to this his appointment would meet with widespread public approval.

Mr. President, that is what the attorney for the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe says, that Mr. Dooley would have the unanimous support of the bar. All through the long hearings, when the Senate Committee on the Judiciary sat so patiently and listened to every bit of evidence and testimony that was produced, the statement was made again and again and again that Mr. Dooley had the unanimous support of the bar.

It made me just a little curious to know whether or not one man in the northern district had the unanimous consent of the bar of Texas, in view of what some of the best attorneys in Texas had told me, and I thought I would endeavor to find out. So I made certain inquiries, and this is what happened: I received letter after letter from able, outstanding attorneys. Each one would say, "Now, I am going to tell you the truth in this letter, but, for goodness sake, do not divulge my name, because I may find myself coming up before Judge Dooley some day, and if he knows that I have opposed his confirmation, I shall not expect to get much consideration from him as judge." In Texas it is generally recognized that when any appointee gets the approval of this New Deal gang in Washington, he is just the same as confirmed. That is the way they have been slipping through here, ever since I have been a United States Senator. This is the first time I have appeared on the floor of the United States Senate to object to the confirmation of a Federal judge in Texas. I would not be doing it now, possibly—I would not be doing it now at least with the hope of any success—were it not for the fact, which has been pointed out to me by many able men in Texas and which has been intimated by the judge, himself, that possibly there would be a different system of handling appointments and confirmations of Federal judges after the election that took place last November 5. They knew many appointments had been railroaded through the Senate during the New Deal administration, but people down in Texas noted that the Republicans were going to be in control of the United States Senate.

While Texas is a great Democratic State, and while I have been honored at the polls every time I ran for public office on the Democratic ticket in Texas—four times—I want to say to Senators that there was great rejoicing in the hearts of many citizens of Texas when the Republicans won control of the Congress last November 5. We were a Democratic State, utterly helpless to help ourselves. The Democratic people down in Texas are still clinging to the good old Jeffersonian democracy. They are utterly sick and tired of this New Deal tomfoolery; but what can they do

about it? It is absolutely certain we are not going to elect any Republicans in Texas; we do not do that; we elect Democrats. Some of them get up here, and become "yes men." So the people thought, "Well, we cannot save ourselves, but maybe the United States Senate, having a Republican majority, can save us, or help save us, from these appointments that we have been getting for the last few years." That gave them encouragement to urge me on and on and on. They believed that if the New Dealers tried to stuff this nomination of Joe B. Dooley down the throats of the people in the northern district, they would have at least one United States Senator who would stand on this floor to oppose it. That is what I am doing. I am doing my duty.

I have this letter from H. C. Pipkin, attorney and lobbyist for the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe. He is not the only attorney for the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe who is endorsing Mr. Dooley, either. Mr. Dooley seems to be a favorite with the big railroad corporations, the big insurance corporations, the big oil corporations.

If I hold out with breath long enough for the next few days, I expect to tell a great deal about this nomination on the floor of the Senate. We might just as well tell the whole story; we have got started now. The letter continues:

> Your endorsement and support of Mr. Dooley will be very highly appreciated. If you desire further information concerning him, I will be glad to furnish this promptly. In these times one of the finest services that can be rendered to the general public is the appointment of competent and qualified judges who can be counted upon to support our laws and to preserve our institutions. This recommendation of Mr. Dooley is without reservation and I hope you will conclude to give his appointment your full approval and support.

I was starting to explain this unanimous approval of the Texas Bar Association, of all the members of the Texas bar; I thought I would look into it. The replies I received came from good attorneys, who knew that they might be seriously handicapped if they objected to the nomination after it had been made, because, just as in the past, it has been routine; it goes on through, once it has been made. This one has not gone through. It was made on January 8, and it has not yet gone through. But I was not getting very far, asking them to speak out. They wrote me but each one would say, "Do not use my name." Letter after letter contained the request, "Do not use my name."

I have a letter here which I should like to read right at this time, if I can find it, Mr. President, one of those "do not use my name" letters; and I am not going to divulge the man's name. I want to give it as a sample. I expect more than a hundred letters were received by me along the same line, saying, "Do not use my name," because the writers are practicing attorneys. It is easy to understand why they would not want their names used in a case such as this. There is but one name that can be used, and that is the name of the junior Senator from Texas. I shall use my name anywhere, whenever I think it is in the cause of righteousness and justice. So this letter comes from another judge in Texas, a State district judge; it is on his letterhead, and it is marked "Confidential." It is signed by him. I want to read it:

> DEAR SENATOR O'DANIEL: It would be unfair to you and Mr. Dooley both for me to answer your inquiry of April 1 with a simple "yes" or "no."

Yes or no, whether he did or did not want Mr. Dooley as his judge.

> If I had to do so the answer would be "no."

Now, this is coming from a judge who is serving not only in Texas, but in this same district.

> I know Joe Dooley well. He has tried many cases in my court and I have tried cases against him when I was practicing law. I do not want to be quoted because if he gets the appointment I may have to practice in his court some day.

That is what the judge says. The letter continues:

> In the first place I want to say that there are plenty of lawyers and judges in the northern district of Texas more qualified for this particular position than is Mr. Dooley. Though I think he is honest and would try to be fair on the bench I do not believe he could do so, because he knows only one side of a lawsuit. His specialty is representing insurance companies, and he is an expert at defeating claims against them, both legitimate and illegitimate.
>
> I do not think a lawyer who has represented only the plaintiff's side of the docket or only the defendant's side should be appointed to a lifetime position so important. I believe the appointment should come either from the members of the district and appellate judges or should be a lawyer who has had general practice.

Mr. President, I stated on the floor yesterday that I regretted very much that I did not have the benefit of a legal education. I am not an attorney. I am not a member of the bar. I wish I were, but circumstances prevented me from going to the university at the time I should have gone. As I said yesterday, my parents were tenant farmers, and instead of going to the university I was plowing corn. Therefore I do not have the legal experience properly to judge a letter of this nature as members of the bar can judge it. I am reading from the letter which has come to me from a legal mind. Members of the bar and attorneys will understand it possibly better than a layman can understand it. The letter continues:

> In addition to the above reasons, I respectfully call your attention to the fact that Mr. Dooley's firm has dictated the last three appointments to the court of civil appeals at Amarillo.

Mr. Dooley is a member of one of the strongest law firms in all west Texas, if not the strongest, Underwood, Dooley, Johnson & Wilson, a great, powerful law firm. But under the New Deal administration, according to what many reputable attorneys have told me, in practicing before the courts it is not a question of what one knows, but a question of whom he knows. It is a question of the attorneys using their influence to force appointments on the Federal bench, and any client seeking the services of an attorney who might win his case in Texas first makes a thorough investigation to find out how well the attorney knows the judge. That is more important than knowing the law, under the New Deal scheme or plan of skulduggery. I reread what the judge wrote:

> In addition to the above reasons, I respectfully call your attention to the fact that Mr. Dooley's firm has dictated the last three appointments to the court of civil appeals at Amarillo.

I continue to read from the letter:

> Two of the three have been taken from the court and put in the firm and the last appointment, a boy with practically no trial experience was appointed through the influence of the firm. I happen to know a member of the firm called the Governor of Texas and asked him not to make an appointment until two men could fly down and see him that night. They flew down, the governor gave them an interview and they came back with the appointment in their pocket. I say that is too much influence for one firm to have with a court.
>
> If it will help your fight to read any part of this letter you have my authority to do so, but I do not want my name mentioned. I am sure a United States Senator would not abuse this confidence.

Mr. President, I exhibit the letter. It can be seen that it is on the letterhead of the writer, and that it is signed, but I cannot read the signature. I am not going to divulge the writer's name because he gave me the information in confidence.

We have a situation in Texas which I tell the Senate is serious. It is no laughing matter. It is a serious proposition and the only way we can hope to change the situation and secure a different type of judge on the bench is for one of the two United States Senators to appeal to his brother Senators for justice. I do so not for personal benefit, but for justice, justice in the State of Texas, and I presume there may be some need for justice in some of the other States.

I have here the letter which I read from an attorney, and a great number of petitions, showing conclusively that 9 days before the judge announced that he was going to retire the lobbying department of the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe was busy securing signatures to petitions for their employee, an employee of the railroad corporation, to be appointed judge.

Yes, there were other candidates. There are many people in the northern district of Texas who would have liked to receive that appointment, but there were too many of them who were known to be friends of W. LEE O'DANIEL, the junior Senator from Texas, and if I had recommended one of them, regardless of his qualifications, it would have been the kiss of death. In fact, I did send two names to the Attorney General. I sent the names of two practicing attorneys, both judges at this time, who had almost perfect qualifications, except for the fact that they were friends of W. LEE O'DANIEL, and except for the further fact that they happened to live in my home town. Those who originated this political plot did not want any attorney appointed from my home town. They wanted an individual appointed who lived just as far away from my home town as

possible. Of course, a perfect right exists to have anyone from any town in the district appointed. I admit that Amarillo is a great city. I am proud of Amarillo, and I would not consent to take the judgeship away from Amarillo if it had been established there for 70 years, and if a United States Senator had lived in Amarillo. I am proud of every city and town in my home State, but when an effort is made to rob my home town of a judgeship which has been filled by a ctizen of that town for almost 70 years, for the express purpose of embarrassing and humiliating one of the United States Senators who will not be a "yes man" for the New Deal administration, then I am against it. I do not think it is right.

Mr. President, I was reading the letter from Judge Wilson. There is so much contained in the letter written by Judge Wilson that I must digress to comment on it. This is from the letter written by Judge Wilson of Fort Worth on January 10, addressed to me:

I became 70 years of age June 21, 1944. A few days before that, in order that all of the bars of Texas would have a chance to furnish my successor, I announced that I was going to retire. The matter stood that way for some weeks, until it became pretty generally discussed. Mr. Clark, now Attorney General, flew by Amarillo to see me about my proposed retirement. He told me they were in great difficulties with the war, and asked me if I would wait until Germany went out. I assured him if they really wanted that, and that there was nothing the matter with me; that I simply thought all judges should retire at 70, but upon their request to do so, I would continue.

The letter continues:

When Germany went out, then both Attorney General Clark and Senator CONNALLY let me know that they would like for me to hold on until Japan went out. I, in substance, told them the same as before—that on account of the war situation I would gladly hold on. After Japan went out, in August of 1945, Senator CONNALLY, as chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Senate, was immediately dragged into these important negotiations and meetings and councils we had touching our foreign relations. Knowing how important his duties were and how strenuous they evidently were, I simply did not have it in my heart to bother him with such a trivial matter, so the result was that I did not call it to his attention, being our senior Senator, until more than a year after Japan had gone out. Not knowing whether his other duties were so strenuous as to permit the consideration of my matter, I prepared my retirement, addressed to the President, and left the date off. I sent it to Senator CONNALLY and told him when he got to where he could attend to the matter to date my retirement and hand it to the President. I do not know exactly, but I think it was dated the 9th of August 1946.

Judge Wilson had reached the retirement age of 70. He desired to retire, and urged that he be permitted to retire and that his successor be appointed. He was asked to remain until Germany was defeated. Judge Wilson does not profess to be a great general. He was not fighting the war. He was a judge in the northern district of Texas. After Germany went down, he was asked to remain on the bench until Japan was defeated. What he had to do with that situation I do not know, but I do know that I hold in my hand a record of civil appointments and a grand summary of the civilian appointments of the Seventy-sixth Congress from January 3, 1941, and through the Seventy-seventh, Seventy-eighth, Seventy-ninth, and Eightieth Congresses, up to and including April 14, 1947.

There were 7,632 civilian nominations; 7,604 confirmed; 38 withdrawn; 3 rejected; and 27 unconfirmed.

The summary of all appointments, including the Army and Navy, shows a total of 104,371; confirmed, 101,280; rejected, 22; withdrawn, 93; unconfirmed, 2,984. There is the record, Mr. President, all through the period of the war. It seems to me that our appointive machinery was in full gear. It was working right along. There was nothing to prevent its action. Nominations were being made and confirmations were being made. Just why Mr. Dooley could not have been nominated during the war is beyond me. I see no reason why it could not have been done. In my opinion, the excuse contained in the letter from Judge Wilson is flimsy.

There was another reason for putting off this appointment. The various interests were conniving and working together to try to get their man on the Federal bench at a time to humiliate and embarrass the junior Senator from Texas in his home town, to hang him on the court house square in his home town. That is what they hoped to do. The New Deal gang has tried almost everything under the sun to purge me from the United States Senate. This is a new attempt. They want to hang me in my home-town square. I do not want to be hanged there, but I cannot keep them from trying.

I could not keep the President from extending his right hand to one of his political stooges in the House of Representatives and giving him his blessing to go down to Texas and defeat O'DANIEL. He was sent down there with all the CIO money that was needed. Pictures were taken of the President of the United States with his hand outstretched toward this man. It looked as though the President's arm were stretching a distance equal to the distance across this room, to try to reach that man. In the picture the President and that man were shaking hands. The President of the United States wanted that Member of the House of Representatives in the Senate to be his "yes man." In the campaign this man acknowledged that he was the President's "man."

The people in Texas simply do not like the idea of electing a "yes man" if they know it. If the candidate had kept quiet, it might have worked, but when he admitted that he was a "yes man" he did not get very far.

A great deal of money was spent in the campaign. The pictures to which I refer were enlarged and big posters made from them. The posters were exhibited along the highways all over Texas. One could drive in their shade all up and down the highways of Texas. The sun's rays could hardly penetrate to the highway because the signs were so thick.

The scheme did not work. In the next campaign something else was tried. The New Dealers are always trying something new. They never give up. The New Deal never gives up unless it is forced to do so. Some of the New Dealers gave up last November 5; but they have not died. They are still fighting. They tried something else. They said, "It would not work to get one of the boys from the House of Representatives to run against O'DANIEL with the blessing of the President, so let us try a new scheme." In the next election they tried something new. They said, "Let us use the Federal bench in this political campaign. We have made a political football of the Federal bench for the past 14 years, so let us do a good job on this one." They had a little stooge down in Texas who would do anything the administration asked him to do. They had him on the bench. He was a Federal judge. Mr. Dooley seeks to be a Federal judge. The President had appointed this Federal judge, and the appointment was rushed through without the recommendation of either of the United States Senators. That shows how far they went. It shows to what extent Texas has been abused. Texas has two United States Senators. The Constitution provides that Senators of the United States shall advise with the President on the appointment of Federal judges. But the President of the United States was joyriding through Texas, and from the rear end of his train he announced the appointment of a Federal judge down there. It did not make any difference in that case that the Federal judge did not live in the district. He did not have the recommendation of either of the United States Senators—and I was not a United States Senator at that time, either.

The New Dealers thought, "He will be a good stooge." Then they commenced looking around to try to find some way to purge Senator O'DANIEL out of the United States Senate when he came up for reelection.

The record of this judge, so far as getting votes is concerned, had been wonderful. He was a great vote-getting candidate. He had been twice elected attorney general of the State of Texas and twice elected Governor of the State of Texas. There he was, with all those honors wrapped around him, and was then further honored by being appointed to sit in that grand place on the Federal bench. So they looked up and saw this great vote-getting man, and said, "That is the kind of man we want. We do not know of anybody who can get more votes as an opponent of Senator O'DANIEL." So they reached up on the bench and dragged the judge down from that high pedestal of honor; they dragged him off the Federal bench and put him into a political campaign for the purpose of trying to make him United States Senator.

They were not satisfied with that. They thought that possibly they needed some more help. This New Deal gang gets quite worried when they begin to think about my reelection. The reason for it is not wholly on account of any special qualifications that I possess, but is on account of the sturdiness and rugged individualism of the vast majority of the good, sound people of the State of Texas. They are the ones who

sent me. I did not do it myself. The fact of the matter is that the first time I was elected I did not have a thing on earth to do with it. I did not even vote for myself. I think it is the only case in the history of the United States in which a candidate for Governor did not vote for himself. The only reason why I did not vote was because I had not paid the poll tax. There is a poll-tax law in Texas, and the poll tax must be paid before a person can vote. I was opposed to payment for the privilege of voting. I have a receipt now; I have had one ever since then. Previous to that I did not have any idea of ever running for Governor.

They got the idea that they had one good candidate to run against O'DANIEL, and should have another. So they found an attorney in Texas who also had a splendid record of getting votes. He was very popular in his day. He had been twice elected as attorney general of the State of Texas and had been twice elected as Governor of the great State of Texas. So they thought, "We will get these two fellows in the first primary and force O'DANIEL into a run-off. If we can ever get him into a run-off we will pour money into Texas and we will surely beat him." They never had done that before. They succeeded part way. They got me in the run-off with the "gold dust twins." That is what I called them. They had plenty of gold. They had so much gold that they just made the dust fly. They did everything but succeed. They were both defeated.

I feel very proud of the people of Texas for honoring me to the extent of defeating practically every big-shot politician at present living in Texas—governors, former governors, attorneys general, railroad commissioners, Congressmen. I have a list of them. I think, if I ever get time, I will get an album in which to place the portraits of those candidates. Some are great men. I was not defeating just a bunch of insignificant candidates. They were the best produced in Texas. I shall get an album and put in it the pictures of those men. There are 50 or more of them. I shall keep it among my souvenirs.

They were not successful, so they devised a new plan this year. They say: "If O'DANIEL runs for reelection we will use the United States Senate the next time. We have already used the White House, the House of Representatives, and the judiciary. We are going to use the United States Senate. We will make an appointment down there in his home town, and if he has any manhood about him at all he will oppose it, we will get the matter on the floor of the Senate, and get a vote on it. Then we will take that vote and publish it in the CIO papers in Texas"—and there are plenty of them—and some of the other papers that are not CIO papers, and they will say, "Here is what the United States Senate said."

It has already been published all over Texas that the junior Senator has no influence at all in Washington, that he is a perfect nonentity, and they seek to prove it by the RECORD. That is why this matter is on the floor of the Senate today. They are trying to use in that manner this dignified body of United States Senators who stand on the firing line trying to protect this Nation, and upholding democracy and liberty in this Chamber, where we have unlimited debate, where every Senator has a right to rise on the floor and speak as long as he wants to about anything he cares to discuss. This is the only body of that type left in the world at the present time. They are seeking to contaminate the United States Senate and trying to drag it down and use it as a political weapon, just as they dragged down the sacred robes of the judiciary and placed them in the political mire. They are trying to do the same with the United States Senate.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I gladly yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I agree with the Senator from Texas that there should be no contamination of the United States Senate, but can the Senator from Texas tell us now whether, if this body approves and ratifies the nomination, it will effect any contamination of the United States Senate?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I am glad the Senator has asked that question. I do not know whether he knows what real politics is; but we have it in Texas. If he will just wait—it does not make any difference what the outcome may be in the United States Senate—it will be an issue in the coming campaign if I am a candidate. That is why the question is here.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator be so kind as to indulge me for another moment?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I shall be glad to indulge the Senator for as many moments, hours, or days as he cares to be indulged.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from New Mexico wants Texas to run its own politics. The Senator from New Mexico would be satisfied with any Senator Texas elects to the United States Senate. I want to be fair, and I do not want to interfere with the politics of Texas. That is the business of Texas. I believe in New Mexico's running its own politics and I believe in Texas running its politics. What I have in mind is not Texas politics. If Texas wants to send my good friend back to the Senate, I still feel like submitting to the inevitable and letting Texas decide. But at this particular moment I am interested in whether, as to this political nominee, whom I happen to know and who is well known to the people of my State, I would be justified in casting my vote to confirm his nomination, or whether the nominee is not qualified for the position.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I appreciate that remark from the able Senator from New Mexico, and I have a high regard for him, and believe in his sincerity. It may be that the particular argument which I am using at the present time does not have sufficient appeal. But I have other arguments; I have a variety of arguments against this nomination, some of which may appeal to one Senator and some to another. It is a bad nomination from A to Z; all the way along it is bad. Perhaps I shall say something after awhile which will convince the Senator that it is a bad nomination. I have the highest respect for the sovereign State of New Mexico. I believe Senators elected there are elected to represent the people of the State of New Mexico.

If either one of the Senators from New Mexico were to rise on the floor of the Senate and tell me that a certain nomination was personally obnoxious to him, I would not ask the Senator for any other reason for opposing it. I have sufficient confidence and sufficient respect for each one of the Senators from New Mexico so that I would gladly invoke the unwritten law of Senatorial courtesy. I would do that in any case, whether it be one involving the Senators from New Mexico or one involving the Senators from any other State of the Union. That is my policy. I believe that the people of each sovereign State elect their Senators becouse they have confidence in them, and I believe that the Senators from each State know more about the politics and policies and everything else concerning their States than any outside persons do.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEM in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I agree with the Senator from Texas that Texas politics are Texas politics, and that what is done there is a matter of their concern, not mine.

But I am confused as to whether, after considering the nomination of this man, who has the respect of a great many among the bench and bar of my State, I am to vote on the basis of his qualifications, or whether I am to vote on the basis of Texas politics.

Mr. President, what is the duty of other Senators? We do not wish to interfere with Texas politics or with politics in any other State. But this nomination has been submitted to the Senate, and Senators have the obligation and duty of passing judgment, not on Texas politics or New Mexico politics, but on the question of whether the nominee is qualified and answers the requirements of the position to which he has been nominated.

Will the Senator enlighten me?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Yes; that is what I have been doing, and I have some more lights that I shall turn on for the enlightenment of Senators as the days go by, because this is a bad nomination any way it is looked at.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The question of qualifications is one thing. If the Senator shows us that the nomination is a bad one, that the nominee is not qualified and does not meet the necessary requirements, that is one thing. But I do not wish to pass judgment on account of Texas politics.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. I should like to make this observation on the comment made by the Senator from New Mexico: If the nominee's qualifications are the sole test by which the nomination is to be

judged and by which we are to determine whether the nomination should be confirmed or should not be confirmed, that is one thing. I have heard the testimony that was given in the committee in regard to this nomination.

But I think the question here, pure and simple, is whether the Senate will follow the precedents that sometimes have been followed and sometimes have not been followed in cases in which one Senator from the State from which the appointment is made says that the appointee is obnoxious to him.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, if that is the argument, well and good. I understand that is one line of argument on this matter. But the main basis, in my opinion, is whether the nominee is qualified.

I would not want to go into Texas politics, any more than I would want to go into Oklahoma politics. I say to the Senator from Oklahoma that if Oklahoma elects a Senator, I am for him.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I do not think that has anything to do with this question; I do not think we are here concerned with what particular brand of politics may be practiced in Texas or in New Mexico or in Oklahoma.

I think the question that has presented itself to many Senators in the past, and that presents itself to many Senators even now, is whether they are to give due consideration and are to extend due courtesies to the Senators from the State from which the appointment is made.

I admit that the precedents are not uniform. As we have heard it said on this floor, some great Senators have held that, in their opinion, when a Senator from a State says that an appointment is personally obnoxious to him, he is not required to go further and to assign the reasons for it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think we should consider the point the Senator from Oklahoma has made. But I should like to know whether I correctly understand the Senator from Oklahoma to mean that the only proposition before this body is that one of the Senators from the State has objected to the nomination for reasons of his own, which no one has questioned; and that aside from that, the qualifications of the nominee are sufficient?

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, I have said that the nominee's qualifications are superior. So far as I am concerned, I have said, and I say now, that the witnesses who appeared in regard to this nomination were almost uniform in testifying that this appointee, Mr. Dooley, is a capable and competent man. But when an appointment is under consideration for confirmation—and especially an appointment to the bench—it rarely ever occurs that anyone takes the chance of appearing before the committee and pointing out the shortcomings of the appointee, because it is the general feeling that when a nomination is made by the President and is sent to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary for its consideration, and when it holds a hearing and testimony is given, and when both Senators from the State—whether it be the State of New Mexico or the State of Texas or the State of Virginia—say that the appointee is satisfactory, unless some controlling objection is made, the Senate does not go much further. That has been my observation in connection with appointments handled in the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more to me?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am attempting to state my confusion in regard to what I am to do if the nomination shall come up for final action this afternoon, if we are to "count noses," this afternoon. How am I to judge what I shall do, under my oath of office, in regard to this matter? Am I to vote on the basis of the nominee's qualifications? Am I to vote on the basis of Texas politics? Or am I to vote because one of the Senators from that State may object to the particular nominee? That is what I wish to find out. I admit that an objection by one of the Senators from the State is a good argument.

Under a Senator's duty and the oath of office that all Senators take, what are we to do? I come from outside the State of Texas, and I am not interested in Texas politics.

It seems to me that when Senators are considering the question of confirmation of a nomination for a judicial position in Texas, the primary question, without going into all the ramifications of who recommended him, and so forth, is whether the nominee is qualified.

So I should like to ascertain whether he is or is not qualified for the particular position to which he has been nominated. If he is qualified, there might be some other matter which would convince me that we should vote against confirmation of the nomination. Probably the objection of one of the Senators from the State would suffice. But I do not wish to be influenced by politics. I do not mind following the best judgment of one of the Senators from that State but I do not want the politics of a State to determine my vote.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me once more?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. MOORE. The Senator from New Mexico has made a fair statement and has given a good reason why he should use his own particular judgment in deciding how he should vote on this nomination. He is interested in the matter of the nominee's qualifications. I think each Senator must determine in his own conscience how he should vote on this nomination.

As for me, I propose at this time, and I think I shall continue to do so, to take the position that unless the appointment is approved by both Senators from the State in which the office lies, I will not vote for confirmation of the nomination. I think I can do that and still be in complete conformity with the oath that I took as a Senator.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I respect the judgment of the Senator from Oklahoma even though I might not agree that that would be a logical conclusion. I respect the Senator from Oklahoma for trying to protect the interests of those whom the people of a State have trusted to represent them in the United States Senate. Whether I agree with the Senator or not, I think that is a beautiful thing.

Mr. MOORE. Commenting further on what the Senator has said, and the position he takes, I certainly can find no fault with his position. I think he can do what he has indicated in all conscience. I think he can do it in conformity with the oath he took. This happens to be a case coming from the State of Texas, where the two Senators are of the same political faith. The people of Texas have elected the senior Senator time and time again to represent the State of Texas, and they have elected twice or more the junior Senator from the State of Texas; so there is reason for believing that the junior Senator from the State of Texas represents a substantial segment of the people of Texas, just as the senior Senator represents a substantial segment of the people of Texas.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the junior Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not take a back seat to any Senator in the matter of respect for the senior Senator or the junior Senator of any State. I venture to say that the junior Senator from Texas will agree that, so far as I am concerned, there has always been manifested by me toward all Senators respect, kindness, and everything of that nature. But the arguments to which I have listened seek to persuade me to vote one way or another on account of Texas politics. I do not want to decide on that basis. I happen to know Judge Dooley. Amarillo, Tex., is closer to my home than it is to the home town of the Senator from Texas. Judge Dooley and I go back and forth with one another. We in New Mexico try to know our neighbors by reputation, and, irrespective of how this body votes, I venture to say that the members of the bench and bar in my State who know Mr. Dooley have the highest regard and respect for him.

I care not a continental whom Texas elects to the United States Senate; I shall respect him. If Texas wants to change to A and B, that is still the business of Texas. But I do want to say that so far as reputation for integrity, for honesty, for fair play, for qualifications and training as a lawyer are concerned, the reputation the nominee has in my State is of the best. That is all I would say. I merely want to be fair.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I regret that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] has left the floor, because I wanted to state that I appreciated the statements he made and the subject he introduced.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield for the purpose of my suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would like to suggest to the Senator from Texas, for his protection, that if he yield——

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have no desire to take advantage of the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is sure that is so.

Mr. HATCH. I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, and that the Senator from Texas not lose the floor by yielding for that purpose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Baldwin	Hill	O'Daniel
Ball	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Holland	Overton
Bricker	Ives	Pepper
Bridges	Jenner	Reed
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Revercomb
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson, Va.
Bushfield	Kem	Robertson, Wyo.
Butler	Kilgore	Russell
Byrd	Knowland	Saltonstall
Capper	Langer	Smith
Chavez	Lodge	Sparkman
Connally	Lucas	Stewart
Cooper	McCarran	Taft
Cordon	McCarthy	Taylor
Donnell	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McFarland	Tydings
Dworshak	McGrath	Umstead
Ecton	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ellender	McMahon	Watkins
Ferguson	Magnuson	Wherry
Flanders	Malone	White
Fulbright	Martin	Wiley
Green	Millikin	Williams
Gurney	Moore	Wilson
Hatch	Morse	Young
Hawkes	Murray	
Hayden	Myers	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I am very sorry that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is not in the Chamber at present, because a few moments ago he asked some questions which were very interesting and very pertinent. I have the highest regard for the Senator from New Mexico, and I appreciate his interest in asking questions. However, I am led to believe that possibly I failed to make myself clear on the subject under discussion at the particular moment when he was interrogating me. I was elucidating Texas politics. That is a subject upon which one can talk easily. It is quite an extensive subject. In talking on that subject I did not intend to indicate that any Senator should consider Texas politics in making up his mind as to how to vote on this nomination. I was using that subject to point out what I considered to be a very evil practice, the practice of attempting to use the United States Senate as a political weapon in elections in any State—not particularly in Texas.

I pointed out that so far as my political career in Texas is concerned, the vote of the Senate will have no bearing whatever on my decision as to whether or not I shall run for reelection. As to what influence it may have on the election if I do run, that is a matter to be determined later.

What I am trying to point out is something that is aimed at the heart of every Senator. If the Senate can be dragged down into a political campaign by virtue of using a Federal appointment against one Senator, it establishes a precedent which may strike at the heart of any Member of this body, or any future Senator.

I abhor the idea of using the United States Senate as a political weapon. That is because I love the United States Senate. No one has a higher regard for our great constitutional form of Government than I have. No one has a greater admiration for the United States Senate as a body, and for every United States Senator, than I have. I do not believe that Senators should knowingly permit this body to be used as a political weapon. That is exactly what is being done in connection with the Dooley nomination. Knowing that to be a fact, I consider it my duty to call it to the attention of Members of the Senate, and that was what I was attempting to do. I was not using Texas politics as a reason for my objection on the ground of personal obnoxiousness. I was not using it as a reason for expecting any Member of the Senate to take an interest in Texas politics.

The question is far more important than that. A principle is involved. Matters of grave importance nationally and internationally are facing the Senate. We should occupy our minds in the consideration of matters of great national and international concern. We should never attempt to lower the dignity of this body by permitting it to be used as a political weapon by designing politicians outside the United States Senate. There are many designing politicians outside the United States Senate who would, by subterfuge or any other method—and some of the methods are very cleverly conceived—involve a United States Senator in carrying water for them.

I do not believe that any United States Senator would wilfully, premeditatedly, or designedly lend his influence to the proposition of degradation of the United States Senate by converting it into a political weapon. That is the point which I was trying to make. I am trying to make several points, in order to show that the Dooley nomination is bad from A to Z. That is one of the points. Another point is that the nomination is personally obnoxious. Those Senators who desire to observe, protect, and preserve the great unwritten law of Senatorial courtesy may do so. Any Senator who thinks he does not care to perpetuate that rule has a right to vote the other way; and I do not question the vote of any Senator on any subject. There is one thing, thank goodness, a United States Senator can do, he can vote any way he believes is absolutely right, and no one has the right to question his vote. At least, a brother Senator has no right to question it. Maybe his constituents may question it. I, as United States Senator, never have questioned and never shall question the vote of a brother Senator.

Mr. President, I love this body. I never expected to have the high honor of being a Member of the United States Senate. I came from very humble parentage, without money, without influence. My parents were just honest, rugged American citizens who worked and toiled with their hands, and never neglected to see that their children got to school, and that they had books. It never occurred to me that a man of such humble surroundings could ever be elevated to the high position of United States Senator. It is certainly a great mark of honor to become a United States Senator. It shows that we have the greatest Government on the face of God's green earth, when a humble tenant farmer's son, from the plains of the West, can be elevated to this high body. I have surely respected that honor. Ever since I have been here I have tried my best, and have succeeded, never to utter one ill word against a brother Senator. I have tried to conduct myself in an honorable manner, so that down through history my children and my children's children might know that their father and grandfather certainly tried to live up to his convictions as an honest, God-fearing American citizen.

So, Mr. President, as I bring out these different points, personal obnoxiousness is one; dragging the United States Senate down into the mire as a political weapon is another; the disqualifications of the nominee are another, together with the fact that hundreds of citizens in his community, who know him well, do not want him as a Federal judge. There are several other reasons. I shall try to touch on every one of those reasons, so that if a Senator does not believe that there is sufficient ground for him to vote against confirmation on one point, there will be another reason that should be sufficient.

I wanted to make that point clear, and I appreciate the fact that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] called my attention to it by asking a question. I certainly do not wish to be misunderstood. The point I was trying to make was that this Dooley appointment is a trick, to use this great body as a political weapon in one of our sovereign States for the purpose of purging a United States Senator.

So I continue reading from this very informative letter written to me on January 10 of this year by a judge who has served 25 years or longer, has reached the retirement age of 70, and who has been trying to retire for more than 3 years. Those who have been engineering the campaign of his successor have strung it out on a very weak excuse, from month to month and from year to year, with no valid reason whatever. As has been stated, there was a double-barreled reason why they have strung it out for over 3 years. One object is to make it a political issue in the next campaign.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am sure the Senator does not mean to say that, after the Dooley nomination was sent to the Senate, either the subcommittee or the full Judiciary Committee was guilty of any tactics of delay. I am sure the Senator

will agree that we proceeded immediately with the hearings, and sought to dispose of the matter as soon as was reasonably possible after the nomination was presented.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I appreciate the remark of the Senator from Washington, and I am glad he mentioned it, because I certainly do not want to be misunderstood. Several times, on this floor, yesterday and today, I have praised the work of the Senate Judiciary Committee. I know the members have suffered long and have worked long hours in the consideration of this nomination. They would think they had it about ready for decision when some new evidence would come in and some new testimony would have to be taken. I have nothing but words of praise for the Senate Judiciary Committee. I think the committee has sought to get at the root of the matter. I think it has made an honest endeavor to find out the truth and the facts. The able chairman of that committee made a very splendid address yesterday, in my opinion, when he brought the nomination in and presented it to the Senate.

I am glad, Mr. President, that the Senator from Washington brought up the subject, because I feel greatly indebted to the Senate Judiciary Committee for the courtesies which the members have shown me all through the period of the consideration of the nomination of Mr. Dooley. They have been fair in all matters. They have shown me great consideration.

Taking into consideration the fact that the matter concerns the State of Texas, and the senior Senator and the junior Senator have opposite opinions with reference to the nomination, it is a very delicate matter. I am very proud of the fact that the members of the Judiciary Committee have shown so much courtesy to me and so much respect for and admiration of my colleague the senior Senator from Texas. They have been able to learn that, so far as my opinion goes, this is not a fight between the two Senators from Texas.

I am glad that the members of the committee and the Members of the Senate have such great admiration for my colleague from Texas. They have no more admiration and no more affection for him than I have. The senior Senator from Texas has served the State of Texas for many years, and is respected, admired, and liked by the people of Texas. The same voters who elected him also elected me. This shows the freedom which exists in the great Senate of the United States. We can both be elected by the same people in the same State and be privileged to exercise our God-given right to use our own individual judgment on the floor of the Senate. I hope that everyone will realize that this is not a fight between the two Senators from the State of Texas. We are both proud of our State. I am particularly glad that my colleague has so many great admirers in this body. I hope that I have a few, and that as time goes on I shall have more. At least, I shall try to conduct myself in a worthy manner.

Mr. President, the decision in this case will not be made on the basis of personality. Senators are too high minded to conduct a beauty contest in the Senate of the United States. The decision will be made right down at the grass roots, right down at the bottom; it will be made on the basis of what each individual Senator thinks is the proper thing for him to do.

It happens to be my lot, by request and by desire, to tell the Senate what a terrible nomination this is. It is rotten to the core. I do not object to nominations unless they are rotten to the core. We receive some that are just mediocre and some that are pretty bad and some that are rotten to the core. This nomination is one of the last-mentioned group, and I am objecting to it honestly and conscientiously and for the protection and benefit of the rights of the citizens of my State.

Mr. President, no harm will be done to the people of Texas or the people of this Nation by having the Senate refuse to confirm the nomination of Joe B. Dooley, but great harm can be done and will be done if his nomination is confirmed. There will be hundreds of attorneys throughout the northern district of Texas who will always feel that they will not get a square deal, if this nomination is confirmed. There will be thousands of common citizens in the State of Texas who will feel that it will be useless for them to spend their time in bringing before Judge Dooley, if his nomination is confirmed, any case they have against the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe or against any of the large insurance corporations that have employed this firm to protect them—as is stated in the letter from the judge, which I just read—to protect them so that they will not have to pay either legitimate or illegitimate claims.

I have letters from citizens telling me that they think it is a crime, and that they cannot expect to get any justice in the court if the railroad corporations are going to dictate who shall sit on the judicial bench. Mr. President, their fears are well founded.

I was reading the letter that Judge Wilson wrote me on January 10. In it he said:

> I prepared my retirement addressed to the President and left the date off.

He was trying to retire, and he wanted to get his retirement all arranged so that everyone would be satisfied and so that he would be able to retire, and so that the person of his particular choice would succeed him. A great many persons who ought to know about this matter—members of the bar—have told me that Judge Wilson is the campaign manager of Mr. Dooley, and is attempting to use his influence to have him named as his successor. Although I am not a member of the bar, I have been told, and I have reason to believe, that the attorneys who are members of various bars throughout the Nation resent activities of that nature. They think that when a judge has been appointed and subsequently reaches the age of retirement and desires to retire, he should retire, but should not attempt to use his influence or the influence of his office in trying to name his successor. Nevertheless, that is what is being done in this case.

The letter continues as follows:

> I prepared my retirement address to the President and left the date off. I sent it to Senator CONNALLY and told him that when he got to where he could attend to the matter, to date my retirement and hand it in to the President. I do not know exactly, but I think it was dated the 9th of August 1946.

Mr. President, will anyone tell me why a judge who has served faithfully and well during the better years of his life, and who has reached the age of retirement under the law, and wishes to retire, should be compelled to wait from June 21, 1944, until August 9, 1946, for his resignation to be dated by someone else and handed to the President? Flimsy excuses have been given in the letter—that we were at war with Germany, and to wait until Germany went down; and then that we were at war with Japan, and to wait until Japan went down—but everyone knows that our appointive machinery was working smoothly and perfectly well all during the war, and that there was no reason why this judge should not have retired, except some of the reasons I am trying to point out.

I continue to read from the letter:

> I supposed, of course, that my successor would be promptly appointed. In fact, I thought my retirement was in effect. So have the public had that idea about it. I thought so until I wrote to the Director of the Administrative Office of United States Courts that though I was retired, I wanted my secretary to be continued at her present salary.

Mr. President, it is all right to continue the office force, but it is not all right for a judge to name his successor. That is contrary to our American philosophy of government. So the judge was interested in continuing his present secretary at her present salary. He also says in the letter:

> I told them they could get the date probably from the Attorney General. To my surprise, they answered that they had investigated the matter, and that the President had never accepted my retirement.

So, Mr. President, we see that the judge thought he was retired. That was the belief of the judge, the man who possesses all the wisdom that a judge is supposed to possess. We always refer to judges as men of wisdom. Nevertheless, he did not know that he had not been retired. That shows how this matter was handled. Politics stepped in. The judge thought he had been retired; but when he wrote to get his secretary a job, he found out that he was not yet retired. He was quite surprised; he says so in his letter.

The letter is addressed to me, and it continues as follows:

> Of course, you know as well as I do that I could arbitrarily retire at any time I wanted to. Whether retired or not, I think so much of the bar, and think so much of the court, that I have made up my mind, to do the work until my successor was appointed.

Mr. President, he is going to stay with his politics. He has been 3 years, now, trying to get out, but he is still staying

with them. He says he is going to stay until his successor is appointed.

He further states in the letter:

I have been hoping confidently that he would be appointed and promptly confirmed, ever since the 9th of August. I am not retired yet legally, nor am I retired in fact. I am carrying on the work of my courts just like I always have.

Mr. President, there we see the ridiculous situation of the judge of that court, Judge Wilson, who on January 10, 1947, made the statement that he was not retired, and that he was going to continue to serve.

Yet 2 days prior to that, the President had appointed his successor.

Judge Wilson pointed out that he had been trying to retire since June 21, 1944. He stated that one of his reasons for making an early announcement, a few days prior to that, and not waiting until that day, was that he wanted to give all the aspirants to that office an opportunity to get their campaigns started.

The campaign that was started for Mr. Dooley, as I mentioned a while ago, was started 9 days before the judge announced that he was going to retire—announced by one of the attorneys and lobbyists for the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railroad Co. The statement was made in the letter written by Mr. Pipkin, the attorney and lobbyist for the Santa Fe, that Mr. Dooley had the practically unanimous approval of all the members of the bar of Texas.

I proceeded to state that there were many members of the Texas Bar Association who had told me they had not given their approval. But I went on, a little while ago, to explain that after a nomination is made, attorneys are very reluctant to make any objections, because things have been proceeding just like clockwork down in Texas. After a man is nominated, it is generally expected that nothing will interfere, and that his nomination will be confirmed. Consequently, it is difficult to get many of the attorneys to raise objections after a nomination has been made by the President. But the statement was so peculiar, that he had practically the unanimous consent, or indeed, the unanimous consent of the bar, that I endeavored to find out about it. I received more than a hundred letters from attorneys stating they did not approve the nomination or the confirmation, each one adding:

But do not mention my name, because he might be confirmed, and I might have a case coming up before him, and I would feel that I would not get justice, because I had openly opposed his confirmation.

I then decided that I would conduct a secret ballot, so that members of the bar would not be obliged to divulge their names. At my own expense, I sent a letter, with a stamped, self-addressed postcard, to each of the more than 3,000 attorneys registered in the northern district of Texas, requesting them to vote secretly by writing on the postcard one word, "yes," if they wanted Mr. Dooley as their judge, or if they did not want him confirmed as their judge, to write the one word, "no." It was not necessary to sign the card; it was simply necessary to drop it in the mail. In response to that secret ballot which I conducted, 40 percent of the attorneys of the northern district of Texas who responded said they did not want Mr. Dooley to be judge. They voted "no." That is quite at variance with the statement made by the attorney for the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe. In his letter of May 29, he said:

He would come nearer than any lawyer I know in having the unanimous support of the bar.

Forty percent of the attorneys who responded voted "no." I have the post cards here on my desk and any Senator who wishes to learn how the poll was conducted can examine them. The poll was open and above board. These post cards, representing ballots, show how the attorneys voted. In Amarillo, the home town of Joe B. Dooley, 23.6 percent of those responding voted "no." Under pressure they may have been forced or induced to sign a petition, but when it came to a secret ballot, when their names were not to be divulged, in Amarillo, out of a total of 55 attorneys who voted, 13 voted "no" and 42 voted "yes," or 23.6 percent of those who responded voted "no."

In Dallas, Tex., somewhat competitive with Fort Worth in civic pride and spirit and rivalry, 191 voted "yes" and 129 voted "no." Forty percent of the attorneys in Dallas and 61 percent in the city of Fort Worth voted against the confirmation of Joe B. Dooley.

In Lubbock, Tex., which is close to Amarillo, 42 percent of the attorneys who responded voted "no." Seventeen voted "no," and 22 voted "yes."

In Wichita Falls, in the direction of Amarillo, between Fort Worth and Amarillo, 30 percent of the attorneys who responded voted "no."

Mr. President, a total of 859 responded. Of that number 516 voted "yes," and 343 voted "no." Forty percent of the attorneys in the northern district of Texas did not want Mr. Dooley to be confirmed as judge.

Several hundred citizens, not members of the bar, wrote me letters and some citizens circulated petitions which were signed and sent to me, in which they said it would be bad for the interests of the citizens of Texas if Mr. Dooley were confirmed, and they did not want him to be confirmed.

Mr. President, as I have said, I am not an attorney. I am simply a common citizen. I think all common citizens of my State should have something to say about the selection of their judge. I have asked for opinions on both sides of the question. I conducted a secret ballot at my own expense among Texas attorneys, and then I asked the common citizens how they stood, and the report, Mr. President, is they do not want Mr. Dooley. I have several reasons for standing on the floor now and opposing Mr. Dooley, but one reason for my objection to confirmation is the result of the secret ballot I conducted. I believe in finding out what the people of my State want. Therefore, I go to the people and find out what they want, and that is what I did in this case, and I am now giving the Senate the result.

In addition to the nomination being personally obnoxious to me, in addition to claims I make that the nominee is not entirely qualified, there is also as ground for objection, the result of the secret ballot. With respect to his qualifications, I will say he has some of the qualifications necessary in a judge, but he lacks some essential qualifications, and inasmuch as the taxpayers are going to pay full salary for life to this man if he becomes judge, they ought to have a whole judge, not a half judge.

This man admitted on the stand that his practice is civil practice. Anyone knows that criminal cases and civil cases come before a Federal judge. Do Senators want to confirm a man to be a Federal judge who has had only civil practice and who has had no experience, by his own testimony, with criminal matters? Do the citizens of the northern district of Texas, anyone of whom might be accused of committing a criminal act, and be brought before a Federal judge, want to be brought before an individual who has had no experience with the criminal law? An individual brought before such a judge would not feel safe.

Oh, yes; Mr. Dooley has handled cases for the large insurance corporations and railroad corporations and the big oil companies against the little people. Those cases are civil cases. He knows more about the civil law than he does about criminal law, because during the entire time he was a member of the firm of Underwood, Dooley, Johnson & Wilson, according to his own testimony, their practice was civil practice.

Mr. President, I think the people of Texas are entitled to a Federal judge who has had experience with criminal cases as well as experience with civil cases. I think that is an important point. I have talked to attorneys, and they tell me the point is a very important one. But if Mr. Dooley is confirmed, the people of the northern district of Texas will have a half judge, maybe not that much of a judge, but at least not a full judge, at least not a judge with full qualifications. There are many attorneys in Texas who are well qualified for the position, who have had considerable experience both in civil and criminal practice, high-caliber men, who have had judicial experience. Mr. Dooley has had no judicial experience except in one isolated case about 25 years ago when he was appointed to hear one little case at San Angelo, Tex. He now expects to be confirmed as judge for the northern district of Texas, and the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co. is willing to have him confirmed. They think he can decide their cases all right. They are not the only ones who think so. There are some big corporations which think he can decide their cases all right. They think he has had enough experience and enough connection and association with the great firm of attorneys in Amarillo so he can decide their cases all right. He might even decide the cases to the satisfaction of certain corporations.

I continue to read the letter from the judge:

To my surprise, they answered that they had investigated the matter—

That is the matter of his retirement—

and that the President had never accepted my retirement. Of course, you know as well as I do that I could arbitrarily retire any time I wanted to. Whether retired or not, I think so much of the bar, and I think so much of the court, that I made up my mind to do the work until my successor was appointed. I have been looking confidently that he would be appointed and promptly confirmed ever since the 9th of August. I am not retired yet legally, nor am I retired in fact. I am carrying on the work of my courts just like I always have.

He was doing that 2 days after the President had appointed his successor.

Now I am not sending a copy of this letter to Senator CONNALLY or Attorney General Clark. You are privileged to do so if you see fit to, however. I wrote a letter to the Attorney General rather recently reminding him of the history of this matter, as I have given it to you. I understood then that he was delaying the matter of choosing my successor. I told him that I was being unjustly mistreated in this matter, and he knew it; that I have been waiting for 2½ years, and putting it off on account of one request after another. In answer he agreed with me. I was considerably assured from his letter that action was going to be taken immediately.

Now listen to this, especially Senators on the other side of the aisle:

Now, with the appearance of things, with a Republican majority, and you objecting to the President's nomination, it is indefinite when I will ever be able to retire.

Mr. President, there were some down in Texas who took a look at the returns of the election held last November. I want to tell the Senate that that election threw the fear of God into many people in Texas. The people I refer to were afraid that perhaps with the Republican majority in the Senate we in Texas would be given a little justice.

Mr. President, I am not particularly appealing to the Republicans. I am simply reading the letter from the judge to show his attitude. He thought he was going to name his successor and have his nomination to go through like greased lightning, but the nomination has now been held up for over 3 years, and in the meantime something happened which many people thought never could happen at the election held last November 5, which changed the complexion of the whole matter, and it has them worried. They fear that perhaps the nomination will not be confirmed now. They fear that perhaps there is a little chance for the people of Texas to secure some justice. There are some people in Texas who feel that if they could induce the junior Senator from Texas to get up on the Senate floor and explain how bad the nomination is, he will receive the consideration of many of the Senators on both sides of the aisle. I am trying to explain the matter to the Senate now. This is the first time in my life I have done such a thing as this, and I hope it will be the last time. I do not particularly relish doing what I am doing.

It is not one of the things I like to do. I am naturally an optimist and a spreader of great joy and cheer. I do not like to take a negative position on anything; but duty demands it, and I am doing it.

The politicians down there became worried. This thing had been dragged out too long, because of the war with Germany and the war with Japan. We ran out of wars, and some other reason had to be found.

The judge continues:

I have been serving in the office about 28 years, and very strenuously much of the time, and surely you feel like I do, that I should be given the privilege of retiring.

I do. I believe that anyone who has served faithfully for as long as Judge Wilson has served ought to be able to retire without a group of politicians coming in and trying to help him name his successor, and arranging things so that all the pressure groups will be satisfied—so that all the politicians will be satisfied, so that the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railroad Corp. will be satisfied, and the big insurance companies will be satisfied. They want all groups satisfied except the people. I think the people ought to be satisfied.

The letter continues:

Also in that letter to the Attorney General I took this position: That if Judge Culver or Judge McDonald, either one of them, should be appointed, that no objection could be made to them—

They are the ones whom I recommended. Judge Culver and Judge McDonald are both from Fort Worth—

that Senator CONNALLY could not make any objection to them, and no other person could make any well-founded objection to them. On the other hand, I stated to him in the event Senator CONNALLY's choice, Mr. Dooley, received the appointment, that no one could truthfully raise any objection to Mr. Dooley, and that I felt confident you would not do so.

I am trying in my feeble way to raise an objection, because there was so much objection to this nomination in Texas that I was requested to make a protest.

They are all men of such high standing and such judicial ability, at least to my view, that I did not think any objections well based could be made against any one of them.

Now here are some facts I want to tell you about, and you can investigate all you want to and you will find they are the facts. My position from the beginning of this matter has been not to favor the appointment of any particular candidate. My correspondence with you will show that, and my correspondence with Senator CONNALLY will show that. I have, though, taken the position that my successor should come from one of the western bars of this northern district.

That is where Mr. Dooley lives.

Now here is where I place that, and you as a fair man are bound to agree with me. The northern district of Texas, including all of this western country, and as it stands today with very slight changes, was created by statutes in 1879. Before I moved here to Fort Worth, I was acquainted with the men in those bars and have been since—about 40 years altogether. I know that just as good ability exists in the bars of the western districts to make us a Federal judge as there are in either Fort Worth or Dallas. Yet in these over 65 years no man has ever been United States district judge from any one of these bars in the West. On the other hand, every district judge has been appointed from either Fort Worth or Dallas. Now I leave it to you whether in the simplest sort of fairness and justice, if the first appointment they have ever had in the West should not be promptly confirmed. I believe the bars of the western part of this district unanimously would say to you that they are in favor of Mr. Dooley's appointment.

These are the words of Judge Wilson, with respect to whom many of the most able attorneys in Fort Worth and the surrounding district make the positive statement that he is the campaign manager for Joe B. Dooley. These are his arguments, which are pretty strong. He says that he will offer no objection to Judge McDonald or Judge Culver, but he goes into considerable detail in pointing out why the appointee should be Mr. Dooley.

The letter continues:

Even the leading lawyers here of Fort Worth, I frankly say to you, are in favor of his confirmation. You can imagine for yourself how much these various bars of the West would be offended as Mr. Dooley has just served a term as president of the bar association of all of Texas.

They bring up that point again. He was president of the bar association. That is putting the cart before the horse. Instead of being brought forth as a candidate after having served faithfully and well in the honorable office of president of the bar association, he is first offered as a candidate, and then it is discovered that he is not properly prepared; he does not have very much to talk about; he is not well known. So it is decided to give him a build-up. After they got these petitions on June 12, 1944, they got busy and elected him to the presidency of the Texas Bar Association on June 29, 1944. Then they began to use that fact as a great qualification, a great asset.

It is a great honor to be president of the Texas Bar Association if that honor comes to a man in the ordinary course of events, and if after faithfully serving as president of the Texas Bar Association his friends get together and say, "There is a great man; he has served well in his profession. He has all the qualifications. He has been honored by being elected president of the Bar Association of Texas. Let us get together and boost him for the nomination as Federal judge." That might be more in line. But what I am trying to point out is that this campaign is patched up all the way along. His supporters do a little patching here and there, and try to get someone in the right mood, until they think all the interested parties are satisfied. Then, lo and behold, a monkey wrench was thrown into their machinery by the election of last November 5. That began to worry them.

So, Mr. President, it can be seen that this nomination has been concocted from the very beginning as a political appointment. The presiding judge, who is now serving on the bench, attempts to name his successor, and everyone who is interested is brought into line.

The letter continues:

I never attended a bar meeting myself, but you can find out all about it. I understood the bar pretty well, of this State, are also for him. A lawyer just can't tell what Federal court he will be into next.

Here is some good advice which I am receiving directly from the judge. The letter started in a political vein, and it has continued in a political vein. Now we get down to something which the judge wanted to tell me:

I don't think if I were you and in your place I would want to have the ill will of every lawyer in the western part of this district and of practically every lawyer in this State. I was in politics myself for about 20 years before I became Federal judge, and if I do say it myself, I did not fail to receive any elective office or appointive office either that I ever sought. So you can form an idea that I know a little something about this politics myself.

Mr. President, I do not pretend to know very much about politics, but I am getting some good advice. In the judge's opinion it would be bad for me to oppose his selection of his successor. The judge goes into that subject a little further before he finishes his letter. He says that he was in politics himself.

I was in politics myself for about 20 years before I became Federal judge.

To me it seems that he is still in politics, Mr. President. The letter continues:

Now I want to say something about Mr. Dooley—

As if he had not said anything so far—

I want to say something about Mr. Dooley as I have found him to be as a practitioner before me for practically these 28 years. I can say to you that he is one of the finest lawyers, from the standpoint of legal ability, that I have had a look at of any bar in Texas, and I have held court all over Texas.

That is a pretty strong recommendation. I found out when I was Governor of Texas that very strong recommendations could be made of very rotten candidates. When a man starts out to get petitions and letters of recommendation he can get some of the most beautiful letters of recommendation about the poorest candidate. So we cannot pay a great deal of attention to beautiful recommendations written by persons who are pouring their hearts out in love and affection for the man they want to succeed themselves.

The letter continues:

Also Mr. Dooley is a man of high moral character.

Listen to this:

He is not my type at all—

He is bragging about Mr. Dooley. The judge has been on the bench for 25 years and wants his successor to be a man who is not his type at all—

He is not my type at all—

We have either had the wrong judge or we are trying to get one that is wrong. They are two different types—

He is not my type at all, and I am sorry, because he is one of those rather inoffensive kind of gentlemen.

He may be right. Maybe that is the correct word to use to describe Mr. Dooley—"inoffensive." That is not the word which I chose; that is the word used in this letter from the judge—"a rather inoffensive kind of gentleman." He does not want to make anyone mad; he wants to sway this way or that way. It appears to me that we should have a man on the bench who would stand for a principle, stand for what is right, stand for justice, try to uphold justice in his court. I can imagine a little, inoffensive man who has been working for that big firm of political attorneys, one of the greatest law firms in northwest Texas. They will stand up against most of the big firms of attorneys throughout the United States. They are powerful. They have had in their fold for 27 years or more this "rather inoffensive kind of gentleman." He likes the firm of Underwood, Johnson, Dooley & Wilson. He would not like to offend that firm if we help him to get on the bench. According to the letter from Judge Wilson, he is inoffensive. He would not want to offend the people with whom he has been a partner. If they should come into his court with a case he would not want to offend them; he would try to see to it that he did not offend them. He is so inoffensive that when the Government wanted to take over the land—about 15,000 acres—on which the Pan-Tex Ordnance Plant was built, near Amarillo, Tex., and needed a man to help in the taking over of that land and to look after the legal affairs of that company, representatives of the Government went to the big firm of Underwood, Johnson, Dooley & Wilson, and that firm had just exactly the man the Government wanted. He was one of their own members. So this member of that firm of attorneys was appointed to represent the Government. His salary went right into the treasury of the partnership of Underwood, Johnson, Dooley & Wilson. He did not resign from the firm. He took that job and kept the salary. He accepted the job and took the money, and the money went directly into the treasury of the law firm.

When the land was taken over by the Government, Mr. Dooley received his share of the money that went into the firm, according to the report of the FBI. I have all the records here and can state just how much money it was, when I get to it.

When the judge speaks about Mr. Dooley's being a rather inoffensive kind of gentleman, I think it is well to tell the Senate exactly how inoffensive he was, so far as I know. I do not know all about it.

This firm of attorneys furnished their man, collected the money for his services, and took the land over from the farmers. There were about 37 farmers involved. They had their crops all out. Many of them had lived there for years, and were asked to move on short notice. They did not object to that. The country was at war, and they were patriotic American citizens; they did not object. But they did want to get paid for their land and for their crops. So the attorney who was representing the Government hired another good friend out there, and between them they figured out a contract which would rob the taxpayers of the Nation. It was similar to other New Deal contracts about which we hear so much these days. They so arranged it that a contract was made, and the FBI reported that there was only one bid made, and that cannot be found. It is lost. Who received the contract? A school teacher and the son of the senior member of the firm of Underwood, Dooley, Johnson & Wilson. He received a third of the rake-off on the contract, and the taxpayers footed the bill. The contract netted a profit of approximately $14,000 or $15,000 for cutting the wheat on the land which the farmers sold to the Government for an ordnance plant.

When it came time to make the contract it was found that the farmers charged $2.50 an acre for cutting wheat. That is a great wheat country. So the son of the senior member of the Dooley firm in partnership with the school teacher received a contract—on one bid, and that cannot be found—for $5.65 an acre, when the prevailing price was $2.50 an acre. They did not have a machine with which to cut the wheat. All they had was "pull" with the Government by reason of the connection through the Dooley firm. They made $15,000 rake-off, and the farmers who would have cut the wheat in the first place for $2.50 an acre did cut it for that amount, but it had to go through the son of the senior member of the Dooley firm, and he had to get his rake-off.

Mr. Dooley is an inoffensive gentleman, the judge says. He was so inoffensive that he said on the witness stand that he did not know anything about what was going on with reference to the wheat deal, when all the farmers in that part of the country were up in arms at the outrageous conduct—and the Dooley firm was back of the whole thing—in stealing the taxpayers' money through a fake contract or a legalized steal.

Mr. Dooley sat in one of the back offices, as a member of that great firm, and said he did not know anything about it. It was so bad that the farmers demanded an investigation, and the FBI was called in. They investigated all the way from Brownwood, Tex., to Alaska, to try to find out what people remembered about this wheat-cutting steal. They brought in a report.

Mr. President, I have already referred to the letter written to me on January 10 by Judge James T. Wilson with reference to the appointment of Mr. Dooley. I quoted the language in the letter where Judge Wilson said, referring to Mr. Dooley:

He is not my type at all, and I am sorry, because he is one of those rather inoffensive kind of gentlemen.

I digressed from the inoffensive description made by Judge Wilson to point out the wheat-cutting deal at Amarillo, Tex., and I explained that briefly; but later, on another day, when I shall have plenty of time, I want to go into that wheat deal thoroughly so that every Senator will understand just exactly what it was about. Suffice it to say that it was of considerable importance, due to the fact that a wheat-cutting contract was made between the Government and a partnership, in which the son of the senior member of the Dooley law firm, Bob Underwood, Jr., was a one-third partner, and that an enormous profit was made, between $14,000 and $15,000, on cutting this wheat, of which the senior member's son received at least one-third, according to the FBI report. I

wanted to point out that Mr Dooley, before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, stated that he knew nothing about the wheat-cutting deal, and that he had not heard about it, even though he was a member of the law firm. The newspapers contained the story that about 37 farmers were up in arms because they thought they were getting a raw deal, and they were making accusations against the Dooley firm and against others. The situation got so hot that an FBI investigation was ordered, and a thorough investigation was made. While this investigation by the FBI was proceeding, Mr. President, representatives of the FBI went into the office of Mr. Dooley's firm, Underwood, Johnson, Dooley & Wilson and conducted investigations there.

The investigator questioned Bob Underwood, Jr., the son of the senior Member, about the wheat deal on which such an enormous profit was made at the taxpayers' expense; and even though the statement was written up, according to the record, the senior Member's son refused to sign the statement.

The FBI investigator also questioned at length the senior member of the Dooley firm, Mr. Underwood, Sr.; and while all this was going on Mr. Dooley, the nominee, who had been a partner in that firm for about 27 years, knew nothing about it, according to his own statement. He did not know it was going on at all. That would indicate that Judge Wilson was right when he said that he was a rather "inoffensive" kind of gentleman—just a meek little lamb in that big, powerful organization. It is quite likely that he would be just exactly the kind of judge that that powerful firm of attorneys would like to have in their district.

This firm of attorneys brought down the ire of a great many farmers. I have received letters from a number of those poor farmers. They felt that some great wrong had been done them. They do not have legal minds, but they knew that someone had done something to them, and they got the impression that it was the Dooley firm, because the son of the senior member of the Dooley firm got one-third of the profits on the cutting of this wheat at a fictitious price of $5.65 when the regular price was $2.50 an acre.

The farmers were indignant, and they believed that the Dooley firm was responsible because of that circumstance, and because the Dooley firm received payment from the Government for the services of one of its members who was employed for the purpose of clearing up titles to the land taken over by the Pan-Tex Ordnance Plant.

To show how this firm of attorneys, powerful as it is, will hound a man almost to death's door, here is a letter, written by Underwood, Johnson, Dooley & Wilson, dated April 4, 1947, addressed to Mr. W. R. Hess, of Higgins, Tex., one of the poor farmers who had enough courage to write his United States Senator and tell him about the wheat cutting deal and give him all the facts as he knew them. Evidently they thought that Mr. Hess should not have done so, so they wrote this letter to Mr. Hess, whose statement had been quoted in the newspapers. On April 4, 1947, this powerful firm of political attorneys in Amarillo wrote as follows:

AMARILLO, TEX., *April 4, 1947.*

Mr. W. H. HESS,
Higgins, Tex.

DEAR SIR: There appeared in the Amarillo Daily News on April 2, 1947, a news item to the effect that Senator O'DANIEL in protesting the confirmation of Mr. Joe B. Dooley as Federal judge had filed with the committee certain letters, one of which, it was stated, was written by you.

The news item stated that among other statements the letter written by you to Senator O'DANIEL stated the following:

"The law firm of Underwood, Dooley & Johnson * * * obtained a contract from the Government to cut this 10,000 acres in the Pantex area at the sum of $5.65 per acre or $3.15 per acre above the customary price. Bob Underwood, Jr., attended to the hiring of farmers to cut this wheat."

This law firm had no such contract, and no member of this firm or anyone who had any connection with this firm had any interest in any such contract directly or indirectly, and no fact or circumstance justifies such statements nor the slanderous implications therein contained. Such statement is wholly untrue, and we are at a loss to understand how or why any such statement could be made by you or anyone else.

The serious implications of the letter, not only to Mr. Dooley whose confirmation as Federal judge is pending before the Senate Judiciary Committee with which the above letter is reported to have been filed, but also to other members of our firm must be apparent to you. We must insist upon adequate and immediate retraction and correction by you, if in fact you wrote the letter as reported in the press.

If you wrote the letter as reported, we request that you immediately notify Senator O'DANIEL and Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Washington, D. C., chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, by wire of your retraction of the statement attributed to you, and also that you advise the Amarillo Daily News of such retraction, and further that you furnish us copies of such retractions.

Yours very truly,
UNDERWOOD, JOHNSON, DOOLEY & WILSON.
By R. C. JOHNSON.

I read that letter for the purpose of showing how they pursued one of these poor farmers. I do not know whether they also took the matter up with the Amarillo Daily News to find out why it had printed something like that; but they did write this letter to Mr. Hess. He was greatly worried for fear that he would be prosecuted and perhaps sent to jail because he had the courage to communicate with his United States Senator and report something with which he was familiar.

This letter reached Mr. Hess just a few days before the storm broke in Higgins, Tex., and Mr. Hess was one of the victims of that storm. So the pursuit of Mr. Hess ended there. But the same course continues in other directions. Every Texas citizen who raises his voice against the thing that is going on in Texas, and has been going on for years, is a man marked for punishment. The only way he can escape is by death, or by a change in the attitude of the administration, so that the people will receive some consideration in the appointment of their judges.

Before leaving the subject of the wheat deal, let me say that this entire transaction was given thorough and full consideration by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. The committee was notified of the FBI report, and some of the members of the committee, at least, took advantage of the opportunity to familiarize themselves with the FBI report.

The FBI report was a good report, and a complete report. I believe that the FBI did a fine job of investigation. My opinion is—although others may differ with me—that it furnished the ground for a suit—against whom, I do not know, but against whoever fleeced the taxpayers out of $14,000 or $15,000.

The report was closed by this letter, a copy of which I hold in my hand, dated Fort Worth, Tex., May 16, 1945. It is addressed to the Attorney General, Washington, D. C.:

SIR: Reference is made to your letter of October 26, 1944, and our reply thereto of November 6, 1944, concerning the above-captioned matter—

Which is Pan-Tex Ordnance Plant.

The letter continues:

Recently the special agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation handling this case was in our office with his final report. The investigation of this matter has now been completed. After thoroughly reviewing the file and talking with the agent, we are of the opinion that this case should be closed without prosecution. The evidence is insufficient to warrant any action by this office. The investigation report discloses that only one bid was submitted, and that is all the law requires. The men involved in this investigation are high class, honorable, and honest citizens.

For these reasons, we are closing our file in this matter.

That would naturally give the members of the Senate Judiciary Committee reason to believe that the file was closed by Frank B. Potter, acting head of the United States attorney's office at Fort Worth, Tex. Frank B. Potter, in my opinion, is an upright, honorable man. He has been assistant United States attorney, acting United States attorney, and has conducted his office in such a manner that when a vacancy occurred three judges got together in appointing him as acting head of the United States attorney's office. But the strange thing about it is that the original letter, a copy of which I hold in my hand, in pen and ink, bore the signature of Frank B. Potter. Yet, it was a forgery. Frank B. Potter did not sign that letter. I have a letter from him stating that he did not sign the letter, that he did not know anything about the wheat deal, and that he had never seen the papers or interviewed any member of the FBI. The letter was signed by someone else in his office. He gives the name of the person, and I have a letter stating who signed it. The name of Frank B. Potter was used to give credence to this report, because anyone who knows him knows that he is an honest man.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'DANIEL. Certainly.

Mr. HATCH. Does Mr. Potter deny the authority of the person who wrote the letter? Does he say it was written without authority from his office?

Mr. O'DANIEL. He says it was written by an assistant in his office.

Mr. HATCH. The reason I am asking the question is that no head of an office can deny responsibility by placing the matter upon an assistant in his office. I want to know what Mr. Potter's attitude is on that subject.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I have Mr. Potter's letter here, which will possibly speak for itself.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator said it was a forgery. That is a grave and serious charge which the Senator is making on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I would consider a forgery as being a name signed by other than the party whose signature it purported to be.

Mr. HATCH. That is quite a definition of forgery. It is entirely independent of the definition generally understood. Forgery is a crime.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I will change the record, then. I will say it was not signed personally by Mr. Potter.

Mr. HATCH. Let us continue further. I want to know what Mr. Potter's attitude is, whether he denies responsibility for the letter and disavows it entirely.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I will read Mr. Potter's letter. It is dated April 5, 1947, and is as follows:

DEAR SENATOR O'DANIEL: I have spent three or four anxious hours since Karl telephoned me this morning—

That is Karl Crowley to whom he refers. He is a member of the bar whom I called when I discovered that this letter was signed by Frank B. Potter, because I was not convinced that Frank B. Potter had signed the letter; I was under that impression and could not conceive of his signing it. Therefore I called Karl Crowley, who is one of the men who recommended Frank B. Potter, and asked him if he knew anything about it. He took it up with Mr. Potter, and here is Mr. Potter's letter:

DEAR SENATOR O'DANIEL: I have spent three or four anxious hours since Karl telephoned me this morning about the matter concerning which I talked to you by phone this afternoon. I was somewhat bewildered because, search as I may, I could not recall to my mind any of the facts concerning the investigation of the wheat-cutting contract at the Pan-Tex Ordnance Plant.

At the time that this occurred I was handling civil matters only. I had originally had some office connection with the Pantex ordnance condemation suit, but later this case was taken over by W. M. Sutton, special assistant in the Lands Division handling land matters in the Amarillo division, and later on after Sutton went to the Army it was handled by Mr. N. J. Harben, special assistant to the Attorney General, Lands Division, with headquarters in our Fort Worth office. Consequently, the only knowledge I had personally concerning the matter was simply hearsay. I had heard that there was a complaint about the excessive amount paid for cutting this wheat, and I knew that an FBI investigation had been ordered. This was done by Mr. Eastus. The file reflects that an investigation was also conducted by Mr. Horace L. Flurry, special assistant to the Attorney General, 1024 Allen Building, Dallas, Tex., who was handling war-fraud cases. It seems that he closed this case out without prosecution. The last instrument appearing in the file in connection with the matter is a letter dated May 16, 1945, addressed to the Attorney General, which is signed "Frank B. Potter, acting head, United States Attorney's Office." In truth and in fact, this letter was written by assistant United States attorney, Cavett S. Binion, who was handling criminal cases in the Fort Worth office at that time. Mr. Eastus had been suspended on April 7, 1945, and I was appointed acting head of the office on that date. The letter, which Mr. Binion wrote to the Attorney General closing this matter without prosecution, was signed by me as acting head only for the reason that all correspondence from the office was so signed when directed to the department.

I repeat, as I advised you by phone today, that I never saw the FBI report and had nothing whatsoever to do with the case, and today is the first time I have ever seen the file. The assistants in the office handling criminal cases have authority to close same out if investigation reports do not warrant prosecution. As is shown by the original carbon copy of the letter, which I have extracted from the file after making another copy of it, you will see that this was dictated by Mr. Binion as it is initialed "CSB," and my name signed on the typewriter. The letter was actually signed by Mr. Binion.

I repeat that I knew nothing of this matter other than just hearing in the office that there was such an investigation. I had no personal contact whatsoever with the matter. When I talked to you I probably did not appear to talk very intelligently about it, but this was because I knew so little about it. However, I felt that as soon as the file was located my lack of connection with it would be fully disclosed.

I trust that this will clear me in your mind of any wrong in connection with the matter. If at any time I can serve you in any way whatsoever, you have but to call upon me.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANK B. POTTER.

That letter is all that I know about it. The original of the letter bears the pen and ink signature of Frank B. Potter, but Frank B. Potter says he did not sign it. I will not say it is a forgery, since the Senator has advised me of the correct legal definition of that word. I do not believe there was any fraud intended to be committed in connection with the signature on the letter; but Frank B. Potter's signature carries great weight, and his name was signed. It was signed without his knowledge.

Mr. HATCH. It is quite apparent, from Mr. Potter's letter, that the signature followed the regular routine of the office.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I do not know just what the regular routine is. I cannot answer that question from personal knowledge.

The letter from Judge Wilson continues:

I don't think, if I were you and in your place, I would want to have the ill will of every lawyer in the western part of this district and of practically every lawyer in this State. I was in politics myself for about 20 years before I became Federal judge, and if I do say it myself, I did not fail to receive any elective office or appointive office, either that I ever sought. So you can form an idea that I know a little something about this politics myself.

Now, I want to say something about Mr. Dooley as I have found him to be as a practitioner before me for practically these 28 years. I can say to you that he is one of the finest lawyers from the standpoint of legal ability that I have had a look at of any bar in Texas, and I have held court all over Texas. Also Mr. Dooley is a man of high moral character. He is not my type at all, and I am sorry, because he is one of these rather inoffensive kind of gentlemen. I mean this—he doesn't pick up any enemies as he goes along. He is always courteous and kind to everybody, also he is very deliberate about every decision he reaches. I do not know of any man in Texas, or woman either, that could possibly have any personal objection to Dooley. I don't know that it has any bearing on this matter, but he lost his only son as a flyer in this war, and he was a magnificent boy. I believe, if you say that Dooley is personally disagreeable to you, that out of over the 6,000,000 people in Texas, that you would be the only one to say that. Of his ability there can be no objection, as is evidenced from the fact that he has just closed a term as president of the bar association.

Now I am making this purely a matter between us. You ought not to continue this injustice to me. However, that is a trivial matter in the picture. Above all, you should not do an injustice to Mr. Dooley, since nobody in Texas stands any higher than he does, and you can think it out for yourself, but I don't think—

Pay particular attention to this, Mr. President—

I don't think that would be a wise policy to be offending the whole bar of this State, and especially to outrage the bars of the western part of this district. I never have seen it fail in my life, if you get all the lawyers of the bar to one view and to a fighting view on one proposition, but what they could carry that county if they really tried to.

That is for my benefit, because I am supposed to run for reelection next year, and that is the advice I am getting from our Judge. I appreciate the advice and I know that it has great weight. It comes from a great brain. But in face of that sound advice from this great man I must, in order to satisfy my conscience, take this opposition stand on the confirmation of Mr. Dooley's nomination.

The letter continues:

Of course, where they are split up and are not united, a county will go just any way. You can take the picture and study it over for yourself. You understand I don't care whether it is Culver, McDonald or Dooley. The point I am talking about, and I have a right to talk about under all the circumstances, is that I want my successor appointed without any further unnecessary delay about it. I feel, and if you will think about it, I am fully justified in taking this position. It's true, this is a political matter—

And that is what I have been saying all the time, Mr. President—

but I am not in the habit of taking any more interest in politics than the ordinary citizen takes, but I assert my right under the circumstances to be very much concerned about this matter being terminated.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES C. WILSON.

Mr. President, there is a great deal of information in that letter which I should like to take time to discuss thoroughly. I have a great deal of other information bearing on the disqualification of Mr. Dooley and upon the fact that a great many people do not want him to become judge.

Inasmuch as we have begun this matter, I should like to discuss it thoroughly, before Senators are called upon to vote on this important question.

As I have said before, I appreciate the work and the fairness with which it has been done, by the Senate Judiciary Com-

mittee; and the chairman of that committee has stated that in his opinion it becomes a matter of personal obnoxiousness and Senatorial courtesy, and that for that reason the nomination was sent to the floor of the Senate, so that each Senator might exercise that prerogative in voting one way or the other on the question of personal obnoxiousness, as claimed by me.

But since the committee has concluded its hearings and has reported the nomination to the floor of the Senate, I have been informed by an attorney in Fort Worth that another letter was written by Judge Wilson—although I did not receive a copy of it—dated on or about November 22, 1946, addressed to the President of the United States, and, according to my informant, urging the interim appointment of Mr. Dooley. My informant said it was considered that Judge Wilson was acting as Mr. Dooley's campaign manager and that he urged an interim appointment because of the fact that the election on November 5, last, had changed the complexion of Congress, and that he thought it would be a distinct advantage for Mr. Dooley to be on the bench before the Eightieth Congress could convene. I did not see that letter, but I am informed on good authority that it does exist.

As a consequence, I requested the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee to obtain the original of that letter, if possible, or a copy of it, because it appears to me that all correspondence passing between the President of the United States and any of these campaign managers or other citizens with reference to this nomination should properly be considered by the Judiciary Committee. If the contents of the letter are as they are purported to be by my informant, it seems to me that the letter should have the attention of the Senate Judiciary Committee, because there are many persons who know about the existence of the letter, and it might be that the Judiciary Committee would like to read it and come to a decision in regard to whether it has any bearing on the nomination.

In order that the Judiciary Committee may have an opportunity to read the letter, which I think is highly important, and to save me the time of explaining what is supposed to be in the letter—of course, I would not wish to attempt to explain what is in the letter, when it is possible to obtain the actual letter and let it speak for itself. I do not care to attempt to go into the details of the letter at this time—and in view of the fact that the Judiciary Committee should have access to the letter, and the further fact that the chairman of the committee has asked me to take it up with the President of the United States and the Attorney General of the United States, to secure from them a copy of the letter, I have done so, and have written a letter to both the President and the Attorney General, asking for a copy of the letter. Up to this moment it has not yet been received by me. I assume that the chairman of the committee can get it either from the President or from Judge Wilson, so that it may receive full consideration in the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. President, I feel so strongly that this letter should receive consideration by the committee that I now move that the nomination of Joe B. Dooley be recommitted to the Judiciary Committee for the purpose of having the committee obtain further important evidence, as indicated in the letter I have just described.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the junior Senator from Texas to recommit.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, this motion is debatable, is it not?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. The statement just made by the distinguished junior Senator from Texas does not set forth exactly all the facts. The letter was sent to me, addressed to me as chairman of the Judiciary Committee. The Judiciary Committee had already reported the nomination to the floor of the Senate. Last Monday I felt that this letter should be laid before the committee. The committee then instructed me, as chairman of the committee, to make contact—which I did while the committee was in session—with the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], requesting him to make the request of the Attorney General and of the President. The letter which was sent to the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, as I recall its contents, stated in substance the conclusion that Judge Wilson was ostensibly the campaign manager for Mr. Dooley, and that he, Wilson, had communicated with the President some time ago and had said something which it was intimated might prove to be obnoxious to the junior Senator from Texas. That was also a conclusion; no facts were stated. That is the way the matter now stands.

I think I have stated the situation with substantial correctness. I might get a copy of the letter from the committee, and, of course, it would show its actual contents.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, let me inquire who wrote the letter and to whom it was addressed.

Mr. WILEY. The letter was written by the junior Senator from Texas, addressed to me, as chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is not the letter which the junior Senator from Texas has been discussing.

Mr. WILEY. No; but in his letter to me he referred to a letter which he claimed Judge Wilson had written to the President.

Mr. CONNALLY. He was demanding that someone get that letter from the President; is that correct?

Mr. WILEY. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. So the motion to recommit would be for the purpose of having the committee demand of the President that he turn over some ghostlike letter to which someone has referred.

Mr. President, let me inquire what is the disposition of the majority leader in regard to having the Senate take a recess from now until tomorrow?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I have had no opportunity to discuss that matter with other Senators on this side of the aisle; but I apprehend that they would not look with favor upon a motion to recess this early in the day. I think we should continue for at least half an hour longer.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. In view of the condition of the calendar and the large amount of business that is ready to be acted upon, I would suggest, first, that we now take up the calendar; and, second, that we try to obtain a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on the motion of the junior Senator from Texas at some convenient time tomorrow, in order that it may be possible for us to proceed with consideration of the unfinished business.

I should like to have some expression of opinion in regard to my suggestion.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Is it the suggestion of the Senator from Wisconsin that we temporarily lay aside the nomination and have a call of the calendar at this time?

Mr. WILEY. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. I assume that the Senator means that the call of the calendar should begin where we last concluded.

Mr. WILEY. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I understand that it is not agreeable to Senators on this side to start the call of the calendar at this time, but that the disposition is to recess. Accordingly, if there is nothing further to come before the Senate at this time, I shall move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, that will be agreeable if it is with the reservation that I have the floor.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE REGULATION OF WHALING

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. May the Chair take the liberty of making an inquiry of the Senator from Maine, with the indulgence of the Senator from Texas? Inasmuch as the Senate is in executive session, and inasmuch as the Senator from Maine has reported the whaling treaty and the two whaling protocols, dealing with entirely noncontroversial matters, would the Senator from Maine be in a position to present that matter to the Senate now? The Chair is sure it is entirely a formality, so that we might at least make that much headway this afternoon.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I think I have my folder here on it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Texas yield for that purpose?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider Executive L (80th Cong., 1st sess.), an International Convention for the Regulation

of Whaling, signed by the United States of America and other countries on December 2, 1946, which was read the second time, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE REGULATION OF WHALING

The Governments whose duly authorized representatives have subscribed hereto,

Recognizing the interest of the nations of the world in safeguarding for future generations the great natural resources represented by the whale stocks;

Considering that the history of whaling has seen overfishing of one area after another and of one species of whale after another to such a degree that it is essential to protect all species of whales from further overfishing;

Recognizing that the whale stocks are susceptible of natural increases if whaling is properly regulated, and that increases in the size of whale stocks will permit increases in the numbers of whales which may be captured without endangering these natural resources;

Recognizing that it is in the common interest to achieve the optimum level of whale stocks as rapidly as possible without causing widespread economic and nutritional distress;

Recognizing that in the course of achieving these objectives, whaling operations should be confined to those species best able to sustain exploitation in order to give an interval for recovery to certain species of whales now depleted in numbers;

Desiring to establish a system of international regulation for the whale fisheries to ensure proper and effective conservation and development of whale stocks on the basis of the principles embodied in the provisions of the International Agreement for the Regulation of Whaling signed in London on June 8, 1937, and the protocols to that Agreement signed in London on June 24, 1938, and November 26, 1945; and

Having decided to conclude a convention to provide for the proper conservation of whale stocks and thus make possible the orderly development of the whaling industry;

Have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

1. This Convention includes the Schedule attached thereto which forms an integral part thereof. All references to "Convention" shall be understood as including the said Schedule either in its present terms or as amended in accordance with the provisions of Article V.

2. This Convention applies to factory ships, land stations, and whale catchers under the jurisdiction of the Contracting Governments, and to all waters in which whaling is prosecuted by such factory ships, land stations, and whale catchers.

ARTICLE II

As used in this Convention

1. "factory ship" means a ship in which or on which whales are treated whether wholly or in part;

2. "land station" means a factory on the land at which whales are treated whether wholly or in part;

3. "whale catcher" means a ship used for the purpose of hunting, taking, towing, holding on to, or scouting for whales;

4. "Contracting Government" means any Government which has deposited an instrument of ratification or has given notice of adherence to this Convention.

ARTICLE III

1. The Contracting Governments agree to establish an International Whaling Commission, hereinafter referred to as the Commission, to be composed of one member from each Contracting Government. Each member shall have one vote and may be accompanied by one or more experts and advisers.

2. The Commission shall elect from its own members a Chairman and Vice Chairman and shall determine its own Rules of Procedure. Decisions of the Commission shall be taken by a simple majority of those members voting except that a three-fourths majority of those members voting shall be required for action in pursuance of Article V. The Rules of Procedure may provide for decisions otherwise than at meetings of the Commission.

3. The Commission may appoint its own Secretary and staff.

4. The Commission may set up, from among its own members and experts or advisers, such committees as it considers desirable to perform such functions as it may authorize.

5. The expenses of each member of the Commission and of his experts and advisers shall be determined and paid by his own Government.

6. Recognizing that specialized agencies related to the United Nations will be concerned with the conservation and development of whale fisheries and the products arising therefrom and desiring to avoid duplication of functions, the Contracting Governments will consult among themselves within two years after the coming into force of this Convention to decide whether the Commission shall be brought within the framework of a specialized agency related to the United Nations.

7. In the meantime the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland shall arrange, in consultation with the other Contracting Governments, to convene the first meeting of the Commission, and shall initiate the consultation referred to in paragraph 6 above.

8. Subsequent meetings of the Commission shall be convened as the Commission may determine.

ARTICLE IV

1. The Commission may either in collaboration with or through independent agencies of the Contracting Governments or other public or private agencies, establishments, or organizations, or independently

(a) encourage, recommend, or if necessary, organize studies and investigations relating to whales and whaling;

(b) collect and analyze statistical information concerning the current condition and trend of the whale stocks and the effects of whaling activities thereon;

(c) study, appraise, and disseminate information concerning methods of maintaining and increasing the populations of whale stocks.

2. The Commission shall arrange for the publication of reports of its activities, and it may publish independently or in collaboration with the International Bureau of Whaling Statistics at Sandefjord in Norway and other organizations and agencies such reports as it deems appropriate, as well as statistical, scientific, and other pertinent information relating to whales and whaling.

ARTICLE V

1. The Commission may amend from time to time the provisions of the Schedule by adopting regulations with respect to the conservation and utilization of whale resources, fixing (a) protected and unprotected species; (b) open and closed seasons; (c) open and closed waters, including the designation of sanctuary areas; (d) size limits for each species; (e) time, methods, and intensity of whaling (including the maximum catch of whales to be taken in any one season); (f) types and specifications of gear and apparatus and appliances which may be used; (g) methods of measurement; and (h) catch returns and other statistical and biological records.

2. These amendments of the Schedule (a) shall be such as are necessary to carry out the objectives and purposes of this Convention and to provide for the conservation, development, and optimum utilization of the whale resources; (b) shall be based on scientific findings; (c) shall not involve restrictions on the number or nationality of factory ships or land stations, nor allocate specific quotas as to any factory ship or land station or to any group of factory ships or land stations; and (d) shall take into consideration the interests of the consumers of whale products and the whaling industry.

3. Each of such amendments shall become effective with respect to the Contracting Governments ninety days following notification of the amendment by the Commission to each of the Contracting Governments, except that (a) if any Government presents to the Commission objection to any amendment prior to the expiration of this ninety-day period, the amendment shall not become effective with respect to any of the Governments for an additional ninety days; (b) thereupon, any other Contracting Government may present objection to the amendment at any time prior to the expiration of the additional ninety-day period, or before the expiration of thirty days from the date of receipt of the last objection received during such additional ninety-day period, whichever date shall be the later; and (c) thereafter, the amendment shall become effective with respect to all Contracting Governments which have not presented objection but shall not become effective with respect to any Government which has so objected until such date as the objection is withdrawn. The Commission shall notify each Contracting Government immediately upon receipt of each objection and withdrawal and each Contracting Government shall acknowledge receipt of all notifications of amendments, objections, and withdrawals.

4. No amendments shall become effective before July 1, 1949.

ARTICLE VI

The Commission may from time to time make recommendations to any or all Contracting Governments on any matters which relate to whales or whaling and to the objectives and purposes of this Convention.

ARTICLE VII

The Contracting Governments shall ensure prompt transmission to the International Bureau for Whaling Statistics at Sandefjord in Norway, or to such other body as the Commission may designate, of notifications and statistical and other information required by this Convention in such form and manner as may be prescribed by the Commission.

ARTICLE VIII

1. Notwithstanding anything contained in this Convention, any Contracting Government may grant to any of its nationals a special permit authorizing that national to kill, take, and treat whales for purposes of scientific research subject to such restrictions as to number and subject to such other conditions as the Contracting Government thinks fit, and the killing, taking, and treating of whales in accordance with the provisions of this Article shall be exempt from the operation of this Convention. Each Contracting Government shall report at once to the Commission all such authorizations which it has granted. Each Contracting Government may at any time revoke any such special permit which it has granted.

2. Any whales taken under these special permits shall so far as practicable be processed and the proceeds shall be dealt with in accordance with directions issued by the Government by which the permit was granted.

3. Each Contracting Government shall transmit to such body as may be designated by the Commission, insofar as practicable, and at intervals of not more than one year, scientific information available to that Government with respect to whales and whaling, including the results of research conducted pursuant to paragraph 1 of this Article and to Article IV.

4. Recognizing that continuous collection and analysis of biological data in connection with the operations of factory ships and land stations are indispensable to sound and constructive management of the whale fisheries, the Contracting Governments will take all practicable measures to obtain such data.

ARTICLE IX

1. Each Contracting Government shall take appropriate measures to ensure the application of the provisions of this Convention and the punishment of infractions against the said provisions in operations carried out by persons or by vessels under its jurisdiction.

2. No bonus or other remuneration calculated with relation to the results of their work shall be paid to the gunners and crews of whale catches in respect of any whales the taking of which is forbidden by this Convention.

3. Prosecution for infractions against or contraventions of this Convention shall be instituted by the Government having jurisdiction over the offense.

4. Each contracting government shall transmit to the Commission full details of each infraction of the provisions of this Convention by persons or vessels under the jurisdiction of that Government as reported by its inspectors. This information shall include a statement of measures taken for dealing with the infraction and of penalties imposed.

ARTICLE X

1. This Convention shall be ratified and the instruments of ratification shall be deposited with the Government of the United States of America.

2. Any Government which has not signed this Convention may adhere thereto after it enters into force by a notification in writing to the Government of the United States of America.

3. The Government of the United States of America shall inform all other signatory Governments and all adhering Governments of all ratifications deposited and adherences received.

4. This Convention shall, when instruments of ratification have been deposited by at least six signatory Governments, which shall include the Governments of the Netherlands, Norway, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America, enter into force with respect to those Governments and shall enter into force with respect to each Government which subsequently ratifies or adheres on the date of the deposit of its instrument of ratification or the receipt of its notification of adherence.

5. The provisions of the Schedule shall not apply prior to July 1, 1948. Amendments to the Schedule adopted pursuant to Article V shall not apply prior to July 1, 1949.

ARTICLE XI

Any Contracting Government may withdraw from this Convention on June thirtieth of any year by giving notice on or before January first of the same year to the depositary Government, which upon receipt of such a notice shall at once communicate it to the other Contracting Governments. Any other Contracting Government may, in like manner, within one month of the receipt of a copy of such a notice from the depositary Government, give notice of withdrawal, so that the Convention shall cease to be in force on June thirtieth of the same year with respect to the Government giving such notice of withdrawal.

This Convention shall bear the date on which it is opened for signature and shall remain open for signature for a period of fourteen days thereafter.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the undersigned, being duly authorized, have signed this Convention.

DONE in Washington this second day of December 1946, in the English language, the original of which shall be deposited in the archives of the Government of the United States of America. The Government of the United States of America shall transmit certified copies thereof to all the other signatory and adhering Governments.

For Argentina:
O. IVANISSEVICH
J M MONETA
G. BROWN
PEDRO H. BRUNO VIDELA

For Australia:
F. F. ANDERSON

For Brazil:
PAULO FRÓES DA CRUZ

For Canada:
H H WRONG
HARRY A. SCOTT

For Chile:
AGUSTÍN R. EDWARDS

For Denmark:
P. F. ERICHSEN

For France:
FRANCIS LACOSTE

For the Netherlands:
D G VAN DIJK

For New Zealand:
G R POWLES

For Norway:
BIRGER BERGERSEN

For Peru:
C ROTALDE

For the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:
ALEXANDER S. BOGDANOV
EUGINE I. NIKISHIN

For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:
A. T. A. DOBSON
JOHN THOMSON

For the United States of America:
REMINGTON KELLOGG
IRA N GABRIELSON
WILLIAM E. S. FLORY

For the Union of South Africa:
H. T. ANDREWS

SCHEDULE

1. (a) There shall be maintained on each factory ship at least two inspectors of whaling for the purpose of maintaining twenty-four hour inspection. These inspectors shall be appointed and paid by the Government having jurisdiction over the factory ship.

(b) Adequate inspection shall be maintained at each land station. The inspectors serving at each land station shall be appointed and paid by the Government having jurisdiction over the land station.

2. It is forbidden to take or kill gray whales or right whales, except when the meat and products of such whales are to be used exclusively for local consumption by the aborigines.

3. It is forbidden to take or kill calves or suckling whales or female whales which are accompanied by calves or suckling whales.

4. It is forbidden to use a factory ship or a whale catcher attached thereto for the purpose of taking or treating baleen whales in any of the following areas:

(a) in the waters north of 66° North Latitude except that from 150° East Longitude eastward as far as 140° West Longitude the taking or killing of baleen whales by a factory ship or whale catcher shall be permitted between 66° North Latitude and 72° North Latitude;

(b) in the Atlantic Ocean and its dependent waters north of 40° South Latitude;

(c) in the Pacific Ocean and its dependent waters east of 150° West Longitude between 40° South Latitude and 35° North Latitude;

(d) in the Pacific Ocean and its dependent waters west of 150° West Longitude between 40° South Latitude and 20° North Latitude;

(e) in the Indian Ocean and its dependent waters north of 40° South Latitude.

5. It is forbidden to use a factory ship or a whale catcher attached thereto for the purpose of taking or treating baleen whales in the waters south of 40° South Latitude from 70° West Longitude westward as far as 160° West Longitude.

6. It is forbidden to use a factory ship or a whale catcher attached thereto for the purpose of taking or treating humpback whales in any waters south of 40° South Latitude.

7. (a) It is forbidden to use a factory ship or a whale catcher attached thereto for the purpose of taking or treating baleen whales in any waters south of 40° South Latitude, except during the period from December 15 to April 1 following, both days inclusive.

(b) Notwithstanding the above prohibition of treatment during a closed season, the treatment of whales which have been taken during the open season may be completed after the end of the open season.

8. (a) The number of baleen whales taken during the open season caught in any waters south of 40° South Latitude by whale catchers attached to factory ships under the jurisdiction of the Contracting Governments shall not exceed sixteen thousand blue-whale units.

(b) For the purposes of subparagraph (a) of this paragraph, blue-whale units shall be calculated on the basis that one blue whale equals:

(1) two fin whales or
(2) two and a half humpback whales or
(3) six sei whales.

(c) Notification shall be given in accordance with the provisions of Article VII of the Convention, within two days after the end of each calendar week, of data on the number of blue-whale units taken in any water south of 40° South Latitude by all whale catchers attached to factory ships under the jurisdiction of each Contracting Government.

(d) If it should appear that the maximum catch of whales permitted by subparagraph (a) of this paragraph may be reached before April 1 of any year, the Commission, or such other body as the Commission may designate, shall determine, on the basis of the data provided, the date on which the maximum catch of whales shall be deemed to have been reached and shall notify each Contracting Government of that date not less than two weeks in advance thereof. The taking of baleen whales by whale catchers attached to factory ships shall be illegal in any waters south of 40° South Latitude after the date so determined.

(e) Notification shall be given in accordance with the provisions of Article VII of the Convention of each factory ship intending to engage in whaling operations in any waters south of 40° South Latitude.

9. It is forbidden to take or kill any blue, fin, sei, humpback, or sperm whales below the following lengths:

(a) blue whales, 70 feet (21.3 meters).
(b) fin whales, 55 feet (16.8 meters).
(c) sei whales, 40 feet (12.2 meters).
(d) humpback whales, 35 feet (10.7 meters).
(e) sperm whales, 35 feet (10.7 meters).

except that blue whales of not less than 65 feet (19.8 meters), fin whales of not less than 50 feet (15.2 meters), and sei whales of not less than 35 feet (10.7 meters) in length may be taken for delivery to land stations, provided that the meat of such whales is to be used for local consumption as human or animal food.

Whales must be measured when at rest on deck or platform, as accurately as possible by means of a steel tape measure fitted at the zero end with a spiked handle which can be stuck into the deck planking abreast of one end of the whale. The tape measure shall be stretched in a straight line parallel with the whale's body and read abreast the other end of the whale. The ends of the whale, for measurement purposes, shall be the point of the upper jaw and the notch

between the tail flukes. Measurements, after being accurately read on the tape measure, shall be logged to the nearest foot: that is to say, any whale between 75'6'' and 76'6'' shall be logged as 76', and any whale between 76'6'' and 77'6'' shall be logged as 77'. The measurement of any whale which falls on an exact half foot shall be logged at the next half foot, *e. g.* 76'6'' precisely, shall be logged as 77'.

10. It is forbidden to use a land station or a whale catcher attached thereto for the purpose of taking or treating baleen whales in any area or in any waters for more than six months in any period of twelve months, such period of six months to be continuous.

11. It is forbidden to use a factory ship, which has been used during a season in any waters south of 40° South Latitude for the purpose of treating baleen whales, in any other area for the same purpose within a period of one year from the termination of that season.

12. (a) All whales taken shall be delivered to the factory ship or land station and all parts of such whales shall be processed by boiling or otherwise, except the internal organs, whalebone and flippers of all whales, the meat of sperm whales and of parts of whales intended for human food or feeding animals.

(b) Complete treatment of the carcasses of "Dauhval" and of whales used as fenders will not be required in cases where the meat or bone of such whales is in bad condition.

13. The taking of whales for delivery to a factory ship shall be so regulated or restricted by the master or person in charge of the factory ship that no whale carcass (except of a whale used as a fender) shall remain in the sea for a longer period than thirty-three hours from the time of killing to the time when it is taken up on to the deck of the factory ship for treatment. All whale catchers engaged in taking whales must report by radio to the factory ship the time when each whale is caught.

14. Gunners and crews of factory ships, land stations, and whale catchers shall be engaged on such terms that their remuneration shall depend to a considerable extent upon such factors as the species, size, and yield of whales taken, and not merely upon the number of the whales taken. No bonus or other remuneration shall be paid to the gunners or crews of whale catchers in respect of the taking of milk-filled or lactating whales.

15. Copies of all official laws and regulations relating to whales and whaling and changes in such laws and regulations shall be transmitted to the Commission.

16. Notification shall be given in accordance with the provisions of Article VII of the Convention with regard to all factory ships and land stations of statistical information (a) concerning the number of whales of each species taken, the number thereof lost, and the number treated at each factory ship or land station, and (b) as to the aggregate amounts of oil of each grade and quantities of meal, fertilizer (guano), and other products derived from them, together with (c) particulars with respect to each whale treated in the factory ship or land station as to the date and approximate latitude and longitude of taking, the species and sex of the whale, its length and, if it contains a foetus, the length and sex, if ascertainable, of the foetus. The data referred to in (a) and (c) above shall be verified at the time of the tally and there shall also be notification to the Commission of any information which may be collected or obtained concerning the calving grounds and migration routes of whales.

In communicating this information there shall be specified:

(a) the name and gross tonnage of each factory ship;

(b) the number and aggregate gross tonnage of the whale catchers;

(c) a list of the land stations which were in operation during the period concerned.

17. Notwithstanding the definition of land station contained in Article II of the Convention, a factory ship operating under the jurisdiction of a Contracting Government, and the movements of which are confined solely to the territorial waters of that Government, shall be subject to the regulations governing the operation of land stations within the following areas:

(a) on the coast of Madagascar and its dependencies, and on the west coasts of French Africa;

(b) on the west coast of Australia in the area known as Shark Bay and northward to Northwest Cape and including Exmouth Gulf and King George's Sound, including the port of Albany; and on the east coast of Australia, in Twofold Bay and Jervis Bay.

18. The following expressions have the meanings respectively assigned to them, that is to say:

"baleen whale" means any whale other than a toothed whale;

"blue whale" means any whale known by the name of blue whale, Sibbald's rorqual, or sulphur bottom;

"fin whale" means any whale known by the name of common finback, common rorqual, finback, finner, fin whale, herring whale, razorback, or true fin whale;

"sei whale" means any whale known by the name of *Balaenoptera borealis*, sei whale, Rudolphi's rorqual, pollack whale, or coalfish whale, and shall be taken to include *Balaenoptera brydei*, Bryde's whale;

"gray whale" means any whale known by the name of gray whale, California gray, devil fish, hard head, mussel digger, gray back, rip sack;

"humpback whale" means any whale known by the name of bunch, humpback, humpback whale, humpbacked whale, hump whale, or hunchbacked whale;

"right whale" means any whale known by the name of Atlantic right whale, Arctic right whale, Biscayan right whale, bowhead, great polar whale, Greenland right whale, Greenland whale, Nordkaper, North Atlantic right whale, North Cape whale, Pacific right whale, pigmy right whale, Southern pigmy right whale, or Southern right whale;

"sperm whale" means any whale known by the name of sperm whale, spermacet whale, cachalot or pot whale;

"Dauhval" means any unclaimed dead whale found floating.

I CERTIFY THAT the foregoing is a true copy of the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling, including the schedule attached thereto, opened for signature in the English language at Washington on December 2, 1946, the signed original of which is deposited in the archives of the Government of the United States of America.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I, JAMES F. BYRNES, Secretary of State of the United States of America, have hereunto caused the seal of the Department of State to be affixed and my name subscribed by the Acting Authentication Officer of the said Department, at the city of Washington, in the District of Columbia, this twenty-third day of December, 1946.

JAMES F. BYRNES
Secretary of State
By B. E. CASH
Acting Authentication Officer
Department of State

INTERNATIONAL WHALING CONFERENCE

Washington, November 20 through December 2, 1946

FINAL ACT

The Governments of Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Denmark, France, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America, represented by plenipotentiary delegations; and the Governments of Iceland, Ireland, Portugal, Sweden, and the Union of South Africa, represented by observer delegations;

Having accepted the invitation extended to them by the Government of the United States of America to participate in an International Whaling Conference;

Appointed their respective representatives, who are listed below by countries in the order of alphabetical precedence:

Argentina
Delegates
Oscar Ivanissevich, Ambassador to the United States; *Chairman*
José Manuel Moneta, Counselor
Commander Guillermo Brown, Naval Mission at Washington
Pedro H. Bruno Videla
Adviser
Martin Luis Drago, Argentine Embassy, Washington

Australia
Delegate
Francis F. Anderson, Director, Fisheries Division, Department of Commerce and Agriculture
Member
Cedric G. Setter, Research Officer, Fisheries Division, Department of Commerce and Agriculture

Brazil
Delegate
Paulo Fróes da Cruz, Agricultural Attaché, Brazilian Embassy, Washington

Canada
Delegates
H. H. Wrong, Ambassador to the United States; *Chairman*
H. A. Scott, Commercial Counsellor, Canadian Embassy, Washington
Technical Advisers
J. A. Rodd, Department of Fisheries
J. R. Dymond, Fisheries Research Board of Canada

Chile
Delegate
Agustín R. Edwards

Denmark
Delegate
Peter Friedrich Erichsen, Adviser on Fisheries of the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries; *Chairman*
Adviser
G. Mortensen, Trangisvaag Faroe Isles

France
Delegates
Armand Anziani, Assistant Director, Economic Affairs, Ministry of French Overseas Territories; *Chairman*
Jean Joseph Le Gall, Director, Scientific and Technical Bureau, Maritime Fisheries
Paul Budker, Assistant Director, Museum of Natural History
Francis Lacoste, Minister Plenipotentiary, French Embassy, Washington
Henri Claudel, Attaché, French Embassy, Washington

Iceland
Observer
Olafur Bjornsson, Secretary, Icelandic Legation, Washington

Ireland
Observer
Thomas V. Commins, Commercial Attaché, Irish Legation, Washington

Netherlands
Delegates
D. J. van Dijk, Head, Department of Fisheries, Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Provisioning; *Chairman*
H. S. Drost, Inspector, Fisheries
G. G. H. von Felde, Attorney, Netherlands Whaling Corporation

New Zealand
Delegate
Guy Richardson Powles, First Secretary, New Zealand Legation, Washington
Member
Roger Hawthorne, New Zealand Legation, Washington

Norway
Delegates
Birger Bergersen, Minister to Sweden
Knut Lykke, Counselor, Norwegian Embassy, Washington
Hans Thomas Knudtzon, Chief of Section, Ministry of Commerce
Valentin Voss, Attorney, Supreme Court of Norway
Johan T. Ruud, Professor, University of Oslo
Advisers
H. Winge Sorensen, Director
Ingvald Haugen, Member of the Norwegian Parliament
Secretary
Harald B. Paulsen, Director

Peru
Delegate
Rear Admiral Carlos Rotalde, Peruvian Navy
Adviser
Commander Guillermo Tirado, Peruvian Navy

Portugal
Observer
Lieutenant Commander Jerénimo Henriques Jorge, Naval Attaché, Portuguese Embassy, Washington

Sweden
Observers
Leif de Belfrage, Commercial Counselor, Swedish Legation, Washington
Axel Hemmar, Member, Swedish Bar Association
Eric de Virgin, Attaché, Swedish Legation, Washington

Union of South Africa
Observer
Jacob Smit, Official, Union of South Africa Government Supply Office

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Delegates
Alexander S. Bogdanov,
Ministry of Fisheries of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Director, Research Institute of Fishing and Oceanography; *Chairman*
Eugine I. Nikishin,
Ministry of Fisheries of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Vladimir A. Tverianovich,
Ministry of Fisheries of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Interpreter
Galina F. Tsibulskaya

United Kingdom
Delegates
A. T. A. Dobson, Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries; *Chairman*
J. Thomson, Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries
N. A. Mackintosh, Director of Research, Discovery Committee
E. Sykes, Dominions Office
E. Melville, Colonial Office
F. V. Cross, Ministry of Transport
M. I. Hutton, Ministry of Food
S. J. Knowles, Ministry of Food

United Kingdom—Delegates—Continued
W. Templeman, Representative of the Commission of the Government of Newfoundland
R. S. B. Best, British Embassy, Washington
A. F. Geolot, British Embassy, Washington
Adviser
Captain H. K. Salvesen

United States
Delegates
Remington Kellogg, Curator, Division of Mammals, Smithsonian Institution; *Chairman*
Ira N. Gabrielson, Consultant, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior
William E. S. Flory, Acting Assistant Chief, International Resources Division, Department of State
Advisers
H. J. Deason, Chief, Office of Foreign Activities, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior
L. Wendell Hayes, Specialist, Division of International Organization Affairs, Department of State
Charles E. Lund, Chief, Foodstuffs Division, Commodities Branch, Office of International Trade, Department of Commerce
Captain Harold C. Moore, Coordinator for Interdepartmental and International Affairs, United States Coast Guard
Fred J. Rossiter, Acting Secretary, Fats, Oils and Seeds Committee, International Emergency Food Council, Department of Agriculture.
Administrative Assistant
Edward Castleman, Divisional Assistant, Division of International Resources, Department of State

The Conference met at Washington on November 20, 1946, under the Temporary Chairmanship of Remington Kellogg, Chairman of the Delegation of the United States of America.

At the opening session a motion was unanimously adopted to extend an invitation for officers of the Secretariat of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations to attend the Conference sessions and committee meetings as observers. The attendance in this capacity of the officers nominated by the Organization, D. B. Finn, Harry Winsor, and H. V. Knight, was approved by the Conference, on the recommendation of the Committee on Credentials.

With the approval of the President of the United States of America, Clarke L. Willard, Acting Chief of the Division of International Conferences, Department of State of the United States, was designated as Secretary General of the Conference, and Donald J. Chaney, Chief Counsel, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior of the United States, was designated Technical Secretary of the Conference.

Remington Kellogg, Chairman of the Delegation of the United States of America, was elected Permanent Chairman of the Conference at the second session, held on November 20, 1946, and Ira N. Gabrielson, Member of the Delegation of the United States of America, was elected Vice Chairman of the Conference at the same session.

The general committees established by the Rules of Procedure adopted provisionally at the opening session were constituted by the Temporary Chairman as follows:

Committee on Credentials
G. R. Powles (New Zealand)—*Chairman*
A. R. Edwards (Chile)
P. F. Erichsen (Denmark)
Frances E. Pringle—Secretary

Committee on Nominations
A. T. A. Dobson (United Kingdom)—*Chairman*
Olafur Bjornsson (Iceland)
Birger Bergersen (Norway)
William L. Breese—Secretary

The following technical committees were appointed by the Chairman:

Committee on Netherlands Proposal
A. T. A. Dobson (United Kingdom)—*Chairman*
Francis F. Anderson (Australia)
D. J. van Dijk (Netherlands)
Hans T. Knudtzon (Norway)
William E. S. Flory (United States)
Donald J. Chaney—Secretary

Committee on Drafting
J. Thomson (United Kingdom)—*Chairman*
A. R. Edwards (Chile)
Armand Anziani (France)
Paul Budker (France)
Jean J. Le Gall (France)
D. J. van Dijk (Netherlands)
G. R. Powles (New Zealand)
Knut Lykke (Norway)
Hans T. Knudtzon (Norway)
Valentin Voss (Norway)
R. S. B. Best (United Kingdom)
William E. S. Flory (United States)
H. J. Deason (United States)
Charles I. Bevans
W. R. Vallance
—Secretaries

Committee on Penalties and Forfeiture
P. F. Erichsen (Denmark)—*Chairman*
José M. Moneta (Argentina)
H. S. Drost (Netherlands)
G. G. H. von Felde (Netherlands)
Hans T. Knudtzon (Norway)
A. S. Bogdanov (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)
V. A. Tverianovich (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)
J. Thomson (United Kingdom)
F. V. Cross (United Kingdom)
Captain H. K. Salvesen (United Kingdom)
Ira N. Gabrielson (United States)
William E. S. Flory (United States)
Captain Harold C. Moore (United States)
W. R. Vallance—Secretary

Committee on Biological Data
N. A. Mackintosh (United Kingdom)—*Chairman*
Pedro H. Bruno Videla (Argentina)
Francis F. Anderson (Australia)
Cedric G. Setter (Australia)
A. R. Edwards (Chile)
P. F. Erichsen (Denmark)
Paul Budker (France)
Jean J. Le Gall (France)
G. R. Powles (New Zealand)
H. S. Drost (Netherlands)
Birger Bergersen (Norway)
Johan T. Ruud (Norway)
A. S. Bogdanov (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)
V. A. Tverianovich (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)
A. T. A. Dobson (United Kingdom)
Captain H. K. Salvesen (United Kingdom)
Remington Kellogg (United States)
Mary F. Shreve—Secretary

Committee on Remuneration of Gunners
D. J. van Dijk (Netherlands)—*Chairman*
Francis F. Anderson (Australia)
P. F. Erichsen (Denmark)
G. G. H. von Felde (Netherlands)
Hans T. Knudtzon (Norway)
Ingvald Haugen (Norway)
V. A. Tverianovich (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)
W. Templeman (United Kingdom)
Captain H. K. Salvesen (United Kingdom)
William E. S. Flory (United States)
Captain Harold C. Moore (United States)
Mary F. Shreve—Secretary.

Committee on Establishment of Whaling Commission
A. T. A. Dobson (United Kingdom)—*Chairman*
Francis F. Anderson (Australia)
Harry A. Scott (Canada)
J. A. Rodd (Canada)
P. F. Erichsen (Denmark)
Armand Anziani (France)
Jean J. Le Gall (France)
D. J. van Dijk (Netherlands)
G. R. Powles (New Zealand)
Knut Lykke (Norway)
Ingvald Haugen (Norway)
A. S. Bogdanov (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)
E. I. Nikishin (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)
V. A. Tverianovich (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)
A. F. Geolot (United Kingdom)
William E. S. Flory (United States)
L. Wendell Hayes (United States)
W. R. Vallance—Secretary

Committee on Use of Scientific Names
Johan T. Ruud (Norway)—*Chairman*
Paul Budker (France)
Jean J. Le Gall (France)
V. A. Tverianovich (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)
N. A. Mackintosh (United Kingdom)
Remington Kellogg (United States)
Mary F. Shreve—Secretary

Committee on Factory Ships Within Territorial Waters.
A. T. A. Dobson (United Kingdom)—*Chairman*
Francis F. Anderson (Australia)
A. R. Edwards (Chile)
P. F. Erichsen (Denmark)
Armand Anziani (France)
Paul Budker (France)
Jean J. Le Gall (France)
Johan T. Ruud (Norway)
Admiral Carlos Rotalde (Peru)
A. S. Bogdanov (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)
V. A. Tverianovich (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)
N. A. Mackintosh (United Kingdom)
H. J. Deason (United States)
W. R. Vallance—Secretary

The final session was held on December 2, 1946.

As a result of the deliberations of the Conference, the following instruments were formulated and opened for signature on December 2, 1946, to remain open for signature for fourteen days thereafter.

International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling

Protocol for the Regulation of Whaling (hereinafter referred to as the Convention and the Protocol, respectively).

The following resolutions and recommendations were adopted:

I. THE INTERNATIONAL WHALING CONFERENCE

Resolves:

1. To express its gratitude to the President of the United States of America, Harry S. Truman, for his initiative in convening the present Conference and for its preparation;

2. To express to its Chairman, Remington Kellogg, its deep appreciation for the admirable manner in which he has guided the Conference;

3. To express to the officers and staff of the Secretariat its appreciation for their untiring services and diligent efforts in contributing to the attainment of the objectives of the Conference.

II. THE INTERNATIONAL WHALING CONFERENCE

Resolves:

That the Government of the United States of America be authorized to publish the Final Act of this Conference, the text of the Convention and of the Protocol, and to make available for publication such additional documents in connection with the work of this Conference as in its judgment may be considered in the public interest.

III. THE INTERNATIONAL WHALING CONFERENCE

Resolves:

That all Signatory Governments should draw the attention of their inspectors and of the whaling companies operating under their jurisdiction to previous cases of taking baleen whales in the closed season on the pretext of providing fenders for the bunkering of whale catchers. The Conference desires to emphasize that this practice constitutes an infringement of paragraph 7 of the Schedule annexed to the Convention and recommends that if it is desired to send whale catchers long distances in the open sea before the commencement of or after the end of the whaling season, suitable arrangements must be made for bunkering them without the use of carcasses of baleen whales.

IV. THE INTERNATIONAL WHALING CONFERENCE

Recommends:

That the chart of Nomenclature of Whales annexed to this Final Act be accepted as a guide by the Governments represented at the Conference.

V. THE INTERNATIONAL WHALING CONFERENCE

Recommends:

That the International Whaling Commission provided for in Article III of the Convention (hereinafter referred to as the Commission) should review the prohibition on the use of factory ships, or whale catchers attached thereto, for the purpose of taking humpback whales in any waters south of 40° South Latitude after taking into consideration the biological and other data available and consider the desirability of either the removal of the prohibition after the 1948–49 season and the southern winter season of 1949 or alternatively a limitation of the number of humpback whales to be taken both in the Antarctic and tropical areas.

VI. THE INTERNATIONAL WHALING CONFERENCE

Recommends:

That the Commission should keep under constant review the question of the limits of the Antarctic whaling season and also the maximum number of blue-whale units as defined by paragraph 8 (b) of the Schedule permitted to be taken during the season.

VII. THE INTERNATIONAL WHALING CONFERENCE

Considers:

That the conditions relating to the use of factory ships within territorial waters of Contracting Governments as provided by paragraph 17 of the Schedule should be kept under review by the Commission so as to ensure that these operations are conducted on an economic basis.

VIII. THE INTERNATIONAL WHALING CONFERENCE

Recommends:

That when adequate information becomes available concerning the migration routes and seasons in localities where land stations are maintained and operated, specific annual open periods for whaling should be prescribed instead of the regulation included in the Schedule as paragraph 10. It is the view of the Conference that the Commission should endeavor to obtain at the earliest possible time scientific information as a basis for prescribing specific seasons during which land stations shall be permitted to operate in the various areas.

IX

At the request of the Delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the following statements are included:

1. Owing to unforeseen circumstances the Soviet factory ship will be unable to reach the whaling grounds by the commencement of the 1946–47 season in waters south of 40° South Latitude. Accordingly the Delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics requests that this ship be permitted to operate with a full complement of catchers for a continuous period of four months from the date on which it is able to commence operations in that area. Note is made that a similar concession was made to other governments for the season of 1945–46.

2. The Delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics also requests that the factory ship be permitted to conduct operations in that area for the four-month period during the season 1946–47 without regard to the sixteen thousand blue-whale unit catch limitation.

The Conference supports these requests and considers them justified in the special circumstances. It is understood that support by the Conference of these requests shall not be regarded as a precedent for future seasons.

X. THE INTERNATIONAL WHALING CONFERENCE

Supports and considers justified the request of the Delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics that the taking of gray whales in the Bering and Chukotsk seas should be permitted when the meat and products of such whales are to be used exclusively for local consumption by the aborigines of the Chukotsk and Korjaksk areas.

XI. THE INTERNATIONAL WHALING CONFERENCE

Recognizes:

The desirability of achieving a large measure of uniformity among the various Contracting Governments with respect to the nature and severity of penalties imposed, for contraventions of the Convention, upon persons or ships operating under their jurisdiction. It recognizes that even under the most favorable management and with the most conscientious and experienced gunners and crews, it is inevitable that some whales will be taken illegally and that a certain latitude should be allowed in assessing penalties for such unavoidable taking. It may be that legal and administrative differences among the Contracting Governments will prevent the adoption of a uniform system of penalties, but it is the view of the Conference that it is desirable that the Governments should provide for the imposition of penalties sufficiently severe to discourage the illegal killing or taking of whales.

The Conference accordingly recommends that the Commission should study the reports regarding infractions made to them in accordance with the provisions of Article IX, paragraph 4, of the Convention, with a view to making recommendations to Governments as provided for in Article VI of the Conventio for the purpose of achieving the greatest possible uniformity in the penalties imposed for contraventions of the Convention.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the following representatives sign this Final Act.

DONE in Washington, this second day of December 1946, in the English language, the original of which shall be deposited in the archives of the Government of the United States of America. The Government of the

United States of America shall transmit certified copies thereof to all the other Governments represented at the Conference.

For Argentina:
O. IVANISSEVICH
J M MONETA
G. BROWN
PEDRO H. BRUNO VIDELA

For Australia:
F. F. ANDERSON
C. C. SETTER

For Brazil:
PAULO FRÓES DA CRUZ

For Canada:
HARRY A. SCOTT
J. A. RODD

For Chile:
AGUSTÍN R. EDWARDS

For Denmark:
P. F. ERICHSEN

For France:
FRANCIS LACOSTE
HENRI CLAUDEL

For the Netherlands:
D J VAN DIJK
H. S. DROST
G. G. H. VON FELDE

For New Zealand:
G R POWLES
ROGER HAWTHORNE

For Norway:
BIRGER BERGERSEN
KNUT LYKKE
H. T. KNUDTZON
VALENTIN VOSS
JOHAN T. RUUD
H. WINGE SORENSEN
HARALD B. PAULSEN

For Peru:
C. ROTALDE

For the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:
ALEXANDER S. BOGDANOV
EUGINE I. NIKISHIN
VLADIMIR A. TVERIANOVICH

For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:
A. T. A. DOBSON
JOHN THOMSON
N. A. MACKINTOSH
F. V. CROSS
S. J. KNOWLES
M. I. HUTTON
R. BEST
A. F. GEOLOT

For the United States of America:
REMINGTON KELLOGG
IRA N. GABRIELSON
WILLIAM E. S. FLORY
HILARY J. DEASON
HAROLD C. MOORE
L. WENDELL HAYES

Observers

For Iceland:
OLAFUR BJORNSSON

For Ireland:
THOS. V. COMMINS

For Portugal:
JERÓNIMO HENRIQUES JORGE

For Sweden:
LEIF BELFRAGE
ERIC VIRGIN

For the Union of South Africa:
J. SMIT

[SEAL] Clarke L. Willard
CLARKE L. WILLARD
Secretary General

ANNEX

Nomenclature of whales

Scientific	English	French	Netherlands	Russian	Scandinavian [1]	Spanish
Balaenidae (Right Whales)						
Balaena mysticetus Linnaeus	Greenland Whale Right Whale Bowhead Arctic Whale Great Polar Whale	Baleine franche Baleine du Groenland	Gröenland Walvisch	Grenlandskii kit	Grönlandshval (N) Sletbak (N) Nordhval (D) Grönlandsval (S) Nordval (S)	Cabeza arqueada
Eubalaena glacialis Bonnaterre Eubalaena japonica Lacépede Eubalaena australis Desmoulins	Right Whale Biscayan Right Whale North Atlantic Right Whale Nordcaper North Cape Whale Scrag Whale Black Whale Black Right Whale Southern Right Whale	Baleine de Biscaye	Noordkaper	Nastoĭashchiĭ kit Severo-Atlanticheskii Nastoĭashchiĭ kit	Rethval (D. N.) Nordkaper (N) Biscayerhval Nordkapare (S) Biscayaval (S)	Ballena franca
Neobalaena marginata Gray	Pigmy Right Whale	Baleine franche naine	Dwerg Walvisch			Enana
Balaenopteridae (Furrow-throated Whales)						
Megaptera nodosa Bonnaterre Megaptera Novae angliae Borowski	Hump Whale Humpbacked Whale Humpback Hunchbacked Whale Bunch	Mégaptère Jubarte	Bultrug	Gorbatyĭ kit Gorbach	Knölhval (N) Bukkelhval (D) Knölval (S) Puckelval (S)	Jorobada
Balaenoptera (Sibbaldus) musculus Linnaeus	Sibbald's Rorqual Blue Whale Sulphur Bottom Great Northern Rorqual	Baleine bleue Rorqual bleu	Blauwe Vinvisch	Sinii kit Bluval	Blåhval (D. N.) Blåval (S)	Ballena Azul
Balaenoptera phy alus Linnaeus	Fin Whale Finner Common Ffnback Herring Whale Razorback Common Rorqual	Rorqual commun	Gewone Vinvisch	Seldĭanoĭ kit Finval	Finhval (D. N.) Rörhval (D) Sillval (S)	Ballena de aleta
Balaenoptera borealis Lesson	Sei Whale Pollack Whale Coalfish Whale Rudolphi's-Rorqual	Rorqual de Rudolf	Noordsche Vinvisch	Seiva.	Seihval (D. N.) Sejval (S)	Ballena Boba
Balaenoptera Brydei olsen	Bryde's Whale Sei Whale	Baleine de Bryde	Bryde Vinvisch		Brydehval (N)	Ballena Brydea
Balaenoptera acutorostrata Lacépède	Lesser Rorqual-Minke Little Piked Whale Pike-headed Whale	Petit Rorqual	Dwerg Vinvisch	Malyĭ polosatik kit zalivov	Minke (N) Vågehval (D. N.) Vikval (S)	Ballena pequeña
Rhachianectidae						
Rhachianectes glaucus Cope	Gray Whale Gray Back California Gray Whale Pacific Gray Whale Devil Fish Hard Head Mussel Digger Rip Sack	Baleine grise	Grÿze Walvisch	Seryĭ kit	Gråhval (N) Gråval (S)	Ballena gris
Physeteridae						
Physeter Catodon Linnaeus	Sperm Whale Pot Whale Cachalot	Cachalot	Potvisch	Kashalot	Kaskelot (D. N. S.) Spermacetival (S) Spermhval (N) Pottval (S)	Cachalote
Ziphiidae						
Hyperoodon ampullatus Hyperoodon planifrons	Bottlenose (Arctic) Bottlenose (Antarctic)		Snavel Potvisch	Butylkonos	Nabbväl (S) Bottlenose (N)	Hocico de botella

[1] D—Danish. N—Norwegian. S—Swedish.

ADDENDUM

As a result of the discussion of certain matters raised at the Conference, the Netherlands Delegate invited the Conference to include in its Final Act a resolution in the following terms:

"The Conference recommends that in the interest of effective conservation and development of whale stocks the Governments represented at the Conference refrain from taking any measures which might prevent any country adhering to the principles of the international whaling agreements from ratifying or entering into the international regulations for the preservation of whale stocks."

This resolution was, however, defeated by nine votes to three, some delegates disagreeing with the substance of the resolution and others considering that it contained implications outside the purview of the Conference. At the express request of the Netherlands Delegate these facts are recorded in this addendum to the Final Act.

I CERTIFY THAT the foregoing is a true copy of the Final Act of the International Whaling Conference, including the annex and addendum attached thereto, signed at Washington on December 2, 1946, in the English language, the signed original of which is deposited in the archives of the Government of the United States of America.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I, JAMES F. BYRNES, Secretary of State of the United States of America, have hereunto caused the seal of the Department of State to be affixed and my name subscribed by the Acting Authentication Officer of the said Department, at the city of Washington, in the District of Columbia, this twenty-third day of December, 1946.

JAMES F. BYRNES
Secretary of State
By B. E. CASH
Acting Authentication Officer
Department of State

REPORT OF THE DELEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE INTERNATIONAL WHALING CONFERENCE, HELD AT WASHINGTON, D. C., NOVEMBER 20 THROUGH DECEMBER 2, 1946

The Honorable, The SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: Overfishing in the past has depleted many whale fisheries to such a degree that they may never recover. With continued unregulated whaling operations the few remaining productive areas might well have suffered a similar fate. Interested nations have realized for some time the magnitude of the problem of dwindling world whale stocks. The importance of whale oil and other whale products from an economic and nutritional standpoint has made it clearly evident that effective international regulation is not only desirable but necessary in order to restore and maintain stocks at a level which will permit a sustained capture of the maximum possible number of whales.

The realization that stocks in some areas are susceptible of natural increases if whaling is properly regulated led to the Convention for the Regulation of Whaling, concluded at Geneva on September 24, 1931 (49 Stat. 3079), and marked the beginning of formal international cooperation in the conservation and management of this valuable world resource. The United States of America played an active part in the formulation of the Geneva Convention, and also in the development of the two subsequent basic agreements:

Agreement for the Regulation of Whaling, signed at London on June 8, 1937 (52 Stat. 1460).

Protocol, Amending the Agreement of June 8, 1937, for the Regulation of Whaling, signed at London on June 24, 1938 (53 Stat. 1794).

The Geneva Convention presented a general foundation for international whaling regulation, and the subsequent agreements amended and extended the regulations contained in the Convention in accordance with increased scientific information and changing needs.

Certain provisions of the basis agreements were limited with regard to the period of their effectiveness and therefore did not apply during later seasons. In view of this fact and in order to provide adequate regulation for the specific situation which existed as a result of the war, several agreements applicable for one year only were concluded. Among these may be noted:

Protocol, Amending the Agreement of June 8, 1937, for the Regulation of Whaling (as amended by the Protocol of June 24, 1938), signed at London on February 7, 1944 (Senate, Executive D, 78th Congress, 2d Session).

Protocol, Amending the Agreement of June 8, 1937, for the Regulation of Whaling (as amended by the Protocol of June 24, 1938), signed at London on November 26, 1945 (Senate, Executive I, 79th Congress, 2d Session).

Since those portions of the basic agreements which were not limited with regard to the period of their effectiveness were not considered to be sufficient in scope to meet expected conservation needs and world requirements for fats and oils, it was recognized at several recent whaling conferences that the nations should give early consideration to the development of a new long-range agreement to provide continuing regulation for the conservation and development of the whale stocks. Development of such an agreement would obviate the necessity for annual formal international conferences on the regulation of whaling, and would provide a greater degree of continuity and predictability in the specific regulations which would apply in any season. At the London Conference of November 1945 it was suggested that at the next international whaling conference, the need for some form of permanent Commission to perform on a continuing basis certain functions pertaining to the regulation of whaling be considered and specific action initiated.

Therefore, in view of the need for adequate regulation for the 1947–48 and subsequent whaling seasons, and the desire for consideration of the possible establishment of long-range administrative machinery for modification, the United States of America issued invitations for a Conference to be held in Washington beginning November 20, 1946. The Agenda for this Conference consisted of the following:

(1) Development of a code of regulations for the 1947–48 and subsequent whaling seasons.

(2) Establishment of an International Whaling Commission to amend these regulations from time to time in the future.

The International Whaling Conference convened in Washington on November 20, 1946, under the chairmanship of Dr. Remington Kellogg, Curator, Division of Mammals, Smithsonian Institution, and a member of the United States Delegation. The business of the Conference was continued on November 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 29, and 30 and concluded on December 2, 1946, with the opening of the final documents of the Conference for signature.

The countries represented by plenipotentiary or observer delegations were as follows: The United States of America, Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Denmark, France, Iceland, Ireland, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Portugal, Sweden, the Union of South Africa, the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Mexico was invited but did not participate.

The American delegates were Dr. Remington Kellogg, Curator, Division of Mammals, Smithsonian Institution, chairman; Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, Consultant, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior; and Mr. William E. S. Flory, Acting Assistant Chief, International Resources Division, Department of State, who were assisted by Dr. H. J. Deason, Department of the Interior; Mr. L. Wendell Hayes, Department of State; Mr. Charles E. Lund, Department of Commerce; Capt. Harold C. Moore, United States Coast Guard; and Mr. Fred J. Rossiter, Department of Agriculture, as technical advisers, and Mr. Edward Castleman, Department of State, as administrative assistant.

Facilities for the functioning of the conference were provided by the International Conferences Division of the Department of State, and the United States Government, as host, provided the Secretariat.

A list of Conference committees and committee members may be found in the Final Act, a copy of which is attached to this report. The work of the committees was highly important with regard to the rapid progress and success of the Conference. Such points as the minimum length of whales, uniform penalties, the composition of the International Whaling Commission and its possible incorporation with the Food and Agricultural Organization, and effective acceptable wording for the final documents all were discussed and agreeably settled in committee sessions. The results of the work of the committees are either embodied in the principal agreement or are included as resolutions or recommendations in the Final Act.

There were fifteen plenary sessions, the final one taking place on December 2, 1946. The final documents of the Conference were (1) an International Whaling Protocol, (2) an International Whaling Convention, and (3) a Final Act. These documents were opened for signature on December 2, 1946, to remain open for a period of fourteen days thereafter.

Members of the plenipotentiary delegations of the following countries signed all three of the final documents during the period in which they were open for signature: The United States of America, Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Denmark, France, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, the Union of South Africa, the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Members of the observer delegations from the following countries signed the Final Act during this period: Iceland, Ireland, Portugal and Sweden.

The two agreements which resulted from this Conference were a Protocol for the Regulation of Whaling effective only for the 1947–48 season, and an International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling effective for the 1948–49 and subsequent seasons.

The Protocol for the Regulation of Whaling which resulted from this Conference extends the provisions of the 1945 Protocol, making them applicable to the 1947–48 whaling season. As stated before, certain provisions of the basic agreements would not have remained effective for the 1947–48 season, and in view of similar needs it was deemed advisable to extend the provisions of the 1945 Protocol in order to provide adequate regulations for the 1947–48 season. Since many of the countries interested in whaling had already become parties to the 1945 Protocol, it was felt that ratification could be expected early, and effective regulation for the 1947–48 season would thus be assured.

The second agreement, the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling, represents primarily the codification, with modifications, of the regulations of previous agreements and additional long-range administrative machinery for amendment.

The Preamble explains the purposes and objectives of the Convention.

Article I is similar in part to Article II of the 1937 Agreement. It provides that the Convention shall be understood to include the Schedule attached thereto as an integral part thereof, in its present terms or as amended in accordance with the provisions

of Article V. It further provides that the Convention applies to all whaling operations under the jurisdiction of the Contracting Governments on the high seas or within territorial waters.

Article II provides definitions for certain key terms, and since these definitions appear in the body of the Convention proper rather than in the Schedule, they can be changed only by a new agreement.

Article III provides for the establishment of an International Whaling Commission which would be empowered to modify the whaling regulations from time to time in the future as conditions may require, eliminating the necessity for annual formal international conferences to provide year by year regulation. It is similar to other Commissions established under international fisheries agreements to which the United States is a party.

Paragraph 1 provides for one member from each Contracting Government who shall have one vote, and who may be accompanied by one or more experts and advisers.

Paragraph 2 provides that the Commission is to elect its own officers and determine its own rules of procedure; also provides for simple majority of members voting on decisions and a three-fourths majority of members voting on amendments.

Paragraph 3 provides that the Commission is to appoint its own Secretary and Staff.

Paragraph 4 provides that the Commission may set up such committees as it considers desirable.

Paragraph 5 provides that the expenses of each member and his advisers shall be determined and paid for by his own government.

Paragraph 6 states the desire to avoid duplication of functions and therefore provides that Contracting Governments will consult among themselves within two years after entry into force of the Convention to decide whether the Commission should be brought within the framework of a specialized agency related to the United Nations.

Paragraph 7 provides that the United Kingdom is to convene the first meeting of the Commission, and initiate the consultation referred to in paragraph 6 above.

Paragraph 8 provides that subsequent meetings of the Commission shall be convened as the Commission may determine.

Article IV is also similar to provisions in recent international fisheries agreements. It provides the Commission with the responsibility for encouraging, recommending or if necessary organizing studies and investigations relating to whales and whaling. The Commission is also to collect and analyze statistical information pertaining to conservation, to study, appraise and disseminate appropriate information, and to publish reports of its activities and other reports containing information considered pertinent to whale conservation.

Article V, which applies to the Commission's power of amendment, is likewise similar to existing international fisheries agreements. It provides that the Commission may amend provisions of the Schedule from time to time by adopting regulations pertaining to the conservation and utilization of whale resources. These amendments shall be such as are necessary to carry out the objectives of the Convention, shall be based upon scientific findings, and shall provide for the conservation, development and optimum utilization of the whale resources. Amendments shall not involve restrictions on the number or nationality of factory ships or land stations, nor allocate specific quotas to any factory ship or land station or to any group of factory ships or land stations. It is also provided that the interest of consumers shall be taken into consideration.

Amendments shall become effective with respect to Contracting Governments ninety days after notification of the amendment by the Commission, except that any Contracting Government may present objection to the amendment within a specified time after receipt of notification, and the amendment thereby would not become effective with respect to the government objecting until such a date as the objection is withdrawn, but will remain effective with respect to all Governments who do not choose to object. The Commission is to notify all Contracting Governments immediately upon receipt of objection or withdrawal of objection thereby allowing ample time for such Governments to take similar action if they so desire.

Since the Protocol, the interim agreement signed at this Conference, applies to the 1947–48 whaling season, and since the Convention does not apply until the 1948–49 season it is specified that no amendment shall become effective before July 1, 1949.

Article VI provides the Commission with the power to make recommendations to any or all of the Contracting Governments on matters concerning whales and whaling and the objectives of the Convention.

Article VII provides that the Commission may arrange for the prompt and uniform submission of pertinent information.

Article VIII is similar to Article X of the 1937 Agreement. It provides the Contracting Governments with the right to grant special permits for the taking or treating of whales for purposes of scientific research. It is included to encourage scientific investigation, but by requiring each Contracting Government to report to the Commission at once all such authorizations which it has granted, it prevents this exemption from becoming a means for circumventing the conservation regulations.

Article IX is similar to provisions of the 1937 Agreement, and was discussed at the 1939 Conference. It provides that Contracting Governments shall take appropriate measures for the punishment of infractions against the provisions of the Convention. It requires each Contracting Government to submit to the Commission full details of infractions and penalties. This as restated in the Final Act is in recognition of the desirability of achieving a large measure of uniformity among the Contracting Governments with respect to the nature and severity of penalties imposed.

Article X is similar to corresponding provisions of earlier whaling agreements. It provides that (1) instruments of ratification shall be deposited with the Government of the United States of America, (2) nonsignatory Governments may adhere after entry into force by notification in writing to the Government of the United States of America, (3) the Government of the United States of America is to inform other signatory governments of ratifications deposited and adherences received, (4) the Convention enters into force upon deposit of instruments of ratification of at least six governments including the United States of America, the Netherlands, Norway, the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics, and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and shall enter into force with respect to each government subsequently ratifying or adhering on the date of deposit of its instrument of ratification or of receipt of its notification of adherence, and (5) provisions of the Schedule are not to apply prior to July 1, 1948, amendments to the Schedule prior to July 1, 1949. The reason for the specified dates is that the Protocol concluded by this Conference applies to the 1947–48 whaling season, and the Convention will not become effective until the 1948–49 season.

Article XI is the usual denunciation clause and is similar to Article XXI of the 1937 Agreement.

Paragraph 1 of the Schedule increases the number of inspectors required on factory ships to two. This was done in view of discussions at the 1945 and earlier Conferences, and in view of the need for more effective enforcement. The matter of appointment and pay of inspectors is taken in part from Article I of the 1937 Agreement. Adequate inspection for land stations is included in accord with discussions at previous Conferences.

Paragraph 2 forbids the taking or killing of Gray Whales or Right Whales, except when the meat and products of such whales are to be used exclusively for local consumption by the aborigines. It is similar in intent to Article IV of the 1937 Agreement and Article III of the 1931 Convention. Since stocks of both species are still at a critical level, this prohibition is deemed essential to their recovery.

Paragraph 3 is similar to Article VI of the 1937 Agreement and is designed to protect immature whales of all species, and female whales accompanied by nursing calves.

Paragraph 4 is similar to Article IX of the 1937 Agreement, and Article VII of the 1938 Protocol. This paragraph is designed to protect whales from factory ship operations on their calving grounds, during their migration to and from such grounds, and in waters where stocks have been depleted.

Paragraph 5 is similar to Article II of the 1938 Protocol, and reestablishes a sanctuary area for Baleen Whales insofar as factory ship operations are concerned.

Paragraph 6 is similar to Article I of the 1938 Protocol and Article III of the 1945 Protocol. It is included since Humpback Whale stocks are not yet considered to be replenished to the point where exploitation could safely be resumed. It is recommended in the Final Act that the International Whaling Commission consider modification of this prohibition when biological and other data make a relaxation advisable.

Paragraph 7 is similar to Article VII of the 1937 Agreement and Article I of the 1945 Protocol in that it establishes a fixed Antarctic whaling season for Baleen Whales commencing at a date when it is believed that the whales have had an opportunity to spend sufficient time on the feeding grounds to put on substantial fat. In this agreement the period established is three and one-half months. This paragraph also provides that treatment of whales taken during the open season may be completed after the end of such season.

Paragraph 8 is similar to Article III of the 1944 Protocol and Article IV of the 1945 Protocol, and establishes an over-all catch limit for the waters south of 40° South Latitude. Certain modifications have been made in the procedure for reporting catches, consistent with the provisions of the present Convention.

Paragraph 9 is similar to Article V of the 1937 Agreement, except for the inclusion of Sei Whales. The specified lengths of the whales are considered to be slightly under the normal size at which they reach sexual maturity. An exception in minimum length is made for the Blue, Fin and Sei Whales taken for delivery to land stations where the meat is to be used for local consumption as as human or animal food. This exception will involve only a relatively small number of whales. The method of measurement is specified, and provides that whales must be measured when at rest on deck or platform.

Paragraph 10 is similar to Article VIII of the 1937 Agreement. It is designed to prevent land stations from taking migrating Baleen Whales both on their way to and on their way from the calving grounds. As mentioned in the Final Act, it is deemed advisable, as soon as conclusive scientific information is available, to specify definite closed seasons for land stations.

Paragraph 11 is similar to Article III, Section 1 of the 1938 Protocol, and was designed to provide reasonable interim protection of the whale stocks during their migrations and during the calving seasons.

Paragraph 12 is similar to Article VI of the Geneva Convention and Article XI of the 1937 Agreement. Its purpose is to assure the

fullest possible production of primary products from all whales killed.

Paragraph 13 is similar to Article VIII of the 1938 Protocol. Whales deteriorate more rapidly prior to than after being cut up on the flensing deck, and, in a large measure, the quality of oil produced from a whale is dependent on the amount of time elapsing between killing and processing. Thirty-three hours is deemed to be the maximum time that a whale should remain in the water, after killing, without marked deterioration.

Paragraph 14 is similar to Article XIII of the 1937 Agreement. It is designed as a method of assuring that the basis for payments to crews does not tend towards violations of whaling regulations.

Paragraph 15 provides for the transmission to the Commission of all official laws and regulations relating to whales and whaling and changes in such laws and regulations, by all parties to the Agreement.

Paragraph 16 is similar to Articles XVI and XVII of the 1937 Agreement in that it provides for the submission of statistical data on all factory ships, whale catchers and land stations engaged in whaling operations. This information is to be transmitted to the International Bureau for Whaling Statistics or to such other body as the Commission may designate.

Paragraph 17 provides that notwithstanding the definition of land station contained in Article II of this Convention, a factory ship operating under the jurisdiction of a Contracting Government, and the movements of which are confined solely to the territorial waters of that government, shall be subject to the regulations governing the operation of land stations within the following areas (1) on the coast of Madagascar and its dependencies and on the west coasts of French Africa, and (2) in certain specified areas on the coasts of Australia.

Paragraph 18 is similar to Article XVIII of the 1937 Agreement, and provides definitions of certain pertinent expressions appearing in the Schedule.

Among the matters presented in the Final Act are a recommendation that the Commission consider modification of the prohibition on the use of factory ships or their whale catchers for the purpose of taking Humpback Whales in any waters south of 40° South Latitude when biological or other data make this action advisable, a recommendation for the earliest possible acquisition of adequate scientific information in order to prescribe fixed seasons for land stations, and a recommendation for the study of infractions and penalties in order to achieve a large measure of uniformity with respect to the nature and severity of penalties imposed. It is also recommended that the chart of common and scientific names of whales annexed to the Final Act be accepted as a guide by the Governments represented. At the request of the Netherlands delegation its position regarding certain Norwegian statutory provisions was included in an Addendum to the Final Act.

The Delegation of the United States of America believes that the interests of this country will be served by ratification of the Agreements concluded at this Conference, since the Protocol will provide adequate regulation during the 1947-48 whaling season, and since the Convention, which is based on the experience gained in all of the previous work done in the international regulation of whaling, is designed to give effective long-range protection to the existing stocks of whales and to provide for the continuing development of those stocks.

Respectfully yours,

REMINGTON KELLOGG
IRA N. GABRIELSON
WILLIAM E. S. FLORY

Delegates of the United States of America, International Conference on Whaling

Attachment: Certified copy of Final Act.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The convention is before the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the convention will be reported to the Senate.

The convention was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution of ratification will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive L, Eightieth Congress, first session, and international convention for the regulation of whaling, signed by the United States of America and other countries on December 2, 1946.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the treaty and two accompanying protocols were sent to the Senate by the President with the very earnest recommendation that they be ratified. The Committee on Foreign Relations referred the treaty and the protocols to a subcommittee composed of the present speaker. Careful consideration was given to the provisions of the treaty and of the protocol, and a report was made to the full committee, recommending adoption of the subcommittee report, and recommending that the treaty and the protocols be sent to the Senate for ratification. This treaty and these protocols provide for the regulation of the whaling fisheries. They are essentially conservation measures, recognizing the depredation that has been going on over the years with respect to the killing of whales, with the resultant marked diminution in this mammal resource.

The treaty was drafted as a result of a conference held in Washington from November 20 to December 2, 1946, at which time the experts of the United States, those at least connected with the Government, represented the United States, and from that conference, which lasted something over 10 days, there emerged the recommendations which are embodied in the treaty.

I can say in a summary way that the treaty and the protocols were definitely conservation measures. It is hoped that we are to preserve this species of animal life for future generations. The treaty goes into great detail with respect to the time for the killing of whales, areas in which they may be killed, the methods that may be employed, and various other details, all looking to the preservation of the animals. I feel, myself, after such study as I have been able to give, that every public consideration urges ratification of the treaty and the protocols. Unless there are questions, Mr. President, I would move the ratification.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification. [Putting the question.] Two-thirds of the Senators presents concurring therein, the Resolution of Ratification is agreed to, and the convention is ratified.

PROTOCOL FOR THE REGULATION OF WHALING—1946

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider Executive K (80th Cong., 1st sess.), a protocol for the regulation of whaling, signed by the United States of America and other countries on December 2, 1946, which was read the second time, as follows:

PROTOCOL FOR THE REGULATION OF WHALING

The Governments whose duly authorized representatives have subscribed hereto,

Recognizing the necessity of an early decision regarding the regulations to be made applicable to the whaling season of 1947-48;

Having due regard both to the world shortage of oil and fats and to the necessity for the conservation of the whale stocks;

Agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

All the provisions of the Protocol for the Regulation of Whaling signed in London on November 26, 1945, shall be made applicable as if in the said Protocol the words "season 1947-48" were substituted for the words "season 1946-47" and the words "1 May 1948 to 31 October 1948" were substituted for the words "1st May, 1947, to 31st October, 1947".

ARTICLE II

This Protocol shall come into force when notifications of acceptance thereof shall have been given to the Government of the United States of America by all the Government Parties to the Protocol of November 26, 1945.

This Protocol shall bear the date on which it is opened for signature and shall remain open for signature for a period of fourteen days thereafter.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the undersigned, being duly authorized, have signed this Protocol.

DONE in Washington this second day of December, 1946, in the English language, the original of which shall be deposited in the archives of the Government of the United States of America. The Government of the United States of America shall transmit certified copies thereof to all the other signatory and adhering Governments.

For Argentina:
O. IVANISSEVICH
J M MONETA
G. BROWN
PEDRO H. BRUNO VIDELA

For Australia:
F. F. ANDERSON

For Brazil:
PAULO FRÓES DA CRUZ

For Canada:
H H WRONG
HARRY A SCOTT

For Chile:
AGUSTÍN R. EDWARDS

For Denmark:
P. F. ERICHSEN

For France:
FRANCIS LACOSTE

For the Netherlands:
D J VAN DIJK

For New Zealand:
G R POWLES

For Norway:
BIRGER BERGERSEN

For Peru:
C ROTALDE

For the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:
ALEXANDER S. BOGDANOV
EUGINE I. NIKISHIN

For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:
A. T. A. DOBSON
JOHN THOMSON

For the United States of America:
REMINGTON KELLOGG
IRA N GABRIELSON
WILLIAM E. S. FLORY

For the Union of South Africa:
H. T. ANDREWS

I CERTIFY THAT the foregoing is a true copy of the Protocol for the Regulation of Whaling opened for signature in the English language at Washington on December 2, 1946, the signed original of which is deposited in

the archives of the Government of the United States of America.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I, JAMES F. BYRNES, Secretary of State of the United States of America, have hereunto caused the seal of the Department of State to be affixed and my name inscribed by the Acting Authentication Officer of the said Department, at the city of Washington, in the District of Columbia, this twenty-third day of December, 1946.

JAMES F. BYRNES
Secretary of State
By B. E. CASH
Acting Authentication Officer
Department of State

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The protocol is before the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the protocol will be reported to the Senate.

The protocol was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution of ratification will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive K, Eightieth Congress, first session, a protocol for the regulation of whaling, signed by the United States of America and other countries on December 2, 1946.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification. [Putting the question.] Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution of ratification is agreed to, and the protocol is ratified.

SUPPLEMENTARY PROTOCOL FOR THE REGULATION OF WHALING

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider Executive P (80th Cong., 1st sess.), a supplementary protocol for the regulation of whaling, signed at London, March 3, 1947, which was read the second time, as follows:

SUPPLEMENTARY PROTOCOL

The Governments of the Union of South Africa, the Commonwealth of Australia, Canada, Denmark, France, New Zealand, Norway, the United Kingdom, the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics,

Having ratified or acceded to the Protocol signed in London on 26th November, 1945 (hereinafter called "The Protocol"), amending the International Agreement for the Regulation of Whaling signed in London on 8th June, 1937, as amended by the Protocols of 24th June, 1938, and 7th February, 1944;

Considering that it is provided under paragraph (i) of Article VIII of the Protocol that the Protocol shall come into force in its entirety when all the Governments referred to in the preamble of the Protocol shall have deposited their instruments of ratification or given notification of accession;

Considering further that ratifications or accessions have been deposited on behalf of all the Governments referred to in the preamble of the Protocol with the exception of the Governments of Mexico and the Netherlands; and

Desiring that the Protocol should be brought into force in its entirety without awaiting ratification by the Governments of Mexico and the Netherlands;

Have decided to conclude a Supplementary Protocol for this purpose and have agreed as follows—

ARTICLE I

Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (i) of Article VIII of the Protocol, the Protocol shall, on the signature of the present Suplementary Protocol, come into force with respect to the Governments signing the present Supplementary Protocol immediately upon signature by them.

ARTICLE II

The present Supplementary Protocol shall bear the date on which it is opened for signature and shall remain open for signature for a period of 14 days thereafter.

In witness whereof the Undersigned, duly authorized by their respective Governments, have signed the present Supplementary Protocol, done in London this 3rd day of March 1947 in a single copy, which shall be deposited in the archives of the Government of the United Kingdom and of which certified copies shall be transmitted to all the signatory Governments.

For the Government of the Union of South Africa:
EUGENE. K. SCALLAN
For the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia:
JOHN. A. BEASLEY
Subjet. to approval
For the Government of Canada:
N. A ROBERTSON
For the Government of Denmark:
E REVENTLOW
For the Government of France:
JEAN LE ROY
For the Government of New Zealand:
W. J. JORDAN
For the Government of Norway:
P. PREBENSEN
For the Government of the United Kingdom:
O. G. SARGENT
For the Government of the United States of America:
W. J. GALLMAN
Subject to ratification.
For the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:
G. ZAROUBIN
Certified a true copy:
[SEAL] E. J. PASSANT,
Librarian and Keeper of the Papers at the Foreign Office.
LONDON, *24 Mar. 1947.*

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The supplementary protocol is before the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the supplementary protocol will be reported to the Senate.

The supplementary protocol was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution of ratification will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive P, Eightieth Congress, first session, a supplementary protocol for the regulation of whaling which was signed at London, March 3, 1947.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification. [Putting the question.] Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution of ratification is agreed to, and the supplementary protocol is ratified.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Marvin Jones, of Texas, to be Chief Justice of the United States Court of Claims, vice Richard S. Whaley, retired (Ex. Rept. No. 7); and

John Caskie Collet, of Missouri, to be judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, vice Kimbrough Stone, retiring May 15, 1947 (Ex. Rept. No. 7).

By Mr. FERGUSON (for Mr. WHITE), from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Lewis V. Evans III, a member of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, to be lieutenant (junior grade) in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3311) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the Judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. STEFAN, Mr. JONES of Ohio, Mr. HORAN, Mr. FENTON, Mr. ROONEY, Mr. GARY, and Mr. O'BRIEN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4031) making appropriations to meet emergencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. ENGEL of Michigan, Mr. STEFAN, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. KEEFE, Mr. KERR, and Mr. MAHON were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2700) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes; that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20 to the said bill, and concurred therein; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 7, and 8 to the bill and concurred therein, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, and that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9 to the bill.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 53. An act conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Harold Turcean;

S. 394. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Raymond Wesley Doyle;

S. 396. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Thurlow Grey Doyle;

S. 397. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Lawrence Stanley Doyle;

S. 398. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Spencer Burgess Doyle; and

S. 399. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Gladys May Doyle.

STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT ON RENT-CONTROL BILL

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield on the condition that I do not lose the floor thereby.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Texas may yield to me for the purpose of making a brief statement and asking for an insertion in the RECORD, on condition that he will not lose the floor by doing so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Rhode Island?

The Chair hears none.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, it appears to me that it has been a lesson well learned on the floor of the Senate that when Senators proceed to the consideration of an issue in a spirit of anger they are often in danger of finding themselves inaccurate. Yesterday during a considerable portion of the time that we were in session the President of the United States was severely criticized for the exercise of a prerogative which I believe the Chief Executive has of sending messages to the Congress. We were told that the President had no constitutional authority to send a message to Congress whenever he signed or gave his approval to a legislative enactment. Words such as these were used, Mr. President, by a Senator:

I humbly urge that the President recognize in such cases his obligations as the Chief Executive of the country, and carry those obligations out to the best of his ability. The President should be given to understand that the Congress will hereafter not countenance politically inspired messages from the Executive after he has taken affirmative action on a particular piece of legislation.

As the debate proceeded we were told that this was probably the first time in our constitutional history, from the days when a message was sent to Congress by President Tyler, that such a thing had occurred. My purpose in rising now, Mr. President, is to keep the record accurate. I have come across a message delivered under exactly similar circumstances to the Congress of the United States on the 25th of June, 1910, when the then President, William Howard Taft, signed a certain bill, and then addressed a message to the Senate and the House of Representatives similar to that which we received from President Truman. I am going to ask at the conclusion of my remarks that the message of President Taft be printed in the RECORD of today's proceedings. I shall quote merely the first and last paragraphs. President Taft said:

I have approved the bill (H. R. 20686) entitled "An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes"; and while I have signed the bill, I venture to submit a memorandum of explanation and comment.

After proceeding with his comment he concluded with the words:

I do not think, therefore, the defects of the bill which I have pointed out will justify the postponement of all this important work. But I do think that in the preparation of the proposed future yearly bills Congress should adopt the reforms above suggested and that a failure to do so would justify withholding Executive approval, even though a river and harbor bill fail.

WM. H. TAFT.

I am happy to note, Mr. President, that we in the Eightieth Congress are not only indebted to the great service of William Howard Taft as President of the United States, but that likewise we are related to him through our leadership in the first degree of consanguinity.

I ask unanimous consent that the message may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the message from President Taft on the river and harbor bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I have approved the bill H. R. 20686, entitled "An act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes"; and while I have signed the bill, I venture to submit a memorandum of explanation and comment.

The bill is an important one and contains many excellent features. It provides for the canalization of the Ohio River, to be prosecuted at a rate which will insure its completion within 12 years; the improvement of the Mississippi River between Cairo and the Gulf of Mexico, to be completed within 20 years; of the Mississippi River between the mouth of the Missouri and the mouth of the Ohio River, to be completed within 12 years; of the Mississippi River between Minneapolis and the mouth of the Missouri River, to be completed within 12 years; of the Hudson River, for the purpose of facilitating the use of the barge canal in the vicinity of Troy, N. Y.; of the Savannah River from Augusta to the sea, with a view to its completion within 4 years; of a 35-foot channel in the Delaware River from Philadelphia to the sea; of a 35-foot channel to Norfolk, Va.; of a 27-foot channel to Mobile, Ala.; of a 30-foot channel to Jacksonville, Fla.; of a 30-foot channel to Oakland, Calif. It also provides for greatly enlarged harbor facilities at certain important Lake ports, including Ashtabula and Lorain, and enlarged facilities for the important commerce of the Detroit River. Indeed, it may be said that a great majority of the projects named in the bill are meritorious and that money expended in their completion will not be wasted.

The chief defect in the bill is the large number of projects appropriated for and the uneconomical method of carrying on these projects by the appropriation of sums small in comparison to the amounts required to effect completion.

The figures convincingly establish the fact that this bill makes inadequate provision for too many projects. The total of the bill, $52,000,000, is not unduly large, but the policy of small appropriations with a great many different enterprises, without provision for their completion, is unwise. It tends to waste, because, thus constructed, the projects are likely to cost more than if they were left to contractors who were authorized to complete the whole work within a reasonably short time. The appropriation of a small sum lessens the sense of responsibility of those who are to adopt the project, and who do not, therefore, give to their decision the care that they would give if the appropriation or contract involved the full amount needed for completion. Moreover, the appropriation of a comparatively small sum for a doubtful enterprise is thereafter used by its advocates to force further provision for it from Congress on the ground that the investment made is a conclusive recognition of the wisdom of the project, and its continuance becomes a necessity to save the money already spent. This has been called a piecemeal policy. It is proposed to remedy this defect by an annual rivers and harbors bill, but that hardly avoids the objections above cited, for such yearly appropriations are apt to be effected by the state of the Treasury and political exigency.

If enterprises are to be useful as encouraging means of transportation, they ought to be finished within a reasonable time. The delays in completing them postpone their usefulness and increase their cost. The proper policy, it seems to me, is to determine from the many projects proposed and recommended what are the most important, and then to proceed to complete them with due dispatch; and then to take up others and do the same thing with them.

There has been frequent discussion of late years as to the proper course to be pursued in the development of our inland waterways, and I think the general sentiment has been that we should have a comprehensive system agreed upon by some competent body of experts, who should pass upon the relative merits of the various projects and recommend the order in which they should be begun and completed.

Under the present system every project is submitted to Army engineers, who pass upon the question whether it ought to be adopted, but they have no power to pass upon the relative importance of the many different projects they approve, or to suggest the most economical and businesslike order for their completion.

General Marshall, while Chief Engineer, at my request furnished me a memorandum in respect to the bill then pending in the Senate, in which he analyzed the criticisms made in the discussion of it in Congress. He considers the bill to be quite as good as any of its predecessors, but points out the defects I have mentioned above, and also suggests that the old projects provided for in the bill include some which were never recommended by the engineers and some which, though once recommended, would not be now recommended because of a change of condition.

Congress should refer the old projects to boards of Army engineers for further consideration and recommendation. This would enable us to know what of the old works ought to be abandoned. General Marshall's plain intimation is that a number of old projects call for action of this kind.

I have given to the consideration of this bill the full 10 days since its submission to me, and some time before that. The objections are to the system, for it may be conceded that the framers of the bill have made as good a bill as they could under the "piecemeal" policy. I once reached the conclusion that it was my duty to interpose a veto in order if possible to secure a change in the method of framing these bills. Subsequent consideration has altered my view as to my duty.

It is now 3 years since a river and harbor bill was passed. The projects under way are in urgent need of further appropriation for maintenance and continuance, and there is great and justified pressure for many of the new projects provided for in the bill. It has been made clear to me that the failure of the bill thus late in the session would seriously embarrass the constructing engineers. I do not think, therefore, the defects of the bill which I have pointed out will justify the postponement of all this important work. But I do think that in the preparation of the proposed future yearly bills Congress should adopt the reforms above suggested and that a failure to do so would justify withholding executive approval, even though a rivers and harbors bill fail.

WM. H. TAFT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 25, 1910.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4031) making appropriations to meet emergencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also anounced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 2700) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

TRANSACTION OF LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, as in legislative session, the following business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the case of 74 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization Service under the authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

JANUARY 1947 REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Corporation showing its activities and expenditures for the month of January 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Office of Temporary Controls, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Twenty-first Report of the Office of Price Administration, for the period ended March 31, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Joint Resolution 24

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to roads providing access to veterans' homesteads

"Whereas the United States has set aside a considerable acreage in the State of California for homesteads for returning soldiers and in so doing is giving many veterans a splendid opportunity to establish themselves in successful careers as farmers; and

"Whereas most of the land opened to such entry is located in the sparsely populated areas of this State and in counties in which a large degree of Federal ownership of land combines with a relatively low tax assessment roll to reduce the county's available funds to a minimum; and

"Whereas in opening these lands to returning veterans the Federal law apparently does not contain provisions for providing roads over which the lands can be reached; and

"Whereas in Modoc County, for example, the United States controls more than 58 percent of the total acreage which is off of the county tax roll, the total tax roll is only $14,000,000, the county already has 600 miles of county roads to maintain, it is financially impossible to build new roads for the veterans, and at least 20 miles of new construction will be required this year for access to the veterans' homesteads in that county; and

"Whereas the problem arises not in Modoc County alone but is common to all counties in which veterans' homesteads are being established; and

"Whereas the problem is complicated by the fact that even if these counties had the money it could not legally be expended for roads unless the rights of way were conveyed to the county, and this can or will not be done by the Federal officers involved; and

"Whereas the effort of the United States to establish our returning veterans in civilian life is highly commendable, but the benefits to the veterans will be of far smaller value unless roads are provided whereby the veterans can reach the other portions of the communities of which they are to become a part; and

"Whereas under all of the circumstances it appears that the furnishing of roads for veterans' homesteads is a function that the Federal Government should assume as a part of furnishing the homestead: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California (jointly).* That the President and the Congress of the United States are highly commended for the program of placing returning war veterans on homesteads of valuable agricultural land and giving them an opportunity for successful civilian life; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the President and the Congress of the United States are hereby memorialized and requested to take such steps as may be necessary to provide that roads be laid out and constructed so as to provide access to the lands being homesteaded by returning veterans; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the secretary of the senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each member from California in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution adopted by the city council of the city of Providence, R. I., favoring the enactment of the so-called Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill; ordered to lie on the table.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Joseph F. Dawson, president, Chamber of Commerce of the United States in the Republic of Chile, Santiago, Chile, confirming cablegram of that organization dated June 30, 1947, regarding the maintenance of the activities of the Office of International Information and Culture; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. LODGE (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to place an embargo on all exports of gasoline and oil and products thereof to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

"Whereas it has already been brought to the public attention by the Congress that there is a known shortage in this country of gasoline and oil and products thereof, and that gasoline rationing is to be expected in the near future: Therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That the Massachusetts House of Representatives hereby urges the Congress of the United States to impose immediately an embargo on all gasoline and oil and the products thereof which are listed for shipment to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"In the house of representatives, adopted, June 19, 1947."

COMMUNISTIC INFLUENCES—RESOLUTION BY LOOKOUT POST, NO. 1289, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution concerning communism adopted by Lookout Post, No. 1289, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States. The resolution, which I shall not read, comes from that post located in Chattanooga, Tenn., and is signed by the commander of the post, Cooper T. Holt; the senior vice commander, Roy Whitmire; the chairman of the resolutions committee, Mr. Richard H. Wallace, and two other members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars Post, 1289, Rlaph E. Holland and Don Southern.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A RESOLUTION OPPOSING COMMUNISM OR ANY OTHER ISM EXCEPT AMERICANISM

Whereas the insidious, slimy tentacles of communistic influences, dominated by a many-headed serpent in Moscow, has begun to seep into this Nation, threatening our domestic way of life; and

Whereas the Veterans of Foreign Wars are unalterably opposed to any ism but Americanism; and

Whereas this organization, suiting action to its words, first rid its own ranks before taking a firm, unwavering position against

encroachments of foreign nations, whoever they might be; and

Whereas this post, along with its brother posts throughout the entire Nation, opposes communisim in any form, and any other influences that may threaten our way of life: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be urged, by all means at hand, to dissolve this influence as soon as possible; that Congress be urged as soon as possible to pass ample, strong legislation curbing not only communism but any other evil influence that may threaten this Nation; that it is regretted our way of life will not permit as strong legislation as we desire.

COOPER T. HOLT,
Commander.
ROY N. WHITMIRE,
Senior Vice Commander.
RICHARD H. WALLACE,
RALPH E. HOLLAND,
DON SOUTHERN,
Resolutions Committee.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 1043. A bill for the relief of Frank J. Shaughnessy, collector of internal revenue, Syracuse, N. Y.; without amendment (Rept. No. 409);

H. R. 837. A bill for the relief of the estate of Abram Banta Bogert; without amendment (Rept. No. 410);

H. R. 1513. A bill for the relief of John C. Garrett; without amendment (Rept. No. 415);

H. R. 1658. A bill for the relief of Norman Thoreson; with an amendment (Rept. No. 412);

H. R. 1851. A bill for the relief of A. J. Davis, Mrs. Lorene Griffin, Earle Griffin, and Harry Musgrove; without amendment (Rept. No. 411);

H. R. 1954. A bill for the relief of Robert Hinton; with an amendment (Rept. No. 413); and

H. R. 2302. A bill for the relief of New Jersey, Indiana, & Illinois Railroad; without amendment (Rept. No. 416).

By Mr. O'CONOR, from the Committee on Civil Service:

S. 1486. A bill to provide for payment of salaries covering periods of separation from the Government service in the case of persons improperly removed from such service; without amendment (Rept. No. 414).

By Mr. BALDWIN, from the Committee on Civil Service:

S. 697. A bill to provide for payment of overtime compensation to supervisory employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; with an amendment (Rept. No. 417).

By Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Public Lands:

H. R. 3309. A bill to amend the Organic Act of Puerto Rico; with amendments (Rept. No. 422).

By Mr. VANDENBERG, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. J. Res. 98. Joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the World Health Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor; with an amendment (Rept. No. 421).

PROPOSED INCREASE IN SUBSISTENCE ALLOWANCE FOR VETERANS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare I ask unanimous consent to report favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 1394) to provide increased subsistence allowance to veterans pursuing certain courses under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes, which was introduced some time ago, proposing to increase the subsistence allowance for veterans from $65 to $75 for single veterans, from $90 to $105 for a veteran with one dependent, and from $90 to $120 for a veteran with more than one dependent, and I submit a report (No. 420) thereon.

Under this bill a married veteran with one child will get $120, a veteran who has just a wife will get $105, and a single veteran will get $75.

On behalf of the committee I wish to emphasize that we feel we have done equity in this bill; and I am pleased to report that the committee wishes to have the bill placed on the calendar and favors its passage.

In submitting the bill and the report, Mr. President, I wish to make one further point, namely, that it should be clearly understood that it never was the intention of Congress that the GI bill should cover the full expenses of a veteran in college; rather, the spirit and intent of the provisions of the GI bill are to allow the veteran substantial aid and assistance in going to college.

We feel that the bill we are now reporting favorably does that and is in conformity with the original spirit and intent of the Congress when the GI bill was passed in the first instance.

Mr. President, I urge Senators to read the printed record of the hearings on this legislation, because if they will read all the evidence in the printed record, I am sure they will agree with the committee in its position. The record shows that the changes in the cost of living alone justify the allowance we propose in this bill.

I wish to say further that from the standpoint of the obligation on the part of those of us who stayed at home during the war, irrespective of the war service we performed on the home front, we should not forget the great obligation we owe the men who went to war and ran the risks of the war and were set back 3 or 4 years, in most instances, in their pursuit of an education. We feel that this bill is a meritorious one and is overwhelmingly supported by the evidence in the record.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

ALLOWANCES FOR ON-THE-JOB TRAINING OF VETERANS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I am also pleased to ask unanimous consent to report favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 1393) to increase the permitted rate of allowance and compensation for training on the job under Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, and I submit a report (No. 419) thereon. Our recommendation, as set forth in our report, calls for an increase in the ceiling for the on-the-job training program from $175 for a single veteran to $200, and from $200 for a married veteran to $250.

Here again it becomes a matter of judgment and of applying a rule of reasonableness in fixing the specific amounts of the wage ceiling. It is a matter of determining what is equity in the light of all the facts and circumstances which have been brought out in the hearings. I think that once again a study of the record will show that the committee is doing equity and has struck a fair and reasonable figure in its recommendations for an increase.

There were proposals which would have increased the cost of these veterans' allowances as much as $3,000,000,000; but the total cost of the bills I am reporting today will be somewhere in the neighborhood of from $275,000,000 to $300,000,000, which, I think, is a fair adjustment of a legislative problem that certainly should be met at this session of Congress before the Congress adjourns.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

VETERANS' AUTOMOBILES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the last bill that it is my pleasure to ask unanimous consent to report with an amendment on behalf of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is the bill (S. 1391) to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes, a bill which by its terms proposes to give to disabled veterans who fall into certain classes of disability, an automobile up to the cost of $1,600, with the right of the veteran to pay a sum in addition to the $1,600 allowance by the Government, if he wishes to have a higher-priced car, and I submit a report (No. 418) thereon.

The testimony shows that in some instances, as to certain disabilities, cars which cost more than $1,600 are particularly desirable because of special equipment which they have.

We have extended the coverage of this bill. The old law provided automobiles only to those who had a leg amputated above the ankle. This bill covers those who have either lost a leg or have lost the use of a leg, and those who have either lost an arm or have lost the use of an arm, and those who have suffered the loss of their eyesight.

Here again it becomes a question of where we shall draw the line. There are other veterans who have other types of infirmities who are not covered by this legislation. We are dealing with a group of veterans, as the record shows, who are seeking to make economic adjustments to civilian life, and are trying to earn their livelihood. Providing them with locomotion will be of great assistance to them and will give them great hope of success in their economic pursuits.

I also wish to say that it will be a great help to them from the point of

view of their psychological rehabilitation, too. It is impossible to work with these veterans and to hear their testimony and to study their problems, as we on the subcommittee have done without recognizing that here is a group of veterans who certainly deserve whatever help the people of the United States can give to them by way of helping them to rehabilitate themselves both psychologically and economically. It is little enough, in our opinion, that we seek to give them this aid. Of course we do not mean it to be exclusive aid, either.

As to the other disabled veterans, who are not covered by this particular piece of legislation, let me say that I shall be among the first Members of the Senate to plead their cause, whenever it can be shown that any particular aid will make it possible for them to make a better adjustment to life than they are able to make without such aid. We as a people certainly cannot do too much for the disabled veterans of the United States.

I am very happy to be able to report this piece of legislation, because I think it is in keeping with the finest traditions of the American people from the standpoint of living up to their moral obligations to those who served us in uniform in time of war.

I wish to close by saying that the presentation of these reports and bills this afternoon must be more than just a gesture; and the way to make them something other than just a gesture is to see to it that when they are placed on the calendar they receive quick, prompt action. I am ready to submit, on the basis of the merits of the cases, Mr. President, that here are three bills that highly deserve early passage by the Senate and the House of Representatives, and that no justification can be made for letting the Congress adjourn on July 26 without having this legislation enacted. So far as I am concerned, as I said in the press conference this afternoon, I am going to be as insistent as humanly possible, as a Member of this body, in urging the Senate to take favorable action, in the case of each one of these three bills, before it adjourns on July 26.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that he had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

On July 1, 1947:

S. 715. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for investigatory personnel of the Federal Bureau of Investigation who have rendered at least 20 years of service; and

S. J. Res. 124. Joint Resolution to enable the President to utilize the appropriations for United States participation in the work of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration for meeting administrative expenses of United States Government agencies in connection with United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration liquidation.

On July 2, 1947:

S. 53. An act conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Harold Turcean;

S. 394. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Raymond Wesley Doyle;

S. 396. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Thurlow Grey Doyle;

S. 397. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Lawrence Stanley Doyle;

S. 398. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Spencer Burgess Doyle; and

S. 399. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Gladys May Doyle.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BARKLEY:

S. 1546. A bill for the relief of Robert O'Hagan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

S. 1547. A bill to provide for a national cemetery at the Veterans' Administration facility at Fort Meade, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 1548. A bill to provide additional inducements to citizens of the United States to make the United States Naval Service a career, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr BYRD:

S. 1549. A bill for the relief of Kenneth Dove and T. T. Grimsley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr SALTONSTALL:

S. 1550. A bill for the relief of John Clark Sharman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 1551. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to sell to Anthony P. Miller, Inc., a parcel of unimproved land adjacent to the Anchorage housing project at Middletown, R. I.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WHITE:

S. 1552. A bill to bring seamen within the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TYDINGS (for himself and Mr. O'CONOR):

S. 1553. A bill authorizing the State of Maryland, by and through its State roads commission or the successors of said commission, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or tunnel or combined bridge and tunnel across or under the Chesapeake Bay, in the State of Maryland, from a point in Anne Arundel County at or near Sandy Point to a point approximately opposite on Kent Island, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 1554. A bill to authorize the establishment of the De Soto National Memorial, in the State of Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. AIKEN):

S. 1555. A bill providing for the donation of farm labor camps to public or semipublic institutions or organizations; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. MORSE) introduced Senate bill 1556, providing equal pay for equal work for women, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BALDWIN:

S. 1557. A bill to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH:

S. 1558. A bill for the relief of Anna Krueger, Tema Krueger, Gina Krueger, and Ita Krueger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 1559. A bill to provide for the temporary advancement in rank and increase in salary of lieutenants in the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia serving as supervisors of certain squads; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GURNEY (by request):

S. 1560. A bill to facilitate the performance of research and development work by and on behalf of the War and Navy Departments, and for other purposes;

S. 1561. A bill to protect the national security of the United States by permitting the summary termination of employment of civilian officers and employees of the Departments of State, War, and the Navy, and the Atomic Energy Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services; and

S. 1562. A bill to amend section 102 (b) of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945 to exclude certain experts and consultants from the coverage of the act; to the Committee on Civil Service.

(Mr. FERGUSON (for himself, Mr. BALL, Mr. SMITH, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. HATCH, Mr. MCGRATH, and Mr. MORSE, introduced Senate bill 1563, to authorize for a limited period of time the admission of certain displaced persons into the United States for permanent residence, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1564. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the centennial anniversary of the movement of Henderson and Seth Luelling to the Oregon country; to the Committee on Civil Service.

(Mr. FLANDERS (for himself, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. MORSE, Mr. IVES, and Mr. JENNER) introduced Senate Joint Resolution 141, to establish a Temporary National Commission on Veterans' Benefits, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. TYDINGS (for himself and Mr. HICKENLOOPER) introduced Senate Joint Resolution 142, providing for the calling of a congress to draft and recommend a program for conserving the Nation's forest and soil resources, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and appears under a separate heading.)

EQUAL PAY FOR EQUAL WORK FOR WOMEN

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill providing for equal pay for equal work for women, and I request that a joint statement prepared by us be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and the joint statement will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1556) providing equal pay for equal work for women, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. MORSE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The joint statement presented by Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. MORSE) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fair-minded Americans have long deplored the existence of wage differentials based on sex in American industry. Such discriminatory practices against women workers fly in the face of the demands of ordinary justice, depress wages and living standards for all employees, both men and women, cut into the living standards of women workers and the families dependent on them, and prevent the maximum utilization of our available labor resources so necessary for full employment, full production, and full purchasing power.

Today there are 16,600,000 women employed or more women back at work than at any time since November 1946. While the Bureau of Census reports that male job holders have risen only 20 percent since 1940, there are 5,000,000 more women in business and industry—an increase of 50 percent over prewar 1940.

New factors in the American economic scene make even more imperative now corrective legislation to eliminate discriminatory wage practices based on sex. Growing unemployment increases the tendency to lower women's rates of pay with consequent lowering of men's rates and the entire wage structure in industry, with serious consequences for purchasing power and living standards. Soaring prices make imperative the elimination of wage practices that further worsen the living conditions of working men and women. With the Taft-Hartley law on the statute books, creating greater obstacles to peaceful settlement of workers' grievances, it is all the more important to eliminate wage differentials based on sex as one cause of labor disputes.

For these reasons we introduce the equal pay bill of 1947, to eliminate discriminatory wage practices against women based on sex. This bill makes it an unfair wage practice to discriminate in the payment of wages between the sexes for work of comparable character on jobs the performance of which requires comparable skills, for comparable quality and quantity of work on the same or similar operations. An administrator, appointed by the Secretary of Labor, shall administer the act, with power to hold hearings and issue cease and desist orders enforceable in the Federal Circuit Court of Appeals.

The enactment of the equal pay bill of 1947 is essential to assure just compensation for women workers, to maintain wage levels for men workers, to prevent unfair competition in industry by under-cutting women's wages, and to help assure purchasing power and decent living standards for the families of American workers.

TEMPORARY NATIONAL COMMISSION ON VETERANS' BENEFITS

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, the people of the United States recognize that war veterans and their dependents have received and should receive special consideration from the Federal Government. Since the Revolutionary War the Government has enacted laws to benefit in one way or another veterans and their dependents. Federal Government expenditures for veterans are running at an annual rate of over $7,000,000,000. *Today*, there are about 800 bills pending in the Eightieth Congress calling for some type of benefit in behalf of veterans. Almost every committee in Congress has veterans bills before it. However, there has as yet been no constructive attempt to coordinate this legislation or even to appraise the categories and relative needs of veterans and their dependents. No principles have been set forth to serve as a guide to Congress and the Chief Executive.

Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and myself, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference, a joint resolution which attempts to offer a positive approach to this problem.

This joint resolution would create a Temporary National Commission on Veterans' Benefits composed of seven private citizens, appointed by the President, specially qualified by training and experience to discharge successfully and impartially the obligations imposed upon the Commission.

It would be the duty of the Commission to—

First. Conduct a comprehensive survey of the categories of veterans who have performed wartime military or naval service or who have been members of the regular establishment and their dependents to ascertain their needs for benefits under a sound and constructive national program of assistance.

Second. Prepare a clear and detailed summary of the benefits and services now received by persons of each such category from Federal, State, and local governments.

Third. Prepare a fair and impartial evaluation of the relative needs of each of the several categories of such persons.

Fourth. Prepare a statement of principles recommended for observance in the evolution of a sound, adequate, and constructive national program of benefits for veterans and their dependents, together with an analysis and evaluation of the social and economic factors involved therein.

Fifth. Prepare specific recommendations for the enactment and administration of such legislation as may be considered necessary or desirable to establish such a program, together with estimates as to the numbers of persons who would be benefited and the cost of providing such benefits.

The Temporary National Commission on Veterans' Benefits would report to the President and the Congress on or before February 1, 1948. The Commission would be authorized to employ an expert staff and draw upon existing information which may be provided by other Federal agencies and State and local governments. It could hold hearings to take testimony from individual veterans, veterans' organizations and such other individuals and organizations as it deems desirable.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 141) to establish a Temporary National Commission on Veterans' Benefits, introduced by Mr. FLANDERS (for himself, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. MORSE, Mr. IVES, and Mr. JENNER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

CONSERVATION OF THE NATION'S FOREST AND SOIL RESOURCES

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland is forced, because of illness, to leave the Chamber for 2 or 3 or 4 days. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and I have worked on a proposition for a Nationwide program of soil and forestry conservation for the Nation, and we are introducing a joint resolution providing that one delegate from each of the 48 States be selected by the Governor of each of the 48 States to attend a convention for the consideration of soil and forestry conservation. These delegates are to be skilled in soil and forestry conservation and are to evolve a Nationwide program of soil and forestry conservation. I do not believe that the programs we have had, though they have been good in part, have been on a Nation-wide basis. They have in many respects been more or less expedient. It was thought that if we could have one man from each of the 48 States to evolve recommendations which would, in turn, be submitted to the President and by him to the Congress, we could have the genesis of a genuine Nation-wide soil and forestry conservation program.

With that idea in mind, on behalf of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution to carry out the objectives which I have briefly outlined.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 142) providing for the calling of a congress to draft and recommend a program for conserving the Nation's forest and soil resources, introduced by Mr. TYDINGS (for himself and Mr. HICKENLOOPER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I should like to say that I am glad to be associated with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] in the introduction of this resolution, and at a later date I hope to speak at a little greater length concerning the vital necessity of an immediate canvass and survey of the resources of this country, especially in connection with conservation measures and long-range conservation plans. I think this joint resolution is a step in the right direction, and I bespeak the careful attention of every Member of the Senate to its provisions and to the preliminary steps and preliminary surveys it is intended to accomplish.

STUDY OF CONTRACT AND DIRECT-HIRE WORK BY GOVERNMENT

Mr. MORSE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 140); which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Senate Resolution 140

Whereas the departments, agencies and independent establishments of the Govern-

ment customarily engage in contract and direct-hire employment operations, each wholly independently of the other; and

Whereas the inauguration of uniform labor-management standards in Government would effect improved labor-management relations and result in increased efficiency and a tremendous over-all saving: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a thorough study and investigation of the field of labor and management comprising contract and direct-hire work paid for from the funds of the Federal Government, and shall report to the Senate not later than July 1, 1948, the results of its study and investigations, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation and such other recommendations as it may deem advisable; and be it further

Resolved, That for the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold hearings; to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate during the Eightieth Congress and prior to July 1, 1948; to employ such experts and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants; to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents; to administer such oaths; and to take such testimony and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic service to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per 100 words. The expense of the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee, which shall not exceed $30,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND SECURITY—AMENDMENTS

Mr. O'CONOR submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 140) to create an executive department of the Government to be known as the Department of Health, Education, and Security, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 405. An act for the relief of Thomas M. Farley, Mrs. Susie Farley, Mrs. Helen Moss, the legal guardian of Donna Louise Farley, and the legal guardian of Melvin Moss;

H. R. 406. An act for the relief of Walter R. and Kathryn Marshall;

H. R. 629. An act for the relief of A. E. McCartney and O. A. Foster; P. W. Woodyard and J. R. Mahon; B. E. Truitt, T. L. Truitt, and W. B. Lacy; G. W. Cox, J. M. Cox, and F. T. Cox; W. W. Cox and Dr. J. W. Cox; Robert Cathcart and Claude Cathcart;

H. R. 642. An act for the relief of Frank F. Miles;

H. R. 650. An act for the relief of Ruston Jamsetji Patell;

H. R. 928. An act for the relief of Riyoko Patell;

H. R. 990. An act for the relief of William B. Moore;

H. R. 1492. An act for the relief of P. L. (Spud) Murphey, owner and manager of Spud's Tailors, Laundry & Dry Cleaning Works;

H. R. 1498. An act for the relief of Hempstead Warehouse Corp.;

H. R. 1502. An act for the relief of Herman Trahn;

H. R. 1535. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Ralph Stanfield, a minor;

H. R. 1670. An act for the relief of Pittsburgh DuBois Co.;

H. R. 1726. An act for the relief of Elsie L. Rosenow;

H. R. 1736. An act for the relief of O. Dean Settles and Mrs. Ruth E. Settles, husband and wife; Mrs. Ruth E. Settles, individually; the estate of Ora H. Hatfield; and Mrs. Kittie B. Hatfield;

H. R. 1930. An act for the relief of the Growers Fertilizer Co., a Florida corporation;

H. R. 2062. An act for the relief of Mrs. Carrie M. Lee;

H. R. 2390. An act for the relief of Elmer A. Norris;

H. R. 2507. An act for the relief of the firm of Barrett & Hilp; and

H. R. 2550. An act for the relief of Mack Gene Odom, a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2511. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to quitclaim two acres of land near Muirkirk, Md., to the Queens Chapel Methodist Church; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 2885. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Becker Little Light; and

H. R. 2886. An act authorizing the sale, under supervision, of land of Richard Little Light; to the Committee on Public Lands.

CIVIL RIGHTS AND MINORITY RIGHTS—ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by President Truman at the thirty-eighth annual conference of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, held at the Lincoln Memorial, Washington, D. C., on June 29, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE FUTURE OF AGRICULTURE—STATEMENT BY SENATOR KILGORE

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him dealing with agricultural conditions, and particularly with respect to the agricultural appropriation bill, which appears in the Appendix.]

RESEARCH LABORATORY, QUARTERMASTER CORPS, BOSTON, MASS.—STATEMENT BY SENATOR MYERS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement in opposition to House bill 612, to authorize the expenditure of $6,000,000 for a research laboratory for the Quartermaster Corps, at or in the vicinity of Boston, Mass., which appears in the Appendix.]

ILLINOIS ACTIVITIES OF FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK ADMINISTRATION—LETTER OF JOHN H. FAHEY

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him on June 12, 1947, by John H. Fahey, Commissioner of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, giving a report of the activities of that organization in the State of Illinois, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NATURE OF FUTURE WAR—EDITORIAL FROM THE BOSTON HERALD

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial on the nature of future war, from the Boston Herald of July 1, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

ELECTRIC UTILITIES—COMMENT IN THE WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Don't Let Utilities Backslide," published in the Washington Daily News of July 2, 1947, and an article by Thomas L. Stokes entitled "Floods and Consciences," published in the Washington Daily News on the same date, which appears in the Appendix.]

JOHN C. CROCKETT—POEM BY HORACE C. CARLISLE

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem entitled "John C. Crockett," by Horace C. Carlisle, which appears in the Appendix.]

CLAIMS OF CERTAIN MOTOR CARRIERS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME FROM SPONSORSHIP OF BILL

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, during a meeting of the Committee on the Judiciary I discovered that my name was placed on Senate bill 1260, to provide for the settlement and payment to certain motor carriers of claims against the United States for damages resulting from Federal possession, control, and operation in time of war of the carriers' transportation systems and properties; to provide for just compensation to such carriers for the use of such transportation systems and properties during such possession, control, and operation; and for other purposes, as a sponsor. I never gave anyone permission to place my name on that bill. On the contrary, I have refused steadfastly to have my name placed on it. I looked at the original bill and found that my name was placed on it in typewriting. I wish to serve notice on the Committee on the Judiciary that my name is on the bill without my consent, and that I shall ask to have it withdrawn, no matter what happens to the bill, whether it is killed or passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota asks unanimous consent to have his name withdrawn from the bill. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONTROL AND ADMINISTRATION OF UNITED NATIONS HEADQUARTERS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 376)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair wishes to hand down, as in legislative session, a message from the President of the United States transmitting to the Congress an agreement between the United States and the United Nations concerning the control and administration of the headquarters of the United Nations in the city of New York. The message of the President will be printed at this point in the RECORD, and the entire file, including the agreement, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress an agreement between the United States and the United Nations concerning the control and administration of the headquarters of the

United Nations in the city of New York. I also enclose a letter from the Secretary of State regarding this agreement.

As you will recall, on December 10 and 11, 1945, the Congress by concurrent resolution unanimously invited the United Nations to locate its permanent headquarters in the United States. After long and careful study, the General Assembly of the United Nations decided during its session last winter to make its permanent home in New York City.

The United States has been signally honored in the location of the headquarters of the United Nations within our country. Naturally the United States wishes to make all appropriate arrangements so that the Organization can fully and effectively perform the functions for which it was created and upon the successful accomplishment of which so much depends.

This agreement is the product of months of negotiations between representatives of this Government and the United Nations. Representatives of the city and State of New York participated in these negotiations. The agreement carefully balances the interests of the United States as a member of the United Nations and the interests of the United Nations as an international organization.

I urge the Congress to give early consideration to the enclosed agreement and to authorize this Government, by joint resolution, to give effect to its provisions.

When the General Assembly of the United Nations meets in New York City this fall it would be most appropriate if this Government were ready for its part to bring the agreement into effect.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 2, 1947.*

(Enclosures: 1. Draft agreement between the United States and the United Nations. 2. Letter from the Secretary of State.)

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY, ETC.—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on House bill 2700, making appropriations for the Department of Labor and Federal Security Agency, and so forth, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the report for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the conference report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2700) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 12, 15, 18, 29, 31, and 42.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 13, 16, 19, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 32, 34, 37, 40, 43, 45, 46, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, and 59, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$843,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$808,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,188,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$489,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert the following:

"Salaries and expenses, Division of Labor Standards: For necessary expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia and purchase and distribution of reports, and of material for informational exhibits, in connection with the promotion of health, safety, employment stabilization, and amicable industrial relations for labor and industry, $200,000.

"The appropriation under this title for traveling expenses shall be available for expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and consultants at conferences concerned with the work of the Division of Labor Standards when called by the Division with the written approval of the Secretary of Labor, and shall be available also in an amount not to exceed $2,000 for expenses of attendance at meetings related to the work of the Division of Labor Standards when incurred on the written authority of the Secretary of Labor:"

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,107,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert $3,373,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,798,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,316,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,633,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$550,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and proposed by said amendment insert the following: "There shall be alloted to the several States for the fiscal year 1948, as provided in such Act, a sum not exceeding $75,000,000, a part of the sum authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1948 by part C of the Act. Whenever the Surgeon General shall have approved an application for a construction project in accordance with section 625 of the Act, the Federal share of the cost of such project, as provided by the Act, shall constitute a contractual obligation of the Federal Government: *Provided*, That the aggregate contractual obligation during the fiscal year 1948 shall not exceed $75,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$947,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$35,054,850"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$330,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$139,850"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to

the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$337,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$328,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$251,726"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 6, 7, 8, 9, 20, and 38.

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
CHAN GURNEY,
JOSEPH H. BALL,
KENNETH S. WHERRY,
PAT MCCARRAN,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

FRANK B. KEEFE,
JOHN TABER,
RALPH E. CHURCH,
JOE HENDRICKS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 2700, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
July 2, 1947.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 20 to the bill (H. R. 2700) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 6 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

Strike out the matter proposed to be stricken out and inserted by the said amendment.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 7 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sums proposed to be stricken out and inserted by the said amendment insert "$1."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 8 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sums proposed to be stricken out and inserted by the said amendment insert "$1."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 38 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sums proposed to be stricken out and inserted by the said amendment insert: "and including $500,000 which shall be transferred to the appropriation 'National Institute of Health, operating expenses,' $14,500,000."

That the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 9 to said bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 6, 7, 8, and 38, and recede from its amendment No. 9 to the bill.

The motion was agreed to.

EMERGENCY APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1948—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on House bill 4031, making appropriations to meet emergencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the conference report for the information of the Senate.

The clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4031) making appropriations to meet emergencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out and inserted by the said amendment, insert the following:

"That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year 1948, and for other purposes, namely:

"INDEPENDENT OFFICES

"OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT REPORTS

"There is hereby appropriated such amount as may be necessary to enable the Office of Government Reports to continue in operation at the same rate and under the same authority as provided for such agency in the fiscal year 1947 until the date of enactment of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1948.

"VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

"The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is hereby authorized to disburse, during the month of July 1947, one-twelfth of the amount provided in each appropriation for the Veterans' Administration included in H. R. 3839 as passed by the House of Representatives and there are hereby appropriated such amounts as may be necessary for such disbursements: *Provided*, That amounts expended hereunder shall be deducted from such appropriation for 1948 when H. R. 3839 is enacted into law.

"Automobiles and other conveyances for disabled veterans: The authority and funds provided under this heading in the First Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1947 (Public Law 663, Seventy-ninth Congress), are hereby continued available until June 30, 1948.

"DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

"The following sums are appropriated for the District of Columbia out of any money in the Treasury to the credit of the District of Columbia not otherwise appropriated, toward expenses for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948:

"Employees' Compensation Fund	$15,000
Repairs and Maintenance of Buildings and Grounds, Public Schools	50,000
Operating Expenses, Public Library	10,000
Operating Expenses, Recreation Department	50,000
Salaries and Expenses, Metropolitan Police	10,000
Salaries and Expenses, Fire Department	10,000
Policemen's and Firemen's Relief	50,000
Salaries and Expenses, Agency Services, Public Welfare	205,000
Operating Expenses, Office of Superintendent of District Buildings, Public Works	50,000
Operating Expenses, Electrical Division, Public Works	10,000
Salaries and Expenses, Central Garage, Public Works	10,000
Operating Expenses, Street and Bridge Divisions (payable from Highway Fund)	50,000
Salaries and Expenses, Department of Vehicles and Traffic (payable from Highway Fund)	10,000
Salaries and Expenses, Division of Trees and Parking (payable from Highway Fund)	10,000
Operating Expenses, Refuse Division, Public Works	150,000
Operating Expenses, Sewer Division, Public Works	50,000
Capital outlay, Sewer Division, Public Works	50,000
Operating Expenses, Washington Aqueduct (payable from Water Fund)	23,000

"The foregoing sums for the District of Columbia shall, unless otherwise specifically provided, be paid out of the General Fund of the District of Columbia as defined in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1947, and shall be deducted from the appropriations for the same purposes contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1948, when enacted into law.

"DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

"BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

"Control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture, during July 1947, to control and eradicate foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest as authorized by the Act of February 28, 1947 (Public Law 8), and the Act of May 29, 1884, as amended (7 U. S. C. 391; 21 U. S. C. 111–122), including expenses in accordance with section 2 of said Public Law 8, $5,000,000, to be merged with the appropriation made under this head in the Second Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947 (Public Law 122).

"SUGAR RATIONING ADMINISTRATION

"Salaries and expenses: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to perform, during July 1947, the functions and duties vested in him by the Sugar Control Extension Act of 1947 (Public Law 30), $750,000, including personal services in the District of Columbia; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946; printing and binding; not to exceed $10,000 for test purchases of commodities and ration currency for enforcement purposes; and hire of passenger motor vehicles: *Provided*, That not to exceed $40,000 may be transferred to the regular departmental appropriation for penalty mail as required by the Act of June 28, 1944: *Provided further*, That of the amount herein $400,000 shall be available exclusively for terminal leave.

"DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

"The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to incur obligations for administrative and force account expenses for the

continued operation of any activity of the Department of the Interior for which provision is made in H. R. 3123, a bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, or in any Senate amendment thereto, but for which obligations may not be incurred under the provisions of section 102 of the Second Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947 (Public Law 122), and for War Agency Liquidation in accordance with the terms of the Budget estimate contained in House Document Numbered 312: *Provided*, That such obligations shall not exceed the rate of obligation provided for such activity for the fiscal year 1947: *Provided further*, That the authority conferred hereunder shall continue until July 31, 1947, or until the date of enactment of H. R. 3123 into law, whichever is the earlier date, except in the case of War Agency Liquidation, which authority shall extend until the date of approval of the appropriation Act providing the supplemental appropriation for this activity for the fiscal year 1948.

"DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

"UNITED STATES CONCILIATION SERVICE

"For salaries and expenses from July 1, 1947, to August 21, 1947, United States Conciliation Service, including printing and binding, travel, penalty mail, and all expenses authorized for such service in the Department of Labor Appropriation Act, 1947, $430,000.

"SEC. 2. Section 102 of the Second Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947, is amended by striking out the last two words of such section and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'provisions of such appropriation acts as passed by the House or of any Senate amendment thereto: *Provided*, That such obligations shall be limited to administrative and force account expenses and not exceed the rate of obligation under any corresponding appropriation for the fiscal year 1947: *Provided further*, That the authority conferred hereunder shall continue until July 31, 1947, or until the date of enactment of such appropriation act, whichever is the earlier date: *Provided further*, That in the case of any activity (including the District of Columbia) for which funds were provided by Congress for 1947 and for which an estimate for the fiscal year 1948 was submitted by the President to the Congress prior to July 2, 1947, but for which no provision for an appropriation is contained in any bill pending in Congress on July 1, 1947, obligations therefor for administrative and force account expenses may be incurred at a rate not to exceed the rate of obligation under any corresponding appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 or the Budget estimate for 1948, whichever is the smaller, but the authority conferred under this proviso shall expire on whichever of the following dates first occurs: (1) on July 31, 1947, (2) the date of enactment of an appropriation act making an appropriation for such activity, or (3) the date both Houses shall have acted and failed to make an appropriation for such activity.'

"SEC. 3. This Act may be cited as the 'Emergency Appropriation Act, 1948'."

And the Senate recede from its amendment to the title.

STYLES BRIDGES,
JOSEPH H. BALL,
KENNETH S. WHERRY,
GUY CORDON,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
ELMER THOMAS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
FRANCIS CASE,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE H. MAHON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the report has to do with the bill that provides interim appropriations for certain agencies of the Government, in order that they may operate in the interim until several appropriation bills are passed. The Senate Appropriations Committee felt that the authority granted in the bill, plus the authority in the second deficiency bill, for interim obligations, was not adequate for the purpose, and yesterday, adopted and passed the House bill, with all stricken from it, and inserted in lieu of it the resolution theretofore offered by the Senator from New Hampshire. That went to conference, and this report, in the opinion of the conference committee, does give adequate authority to the Government agencies to operate and to incur obligations in the interim, until the bills are enacted, or until the 31st day of July. It does not provide for the payment of money, but it does provide for the incurring of obligations for administrative and force account expenses for all agencies of the Government.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Oregon if the conference report contains any provision for the payment of the salaries of Government employees during the period when they are awaiting action by the Congress on the passage of the appropriation bills, some 11 of which have not yet been acted upon.

Mr. CORDON. The payment of the amount, the rate of salary—is that the question?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; the payment of the amount.

Mr. CORDON. It does not. As I understand, it simply provides that the agencies may continue their activities and incur obligations up to the amount set in the appropriation bills which have passed the House, or as they may have been amended by the Senate. In the case of estimates that have come up, action on which has not yet been had, they may continue the activities and incur obligations, based upon corresponding appropriations for 1947.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Then it is my understanding that employees of every Department and agency of Government for which an appropriation bill has not been passed during the effective period of the conference report will not be able to draw their salaries though they do the work?

Mr. CORDON. They will not be able to draw or to get their money. They will not be paid, but they will have the right to payment as soon as the bill is passed. In other words, the obligations can be incurred, all Government help will remain on the rolls, but the ordinary time of payment will have to be carried forward until the bill itself is enacted.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I understand that so far as these employees are concerned, a valid obligation will have been incurred for the payment of their salaries, and, though they may have a payless pay day, eventually, when Congress gets around to passing the appropriation bills they will get their back pay.

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to ask another question with respect to the District of Columbia. I understand the conference report does actually appropriate certain sums for certain activities.

Mr. CORDON. That is correct; and that is also true with reference to certain other activities where case-aid money was deemed to be necessary, and where the right of incurring an obligation was not added. That is true in the matter of the Office of Government Reports, certain activities of the Department of Agriculture, and others.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. When it was providing for the payment of salaries to certain employees of the District of Columbia, why was the conference not willing to provide for the payment of salaries, for example, of the employees of the Department of the Interior?

Mr. CORDON. Money for the payment of salaries of the personnel is not appropriated. The funds appropriated for the District of Columbia are for certain aid payments and other types of payment which are made in many instances weekly. The funds are provided for that type of payment, and not for salary payments.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Do I understand that covers welfare payments, and so forth?

Mr. CORDON. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I feel, Mr. President, that while the Senate conferees have brought back a measure which is substantially better than the original provision sent to us by the House, it still remains inadequate. But I assume that it is the best that could be obtained in the present situation.

Mr. CORDON. I may say that the Senator from Oregon is getting just a little weary of coming on the floor of the Senate and suggesting that he does not like what he has done, but it is the best he can give.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask two questions in regard to the report. First, in regard to the question raised by the Senator from Wyoming, it is my understanding that in the normal course of events, the pay rolls would not be made up anyway until about the 15th or 20th of the month, and presumably the other appropriation bills, or a large part of them, will be passed by that time.

Mr. CORDON. I am satisfied that there will be very few of the Government personnel who will not be paid on time. But as to those, at least they will know that the minute a bill is enacted they will be paid for their time up to the 1st of July.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The second question is this. We just today agreed to the conference report on the second of the appropriation bills, that for Labor and Federal Security. In that bill, due to the

changes under the Taft-Hartley Act, we did not provide funds for the Conciliation Service, with the understanding that the funds for the Conciliation Service for the interim period between July 1 and August 21, when the new set-up takes place under the Taft-Hartley Act, would be provided in the bill now before us. Are they so provided?

Mr. CORDON. Yes, they are.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I wish to ask another question. Am I to understand that the employees of the Senate and the House whose funds are carried in the legislative appropriation bill, which has not yet been acted upon, will or will not receive their pay, according to practice, on the 15th of July?

Mr. CORDON. I do not have the report in front of me. My opinion is that they and all others who are paid from regular appropriations, except as to certain activities—and it is not one of them—will receive their pay only after the enactment of the appropriation bill itself.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In other words, that means that legislative employees who have been accustomed to draw their salary on the 15th of each month will not be able to do so this July?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I may say that we are attempting to expedite the legislative appropriation bill, and that tonight the subcommittee on the legislative bill of the Committee on Appropriations is to sit in session beginning at 7:30, and and we are going to run through until midnight tonight, if necessary, in an attempt to have the hearings concluded on the legislative bill, which we have just received from the House. We are trying to meet the situation, and I wish to say that the Senator from Oregon, who is in charge of the conference report now under consideration, has done an excellent job in respect to it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think he has.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senate conferees have done the very best they could, and we have obtained the best deal possible in protecting the various divisions of Government employees.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; considering all the circumstances, and those circumstances we shall not attempt to describe at this late hour.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

NOMINATION OF ROBERT F. JONES TO THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I should like at this time to make a statement that is pertinent as an executive question, and which is therefore proper in an executive session.

My attention has been called to a very serious charge made against one of our colleagues in the House, ROBERT F. JONES, of Ohio, now nominated to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission. I have seen three affidavits from Mr. JONES' neighbors in Ohio stating under oath that he was a member of the Black Legion.

Though man's memory sometimes is short, most of us probably recall the anti-Jewish, anti-Catholic, anti-Labor, and anti-Negro operations of the Black Legion in Ohio and Michigan when it inherited the remnants of the old Ku Klux Klan.

I do not want to be unfair to Mr. JONES, and I understand that he has denied he was ever a member of the Black Legion. But I do know that these are statements made under oath, and it would appear most important to me that the matter be cleared up thoroughly and conscientiously in committee before it is brought before the full Senate for vote.

I learned from the clerk of the Interstate Commerce Committee that a subcommittee meeting on Mr. JONES' confirmation is scheduled for 9:30 tomorrow morning. However, my colleague the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the chairman of the subcommittee, is absent, and I understand he will not be here tomorrow. I have tried to communicate with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], also a member of the subcommittee, to ascertain the truth of a rumor that the subcommittee intends to rush approval of Mr. JONES at the meeting tomorrow. I cannot believe this is so.

However, because both my colleague from Maine and my colleague from Indiana are out of the city, I take this opportunity to serve notice that should approval of Mr. JONES be voted in subcommittee tomorrow without an adequate examination of the witnesses swearing to these affidavits, I, and I believe, many other Senators, would want to consider the matter very carefully before voting confirmation on the floor.

One of these affidavits is particularly significant. It is sworn to by the chief of police of Beaver Dam, Ohio, Mr. Frank Barber. I shall read it:

> I, Frank Barber, administered the preliminary obligation to ROBERT F. JONES prior to his joining the Patriotic Legion of America, commonly known as the Black Legion. I remember that the ceremony took place in the woods on Tapscott farm about 2 miles from the city of Lima, Ohio. I believe it was the year 1934 as nearly as I can remember. I definitely remember it was before ROBERT JONES became county attorney, because it was the Patriotic Legion of America which helped place him in that office.
>
> June 30, 1947.
>
> Witnessed by Joseph B. Emmons and Jack Anderson.
>
> Notarized by Leon N. Stone.

Another affidavit is sworn to by Glenn E. Webb, a member of the initiating crew of the Black Legion. He states under oath:

> I, Glenn E. Webb, swear on oath that I initiated ROBERT F. JONES into the Black Legion on the Tapscott farm, east of Lima, Ohio. ROBERT JONES kneeled before me where I could see him face to face, with a gun at his back, according to the ritual, as he accepted the oath of obligation. This ceremony took place around 1935.
>
> Sworn to before Leon N. Stone, notary public.

We have noticed that the two gentlemen swearing to the affidavits are uncertain of the time; which only goes to show that it is important the matter should be cleared up. They should be brought before the committee to verify this matter definitely one way or another.

Another final affidavit is sworn to by Virgil Herbert Effinger, former head of the Black Legion, who swears:

> Virgil Herbert Effinger, being duly sworn, says that he was personally present at a meeting of the Black Legion when ROBERT F. JONES took the oath required to be taken by all applicants for membership in said organization.
>
> Sworn to before Pauline Pool, notary public, Allen County, Ohio.

Mr. President, inasmuch as we are nearing the end of the session and time is precious on the floor of the Senate, I hope that this matter will be thoroughly threshed out in committee before it is brought to the floor. Otherwise there may be considerable delay while the matter is investigated on the floor. I hope the committee will bring in the witnesses and hear from them before the matter is reported.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I think I have sensed in what the Senator from Idaho has said something of suspicion that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will not give proper consideration to this nomination. Speaking of the committee, I may say that as soon as we heard that there was any question with respect to the nomination, a subcommittee was appointed for the purpose of giving consideration to the case, and to all that might be said for and against the nominee. My colleague the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] was made chairman of that subcommittee. I think there is some question about his presence here tomorrow morning, although I am not sure. But I believe that the other two members of the subcommittee, who are the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], will both be here, and I have the hope and expectation that the subcommittee will be prepared to make a preliminary report at least to the full committee tomorrow. Of course, what the full committee will do and what it ought to do, must be in some degree at least dependent upon the recommendation made to us by our subcommittee. I want to give assurance that there is no disposition to speed our course to the prejudice of anyone's rights.

Mr. BRICKER subsequently said: Mr. President, a distinguished citizen of the State of Ohio, a Member of the Congress, Mr. ROBERT F. JONES, has been appointed by the President as a member of the Federal Communications Commission. Objection has been filed, testimony has been taken by a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, in regard to Mr. JONES, and there have been statements introduced in the RECORD here during the day in regard to his appointment.

I have known Mr. JONES for many years, since he was first out of law school.

I have been associated with him in public office. I know him to be a citizen of the highest character. His integrity is unquestioned. His ability has been proved both in his private capacity as a lawyer and in public office. I ask unanimous consent at this time to introduce for printing in the RECORD a statement of Representative JONES, in the nature of an affidavit, together with a copy of a letter addressed by him, as prosecuting attorney, to the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

I have here also 17 letters from prominent citizens of Mr. JONES' county and home city. These letters are from members of both political parties and persons of various religious faiths in those communities; all of them expressing the same high appreciation of the character of Representative JONES that I myself have already expressed. That the Senate may be informed, and that the committee may have these, as a matter of record, I ask unanimous consent that they all may be published in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., July 1, 1947.

Senator OWEN BREWSTER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BREWSTER: Since completion of the hearing by your subcommittee on June 27 to hear testimony by Andrew Pearson with respect to my nomination to the Federal Communications Commission, I have had opportunity to study the record. I did not take advantage of your very gracious offer at that time to prepare an answer, preferring to take the stand immediately to refute the charges and insinuations made by Pearson, and I now ask your permission and that of your colleagues to supplement that record with the following statement.

I believe that any competent lawyer, reading Pearson's testimony, would dismiss it instanter as the flimsiest hearsay and of no probative value. I intend in due course to take proper legal action with respect to it, but in view of the fact that your committee has held a public hearing which has given opportunity for such slanderous remarks to be widely broadcast, it seems to me important for the sake of my wife, mother, and children that the permanent record should meet in specific detail every allegation made by Pearson before the committee.

It is clear that Andrew Pearson's fundamental charges against me are—

(a) that my father was a member of the Ku Klux Klan and introduced me at Klan meetings when I was a boy of 16 as a Klan member, and

(b) that I was a member of an organization known as the Black Legion.

The first charge is wholly false and entirely unsubstantiated as is set forth with particularly in the detailed statement attached.

The second charge is false. It rests upon two affidavits which I have not, as yet, had an opportunity to see. The first affidavit was completely and publicly repudiated by the affiant; the second was dictated by Andrew Pearson personally over the long distance telephone approximately 30 hours after the close of the hearing held before your committee on Friday, June 27.

I most emphatically deny ever having been a member of either of the above-mentioned organizations.

I submit that your committee should bear in mind that Pearson has an interest at stake and an ax to grind and cannot be considered a disinterested witness. He and his associates are seeking the grant of one of the most valuable radio franchises in the United States and for some reason best known to himself prefers to have the membership of the Federal Communications Commission remain unchanged.

There is attached hereto a detailed statement which I earnestly hope you will examine carefully.

DETAILED STATEMENT

1. Credibility and bias of the witness: It is elemental in Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence that the credibility and bias of a witness must be given due weight in assaying his testimony. Pearson himself acknowledged on the stand that he has a personal reason for preferring the status quo in the Federal Communications Commission, citing his interest in obtaining the frequency now assigned to radio station WBAL in Baltimore. The committee should know, I believe, that Pearson and a former associate are prosecuting an action before the Commission to obtain the Baltimore frequency. This property is worth, according to competent radio-station authorities, in excess of $1,000,000. He testified that he fears that if I were made a member of the Commission he would not receive a fair hearing. Pearson baldly affirms that he is playing for high stakes and he wants nothing done that would jeopardize his opportunity to win that stake. It must be obvious that the questions naturally arise: What assurances does Pearson now have that he will obtain the Baltimore frequency grant? Why is he so sure that he is safe with the present membership of the Commission and not sure if I were a member of the Commission? Does this not impugn the integrity and motives of the present members of the Commission; the integrity and motives of Mr. Ray C. Wakefield, whose renomination was withdrawn by the President? I want the committee to know that I do not know Mr. Wakefield personally; I do not recall ever having met him; I know absolutely nothing against him or his character, and I assume and believe that he is an honest and conscientious public servant and without any evidence to the contrary I assume the same facts with respect to every member of the Commission. However, Pearson, by inference, insinuates that any change in the present make-up of the Commission jeopardizes his chance to obtain a $1,000,000 piece of property.

(b) I suppose there is little I can add to the reputation of Pearson for truth and veracity. I am sure that the members of the committee have every right to take judicial notice of the fact that Pearson's credibility has been attacked upon scores of occasions. It is sufficient, I believe, to cite as witnesses in my behalf as to Pearson's reputation for truth and veracity the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt, who publicly denounced him as a "liar"; innumerable Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives who have publicly termed him a "fabricator," a "liar," a "prevaricator," one who "peddles tissues of lies" and "statements made out of the whole cloth"; members of the Washington press corps who in a poll voted him the most unreliable commentator. Nevertheless, it is this witness, with this reputation, who has been accorded an opportunity for public hearing to blacken my name and my reputation, a reputation which I treasure above any monetary value or any public post, and a reputation which has been builded in my home where people have known me since childhood, and my family before me, and where they have done me the signal honor to reelect me to Congress five successive times, a record held by no other Representative to Congress from my district in all its history, no man ever before having been elected successively more than three times.

(c) In connection with Pearson's credibility and bias, I believe the committee will want to give some consideration to the fact that in his daily newspaper column of June 25, in which Pearson first discussed the question of the nomination to the Federal Communications Commission, his principal point of attack was against President Truman, House Minority Leader SAM RAYBURN, and the Democratic Party generally for having made a political deal.

He asserted then that Mr. RAYBURN was angry with the Commission for having failed to make a grant in which a relative of Mr. RAYBURN was interested; that in my capacity as chairman of House Appropriations Subcommittee on the Interior Department I had reduced reclamation and irrigation funds which alienated western Congressmen; that I was, in effect, being pushed out of the House of Representatives. While he repeated these insinuations before your committee, he apparently realized that neither President Truman nor Mr. RAYBURN were on trial before the committee, and tossed together a hastily constructed tissue of lies with respect to my personal life and background. I believe that it is significant for the committee to know that while Pearson told the committee on the morning of June 27 that he had an affidavit that would support some of his charges and that he would make it available to the committee that afternoon, Pearson himself actually secured whatever basis he had for the charges against me the evening before he testified in a series of telephone conversations with Lima residents; that on Saturday and Sunday following his testimony he was still in pursuit of substantiating evidence by long-distance telephone to back up his charges, and that on Saturday evening, more than 36 hours after he told the committee an affidavit was on its way to Washington, he actually dictated such an affidavit over the long-distance telephone to a man who has been my long-time political enemy in Lima, who has tried unsuccessfully to defeat me, but who, either individually or in conjunction with his associates, never has had the temerity to publicly make the charges which Pearson made on the witness stand before your committee.

2. The Coughlinite-Gerald L. K. Smith charge: On pages 11, 12, and 13 of the transcript, Pearson charges that I worked hand in glove with Gerald L. K. Smith, that they endorsed me; that in Mercer, Shelby, and Stark Counties (Stark County is not in my district, and I never appeared on a public platform in that county) that Smith and I jointly have tremendous followings, and that in 1938 I was endorsed by the Coughlinites.

What are the facts? In 1938, when I first ran for Congress, I was not endorsed by Father Coughlin or any of his local leaders in my congressional district. Perhaps the reason for that is that their candidate in that campaign was one John C. Fischer, of Auglaize County, Ohio, running as an independent candidate. Obviously I did not have the Coughlin support. Mr. Fischer, in that campaign, received 5,616 votes; the Democratic candidate, William Swonger, received 33,284 votes, and I received 56,399 votes. The best indication of the so-called Coughlin strength in my district is attested by the fact that they polled slightly more than 5,000 votes in a total ballot of 94,299. It also may be noted that while these people undoubtedly reached their peak political strength in that year, in none of my campaigns was my majority less than 14,000 votes, and obviously they never affected my political fortunes.

(a) Pearson refers to a meeting in Lima, Ohio, in 1940 addressed by Gerald L. K. Smith, during which Harry Romer, a leader of the Smith group in my congressional district and a candidate for Vice President on the Smith ticket, sat at Smith's side. Romer, according to Pearson, told the audience that I should be elected for life. The inference here is that Romer is my supporter; that Romer is or was a Smith man; that he was talking to a Smith audience; that because he said I should be elected for life that ipso facto I am a supporter of Smith and his political or economic views. Whether this sort of sly innuendo should be dignified by explanation to intelligent men is doubtful. But I do want to point out what Pearson's analogy leads to. He quotes Romer as saying the Communists ought to be shot; he links me with Romer; therefore, he implies, JONES believes the Communists ought to be shot. The committee should know these facts: Romer has been, and is, a member of the Republican political organization in Mercer County and a precinct committeeman; acting in that capacity, Romer would be expected to endorse all Republican candidates on the ticket, and it would be most unusual if he failed to do so; the first time that it was publicly stated that I was connected with the Gerald L. K. Smith organization in 1944, I publicly repudiated the charge, and that repudiation which was published in the Lima newspapers the following day, appears on page 52 of the transcript.

(b) Pearson charges, on page 13 of the transcript, that a Smith publication, the Cross and the Flag, in October 1943 carried a story that at a meeting of the Farmers Guild in Mercer County that month, Mayor Tennyson Guyer of Celina brought greetings from me. This is the first time that I have ever heard that Guyer brought greetings from me; if he did, they were entirely unauthorized by me.

(c) Pearson charges, on page 14 of the transcript, that a man who favors Gerald L. K. Smith's belief would have a prejudiced mind and would thus be disqualified from holding the office of Federal Communications Commissioner. I have disavowed any connection or affiliation with Gerald L. K. Smith and his political and ideological beliefs. I would oppose to the utmost the appointment to public office of any man who is intolerant, biased, bigoted, or prejudiced. Pearson has created a man of straw by pyramiding assumption upon assumption on a false foundation; he knows that the committee would never confirm Gerald L. K. Smith to be a Federal Communications Commissioner and the net effect of all his innuendo is that he has testified against the confirmation of Smith.

3. The Ku Klux Klan charge: Pearson charges on page 15 of the transcript that my now deceased father was an active organizer for the Klan, and that he introduced me at meetings as the youngest member of the Klan.

(a) Of all the vile and false insinuations made by Pearson, the bald, unsubstantiated and uncorroborated charge that my father was a Klan organizer or a member of the Klan is the vilest because it makes charges against a man now dead who cannot answer for himself. Although I was only 16 years old at the time to which Pearson alludes, my father and I were especially close to each other. Apart from time in school I was with him constantly; I shared his confidences and thoughts. I never accompanied him to any meetings of the Ku Klux Klan and I state emphatically and categorically that he was neither a member of the Klan nor an organizer for them. On the contrary, and I feel the committee must know this, my father was a modest storekeeper who opened his shop at 6 or 7 in the morning and closed at 10 or 11 at night; at the height of the Klan movement in our part of the country, my father was told by Klan officials that he must stop selling food to three Catholic families in our community. He refused, of course, and his store was boycotted by a substantial number of residents and as a result he finally closed the store. I repeat what I said before the committee "if anyone was punished by the Ku Klux Klan, my family was punished, and the never did recover."

(b) I categorically deny that my father ever took me to any Klan meeting, or that I ever attended any Klan meeting, or that my father ever introduced me any place to anyone as "the youngest member of the Klan," or that I ever was a member of the Klan.

5. The Black Legion charge: Pearson charges, on pages 15, 16, and 25, that I was inducted into the Black Legion in the basement of the home of Bert Effinger, of Lima, Ohio, and that the Black Legion was a bigoted, anti-Catholic, anti-Jewish, and anti-other racial groups organization.

(a) From January 1935 to February 1939 I was prosecuting attorney of Allen County, Ohio. In 1938 I was in charge of the prosecution of Bert Effinger to be extradited from Lima, Ohio, to Detroit, Mich., on a warrant charging him with a criminal offense as an officer of the Black Legion for a crime or crimes committed in Wayne County, Mich. I was assisted in that prosecution by the then assistant attorney general of Michigan and the assistant prosecutor of Wayne County, who can bear witness as to my attitude toward the Black Legion. I successfully prosecuted this matter through three courts, including the supreme court of the State of Ohio. During the latter stages of this prosecution I was a candidate for my first term to the Congress of the United States and it was a matter of public knowledge that I was an avowed and relentless foe of this organization and all it stood for. Sometime prior to this prosecution I became concerned about the activities of the Black Legion and its impact upon local law-enforcement agencies. Consequently I addressed a letter to J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, advising him of my concern and requesting the assistance of the FBI in combating this evil. I have requested Mr. Hoover to furnish me with a photostatic copy of that letter so that I may furnish it to the committee as a part of this record.

(b) During the hearings before the committee Pearson stated that he expected to be in receipt of an affidavit that I was inducted into the Black Legion in the basement of the home of Bert Effinger, who was the leader of the Black Legion. During his Sunday evening (June 29) broadcast he read an affidavit, purportedly executed by Bert Effinger in 1938, which declared that I was a member of the Black Legion. Effinger, in a statement made to the editor of the Lima News on June 27, subsequently printed in the Lima News and carried by the Washington Evening Star on June 28, denied that I ever was a member of the Black Legion. The newspaper story said, "Virgil H. (Bert) Effinger, one time officer of the Black Legion, told the Lima News tonight that Congressman ROBERT F. JONES, of Lima, never was a member of the so-called Black Legion." This statement has been confirmed to me by telephone from the editor of the Lima News, Mr. Robert Barton. It should be remembered that the now repudiated Effinger affidavit purportedly executed in 1938, upon which Pearson has relied, was made during the time I was prosecuting Bert Effinger. Also it should be noted that no affidavit was received by the committee on the afternoon of June 27 as promised by Pearson and I have not yet seen an affidavit.

(c) In a desperate move to cover up when the Effinger affidavit was repudiated, approximately 30 hours after he had testified before the committee that an affidavit was on its way, Pearson took it upon himself to personally dictate another affidavit, prepared for the signature and execution of one Glenn Webb, a Lima labor official, who during my past two congressional campaigns bitterly opposed my reelection. Pearson admitted making two long-distance-telephone calls prior to his appearance before the committee. However, on information and belief I think that investigation will reveal that the night before the committee hearing, in his zeal to block my confirmation, Pearson made telephone calls to a number of my political opponents, including Francis W. Durbin, Democratic State central committeeman; Lena B. Siferd, long identified with Lima Democratic politics; Clarence C. Miller, Lima attorney and counsel for Bert Effinger, when I prosecuted the latter for extradition in connection with his Black Legion activities and who was my Democratic opponent for Congress in 1940 and 1942 under the campaign directorship of Francis W Durbin; Lynn Timmerman, my opponent in the 1938 primary campaign; L. E. Ludwig, my Democratic opponent in the 1944 congressional campaign. From these people and others he sought information with which he could block my confirmation after he already had informed a committee member that he had information which the committee should consider.

The day following the committee hearing, Pearson had a long-distance-telephone conversation with one Joe Emmons, a Lima labor-union official who also bitterly opposed my reelection in 1944 and 1946. Pearson dictated to him the full text of an affidavit in a form best calculated to serve Pearson's objective of blocking my confirmation prepared for the signature of Glenn Webb, who is Emmons' associate and colleague in political dealings. That affidavit, to which Pearson referred in his radio broadcast of June 29, and which the committee had not yet received when this letter was written and which I have not seen, alleges that I was inducted into the Black Legion on the Tapscott farm in Allen County, Ohio, during 1935, although Webb and Emmons told Robert Barton, editor of the Lima News, on the evening of June 28 that they could not remember whether it was 1934 or 1935. Webb asserts, according to Pearson, that he personally inducted me into the Black Legion.

I categorically and most emphatically deny that I am now or ever was a member of the Black Legion, that I ever subscribed or do now subscribe to their tenets or beliefs, that I ever was inducted at any time at the Tapscott farm or any place into the Black Legion; on the contrary, I opposed the Black Legion in my capacity as prosecuting attorney. I opposed everything it stood for or purports to stand for during my tenure in Congress, and my record so proves. I will continue as long as I live, in public life and in private life, to oppose any such organization adhering to such beliefs.

6. I consider it of paramount importance for the committee to realize that Pearson's efforts to block my confirmation as a member of the Federal Communications Commission rest upon two charges:

(a) That I was introduced by my father as a member of the Ku Klux Klan; and

(b) That I was a member of the Black Legion.

The charge that either my father or I was a member of the Ku Klux Klan is wholly false and unsubstantiated.

The charge that I was a member of the Black Legion depends upon two affidavits. One was executed by Bert Effinger in 1938

and has since been publicly repudiated by Effinger himself. The other purportedly executed by Glenn Webb, was in fact, personally dictated by Pearson over the long-distance telephone to suit his own purposes. Both of these affidavits are fabricated out of the whole cloth and rest upon a tissue of lies.

In conclusion, I most earnestly and sincerely ask that the members of this committee and the Senate as a whole compare carefully the competency of Andrew Pearson's testimony with the statements made in the hearing before your committee and contained herein. This entire statement is made under oath, and I shall be happy to answer any questions that any member of the committee may desire to ask.

Very sincerely,

ROBERT F. JONES.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this the 1st day of July 1947.

TILLIE J. POLSKY,
Notary Public, District of Columbia.

My commission expires February 1, 1951.

ALLEN COUNTY PROSECUTING ATTORNEY,
Lima, Ohio, January 28, 1937.

J. EDGAR HOOVER,
Federal Bureau of Investigation,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOOVER: I am concerned with the apprehension of Virgil E. Effinger, who is wanted on a charge of criminal syndicalism in Detroit, Mich. He has been extradited and a warrant issued by the Governor of the State of Ohio to the sheriff of Allen County and has has not been apprehended since the warrant was issued in August.

There is a great amount of rumor in this vicinity that members of the police department and high city officials are members of the Black Legion. For this reason rumors prevail that Effinger is hid in the city of Lima and reports come to this office from reputable sources that he has been seen on the city streets. It is needless to discuss the effect upon respect of the people of Lima for the police department with this sort of stigma attached to them.

Mrs. O. E. Smith leased a home to him several years ago which is now vacant, and a letter came to Effinger at that address and she has possession of the letter. I have not taken this matter up with the local postal inspector, hoping that your Department could be of some help to us in locating him. She will hold the letter, per my instructions, and if you decide that it will be of any probative value and that you can help in this matter I will forward it to you.

Let me say again I sincerely request that you help locate Virgil E. Effinger because of the widespread effect upon law enforcement in this community failure to locate him has. This is a situation which you can readily see county officials cannot cope with and the membership of the Black Legion is reputed to be so large in this section that one cannot hazard a guess as to whom might be depended upon.

Yours very truly,

ROBERT F. JONES,
Prosecuting Attorney,
Allen County, Ohio.

LIMA, OHIO, *July 1, 1947.*

Hon. OWEN BREWSTER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

SIR: It has been my privilege to be an acquaintance of Hon. ROBERT F. JONES of the Fourth Ohio Congressional District for many years, having known him as our capable county prosecutor, as a conscientious and hard-working Congressman, and as a good substantial citizen of our community. And although he belongs to my opposite political faith, I can say truthfully and honestly that I have never once known of his name being connected with the Ku Klux Klan or the Black Legion.

I trust that your committee will in all fairness to Mr. JONES recommend his appointment to the Federal Communications Commission.

Yours very sincerely,

FRANK J. CALLAHAN.

JUNE 30, 1947.

Senator OWEN BREWSTER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I was amazed when I read in our local paper that Drew Pearson had accused Representative BOB JONES of being a member of the Black Legion and connected with the Ku Klux Klan. I happen to be a Catholic and have known BOB JONES for the past 20 years. In fact, I am proud to state that I consider Mr. JONES a very good friend of mine and whenever he is in Celina and has time, drops in at my home. In all these years of association with him I have always found him very open-minded and tolerant on religious matters and am positive that Mr. Pearson's accusations are as Mr. JONES himself stated in his testimony, just unmitigated lies.

I personally hate to see our district lose such an honest, able, and industrial Representative and I am sure that he would fulfill his duties as a member of the FCC in an efficient and honest way.

Very truly yours,

THE MERSMAN BROS. CORP.,
R. J. MILLER, *Secretary.*

JUNE 30, 1947.

Senator OWEN BREWSTER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I read an article in the Chicago Tribune about the accusations made by Drew Pearson against our Representative, BOB JONES.

I happen to be a member of the Catholic Church and dislike nothing more than religious intolerance and am positive that there isn't a particle of truth in Mr. Pearson's accusations. I consider myself a very good friend of Bob's and if he would have had any affiliation or association with any intolerant groups like the Ku Klux Klan and the Black Legion I certainly would have known it.

He has been one of the most able, industrious and honest Representatives that our district has ever sent to Congress and I feel that he is certainly entitled to the appointment given him by President Truman as a member of the FCC.

Very truly yours,

THE MERSMAN BROS., CORP,
WALTER J. MERSMAN,
President.

CAMPNELL & CO.,
Lima, Ohio, June 30, 1947.

DREW PEARSON,
American Broadcasting Co.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PEARSON: Most Americans have an inherited keen interest in their Government and they gain most of their knowledge of such affairs through the newspapers and commentators. I have always been one of your admirers and was shocked to find that you would stoop to the low methods you used in attempting to smear the character and good name of BOB JONES. Your scheme for obtaining information on Mr. JONES' character would be quite similar to the using of one of the Capone gang as a character witness for his prosecutor.

It would seem that you as a commentator have a responsibility to the American people which, if you were a good citizen, you would be duty bound to keep clean and truthful.

We who know BOB JONES must certainly question any statement you would make in the future, knowing that you are not above dirty politics. The sad part of the whole affair is that those who do not personally know BOB JONES and who, like us, until now believed in your opinions might have some doubt after your blast as to Mr. JONES' character. Had you inquired from those who really know Mr. JONES you would have found that he is a member of the Methodist Church, pays his dues even while in Washington, properly loves and supports his family, pays his bills promptly, and meets every requirement for being 100 percent American.

It might be well to investigate the files of some of the communistic labor leaders for the real reason behind this attempt to stop Mr. JONES' appointment.

Very truly yours,

E. D. CAMPNELL.

THE LIMA NEWS,
Lima, Ohio, June 30, 1947.

Hon. ROBERT F. JONES,
Member of Congress, New House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JONES: On Saturday, June 28, at about 5 p. m. I was present in the Lima regional CIO headquarters when Glenn E. Webb signed a statement to the effect that he, as a member of the Black Legion, inducted ROBERT F. JONES into the Black Legion near Lima in 1935.

Joseph Emmons, secretary of the regional CIO council, told me that Drew Pearson had been apprized by telephone of the fact that Webb was ready to sign such a statement. Emmons told me that the statement which I saw Webb sign had been dictated to him (Emmons) by Drew Pearson in a telephone conversation a short time earlier.

Robert Waldron of the Lima News reportorial staff, and Glenn Webb were present when Emmons made these statements to me.

You may use this letter as you see fit.

Very truly yours,

R. C. BARTON,
Managing Editor.

THE LIMA NEWS,
Lima, Ohio, June 30, 1947.

Hon. ROBERT F. JONES,
Member of Congress,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BOB: I am sending this letter to you at the request of Anne Beehler. For your information, Joe Emmons was a visitor at The Lima News today (June 30) and objected mildly to one or two statements in The Lima News story Sunday, concerning Glenn Webb's statement.

The published anouncement that Webb's statement was dictated by Drew Pearson was not among the items to which Emmons objected.

You may use this information if you believe it to be of any value.

Cordially yours,

R. C. BARTON,
Managing Editor.

NEON PRODUCTS, INC.,
Lima, Ohio, June 30, 1947.

Hon. OWEN BREWSTER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The writer is a citizen of Lima, Ohio, of Jewish faith. The writer has known the Honorable ROBERT F. JONES, Congressman of our district, for more than 15 years. This is, therefore, to raise the writer's voice in protest for the unjustified "smear" campaign against Mr. JONES.

Our Congresssman JONES was always ready and willing to help anyone that needed and deserved his help, regardless of race or religion.

Several years ago, Mr. JONES gave his two principal appointments, one to Annapolis and one to West Point, to two boys here in Lima of the Jewish faith.

The writer is also fully familiar with the invaluable help that Mr. JONES gave our former Rabbi Ostrovsky. This rabbi was in this country on a temporary visit. His wife and child were in Palestine. Congressman JONES helped him established himself in this country and was also instrumental in helping the rabbi to bring his wife and child over to this country. All of this was done by the Congressman without any remuneration of any kind.

In my opinion, these facts prove beyond question that there is no race prejudice in Mr. JONES.

Congressman JONES' appointment to the FCC should be confirmed. I believe he will discharge his duties of this office fairly and without bias to anyone.

Respectfully yours,

S. KAMIN,
President and Sales Manager.

LIMA, OHIO, *June 29, 1947.*

BOB JONES,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

The good people of Lima are with you. If there is anything I can do, let me know.

OSCAR ALTSTETTER.

LIMA, OHIO, *June 30, 1947.*

Hon. ROBERT F. JONES,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BOB: I am enclosing a copy of the letter which I have today sent to Hon. OWEN BREWSTER, a copy of which I also mailed to the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

I thought, since you were catching so much hell from some of our local dignitaries that it might be refreshing for you to know that a few of us don't feel that way.

Don't worry about this thing, Bob. We are sure you will not have any trouble, but I know that it is disturbing to have certain elements doing what they are doing to you. The average, good citizen is behind you 100 percent.

The best of luck to you.

Sincerely,

BOB.
R. H. McDONALD.

LIMA, OHIO, *June 30, 1947.*

Hon. OWEN BREWSTER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BREWSTER: The newspapers are carrying stories accusing our Congressman, ROBERT F. JONES, of belonging to this and that organization, which certain individuals such as Drew Pearson, and certain CIO radical labor leaders, would have you believe would make an undesirable appointee out of Mr. JONES for the Federal Communications Commission.

I have known BOB JONES for many years. I also knew his father and mother. They were fine people and Bob is considered, in his home community and in his home territory, a fine, honorable citizen. He would not do anything to bring discredit to his people or his country, knowingly.

During the year 1947, I happen to be the president of the Lima Association of Commerce, and I feel that I have a very close contact with the average businessman in this community, and I can assure you that the views of those who are attempting to belittle Mr. JONES or his ability are not shared by the better class of businessmen and individuals here.

I think that Mr. JONES would make a good Commissioner.

Very truly yours,

R. H. McDONALD.

JUNE 30, 1947.

Senator OWEN BREWSTER,
Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BREWSTER: There is considerable discussion in the newspapers and over the radio about the qualifications of ROBERT F. JONES to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission.

I have managed radio stations for 16 years, and have been a consultant to radio stations on management and operation for the past 2 years. I own no stock in any radio station, and am only concerned with their better operation.

I am from Van Wert, the county adjoining Allen County where BOB JONES comes from. He, Mrs. Jones, and I were in school together at Ohio Northern University. I got to know him as a close friend and have followed his legal and political career closely and with great interest.

His reputation in Lima and Allen County, Ohio, is good. He is known as having a good character—a man of constructive convictions and one who is a credit to his community. He has always impressed me as being rather conservative and a foremost exponent of established law and order.

My experience with radio dates back to 1929. There have been many different types of members on the former Federal Radio Commission and the present Federal Communications Commission. I believe BOB JONES will measure up to the highest standards established by this body.

I have no interest other than to see the radio industry have the best possible leadership and to speak a good word for a man in public life whom I know and can sincerely recommend.

Yours very truly,

FRED A. PALMER.

P. S.—My only criticism of Mr. JONES is that when he sang tenor on my college quartet, his highest note was just a little thin.

JUNE 30, 1947.

Hon. OWEN D. BREWSTER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BREWSTER: At noon on the day that the story broke in our local newspaper relative to the Honorable ROBERT F. JONES I had a telephone call from a member of the American Jewish Committee inquiring what I knew about BOB JONES and his connection with the Black Legion and other subversive groups.

It has been my pleasure to know BOB JONES for many, many years, to vote for him each time he has been a candidate for the House of Representatives, and to use what little influence I have in his support. I consider BOB JONES a fine young American, not only qualified to represent this district in the House of Representatives, but qualified for the position to which he is to be appointed. I never believed that BOB JONES was anti-Semitic or anti anything else that was against the traditions of democracy. I consider the recent attack unwarranted and unfair. I would like to see the appointment of this young man confirmed, and anything that is done in his behalf will be appreciated.

Respectfully,

J. F. SOLOMON,
Executive Vice President-Treasurer,
Colonial Finance Co.

JUNE 30, 1947.

Hon. OWEN BREWSTER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: The events of the past week concerning one of Allen County's illustrious sons, ROBERT F. JONES, have indeed been startling to me. I have known Bob for a period of some 20 years and, while we have not always seen eye to eye on various issues, still there never has been one instance when there was even the slightest cause for suspicion of irregularity or wrongdoing on the part of Bob.

He served as prosecutor of Allen County for five consecutive terms and then the electorate saw fit to send him to Congress to represent the Fourth Congressional District. During his tenure in Congress he has made what, I think, an enviable record of voting as his conscience dictated.

At the present time, in my capacity as executive secretary of the Lima Association of Commerce, I find many occasions to get a representative cross-section of the community on various matters such as this, and I can truthfully say that the only opposition I have ever found to Bob is in the matter of difference in political opinion. We know him here as a reputable citizen of high integrity. He is highly respected in this community. The very caliber of local opposition to Bob's appointment to the FCC indicates a vicious plan to smear the name and reputation of a fine young man.

It is my hope that confirmation of ROBERT F. JONES as a member of the Federal Communications Commission be expedited as rapidly as possible.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES O. GUY.

JUNE 30, 1947.

Hon. OWEN BREWSTER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BREWSTER: Prominent members of my parish have brought to my attention accusations made against Congressman ROBERT F. JONES charging him with membership in un-American and anti-Catholic organizations. I have contact with many prominent Catholic electors of the Fourth Congressional District who spend their vacation weeks at Indian Lake and in my parish, and it has never been brought to my attention that Congressman ROBERT F. JONES is anti-Catholic. I know not the slightest reason to believe that he is possessed of religious or racial prejudices. On the contrary, in justice to the man in the face of the present slander broadcast against him, I want to state I have often heard these people remark that Congressman JONES is a trusted Representative and that they support him in office.

Very truly yours,

ST. MARY OF THE WOODS CHURCH,
Rev. ANTHONY WOLF, *Pastor.*

CHURCH OF ST. ROSE,
Lima, Ohio, June 30, 1947.

Hon. OWEN BREWSTER,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BREWSTER: I have just heard that ROBERT F. JONES, Congressman from this district, has been recently charged in certain circles with religious prejudice and an anti-Catholic bias.

I have lived in Lima many years and it seems strange to me that now, for the first time, I should hear such a charge against the Honorable Mr. JONES.

With us, on the contrary, he has been perfectly fair and highly ethical in aiding young

men from this parish to enter Annapolis Academy.

Very sincerely yours,

J. S. ELDER, *Pastor.*

LIMA, OHIO, *June 30, 1947.*

Senator OWEN BREWSTER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BREWSTER: I am writing to you as a common citizen and an aroused Republican who deeply resents the current attempt to smear the character of Congressman ROBERT F. JONES.

BOB JONES has been a personal friend of mine for 30 years. He is a man of the highest integrity, an active member of the Methodist Church, and one of the strongest, cleanest, most upright citizens in this entire congressional district. It is unfortunate that members of the opposite political faith, who have been trying through five political campaigns to defeat him for office, now attempt by this underhanded method to secure a political vindication. I am sure that your committee will consider this political viciousness for just exactly what it is worth.

May I assure you that these recent unwarranted attacks have strengthened BOB JONES in the esteem of his constituents in the Fourth District and his friends throughout the length and breadth of the State of Ohio.

Yours very truly,

E. J. WARD.

JUNE 30, 1947.

Senator OWEN BREWSTER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BREWSTER: In fairness to my friend, BOB JONES, who appeared before your committee recently in reference to an appointment, I wish to say that I have known Bob for a number of years, in fact, before he became prosecuting attorney for Allen County.

During his first campaign for Congress from our district he was prosecuting Effinger, a Black Legion member wanted for murder in Detroit. At that time I spoke to Bob as to what effect his election would have on the handling of the Effinger case, and he promised me that if he became Congressman, he would conclude that case as prosecuting attorney, Congress or no Congress.

This he did, which was beyond his call of duty.

His recommendations for positions have been made to Catholics and non-Catholics, and I know all ministers and pastors in our county have only the highest regard for Bob and he has always given all parties who called upon him prompt service. We in Mercer County hate to lose Bob as our Representative in Congress, but will not stand in his way to advancement for we all know he not only served our district as it should be, but he also has the best interest of America at heart, and always took the trouble to find out what his district wished on any line of action and followed it; he truly is a Representative of us as our forefathers intended it should be.

In our county Bob will always get a nice majority of the votes as long as he chooses to run, because he is a gentleman, clean cut, honest, and fearless, and we like him for those qualities.

You know Drew Pearson and his record; so do I.

I know his testimony will not effect the favorable consideration of your committee for Bob's appointment, rather it should make you feel all the more certain that you have the right man in BOB JONES.

Thanking you for your careful attention to this matter, I beg to remain.

Sincerely yours.

WM. H. SPIELMAN.

TAKOMA PARK, MD., *June 29, 1947.*

Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: If the testimony of Drew Pearson has any weight with your committee, surely the facts concerning the attitudes and character of ROBERT F. JONES from one who went to college with him and was his pastor for 2 years ought to overbalance any such hearsay testimony as Drew Pearson has to offer.

I was the pastor of the Methodist Church in Cairo, Ohio, from September 1926 to September 1928. During those 2 years Bob and I drove from Cairo to Ada, Ohio, where we were both students at Ohio Northern University.

I knew Bob's father and mother well. If your committee will take the trouble to investigate you will find that because of his lack of sympathy with the Ku Klux Klan and his refusal to join in that wave of hysteria which swept over our country, Mr. Jones' business suffered greatly. Because he treated the two or three Catholic families who lived in the community as honorable citizens of the community he incurred the enmity of the people who undoubtedly are the source of Drew Pearson's biased information. Some of Mr. Jones' enemies are still living.

You can readily see how two college students, riding 22 miles each way, 5 days per week, would, during that ride discuss politics, business, law, science, philosophy, and religion. I think I know BOB JONES' mind better than any of his friends. Being a young theological student who was finishing his work in college and while the strength of the Ku Klux Klan was not as much in evidence in 1926–28 as a few years earlier, it was only natural that we should discuss that. Heavy pressure had been brought upon the pastor of the local church and upon the businessmen of the village. We agreed that under the Constitution every person had the right and should have the privilege of practicing his religious beliefs in his own way.

I recall distinctly that on several occasions when the American Legion needed community support BOB JONES stepped in and provided able support.

Having served as a chaplain in the Army for 51 months I feel I ought to be qualified to testify as to BOB JONES' loyalty and belief, as well as practice, of his ideas of religious freedom.

Yours very truly,

CHARLES O. DUTTON.

TAKOMA PARK, MD., *June 29, 1947.*

Senator OWEN BREWSTER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In this evening's issue of the Star there is reported an account of the attack of Drew Pearson upon my college chum, ROBERT JONES, of Lima, Ohio. I am incensed, not only upon this attack upon Bob, but upon his father, whom I knew well.

Let me identify myself. I was the pastor of the Jones family in the little village of Cairo, Ohio, for 2 years. The dates were September 1926 to September 1928. At the same time I was preaching at the Methodist Church there I was completing my college work at Ohio Northern University at Ada, Ohio. Bob and I drove from Cairo to Ada and back again each day. One week we would take his car and the other it would be mine. You can see how readily I would come to know how Bob felt and thought.

First, let me tell you about Bob's father. He was one of the finest gentlemen in the whole community. If you would investigate you would find that it was because of his opposition to the Ku Klux Klan that his business suffered. Rather than do the popular thing and join in the wave of hysteria that swept over the country, Mr. Jones remained true to his ideas of good citizenship. His business suffered as a consequence. There were only a few Catholic families in this community and I can personally bear witness to the fact that at least one of these was a regular customer in Mr. Jones' store.

In our conversations during our rides to and from Ada, we often discussed politics, religion, law, and science. Time and time again Bob would join me in the view that no matter what a person's religious belief and practice might be, as a principle of American democracy he had the right to believe and practice it in his own way. I have no reason to believe that he has changed in his views since that time.

While he was too young to have participated in World War I, and therefore ineligible to join the American Legion, yet I can testify to the fact that Bob helped the Legion in that small village several times when it needed community support. I was a member of the Legion there.

I was released from the Army on July 26, 1946, having served 51 months as a chaplain. If I can help you in any way to get the true picture of ROBERT F. JONES please call on me. I know the people in his home community and his friends will be only too willing to give you an accurate picture of the facts in the case.

Yours very truly,

CHARLES O. DUTTON.

TAKOMA PARK, MD., *June 30, 1947.*

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMITTEE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: Permit me to comment upon Drew Pearson's attempt to smear my old college chum BOB JONES. Reading the newspaper report of the content of Pearson's criticism I am struck with the absurdity of it. For instance, when he says that passages from JONES' speeches have been quoted by subversive publications, I am sure you immediately become aware of the shallowness of such criticism. Perhaps you could find subversive publications quoting from Lincoln's speeches.

As I have indicated in my letters to Senators BREWSTER and CAPEHART, I am in a better position than Drew Pearson or perhaps any other living person, with the exception of Bob's wife, to know Bob's individual views and feelings. I will not comment upon the vicious attempt to make Bob responsible for the acts of his father. I have personal knowledge that his father's activities were above reproach. That it was because of Mr. Jones' resistance to the wave of hysteria that swept over the country that his business suffered and he incurred the hatred of the people who are the sources of Pearson's information.

As the pastor of the Methodist church in Cairo, Ohio, where the Jones family attended church, from September 1926 to September 1928, and having driven with Bob from Cairo to Ada, Ohio, where we were both students at Ohio Northern University, we discussed problems of philosophy, law, science, politics, and religion. I can assure you that Bob's ideas of religious tolerance coincided with mine and that he was absolutely free from bigotry.

I am sure that intelligent Members of the Senate will refuse to listen to this attempted smear of a fine Member of Congress. If there was anything to the charges made by Pearson, the voters in his home county and his congressional district would know about it. I suggest that you allow the public record of ROBERT F. JONES to be the basis of your judgments rather than those of one who is forced to get his information second handed and from prejudiced sources.

If I can be of any further use to you in your attempt to get the truth in this matter please call upon me.

Yours very truly,

CHARLES O. DUTTON,

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 30, 1947.*

Hon. ROBERT F. JONES,
Congress Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR BOB: Enclosed is a letter which I am about to mail to the attention of Senator BREWSTER, which certainly should have some weight.

However, in politics it isn't a question of honorable weight but mostly short measure for the victim until he can successfully overcome injustice. This I am definitely certain with your past record as a splendid citizen you will be able to do and rise higher than your present office in life. You are worthy, and always have been, of continued progress; so keep your chin up and you will win.

If I can be of any further personal service, don't hesitate to let me know.

With my best personal regards, I am,

Most sincerely,

CORA S. BANTA.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 30, 1947.*

The SENATE INTERSTATE FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE,
United States Capitol Building,
Washington, D. C.
(Attention Senator BREWSTER.)

GENTLEMEN: Relative to the outrageous attack on the Honorable ROBERT F. JONES, which appeared in the Saturday Evening Star of June 28, I, as a senior citizen of Lima, Ohio, cannot refrain from bringing to your attention the following facts:

I have known Mr. JONES since he was a mere boy, and am happy to say that never a finer one walked the streets of Lima. He grew to manhood holding the esteem of everyone in the community and early became a highly respected public servant.

He was always an independent thinker and fearless speaker in the interest and welfare of the public, and not the type to ever be anti-Catholic or anti-Jewish, as accused. In fact, he was very popular with all classes.

Due to this, as well as to his sterling principles in meting out justice to all, he was chosen for the office he now so splendidly and satisfactorily fills.

I clearly recall the Black Legion and its activities in Lima and personally know of the open stand he took against it. Consequently, to accuse him of being a member of it while at the same time he was publicly fighting it clearly does not make sense.

As a registered Democrat with no political aspirations for either Mr. JONES or myself, be assured I am quite disinterestedly taking the liberty of informing you of these facts concerning this splendid young man and of thanking you in advance for his vindication, which I am confident will be the result of the investigation.

Most cordially,

CORA S. BANTA.

CELINA LUMBER & SUPPLY CO.,
Celina, Ohio, June 30, 1947.

Hon. OWEN BREWSTER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BREWSTER: Our local paper carried an article in today's issue, in which Drew Pearson, accused our Congressman, ROBERT F. JONES, and his father, of being members of the Ku Klux Klan and of having held membership in the Black Legion.

As a devout Catholic all of my life and having known Congressman JONES for the past 25 years, I know of no accusation that is so absolutely absurd. As the county prosecutor of Allen County, Ohio, for several terms, he successfully waged a legal fight to the highest Ohio court, which resulted in the extradition from Ohio to Detroit of the head of the Black Legion, to stand trial for murder.

I have known the Jones family for years. They come of fine stock and BOB JONES has done his part in fighting organizations like the Klan, Black Legion, etc. He surely deserves every consideration possible as a member of the Federal Communications Committee.

Very truly yours,

FERD WINKELJOHN.

THE METROPOLITAN BANK,
Lima, Ohio, June 30, 1947.

Senator OWEN BREWSTER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

YOUR HONOR: The Lima papers have recently contained considerable publicity regarding the comments that Drew Pearson has made before your committee and on the air regarding my good friend, ROBERT F. JONES.

It is so often that one raises his voice to speak against and not in favor of an individual that I hasten now to say a word in his behalf. I have known Mr. JONES intimately during all of his professional life in Allen County, and have always found him to be most honest, upright, and honorable. In none of the intervening years have I ever known him to be possessed of any religious prejudices. Rather, to the contrary, I have found him always to be most open, considerate, and unbiased in the representation of the Fourth Congressional District of Ohio. These same attributes he will, I know, carry with him to the Federal Communications Commission if the Senate is given an opportunity to affirm his appointment thereto.

I can speak no words too high in his behalf, and commend him and his capabilities most sincerely to you, your associates, and the Nation at large.

Sincerely yours,

A. D. MACDANIEL,
President.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Wapakoneta, Ohio, June 30, 1947.

ROBERT JONES,
Congressman, Fourth Congressional District of Ohio, Washington, D. C.:

It has been my pleasure to be personally acquainted with BOB JONES, Congressman from the Fourth Congressional District of Ohio, for over 20 years, and in that time his integrity has never been questioned by the people of Allen County, where he was born, and from the other counties of the Fourth Congressional District.

The scandal of Drew Pearson and the likes of him, brought against Mr. JONES are utterly false. To my way of thinking, this is a communistic way of breeding unrest in the country. BOB JONES stands for something, and I am positive that he has never belonged to the Ku Klux Klan and the Black Legion. I may suggest to you that perhaps it would be a good idea to investigate the so-called leaders in Allen County, and I may include also Drew Pearson. I think you would find that all the charges made by them will not hold water.

If you knew personally the type of men who are trying to stir up this trouble, after investigation, you would throw out the evidence. If the country had more men like BOB JONES—and his record speaks for itself in the community in which he lives and the Fourth Congressional District—communism and the rest of the charges brought against him would never get a foothold. If I can be of any further assistance to you, please do not fail to call on me.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY KAHN,
Secretary, Chamber of Commerce, Wapakoneta, Ohio; Secretary, Auglaize County Agricultural Society.

THE RENTAL SITUATION

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, this morning I received a letter from a prominent lawyer in Chicago, and I think I should read it to the Senate:

JULY 1, 1947.

Hon. SCOTT W. LUCAS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: This morning all the tenants of the Belden-Stratford Hotel, 2300 Lincoln Park West, Chicago, Ill., were greeted upon arriving on the ground floor with a notice to the effect that all of the tenancies had been terminated and various increases made on a month to month tenancy.

I have lived in the Belden-Stratford Hotel for a period of 10 years, and started with a rental of $300 per month, which was subsequently increased from time to time, the last increase being given with OPA permission, and the rent today is $420 per month. The notice today increased my rent to $638 per month on a month to month tenancy.

It is interesting to note that this hotel was reorganized in a chapter X proceeding in the United States district court. The property has been in litigation for a period of about 20 years. As a result of the reorganization, the taxes due the State of Illinois were substantially reduced and the bonds were selling as low as 5 cents on the dollar. An investigation would undoubtedly disclose that the vast majority of the bondholders had disposed of their bonds and that the new owners have purchased these bonds at a fraction of their original cost and are now boosting the rents out of all proportion.

I urge you to do something to alleviate this condition. As my letterhead will denote, I am a practicing lawyer and have today received at least 10 telephone calls from various tenants who have been similarly treated. It strikes me that Congress should act now before adjournment.

Respectfully yours.

Mr. President, I think this is only the first of a number of letters which will be received as a result of what the Congress of the United States has done with respect to rent control. It seems to me that the President was on safe ground in requesting an investigation by the Congress of cases of this kind. We can readily understand what is happening in this particular hotel in Chicago as a result of the bill we passed. I merely pass this letter on to the Senate at this time for whatever it is worth.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN ADVISES A TREASURY SURPLUS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to make an announcement of what seems to me to be a rather notable circumstance, namely, that the fiscal year which ended 2 days ago on June 30 is the first in 17 years in which the Government of the United States has balanced its budget. The Treasury Department spent all day yesterday and a considerable part of last night, balancing the books. Announcement was made this

morning by Secretary Snyder that the Government closed the fiscal year 1947, on Monday, June 30, with an actual surplus of $754,000,000. I think it is worthy of note that we not only have a balanced budget, but we have a surplus of three-quarters of a billion dollars. President Truman and his able Secretary of the Treasury deserve credit for that achievement.

I think it is also worthy of note, Mr. President, that if the tax-reduction bill which was introduced in the House at the beginning of this session of Congress had been enacted, thereby reducing income taxes retroactively to the 1st of January of this year, we would not in fact have a real surplus or a balanced budget at this time. Instead, we would be under obligation to use every penny of the $754,000,000 and need more in addition to refund tax payments to taxpayers at a time when incomes received in the United States are at an all-time high.

SURPLUS WILL REDUCE DEBT

Mr. President, this $754,000,000 will be applied to reduce the national debt, which is in the neighborhood of $259,000,000,000. As has often been stated upon this floor, that debt is the greatest debt in the history of this Government or any other government. It constitutes a mortgage on all future production.

There are several significant facts about this notable occasion when the United States has a balanced budget for the first time since the middle of the administration of President Herbert Hoover and a surplus in the Treasury. One of them is that the expenditures made by the Federal Government during the year ended June 30, 1947, were less than the expenditures in the fiscal year which ended on June 30, 1946 by more than $21,000,000,000. That is proof of the diligence of the Truman administration in cutting expenditures. The President should receive credit for that, too.

Not only is that true, Mr. President, but it is my information that the expenditures during this fiscal year just closed were less than the appropriations which had been made by the Congress, less than the total expenditures which had been authorized by Congress. The receipts were in excess of $43,000,000,000 and above the estimates at the beginning of the fiscal year. So here we have this extraordinarily sound fiscal position of the Government of the United States, with a balanced budget and a surplus in the Treasury which will be applied to the national debt.

It may be worth while adding, Mr. President, that the procedure whereby the national debt is reduced, in simplified terms, is something of this character. Periodically, every month, or more frequently, certain obligations of the United States come due and must be either paid or refunded. This month, obligations, promises to pay, of the United States will come due. For 17 years for the most part when those obligations fell due we were compelled to refinance them. Like a borrower giving a new note or getting an extension of his old one, we sold new securities of indebtedness or new bonds to take the place of those which were payable. Now, when that next occasion arises, we shall be able to apply this surplus of $754,000,000 in the reduction of the debt; and that will be a debt reduction out of the cash receipts of the past year—not out of borrowings.

The administration, since President Truman took office, has reduced the national debt by some $20,000,000,000 out of receipts from the sale of bonds, that is to say, out of receipts which had been obtained by bond transactions in excess of what was needed to win the war.

People have talked for many years about a "sound fiscal policy," and about the necessity of "not spending more than you take in." I think that we can take a great deal of satisfaction, Mr. President, in the fact that ever since President Truman became the Chief Executive of this country he has been devoting his attention to the reduction of the expenditures, to the effort to bring about a balanced budget, and to the reduction of the debt. I think he is deserving of credit for this great accomplishment in the achievement of a sound fiscal policy, and I think the people should know about it.

HOW CONGRESS DELAYS APPROPRIATIONS

That prompts me, Mr. President, to call attention to another fact. At the beginning of this Congress the House of Representatives passed a resolution announcing that we should have a legislative budget which was $6,000,000,000 less than the budget submitted by the President for the fiscal year 1948. Now, the President's budget, $37,500,000,000, was approximately $5,000,000,000 less than the budget which had been allowed for the fiscal year 1947. He had cut deeply below department requests and five billions below the previous budget.

Those who introduced that resolution to provide for a reduction of $6,000,000,000 were confident that Federal expenditures could be cut, no doubt; but when the resolution came over to the Senate we did not agree that so great a cut below the low budget of President Truman could be made effective. The Senate believed national defense would be impaired and so the Republican leadership have passed a resolution providing for a reduction of $4,500,000,000 instead of $6,000,000,000 below the President's budget. That was all done in January. We are now in July, 6 months later, and neither one of these resolutions has been enacted by the Congress. The Senate conferees were unwilling to accept the House resolution, and the House conferees have been unwilling to accept the Senate resolution, because neither of them was able to foresee how it would be possible to accomplish the reductions mentioned in either of the resolutions.

Mr. President, can there be any doubt about that? No person can be in doubt of it for a moment, if he will only glance at the last page of the calendar of the United States Senate, which lies on the desk of every Senator. This is a statement showing the status of appropriation bills for the first session of the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. President, there are 12 major appropriation bills. Only one of the 12 has been sent to the White House for signature, although the fiscal year ended 2 days ago; and we are now in the fiscal year 1948, and the Government of the United States, except for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, is operating without funds allowed by Congress in a major appropriation bill.

SENATE IS BEING HANDICAPPED

Not only is that true, Mr. President, but the following bills, which were received by the Senate of the United States during the month of June, have not yet been considered by the Senate, and have not been fully marked up by the appropriate Senate subcommittees on appropriations which have jurisdiction over them.

The first of these is the military bill, received in the Senate on June 6. The second is the bill on Government corporations, received in the Senate on June 12. The third is the Independent Offices bill, for all the independent offices and agencies of the Government outside the major departments. That was received in the Senate on June 19. The legislative bill, to provide for the expenditures of Congress, was received in the Senate on June 30. The War Department Civil Functions bill has not yet been passed by the House, unless it was passed this afternoon. The District of Columbia appropriation bill has not yet been passed by the House of Representatives.

Therefore it becomes apparent that of these major appropriation bills, seven have been crowded into the Senate during the month of June, in circumstances that make it impossible for the Senate Committee on Appropriations to give full and proper consideration to the measures. Hearings have been held under such pressure that in many of the subcommittees only one Senator was present while the great Departments of the Government were seeking to tell this body why the cuts made by the House would impair the public service. So many of these subcommittees were meeting at the same time, and so much time has been required of Senators upon the floor of the Senate, that no adequate consideration has been possible for seven of the major appropriation bills. We are, in fact, neglecting the business of the people in pursuit of the Republican false promise of tax reduction.

I make this statement, Mr. President, because I believe that the contrast ought to be drawn between the sound fiscal policy of the Chief Executive, which has given the people of the United States a balanced budget and a surplus of $754,000,000 and, on the other hand, the delay, the ineptitude, the inadequacy with which the appropriation bills are being handled by the Congress, the leadership of which is in such a rush to reduce taxes.

It is utterly impossible to determine what the expenditures for the fiscal year 1948 can or should be until these bills are acted upon; and here we are, on the 2d day of July, without the slightest possibility that by the middle of the month all these bills will have been enacted.

There never has been such a situation with respect to appropriation bills within my memory. There have been occasions, of course, when this bill or that bill failed to pass, by the 30th of June, but I do not remember a single occasion when 11 of the 12 major appropriation bills, on the 2d day of July, still remained in the Congress, without having been sent to the Executive for action. On most of these bills no conference has been held.

Mr. President, I desire to ask unanimous consent that, at the close of my remarks, there be printed in full a statement made by Secretary of the Treasury John Snyder, issued this morning, giving detailed information on this matter.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Secretary of the Treasury John W. Snyder announced today that the Treasury closed the fiscal year 1947 with a budget surplus of $754,000,000.

The Secretary said that this achievement of a budget surplus in a fiscal year commencing only 10 months after the completion of our military victory was made possible by the untiring economy efforts of President Truman. It is noted that this occurred during a period in which a large proportion of the total Government expenditures was still occasioned by the cost of liquidating obligations resulting from the war.

The President, Secretary Snyder said, has constantly taken the initiative in cutting expenditures consistent with the national safety and welfare. Whenever possible, the President has regarded the appropriations granted by Congress as ceilings, rather than as targets. In numerous cases he has cut expenditures drastically below those authorized by Congress. Since taking office, President Truman has recommended to the Congress the cancellation of appropriations totaling over $65,000,000,000.

Total Government expenditures in the fiscal year just ended amounted to $42,505,000,000. This is a decline of a third from the expenditures of $63,714,000,000 during the preceding fiscal year and a decline of nearly 60 percent from the wartime peak of $100,397,000,000 reached in 1945.

The expense of the transition from war to peace continues to comprise a substantial proportion of Federal expenditures. Expenditures for veterans (including terminal leave), for example, amounted to $9,250,000,000 in the year just ended; while expenditures for UNRRA the credit to Great Britain, Export-Import Bank loans, and subscriptions to the International Bank and Monetary Fund amounted to another $5,915,000,000.

In contrast to the sharp reduction in expenditures, net receipts were practically the same as in the preceding year. The primary reasons for this maintenance of receipts have, of course, been the success of the Nation's reconversion from a wartime to a peacetime economy, the continued high level of production and employment, and substantial receipts from the sale of surplus property.

Of great importance has been the Treasury Department's vigorous enforcement of internal revenue legislation. Secretary Snyder estimated that the extra enforcement activities of the Treasury yielded an additional $2,000,000,000 in revenue during the fiscal year. The funds granted to the Treasury Department by Congress for this extra effort have been repaid many times over.

The Secretary declared that as long as business, employment, and national income continue high we should maintain tax revenues at levels that will permit a continued reduction in the public debt. The desirability of such a policy, he added, is emphasized by the fact that the financial soundness and continued stability of the American economy is the cornerstone of our national life.

COMPARISONS WITH APRIL BUDGET ESTIMATES

Receipts were $759,000,000 more than the estimates released by the President on April 19, practically all of which was due to an unexpected increase in miscellaneous receipts. This resulted principally from a settlement of accounts earlier than had been anticipated between the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Treasury amounting to $580,000,000, relating to sales of surplus property and repayment of capital of the Smaller War Plants Corporation.

Expenditures exceeded the April estimates by $1,255,000,000, due largely to the payment by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Treasury in the settlement of accounts mentioned above and to the fact that refunds of taxes were considerably heavier than had been expected. The Treasury, of course, has no control over the amount of refunds which are required by law to be made, but has endeavored to speed up the program as much as possible in the interest of economy and as a service to the taxpayers. The acceleration of the payment of tax refunds during the year resulted in substantial interest savings to the Treasury, the amount of interest paid on refunds being $3,300,000 less than last year.

REDUCTION IN DEBT

During the fiscal year just ended the public debt—including guaranteed obligations held outside the Treasury—was reduced by $11,522,000,000, of which $754,000,000 was the result of the budget surplus. The total amount outstanding on June 30 was $258,376,000,000. This compares with $279,764,000,000 at the postwar peak which was reached on February 28, 1946. The major part of this reduction in the debt has been accomplished by reducing the Treasury cash balance from its postwar peak to its present level. Future reductions in the debt can occur only from budget surpluses.

Practically the entire decline in the debt since the peak has been in the holdings of the commercial banking system. Holdings of debt by nonbank investors as a whole have remained practically constant. This concentration of debt reduction in bank holdings has been in accordance with the Treasury policy of spreading the ownership of the debt as broadly as possible, and has helped to alleviate inflationary pressures during the reconversion period. This debt reduction program was made possible by the Treasury's policy of maintaining a substantial portion of the debt in short-term securities.

This policy maintained the liquidity of the banking system and put a large portion of the debt in a form in which it could be easily retired. As a consequence of the liquidity of the banks' Government-security portfolios, the large turn-over of funds incident to the debt-reduction program occurred without disturbance to the money market. The reduction in the debt has naturally resulted in a substantial decline in the proportion of short-term securities, as well as in the proportion held by banks. The twofold character of this decline has consequently resulted in keeping the maturity distribution and the form of the debt well adjusted to the character of its ownership.

A more detailed analysis of the fiscal year's operations follows:

I. BUDGET RESULTS

Budget receipts exceeded expenditures by $754,000,000, as compared with a deficit of $20,676,000,000 last year.

Net receipts amounted to $43,259,000,000, an increase of $221,000,000 compared with last year. Total expenditures amounted to $42,505,000,000, a decrease of $21,209,000,000 from the year before. This improvement in the Government's budget of $21,430,000,000 was accomplished notwithstanding that in 1947 there were several large items of expenditure which were not in the figures for 1946, notably $1,426,000,000 for subscriptions to the International Bank and the International Monetary Fund under the Bretton Woods Agreement, $2,050,000,000 under the credit to the United Kingdom, $837,000,000 additional for United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, and about $2,000,000,000 for armed forces leaves.

A comparative table showing the trend of expenditures during the last 3 fiscal years is shown below (in billions of dollars):

Budget expenditures	1945	1946	1947	Increase or decrease 1947 from 1946
War and Navy Departments [2]	$80.4	$43.0	$14.4	−$28.6
Veterans' Administration	2.1	4.3	[1] 7.3	+3.0
Interest on the public debt	3.6	4.7	5.0	+.3
Tax refunds	1.7	3.0	3.0	------
International finance	------	.7	4.4	+3.7
United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration	.1	.7	1.5	+.8
All other	12.5	7.3	6.9	−.4
Total	100.4	63.7	42.5	−21.2

[1] In addition, about $2,000,000,000 of armed forces leave payments (bonds and cash) were made during the year, classified herein under War and Navy Departments and "All other" (Coast Guard).
[2] Excludes river and harbor work and flood control.

II. PUBLIC DEBT

The gross public debt amounted to $258,286,000,000 on June 30, 1947, a decrease of $11,136,000,000 during the year. In addition, guaranteed debt held outside the Treasury declined by $386,000,000 during the year. The sources of debt reduction during the year are indicated below:

Direct debt:	
Decrease in general fund balance	$10,930,000,000
Budget surplus	754,000,000
Subtotal	11,684,000,000
Excess of expenditures in trust accounts, etc	548,000,000
Total decrease in direct debt	11,136,000,000
Guaranteed debt: Decrease	386,000,000
Total decrease in debt	11,522,000,000

CHANGES IN COMPOSITION OF DEBT

Marketable issues were reduced $20,904,000,000, but this decrease was partially offset by increases in special issues to Government-trust funds and investment accounts by $5,034,000,000, and nonmarketable public issues. $2,872,000,000, represented principally by increases in armed forces leave bonds and United States savings bonds and partially offset by a decrease in Treasury savings notes. There was also an increase in the debt amounting to $2,140,000,000 resulting from noninterest-bearing special notes issued to the International Bank and the International Monetary Fund.

Sales of United States savings bonds (including discount accruals) exceeded redemptions during the year by $2,354,000,000, indicating a continuing public interest in this form of savings.

The net changes in the public debt and the Treasury's cash balance are indicated below:

Classification	Feb. 28, 1946	June 30, 1946	June 30, 1947	Change— From Feb. 28, 1946, to June 30, 1947	Change— During fiscal year 1947
	Millions	*Millions*	*Millions*	*Millions*	*Millions*
Gross public debt:					
Interest-bearing:					
Public issues:					
Marketable	$199,810	$189,606	$168,702	−$31,108	−$20,904
Nonmarketable	57,206	56,173	59,045	+1,839	+2,872
Subtotal	257,016	245,779	227,747	−29,269	−18,032
Special issues to	20,897	22,332	27,366	+6,469	+5,034
Non-interest-bearing notes issued to International Bank and Monetary Fund			2,146	+2,140	+2,140
Other [1]	1,301	1,311	1,033	−268	−278
Total gross public debt	279,214	269,422	258,286	−20,928	−11,136
General fund balance	25,961	14,238	3,508	−22,653	−10,930
Net	253,253	255,184	254,978	+1,725	−206

[1] Includes matured debt and other debt bearing no interest.

CHANGES IN MATURITIES [1]

One of the results of the debt-retirement program was to retire a substantial amount of bank-held short-term debt. In carrying out the debt-retirement program, the 91-day Treasury bills were reduced by $1,264,000,000 and the 1-year certificates of indebtedness [2] were reduced $14,418,000,000. In addition, all other marketable debt callable or maturing during the year was reduced $5,222,000,000. Changes in the maturities (based on maturity or first call date) of the marketable public debt are indicated below:

[In millions.

Maturing	Feb. 28, 1946	June 30, 1946	June 30, 1947	Change From Feb. 28, 1946 to June 30, 1947	Change During fiscal year 1947
Within 3 months	$29,349	$28,755	$26,650	−$2,699	−$2,105
3 months to 1 year	40,914	33,220	25,677	−15,237	−7,543
1 to 5 years	35,388	35,066	42,543	+7,155	+7,477
5 to 10 years	33,131	32,953	19,024	−14,107	−13,929
10 to 15 years	17,400	16,012	13,326	−4,074	−2,686
15 to 20 years	17,796	21,227	27,076	+9,280	+5,849
Over 20 years	25,832	22,372	14,405	−11,427	−7,967
Total	199,810	189,606	168,702	−31,108	−20,904

INTEREST ON THE PUBLIC DEBT

Interest payments on the public debt during the fiscal year amounted to $4,958,000,000, compared with $4,722,000,000 in 1946. Interest payments in 1947 do not reflect the full annual interest savings which ultimately will be effected from debt retirements made during the year. In the first place, there is a time lag between the retirement of debt and the time the interest savings become effective; for instance, only about a half-year's interest would be saved on debt retired in the first half of the year while the interest savings on debt retired in the latter half would not be noticeable until the year following. The second factor which tends to offset interest savings on the retirement of marketable debt is the somewhat higher average rate paid on new issues during the year of securities such as special issues to trust funds and Government investment accounts than the rate paid on the issues retired.

The effect of Treasury financing during the year as it relates to the interest burden of the debt is shown in the following table. It should be noted that the figures in this table relate to computed annual interest charges as of a specified date and not to actual payments during any particular year. The principal reason why computed interest charges currently exceed interest payments is that accruals of discount on savings bonds (included as payments) are still well below the average annual interest on such bonds if held to maturity (included as charges):

Computed average interest rate and annual interest charge on outstanding public debt

Classification	June 30, 1946		June 30, 1947		Change in annual interest charge
	Average interest rate	Annual interest charge	Average interest rate	Annual interest charge	
	Percent	*Millions*	*Percent*	*Millions*	*Millions*
Marketable:					
Bills	0.381	$65	0.382	$60	−$5
Certificates	.875	305	.875	221	−84
Notes	1.289	235	1.448	118	−117
Bonds	2.307	2,757	2.307	2,757	
Subtotal	1.773	3,362	1.871	3,156	−206
Nonmarketable:					
Armed forces leave bonds			2.500	45	+45
Savings bonds	2.777	1,362	2.765	1,420	+58
Savings notes	1.070	72	1.070	59	−13
Depositary bonds	2.000	9	2.000	7	−2
Subtotal	2.567	1,442	2.593	1,531	+89
Special issues:					
Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund	1.923	114	1.980	141	+27
Unemployment trust fund	1.875	126	2.000	143	+17
National service life insurance fund	3.000	157	3.000	194	+37
Other (Government employees' retirement funds, Postal Savings System, etc.)	3.351	150	3.147	209	+59
Subtotal	2.448	547	2.510	687	+140
Total	1.996	5,351	2.107	5,374	+23

[1] Interest-bearing marketable securities only.

[2] Includes the 0.90-percent, 13-month notes which matured July 1, 1946.

There are certain differences between computed annual interest charges shown in this table and actual interest payments. The average rates shown for savings bonds and savings notes represent the annual yield if held to maturity. Only the discount currently accruing on savings bonds, which at present is less than the computed annual interest charge, is included in interest payments. On the other hand, interest on armed forces leave bonds and savings notes is reflected as payments only at time of redemption.

The over-all computed average rate on the interest-bearing public debt outstanding on June 30, 1947, was 2.107 percent, compared with 1.996 percent a year ago. This increase in the general average rate was due to the retirement of large amounts of short-term debt bearing relatively low rates of interest, and the continued issue of nonmarketable and special issues at higher-than-average rates.

III. GENERAL FUND

The general fund cash balance at the close of the fiscal year amounted to $3,308,000,000, a reduction of $10,930,000,000 during the fiscal year. Deposits with special depositaries on account of sales of Government securities (i. e., war loan accounts) decreased from $12,993,000,000 on June 30, 1946, to $962,000,000 on June 30, 1947, a decrease of $12,031,000,000.

Classified statement of budget receipts and expenditures, fiscal years 1945–47

[In millions of dollars]

	1945	1946	1947	Increase (+) or decrease (−), 1947 from 1946
Budget receipts:				
Internal revenue:				
Income tax:				
Withheld by employers	$10,289	$9,392	$10,013	+$621
Other	24,884	21,483	19,292	−2,201
Miscellaneous internal revenue	6,949	7,725	8,049	+324
Social-security taxes	1,494	1,418	1,644	+226
Taxes upon carriers and their employees	285	283	380	+97
Railroad unemployment insurance contributions	13	13	14	+1
Customs	355	435	494	+59
Surplus property (act Oct. 3, 1944)	101	501	2,886	+2,385
Other miscellaneous receipts	3,369	2,979	1,929	−1,050
Total receipts	47,740	44,239	44,703	+464
Deduct: Net appropriation to Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund	1,283	1,201	1,444	+243
Net budget receipts	46,457	43,038	43,259	+221
Budget expenditures:				
General:				
Agriculture Department	769	1,007	2,323	+1,316
Bretton Woods Agreements Act:				
International Bank		159	476	+317
International Monetary Fund			950	+950
Commerce Department	80	98	149	+51
Credit to United Kingdom			2,050	+2,050
Export-Import Bank of Washington capital stock		674	325	−349
Federal Security Agency	549	624	911	+287
Federal Works Agency	100	122	315	+193
Interior Department	137	161	260	+99
Justice Department	68	72	101	+29
Labor Department	21	22	107	+85
National Housing Agency	12	40	385	+345
Panama Canal	9	18	20	+2
Post Office Department (deficiency)	1	161	242	+81
Railroad Retirement Board	6	6	9	+3
River and harbor work and flood control	142	168	222	+54
State Department	52	51	115	+64
Tennessee Valley Authority	20	29	25	−4
Treasury Department:				
Interest on the public debt	3,617	4,722	4,958	+236
Refunds of taxes and duties	1,715	3,034	3,050	+16
Other	300	343	525	+182
Veterans' Administration	934	2,871	6,442	+3,571
Other agencies	198	177	363	+186
Subtotal	8,730	14,559	24,323	+9,764
National defense and related activities:				
Agriculture Department	1,198	1,041	[1] 174	−1,215
Navy Department	30,047	15,161	5,575	−9,586
Payments for United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation	114	664	1,501	+837
Surplus property disposal agencies	[2]	106	442	+336
Treasury Department	1,462	695	158	−537
United States Maritime Commission	3,227	694	271	−423
War Department	50,399	27,852	8,832	−19,020
War Shipping Administration	2,042	1,367	74	−1,293
Other	1,540	962	462	−500
Subtotal	90,029	48,542	17,142	−31,400
Transfers to trust accounts, etc.:				
Employees' retirement funds (United States share)	197	247	223	−24
National service life insurance fund	1,117	1,381	817	−564
Railroad retirement account	309	292	298	+6
Other	24	[1] 2	17	+19
Subtotal	1,646	1,918	1,355	−563
Total, excluding corporations	100,405	65,019	42,819	−22,200
Government corporations (wholly owned), etc. (net):				
Commodity Credit Corporation	471	[1] 1,044	[1] 1,076	−32
Export-Import Bank of Washington	[3]	[1] 106	613	+719
Federal Housing Administration	[1] 5	[1] 20	[1] 1	+19
Federal Public Housing Authority	12	1	1	
Home Owners' Loan Corporation	[1] 323	[1] 275	[1] 202	+73
Reconstruction Finance Corporation:				
National defense and related activities	472	328	138	−190
Other	[1] 288	[1] 23	215	+238
Rural Electrification Administration	[1] 3	[1] 7	[1] 30	−23
Other	[1] 342	[1] 159	27	+186
Total Government corporations, etc.	[1] 7	[1] 1,305	[1] 314	+991
Total budget expenditures (excluding public debt retirements)	100,397	63,714	42,505	−21,209
Budget surplus (+) or deficit (−)	−53,941	−20,676	+754	+21,430

[1] Excess of credits, deduct.

[2] Included under "General, other agencies" in 1945, and "War activities" in 1946 and 1947.

[3] Less than $500,000.

NOTE.—Figures are rounded to the nearest million and will not necessarily add to the totals shown.

Composition of the outstanding public debt

[In millions of dollars]

Issues	Feb. 28, 1946	June 30, 1946	June 30, 1947	Change	
				Feb. 28, 1946 to June 30, 1947	June 30, 1946 to June 30, 1947
Public issues (interest bearing):					
Marketable obligations:					
Treasury bills	$17,032	$17,039	$15,775	−$1,257	−$1,264
Certificates of indebtedness	41,413	34,804	25,296	−16,117	−9,508
Treasury notes	19,551	18,261	8,142	−11,409	−10,119
Treasury bonds	121,635	119,323	119,323	−2,312	
Postal savings and other bonds	180	180	166	−14	−14
Total marketable obligations	199,810	189,606	168,702	−31,108	−20,904
Nonmarketable obligations:					
Armed forces leave bonds			1,793	+1,793	+1,793
Treasury savings notes	8,043	6,711	5,560	−2,483	−1,151
United States savings bonds	48,692	49,035	51,367	+2,675	+2,332
Depositary bonds	471	427	325	−146	−102
Total nonmarketable obligations	57,206	56,173	59,045	+1,839	+2,872
Total public issues	257,016	245,779	227,747	−29,269	−18,032
Special issues to Government trust funds and agencies	20,897	22,332	27,366	+6,469	+5,034
Matured debt on which interest has ceased	238	376	231	−7	−145
Debt bearing no interest:					
International Bank and Monetary Fund			2,140	+2,140	+2,140
Other	1,063	935	802	−261	−133
Total gross public debt	279,214	269,422	258,286	−20,928	−11,136
Guaranteed debt: Not owned by the Treasury	551	476	90	−461	−386
Total public and guaranteed debt	279,764	269,898	258,376	−21,388	−11,522
General fund balance	25,961	14,238	3,308	−22,653	−10,930
Total debt less general fund balance	253,803	255,660	255,068	+1,265	−592

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and will not necessarily add to totals.

Disposition of matured marketable securities during fiscal year 1947 [1]

[Dollar amounts in millions]

Date of maturity	Matured securities			Disposition		
	Class	Rate of interest	Amount	Payable in cash	Exchanged	
					New security	Amount
		Percent				
July 1, 1946	Note	0.90	$4,910	1,994	⅞ percent certificate	$2,916
Aug. 1, 1946	Certificate	⅞	2,470	1,246	do	1,223
Sept. 1, 1946	do	⅞	4,336	1,995	do	2,341
Oct. 1, 1946	do	⅞	3,440	2,000	do	1,440
Nov. 1, 1946	do	⅞	3,778	2,003	do	1,775
Dec. 1, 1946	do	⅞	3,768	487	do	3,281
Dec. 15, 1946	Note	1½	3,261	3,261		
Jan. 1, 1947	Conversion bond	3.0	13	13		
Jan. 1, 1947	Certificate	⅞	3,330	196	⅞-percent certificate	3,134
Feb 1, 1947	do	⅞	4,954	1,007	do	3,947
Mar. 1, 1947	do	⅞	3,133	991	do	2,142
Mar. 15, 1947	Note	1¼	1,948	1,948		
Apr. 1, 1947	Certificate	⅞	2,820	1,499	⅞-percent certificate	1,321
June 1, 1947	do	⅞	2,775	998	do	1,777
	Total		44,936	19,640		25,296

[1] This table does not take into account a net reduction of $1,264,000,000 in the outstanding Treasury bills.

NOTE.—Figures are rounded and will not necessarily add to totals.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

TRANSFER OF THE SHIP *JOSEPH CONRAD* TO MARINE HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION OF MYSTIC, CONN.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3333, Calendar No. 411, to authorize the transfer of the *Joseph Conrad* to the Marine Historical Association of Mystic, Conn., for museum and youth-training purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3333) to authorize the transfer of the *Joseph Conrad* to the Marine Historical Association, of Mystic, Conn., for museum and youth-training purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with an amendment, on page 2, line 7, after "maritime", to strike out "matters, in" and to insert "matters. In."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the bill was reported favorably by the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, but after it had been reported it was found that there was an error in the House language by reason of the omission of two necessary words. I have discussed the matter with the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and believe he understands the situation. He is agreeable to the amendment which I shall offer.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, has a request been made for unanimous consent to consider a bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida indicated that he will be unable to be present tomorrow when the calendar will be called, and asked unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill, which was granted.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in order that the Senate may be advised of the situation, the bill does nothing more than to give an old square-rigged sail-

ing vessel now belonging to the Maritime Commission to the Marine Historical Association, of Mystic, Conn. The Commission desires to get rid of the vessel, and deliver it to the Marine Historical Association. Since the bill was introduced by a Representative from my State of Florida, who discovered the error in the language, I took the matter up with the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], and I believe the matter is understood all the way around. I cannot conceive of any objection to the bill.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. As I understand the situation, the amendment corrects a manifest clerical error.

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes. It is necessary that the correction be made.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. I now offer an amendment on page 2, line 10, after the words "authorized to", to insert "give and."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

JOE B. DOOLEY

The Senate, in executive session, resumed the consideration of the nomination of Joe B. Dooley to be United States district judge for the northern district of Texas.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on the calendar day of Tuesday, July 8, 1947, at the hour of 4 o'clock p. m., the Senate proceed to vote, without further debate, on the question of the confirmation of Joe B. Dooley to be United States district judge for the northern district of Texas. I think that should include the motion to recommit, and any other related motions. I further request that on the day specified the time be equally divided, upon the meeting of the Senate at 11 o'clock a. m., between the proponents and opponents of the nomination, the time to be controlled, respectively, by the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL].

Mr. President, I wonder if there is any objection to that part of the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I should like to interrogate the Senator. I am agreeable to a vote on Tuesday, but I am amazed at the liberality of the Senator toward the junior Senator from Texas. The junior Senator from Texas has consumed almost 2 days already. I do not understand why he should have one-half the time on next Tuesday, when not only I, but quite a number of other Senators, wish to speak.

Mr. WHERRY. I know that the distinguished senior Senator from Texas will agree that we are attempting to expedite consideration of the nomination.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am endeavoring to do so.

Mr. WHERRY. We deeply appreciate the Senator's consideration. I am suggesting, with the approval of the majority leader, that the Senate convene at 11 o'clock on Tuesday, so that there will be 5 hours of debate, and that the time be equally divided.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will agree to the request; but it is manifestly unfair to the proponents of this nomination to allow the opponents to have a day and a half or two days, and also have the remaining time on Tuesday. However, I shall not object. It will not take me very long to lay the facts before the Senate. However, I have in mind that a number of other Senators wish to speak in favor of the nomination, and I must consider their necessities along with mine. If necessary, I shall cut my time down to 30 minutes.

Mr. WHERRY. I deeply appreciate the attitude of the senior Senator from Texas, and I thank him for it.

The unanimous consent request further provides that at the close of business today a recess be taken, in legislative session, until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow, and that the unfinished business, which is the extension of the Second War Powers Act, be proceeded with; that after its disposition the Senate proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar to which there is no objection; and that on Monday the Senate proceed to the consideration of the so-called unification bill, Senate bill 758.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, as I understand, this means that the unification bill will be considered on Monday, and that on Tuesday, with the Senate meeting at 11 o'clock, it will be displaced until 4 o'clock in the afternoon.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

The unanimous-consent agreement was reduced to writing, as follows:

Ordered, That on the calendar day of Tuesday, July 8, 1947, at the hour of 4 p. m., the Senate proceed to vote without further debate upon any motion that may be pending or that may be made with respect to the nomination of Joe B. Dooley to be United States district judge for the northern district of Texas, and upon the question of advising and consenting to the said nomination; that on said day the time between the meeting of the Senate and the said hour of 4 p. m. be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the said nomination, to be controlled, respectively, by the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL].

Ordered further, That at the close of the business of the Senate today, a recess be taken in legislative session until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow, when the unfinished business, viz, the bill S. 1461, will be proceeded with; that after its disposition the Senate will proceed to the consideration of bills on the calendar to which there is no objection; and that on Monday, July 7, 1947, the Senate, upon convening, will proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 758, to promote the national security by providing for a national defense establishment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the other nominations on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of United States attorneys.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, it has been agreed that the nominations for United States attorneys be passed over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be passed over.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James Bruce, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Argentina.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] yesterday objected to that nomination.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will ask that the nomination be passed over pending the return of the Senator from North Dakota.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles E. Saltzman, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

Without objection, the President will be notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

DISPLACED PERSONS

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I desire to introduce a bill, but prior to doing so I wish to make a few remarks in relation to it. Peace has not been made in Europe. With peace will come many postwar responsibilities in the conquered countries of central Europe.

One of the vital problems is the responsibility America has for displaced persons in Europe. At the present time we are responsible for 588,000 refugees and persecuted persons in Germany and Austria, out of a total of approximately 800,000. These people at the present time, of

course, live under our flag, and the administration is responsible for what has happened to them since they came under our care, and for what will happen to them in the future.

During the fiscal year 1947 this responsibility has cost the Government of the United States $130,000,000. It is not only the cost, however, with which we should be concerned but it is the effects these people and their plight at the present time have on the foreign relations of the world.

Yesterday, with the signature of the President, the United States became a member of the International Refugee Organization. This is an organization whose constitution was approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations on December 15, 1946. This agency takes over the administration of the displaced persons, and it will in a way become responsible for the welfare of the displaced persons. As our contribution, we have appropriated to this agency $73,325,000.

The senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], in discussing this bill, said on the floor of the Senate:

The ultimate answer to the displaced-person problem obviously is resettlement of displaced persons.

The senior Senator from Michigan stated that the IRO would be "a new impetus in respect to resettlement, which is the ultimate answer to the whole situation."

The International Refugee Organization was not intended to represent a change in our immigration law. It is apparent that the present quotas under the immigration law will not solve the problem before us. How can we now share our responsibility for the ultimate answer to the displaced-person problem? It is clear that we must study the question of resettlement in the United States of some of these people.

Many bills have been introduced in the House, and one bill has had a hearing. In that bill it is proposed that there be brought into this country on a nonquota basis 400,000 people in the next 4 years. I am sure that the sponsors of the legislation believe that we should be working on the problem at the present time, because we realize how urgent it is, and how we must cooperate with the IRO if the problem is to be solved.

In the past America has been the haven for those who have been persecuted for political and religious activities. They have added both to the virility and wealth of our Nation, and the strength of our representative government. We cannot close our doors to those who are seeking such a refuge at the present time. Those of us who have seen displaced persons appreciate how important it is that we proceed with this program.

The bill which I am introducing today on behalf of myself and other Senators will enable us to help solve the serious problem which is now facing us in connection with the reconstruction of Europe. I am sure that it will encourage displaced persons in camps to feel that we have not forgotten them, and that there is still a haven in a safe land, a land where liberty is not only a word, but a living thing to be enjoyed by mankind.

Mr. President, I wish to read at this time the provisions of the bill which I am introducing on behalf of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and myself.

In the first part of the bill we define the words "displaced persons." A displaced person is:

(a) A person displaced from the country of his residence during World War II by forceable deportation.

(b) A person who is registered as a displaced person by the United Nations Relief Administration, the International Governmental Committee on Refugees, or the International Refugee Organization.

(c) A person born in Poland, Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Germany, Austria, or Italy, and who, during World War II, bore arms against the enemies of the United States, and (1) is unable to return to the country of which he is a national for fear of political reprisal, or (2) is unwilling to return to, or remain in, the country of which he is a national because of persecution or his fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinions.

That is the definition of the persons whom we have in mind.

Section 3 of the bill reads as follows:

SEC. 3. For a period of 4 years commencing on the first day of the first month beginning after the date of enactment of this act, any displaced person applying for admission for permanent residence to the United States shall be admitted as a nonquota immigrant, if the displaced person is qualified under the immigration laws of the United States for admission for permanent residence.

It will be noted that we do not specify in the bill the number to be admitted. The reason is that we believe that the committee should, through a study, ascertain how many persons should be allowed to enter. We do not believe that in advance of that study we should arbitrarily decide on the number.

It is also necessary that they be brought in on a nonquota basis. Anyone who has looked into the situation must realize that a quota basis such as we have had in the past would not solve our problem, because of the number of people coming from different lands into the camps which are provided.

Section 4 is a very important section, because we believe that we should establish certain priorities when we consider the question of immigration. Section 4 reads as follows:

SEC. 4. Priority under this act shall be given, first, to orphans who are under 21 years of age, and, second, in the following order: To the widow, children, parents, and other relatives (within the fourth degree of consanguinity under common law) of citizens of the United States or of persons who served honorably in the armed forces of the United States during World War I or World War II.

Mr. President, it will be noted that we give priority to orphans under 21 years of age who are displaced persons. I believe that this is a proper priority, and should merit the attention of all, because when we bring into this country youths who are unable to return to their own lands and are unable to find a haven anywhere else in the world, we shall find that they will make excellent citizens. If the time ever comes when their services are needed, America can expect and will receive the aid of those people. Also they will grow up under our laws and institutions, and become fine Americans.

Another point is that many people in this country would be anxious to adopt such children and raise them in their own homes, in order that they might become better citizens. I believe we should give first priority to the youth who are waiting for a haven, a place where they may find economic, political, and religious freedom.

The next persons we would have given priority would be those who are relatives of people in America or who have fought on the side of America. This, we believe, will help, because it will bring here those who have some ties, those who can be guided by persons who have been here in the past. It will also help in connection with the housing problem of the people who are to come to these shores.

Last, but not least, we believe we should screen these people very carefully so that they will fit into our economic, political, and industrial life in America, because we believe that in the past immigration was a question in the jurisdiction of Congress, and that it now should be studied and decisions made by Congress. Not that we do not want to give all a haven, for we do, but they must fit into the pattern which Congress will lay down, so that we can set an example for the rest of the world.

The next section deals with those who are to screen these persons, who are to determine who shall come to America from among the displaced persons. It is provided in the bill that the Secretary of State and the Attorney General shall have authority, acting jointly, to prescribe appropriate regulations for the administration of the act, and that the President is authorized to use such agencies in the executive branch of the Government as he deems necessary to carry out the purpose of the act.

The two Cabinet officers referred to, the Secretary of State and the Attorney General, should be able, under the immigration laws which now exist, to screen all persons so that we shall not receive in this nonquota immigration any who are subversive to our institutions, whether they be Communists, whether they be Nazis, or persons in any way opposed to our institutions, or desiring to overthrow our Government.

Therefore, Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill which is introduced in behalf of myself, the junior Senator from Michigan, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

I see on the floor some of the other sponsors of the measure, and I hope they will see fit to say something about the bill which we now present to the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FERGUSON. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1563) to authorize for a limited period of time the admission of certain displaced persons into the United States for permanent residence, introduced by Mr. FERGUSON (for himself, Mr. BALL, Mr. SMITH, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. HATCH, Mr. MCGRATH, and Mr. MORSE), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Emergency Displaced Persons Admission Act."

SEC. 2. When used in this act, the term "displaced person" means—

(a) a person displaced from the country of his residence during World War II by forcible deportation;

(b) a person who is registered as a displaced person by the United Nations Relief Administration, the International Governmental Committee on Refugees, or the International Refugee Organization;

(c) a person born in Poland, Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Germany, Austria, or Italy and who, during World War II, bore arms against the enemies of the United States and (1) is unable to return to the country of which he is a national for fear of political reprisal or (2) is unwilling to return to, or remain in, the country of which he is a national because of persecution or his fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinions.

SEC. 3. For a period of 4 years commencing on the first day of the first month beginning after the date of enactment of this act, any displaced person applying for admission for permanent residence to the United States shall be admitted as a nonquota immigrant, if the displaced person is qualified under the immigration laws of the United States for admission for permanent residence.

SEC. 4. Priority under this act shall be given first, to orphans who are under 21 years of age and second, in the following order: To the widow, children, parents, and other relatives (within the fourth degree of consanguinity under common law) of citizens of the United States or of persons who served honorably in the armed forces of the United States during World War I or World War II. Subject to the above priorities, so far as practicable there shall be admitted under the program contemplated by this act persons possessed of special trades, skills, professions, or aptitudes as will best meet the economic needs of the United States and contribute to its cultural, religious, economic, or industrial welfare and prosperity.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of State and the Attorney General shall have authority, acting jointly, to prescribe appropriate regulations for the administration of this act; and the President is authorized to utilize such agencies in the executive branch of the Government as he deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am happy to be associated with the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and the other Senators whom he has named, in the introduction of this bill, which proposes that the United States shall admit a fair share of the displaced persons who are in Europe, most of whom are in the United States zones of occupation in Germany and Austria.

My interest in these unfortunate people was first aroused in March 1944 when, like many others, I saw thousands of them streaming back along the roads of Germany without transportation and without adequate clothing or food, but happy in their liberation. It was a moving and a dramatic picture.

After the war, by reason of certain assignments, I had the opportunity to talk with representatives of those nations who came to arrange for the repatriation of these nationals, to visit their camps, and to talk to displaced persons from many countries. From those experiences I learned something of their forced enslavement. Since that time many millions have been repatriated. But today some 850,000 yet remain in Germany and Austria. Their condition has been ameliorated in a material sense, in the supplying of food and clothing and shelter; yet there can be no great hope for them as they look to the future unless provision is made for their settlement.

A short time ago Congress made provision that this country should participate in the International Relief Organization.

The IRO makes provision for their care; it proposes that steps shall be taken for their ultimate settlement; but I believe that unless this country leads the way, little progress will be made in that direction and that the International Relief Organization will be meaningless.

Many arguments have been advanced against the entry of these people. I shall not discuss in detail these objections. It has been said that to permit such persons to come to this country would be to provide a new method of infiltration of communism. I believe the best answer to that statement is that these people are without homes, because they have resisted or will not live in totalitarian states. They cannot return to their native countries, or, if Germans, cannot remain there because of the fear or memory of religious, political, or racial intolerance and persecution. I am thinking particularly of those who were persecuted. I am thinking also of those who come from Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, many of whom suffered two occupations, both, I believe, totalitarian occupations and who, with our assent, have no country and no homes.

I think this country should take this step because of its own traditions. I think that, in our tradition of humanitarianism, of our love of justice, and of Christianity, this great step should be taken.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, as one of the sponsors of the bill, introduced by the distinguished Senator from Michigan, and as one who has given a good deal of thought and study to the matter for several months, I want to add a few words and give a few figures for the record regarding the situation in which we find ourselves in connection with the bill.

Our occupying forces now have in their hands hundreds of thousands of the surviving victims of the Nazi armies. They were brought into Germany for forced labor. They will not willingly go back to the areas from which they were uprooted. Those areas are now, after the remaking of the map, under governments to whose political and economic systems they are irrevocably opposed.

I know of a number of individual instances of relatives of friends of mine in this country who are not able to return to their original countries because if they should do so they would be purged, as the saying is. They are some of the finest people in Europe.

It is my understanding that there are more than 1,000,000 of these displaced persons in Germany, Austria, and Italy. Of these, 850,000 are in Germany, 148,000 in Austria, and the rest in Italy. About 8 of every 10 of these displaced persons live in camps or organized communities. Sixty-five percent of them are Catholic, 20 percent Jewish, and 15 percent Protestant. Children under the age of 18 comprise 21 percent of these displaced persons, while 66 percent are between the ages of 18 and 44. Only 13 percent are above the age of 44. I want to reemphasize the point that only 13 percent are above the age of 44.

As to the groups into which these displaced persons are divided, about 17 percent are "Balts"—that is, from Esthonia, Latvia, or Lithuania, formerly a part of Russia—30 percent are Poles, 7 percent are Yugoslavs, and 20 percent Jews. The rest are composed primarily of Ukranians, Russians, and stateless persons. Almost 60 percent of the total number of displaced persons are in the United States Zones of Occupation in Germany and Austria, or under United States care in Italy. The point should be emphasized that 60 percent of the total number are in our Zones of Occupation in Germany and Austria, or under our care in Italy. We already have them under our care.

This bill would permit the United States to do what we have been urging other countries in the world to do, namely, to receive a reasonable proportion of these displaced persons for resettlement. Belgium, France, Norway, Paraguay, Brazil, and Venezuela are already joining in receiving these people. We in America cannot in good conscience ask our neighbors in the world to be practical as well as virtuous by doing something we ourselves hesitate to do.

As I have said on numerous occasions, the United States has emerged from the war the most powerful and the most influential nation in the world. We cannot safely ignore the responsibility of leadership that is ours, nor can we morally ignore the great obligations to humanity that have been thrust upon us. But let us never forget that we can truly lead only if our national life supports the ideals which we proclaim to others.

Therefore we should be among the first to extend the hand of fellowship to these casualties of the war, and thus join in completing this residual task.

Such people will not in their principles be strangers to America. They have been screened by adversity, and will be

subject to the standards of our immigration laws. Let me add here that America throughout her history has grown in stature and vision by her welcome to immigrants from other countries. One could cite any number of examples to prove that point.

I have personally talked very recently with men and women who have had a wide experience in the care of these people in Germany, who know both the best and worst about them. They will not be a burden upon our country. Church groups and other welfare groups, serving people of the different nationalities involved, are organized and stand ready to aid in the distribution and settlement of these people throughout the country in many communities. This will safeguard against the possibility of their becoming public charges, and will integrate them naturally into American life through their friends and kinfolk in this country.

Priority under the act shall be given, first, to orphans who are under 21 years of age and, second, in the order named, to the widows, children, parents, and other relatives of citizens of the United States or of persons who served honorably in the armed forces of the United States during World War I or World War II. After those priorities, we shall take them on the basis of their aptitude to fit into our economic life.

Mr. President, inasmuch as the bill helps in the solution of a grave humanitarian and economic problem, it is my sincere hope that the Congress will act upon it during the present session. Such action will confirm the faith of free men in the United States.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I am happy to join with the sponsors of this bill, the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and the other Senators who join with him in introducing it. If we were to open the floodgates of immigration to this country, millions of people from the distressed areas in the world would come to us, perhaps to the destruction of all we hold dear and all that is best in the American tradition. No one deplores more than I do the illegal entry of hundreds of thousands of persons who have come to this country during the period of the war and in more recent months. That is a separate problem from the one we face and are trying to meet in connection with this bill.

My ancestors came to this country to escape religious and political persecution, and no doubt that is true of the ancestors of most, or at least a number, of the other Members of this body. For ages, America has been a haven for those who have been persecuted personally for their religious convictions or for their political beliefs. It is the noblest of our traditions.

So today, when the whole world is facing the serious problem of providing for the unfortunates known as displaced persons, I am happy to say that I am heartily in favor of our adopting an effective program for the proper screening of those who desire to come, and at the same time meeting a distressing human need in other places of the world. People of all races and from all climates and from all nations have contributed much to the success of America. They have brought to us much that has been helpful in the building of a great United States. No doubt on the list of those covered by the bill will be those who in coming to the United States will contribute much to the constructive future of our Nation.

I am glad to join in a program which will permit the United States to continue her noblest traditions, to continue to live in the high spirit that has builded us, and at the same time to bring succor to those who are in distress and need in so many places in the world today.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I do not rise to comment on the bill which has just been introduced, but in passing I wish to commend those who have introduced the bill. I think they are proposing to deal with a problem in regard to which we have too long delayed in fulfilling our responsibilities in connection with the purposes for which the war was fought.

In my trip through Europe last year I visited a great many of the displaced persons camps; and after my return, from various platforms in America I endeavored to point out to my fellow Americans that we have a very definite obligation and a definite responsibility to the peace, which we have not been fulfilling in the case of these displaced persons.

Take, for example, the so-called Sudeten Germans, who were displaced from Czechoslovakia at the beginning of the war, already to the regret of the leaders of that country, I believe. I know of no better group of people who could be taken into the United States than that group of hard-working people who for many years past have had no real connection with Nazi Germany.

I wish to say that I think the Senators who are sponsors of the bill have taken a very important step in the right direction; but, of course, peace in Europe will never be achieved permanently until the basis that gave rise to the movement of these displaced persons is forever eliminated in Europe.

I have been one who for a long time past has said that following the war there should have been a conference of the Allies in the war in regard to the distribution of all these displaced persons around the globe. Although it is now late, I hope it is still not too late for the United States to lift her sights a little in regard to her obligations to these displaced persons, and to see to it that the great injustices that are present in the concentration camps in Europe—that is what the displaced-persons camps really are—will be removed as a blot from the face of the earth.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the hour is late, but even if it is, I do not want the opportunity to pass without saying at least one word in support of the legislation which has just been introduced in behalf of the several Senators, relating to displaced persons.

Mr. President, I think I can cover the entire field with this simple, brief statement. Our country is under a moral obligation, an obligation to humanity, and even a religious obligation, in connection with these people. I do not see how we can possibly take the position of insisting that others perform similar obligations resting upon them unless we evidence a willingness to perform some part in the discharge of our own obligations. Therefore, Mr. President, I am glad to be associated with those who sponsor the legislation, and I hope we may have quick action on it.

LABOR EXTENSION SERVICE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to make a brief statement in regard to an insertion which I wish to have made in the RECORD.

I wish to say that in the uproar on both sides in the Senate in the recent fight over labor legislation, another piece of labor legislation should not be overlooked. On June 5 the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] and I introduced a bill (S. 1390) for a Labor Extension Service in the Department of Labor. This bill has the support of all organized labor and of leaders in the field of labor education. In supporting the bill, workers are asking for better access to the facts of their everyday lives, of the industries in which they are employed, and for training in the effective use of these facts and in peaceful collective bargaining. They also seek knowledge of national and world affairs so that they may better meet their obligations as citizens.

As has been said, the bill offers no overnight solution to our industrial-relations problems; but by the slower but surer processes of education and understanding, its enactment and administration would equip labor to carry out its share of the collective-bargaining process more effectively in its own interest and in the public interest. It will still be true that it takes two to make a bargain, and that industrial peace depends not alone upon labor but equally upon the willingness and good faith of employers in their dealings with employees. But labor, by asking for this help, which is similar to the substantial aid long given to farmers by the Agricultural Extension Service, has given definite evidence of its good will and good intent.

Let me also say that in view of the constant depletion of the services of the Department of Labor, for which Congress is responsible in this session, as evidenced by the action we took yesterday, I think we could well consider really putting in the Department of Labor some services that will be helpful to the peaceful solution of industrial relations problems, instead of stripping that Department of its value in that field.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an article by the distinguished columnist, Malvina Lindsay, which appeared in the Washington Post for June 28, and which sets forth in simple human terms the background of labor's request for the service provided in Senate bill 1390.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW HORIZONS FOR WORKERS

(By Malvina Lindsay)

CHANCE TO LEARN

For decades the Government has been spending money to develop better informed and more productive farmers. Now it is being asked to start similar extension education for men and women who work in factories and offices.

In a Congress that is pinching pennies the bill of Senators ELBERT D. THOMAS and WAYNE MORSE to establish a labor extension service for the Department of Labor might seem a hopeless gesture. But it, like aid to farmers, promises a return on the investment. Better-informed workers would increase productivity. They would, also—since ignorance breeds belligerence—do more in the long run to bring about industrial peace than all the labor laws Congress could devise.

Even greater aims are involved. A bridge would be started across one of the most dangerous gulfs that divides the American people, that between those who never had a chance to learn and those who did. And millions of adults, who in the next few years must make world-shaking decisions at the polls, would be given a short cut in understanding in the problems of the day.

The hunger of American workers for more learning is general and deep-seated, those engaged in labor education have found. Now that industrial workers are coming up against greater responsibilities in their unions, being drawn into more activity in the social and political projects of their communities, they are especially eager to improve themselves.

They flock to the classes, forums, institutes, and summer schools opened to them by voluntary efforts. Between 50 and 75 colleges and universities offer such courses. But these can reach only a fraction of the millions who want to attend, and whose unions are willing to pay for sending them. Also, the demand for teachers and lecturers at union halls is far greater than can be met.

What is needed for the country's 42,000,000 industrial and office workers is an extension program similar to that which the Department of Agriculture provides for 6,000,000 farm families through extension workers, county agents, and its money grants to States willing to match a part of the funds. The labor extension service bill provides for grants-in-aid to States to start such a program.

Workers who come to the summer schools are a professor's dream. They do not have to be prodded to study, nor do they doze in class. Their excitement over knowledge is contagious. A girl at the Hudson Shore Labor School—a year-round project that grew out of the Bryn Mawr summer labor school—reported she had written her father a long letter telling what she had learned about the sun's moving. "Now," she said, "he's written me back five pages of questions."

The Hudson Shore School—across the river from Hyde Park—has pioneered in developing courses and methods for labor education. It has found that workers want to understand labor relations, economics, and government, but that they also want English and science, and are especially eager to find creative outlets in the arts. A class in which men and women long frustrated by their educational lack suddenly discover they can paint, sculpture, write poetry, otherwise express their creative yearnings is a deeply moving experience for both pupils and teacher.

Responsible labor leaders are looking to the labor-education movement to stabilize unions and to prevent wildcat strikes. As more workers understand labor problems, also the operations of unions and methods of negotiations, they will act more advisedly, it is believed.

Women workers are eager for the education that will enable them to take more active part in unions—in many of which they are still kept on back seats—and also to advance in their factories, where their chief progress has been to that of shop stewards.

PROBLEMS IN OCCUPIED GERMANY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, at this late hour I shall not take much of the Senate's time, but I wish to make a few brief remarks regarding some of the problems facing the occupation authorities overseas. Certainly the Members of the Senate recognize some of the grave economic problems facing our occupation authorities in the American zone in Germany, and we recognize that other problems face the British in their occupation area, and that undoubtedly many problems face the Russians in their zone of occupation in Germany. This whole problem, as far as the American and British zones are concerned, particularly, ties into the so-called Marshall plan for the economic rehabilitation of western Europe.

I recently ran across an article which I felt was so significant that it should be printed in the body of the RECORD. It is from the London Times of June 26, just a short time ago, and it deals with the problems in the British occupation zone, points out some of the grave conditions existing there, and, while they are not exactly parallel, by any manner of means, to those existing in the American zone, we do have many of the same problems, and I think it will be helpful to Members of the Senate to read this article very carefully, as it will throw a considerable amount of light on the critical conditions existing in western Europe at the present time. I wish to say that the information contained in the article is confirmed by many letters I have received from men who are still overseas, and with whom I served while in the Army. I call this article to the attention of the Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNREST IN LOWER SAXONY—EFFECTS OF FOOD AND COAL SHORTAGE—ECONOMIC RECOVERY THREATENED

Lower Saxony (Land Niedersachsen), one of the three states of the British zone of Germany, was formed last winter by the union of the states of Hanover, Brunswick, and Oldenburg, and the small duchy of Schaumburg-Lippe. It is half agricultural and half industrial, and is the only state in the British zone which produces food beyond its own requirements. Hannover, Brunswick, Osnabrück, and Oldenburg apart, it has no large cities. Its industrial belt, stretching from Oldenburg, in the west, to Helmstedt, on the Russian zonal frontier, in the east, contains about a third of the whole industry of the British zone.

Lower Saxony has been the last region to be affected by the apathy and unrest which now prevail in the British zone. Because of its economic construction it has always had the little extra food that in such times, diverts people's minds from the forces that control their greater destinies. Now, at this critical time between the old harvest and the new, that extra food is exhausted. The industrial towns, even the smaller ones set in farming country, have been forced back on the official issue of food. That issue is a third below the 1,550 calories a day which against German advice, is still the nominal minimum ration for the British and American zones. Germans in the industrial towns of Lower Saxony are living on bread, cereals, and milk—and not too much of any of these. When the crops are ready they will probably be better off than workers in the Ruhr and Hamburg, because, leaving aside the black market to which everyone resorts as and when he can, they will have the benefit of a highly developed allotments and garden policy, which British military government have directed and encouraged.

DEPENDENCE ON COAL

Meanwhile there is an interval of scarcity and hunger which gives the German in Lower Saxony ample opportunity of realizing how slowly ultimate betterment may be expected. Already, in the winter, he was made to realize the economic malaise of his country. In December and January, when the canals were frozen, petrol was short for road transportation, and the railways could not take the additional burden, Ruhr coal did not come in. Power had to be rationed; almost all factories were closed down; men were thrown out of work and industrial production dwindled to almost nothing.

Once the winter was over coal began to come in. Then at Easter the Ruhr coal miners' discontent with their families' short rations sent coal production down. Now, according to British estimates, the power stations and factories of Lower Saxony are getting about half the coal they need. Imports of electric power, which, before there were zones in Germany, Lower Saxony got from Leipzig and Halle, and now gets from the Ruhr, are also half what they should be. Factories are being closed down again, and it would require 6 months of adequate coal deliveries to restore industrial production to last November's level. Coal production in the Ruhr has recently increased from 210,000 to over 220,000 tons a day, but this improvement is too small to open up the prospect of adequate delivery, and this must prejudice any plan of German economic recovery or any chance which still remains of making the British occupation a material and moral success. It also produces immediate dangers.

Unless more coal can be produced in the Ruhr and distributed quickly, transport in the British zone will deteriorate still further. Railway engines and trucks cannot get even the daily maintenance they require because there is not enough steel. Because of the lack of artificial rubber and textiles, the Continental Tire Works in Hannover cannot produce enough tires to meet the strictly rationed needs of the country, and British officials believe that by next winter this may cause a break-down in transport.

INDUSTRIAL OUTLOOK

The general industrial outlook is no more industrial fair will be held in Hannover to other raw materials are short—steel, chemicals, hides, industrial fats, wool and cotton, and timber. In August and September an industrial fair will be held in Hannover to advertise the manufactures of the British and, to a less extent, of the American zone. The fair, at which 7,000 visitors are expected from Britain and elsewhere oversea, is intended to help German manufacturers to renew old contacts and so turn their thoughts to export markets. Till more coal is won in the Ruhr and distributed in the western zones there is little prospect of reaching this year's export target of $350,000,000 for the two western zones. The best that is hoped of the fair is that small orders can be accepted for delivery in 18 months to 2 years. Germans are expected to attend

the fair in large numbers. British propaganda will require a finer touch than it has yet shown if German expectations are not to be pitched too high and made to suffer another disappointment.

The history of the British zone is a chronicle of disappointments. The encouraging word has been said too often to make more than a transient impression now. Lord Pakenham has won good German opinions for his evident sincerity; but unless he can produce results, he will fail just as Mr. Hynd failed. Nine months ago it was possible to write that only irresponsible Germans were saying: "It is British policy to starve us to death." Now it must be recorded as a fact that in lower Saxony and elsewhere in the zone responsible Germans are losing faith in British policy.

In general, the political parties (except the Communists) have cooperated loyally, hoping that eventually some way would be found out of the impasse of hunger, industrial stagnation, lack of consumer goods, and miserable housing. They and the trade-unions, whose leaders are predominantly Social Democrat, advocated patience and exercised restraint during the long, bitter winter. When spring brought the hunger demonstrations, the trade-union leaders managed to guide the unrest into peaceful demonstrations till it had spent itself for the moment.

But restraint is hard to maintain over hungry people when the grounds for patience are not evident. There are young hooligans, children whose school of life is the black market, who are ready to turn any demonstration into a riot—as has already happened once in Brunswick. Worse still, there is a constant Communist propaganda against the western powers, directed from Berlin. The local Communists, unable to capture the trade-unions, have established themselves in the works councils. Thence they spread the subtle suggestion that the trade-unions have no influence with military government; otherwise, so runs the taunt, they would have achieved something more for the workers than the abolition of double summer time.

In Lower Saxony the loss of morale is accompanied by a feeling that too much attention is paid to the special needs of the Ruhr. Some of the resentment that the Ruhr miner is not playing his part is transferred to military government, who continue to give him his extra food, schnapps, cigarettes, clothing, and boots, and to improve his housing. This is seen as part of the general purposelessness of British policy. Just as no German believes there is not enough food somewhere in the world for the whole world's needs, so no German believes that, after having organized an empire that was Germany's envy, the British could not organize their zone of Germany—if they were minded to do so.

THE BRITISH ROLE

Too many Germans believe the end of British policy to be the destruction of Germany as a potential industrial competitor. How else, they ask, is one to explain the delay in the socialization of basic industries, or the delay in saying what amount of industry is to be left in the zone, or the keeping of Germany on a bare subsistence of food? The impetus in morale that came from the economic fusion of the British and American zones in January is exhausted because fusion did not produce more food. Now, there is almost no faith that the new bizonal machinery, whose effectiveness cannot in any case be immediate, will make a real difference.

Since, for the British official in the zone, German problems in the end become British problems—no matter to what extent authority may be transferred—British morale cannot stay up when German morale goes down. The British official who wanted a good time or to make money easily has injured the reputation and efficiency of the control commission. But this is not the commission's greatest weakness. There is a real danger in the tendency for officials with ability and a sense of mission—and the two qualities generally go together—to resign as their contracts expire.

Ability and a sense of mission are still there, brilliantly typified in Sir Brian Robertson, the deputy military governor. But they are too often, as is the whole administration of the zone, corroded by two evils—the lack of a constructive British policy, initiated in London and directed from Berlin, and the growth of the control commission and its agent military government into a bureaucracy that stifles initiative and makes life itself a round of irritations. It is the less desirable men, often those of no settled career, who are first in the scramble for the longer contracts now belatedly being offered.

The evil of the short contract is evident in the lower reaches of officialdom. The minor official, whose interest in Germany is that it gives him a living, is as good a man as the next; as the soldier went out and the civilian came in, his number increased. In an atmosphere of progress he could do excellent work. In an atmosphere of frustration he does what he has to do, but without inspiration. Neither British nor German morale will improve until the British zone moves toward prosperity and contentment; and that change will not begin until some means has been found of giving Germans more food. In a world of scarcity, Germans on their record have no claim to preference. But the alternative is that the British zone should limp slowly toward disaster.

The measures taken by the British and Americans to secure the economic welfare of their joint zones have good in them, but they depend on German effort. Now that promises are ineffective and scolding merely increases resentment, the only means of securing that effort is to provide more food. With more food there will be more coal, more industry, more hope. Without it, we shall remain what we have now become—hated conquerors in a decaying land that scorns the moral values Britain represents.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made.

RECESS

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) in legislative session, the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, July 3, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 2 (legislative day, April 21), 1947:

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to examination required by law. All others have been examined and found qualified for promotion.

To be lieutenant colonels

Maj. John Boyden Goodell, Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 3, 1947.

Maj. Harold Dean Jones, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from February 12, 1947.

Maj. Philip Stueler Lauben, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from February 18, 1947.

Maj. Charles Rexford Stark, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 19, 1947.

Maj. Humbert Orazio Nelli, Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 23, 1947.

Maj. Edward Hern Farr, Infantry, with rank from March 25, 1947.

Maj. Gilbert Leaing McMurrin, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from April 2, 1947.

Maj. Murry John Martin, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from April 11, 1947.

×Maj. Charles Cooper Young, Judge Advocate General's Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from April 29, 1947.

Maj. Arthur Cecil Ramsey, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from May 10, 1947.

Maj. William Leonard Saunders, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from May 19, 1947.

Maj. Emil Pasolli, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from May 31, 1947.

Maj. Harold Albert Buck, Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 4, 1947.

Maj. George Spence Wise, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Maj. Wallace Howard Hastings, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Emerson Leroy Cummings, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Earle Everard Partridge, Air Corps (temporary major general), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Donald Charles Hill, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Benjamin Schultz Mesick, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Reginald Langworthy Dean, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Merrow Egerton Sorley, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Philip Robison Garges, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. George Dakin Crosby, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Arthur Gilbert Trudeau, Corps of Engineers (temporary brigadier general), with rank from June 12, 1947.

×Maj. John Held Riepe, Cavalry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Emerson Charles Itschner, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Ernest Orrin Lee, Finance Department (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Howard Ker, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Charles Day Palmer, Field Artillery (temporary brigadier general), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Herbert Davis Vogel, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Fremont Swift Tandy, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Emil John Peterson, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Gordon Edmund Textor, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Everett Chalmers Wallace, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Vernum Charles Stevens, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Otis McCormick, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Wendell Blanchard, Cavalry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Thomas Du Val Roberts, Cavalry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Clinton Frederick Robinson, Corps of Engineers (temporary major general), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Frederic Allison Henney, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. David Jerome Ellinger, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Leonard Lawrence Bingham, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Joseph Peter Shumate, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. John Ismert Hincke, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Raymond Thomas Beurket, Chemical Corps (temporary colonel) with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Heyward Bradford Roberts, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Charles George Meehan, Cavalry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Victor Allen Conrad, Signal Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Robin Bernard Pape, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary brigadier general), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Harry Jordan Theis, Cavalry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Amel Thomas Leonard, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Clyde Massey, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Bruce Woodward Bidwell, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

×Maj. Robert Ward Berry, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary brigadier general), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Harry Van Wyk, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Glenn Bruce McConnell, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. William Howard Arnold, Infantry (temporary major general), with rank from June 12 1947.

×Maj. Raymond Hendley Coombs, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Wellington Alexander Samouce, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Francis Elmer Kidwell, Signal Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Eugene Barber Ely, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Leslie Earl Simon, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel) with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Charles Trueman Lanham, Infantry (temporary brigadier general), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Richard Warburton Stephens, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

×Maj. Edwin Henry Harrison, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Cary Judson King, Jr., Signal Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Lawrence Russell Dewey, Cavalry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Ralph Irvin Glasgow, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Wilbur Kincaid Noel, Judge Advocate General's Department (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Jesse Bernard Wells, Cavalry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

×Maj. Cecil Ernest Henry, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. George Anthony Bicher, Signal Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

×Maj. Harold Phineas Gard, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. William Lloyd Richardson, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general), with rank from June 12, 1947.

×Maj. Andrew Allison Frierson, Cavalry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

×Maj. Ovid Thomason Forman, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Charles Raeburne Landon, Adjutant General's Department (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. George Wesley Palmer, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Ernest August Merkle, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Carl William Albert Raguse, Cavalry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Earl Mattice, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. James Stewart Willis, Signal Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

×Maj. Frank Jay Thompson, Cavalry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Augustine Davis Dugan, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Clarence Everett Rothgeb, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Marcus Butler Stokes, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Francis Marion Day, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. William Herbert Schaefer, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Clarence William Bennett, Cavalry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Gordon Byrom Rogers, Cavalry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Peter Wesley Shunk, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. James Frederick Howell, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Russell Layton Mabie, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. William John Eyerly, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Murray Bradshaw Crandall, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. William Joseph Reardon, Cavalry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Charles Lanier Dasher, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Sanford Joseph Goodman, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Gerald Goodwin Gibbs, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

×Maj. George William Busbey, Cavalry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Haydon Lemaire Boatner, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Cary Brown Hutchinson, Cavalry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Clarence Keith Darling, Cavalry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Zachery Winfield Moores, Cavalry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Perry William Brown, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. James Edward Moore, Infantry (temporary brigadier general), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Silas Woodson Hosea, Infantry, with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Stephen Stanley Koszwski, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. John Clair Smith, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Peter Conover Hains 3d, Cavalry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. George Edmund Young, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

×Maj. Ricardo Poblete, Philippine Scouts (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Richard Emmel Nugent, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Walter Allen Buck, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. John Phillips Kirkendall, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Vonna Fernleigh Burger, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Charles Dwelle Daniel, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Cleland Charles Sibley, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. James Edward McGraw, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Robert Roy Selway, Jr., Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. John Gilbert Moore, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Edward Lynn Andrews, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. James Grafton Anding, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Darwin Denison Martin, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Joseph Rogers Burrill, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Leslie Alfred Skinner, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. John Alfred McComsey, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Howard Everett Kessinger, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Francis Edwin Gillette, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Albert Kellogg Stebbins, Jr., Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Washington Mackey Ives, Jr., Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Richard Givens Prather, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Douglas Byron Smith, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Robert Edward Cullen, Adjutant General's Department (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Samuel Glenn Conley, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Stephen Wilson Ackerman, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Charles Hunter Coates, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Frank Glover Trew, Signal Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. William Henry Kendall, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Robert Wells Harper, Air Corps (temporary major general), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Augustus Jerome Regnier, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Howard McNath Turner, Air Corps (temporary major general), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Willard Koehler Liebel, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Oliver Malcolm Barton, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Bjarne Furuholmen, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Charles Pelot Summerall, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Thomas George McCulloch, Finance Department (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Leonard Henry Rodieck, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. John Harry Stadler, Jr., Cavalry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Louis Chadwick Friedersdorff, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. John Lyman Hitchings, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Kenneth Crawford Strother, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. George Alvin Millener, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Daniel Francis Healy, Jr., Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. George Hinkle Steel, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Russell Andrew Baker, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Frank Smith Kirkpatrick, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. George Walter Vaughn, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12 1947.

Maj. Paul Cooper, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Laurence Knight Ladue, Cavalry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Logan Carroll Berry, Cavalry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Onto Price Bragan, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Robert Joseph McBride, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Charles Ward Van Way, Jr., Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Harry Dillon McHugh, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. William Harry Bertsch, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Gerald Jay Reid, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Edward Higgins White, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. James William Clyburn, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. David Griffith Erskine, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Armistead Davis Mead, Jr., Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj Albert Newton Stubblebine, Jr., Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Charles Harold Royce, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Paul Albert Pickhardt, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Oswaldo de la Rosa, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. William Olmstead Eareckson, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. William Leo Coughlin, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. William Thaddeus Sexton, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Henry Coates Burgess, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. George Edmund Wrockloff, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Frederick Raymond Keeler, Adjutant General's Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Charles Edward Hart, Field Artillery (temporary brigadier general), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Kenneth Negley Decker, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Edward Amedee Chazal, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Thomas Allen Jennings, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Rupert Davidson Graves, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Mark Edward Smith, Jr., Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. John Gillespie Hill, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Joseph Massaro, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Wolcott Kent Dudley, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. James Barry Kraft, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj Andrew Suter Gamble, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Howard Jehu John, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. John Reynolds Hawkins, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Earl Lynwood Scott, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Andrew Paul Foster, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Emil Lenzner, Signal Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Hobart Amory Murphy, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. William Henry Maglin, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Ralph Emanuel Fisher, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. William Samuel Triplet, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. George Winfered Smythe, Infantry (temporary brigadier general), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. John Harold Claybrook, Cavalry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Jesse Thomas Traywick, Jr., Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Howard Alexander Malin, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. John Archer Elmore, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

×Maj. John Wesley Ramsey, Jr., Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Francis John Graling, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

×Maj. James Pierce Hulley, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Samuel Waynne Smithers, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Ralph Arthur Koch, Finance Department (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

×Maj. Kenneth Rector Bailey, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel) with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Lucien Francis Wells, Jr., Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. George Patrick O'Neill, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

×Maj. Richard Tonkin Mitchell, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Samuel Henry Fisher, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Dennis Milton Moore, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

×Maj. Clark Norace Bailey, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Clyde Davis Eddleman, Infantry (temporary brigadier general), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Sarratt Thaddeus Hames, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Virgil Rasmuss Miller, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. James Somers Stowell, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. George Emmert Elliott, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Henry Isaac Kiel, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Daniel Harrison Hundley, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Jacob Robert Moon, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Thomas Harrison Allen, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Raymond Rodney Robins, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Peter Sather, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Frank Faron Carpenter, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Ralph Parker Eaton, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Robert Carlyle Andrews, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

×Maj. Noah Mathew Brinson, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

×Maj. Jean Dorbant Scott, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Ovid Oscar Wilson, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Maj. Martin Frank Hass, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

×Maj. Cornelius Walter Cousland, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

×Maj. Raleigh Raymond Hendrix, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 14, 1947.

Maj. Howard Donald Criswell, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 15, 1947.

Maj. Robert Douglas McLeod, Jr., Chemical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 15, 1947.

Maj. Glenn Newman, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 15, 1947.

Maj. Charles Edward Shepherd, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 15, 1947.

Maj. Walker Wesley Holler, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel), with rank from June 15, 1947.

Maj. Malin Craig, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 15, 1947.

Maj. Samuel Howard Morrow, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 15, 1947.

Maj. Vern Walbridge, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 15, 1947.

Maj. Joris Bliss Rasbach, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 15, 1947.

Maj. Leonard Marion Johnson, Chemical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 15, 1947.

Maj. Chester Archibald Rowland, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel), with rank from June 15, 1947.

Maj. Louis Bernard Rutte, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 15, 1947.

Maj. Nunez Christian Pilet, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 15, 1947.

Maj. Stephen Smith Hamilton, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 15, 1947.

Maj. Farris Newton Latimer, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 15, 1947.

Maj. Carl Joseph Crane, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 15, 1947.

Maj. John Douglas Salmon, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 15, 1947.

Maj. Raymond Dishmann Palmer, Cavalry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 15, 1947.

Maj. Murray Eberhart McGowan, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel) with rank from June 15, 1947.

Maj. Thomas Clagett Wood, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 15, 1947.

Maj. George Henry Decker, Infantry (temporary major general), with rank from June 15, 1947.

Maj. Conrad Lewis Boyle, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 15, 1947.

Maj. Edward Joseph O'Neill, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 15, 1947.

Maj. Robert Reinhold Martin, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 15, 1947.

Maj. John Perry Willey, Cavalry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 15, 1947.

Maj. John Vogler Tower, Signal Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 15, 1947.

Maj. George Edward Isaacs, Adjutant General's Department (temporary colonel), with rank from June 15, 1947.

Maj. Harold Francis Chrisman, Finance Department (temporary colonel), with rank from June 15, 1947.

Maj. George Cooper Reinhardt, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel), with rank from June 15, 1947.

Maj. William Joseph Bradley, Cavalry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 15, 1947.

Maj. Clark Louis Ruffner, Cavalry (temporary major general), with rank from June 15, 1947.

Maj. Ridgely Gaither, Infantry (temporary brigadier general), with rank from June 15, 1947.

Maj. Earl William Aldrup, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 15, 1947.

Maj. Conrad Gordon Follansbee, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 15, 1947.

Maj. John Henry Sampson, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 15, 1947.

Maj. August Edward Schanze, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 15, 1947.

Maj. Howard Eugene Engler, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 15, 1947.

Maj. Thomas Adams Doxey, Jr., Chemical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 15, 1947.

Maj. William Donald Old, Air Corps (temporary major general), with rank from June 15, 1947.

Maj. Andral Bratton, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 15, 1947.

Maj. Harold Mills Manderbach, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 15, 1947.

Maj. George Laurence Holsinger, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 15, 1947.

Maj. Harold Witte Uhrbrock, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 15, 1947.

×Maj. Raymond Charles Lane, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 15, 1947.

Maj. Sheldon Perkins McNickle, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 15, 1947.

×Maj. Harold George Peterson, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 15, 1947.

Maj. George Francis Schulgen, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general), with rank from June 15, 1947.

Maj. Otto Paul Weyland, Air Corps (temporary major general), with rank from June 15, 1947.

Maj. Frank Riley Loyd, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 15, 1947.

×Maj. Harry William Miller, Cavalry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 15, 1947.

Maj. Sheldon Brightwell Edward, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 15, 1947.

Maj. Clarence Steven Thorpe, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 15, 1947.

Maj. Wilfred Joseph Paul, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 15, 1947.

Maj. Glenn L. Davasher, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 15, 1947.

Maj. Charles Stowe Stodter, Signal Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 15, 1947.

Maj. William Hamner Piper Purdin, Adjutant General's Department, with rank from June 19, 1947.

Maj. William Frederick Schweikert, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 23, 1947.

Maj. Curtis Leigh Varner, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 30, 1947.

Maj. Lewis Dewey Erwin, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 16, 1947.

Maj. Lewis Ebenezer Perry, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from July 24, 1947.

To be majors

Capt. Royal Oscar Nunamaker, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 4, 1947.

Capt. Briard Poland Johnson, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 7, 1947.

Capt. Metticus Walter May, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 7, 1947.

Capt. George Alexander Bridgers, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 7, 1947.

Capt. Cornelius Burton Cosgrove, Jr., Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 8, 1947.

Capt. Algene Earl Key, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from February 8, 1947.

Capt. Vardell Edwards Nesmith, Adjutant General's Department (temporary major), with rank from February 9, 1947.

Capt. Jerome Lyon Spurr, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 10, 1947.

Capt. John Henry Heil, Jr., Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 16, 1947.

Capt. Frederic Gerald Bryan, Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 17, 1947.

Capt. Benjamin Albert Lentz, Quartermaster Corps (temporary major), with rank from February 19, 1947.

Capt. Russel Orville Harris, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 19, 1947.

Capt. William Sewall Jones, Quartermaster Corps (temporary major), with rank from February 22, 1947.

Capt. Claude Everett Reitzel, Jr., Judge Advocate General's Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 23, 1947.

Capt. Stoessel Smythe Barksdale, Chemical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 24, 1947.

Capt. Samuel Greenberry Kelly, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 25, 1947.

Capt. Harolde Turner Loftin, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from March 3, 1947.

Capt. Thomas Greenleaf Boardman, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from March 8, 1947.

Capt. Herman Andrew Edgerly Jones, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from March 10, 1947.

Capt. Gordon McTavish Johnson, Adjutant General's Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from March 11, 1947.

Capt. Kelly Leo Brazier, Finance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from March 16, 1947.

Capt. Abram Ladue Whipple, Jr., Judge Advocate General's Department, with rank from March 19, 1947.

Capt. Howard Raymond Whittaker, Ordnance Department (temporary major), with rank from March 20, 1947.

Capt. Howard Hillman Hasting, Judge Advocate General's Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from March 23, 1947.

Capt. John Maurice Henderson, Jr., Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from March 27, 1947.

Capt. Charles Dahl Farr, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from March 27, 1947.

Capt. Richard Alonzo Warner, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from March 28, 1947.

Capt. Harold Dean Shrader, Judge Advocate General's Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from April 1, 1947.

Capt. Andrew Thomas McAnsh, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from April 6, 1947.

Capt. Robert Joseph Martin, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from April 9, 1947.

Capt. Harold Carlos Rowe, Quartermaster Corps, with rank from April 11, 1947.

Capt. Frank George Wise, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from April 11, 1947.

Capt. Willie Carl McMillion, Adjutant General's Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from April 12, 1947.

Capt. Wilfred Bailey Ashworth, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from April 12, 1947.

Capt. William Preston Nuckols, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from April 13, 1947.

×Capt. Karl Clifford Hansen, Quartermaster Corps (temporary major), with rank from April 13, 1947.

Capt. Arthur Lloyd Selby, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from April 17, 1947.

Capt. James Edward Reilly, Chemical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from April 18, 1947.

Capt. Robert Sebastian Drake, Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from April 20, 1947.

Capt. Ernest Entler Smith, Adjutant General's Department, with rank from April 29, 1947.

Capt. Richard D. Boerem, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from April 29, 1947.

Capt. John Greaves Bennett, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from May 1, 1947.

Capt. Clarence Oswald Gilly, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from May 1, 1947.

Capt. Gage Henry Spies, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from May 3, 1947.

Capt. Lester Harold Gallogly, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from May 5, 1947.

Capt. Carroll B. Henderson, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from May 5, 1947.

Capt. Francis Copass Bowen, Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from May 5, 1947.

Capt. Gerald Hoyle, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from May 8, 1947.

Capt. Jarrer Vincent Crabb, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general), with rank from May 8, 1947.

Capt. Tom William Scott, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from May 8, 1947.

Capt. John Hubert Davies, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from May 8, 1947.

Capt. Edwin William Rawlings, Air Corps (temporary major general), with rank from May 8, 1947.

Capt. Julius Kahn Lacey, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general), with rank from May 8, 1947.

Capt. George Frank McGuire, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from May 8, 1947.

Capt. Oliver Stanton Picher, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from May 8, 1947.

Capt. Minthorne Woolsey Reed, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from May 8, 1947.

Capt. Morley Frederick Slaght, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from May 8, 1947.

×Capt. Roy Dale Butler, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from May 8, 1947.

×Capt. Berkeley Everett Nelson, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from May 8, 1947.

×Capt. Archibald Johnston Hanna, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from May 8, 1947.

Capt. Richard August Grussendorf, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from May 8, 1947.

Capt. John Hiett Ives, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from May 8, 1947.

Capt. Frederick Earl Calhoun, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from May 8, 1947.

Capt. Carl Ralph Feldmann, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from May 8, 1947.

Capt. Robert Goodwin Youngblood, Quartermaster Corps (temporary major), with rank from May 14, 1947.

Capt. John Richard Gee, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from May 15, 1947.

×Capt. James Craig Barlow, air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from May 16, 1947.

Capt. Willard Sanford Renshaw, Adjutant General's Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from May 18, 1947.

Capt. Anson Day Marston, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel), with rank from May 20, 1947.

Capt. Robert Van Gorder Dunn, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from May 22, 1947.

Capt. Frank Rockwell Swoger, Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from May 24, 1947.

Capt. Marshall Gordon Lassek, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from May 25, 1947.

Capt. Roger McKeene Page, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from May 26, 1947.

Capt. Folkey Lauretz Johnson, Quartermaster Corps (temporary major), with rank from May 27, 1947.

Capt. John Thomas Cox, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from May 28, 1947.

Capt. James Wilson Holsinger, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from May 28, 1947.

Capt. Marvin White Ludington, Judge Advocate General's Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from May 29, 1947.

Capt. Charles Pelman Crosby, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 2, 1947.

×Capt. Howard Thomas McCone, Quartermaster Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 3, 1947.

Capt. William Edward Murphy, Jr., Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 4, 1947.

Capt. Theodore Burgess Freeman, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Capt. Paul Frailey Yount, Corps of Engineers (temporary brigadier general), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. William Arnold Carter, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. William Whipple, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel), with rank from 12 June 1947.

Capt. Ralph Powell Swofford, Jr., Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Paul Ernest Ruestow, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Philip Frederick Kromer, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Clement Van Beuren Sawin, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. LeRoy Bartlett, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Emil Fred Klinke, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. George Fletcher Schlatter, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Edward Fenlon Kumpe, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Robert Lynn Lancefield, Judge Advocate General's Department (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Clarence Harvey Gunderson, Chemical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Oscar Benjamin Beasley, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Robert William Porter, Jr., Cavalry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. John Henderson Dudley, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Albert Eugene Dennis, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

×Capt. William Herschel Allen, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Howard Monroe McCoy, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Carl Henry Fernstrom, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Charles William Haas, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Hubert duBois Lewis, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Charles Lee Heitman, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Louis Theilmann Heath, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Albert Joseph Mandelbaum, Signal Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Andrew Pick O'Meara, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Robert Jefferson Wood, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Aubrey Kenneth Dodson, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Mark Edward Bradley, Jr., Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Philip Campbell Wehle, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Wiley Duncan Ganey, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. George Clifford Duehring, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Francis Frederick Uhrhane, Signal Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Charles Granville Dodge, Cavalry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Herbert Voivenelle Mitchell, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Thetus Cayce Odom, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Alexander Graham Stone, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Jacquard Hirshorn Rothschild, Chemical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Stuart Francis Crawford, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Walter Campbell Sweeney, Jr., Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Henry Bing Kunzig, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

×Capt. Keith Hartman Ewbank, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Thomas Irwin Edgar, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

×Capt. Frank Kowalski, Jr., Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Hamilton Hawkins Howze, Cavalry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Robert Highman Booth, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Arthur Leonard Fuller, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Winfield Wilber Sisson, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Maximiano Saqui Janairo, Philippine Scouts (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Morris John Lee, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

×Capt. John Joseph MacFarland, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Wendell Holmes Langdon, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Harry Raymond Boyd, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

×Capt. Samuel Lynn Morrow, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Albert Watson, 2d Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Franklin Fearing Wing, Jr., Cavalry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. James Owen Curtis, Cavalry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Phillips Waller Smith, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Alva Rivista Fitch, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Joseph Henry Twyman, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Percy Howard Brown, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Paul Clark, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Edward Sedgwick Berry, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. David Hodge Baker, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

×Capt. Albert Everett Harris, Cavalry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. James Sylvester Sutton, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. James Theopold Darrah, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Roy Ernest Lindquist, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Sidney Clay Wooten, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

×Capt. Robert Edwin Cron, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Ross Thatcher Sampson, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. William Henry Sterling Wright, Cavalry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Archibald William Stuart, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Willis Almeron Perry, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. John Frank Greco, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Alden Pugh Taber, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Charles Joseph Odenweller, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Neal Edwin Ausman, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. George Goodrell Garton, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Robert Louis Brunzell, Field Artillery, with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Aubrey Dewitt Smith, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Barksdale Hamlett, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Brainard Spencer Cook, Cavalry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Troup Miller, Jr., Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. William Ewing Grubbs, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. William Dole Eckert, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Frederick Reginia Weber, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. O'Neill Keren Kane, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Arthur Carey Peterson, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Harold Eugene Brooks, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Paul Arthur Roy, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. William Henry Harris, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Tom Robert Stoughton, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Thomas Weldon Dunn, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Adam Andrew Koscielniak, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. John Brazelton Fillmore Dice, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Millard Lewis, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Othel Rochelle Deering, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. James Frederick Ammerman, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. John Chesley Kilborn, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. William Naille Taylor, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Frederick Dwight Atkinson, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. William Warner Harris, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Carl Amandus Brandt, Air Corps (temporary brigadier general), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Frederick Gardner Crabb, Jr., Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Buford Russell Nyquist, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. John Charles Hayden, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Robert Allen Ports, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Roderick Leland Carmichael, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Carl Irven Hutton, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. George Wareham Gibbs, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

×Capt. Arthur Cleveland Goodwin, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Roy Whitman Muth, Chemical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Harold Lester Smith, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Jaromir Jan Pospisil, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Richards Montgomery Bristol, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Edward Irving Sachs, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Samuel Philbrick Kelley, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Norman Ray Burnett, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Charles Lind Olin, Signal Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Samuel Roth, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Eugene Anthony Kenny, Signal Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. John Livingood Pauley, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Frank Theodore Folk, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Richard Joseph O'Keefe, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Carleton Merritt Clifford, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Howard Walter Quinn, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Raymond Charles Brisach, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Charley Paul Eastburn, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Clifton Donald Blackford, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Ephraim Melmoth Hampton, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

×Capt. Thomas Ferguson Wall, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Jack Griffin Pitcher, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. James Sawyer Luckett, Infantry, (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Myron Albert Quinto, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Joseph Arthur Miller, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

×Capt. Ned Dalton Moore, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Christian Hudgins Clarke, Jr., Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Thomas Mifflin, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

×Capt. Daniel Russell Taylor, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. James Knox Wilson, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Francis Joseph Corr, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Kurt Martin Landon, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Gerry Leonard Mason, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Hubern Paul Dellinger, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Daniel Anderson Cooper, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Theodore Roberts Kimpton, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. John Simpson Guthrie, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Allan Duard MacLean, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Richard Cloyd Parker, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Howard Russell Moore, Adjutant General's Department (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. James Lowell Richardson, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Eli Stevens, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Jacob Samuel Sauer, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

×Capt. Joseph Eakens James, Jr., Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Charles Edward Beauchamp, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Paul Aloysius Chalmers, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Sory Smith, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

×Capt. Henry Estil Royall, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Jasper Joseph Riley, Jr., Infantry (temporary major), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Theodore Francis Bogart, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Thad Adolphus Broom, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Walter Edwin Ahearn, Finance Department (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Paul Russell Weyrauch, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Morton Elmer Townes, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. James McKay Emigh, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Fred Joseph Delmore, Chemical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Capt. Maurice Anthony Peerenboom, Chemical Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 13, 1947.

Capt. Jesse Donald Bell, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 14, 1947.

×Capt. Carl Sharrai Brandner, Adjutant General's Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 15, 1947.

Capt. Charles Seawell Paullin, Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 16, 1947.

Capt. William Duncan Stenhouse, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 17, 1947.

Capt. Elvin Freestone Maughan, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 18, 1947.

Capt. LaRue Maxwell Edelen, Infantry (temporary major), with rank from June 20, 1947.

Capt. Frank Clarke Newlon, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 26, 1947.

Capt. Robert Beryl Wilson, Ordnance Department (temporary major), with rank from June 26, 1947.

Capt. Cleo Forrest Peterson, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 27, 1947.

Capt. Robert Collis Smith, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 27, 1947.

Capt. Frank Leonidas Hickisch, Adjutant General's Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 29, 1947.

Capt. Lyman Francis Stangel, Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 30, 1947.

×Capt. Eugene Harmon Cocanougher, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 7, 1947.

Capt. William Elam Eckles, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 7, 1947.

×Capt. Robert Chatham Woods, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 10, 1947.

Capt. Robert Fitzpatrick Wilson, Signal Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 11, 1947.

Capt. William Patrick Berkeley, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 13, 1947.

Capt. George Walton Peterson, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 16, 1947.

Capt. Samuel Stanford Wolf, Quartermaster Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 16, 1947.

×Capt. Daniel Aloysius O'Connor, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 17, 1947.

Capt. William Clemens Pritchard, Field Artillery (temporary major), with rank from July 19, 1947.

Capt. Clarence O. Brunner, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 22, 1947.

Capt. Howard Coleman, Ordnance Department (temporary major), with rank from July 22, 1947.

Capt. Frederic William Cornelius Ledeboer, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 23, 1947.

Capt. John David Howe, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 24, 1947.

Capt. Robert Guy Haines, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 25, 1947.

Capt. Joseph Caccavajo Boyer, Adjutant General's Department (temporary colonel), with rank from July 27, 1947.

Capt. Herbert Lucian Scofield, Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 27, 1947.

Capt. Carl Peter Schneider, Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 28, 1947.

Capt. Walter Bernard Yeager, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 30, 1947.

Capt. Henry Craig Kerlin, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 30, 1947.

Capt. George Brice Sumner, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 30, 1947.

To be captains

×First Lt. Virgil Floyd Fairfax, Chemical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from November 22, 1946.

First Lt. Joseph Ambrus Thornton, Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from December 24, 1946.

First Lt. Virgil Henry Thornton, Quartermaster Corps (temporary captain), with rank from February 1, 1947.

First Lt. Loren Frederick Stone, Field Artillery (temporary major), with rank from February 2, 1947.

×First Lt. Clarence William Hahn, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 3, 1947.

First Lt. Dan Laws Smith 2d, Quartermaster Corps (temporary major), with rank from February 3, 1947.

First Lt. Franklin Goodwyn Pruyn, Jr., Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 4, 1947.

First Lt. Cecil Hudson Fuller, Corps of Engineers (temporary major), with rank from February 4, 1947.

First Lt. William Robert Clark, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 5, 1947.

First Lt. David Nelson Roper, Field Artillery (temporary major), with rank from February 7, 1947.

First Lt. Thomas Warner Burke, Infantry, with rank from February 7, 1947.

First Lt. Walter George William Clatanoff, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 7, 1947.

First Lt. Lawrence Florian McCaffery, Air Corps (temporary major), with rank from February 8, 1947.

First Lt. Raymond Walter Cassell, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 10, 1947.

First Lt. John Clifton Dalrymple, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 10, 1947.

First Lt. Charles Lincoln McMackin, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 10, 1947.

×First Lt. Gerald Edmond Feidt, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 11, 1947.

First Lt. Joseph Henry Botts, Quartermaster Corps (temporary major), with rank from February 11, 1947.

×First Lt. John Albert Geddes, Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 11, 1947.

First Lt. Vincent Camden Frisby, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 12, 1947.

×First Lt. Edmonde Bernard Kelly, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 12, 1947.

First Lt. Robert James Jagow, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 12, 1947.

First Lt. William Perry Jones, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel), with rank from February 12, 1947.

First Lt. Alvin Berthold Auerbach, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 12, 1947.

First Lt. Willard Paul McCrone, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 12, 1947.

First Lt. Aldo Hector Bagnulo, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 12, 1947.

First Lt. Francis James Loomis, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 12, 1947.

First Lt. Edward Henry Dillon, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 12, 1947.

First Lt. Jackson Graham, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 12, 1947.

First Lt. Christian Hanburger, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 12, 1947.

First Lt. Miles Howlett Thompson, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 12, 1947.

First Lt. James Walter Sloat, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 12, 1947.

First Lt. Karl Fred Eklund, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 12, 1947.

First Lt. Howard James Lowe, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 12, 1947.

First Lt. William Edward Leonhard, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 12, 1947.

First Lt. Charles Duane Butler, Air Corps (temporary major), with rank from February 12, 1947.

First Lt. William Nels Redling, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 14, 1947.

First Lt. Frederick Joseph Lagasse, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 15, 1947.

First Lt. Franklin Knapper Eberhard, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 17, 1947.

First Lt. Edwin Hess Burba, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 18, 1947.

First Lt. Edward Joseph Soulliere, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 22, 1947.

First Lt. George Washington Jones, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from February 22, 1947.

First Lt. Harold Benjamin Mangold, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 23, 1947.

First Lt. Robert Merrill Rader, Ordnance Department (temporary major), with rank from February 25, 1947.

First Lt. Charles Alexander Post, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from February 25, 1947.

First Lt. Robin Gloor Montgomery, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 26, 1947.

First Lt. Ernest Murray Cassell, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major), with rank from February 26, 1947.

First Lt. Clyde Fischer Townsend, Corps of Engineers (temporary major), with rank from February 28, 1947.

First Lt. James Austin Thetford, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from March 1, 1947.

First Lt. John Armond Ulrich, Ordnance Department (temporary major), with rank from March 1, 1947.

First Lt. Jeff F. Hollis, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from March 3, 1947.

First Lt. William Hightower Smith, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from March 4, 1947.

First Lt. Clarence Stenson Campbell, Corps of Engineers (temporary major), with rank from March 4, 1947.

First Lt. René Edward de Russy, Jr., Quartermaster Corps (temporary major), with rank from March 6, 1947

First Lt. Joseph Willard Jarvis, Cavalry (temporary captain), with rank from March 7, 1947.

First Lt. Richard Frederick Jeffers, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from March 7, 1947.

First Lt. Paul Harry Scordas, Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from March 8, 1947.

First Lt. George Draughon Pace, Quartermaster Corps (temporary major), with rank from March 8, 1947.

First Lt. John Allyn Ord, Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from March 9, 1947.

×First Lt. Emerson Francis Hurley, Infantry (temporary major), with rank from March 9, 1947.

First Lt. Norman Douglas Janney, Air Corps (temporary major), with rank from March 9, 1947.

First Lt. Samuel Lake Clark, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from March 9, 1947.

First Lt. Joseph John Peot, Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from March 10, 1947.

First Lt. John Charles Hinchie, Chemical Corps (temporary major), with rank from March 10, 1947.

First Lt. Howard William Lindsey, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from March 11, 1947.

First Lt. Benjamin Rudisill Bush, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from March 11, 1947.

First Lt. Edward Milton Miller, Finance Department (temporary major), with rank from March 12, 1947.

First Lt. Judd McClelland Carrithers, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from March 12, 1947.

First Lt. John Wilson Grant, Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from March 13, 1947.

First Lt. Curt Alden Remfrey, Ordnance Department (temporary major), with rank from March 14, 1947.

First Lt. David Lloyd Jones, Air Corps (temporary major), with rank from March 15, 1947.

First Lt. Lewis Newell Shaffer, Field Artillery, with rank from March 17, 1947.

×First Lt. William Donald Eister, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from March 19, 1947.

First Lt. Carl Robert Yost, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from March 20, 1947.

First Lt. William Fredric Rader, Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from March 21, 1947.

First Lt. Jack Clement Pittsford, Quartermaster Corps (temporary major), with rank from March 21, 1947.

First Lt. Emmett Murchison Tally, Jr., Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from March 23, 1947.

×First Lt. Estil Lee Hamill, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from March 23, 1947.

First Lt. Cornelius Michael Schmelzle, Chemical Corps, with rank from March 24, 1947.

First Lt. Cleo Elwin Morrison, Air Corps (temporary major), with rank from March 24, 1947.

First Lt. Albert Charles Davies, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from March 25, 1947.

×First Lt. Gerald Otto Jacobs, Quartermaster Corps (temporary captain), with rank from March 25, 1947.

First Lt. Floyd J. Gudgel, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from March 26, 1947.

First Lt. George Edward Larsen, Quartermaster Corps (temporary captain), with rank from March 26, 1947.

First Lt. Robert John Tolly, Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from March 27, 1947.

×First Lt. Waldemar Martin Mueller, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from March 28, 1947.

First Lt. Douglas Richard Smith, Air Corps (temporary major), with rank from March 28, 1947.

First Lt. Charles Joseph Payne, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from 29 March 1947.

First Lt. Robert Lawrence Prahl, Quartermaster Corps (temporary major), with rank from March 30, 1947.

First Lt. Lawrence Pierce Jacobs, Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from March 31, 1947.

First Lt. Russell Biglow Sell, Ordnance Department (temporary major), with rank from April 1, 1947.

First Lt. Albert William Albrecht, Field Artillery (temporary major), with rank from April 2, 1947.

First Lt. Edwin William Weissman, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from April 2, 1947.

First Lt. Harry Francis Lambert, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from April 4, 1947.

×First Lt. Cecil Harold Davidson, Quartermaster corps (temporary lieutenant colonel, with rank from April 5, 1947.

First Lt. Perry Benjamin Priest, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from April 6, 1917.

First Lt. William Henry Considine, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from April 7, 1947.

First Lt. Edward Raciene Mason, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from April 8, 1947.

First Lt. Charles Elmer Wright, Corps of Engineers (temporary major), with rank from April 8, 1947.

First Lt. Harold Boyd Benedict, Ordnance Department (temporary major), with rank from April 9, 1947.

First Lt. Frederick William Richards, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from April 9, 1947.

×First Lt. Francis Merle Vaughn, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), with rank from April 10, 1947.

First Lt. Albert Lewis Tait, Field Artillery (temporary major), with rank from April 12, 1947.

First Lt. Leonidas George Gavalas, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from April 13, 1947.

First Lt. James Sylvester Dunn, Quartermaster Corps (temporary captain), with rank from April 13, 1947.

First Lt. Arnold Clifford Gilliam, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from April 16, 1947.

First Lt. James Wells Utterback, Finance Department (temporary major), with rank from April 16, 1947.

First Lt. Sydney Emil Sacerdote, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from April 17, 1947.

First Lt. Lonnie Elwyn Martin, Air Corps (temporary major), with rank from April 17, 1947.

First Lt. Gerald D. Shepherd, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from April 17, 1947.

First Lt. Albert Oliver Chittenden, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), with rank from April 17, 1947.

First Lt. Arthur Leverett Sanford, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from April 17, 1947.

First Lt. Haviland Arthur Neil Connolly, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from April 19, 1947.

First Lt. Frederick Herren Sherwood, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from April 20, 1947.

First Lt. Edward Jennings McKillips, Quartermaster Corps (temporary major), with rank from April 22, 1947.

First Lt. Louis Gershenau, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from April 23, 1947.

First Lt. Edward Cockerill Walter, Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from April 23, 1947.

×First Lt. John Mason Bigelow, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from April 23, 1947.

×First Lt. James Harold Jackson, Quartermaster Corps (temporary major), with rank from April 24, 1947.

First Lt. Richard Rhoda Roach, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major), with rank from April 24, 1947.

First Lt. John Henry Dougherty, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary major), with rank from April 25, 1947.

First Lt. Bruce William Gillanders, Air Corps (temporary major), with rank from April 25, 1947.

First Lt. Kenneth William Copeland, Quartermaster Corps, with rank from April 25, 1947.

First Lt. William McAmis Brown, Infantry (temporary major), with rank from April 26, 1947.

First Lt. Henry Frankel, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from April 27, 1947.

First Lt. William Melville Gold, Finance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from April 27, 1947.

First Lt. George Francis Meyer, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary major), with rank from April 28, 1947.

First Lt. Lloyd Woodrow Cassell, Finance Department (temporary major), with rank from April 28, 1947.

First Lt. Milton Robert Blum, Finance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from April 30, 1947.

First Lt. Ernest Lee Janes, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from May 1, 1947.

First Lt. William Perrow Moon, Jr., Infantry (temporary major), with rank from May 2, 1947.

First Lt. Sanford Holmes Kirkland, Jr., Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from May 2, 1947.

First Lt. Paul Norman Harlow, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from May 3, 1947.

First Lt. Carl Edward Bledsoe, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from May 4, 1947.

First Lt. Carl Edward Norris, Air Corps (temporary major), with rank from May 4, 1947.

First Lt. Erwin Gilbert Nilsson, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from May 4, 1947.

First Lt. George Marvin Frasor, Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from May 4, 1947.

First Lt. Asa Ben Gibbs, Signal Corps (temporary major), with rank from May 6, 1947.

First Lt. John Francis Coote, Quartermaster Corps (temporary major), with rank from May 7, 1947.

First Lt. Gustin Anthony Hess, Ordnance Department (temporary captain), with rank from May 8, 1947.

First Lt. Donald Vincent Smart, Infantry (temporary major), with rank from May 10, 1947.

First Lt. Lee Henry Kostora, Infantry (temporary major), with rank from May 11, 1947.

×First Lt. William Raymond Milburn, Chemical Corps (temporary major), with rank from May 11, 1947.

First Lt. Dent Leroy Lay, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from May 12, 1947.

First Lt. John Lowe Parker, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from May 13, 1947.

First Lt. William Clark Rogers, Ordnance Department (temporary major), with rank from May 15, 1947.

×First Lt. Lawrence Bruin Ocamb, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from May 19, 1947.

First Lt. Barney Driggs White, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from May 22, 1947.

First Lt. Glen Avery Mounsey, Infantry (temporary major), with rank from May 22, 1947.

First Lt. Roger Barton Payne, Air Corps (temporary major), with rank from May 24, 1947.

First Lt. Charles Phillips Brown, Jr., Infantry (temporary major), with rank from May 24, 1947.

×First Lt. Clarence Leonard Humphrey, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from May 25, 1947.

First Lt. James Orrin Beckwith, Jr., Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from May 26, 1947.

First Lt. Choice Randall Rucker, Infantry (temporary major), with rank from May 26, 1947.

First Lt. Luther William Burns, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from May 27, 1947.

First Lt. Richard Leofric Temple, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from May 27, 1947.

First Lt. Harold Alvin Smith, Signal Corps (temporary captain), with rank from May 28, 1947.

First Lt. James Alexander Gunn 3d, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from May 28, 1947.

First Lt. Ralph Hunter Smith, Jr., Quartermaster Corps (temporary major), with rank from May 28, 1947.

First Lt. William Frederick Lynch, Chemical Corps (temporary major), with rank from May 28, 1947.

First Lt. Robert Clendenin Leech, Ordnance Department (temporary major), with rank from May 29, 1947.

First Lt. Philip J. Teusink, Air Corps (temporary major), with rank from May 31, 1947.

First Lt. Rafael Cleveland, Signal Corps (temporary major), with rank from May 31, 1947.

First Lt. Robert Rives Taylor, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 1, 1947.

First Lt. Melvin William Godshall, Quartermaster Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 2, 1947.

First Lt. Arthur Malcolm Clark, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 3, 1947.

First Lt. James Earl Fantone, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 3, 1947.

First Lt. Helmer Marvin Grotte, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 5, 1947.

First Lt. Frederick Alton Sturm, Finance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 6, 1947.

First Lt. James Solon Moncrief, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 7, 1947.

First Lt. Harry Raymond Tuebner, Field Artillery (temporary major), with rank from June 10, 1947.

First Lt. Howard Lee Ralls, Jr., Quartermaster Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 10, 1947.

First Lt. Arthur William Oberbeck, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. David Bennett Parker, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Frederick James Clarke, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Eugene Joseph Stann, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Jack Norman Donohew, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Fred Earl Ressegieu, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Charles Francis Mitchim, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. William Bayer Strandberg, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Charles Moses McAfee, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Charles Stanley Kuna, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Gerard Joseph Forney, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. John Dudley Stevenson, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Julian Vincent Sollohub, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Charles Boes Hines, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Nils Olof Ohman, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. George Lawrence Holcomb, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Edward Chandler Spaulding, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Peter Clarke Hyzer, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. James Stephen Barko, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. William Ray Clingerman, Jr., Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Hamilton William Fish, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Ellis Edmund Wilhoyt, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Charles Lewis Register, Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

×First Lt. Leigh Cole Fairbank, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Asher Burtis Robbins, Jr., Ordnance Department (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

×First Lt. John Manning Cromelin, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. William Horace Lewis, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Frederick Otto Diercks, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. David Tice Griffin, Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

×First Lt. Walter Eckman, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Giles Lincoln Evans, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Jay Alan Abercrombie, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Douglass Phillip Quandt, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. John Brockenbrough Randolph Hines, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. William Noel Snouffer, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Richard Phillip Klocko, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

×First Lt. Robert Francis Seedlock, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. John Gamble Schermerhorn, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Robert Stanley Palmer, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Houghton Ross Hallock, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Noel Houk Ellis, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Eric Dougan, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Jack West Chapman, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. George Henry Walker, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. George Joseph Murray, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Carlin Hamlin Whitesell, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Alexander Day Surles, Jr., Cavalry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

×First Lt. Henry Alfred Byroade, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Robert Carl Miller, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Walter Cinn DeBill, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. John Francis Batjer, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Donald Wilt Shive, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Thomas Alexander Holdiman, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Perry Huston Eubank, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Kenneth Sayre Wade, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. John Graham Zierdt, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Raymond William Rumph, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. John Gordon Eriksen, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Henry Mershon Spengler, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Elwyn Norman Kirsten, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Milton Harvey Clark, Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Edgar John Ingmire, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Robert William Griffin, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

×First Lt. Harry Francis vanLeuven, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Richard Risley Barden, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Edwin Allen Russell, Jr., Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Alfred Eugene Diamond, Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Paul Bates Whittemore, Signal Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Horace Greeley Davisson, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Jamess Armitt Scott, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Wilbur Harvey Stratton, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Richard William Fellows, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. William George Easton, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. George Franklin Leist, Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. John Martin Cone, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Whiteford Carlisle Mauldin, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Edward Morris Lee, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Elmer Carl Blaha, Field Artillery (temporary major), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Bruce Keener Holloway, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. James Haynes Reeves, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. John McMullan Gulick, Air Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Carlos Antonio Nadal, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Emmette Young Burton, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Maurice Arthur Preston, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Robert Harley Fitzgerald, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Ivan Wilson McElroy, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. William Kienle Horrigan, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. George Vernon Underwood, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Chester Lee Johnson, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Charles Stuart O'Malley, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Alan Doane Clark, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. James Nixon Peale, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Robert Hensey Herman, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. William Wise Bailey, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Edgar Major Teeter, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Daniel Allen Richards, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Edward Chrysostom David Scherrer, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Linscott Aldin Hall, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Thomas Charles Compton, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Arthur Harrison Wilson, Jr., Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Oscar Baker Steely, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. (David Bearse Nye, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Thomas McGarey Metz, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Don Richard Ostrander, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Thomas Denman Neier, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Albert Ollie Connor, Field Artillery (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Stanley John Cherubin, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Meyer Arendt Edwards, Jr., Cavalry (temporary major), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Robert Clyde Gildart, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Fred Pierce Campbell, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. James Early Norvell, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Robert Henry Stumpf, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. George Caldwell McDowell, Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. James Young Parker, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Joseph Brady Mitchell, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Sam Wilkerson Agee, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Robert Taylor 3d, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Wilbur Emmet Davis, Field Artillery (temporary major), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Lukas Ernest Hoska, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Edward Marion Postlethwait, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Battle Malone Barksdale, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Martin Levering Green, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Joseph Ludger Chabot, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. John Thomas Shields, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Luis Fernando Mercado, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Robert Maurice Stegmaier, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

×First Lt. Maurice Wuchter Musgrave, Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Woodrow Wilson Stromberg, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Harold Everett Marr, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Dan Cashemere Russell, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Cecil Himes, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Curtis Raymond Low, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Joseph Harper Hodges, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Ferdinand Thomas Unger, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Walter Clem Conway, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. John Laurence Powers, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Coy Lyman Curtis, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Richard Hilton Hackford, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Charles Glen Young, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Max Shields George, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Edwin Borden Broadhurst, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Charles Bainbridge Westover, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Carl Lawrence Lindquist, Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Bernard Peter Major, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Richard Gates Williams, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Samuel Charles Gurney, Jr., Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. John Hincks Montgomery, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Harvey Charles Dorney, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. James Robert Johnson, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. LeRoy Lutes, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Robert Heber Van Volkenburgh, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. George Maryan Maliszewski, Infantry (temporary major), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. James Samuel Brierley, Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Charles Robert Meyer, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Conrad Henry Diehl, Jr., Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Paul William Scheidecker, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Oscar Gordon Kreiser, Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Harry Walter Elkins, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. John Whitelaw Browning, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. James John Cosgrove, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Robert Besson, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. James Ferris Pearsall, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Stanley Warren Connelly, Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Charles Junious Harrison, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Kelsie Loomis Reaves, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

×First Lt. William Emmett McDonald, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Benjamin Franklin Taylor, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Robert Sorrel Kennedy, Infantry (temporary major), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Ernest Hertel Laflamme, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

×First Lt. Jasper Newton Durham, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. John Russell Ulricson, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Lawrence Augustus Spilman, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Kelton Seymour Davis, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. William Grover Hipps, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. John Randal Weikel, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Joseph George Focht, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Marshall Randolph Gray, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Parker Calvert, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Victor Edward Sinclair, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Augustin Mitchell Prentiss, Jr., Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Maxwell Awyn Tincher, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Charles Thomas Clagett, Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Bryan Coffield Arnold, Infantry (temporary major), with rank from June 12, 1947.

×First Lt. Carroll David Wood, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Philip Delano Brant, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Delk McCorkle Oden, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

×First Lt. George Alexander McGee, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. William Dawes McKinley, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Walter Ralls Lawson, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Winfield Lee Martin, Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Woodrow William Dunlop, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

×First Lt. William Allen Dodds, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Kelley Benjamin Lemmon, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Kenneth Oliver Sanborn, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

×First Lt. Elery Martin Zehner, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. George Bidwell Sloan, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Arthur Kirkham Amos, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Carl Freeman Lyons, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Olen John Seaman, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. John Jarvis Tolson 3d, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

×First Lt. Frederick John Dooley, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. John Huff Van Vliet, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Edwin Walter Richardson, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. James Howard Skeldon, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Harold McDonald Brown, Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. William Joseph Cain, Jr., Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. James Wilson Duncan, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Noel Ambrose Menard, Chemical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Malcolm Green, Jr., Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Thomas Everett Powell, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Ephraim Foster Graham, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Charles William Stark, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. William Barrett Travis, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. George Millard Simmons, Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. George Russell Cole, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Raymond Clayton Cheal, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Morton David Magoffin, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. William Ragland Maxwell, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. James Theo Posey, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Gordon Talmage Kimbrell, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Howard Norrington Smalley, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Wesley Skilton Calverley, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Eads Graham Hardaway, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. William Brackett McClellan Chase, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Render Dowdell Denson, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Frank Ray Harrison, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. John Fleming Polk, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. John Powers Connor, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

×First Lt. Charles William Blauvelt, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Ted Franklin Douthitt, Cavalry (temporary major), with rank from June 12, 1947.

First Lt. Joseph Edward Boyle, Quartermaster Corps, with rank from June 13, 1947.

×First Lt. John Edward Harding, Field Artillery (temporary major), with rank from June 14, 1947.

First Lt. Robert Hugh Evans, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 17, 1947.

First Lt. Marion Hubert Jackson, Field Artillery (temporary major), with rank from June 19, 1947.

First Lt. Leo Belton Smith, Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 20, 1947.

First Lt. Raymond Christian Wittmayer, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 23, 1947.

First Lt. Robert Nelson Davie, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 24, 1947.

×First Lt. Toliver Gholson McCoy, Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 25, 1947.

First Lt. Michael Popowski, Jr., Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 26, 1947.

First Lt. Arthur Trowbridge Learnard, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 27, 1947.

First Lt. Peter Joseph O'Rourke, Field Artillery (temporary major), with rank from June 27, 1947.

First Lt. Robert Quin Smith, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 27, 1947.

First Lt. Herman John Ruoff, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel) with rank from June 28, 1947.

First Lt. Edward Montague Blight, Finance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 28, 1947.

×First Lt. John Howard Saylors, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 29, 1947.

First Lt. Charles Vincent McLaughlin, Infantry (temporary major), with rank from June 29, 1947.

First Lt. Victor A. Ishoy, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 30, 1947.

First Lt. Ralph Winston Bond, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1947.

First Lt. Carroll Thompson Newton, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel), with rank from July 3, 1947.

First Lt. Donald Clinton Clayman, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 3, 1947.

First Lt. Joseph Warren Sisson, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 3, 1947.

×First Lt. David Greene Hammond, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel), with rank from July 3, 1947.

First Lt. Joseph Russel Groves, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 3, 1947.

First Lt. Robert Whitsett van de Verde, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 3, 1947.

First Lt. Arthur George Christensen, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 3, 1947.

First Lt. Harry Gantcliffe Benion, Infantry (temporary major), with rank from July 3, 1947.

First Lt. Arthur Howland Baker, Jr., Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 3, 1947.

First Lt. Arthur Charles Harris, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 3, 1947.

First Lt. Linwood Eugene Funchess, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 3, 1947.

First Lt. Laurence Clifford Brown, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 3, 1947.

×First Lt. Walter Ward Davis, Infantry (temporary major), with rank from July 3, 1947.

First Lt. William Andrew Enemark, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 3, 1947.

×First Lt. Merten Kenneth Heimstead, Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 3, 1947.

First Lt. Leon John de Penne Rouge, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 3, 1947.

First Lt. William Sherbourne McCrea, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 3, 1947.

First Lt. Donald Frederick Thompson, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 3, 1947.

First Lt. John Gordon Nelson, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 3, 1947.

First Lt. Edward Wallace McLain, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 3, 1947.

First Lt. John Unsworth Allen, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 3, 1947.

First Lt. Byron William Ladd, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 3, 1947.

First Lt. Lyman Hodges Ripley, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 3, 1947.

First Lt. Donald Washington, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 3, 1947.

First Lt. Charles Robert Etzler, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 3, 1947.

First Lt. John Brockway Rippere, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 3, 1947.

First Lt. Steve Archie Chappuis, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from July 3, 1947.

First Lt. Elmer Bolton Kennedy, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 3, 1947.

First Lt. Thomas Brownbridge Simpson, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 3, 1947.

First Lt. Paul Thomas Boleyn, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 3, 1947.

First Lt. Frederick William Nagle, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 3, 1947.

First Lt. Otho Anthony Moomaw, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 3, 1947.

First Lt. Jabus Willie Rawls, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 3, 1947.

First Lt. Jack Leslie Coan, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 3, 1947.

First Lt. Edward Francis Kent, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 3, 1947.

×First Lt. George William Croker, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 3, 1947.

First Lt. Willard Wright Smith, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 3, 1947.

First Lt. William Hart Hanson, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 3, 1947.

First Lt. John Willis Paddock, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 3, 1947.

First Lt. Joe Stallings Lawrie, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 3, 1947.

First Lt. Kenneth Raymond Philbrick, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), with rank from July 4, 1947.

First Lt. Robert John Ormond, Infantry (temporary major), with rank from July 4, 1947.

First. Lt. Leo Francis Valiante, Quartermaster Corps (temporary captain), with rank from July 6, 1947.

First Lt. Howard Frederick Haberman, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 6, 1947.

First Lt. Gordon Charles Murray, Quartermaster Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 9, 1947.

First Lt. Orrin Ardeen Tracy, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from July 10, 1947.

First Lt. Robert Edward Peters, Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 10, 1947.

First Lt. Harold Lee Dorsett, Quartermaster Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 11, 1947.

×First Lt. Earl Lester Edwards, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 12, 1947.

First Lt. Gordon Bennett Knight, Air Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 12, 1947.

First Lt. Brendan Emmett Toolin, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 14, 1947.

First Lt. Chester Frank Myszewski, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from July 15, 1947.

First Lt. Robert Emil Greiner, Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from July 16, 1947.

First Lt. Gordon Elliott Murch, Infantry (temporary major), with rank from July 16, 1947.

First Lt. Roger Stanton Rees, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from July 17, 1947.

First Lt. Carl Edward Grant, Chemical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 18, 1947.

First Lt. William Albert Bennett, Jr., Air Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 19, 1947.

First Lt. William Patton Brooks, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 19, 1947.

First Lt. Leon Dmitry Curtis, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain), with rank from July 19, 1947.

First Lt. Joseph Jenkins Huddleston, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 21, 1947.

First Lt. Neywood Hutchings Roberdeau, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 22, 1947.

First Lt. George Matile Griswold, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 22, 1947.

First Lt. Gilbert Earle Teal, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 22, 1947.

First Lt. Hugh Andrew Frandsen, Air Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 23, 1947.

First Lt. Richard Raphael Entwhistle, Ordnance Department (temporary captain), with rank from July 23, 1947.

First Lt. Ernest Van Dyke Murphy, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 25, 1947.

First Lt. Charles Yancey Talbott, Sr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 27, 1947.

First Lt. John Bisbing, Infantry (temporary major), with rank from July 28, 1947.

First Lt. Samuel McClure Smith, Air Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 29, 1947.

First Lt. Floyd Edward Minor, Infantry (temporary major), with rank from July 29, 1947.

First Lt. William Joseph Gallagher, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 30, 1947.

×First Lt. Louis Byron Swortwood, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from July 30, 1947.

To be first lieutenants

Second Lt. William Francis Rapson, Quartermaster Corps, with rank from January 28, 1947.

Second Lt. Eugene Holt Bishop, Chemical Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from February 3, 1947.

Second Lt. Milo Claude Johnson, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from February 5, 1947.

Second Lt. Charles Whitney Abbott, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from February 5, 1947.

×Second Lt. Albert James Brown, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from February 5, 1947.

Second Lt. Charles William Swindell, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from February 5, 1947.

Second Lt. John Richard Workman, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from February 7, 1947.

Second Lt. Raymond Casimer Bird, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from February 8, 1947.

×Second Lt. Philip George Cardin, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from February 8, 1947.

Second Lt. James Harris Hartzell, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from February 8, 1947.

Second Lt. Robert Amandus Reinert, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from February 8, 1947.

×Second Lt. Russell Sawyer, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from February 8, 1947.

Second Lt. Paul Edgar Harris, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from February 8, 1947.

Second Lt. David Allen Roe, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from February 8, 1947.

Second Lt. Joseph Griswold Wilson, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from February 8, 1947.

Second Lt. James William Brady, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from February 8, 1947.

Second Lt. Alpheus Wesley Blizzard, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from February 8, 1947.

Second Lt. Roland Clark Beasley, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from February 8, 1947.

Second Lt. William James Herman, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from February 8, 1947.

Second Lt. David Bradley Gammons, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from February 8, 1947.

Second Lt. Robert Harold Reeves, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from February 8, 1947.

Second Lt. James Marvin Baxter, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from February 8, 1947.

Second Lt. Eugene Clarence Stamm, Jr., Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from February 8, 1947.

Second Lt. Frederick Weimer Butscher, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from February 8, 1947.

Second Lt. George Albert Hesse, Jr., Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from February 8, 1947.

×Second Lt. Ray Guy Harris, Jr., Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from February 8, 1947.

Second Lt. Alfred Carroll Hearne, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from February 8, 1947.

Second Lt. Artist Hudson Prichard, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from February 8, 1947.

Second Lt. John Schley Goodson, Jr., Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from February 8, 1947.

Second Lt. John Richard Ruehle, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from February 8, 1947.

Second Lt. William Charles Leonard, Jr., Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from February 8, 1947.

Second Lt. Edward Earl Stratton, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from February 8, 1947.

Second Lt. Paul McLellan Spurrier, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from February 8, 1947.

Second Lt. Donald Richard Scheller, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from February 8, 1947.

Second Lt. Frank William Klibbe, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from February 10, 1947.

Second Lt. Herbert Richard White, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from February 10, 1947.

Second Lt. Lloyd Allen Osborne, Quartermaster Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from February 11, 1947.

Second Lt. C. J. LeVan, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from February 13, 1947.

×Second Lt. John Joseph William Oberg, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from February 16, 1947.

Second Lt. Richard Franklin Beveridge, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from February 18, 1947.

Second Lt. George Balch Farrar, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from February 20, 1947.

Second Lt. Edmund Grover Thompson, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from February 24, 1947.

Second Lt. Bill McDonald, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from February 25, 1947.

×Second Lt. John Preston Jones, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from February 26, 1947.

Second Lt. Charles Angelakis, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from February 26, 1947.

Second Lt. Willard James Lawrence, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from February 26, 1947.

Second Lt. Charles Arthur Snoden, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from February 26, 1947.

Second Lt. Carl K. Dunlap, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from February 26, 1947.

Second Lt. Henry James Latimore, Jr., Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from February 26, 1947.

Second Lt. James Constantine Alexander, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from February 26, 1947.

Second Lt. Norman Clark Schroeder, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from February 26, 1947.

Second Lt. Harvey Andrew Cook, Jr., Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from February 28, 1947.

Second Lt. Earl Deloss Provancha, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from February 28, 1947.

×Second Lt. John William Harrop, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from March 1, 1947.

×Second Lt. Wallace Burns Allen, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from March 4, 1947.

Second Lt. Glen Woodard Smith, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from March 4, 1947.

Second Lt. Carl Ray Duncan, Chemical Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from March 4, 1947.

Second Lt. Robert Louis Andreoli, Chemical Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from March 4, 1947.

Second Lt. Charles McCall Shadle, Chemical Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from March 4, 1947.

Second Lt. Robert Clarence Petit, Jr., Cavalry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from March 5, 1947.

Second Lt. William Nicholas Michels, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from March 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Edward Henry Marxen, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from March 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Lynn Ellis Garner, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from March 9, 1947.

Second Lt. Gregory L. Olney, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from March 10, 1947.

Second Lt. Hazil Lee Holley, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from March 10, 1947.

Second Lt. Floyd George Nixon, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from March 12, 1947.

×Second Lt. Oliver William Cairns, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from March 12, 1947.

Second Lt. William Edgar Marshall, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from March 12, 1947.

Second Lt. Lester Earl Clark, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from March 12, 1947.

Second Lt. Arden Blain Curfman, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from March 12, 1947.

Second Lt. John Carlyle Smith, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from March 12, 1947.

Second Lt. Gordon Wentworth Lake, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from March 12, 1947.

Second Lt. James Campbell Buie, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from March 12, 1947.

Second Lt. Constantine Taddeus de Wolski, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from March 12, 1947.

Second Lt. Carl Herbert Peterson, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from March 12, 1947.

×Second Lt. Gerald Edward Hallas, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from March 12, 1947.

Second Lt. John Charles Lindsay, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from March 12, 1947.

Second Lt. Ellis Crain Baker, Jr., Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from March 12, 1947.

Second Lt. Jack Franklin Curtis, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from March 12, 1947.

Second Lt. Norman William Bernier, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from March 12, 1947.

Second Lt. Burton Alfred Davis, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from March 12, 1947.

Second Lt. Edward Paul Anderson, Quartermaster Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from March 12, 1947.

Second Lt. Thomas Lawson Bates, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from March 12, 1947.

Second Lt. Thomas Lee Keal, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from March 12, 1947.

Second Lt. Alfred James Gardner, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from March 12, 1947.

Second Lt. Marvin Turner Ross, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from March 12, 1947.

Second Lt. Claude Rufus Nelon, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from March 12, 1947.

Second Lt. Allan M. Spencer, Jr., Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from March 12, 1947.

Second Lt. Frank Ross Kerr, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from March 12, 1947.

Second Lt. Howard Kenneth Biles, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from March 12, 1947.

Second Lt. Ernest Felix Benkoski, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from March 12, 1947.

Second Lt. Kenneth Paul Juhn, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from March 12, 1947.

Second Lt. Francis William Copeland, Air Corps, with rank from March 12, 1947.

Second Lt. Dewey Franklin Louis Moser, Quartermaster Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from March 12, 1947.

Second Lt. Donald Archibald Currie, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from March 13, 1947.

Second Lt. William Walters Griffith, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from March 15, 1947.

Second Lt. Benjamin Stump Silver, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from March 16, 1947.

Second Lt. James Lamar Sherrard, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from March 18, 1947.

×Second Lt. George Kitchen Smith, Quartermaster Corps (temporary captain), with rank from March 18, 1947.

Second Lt. Martin Harrison Plotkin, Quartermaster Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from March 18, 1947.

Second Lt. Henry Atkins Glover, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from March 18, 1947.

Second Lt. Jack LeMaster Treadwell, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from March 23, 1947.

Second Lt. Philip Barton Porter, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from March 25, 1947.

×Second Lt. Erik Faddersboll Yde, Field Artillery, with rank from March 25, 1947.

Second Lt. Robert Warren Libell, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from March 26, 1947.

Second Lt. Bascom Perle Smith, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from March 26, 1947.

Second Lt. Ralph Eugene Main, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from March 28, 1947.

Second Lt. Charles Floyd Eisman, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from March 31, 1947.

Second Lt. Mack Alexander Blevins, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from March 31, 1947.

Second Lt. James George Sutton, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from April 1, 1947.

Second Lt. Edward Michael Dooley, Ordnance Department (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from April 1, 1947.

Second Lt. Charles Arthur Bassett, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from April 3, 1947.

Second Lt. Richard Albert Wise, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from April 4, 1947.

Second Lt. Rayford Warren Jeffrey, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from April 4, 1947.

Second Lt. David William Irvin, Jr., Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from April 5, 1947.

Second Lt. Richard Keith Williams, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from April 8, 1947.

Second Lt. Max Malcholm Rule, Quartermaster Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from April 8, 1947.

Second Lt. Gerald E. Weathermon, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from April 9, 1947.

Second Lt. Basil Webster Romans, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from April 11, 1947.

Second Lt. James Edward Carson, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from April 12, 1947.

Second Lt. Peter Raymond DeLonga, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from April 13, 1947.

×Second Lt. Malcolm Cleverdon Frazee, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from April 13, 1947.

Second Lt. Lee Blackstone Nolton, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from April 15, 1947.

×Second Lt. Robert Allen Bailey, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from April 15, 1947.

Second Lt. Jack Ames Wells, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from April 15, 1947.

Second Lt. Addison William Stone, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from April 15, 1947.

Second Lt. John Leonard Thomas, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from April 15, 1947.

Second Lt. George Charles Donnelly, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from April 15, 1947.

Second Lt. Jerome Ivan Saubers, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from April 15, 1947.

×Second Lt. Charles Francis Wright, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from April 15, 1947.

Second Lt. Lewis Tasker Johnson, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from April 15, 1947.

Second Lt. Roland Eugene Lane, Jr., Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from April 15, 1947.

Second Lt. Charles Donald Rafferty, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from April 15, 1947.

Second Lt. Samuel Zayne Hunnicutt, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from April 15, 1947.

Second Lt. Leonard Farrel Parks, Quartermaster Corps (temporary captain), with rank from April 15, 1947.

Second Lt. Herbert Henry Brothers, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from April 15, 1947.

Second Lt. Hilburn Frazer Richards, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant) with rank from April 15, 1947.

Second Lt. Leon Magill Grisham, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from April 15, 1947.

Second Lt. Paul Laurance Chell, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from April 15, 1947.

Second Lt. Thomas Phillip Broe, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from April 15, 1947.

Second Lt. Gustav Joseph Braun, Jr., Cavalry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from April 16, 1947.

Second Lt. Robert Charles Canham, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from April 18, 1947.

Second Lt. Joseph Jasper Ring, Jr., Quartermaster Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from April 19, 1947.

Second Lt. David Boyd Humphrey, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from April 19, 1947.

×Second Lt. James Francis Powers, Signal Corps (temporary captain), with rank from April 20, 1947.

Second Lt. Charles Worrell Jackson, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from April 22, 1947.

Second Lt. Edwin John Istvan, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from April 23, 1947.

Second Lt. Ben Lamb Holliday, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from April 24, 1947.

Second Lt. Orville Roy Hughes, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from April 25, 1947.

Second Lt. Edwin Elmer Neel, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from April 25, 1947.

Second Lt. James Richard Cicarelli, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from April 25, 1947.

Second Lt. Paul Lemuel Maret, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from April 27, 1947.

Second Lt. Louis Higgins Carrington, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from April 27, 1947.

Second Lt. Lester Owen Styve, Quartermaster Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from April 29, 1947.

Second Lt. Herbert Lee Ragsdale, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from April 29, 1947.

Second Lt. Harley Linnet Hansen, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from April 29, 1947.

Second Lt. Louglas Aloysious Heimstead, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from April 29, 1947.

Second Lt. William Ray Haughey, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from April 29, 1947.

Second Lt. Charles Walter Dewitt, Air Corps (temporary captain) with rank from April 30, 1947.

Second Lt. James Milton Martin, Air Corps, (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 5, 1947.

Second Lt. Dugald Walker Hudson, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from May 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Rex Conrad Gunnell, Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 6, 1947.

Second Lt. William Frederick Uhlman, 3d, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from May 6, 1947.

Second Lt. George Edward Cameron, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Daniel DeYoung, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from May 7, 1947.

Second Lt. Dale James Metzinger, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 8, 1947.

Second Lt. Lawrence Jack Evans, Jr., Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 9, 1947.

Second Lt. John Quint Henion, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 9, 1947.

Second Lt. Thomas Henry Hoy, Quartermaster Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 10, 1947.

Second Lt. Thomas Joseph McDonald, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from May 14, 1947.

×Second Lt. George Warren Parker, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from May 16, 1947.

×Second Lt. Cecil Ward White, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 16, 1947.

Second Lt. Dean Edward Hutter, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 16, 1947.

Second Lt. John Gerard Lownds, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from May 16, 1947.

Second Lt. Edwin Carl Adams, Corps of Engineers (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 16, 1947.

Second Lt. Philo Henry Rhynehart, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 16, 1947.

×Second Lt. William George Hutchinson, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 17, 1947.

Second Lt. James Brewer Bowers, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 17, 1947.

Second Lt. Warren Harding Jepson, Quartermaster Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 18, 1947.

Second Lt. William Clarance Malkemes, Quartermaster Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 19, 1947.

Second Lt. Robert William Jones, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 19, 1947.

Second Lt. Edward Milner Turner, Jr., Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 19, 1947.

Second Lt. Robert William Betchtel, Infantry (temporary major), with rank from May 20, 1947.

×Second Lt. Drue Wilmer Folk, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 20, 1947.

Second Lt. James William Evans, Jr., Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 20, 1947.

Second Lt. William Michael Ratchford, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 20, 1947.

Second Lt. Jesse Herman Beitman, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 20, 1947.

Second Lt. Tom Joseph Wintersole, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 21, 1947.

Second Lt. Robert Lathem Ray, Air Corps, with rank from May 23, 1947.

Second Lt. James Paul Robertson, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 23, 1947.

Second Lt. Wayne Floyd Swegle, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 23, 1947.

×Second Lt. Luther Pearson Hampton, Jr., Field Artillery, with rank from May 23, 1947.

Second Lt. William Finkley Riddling, Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from May 23, 1947.

Second Lt. Dale Edward Borgen, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 23, 1947.

Second Lt. Leonard John Stevens, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 23, 1947.

Second Lt. Kenneth Weare Rasmussen, Air Corps, with rank from May 23, 1947.

Second Lt. Stewart Penfold Blake, Signal Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 23, 1947.

Second Lt. Kenneth Coleman, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 23, 1947.

Second Lt. John Junior Burch, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 23, 1947.

Second Lt. Charles Edward Fulbeck, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 23, 1947.

Second Lt. Richard Otto Ransbottom, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 23, 1947.

Second Lt. Lee Roy Young, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 23, 1947.

Second Lt. Gerald Ernest Neuburg, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 23, 1947.

Second Lt. John Peter Flynn, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 23, 1947.

Second Lt. Jay Henry Williams, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 23, 1947.

Second Lt. Thomas Joseph McDonald, Ordnance Department (temporary captain), with rank from May 24, 1947.

Second Lt. James Vincent O'Brien, Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 25, 1947.

Second Lt. Kemper Warren Baker, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 26, 1947.

Second Lt. Delbert Ralph Smyth, Air Corps, with rank from May 27, 1947.

Second Lt. Alan Harry Sellen, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from May 27, 1947.

Second Lt. Robert Emmett Scanlon, Air Corps (temporary major), with rank from May 27, 1947.

Second Lt. Charles Warner Johnson, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 29, 1947.

Second Lt. Harry Barnell Hardy, Jr., Cavalry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 29, 1947.

Second Lt. Alfred Edward Ireland, Jr., Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 29, 1947.

Second Lt. Howard Walter Weinberger, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 30, 1947.

Second Lt. Robert Walston LeMay, Jr., Ordnance Department (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 31, 1947.

Second Lt. George Russell Berry, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 2, 1947.

Second Lt. John Robert Gregor, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 2, 1947.

×Second Lt. Willie James Ellias, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 3, 1947.

Second Lt. Lee Leslie Wilder, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 3, 1947.

×Second Lt. Thomas Arthur Cook, Cavalry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 3, 1947.

Second Lt. Robert Christopher Brouns, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 4, 1947.

×Second Lt. Kenny D. O'Bryan, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 5, 1947.

×Second Lt. James Franklin Scoggin, Jr., Signal Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Ernest Graves, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Andrew King Keller, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Francis Joseph Hale, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Kenneth Banks Cooper, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Joseph Raymond Waterman, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. John Henry Carlson, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. John Franklin Kimbel, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Robert Neville Ginsburgh, Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. George Lyman Ingersoll, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. John Holloway Cushman, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Albert Lambert Bethel, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Donald Clarence Ingram, Corps of Engineers (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Noel Degner Austin, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. John Welsh Howell, Corps of Engineers (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. William Frederic Spalding, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. Frank Cadle Mahin, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Robert Sherwood Day, Corps of Engineers (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Charles Junior Davis, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Owen Thornton Reeves, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Frederick Adair Smith, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. James Irvine, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Bernard Sohn, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Franklin Oliver Forthoffer, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Robert Bruce Codling, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Beverly Carradine Snow, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Robert Carey Sellers, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Joseph Philip Barnes, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. Robert Warren Conant, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. Otto William Steinhardt, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Erwin Howard Kleist, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. Donald Charles Vogler, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Geoffrey Cheadle, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Richard Erlenkotter, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. William Byron Graham, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Edwin Radford Decker, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Franklin Boyd Moon, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Marshall Emerson Nolan, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Donald Foster Thompson, Signal Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lieutenant Albert Quincy Brooks, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. William Earl Peugh, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. William Elbert Steger, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Alan Evans Weston, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. Jack Murph Pollin, Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. Howard Charles Metzler, Corps of Engineers (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. David Ewing Ott, Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Alexander Morton Maish, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Pierre Anthony Tisdale, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Walter Allen Guild, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Henry Shaw Beukema, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Edwin Thomas O'Donnell, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Donald Alfred Gruenther, Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Kermit Orvill Lindell, Corps of Engineers (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Robert Boyd Robinson, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. John Davis Calhoun, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Keith Edward Eiler, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Richard Llewellyn Dennen, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. James Kenneth O'Brien, Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Thomas Ben Ragland, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Roger Joseph Hendrick, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Jean Belair LaMarre, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Charles William Sampson, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. James Todd White, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. Albert Guy Dancy, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Frank David Henderson, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Alfred Mudge McCoy, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Arthur Derry Nelson, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Charles Lowndes Steel, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Alvin Miles Wald, Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Thomas Edmund Mahoney, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Dallas Loyd Knoll, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Donald Gribble MacWilliams, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Robert Clinton Dart, Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. William Justus Henderson, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Henry Spiese Aurand, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Martin Everett McCoy, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. John Edward Glab, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Robert Henrik Brundin, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Jelks Henry Cabaniss, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. John Goold Cleveland, Corps of Engineers (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. John Tardy Moore, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. Robert Louis Algermissen, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Robert Charles Zott, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Robert Tharp Nixon, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Frank Errette Cash, Jr., Cavalry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Winston Paine Anderson, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Louis Andrew Wilson, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Roald Max Andresen, Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Louis George Gamble, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Theodore John Bartz, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. John Wisdom Carley, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. William John Nelson, Ordnance Department (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Jerry George Capka, Corps of Engineers (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Glen Roger Hempleman, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. William Charles Pullilove, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lieutenant George Robert Hayman, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Luther Erwin Armstrong, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Harry Lovejoy Rogers, 3d, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Bryan Henry Leeper, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Jack Brown Bruno, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. James Richard Nelson, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. William Randolph Sullivan, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. George Albert Tuttle, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Arthur Roy Marshall, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Walter Rawlins Harris, Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Robert Eugene Morrison, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Robert Morris Rodden, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. John Stapleton Howland, Cavalry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. John James Tkacik, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. Luther Daniel Wallis, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Robert Odell Harper, Ordnance Department (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Douglas Warren Gallez, Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Dixon Carle Rogers, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. John Russell Geyer, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. William Edward Burr 2d, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. James Thomas Blandford, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Hiram Baldwin Ely, Jr., Ordnance Department (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Frederick William Gerhard, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Paul Jones, Jr., Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. William Henry Milnor, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Mason James Young, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. George Van Swearingen, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Charles Harold Czapar, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Alfred Stewart McCorkle, Jr., Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. John Sheldon Doud Eisenhower, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Eugene Alex Dabrowski, Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Dennis Philip McAuliffe, Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Robert McClellan Mummey, Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Paul Washington Phillips, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. David Perry Wood, Jr., Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Gerson Kirkland Heiss, Jr., Ordnance Department (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. James Wilkie Dunham, Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Thomas Edward Moore, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Patrick McAlester Neilond, Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Harold Griswold DeArment, Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. John Nicholas Robinson, Jr., Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. William Henry Walters, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Robert William Faas, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Robert Evans Drake, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. William Robert Hammond, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. George Bellinger Brown, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Harold Blackwood Sloan, Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. James Shepard Douglas, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Robert Amos Mortland, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. John Benedict Desmond, Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. Ralph Anthony Sciolla, Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Howard Kaplan, Signal Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Robert Rogers Wessels, Corps of Engineers (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Wilbur Leonard Kahn, Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Stephen Harrison Smith, Cavalry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. John Case Trimmer, Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. James Bascom Giles, Jr., Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. William Madison Shirey, Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Saul Aaron Jackson, Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. John Willson Donaldson, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. James Cruden Gerhard, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Gregg F. Glick, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Alva J. Forsythe, Cavalry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Robert Taylor Martin, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Duncan Dixon Clore, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. John Gordon William, Jr., Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Robert Brown Callan, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. Munson Hackett Pardee, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Thomas Francis Flynn, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain) with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Gerald Dean Hall, Cavalry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Lloyd Barnett, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. James Tuttle Bartley, Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Robert Houstoun Murphy, Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. James Ross Bandy, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. William Best Murray, Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Alan Clifford Edmunds, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Norman Cornelius Shepard Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Joseph Frederick Hughes Cutrona, Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. Fielding Lewis Greaves, Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Wilfred LaVern Dondanville, Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. James Richard Cumberpatch, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. Arthur Joseph McLean, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. Roy Andrew Bahls, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Charles Roscoe Howland Bootz, Ordnance Department (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Wilson Clark Harper, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Edgar Willis Gregory 2d, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Francis Benedict Hennessy, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Ralph Leach Rhodes, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Edward Worthington Samuell, Jr., Cavalry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. Foster Lee Smith, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. Raymond Janeczek, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Howard Hamlet Symons, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Henry Sweet Jones, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Eugene Quirn Steffes, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Dorsey Daniel Schaper, Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Theodore Hess Geltz, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Robert Warren Selton, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Robert Alexander Smith, Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Leverett Norton Jenks, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Theodore John Altier, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. William McGregor Stowell, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. Harry Archer Buzzett, Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Daniel Pryor Lee, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. William Albert Baker, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Randolph Hutchinson Andrews, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Richard Samuel Ware, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Howard Wade Richards, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Gordon Emmons Burrell, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. George Andrew Brown, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. Robert Charles Daly, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Heath Bottomly, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Gerald St. Claire Mickle, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Stephen Adam Farris, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Lewis Sheppard Norman, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Francis Allyn Cooch 3d, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Nels August Parson, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Henry Augustus Grace, Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Henry Minton Francis, Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. Richard Nalle, Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Dee William Pettigrew, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. James Boniface Campbell, Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947

Second Lt. Dale Denman, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Carl Leroy Peterson, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Robert Paul Reagan, Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Robert White Parks, Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Sam Dowty Hesse, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Andrew James DeGraff, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Winfield S. Scott, Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. John Christopher Pile, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. James Maguire Connell, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. John Oscar Lamp, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Warren Sanderson Conlon, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. Leslie Griffin Callahan, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Kern Phillips Pitts, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Rodney Walter Lindell, Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. William Clark Kennedy, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Robert McIntyre Pearce, Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. David Zillmer, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Robert Warren Samuel, Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947

Second Lt. Steve Watson Mulkey, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. Robert Chester Tompkins, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Roy Albert Hoffman, Ordnance Department (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Frederick Brenton Porter, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. Willard Ainsworth Marks, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Robert Louis Royem, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Charles Francis Frock, Ordnance Department (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Channing Wallace Gilson, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Thomas Joseph McGuire, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Henry Paul Kutchinski, Jr., Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Archer Lynn Lerch, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Leo Douglas Kinnard, Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. George Samuel Blanchard, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947

Second Lt. Lorin Russell Klingle, Quartermaster Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. George Arthur Davis, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Robert Hawkins Armstrong, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Lawrence Frank Ciszewski, Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. John Francis Mangan, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. James Thomas Milam, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Charles David Daniel, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Carlyle Fairfax Whiting, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. James Oliver Cowee, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Oliver Beirne Patton, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Lloyd Randolph Pugh, Jr., Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Thomas Owen Mahon, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. John Wesley Brown, Jr., Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. Walter Hugh Snelling, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Clarence Wilfred Cyr, Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. Clifford Dixon Coble, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Harold Ira Hayward, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Lester LeRoy Salzer, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Bruton Burke Schardt, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Thomas James Lynn, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Edgar Norman Millington, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Anthony Jack Vitullo, Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. John Peter Moore, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Noble Franklin Greenhill, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Douglas Lee Harris, Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. John Louis Grimmeison, Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Andrew Joseph Cupper, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Elton Caron Parker, Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Robert Graham Brotherton, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Maxwell Cole Murphy, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. George Emmett Maxon, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Alan Lyon Partridge, Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. John Gordon Weir, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Ivan Windingland Nealon, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Bruce Keeley Deakin, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Arthur Siegmar Hyman, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. William Lane Bingham, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Ray Aloysius Dunn, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. Evarice Camile Mire, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Edward Conley Murphy, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Abraham Merton Glass, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Joseph Richards Shelton, Jr., Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. John Leon Susott, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. George Elmer Wear, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Leo Hinkey, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Leonard Henderson Sims, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. George Steve Pappas, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Robert Milton Shoemaker, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Bernard Edward McKeever, Jr., Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Duncan Palmer, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Grady Olan White, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Cornelius John Molloy, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. John Joseph Hennessey, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. John Bernard Brady, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. David Blake, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Frederick Harry Black, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. John Martin Werner, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Philip Barrett Toon, Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. James Albert Downs, Jr., Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. John Creighton King, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Mark Joseph Klein, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Alexander Carver Bridewell, Jr., Chemical Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. John Travis Lisenby, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Frank Edward Walton, Jr., Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Donald Edgerton Tripp, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. David Edwards Fitton, Jr., Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Robert Gist Pickens, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Dean Michael Bressler, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. John Richard McPherson, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. William Claude McGlothlin, Jr., Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Joseph Wesley Losch, Ordnance Department (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Joseph Carlton Petrone, Jr., Ordnance Department (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. Malcolm Pitzer Mickelwait, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. William Robert Buckley, Jr., Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Michael Edward Nicoletti, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. Armond DiSilvio, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Thomas Byron Hoxie, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. William Francis Enos, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. James Joseph Patterson, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Henry Caleb Lindsey, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. Chalmer Lee Deeter, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. William Edward Charlson, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Robin Schofield Kendall, Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Richard Bernard Fowler, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Thomas McKee Tarpley, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. George Edward Pickett 4th, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. Corydon Fargo Schellenger, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Clarence Emanuel Wolfinger, Jr., Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. John Mills Simmons, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Casimir Myslinski, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Harold Langford Wilhite, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. Thomas Edward Lawrence, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1937.

Second Lt. Howard Nelson Tanner, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 16, 1947.

Second Lt. Philip Schuyler Grant, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. Leslie H. Hendrickson, Jr., Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. Wallace Daniel Moore, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Bruce Ingle Staser, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. Paul James Hamm, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Richard Lawrence Creed, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. James Gregory Monihan, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. William Neely Todd 3d, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. Simon Seelig Marks, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Leslie Harrison Halstead, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. Lindley Corydon Ellis, Ordnance Department (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Robert Kelly Routh, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Peter Williams Almquist, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. James Harvye Stewart, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Robert Homer Strecker, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. John Peyton Kincaid, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Edward Heacock Hibbard, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Ralph Carl Hollstein, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. George Harold Farne, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Lyall Davies de la Mater, Jr., Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. George Earl Hoffman, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Robert Francis Shannon, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. William Johnston Humma, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. Val Edward Prahl, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Wallace James Moulis, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Frederick Banks Gervais, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Frank Edward Moore, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Charles Spurgeon Johnson, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Max Lawrence Marshall, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Robert Henry Hurst, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. E. Paul Anderson, Ordnance Department (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Raymond Le Gordon, Jr., Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Vernon Everett Robbins, Signal Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Grey Fitzpatrick, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. William Blackburn White 4th, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Oliver George Becker, Signal Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Aloysius Arthur Norton, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Charles Harris Mullin, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. William Taylor Courtney, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. John Octavius McElvey, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. James Wesley Weathers, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Eugene Francis Callaghan, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. John Robert Flynn, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. William Thomas Miller, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Corbie Ralph Truman, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Arthur Linton Handley, Jr., Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Edward Schuyler Stahl, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Lawrence Locke Clayton, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Harold Robert Emerson, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. John Nettleton Johnson 3d, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Candler Asbury Wilkinson, Jr., Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Edwin Moriel Aldrich, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Carl Bayard Anderson, Jr., Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Thomas Oakley Phillips, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. John Boning, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. William Sidney Chandler, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. William Edward Wightman, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. John Tyler Elliott, Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Charles Byers Nye, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Odie David Minatra, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Harold Knight Boutwell, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. John Thornton Peterson, Ordnance Department (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. DeRosey Carroll Cabell, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Clarence Andrew Mitchell, Jr., Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. John Stephen Sullivan, Jr., Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. Randolph Jefferson Cary, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. Henry Hastings Burnett, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Doniphan Carter, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Oscar Eugene Duttweiler, Jr., Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Paul Caspar Emley, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. William Francis Bradley, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. John Thomas Wells 3d, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Hollis LeRoy Muller, Jr., Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. William Herman Fairbrother, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Leslie Edwards Babcock, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Alfe Levando Francis Erickson, Ordnance Department (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Francis Ellis Merritt, Jr., Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. David Linton Silver, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Edward Basilio DiNapoli, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. John Sanders, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. John Warren Hanley, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Louis William Howe, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. Melville Brooke Withers, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. James Harvey O'Connor, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. Frederick John Keifer, Jr., Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Robert Dorrance Ingalls, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Larkin Smith Tully, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Robert Paul Bright, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Robert Mitchell Cowherd, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Wilson Norton Boyles, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. William Bell 3d, Chemical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. James Bradshaw Adamson, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Robert Stafford Rivers, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. Robert Stephen Mills, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. John William Combs, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. William Benjamin Tuttle, Jr., Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Dale Robert Fleming, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Dean Garland Crowell, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 7, 1947.

Second Lt. Warren Dudley Hodges, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 7, 1947.

Second Lt. Bernard Hartley Coleman, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 8, 1947.

Second Lt. Charles Robert Blaha, Jr., Ordnance Department (temporary captain), with rank from June 10, 1947.

Second Lt. Alexander Harrison VonPlinsky, Jr., Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 10, 1947.

Second Lt. Robert Lee Filson, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 10, 1947.

Second Lt. Frank Ditsler Peel, Ordnance Department (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 10, 1947.

Second Lt. Conrad Scott Allman, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 15, 1947.

×Second Lt. William Douglas Noid, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 15, 1947.

Second Lt. Van Thurman Barfoot, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 15, 1947.

Second Lt. Ralph Henderson Miller, Jr., Quartermaster Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 16, 1947.

×Second Lt. Fred Bradley Schoomaker, Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 16, 1947.

Second Lt. Gail Seymour Halvorsen, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 17, 1947.

Second Lt. Gordon Ray Myers, Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 17, 1947.

Second Lt. Edwin Morris Freakley, Infantry, with rank from June 19, 1947.

Second Lt. Robert Edwin Johnson, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 19, 1947.

Second Lt. Eubert Harrison Malone, Jr., Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 20, 1947.

Second Lt. John Alfred Kjellstrom, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 20, 1947.

Second Lt. Donald Henry Murray, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 23, 1947.

Second Lt. David Madison Critchlow, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 27, 1947.

Second Lt. Ray Morris Griffith, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 27, 1947.

Second Lt. Emmett Napoleon Long, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 27, 1947.

Second Lt. Marvin Ellis Anding, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 27, 1947.

×Second Lt. Burr Sells Watters, Jr., Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 27, 1947.

Second Lt. Richard Arthur Beyer, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 27, 1947.

Second Lt. William Elmer Archbold, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 27, 1947.

Second Lt. Ferdinand John Winter, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 27, 1947.

Second Lt. Robert Sylvester Urban, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 27, 1947.

Second Lt. Ray Burgess May, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 27, 1947.

Second Lt. Frederick Irving Eglin, Jr., Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 27, 1947.

Second Lt. James John Benshoff, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 27, 1947.

Second Lt. Christian Laurin March, Jr., Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 27, 1947.

Second Lt. Hugh James White, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 27, 1947.

Second Lt. Daniel Fitzgerald Duke, Jr., Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 27, 1947.

Second Lt. John Samuel Adams, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 30, 1947.

Second Lt. Freddie Charles Kight, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from July 1, 1947.

Second Lt. Curtis Edward Hopkins, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from July 1, 1947.

Second Lt. Robert Earl Starkey, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from July 1, 1947.

Second Lt. Wayland Whitney Williams, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from July 3, 1947.

Second Lt. Harry Malcolm Hill, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from July 3, 1947.

×Second Lt. William Teunis Van Atten, Cavalry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from July 4, 1947

Second Lt. William Wesley Gist 3d, Cavalry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from July 4, 1947.

Second Lt. LeRoy Oliver Sidfrid, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from July 4, 1947.

Second Lt. James Inglis, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from July 4, 1947.

Second Lt. Charles Elwood Yeager, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from July 6, 1947.

×Second Lt. Richard LeRoy Johnson, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from July 8, 1947.

Second Lt. Chester John St. Clair, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from July 8, 1947.

Second Lt. James Blakely Owings, Chemical Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from July 8, 1947.

×Second Lt. Jack Glessner MacDonald, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from July 10, 1947.

Second Lt. Phillip Allen Rand, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from July 11, 1947.

Second Lt. Edward Richard Weed, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from July 12, 1947.

Second Lt. Donald Otto Scherer, Air Corps (temporary captain), with rank from July 12, 1947.

Second Lt. Charles Robert Clark, Corps of Engineers (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from July 12, 1947.

Second Lt. James Edward Devine, Corps of Engineers (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from July 12, 1947.

×Second Lt. Shelby Dale Scott 3d, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from July 13, 1947.

Second Lt. Ronald Clark Good, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from July 14, 1947.

Second Lt. Jackie Stephen Robinson, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from July 14, 1947.

Second Lt. Julian Milton Blomberg, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from July 16, 1947.

Second Lt. Ray Curtis Gordon, Jr., Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from July 18, 1947.

Second Lt. William MacGregor Home, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from July 18, 1947.

Second Lt. Loren Everett Davis, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from July 21, 1947.

Second Lt. Harold Arthur Kissinger, Signal Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from July 22, 1947.

×Second Lt. James Gerard Pelland, Signal Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from July 22, 1947.

Second Lt. John Roger Siska, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from July 25, 1947.

Second Lt. Paul James Rowan, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from July 25, 1947.

Second Lt. Theodore Ross MacKechnie, Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from July 25, 1947.

Second Lt. Stephen Goode Martin, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from July 25, 1947.

Second Lt. Herbert Fullerton Dickson 2d, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from July 27, 1947.

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonels

×Maj. Dean McLaughlin Walker, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from March 5, 1947.

Maj. Merritt Gartley Ringer, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from April 6, 1947.

Maj. Charles Tindal Young, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 17, 1947.

Maj. Oliver Kunze Niess, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 2, 1947.

Maj. Carl Milo Rylander, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 2, 1947.

Maj. James Patrick Cooney, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 17, 1947.

Maj. Louis Holmes Ginn, Jr., Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 17, 1947.

Maj. Seth Gayle, Jr., Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 17, 1947.

Maj. Howard Sterling McConkie, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 23, 1947.

To be majors

Capt. Ronald Fisher Kirk, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 5, 1947.

Capt. Oswald Massena Weaver, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from February 8, 1947.

Capt. David Fisher, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 21, 1947.

Capt. Bryan Coleman Thomas Fenton, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from March 2, 1947.

Capt. George Harold Kojac, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from March 2, 1947.

×Capt. Lindsay James Ervin, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from March 8, 1947.

Capt. Ralph Leon Marx, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from March 11, 1947.

×Capt. Aloysius Thomas Waskowicz, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from March 20, 1947.

Capt. Charles Joseph Farinacci, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from April 1, 1947.

×Capt. Gladen Robert Hamilton, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from April 20, 1947.

Capt. George Holmes McCain, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from April 28, 1947.

×Capt. Weldon Kenneth Ruth, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from May 1, 1947.

Capt. Gus Warlick Neece, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from May 10, 1947.

×Capt. Ryle August Radke, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from May 18, 1947.

Capt. Robert Allan McLane, Jr., Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from May 24, 1947.

Capt. Scott Murray Smith, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 1, 1947.

Capt. Louis Keller Pohl, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 2, 1947.

Capt. Frank Dudley Jones, Jr., Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 3, 1947.

Capt. Robert Reed Kelley, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 3, 1947.

Capt. Kenneth McFeely Reighter, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 4, 1947.

Capt. Warren Henry Diessner, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 8, 1947.

Capt. Robert La Tourrette Cavenaugh, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 17, 1947.

Capt. Marshall Eugene Groover, Jr., Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 20, 1947.

Capt. Maurice Crawford Davidson, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 24, 1947.

Capt. Charles Henry Bramlitt, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 29, 1947.

Capt. Robert Stuart Nelson, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1947.

Capt. Bruno Jastremski, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1947.

Capt. Theodore Moffett Carow, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1947.

Capt. James Polk Sullivan, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 5, 1947.

×Capt. Alton Herbert Saxer, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 9, 1947.

Capt. David Wanless Clotfelter, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 13, 1947.

Capt. George Frederick Baier 3d, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 13, 1947.

Capt. Louis Kenneth Mantell, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 13, 1947.

Capt. John Harry King, Jr., Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 13, 1947.

Capt. Robert White Du Priest, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 22, 1947.

Capt. Robert Earle Nuernberger, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 22, 1947.

Capt. Hyman Richard Osheroff, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 25, 1947.

To be captains

First Lt. Marshall Dunnick Jackson, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from February 11, 1947.

First Lt. Robert Sumner Lockwood, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from February 14, 1947.

First Lt. Lloyd Ray Stropes, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from March 28, 1947.

DENTAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonels

Maj. Elmer Osman Hinman, Dental Corps, with rank from May 10, 1947.

Maj. Clarence Price Canby, Dental Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 15, 1947.

To be majors

Capt. Thomas Benton Seay, Dental Corps, with rank from February 10, 1947.

Capt. Arthur Julian Hemberger, Dental Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from February 17, 1947.

Capt. John Wesley Mainwaring, Jr., Dental Corps, with rank from March 23, 1947.

Capt. Thomas Guy Fowler, Dental Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from March 25, 1947.

Capt. George Graydon Lesemann, Dental Corps, with rank from April 27, 1947.

×Capt. Jerome Travis Smith, Dental Corps (temporary major), with rank from May 19, 1947.

Capt. Garnet Paul Francis, Jr., Dental Corps (temporary major), with rank from May 26, 1947.

VETERINARY CORPS

To be majors

Capt. Floyd Edward Monroe, Veterinary Corps, with rank from March 24, 1947.

Capt. George Henry Zacherle, Jr., Veterinary Corps (temporary major), with rank from April 2, 1947.

Capt. John Howard Rust 3d, Veterinary Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from April 4, 1947.

×Capt. Robert Ransome Miller, Veterinary Corps, with rank from April 30, 1947.

Capt. Walter Smit, Veterinary Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from May 1, 1947.

Capt. Donald Clifford Kelley, Veterinary Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 1, 1947.

Capt. Frank Arnold Todd, Veterinary Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 20, 1947.

Capt. Bernard Francis Trum, Veterinary Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 25, 1947.

Capt. John Gale, Veterinary Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 14, 1947.

Capt. Thomas Carlyle Jones, Veterinary Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 24, 1947.

To be captain

First Lt. William Gordon Brooks, Veterinary Corps (temporary captain), with rank from July 31, 1947.

CHAPLAINS

To be lieutenant colonels

×Chaplain (Maj.) James Robert Davidson, Jr., United States Army, with rank from February 2, 1947.

Chaplain (Maj.) Louis Curtis Tiernan, United States Army (temporary colonel), with rank from February 7, 1947.

×Chaplain (Maj.) Edward Joseph DeMars, United States Army, with rank from March 19, 1947.

Chaplain (Maj.) Charles Patrick Malumphy, United States Army (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 12, 1947.

To be majors

Chaplain (Capt.) John Frazer Chalker, United States Army (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from March 19, 1947.

×Chaplain (Capt.) Kenneth Lyndle Ames, United States Army (temporary major), with rank from March 20, 1947.

Chaplain (Capt.) Glen Cowden Shaffer, United States Army (temporary major), with rank from April 3, 1947.

Chaplain (Capt.) Dwayne Halley Mengel, United States Army (temporary major), with rank from May 18, 1947.

Chaplain (Capt.) Robert Aurelius Bryant, United States Army, with rank from May 25, 1947.

Chaplain (Capt.) Charles Joseph Murphy, United States Army, with rank from June 6, 1947.

×Chaplain (Capt.) Thomas Joseph McDonald, United States Army, with rank from July 13, 1947.

Chaplain (Capt.) Elmer Ivan Carriker, United States Army (temporary major), with rank from July 19, 1947.

PHARMACY CORPS

To be lieutenant colonels

Maj. Frederick Harrell Gibbs, Pharmacy Corps, with rank from March 31, 1947.

Maj. Anthony Carter Tucker, Pharmacy Corps, with rank from May 3, 1947.

To be majors

Capt. Edwin Hammond Potts, Pharmacy Corps, with rank from March 12, 1947.

Capt. Philip Rich Carlquist, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major), with rank from March 25, 1947.

Capt. Ralph Edward Paige, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 22, 1947.

To be captains

First Lt. Raymond Joseph Caldbeck, Pharmacy Corps (temporary captain), with rank from January 29, 1947.

First Lt. Layton Ogan Burris, Pharmacy Corps (temporary captain), with rank from February 5, 1947.

First Lt. Thomas Laughlin, Jr., Pharmacy Corps (temporary captain), with rank from February 6, 1947.

First Lt. Paul Maurice Levesque, Pharmacy Corps, with rank from February 9, 1947.

First Lt. Morris Vincent Olson, Pharmacy Corps (temporary captain), with rank from February 14, 1947.

First Lt. John Valentine Mendenhall, Pharmacy Corps (temporary captain), with rank from February 14, 1947.

First Lt. John Allen Hilcken, Pharmacy Corps (temporary captain), with rank from March 5, 1947.

First Lt. Benjamin Franklin Lambert, Pharmacy Corps, with rank from March 5, 1947.

First Lt. Norman Shirley Drowns, Pharmacy Corps (temporary captain), with rank from March 7, 1947.

First Lt. Paul Herman Myers, Pharmacy Corps (temporary captain), with rank from March 13, 1947.

First Lt. Stanley Howard French, Pharmacy Corps (temporary captain), with rank from March 15, 1947.

First Lt. Owen Brooks Wagner, Pharmacy Corps, with rank from March 15, 1947.

First Lt. Robert Leslie Hughes, Jr., Pharmacy Corps (temporary captain), with rank from March 17, 1947.

First Lt. Volney Higdon Rattan, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major), with rank from March 19, 1947.

First Lt. Robert Douglas Fakes, Pharmacy Corps, with rank from March 26, 1947.

First Lt. Rees Frank Schaller, Pharmacy Corps (temporary captain), with rank from April 11, 1947.

First Lt. Jack Tillmon Walden, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major), with rank from May 5, 1947.

First Lt. Russel Lee Bryant, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major), with rank from May 21, 1947.

First Lt. Walter Edward Ford, Pharmacy Corps (temporary captain), with rank from May 27, 1947.

First Lt. Gordon Francis McCleary, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 19, 1947.

First Lt. John Mathias Rogers, Pharmacy Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 28, 1947.

First Lt. John Howard Trenholm, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 3, 1947.

First Lt. Ben Carr Liles, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 7, 1947.

First Lt. Paul William King, Pharmacy Corps (temporary captain), with rank from July 18, 1947.

First Lt. Richard Jack Coker, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 21, 1947.

First Lt. William Marbry Gordon, Pharmacy Corps (temporary captain), with rank from July 22, 1947.

×First Lt. William Alton Hill, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 22, 1947.

First Lt. Scott Harry Davis, Pharmacy Corps (temporary captain), with rank from July 28, 1947.

First Lt. Leo Edward Benade, Pharmacy Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 29, 1947.

First Lt. Lester Joseph Wright, Pharmacy Corps (temporary captain), with rank from July 30, 1947.

First Lt. David Leon Moore, Pharmacy Corps (temporary captain), with rank from July 31, 1947.

To be first lieutenants

Second Lt. Andre Raymond Pascal, Pharmacy Corps, with rank from September 15, 1946.

Second Lt. Carroll Eugene Clutter, Pharmacy Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from February 6, 1947.

Second Lt. Kenneth Perry Darling, Pharmacy Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from March 15, 1947.

Second Lt. Robert Louis Lansche, Pharmacy Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from March 18, 1947.

Second Lt. Wade Hampton Dexter, Pharmacy Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 5, 1947.

Second Lt. Lynn Ross Cheezum, Pharmacy Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from May 26, 1947.

Second Lt. Egbert Venoy Bunger, Pharmacy Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 12, 1947.

Second Lt. John Marshall Evans, Pharmacy Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 23, 1947.

Second Lt. Clarence Wilbur Edmonds, Pharmacy Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from July 8, 1947.

Second Lt. Wayne Eugene McCoy, Pharmacy Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from July 15, 1947.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 2 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Charles E. Saltzman to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO URUGUAY

Ellis O. Briggs

TO BE FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF THE CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Walter J. Donnelly
Robert B. Macatee
George R. Merrell
Albert F. Nufer
Lowell C. Pinkerton
Christian M. Ravndal
Herschel V. Johnson

TO BE CONSULS GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

John H. Madonne
Russell M. Brooks
U. Alexis Johnson
Robert P. Joyce

TO BE CONSULS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

T. Eliot Weil
Charles C. Gidney, Jr.
Carl Birkeland
Lyle C. Himmel
Ralph H. Hunt
Gerald G. Jones
Foster H. Kreis
Joseph E. Maldonado
John H. Marvin
John H. E. McAndrews
Harold D. Pease
Henry T. Unverzagt
Stephen B. Vaughan
Harold C. Wood

POSTMASTERS

ILLINOIS

Milton W. Pearce, Alhambra.

MINNESOTA

Clarence T. Nelson, Geneva.
Irene Rutter, Kinney.
Harris D. Holmgren, Lafayette.
Hildur C. Berg, Marble.
Harold J. Rossetti, Nevis.
Herbert Aufderheide, Wanda.
Mayme W. Gustason, Winton.

MONTANA

John L. Weaver, Belgrade.
James E. Elgie, Brockton.
William L. Reed, Deer Lodge.
Clifford A. Brown, Dixon.
Pauline E. Russell, Hot Springs.
Frank B. Farr, Lame Deer.
Roy Wayne Willis, Laurel.
David C. Bryan, Whitehall.
Gerald E. Owen, Whitetail.

NEVADA

Mildred I. Stephens, North Las Vegas.

NORTH CAROLINA

Edgar William Buliard, Belmont.
Clyde J. Smith, Bennett.
Willie Earl Gresham, Beulaville.
Bascom W. Rutherford, Enka.
James C. Chesnutt, Magnolia.
Nellie R. Kibler, Morven.
Joseph B. Stephenson, Seaboard.
Addie S. Winborne, Sims.
Wesley G. Cromer, Skyland.
Robert S. Lancaster, Vanceboro.
Margaret A. Seagroves, Varina.
Joe C. Hinkle, Welcome.
Herbert Maurice Brett, Winton.

NORTH DAKOTA

William A. Borderud, Davenport.
Philip J. Thorne, Tuttle.
Ruth O. Cavanaugh, Velva.
Amanda J. Shaw, Wolford.

PENNSYLVANIA

Nancy C. Tishue, Addison.
William James Carey, Ardmore.
Allen W. Kessler, Codorus.
John F. Rauch, Emigsville.
George Wesley Fordney, Enola.
Rose H. Poll, Forest Park.
Mazie N. Fulton, Hanlin Station.
Sara M. Slight, Hartsville.
Lillie E. Armstrong, King of Prussia.
Albert F. Wydeen, La Plume.
Israel M. Ziders, Laughlintown.
Harold E. Hake, Lewisberry.
Jennie A. Evans, Orwin.
Arthur C. Gulick, Riverside.
Ray M. Spahr, Shepherdstown.
William A. Bailey, Southwest.
Otis C. Quinby, Springboro.
Eleanor B. Burns, Wolfdale.

TENNESSEE

Alva A. Duffield, Brentwood.
Omar L. Hardison, Columbia.
Charles H. Winfrey, Concord.
Eva A. Thornton, Duff.
John Hatcher Crowder, Fountain Head.
Maxine F. Wallace, Jamestown.
Maude E. Pemberton, Lancing.
Ottis C. Doyle, Jr., McEwen.
Alonzo G. Robbins, Monroe.
Gray D. Sands, Old Hickory.
Guilford J. Hutcheson, Ripley.
James D. Creson, Sherwood.

TEXAS

Tobe Hahn, Beaumont.
Cecelia B. Phillips, Brazoria.
James B. Scales, Bridge City.
Roland N. Allbright, Crockett.
Ellen Lucile Kerr, Grand Prairie.
Walter L. Hunter, Lake Dallas.
Volna Ogden, Lefors.
Pauline Stagner, McDade.
Noel G. Oates, Midland.
Bailey Hair, Olton.
John T. Morse, Quitman.
Inez L. Mullins, Sanford.
Imogene J. Benton, Sunray.
Euel B. Britton, Stamford.

VERMONT

Mildred D. Murphy, Center Rutland.
Francess H. Holden, Chester Depot.

WASHINGTON

John A. Croy, Chelan.
Ole C. Noste, Conway.
Ruby Grandstaff, Easton.
Margaret M. Learned, Hadlock.
Ada E. Buchanan, Kahlotus.
Ida B. Howell, Lakeside.
Wilma M. Strutzel, Monitor.
Marion J. Rasmussen, Naselle.
Howard F. Christeson, Springdale.
Ailsie P. Lane, Washtucna.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JULY 2, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the Lord God of all mankind, in this moment of prayer, wilt Thou touch our minds and hearts with a reassuring sense of Thy nearness, Thy peace, and Thy power.

Grant that in our deliberations and decisions we may be sensitive to the leading of Thy spirit and find strength of soul in the glorious assurance that where Thou dost guide Thou wilt also provide.

May we daily walk and work together in the fear of the Lord and at eventide receive the benediction which Thou dost bestow upon the faithful.

To Thy name we ascribe the praise. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On June 30, 1947:

H. R. 3203. An act relative to maximum rents on housing accommodations; to repeal certain provisions of Public Law 388, Seventy-ninth Congress, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3769. An act to amend the Bankruptcy Act with respect to qualifications of part-time referees in bankruptcy;

H. R. 2369. An act providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the Territory of Alaska;

H. J. Res. 221. Joint resolution to provide for permanent rates of postage on mail matter of the first class, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 92. Joint resolution authorizing the presentation of the Distinguished Flying Cross to Rear Adm. Charles E. Rosendahl, United States Navy;

H. J. Res. 96. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue posthumously to the late Roy Stanley Geiger, lieutenant general, United States Marine Corps, a commission as general, United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 167. Joint resolution to recognize uncompensated services rendered the Nation under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 407. An act for the relief of Claude R. Hall and Florence V. Hall;

H. R. 1318. An act for the relief of Mrs. Fuku Kurokawa Thurn;

H. R. 1362. An act to permit certain naval personnel to count all active service rendered under temporary appointment as warrant or commissioned officers in the United States Navy and the United States Naval Reserve, or in the United States Marine Corps and the United States Marine Corps Reserve, for purposes of promotion to commissioned warrant officer in the United States Navy or the United States Marine Corps, respectively;

H. R. 1807. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the county of Pittsburg, Okla., a perpetual easement for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a public highway over a portion of the United States naval ammunition depot, McAlester, Okla.;

H. R. 2339. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the designation of Army mail clerks and assistant Army mail clerks," approved August 21, 1941 (55 Stat. 656), and for other purposes;

H. R. 2411. An act to authorize patenting of certain lands to Public Hospital District No. 2, Clallam County, Wash., for hospital purposes;

H. R. 2545. An act to provide funds for cooperation with the school board of the Moclips-Aloha District for the construction and equipment of a new school building in the town of Moclips, Grays Harbor County, Wash., to be available to both Indian and non-Indian children;

H. R. 2654. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to grant to the mayor and city council of Baltimore, State of Maryland, a permanent easement for the purpose of installing, maintaining, and servicing a subterranean water main in, on, and across the land of the United States Coast Guard station called Lazaretto Depot, Baltimore, Md.;

H. R. 2655. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to grant to the mayor and city council of Baltimore, State of Maryland, a permanent easement for the purpose of installing, maintaining, and servicing two subterranean water mains in, on, and across the land of Fort McHenry National Monument and Historic Shrine, Md.;

H. R. 2915. An act for the relief of Mrs. Frederick Faber Wesche (formerly Ann Maureen Bell); and

H. R. 3124. An act to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the eighty-first national encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held in Cleveland, Ohio, August 10 to 14, 1947.

On July 1, 1947:

H. R. 381. An act for the relief of Allen T. Feamster, Jr.;

H. R. 577. An act to preserve historic graveyards in abandoned military posts;

H. R. 1358. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the management and operation of naval plantations outside the continental United States," approved June 28, 1944;

H. R. 1371. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to appoint, for supply duty only, officers of the line of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1376. An act to amend the acts of October 14, 1942 (56 Stat. 786), as amended, and November 28, 1943 (57 Stat. 593), as amended, so as to authorize transportation of dependents and household effects of personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard to overseas bases;

H. R. 1514. An act for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1628. An act relinquishing to the State of Illinois certain right, title, or interest of the United States of America, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1742. An act for the relief of Mary Lomas;

H. R. 1997. An act to provide seniority benefits for certain officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia who are veterans of World War II and lost opportunity for promotion by reason of their service in the armed forces of the United States;

H. R. 2237. An act to correct an error in section 342 (b) (8) of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended;

H. R. 2436. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1067. An act for the relief of S. C. Spradling and R. T. Morris;

H. R. 1845. An act to amend existing laws relating to military leave of certain employees of the United States or of the District of Columbia so as to equalize rights to leave of absence and reemployment for such employees who are members of the Enlisted or Officers' Reserve Corps, the National Guard, or the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2248. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to grant an easement and to convey to the Louisiana Power & Light Co. a tract of land comprising a portion of Camp Livingston in the State of Louisiana; and

H. J. Res. 193. Joint resolution to grant authority for the erection of a permanent building for the American National Red Cross, District of Columbia Chapter, Washington, D. C.

On July 2, 1947:

H. R. 3629. An act to authorize the transfer to the Panama Canal of property which is surplus to the needs of the War Department or Navy Department; and

H. R. 1144. An act for the relief of Samuel W. Davis, Jr.; Mrs. Samuel W. Davis, Jr.; and Betty Jane Davis.

On July 1, 1947:

H. R. 1375. An act to further amend section 10 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, so as to provide for the clothing allowance of enlisted men of the Army, Marine Corps, and Marine Corps Reserve; and

H. R. 2276. An act to authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to pay certain expenses incident to training, attendance, and participation of personnel of the Army of the United States and of the naval service, respectively, in the seventh winter sports Olympic games and the fourteenth Olympic games and for future Olympic games.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 3311. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BALL, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. MCKELLAR, and Mr. TYDINGS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4031. An act making appropriations to meet emergencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BALL, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. CORDON, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

THE LATE HONORABLE JOHN H. TOLAN

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was unavoidably absent yesterday when the announcement of the passing of Hon. John H. Tolan was made by his successor, Hon. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR., so I, too, could have joined in a tribute of respect to a man who was held in the highest esteem by those who knew him both in public and private life.

I never knew a man more devoted to his family, and who in turn was adored by his wife, his children, and his grandchildren. His sudden ending was brought on by a shock and overexertion resulting from the disappearance of one of his grandchildren in the beautiful wild foothills of the Sierra Nevada Mountains.

John Tolan not only loved his family, but he loved his fellow man. This fact was evidenced in his chairmanship of the Tolan committee authorized by Congress which gave months to exhaustive hearings and study in an effort to help the thousands of unfortunate migratory workers in this country during the depth of the depression.

Our hearts go out to his devoted family in their loss.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TWYMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Mr. George Sokolsky.

Mr. YOUNGBLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SOMERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATIONS, 1948

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3311) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. STEFAN, JONES of Ohio, HORAN, FENTON, ROONEY, GARY, and O'BRIEN.

EMERGENCY APPROPRIATIONS, 1948

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4031) making appropriations to meet emergencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate; and that the managers on the part of the House have authority to agree to the amendments of the Senate with amendments, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 2 of rule XX, and that the conference report may be considered at any time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, ENGEL of Michigan, STEFAN, CASE of South Dakota, KEEFE, KERR, and MAHON.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the American Legion chairman of the housing committee.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include three various subject matters and one resolution.

Mr. REDDEN, Mr. BURLESON, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Mr. GAVIN, and Mr. WILLIAMS asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 2700) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement on the part of the managers of the House may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2700) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 12, 15, 18, 29, 31, and 42.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 13, 16, 19, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 32, 34, 37, 40, 43, 45, 46, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, and 59, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$843,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$808,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,188,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$489,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert the following:

"Salaries and expenses, Division of Labor Standards: For necessary expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia and purchase and distribution of reports, and of material for informational exhibits, in connection with the promotion of health, safety, employment stabilization, and amicable industrial relations for labor and industry, $200,000.

"The appropriation under this title for traveling expenses shall be available for expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and consultants at conferences concerned with the work of the Division of Labor Standards when called by the Division with the written approval of the Secretary of Labor, and shall be available also in an amount not to exceed $2,000 for expenses of attendance at meetings related to the work of the Division of Labor Standards when incurred on the written authority of the Secretary of Labor."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$2,107,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,373,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$3,798,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,316,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$1,633,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$550,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "There shall be allotted to the several States for the fiscal year 1948, as provided in such Act, a sum not exceeding $75,000,000, a part of the sum authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1948 by part C of the Act. Whenever the Surgeon General shall have approved an application for a construction project in accordance with section 625 of the Act, the Federal share of the cost of such project, as provided by the Act, shall constitute a contractual obligation of the Federal Government: *Provided*, That the aggregate contractual obligation during the fiscal year 1948 shall not exceed $75,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$4,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$947,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$35,054,850"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 47: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and agree to the same with and amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$330,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$139,850"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$337,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 57: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 57, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$328,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 58: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$251,726"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 6, 7, 8, 9, 20, and 38.

FRANK B. KEEFE,
JOHN TABER,
RALPH E. CHURCH,
JOE HENDRICKS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
CHAN GURNEY,
JOSEPH H. BALL,
KENNETH S. WHERRY,
PAT MCCARRAN,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2700) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, submit the following report in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Amendment No. 1 appropriates $843,200 for salaries, Office of the Secretary, instead of $819,500 as proposed by the House and $866,900 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 2 appropriates $800,000 for salaries and expenses, Office of the Solicitor, instead of $755,300 as proposed by the House and $860,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3 appropriates $2,188,300 for traveling expenses for the Department, instead of $2,112,400 as proposed by the House and $2,264,200 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4 appropriates $489,700 for printing and binding for the Department, instead of $414,700 as proposed by the House and $564,700 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 5 inserts the provision of the Senate providing funds for salaries and expenses, Division of Labor Standards, amended to provide $200,000 for such purpose instead of $400,000, and strikes out the provision of the Senate in this item providing for certain functions under the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Amendments Nos. 6, 7, 8 and 9, relating to the Conciliation Service, are reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 10 appropriates $2,107,800 for Apprentice Training Service, instead of $2,015,600 as proposed by the House and $2,200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 11, 12 and 13, relating to salaries and expenses, Bureau of Labor Statistics, appropriate $3,373,400 for such purpose, instead of $2,373,400 as proposed by the House and $3,750,000 as proposed by the Senate, of which amount not to exceed $2,202,700 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia as proposed by the House instead of $2,750,000 as proposed by the Senate, and of which $845,000 is provided for a cost-of-living study and report as proposed by the Senate instead of $695,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 14 and 15 appropriate $3,500,000 for general administration, United States Employment Service, instead of $2,656,800 as proposed by the House and $4,366,400 as proposed by the Senate, of which $1,756,800 shall be available for carrying into effect the provisions of title IV of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (Veterans' Employment Service) as proposed by the House instead of $2,120,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16 appropriates $57,382,400 for grants to states for public employment offices as proposed by the Senate instead of $71,728,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 17 and 18 appropriate $3,798,000 for salaries, Wage and Hour Division, instead of $3,748,400 as proposed by the House and $3,847,600 as proposed by the Senate, of which not to exceed $746,100 may be expended for departmental salaries as proposed by the House instead of $672,800 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 19 strikes out a proposal of the House authorizing the Secretary of Labor to allot or transfer funds of the Wage and Hour Division to other bureaus of the Department.

Amendment No. 20 is reported in disagreement.

TITLE II—FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Amendments Nos. 21 and 22 appropriate $1,316,200 for salaries and expenses, Bureau of Employees' Compensation, instead of $1,276,000 as proposed by the House and $1,356,400 as proposed by the Senate; and authorize the temporary employment of experts at $35 per diem as proposed by the Senate instead of $75 per diem as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 23 appropriates $10,250,000 for the employees' compensation fund as proposed by the Senate instead of $10,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 24 and 25 appropriate $4,000,000 for salaries and expenses, Food and Drug Administration, as proposed by the Senate instead of $3,884,700 as proposed by the House; and provide for the temporary employment of experts at $35 per diem as proposed by the Senate instead of $75 per diem as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 26 and 27 appropriate $431,000 for certification services, Food and Drug Administration, as proposed by the Senate instead of $331,000 as proposed by the House; and provide for the temporary employment of experts at $35 per diem as proposed by the Senate instead of $75 per diem as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 28 and 29 appropriate $17,750,000 for further development of vocational education as proposed by the Senate instead of $14,200,000 as proposed by the House; and restore the provision of the House providing for the apportionment to the States on the basis of not to exceed $19,842,759.97.

Amendments Nos. 30 and 31 appropriate $1,633,900 for salaries and expenses, Office of Education, instead of $1,252,900 as proposed by the House and $1,683,900 as proposed by the Senate; and restore the provision of the House providing that not less than $434,400 shall be available for the Division of Vocational Education.

Amendments Nos. 32 and 33 appropriate $550,000 for general administrative expenses, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, instead of $500,000 as proposed by the House and $600,000 as proposed by the Senate; and provide for the temporary employment of experts at $35 per diem as proposed by the Senate instead of $75 per diem as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 34 provides for the temporary employment of experts by the Public Health Service at $35 per diem as proposed by the Senate instead of $75 per diem as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 35 strikes out the House provision relating to allotments to the States for hospital construction and contractual obligations thereunder and inserts the proposal of the Senate, amended to authorize contractual obligations of not to exceed $75,000,000.

Amendment No. 36 appropriates $4,250,000 for mental health activities, instead of $4,000,000 as proposed by the House and $4,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 37 appropriates $9,626,000 for operating expenses, National Institute of Health, as proposed by the Senate instead of $9,126,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 38 is reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 39 appropriates $947,500 for salaries, Bureau of Employment Security, instead of $900,000 as proposed by the House and $995,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 40 makes the appropriation for the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance available for expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the work of the Bureau, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 41 authorizes trust fund expenditures of $35,054,850 for salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, instead of $34,909,700 as proposed by the House and $35,200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 42 strikes out the authorization proposed by the Senate for expenditure of old-age and survivors insurance trust funds for alterations and repairs to certain buildings.

Amendment No. 43 appropriates $431,000 for salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau, as proposed by the Senate instead of $400,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 44 appropriates $750,000 for salaries and expenses, maternal and child welfare, Children's Bureau, instead of $700,000 as proposed by the House and $800,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 45 appropriates $2,000,000 for salaries, consolidated operations, Social Security Administration, as proposed by the Senate instead of $2,072,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 46 and 47 appropriate $330,000 for salaries, Office of the Federal Security Administrator, instead of $320,000 as proposed by the House and $340,000 as proposed by the Senate; and provide for the temporary employment of experts at $35 per diem as proposed by the Senate instead of $75 per diem as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 48 appropriates $139,850 for salaries, Division of Personnel Management, instead of $132,500 as proposed by the House and $147,200 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 49 appropriates $337,600 for salaries, Office of the General Counsel, instead of $325,600 as proposed by the House and $350,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 50 appropriates $670,000 for printing and binding, Federal Security Agency, as proposed by the Senate instead of $558,700 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 51 appropriates $500,000 for penalty mail costs, Federal Security Agency, as proposed by the Senate instead of $480,000 as proposed by the House.

TITLE III—NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Amendment No. 52 appropriates $3,750,000 for salaries as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,063,100 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 53 appropriates $900,000 for miscellaneous expenses as proposed by the Senate, instead of $805,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 54 appropriates $24,700 for penalty mail costs as proposed by the Senate, instead of $18,400 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 55 appropriates $300,000 for printing and binding as proposed by the Senate, instead of $146,700 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 56 clarifies the applicability of the House limitation on the use of funds in complaint cases, as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE IV—NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Amendments Nos. 57 and 58, relating to salaries and expenses, appropriates $328,700 for this purpose instead of $316,000 as proposed by the House and $338,700 as proposed by the Senate, of which not to exceed $251,726 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia instead of $236,000 as proposed by the House and $261,726 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 59 appropriates $45,000 for printing and binding, National Railroad Adjustment Board, as proposed by the Senate instead of $39,000 as proposed by the House.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

Amendments Nos. 6, 7, 8, and 9 relate to the Conciliation Service, Department of Labor. The managers on the part of the House have directed that appropriate motions be made that the House recede from its disagreement to the said amendments and concur therein with certain amendments thereto.

Amendment No. 20 provides authority for the Secretary of Labor to make certain transfers of funds connected with departmental reorganizations. The managers on the part of the House have directed that a motion be made that the House recede from its disagreement to the said amendment and concur therein.

Amendment No. 38 relates to the National Cancer Institute. The managers on the part of the House have directed that a motion be made that the House recede from its disagreement to the said amendment and concur therein with the following amendment thereto: In lieu of the sums proposed to be stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert: "and including $500,000 which shall be transferred to the appropriation 'National Institute of Health, operating expenses', $14,500,000."

FRANK B. KEEFE,
JOHN TABER,
RALPH E. CHURCH,
JOE HENDRICKS,
Managers on the Part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, this is the conference report on H. R. 2700, making appropriations for the Federal Security Agency and the Department of Labor. An inspection of the conference report would indicate that the House has receded on a great many items. An examination of the estimates, however, indicates that the recessions which we made were those that were incidental to and necessary in any conference in order that an agreement might be reached. They relate purely to items in the bill in which the Senate had increased the amount agreed upon by the House and the recession on the part of the House represents in most cases a 50-percent cut on the increase offered in the Senate bill; so we met them halfway in order to arrive at a bill and get the bill passed and get it through to the President.

There are one or two things in this bill that I think should be discussed for just a moment in order that it may be clear. One relates to the Conciliation Service of the Department of Labor. You will observe that the managers on the part of the House have brought back amendments Nos. 6, 7, 8, and 9 in disagreement. They relate to the Conciliation Service and relate to the amounts carried in the House bill for that Service. Much ado has been made of the fact—and it has been alleged—that the House carried language in its bill attempting to dismiss one Edgar L. Warren and a number of other employees of the Conciliation Service. The bill as passed by the House carried no such language. It is true that in the report accompanying the bill the

House committee set forth language which indicated that we were making no appropriation for certain specific jobs in the Conciliation Service, among them being the Director of Conciliation, and we appropriated in the bill a specific sum of money for the Conciliation Service. When it went to the other body they increased the amount of the appropriation for the Conciliation Service generally by a small amount, but they said in their report that they did not consider that it was proper for the legislative branch of the Government to attempt to tell the Executive what individuals should be hired or fired, or words to that effect. In the conference neither the Senate report nor the House report was touched in any way, shape, or manner; in fact, the subject was not even discussed, because subsequent to the passage of this bill in the House and in the Senate the Taft-Hartley bill has become law, and under the provisions of the Taft-Hartley bill the Conciliation Service as it existed was abolished.

What have we done? We make no provision in this bill whatsoever for the old Conciliation Service, because in this bill which was passed the other day and which was acted upon by the Senate yesterday we had set up the funds to provide for the Conciliation Service until August 21, 1947, when the new Conciliation Service goes into operation. It means, therefore, that the President will have to appoint a new head of the new Conciliation Service and do so before the Congress recesses or adjourns. There will have to be a new estimate sent up by whoever the new man is to the Appropriations Committee setting forth the funds they expect to get from the Congress for this new Service. So in the bill under consideration, H. R. 2700, and in this conference report, we are not making any appropriation whatsoever except $1 for the Conciliation Service; therefore, there will be no funds available from this appropriation to turn over to the new Service on August 21.

I notice by the press last evening and this morning that the present Director of the Conciliation Service has resigned. I think that is all it is necessary to say on that subject matter, despite some of the innuendoes that are carried in the newspaper clippings I took from the Washington Post this morning which stated that Mr. Warren "apparently waited until he was cleared of the charges hanging over him before announcing his resignation." I am perfectly willing that the Post or Mr. Warren or anybody else who wants to can take unto themselves that much satisfaction out of the picture. There was no clearing of anybody. Mr. Warren has resigned and the attitude so definitely indicated and taken by this House has been fully vindicated by what has taken place.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. The charges that were leveled at Mr. Warren have never been disproved by Mr. Warren or anyone else, nor has there been any testimony to disprove the charges?

Mr. KEEFE. There has not been. There has been no trial and Mr. Warren has not been acquitted of anything. The fact of the matter is Mr. Warren has resigned. Let the matter rest there. I do not want to persecute Mr. Warren and never did want to. I am happy to see that he has seen fit to step out of the Conciliation Service and I have assurances that his service in that branch of the Government has perhaps ended. What other branch of the Government he will turn up in later I do not know. That will be up for consideration later on.

The next amendment in disagreement is a very simple little thing and provides for some language to be inserted in the bill that was put in by the Senate relating to transfers of funds. At the proper time I shall move to recede and concur in that Senate amendment.

Amendment No. 38 in disagreement is one that I think we are all interested in. You will recall that the House gave in excess of $17,000,000 to the Public Health Service for cancer research. The Senate in its wisdom cut that appropriation $6,000,000. You will also understand that on the floor of the House an effort was made to try to see to it that there ultimately be incorporated in this bill a proviso for at least $1,000,000 to take care of the new streptomycin research which has proven so efficacious in the treatment and arrest of tuberculosis. The House committee at all times stated that they would consent and agree if the $1,000,000 were placed in this bill in the Senate. It came up too late from the Bureau of the Budget for us to include at the time the bill was presented to the House. I stated on the floor of the House, and my distinguished friend from Rhode Island and the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] were in complete accord with that when we discussed the bill, that in conference we would consent that the $1,000,000 be put in the bill so we could take care of this streptomycin research.

Now, the other body did this: They provided for $1,000,000, but they provided for it in this way; they set up a specific appropriation of only $500,000, and they earmarked another $500,000 out of the general research program of the Public Health Service, the result being that the Public Health Service, in order to provide the streptomycin research, would have to abandon one or more of the very important research programs that they now have under way; for instance, cardiovascular diseases or some others that are equally important.

So, in the conference we did this: We succeeded in getting the Senate to increase the amount for cancer research up to $14,500,000, but we provided language that would take $500,000 of those additional funds and turn it over into streptomycin research so that the $1,000,000, that so many Members of Congress have been interested in, will be provided for, and the research into that field will be accomplished.

Other than that I see nothing in disagreement, and we have tried to bring in a bill here that will meet all of the issues and take care of these departments in the next fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, you and the Members of the House will note that I have not affixed my signature to the conference report on this Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill or the statement of the managers on the part of the House. As one of the conferees on the part of the House I could not in good conscience agree to the unwarranted slashes made by the majority in such items as those for the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the United States Employment Service, the Veterans' Employment Service, in grants to States for public employment offices, and for mental health activities and the National Cancer Institute. While the conferees did agree to restore the Division of Labor Standards, which was originally legislated out of existence by the House, the appropriation allowed for the important functions of that bureau is in my opinion ridiculously inadequate in amount. I could not acquiesce in the usual penny-wise and pound-foolish economy of the majority.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I have learned of the death of our late beloved colleague, John H. Tolan, of California. John Tolan, as those who served with him and those who knew him so well know, was a man who was possessed of a sweet, lovable disposition and character. His service, while a Member of this body, was sincere, constructive and courageous. In the journey of life we make many friendships that last for all time. In the case of John Tolan he was one who created such a respect in the minds of others that the friendship that developed as the result thereof was one that lasted for all time. Those who knew John Tolan will always remember him for the fine, humane characteristics that he possessed. He was a man possessed of deep faith; faith in his religious convictions, faith in his Government, and faith in the great principles of mankind that our Government stands for. By his example John Tolan was an inspiration for all to follow. I express to his widow and his family my deepest sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. May I say to my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts that I believe every Member of Congress is very happy to know that his granddaughter, whose being lost really brought on the attack that caused his death, has been found and is safe at home.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. I wish to join my colleague from Massachusetts in paying tribute to the life, services, and character of former Congressman Tolan.

Mr. McCORMACK. I appreciate the observation of my friend.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BEALL].

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of former Congressman Tolan I have lost a friend, one to whom I was deeply grateful for the courtesy and kindness he showed me, and his passing is a deep personal loss.

I admired his fondness for his family and his devotion to his home. He was always a good public servant, but the responsibilities of his office, great as they were, never dimmed the human qualities that we loved.

My sincere sympathy is extended to his family. A kindly, gracious, and courteous gentleman and friend, Congressman Tolan will always remain in the memory of those of us who were privileged to know him.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 6: Page 4, strike out all of line 4, after the comma and all down to and including line 7, and insert "including the temporary employment of arbitrators (not to exceed $25,000) and mediators (not to exceed $50,000) on labor relations without regard to the civil service and classification laws."

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KEEFE moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 6 and concur therein with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter proposed to be stricken out and inserted by the said amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 7: Page 4, line 11, strike out "$133,500" and insert "$200,000."

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KEEFE moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 7 and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sums proposed to be stricken out and inserted by the said amendment insert: "$1."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 8: Page 4, line 12, strike out "$2,080,000" and insert "$2,200,000."

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KEEFE moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 8 and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sums proposed to be stricken out and inserted by the said amendment insert "$1."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 9: Page 4, line 12, insert the following: ": *Provided*, That not more than $300 shall be paid for arbitration in any one case."

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 20: Page 11, line 3, insert the following:

"In order that the Secretary may effectuate necessary reorganizations within the Department and field, he may transfer to the appropriations under this title from funds appropriated, other than grants to States for public employment offices, such sums as necessary, but not to exceed 2 percent of the total funds appropriated: *Provided*, That such transfer or transfers shall not be used for the purpose of creating new functions within the Department, or for the continuation of any function which the Congress in its final report recommends be discontinued: *Provided further*, That no appropriation item shall be reduced more than 5 percent by such transfer."

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 38: Page 27, line 11, strike out "$17,328,200" and insert "$12,000,000."

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. KEEFE moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 38 and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sums proposed to be stricken out and inserted by the said amendment insert "and including $500,000 which shall be transferred to the appropriation 'National Institute of Health, operating expenses,' $14,500,000."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

JAMES HARRY MARTIN—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 377)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I am withholding my approval of H. R. 617, a bill for the relief of James Harry Martin.

The bill provides that James Harry Martin, of Pontiac, Mich., be permitted to file an application with the Secretary of War for benefits under the World War Adjusted Compensation Act, as amended (World War I), on or before July 1, 1949, any time limit in such act for filing such application to the contrary notwithstanding.

The World War Adjusted Compensation Act, approved May 19, 1924, provided that application for benefits thereunder should be made on on before January 1, 1928, and by amendatory acts its final date was extended to January 2, 1940. There was enacted during the Seventy-sixth Congress a bill (H. R. 5450) which proposed an extension of the time for filing such applications until January 2, 1945. The then President withheld his approval of this measure, pointing out that under the original act veterans and their dependents were granted approximately 3½ years, and by subsequent liberalization had been given a period of over 15 years from the date of enactment of the original act in which to claim benefits thereof; that during this period much publicity was given the original act and amendments, with the result that every reasonable opportunity to file a claim under the act had been afforded.

It seems to me that the Presidential action of August 10, 1939, was appropriate, and in any event, there appears to be no justification for singling out for preferential treatment the case of James Harry Martin, as proposed by the present measure.

I regret, therefore, for the reasons above indicated, that I do not feel justified in giving the present measure my approval.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 2, 1947.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

On motion of Mr. MICHENER, the bill and message were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

HEADQUARTERS OF UNITED NATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 376)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on

Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress an agreement between the United States and the United Nations concerning the control and administration of the headquarters of the United Nations in the city of New York. I also enclose a letter from the Secretary of State regarding this agreement.

As you will recall, on December 10 and 11, 1945, the Congress by concurrent resolution unanimously invited the United Nations to locate its permanent headquarters in the United States. After long and careful study, the General Assembly of the United Nations decided during its session last winter to make its permanent home in New York City.

The United States has been signally honored in the location of the headquarters of the United Nations within our country. Naturally the United States wishes to make all appropriate arrangements so that the Organization can fully and effectively perform the functions for which it was created and upon the successful accomplishment of which so much depends.

This agreement is the product of months of negotiations between representatives of this Government and the United Nations. Representatives of the city and State of New York participated in these negotiations. The agreement carefully balances the interests of the United States as a member of the United Nations and the interests of the United Nations as an international organization.

I urge the Congress to give early consideration to the enclosed agreement and to authorize this Government, by joint resolution, to give effect to its provisions.

When the General Assembly of the United Nations meets in New York City this fall it would be most appropriate if this Government were ready for its part to bring the agreement into effect.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 2, 1947.*

(Enclosures: (1) Draft agreement between the United States and the United Nations. (2) Letter from the Secretary of State.)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement recently made before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee by the mayor of the city of New Orleans.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. DEVITT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio speech.

Mr. GWINN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by Mr. Robert A. Milliken against Federal aid to education. This exceeds the limit by $260, but in view of the very pertinent character of the speech and its quality, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed notwithstanding the cost.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding and without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. ROHRBOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include a short editorial with each.

Mr. KENNEDY (at the request of Mr. DEANE) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances.

Mr. MORGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Mr. C. M. Marino.

DISLOYAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 267), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3813) to provide for removal from, and the prevention of appointment to, offices or positions in the executive branch of the Government of persons who are found to be disloyal to the United States. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

NATIONAL MINERAL RESOURCES DIVISION, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 268), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1602) to establish within the Department of the Interior a National Minerals Resources Division, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Lands, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Public Lands now printed in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and thirty-six Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 98]

Andersen, H. Carl	Elston	Madden
Andresen, August H.	Engle, Calif.	Mansfield, Tex.
Andrews, N. Y.	Feighan	Miller, Calif.
Bakewell	Fellows	Miller, Nebr.
Bates, Ky.	Fernandez	Morrison
Bennett, Mich.	Folger	Murray, Tenn.
Bland	Fuller	Norton
Boykin	Gallagher	O'Brien
Bramblett	Gifford	Pfeifer
Buckley	Gillie	Philbin
Butler	Gordon	Powell
Camp	Gore	Price, Fla.
Cannon	Grant, Ind.	Rabin
Carroll	Hardy	Riehlman
Celler	Harless, Ariz.	Rivers
Chapman	Hart	Robsion
Clements	Hartley	Rockwell
Clippinger	Hébert	Sanborn
Cole, N. Y.	Heffernan	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Cooley	Jenkins, Pa.	Short
Cotton	Kearney	Smith, Ohio
Coudert	Kearns	Taylor
Davis, Tenn.	Kelley	Thomas, N. J.
Dawson, Ill.	Kennedy	Thomason
Delaney	Keogh	Towe
Domengeaux	Kilburn	Vinson
Douglas	King	Whitten
Eberharter	Larcade	Wolverton
Elsaesser	Latham	Worley
	Lea	
	Lesinski	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 343 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

WAR DEPARTMENT CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATIONS BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1948

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4002) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4002, with Mr. MICHENER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, has the Committee reached the item of flood control on page 8, line 14, of the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. It has not.

When the Committee rose yesterday, the so-called Rankin amendment was

pending. A voice vote had been taken. Tellers were demanded and ordered.

Without objection, the Clerk will again read the so-called Rankin amendment.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, is it not in order to vacate or disregard the standing vote and take the standing or voice vote again?

The CHAIRMAN. Tellers have already been ordered.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand that, Mr. Chairman, but I believe that where a vote is not completed on one day it is taken again when the question again comes up for consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's inquiry is: Can the order for tellers be vacated, and the Committee proceed de novo on the amendment? That can be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that the proceedings on the vote on the Rankin amendment when the Committee was last in session be vacated and that the vote be taken de novo. Is there objection?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will again report the amendment.

The Clerk again reported the amendment offered by Mr. RANKIN.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair appoints the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 71, noes 115.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Yesterday before the Committee rose, consent had been secured to return to page 7 in order that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] might offer an amendment.

The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PACE: Page 7, line 16, strike out "$94,659,700" and insert "$97,659,700."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, the circumstances regarding this project were such that I feel I should bring it to the attention of the committee and ask the committee to give favorable consideration to the amendment.

This item relates to a project known as the Chattahoochee, Flint, and Apalachicola rivers. The Chattahoochee River for the most part divides the States of Georgia and Alabama. The Flint River is involved at a point known as Junction where these two rivers join to form the Appalachicola.

This project was authorized by the Congress in 1945 to make the Chattahoochee navigable originally to a depth of 6 feet up to Fort Benning and Columbus, Ga. Upon a review of the project by the engineers and Congress last year the authorization was changed to authorize navigation at a depth of 9 feet up to Fort Benning and Columbus, Ga. I am sure it will be astonishing to the Members of the House that a river of this magnitude is not navigable, and its navigability has not heretofore been provided for. The fact remains however that this river is not now navigable. The project is to make it navigable at least up to Columbus, Ga., where is located our greatest military establishment, Fort Benning, and up to Bainbridge, Ga., on the Flint River. The proposal is to make these rivers navigable and to tie in with the already completed inland waterway which begins at Appalachicola and extends inland all the way across to New Orleans. It will bring about great savings in transportation charges and will make this section of the country subject to enormous development.

I may say, Mr. Chairman, that at one time a President designated my section of the country as the Nation's economic problem No. 1. If you will devote a little time to a study of its resources and its possibilities you will agree that this section represents the Nation's opportunity No. 1.

This section in here is undeveloped [indicating on map]. It has enormous natural resources both in the land and on the land which I shall not now attempt to enumerate. The project was authorized by the Congress for four purposes. The first is navigation; second, flood control; third, power development, and fourth, as was mentioned to you by the distinguished Representative from the Atlanta district yesterday, in order to provide at the Buford Dam a water supply for the military establishments near Atlanta.

The last Congress appropriated for the beginning of the project $1,185,000. That was for the planning and commencement of construction on the dam at Junction, which is the first dam to be constructed.

The project contemplates a dam at Junction, one at Columbia, one at Fort Benning, and the other the Buford Dam. I am sure you gentlemen realize that comparatively speaking it would be a rather insignificant sum now available for the commencement of construction out of a total of $1,185,000 which was appropriated for the planning of the Junction Dam and the commencing of that construction.

The amendment which has been submitted for your consideration is the appropriation of an additional sum of $3,000,000 in order that we may, in keeping with the philosophy announced by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee yesterday, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], begin in an economical manner. I earnestly ask the sympathetic consideration of the committee in the hope that you can approve an appropriation of $3,000,000 to be supplemented by the small balance remaining in order that real construction may be undertaken at the Junction Dam.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate close in 20 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. On the pending amendment?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. On this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE]. He very ably demonstrated to you the benefits to be derived from the development of this project known as the Chattahoochee-Flint-Apalachicola River. The people in that section of our Nation have been working for 25 years in an effort to get this Chattahoochee Valley developed.

Last year the Congress authorized the development of this project. The blueprints call for a navigable channel up the Chattahoochee River from the Gulf of Mexico to Columbus, Ga., to be 9 feet in depth, and for the erection of four dams. The first one is to be built at Junction, Fla., the second one at Columbia, Ala., the third at Fort Benning, Ga., and the fourth up near Atlanta, at Buford. This is a multipurpose project—navigation, hydroelectric power and flood control.

I would like to point out one fact that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] mentioned very briefly, and that is the fact that at Columbus, Ga., is situated Fort Benning, one of the greatest Army establishments in this country. The distance from Fort Benning down to the Gulf of Mexico is approximately 225 miles. There is not a railroad from Fort Benning down to the Gulf.

I wish to point out also that the section through there is filled with natural resources—bauxite, timber, as well as land suited for agricultural production. This project affects 3 States, 73 counties, and approximately 2,000,000 people. The engineers have stated that the financial benefits that will result from the development of this project will amount to $5,463,000 per year. If construction were started tomorrow on that project, it would take 6 or 7 years to complete it. We, who are interested in the project, feel just as certain as possible that some day construction will get under way on this project.

We sincerely hope this committee will see fit to give us permission to start at this time. As I say, it is a multipurpose project providing for hydroelectric power, navigation, and flood control. It means so much to so many of our people down there, and I sincerely hope that

the Committee will adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I regret that the Committee on Appropriations did not see its way clear to make an appropriation for beginning the execution of this project. I am not here asking the Committee to overthrow the Committee on Appropriations in the sense of expressing hostile opposition to its recommendations, but I am asking the full membership to regard with favor the amendment offered by my friend, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

These rivers traverse the part of the country from which I come. The Chattahoochee borders my district on the west, and the Flint runs through near the middle of my district It lies east of the Chattahoochee in this vicinity, where I was born and where I lived until a boy in his teens. Of course the whole thing is wrapped up in my affections.

The project has been justified by the engineers of the War Department upon economic grounds, and its execution would give tremendous impetus to the general movement in the way of progress that is active in that part of the country at this time. The people of that area have been hopefully looking forward to the time when Congress would take action toward the development of these waterways. I do hope that you may find it consistent with your sense of good legislation to put this appropriation in the bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. May I call attention to the fact that this is one of the projects where there is a considerable unobligated balance which is available for expenditure in the year now beginning. The table at page 218 of the hearings shows there was $625,000 available for expenditure as of June 30. In the hearings Colonel Feringa testified that he expected to undertake some construction with that money during this coming fiscal year.

Mr. COX. The unobligated balance to which the gentleman refers is for further planning and construction, but is not in sufficient amount to talk of construction to such extent or would amount to very much. Progress ought not to be held back by withholding needed money.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MUHLENBERG].

Mr. MUHLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I take this time particularly because I want to bring to your attention the very important decisions you are going to have to make today. First of all, you are going to make a decision as to whether or not you will be swayed by oratory or by engineering judgment. Then you will have to decide on merits or demerits of various proposals. If you are going to respond to oratory, the chances are that you will vote for all the various amendments that will be proposed today. If you are going to follow engineering judgment, then I believe you probably will vote against most of the amendments today and to support the committee.

I recommend to you very strongly that you be not swayed by oratory, rather that you respond to the cool and unbiased judgment that is shown by those who are consulting engineers for us. You have retained, as you know, the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, of whom I was one, as your consulting engineers. I hope you will wait for and follow their advice.

I also want to bring out the point that you are deciding today on the question of appropriations, not judging on the question of recommendations by the very committee of Congress that you empower to pass prior judgment on these things before they come up to you.

You will find two separate types of requests that will come before you today, one asking for more money and the other asking for less money. In the one case, you will be told that there are various good arguments for it, and there probably are in each case. In the other case, you will be told there are fine ways to save money. But in either case, in the absence of an engineering report, I believe the best thing you can do is to follow the recommendation of the committee, who from their standpoint of appropriations this year have judged the matter from a viewpoint of the greatest economy and immediate usefulness for the United States today.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUHLENBERG. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I respect the gentleman from Pennsylvania, a member of the Committee on Public Works, and the fact that he has been an Army engineer and has sound engineering judgment. Do I correctly understand from his remarks that he agrees that those projects which the United States Army engineers have approved are sound and should be considered by the House?

Mr. MUHLENBERG. Of course, I consider that they are sound, but whether or not there should be an appropriation this year, it seems to me, is a matter for the Committee on Appropriations to decide.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, my distinguished friend the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has pointed out that there is now more money available for initial construction on the Apalachicola and connecting waterways. There is presently remaining about $650,000 of unexpended appropriations. Part of that is needed for continued planning, and the remainder will be used to begin construction on the junction dam at Chattahoochee. The important thing to remember is that it is a very small amount compared with the amount which is needed. What we are asking for today is a little additional money so that the work which will be instituted, we hope, by the engineers before the end of this year, can be carried on in an orderly, efficient, and economically sound manner.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that the Apalachicola is one of the few important undeveloped waterways in the Nation. Yet it is a large, easily developed waterway, extending into an area of great industrial and agricultural significance which has already been developed to a considerable extent, and which is on the threshold of greater development. We need the development of the waterway. We need is very much. We are asking only for enough money to carry the work which the engineers have so amply justified. As has been ably pointed out to you here today, it provides for navigation, flood control, hydroelectric development, and for a water supply for the city of Atlanta.

May I take just a moment to emphasize that it also is valuable from the standpoint of national defense. You will recall that the inland waterway, which was mentioned a little while ago and which extends from Saint Marks, in Florida, to the southern tip of Texas, had to be completed after the war started. It had to be completed at a time when costs were high, when we were losing ships from submarine attacks in the Gulf. We lost many valuable cargoes. We lost many lives which could not be replaced. We lost time which in another war might be ruinous. But we had to complete the development of that coastal waterway after the war had started. Even at that late date it proved to be of inestimable value.

I submit that it is cheaper to complete the construction of our waterways now, during peacetime, with the hope that if we do need them again for defense they will be available.

Mr. Chairman, this waterway extends into the industrial heart of the Southeast; into a rich manufacturing and agricultural area, an area possessing great timber resources which now are inaccessible either by road or waterway.

It is significant that along a large area to be served by this waterway there is today not even a north-south railroad. Water transportation is highly essential to the full development of that area.

The waterway will extend to ports already well developed and fully in operation. From these ports steamship lines extend to all parts of the world. At Apalachicola this waterway will connect with the Nation's inland waterway system, extending along the coast and up the great Mississippi Valley. It is a project too valuable to public welfare to be longer delayed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, this is one of 700 authorized flood-control projects. All of them have been approved by the War Department and have been pronounced as being good projects. They have been authorized by the Committee on Flood Control.

It will cost $94,000,000.

Of the 700 projects, there are 78 projects in this bill. As I said yesterday, the total cost will be $1,310,000,000. When we add the McNary Dam which will cost

$186,000,000, it means that the 79 projects will cost approximately $1,500,000,000. Eight of these 78 projects will cost more than $50,000,000 each and will total $771,000,000. There are 18 projects which will cost more than $25,000,000 each or a total of $1,100,000,000 leaving $404,000,000 for the other 61 projects.

All of you are interested in them. This project will cost $94,000,000. It will cost $20,000,000 a year to continue it on an economical basis because you have to follow a certain speed of construction so that the construction can be done economically and you have to use large machinery. The President will say to Congress again: "You can have so much money." If this project is in, there will be $20,000,000 less to spend on the other projects. Whatever you vote here will come out of the projects in the bill now.

I ask that this amendment, together with any other amendments, be voted down. I feel we ought to complete the projects we have now. It will take at least $200,000,000 a year to build the projects we have in now, at an economical rate of construction.

I ask that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

All time has expired on this amendment.

The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PACE) there were—ayes 52, noes 106.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SASSCER: On page 7, line 16, strike out "$94,659,700" and insert "$94,809,700."

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Chairman, the effect of this amendment is to raise the total $150,000, for the purpose of dredging and widening Curtis Creek in Baltimore Harbor. This item has run the gantlet of careful study by the Army engineers and has been approved.

I realize the resistance to any amendments to this bill; but in view of the fact that the estimated cost of this item has risen from $100,000 to $150,000 since it was first approved, I submit should be included in the bill at this time.

In this particular arm of the harbor there is a tremendous amount of commerce, consisting of the Armour Fertilizer Works, the Davison Chemical Corp., the Petro Terminal Corp., the Southern States Fertilizer Service, the Standard Wholesale Phosphate Co., Tide Water Associated Oil Co., and the American Oil Co.

The present depth is 5 feet. It is proposed to deepen it to 25 feet and to widen it from 100 to 200 feet.

The Maryland pilots, the shipping interests, and those interested in the tremendous amount of commerce that goes into this, the second largest harbor as far as foreign commerce is concerned in the United States, are vitally interested in it.

Silt has filled up this Curtis Creek until at the present time many big ships refuse to enter it, and even small ships are unable to turn around if they do enter it. These important industries which I have just enumerated in many instances have to get their cargoes from the ships by transferring them to lighters or barges and then bringing them to their warehouses on Curtis Creek. The purpose of this legislation is to aid commerce. Here is an arm of the great harbor of Baltimore that is filled up to the extent that it cannot be used. There is a tremendous amount of commerce to be served. Something has to be done. The cost of the project has increased approximately 33 percent since it was first approved. I respectfully urge in the interests of economy and in the interest of commerce that this $150,000 item be included.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I sat on this subcommittee with my colleagues over a period of weeks in the preparation of this bill. The bill is not perfect, it has some features that I would change, but it is the best that we were able to work out. Let me say, however, that the bill was written in a spirit of nonpartisanship. It did not make any difference where the projects were, they got full consideration of the committee. It is embarrassing to me to oppose projects that are brought up here, that I know are worthy, such as the project presented by the able gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER]. It is a worthy project.

The project presented by the able gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] is a worthy project, and excellent one. The gentleman from Georgia is one of the real leaders of the House, and he always does a good job.

I want to pause to say that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will not reveal the complete effort that was made by various Members worthily to present to the Congress the projects in which they were and are interested. Members made more complete and detailed statements to the committee, which are printed in the hearing on this bill. The importance of the Chattahoochee River project was ably and forcefully presented in the hearings by such able and experienced legislators as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], the gentlemar from Georgia [Mr. COX], the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ANDREWS] was especially active on this Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint River proposition. He is an able member of the Appropriations Committee and made an excellent statement before the subcommittee. He made a good fight for the project in the full Appropriations Committee where he offered an amendment to start work on the program. I have not seen a better presentation made in behalf of any project.

It is unfortunate that projects which have been so well presented and which are of such merit cannot be included in this measure, but I think Members understand the handicap under which we are operating.

I wish to commend all Members who appeared before our subcommittee on various projects and I wish it were possible to provide for the completion of all these worth-while projects. Certainly they were well presented without exception. But there are six or seven billion dollars worth of projects that have been authorized by the Congress and the Congress is making an effort to cut Federal spending.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. I notice on page 11 of the report it is provided "no reductions are recommended in the items for preliminary examinations, surveys, and contingencies, of $3,500,000." Do I understand that to mean it is the committee's intention that the surveys already under way shall be completed before the Department embarks on any new projects?

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman, and he is correct in saying that the committee did not reduce the budget recommendation for the continuation of these surveys.

The reduction was in planning funds not in funds provided for surveys. The surveys should proceed without delay or interruption.

This bill is not a partisan proposition. If it were, the Republican side of the aisle has the majority of the votes. It had also in the committee a majority of the votes. If it is going to be settled purely on partisanship nobody on the Democratic side of the aisle has a chance. However, the committee did not consider this measure from a partisan angle. There have been political considerations in connection with other measures this year on account of the situation that exists, but that was not the case in the preparation of this bill.

Mr. MUHLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MUHLENBERG. Bringing out the point the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] talked about, it is the gentleman's opinion, is it not, that his committee is not an engineering committee but, rather, an appropriation committee?

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman. All we can do as members of the committee is to be the servants of the Congress and recommend appropriations of money which the Congress has authorized as far as we can go under the circumstances. Generally speaking, they were almost without exception confined to the budget estimate.

Mr. Chairman, if there is any criticism I have of this bill, it is that of the policy of Congress. That policy, in my opinion, is somewhat in error in that we spend these vast sums of money on rivers at places where they reach the flood stage. A writer once said that the largest river that ever plunged into the sea could be put into a teacup somewhere. Perhaps we could say of the mighty Mississippi, "Old Man River," that if you were to go

to the very fountainhead where the first drop of water springs, it could be put into a teacup.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, more emphasis should be placed, and as soon as possible, on flood-control work in the upper reaches of these rivers before they are a menace to the people downstream. In that way we will conserve our soil, we will aid agriculture, we will aid the surface water-supply programs, we will aid underground water-supply programs, we will prevent these vast floods on the rivers. For purposes of power and flood prevention I know that some of these large dams have to be constructed down in the area of the floodwaters, but Congress ought to begin immediately to emphasize a dam-construction program on the smaller riverlets, branches, and streams that are far removed from the major centers of population in this country. That is a program which I have advocated for years. There is where our work will cost less and do the most good. Of course, that program cannot be put in operation in this bill, but I feel Congress should be thinking about it and doing something about it if we are to conserve the resources of this country, as they must be conserved for our responsibilities of the future.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. I want to concur in the statement made by the distinguished gentleman that we should go back to where the water starts in order to control it. But I want to call his attention to the fact that that is not the policy and the program of the Army engineers.

Mr. MAHON. The Army engineers' program is more or less the program of the Congress, because the engineers can do nothing other than what they are authorized and instructed to do by the Congress, and it is here that we can remedy the situation, and it cannot be done by the Army engineers without our first taking action.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I believe enough Members who voted against my amendment for funds to begin work on the Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway have assured me that they would vote for such an appropriation next year to offset the majority by which my amendment was defeated.

I am sorry they did not vote with me today, so we could get this work started now. If the Senate inserts such a provision in the bill, which I feel confident it will, then I hope these Members will help me to hold the provision in the bill.

I am compelled to disagree with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] that we must concentrate on the little streams that flow down and join other little brooks to make the larger brook that finally joins others to make creeks that finally combine to make rivers.

He reminds me of the Englishman who was shingling his house, when he said the fog got so thick that the first thing he knew he had shingled out 10 or 15 feet onto the fog.

If we are going to do anything for the rivers of this country, we must take each one as a whole.

In 1933, 14 years ago, I had such a fight on the floor of the House on the creation of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and strange as it may seem, on the first vote of the Norris-Rankin bill that finally became a law, creating the TVA, we only got 68 votes on both sides of the aisle.

Today, after 14 years of struggle, we have in the TVA, the greatest development of ancient or modern times. We did not fiddle around with the creeks or the tributaries alone. We took the entire stream from the beginning to the end. In addition to that, in addition to conserving the soil, in addition to providing navigation, in addition to providing for the control of floods, the TVA today generates 12,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity a year, which is equal to the combined physical strength of every man in the United States living east of the Mississippi River.

We had the same fight on the Columbia River. I led the fight here to prevent making a low dam at Grand Coulee which would have meant the waste of untold billions of kilowatt-hours of electric power every year.

They said we did not need the power. They did not know what we would need 25 or 50 years hence. Today the power generated at Grand Coulee in 24 hours equals the combined physical strength of every man in the United States working 8 hours a day.

Mr. Chairman, if we are going to develop our streams, we are going to have to develop them from one end to the other.

I remember when they sealed up the power in the Ohio River. Of all the mistakes I have ever seen wise men make, it was made here under the leadership of the then chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, when Congress provided for low dams on the Ohio River. You have not controlled the floods on that stream. The floods seem to be worse on the Ohio today than they were before these low dams were constructed.

They sealed up 10,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity annually that the people of Ohio are going to need in the years to come.

These gentlemen from the West are entitled to these flood-control projects. I do not know whether they are going to get them or not, but they are going to get my help, just as I helped on the Central Valley. We cannot afford to stand idly by and see human beings drown and untold millions of dollars' worth of property destroyed by these floods on streams under our supervision.

You take the Missouri River today, hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of property is being destroyed; human lives are being wiped out, and 10,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity going to waste there every year, in an area that needs it worst, because Congress has failed to provide the proper improvements on that majestic stream.

We had better get down to business and develop our inland waterways as well as the power resources in every river in America. I have constantly followed that policy. As I said yesterday, I helped to create and develop the TVA. I supported development of the Cape Cod Canal; I supported the development of the Central Valley; I supported the development of the Columbia River. I shall continue to support the development of our internal resources—and especially our waterways.

When you bring this bill out here and get up and preach against projects that are absolutely necessary, that will mean untold millions to the American people in the years to come, and refuse small pittances for the beginning of their construction, while sending billions to foreign countries, you simply strain at a gnat and swallow a camel.

For my part, I want to see our waterways developed for all purposes and the power produced on them supplied to the American people at rates they can afford to pay.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

WAR DEPARTMENT CIVIL WORKS IN THE STATE OF OREGON

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a statement in support of adequate appropriations for carrying on the civil works under the jurisdiction of the War Department in the State of Oregon. I am particularly interested in river and harbor developments by reason of the fact that my congressional district borders on the Columbia River and the Bonneville project is in the district. I am also chairman of the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors of the House Public Works Committee, and served on the Rivers and Harbors Committee during my 9 years' service in the Congress. I have been familiar with these various northwestern projects throughout my life, having been born and reared in the State of Oregon near the Columbia River. The development of the Columbia River for multiple purposes is the key to the economy of the entire Northwest. The comprehensive plan for long-range development of the river was contained in House Document No. 704, Seventy-fifth Congress, third session.

This plan provided for development of the main stem of the Columbia River and its tributaries for navigation from its mouth to Lewiston, Idaho. A series of stages in this development were outlined, a number of which have already been partially or completely carried out. The improvement of the channel was of major importance, and the construction of locks and dams for slack-water navigation permitted river traffic over obstacles in the river. The Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams have been completed and the McNary Dam is now in process of construction.

Projects under the jurisdiction of the Army Engineers need annual appropria-

tions for maintenance and construction work to provide for additional facilities as demands require. There are a number of civil projects under the War Department in the State of Oregon and I would like to discuss them and respectfully urge that sufficient appropriations be made so that the work may be carried forward without injury to the economy of the State of Oregon and the Northwest generally. I am in full accord with the program of my party for reduction in the cost of Government and elimination of all nonessential Federal activities so that the tax burden may be reduced, payments made on the public debt, and the budget brought into balance. However, I do feel that public works, such as maintaining our river and harbor projects and Federal hydroelectric facilities with full efficiency are justified and economically sound. These projects are not only necessary to provide industrial and economic opportunity for the people, but they are self-supporting and pay their own way in the long run. I will present some figures in connection with the hydroelectric developments in the area which, I believe, conclusively justify them.

BONNEVILLE PROJECT

The Bonneville Dam and Grand Coulee Dam on the Columbia River are the keys to hydroelectric development in the Northwest and they supplied the power for production of one-third of the aluminum going into our war effort. With the cessation of war the demands of the area for hydroelectric power have been such that the entire generating capacity has not been sufficient to meet the demand. The judgment of both private power utilities and Federal officials is that unless additional facilities are provided there will be a heavy shortage of electric energy in the area and existing industries will be unable to continue at full strength. In addition, new developments seeking power will be barred from the area.

I trust that your committee will provide sufficient appropriations to permit the War Department, in the operation of its civil functions, to continue Bonneville and the other essential public works in the area up to capacity.

M'NARY DAM

This combined navigation, power, and irrigation project being constructed on the Columbia River near Umatilla, 292 miles above the mouth of the Columbia River and 148 miles above Bonneville Dam, was authorized in the River and Harbor Act approved March 2, 1945. Construction funds were provided in the 1947 appropriation and an estimate is included for continuation of such work during the fiscal year 1948. This structure is a highly essential project required to meet urgent power requirements, being the key project in the ultimate development of the lower Columbia River Valley. The present contemplated installation includes 4 units of 69,000 kilowatts each. In addition to providing urgently needed electric power, as attested by both the public utilities of the area and the Bonneville Power Administration, the pool to be formed by the dam will extend 9-foot navigation above the dam for a distance of 59 miles, in which section navigation is now seriously hampered by swift water over rapids with a controlling depth of 5 feet. The pool will also benefit the development of more than 240,000 irrigable acres of land by a reduction of 64 feet in average pumping lift.

NATIONAL AND REGIONAL POWER REQUIREMENTS

It is now generally recognized over the entire country that power-load demands are rapidly catching up with installed generating capacity. The closing of this protective gap is too rapid for comfort. This is the result of a general holding back of equipment orders during the past 7 years. Equipment required to meet the normal trend line increases in the electric business was directly competitive with the wartime air, carrier, radar, and atomic-bomb programs. Consequently, from the time that the President declared a national emergency in May 1940, the War Production Board and its predecessor agencies clamped down on all electric plant equipment production. The catching-up process which I have cited is directly the result of these cited war conditions.

The upward trends, which I will hereafter describe, started last summer. The "jumpy" nature of the electric load increase came to my attention last fall and I then investigated the control statistics, applying to the Bonneville plant, which is in my district. When I appeared before the House Interior Subcommittee last February I brought out what was then happening. The record can be found on page 355 of part 2 of the House appropriation hearings of the 1948 Interior supply bill. I have since investigated further, and I feel that this general situation should be fully considered in connection with such multipurpose projects as the McNary Dam.

In the year 1946 the recorded kilowatt-hour total national output amounted to 223,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours, which was practically the same as the last war year. Last August the kilowatt-hour monthly output record started a marked rise, resulting in a 20.6 percent gain over the previous year. This experience was actually recorded during the peak winter month of this past season. More astonishing, and more important still, was the actual sharp increase in peak demand, as this item is a direct measure of required capacity. The maximum national wartime peak demand was 38,252,630 kilowatts, attained in January 1945. The comparative December 1946 figure was 43,173,808 kilowatts, or an increase of 12.5 percent above the maximum wartime demand. This means that we are fast feeling a serious brake on national economy, and unless rectified manufacturing activity must drop off as industry is now running on the last component of a normal protective capacity reserve. These demand figures are definitely tied directly to installed plant capacity, and show that the United States standard of living has also risen to a new peak.

To meet this situation, nationally, 361,000 kilowatts of new electric-plant capacity was planned for 1946 installation, but only 85,000 kilowatts was actually installed, which was only 23 percent of the amount that was thought possible. This divergence was the result of a short supply of critical materials going into such manufacture, and shows the relationship between schedules and actualities under conditions of short supply.

To meet the national power-load increases, without brown-outs, will require the installation of at least 3,000,000 additional kilowatts in 1947, and 7,500,000 kilowatts between 1948 and 1949. These are very conservative figures. The majority of the equipment now on order represents steam-generating equipment and all such manufacturing facilities are completely booked until 1950. However, the same situation does not now exist in the manufacturing field applicable to hydro equipment, as this type of manufacture has idle manufacturing capacity as a result of the stoppage of ship construction. The hydro manufacturing space during the war was entirely used for ship construction.

The power load capacity situation in the Pacific Northwest is more acute than in the rest of the country, due to a larger proportionate increase in population and manufacture. Also located in this region is a power grid into which all public and private power generating outputs are pumped. This situation, therefore, permits of close and accurate estimates of future regional needs. Last January all the public and private power representatives connected with the operation of this grid met in Tacoma, Wash., and agreed on a policy statement covering needs for additional generation. This agreed estimate and statement has been filed with both House and Senate Appropriation Committees. Agreed investigations, on which this joint statement was based, shows that the peak demand load of all the utilities in the region increased from 1,043,000 kilowatts in 1940 to a little less than 2,600,000 kilowatts in 1946, or an increase of 159 percent. In the Portland area alone the similar increase was from 262,700 kilowatts to 450,000 kilowatts, exclusive of the large industrial loads served directly by the Bonneville transmission lines.

Six additional units are on order for the Grand Coulee plant, and are scheduled for completion by the fall of 1949. This additional capacity plus all other public and private capacity scheduled in the region totals 745,000 kilowatts. The agreed load increase by the fall of 1949 will be 1,063,000 kilowatts, or the total available generation will be 318,000 kilowatts less than the indicated load increase. By 1953 the like deficiency, even with several units installed in McNary, will be 1,560,000 kilowatts.

These officially agreed figures show that the McNary project, like the Bonneville plant, will be fully loaded as rapidly as the units are installed. This is revenue-producing load under the terms of the Bonneville Act, as the Bonneville Act was made applicable to the McNary plant under the provisions of the 1945 Rivers and Harbors Act. These acts provide for power sales making a full return to the Treasury. Therefore, appropriations for the McNary project are fully justified by a national, regional, and return consideration.

ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF M'NARY PROJECT

It is almost the universal rule that nature is compensating in the bestowal of its benefits. The Pacific Northwest is practically devoid of all types of fuel deposits. The coal that it uses industrially needs to be imported from the Great Lakes region and from Utah and Wyoming. The region has also no natural gas, and oil must be imported from California and Texas. Less than 1 percent of the Northwest power requirements comes from steam generation and at this time it is next to impossible to secure sufficient oil to handle one-third of 1 percent of its energy requirements. Therefore, the Pacific Northwest has, from necessity, become entirely dependent upon high grade hydroelectric power for its energy base.

There are very few sections in the country that have hydropower comparable in quality and quantity to that which is developed or can be developed in the Northwest. Nearly half of the remaining potential high-class hydropower on this continent is found within the confines of the Columbia Basin. Experience with hydropower in other sections of the country is no index to the potentialities of the Columbia. To properly evaluate Columbia power effects, we must adopt a new standard of comparison.

Availability of large amounts of energy from the Bonneville and Grand Coulee plants have caused all commercial and agricultural interests throughout the region to count upon this energy base, and to invest their money and their manpower upon the continuance of such a base. During 1946 more than half of the total power consumed within the area came from the Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams. Following VJ-day, the temporary surpluses resulting from the shut-down of the major war industries was rapidly absorbed by the held-back demands of home and farm and in addition by the forward pace set by industrial growth.

The effect of power shortages can easily be directly measured. Power cutbacks due to present short supply in 1947 will cause an employment curtailment of about 18,000 direct workers. The indirect workers affected by these cutbacks will amount to around 50,000. By 1949 the lack of meeting the 318,000-kilowatt insight load will affect directly 48,000 jobs and indirectly 100,000 jobs in addition. These unemployment figures represent only the employment effect during a single year and represent the most accurate calculations of the direct effect of power curtailment. When the energy and employment base is altered, a chain reaction is set up which is felt through every field of activity.

Southwest Oregon now has the last remaining large stands of matured timber. As a result, a large segment of the national timber industry has shifted to this area. The effect of this shift is plainly apparent from the inadequate power supply presently encountered and the unfilled needs of the sawmills and logging camps. The effect on lumber production cannot be considered as a local problem. For example, veneer curtailment in southwest Oregon also affects employment in the furniture factories in Michigan. Also the reduction of pulp production in this area will be felt in the employment rates in the paper mills of Pennsylvania and New England.

From the time that the first units were started at the Bonneville plant to date the Bonneville and Grand Coulee plants have brought into the Federal Treasury over $100,000,000 in power revenues. From any angle you look on power justification in the Northwest, you will find the same answer, namely, that it is good business for the Federal Government to continue the prudent development of such a multipurpose project like McNary. By 1949 the indicated 318,000 kilowatts of power shortage will represent a loss of $5,600,000 of power revenue to the Federal Treasury annually. The cited 1953 shortage figure will represent a direct revenue loss of around $27,000,000 annually. The total power revenues derived from the Bonneville and Grand Coulee plants in the last 7 years amount to over one-third of the total Federal investment to date in these two projects.

The results from the McNary project will be similar to this actual experience, as the McNary project is almost an exact duplication of the Bonneville project. It is, therefore, amply justified.

COLUMBIA RIVER BETWEEN VANCOUVER, WASH., AND THE DALLES, OREG.

The River and Harbor Act approved July 24, 1946, provides for the extension of 27-foot navigation in the Columbia River from Bonneville to The Dalles. Provision of the 27-foot channel to Bonneville is completed except for the removal of rock at certain locations. The section of the Columbia River between Vancouver and The Dalles is an important link in the system of waterways between the Portland area and the "Inland Empire," and will, when completed, provide a deep-draft channel between The Dalles and the sea. It is highly essential that funds be made available for completion of the remaining section of the channel between Vancouver and Bonneville.

Maintenance funds are also required for dredging in the completed 27-foot channel at locations where considerable shoaling has taken place. The commerce on this project during 1945 was in excess of 2,000,000 tons.

SNAKE RIVER, OREG., WASH., AND IDAHO

The project, as authorized in the 1945 River and Harbor Act, provides for the construction of such dams as are necessary, and open channel improvement, for the purpose of providing slack water navigation, irrigation and power between the mouth of the river and Lewiston, Idaho, a distance of 145 miles. The States of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana will benefit directly from this improvement by the opening up to low-cost water transportation of this large agricultural, mining, and lumbering area abounding in mineral resources which will find a ready market in the rapidly expanding metallurgical and industrial activities in the lower Columbia River Basin. The power to be generated will also aid in the existing serious power shortage in the Pacific Northwest. No construction work has yet been done on the project. It is highly desirable that funds be made available for detail planning of features of the work.

COLUMBIA AND LOWER WILLAMETTE RIVERS BELOW VANCOUVER, WASH., AND PORTLAND, OREG.

This section of the Columbia and lower Willamette Rivers has been improved by the provision of channels 30 and 35 feet deep and as such provides for deep draft navigation between the ocean and the ports of Portland, Oreg., and Vancouver, Wash., a distance of 103½ miles and 118 miles, respectively. The commerce during the calendar year 1945 was in excess of 17,360,000 tons. Funds are urgently needed to provide for maintenance dredging in the channels, for dike repairs, and for surveys.

COLUMBIA RIVER AT BONNEVILLE, OREG.

Funds are required annually for operation and maintenance of the navigation lock and dam, fishways, and power plant, including ordinary repairs and maintenance. This multiple-purpose project, in addition to providing increased navigation facilities, furnishes a large amount of electric energy, the power generated in recent years being in excess of 3,000,000,000 kilowatts each year. Commerce during 1945 was in excess of 800,000 tons.

WILLAMETTE RIVER ABOVE PORTLAND, OREG., AND YAMHILL RIVER, OREG.

The work entails maintenance of 167 miles of channel between Portland and Harrisburg, Oreg., which have been improved to depths ranging from 2½ to 8 feet, and for operation and care of the lock and dam constructed in the Yamhill River. Commerce during the calendar year 1945 amounted to 2,956,000 tons.

WILLAMETTE RIVER AT WILLAMETTE FALLS, OREG.

Funds are required each year for operation and maintenance of a series of 4 locks located at Willamette Falls, a rocky reef in the Willamette River at Oregon City, about 26 miles above the mouth of the river. Commerce during 1945 was in excess of 1,619,000 tons. Construction of a new, single-lift main lock and a guard lock to replace the present structures was authorized by Congress in the 1945 River and Harbor Act. No work has yet been done in this modification.

COLUMBIA RIVER AT MOUTH, OREGON AND WASHINGTON

Provision of a channel 40 feet deep across the bar at the mouth of the river has been provided by dredging and by the construction of jetties on each side of the river, the south jetty being about 7 miles long and the north jetty about 2½ miles in length. This channel is utilized by all ocean-going traffic proceeding to or from the ports of Portland, Oreg., and Vancouver, Wash., located 103 miles and 118 miles inland, as well as intermediate points. Funds are required for maintenance dredging in the entrance channel and for needed jetty repair. Commerce during 1945 was in excess of 7,850,000 tons.

COOS BAY AND RIVER, OREG.

Funds are needed to provide for maintenance dredging in the completed 24-foot bay channel carrying a commerce

in excess of 1,250,000 tons. As an indication of the need for increased channel depths at this location, it may be pointed out that Congress in the 1946 River and Harbor Act, adopted a modification of the project to provide for a depth of 40 feet over the bar and 30 feet in the inner channel. On the Coos River, snagging and boulder removal is required throughout about 22 miles of channel to provide 3-foot navigation. Commerce during 1945 amounted to 473,000 tons.

UMPQUA RIVER, OREG.

Funds are needed for the operation of a seagoing hopper dredge on the completed 22-foot bar and lower river channel carrying a commerce of 472,000 tons in 1945.

COLUMBIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES ABOVE CELILO FALLS, OREG., TO KENNEWICK, WASH.

Funds are required for maintenance dredging of boulders, gravel, and sand from shoals and reefs in this 128-mile section of the river to provide 6- and 7-foot navigation to serve a commerce in excess of 612,000 tons in 1945. Construction of the McNary Dam at Umatilla will increase depths on the upper 59 miles of this project to a least depth of 9 feet and will reduce maintenance costs accordingly.

DEPOE BAY, OREG.

Maintenance funds are required to provide for dredging in the existing 5-foot channel serving this commercial fishing harbor.

SKIPANON CHANNEL, OREG.

Maintenance funds required for dredging in the existing 30-foot channel leading to the town of Warrenton. Commerce during 1945, 216,500 tons.

COQUILLE RIVER, OREG.

Maintenance funds are required for the operation of a seagoing hopper dredge in the completed 13-foot entrance channel carrying a commerce during 1945 in excess of 322,000 tons.

WESTPORT SLOUGH, OREG.

Maintenance funds are required for dredging in the completed 28-foot channel leading to Westport, carrying a commerce during 1945 of 308,000 tons.

THE DALLES-CELILO CANAL, OREG. AND WASH.

Funds are required for operation and maintenance of the completed locks constructed in the 12-mile reach of the Columbia River between The Dalles and Celilo carrying a commerce of nearly 600,000 tons in 1945. Enlargement of harbor facilities at The Dalles was authorized in the 1946 Rivers and Harbors Act to provide better facilities for recreational boats and boathouses, commercial fishing boats, and the United States Coast Guard activities on the upper Columbia River.

YAQUINA BAY AND HARBOR, OREG.

Funds should be provided for work on this project which serves Newport and Yaquina. Commerce during 1945 amounted to 46,000 tons.

TILLAMOOK BAY AND BAR, OREG.

Funds should be made available for work on this project which serves the towns of Tillamook, Garibaldi, Hobsonville, and Bay City. Commerce during 1945 was in excess of 151,000 tons.

WILLAMETTE RIVER BASIN, OREG.

The Flood Control Acts of June 22, 1936, and June 28, 1938, authorized a comprehensive plan for flood control, navigation, and other purposes in the Willamette River Basin, as set forth in House Document No. 544, Seventy-fifth Congress, third session. The plan includes the construction of reservoirs, channel improvements, and contraction works for navigation.

The Willamette River Valley is subject to severe floods at frequent intervals and minor floods practically every year. Floods in the valley cause serious damage to very fertile agricultural lands, crops, livestock, buildings and improvements, commercial and industrial facilities, and to transportation facilities. Floodwaters seriously erode and cut the banks, remove the topsoil from the rich soil of the valley, and deposit gravel and other debris as much as 4 feet in depth. Among the more recent major floods in the Willamette Basin are those of 1927, 1943, and 1945. The flood of 1927 inundated 272,000 acres, with resulting damage amounting to $4,200,000; the flood of 1943 inundated 340,000 acres, with damage amounting to $5,700,000; and the flood of 1945 inundated 360,000 acres with damages estimated at $6,000,000.

The reduction in damages credited to the operation of the completed Cottage Grove and Fern Ridge Reservoirs during the 1945 flood is estimated at $1,200,000. The total damage could have been reduced to $2,800,000 had the proposed Dorena, Lookout Point, and Detroit Reservoirs been in operation.

The construction and operation of the 7 reservoirs authorized in the comprehensive plan would reduce floods through a 150-mile reach of the Willamette River, allay the fear of flooding to about 300,000 people residing in the flood plain, reduce or eliminate loss of life, and enable additional economic development and increased agricultural activity on approximately 500,000 acres now subject to flooding.

DORENA RESERVOIR, OREG.

This is an earth-fill dam with storage capacity of 70,000 acre-feet, located on Row River 7 miles above the mouth. The total estimated Federal cost of the project is $9,894,000, of which $4,126,000 has been appropriated to date. The construction of the dam and appurtenant work is under way under a continuing contract. Contracts are also underway for the relocation of roads and railroads and the construction camp. Additional funds are needed in the fiscal year 1948 for continuation of construction of the project. The estimated average annual benefits attributable to the project are estimated at $447,820.

WILLAMETTE RIVER, OREG., BANK PROTECTION

Bank revetment and channel improvement is necessary at various locations along the Willamette River to prevent erosion of high banks and consequent overflow of highly developed urban and agricultural areas, and to prevent major changes in stream regimen. The total estimated Federal cost of the project is $4,198,200, of which $1,738,200 has been appropriated to date. Contracts are now underway for 7 locations on the Willamette River and 1 location on the McKenzie River. Additional funds are needed in the fiscal year 1948 to continue this work and provide the necessary bank protection works with additional locations where the need is most urgent at this time. The average annual benefits attributable to the project are estimated at $313,500.

DETROIT RESERVOIR, OREG.

This project is a concrete dam with storage capacity of 320,000 acre-feet located on the North Santiam River 60 miles above its mouth. The total estimated Federal cost of the project is $35,697,000, of which $3,977,100 has been appropriated to date. A contract for the relocation of the North Santiam highway is under way under an agreement with the Public Roads Administration. In addition, several contracts are under way for the construction of the construction camp. Additional funds are needed in the fiscal year 1948 to continue construction of the project by road relocation and preliminary work prior to the initiation of the construction of the dam. Average annual benefits attributable to the project are estimated at $1,633,000.

LOOKOUT POINT RESERVOIR, OREG.

This is an earth and gravel fill dam about 3,000 feet long and a maximum height of 250 feet, with a total storage capacity of 418,000 acre-feet. The dam site is located on the Middle Fork of the Willamette River 21.3 miles above its confluence with the Coast Fork and about 22 miles southeast of Eugene, Oreg. The total estimated Federal cost of the project is $37,132,000, of which $1,835,000 has been appropriated to date. A contract for a part of the railroad relocation of the Southern Pacific Railway is now under way, and contracts for housing facilities and warehouses are expected to be awarded in the near future. A part of the warehousing is now under construction by hired labor. Additional funds are needed in the fiscal year 1948 for continuation of construction of the project. The average annual benefits attributable to the project are estimated at $1,880,000.

Mr. Chairman, I know from past experience that the Congress is in full accord with the soundness of making adequate appropriations for carrying on the work of these civil functions under the War Department that are a part of the economic life of our country and upon which the welfare of our people depends. I solicit your approval of sufficient funds for that purpose. I should like to say that I am in entire accord with the general program to save funds, and I think we are doing so. But I do feel that projects which have to do with the economy of the country and upon which communities depend certainly ought to receive adequate appropriations for their continuance, particularly those that have been under construction for some time. Some of these Oregon projects are completed and merely require additional appropriations for upkeep and maintenance. Bonneville, for instance, is completed, but it requires funds from year to year for maintenance and also for additions.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I think one of the soundest proposals I have heard during this whole debate is the suggestion made by the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], about setting aside $200,000,000 a year in a fund for the purpose of taking care of flood control throughout the country. I have heard talk about these big projects, but I think we owe it to ourselves and the people we represent to consider some of the smaller projects. I for one hope that in the event this $200,000,000 proposal is adopted finally as a recommendation of the full committee we will go into some of the small projects and give all kinds of flood control throughout the country to the needy areas.

I want to emphasize to you at this time the Susquehanna River. That river has been called the Mississippi of the Northeast. It flows through three States. It is one of the most important rivers in the entire Nation, not only in size but because it performs a great many valuable functions. It starts in or near my district. At the confluence of the Chenango and the Susquehanna is located the triple-cities area of Binghamton, Johnson City, and Endicott, which have for many years been the target of vicious and violent floods which have poured down the Chenango and the Susquehanna and taken a toll of many lives. The work of the Army engineers in this area has been outstanding. There is, however, a great deal to be done. I think that, in the consideration of the general policy of flood control, projects such as these which have been started along the Susquehanna should be continued and completed so that they can be brought to full perfection.

It is just like pouring money down the drain if we are not able to complete a project once it has been started. If millions of dollars have been dumped into a dam or into dredging a river and only half the job is done, there is little point in our continuing any flood control unless it is finally decided that the project should be completed.

Along with my praise of the intelligent approach the members of the committee have made to this problem, I want to urge upon them the consideration of a definite program which will authorize a set amount of money so that we can expect in connection with these various flood-control projects throughout the country, and there are hundred of them, large and small, a decent and orderly procedure.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Is the gentleman in favor of the development of the St. Lawrence inland waterway and power project?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I think the gentleman asked me that question about a year ago.

Mr. RANKIN. I am still waiting for an answer.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I do not recall what I answered then, but my answer at the present time is that I am indulging in a very careful study. I assure the gentleman that before the question comes to a head I shall have been able to digest all the available testimony and that a study will have been made and a decision reached, and I will vote courageously upon that question, because it is an important one, indeed.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the committee has included in the bill for the Mississippi River and tributaries the $24,000,000 recommended by the President in his budget to the Congress. This appropriation is utterly inadequate. I, therefore, trust that the President of the United States will promptly submit a supplemental budget estimate to the Congress for a reasonable increase in this appropriation.

I recognize the limitations of the committee and I shall offer no amendment because of the fact that the committee has recommended the full amount in the budget recommendation.

It might be well, as we have spoken of flood control, to keep in mind that the lower Mississippi River drains two-thirds of the States of the Union, from the Appalachian Mountains on the east to the Rocky Mountains on the west. The Ohio takes its source in western New York, and the Missouri in southwest Canada, Montana, and Wyoming.

The Mississippi River flood-control project is the most monumental in this or any other country. The levees are the greatest marks ever made by mortal man across the face of the earth, longer and stronger than the great Chinese Wall. It was so essential to national safety that during the war, while flood-control appropriations were discontinued generally for the duration, they were continued for the Mississippi River. The river bisects the United States. It was imperative that the project be completed in order not to disrupt communications and transportation from east to west.

The eyes of the Nation are upon the floods now raging along the Missouri and the upper Mississippi. Those floods must pass between the levees from Cairo to the Gulf of Mexico. The President recommended in his budget $24,000,000 for the Mississippi River and tributaries. These tributaries include the Yazoo, the St. Francis, and the backwater areas of the White, the Arkansas, and the Red. They also include the outlet through the Atchafalaya Basin. In view of the existing floods, the budget recommendation might well be increased to at least $40,000,000.

The works along the tributaries were suspended for the duration. There have been two major floods along the Yazoo River system in 1947, and there have been major floods along the Yazoo and the other tributaries of the lower Mississippi River annually for the past 4 years. The works discontinued for the duration along these streams should be continued and completed. Additional appropriations should be made for construction during the fiscal year 1948.

There are many reasons why the budget recommendation for the Mississippi River and tributaries is inadequate for the next fiscal year. I mention but a few:

First. The adopted project in 1928 contemplated diversions first through the Boeuf River or Cypress Creek and then through the Tensas Basin beginning at Eudora.

In the process of the work, the river was shortened by cut-offs 175 miles from Memphis to Baton Rouge. Flood heights were reduced at Vicksburg from 6 to 10 feet. The project was modified in 1941, and it provided for raising the main line levees between Cairo and Baton Rouge from 3 to 7 feet so that flood waters could be carried between the two levees. Appropriations were continued during the war as I have stated. The reason was primarily to complete the main-line levees.

Second. For the past 16 years, the average annual appropriation for the Mississippi River and its tributaries has been about $33,800,000. For the present fiscal year 1947, the appropriation was $46,500,000. I repeat that in view of the existing floods, and to make effective levees and other works already constructed, the budget recommendations should be increased to at least $40,000,000 with provisions for the same appropriations in 1948 as were made in 1947 for the Yazoo and other tributaries.

Third. The main river levees are now substantially 75 percent complete, but a levee is no stronger than its weakest link or mile. They should be brought to immediate completion. There has not been a major flood along the lower river since 1927. That flood may come in 1948. If the levees are topped, the loss and damages would be unparalleled.

There are 1,705 miles of main river levees and 1,753 miles of levees along the tributaries of the lower Mississippi River. The levees along the tributaries must also be brought up to grade and section. The levees along the main river must be completed.

Fourth. Revetments to prevent caving of main river levees must be constructed. These revetments are to protect main-line levees in Missouri, Arkansas, Mississippi, and Louisiana.

The recommendation of $24,000,000 is one of the smallest ever submitted to Congress.

Fifth. Additional budget recommendations should be submitted for the lower Mississippi and its tributaries primarily to provide for the completion of the main river levees and revetments.

Sixth. The tributaries of the lower Mississippi are large and important rivers. The improvements have been authorized. The people were assured that they would be resumed following the war. On the Yazoo River system the improvements are about one-half completed. It

is essential that the remainder of the improvements be completed so as to make effective the works already done.

Seventh. Flood control involves large construction. Contracts cannot be completed in the fiscal year. There must be balances on hand to liquidate obligations. There must be balances for contingencies. No one can tell when a caving levee will result. Caving banks in the Yazoo Mississippi Delta and other similar emergencies are responsible for increasing the expenditures in the lower Mississippi Valley twice by the President following the impounding order of August 1946.

Eighth. One-half of the $24,000,000 recommended by the President in the budget is required for maintenance. It takes a lot to maintain a project that costs as much as the lower Mississippi River. It represents an investment of more than one-half billion dollars. It is the greatest navigable river in the United States, or, for that matter, in the world. Levees and revetment are essential for navigation.

Finally, the small budget recommendation for the next year aroused the people of the lower valley. There were more requests for hearings than in years. Those who live behind the 30-foot levees know that a break in the levees or an overflow along the lower Mississippi River would bring unprecedented destruction to both life and property. I trust that the President will promptly submit a supplemental budget estimate for increasing the work during the fiscal year 1948 along the Mississippi River and its tributaries. Such a course is necessary to make effective the works already done and to prevent a major overflow that may come as long as the main river levees remain incomplete. Formerly about every 15 years the entire valley for an average of 50 miles wide and 1,000 miles long by river was overflowed. The purpose of the flood-control project is to keep those floods, when they come, between the levees, and no man knows when the next flood will come.

When De Soto discovered the Mississippi River in 1541 he found it in flood overflowing the valley from 20 to 80 miles wide. The historian of his expedition records the fact that an old Indian woman told De Soto and his men that a great flood came after 40 days and nights of rain and that similar floods occurred about every 15 years.

In my day those floods have been coming periodically, substantially every 15 years. I recall the floods of 1882, 1897, 1912, and 1927, but in the providence of the Almighty there has not been a great flood since 1927 along the entire lower Mississippi River system. I do not know when the next flood will come, but I do not want the responsibility for the unparalleled destruction that may come because of the incompletion of that great project, to rest upon the shoulders of the Congress of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and on this paragraph close in 2 minutes, and I ask to be recognized for the 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, there is an amendment pending. The amendment was offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER], and proposes to increase the amount in the river and harbor fund for the benefit of Baltimore Harbor, Md.

The committee is well aware of the fact that Baltimore Harbor is increasing greatly in importance, but I would like to call attention to the fact that there is $50,000 included in the bill for the maintenance of the harbor, and, according to the table furnished us by the engineers, shown at page 217 of the hearings, there is $473,400 in unobligated balances as of June 30, last. That means $523,400 for expenditure on Baltimore Harbor in the fiscal year 1948. There are also $364,200 in unliquidated obligations, a part of which at least will be available for work during this coming year.

In our conference on these projects with the engineers, it appeared that this would provide ample funds for all that could be expeditiously and efficiently accomplished in the improvement of the harbor during the coming year, particularly because of this $470,000 which had not been expended on June 30.

Consequently, we ask, Mr. Chairman, for a rejection of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

FLOOD CONTROL

Flood control, general: For the construction and maintenance of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes, in accordance with the provisions of the Flood Control Act, approved June 22, 1936, as amended and supplemented, including printing and binding, and office supplies and equipment required in the Office of the Chief of Engineers to carry out the purposes of this appropriation, and for preliminary examinations, surveys, and contingencies in connection with the flood control, $132,041,800: *Provided*, That funds appropriated herein may be used for flood-control work on the Salmon River, Alaska, as authorized by law: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated herein may be used to execute detailed surveys, and prepare plans and specifications, necessary for the construction of flood-control projects heretofore or hereafter authorized or for flood-control projects considered for selection in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of the Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938, and section 3 of the Flood Control Act approved August 18, 1941 (55 Stat. 638): *Provided further*, That the expenditure of funds for completing the necessary surveys shall not be construed as a commitment of the Government to the construction of any project: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available or used to maintain or operate the Garrison (North Dakota) Reservoir at a higher maximum normal pool elevation than 1,830 feet, or for constructing dikes or levees which would be required by a higher maximum normal pool elevation than 1,830 feet for operating such dam: *Provided further*, That in the construction of the Fort Gibson flood-control project in Oklahoma, the Chief of Engineers is authorized and directed to cooperate with the officials of the city of Muskogee in protecting the domestic water supply of such city.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in connection with what the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] said a moment ago, I want to say to the members of the committee that my first consideration in flood control, necessarily, is the lower Mississippi and its tributaries. I am a member of this subcommittee, and yet we have before us a budget estimate of only $24,000,000. I asked General Wheeler when he was on the stand if he made a request for $24,000,000. General Wheeler testified that he requested in excess of $50,000,000 for the lower Mississippi and its tributaries.

I want to say this: When the subcommittees on appropriations get to the point where we pay no attention to the recommendations of the Army engineers or the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget, we are going to get into a chaotic condition. I am going along on the $24,000,000 budget estimate, hoping that the President may see fit to send an additional estimate to us. Certainly adequate development in such rivers as the Arkansas, White, St. Francis, Sabine, Ouachita, and other rivers in that area. All these rivers are tributaries of the Mississippi. However, our subcommittee must be guided by certain standards. First, by the recommendations of the Army engineers, who have technical knowledge of flood control and rivers and harbors in this country. Secondly, we must be guided by the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget, whether it is under a Republican or Democratic administration.

Some of you are very much interested in emergency work for flood control—small projects here, there, and yonder. May I call your attention to the fact that outside of the lower Mississippi, for expenditures in other sections of the country, we provided adequate legislation to protect you a few days ago. We have already appropriated $12,000,000 that may be used in these emergency cases. So there is not any use to add emergency flood-control projects to this bill. You are already protected by this emergency authorization and appropriation.

This committee has tried to be fair; it has tried to be equitable. It is hard to say no to a colleague. We have been guided by proper standards, not only for our own protection, but for the protection of the House and the Senate. We have brought in a bill that I think ought to be passed without amendments. As far as I am concerned, although I should like to go along with various amendments, because I respect and admire my colleagues on either side of the aisle, any

amendments that may be offered will be amendments not based on budget estimates.

Let me say in conclusion that if you should get some item of construction added to this bill and the Army engineers are not ready for it, the construction of such project would not start. I have a project in Arkansas and the surveys and investigations I think are about complete. Some of us got in touch with the Army engineers and asked: "If we put $2,000,000 in this bill, can you start construction?" They said: "If $2,000,000 of construction funds were added to the bill it would not be used." You cannot force the Army engineers, Mr. Chairman, to proceed faster than they are technically able to proceed.

In conclusion, may I say that the subcommittee has been guided by the recommendations of the Army engineers and the Bureau of the Budget. Possibly new and additional estimates may be secured in the future and other highly desirable and worth-while projects can be constructed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, the worst flood in 103 years is now descending the Mississippi River and some of its tributaries. It has reached a point where it is about to crest in southern Illinois and in Missouri. Not since the year 1844 has such a torrent of swirling, muddy, and untamed water descended upon the valley people of the central Mississippi Valley. It is destroying untold millions of dollars in property, causing the depopulation of towns and villages, in some cases taking the lives of the people of this area, and generally rendering unfit for cultivation for this year millions of the best farm lands in this country. These facts should certainly give us pause for thought and careful consideration in the handling of this bill.

The 1947 disaster of the central Mississippi Valley reminds me forcibly of a similar tragedy in the Red River Valley which occurred in 1945. It was during the spring of that year that the floodwaters of Oklahoma, Texas, and Arkansas, accumulating following some of the heaviest rainfalls in history, descended upon the residents of the lower Red River Valley. Records of the Army engineers indicate that these rains produced the greatest flood in the Red River Valley of record. A million or more acres of fertile land were inundated, and millions of dollars of property destroyed. At a time when the world sorely needed food for winning the war, these inundated acres of alluvial land could and should have been used for the growing of crops for victory. Instead of this, muddy, turbulent, and untamed waters swept over the landscape and remained there until it was too late to plow and plant.

These floods have a regular habit of visiting the Red River Valley; and, as a result of this fact, the Army engineers in response to a resolution introduced by me several years ago, recommended an interim flood-control plan for the valley. This plan was well thought out by a hard-working corps of able Army engineers and, after painstaking thought, was submitted to the Congress for its approval. The flood-control plan for the Red River, which includes the States of Oklahoma, Arkansas, Texas, and Louisiana, was therefore in due course approved by this Congress for construction at a cost estimated at $77,500,000. Naturally, with a recollection of what happened to us in 1945 constantly before us and a picture of what is happening this very day in the central Mississippi Valley vividly presented to us, I am anxious that funds be appropriated for use by the engineers in proceeding with actual construction of those works which will make our valley immune to the constantly recurring flood disasters.

This bill contains money which will make it possible that the engineers proceed with their plans. I understand the break-down will permit approximately $250,000 for this purpose. Of course, we are grateful to the committee for this amount to be the planning money; but I am disappointed that the amount is small and further that no construction money is included.

More than this, Mr. Chairman, it is urgent—imperative—that construction proceed upon this project at the earliest possible date. The Red River Valley is one of the last great valleys of the United States which has not been developed for flood-control purposes. The Red River receives its headwaters from the State of Colorado and flows eastward and southward for 1,200 miles through the States of Oklahoma, Texas, Arkansas, and Louisiana. It traverses a veritable empire in itself; and of course the largest city in the valley is that of my home city, Shreveport, La.

Millions of people live in this valley and contribute their mite to the tax and wealth resources of the Nation. It is certainly folly for this Government to fail to give these people protection from periodic floods and thereby retard the growth and development of this great valley. At a time such as this, when food is the prayer of peoples over the world, it is short-sighted to ignore conditions which reduce the production of the farm and close our eyes to periodic crop failures caused by floods. Construction money is needed; and, in my judgment, the sum of $5,000,000 for this purpose could be profitably used at this time.

Progress in the handling of the Overton canal flood-control project is equally important and just as urgent. It is true that this legislation does authorize planning money for the beginning of this canal project. I am disappointed that the committee sees fit to cut this amount by 50 percent from $2,500,000 to $1,050,000. This will mean the retardation of this and other projects which have been approved for rivers and harbors by previous Congresses. Failure to appropriate a larger sum will mean especially the retardation of the progress of the lateral canal project which arises at Shreveport, La., and follows generally a course to the west of Red River to its mouth. The Seventy-ninth Congress approved this project at a cost of $42,000,000 and it is urgently needed. It will open up the great Southwest to water navigation.

The resources of this section of the country are fabulous. Of course, the agricultural resources of cotton and lumber are well-know to everyone. Likewise in importance is the production of oil and gas in this area of the country and at a time when predictions of acute shortage of oil in this section are being made at every turn, the need for this commodity is especially important. Recently iron deposits in east Texas have been tapped and now ore is being smeltered in a new and rapidly growing steel industry in this area. All of these commodities urgently need water transportation in order for their continued progress and gradual development. The farmers and the city people, the poor and the rich, the workingman and the businessman, all alike will be benefited by the construction of his canal at an early date.

At one time not many years ago water navigation to Shreveport down the Red River was a reality. Conditions during the course of years have changed, and now this work is necessary to restore navigation to us in this section of the world. At a time when the world is literally crying for our supplies and the results of our labor, it is vital that we continue to develop our own country and make it produce to a maximum. I know of no other project that holds out the possibilities of development and production to this country at the cost estimated by the Army engineers as does the Red River lateral canal project.

Mr. Chairman, the construction of this project should be pushed with all possible speed. I am sure that the engineers could reasonably use during the current year $3,000,000 for such purposes and I deeply regret that this amount for construction was not placed in this bill. The bill now goes to the Senate; and I trust Members of the other body, with the tragic news coming to us from Missouri, Iowa, Illinois, and other areas, will see fit to raise the amount available for the development of our water resources throughout this country and especially for the work along the Overton Red River lateral canal.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DONDERO: Page 8, line 22, after the word "control", strike out the figure "$132,041,800" and insert "$128,241,880 to eliminate funds in the bill for the Buggs Island Reservoir project."

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment which I spoke on yesterday. First of all I want the committee to understand that I am not opposed to the development of our national resources when justified. If there are those in this body who hold opinions different from the purpose of this amendment you have no quarrel with me. Your quarrel is with the facts concerning this project. In the debate yesterday afternoon no one took this floor to controvert the figures which I presented to the House in connection with this project.

It started with an estimate of $32,000,000 in 1944. It is now estimated with interest to cost $60,000,000. Ninety-five percent of it is power, 5 percent of it is flood control. For the 36,000,000 acres that might be benefited below the dam 51,000 acres will be flooded or inundated above the dam. When this project was first presented to the House the value which the engineers placed upon the power to be developed at this dam was 5.3 mills per kilowatt-hour. Now with the increased cost amounting to $60,000,000 it is now valued at 11.69 mills per kilowatt-hour, which is 4.69 mills more than power is now generated, sold and delivered to customers in that particular area.

In the face of those figures how can anybody justify this further appropriation? You may say that we have already spent $4,500,000 on it, which is true. I have examined the record and I find there is no part of that unobligated. That is about 8 percent of the total amount of this project. Undoubtedly all of it might be saved if we reconsidered this project on a flood-control basis.

There is one item in connection with this project that no one dares overlook. In the 51,000 acres which will be flooded or inundated by the Buggs Island project is the largest single deposit of tungsten in the United States. It represents better than 25 percent of all the tungsten in this country. It is a strategic material and the industry amounts to about $1,000,000 a year in North Carolina. Even the State geologist of North Carolina has come forward to say that if this dam is built the deposits in that mine will be placed in great jeopardy and by that he undoubtedly meant that would be destroyed.

Mr. Chairman, from the standpoint of national defense what harm can there be in eliminating this item from the bill, reconsider this matter for another year, and if it can be justified let it be included in the next appropriation bill.

In order that the committee may know to what extent the Army engineers sometimes go I want to make a certain reference to an item in the News-Observer of Raleigh, N. C., for January 8 of this year. There is no one on this floor who has a higher regard for the Corps of Army Engineers than the one who is now speaking. There have been occasions, however, when, in my opinion, they have exercised an overenthusiastic attitude toward some project. This point of view has been sustained on more than one occasion on this floor during my term of service in this House which extends over a period of 15 years.

This item from the News-Observer of Raleigh, N. C., quotes a member of the Engineering Corps and I ask you to listen, if you want to know whether or not all projects are based upon merit.

I quote Burton J. Bell, chief of technical information for the southeastern region of the Army Corps of Engineers:

> Organized efforts along any river basin will bring desired results to the local residents.

Are we to consider projects on organized efforts in river basins, or are we to consider projects upon their merits? The purpose of this amendment is to determine whether there is sufficient merit in the Buggs Island project to continue it or discontinue it. That is my only interest in this matter; that these projects be constructed on the basis of merit, and no other.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The gentleman in the early part of his remarks said that 5 percent of this project was flood control and 95 percent was power.

Mr. DONDERO. That is correct.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Does the gentleman have any information as to where the line of demarcation is between a power dam and a flood-control dam, and under whose jurisdiction should they be built?

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman's question almost answers itself. This is a power project. While the Corps of Army Engineers have presented the situation to the House, nevertheless flood control, of which we have heard much yesterday by those who are in favor of this project, is but a very minor part of the expense. In fact, only 5 percent of it; the other 95 percent is power. There is no showing here that there is not sufficient power in that area to meet all needs. You can buy power today in that area from private utilities at nearly one-half of a cent less per kilowatt-hour than it can be furnished under this project.

That is all I have to say about it. I hope that my amendment will be adopted for the reasons stated and in the interest of economy. We can reduce this bill by $3,800,000 by adopting my amendment.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Public Works should offer an amendment of this kind in reference to a project which is most commendable and which has been under consideration and on which a great deal of work has been done for several years. There has been appropriated for this Buggs Island Dam the sum of $4,000,000, and every dollar of it has been used or is under contract for use. I am satisfied that the information the gentleman has had about this is not the information the House ought to accept, and I say it frankly.

I was born in sight of the Roanoke River basin, which extends from the mountains of North Carolina and West Virginia to Albemarle Sound, 500 miles away from its source. I know something about the flood hazard in this river, and I have learned something about the power available in the river. It is estimated that the potential power in the Roanoke Valley basin is equal to that of the Tennessee Valley basin. I am constrained to believe that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works has received information in respect to this project only from those who are endeavoring to prevent its construction, and those are the power companies' employees and officers in the States of Virginia and North Carolina. I called the distinguished gentleman and asked if his committee had heard any evidence in respect to this matter, and he said that it had not, but I do know that he has been approached by the power company attorneys and the power company representatives, and I am satisfied that the evidence he has offered here is the evidence they have submitted to him.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman knows that the Committee on Public works did not receive the flood-control projects until January of this year. In addition, the information the gentleman from Michigan has obtained regarding this project is open to anybody who will just read the record and the hearings on this matter. That is the basis of my information on this project.

Mr. KERR. Has not the gentleman heard Mr. Long on this matter?

Mr. DONDERO. Yes; Mr. Long came to me.

Mr. KERR. Has not the gentleman heard representatives of the power companies from North Carolina?

Mr. DONDERO. I heard two farmers from the gentleman's district who were opposed to this.

Mr. KERR. Has not the gentleman heard representatives of the power companies?

Mr. DONDERO. I have received some letters; yes.

Mr. KERR. Has the gentleman not heard from the power companies in Virginia in respect to this matter?

Mr. DONDERO. I do not recall that I have, but I have from the gentleman's State.

Mr. KERR. I said the gentleman had heard from them, and he admitted it.

Mr. DREWRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. DREWRY. If the gentleman will refer to page 8027 of the RECORD of yesterday, he will see that the gentleman from Michigan made this statement:

> I looked at the hearings in a very superficial way and found the statement of but one witness in regard to this project and in regard to this tungsten mine.

Mr. KERR. I thank the gentleman.

Now, let us talk about this matter from the common-sense point of view. The floods have been recorded for 90 years in the Roanoke Valley. The floods occur when the water comes down into North Carolina, in the Coastal Plain area, and covers an area from 10 to 20 miles through five great agricultural counties. In the last 90 years in which a record has been kept of these floods, in 31 years out of the 90 the area has been flooded, and at least from $250,000 to $300,000 worth of property in those five counties in North Carolina has been destroyed.

The gentleman who preceded me says that the power value of this is only 5 percent. The gentleman is mistaken about it. I want to read a statement from the Office of the Chief of Engineers, of which I made inquiry today in reference to the power, to show that he is mistaken. The Office of the Chief of Engineers states that the statement made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] that the Army engineers were using the figure of 11.69 mills per kilowatt-hour as the cost of power from the Buggs Island project is absolutely incorrect. The gentleman from Michigan states that the power from this Government-owned project would cost 11.69 mills per kilowatt-hour as against 7 mills per kilowatt-hour charged by the private power companies in this area.

The Army engineers actually used the figure 3.12 mills per kilowatt-hour in this report. Of course, when the project is completed it will be under the charge of the Federal Power Commission and it will fix the amount that is necessary to be paid for the electricity.

In other words, he makes a mistake when he mentions 11.69 mills which he says it will cost when it will only cost 3 and a fraction.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. Is this project already under construction and has money been spent on it?

Mr. KERR. There has been practically $4,000,000 spent on it. Four million dollars has been allocated for it, and it is all spent with the exception of probably a few hundred thousand dollars which are now in the process of being used.

Mr. JENNINGS. Has some of it been let to contractors; and if this bill does not go through as has been reported, would that likely result in claims for damages on account of the suspension of the work?

Mr. KERR. The gentleman is a lawyer as well as myself, and I would say that it unquestionably would result in claims for damages.

Mr. JENNINGS. That is the impression I have. That is the information I get from the gentleman from Michigan who reported this as the chairman of the committee. I would hate to see it stopped in view of that situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. Does not the gentleman interpret this amendment as a deauthorizing amendment?

Mr. KERR. I certainly do; it would tend to have that effect.

Mr. RAYBURN. Does not the gentleman think that if the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] wants to deauthorize projects which have already been authorized he ought to do it in the regular way and report them from the committee of which he is chairman?

Mr. KERR. Of course, that would be the proper way to do it.

The distinguished chairman of the Public Works Committee has referred to the tungsten properties located near the proposed dam. I want to read from the record how much they are involved in this and I want to show that what the gentleman says about it is not correct. Of course, I assume he has received his information from the president of the tungsten mine but this evidence is not borne out by the Army engineers' reports or the evidence of others who are equally well qualified to give an opinion in reference to the damage incident to this mine by reason of the construction of this proposed dam.

When this matter was being considered by the Senate some years ago Senator Bailey became interested in it and wrote the Chief of Engineers as to what they thought the damage to the tungsten mine there would be, to which the Chief of Engineers said that the value of the tungsten ore affected by the Buggs Island project is absolutely zero.

In that area there are other mining activities. I hold in my hand a letter from Robert G. Lassiter, one of the fine citizens of my State, who has been interested in mining and the exploration, in various parts of the Nation, for mineral lands. He wrote me this letter unsolicited when he learned that the tungsten mine owners near the proposed dam were complaining about the flooding of their mines.

Here is what Mr. Lassiter says in respect to the damage to the tungsten mine:

> Our interests own tungsten properties for a distance of about 2½ miles north and about 5 miles south of the Tungsten Mining Corp. property which claims the Buggs Island development would damage their mine.
>
> This is to advise you that, in our opinion, the Buggs Island development will not damage any tungsten of value, but will add very greatly to the value not only of the tungsten fields but of the Virgilina copper-mining district, about 25 or 30 miles west of the tungsten fields.

There is not a single person in the House who does not know that the question of mining is so scientific that you can mine under the ocean. In Nova Scotia they are mining coal 6, 7, and 8 miles under the ocean, and it is nothing to mine under a river or a dam or pond.

The Buggs Island flood and power dam has been enthusiastically endorsed by the Conservation and Development Committee of North Carolina, the Roanoke River Flood Control Committee, the Roanoke River Basin Association, the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, a joint resolution of the General Assembly of North Carolina, and many local public organizations in the Commonwealth of Virginia, as well as the Governor of that great Commonwealth.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR] has again expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. DONDERO: On page 8, line 22, after the comma, strike out "$13,041,800" and insert "$135,041,800."

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, under the parliamentary situation, it became necessary to offer this as a substitute to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]. I planned to offer it as a straight amendment, and have had an original amendment on the Clerk's desk for 2 days, but when the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] offered his motion to reduce the amount, I was forced under that parliamentary situation to offer my amendment as a subsitute for his.

My amendment proposes to increase the sum for flood control on page 8 of the bill from $132,041,800 to $135,041,800, an increase of $3,000,000. The object of that is to give us something to begin actual construction on the Red River flood-control plan which was approved by the Congress just last year. The Members will recall that very important item which was included in the omnibus flood-control bill and approved by the President about 1 year ago.

The Red River is about 1,200 miles long and it drains a great part of four States: Oklahoma, Arkansas, Texas, and Louisiana. It is conceded to be one of the most treacherous rivers in the entire Nation. In 1945 we had the greatest flood we have had in 9 years. What some of you gentlemen are now having in the Midwest—Ohio, Illinois, and Missouri—we had in 1945 on Red River. We had considerable destruction of crops, homes, cattle, and other property.

I am seeking by this amendment to get a small sum to begin this work. The engineers tell me that with this sum they can start the plan that was evolved last year by the engineers and approved by the Congress, after several years' study—a combination plan of reservoirs and levees, a number of reservoirs upstream and levees on the main channel of the Red River from Denison Dam on down to the mouth of Red River where it flows into the Mississippi River.

I cannot too strongly emphasize the importance of this. I know that the distinguished gentlemen heading the subcommittee will probably say there is no sum in the budget for this construction work. I am not here to criticize the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] and the other splendid gentlemen on that

subcommittee. They have worked hard and they gave us a very courteous hearing and I am not here condemning them. I fully recognize the fact that they were working under budget handicaps. But, Mr. Chairman, I take a position today when my party is in the minority as I did when my party was in the majority, namely, that it is the business of the elected representatives of the people in this Congress to pass on these matters and that we should not be bound by what a few men in the Budget Bureau include in a budget estimate. I contend that when Congress sees a vital project is left out without any budget recommendation, it is the business of the Congress to do what the facts of the case warrant and if Congress, after due consideration, reaches the conclusion that a certain project ought to be included, then we ought to do it, the budget to the contrary notwithstanding. In other words, I accept the recommendations of the Budget Bureau as a guide, but not as mandatory and infallible. I am not contending that their recommendations should be passed over lightly, but I am insisting that Congress has not only the right, but the duty, upon proper showing, to pursue the course which reason, common sense, and good business judgment dictate, even though it be contrary to budget recommendations. I have maintained that position, as I said, regardless of which party was in power.

Now, here today, I admit that the President's budget did not contain a cent for construction on the flood-control plan on Red River as passed last year. But, Mr. Chairman, I feel the need of starting this work so badly that I am constrained to present this amendment anyway and do my best to get at least a sum large enough to start construction work.

I want to say here also that we need funds to start construction work on the Red River lateral canal, also approved in the last Congress. If we had as much as $3,000,000 we could start that also. The amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] for a similar navigation project was voted down by the House a few minutes ago and it is obvious that an amendment for the navigation canal on Red River in exactly the same budgetary position would suffer a like fate, if presented.

It may be hard for some of the Members to conceive what a mammoth flood is unless they happen to be living in the mouth of the funnel like we are, with water from three-quarters of the States flowing down on us in Louisiana. We get the whole thing. Many are trying to conserve water for irrigation purposes, but our constant problem is to keep from being washed away. We have had a terrible time. We are in danger every year. We are desperately in need of relief and I appeal to you to give us this small sum just to start, that is all we are asking for, just enough money to start. It will take a long time to complete this great flood-control project at best, and I would like so much to see it started now.

Mr. Chairman, I implore the House to give favorable consideration to this amendment.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McDONOUGH to the substitute amendment offered by Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana: On page 8, line 12, after the comma, strike out "$132,041,800", and insert "$140,301,800"; and add the following: *"Provided,* That funds appropriated herein may be used for the following flood-control projects in Los Angeles County: $200,000 for Compton Creek; $2,260,000 for the Los Angeles River and its tributaries; $1,000,000 for Tujunga, Washington; $900,000 for San Antonia Dam; $100,000 for Burbank-Western Power Project."

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, yesterday during the debate——

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McDONOUGH. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I think the gentleman should explain that this adds to the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana and is not a substitute for it.

Mr. McDONOUGH. That is a good point. For the information of the House, because of the parliamentary procedure in which we find ourselves, with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] asking for a reduction of $3,800,000, the amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN] asking for an addition of $3,800,000, it is necessary for me in my amendment to add to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN]. In other words, in the first instance, I did not ask for the additional sum of $132,000,000 increased to $140,000,000; I asked for a change from the sum of $132,000,000 to include an increase of $4,260,000 and I specify in my amendment where I think the funds should be spent on projects that have been authorized by the Army engineers in Los Angeles County. The sum of $4,260,000 is equal to the total sum of the funds provided by the committee for two projects for both of which bills have been introduced to deauthorize, to stop the projects, to rescind the funds, one for the Clark Hill, N. C. and Ga., project, of $2,260,000, and the other for the Dillon Dam. The sum is equal to the total that has been provided by the committee for these two projects that bills have been introduced to deauthorize. I am not arguing that the projects be deauthorized. I am not stating that the committee may have had a justifiable reason for putting them into the bill. I am stating that by the inclusion of these projects, certain projects that have been authorized, the Army engineers in Los Angeles County have necessarily been neglected. We are providing by assessment out of our own tax revenue $3,400,000 for the next fiscal year which, as a matter of fact, is $271,000 more than the amount that the bill provides for new flood-control projects in Los Angeles County; therefore, in fairness, we are entitled to the additional sums of money that have been requested in my amendment.

On behalf of the delegation that came here from Los Angeles to appear before the committee I want to say they were very courteously treated, and I compliment the committee for the hearing which was given. During the hearing there was evidence that the cost ratio of these projects was not thoroughly understood by the committee because there was a question asked by one of the members of the flood-control engineer of Los Angeles County what the cost ratio benefit to the public of these projects was. Evidence was produced to show that the ratio in 1940 was 1.52; that due to the increased assessed valuation and the increased population and to the many other factors that added to the benefits, the ratio has increased 40 percent up to now. In other words, these projects are not something that may be built out in the country where no one lives. As I told you yesterday, they are in a highly concentrated populated section of a county with more than 3,000,000 people who are willing to put up their share of the cost of flood-control projects, but under the contract we have with the Army engineers and under the comprehensive plan of the Army engineers in Los Angeles County, we cannot spend our own tax money without the approval of the United States Army engineers.

Let me read to you a letter from the resident engineer, Los Angeles County, concerning these projects, and referring back to the wisdom advanced on the floor here by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MUHLENBERG] that the Army engineers should be consulted in all of these projects. I agree with him on that. Here is the evidence that the Army engineers believe these projects should be built.

Colonel Killian writes to me as follows:

With respect to flood control in Los Angeles County, it is considered most urgent and necessary that the existing project for the Los Angeles County drainage area, California, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1941, be prosecuted as rapidly and in as orderly manner as may be consistent with budgetary requirements. In this connection, the district engineer recommends to the Chief of Engineers that consideration be given to a request for appropriation of funds in the fiscal year 1948 for the continuation or initiation of construction of the following items—

And the "following items" in this letter are the ones recommended by the resident United States Army engineer of Los Angeles—

LOS ANGELES RIVER

Location: Los Angeles County.

Description of improvement: Existing project, partly completed, comprises improvement of 49.07 miles of main channel of Los Angeles River from Owensmouth to Pacific Ocean.

Federal authorization: Flood Control Act, approved August 18, 1941.

State Authorization: Chapter 1514, Statutes of 1945.

Estimated first cost: $60,000,000.

Need for project: Flood protection to city of Los Angeles.

Status of project: Partially completed. Rights-of-way are being acquired. Construction plans under preparation.

Appropriation requested and proposed use thereof: A sum of $4,716,000 is requested to be appropriated by the Congress for the construction of a reinforced concrete rectangular section 130 feet in width from a

point 1,200 feet downstream from Lankershim Boulevard to the junction of the Los Angeles River and West Tujunga Wash near Radford Avenue.

LOPEZ CANYON (FLOOD-CONTROL BASIN)

Location: On Pacoima Creek, a tributary of Tujunga Wash, near the town of San Fernando, Los Angeles County.

Description: A debris basin which is an integral feature of the combined Lopez flood-control basin and Pacoima Wash channel improvement.

Federal authorization: Public Law 534, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, adopting House Document No. 838, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session.

State authorization: Chapter 1514, Statutes of 1945.

Estimated first cost: $7,420,000 (1940 prices).

Need for project: The combined Lopez flood-control basin and the Pacoima Wash channel is an important feature of the comprehensive general plan for flood control in the Los Angeles County drainage area.

Status of project: Contract, plans, and specifications scheduled for submission March 1, 1948; could be advanced.

Appropriation requested and proposed use thereof: $360,000 for acquisition of reservoir rights-of-way and completion of surveys and plans.

TUJUNGA WASH

Location: Los Angeles County.

Description of improvement: Reinforced concrete channel, 60 to 70 feet wide, and varying in height from 8 to 16.5 feet, extending from mouth to Hansen Dam, a distance of 9.4 miles.

Federal authorization: Flood Control Act approved August 18, 1941.

State authorization: Chapter 1514, Statutes of 1945.

Estimated first cost: $7,748,000 (1940 prices).

Need for project: Flood protection to city of Los Angeles.

Status of project: Construction plans under preparation.

Appropriation requested and proposed use thereof: The sum of $3,000,000 is requested to be appropriated by the Congress for the 1948 fiscal year for completion of plans and construction of unit No. 1, which consists of 10,500 feet of rectangular reinforced concrete channel 70 feet in width from junction of Tujunga Wash and Los Angeles River to Magnolia Street. The channel is located in West Tujunga Wash.

BURBANK, WESTERN (LOWER)

Location: Los Angeles County.

Description of improvement: Rectangular reinforced concrete channel, 1.6 miles in length on lower Burbank Wash, including reconstruction of highway and railroad bridges now completed. The remaining work comprises the construction of three railroad bridges and permanent-type fence.

Federal authorization: Flood Control Act approved August 18, 1941.

State authorization: Chapter 1514, Statutes of 1945.

Need for project: Flood protection to cities of Burbank and Glendale.

Status of project: Completed with exception of construction of three railroad bridges and the permanent-type fence.

Appropriation requested and proposed use thereof: A sum of $100,000 is requested to be appropriated by the Congress for 1948 fiscal year for the construction of three railroad bridges and a permanent-type fence along the channel walls.

SANTA FE FLOOD-CONTROL BASIN

Location: On San Gabriel River, about 29 miles above its mouth, near Azusa, Los Angeles County.

Description: A rolled-fill earth dam forming a flood-control basin of 33,000 acre-feet capacity which will be an integral feature of the general flood-control plan for the San Gabriel River Basin.

Federal authorization: Public Law 534, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session.

State authorization: Chapter 1514, Statutes of 1945.

Estimated first cost: $12,393,000.

Need for project: Protection of a highly developed areas of 75,000 acres, evaluated at $100,000,000 in 1946, including oil fields and agricultural, residential, commercial, and industrial properties; and prevention of flood damage and control of debris.

Status of project: Construction 85 percent complete.

Appropriation requested and proposed use thereof: $730,000 for completion of project including procurement and installation of gates, and construction of control house and operator's quarters.

SAN GABRIEL RIVER CHANNEL

Location: Los Angeles County.

Description of improvement: Raising and strengthening 3.5 miles of existing levees and constructing 4.5 miles of open channel with slope protection above and below Santa Fe Dam, respectively.

Federal authorization: Flood Control Act, approved August 18, 1941.

State authorization: Chapter 1514, Statutes of 1945.

Estimated first cost: $4,700,000.

Need for project: Improvements are an integral part of general plan for San Gabriel River Basin for flood protection.

Status of project: Contract plans and specifications are under preparation.

Appropriation requested and proposed use thereof: A sum of $1,085,000 is requested to be appropriated by the Congress for the 1948 fiscal year for the construction of 8,400 feet of new levee and 20,000 feet of reconstructed levee located between the Santa Fe Flood Control Basin and the mouth of the San Gabriel Canyon for the purpose of insuring flood flows reaching the basin.

WHITTIER NARROWS FLOOD-CONTROL BASIN

Location: In lower San Gabriel Valley, Los Angeles County, 10 miles easterly from Los Angeles and about 2½ miles downstream from the town of El Monte.

Description: A compacted earth fill dam about 50 feet high above stream bed, creating a basin of 48,800 acre-feet capacity for flood-control purposes.

Federal authorization: Flood Control Act, approved August 18, 1941.

State authorization: Chapter 1514, Statutes of 1945.

Estimated first cost: $20,224,000 (1946 revision).

Need for project: An important unit in the general plan for San Gabriel River Basin for the protection of an overflow area of 75,000 acres, including oil fields and agricultural, commercial, and industrial properties, evaluated at $100,000,000 in 1946; and for the prevention of flood damage and the control of debris.

Status of project: Division office advises that recommendations concerning schedules for preparation and submittal of contract plans and specifications will be made in the near future.

Appropriation requested and proposed use thereof: $3,000,000 for the acquisition of rights-of-way and preparation of plans.

SAN ANTONIO DAM

Location: Los Angeles and San Bernardino Counties.

Description of improvement: Flood-control basin, capacity 11,000 acre-feet, in delta cone of San Antonio Creek, about 8 miles northwesterly of city of Ontario, and 9 miles of lined channel. This basin is a unit of San Antonio and Chino Creeks project (total estimated cost $12,000,000).

Federal authorization: Flood Control Act, approved June 22, 1936, as modified by Flood Control Act, approved June 28, 1938.

State authorization: Chapter 1514, Statutes of 1945.

Estimated first cost: $6,500,000. (For flood control basin, only.)

Need for project: Flood protection to a population of 70,000 located in a flood plain of 57,000 acres in San Bernardino and Los Angeles Counties.

Status of project: Definite project report 90 percent complete.

Appropriation requested and proposed use thereof: A sum of $3,000,000 is requested to be appropriated by the Congress for the 1948 fiscal year for the first year's construction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I understand the amendment I have prepared has to be offered as an amendment to the Dondero amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The parliamentary situation is this: The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] has an amendment pending. For that amendment a substitute has been offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN] to the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH].

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, a further parliamentary inquiry. My amendment was designed to take place in the bill at the same point the Dondero amendment was offered, decreasing the amount for the Clark Hill project.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the Chair would suggest that the Dondero amendment be disposed of and then it will be in order for the gentleman from Indiana to proceed. In the event the Dondero amendment is voted down, then the gentleman from Indiana can proceed in his own way.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RAYBURN. If the amendment to the substitute is adopted and the substitute as amended is adopted and then the Dondero amendment is adopted, that will be the end of it, will it not.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the substitute amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Is that going to give me time to offer my amendment? I have spoken to the chairman of the subcommittee about it, and I would like to have five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. If the Dondero amendment is voted down, then the field will be open for the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. If the Dondero amendment is not voted down, how will I get my amendment in?

The CHAIRMAN. If that amendment is adopted, the gentleman will just be out of luck.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Then I object to the unanimous-consent request, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is it not a fact that the gentleman from Indiana may offer his amendment as an amendment to the original Dondero amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. I think the Chair so stated.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. The parliamentary situation, as I understand it, is this: A substitute has been offered——

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not making a point of order.

Mr. RANKIN. I am making a point of order, Mr. Chairman. If the gentleman will listen, he may learn something about the rules of the House.

Mr. HINSHAW. I think I know something about the rules of the House.

Mr. RANKIN. It has been a long time since this proposition has been thrashed out on the floor. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] has offered an amendment. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN] offered a substitute. The gentleman from California [Mr. MCDONOUGH] has offered an amendment to that substitute. Any amendment to that amendment would be in a degree and would not be permitted under the rules of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has stated that.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my unanimous-consent request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. MCDONOUGH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I want to conclude by informing the House that out of the tax revenues of Los Angeles County we have spent $75,000,000 in flood-control projects in that county; that we are raising this year $3,400,000 to prosecute the work that will be constructed this year. But, as I said before, it is only under the purview and the jurisdiction and the supervision of the Army engineers that our own money can be used because of the comprehensive flood-control plan that we have agreed to years ago.

I appeal to you on the basis of fairness to a section of the United States where thousands and thousands of people from all States of the Union are coming to make their homes that this amendment to protect the life, limb, and property in the highly populated area of Los Angeles County be adopted.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the McDonough amendment to the substitute close in 10 minutes, the last 2 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I get a little bit sick of the House of Representatives taking certain actions on appropriation bills and then having those bills go to another body where that body promptly puts in the amounts the House has declined to add because of the recommendations of its committees. In the instant case and in any other similar case if an amendment such as has been proposed here either by the gentleman from Louisiana or my colleague from California is voted down, it becomes very difficult indeed for the other body to insist upon their amendment to the House bill, because such an amendment has already been voted down in the House.

In connection with the Los Angeles County project, the Corps of Engineers recommended $15,991,000 for expenditure on that project in the fiscal year 1947–48, a project which has been under way since 1935. The gentleman from Michigan, chairman of the subcommittee, said the other day that he thought that appropriation should be made to complete all flood-control projects within 4 or 5 years after their inception. This one has been under construction for 12 years and it is still only 45 percent complete. I offer that for the consideration of the gentleman from Michigan for next year's appropriation bill.

In the meantime, I think it would be wise procedure for the gentleman from California [Mr. MCDONOUGH] to ask unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment, and let it be considered in the other body.

Mr. MCDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I respect the judgment of my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW]. Many of the projects that are in that amendment are in his district.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman knows how strongly I feel about this matter. Much of the money intended to be provided by his amendment would be spent in my district. I think, nevertheless, it would be wise to withdraw the amendment, and let the matter be considered in the other body.

Mr. MCDONOUGH. In view of the fact that his district would be affected most if the amendment is not adopted, I shall be glad to follow his suggestion.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment. This will also make less complicated the parliamentary tangle we are in at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman from Michigan, as chairman of the subcommittee, will next year carry out the statement he made the other day, namely, that adequate appropriations should be made for existing flood-control projects to complete them in 4 or 5 years. At the present rate we are going at the projects in Los Angeles County, which includes the districts of nine Members of this House, it will be 50 years before the projects are completed. By that time goodness knows what the cost will be.

Mr. Chairman, the district engineer urged appropriation in fiscal 1948 of $15,991,000 for flood control in Los Angeles County. I do not know what the Chief of Engineers did to that request but the President, through the Bureau of the Budget, reduced that amount to $1,314,000. The House Appropriations Committee has recommended to the House exactly what the President recommended to the Congress, namely, $1,314,000, so the committee did not cut below the President's recommendation. The fault seems to lie with the President's Bureau of the Budget.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am not here to talk about flood control; I am here in the well of the House primarily in the interest of national defense. I thought probably the House would be interested in knowing the background of some of this argument about tungsten.

In 1941, when we were caught in this country without any tungsten, which came from Indochina at that time, a group of the Committee on Military Affairs called on the President to give us some money from his emergency fund to build roads to a couple of mines which were discovered in Idaho so that we would have some tungsten, and this mine was put in operation. Then later we discovered a mine in Arizona, and later the mine in North Carolina. That mine today, of course, is very important to our national defense. I hold the report from the War Department on the stock-piling of materials that we authorized last year under Public Law 520, which, in my opinion, is the basis for all of our defense. Of course, we are all concerned about whether or not we will be caught in the same situation in which we were caught in 1940 and 1941.

I arose primarily to assure myself and the House concerning the question that has been injected into the debate with reference to the losing of this mine by flooding. I am sure the committee does have the information as to whether or

not this mine will be flooded or at least be put out of operation and become more expensive to operate, although, as the gentleman from North Carolina has said, it probably could be mined under water, but this type of mining is very expensive, and you know what that means—a much more expensive product that is so vital to national security.

I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if he can assure the House that the operation of this mine will not be endangered by this flood-control project.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. We had one witness from the mine, and I think the gentleman from North Carolina, Judge KERR, answered that witness very well. I will ask the gentleman from North Carolina, Judge KERR, to give the information on that tungsten mine, as he is very familiar with that situation.

Mr. KERR. I have never been impressed that this tungsten mine would be molested at all. I have had reports from the Army engineers. If the gentleman understands how tungsten is mined he can very easily understand why it is almost impossible to flood the mine. Tungsten is found in a small ledge of flint rock. They follow this little vein of flint rock which never gets any thicker than about 4 or 5 feet. They go down into the ground and crop out of the ground occasionally. But the Army engineers, as I read from the letter in my speech, in reply to Senator Bailey, former Senator from North Carolina, who is now dead, said that so far as the tungsten is concerned the damage by reason of the building of this dam would be zero and would have no effect whatsoever.

Mr. DURHAM. I am sure the gentleman is as much interested in national defense as I am. I am sure the gentleman knows about the situation because his own district is close by the operation which is carried on by a neighbor of his.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. The general manager of this mine presented evidence to the committee, including a statement from the State geologist of North Carolina, that if this dam is built, because of the very nature of the terrain in that area, it would seriously jeopardize the deposit of tungsten and even the mine that is in operation. I do not know your State geologist but that is the statement that has been presented to me and which I gave to the committee.

Mr. DURHAM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. If the gentleman has satisfied his mind in this regard, I want to take this opportunity to congratulate him on this and every other attitude that he has had looking toward our national defense and his concern for our stock-piling measures. We have not gone as far as we should nor done as much as is needed in those matters for national security. However, the gentleman from North Carolina has always been alert to the Nation's needs.

Mr. DURHAM. I thank the gentleman very much for his remarks. I am concerned about it. At the present time, stock piles of critical materials are in a very critical condition.

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MEADE of Kentucky to the substitute amendment offered by Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana: On page 28, line 22, after the comma, strike out "$132,141,800" and insert "$137,281,800."

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, my story is a little different from that usually heard on the floor, and for that reason I ask that you pay attention to it for these 5 minutes.

In my district in Kentucky there is a project known as Dewey Reservoir or Dewey Dam. That project was authorized by this Congress in 1938 as a part of the Ohio River Basin flood control. It is one of 80 dams. While I was in the service overseas, this Congress appropriated sufficient funds to begin this project, and construction was started. Upon my return and entry into politics for the first time in my life, I found that the people in the basin that would be flooded by this project were opposed to it on the ground that their land would be flooded, and even though they would be compensated, they would not want to leave their homes. My opponent had sponsored this project in this House. It was perfectly natural, I am sure you who are not statesmen but who are politicians will agree, that I should not have said too much in favor of the project. Consequently, I have had very little interest in it at all. I made no protests. I have been quoted to members of the committee as having that attitude. I do not want to reverse my stand as to having sympathy for people who are going to be forced out of their homes, but, on the other hand, I do want to be big enough, and I want you to be big enough to support me, when I publicly announce that I have been wrong in this, and I propose to prove to you, the same way it has been proved to me, that I have been wrong.

In the first place, the total cost of this project is $4,085,000. Of that amount, $1,645,000 has been authorized or spent. Forty percent of that project is completed. The work is now going on. It offers protection to my home town to the extent of 3.7 feet less floodwater, which I know in my section—and I did not know it until last night—will eliminate flood damage to property that I own. In the town next below, that is not in my district, it will reduce the flood stage by 2½ feet. Where the river enters the Ohio River it will reduce it one-half foot.

I am sorry that these facts have come to me so late, but despite my attitude, I do not think the committee should have taken the attitude that it did.

The engineers have given as their estimate that the Dewey Dam has a ratio of 1 to 1.7. That is the second highest ratio of any flood-control dam on the Ohio River. Dillon Dam, which cost three and a half times as much as this dam, has a ratio of 1 to 1.1. This is 1 to 1.7. The Bluestone Dam is 1 to 1.24; this is 1 to 1.7. The Red Creek Dam is 1 to 1.5; this is 1 to 1.7. It is a worthy project. I publicly apologize to my people and the people below this dam for having taken the attitude I have in the past and I hope now that you, too, will back me up in this admission that I was wrong and restore this worthy project.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this particular amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I shall not use the entire 5 minutes to which I am entitled under my motion.

The gentleman from Kentucky has made a very understandable statement with regard to this project, and I am sure no member of the committee would have any desire to be critical of his position. Rather extensive hearings were held, however, by the committee with respect to this proposal, and the project was not included in the bill. It seems to me it would be most unwise now after this short 5- or 10-minute period during which the House will give the matter consideration for the House to accept this amendment. On behalf of the committee, therefore I ask that the amendment be voted down. If at a later date facts are developed to warrant a continuation of this project that, of course, will be a different story.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think the committee and the House should know there was some testimony presented to the committee by another Member of Congress quoting telegrams and letters from people in the area. For instance, at page 944 of the hearings there is one letter they emphasized:

They passed a law to put a dam in our creek and called it a flood control, which floods thousands of acres of the best agricultural land in our county and destroys the homes of about 150 families.

There was other testimony along that line which was submitted. The committee, in view of the evidence before it and the apparent controversy over it and dissatisfaction in the area affected, thought this was one project where properly we might save funds.

It may be that the gentleman has a good case but he is in a difficult parliamentary situation, for even if his amendment to the substitute were adopted and the substitute were lost he still would be out in the cold under the parliamentary situation that exists at the moment.

He can do one of two things, either let it come to a vote and possibly not win out, or he might want to withdraw his amendment and perhaps submit further evidence on it in the other body.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman from South Dakota for his statement. It is perfectly understandable that a Member will come here and want funds for a project in his district but it must also be borne in mind that in most of these flood-control projects where dams are constructed and reservoirs provided somebody is bound to suffer; and it is a matter of attempting to balance benefits against damages.

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. The gentleman from South Dakota made reference to certain letters that were received. They were letters that I myself had received, so there is no point there.

I further call attention to the fact that General Wheeler of the Army engineers made this statement:

> It is a worthy project. It protects industrial areas downstream and protects towns downstream and the cost benefit ratio is 1 to 1.7, that being a very high benefit.

If I am willing to get up here and admit I was wrong I think the Congress now should back me up.

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman will read the hearings further he will see where reference is made by General Wheeler to the controversial nature of the project.

In view of all the circumstances, as stated by the gentleman from South Dakota and myself, as well as from what may be inferred from the statement of the gentleman, I ask that the committee be sustained and that the amendment be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the substitute be limited to 10 minutes, 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute.

Mr. Chairman, I realize the difficult parliamentary situation presented here in reference to the substitute, but nevertheless I am so strongly in favor of the substitute amendment that I take this opportunity to say just a few words in reference to it.

Those of us living in the United States are prone to overlook some of the big things which we have immediately around us. I think sometimes that is the situation in reference to the Red River system in the Southwest. Some of us may know but do not fully realize that the Red River constitutes one of the major river systems of North America. Some of us do not fully realize that the headwaters of the Red River come from eastern Colorado and this river flows along the boundary line of Texas and Oklahoma for hundreds of miles to enter the State of Arkansas in its southwest corner; then the river passes through the southwest corner of Arkansas into the State of Louisiana. Some of us do not realize that from the top to the bottom the Red River is over 1,200 miles in length and that it flows through a veritable empire in the Southwest. Yet, Mr. Chairman, the Red River system is one of the few major river systems of North America that has not been improved for navigation or for flood control.

Mr. Chairman, it was with that thought in mind, following the great flood of 1945, in response to a resolution which I introduced asking for an interim flood report, that the United States Army engineers went to work in high gear and gave to this Congress an interim program for flood control of Red River and a navigation program.

I certainly think the time has come in the progress of this country where attention should be given to the development of the Red River Valley in the Southwest. As I have said, it vitally affects four great States in the Southwest and it affects literally millions of people in that area of our country.

I had the experience of going through the disastrous flood of 1945 in the valley and the stories which I read now regarding the flood in Missouri, Illinois, and Iowa bring back vividly to mind the same pictures which I saw enacted at that time in the major flood of the Southwest. In the Seventy-fifth Congress there was adopted a program for flood development of the Red River, carrying with it an authorization of $77,500,000. We have likewise a navigation program there carrying with it an authorization of $42,000,000. These two great programs remain to be constructed.

Our people in the Southwest feel that some substantial progress should be made in the development of these two great projects which mean so much to our people in that section of the country. We see these flood waters coming down through the valley this year. We see possibilities of flood waters in the future such as we had in 1945 when millions of dollars worth of property was destroyed in the Southwest, and we feel that some substantial progress ought to be made.

Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of this amendment. I am sorry that it does not go further to provide additional funds and to provide some means of taking care of the navigation project which is so essential to our people in northern Louisiana, and all parts of the Southwest.

In addition to this, I wish to express my interest in the Bayou Pierre drainage project. In the Seventy-ninth Congress, this project called for an ultimate expenditure of $167,000. While this is not a large project, it is nonetheless a very urgent project. In the break-down of the planning money, the sum of $12,000 is provided for planning purposes on this project. Although it is true that this project was only approved last year, I think it is exceptional enough to have warranted extreme speed in pushing the work on this project. A large portion of the city of Shreveport is almost annually inundated by Bayou Pierre floodwater and these people need this assistance. I hope this project will soon receive the needed funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] to close debate.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the committee recognizes that this is an authorization project. There is $250,000 in the estimates for getting started on this by way of planning. That was the recommendation of the engineers, and it is within their discretion to apply that much money out of the planning money provided in the bill. On that basis the committee did not include any construction money feeling that this planning should get under way. I ask that the Allen substitute amendment be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN] for the Dondero amendment.

The substitute was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Dondero amendment be limited to 8 minutes, and I ask for recognition.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Has the McDonough amendment been disposed of?

The CHAIRMAN. It was withdrawn by unanimous consent.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, first I want to quote the Army engineers as to the flood-control project on Buggs Island, and this is the justification which they brought us. On page 190 of the justification furnished by the War Department, we find the following:

> The flood of September 1945 caused damages on the Roanoke River estimated at $970,000 of which about 80 percent would have been prevented had the project been in operation. The largest flood on record on the Roanoke River, in August 1940, caused flood damages in excess of $3,000,000. The operation of Buggs Island reservoir would have reduced damages from a similar flood to less than $1,000,000.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to repeat what I said in my opening remarks on the bill yesterday. My very good and dear colleague, the gentleman from Michigan, the able and distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works [Mr. DONDERO], wrote me a letter as chairman of the War Department subcommittee asking me to withhold funds on some 11 projects. Let us see what would happen if we withheld the funds and then Congress did not deauthorize these projects. Remember that we must get a measure through both Houses and signed by the President to deauthorize these projects.

If we withhold funds from the War Department to continue these projects, then the projects would be stopped, contracts would cease, and if the Congress should fail to pass a bill to deauthorize these projects, work on those projects would stop. We would have to open them again at great cost, just as we did after the war.

I agree with the chairman of the Committee on Public Works that some of the projects ought to be deauthorized. I have taken the position, however, that when the Congress has passed a law authorizing a project, has made one or two appropriations and started construction, it is not within the province of my committee to deauthorize the project. The gentleman from Michigan should bring out a bill to deauthorize these projects and bring it to the floor of the House, and then have the House and the Senate pass it. That is the answer to his problem. I do not want my subcommittee or the House to be left in the position where we have withheld funds, and then the House has failed to carry through the policy suggested by the Committee on Public Works. I do not want to be left in the position where we are going to stop contracts by an act of this House or of my subcommittee, and then have the House fail to enact a law to deauthorize them—and remember, it has to be passed by a two-thirds vote over the President's veto—and leave these contracts all up in the air.

I ask that not only this but all other projects here be carried on until such time as Congress has actually passed legislation deauthorizing these contracts. There is a way to do these things, and this is not the way. I personally have no interest in the matter whatsoever. I ask the House to stand by me and by the committee, not only on this but on every project that is to come from here on. I ask that the Dondero amendment be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MICHENER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4002) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2700) entitled "an act making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and relative independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 6, 7, 8, and 38; and recedes from its amendment No. 9 to the above-entitled bill.

MAKING EMERGENCY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1948

Mr. TABER submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 4031) making emergency appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendmen. of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4031) making appropriations to meet emergencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: in lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out and inserted by the said amendment, insert the following: "That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year 1948, and for other purposes, namely:

"INDEPENDENT OFFICES

"Office of Government Reports

"There is hereby appropriated such amount as may be necessary to enable the Office of Government Reports to continue in operation at the same rate and under the same authority as provided for such agency in the fiscal year 1947 until the date of enactment of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1948.

"Veterans' Administration

"The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is hereby authorized to disburse, during the month of July 1947, one-twelfth of the amount provided in each appropriation for the Veterans' Administration included in H. R. 3839 as passed by the House of Representatives and there are hereby appropriated such amounts as may be necessary for such disbursements: *Provided*, That amounts expended hereunder shall be deducted from such appropriation for 1948 when H. R. 3839 is enacted into law.

"Automobiles and other conveyances for disabled veterans: The authority and funds provided under this heading in the First Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1947 (Public Law 663, Seventy-ninth Congress), are hereby continued available until June 30, 1948.

"District of Columbia

"The following sums are appropriated for the District of Columbia out of any money in the Treasury to the credit of the District of Columbia not otherwise appropriated, toward expenses for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948:

"Employees' Compensation Fund	$15,000
Repairs and Maintenance of Buildings and Grounds, Public Schools	50,000
Operating Expenses, Public Library	10,000
Operating Expenses, Recreation Department	50,000
Salaries and Expenses, Metropolitan Police	10,000
Salaries and Expenses, Fire Department	10,000
Policemen's and Firemen's Relief	50,000
Salaries and Expenses, Agency Services, Public Welfare	205,000
Operating Expenses, Office of Superintendent of District Buildings, Public Works	50,000
Operating Expenses, Electrical Division, Public Works	10,000
Salaries and Expenses, Central Garage, Public Works	10,000
Operating Expenses, Street and Bridge Divisions (payable from Highway Fund)	50,000
Salaries and Expenses, Department of Vehicles and Traffic (payable from Highway Fund)	10,000
Salaries and Expenses, Division of Trees and Parking (payable from Highway Fund)	10,000
Operating Expenses, Refuse Division, Public Works	150,000
Operating Expenses, Sewer Division, Public Works	$50,000
Capital outlay, Sewer Division, Public Works	50,000
Operating Expenses, Washington Aqueduct (payable from Water Fund)	23,000

"The foregoing sums for the District of Columbia shall, unless otherwise specifically provided, be paid out of the General Fund of the District of Columbia as defined in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1947, and shall be deducted from the appropriations for the same purposes contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1948, when enacted into law.

"Department of Agriculture

"Bureau of Animal Industry

"Control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture, during July 1947, to control and eradicate foot-and-mouth disease and rinderpest as authorized by the Act of February 28, 1947 (Public Law 8), and the Act of May 29, 1884, as amended (7 U. S. C. 391; 21 U. S. C. 111–122), including expenses in accordance with section 2 of said Public Law 8, $5,000,000, to be merged with the appropriation made under this head in the Second Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947 (Public Law 122).

"Sugar Rationing Administration

"Salaries and expenses: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to perform, during July 1947, the functions and duties vested in him by the Sugar Control Extension Act of 1947 (Public Law 30), $750,000, including personal services in the District of Columbia; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946; printing and binding; not to exceed $10,000 for test purchases of commodities and ration currency for enforcement purposes; and hire of passenger motor vehicles: *Provided*, That not to exceed $40,000 may be transferred to the regular departmental appropriation for penalty mail as required by the Act of June 28, 1944: *Provided further*, That of the amount herein $400,000 shall be available exclusively for terminal leave.

"Department of the Interior

"The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to incur obligations for administrative and force account expenses for the continued operation of any activity of the

Department of the Interior for which provision is made in H. R. 3123, a bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, or in any Senate amendment thereto, but for which obligations may not be incurred under the provisions of section 102 of the Second Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947 (Public Law 122), and for War Agency Liquidation in accordance with the terms of the Budget estimate contained in House Document Numbered 312: *Provided*, That such obligations shall not exceed the rate of obligation provided for such activity for the fiscal year 1947: *Provided further*, That the authority conferred hereunder shall continue until July 31, 1947, or until the date of enactment of H. R. 3123 into law, whichever is the earlier date, except in the case of War Agency Liquidation, which authority shall extend until the date of approval of the appropriation Act providing the supplemental appropriation for this activity for the fiscal year 1948.

"Department of Labor

"United States Conciliation Service

"For salaries and expenses from July 1, 1947, to August 21, 1947, United States Conciliation Service, including printing and binding, travel, penalty mail, and all expenses authorized for such service in the Department of Labor Appropriation Act, 1947, $430,000.

"SEC. 2. Section 102 of the Second Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947, is amended by striking out the last two words of such section and by inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'provisions of such appropriation acts as passed by the House or of any Senate amendment thereto: *Provided*, That such obligations shall be limited to administrative and force account expenses and not exceed the rate of obligation under any corresponding appropriation for the fiscal year 1947: *Provided further*, That the authority conferred hereunder shall continue until July 31, 1947, or until the date of enactment of such appropriation act, whichever is the earlier date: *Provided further*, That in the case of any activity (including the District of Columbia) for which funds were provided by Congress for 1947 and for which an estimate for the fiscal year 1948 was submitted by the President to the Congress prior to July 2, 1947, but for which no provision for an appropriation is contained in any bill pending in Congress on July 1, 1947, obligations therefor for administrative and force account expenses may be incurred at a rate not to exceed the rate of obligation under any corresponding appropriation for the fiscal year 1947 or the Budget estimate for 1948, whichever is the smaller, but the authority conferred under this proviso shall expire on whichever of the following dates first occurs: (1) on July 31, 1947, (2) the date of enactment of an appropriation act making an appropriation for such activity, or (3) the date both Houses shall have acted and failed to make an appropriation for such activity.'

"SEC. 3. This Act may be cited as the 'Emergency Appropriation Act, 1948'."

And the Senate recede from its amendment to the title.

JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
FRANCIS CASE,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE MAHON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

STYLES BRIDGES,
JOSEPH H. BALL,
KENNETH S. WHERRY,
GUY CORDON,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
ELMER THOMAS,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4031) making emergency appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, submit the following report in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

The action of the conferees restores emergency appropriations as provided by the House and in addition thereto makes emergency appropriations required by the District of Columbia pending enactment of the appropriation bill for the District of Columbia. It authorizes the agencies of the Government to incur obligations for administrative and force account expenses in such amount as may be authorized by the provisions of appropriation bills as passed by the House or Senate amendments thereto or of pending budget estimates for activities for which appropriations were made in 1947.

JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
FRANCIS CASE,
JOHN H. KERR,
GEORGE MAHON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the unanimous-consent request that was granted this morning, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 4031, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this conference report is a unanimous one. I believe it takes care, so far as we may, of any emergency matters that may come up before the appropriation bills are finally enacted.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is the continuation of the car-for-amputees appropriation taken care of?

Mr. TABER. It is just as it was when it left the House. It is in the bill as it will be enacted.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. In other words, that will carry until we pass a better bill?

Mr. TABER. It will carry $6,000,000 until it is expended.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAR DEPARTMENT CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1948

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4002) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4002, with Mr. MICHENER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard numerous Members of the House say in connection with the consideration of this and other appropriation bills that they can see no good reason why we should refuse to appropriate money for worth-while approved projects here in the United States and at the same time appropriate money for similar projects to be carried on in foreign countries throughout the world.

I am happy to note that in the consideration of the pending bill that type of argument has not prevailed thus far. Up to this moment the House has seen fit to accept this bill as it has been reported by the Committee on Appropriations without additions and without amendments. I trust that will continue to the final consideration of the bill.

I rise to call your attention to this fact and to caution the Members of the House that you are shortly going to be called upon to appropriate money to implement all of these programs for foreign relief which have been passed and those that will perhaps be passed in the next few days. I hope that when we come to the consideration of these appropriation items we will use the same care that we are using in the consideration of the items in the pending bill.

May I say to you that the deficiency committee for some considerable time now has been hearing the evidence of the State Department and its related outfits in attempted justification of the various programs that have been authorized by this Congress for foreign relief. I hope when those printed hearings are available that every Member of this Congress will read them, and I am sure you will get an awakening that will shock you into the realization that it is about time we applied the same reasoning to these foreign loans and these foreign commitments that we apply to the commitments involved in the present legislation.

May I say to you that ultimately you are going to be confronted with requests for appropriation items totaling $4,091,200,000—four billion—to implement programs that have already been presented to this Congress, and more to come. Nobody in God's world can tell now how much more. All I want to do today is to warn you to stand steadfast, to try to protect the solvency of our Treasury in the consideration of current appropriations; stand back of the committee that has given its time to the consideration of the pending bill; but when the next appropriation bill comes before you, involving appropriations for foreign relief, let us not be swayed by these old familiar arguments that unless we give them a blank check to do with as they please, the big bugaboo of Stalin will come up on the horizon and swallow us up.

I think it is about time we began to consider where we are going and where we are going to get the money to finance this foreign program that you and I voted for, and which the State Department, in my humble opinion, is having just one terrible time trying to justify before the deficiency committee of this House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has expired.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LECOMPTE: On page 8, line 22, strike out "$132,041,800" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$137,041,800, *Provided*, That $5,000,000 of the funds appropriated herein may be used for prosecuting work of construction on the Red Rock Dam on the Des Moines River, as authorized by the act entitled, 'An act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes', approved December 22, 1944."

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, I suppose that every Member of the House is conscious of the devastating floods that have been sweeping down the Mississippi basin during the last few weeks. The Des Moines River is not the largest river in the United States, but the Des Moines River flows through the most fertile and the most productive valley in the United States. I heard former Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes say that there is no region on the face of the globe of equal area and extent that is as productive and as fertile as the State of Iowa, 300 miles long and 200 miles wide.

In 1944 the Congress authorized a flood-control program for the Des Moines River. The Des Moines River has been at flood stage three times this year with a destruction of property amounting to $10,000,000 in the city of Ottumwa alone, and this is scarcely higher than the flood stage of the Des Moines River in 1945, 2 years ago. The Des Moines River floods on an average of about every other year.

The Red Rock Dam project will control floodwaters on the Des Moines River, according to Army engineers as well as private engineers. Moreover Colonel Feringa says that work can start on this project this year. The whole estimate of costs is only $15,000,000. We are asking for only $5,000,000 in order to start the project.

I read a few telegrams received from flood-stricken districts and from groups conscious of the need for this project:

OTTUMWA, IOWA, *July 1, 1947.*
Representative KARL M. LECOMPTE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

On behalf of victims of recent floods in Des Moines River Valley, Local No. 1, UPWA-CIO, urges you to work for amendment to appropriations bill in order to commence immediate construction Red Rock Dam and flood control.

LOCAL NO. 1, UPWA-CIO,
DONALD JONES, *President.*

DES MOINES, IOWA, *July 1, 1947.*
Representative KARL LECOMPTE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

On behalf of CIO members of Des Moines River Valley who suffered in recent disastrous floods, we urge you do everything possible to get amendment to appropriation bill adopted in order to commence immediate construction of Red Rock Dam and flood control.

KENNETH EVERHART,
Secretary-Treasurer, Iowa Nebraska States Industrial Union Council.

DES MOINES, IOWA, *July 1, 1947.*
Representative KARL LECOMPTE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge you get amendments to appropriation bill passed directing Army engineers commence immediate construction Red Rock Dam and flood-control works for Des Moines.

A. A. COUCH,
President, Iowa Federation of Labor.

I see by one daily paper that this country is spending abroad $21,000,000 per day. Can we not do a little for our own folks who are in distress?

In addition to the property destruction five persons lost their lives. One-third of the city of Ottumwa, with a population of 35,000 people, were driven from their homes. The richest valley in the world has been scarred and the Soils Survey of the State of Iowa states that 115,000,000 tons of topsoil has been washed away. To that extent the richest valley in the world has been damaged. This rich black soil cannot be restored at any figure that we can estimate.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE] provides for the building of a dam at Red Rock and the building and construction of that dam would prevent a recurrence of the disaster that has taken place the past few weeks. The residents along the Des Moines River in the city of Ottumwa and in towns below, to the extent of 10,000 were made homeless. Some 10 or 15 lost their lives, and large areas of valuable land were destroyed.

Mr. LECOMPTE. That is correct. Among the other towns I might mention Keosauqua, Eldon, Eddyville, Farmington, Bonaparte, Keokuk, and others.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield.

Mr. TALLE. I want to ask my colleague if it is not true that no similar disaster has come to our State during the statehood of Iowa extending more than a hundred years.

Mr. LECOMPTE. There has been no similar disaster in the amount of property that has been destroyed. The Des Moines River has been at flood stage and almost equally high every 2 years. It caught the people unawares this year. There was no dam or levee on the lower river to take care of the flood stage.

Both Army engineers and private engineers say that construction of the Red Rock Dam in Marion County, incidentally not in my congressional district, will take care of these devastating floods that come to the State of Iowa about every second year.

Mr. TALLE. Is it not also true that the proposed dam to which the gentleman refers was recommended for construction by the Army engineers in 1944 and was also authorized by the Congress in 1944

Mr. LECOMPTE. Yes, it was recommended for construction by the Army engineers and it was authorized by the Congress on December 22, 1944. Our friend and former colleague, Senator Gillette, handled this bill in the Senate. It was authorized by an act of Congress in 1944.

Mr. TALLE. I want to say to my colleague that I believe the project proposed in his amendment has as much merit as any project that could be promoted at this time. I will support his amendment wholeheartedly.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I yield briefly.

Mr. RANKIN. If funds had been provided in 1944——

Mr. LECOMPTE. We would not have had the flood this year.

Mr. RANKIN. This flood would have been avoided.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Not only that, but the floods at St. Louis would not have been so serious because the Des Moines River is one of the tributaries of the Mississippi River.

Mr. RANKIN. How many lives did the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] say had been lost in this flood?

Mr. LECOMPTE. I think I said there were five or six in the city of Ottumwa alone.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Fifteen, altogether.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Yes, and five or six in Ottumwa alone.

Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that the Committee would accept this amendment to the Rivers and Harbors Section of this bill. One dollar spent on the Des Moines project is worth $100 spent on any other project I know anything about. This is the most important flood control proposition of which I have any knowledge at all. There are also recreational facilities and power possibilities but we offer this amendment purely for flood control.

Iowa asks nothing for herself. Every man, woman and child is interested in saving the soil in Iowa to the end that Iowa continues as the big breadbasket of the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 15 minutes, the last two to be reserved for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, for the past nine sessions I have heard and watched with a great deal of interest certain Members of this House support

with all their talents and votes most every piece of legislation to spend the American people's money by the billions for every conceivable, useless spending scheme the White House palace chiefs could cook up not only to waste in the United States of America, but also to waste over the whole wide world.

These Congressmen seem to have forgotten that some day they might want an appropriation for a worthy project in their districts for the benefit of their own people; then if their proposed project is turn down by the Congress, they howl to high heaven.

Let me say here and now that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE], like every Member from Iowa, has vigorously opposed the needless spending and wasting of the people's money as the records will show. Also the facts are that very, very few dollars have ever been spent for flood control on the interior rivers of Iowa, regardless of the fact that Iowa has needed and now urgently needs a lot of such work done on many of its rivers, as is made so evident by the terrible floods which are right now raging on these rivers and have been raging for the past 30 days, destroying human life and property and taking out of production millions of acres of the most productive land in the world when full production is so vitally needed.

The people of Iowa are certainly entitled to help and must have help in controlling floods and the Members of Congress from Iowa propose to exert our full efforts and to employ every fair means in seeing to it that the people of Iowa receive equitable treatment with other States of the Union.

I know the very able chairman of this committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], as well as every member of his committee, will give Iowa fair treatment.

I want to thank the committee for the items it has placed in this bill for flood control on the lower reaches of the Missouri River and its tributaries, also for the money in this bill for dams and other facilities upstream to finally hold the flood waters from coming down and onto our lands.

I would like to ask the chairman of the committee regarding the item of $500,000 in this bill for the Nishnabotna-Missouri River levee project, known as L575, if it is a fact that $180,000 of that amount is to be spent for the continuation of the Nishnabotna River project now under construction and $320,000 to be spent for the levee system to be built along the Missouri River from Plum Creek in Fremont County down to and connecting onto the Nishnabotna levee a short distance south of the Iowa-Missouri line.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. That is the understanding of the committee.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman for clearing up that point for the record.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. In connection with the request that is made for additional funds by Iowa, can the gentleman tell me, How much is the State of Iowa contributing toward this flood control problem that they have now?

Mr. JENSEN. The State of Iowa has well organized soil conservation districts, possibly to a greater extent than most any other State in the Union. Almost everybody in Iowa is cooperating with the Soil Conservation Service to hold the water and the soil up on the hills where it belongs, and I may say to the gentleman that the greatest contribution the people of a State can make toward flood control is to practice soil conservation by contouring, terracing, gully filling, and by seeking moisture-holding grasses on hilly or rolling lands.

Mr. McDONOUGH. What about the money it has spent?

Mr. JENSEN. The people of Iowa always have and always will pay their own way when humanely possible, but they cannot cope with Old Man River when he goes on this kind of a rampage.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER].

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I observe that the various amendments which have come before this Committee this afternoon for increased appropriations for various items have met with very unfavorable response by the Committee. However, I must say this: The State of Iowa is one of those fortunate areas whose people ordinarily do not come to the Congress asking for funds. Indeed, Iowa is one of those favored regions in the United States where we have a balanced economy. Normally, Mother Nature is very good to us and has not abused us by too much water or too much drought.

But this year we have been literally inundated in our State. Already attention has been called to the floods that have occurred in the lower Des Moines River Valley, also in the upper reaches of the Des Moines River there have been constant rains and disastrous floods. The Sixth Iowa District is crossed diagonally from northwest to southeast by that river. In my own home town of Fort Dodge many hundreds of people were driven from their homes, and all public service—light, water, gas, and sewage—were disrupted for days. Many bridges, roads, and other public works were flooded and destroyed. The private and public property loss will run to untold amounts of money, and require many months to replace or repair.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I would like to call the attention of the Members of the House to a fact, which has been brought out by the questioning of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], regarding soil conservation and reclamation. The site for the dam that would be built under the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE] is in the pioneer county of all counties of the whole United States on soil-conservation development.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Following that up, I would like to say that according to the report made by the Iowa State Conservationist for the Federal Soil Conservation Service, 1,079,000 acres of rich Iowa soil have been inundated and an estimated 115,000,000 tons of Iowa soil has been lost from 6,000,000 acres of land.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. In that connection, should not the Members of the House from all parts of the United States realize that if that thing is not prevented in Iowa, it will increase the cost of the bread and meat of the people of this whole country?

Mr. DOLLIVER That is precisely true.

At this point I would like to commend the statement of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] when he referred to the advisability of preventing floods in the headwaters of these streams. My district encompasses the headwaters of the Des Moines River, and there is the place to start this program of flood prevention. As has already been pointed out, it will help the situation not only in the northern part of Iowa, but also in the lower reaches of this river basin.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I think the gentleman should mention that corn is selling at an all-time record high today; that we are going to have the shortest corn crop in Iowa that we have had in years as the result of this year's floods.

Mr. DOLLIVER. This year's floods have inundated literally hundreds of thousands of acres of our best land with the inevitable effect upon the price of corn.

While the proposal made in the amendment of my colleague the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE] will not directly affect my congressional district, nevertheless, for the general good of all our people, it ought to pass.

I have recently requested of the Committee on Public Works and the Army engineers to make a survey of the upper Des Moines River Valley, with a view of determining the requirements for flood control in that area of Iowa, as it is related to the entire river system. I trust the request will be granted, and the survey made.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I need not tell this committee that Iowa is the leading agricultural State in the Union, and that it is in the heart of the bread basket of the world. In these critical days when we are being called upon to not only help feed the people of the United States but the people throughout the length and breadth of this world, it is time that we take an inventory of our prospective food supplies. Many people far removed from the food-production areas of this country—and this is no reflection on those good folks—seem to think that food simply grows on trees. Such is not the case. We sow the seed, till the soil, and wait upon Mother Nature to do the rest. But when floods carry

away our crops as they have in many sections of Iowa this year, we are not so sure about the food supply for the Nation and the world. The people of Iowa seldom complain. They ask very little from their Federal Government, but when the entire economy of this country is involved, when the production of food is jeopardized as it is today on account of the floods, I think we have a right to come in here and ask for help from the Federal Government in stopping the flood danger. Floods in Iowa have already affected the price of corn, and we will have a much shorter crop this year. Estimates are that the corn crop will vary all the way from 30 percent to 85 percent of normal, depending upon what particular part of Iowa we are talking about. Only yesterday, I believe, we had $2.04 corn, which is going to mean higher-priced meat and a shortage of feed. It will affect the economy of the United States in every way. This Congress should wake up to the fact that if we in Iowa are going to continue to provide food as we have in the past we must have protection from ravaging floods so that our fertile soil will not be washed into the Mississippi and the Missouri and the other rivers of our State.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman is aware of the fact, is he not, that no budget request was submitted to the Congress for construction, not even for planning on this so-called authorized project?

Mr. HOEVEN. I appreciate that.

Mr. LECOMPTE. If the gentleman will yield, I will correct that.

Mr. HOEVEN. Of course, we have no warning when floods come. Our farmers are dependent almost entirely upon the elements and they certainly could not anticipate what is happening this year. Now I yield to my colleague from Iowa, whose district is so seriously affected.

Mr. LECOMPTE. It is not in the budget because the Budget Director will not allow it, but this Congress is going to be remiss in its duty if it does not do something for the Middle West in this bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The budget did not submit any request.

Mr. LECOMPTE. We cannot get it. The Army engineers unequivocally endorsed it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Army engineers did not submit any request to the committee for either construction or planning money. The budget did not include any money for the construction of projects for which no previous construction money had been appropriated.

Mr. LECOMPTE. True enough, but the Army engineers unequivocally endorse, approve, and recommend this project.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am not saying that they may not have, but there was nothing before the committee on it. There was not even planning money. I want to be helpful for I am sympathetic with the gentleman's problem. I saw the floods in Iowa when I came across the State about 2 weeks ago.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Then why did you not put it in the bill?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Because there was no request or estimate before us. I would like to suggest what is a proper and appropriate thing. There is some general planning money in the bill—a sum of $2,000,000. Some of that planning money might be applied by the Corps of Army Engineers to preparing detailed specifications and designs of the works in the project desired. Personally I would favor application of some of these funds for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the gentleman from South Dakota, I hope we are not hamstrung here in such narrow confines as he has indicated, requiring that so much be done preliminarily. The Bureau of the Budget cannot get the point that this situation in Iowa represents an emergency. If we are so hamstrung with this routine of procedure, we had better fold up as a House of Representatives and stop trying to function as a legislative body.

You are talking about an emergency here that affects not only the people of my State and my district but the welfare of the entire Nation. I do not think I can adequately describe in 3½ minutes the impact of the flood disaster this year on the raising of hogs in my district, for instance. I have the three top counties of Iowa in hog production. You cannot fatten hogs successfully on anything but corn. You take a million acres out of Iowa corn production and you will have to go pretty far to make up for that shortage of corn and its effect in decreasing 1 year's meat supply. That will seriously affect the meat supply of our entire Nation. We should also give some consideration to other crops as well as the raising of hogs.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. TALLE. I want to stress strongly and emphasize to my colleague from Iowa that during the war Iowa produced 10 percent of our Nation's food, and therefore a disaster in Iowa which destroys food is something that must affect everybody in the Nation.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Yes. I am not willing to subjugate the food production of Iowa and of the Nation to the long, tedious, and narrow process mentioned by the gentleman from South Dakota a moment ago. I think it is too important. It is an emergency. It is right on our doorstep now. It is a disaster not only to the individuals affected but to the entire Nation's food basket, and it will be seriously felt next year when it comes to filling our own needs, let alone the needs of the other nations of the world. I am watching other items of the budget and how they come out as to meeting disasters. The Cedar River, the Iowa River, and the Des Moines River all flow through my district and empty into the Mississippi in my district. I have seen disaster after disaster descend upon my district because of floods. I think it is high time we were waking up and taking action and not confining ourselves to too strict an interpretation of detailed procedure in meeting these disasters. Let us vary a little bit in the name of common sense for the protection of our food production and for the welfare of these people who have been suffering so much from flood disasters such as we have experienced this year.

I am also watching the building of levees along the Mississippi from Davenport down to Keokuk. Those levees are seriously in need of repair. I am not registering too strong a complaint against the district engineer's office at Rock Island. They have done a good job but they need money to do it. The levees along the Iowa River where it empties into the Mississippi are too low to protect the people there. All the people in Oakville, Iowa, in my district had to move out of their homes twice during the last 18 months, when the entire town had to be abandoned because of flood waters.

Mr. JENSEN. Does the gentleman know that the Budget Bureau put $100 in the budget for emergency flood control?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Yes, and that item of $100 only emphasizes the fact of denial of Federal responsibility to meet the very emergency that now confronts the people who are victims of these disastrous floods. It also indicates intentional delay in meeting the situation until endless tedium of detailed procedural fol de rol can be followed to the letter even though stark tragedy stalks the land at every turn.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, to have the record straight on this matter, the budget had $100 in for emergency work. The committee put in $500,000 for emergency work over and above the budget.

Mr. Chairman, this is an illustration of what can happen when we are too eager to make appropriations. I have sympathy with the project. We have two dams which are going to cost about $300,000,000—the Garrison Dam and the Randall Dam, which will lower the waters in the Missouri River and take care of part of this trouble. Here you are asking for $5,000,000 on a dam which will cost about $15,000,000, when the engineers have not even made plans. If you gave them the $5,000,000, they could not spend it because there are no plans. There is no record in the committee that there are any plans on this. They could not spend this money if you gave it to them. If there is any part of the country that this committee has been sympathetic toward, it is the Missouri River section and on the projects all the way down. If there is any part of the country that has received our sympathetic consideration, it has been that area, because we have an able Member from Kansas on the committee and another able Member from South Dakota and others from the Midwest. We are certainly going to look after the Midwest.

I ask you to turn this down. I am going to ask the War Department to formulate plans so that we can go about this in an orderly way.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I said yesterday and the day before that if we are going to judge the merits of flood-control projects by some policy we may have of giving some money to foreign countries, God help America and God help flood control. There is no money in this bill for planning. The engineers have no plans on this project. This is the first the committee has heard of it. They are asking us to put this in now. In fairness, they should have come before the committee. Nothing was said or done. We are sympathetic with the proposition. The engineers could not spend the money if they had it.

I ask that this amendment be turned down.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think it is very seldom I have ever spoken a personal word about myself individually on the floor of this House. I want the record perfectly clear that if there was ever any reference in the press to my taking any trip to investigate the expenditure of this money abroad, it is the first time it has come to my attention. If the gentleman will permit me, with regard to this matter before us, I was born in Iowa. I am sympathetic with the needs of that territory. I came across Iowa during this flood 2 weeks ago Sunday. I know I had to change trains in Omaha because the train I was scheduled to go on had been taken off. I saw the water on both sides of the road, from the train on which I did ride, for miles. I saw stock driven into the corners of fences, trying to find the last little bit of high ground, to find a chance to survive. I saw the people trying to move around. There is a desperate situation in this flood in Iowa, but it may be the first time they have had that in 100 years. I do not know. There is nothing before the committee on the matter. Personally, I feel that, in spite of the fact that the planning estimates as they came to us did not indicate anything for even starting the planning, it would not be a violation of the planning money if some of it were used to get some plan started on this project. But the committee had neither a request for planning money nor construction money.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time, and I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RIZLEY. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], when he walked away from the reading stand, said he withdrew his motion. My inquiry is if we have to vote on it after he has withdrawn it.

The CHAIRMAN. Such a motion can be withdrawn only by unanimous consent. If the gentleman made any such request, the Chair and those at the desk did not hear it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I did make such a request as I have on other occasions, but I seem to have difficulty in people hearing me. Maybe I do not speak loudly enough.

The CHAIRMAN. There must be something wrong.

The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to withdraw his motion that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Is there objection?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object——

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand the regular order.

Mr. McCORMACK. Then, Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. McCORMACK) there were—ayes, none; noes, 104.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LECOMPTE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LECOMPTE) there were—ayes, 36; noes, 107.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILSON of Indiana: On page 8, line 22, after the comma, strike out "$132,041,800" and insert "$130,560,800."

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask the indulgence for just a few minutes of those Members who have been speaking in behalf of flood control and asking additional funds for their particular districts, for I think I can help them in solving their problem by showing them how to get some money for true flood-control projects.

My amendment is to eliminate from the flood-control section of this appropriation bill funds for a project which is 98 percent power, a project which private enterprise is anxious, ready, willing, and able to build. We will thereby save a minimum of $46,334,700 for our already depleted Treasury and will make possible a private enterprise valued at a similar amount which through taxes, will help to restore our depleted Treasury in days to come. This amendment is in the interest of private enterprise and a vote for the amendment is a vote for private enterprise; a vote against this amendment is a vote for national socialism.

This project, the Clark Hill project, which I propose to eliminate from the appropriation, was originally authorized in 1944 to cost $35,300,000. The flood-control benefits of the project were estimated at $16,750 annually. The amount allocated to flood control was only $364,000 or slightly over 1 percent of the estimated cost. At present the Army engineers estimate that the construction cost will be at least $46,334,700, an increase of $11,034,700, or 31.3 percent over the 1944 estimate.

Our distinguished chairman of the Civil Functions Appropriations Committee has stated that the committee passed a resolution years ago to refer legislation with an increase in cost of over 25 percent back to the House for reauthorization. The present estimated cost of the Clark Hill project is 31.3 percent above the amount for which it was authorized. The flood-control benefits are now estimated at $32,000 annually and the amount allocated to flood control is less than 2 percent of the present estimated cost of the project. There is no justification for Government construction. There is not a single, justifiable criticism of the service, rates, or treatment of customers by the private utility which serves the Augusta, Ga., area, in which the Clark Hill power would be distributed.

The residential use of electricity in the Augusta area has increased threefold in the past 10 years. It now exceeds the per residential customer average in the TVA area. During 1946 the residential use of electricity in the Augusta area averaged 2,178 kilowatt-hours per residential customer as compared with an average residential use of 2,016 kilowatt-hours in the TVA area and a national average use of 1,329 kilowatt-hours.

The Savannah River Electric Co., which owned the dam site until the title was recently taken from them by the Government, without notice, in an unwarranted, arbitrary manner, is ready, able and willing to build the project substantially in accordance with the plans of the Army engineers and to reimburse the Government for its expenditures to date.

The water in the reservoir and its release will be under the control of the Army engineers at all times, thereby assuring the same flood-control benefits which would be obtained if the project were constructed by the Government.

The Federal Power Commission license for a hydroelectric project specifies that the project must be operated as directed by the Army engineers and the water that flows through the dam would have to flow through it in accordance with regulations as prescribed by the Army engineers the same as if the project was operated directly by them.

There is no lack of faith on the part of the Savannah River Electric Co., as was indicated to this House yesterday by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN]. I asked him at that time to please permit me to correct the RECORD. I know he wanted the

RECORD straight, but he refused at that time.

Therefore I want to present to you a letter and brief which the Augusta Herald of August 15, 1935, states was carried to the President of the United States by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] and two Members of the other body.

On page 1360 of the hearings on the War Department civil functions appropriation bill for 1948, Mr. BROWN states:

Senators GEORGE and RUSSELL and I called on the President, delivered the letter and the brief, and requested him to appoint the committee as requested by citizens of the area.

This letter asking the President to appoint a PWA Commission and the brief proves conclusively that the Savannah River Electric Co. never broke faith and never breached their contract at any time.

Yesterday Mr. BROWN accused them of having broken faith. He said a license was granted the Savannah River Electric Co. to build this project in 1928 but, he said, they turned that license back 4 years later. He did not state the reason for surrendering the license and left the impression that the company acted in bad faith.

In this letter and brief which he carried to the President of the United States in August 1935, the reason for surrendering the license in 1932 is given. It also outlines the basis for a cooperative effort started in 1935. The brief states:

It is also generally known that the Savannah River Electric Co., a subsidiary of the Commonwealth & Southern Corp., secured a Federal license to construct a hydroelectric development at Clark Hill some years ago, and has actually acquired the necessary dam site and more than 50 percent of the land required for reservoir purposes, according to Army engineers' estimate.

This company was perfecting plans to proceed with this development about 1929 or 1930; but on account of financial conditions and anticipated decreasing demands for electrical power in the years immediately following 1930, canceled its plans and surrendered its Federal license. Since this time, however, and during the past 6 months especially, the demand for electrical energy in this section has turned upwards, and there is now reason to believe that an agreement might be worked out between the Federal Government and the Savannah River Electric Co., through the Georgia Power Co., another subsidiary of the Commonwealth & Southern Corp. (similar to the agreements made with private power oompanies in connection with the Boulder Dam development on the Colorado River), which would result in the construction of this development at an early date; such an agreement to be based on the following general considerations:

1. Savannah River Electric Co. to transfer its present dam site and reservoir land to the Federal Government at a fair price based on cost.

2. Federal Government to acquire additional land required and construct the proposed dam, or dam and powerhouse.

3. Savannah River Electric Co. or Georgia Power Co. to construct and own the proposed powerhouse, or lease the powerhouse, if constructed by the Federal Government for a term of 50 years.

4. Savannah River Electric Co. or Georgia Power Co. to purchase or lease all rights to use of water for power production at a specified rate per kilowatt or kilowatt-hour.

5. Savannah River Electric Co. or Georgia Power Co. to operate the entire development, and also maintain the powerhouse and generating equipment for a period of 50 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Now here is where I want to prove conclusively that they did not break faith with their people, because in this same letter and brief carried by Mr. BROWN to the President of the United States there was this provision:

3. Savannah River Electric Co. or Georgia Power Co. to construct and own the proposed powerhouse, or lease the powerhouse, if constructed by the Federal Government for a term of 50 years.

They were willing to surrender their holdings in this project, certainly, because they were going to get the power. It was part of the cooperative arrangement, and the Savannah River Electric Co. and Georgia Power Co. wholeheartedly cooperated with the people in the Augusta area to have the project built under the plan outlined.

In order that the Members will have the benefit of the full text of the letter and brief containing the basis of the cooperation between the people in the Augusta area and the Savannah River Electric Co. and Georgia Power Co., I am placing them in the RECORD at this point:

THE CITY COUNCIL OF AUGUSTA, GA.,
August 8, 1935.

SAVANNAH RIVER IMPROVEMENT

Hon. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Representing respectively the Savannah River Improvement Commission and the city of Augusta, we have the honor to appeal to you for assistance in furthering the development of the Savannah River by the Federal Government from the standpoint of flood control, navigation improvement, prevention of soil erosion, and power production.

We are attaching hereto a brief statement of the problem, based on information secured from the study and report which has been made of this subject by the Army engineers, as set forth in House Document No. 64 of the Seventy-fourth Congress, first session, entitled "Savannah River, Ga., S. C., and N. C."

We will appreciate it if you will read this brief and appoint a PWA commission to investigate this matter carefully, with the idea of working out some plan, such as that suggested in the brief, which will lead to the further development of the river by the immediate construction of the Clark Hill Reservoir—the next logical step in the development program outlined by the Army engineers. We will cooperate with such a commission to the fullest possible extent, and hope that our request will meet with favorable action at your hands.

Respectfully yours,

THE CITY COUNCIL OF AUGUSTA,
By RICHARD ALLEN, *Mayor.*

SAVANNAH RIVER
IMPROVEMENT COMMISSION,
By FERDINAND PHINIZY,
Vice Chairman.

BRIEF ON SAVANNAH RIVER DEVELOPMENT WITH RESPECT TO FLOOD CONTROL, NAVIGATION, PREVENTION OF SOIL EROSION AND POWER DEVELOPMENT

GENERAL

The Savannah River is the boundary line between the States of Georgia and South Carolina, and is 314 miles in length, the area of the watershed being 10,579 square miles. The river is formed by the junction of the Seneca and Tugalo Rivers which drain a portion of the eastern slope of the Blue Ridge Mountains in Georgia and North Carolina, where the average rainfall varies from 70 to 80 inches per annum. The top of this ridge varies from 4,000 to 5,000 feet in altitude, and the actual fall in the Savannah River from its head to mouth is approximately 500 feet. As the Tennessee River has a fall of 500 feet in 652 miles of length, and drains an area of 40,000 square miles, it is apparent that the flood and power potentialities of the Savannah River are only about 25 percent of those on the Tennessee River, but the Savannah River is nevertheless one of the largest rivers in the southeastern section.

The city of Augusta, with a population of approximately 60,000 people, is the third largest city in Georgia, and is located on the Savannah River about 200 miles above its mouth at Savannah, Ga.

FLOOD CONDITIONS

The Savannah River is a flashy stream and subject to frequent floods of 100,000 to 350,000 cubic feet per second at Augusta. The city is now protected from these normal floods by a levee which was constructed by the city in 1914, and which has been raised and strengthened several times since. Additional improvements now being made will furnish reasonable protection against such floods as have been experienced in the past, but complete protection can only be secured by the construction of a storage reservoir on the river above Augusta. The flood of 1929, which resulted in serious damage to the city, had an estimated discharge of 350,000 second-feet, while the flood of 1796 was estimated at 360,000 second-feet, and that of 1908 at more than 300,000 second-feet.

RIVER NAVIGATION

The Savannah River is considered a navigable stream and boats are in actual operation as far up the river as Augusta. The Federal Government is now constructing a lock and movable dam at New Savannah Bluff, about 15 miles below Augusta, which will materially improve the present unsatisfactory navigation conditions in the river; but on completion of this work a 6-foot channel will be available for only 80 to 85 percent of the time, or approximately 10 months out of the year, and during the remaining 2 months low water conditions will be encountered by boats and barges now plying the river.

HYDROELECTRIC DEVELOPMENT

Despite the fact that the Savannah River is one of the largest rivers in the southeast and easily adaptable to hydroelectric development, there are only three power developments on the main stream—one of 3,000-horsepower capacity, with a 14-foot dam at Gregg Shoals, about 75 miles above Augusta, which is owned by the Georgia Power Co.; a second development, known as Stevens Creek development, owned by South Carolina Power Co., which includes a 30-foot dam and 25,000 horsepower hydroelectric plant, about 9 miles above Augusta; and a third development, known as the Augusta Canal development, which consists of a low dam about 10 feet high, 7 miles above the city, to divert water to the canal from which 12,000 horsepower can be developed in 10 or 12 small industrial plants, a total power capacity in the three developments of only 40,000 horsepower.

FUTURE DEVELOPMENT

A complete study has been made by the Army engineers, and a comprehensive plan proposed for the complete development of the river from the standpoint of flood control, navigation, and power production, as described in House Document No. 64 of the Seventy-fourth Congress, first session, entitled "Savannah River; Georgia, South Carolina, and North Carolina." Five of these proposed developments are located on the main stream which, with the proposed total installed generating capacity of 396,000 kilowatts, would produce 650,000,000 kilowatt-hours in firm power and 600,000,000 kilowatt-hours in secondary power per annum when the market can absorb this amount of energy.

After analyzing all these developments carefully from the standpoint of power output and value for flood control and navigation purposes, the Army engineers have concluded that additional protection against floods at Augusta and further improvement of navigation conditions in the river below Augusta can best be secured from the storage reservoirs which would be formed by the construction of hydroelectric developments on the river above Augusta, and that the next logical step in such a program is to construct the Clark Hill development. These conclusions are set forth in the following paragraph, which is taken from page 20 of the report referred to:

"That the most economical plan for the coordination of developments for power and navigation is the one consisting of the development of the Clark Hill site for power and storage by private interests, so as to provide a minimum continuous regulated flow of 4,180 second-feet at the site in a year like 1931, and improvement for navigation below Augusta by the United States by means of a lock and dam at New Savannah Bluff and channel regulation works below, but that the United States is not economically justified in making the improvements for navigation until the power development is undertaken."

The selection of the Clark Hill development among many analyzed was based on the following considerations, as set forth on pages 69 and 70 of the report:

"(a) It will probably be the next power development to be undertaken.

"(b) Proposed reservoir at this site is greater than at any other power site.

"(c) The drainage area above Clark Hill is 85 percent of that above Augusta, hence the reservoir requirements as to operation for either power or navigation should be very nearly the same.

"(d) The Clark Hill site is only 21 miles above Augusta and therefore the effectiveness of the proposed reservoir for navigation cannot be questioned."

The development at New Savannah Bluff referred to in the conclusion quoted above is now under construction, but it will be noted that the Army engineers have recognized that the Clark Hill development cannot be economically justified for navigation and flood control purposes except as part of a power development; and it is also brought out in the report that the power development could not be justified until the market in this territory can absorb a large part of the power output of same. The Clark Hill development, as proposed by the Army engineers, includes a dam 110 feet high and an electric generating plant of 143,000 kilowatts installed capacity, which will produce an average annual output of 507,000,000 kilowatt-hours when the load in the surrounding territory demands this much energy. The prime capacity of the plant at 100-percent load factor is estimated at 25,900 kilowatts, and the cost $17,485,500. A similar development with only 93,700 kilowatts installed generating capacity is estimated to cost $15,385,200 with a corresponding reduction in output.

The interim report in power series No. 1, issued by the Federal Power Commission a few months ago in connection with the national power survey, states that there is a deficit in electric generating capacity of more than 10 percent in Georgia and between 5 percent and 10 percent in South Carolina.

It is also generally known that the Savannah River Electric Co., a subsidiary of the Commonwealth & Southern Corp., secured a Federal license to construct a hydroelectric development at Clark Hill some years ago and has actually acquired the necessary dam site and more than 50 percent of the land required for reservoir purposes, according to Army engineers' estimate. This company was perfecting plans to proceed with this development about 1929 or 1930, but on account of financial conditions and anticipated decreasing demands for electrical power in the years immediately following 1930 canceled its plans and surrendered its Federal license. Since this time, however, and during the past 6 months especially, the demand for electrical energy in this section has turned upward, and there is now reason to believe that an agreement might be worked out between the Federal Government and the Savannah River Electric Co., through the Georgia Power Co., another subsidiary of the Commonwealth & Southern Corp. (similar to the agreements made with private power companies in connection with the Boulder Dam development on the Colorado River), which would result in the construction of this development at an early date; such an agreement to be based on the following general considerations:

1. Savannah River Electric Co. to transfer its present dam site and reservoir land to the Federal Government at a fair price based on cost.

2. Federal Government to acquire additional land required and construct the proposed dam, or dam and powerhouse.

3. Savannah River Electric Co. or Georgia Power Co. to construct and own the proposed powerhouse, or lease the powerhouse, if constructed by the Federal Government for a term of 50 years.

4. Savannah River Electric Co. or Georgia Power Co. to purchase or lease all rights to use of water for power production at a specified rate per kilowatt or kilowatt-hour.

5. Savannah River Electric Co. or Georgia Power Co. to operate the entire development and also maintain the powerhouse and generating equipment for a period of 50 years.

FINANCIAL ANALYSIS

Based on the estimates of cost prepared by Army engineers as quoted above, and an allowance of 4 percent per annum for fixed charges to include interest at 3 percent plus 1 percent for amortization of entire investment in 50 years, with additional allowance for other items of expense, a financial analysis of the project is given in following table.

	Small plant	Large plant
Installation, kilowatts	93,700	143,000
Primary capacity (100 percent load factor), kilowatts	25,900	25,900
Annual possible output (90 percent utility), million kilowatt-hours	430	505
Estimated cost (dollars)	15,385,200	17,485,500
Annual charges:		
Percent		
Interest 3.00		
Amortization, 50-year sinking-fund basis 1.00	$616,000	$700,000
Total 4.00		
Allow for operation and maintenance of dam, navigation, and flood-control works	100,000	100,000
Total annual cost	716,000	800,000
Possible revenue:		
From capacity charge for water at $10 per kilowatt of prime capacity (100 percent load factor)	$259,000	$259,000
From energy charge at 2 mills per kilowatt-hour:		
A. Based on production of 226.5 million kilowatt-hours	457,000	
B. Based on production of 260.5 million kilowatt-hours		561,000
Total annual revenue	716,000	800,000
Profit from energy charge on additional generation possible if such energy can be sold at say 1 mill per kilowatt-hour	[1] 201,900	[2] 226,500

[1] Small plant 201,900,000 kilowatt-hours.
[2] Large plant 226,500,000 kilowatt-hours.

If a portion of the total cost of the project, say $5,000,000, is directly allotted to navigation, flood control, and prevention of soil erosion, and the balance to power production, the net annual profit to the Government from power production at the proposed development would be $200,000 greater than the last figures shown in the above table, or $401,900 per annum in the case of the small plant, and $426,500 per annum, in the case of the large plant, assuming, of course, that the entire output is utilized at rates indicated. Figures given in the Army engineers' report indicate that a value of at least $5,000,000 could be placed on this development from the standpoint of value for flood protection and navigation improvement.

The physical characteristics of the Clark Hill development quoted above are taken from the Army engineers' report. The site owned by the Savannah River Electric Co. is at a slightly different location from that proposed by the Army engineers, and the physical characteristics of the development planned by the Savannah River Electric Co. may be slightly different from those quoted above. These figures, however, are submitted only as a rough analysis of the problem, subject to such corrections as may be necessary following further study, simply to indicate that there is a real basis for the belief that some plan can be worked out with the interested power company which will lead to construction of this project immediately.

CONCLUSION

The construction of this development with the facilities already provided by the Federal Government in cooperation with the citizens of Augusta will completely protect the city against damage from all floods and provide all improvements necessary for navigation in river below. Its construction will also afford sufficient power to the city of Augusta for the needs of its present and new industries for many years to come and also supply the deficiency in power which now exists for urban and rural purposes in the Savannah River Valley near Augusta, where several hundred thousand people reside, at reasonable rates.

In conclusion, you are respectfully requested to consider the fact that the entire project involving navigation, flood control, protection of life and property, elimination of soil erosion, and development of a large amount of urgently needed hydroelectric power will pay, in the opinion of conservative engineers, necessary interest on the entire cost of construction, amortize the debt in 50 years, and will yield a large profit to the Government out of the proceeds which can be secured from sale of power on basis outlined above.

In addition, this undertaking would employ an average of 1,500 to 2,000 people, 5 days per week, for at least 2 years' time. A large number of these people could be put to work

immediately in clearing land already acquired for reservoir purposes, and this number gradually increased as plans for the project are developed and the work progresses. The conditions surrounding this project are such that no delay need be sustained in putting these people to work on this project if the report of a commission appointed as requested in attached letter is formally approved and work authorized.

The cooperation continued until the passage of the Flood Control Act of 1944, which authorized the Clark Hill project. This same act contained a clause giving preference in the sale of power to public bodies and cooperatives. The history of this clause is most interesting.

After the bill containing the Clark Hill authorization was reported to the House President Roosevelt addressed a letter to the chairman of the committee objecting to disposal of Clark Hill—if authorized—power at the switchboard as contrary to the public-power policy of Congress and submitting a suggested amendment to H. R. 3961 providing that "preference in the sale of such power and energy shall be given to public bodies and cooperatives."

The letter was printed as Document No. 1, of the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors and marked confidential. It was not made public at the time, probably because it would not meet with the approval of any of the people who believed in private enterprise versus national socialism. Mr. Brown said that those people never came up here to be heard on anything. They did not have a chance to be heard on this amendment because no public hearing was held. The proposed amendment was discussed in the Committee of the Whole House.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], now chairman of the Committee on Public Works, fought the proviso and it was defeated by the House. Later it was put in by the other body after a prolonged debate. It was included in the Flood Control Act of 1944, as approved by the President on December 22, 1944.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I think the gentleman's amendment presents this issue to the House and to the country: Do we believe in private enterprise or do we believe in state socialism? Now, much is going to be made on one point, and that is that the power companies in the area where this dam is located were willing that the Government should construct the entire project, but that offer was made primarily on the basis that all of the power generated at Clark Hill would be sold to the companies in that area at the rate fixed by the Federal Power Commission.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. That is correct, and I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Now, I want to clear up another accusation made by Mr. Brown which was misleading, and that was in regard to the Furman Shoals project. Mr. Brown said that the power company started it years ago and it was still unfinished. Yes, they started the Furman Shoals project on the Oconee River which at that time was generally conceded to be a nonnavigable stream, and they proceeded to construct it. After the company had spent some $6,000,000 the stream was declared to be navigable and the company applied to the Federal Power Commission for a license to complete the project. I have before me a copy of a letter from the president of the Georgia Power Co., dated April 1, 1947, to the editor of the Atlanta Constitution explaining the situation. They did not act in bad faith with the people in this area. They want to build the Furman Shoals project and the only reason they have not completed it is because the Federal Power Commission has not, to this day, granted them a license. Here is the letter from Mr. Arkwright, Jr., the president of the Georgia Power Co. to which I referred:

GEORGIA POWER CO.,
Atlanta, Ga., April 1, 1947.

MR. RALPH MCGILL,
Editor, the Atlanta Constitution,
Atlanta, Ga.

DEAR MR. MCGILL: The story in this morning's Constitution, Power Company Denies Work Near on Furman Shoals Dam, creates an impression which we are very anxious to correct.

We are ready and anxious to complete construction of the Furman Shoals project on the Oconee River as soon as a license has been granted by the Federal Power Commission. At the time the project was first commenced, it was not considered that a license was necessary, but in view of the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the New River case and the 1935 amendment to the Federal Power Act it was necessary for the company to get a ruling from the Federal Power Commission on whether or not the project came within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government and therefore required a license.

Since it was decided in the early part of 1946 that a license was required, the company filed an application for a permit pursuant to the order of the Commission in June 1946, and will commence work as soon as practicable after the license is granted by the Commission.

As in the case of the Clark Hill project, the company is ready to and will begin work as soon as a license is granted by the Federal Government.

Yours very truly,
P. S. ARKWRIGHT, Jr.,
President.

Mr. Chairman, while on the subject of acting in good faith, there is a matter I would like to bring to the attention of the Members. On December 20, 1946, the Army engineers were granted possession of the Clark Hill Dam site and other lands owned by the Savannah River Electric Co. Since that time they have had full use and occupancy of the lands without any interference from the Savannah River Electric Co. On June 10, 1947, the Government filed a declaration of taking to divest completely the Savannah River Electric Co. of the Clark Hill Dam site and 1,532.63 acres of land owned by the company. On June 12, 1947, 2 days later, this order was signed without notice to the Savannah River Electric Co. or an opportunity to be heard. Several similar declarations covering additional land have since been taken. By these actions the Savannah River Electric Co. has been completely divested of its ownership of the dam site and much of the lands needed for the reservoir. By this drastic legal step the Government has deprived the company of its property. I do not know what their motive is, but it cannot be overlooked that they have taken this action only after there has been an indication that Congress might either deauthorize the Clark Hill project or refuse further appropriations. I am placing a copy of declaration of taking No. 2 in the RECORD at this point so that the Members may see how drastic it is:

[United States of America, western district of South Carolina, in the District Court, Greenwood Division—*United States of America, Petitioner,* v. *1,532.63 acres of land, more or less, in McCormick County, S. C., and Savannah River Electric Co., et al., defendants*—judgment on declaration of taking No. 2, civil action No. 740]

This day comes the petitioner in the above-entitled cause, the United States of America, by Oscar H. Doyle, Esq., United States attorney, and moves the court to enter a judgment on the declaration of taking No 2 filed in the above-entitled cause on June 10, 1947, and upon consideration thereof, and of the amended petition in condemnation filed herein, the statutes in such cases made and provided, and it appearing to the satisfaction of the court:

First. That the United States of America is entitled to acquire property or interests in property by eminent domain for the purposes as set out and prayed in said amended petition.

Second. That an amended petition in condemnation was filed at the request of the Secretary of War, the authority empowered by law to acquire the lands described in said amended petition, and also under authority of the Attorney General of the United States.

Third. That said amended petition and declaration of taking State the authority under which, and the public use for which, said lands are taken, that the Secretary of War is the person duly authorized and empowered by law to acquire lands such as are described in the amended petition to provide for a dam site, borrow and construction areas and access roads, for flood control and other purposes incident thereto in connection with the Clark Hill project, Georgia-South Carolina (Savannah River), and for such other uses as may be authorized by Congress or by Executive order, and that the Attorney General of the United States is the person authorized by law to direct the institution of said condemnation proceedings.

Fourth. That a description of the land taken, sufficient for identification thereof, is set out in said declaration of taking No. 2.

Fifth. That said declaration of taking No. 2 contains a statement of the estate or interest in the said lands taken for said public use.

Sixth. That plats showing the tracts of land taken are incorporated in said declaration of taking No. 2.

Seventh. That a statement is contained in said declaration of taking No. 2 of a sum of money estimated by said acquiring authority to be just compensation for said lands in the amount of $23,600, and that said sum was deposited in the registry of this court for the use of the persons entitled thereto simultaneously with the filing of said declaration of taking No. 2.

Eighth. That a statement is contained in the declaration of taking No. 2 that the amount of the ultimate award of compensation for the taking of said lands, in the opinion of the said Secretary of War, will be within any limits prescribed by Congress as to the price to be paid therefor.

Now, therefore, on motion of Oscar H. Doyle, United States district attorney, attorney for petitioner, it is ordered, adjudged, and decreed, that the title to tract No. B-112—

A portion of that tract or plantation lying and being in McCormick County, S. C., known as the Ada B. Nixon tract, and as described on a plat made by Nisbet Wingfield Co. on June 24, 1926, said plat being filed in the McCormick County records; and all of that tract adjacent thereto formerly owned by Mary John Bell and known as tract No. 12 of the John T. Middleton estate. The said two tracts taken together are bounded on the north by the lands of the Augusta Power Co., on the east by lands of Mrs. Rena Bunch Addy and by lands of the Tillman estate, on the south by the Bailey estate and lands of the United States Forest Service, and on the west by the Savannah River; said tract being more fully described as follows:

Beginning at the northeast corner of said tract, this corner being marked by a 2-inch iron pipe approximately 8 inches above ground and on the boundary line with the Augusta Power Co. tract, said corner being located 1,674 feet on a bearing of south 47°47' west from a 15-inch hickory tree marking the southwest corner of the Laura Grove Baptist Church lot near State Highway No. 28.

Thence from said initial point, by metes and bounds,

South 42°47', east, 2,087.7 feet to a stake on the north boundary line at the Nixon homeplace;

Thence along said boundary line south 40°54' west, 332.9 feet to a stake;

South 11°21', west, 163.6 feet to an iron pipe;

South 46°16', east, 130.3 feet to a stake in the old road through the Nixon homeplace;

Then along said road south 77°55', west, 426.1 feet to a stake;

Thence south 0°12', east, 512.0 feet to a stake on a terrace;

South 7°04', east, 1,669.9 feet to a 15-inch hickory on a branch;

South 47°17', west, 1,571.6 feet to a 2-inch iron pipe;

South 68°57', west, 1,130.6 feet to a rock pile;

South 42°25', east, 1,155.2 feet to a stake in a rock pile on north edge of Lukes Ferry Road;

Thence south 54°45', west, 6,454.8 feet to a 30-inch ash on the east bank of Savannah River;

Thence along the east bank of the river in a northerly direction, 5,700 feet along the low-water line to a point of intersection of this line and the north boundary line.

Thence north 47°47' east, 7,208.0 feet to the point of beginning.

The survey was made on March 12, 1946. The directions of the lines refer to the true meridian and were determined by deflection angles from known azimuths of the United States Coast and Geodetic triangulation system for the State of Georgia. The magnetic declination was zero. The tract as surveyed contains 815 acres, more or less.

Said tract consisting of the following two tracts: That tract known as the Ada B. Nixon lands, excluding approximately 54 acres on the east boundary near State Highway No. 28, and being the same lands as described in a deed of J. E. Parker to the Savannah River Electric Co. dated December 3, 1927, and recorded in deed book 12, page 207, of the McCormick County, S. C., records; and that tract of land as described in a deed of J. E. Parker to the Savannah River Electric Co. dated September 18, 1931, and recorded in deed book 13, page 1, of the McCormick County, S. C., records.

Names and addresses of purported owners: Savannah River Electric Co., Charleston, S. C.; J. E. Parker, his heirs and assigns, names and addresses unknown; Treasurer, McCormick County, McCormick, S. C.

Estimated compensation: $15,850.

TRACT NO. B-115

All that tract or parcel of land lying and being in McCormick County, S. C., known as tract No. 30 as shown by plat of A. N. Smith dated March 5, 928, and bounded on the north by lands of Savannah River Electric Co., on the east by right-of-way line of South Carolina State Highway No. 28 lands of Grace E. Pearson and Addie E. Hagan, and the Laura Grove Baptist Church lot, on the south by lands of Mrs. Rena Bunch Addy and of the Augusta Power Co., and on the west by the Savannah River; said tract being more fully described as follows:

Beginning at a point on the north boundary, marked by a rockpile and a stake, said point being the intersection of the north boundary and the west right-of-way line of South Carolina Highway No. 28, 1.5 miles north along said highway from a point opposite the post office at Clarks Hill, S. C.

Thence from said initial point by metes and bounds, along the west right-of-way line of South Carolina Highway No. 28, along a curve to the left, with radius of 1,823.72 feet 205.8 feet along the curve, the chord of which bears south 48° 55' east 205.72 feet to an iron pin;

Thence south 52° 09' east 1055.2 feet to an iron pin;

Thence along a curve to the left, with radius of 1179.27 feet 584.66 feet along the curve, the chord of which bears south 66° 22' east 578.90 feet to an iron pin;

Thence south 80° 35' east 982.3 feet to an iron pin;

Thence along a curve to the right, with radius of 1,113.27 feet 613.3 feet along the curve, the chord of which bears south 64° 48' east 605.6 feet to a stake;

Thence south 25° 06' west 337.1 feet to a rock pile;

Thence south 54° 54' east 649.3 feet to a stake, said point being the northeast corner of Laura Grove School and Church lot;

Thence south 49° 56' west 101.8 feet to a stake;

Thence north 88° 23' west 164.8 feet to an iron axle;

Thence south 4° 45' east 86.7 feet to a stake;

Thence south 57° 24' east 197.0 feet to a 15-inch hickory at the southwest corner of Laura Grove School;

Thence south 47°36' west 820.56 feet to an iron pipe in Sharptons Branch;

Thence along the center line at Sharptons Branch in a southwesterly direction 9,000.0 feet to the intersection of Sharptons Branch with the low water line of the Savannah River;

Thence in a northwesterly direction along the low-water line of the Savannah River, 2,050 feet to the intersection of the said low-water line and the north boundary; thence north 42°17', east 8,290 feet to the point of beginning.

The survey was made March 4, 1946, the directions of the lines refer to the true meridian and were determined by deflection angles from known azimuths of the United States Coast and Geodetic triangulation system for the State of Georgia. The magnetic declination was zero. The tract as surveyed contains 474.1 acres, more or less.

Said tract being know as tract No. 30 and formerly in the name of Mrs. Laura N. Bunch and was deeded to J. E. Parker on June 7, 1928, said tract being conveyed later by deed of J. E. Parker to the Savannah River Electric Co. on September 18, 1931, and recorded in deed book 13, page 1 of the McCormick County, S. C., records.

Names and addresses of purported owners: Savannah River Electric Co., Charleston, S. C.; Treasurer, McCormick County, McCormick, S. C.

Estimated compensation: $7,750.

in fee simple absolute, subject only to existing easements for public roads and highways, for public utilities, for railroads, and for pipe lines therein, vested in the United States of America upon the filing of said declaration of taking No. 2 and the depositing in the registry of this court of the sum of $23,600 as hereinabove recited; the said lands are deemed to have been condemned and taken for the use of the United States of America and the right to just compensation for the property taken, upon the filing of said declaration of taking No. 2 and making the deposit, vested in the persons entitled thereto, and the amount of compensation shall be ascertained and awarded in this proceeding and established by judgment herein pursuant to law.

It is further ordered, adjudged, and decreed, that any liens and encumbrances existing against said tracts of land at the time of the filing of declaration of taking No. 2 and making of the deposit, as above recited, are hereby transferred from said lands to said deposit, to the end that the United States of America took a fee-simple title to said tracts of land, free and clear of all liens and encumbrances.

It is further ordered, adjudged, and decreed that the United States of America is now entitled to immediate possession of the lands hereinabove described; that after service of a certified copy of this judgment upon the defendants in possession of said lands, or if no defendants are in actual possession thereof, then after the posting of such certified copy at a conspicuous place upon the premises, the United States of America and its agents are hereby authorized to enter forthwith and immediately upon said premises and to take full and complete possession thereof for the uses and purposes above stated.

It is further ordered that the United States marshal be, and he is hereby, directed and instructed forthwith to serve a certified copy of this judgment or order upon any of the defendants now in possession of the above-described premises, or if no such defendants are found in actual possession of said premises, then he is ordered to post such certified copy at a conspicuous place upon said premises and forthwith make due return of said service to this court.

This cause is held open for such other and further orders, judgments, and decrees as may be necessary in the premises.

C. C. WYCHE,
United States Judge, Western District of South Carolina.

SPARTANBURG, S. C., *June 12, 1947.*

Mr. Chairman, if there has been any breach of faith it has not been by the Savannah River Electric Co. They are ready, willing, and able to build the Clark Hill project substantially in accordance with the plans of the Army engineers and to reimburse the Government for its expenditures to date. They have given assurances that they will do so if given the opportunity. I ask for the support of my amendment by all Members who believe in private enterprise.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the theme song of the advocates of this kind of legislation ought to be "The Sam Insull days are here again."

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON], commonly known as "CURFEW" WILSON for his attempt a few years ago to make the women of Washington go to bed at an early hour, in getting up here and reading a speech that seemed to be largely copied from the mouthpiece of the power trust in Georgia reminded me of a colored fellow who got caught in a thunderstorm down at home one night. He was trying to follow a path through the woods by the flash of the lightning while thunder shook the

ground, and praying to the Lord to give him "less racket and more light."

I thought of that story several times as I listened to the gentleman from Indiana in his attempt to destroy what has been done up to now on the Savannah River and to turn the great Clark Hill project over to the Power Trust, which he admits is owned by a holding company, that we know uses the small power companies to collect money from the overburdened consumers through exorbitant rates to pay dividends on their watered stocks.

While the gentleman from Indiana was reminding the women of Washington to go to bed early—I suppose that was to save electricity—in his curfew bill, and while he is now attempting to impose the penalties of the Power Trust on the people of Georgia and South Carolina, it would not do him any harm to take a "squint" at the power rates paid by the unprotected people of Indiana. If he would put in some of his valuable time trying to put a stop to the power trust's plundering the people of his own State, he would do a great deal more good for the people he represents than he ever could by imposing a curfew on the women of Washington, or the Power Trust on the people of Georgia.

Last year the people of Indiana were overcharged more than $45,000,000 for their electric lights and power. What they need is a Clark Hill project of their own to force electric rates down to a reasonable level, and as the Negro said give them less racket and more light, especially in the gentleman's district, and particularly on election year.

I was on the committee that authorized this Clark Hill project. We went into it carefully. It was recommended by the Army engineers, and, if I remember it correctly, it was reported unanimously by the committee.

This is power that belongs to the Federal Government. All the power in our navigable streams and their tributaries belongs to the Federal Government. That is the only thing we have left to furnish a yardstick to protect the American people from the exorbitant overcharges that were imposed a few years ago, and are imposed now in a great many States. If it had not been for the TVA, the Columbia River development, Boulder Dam, and a few other public-power projects that provide water power as yardsticks for the Nation, you would be paying 15 cents a kilowatt hour, or probably 20 cents a kilowatt hour, for electricity in every State in this Union.

For Mr. Collier, the successor to Mr. Arkwright, to come up here and tell you that the consumers use more power per capita in that area than they do in the Tennessee Valley area is the silliest nonsense I have ever heard, and if you want the proof I can produce it for you.

What they are trying to do is to take over the water power of the Nation. The people of Georgia last year outside of the TVA area were overcharged $22,000,000 for their electricity, and the people of South Carolina were overcharged more than $9,000,000.

This beneficent outfit headed by Mr. Collier overcharged the people of Georgia $22,000,000. Do you know what that means? It means it would take 500 to 1,000 bales of cotton in every county served in the State of Georgia by this concern to pay these overcharges. Do you know what else it means? It means holding rates so high that the people cannot use electricity for the purposes for which it was created. The cheaper the rates the more freely electricity flows, and the more of those appliances that lift the burden of drudgery from the farm women and farm men, as well as the people in the towns and cities, will be used for that purpose.

The women of Washington did not get excited over the gentleman's attempt to impose the curfew on them, but you let the women of Indiana find out that he is flirting with the Power Trust which would raise their electric rates and deprive them of the use of many of those appliances that brighten their homes and lift the burdens of drudgery from their shoulders, and he will hear a different story.

This Clark Hill Dam is a glorious asset to the people of Georgia and South Carolina, and I, for one, will most certainly oppose any attempt on the part of the distinguished curfew advocate from Indiana to destroy it, or to turn it over to the Power Trust.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes, the last 7 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN.]

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, when I came on the floor of the House today a friend of mine on the left side of the aisle handed me an unsigned and undated letter, headed Clark Hill. I am very much surprised that the author, whoever he was, would be so narrow as to think he could vote one side of the aisle and not pay any attention to the other side of the aisle on a matter of such public interest. This letter reminds me of the kind of letter that politicians sometimes write the night before election and, as a matter of fact, it is just about as reliable.

I live in the Savannah River Basin and I know all the people down in that area and they want this appropriation made so that the work already begun on Clark Hill will continue by the Army engineers without interruption.

The gentleman from Indiana, whose amendment would strike the appropriation for Clark Hill from the bill, is in error in many of his statements just made.

This company obtained a license to construct this project in 1928 and they surrendered it in 1932. Then, when the citizens of that area asked Mr. Arkwright, president of both companies, what he was going to do, he said, "We are not going to ever apply for a license again." He said, "We will cooperate with the people and the Government to get the river developed." Then it was that a group of citizens in the area came up here, and the President of the United States appointed an impartial board to look into the feasibility of the development of the resources of the Savannah River Basin. The company joined us at every stage until August 1946. We have had two reports, unanimous reports, from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and a unanimous report from a similar committee of the Senate. The Senate Committee on Commerce included the project in both the flood-control and the rivers-and-harbors bills in 1944. The project was approved unanimously by the House as well as the Senate. We secured an appropriation in 1945, of $1,000,000; then in May 1946, of $4,500,000, making a total of $5,500,000. The report of the committee headed by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan shows the Army engineers have spent or made commitments on this project totaling more than $4,000,000 to date. For 11 long years officials of the Georgia Power Co. and the Savannah River Electric Co. cooperated with us until recently.

It is very strange that a gentleman who lives 1,000 miles away from the project should lead the fight for the power companies against the people in my area. During the 6 years the gentleman from Indiana has been a Member of this House, so far as I know and so far as the record shows, he never opposed this project before.

Gentlemen, I ask you to give us a unanimous vote on this worthy project.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I do not think anybody will accuse me of advocating State socialism. I think my record stands fairly clear.

There was not a project among the 78 to which this committee gave more time and more careful consideration than this particular project. Now, let us see what the project is. The project was estimated to cost $46,334,700. Like 90 percent of the projects, it has increased 15, 20, 25, 30, or 35 percent; some of them as much as 100 percent increase, due to the fact that we did not get proper estimates from the engineers on some of the projects, and because of increased construction prices.

This is one of the 118 projects which came before the House a year ago last fall. The committee recommended that all projects hereafter should be referred to the Flood Control Committee, which exceeded the estimates by more than 25 percent. This project was one of those exempted from that provision by the provision itself.

Now, we have allotted to this project to date $5,500,000. The Budget approved $6,075,000 for this project. We have an investment of $5,500,000, and the Budget approved $6,075,000. The chairman of the committee, the able and distinguished gentleman from Michigan, [Mr. DONDERO], informed me that they had some negotiations whereby there was a possibility of the power company taking over this project. The project was authorized by the Congress and it was appropriated for by the Congress, and only

the Congress can change the status of that project by law. That bill must be introduced into the Congress, brought before the committee, passed by the Flood Control Committee, passed upon by both Houses, and signed by the President. The committee felt there was some chance of getting together on this project. There was a possibility. We analyzed the project, and we found that the $6,075,000 was to be spent as follows:

One million and ninety-five thousand dollars will be applied to the completion of the diversion channel and the downstream construction bridge and the first stage of the cofferdam. That is for the completion of work under way now.

Three hundred and ninety thousand dollars will be applied to a continuation of the construction of the east embankment; the remainder, $676,000, will be applied to the construction of the concrete dam and appurtenant equipment; and the balance, $918,000 for land acquisition, reservoir clearing, and so forth.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman is correct in stating to the committee that negotiations have taken place between the Government representatives and the power company, to the effect that should this amendment, offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON], be defeated, I have introduced a bill which provides that the Government will complete the building of the dam, and the power company will build the powerhouse and install the machinery, and they will buy the water rights from the United States Government. I do not think there will be opposition on the part of the Government representatives to that proposal, and it still would keep private enterprise in the picture and not put it out of business entirely.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. That bill will have to be passed by the Congress. The policy will have to be fixed by the Congress and not by my subcommittee. With that in mind, we cut that appropriation from $6,075,000 down to $1,481,000. That included the two items, one for $1,091,000 to complete the diversion channel and the downstream construction bridge, and the first stage of the cofferdam—work under way. Now, that should be done. Then $390,000 is for the construction of the east embankment and we stop short of the construction of the dam itself to give the committee and the Congress an opportunity to fix the policy and to change the policy if it wants to change it. If Congress does not change it within the next year then we can go ahead and build the dam. I believe we did the right thing and I ask the House to stand with the committee on this matter.

I am sure that what we did does not subject the Committee to any proposition of advocating state socialism. I ask the Committee to stand by us in making this appropriation of $4,800,000 instead of $6,000,000; and then if next year the House fixes the policy we can go ahead with the construction.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. It does not present the Members, however, with the proposition of the issue of private ownership, private enterprise in this country as against public ownership. I do not think there is any argument that the citizens of the country cannot compete with their own government.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. That is an issue that will be presented when the chairman of the Public Works Committee brings his bill before the House. It is not before us now. Suppose we quit, suppose we shut this down and leave this work uncompleted, and the Congress did not pass this bill—where would we be with the project uncompleted and up in the air?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The bill the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] mentions does not have any more chance of becoming law under this administration than Gov. Bob Taylor's gutta-percha dog had of catching the asbestos cat in Hades.

We are not going to have the Government build this great project and then turn it over to the Power Trust.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I do not know, of course, what is going to happen to that bill. I am just trying to dispose of this bill intelligently. I think the committee has done some very good work, and I ask that the House stand by the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I submit for information of all Members of Congress and others interested a tabulation showing the complete detailed break-down of the presentation made to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control, the action taken by the committee and now approved by the House:

River and harbor construction

	Budget estimate	Recommended
Agate Bay Harbor, Minn	$250,000	
Baltimore Harbor and Channels, Md	400,000	
Black Rock Channel and Tonawanda Harbor, N. Y	1,000,000	$1,000,000
Brazos Island Harbor, Tex	685,500	500,000
Bridgeport Harbor, Conn	400,000	400,000
Caloosahatchee River and Lake Okeechobee drainage areas, Florida	12,700	12,700
Cape Fear River, N. C., at and below Wilmington	300,000	100,000
Cape Vincent Harbor, N. Y	19,200	19,200
Columbia River, Wash. and Oreg., Umatilla (McNary) Dam	3,500,000	3,000,000
Columbia River between Vancouver, Wash., and The Dalles, Oreg	201,000	
Crisfield Harbor, Md		45,000
Delaware River, Philadelphia, Pa., to the sea	500,000	
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway (Galveston district)	664,800	500,000
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway (New Orleans district)	300,000	200,000
Illinois waterway, Illinois	180,000	
James River, Va	80,000	80,000
Keweenaw waterway, Michigan	145,000	
Lake Worth Inlet, Fla	106,300	106,300
Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn	500,000	271,500
Mississippi River between Missouri and Illinois Rivers	$3,750,000	$3,000,000
Missouri River, Kansas City to mouth	1,500,000	1,500,000
Missouri River, Kansas City, Mo., to Sioux City, Iowa	3,000,000	2,500,000
Missouri River at Fort Peck, Mont	100,000	100,000
Neches and Angelina Rivers, Tex	1,300,000	800,000
New Haven Harbor, Conn	200,000	200,000
New York Harbor, N. Y	400,000	400,000
New York and New Jersey channels	590,000	
Ohio River open channel	200,000	
Oswego Harbor, N. Y	236,000	236,000
Peoria Harbor, Ill (Illinois waterway)		44,000
Port Aransas-Corpus Christi waterway, Texas	150,000	150,000
Sabine-Neches waterway, Texas	831,500	500,000
St. Johns River, Fla., Jacksonville to Lake Harney	200,000	100,000
St. Lucie Inlet, Fla		53,000
St. Marys River, Mich	600,000	600,000
San Diego Harbor, Calif	50,000	50,000
Savannah Harbor, Ga	300,000	100,000
Tampa Harbor, Fla	200,000	200,000
Winyah Bay, S. C	600,000	500,000
Total	23,452,000	17,367,700

River and harbor advance-planning funds

	Budget estimate
Alabama and Coosa Rivers, Ala. and Ga	$290,000
Apalachicola, Chattahoochee, and Flint Rivers, Ga. and Fla	450,000
Caloosahatchee to Anclote Rivers, Fla., waterway	10,000
Cleveland Harbor, Ohio	50,000
Columbia River at Foster Creek, Wash	275,000
Cumberland River, Tenn. and Ky	100,000
Detroit River, Mich	20,000
Florida barge canal	20,000
Illinois waterway, Ill	150,000
Jacksonville to Miami, Fla., waterway	25,000
Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn	175,000
Mississippi River, Baton Rouge, La., to Gulf of Mexico	25,000
Ohio River lock and dam construction	100,000
Portland Harbor, Maine	5,000
Red River and tributaries, Louisiana, Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Texas	75,000
Sacramento River, Calif	50,000
St. Marys River, Mich	50,000
San Diego River and Mission Bay, Calif	20,000
Snake River, Oreg., Wash., and Idaho	400,000
Tennessee-Tombigbee Rivers, waterway	300,000
Total	2,500,000

The budget estimate totaling $2,500,000, as shown above, was reduced by 50 percent or a total reduction of $1,250,000.

Statement showing the proposed application of funds included in the budget estimate of $76,042,000 for maintenance and improvement of river and harbor projects during the fiscal year 1948

Project	Maintenance	Operation and care	Examinations, surveys, and contingencies
Penobscot River, Maine	$60,000		
Kennebec River, Maine	40,000		
Portland Harbor, Maine	90,000		
Essex River, Mass	57,000		
Boston Harbor, Mass	100,000		
Weymouth Fore River, Mass	50,000		
Cape Cod Canal, Mass	150,000	$272,700	
Nantucket Harbor, Mass	70,000		
Cuttyhunk Harbor, Mass	20,000		
Providence Harbor, R. I	200,000		
Pawtucket River, R. I	150,000		
Connecticut River below Hartford, Conn	170,000		
Duck Island Harbor, Conn	78,000		
New Haven Harbor, Conn	56,000		
Milford Harbor, Conn	35,000		
Southport Harbor, Conn	24,000		

Statement showing the proposed application of funds—Continued

Project	Maintenance	Operation and care	Examinations, surveys, and contingencies
Examinations, surveys, and contingencies, New England			$81,550
Westchester Creek, N. Y.	$90,600		
Manhasset Bay, N. Y.	350		
Glen Cove Creek, N. Y.	37,300		
Huntington Harbor, N. Y.	560		
Port Jefferson Harbor, N. Y.	500		
Peconic River, N. Y.	30,140		
Sag Harbor, N. Y.	300		
Long Island Intracoastal Waterway, N. Y.	800		
Fire Island Inlet, N. Y.	51,250		
Jamaica Bay, N. Y.	600		
Sheepshead Bay, N. Y.	330		
New York Harbor, N. Y., entrance channels and anchorage areas	190,600		
Coney Island Creek, N. Y.	500		
Gowanus Creek Channel, N. Y.	420		
Wallabout Channel, N. Y.	450		
Hudson River Channel, New York Harbor	656,000		
New York Harbor drift collection	300,000		
Irvington Harbor, N. Y.	420		
Tarrytown Harbor, N. Y.	250		
Peekskill Harbor, N. Y.	250		
Rondout Harbor, N. Y.	2,000		
Hudson River, N. Y.	175,000	$60,200	
Narrows of Lake Champlain, N. Y. and Vt.	3,900		
Burlington Harbor, Vt.	500		
Plattsburg Harbor, N. Y.	500		
Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic Rivers, N. J.	308,000		
New York and New Jersey Channels	200,000		
Elizabeth River, N. J.	600		
Woodbridge Creek, N. J.	1,230		
Great Kills Harbor, N. Y.	500		
Raritan River, N. J.	400		
Cheesequake Creek, N. J.	250		
Wappinger Creek, N. Y.	500		
Examinations, surveys, and, contingencies, New York			240,750
Delaware River, Pa., N. J., and Del., Philadelphia to the sea	2,650,000		
Schuylkill River, Pa.	900,000		
Wilmington Harbor, Del.	300,000		
Inland waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay, Del. and Md.	400,000	312,700	
Smyrna River, Del.	45,000		
Mantua Creek, N. J.	20,000		
Raccoon Creek, N. J.	50,000		
Cohansey River, N. J.	35,000		
Cold Spring Inlet, N. J.	15,000		
Absecon Inlet, N. J.	40,000		
Barnegat Inlet, N. J.	14,000		
New Jersey Intracoastal Waterway, N. J.	30,000		
Examinations, surveys, and contingencies, Philadelphia			64,400
Baltimore Harbor and Channels, Md.	50,000		
Northeast River, Md.	18,000		
Corsica River, Md.	30,000		
Honga River and Tar Bay, Md.	35,000		
Wicomico River, Md.	125,000		
Chincoteague Bay, Va.	15,000		
Ocean City Harbor and Inlet and Sinepuxent Bay, Md.	70,000		
Fishing Creek, Calvert County, Md.	4,000		
Examinations, surveys, and contingencies, Baltimore			88,000
Washington Harbor, D. C.	7,750		
Potomac River at Alexandria, Va.	500		
Potomac River below Washington, D. C.	34,000		
Potomac River at Mount Vernon, Va.	1,000		
Occoquan Creek, Va.	2,000		
Monroe Bay and Creek, Va.	500		
Little Wicomico River, Va.	16,000		
St. Jeromes Creek, Md.	22,000		
Rappahannock River, Va.	76,250		
Hoskins Creek, Va.	1,000		
Examinations, surveys, and contingencies, Washington			41,500
Mattaponi River, Va.	9,000		
Pamunkey River, Va.	9,000		

Statement showing the proposed application of funds—Continued

Project	Maintenance	Operation and care	Examinations, surveys, and contingencies
Thimble Shoal Channel, Va.	$5,000		
James River, Va.	392,150		
Appomattox River, Va.	27,000		
Deep Creek, Va.	4,300		
Portsmouth Harbor, Va., channel to Nansemond Ordnance Depot	2,200		
Willoughby Channel, Va.	3,000		
Channel to Newport News, Va.	2,500		
Norfolk Harbor, Va.	540,850		
Inland waterway from Norfolk, Va. to Beaufort Inlet, N. C. (Norfolk district)	232,700	$139,900	
Inland waterway from Norfolk, Va. to Beaufort Inlet, N. C. (Wilmington district)	80,000	80,000	
Waterway from Norfolk, Va., to the Sounds of North Carolina	83,000	124,600	
Examinations, surveys and contingencies, Norfolk			$106,700
Roanoke River, N. C.	75,000		
Manteo (Shallowbag) Bay, N. C.	50,000		
Pamlico and Tar Rivers, N. C.	66,000		
Rollinson Channel, N. C.	15,000		
Silver Lake Harbor, N. C.	15,000		
Neuse River, N. C.	12,500		
Drum Inlet, N. C.	30,000		
Waterway connecting Pamlico Sound and Beaufort Harbor, N. C.	11,750		
Morehead City Harbor, N. C.	175,000		
Beaufort Harbor, N. C.	17,500		
Inland waterway, Beaufort to Cape Fear River, N. C., including waterway to Jacksonville, N. C.	161,000		
Intracoastal Waterway, Cape Fear River, N. C., to Winyah Bay, S. C. (Wilmington district)	50,000		
Cape Fear River, N. C., at and below Wilmington	225,000		
Cape Fear River, N. C., above Wilmington	60,000	31,500	
Northeast (Cape Fear) River, N. C.	5,000		
Lockwoods Folly River, N. C.	5,000		
Examinations, surveys, and contingencies, Wilmington			19,050
Intracoastal Waterway, Cape Fear River, N. C., to Winyah Bay, S. C. (Charleston district)	79,000		
Winyah Bay, S. C.	35,000		
Waccamaw River, N. C. and S. C.	13,000		
Great Pee Dee River, S. C.	10,000		
Waterway from Winyah Bay to Charleston, S. C.	125,000		
Congaree River, S. C.		200	
Charleston Harbor, S. C.	615,000		
Ashley River, S. C.	30,000		
Shipyard River, S. C.	121,900		
Waterway from Charleston to Beaufort, S. C.	38,000		
Examinations, surveys, and contingencies, Charleston			60,000
Savannah Harbor, Ga.	1,947,670		
Savannah River below Augusta, Ga.	47,000	30,000	
Waterway between Beaufort, S. C., and St. Johns River, Fla. (Savannah district)	188,000		
Altamaha, Oconee, and Ocmulgee Rivers, Ga.	32,200		
Brunswick Harbor, Ga.	375,000		
Satilla River, Ga.	7,100		
St. Marys River, Ga. and Fla.	8,100		
Fernandina Harbor, Fla.	55,000		
Examinations, surveys, and contingencies, Savannah			72,200
Waterway between Beaufort, S. C. and St. Johns River, Fla. (Jacksonville district)	4,000		
St. Johns River, Fla., Jacksonville to the ocean	200,000		
Oklawaha River, Fla.	3,500	12,000	

Statement showing the proposed application of funds—Continued

Project	Maintenance	Operation and care	Examinations, surveys, and contingencies
Intracoastal Waterway from Jacksonville to Miami, Fla.	$136,000	$13,200	
Fort Pierce Harbor, Fla.	57,000		
Lake Worth Inlet, Fla.	5,000		
Hollywood Harbor (Port Everglades), Fla.	50,000		
Miami Harbor (Biscayne Bay), Fla.	42,000		
Key West Harbor, Fla.	40,000		
Caloosahatchee River and Lake Okeechobee drainage areas, Florida	195,000	130,000	
Tampa Harbor, Fla.	150,000		
Anclote River, Fla.	20,000		
Withlacoochee River, Fla.	25,000		
Removing the water hyacinths from navigable waters in the State of Florida	75,000		
Examinations, surveys, and contingencies, Jacksonville			$145,000
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway from Apalachee Bay to the Mexican border (Mobile district)	333,000		
Apalachicola, Chattahoochee, and Flint Rivers, Ga. and Fla.	52,280		
St. Josephs Bay, Fla.	55,000		
LaGrange Bayou, Fla.	20,000		
St. Andrews Bay, Fla.	132,500		
Pensacola Harbor, Fla.	92,500		
Mobile Harbor, Ala.	378,000		
Removing the water hyacinth (Mobile River, Ala., tributaries)	45,000		
Black Warrior, Warrior, and Tombigbee Rivers, Ala.	373,000	554,400	
Alabama-Coosa Rivers, Ala. and Ga.		7,500	
Pascagoula Harbor, Miss.	112,500		
Biloxi Harbor, Miss.	21,000		
Gulfport Harbor and Ship Island Pass, Miss.	265,000		
Examinations, surveys, and contingencies, Mobile			95,000
San Juan Harbor, P. R.	37,000		
Mayaguez Harbor, P. R.	100,000		
Examinations, surveys, and contingencies, Antilles			20,000
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway between Apalachee Bay, Fla., and the Mexican border (New Orleans district)	542,000	351,800	
Mississippi River, Baton Rouge, La., to the Gulf of Mexico	1,767,000		
Bayous La Loutre, St. Malo, and Ysckloskey, La.	22,600		
Bayou Dupre, La.	12,600		
Bayou Bonfouca, La.	2,500		
Barataria Bay, La.	200		
Bayou Lafourche, La.	92,000		
Bayou Terrebonne, La.	105,000		
Little Caillou Bayou, La.	105,000		
Waterway from the Intracoastal Waterway to Bayou Dulac, La. (Bayous Grand Caillou and LaCarpe, La.)	44,800		
Bayou Grossetete, La.	5,500		
Bayou Teche, La.	18,000	14,200	
Atchafalaya River, Morgan City to the Gulf of Mexico, La.	90,800		
Inland waterway, Franklin to Mermentau River, La.	5,500	12,400	
Petit Anse, Tigre, and Carlin Bayous, La.	21,500		
Waterway from White Lake to Pecan Island, La.	10,200		
Mermentau River, Bayou Nezpique, and Bayou des Cannes, La.	2,500		
Calcasieu River and Pass, La.	273,800		
Lake Charles deep-water channel, Louisiana	50,500		
Removing water hyacinths, Louisiana	250,000		
Red River below Fulton, Ark.	31,000		
Cypress Bayou and waterway between Jefferson, Tex., and Shreveport, La.	1,000	2,800	

Statement showing the proposed application of funds—Continued

Project	Maintenance	Operation and care	Examinations, surveys, and contingencies
Ouachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La. (New Orleans district)	$112,000	$95,800	
Examinations, surveys, and contingencies, New Orleans			$65,500
Ouachita River, Ark. (Vicksburg district)	54,000	60,200	
Examinations, surveys, and contingencies, Vicksburg			8,300
White River, Ark. (below Peach Orchard bluff)	25,000		
Wolf River (Memphis Harbor), Tenn	95,000		
Examinations, surveys, and contingencies, Memphis			12,500
Sabine-Neches waterway, Tex	750,000		
Gulf Intracoastal Waterway between Apalachee Bay, Fla., and the Mexican border (Galveston district)	1,900,000	629,200	
Galveston Harbor, Tex	250,000		
Galveston Channel, Tex	166,000		
Channel from Galveston Harbor to Texas City, Tex	250,000		
Channel to Port Bolivar, Tex	17,500		
Houston ship channel, Texas	1,250,000		
Double Bayou, Tex	20,000		
Anahuac Channel, Tex	25,000		
Trinity River and tributaries, Texas	4,000		
Cedar Bayou, Tex	2,500		
Clear Creek, Tex	20,000		
Dickinson Bayou, Tex	17,000		
Freeport Harbor, Tex	200,000		
Channel from Pass Cavallo to Port Lavaca, Tex	50,000		
Port Aransas-Corpus Christi waterway, Texas	780,000		
Brazos Island Harbor, Tex	350,000		
Examinations, surveys, and contingencies, Galveston			326,750
Upper White River, Ark	8,000	30,000	
Examinations, surveys, and contingencies, Little Rock			70,000
Examinations, surveys, and contingencies, Tulsa			4,000
Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn:			
St. Paul district	480,000	877,900	
Rock Island district	448,300	951,000	
St. Louis district	275,000	270,000	
Reservoirs at headwaters of Mississippi River		60,000	
St. Croix River, Wis. and Minn	15,000		
Minnesota River, Minn	2,000		
Black River, Wis	2,000		
Examinations, surveys, and contingencies, St. Paul			32,000
Illinois and Mississippi Canal, Ill		170,000	
Mill Creek and South slough at Milan, Ill	2,000		
Examinations, surveys, and contingencies, Rock Island			41,000
Mississippi River between Ohio and Missouri Rivers	1,000,000		
Illinois waterway, Ill. (St. Louis district)	135,000		
Examinations, surveys, and contingencies, St. Louis			67,500
Missouri River, Kansas City to mouth	2,860,000		
Osage River, Mo		6,800	
Missouri River, Kansas City to Sioux City (Kansas City district)	1,150,000		
Missouri River, Kansas City to Sioux City (Omaha district)	1,750,000		
Missouri River at Fort Peck, Mont		296,000	
Examinations, surveys, and contingencies, Kansas City			23,000
Examinations, surveys, and contingencies, Omaha			30,100

Statement showing the proposed application of funds—Continued

Project	Maintenance	Operation and care	Examinations, surveys, and contingencies
Examinations, surveys, and contingencies, Fort Peck			$10,000
Ohio River lock and dam construction		$6,440,770	
Ohio River open channel work	$1,368,600		
Monongahela River, Pa. and W. Va	105,000	888,500	
Allegheny River, Pa	10,000	285,100	
Youghiogheny River, Pa	18,300		
Tygart River Dam, W. Va		38,500	
Examinations, surveys, and contingencies, Pittsburgh			49,100
Muskingum River, Ohio	25,000	133,900	
Little Kanawha River, W. Va		14,300	
Kanawha River, W. Va	55,000	252,500	
Big Sandy River, W. Va. and Ky., including Tug and Levisa Forks		13,800	
Examinations, surveys, and contingencies, Huntington			88,400
Green, Barren, and Nolin Rivers and Bear Creek, Ky	18,000	95,360	
Rough River, Ky		4,950	
Kentucky River, Ky	28,000	146,820	
Examinations, surveys, and contingencies, Louisville			156,500
Cumberland River, Tenn. and Ky	141,600	659,500	
Tennessee River, Tenn., Ala., and Ky	30,500	801,000	
Examinations, surveys, and contingencies, Nashville			27,500
Grand Marais Harbor, Minn	1,000		
Duluth-Superior Harbor, Minn. and Wis	162,000		
Port Wing Harbor, Wis	10,500		
Cornucopia Harbor, Wis	10,500		
Ashland Harbor, Wis	27,000		
Ontonagon Harbor, Mich	26,000		
Keweenaw waterway, Mich	210,000		
Presque Isle Harbor, Mich	2,000		
Marquette Harbor, Mich	17,000		
Grand Marais Harbor of Refuge, Mich	51,000		
Warroad Harbor and River, Minn	16,000		
Examinations, surveys, and contingencies, Duluth			42,600
Manistique Harbor, Mich	17,500		
Menominee Harbor and River, Mich. and Wis	15,000		
Oconto Harbor, Wis	1,000		
Green Bay Harbor, Wis	51,000		
Fox River, Wis	22,000	408,000	
Sturgeon Bay and Lake Michigan Ship Canal, Wis	107,500		
Algoma Harbor, Wis	5,500		
Kewaunee Harbor, Wis	44,500		
Two Rivers Harbor, Wis	19,500		
Manitowoc Harbor, Wis	55,000		
Sheboygan Harbor, Wis	19,500		
Port Washington Harbor, Wis	12,300		
Milwaukee Harbor, Wis	84,500		
Racine Harbor, Wis	19,500		
Kenosha Harbor, Wis	16,500		
St. Joseph Harbor, Mich	36,500		
South Haven Harbor, Mich	29,000		
Saugatuck Harbor and Kalamazoo River, Mich	8,000		
Holland Harbor, Mich	17,000		
Grand Haven Harbor and Grand River, Mich	57,000		
Muskegon Harbor, Mich	15,500		
White Lake Harbor, Mich	11,000		
Pentwater Harbor, Mich	8,000		
Ludington Harbor, Mich	75,000		
Manistee Harbor, Mich	26,500		
Portage Lake Harbor, Mich	1,000		
Frankfort Harbor, Mich	20,000		
Leland Harbor, Mich	1,000		
Charlevoix Harbor, Mich	9,000		
Examinations, surveys, and contingencies, Milwaukee			29,200
Waukegan Harbor, Ill	56,500		
Chicago Harbor, Ill	234,500		
Chicago River, Ill	4,000		
Calumet Harbor and River, Ill. and Ind	220,000		
Lake Calumet, Ill	500		
Indiana Harbor, Ind	254,000		

Statement showing the proposed application of funds—Continued

Project	Maintenance	Operation and care	Examinations, surveys, and contingencies
Michigan City Harbor, Ind	$26,500		
Illinois Waterway, Ill	485,560	$642,000	
Examinations, surveys, and contingencies, Chicago			$65,250
St. Marys River, Mich	118,600	1,695,100	
St. Clair River, Mich	80,000		
Channels in Lake St. Clair, Mich	15,000		
Detroit River, Mich	127,500		
Saginaw River, Mich	75,000		
Black River, Mich	15,000		
Rouge River, Mich	81,500		
Monroe Harbor, Mich	30,000		
Toledo Harbor, Ohio	192,500		
Examinations, survey, and contingencies, Detroit			81,900
Sandusky Harbor, Ohio	45,500		
Huron Harbor, Ohio	37,000		
Lorain Harbor, Ohio	106,400		
Rocky River Harbor, Ohio	7,700		
Cleveland Harbor, Ohio	626,500		
Fairport Harbor, Ohio	200,300		
Ashtabula Harbor, Ohio	277,400		
Conneaut Harbor, Ohio	159,840		
Erie Harbor, Pa	310,900		
Buffalo Harbor, N. Y	212,000		
Black Rock Channel and Tonawanda Harbor, N. Y	160,900	238,000	
Niagara River, N. Y	3,000		
Olcott Harbor, N. Y	163,000		
Rochester (Charlotte) Harbor, N. Y	285,200		
Great Sodus Bay Harbor, N. Y	17,000		
Oswego Harbor, N. Y	13,700		
Ogdensburg Harbor, N. Y	18,100		
Examinations, surveys, and contingencies, Buffalo			129,150
Morro Bay Harbor, Calif	150,000		
San Diego Harbor, Calif	60,000		
Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors, Calif	772,000		
Examinations, surveys, and contingencies, Los Angeles			49,500
Crescent City Harbor, Calif	5,000		
Humboldt Harbor and Bay, Calif	210,000		
Noyo River and Harbor, Calif	54,500		
Bodega Bay, Calif	80,000		
San Francisco Harbor, Calif	235,000		
San Rafael Creek, Calif	4,000		
Petaluma Creek, Calif	80,000		
Napa River, Calif	4,900		
San Pablo Bay and Mare Island Strait, Calif	360,000		
Richmond Harbor, Calif	147,000		
Oakland Harbor, Calif	948,000	25,000	
Redwood Creek, Calif	48,000		
Monterey Bay (Moss Landing), Calif	10,000		
Monterey Harbor, Calif	4,000		
Examinations, surveys, and contingencies, San Francisco			151,000
San Joaquin River, Calif	140,000		
Stockton and Mormon Channels, Calif. (diverting canal)	5,000		
Mokelumne River, Calif	1,000		
Sacramento River, Calif	270,000		
Feather River, Calif	1,000		
Suisun Bay Channel, Calif	45,000		
Suisun Channel, Calif	1,500		
Old River, Calif	20,000		
Yuba River restraining barriers, California	18,500		
Sacramento River and tributaries, California (debris control)	25,000		
Examinations, surveys, and contingencies, Sacramento			86,400
Columbia and lower Willamette Rivers below Vancouver, Wash., and Portland, Oreg	1,100,000		
Columbia River at Bonneville, Oreg		1,147,000	
Willamette River above Portland and Yamhill River, Oreg	500,000	10,000	
Willamette River at Willamette Falls, Oreg		125,000	

Statement showing the proposed application of funds—Continued

Project	Maintenance	Operation and care	Examinations, surveys, and contingencies
Columbia River at mouth, Oreg. and Wash.	$350,000		
Coos Bay, Oreg.	300,000		
Umpqua River, Oreg.	114,000		
Columbia River and tributaries above Celilo Falls to Kennewick, Wash.	62,000		
Depoe Bay, Oreg.	8,000		
Skipanon Channel, Oreg.	20,000		
Columbia River between Vancouver, Wash., and The Dalles, Oreg.	425,000		
Coquille River, Oreg.	30,000		
Westport Slough, Oreg.	8,000		
Cowlitz River, Wash.	15,000		
Columbia River at Bakers Bay, Wash.	25,000		
Columbia River between Chinook, Wash., and head of Sand Island	12,000		
The Dalles-Celilo Canal, Oreg. and Wash.		$110,000	
Yaquina Bay and Harbor, Oreg.	7,000		
Coos River, Oreg.	4,000		
Tillamook Bay and Bar, Oreg.	3,000		
Examinations, surveys, and contingencies, Portland			$600,000
Grays Harbor and Chehalis River, Wash.	178,600		
Willapa River and Harbor, Wash.	79,200		
Puget Sound and its tributary waters, Washington	87,000		
Quillayute River, Wash.	33,500		
Swinomish Slough, Wash.	70,000		
Everett Harbor, Wash.	56,000		
Waterway connecting Port Townsend Bay and Oak Bay, Wash.	1,000		
Lake Washington ship canal, Washington		317,900	
Nome Harbor, Alaska	169,000		
Stikine River, Alaska	700		
Examinations, surveys, and contingencies, Seattle			318,000
Honolulu Harbor, T. H.	188,800		
Kahului Harbor, T. H.	36,250		
Port Allen Harbor, T. H.	21,440		
Nawiliwili Harbor, T. H.	53,510		
Examinations, surveys, and contingencies, Honolulu			44,700
Total	50,000,000	20,000,000	3,645,000

NOTE.—The gross commerce for ports, canals, rivers, and connecting channels during the calendar year 1945 amounted to 1,336,400,000 tons. Based on the estimate of $70,000,000 for maintenance and operation and care during the fiscal year 1948 the average Federal maintenance cost is thus about 5¼ cents per ton.

Summary

No.	Project title	Amount
1.1	Maintenance	$50,000,000
1.2	Operation and care	20,000,000
1.3	Examinations, surveys and contingencies	3,645,000
1.4	Removal of wrecks	300,000
1.5	Survey of northern and northwestern lakes	300,000
1.6	Supervisor of New York Harbor	350,000
1.7	Expenses of California Debris Commission	12,000
3	Salaries, Office of Chief of Engineers (allotment roll)	470,000
4	Printing for River and Harbor Board (sec. 6, River and Harbor Act, July 3, 1930, and surveys authorized by law)	40,000
5	River and Harbor Board expenses	400,000
6	Beach Erosion Board	100,000
8	Snagging, River and Harbor Act, Mar. 2, 1945 (sec. 3)	300,000
9	Transfer to Geological Survey (stream gaging)	125,000
	Grand total	76,042,000

Flood control, general construction program

	Budget estimate	Recommended
Allatoona Reservoir, Ga.	$7,425,000	$6,572,100
Almond Reservoir, N. Y.	1,600,000	1,600,000
Bayou Bodcau, Red Chute and Loggy Bayou, La.	86,500	86,500
Big Dry Creek Reservoir and diversion, Calif.	771,000	771,000
Bluestone Reservoir, W. Va.	5,900,000	5,000,000
Buffalo Bayou, Tex.	1,854,700	1,654,700
Buggs Island Reservoir, Va. and N. C.	4,800,000	3,800,000
Bull Shoals Reservoir, Ark.	3,694,000	3,000,000
Burbank-Western System (lower), Calif.	100,000	
Canton Reservoir, Okla.	2,200,000	2,000,000
Center Hill Reservoir, Tenn.	5,703,000	5,703,000
Chariton River, Mo.		300,000
Cherry Creek Reservoir, Colo.	3,500,000	2,700,000
Cincinnati, Ohio	850,000	850,000
Clark Hill Reservoir, Ga. and S. C.	6,075,000	1,481,000
Clear Creek drainage and levee district, Illinois	200,000	200,000
Clearwater Reservoir, Mo.	2,000,000	2,000,000
Conemaugh River Reservoir, Pa.	3,200,000	5,200,000
Conway County levee districts, Nos. 1, 2, and 8, Arkansas	400,000	400,000
Council Bluffs, Iowa	500,000	500,000
Dale Hollow Reservoir, Tenn. and Ky.	900,000	900,000
Degognia and Fountain Bluff levee and drainage district, Illinois	563,000	300,000
Delaware Reservoir, Ohio	1,800,000	1,800,000
Detroit Reservoir, Oreg.	1,250,000	1,000,000
Dewey Reservoir, Ky.	2,200,000	
Dillon Reservoir, Ohio	3,400,000	2,000,000
Dorena Reservoir, Oreg.	2,150,000	1,750,000
Elkins, W. Va.	628,000	628,000
Elmira, N. Y.	1,900,000	1,600,000
Emergency bank protection	500,000	500,000
Fall River Reservoir, Kans.	3,600,000	3,000,000
Fort Gibson Reservoir, Okla.	6,000,000	4,700,000
Fort Randall Reservoir, S. Dak.	6,500,000	5,000,000
Galena, Ill.		465,000
Garrison Reservoir, N. Dak.	13,000,000	6,500,000
Goldsboro, N. C.		85,200
Harlan County Reservoir, Nebr.	5,000,000	3,775,000
Harrisonville and Ivy Landing drainage and levee district No. 2, Illinois	130,000	130,000
Hartford, Conn.	293,000	293,000
Heise-Roberts area, Idaho	300,000	300,000
Holyoke and Springdale, Mass.	70,000	70,000
Hords Creek Reservoir, Tex.	1,303,800	1,303,800
Hot Springs, S. Dak.	200,000	200,000
Jeffersonville-Clarksville, Ind.	209,000	209,000
Jenks, Okla.	107,000	107,000
John Martin Reservoir, Colo.	550,000	550,000
Kanapolis Reservoir, Kans.	2,900,000	2,000,000
Kansas Citys, Mo. and Kans.	1,800,000	1,800,000
Little Rock to Pine Bluff, Ark.	168,000	168,000
Lookout Point Reservoir, Oreg.	3,850,000	2,850,000
Los Angeles River, Calif.	1,314,000	1,314,000
Louisville, Ky.	650,000	650,000
Mansfield Hollow Dam and Reservoir, Conn.	510,000	
McLean Bottom levee district No. 3, Arkansas	217,000	217,000
Memphis, Tenn.	1,052,000	566,000
Merced County stream group, California		250,000
Missouri River between Kensler's Bend, Nebr., and the combination bridge at Sioux City, Iowa	500,000	500,000
Missouri River levees (unit L-575, Iowa, Nebraska, and Missouri) (Nishnabotna River)		500,000
Mud Mountain Dam, Wash.	448,000	448,000
Muncie, Ind.	60,000	60,000
Narrows Reservoir, Ark.	2,061,500	1,761,500
Near Dardanelle, Ark.	221,500	221,500
New Albany, Ind.		400,000
Newport, Ky.	600,000	600,000
Olean, N. Y.		500,000
Omaha, Nebr.	1,500,000	1,200,000
Owasco Inlet and Outlet and tributaries, New York		235,500
Parkersburg, W. Va.	300,000	300,000
Park River Reservoir, N. Dak.		200,000
Philpott Reservoir, Va.		250,000
Portsmouth-New Boston, Ohio	1,400,000	1,400,000
Punxsutawney, Pa.		400,000
Red Lake and Clearwater River, Minn.		300,000
San Gabriel River, Calif.	1,085,000	1,085,000
Santa Fe Reservoir, Calif.	730,000	730,000
Shreveport, La.	1,000,000	900,000
Snagging	500,000	500,000
Soy Basin, Ill.		200,000

Flood control, general construction program—Continued

	Budget estimate	Recommended
Stringtown-Fort Chartres and Ivy Landing drainage and levee district, Illinois	$529,000	$329,000
Sunbury, Pa.	1,369,000	1,169,000
Tacoma, Wash.	1,350,000	850,000
Trinity River, Tex. (including Lavon Reservoir, $500,000; Benbrook Dam, $1,400,000)	1,600,000	1,900,000
Tully Dam and Reservoir, Mass.	340,000	340,000
Union Village Reservoir, Vt.	100,000	100,000
Whitney Reservoir, Tex.	5,700,000	4,625,000
Willamette River, Oreg., bank protection	300,000	300,000
Williamsport, Pa.	2,436,000	1,836,000
Wilson and Wenkel and Prairie du Pont drainage and levee districts, Illinois	478,000	378,000
Wister Reservoir, Okla.	4,100,000	2,950,000
Wolf Creek Reservoir, Ky.	6,800,000	4,000,000
Yakima, Wash.	202,000	202,000
Total	151,584,000	122,269,800

Flood control, general planning program

	Budget estimate
Alamo Reservoir, Ariz.	$25,000
Allegheny River Reservoir, Pa.	75,000
Barre Falls Reservoir, Mass.	10,000
Bayou Pierre in vicinity of Shreveport, La.	12,000
Bear Creek Reservoir, Pa.	100,000
Belton Reservoir, Tex.	100,000
Braden bottom levee, Oklahoma	8,000
Brady floodway, Texas	25,000
Buffumville Reservoir, Mass.	15,000
Cagles Mill Reservoir, Ind.	100,000
Carden's bottoms levee District No. 2, Arkansas	47,500
Catlettsburg, Ky.	30,000
Chehalis River Basin, Wash.	50,000
Covington, Ky.	60,000
Cumberland, Md., and Ridgely, W. Va.	50,000
Davenport Center Reservoir, N. Y.	15,000
Eufaula Reservoir, Okla.	100,000
Falmouth Reservoir, Ky.	110,000
Freeport, Ill.	25,000
Gathright Reservoir, Va.	100,000
Gavins Point Reservoir, Nebr. and S. Dak.	50,000
Genegantslet Reservoir, N. Y.	90,000
Indianapolis, Fall Creek section, Indiana	65,000
Isabella Reservoir, Calif.	50,000
Joanna Reservoir, Mo.	50,000
Lucky Peak Reservoir, Idaho	108,000
Macon, Ga.	40,000
McGinnis levee, Indiana	20,000
Mill Four drainage district, Oregon	8,000
Missouri River levees, Sioux City, Iowa, to the mouth	200,000
Montour Falls, N. Y.	75,000
Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. ($850,000 carried in construction funds for Fort Randall).	
Oklahoma City, Okla.	100,000
Osceola Reservoir, Mo.	50,000
Pajaro River, Calif.	21,000
Perry County levee districts Nos. 1, 2, and 3, Missouri	50,000
Pine Flat Reservoir, Calif.	100,000
Point Pleasant, W. Va.	50,000
Poplar Bluff, Mo., to Knobel, Ark., levees	75,000
Prairie du Rocher, Ill.	50,000
Recreation development—investigations and plans	175,000
Redmond and vicinity, Utah	25,000
Red River below Denison Dam, Okla., Tex., Ark., and La.	250,000
Reevesville, Ill.	25,000
Ridgway, Johnsonburg, Brockway, Pa., and vicinity	25,000

	Budget estimate
Rocky Ford Reservoir, Ohio	$45,000
Roseville, Ohio	20,000
Sacramento River levees, California	25,000
Salem Church Reservoir, Va	75,000
San Diego River, Calif	25,000
Shenango Reservoir, Pa. and Ohio	48,000
Shufflebarger levee, Indiana	20,000
Trinidad floodway, Colorado	20,000
Turtle Creek Reservoir, Pa	60,000
Tyrone, Pa	81,500
Umpqua River and tributaries, Oregon	13,000
West Peterboro Reservoir, N. H	50,000
West River Reservoirs, Vt	100,000
Whitlow Ranch Reservoir, Ariz	75,000
Whittier Narrows Reservoir, Calif	75,000
Wilkesboro Reservoir, N. C	75,000
Willow Creek, Colo	9,000

The budget estimate totaling approximately $4,000,000 for plans and specifications for flood control, general, as shown above was reduced by a total of $2,000,000.

Statement showing the proposed application of funds included in the budget estimate of $2,400,000 for maintenance of completed works, flood control, general, fiscal year 1948

	Tentative allocation for fiscal year 1948
Franklin Falls Reservoir, N. H	$18,500
Blackwater Reservoir, N. H	4,500
Surry Mountain Reservoir, N. H	29,100
Birch Hill Reservoir, Mass	28,700
Knightville Reservoir, Mass	26,500
Whitney Point Reservoir, N. Y	22,000
Arkport Reservoir, N. Y	11,700
Oxford, N. Y., channel	2,700
Lisle, N. Y., channel	3,700
Binghamton, N. Y., channel	3,700
Corning, N. Y., channel	5,600
Painted Post, N. Y., channel	6,000
Avoca, N. Y., channel	2,700
Hornell, N. Y., channel	14,300
York, Pa	10,000
Wallace Lake Reservoir, La	$5,000
Bayou Teche and Vermilion River, La	15,000
Bayou Pierre, La	15,000
Big Black River, Miss	75,000
Buffalo Bayou, Tex	80,000
Conchas Reservoir, N. Mex	55,000
John Martin Reservoir, Colo	70,000
Nimrod Reservoir, Ark	75,000
Norfork Reservoir, Ark	310,000
Blue Mountain Reservoir, Ark	100,000
Fort Supply Reservoir, Okla	56,000
Great Salt Plains Reservoir, Okla	64,000
Denison Reservoir, Tex. and Okla	420,000
Lake Traverse and Bois de Sioux River, S. Dak. and Minn	9,000
Lac Qui Parle Reservoir, Minn	9,000
Middlesboro, Ky., channel	5,700
Dale Hollow Reservoir, Tenn. and Ky	39,800
Muskingum River reservoirs, Ohio	233,300
Newark, Ohio, Channel	5,000
Tionesta Reservoir, Pa	24,000
Crooked Creek Reservoir, Pa	23,000
Johnstown, Pa., channel	7,000
Mahoning Creek Reservoir, Pa	26,000
Loyalhanna Reservoir, Pa	30,000
Youghiogheny River Reservoir, Pa	25,000
Berlin Reservoir, Ohio	26,000
Mosquito Creek Reservoir, Ohio	23,000
Hansen Dam, Calif	33,000
Sepulveda Dam, Calif	30,000
Los Angeles River and tributary channels, California	75,000
Prado Dam, Calif	25,000
Brea Dam, Calif	15,000
Fullerton Dam, Calif	12,000
Willamette River, Oreg., channel	----------
Fern Ridge Reservoir, Oreg	46,000
Cottage Grove Reservoir, Oreg	31,000
Mill Creek, Wash	17,500
Mud Mountain Dam, Wash	85,000
Stillaguamish River, Wash	15,000
Total	2,400,000

Statement showing the proposed application of funds included in the budget estimate of $24,000,000 for flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, tentative program for fiscal year 1948

Item of work	Project No. 1, new work	Project No. 2, maintenance	Total
Mississippi River levees	$1,070,000	$2,000,000	$3,070,000
Bank stabilization work	8,100,000	3,850,000	11,950,000
Dredging	400,000	2,787,000	3,187,000
Tiptonville-Obion extension	50,000	----------	50,000
Memphis Harbor	50,000	----------	50,000
St. Francis Basin	340,000	100,000	440,000
White River Basin:			
Augusta to Clarendon and DeValls Bluff	320,000	----------	320,000
Backwater levee	15,000	50,000	65,000
North bank Arkansas River	180,000	----------	180,000
South bank Arkansas River	----------	600,000	600,000
Yazoo River Basin:			
Headwater project	125,000	500,000	625,000
Backwater project	90,000	----------	90,000
Yazoo-Vicksburg area	50,000	----------	50,000
Big Sunflower, etc	100,000	----------	100,000
Tensas Basin:			
Boeuf, Tensas, and Macon in Arkansas and Louisiana	150,000	----------	150,000
Red River backwater	50,000	----------	50,000
South bank, Red River	----------	600,000	600,000
Atchafalaya River Basin:			
Atchafalaya River and basin improvements	----------	25,000	25,000
Atchafalaya Basin floodway	150,000	600,000	750,000
Morganza floodway	200,000	50,000	250,000
Wax Lake outlet and Charenton Canal	----------	20,000	20,000
Bayou Des Glaises Channel	----------	5,000	5,000
Bonnet Carre	----------	200,000	200,000
Mapping	60,000	30,000	90,000
Surveys, gages, and observations	----------	450,000	450,000
Plant	500,000	----------	500,000
Project No. 3, salaries, etc., Office, Chief of Engineers	----------	133,000	133,000
Total	12,000,000	12,000,000	24,000,000

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MEADE of Kentucky: Page 8, line 22, strike out "$132,041,800" and insert "$134,241,800."

Mr. MEADE of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, a few moments ago I made a statement here with regard to the Dewey Reservoir or the Dewey Dam. It is located on a tributary of the Big Sandy River in Kentucky and it is part of the Ohio River Basin flood-control project.

We have heard today some very fine arguments against appropriations. One was made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MUHLENBERG] to the effect that we had a fine Engineers Corps, and we should follow closely the recommendations of the engineers. The engineers say of this project:

> Early completion of the project is needed to protect the Johns Creek and Big Sandy River Valley, and the work proposed with the allocation for fiscal year 1948 should be accomplished to avoid a costly shut-down of operations now in progress.

I may say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], who is always valiantly opposing expenditures, that to shut this down, according to the engineers, will cost money. This work is going on today. It is 40 percent completed.

Answering the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, the engineers say that the return on this project has a ratio of 1 to 1.7 or 70 percent profit on this project.

The chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], has objected to various proposals here on the ground that no plans are available. Not only are plans available in this case but 40 percent of the work has been completed and $1,645,000 have been spent. This amendment calls for an additional $2,200,000, which will bring this project within the next fiscal year to over 90 percent completion.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] has made an objection to a project on the ground it is a power project and that private enterprise would be interfered with. To this I say that the engineers have testified that our project is 100 percent flood control. It is an earth-fill dam. There is no provision made for any power.

Mr. Chairman, this is a flood-control project and should be continued. It is of interest to the people on the Big Sandy River and the Ohio River; it is a part of the Ohio River Basin of 80 dams, and to have complete flood control on the Ohio River and the Mississippi River it is necessary that this project be continued.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the committee will support my amendment. It is a worthy amendment, and, as has been testified, this is a worthy project and should be continued. To stop it now would result in loss of money. Those interested in flood control should be interested in its continuation.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for support of the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. Chairman, the committee does not know what is wanted out there in that district. Once they say they want the

project, the next minute they do not want it, then they do want it. When they get together and decide what they want, I think we can take care of them. In the meantime I ask that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MEADE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MEADE of Kentucky) there were—ayes 10, noes 92.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries: For prosecuting work of flood control in accordance with the provisions of the Flood Control Act approved May 15, 1928, as amended (33 U. S. C. 702a), including printing and binding and office supplies and equipment required in the Office of the Chief of Engineers to carry out the purposes of this appropriation, $24,000,000.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, the completion of the Pick-Sloan plan of development for the Missouri River should not be delayed any longer than is absolutely necessary. Flood control and river navigation are of vital importance to my congressional district. Sioux City is strategically located at the present head of the Missouri River navigation system and is at the present time the northwest terminal of the entire river navigation system of the midcontinent area of the United States. Under the Pick-Sloan plan of development of the Missouri River, a 9-foot channel has been authorized to Sioux City. The channel, however, is still incomplete and all that we really have to date to Sioux City is an uncompleted 6-foot channel.

Under the Flood Control Act of 1944, a complete development program was adopted for the Missouri River Basin and the people of my district have fought for such a program of development for the past 25 years. Just when we are at the point of realizing some of the benefit of our efforts, appropriations are reduced so that the plan will be longer delayed than anticipated.

I think it is well known that the Midwest section of the United States already produces about 56 percent of all the crops and 69 percent of all the livestock and livestock products in the United States. It produces 63 percent of the gross farm income in the United States. Therefore we are not entirely selfish in asking for adequate appropriations to carry out the great program for which we have been working for so many years. Money expended to bring about the full realization of the possibilities of this region will be returned to the Federal Government manyfold in tax returns. In fact, the economy of the entire Nation will benefit by the development and stabilization of the economy of the Missouri Valley. Although we have been blessed with good yields of our crops during the last few years, we also know something about the destruction of our fertile land by floods, and we should therefore lose no time in carrying out the full program of river development. The flood experiences of this year in the Missouri Valley should be a warning to all that time is fast running out.

There is no particular advantage in delaying the construction of this program. While we are spending billions of dollars for relief and rehabilitation overseas, there is no reason in the world why we should not be spending some of that money in America to preserve our own natural resources and our own economy. The Pick-Sloan plan is sound from an engineering standpoint and it is sound from an economic standpoint. It is absolutely essential and I know of no program that will come nearer meeting the inevitable conditions in the future than the harnessing of the waters of the Missouri watershed. I strongly urge that ample funds be appropriated for this project so that we will be well prepared whenever we again have to fight the hazards of nature for our economic existence.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I dislike very much to take the time of the Committee at this late hour of the day and I hope I will not consume the entire 5 minutes. It had been my intention to offer an amendment providing for a very small sum of money for a very critical situation which exists in the lower Mississippi Valley and which by no stretch of the imagination could be termed a new project.

The Members of Congress who have followed flood-control legislation will recall that about 10 years ago Congress authorized, and the engineers built, the famous Bonnet Carre spillway about 25 miles north of the city of New Orleans. That spillway has been opened twice. It diverts the floodwaters of the Mississippi just a few miles north of the mouth of the Mississippi out of its main channel into Lake Pontchartrain, which lies north of New Orleans. Great quantities of water leave the Mississippi at its main channel and go into Lake Pontchartrain, where it soon moves to the Gulf of Mexico through two passes, Rigolets and Chef Menteur.

Now, as a result of this action by the Federal Government the great properties located along the lake front have been threatened each time this spillway is opened. The engineers have surveyed the area. They have recognized the fact that that is a legitimate incident of flood control in the lower Mississippi Valley. Congress has authorized the expenditure of $900,000 which is a relatively small sum of money to protect millions upon millions of dollars invested by the residential property owners of Tift Parish and the up-river section in that area.

I am very hopeful that in the other body we will reach some agreement upon this proposition. It is fundamentally fair because it is an incident of the entire lower Mississippi Valley flood-control plan. I trust that if that recognition is achieved in the other body, that you gentlemen, being familiar with it, will acquiesce.

The Clerk read as follows:

MISCELLANEOUS CIVIL WORKS

Maintenance and Operation, Certain Federal Water Mains Outside the District of Columbia: For the maintenance, operation, improvement, extension, and protection of Federal water lines located outside the District of Columbia required to serve nearby Government establishments and facilities with water from the water supply system of the District of Columbia, including interconnections with other water systems for emergency use wherever located, to be immediately available and to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers, $12,000.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, if the observations I make seem partly out of order, probably they could be justified by the very first language that appears in the appropriation bill to the effect that there is appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

To be sure, that money must find its way into the Treasury, and that is one of the functions, among others, of the Treasury Department of the United States. After a great many weeks the Subcommittee on Treasury-Post Office Appropriations completed its action on that bill, the conference action was completed, and the President signed the bill on Monday. Unfortunately the President could not refrain from berating the Congress for playing politics with the appropriation for the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and he very specifically directed some of his remarks to what I esteem to be quite a fiction to the effect that by virtue of the reductions made in the administrative expenses for the Bureau of Internal Revenue we were probably throwing $400,000,000 out of the window.

Now, that refrain has been taken up by the officials of the Treasury Department who say that that action of the Congress, is in favor of the tax cheats and the tax evaders.

This is a rather strange argument coming from our esteemed friend, the President of the United States, because the very first cut in the estimate was made by the Bureau of the Budget, which is an arm of the President of the United States, and by his logic, or should I say, his illogic, would throw $100,000,000 out of the window. Now then we are aware of the fact that notwithstanding the emphatic admonition that the committee wrote in the report, and the emphatic language that was placed in the conference report, that instead of cutting the 33,000 administrative and clerical help in the Treasury Department they are now engaged in the business of reducing the enforcement staff, notwithstanding the admonition of the subcommittee. Now it is being reported to us that they are sending dismissal notices to many of the trusted and trained employees of the Treasury Department, particularly in the enforcement field, and retaining the less efficient employees. The Subcommittee on Treasury-Post Office has promised the Congress that it would manifest a continuous oversight over the operations of the Treasury Department, and we pro-

pose to do so. We propose to see just exactly what the Treasury Department is going to do by deliberately crippling the enforcement arm.

It is one of those surpassingly strange things, that the President of the United States followed the very logic that was presented, and not very convincingly, to the members of the subcommittee. We propose to look into this at once. We had a meeting about it today, and requested the assignment of a very competent corps of investigators to it. They are going to get busy at once and determine who is being relieved of his responsibility in the Treasury, whether they are going to maintain a great army of more than 30,000 clerical, administrative, and fiscal assistants and let a large proportion of trusted agents in the field go. I fancy that before this Congress adjourns the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments is going to have a pretty good story to tell to the Congress.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. Is it not true that under the 1948 bill signed by the President yesterday the Bureau of Internal Revenue is provided with the largest appropriation in the history of the Bureau?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Exactly, and the figures will testify to that statement.

Mr. CANFIELD. Yet they estimate that under that appropriation they will collect billions less than they collected in recent years.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Precisely so.

Let me point out one more thing. It is possible, of course, for the Bureau of Internal Revenue to make their own prophecies and predictions of revenue losses come true. If the President, as he did in his accompanying message, indicates that $400,000,000 of revenue will be lost, all they have to do is impair the efficacy of the enforcement arm of the Treasury, which they are doing, let the efficient employees go, and let this great bureaucracy, which subverts the intentions of Congress, stand here while they are diminishing their own efficiency in the field. Of course, you cannot only dissipate $400,000,000 of revenue by that kind of executive operation, you might dissipate three or four billions of revenue. However, the committee under the able leadership of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD] will certainly give an account of itself in a very short time. We will go into this thing from stem to stern and then come back and make a complete report to the Congress as to whether or not the legislative intent will be carried out.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and be subject to amendment, amendments to be offered chronologically.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will that deprive Members of an opportunity to make a point of order to any language in the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan did not include that in the request. Under the request, the only thing waived would be the technical reading of the bill. The rights of the Members would be preserved.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Points of order against language in the bill can therefore be made after this request is granted?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. Points of order would be in order, but the points of order would have to be made before there was discussion and amendments were offered.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCORMACK. In order to try to clarify the situation, as I understand the Chair's ruling, if the unanimous-consent request is granted, as I hope it is, a point of order against any provision in the bill would have to be made immediately?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct. In other words, the procedure will be this: If the request of the gentleman from Michigan is granted, the Chair will then be ready to receive any points of order. If points of order are made, they will be disposed of. After the points of order are disposed of, then the bill will be open to amendment.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on page 17, line 18, subdivision (7), "that no alien employed on the Canal Zone may secure United States civil-service status," is legislation on an appropriation bill in that it clearly changes existing law.

The existing law, Mr. Chairman, is found in the treaty which was signed between the Republic of Panama and the Government of the United States. The treaty was ratified by the Senate of the United States in 1939. That treaty contains a letter which was written by the then Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, to the Panamanian Treaty Commission. It reads as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D. C., March 2, 1936.

The Honorable RICARDO J. ALFARO,
The Honorable NARCISO GARAY,
Members of the Panamanian Treaty Commission.

SIRS: With reference to the representations made by you during the negotiations of the treaty signed today regarding Panamanian citizens employed by the Panama Canal or the Panama Railroad Company, I have the honor to state that the Government of the United States of America, in recognition of the special relationship between the United States of America and the Republic of Panama with respect to the Panama Canal and the Panama Railroad Company, maintains and will maintain as its public policy, the principle of equality of opportunity and treatment set down in the order of December 28, 1908, of the Secretary of War, and in the Executive orders of February 2, 1914, and February 20, 1920, and will favor the maintenance, enforcement, or enactment of such provisions consistent with the works and their effective protection and sanitation as will assure to Panamanian citizens employed by the Canal or the railroad, equality of treatment with employees who are citizens of the United States of America.

Accept sirs, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

CORDELL HULL.

In February of this year an Executive order was issued by the President modifying the civil-service rules. One portion of that Executive order distinctly permits Panamanians to take civil service examinations and be enrolled in the United States Civil Service. Consequently, this language against which I have raised a point of order forbids Panamanian citizens from securing civil-service status. Thus, it changes the law as set forth in the treaty and changes the law as set out in the Executive order. It is clearly legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, if I may be heard on the point of order, the first part of that section reads as follows:

No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used directly or indirectly, except for temporary employment in case of emergency, for the payment of any civilian for services rendered by him on the Canal Zone while occupying a skilled, technical, clerical, administrative, executive, or supervisory position unless such person is a citizen of the United States of America or of the Republic of Panama: *Provided, however*—

Then going to subdivision (7)—

that no alien employed on the Canal Zone may secure United States civil-service status.

Under the Holman rule, even legislation on an appropriation bill is permitted if it succeeds in the reduction of an expenditure. If aliens are to be given United States civil-service status, it will increase the liability of the United States for the payment of civil-service retirement and other provisions of that sort. Consequently, it seems to me that in that sense the inclusion of this language is a protection of the Treasury of the United States and may be permissible under the Holman rule. Clause 7, of course, is directly related to the "provided, however," and the language of limitation in the first part of the section.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the Chairman's attention to the fact that an act of Congress takes precedence over a treaty or even an Executive order in the form of a treaty. So this language is clearly in order. Congress has the right to enact this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MICHENER). The Chair is ready to rule. So far as the remark just made by the gentleman from Mississippi is concerned, as the Chair remembers, it is in the last analysis an act of Congress, whether it be a treaty or whether it be a law. Therefore, that remark is not germane to the question now before the Committee.

As far as the statement of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is concerned, regarding the Holman rule, at most, this suggests that there might

be a saving; there is the possibility of a saving. The Holman rule is very clear that legislation must in its language show an absolute saving. Therefore, that point would not be of any value in sustaining the position which the gentleman takes.

Section 7 provides that no alien employed on the Canal Zone may secure United States civil-service status. So far as the Chair has been advised, there is no law anywhere providing for that very thing, excepting this legislation found in an appropriation bill.

The Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

Are there any other points of order to be raised?

Are there any amendments to be offered?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer two perfecting amendments which are at the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. ENGEL of Michigan: On page 17, line 3, after the word "executive", strike out the word "position" and insert the word "positions."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. ENGEL of Michigan: On page 18, strike out the language in lines 5, 6, 7, and 8, as follows: "Notwithstanding the provision in the act approved August 11, 1939 (53 Stat. 1409), limiting employment in certain positions to citizens of the United States, citizens of Panama may be employed in such positions."

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. That duplicates the provision in line 13, page 16, of the instant bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in listening to the remarks of my very distinguished, capable, and eloquent friend from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], when he made his comment concerning the statement of the President yesterday when he signed the Treasury-Post Office Department appropriation bill. The fact remains that a reduction of $20,000,000 will certainly interfere with the investigation of 30,000 leads on tax evasion, which are still awaiting investigation.

We know that as a result of a drive that has been made, many millions of dollars have been collected that otherwise would not have been collected. Those of us who have been paying our income taxes naturally are interested in seeing that those who do not pay the tax actually pay their just share. The drive made has been productive of unusually excellent results financially to our country, now and for the future. It is very apparent from the disturbed attitude of my distinguished friend from Illinois that the President's observations were remarkably apropos.

The fact remains that the $20,000,000 cut could really result in a loss to the Federal Government ultimately of about $400,000,000. It is just such things that we have been fighting this year, the question of false economy.

The smoke screen of economy has been raised and this year we have been fighting—those who have taken a similar position to that which I have—the question of real economy against false economy. We started out in the Interior Department appropriation bill with sharp cuts on projects in the great West and the great Northwest. It was a strange sight to me to see distinguished Members representing congressional districts in those areas, when they were put on a roll call, voting in favor of reductions of appropriations for projects located in their districts and their section of vital importance to the people of that great area.

It was also interesting to me to observe those Members who voted for the reductions in the Agriculture appropriation bill. When I voted for $300,000,000 contract authority last year for soil conservation I voted with the intention that the Congress would follow it up with the farmers who complied and pay them. Certainly they considered it a contract. I considered it an implied contract, and I believe an implied contract is just as binding upon me as an express contract; as a matter of fact sometimes more so, because there is at times a greater moral obligation involved to carry out an implied contract than there is an express contract.

Then we find the reductions in the War Department with General Eisenhower only the other day testifying that such reductions would seriously impair the Army in view of world conditions of today.

We find the same situation applicable to the Navy Department. Now we find the elimination of the controls on so-called nonessential items on construction, and that means a serious interference with the construction of homes, particularly among the veterans. We find a 15 percent voluntary increase in rents and all over the country the headlines are telling the immediate result of the so-called rent-control bill—a 15-percent increase in private rentals and in the case of some hotels an increase of as much as 400 percent—anywhere from 50 to 400 percent, because hotels are eliminated completely from all rent control. Those are the things we see, as a result of such legislation.

We see private utilities obtaining public power from projects in sections of our great country where the development of public power is vitally important to the people.

So it is well that my distinguished friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]—and there is no more capable exponent of their views; there is no one more capable than my friend of throwing such a smokescreen to cover their errors—it is well that my Republican friends look to him for the purpose of trying again to befog the people's minds, and to place a misinterpretation upon the real effect that will result from the failure to make the $20,000,000 appropriation in connection with the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. I know the very distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts wants to be fair. I know he will recall that when the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill was passed by the House it contained a greater cut than agreed upon in conference and as signed by the President. The cut was thirty-odd million; and the vote in the House was a record vote of 387 to 0. And the gentleman from Massachusetts voted "aye" to that cut.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Ah, but my distinguished friend from New Jersey well knows there were hundreds of other items in that bill. He well knows the record of the minority party on the motion to recommit and on the offering of amendments in the Committee of the Whole. Let me ask my friend the gentleman from New Jersey, Does he think that that is a fair statement to make on the passage of an appropriation bill? I am asking the gentleman because I know he has intellectual honesty.

Mr. CANFIELD. I may say this, in answer to the gentleman from Massachusetts: Often during election times we pick up a paper from Boston, Mass., quoting statements made by the gentleman from Massachusetts. Time after time he says, "I stand by the record." So do I today.

Mr. McCORMACK. I asked the gentleman a question. Does the gentleman want to answer the question?

Mr. CANFIELD. I stand by the record.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman stands by the record. In other words, the gentleman tries to create the impression that everybody who voted for the Post Office-Treasury appropriation bill on final passage did not try to increase other appropriations in the bill? Is that the impression the gentleman is trying to create?

Mr. CANFIELD. I do not believe the gentleman from Massachusetts took the floor at all on that bill. At least, I do not remember him doing so.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts was in favor of an increased appropriation for the Bureau of Internal Revenue on the ground it would bring in more money for the Government. The gentleman from New Jersey knows just as well as I do that on the

passage of an appropriation bill in its final stages the question presented to us is entirely different than when a particular item is being considered in the Committee of the Whole. The gentleman recognizes that fact, and if he does then I have made my case.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the kindness shown me by the Committee. You have approved $3,000,000 additional for the great Bull Shoals project. This is one of the great improvements in this country. It is a flood-control project of the first magnitude. Incidental to it is the power-development phase of it. Our section of the country is moving forward. Cheap electricity is one of the essentials of our march to greater things. Therefore, this appropriation, with what has already been appropriated heretofore, insures the completion of this project. Our people, I am sure, want me to express to each of you our appreciation.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MICHENER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4002) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will vote them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], as I understand it, has secured unanimous consent that all Members may extend their remarks on the bill just passed. I want it understood that Members who have spoken on the bill today may have permission to revise and extend their remarks, and I make that as a unanimous-consent request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole and include a tabulation compiled by a clerk under his supervision on various subjects.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, in one to include an editorial from the New York Times.

STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill H. R. 3311, the State, Justice, and Commerce appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TRIMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD following those of Mr. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee today and include certain tables of statistics.

Mr. FOOTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and to include in each an editorial or an article.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include in each extraneous matter.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Stars and Stripes.

Mr. HAYS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the flood-control bill following those of Mr. TRIMBLE.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR TOMORROW

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, many Members would like to know the program for tomorrow.

Mr. HALLECK. I have not checked to see what conference reports might be ready. So far as I know, there is nothing of great consequence for consideration in the House tomorrow.

Mr. RAYBURN. And it is the intention to go over tomorrow until Monday?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes.

Mr. BONNER. Will the Consent Calendar be called Monday?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GOSSETT] is recognized for 20 minutes.

A NEW FIFTH COLUMN OR THE REFUGEE RACKET

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, every issue decided by this Congress, should be decided solely on the ground of what is best for America. On this basis of what is best for America, I am bitterly opposed to the Stratton bill. This bill proposes to bring to this country over and above present immigration, 400,000 refugees from the DP camps of Europe. On this issue, I wish to speak for millions of Americans who are unable to speak for themselves, and for many thousands of others who are afraid to speak.

The statements to be made in this discussion are based upon careful study and research, and upon information furnished me by reliable persons, many of whom would suffer reprisals should their names be used. What happens to me personally or politically is of no consequence if what I have to say here helps to awaken this country to the danger that lurks in such legislation as the so-called refugee bill.

One of the largest, best paid lobbies in the city of Washington at this time is the so-called displaced persons lobby. They are backed up by a Nation-wide organization that has spent and is spending millions of dollars on propaganda. These organizations have filled the press and the radio of the Nation, a large part of which they control, with canned editorials, syndicated columns, sentimental appeals, feature stories, and a vast array of misleading information. They have lined up many politicians in both parties who seek to acquire or retain the foreign bloc votes in the pivotal States.

EXISTING IMMIGRATION LAWS

Before taking up the Stratton bill specifically, let us consider briefly existing immigration laws and policy. Those of us opposed to this refugee bill are not unfriendly to immigrants. Most of us are proud of the strong immigrant blood that went into the building of this country. When there were frontiers to conquer and jobs to fill, immigrant blood meant strength. The blood now offered means weakness and pollution. The Germans, the Irish, the Norwegians, the immigrants from northern and western Europe who came here in the last century are among our best citizens. They

settled in and helped develop all sections of this great Nation. Today there are no jobs to fill. We do not need workers or nonworkers. Not only have times and conditions changed, but so have the immigrants. Of the immigrants coming here last year, not over 1 percent went to the farms. At least 95 percent poured into our big and overcrowded cities. Unemployment, housing, slum clearance, crime, education, health, and all of our many social, political, and economic problems are further complicated and aggravated by today's immigration. Following the First World War we passed our basic immigration laws setting up certain quotas and restrictions through which we sought to protect the American way of life, American institutions, and American standards of living. These laws are exceedingly liberal. They should be strengthened, not weakened. From Europe generally, we permit the entry of 154,000 a year under quotas. We impose no quotas whatsoever on countries of the Western Hemisphere. Even from quota countries we permit many to come over and above the 154,000. Wives and minor children of American citizens, ministers, and professors, and certain classes of merchant seamen, may come in outside of the quotas. We place no limit upon visitors, or students, or treaty merchants. Furthermore, during the World War we naturalized 110,000 aliens serving in the American Army, under legislation which I helped to pass. We brought in around 100,000 war brides; we removed certain other discriminations and inequities, all under legislation sponsored or supported by me. Under existing laws, we will probably receive into this country through various channels not less than two or three hundred thousand immigrants per year—more than we can adequately assimilate.

FOREIGN-BORN POPULATION

According to official figures, around 35,000,000 of our 140,000,000 inhabitants are of recent immigrant origin. The 1940 census listed 11,500,000 people in this country of foreign birth, and over 23,000,000 who had at least one foreign-born parent. The 1940 census listed six cities of more than 500,000 population in this country where less than 40 percent of the white population is of native parentage. There were 11 cities between 100,000 and 500,000 where less than 40 percent of the white people were of native parentage. In 1940, 1,047 newspapers in this country were published in 38 foreign languages and were read by more than 10,000,000 people. In 1920, one out of every five persons of voting age in this country were foreigners. In many of our northeastern cities the ratio of foreign-born to native-born voters is approximately 1 to 3. No other nation in the world has so large a percentage of foreign-born folks.

NATIONAL POLICY

Mr. Speaker, our very survival in a mad world depends upon internal strength and unity. Furthermore, we cannot teach democracy abroad unless we preserve it at home. The President's Expert Commission recently reporting on national defense, specified as the first requirement for our security that we must have a strong, educated, united population. It takes time for roots to grow deeply. To say that 400,000 refugees from the displaced persons camps of Europe would add to our strength, our health, our unity, or our influence abroad, or would promote our welfare in any way is absurdly false. Unquestionably, the exact reverse is true.

Dr. Henry Pratt Fairchild, professor of sociology in New York University, in a 1943 discussion of the Implication of Population Trends for Postwar Policies, concludes that immigration should be restricted. He expresses the danger of new immigration in these words: "We are fighting this war for the sake of democracy, the rights of the common man, the eradication of race prejudice, and the general recognition of human equality. If the findings of science were in accordance with unenlightened, liberal sentiment, there might be no particular danger. Since this is not the case, it is essential that the peace negotiators be prepared to recognize, and to make clear to the world, that what may seem like a narrow or illiberal policy is really a liberal policy because it promises the greatest welfare for the greatest number of people over the longest stretch of time."

Many statesmen, including Woodrow Wilson, expressed the same convictions and fears. No other intelligent conclusion is possible. Out of such philosophy our present inadequate laws have grown. Common ideals, common heritage, real Americanism, is more essential today than ever before. We should now patch the holes in the fence through which illegal immigrants pour. We should now raise, not lower, immigration barriers. Now, of all times, we should promote internal strength and unity or we shall lose democracy at home, forfeit the sacrifices of two great wars, and end up by being, ourselves, destroyed.

Two years ago many of those now wanting to dump the refugees of Europe into America were before Congress pleading for a guaranteed full-employment bill. They predicted inevitable mass unemployment and depression. We set up at that time an Economic Planning Board, seeking to forestall inevitable recession. We are still working at that job. Although our prosperity has confounded the pessimists, we even now have 2,500,000 people out of work. We have millions on some sort of relief. About 50 percent of our families still live on incomes of less than $2,400 per year. Some 10 percent live on less than $500 annually. Approximately 40 percent of our veterans are still living doubled up with relatives and friends, while nearly 25 percent of our married veterans are without homes of their own. Thousands of veterans are still trying to get into overcrowded schools, while at least 2,000,000 will soon flow from these institutions seeking useful jobs in a land that owes them first consideration.

To the problem of normal immigration, we have added an increasing influx of Puerto Ricans. When we acquired Puerto Rico it had around 800,000 inhabitants. It now has 2,500,000 people living on a tiny island that will not adequately support one-third of that number. A New York newspaper complains that 100,000 Puerto Ricans a year are pouring into the slums of that city. A million of these folks will doubtless migrate to the States within the next few years. Among other things, the next Congress will be called upon to appropriate billions for slum clearance, billions for health, and millions to combat an ever-increasing crime wave. Mr. Speaker, we will do well to absorb the poison already flowing in the bloodstream of this country without the injection of more foreign virus.

THE DISPLACED PERSONS

Mr. Speaker, this brings me to a brief discussion of our displaced-persons camps from which we are urged to take an original installment of 400,000 refugees. These camps could and should have been closed and abolished a year ago. Their administration has not been good, and their continued maintenance is disgraceful. To solve the problem by dumping any part of them into this country is the worst and most dangerous of many alternatives. Since the war Allied military authorities have repatriated—returned to their homes or places of their choice—more than 7,000,000 of these persons. Ninety percent of some 800,000 persons in some 300 DP camps still under our supervision could and should have been repatriated. Such could and would have been done but for the selfish, vicious, political, and misguided humanitarian pressures in this country. To be a displaced person in an American camp has long been a preferred status in Europe. Bear in mind probably not more than 30 percent of these so-called displaced persons were in fact displaced persons at the time the war ended. For various reasons, they have displaced themselves and have flocked into these camps from all over Europe. Many of them have come from Russia and countries under Russian domination. While a few good people remain in these camps, they are by and large the refuse of Europe. The camps are filled with bums, criminals, black-marketeers, subversives, revolutionists, and crackpots of all colors and hues. Contrary to reports, we have maintained no confines around these camps as other countries have done. Many people have come in, acquired blankets, food, and clothes, gone out and sold them on the black market, changed their names, gone to other camps, and repeated the performance. We have outfitted the whole caboodle at least twice.

Mr. George Meader, appointed special investigator by the Mead committee in the last session of Congress, in a nonpartisan report on displaced-persons camps states: "These persons are, for the most part, penniless and do not desire to work, but expect to be cared for, and complain when things are not as well done as they think they should be. Mr. Goldman, the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation director of the camp, said that he had not been able to get more than 400 of the 3,000 to do any work, even fixing up their own dwelling space. When he did get any work out of them, it was because of offering special inducements, such as extra cigarettes."

Mr. Meader points out that at least 120,000 Jews have flocked into these camps since January 1946, and others continue to come. Bear in mind these are not German Jews, of whom there are less than 30,000 left, but they come from other parts of Europe.

Mr. Meader further describes an incident where 3,000 newly arrived Jews pulled a sit-down strike and refused to leave the train at the Babenhausen camp which had been opened only 2 weeks at that time. The train was turned around by American authorities and these folks taken to another camp.

Of course these reports have been given little publicity in this country.

Now self-styled humanitarians, some real, some phony, say these people will get killed if they go home. This is false. Maj. Gen. Lowell W. Rooks, Director General of UNRRA, in a statement on June 4 appearing in the Christian Science Monitor stated that of the 7,000,000 persons repatriated since the end of the war, not one substantiated instance of persecution or reprisal had come to his attention. Of many witnesses appearing before our committee in support of the Stratton bill, not one has produced a substantiated instance of persecution after repatriation.

Last year, according to General Clay as reported by AP from Berlin on April 14, we offered a 60-day supply of food as a sort of bonus to DP's in the American zone if they would go home. In response to this offer, 48,000 Poles returned to their homeland. Again this year we instituted this bribe seeking to induce these people to leave. We get down on our knees and say to our guests of 2 or 3 years, "Won't you please go home?" The best of them have gone. Many have come to this country. Now we are asked to open our doors and admit the worst of them into our very homes.

These people are living in a land that is devastated. There are cities that need rebuilding, lands that need cultivation, and isms that need fighting. Still they do none of these things. If they shirk responsibility abroad they will certainly assume none here. If they are worth anything to us, they would be worth a great deal more to the countries from whence they come. Again, if they refuse to go home, there are many other places to which they could go instead of coming into the already overcrowded cities of America. Australia has a population of 2.5 persons per square mile; Africa 14.7; Canada 3.1; South America 14.1; while in the United States we have 43.7 persons per square mile. An article in last Sunday's New York Times is headed: "Australia seeks citizens." Australian immigration commissioner, Arthur Calwell, is quoted as saying:

> If we could bring 200,000 adult and junior workers here tomorrow, Australia would give them all work within a week.

Another newspaper headline declares, "South America wants 7,000,000 immigrants in 10 years." Some time ago Robert Prigent, while Minister of Population in France, stated:

> Unless we import 3,000,000 workers within the next 10 years France cannot survive.

Vast areas of the earth are in need of workers and artisans of all kinds. The fact that these people will not go home, will assume no risks or responsibilities in their homelands, will not go where workers are needed, is abundant proof of their liability to us. But there are other reasons for caution.

MANY SUBVERSIVES AMONG REFUGEES

Mr. Speaker, the majority of these folks are not the material out of which good citizens could be made, even if we had the time, money, and facilities for doing such a job. Some of these camps are little more than training schools for revolutionary activities. Doubtless many persons have been planted in these camps to infiltrate this country and to serve alien causes. Doubtless many of our foreign enemies would be happy to see the refugee camps emptied into this Nation. Trojan horses are offered us on every hand. On January 26, 1947, the New York Herald Tribune carried a wireless dispatch from Frankfurt, as follows:

> Army headquarters, meanwhile, is warily watching the actions of approximately 40,000 Polish Jews now temporarily located along the Polish-Czech frontier. While this group probably will not migrate in the severe winter months, it is known here that the Russian, Polish, and Czech Governments facilitate the movement of Polish Jews from east to west. This strategy is based on the belief that the more of the Jews who become the responsibility of the western powers, the more embarrassed the western powers will become, in view of the tense Palestine situation.

Mr. Speaker, nations are destroyed from within before they are destroyed from without. Infiltration is a deadly form of attack. Hundreds of dangerous persons have entered this country in recent years, and many are still coming. Other hundreds of potential fifth columnists sit in the DP camps and await passage to America.

WHY PREFERENCE FOR DISPLACED PERSONS?

Assuming, however, for the sake of argument, that all the good things said about the displaced persons were true, there is still no reason to give them preference over even better folks. There are at least 100,000,000 who fought and sacrificed in the war on our side who are just as desperate as they; there are at least 100,000,000 of our friends who are hungrier than those in the DP camps; there are at least 100,000,000 who wish to come to America just as badly as do they; and there are hundreds of millions who dislike just as much the governments under which they live.

SCREENING IS BAD

When well-grounded objections are raised to the character of the DP's who would come under this bill, proponents always answer that we will screen them carefully. Our screening to date has been a joke—a joke for which we may pay dearly. We have no reason to suppose a better job would be done in the future. In this connection I would point out that thousands of refugees are now coming in under a Strattonized Executive order issued by the President on December 22, 1945. This order was purportedly written by Judge Samuel Rosenman. No Member of Congress was consulted, and the order was severely and properly criticized by the House Committee on Immigration in the last session. The order sets aside 90 percent of our nonpreference quotas for the DP's in Europe. This order violates both the spirit and the letter of our immigration laws and should be revoked. Upon its promulgation the State Department enlarged its consulates abroad and instructed them to waive the usual requirements of immigration laws; that is, first, a birth certificate to establish one's country of origin; second, a police record showing one not to be of bad character; and, third, evidence that one will not become a public charge. As a substitute for the usual showing that one will not become a public charge, the State Department accepts the assurance of charitable corporations, organized in this country, to facilitate refugee immigration. These organizations and affiliates have conspired in the wholesale violation of our immigration laws. Thus, the back-office boys in the State Department have, in effect, eliminated even the superficial screening that we have heretofore given prospective immigrants. Under the President's Executive order, which gives a small preview of proposed operations under the Stratton bill, many dangerous persons have entered this country. Under the Stratton bill, injury and insult to our national well-being would be multiplied manyfold.

DISCRIMINATION PRACTICED

In the President's directive which seeks to facilitate DP immigration, appears this stipulation:

> Visas should be distributed fairly among persons of all faiths, creeds, and nationalities. I desire that special attention be devoted to orphaned children to whom it is hoped the majority of visas will be issued.

This provision has been totally ignored. According to officials of the State Department, about 20 percent of the persons in the DP camps were Jews. However, State Department officials before an Immigration Committee last fall admitted that 75 percent of all visas issued had been issued to persons of Jewish faith. Thus rank discrimination is practiced against Protestants, Catholics, orphaned children, and others. In fact, gentiles in our zone of Europe have been known to masquerade as Jews in search of preferred treatment.

OUR FAIR SHARE

Proponents of the Stratton bill all cry out we must do our "fair share," that we have a "moral obligation" to find acceptable homes for these DP's. We suffered a million casualties and spent more than $350,000,000,000, including more than fifty billions in lend-lease, in liberating the peoples of Europe, including these refugees for whom we are asked to furnish perpetual care. Since the shooting stopped, we have spent or obligated ourselves to spend in cold cash, more than $20,000,000,000 in tax money in their rehabilitation and relief, to say nothing of many millions of dollars that we have spent and continue to spend through private charity and individual contributions in food, clothing, and materials. The chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations estimates that we will spend approximately $6,000,000,000 in

1948 for the relief of the peoples of Europe. In blood and in treasure, has any country at any time ever done one-tenth so much for the peoples of other lands? To say that we are further morally bound to open our country to this great additional number of refugees is to insult our patriotism, our intelligence, and our Christianity.

APPEASEMENT OFFERED

Again, proponents try to appeal to our pride and self-interest by saying that we will make friends and will set an example for other nations to follow. Can we buy friendship? Do we make friends by allowing ourselves to be pushed around? Should we thus practice appeasement? We cite all of history, both sacred and profane, in refutation.

WHAT'S BACK OF THE STRATTON BILL

Mr. Speaker, after long and serious thought and deliberation, I have decided that it is my duty to make a charge and issue a warning. I charge that the Stratton bill originated with, and has been largely sustained by, a number of prominent Jewish organizations. These powerful and influential organizations have shrewdly and cleverly enlisted the support and influence of many prominent non-Jewish citizens, non-Jewish organizations, and non-Jewish religious groups. Most informed persons in this country, however, know that the sustaining force back of this movement is our Jewish friends.

Mr. Speaker, we must avoid anti-Semitism in this country as though it were the plague. When anti-Semitism becomes pronounced or rampant, it destroys both Semitic and anti-Semitic, both Christian and Jew. The blackest page in the history of our civilization is the Fascist and Nazi persecution of the Jews. It was anti-Semitism that gave a perverted madman a sordid vehicle on which to ride to power in Germany. It has cursed and brought unspeakable sorrow to an entire world.

Anti-Semitism in America could furnish fertile soil for some fanatical Hitler to repeat sadistic history in this country. It would lay us open to pillage and destruction and turn civilization back to the Dark Ages. Thus far anti-Semitism cannot be charged to the American people. We have received the Jewish people with open arms and have accorded them places of honor and responsibility. They have contributed much to American wealth and culture. There is no better judge on the United States Supreme Court than Felix Frankfurter, himself a Jewish immigrant. Many of the finest and ablest Members of Congress are Jews. A few years ago I made a speech entitled, "Distinguished Citizens of Foreign Birth," and paid especial tribute to the dean of the House of Representatives, the Honorable ADOLPH SABATH, of Chicago, who was himself a Jewish immigrant. At least two of the five members of our all-important Atomic Commission are persons of Jewish faith. We have never sought to impose any restrictions of any kind upon Jewish immigration. According to the American Jewish Yearbook for 1946–47, published by the American Jewish Committee, we had in this country in 1907 only 1,776,885 Jews. In 1927 this number had grown to 4,228,029; in 1946, to 5,000,000, or approximately one-half of all the Jews left in the world. According to this same authority, from 1937 to 1943, by yearly averages, more than 60 percent of all immigration into this country was Jewish. In 1943, by Executive order, the word "Jew" or "Hebrew" was eliminated from immigration papers. In 1944 Jewish authorities claimed more than 400,000 Jewish aliens in this country. No one denies our generosity toward this persecuted race. But they should not insist upon our opening our doors to the ends of the earth.

Here, Mr. Speaker, is what I want to say to our good Jewish citizens. When they band themselves together in Jewish organizations, when they use their power and influence for obviously selfish purposes, when they seek to control the press and radio for selfish ends, when they conspire to destroy immigration barriers, they stimulate and promote anti-Semitism within this country to the serious detriment of all. Unless they desist and refrain from such activity they will bring great sorrow upon this Nation. For the sake of all the Jews, as well as the rest of us, they must not become a minority pressure group in this country.

THE CHURCH GROUP

Mr. Speaker, a good many ministers in this country, including some prominent in my own denomination, have aligned themselves with those who seek to break down our immigration laws. Most of them have been deceived by these cries for help. Acting on wrong information, they have allowed their hearts to overcome their better judgment. They have either wittingly or unwittingly aligned themselves with those who would do this country a great disservice. A few of our prominent ministers have so confused religion and politics that they no longer render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, nor unto God the things that are God's. In restrictive and selective immigration we seek to protect the spiritual as well as the material values of this country. To my preacher friends I wish to say that in your support of the Stratton bill you have gone far beyond the bounds of Christian charity. The good Samaritan stopped on the road to Jericho to minister to the man who had fallen among thieves. He dressed his wounds and he carried him to an inn, and he paid for his lodging. This we have done, and more. The good Samaritan did not, however, take the stranger home with him or open up his household to the stranger's family for permanent abode. If the Federal Council of Churches and other religious groups who have been beating the drums for the Stratton bill should succeed in their campaign of dumping the refugees of Europe into this country they will simply add to the long line of crimes that have been committed in the name of the Church and of the Holy Religion.

ARGUMENTS SUMMARIZED

Mr. Speaker, the arguments of those who seek to open our doors to the refugees of Europe may be summarized as follows: They have no place to go; they will make useful citizens; they will be carefully screened; we need their talents and abilities; we have not done our fair share; we have a moral responsibility to take them. We have shown all these arguments to be without any foundation whatsoever. We hope, Mr. Speaker, this country will not be misled by any false appeals to our generosity.

ON OUR SIDE

I am happy to report that a vast majority of the great patriotic societies and organizations of this country, including the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, have not been misled by the volume of propaganda in behalf of the Stratton bill. They realize its folly and its dangers; they recognize it as a major attempt to break down our immigration laws. Like most of the members of our committee, they believe that immigration bars should be raised, not lowered; that we should select immigrants with greater, not less, care.

CONCLUSION

Mr. Speaker, those of us who speak out against the Stratton bill will be ridiculed by that certain type of intellectual who has contempt for all established institutions; by those ultra-liberals who would equalize everybody by reducing all to the lowest common denominator; by the crackpots who think anything foreign is better than anything American; and by those misguided humanitarians who would throw their doors open to any and all who knock.

Mr. Speaker, if loving one's own folks just a little better than one loves strangers is bigotry, then I am a bigot. If seeking to defend American ideals and institutions is intolerance, then I am intolerant. If thinking this country of ours is the best in the world and wanting it to remain so is chauvinism, then I am chauvinistic.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, our country has not and will not shirk her many responsibilities. She will serve humanity most through the preservation of her integrity and her institutions. Not through weakness and compromise, but through strength and justness, will she lead a fear-crazed, hate-ridden world along the paths of peace. And in these efforts, I am sure all of us will join the immortal Stephen Decatur in saying:

> Our country! In her intercourse with foreign nations may she always be right; but our country, right or wrong!

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCDOWELL). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSSETT. I yield.

Mr. FISHER. The gentleman has made a very splendid discussion of this very important subject which now has the attention of the entire country. I should like to commend him for the many interesting and very pertinent facts that have been disclosed during this discussion. I have heard the arguments made in connection with the discussion of this subject recently, that the admission of these displaced persons at this time

would strengthen our economy and promote prosperity. What is the gentleman's reaction to that argument?

Mr. GOSSETT. I may say to the gentleman, we are now admitting to this country, through normal channels and through illegal entry, in the neighborhood of two or three hundred thousand immigrants, many of whom are refugees. The evidence shows that those who are now coming here have little to offer; that less than 1 percent of those who came last year went to the farms; that practically all of them, 95 percent of them, at least, settled in the big cities of the country, adding to the slum problem. They are going to aggravate all of the social, political, and economic problems with which we are now struggling—housing, jobs, and so on. We do not need workers. We do not need nonworkers. These people certainly would be liabilities and not assets.

Mr. FISHER. It is true that if a large number of people has any connection with prosperity, then such countries as India and China would be the most prosperous in the world today.

Mr. GOSSETT. I think that is logical; yes.

Mr. FISHER. At the present time, about how many of the so-called displaced persons are being admitted to this country each month?

Mr. GOSSETT. There are no accurate figures on that, but many thousands are coming.

Mr. FISHER. Would that approximate 1,600 a month?

Mr. GOSSETT. I could not answer that question. I am sure it would be at least that many. I know a great many are coming in. I may say that the cream has been skimmed off of those camps. England has admitted many workers. Australia is seeking workers. By and large those who are able to do things have been screened out and have gone elsewhere.

Mr. FISHER. It is the gentleman's position, then, that if the Stratton bill should be enacted, it would mean the scrapping or the scuttling of our quota system that has been the immigration policy of this country since 1924, and probably would be the beginning of a break-down in our entire immigration policy and system, and would mean not just the bringing in of 400,000 but probably several times that many, before it could be stopped, if it is ever stopped?

Mr. GOSSETT. I think unquestionably the passage of the Stratton bill or any similar bill would completely destroy the policy and the whole immigration structure that we set up in 1924.

Mr. FISHER. On that point, there would be many people becoming eligible for entry over and above the quota.

Mr. GOSSETT. That is true. If we brought 400,000 here, as fast as they became naturalized citizens they could bring in their spouses and minor children over and above and outside of the quota; and, of course, they would be continually trying to bring in their aunts, uncles, cousins, and all the rest of their kin. The 400,000 figure would just be an original installment.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker.

H. R. 2700. An act making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 53. An act conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Harold Turcean;

S. 394. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Raymond Wesley Doyle;

S. 396. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Thurlow Grey Doyle;

S. 397. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Lawrence Stanley Doyle;

S. 398. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Spencer Burgess Doyle; and

S. 399. An act authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Gladys May Doyle.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 3, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

883. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 74 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension; to the committee on the Judiciary.

884. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting a report of its activities and expenditures for the month of January 1947; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

885. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Defense Homes Corporation for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1945 and 1946 (H. Doc. No. 375); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 489. A bill for the relief of the city of El Paso, Tex.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 775). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPRINGER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1466. A bill authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to allow credits to and relieve certain disbursing and certifying officers of the War and Navy Departments in the settlement of certain accounts; with an amendment (Rept. No. 776). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 267. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 3813, a bill to provide for removal from, and the prevention of appointment to, offices or positions in the executive branch of the Government of persons who are found to be disloyal to the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 777). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 268. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 1602, a bill to establish within the Department of the Interior a National Minerals Resources Division, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 778). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SADLAK: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R 3075. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, relating to the classification and compensation of employees of the postal service, so as to provide proper recompense in the form of compensatory time for overtime performed by supervisors; without amendment (Rept. No. 779). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 4007. A bill to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 780). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POTTS: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Report pursuant to House Resolution 36 (80th Cong., 1st sess.), to continue the investigation by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries began under House Resolution 287, Seventy-seventh Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 781). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 3314. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 783). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLACKNEY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 4017. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to provide that bonds issued under such act shall be redeemable at any time after September 1, 1947, to permit settlement and compensation under such act to be made in cash, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 784). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Report pursuant to House Resolutions 90 and 100, investigation of disposition of surplus property; without amendment (Rept. No. 785). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOFFMAN: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Report pursuant to House Resolutions 90 and 197, participation of Federal officials in health workshops; without amendment (Rept. No. 786). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 434. A bill for the relief of Lewis H.

Rich; with an amendment (Rept. No. 761). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 439. A bill for the relief of Roy Durbin; without amendment (Rept. No. 762). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 618. A bill for the relief of Fred O. Donohue; without amendment (Rept. No. 763). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1534. A bill for the relief of Graff, Washbourne & Dunn; with an amendment (Rept. No. 764). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1781. A bill for the relief of Annie L. Taylor and William Benjamin Taylor; with amendments (Rept. No. 765). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2373. A bill for the relief of Stanley-Yelverton, Inc.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 766). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2374. A bill for the relief of Nita H. Stanley; with an amendment (Rept. No. 767). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2696. A bill for the relief of Otto Kraus, receiver of the Neafie & Levy Ship & Engine Building Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 768). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPRINGER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2811. A bill for the relief of G. F. Allen, former Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 769). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3118. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Susan W. Roe; with an amendment (Rept. No. 770). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3168. A bill for the relief of Antone G. Pina; without amendment (Rept. No. 771). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3361. A bill for the relief of J. Rutledge Alford; without amendment (Rept. No. 772). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 851. An act for the relief of Belmont Properties Corp.; without amendment (Rept. No. 773). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. REEVES: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 358. An act to provide for settling certain indebtedness connected with Pershing Hall, a memorial in Paris, France; with amendments (Rept. No. 774). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois:

H. R. 4065. A bill to provide for the placing upon all gifts from the American people indelible markings with respect to their origin, destination, and unsalability; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRADLEY:

H. R. 4066. A bill to provide increases in the rates of pension payable to veterans of the Indian wars and their dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. R. 4067. A bill to provide that clerks in third-class post offices who are required to perform service on Saturdays, Sundays, or holidays shall be allowed compensatory time for such service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 4068. A bill to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to construct a building for the General Accounting Office on square 518 in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KNUTSON:

H. R. 4069. A bill to terminate certain tax provisions before the end of World War II; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H. R. 4070. A bill to carry into effect certain parts relating to patents of the treaties of peace with Italy, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania, ratified by the Senate on June 5, 1947, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Connecticut:

H. R. 4071. A bill to amend sections 301 (k) and 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee:

H. R. 4072. A bill to authorize the appointment as officers in the Regular Establishments of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of enlisted men who served as officers under combat conditions; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 4073. A bill to provide a more satisfactory program of benefits relating to active service in the armed forces of the Commonwealth of the Philippines during World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 4074. A bill for the relief of Evans County, Ga.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 4075. A bill to regulate commerce among the several States, with the Territories and possessions of the United States, and with foreign countries; to protect the welfare of consumers of sugars and of those engaged in the domestic sugar-producing industries; to promote the export trade of the United States; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York:

H. R. 4076. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to proceed with construction at military installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 4077. A bill to authorize assistance to certain veterans in acquiring specially adapted housing which they require by reason of the nature of their service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 4078. A bill to broaden the cooperative extension system as established in the act of May 8, 1914, and acts supplemental thereto, by providing for cooperative extension work between colleges receiving the benefits of this act and the acts of July 2, 1862, and August 30, 1890, and other qualified colleges, universities, and research agencies, and the United States Department of Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H. R. 4079. A bill to amend the Taylor Grazing Act of June 28, 1934 (48 Stat. 1269), as amended June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1976); to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 4080. A bill to reduce the surtax, increase the personal exemption, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. Res. 269. Resolution for a special committee to investigate the court martial of Lt. Comdr. Edward N. Little; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to place an embargo on all oil and products thereof to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; to the Committee or Armed Services.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 4081. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain lands in the State of Montana to James A. Hansen; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 4082. A bill for the relief of Naomi Sheila Gorby; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

712. By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of Aquinas Council, No. 757, Knights of Columbus, endorsing H. R 2910 and urging its enactment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

713. Also, petition of the Council of the City of New York, petitioning the Department of the Interior to declare St. Ann's Church of Morrisania a national historic site; to the Committee on Public Lands.

714. By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Petition of the House of Representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts in favor of the enactment of the Reed bill, H. R. 3237; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

715. Also, petition of the Massachusetts House of Representatives, to place an embargo on all exports of gasoline and oil and products thereof to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; to the Committee on Armed Services.

716. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the City Council of the City of Providence, R. I., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to passage of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.